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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; AčarHLPatm 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 Ačaryan’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 mijin 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 Ačaryan’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 Ačaryan’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 Łarabal, 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  
- **H**: laryngeal  
- **R**: resonant  
- **N**: nasal  
- **V**: vowel  
- `<` developed from  
- `>` developed into  
- `<<` replaced analogically by  
- `>>` analogically replacing  
- `<...>` omitted part of text  
- `*` reconstructed form  
- `+` and later

### Abbreviations of languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeol.</td>
<td>Aeolic Greek</td>
<td>Etrusc.</td>
<td>Etruscan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afgh.</td>
<td>Afghan</td>
<td>Finn.</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akkad.</td>
<td>Akkadian</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alb.</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>Fris.</td>
<td>Frisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>FUGr.</td>
<td>Finno-Ugric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aram.</td>
<td>Aramaic</td>
<td>Gaul.</td>
<td>Gaulish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm.</td>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td>Germ.</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assyr.</td>
<td>Assyrian</td>
<td>Goth.</td>
<td>Gothic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>Attic Greek</td>
<td>Gr.</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>Avestan</td>
<td>GZ</td>
<td>Georgian-Zan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balt.</td>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td>Hatt.</td>
<td>Hattic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashk.</td>
<td>Bashkir</td>
<td>Hebr.</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeot.</td>
<td>Boeotian Greek</td>
<td>Hitt.</td>
<td>Hittite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bret.</td>
<td>Breton</td>
<td>HLuw.</td>
<td>Hieroglyphic Luwian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSL.</td>
<td>Balto-Slavic</td>
<td>Hom.</td>
<td>Homeric Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddh.</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Hung.</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulg.</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Hurr.</td>
<td>Hurrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byel.</td>
<td>Byelorussian</td>
<td>Ic.</td>
<td>Icelandic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celt.</td>
<td>Celtic</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin.</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Ilr.</td>
<td>Indo-Iranian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIArm.</td>
<td>Classical Armenian</td>
<td>Illyr.</td>
<td>Illyrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLuw.</td>
<td>Cuneiform Luwian</td>
<td>Ion.</td>
<td>Ionian Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cret.</td>
<td>Cretan Greek</td>
<td>Khot.</td>
<td>Khotanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan.</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>Khwar.</td>
<td>Khwarezmian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dor.</td>
<td>Doric Greek</td>
<td>Kurd.</td>
<td>Kurdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECAuc.</td>
<td>East Caucasian</td>
<td>Lat.</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt.</td>
<td>Egyptian</td>
<td>Latv.</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engl.</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Lezg.</td>
<td>Lezgian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EpArm.</td>
<td>Epic Armenian</td>
<td>Lith.</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Language or Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luw.</td>
<td>Luwian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyc.</td>
<td>Lycian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maced.</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Middle Irish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManMPers.</td>
<td>Manichaean Middle Persian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ManParth.</td>
<td>Manichaean Parthian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megr.</td>
<td>Megrelian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModArm.</td>
<td>Modern Armenian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHG</td>
<td>Middle High German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPers.</td>
<td>Middle Persian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myc.</td>
<td>Mycenaean Greek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norw.</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPers.</td>
<td>New Persian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-</td>
<td>Old &lt;...&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavonic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>Old High German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Old Prussian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osc.</td>
<td>Oscan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oss.</td>
<td>Ossetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P. | Proto-
| Pahl. | Pahlavi |
| Pal. | Palaic |
| Parth. | Parthian |
| Phryg. | Phrygian |
| PIE | Proto-Indo-European |
| Pbl. | Polabian |
| PN Cau c. | Proto-North-Caucasian |
| Pol. | Polish |
| QIE | Quasi-Indo-European |
| Russ. | Russian |
| Sax. | Saxon |
| Sem. | Semitic |
| SerbCS | Serbian Church Slavonic |
| Skt. | Sanskrit |
| Slav(on)ic | Slavonic |
| Slovene | Slovene |
| Swedish | Swedish |
| Toch. | Tocharian |
| Turk. | Turkish |
| Turkmen | Turkmen |
| Ukr. | Ukrainian |
| Uzb. | Uzbek |
| Urart. | Urartian |
| Uygh. | Uyghur |
| Uyghur | Uyghur |
| Vedic Sanskrit | Vedic Sanskrit |
| West Caucasian | West Caucasian |
| Young Avestan | 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
- aorist
- Gd = Gedenkschrift
- AV = Atharva-Veda
- g(en). = genitive
- c. = commune
- 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
- imperative
- dial. = dialectal
- impf. = imperfect
- dimin. = diminutive
- inf. = infinitive
- du. = dual
- i(nstr.) = instrumental
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intrans.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iter.</td>
<td>iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>line (with the ‘minus’ sign [-] when counted from the bottom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lex.</td>
<td>in lexicographic works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literal(ly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MedPont</td>
<td>Mediterranean-Pontic substratum (a conventional term; see 3.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW</td>
<td>loanword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>north(ern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl.</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op. cit.</td>
<td>opere citato, in the work quoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.c.</td>
<td>personal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>proterodynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perf.</td>
<td>perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pers. pron.</td>
<td>personal pronoun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pl(ur.)</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. tant.</td>
<td>plural only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prep.</td>
<td>preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prob.</td>
<td>probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ref.</td>
<td>references</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV</td>
<td>Rig-Veda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>south(ern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subj.</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subst.</td>
<td>substantive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.v.</td>
<td>sub verbo, under the lemma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trans.</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viz.</td>
<td>videlicet, namely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voc.</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vol(s).</td>
<td>volume(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs.</td>
<td>versus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>west(ern)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yt.</td>
<td>Yašt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YV</td>
<td>Yajur-Veda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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: 223-224) 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 Ačyan (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-ue’-anem, 3sg.aor. agoye ‘to dress someone, make put on clothes; to put into rings’ (Bible+), ag-oyc’, i-stem: IPl 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. aubra ‘footwear’, Lat. induo, -ere ‘to put on, dress oneself in; to assume; to fall or be impaled (upon)’, OCS ob-uti ‘to put on footwear’, Lith. aiti ‘foot-cloth, rag’, aiti ‘to put on footwear’, Latv. aits ‘cloth, bandage’, see Hübßchmann 1897: 411; Açaüen 1908: 121a; Lidén 1933: 41; HAB 1: 75-76; Pokorny 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-o’-oc’ ‘cover, coat, garment; blanket’.

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

However, if Hitt. umu-zi ‘to adorn, decorate, lay (the table)’ belongs with aganim, etc. and derives from PIE *h₂u-něu-ti and *h₂u-mu-enti (see Kloekhorst 2008: 918-920; cf. also Eichner 1978: 151₂₈), the Armenian forms hag- and ag- may be
aganim

explained from *h₂eu- (*hoganim > haganim, see, however, s.v. hoviw ‘shepherd’) and *h₂ou- (*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-.


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 avt’, i-stem ‘sleeping place, spending the night’.

ETYM Connected with Gr. αὐ̃λις, -ιδος f. ‘tent or place for passing the night in’, iaiôw ‘to sleep, spend the night’, aor. ἰασα, 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 *h₂uès-, cf. Hitt. hius- ‘to live’, Skt. vasati, ávasat, vásant- ‘to stay, dwell, spend the night’, etc.; Gr. iaiôw ‘to sleep, spend the night’ is a reduplicated present from *h₂i-h₂eu-; 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, 223-225.

An IE *h₂uV- would yield Arm. *gV-. One therefore derives ag- from a full-grade *h₂eu- (Polomé 1980: 28; cf. also Eichner 1978: 151, 151-28). This would give Arm. *haw/g-, however. More probably we can posit PArm. *ag- < *aw(h)- < QIE zero grade *h₂us- (for the development, see s.v. ayg ‘morning’). This zero grade form may be corroborated by avt’, 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 avt- ‘place to spend the night’ < *ou-ti- (cf. the vocalic development in ayt ‘cheek’). This view is improbable as far as avt- is concerned because: 1) I prefer a different analysis for ayt ‘cheek’ (q.v.); 2) avt’, i-stem is most probably a *-ti-derivative and is likely derived from a zero-grade root *h₂us- or, perhaps better, PArm. *aw- < *ag- from *h₂us- (see s.v. awt’).

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

For the contextual relatedness with art ‘cornfield, tilled field’ (q.v.) cf. e.g. Isaiah 27:4: pahel zōc artay yagaraki : φολιάσανην καλάμην ἐν ἑρέῳ.

In Agat’angeloś § 126 (1909= 1980: 73-74), 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’, sên ‘village’, geôl ‘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*.


●**DIAL** No dialectal evidence is recorded in HAB 1: 77. Here Ačaryan 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 Xotorjur *agruk* ‘country-house, bower, summer place’ [YušamXotorj 1964: 459].

●**ETYM** Since long, connected with Gr. ἀγρός ‘field’, Lat. ager m. ‘field’, Skt. ájra- m. ‘field, plain’, etc. Since these forms go back to PIE *h2eĝ-ro-* which cannot yield Arm. *agarak*, Ačaryan (HAB 1: 77a) assumes a loan from a lost IE language of Asia Minor. Others (e.g. Karst 1911: 402; Lap’anc’yan 1939: 17; see also Jahukyan 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. *agarak* 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 *agarak* as a loan from Hurr. *avari* ‘field’. He stresses that the Hurrian word would appear in Urartian as *äre*, so Arm. *agarak* must come from Hurrian, not Urartian. According to Jahukyan (1987: 425), this comparison is phonologically possible, but the other etymology is more probable.

agli, Gġg aw-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 əst manut’ean karčii, ew xayt’oe’ yagis noc’a (Revelation 9.10); Agik’ noc’a manut’iwen əji. (Revelation 9.19). In these passages Arm. agi (= Gr. ὀὐρά) refers to the tails of scorpions and snakes.


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 Ačaryan’s statement (see HAB 1: 77b).

A meaning ‘penis’ can be deduced from agat ‘whose penis is cut off’ used by Grigor T’at’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, Hačan, Aslanbek, Xarberd, Rotost’o, Akn, Sebastia, Jt’, Aläskert, Suč’ava [HAB 1: 78a], Papen, Xotırjur [HayLezBrbaar 1, 2001: 3b]; Svedia [Andreasyan 1967: 352a];

The initial hā- in Šatax hākyi regularly corresponds to Van ā- in ākyi (see M. Muradyan 1962: 25, 33, 76, 172, 191a). Ačařyan (1952: 24f) does not explain this ā- > Van ā- development. Bearing in mind that the Classical y- yields voiced h- in Šatax whereas it disappears in Van (see Ačařyan 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-BrbBar 1, 2001: 3b].

In most of the dialects, the word generally means ‘tail’ (as stressed byAčařyan 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), Ačařyan and Svedia. Svedia is particularly interesting, for here we have a contrast: ağa ‘tail’ (< aği), NPI ākəsən ‘tails’: ākäk’ ‘lap’ (< aği-k’) [Andreasyan 1967: 40, 42, 52, 352a]. The latter formation should be interpreted as a common development shared with Ačařyan 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 Alakert we find ‘edge of the spinal column’.

The by-form ağa in Larabal, Goris and partially in Kakʿavberd (see above), has perhaps resulted from a generalization of the oblique stem agw-, cf. Larabal e.g. AblSg hyak’van [S. Harut’yunyan 1965: 94b, Hoɾgo], Kakʿavberd (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’ (ʼnɔc̕r; ʼnɔe̱n) [EtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 479]. This Arm. word demonstrates semantic variety already in the Bible, whereas aği appears in the literature only in the meaning ‘tail’, the other meanings being confined to the dialects; cf. also V. Arāk’elyan 1984: 50.

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

Jahukyan (1967: 191) connects the word to Pol. ogon and Czech ohon ‘tail’ < IE *aǵ- (= *h2eǵ-) ‘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’ < *p(e)h2u- and *hagí 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-iV- > Arm. *(h)agíV- > 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’ (Elišê, see Ter-Minasayan 1989: 404=414), azazanam ‘to become dry’ (Philo), azazem ‘to make dry’ (Vkyak’ arevelic’, Sargs Šnorhali, Čarântir); azaz-un ‘dry, withered’ in Genesis 41:23-24 (said of hast ‘ear of corn’, Zeyt’unyan 1985: 342), Philo, etc.

azbn, -bin, -bamb ‘weft, web, warp’.

azaz-im, azaz-an-am ‘weft, web, warp’.

azaz-un ‘dry, withered’ in Genesis 41:23-24 (said of hast ‘ear of corn’, Zeyt’unyan 1985: 342), Philo, etc.


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

The “pure” root *azb (without -n) is found in two derivatives: azb-a-xumb ‘crowd, rabble’ (P’awstos Buzand 4.5: 1883=1984: 71=74) 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: ṭiç’el anc’anel i veray azbxumb 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. ysha < *(a)zbá- ‘reed’; see the etymological section.
The interpretation of \textit{azbaxumb} should be reconsidered. The first component can in fact be equated with \textit{*asp-} ‘to arm’, a quasi-word based on a re-analysis of \textit{aspazən} and contamination with \textit{aspar} ‘shield’ and \textit{(a)sparapet} ‘commander-in-chief’. A secondary (dialectal?) voicing of sibilants and affricates is not uncommon in Buzand’s History; cf. \textit{Alj’k} < \textit{Alč’k}, \textit{Amaraz} < \textit{Amaras}, \textit{Tzβ} < \textit{Tosp}. So, \textit{azbaxumb} may have been made up to mean ‘armed crowd, rabble’. This suits the context: \textit{azbaxumb zōrut eanc’}.

\textbf{DIAL} Preserved in numerous dialects. A trace of the final -\textit{n}, although lacking even in Goris, Melri and other neighbouring dialects, appears to be found in Lernayin Larabal: \textit{asp} (Larabal, Hadrut, Šalax-Xcaberd, Mehtišen) [Davt’yan 1966: 300]. In what follows, I will only mention data which are relevant for the semantics.

According to HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 106b, the basic dialectal meaning of \textit{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 “rück”) meaning cited in NHB 1: 6b: “the comb-like woof through which the \textit{ařēj’k’} pass; = Turk. \textit{/p’ōčū, p’ūčū”}. Compare \textit{*aspantr} (in many dialects) ‘the comb (\textit{santr}) of \textit{asp}, a part of the loom by which the woven fabric is pushed forward’ [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 106b], as well as \textit{azboc’} ‘weaver’s comb’ (see above).


Compounds \textit{*azbat’el} and \textit{*azbap’ayt} (with \textit{t’el} ‘thread’ and \textit{p’ayt} ‘wood’, respectively, as the second members) are recorded in Melri (\textit{əzbát’il} and \textit{əzbáp’ɛt} [Alayan 1954: 260]) and Larabal (\textit{əspát’il} and \textit{əspáp’ɛt, -əp’at}, etc. [Davt’yan 1966: 300]). Larabal \textit{*azbap’ayt} is cited in HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 7b in the meaning ‘the horizontal thin wood of a (weaver’s) loom on which \textit{azb} is based/put’. No Goris form is recorded in Margaryan 1975. However, Lisic’yan (1969: 158) mentions \textit{aspi p’ɛtnɛr} (= Turk. /küzü-alajl/) and the stick (\textit{čipot}) on it – \textit{aspap’tin čəpat} (= Turk. /küzü-čubuxi/). For additional ethnographic information concerning \textit{azb(n)}, see Lisic’yan 1969: 160-161. Note also \textit{azbel} (in a few dialects) ‘to stretch the \textit{azb-}’s for the weaving’, a process where \textit{aspnkoč}, with \textit{koc’ beam} as a second member (only in Sebastia), is involved, too [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 7b, 106b].

\textbf{SEMANTICS} NHB and HAB specify the meaning of \textit{azbn} as follows: ‘initial edge-threads (glossed as \textit{cop}) of a woven fabric’. The same is stated by Alayan (1954: 260a) concerning Melri \textit{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 \textit{azbel} (in a few dialects) ‘to stretch the \textit{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 \textit{azbel}. 

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

● ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 1: 84b) considers the resemblance with Syriac *azbā ‘pubic or armpit hair’ as accidental. Indeed, it is semantically remote. Then Ačaryan (AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 184; cf. Jahukyan 1985a: 367; 1987: 436-437; 1990: 63) mentions the word in the list of etymologically opaque words, conjecturally of Urartian origin. Jahukyan 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. áthka- m. ‘coat, outer garment’, Gr. ἄτροπα < *ātr-joyā < *ātr-joya ‘set the warp in the loom, i.e. begin the web’, ὄμα, more usual diāmya, -άτος n. ‘warp/Kettenfäden’ (cf. διάζημα ‘to set the warp in the loom, i.e. begin the web’), Alb. endēn(d) ‘weaven; anzetteln’. The Armenian form is derived from *ant-s-mn.

Though semantically attractive (διάργεμα 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 *anjbā rather than *anzbā > azbn”. In my view, this objection is not essential. The developments -j- > -z- in such a cluster and *-Vnz > -Vz are unparalled, 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. skizbn: 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 EWAA 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 ἄργα, assuming “an Arm. sound change *-tm- (> *-tm-) > *-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. διάργεμα 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. ysha = *(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. ḫāš- ‘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. elēgn in Hamšen [HAB 2: 19a; Ačaryan 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-bʰ-η. 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. ἄχος ‘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 *-bh- shared by Armenian and Iranian; cf., apart from skiz-b- ‘beginning’ (see above), also det-b vs. det-in ‘yellow’, surb ‘pure’ (see s.v.v.). Since PIE *H₂ebʰ- ‘to weave’ (cf. Skt. yabh- ‘to bind, fetter’, MPers. waf- ‘to weave’, etc.) seems to be an enlargement of the synonymous *Hei-o- (see Gamkrelidze / Ivanov 1984: 581-585; Klimov 1989: 27; Mallory / Adams 1997: 572a), one may compare the *-bʰ- to that of *H(o)sd-bʰ-.

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

•ETYM The connection with Skt. sákthi-n. ‘thigh’ (RV+), Gr. ἱσχίον 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. ὀσφῦς, -ύος f. ‘loin or loins, lower part of the back’, etc.; see s.vv. oskr ‘bone’), reconstructing *ost-dʰ-ur > *ozdʰur > azdr. Olsen (1999: 149) independently suggests the same etymology, but points out that “the formal divergences are not easily overcome”. The determinative *-dʰ- is not 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: *h₁st-dʰ-. Further, compare asr ‘fleece’ and tarr ‘element’ (see s.v.v.). Hamp (1984: 200) derives Gr. ὀσφῦς from *Host-bʰu(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-bʰ- or the like, though this is uncertain, too.

*ažn-awor

•DIAL Arm. *ažnavor ‘huge man, giant; supernatural being, spirit’ is present in the dialects of Bulanax, Xlat’, Van, Nor Bayazet [HAB 1: 87b], Ararat [Amatuni 1912: 3], Sebastia [Gabikean 1952: 42], Alaškert [Madat’yan 1985: 206a], Svedia, etc. [HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 8a]. In a fairy-tale from Goris, the village of Yayǰi, recorded in Yerevan in 1969 (HZHek’ 7, 1979: 507),: min ažnavar arč ‘a giant bear’.

S. Avagyan (1978: 176a) records ažnav ‘a mythical giant man’ in Arčak (close to Van). On the road to Arčak – Van, there is a heap of stones called Ažnavur kerezman “grave of Ažnavur”, 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, 71) points out that the word aznawur denotes “die Urbevohner Armeniens” and is equivalent to dew.

For other textual illustrations, see Mik’ayelyan 1980: 14a 116f, 15a 124 (Nor Bayazet).

In Gomer, aznahur is recorded [HayLezBrbBar’t 1, 2001: 8a]. The -h- instead of -w- is also seen in *anjnahur (see below).

In the meaning ‘nobleman’: Šatax āznävwur [M. Muradyan 1962: 208a]; Akn aznavour (as a personal-name) [Gabriëlean 1912: 233].

**ETYM** According to Ac’āryan (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 SasCr 2/2, 1951: 821; Petoyan 1965: 380], but rather continues ClArm. anjn-awor ‘subsistent; breathing’ < ‘body/soul possessing’ (Eznik Kolbac’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, Ač’āryan (HAB 1: 204a) mentions only Aparan anjnahur ‘a mythical being’, stating that it is a reshaped form of *aznavor < Caucasian aznauri ‘nobleman’. As we saw, however, the form anjnavor 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-āvār ‘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.). Ac’āryan (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 Šırak (HZHek’ 4, 1963: 154-155): mek vișap, mek dew, ya uriš me janavar “a dragon, a devil, or another janavar”; oč’ dew guv, oč’ vișap, oč’ et 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. anj-n-awor.

Turk. ʿaznavir ‘vengeful, cruel, fierce, big and strong’ and Pers. āznāvur (in Steingass 45a: āznāvur ‘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. āznāvur ‘noble’.

alawunk’, alawsunk’ ‘Pleiades’.


In Barğirk’ havoc’ (see Amalyan 1975: 8N128), alawun, var. alasun, is rendered by bazmast or bazum ast or erroneously bazmata (cf. HAB 1: 9, 92a) ‘Pleiades’.

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

●ETYM No etymology in HAB 1: 92a. Ėahukyan (1963a: 86; cf. 1987: 270, with some reservation) connects the word to alawni ‘dove’ deriving both from *alau- ‘white, shiny’ and comparing also *albho-, read *h₂elbho-. This etymology is uncertain, since the only (cited) evidence for *-a-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 alawni, regardless of the ultimate origin of the latter. However, neither this would be convincing because, first: -l- instead of -l- is not explained; second, the origin of -s- remains obscure; third, alawni ‘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 Ėahukyan’s etymology stating that the -s- is a determinative, and treating the -n- as from the determinative *-b²-. See also S. Grigoryan 1988: 192. None of the authors specifies the origin of the -s-.

There is synonymous alabasar (only in P’eštBaṙ 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 \textit{alaw(s)unk} ‘Pleiades’ from \textit{y-olov} ‘many’ (< *polh1us, cf. Gr. \textit{πολύς} ‘many’, Skt. \textit{purū-}, etc.). It is remarkable that the Iranian (YAv. API f \textit{paoririæinius} < \textit{parpijanī}-, NPers. \textit{parvin}, etc.) and the Greek (\textit{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 \textit{alawni ‘dove’} (see above for the criticism) and Hurrian \textit{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 \textit{gel-} (cf. Russ. \textit{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 \textit{πλέω}), etc. [Scherer 1953: 143f; 1974: 18918].

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

Celtic \textit{*lu-uo} ‘viel’ from \textit{*plh₁u-o-} (see Zimmer 1997: 354-355) seems particularly interesting. If containing the heteroclitic suffix \textit{*-er/n-}, it matches \textit{alawunk} and helps to reconstruct a paradigm identical with that of \textit{harawunk}, cf. Gr. \textit{ἀρουρα f. ‘tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields’}, etc.

At last, one might also take into consideration Karst’s (1948: 79) brief note in which he compares \textit{alaw(s)unk} with Turan. Pers. \textit{aliśs, ulus ‘troupe, foule’}. This is uncertain, however.

\textbf{alewr}. \textbf{alwr}. GDSg \textit{aler} (later also \textit{o}-stem) ‘flour’ (Bible+).

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

\textbullet ETYM Belongs with the family of \textit{alam} ‘to grind’ (q.v.), cf. especially Gr. \textit{ἄλευρον n., mostly in pl. \textit{ἄλευρα}, also \textit{ἄλευρος f. ‘flour’} [Hübschmann 1897: 414; HAB 1: 94b].

Usually, \textit{*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 \textit{*h₂(e)leh₁uro-}, which does not agree with Kortlandt’s view on the loss of \textit{w} (see 2.1.33.1). Eichner (ibid. 153-154) derives \textit{alwr} ‘flour’, \textit{albwr} ‘well, spring’, etc. from nominative \textit{*-ewr}, assuming a subsequent development \textit{-iwr > -ewr} analogically after the genitive \textit{-er}, which in turn has
ali-k'

derived, he says, from *-ewros, a replacement of an original *-ewn(os). Clackson (1994: 94) considers this explanation as entirely ad hoc, since the oblique stem of the word for ‘spring’ must have been *bhrun-, 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 -ɫ-. 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. ἀλέυρον, and concludes: “Clearly, the appearance of Arm. alewr instead of *aɫewr 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-ur̥. 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 aɫer see HAB 4: 628a, etc. (for more detail and references, see 2.1.33.1).

ali-k', (plurale tantum), ea-stem: GDPl ale-a-c', AblPl y-ale-a-c', IPl 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 Łarabał alakçena (Lisic’yan 1981: 67a, in the context of the sea at the 7th heaven); Ararat alēkorcum (Nawasardeanc' 1903: 6a), cf. alēkorcumn attested in Augustinos Bajec’i (HAB 2: 616a).


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; Ravnaes 1991: 11-12, 92; Witzak 1999: 176; Olsen 1999: 496-498; Beeckes 2003: 156, 171). It has been suggested that the initial *ḥ- of the
...
\textbf{axaz}, GDPI \textit{axaz-a-c}' ‘ermine, mustela alba’.

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

\begin{quote}
\textit{Nmanin ofaxohk ‘axazac’, ork’ t’ohun zink’eans ambřil yorsordac’ k’an t’ě šatuxil} “The righteous (people) resemble ermines, which prefer to let themselves be caught by hunters rather than to sin”. The source, that is Kaf. ar leh., is missing in the bibliographies of both NHB and HAB. Its author seems to be Siměon Lehac’i (17th cent.), of which I find another attestation of \textit{axaz} in ‘Ulegrut’iwn’, in the meaning ‘ermine-fur’; see Akinean 1936: 381\textsuperscript{144}, 421 (citing the Dictionary of Step’anos Roš’ka, 17-18\textsuperscript{th} cent.).
\end{quote}

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

In my view, \textit{axaz} can be explained by a contamination of Arm. \textit{ak’is} ‘weasel’ and Pahl. and NPers. \textit{xaz} ‘marten’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 94). For a thorough discussion, see s.v. \textit{ak’is}.

\textbf{acem} ‘to bring, lead, move, beat, pour, etc.’, later also ‘to cut, shave; to play (a music instrument); to lay an egg’, etc. (Bible+).

\textbf{DIAL} Widespread in the dialects, especially in the meaning ‘to lay eggs’; in the Eastern peripheries (T’iflis, Larabal, Agulis, Jula, etc.): ‘to pour’, ‘to play a music instrument’ [HAB 1: 102]. See also s.v. \textit{acu} ‘garden-bed’. On the epenthetic \textit{-r-} in \textit{*arcu} ‘garden-bed’ and \textit{*arceli} (vs. \textit{ac-eli}) ‘razor’, see 2.1.30.2.


Given the absence of the initial \textit{h-} as the expected reflex of the laryngeal, Clackson (1994: 218) points out: “Kortlandt’s rule that \textit{*h₂-} goes to Armenian \textit{ha}- does not explain \textit{acem} ‘I bring’”. In fact, Kortlandt (1983: 14; 1996a: 56 = 2003: 44, 118; see also Beekes 2003: 175, 182) derived \textit{acem} from \textit{*h₂e-γ-}, cf. Lat. \textit{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 \textit{acem} with the widespread thematic present \textit{*h₂e-γ-ο-} and suggests that the initial \textit{h-} might have been lost “through influence from compound words ending in -\textit{ac}, which were synchronically associated with the verb \textit{acem} (Olsen 1999:231-6)”.

The meaning ‘to play a music instrument’ is derivable from ‘to beat, sling’ (cf. Skt. \textit{aj}- ‘to drive, sling’, \textit{go-ájana} ‘whip, stick for driving cattle’, Arm. \textit{gawazan ‘id.’} from Iranian, etc.).
See also s.v.v. acu ‘garden-bed’, aṙac ‘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, 225; Mvssēs Xoreanac’i 1.3 (1913=1991: 10; Thomson 1978: 69).

The only evidence for the o-declension comes from Middle Armenian: GDPl acu-o-c’, AbPl i yacuoc’ [Mi HayBaṙ 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 Hamsen [Ačaryan 1947: 219], Dersim [Balramyan 1960: 71b], Zeyt’un [Ačaryan 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. ajyənak’ [Ačaryan 2003: 152].

According to Ačaryan (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 J̄uaṙcu [HayLezBrbBaṙ 1, 2001: 100a]. Given the etymology of the word, the -r- should be seen as epenthetic; cf. also ac-el-i ‘razor’ : dial. *arceli (see 2.1.30.2).

Remarkable is the paradigm preserved in Zeyt’un: NPl aj-u-k’, GDPl aj-y-ic’. [Ačaryan 2003: 188]. The other classical words displaying such a paradigm are balan-i-k’ ‘baths’, haras-i-k’ ‘wedding’, vart-i-k’ ‘trousers’ and mavru-k’ ‘beard’ (ibid.). All these words, except for mavru-k’ (GDPl mavru-ac’), have classical -i-k’: GDPl -eac’. Since the classical diphthong ea regularly yields i in Zeyt’un (see Ačaryan 2003: 85), the classical GDPl -eac’ can be seen as directly continued by Zeyt’un GDPl -ic’. This would imply that the Zeyt’un word under discussion may presuppose 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. *acu-i (> class. acu), NPl *acu-i (> class. NPl *acu-i-k’, GDPl *acu-eac’).

One would perhaps prefer a simpler, analogical solution, particularly given that the word for ‘beard’ (ClArm. mavru-k’, mavru-ac’ : Zeyt’un muyu-k’, muyv-ic’) is irregular, too. However, this word seems analogical after acu-k’ rather than other body-part terms, which in Zeyt’un display different GDPl endings, namely -uc’ and -oc’ (see Ačaryan 2003: 188). The Zeyt’un paradigm of acu-k’ can therefore be viewed as old. The reason for the analogical influence 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. GDAblPl (yjacuoc’) (see above) may be seen in Svedia / Musa-Ler, in the refrain of a famous dance-song (YušMusLer 1970: 222): Ku gir mnir ećac’q / orka nuuí kir eêr cuc’g “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. ajati, Gr. ἄγω ‘lead’ (Il.), etc. [HAB 1: 101-102]. Arm. acu is directly compared with Gr. ἄγυια, pl. ἄγυιαι f. ‘street, road’ (Il.) and interpreted as a perfect participle *-us-ieh₂- (see Jahukyan 1987: 241; cf. Clackson 1994: 225-226).

After a thorough examination of the Greek word, however, Szemerényi (1964: 206-208) concludes: “It seems therefore clear that the connection of ἄγυια and ἄγω is nothing more than popular etymology, probably overlying and obscuring an indigenous word”, see also Beekes 1998: 25 and his 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-ieh₂- > PArm. *acú-i > ClArm. acu, NPI *aǵus-ih₂-es > *acu-i-k’, oblique *aǵus-ieh₂- > PArm. *acu-ia- > GDPl *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.

acu, 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: Τ’xac’an k’an zacux tesilk’ iwreanc’: Ἐσκότασεν ὑπὲρ ἀσβόλην τὸ εἰ̃δος 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’ange ɫkos § 219 (1909=1980: 116); transl. Thomson 1976: 223; see also Norayar Biwzandac’i 1911: 167): ew tesin zi t’xac’eal ēr marmin nora ibrew zacu ɫ (vars. zacux, zacux, zarchi) sewac’eal “and they saw that his body was blackened like coal”. The place-name Acu is found in Step’anos Tarəenc’/Asotik (referring to P’awstos) and Vardan Arewelc’i, in the forms Arjka ɫ and Arcu ɫ, respectively; for a discussion, see s.v. place-name Dalari-k’.

In P’awstos Buzand 3.20 (1883=1984: 45); transl. Garsoïan 1989: 97): Alè, tesèk’ acul, orov erkat’ šolac’usc’uk’, zi zač’s xaresc’uk’ zark’ayis Hayoc’. Èw andèn berin acul, orov xarèn zac’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 Acul, see s.v. place-name Dalari-k’.

Yovhan Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhan Mayragomec’i (7th cent.) mentions acul in a list of sorceries, between at’ ‘salt’ and asleni karmir ‘red thread’. This attestation is not found in NHB or HAB s.v., although NHB (1: 314b) has it s.v. asleni. Here, the word is cited with auslaut -x. The recent edition (2003: 1262b-234), however, has acul. 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’orłak’yan 1981: 147a on Hamšen.
In “Yačaxapatum” 6: acux seaw ꞌanne k’an zstuer “the coal is blacker than the shadow” [NHB 1: 21b].

In Bārgīrk’ hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 9Nr18), acux is rendered by gorceli ‘coal’ (on this word see HAB 4: 646b), mur ‘soot’, and anjol. On the last word, see below.

The verb acxanam (var. acxanam) ‘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: 126-20, 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’ēal, astuacakēk ararin zna yormzddakan 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 Ačaryan (HAB 1: 103a), except for Rodost’o aju, contain an epenthetic -n-: Larabal, Goris ânjul, Šamaxi hanjul (see also Bahramyan 1964: 185), Ararat ânjul, Nor Bayazet anjox, Hačen anjol. Note also Sasun anjox ‘coal’, half-burnt wood’ [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443], and Lazax, etc. (see HayLezBrBBr 1, 2001: 63b, with textual illustrations). Apart from ânjol and ânjul, Larabal has also ânjōhno [Dav’yyan 1966: 301].

As reported by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 103a), the form ânjol is attested in Ėfinērite (17th cent.). He does not mention the testimony of Bārgīrk’ hayoc’, where acux is rendered by three synonyms: gorceli ‘coal’, mur ‘soot’, and anjol (see above). Since *anjol is present in limited areas, namely in the Eastern (Larabal, Ararat, etc.) and extremely South-Western (Sasun and Hačen) dialects, one may take this as an example of affiliation of Bārgīrk’ hayoc’ with the Eastern dialects, especially Larabal, etc. (H. Martirosyan 2008). Note that in an older lexicographic work (abbreviated as HinBr), acux is glossed by gorceli and mur (see NHB 1: 21b), just as in Bārgīrk’ hayoc’; only anjol is missing. If indeed the original gloss did not include anjol, this form may have been added by the compiler/redactor of Bārgīrk’ hayoc’ (probably Eremia from Melri), for whom it was a living form. Note also that, in manuscripts, one finds not only anjol and anjōl, but also anjul, which is reminiscent of doublet forms in Larabal, namely ânjol and ânjul.

●ETYM Since Tēvrīšan and Müller (see HAB 1: 103a ; apud Minassian 1978-79: 22; cf. Hübschmann 1877: 21, without the Armenian form), connected with Skt. âŋgāra- m. ‘coal’ (RV+), Lith. anglis m. ‘coal’, OCS oğlo 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. However, he (1904: 395, 3951) assumes the opposite since, in cases with the alternation l : x, the form with l (> y, x) is the original one. Besides, the l-form is found in P’awstos Buzand, Agat’angełos (both 5th cent.), Yovchan Mandakuni/Mayragomec’i (5th or 7th cent.; not cited in NHB, Hübschmann, HAB), etc., and has, thus, more philological weight. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 103a) follows Hübschmann, explicitly stating that the original form was acul and ascribing the final -x to the probable influence of cux ‘smoke’ (see also Jahukyan 1987: 183). Kētekean (1905), too, treats acul 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 acu and dial. *anjo, but does not even mention acu.

Menëvišan (apud Këtikean 1905: 347-348; see also Ačarjan 1967: 127) draws a comparison with Russ. úgol’ and Germ. Kohle ‘coal’. Pedersen (apud Këtikean 1905: 348) is more inclined towards Germ. Kohle and Ir. giaľ ‘coal’ than the Sanskrit and Balto-Slavic forms. In this case, however, the initial a- of Arm. acal remains unexplained, unless one postulates PIE *Hg(e)ol- (Witzczak 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’.

Ačarjan (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 acu in her list of unknown words. Greppin (1983) did not include the word in his etymological dictionary.

The connection with Skt. ángāra-, Lith. anglis, etc. ‘coal’ seems very plausible. The scepticism of scholars is understandable, since the expected Armenian form should have been *ank(V)l. In order to solve the phonological problems, Saradževa (1986: 46) assumes a by-form of the PIE root with *g- or *g’. Jahukyan (1987: 141, 183) suggests *angoli- > *angiol-, with a metathesis of the -i-. This view cannot be maintained on the following grounds: (1) *g- would have rather yielded -c-; (2) the loss of the nasal in CIArm. 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 *HNg*u- > PArm. *an’k’u- > *auk- > *auc-, with regular palatalization of *g before *u, as in avj ‘snake’, awcanem ‘to anoint’, etc.; see s.v. awji-k ‘collar’; cf. also 2.1.17.3.

If Lat. ignis m., Skt. agni- m., etc. ‘fire’ belong to this PIE word, they may be derived from *h1ongwni- (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/ā)dl- [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 *h1ongw-ol- gen. *h1ng-”l-ōs.

From NSg *-ōl, one would expect Arm. *ā(n/w)cul > *ac(u)l. 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(n/ōng)-ōl- (cf. Skt. ángāra- (although the Sanskrit form may reflect both *-ol-o- and *-ōl-; for *-ol- cf. Gr. ἁσβολος, ἁσβού ‘soot’, see s.vv. aciwn ‘ash’, askn ‘ruby’). This is attractive since it helps explain the loss of -v- by the pretonic position: PArm. *a(w)cul-o- > acu, cf. ačem ‘to grow’ < PArm. *aug-jé-mi vs. Lat. augéō, 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. *anjo may be secondary, as Ačarjan (2003: 139) states for Hačan anjo, drawing a comparison with cases such as masur ‘sweet-brier’ > Hačan mansyu, mec ‘big’ > Zeyt’un minj, šak’ar ‘sugar’ > Zeyt’un šang’oy, etc. Also, Şamuxi hanjul is listed with examples of n-epenthesis [Balramyan 1964: 65]. For Larabal ḏanju/uł (< acu), Davt’yan (1966: 77) cites the example of koriz ‘stone or
Nevertheless, *anjo* is present in the Eastern (Larakbal, Ararat, etc.) and extremely South-Western (Sasun and Haçan) 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, 233, 613) ascribes an etymological value to it. If indeed original, the nasal may have resulted from a generalization of the full-grade nominative *h₁ongw*-öl-<sup>a</sup>-<sup>b</sup>, whereas the sequence *h₁ngw*öl- 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*-of ‘half-burnt wood’ (from *xanj- ‘to scorch, singe’, q.v.), attested from the Bible onwards and dialectically present in the extreme NW (Trapizon, Hamšen, etc.), SW (Syria), and SE (Larakbal, etc.).

If *anjo* is original, *xanj*-of may be treated as an analogical formation after it. Compare also the discussion s.v. *awji*-k ‘collar’.2

**akanj.** i-stem: LocSg y-akanj-i (Epiphrem), ISg akanj-i-w (Paterica), IPI akanj-i-w-k’ (Anania Şirakac‘i, 7<sup>th</sup> cent., A. G. Abrahanyan 1940: 62;<sup>21</sup>); 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.** Dialectically ubiquitous, mostly with metathesis of the nasal: *ankan* [HAB 1: 104b]. On this and on Muš anganj, see 2.1.29. With unclear -o/a- instead of the second -a-: Larabal angüč, anjęg, Šamaxi angyj, Jula angoč, etc. Unchanged: Van-group akanj [Orbeli 2002: 199; Açaşyan 1952: 242; M. Muradyan 1962: 191a], Akn agojn, pl. agož-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 ac‘ ‘eye’ (also a dual), with voicing after nasal [Meillet 1903: 147; 1936: 84; HAB 1: 104b]; further, see Mariés/Meillet apud Minassian 1978-79: 22.

Pisani (1950: 167) assumes *ousen-q”q* > unkn vs. *ausq-q”-i > akanj, with the dual *i*. 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 *h₂ejus-n-ih₁* (cf. e.g. Eichner 1978: 147, 151) would yield Arm. *h₂aganj*. The same holds for *h₁wsnt-ya₁* [≡ *h₁wsnt-ih₁*], reconstructed by Wittczak (1999: 175). Lindeman (1980; 1982: 39) assumes *awsq-n* (cf. Gr. ὀφαρτε < *owsq-t-a* > Arm. *aw(h)an-a + -c’* from ac‘ ‘eye’ with subsequent voicing after nasal. Arriving at *aganj*, he, basing himself upon the idea of voiced aspirates in Armenian, derives akanj from *aganj’ < *ag’ anj’* through dissimilation of aspirates. For other proposals/references, see Jahukyan 1982: 222; Rasmussen 1989: 158-159, 170-171; HAB 1: 104b; Viredaz 2001-02: 29-30, 30.<sup>2</sup>

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;

---

<sup>2</sup> I wonder if Arm. unj ‘soot’ (q.v.) could be connected with these words, deriving from *h₁ongw*-jV-.
akn

Kortlandt 1985b: 10 = 2003: 58. Beekes (2003: 189) notes that the *h₂- of *h₂us-n- (> un-kn ‘ear’) “perhaps lives on in pl. ak-an/k’”, whose further origin is unclear.

I suggest the following solution: *h₂(e/o)us- > PArm. *ag- (cf. s.vv. ayg ‘morning’ and ɛg ‘female’) + suffix -k (as in akn ‘eye’) + dual *-ih₁ = *agkanf > *ak(k)anf > akanf.

According to Lap’anc’yán (1961: 93; 1975: 352; see also Abaev 1978: 48), Arm. akanf has nothing to do with unkn and reflects Zan ʼgʼawanj ‘ear’ from Kartv. (unattested) *qw-ar-, cf. Megr. guţ, etc. He (1975: 352) also assumes that Larabal anguc, etc., with -ur, reflects the labial -w- of the Kartvelian form.1 This is unconvincing and was rightly rejected by Ačăryan (HAB 1: 104b). The resemblance of akanf with some ECauc forms is probably accidental, too (Jahukyan 1987: 611).

akn (singulative), gen. akan, instr. akam-b (Bible+), loc. y-akan (Yovhan Mandakuni); pl. < dual ač-‘k’ (q.v.) ‘eye’ (Bible+); akan, an-stem: GDSg akan, NPI akan-k’ (also akun-k’), API akan-s, GDPl akan-c’, IPl akam-b-k’ ‘gem, precious stone, jewel’ (Bible+); akan, an-stem: GDSg akan, AbISg y-akan-ɛ, NPI akun-k’, API akun-s, AbIPI y-akan-s ‘source, spring’ (Bible+).


The compound akan-a-vč’it ‘crystal-pure, limpid’ is attested twice in T’ovmay Arcruni (Ananun): 4.4 and 4.7 (V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 428L-1, 450L-13; transl. Thomson 1985: 340, 353 [here: 4.3 and 4.6]): *st nmanut’een erkuc’a knavelč’ it “like two fountains near each other” (in this translation, akan-vč’it is omitted); albiwr akanavelč’ “a spring of crystal-pure water”.


Further data can be taken from derivatives: Xarberd *akan-ik ‘fried eggs (unbeaten)’ (see Ačărean 1913: 64a = akan ‘eye’ + diminutive -ik (semantically cf. Russ. glazin’ ya ‘fried eggs’ from glaz ‘eye’). Note also Zeyt’un *akner (though here the eggs are beaten). For alber-akan , GDSg -akan ‘fountain-head, source’ > Balanox h’alborak, h’alborakan, etc., see s.v. albewr ‘spring’.

In all the dialects, except for Larabal, 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: G5g akan, AbI5g akan-en or akan-ic’, NPI akan-er, etc. [Ačăryan 1952: 124; M. Muradyan 1962: 102; Orbeli 2002: 199]. For textual

1 Klimov (1998: 246) reconstructs GZ *qur-.
illustrations of Moks AblSg akn-en “from the fountain-head” cf. two proverbs in Orbeli 2002: 124^\text{206}\text{f}.

In a Gavaš version of the epic “Sasna črė” 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)kw-. For the forms and references, see s.v. ač’-k’ ‘eyes’. The vocalism and the -k- instead of -k’- are disputed.


Kortlandt (1985b: 9 = 2003: 57-58) derives akn and ač’- from PIE AccSg *okw-m and NDu *okw-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 *h3okw- because akn has no h- (noting that it is another example of a prothetic vowel), but does not exclude *h3ok’-. 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. ökkov ‘eye’ (Grammont 1918: 239; Mariés/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. ökkov ‘eye’). The same suffix is also seen in armukn ‘elbow’, mukn ‘mouse’, unkn ‘ear’, etc. (see s.vv.).

I conclude that Arm. akan is composed as PArm. *ak’- (< *h3k’-) + -kon (cf. Gr. ökkov ‘eye’, Arm. un-kn ‘ear’, etc.) = *ak’kon > *ak(k)n > akan. For the phonological development of such geminates, see s.vv. akanj ‘ear’, ak’atał ‘rooster’. An older reflex of *-k’- 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. akan ‘eye’).

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

akut’ ‘cookstove’, attested in Vardan Barjrberdc’i (13-14th cent.), Canon Law, and Yaysmawurk’ (AblSg y-akut’-ē). In Bağgirk’ hayoc’ (see Amalyan 1975: 141^\text{10}\text{f}.), akut’ renders xaroyk ‘campfire’. In Canons by Dawit’ Alawkay ordi (12th cent., Ganjak/Kirovabad): Ayl t’ē i t’ondruk’ kam aṙ akut’ merj gtani, <...> [A. Abrahamyan 1952: 54^\text{108}].

● DIAL Ačaryan (HAB 1: 110a) only cites dialect records from Jula, P’ambak, and Šamači. Mehri and Areš must be added here [Alayan 1954: 260b; Lusenc’ 1982: 195b]. The word also seems to be found in dialects of the Van-group: Šatax h’ängyüt’ ‘= oǰax’ 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 \(\ddot{a}\); 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; Aćāryan 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.

Jahukyan (1967: 151) lists akut’ among words showing no consonant shift, linking it with the PIE word for ‘oven’: *Hukw*: OIC. ōfn, Gr. ἱρώς; 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. aulla ‘pot’, Goth. aūhns ‘oven’, Skt. ukhā ‘cooking pot’.

However, this looks highly improbable, since the formal problems associated therewith are insurmountable. For another IE etymology, see Witczak 2003: 84. Jahukyan (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.

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

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

alaxin, o-stem, a-stem; note also NPl alaxn-ak’, API alaxn-ay-s, GDP alaxn-a(n)c’ (on declension, see Meillet 1936c: 73; Jahukyan 1959: 264; 1982: 94-95; Tumanjan 1978: 294-295) ‘female servant’ (Bible+).

**ETYM** According to Marr, derived from alx, i-stem ‘lock; ring; furniture, possessions; group of wayfarers, crowd’ (Bible+), in Samuēl Aneć’i (12th cent.): ‘tribe’, the original meaning of which is considered to be ‘house’. Next to the meaning ‘possessions’, in Movsēs Xorenc’i, alx sometimes seems to refer to (coll.) ‘entourage/tribe’, e.g. in 1.12 (1913=1991: 38\(^\circ\), 40\(^\circ\)). See also s.v. alk’at ‘poor, beggar’. Aćāryan (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. ali’ij ‘virgin, girl’. In view of the otherwise unknown suffix -axin, Greppin (1983: 266) considers this problematic and prefers the origin.

Olsen (1999: 470, 770, 776, 836) draws a connection with Lat. ałō ‘to nurse, nourish’, etc., positing IE *(h)l̥h-k-ih1no- with the complex diminutive suffix (cf. Germ. *-ikino- in Germ. Lämmchen, Engl. lambkin, etc.) and interpreting Arm. -x- from *(h)k- by means of “preaspiration”. This etymology (see also s.v. ali’ij ‘girl’), in
particular the theory of “preaspiration” (on which see Olsen 1999: 773-775), is not convincing.


If the basic meaning of *alx* was indeed ‘house, household, possessions, estate’, the derivation of *alaxin* from *alx* (Marr; cf. also Jahukyan 1967: 121) going back to Hurrian and/or Urartian (D’jakonov) is the best solution. For the semantic development, cf. OPers. *mānīna* n. ‘household slave(s)’ from *māna-* ‘house’: OAv. *domāna-* n. ‘house’, Pahl., NPers. *mān* ‘house’, Parth. *mān* ‘house’, Skt. *māna- m. ‘house, building, dwelling’ (RV+), etc. (see Kent 1953: 202b; Mayrhofer EWAA 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 *kurtāš*, cf. YAv. *gorōba-* m. ‘house of daēvic beings’, Pahl. *gāl* [g’l] coll. ‘the gang, the villeins labouring on the estates of the kings, the satraps, the magnates, etc.’, Skt. *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, 333296]; on *kurtāš* 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. *alaxin* is not probable.

**atālak, a-stem: GDsg atālak-i, ISg atālak-a-w (frequent in the Bible) ‘shouting’; atālakem ‘to shout’ (Bible+); dial. *atāl-; interjection atē (Bible+).**

- **DIAL** Zeyt’un *atālb* [Açaryan 2003: 296]; reshaped: Ararat *atāl-ank* ‘cry, lamentation, shout’ [HAB 1: 119a], according to Amatuni (1913: 17b) – ‘curse, scold’. The original verbal root *atāl- has been preserved in Axalc’xa *atāl* ‘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 onomatopoetic nature of the word, Ačaryan (HAB 1: 119a) is sceptical about the numerous attempts to connect the Armenian words with Gr. *ἀλαλαί* (interjection) ‘cry of war’, *ἀλαλαί* pl. ‘(war)cries, shouting’, *ἀλαληγώς,
ālālaγή ‘shouting’, Skt. alalā, etc. However, the onomatopoeic nature of a word does not necessarily imply that the word cannot be inherited. Positively: Jāhukyan 1987: 111 (cf. 447, 451).

As is pointed out by Olsen (1999: 251), the complete formation of aalak, a-stem ‘shouting’ may theoretically be identical with the cognate Greek noun ālalaγή ‘shouting’. Thus: Arm.-Gr. onomatopoeic *al-al- ‘to shout’, *al-al-ag-eh2-‘shouting’.

alam, aor. alac’, imper. ała ‘to grind’ (Bible+).

In numerous late attestations, the compound fr-alac ‘‘water-mill’ occurs with loss of -r-: jalač, pl. jalač-ani, GDPl jat(a)c’-ac’. This form is represented in NH 2: 669b as a dialectal form. It is widespread in the dialects (see below).

See also s.v. alawri.

DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly as alal. Note also Zeyt’un and Hačan ałəl, Tigranakert ałəl. Larabal and Šamaxi have ałil.

There are also forms with -an- and -ac’-: T’avriz alanəl, Agulis șənləl, C’lina șənləl, Suč’aya ałəc’əl, Rodost’o ałəc’əl. According to Ačærən (HAB 1: 118b), these forms arose in order to distinguish the verb for ‘to grind’ from atem ‘to salt’ (cf. Agulis ałəl [Ačærən 1935: 332], etc.). Then (ibid.), in Larabal, the opposite process has taken place: next to ałıl ‘to grind’, atem ‘to salt’ has been replaced by the compounded verbs ałəv anı1 (ISg of al ‘salt’ + ‘to do, make’) and ałəb nil ‘to put into salt(-water’).

The word ał-ən ‘wheat that is (ready to be) taken to water-mill’ (see Ačærən 1913: 89a) is attested in Oɔskip’orik. In Larabal, one finds ałəmən instead, cf. mrəjwən ‘ant’ > mrəjəmən [HAB 1: 118b], q.v.

The r-less form of fr-alac’, namely jalač, jalač-’k (see above), is widespread in the dialects; see Amatuni 1912: 573b; Ačærən 1913: 935. The spread of this form and the operation of the Ačærən’s Law, for example, in Larabal, Hadrat, Šalax čələc‘ (see Dausterity 1966: 464) and Van, Moks, Šatax čələc‘, čələc’ (see Ačærən 1952: 290; M. Muradyan 1962: 16419, 204b; Orbeli 2002: 12629, 279), suggest an early date. In Goris, the -r- has been metathesized: čałəc‘ (see Margaryan 1975: 361b).

ETYM Since 1852 (Ayvazovski’i; see HAB), connected with Gr. āllo ‘to grind’ (probably an athematic present), MInd. ałə ‘flour’, Av. aṣa- (< *arata) ‘ground = gemahlen’, NPers. ārə ‘flour’, etc. [HAB 1: 118a; Hübenschmann 1897: 414; Meillet 1924: 4-6; Pisani 1950a; Mayrhofer EWAia 1: 108; Cheung 2007: 166]; for Hindi aɫə, etc. see also Scheller 1965, for Pers. ās, etc.: Blässing 2000: 35-36.

Meillet (1924: 5) assumes a present nasal infix (*-ln- > Arm. -l-) and treats aor. alac’i as secondary. Klingenschmidt (1982: 93; see also 107, 286) points out that alam “kann entweder auf ein n-Infix-Präsen *hələ-n-ər- zurückgehen [see also Klingenschmidt apud Eicher 1978: 15327] oder aus einem athematischen Wurzelpräsen *həalsər-/*həfələr- entstanden sein”. In the latter case, he reconstructs *hələ- and *həfələ-te for 1PIPres alam-’k’ and 2PlPres ałəy-’k’, respectively, and for the former alternative he mentions Iran. *arna-: Khot. ārr-, Pashto anəl ‘mahlen’. On the problem of *-ln- > Arm. -l-, see op. cit. 242, as well as Clackson 1994: 21927 (with references). See also 2.1.22.8. Lindeman (1982: 40) argues against the derivation of aba- from *hələ-n-ər-, stating that aba- “may represent a
pre-Armenian (secondary) nasal present *aln̄- (of the type seen in *barjnam > barən̄am) which has ousted an earlier athematic present formation”; see also Clackson 1994: 92, 219.22.

With alam: Gr. ἄλξω ‘to grind’ also belong alawr ‘mill; female grinder (of corn)’: Gr. ἀλξηρίς ‘woman who grinds corn’ and alewr ‘flour’: Gr. ἀλέω ‘id.’ (see s.vven.). Hamp (1970: 228) points out the remarkable agreement of Armenian and Greek in this whole family of formations of alam = ἄλξω, 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. alawr and alewr, I basically agree with this view.

**alač’em** ‘to supplicate, beseech; to pray’ (Bible+); alawr’, i-stem ‘prayer’ (q.v.).

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

- **ETYM** Related with alawt’-k’, the latter being a deverbal noun probably in *-ti- (Meillet 1936: 76-77), as well as with ok’ ‘supplication’ (q.v.) and Lat. loquor ‘to speak, talk, say; to mention’ (see Pedersen 1905: 218-219; 1906: 348, 389-390 = Meillet 1936: 76-77), as well as with *-kt- and connects it with Arm. ok’- ‘lamentation, caress, supplication’, ok’- ‘supplication’, otk’- ‘lamentation’. The connection of alawt’-k’ with alač’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; Mariēs / 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; Kortland 1983: 13 = 2003: 43, etc. Berbérain (1974) reconstructs *-kt- ‘to pray, supplicate’ for al-ač’em, al-awt’, and al-ers, and compares this group also to other words such as alamol, aland, alawat, alčat, etc.

Pokorny (1959: 306) places alawt’-k’, otk’, as well as almuk ‘bustle, turmoil, clamour’ under the ‘Schallwurzel’ *el-/*el-, cf. Gr. ἀλοιχώ ‘to cry out loudly, call, moan’, etc. ǧahkian (1987: 121; 1992: 20) derives alač’em and alawt’-k’ from *oleb-je- and *oleb-, respectively, assuming an epenthetic -w-, which is untenable.

Winter (1965: 103-105, 114; see also Polomé 1980: 19; Greppin 1986: 279) derives alawt and alač’- from *pOti- and *pOje- (read *plh-ti- and *plh-te-) linking it with Lat. plōrō ‘to wait, weep’, implōrō ‘to invoke, entreat, appeal to; ask for, help, protection, favours, etc.’, which reflects an *-present *pleh-t-s-.

Klingenschmitt (1970; 1982: 60-61, 68, 93) derives Gr. ἀλάσκωμαι ‘to appease, be merciful’ from reduplicated present *si-slh-,sk/e/-o- and connects it with Arm. ałač’em < *slh-sk/e/o-. However, this would yield *alač’-, thus *sk-je- is more probable, see s.v. *can- ‘to know, be acquainted’ and 2.2.6.1 on čanač’em < QIE *gnh-,sk-je-: For the formation of alawt’, i-stem, see 2.1.22.12. For the problem
of \(*\text{HHC} > \text{ala, see Beekes 1988: 78; 2003: 194; Ravnaes 1991: 91, 99;} \text{Kortlandt 1991 = 2003: 96-97). For a thorough discussion, see Clackson 1994: 37, 173-174.\text{The root \(*\text{selh}_2\) may also be reflected in Lat. sölāri, -ārus 'to console'; etc.; for more cognates and references, see Schrijver 1991: 126; Clackson 1994: 174; sceptical: Greppin 1986: 279\text{,} 289. On the whole, the etymology is quite plausible.\text{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.}\n
\textbf{atatel} 'to lament bitterly' (Karapet Sasnec’i, 12th cent.); dial. \textit{alat} 'caress; supplication'.

\textit{Dial.} Van \textit{atatil} 'to supplicate'; Zeyt’un, Haćan \textit{alid} 'lamentation'; Ganjak \textit{atal} 'love, caress', Lazax, Larabal \textit{atal-ov, atat-atat} 'bitterly (said of weeping)', Lazax, Larabal, Agulis \textit{at-lat-ov} 'bitterly (said of weeping)', Larabal \textit{atal-at-ov line} 'to love very much, caress'; Larabal \textit{atal-palat} 'supplication' [Ačařeăn 1913: 73-74; HAB 1: 122a].

\textit{ETYM} No etymology in HAB 1: 122a.

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

It seems most probable that \textit{atal} is a rhyming formation based on \textit{alač}- and \textit{palat} (q.v.), cf. the compound \textit{alač-palat} in a number of dialects (HAB 4: 14a) and especially Larabal \textit{atal-palat} (see above). Note also \textit{okol} ‘supplication’ vs. \textit{bolok} ‘complain’ (q.v.). Typologically compare Larabal \textit{amč’k-phēk} from \textit{amč} ‘curse’ (Martirosyan/Gharagoyozyan FW 2003, Goris-Larabal).

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

\textbf{a\textit{l}aw\textit{t’}-\textit{k}} (pl. tant.) \textit{i-stem: GDP1 \textit{alawt’} ‘i-c’, IPL \textit{alawt’} ‘i-w-k’ (abundant evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 42-44) ‘prayer’ (Bible+).

\textit{Dial.} Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 138a]. Some dialects have -\textit{c’k} alongside with the normal variants in -\textit{t’k’}: Van \textit{aloc’k}, Zeyt’un \textit{ahōc’k} [HAB 1: 138a; Ačařyăn 1952: 243; 2003: 296]. In both dialects the development \textit{t’} > \textit{c}’ is exceptional and unexplained [Ačařyăn 1952: 59; 2003: 100]. With a further development -\textit{c’k’} > -\textit{sk’} : Sivri-Hisar \textit{atšsk’} (see PtmSivHisHay 1965: 460a).

\textit{ETYM} The word is a deverbal noun based on \textit{alač} ‘em ‘to supplicate’ which may be derived from QIE *\textit{sh}-\textit{sk-je-} or *\textit{plH-sk-je-} or *\textit{H(o)-l)(o)-sk-je-}, see there for an etymological discussion.

Arm. dial. (Van, Zeyt’un, Sivrihisar) \textit{atoc’-k’} < \textit{atōt’-k’} has not been explained. One may assume a dissimilation -\textit{t’k’} > *-\textit{c’k’}, or generalization of API \textit{alōt’-s} > *\textit{atoc’}. Alternatively, the -\textit{c’} might be regarded as an archaic reflex of IE *-\textit{sk}-form (cf. the related verb \textit{alač} ‘em ‘to implore, supplicate’ from *-\textit{sk-je-}). In this respect Georgian \textit{loc’va} ‘prayer’ calls attention. This word is considered an Armenian loan, although Ačařyăn (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. *ašni*. For the absence of the initial a- in Georgian cf. Georg. (aludi 'beer' vs. Arm. awši 'a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage' < QIE *h₂(e)lu-t-i-ijV*.

**açãoni.** **ea-stem:** GDGSg. **ašni**-oy (also **ašni**-oy, e.g. in Genesis 8.9, Zeyt'unyan 1985: 179), GDPI *-ašni*, GDPL. **ašni**-ea-c’ (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 37-38) 'pigeon, dove'.

The above-mentioned paradigm points to *ea-stem*. GDGSg. **ašni**-oy is probably due to haplology from the expected *ašni**-oy*. The same paradigm is also attested in later periods. For instance, in Book of Chries 5.5 (G. Muradyan 1993: 1985: 179), GDPl *-ašni*-s, GDPI. **ašni**-ea-c’ (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 37-38) 'pigeon, dove'.

The dialectal evidence can be grouped as follows:

1. Ašni [Açarayn 1935: 83], Van *ašni* (probably from *ašni*, see Açarayn 1952: 49, 243), Ozim *ašni* / yuq [Açarayn 1952: 243], Salmast *ašni*, *ašni* (see also Dav'tyan 1966: 48, 303), Goris *ašni* (from *ašni* < *ašni*-ak, see Margaryan 1975: 68, 312a), Ararat, Juš *ašni*, T'iflis *ašni* [HAB 1: 123a], Metri *ašni* [Alayan 1954: 62, 261a], Karçewan and Kak’avaberd ouni [H. Muradyan 1960: 45, 188b; 1967: 62, 165a].

The initial *a*- of some dialectal forms is perhaps due to assimilation: *ašni* (-eak). Note e.g. Alasht *ašni* vs. *ašni* (see above), Ararat *ašni* vs. *yelunik* [Markosyan 1989: 296b].

The word **açãoni** is exceptional in that it has not developed into *ašni*. It has been assumed that **açãoni** was pronounced as *ašni*, which is corroborated by dial. *ašni*, etc., whereas the alternant **açãoni** itself is reflected in Agulis, Larabal, Van, etc. *ašni* (Hübßchmann p.e. apud HAB 1: 123; Açarayn 1935: 83; 2003: 84). Similarly, Karst (1901: 28, § 14 = 2002: 37) posits *ašni* in view of Ašni *ašni*. Note also the doublets of the river name nowadays called Hagar: *ašni**-oy* (see Hishanian 1991: 230).

H. Muradyan (1982: 176-177), however, argues against this, positing instead a development *ašni* > *ašni* > *ašni*. 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 syncopa of the medial -a- (12th cent. onwards; 10-11th century.

---

4 A form *ašni*, 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 Ačaryan is therefore preferable.

The reason for the twofold reflection of alawni remains unexplained. I propose to posit a productive -i-derivation (which is frequent in particular with animal names), based on an older n-stem: *alaw-(unj), gen. *alawu>n. The derivation from a single proto-paradigm may also explain the co-existence of the doublets within the same dialects, e.g. Nor Naxijewan alvenik' vs. ałunik' [HAB 1: 123a], Alaškert yelvonag vs. ałunig (see above). The same contrast is seen between very close dialects, e.g. Van yelunik vs. Šatax yelvonek. Note that *yelunek (< elůnek) cannot yield yelvonek, 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 ałunek, K’esab also has alun [Čolak’ean 1986: 194b]. Theoretically, this form may reflect an older *alawun, cf. sołun ‘reptile’ > julun, although ClArm. -un normally yields K’esab -un (op. cit. 34).

Some forms point to an ending -ak rather than -eak or -ik. Beside Partizak elvonag and T’iflis ałunak (see above), here belongs Ararat Hoktemberyan yelunag [Baldasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan 1973: 304]. This form too may testify to an original -i-less form *alaw(unj).

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


This traditional etymology is difficult both formally and semantically (see Greppin 1978: 131-132; 1983: 268-269). Klingenschmitt (1982, 68, 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: 284) and reconstructs *pl̥h₂-b’h₂-n-ih₂-. Compare also Gr. ἀλεες f. ‘wild pigeon’, Op. poalis ‘dove’. These forms probably derive from PIE *pel- ‘grey’ (see Euler 1985: 95; de Vaan 2008: 442), cf. also πολίς ‘grey, grey hair’, Arm. ali-kt’ ‘grey hair; waves’ (q.v.).

The same etymology has independently been considered by Witzczak (1999: 177), who, however, points out that -awni is unexplained and prefers to derive alawni from IE *b₀lōn-iy-o- (cf. Lith. balatūdis ‘dove, pigeon’, Ossetic balon ‘id.’), which is improbable.

Technically speaking, also the forms with -ik presuppose *alawn- or *alōn- + -ik rather than *alawni + -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. *pl̥h₂-bh-ōn- (> PArm. *alawun), gen. *b-ō-n-os (> Lat. *palumb-, for the metathesis cf. PIE *bʰud’no- > Lat. *fundus ‘bottom’, etc., see s.v. *andund-k’ ‘abyss’). We are probably dealing with a Mediterranean word; cf. hypothetical *kɔl(ə)m bó(e) h₂-; Lat. *columba* f. ‘dove, pigeon’ vs. Arm. *salamb*, a-stem ‘francolin’ (q.v.), also a Mediterranean word.

### **alawri**

*ee-stem: GDSg *alawrw-oy, GDPi *alawr-eac* ‘mill; female grinder (of corn)’ (Bible+) [NHB 1: 48c; Clackson 1994: 92, 219₃₁]; later: ‘tooth’ (Grigor Narek’i 63.2). For possible evidence for Arm. *alawr* ‘mill’, see Clackson 1994: 219₃₁.

In Jeremiah 52.11: *i tun alō-reac’ (< εἰς οἰκίαν μύλωνος). Clackson (1994: 92) points out that “the Armenian phrase could denote the house by its occupants”. For the passages from Ecclesiastes, see Olsen 1999: 443₅₁₀.


*ETYM* Belongs with *alam* ‘to grind’ (q.v.); cf. especially Gr. ἀλέτρις ‘woman who grinds corn’. (Hübschmann 1897: 414; HAB 1: 118a; Mariès/Méillet 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: 288₂₂; see also Clackson 1994: 92), the frequently cited Gr. ἀλέτριος appears to be a ghost-word. As *alawri* 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-ih₂-, apparently with the dual *-ih₂-. This is reminiscent of Skt. aráṇ-ı (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 *ala(-) in *alawri* with the verbal stem *ala(-y), which is gratuitous.

It seems that PIE *-l- have yielded -l- rather than -l- in *alawr/C/R, see s.vv. *alawun-k’, alawr, yolov. If this is accepted, the apparent counter-example *alawri* may be explained by the influence of the underlying verb *alam* ‘to grind’ (cf. Olsen 1999: 443-444, 77₆).

Arm. *alawri* matches Gr. ἀλέτρις ‘woman who grinds corn’ perfectly. However, Clackson (1994: 92-93) derives *alawri* from an instrument noun *alawr* with PIE *-tr- (cf. *arawr* ‘plough’, q.v.), as opposed to agent nouns in *-l- (cf. *cnawr* ‘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’).
alb, o-stem: GDSg alb-o-y, ISg alb-o-y (Bible), LocSg y-alb-i (Čarăntir), note also AblSg y-alb-i in Nersês Lambrancaci'i, 12th cent. (which is not compatible with o-stem) 'dung, excrement, filth, manure' (Bible+), coll. alb-i-k' 'place for garbage' (Ephrem), albell 'to defecate' (Matt'ēos Uthayac'i), 'to fertilize the soil' (Geoponica); see further s.v. alb-em-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 alt 'dirt, filth', q.v.) are unconvincing.

Schindler (1978) connects alb, o- and i-stems, with Hitt. šalpa-, šalpi- c. 'dung'? (on the word see ChicHittDict vol. 5, fasc. 1, 2002: 107) reconstructing *sal-b'-o-adj. 'dirty', with the suffix *b'-o- frequently found in color adjectives (cf. Hitt. alpa- 'cloud', Gr. ἄπωρ 'dull-white leprosy'), and *sal-b'-i- subst. 'dirt, excrement', respectively. He derives the forms from the root *sal- 'dirty, grey': OWelsh pl. halou 'stercora', Ofr. sal 'dirt, filth', OHG salo < *sal-yo- 'dirty', etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 879). This etymology 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; Witzczak 1999: 177. Further see s.v. alt '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. sarpis- n. 'molten butter, lard', Germ. Salbe 'ointment', etc. This etymology is advocated by Olsen 1999: 37. The development *-lp-> Arm. -lb- (beside the regular voicing after after r and nasals) is possible, although the evidence is scanty, cf. helg 'lazy' if from *selk-.

Compare also judl 'roee, spawn' (q.v.), if composed of *ju- 'fish' (see s.v. ju-ku 'fish') and alb 'excrement, dung'.

altern, abivir, r-stem: GDSg alter, AblSg y-ather-i, API alter-s, GDPi alter-c'. IPI alter-b-k': in pl. obl. mostly I-r-a-: GDPi alter-a-c' (Bible; P'awstos Buzand 4.15, 1883=1984: 1021-16; Movsēs Xorenaci 1.16, 1913=1991: 5114, Hexaemeron 4 [K. Muradyan 1984: 107113], etc.), IPI alter-a-w-k' (Grigoris Ar'saranu, 7-8th cent.) 'fountain, spring' (Bible+). In derivatives, mostly alter-, cf. alter-akn, GDPi (-akn(c'), IISg(Pi) -akamb(-k'), API -akan-s, etc. 'fountain-head, source' (Bible+). In Hexaemeron 4, e.g., one finds alter-akn-k' and alter-akan-c' (K. Muradyan 1984: 107, lines 3 and 9).


In view of Şatax, etc. hä-, Van ä-, and Alaškert, Muš h'axb'ur (see HAB 1: 126a), Weitenberg (1986: 93, 97) reconstructs *y-albivir. 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 axpöir 'rodnik', belonging to the a-declension class: GSG axp-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-: hàxprış čambix woskš'
aɫb-ew-k’
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pʼeríc’ in “рассыпали по дороге к роднику золотые” [94L3f, transl. 163]; tʼeíc’ in vár hąxpı́r čampʼix in “бросили его на дороге к роднику” [95L11, transl. 164 (cf. 1982: 99)]; ná lač tărıkʼ tık’ hąxpı́r “понесите этого мальчика, положите около родника” [98L3, transl. 166].

These attestations do not come from the village of Capʼanc’. One may therefore think that the form without initial h- is found in Capʼanc’, 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\textsuperscript{NED}] reads: Mart’ hąxpı́rım čūr xom’s, aṭk čʼ q’ar tʻals k’ıns: “(When) one drinks water in a spring, it is not nice that he throws a stone into it”. Clearly, hąxpı́r means ‘in a spring’ here.

ClArm. aber-akn, GDSg aber-akan has been preserved in Muš-Bulanax, as repetitively found, for example, in a fairy-tale recorded in the village of Kop’ in 1908 [HŽHek’ 10, 1967: 17-21]: hʼalvarakan, majʼor ([in/on]) hʼalvarakan, AblSg hʼalvarak-ic’. Cf. also Muš/Bulanax or Sasun/Bolnus vor hʼalbi akon “on the source of the fountain” [HŽHek’ 10, 1967: 65\textsuperscript{L3L;L15}]; Ozim haxb rak [HAB 1: 109a; Aćāiran 1952: 242]; Moks (the village of Capʼanc’) așpra-ak/k’ “источник” [Orbeli 2002: 199].

\textbullet{}ETYM Since H. Ebel, connected with Gr. ὁπίσω, -ατος n. ‘an artificial well; spring; tank, cistern’ [HAB 1: 125-126]. Beekest (2003: 191, 206; cf. also 1969: 234) reconstructs *b’hre˘h1-ur. The oblique stem of the PIE word must have been *bhun-, cf. Goth. brunna, etc. [Schindler 1975a: 8]. The original PArn. paradigm would have been then, as follows: NSg *ałbewr (< *bhrewr) and GSG *ałbun (< *bhun-). This paradigm has been replaced by NSg abewr, GSG aber analogically after the type of r-stems like oskr ‘bone’ : osker- [Godel 1975: 97], and GSG aber is explained from *ałbewr by regular loss of intervocalic *-w- before *-r, or by contraction -ewe- > -e- (Meillet 1908/09: 355; HAB 4: 628a; Jahuuky 1959: 172-173; 1982: 31, 92, 221\textsuperscript{20}; Zekiyan 1980: 157; Ałabekyan 1981: 104; Godel 1982a: 12; Clackson 1994: 94; Olsen 1999: 791). Others suggest a secondary genitive *bhrewros (Eichner 1978: 153-154), with the development *-ewrV- > Arm. -er [Kortlandt 2003: 29-30, 103; Beekest 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.

aɫb-ew-k’, a-stem: GDP1 albew-a-c’ (Bible+). LocPl y-albew-s (Job 2.8) ‘filth, garbage, dung-heap’; later aɫbiws-k’, GDP1 aɫbiws-a-c’ seems to be a blend of generalized API forms albew-s and albi-s (beside coll. nom. albi-ko’), see HAB 1: 123-124.

A textual illustration from Job 2.8 (Cox 2006: 58): ew nstér yaltews artakʼoy kʼalakʼin “and he sat in filth (Gr. kospiá ‘dung-heaps’) outside the city”.

\textbullet{}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. *spetisa’, 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-.
aleln (GSG alelan) ‘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-aleln ‘arrow and bow’, cf. Akn netvelt, Van netveln, Ararat netvenel, T’iffis nitvanit, Zeyt’un nidb’ alel, lomb’ alel, etc. [HAB 1: 126b; Acharyan 2003: 296].

Many dialects (Van, Moks, Ozim, Alaškert, Sebastia, T’iffis, Axalce’xa, Agulis [HAB 1: 126b, etc.] have *anel. Unlike Goris (hanael, anel, anel, see Margaryan 1975: 312a), Larabal [Dav’tyan 1966: 304] has forms both with and without the final -n, namely haneňna and (h)anel. A trace of the final -n can be seen in GSG ankan in Van and Moks, as well as in Van ananak, Ozim anshnak, etc. from *alelnak ‘rainbow’ (see below). Note also the initial h- in Larabal and Goris.

Acharyan (2003: 140) treats the b- of Zeyt’un nidb’ alel as epenthetic. In my view, we are here dealing with the sound change -dv- > -db- (assimilation of the plosiveness), which is also seen in astuc ‘god’ > *astuıc ‘Zeyt’un asb’ay (vs. Haçn asvaj), GSG assju (see Acharyan 2003: 299) and Moks âspâc, GSG âs(c)ju, âstacu (see Orbeli 2002: 206).

As to the other Zeyt’un form, namely lomb’alel, Acharyan (2003: 115, 135) considers it strange, pointing out that lomb- 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- > *nimb- > *nimb- > *limb-. The last step involves nasal dissimilation (cf. nmanim ‘to resemble’ > Nor-Naxijewan, Aslanbek, Polis, Sebastia, Xarberd, Tigranakert, Marala, Alaškert, Hamšen, etc. *[ol]manil [HAB 3: 459b]), and/or the alternation n-/l-, cf. napastak : dial. *(a)lapastrak ‘hare’, nuik/muić : dial. *luć ‘a plant’, etc.

This scenario may have been supported/triggered by a contamination with lput ‘wool carder’ (in the dialects of Ozim, Muş, Bulanax, Alaškert, see HAB 2: 306a). A theoretically possible form in Cilicia/Syria would be *lombud, with nasal epenthesis, cf. hapaš ‘bilberry’ (from Arab. habb-al-ás) > Svedia lambalus (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 Acharian 1913: 97a), Muş, Širak, etc. *anel (see Amatuni 1912: 30b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 58a), Rodost ’awthnag [HAB 1: 126b], as well as Zeyt’un aňel (see Acharyan 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 anel (GSG ankan, see Orbeli 2002: 202). In this respect, a fairy-tale “in the dialect of Lazax”, recorded in 1894

---

6 Both geographically and dialectally, Lazax is between Lori and Larabal.
aij (see IlIŽHek’ 6, 1973: 318–329), is particularly interesting. There lived a wool-carder (pürt’ kyzol) 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 ael (319[29b]), then pürt’ kyzelu anel (316[13]). For the question of interdialectal borrowings, see 1.5.

With the suffix -ak, *ateln-ak ‘rainbow’: Agulis šihiškon (Aĉaṙean 1935: 121, 332, assuming *atelnak > *atelakan); Alaškert aneṣnag, Ozim aneṣnag, cf. Axalc’xa altsnavor (as well as Rodost’o aneṣnag, referring to the above-mentioned implement), see HAB 1: 126b. Interesting is Van ananak (not anank, as is misspinned in HAB 1: 126b; see HAB-Add 1982: 6; Aĉaṙyan 1952: 243) from *amerẹ̄̄nak. The dialectal form ananak is recorded already in NHB 1: 1015b, correctly deriving it from *ateln-ak. Note also anana in a riddle from an unspecified area (see S. Harut’yunyan 1965: 15-16[31b]). See also s.v. ciacan ‘rainbow’.

The form *anel(n)-ak < ateln-ak is due to dissimilation (see Aĉaṙean 1935: 121) or, perhaps better, to both assimilation and dissimilation: l-l-n > n-l-n; cf. 2.1.25.

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

Given the semantic fluctuation in, for example, Gr. βιός m. ‘bow’ and ‘bowstring’, one may wonder if ateln ‘bow’ derives from aℓ(-k’) ‘intestine; string of musical instruments’.

alers, i-stem, o-stem (late evidence) ‘supplication’ (Bible+), adersem ‘to supplicate’ (Bible+), alers-an-k’, pl. tant. a-stem: GDPl alers-an-a-c’ ‘supplication’ (John Chrysostom, etc.).

● DIAL. Muš alersal ‘to supplicate’, alersank ‘supplication’ [HAB 1: 127a].


aij : Timothy Aelurus (6th cent.), Knik’ hawatoy= “Seal of Faith” (7th cent., see Aĉaṙean 1908-09a, 1: 367b); alic (a-stem, cf. GDPl alic-ac’ in Anania Narkac’i, 10th cent.): Eusebius of Caesarea, Anania Narekac’i; ajlik, an-stem (GDSg alikan, ISg aljakaw or aljkamb, NPl aljkank’, GDPl aljkanc’, etc.): Bible+; MidArm. aljkin ‘virgin, girl’; in Eusebius of Caesaria: alic ‘prostitute’ (see HAB 1: 129b for semantic parallels).
Phryg. (Hesychius). Consequently, he derives this scenario is improbable. IE the Armenian development (which he characterizes as “quite regular”) as follows: IE instead of -kr-. According to Witczak (1999: 177-178), the primitive form *altik is ubiquitous in the dialects. Zeyt’un asj’ān, asgi’ān, gen. ašgonon, Haçač anç’aq’in, Xarberd aç’xin (see HAB 1: 130a; Aça’ryan 2003: 296), Kesaria aç’lon, gen. aç’lošon (Am’osyan 1961: 181) continue MidArm. aļifkin. For a textual illustration of the Zeyt’un (= Ulmia) form, see X. K’. 1899: 18a-14. In Muš, Aça’ryan (HAB 1: 130a) records a vocative form asj’-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. inālī ‘Dienerin’ from *eni-(h)altīh₂ (the root of Lat. alīd ‘to nurse, nourish’, etc.), as suggested by Olsen, is equally unconvincing (1999: 448). The derivation from *alam ‘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’emurçyan 1970: 88a); cf. also Gr. ἀλέκω, -îōc f. ‘female slave who grinds corn’, from ἀλέκω ‘to grind’, a cognate of Arm. atom. As pointed out by Greppin (1983: 273), the final -i is unexplained. Hambarjumyan (1998: 29-33) advocates Meillet’s etymology and identifies the suffix with -ic seen in kaw: kaw-ic, lu: lu-ic, etc. I suggest to start with *alii- < *h₂l-i(e)h₂. In this case, the form aļif would be secondary. The connection with alaxin ‘female servant’ is improbable (see s.v.).

Likewise unconvincing is the derivation from *k’l-, cf. Toch. A k’a, lī 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’al (cf. *k’y from QIE *k’l-)

Jahukyan (1963a: 87-88; 1987: 145) derives *al- from *p₂- (cf. ul ‘kid’) and for -j- compares erini ‘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 *alii may be related to two other Palaeo-Balkan words denoting ‘young girl’, namely Maced. άξιαται and Phryg. (Hesychius) ἀξιατης. He reconstructs *akrēyā t. ‘young girl’ and represents the Armenian development (which he characterizes as “quite regular”) as follows: IE *akrēyā > *arKēyā (metathesis) > *aRGiyā (lenition) > *aļif (palatalization) > aļif. Consequently, he derives alifkin from *akr(e)-gōn-.

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 *avri- or *awri-, so one might rather think of Arm. awri-ord ‘virgin, young girl’, q.v.

Conclusion: PArm. *alif- ‘girl’ is an old feminine, which probably derives from *h₂l-i(e)h₂- (or *p₂H-i(e)h₂-) and basically means ‘female grinder’ (or ‘young female’). The form aļif is secondary.

**aļ(i-k’)**, ea-stem: GPSG ašg-ō-y in Sirach, Gregory of Nyssa, aši-o-y in Grigor Magistros, ISG ašg-a-w in Severian of Gabala, GDPI ašg-a-c’ in Grigor Narekac’i 26.3 (Xac’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 346) ‘intestine’ (Bible, mostly in plural) ‘string of musical instruments’ (ISG ašg-a-n in Severian of Gabala; in compounds: Bible, Agat’angelos, etc.).

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects, as a frozen plural: *ali-k’ ‘intestine’; in Agulis, Larabal and Goris, with a nasal epenthesis: *alink’. Aça’ryan (HAB 1: 129a) records a textual illustration of the Zeyt’un (= Ulmia) form, see X. K’. 1899: 18a-14.
no dialectal forms reflecting the “pure” singular (i.e. k-less) *ali, apart from Sebastia plural *alstan. Nevertheless, one finds Ararat sambali ‘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 Larabal sambetan.

On Agulis ̣ʼaralkàn and Larabal királkə̄nk ‘rectum’ see HAB s.v. ̣ʼar ‘fat’.

\*ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 1: 129a. Jahukyan 1967: 269 hesitantly connects with ̣ʼolor-k ‘twist, circle’. This is uncertain. A better suggestion can be found in his 1987 book (p. 296), where Jahukyan, with reservation, treats *ali-k as borrowed from Finno-Ugric *solijä, cf. Finnish soili, Mari solo ‘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 *hjelito– (R. Derksen, p.c.). The Armenian form can be derived from *h1oliteh (or *ioliteh).\n
\*alc- ‘filth’: alca-pilc ‘filthy, abominable’ (a compound with pilc ‘id.’), attested in Movses Kalankatuac’i/Daxuranc’i 2.32, 7/10th cent. (V. Arak’eyan 1983: 212L17), Yovhannès Öjnc’i (8th cent.), etc., alcapic-ut’iwn ‘uncleanliness’ (Book of Chries); alcem ‘to defile’ (Canon Law), see HAB 1: 132a.

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

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

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

alkaltk, a-stem: GDPl alalka-a-č’ (Grigor Astuaacaban, Grigor Narekac’i) ‘indigent, poor, miserable’ (Grigor Astuaacaban, John Chrysostom, Xosrov Anjewac’i, etc.); alkalk-ut’iwn in Philio, etc.


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].

\*alj- ‘darkness, fog, twilight’: alj-ut’iwn-k ‘darkness’, only in Grigor Narekac’i 6.4 (beg. of the 11th cent.), in an enumeration, followed by amprop-k ‘thunder’ [Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 269b-84]; translated as ‘zatemnε’ [Darbinjan-Melikian/Xanlarjan 1988: 47] and ‘eclipse’ [Khachatourian 2001: 37]; alj-alj ‘fog’ (Ab1_sg y-aljal-‘i in Gregory of Nyssa; according to HAB, GD1sg -i), ‘dark, badly organized (church)’ (Smbat Sparapet, 13th cent., Cilicia); alj-a-mulji, i-stem or a-stem: GD1sg aljamli-i (Bible, Anania Sırakac’i), ISg aljamli-i-w (Yovhan Mandakuni [2003: 1161a14]), Philo, Ephrem, Sargis Šnorhali, aljamli-a-w (Grigor Astuaacaban Nazianzac’i, Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet); also some derivatives, e.g. aljamli-in ‘dark’ in Yovhan Mandakuni [2003: 1165a-17]: tartarok’ aljamlijnk ‘li xawaraw. For -in cf. mt’-in from mut’(n) ‘dark’ (Bible+).

xawari(n) yawitean paheal kan : օիչ ա ժոյովն ու որտ սկոտուս տեղեստու : “for them the nether gloom of darkness has been reserved”. As we can see, in the Biblical passages, alfamulj mostly corresponds to Gr. σκότος ‘darkness, gloom (of death, the netherworld, etc.)’, and once (as also in Philo) to ժոյովն ‘nether darkness; gloom, darkness; the West’.

The word (alfamulj, var. alfamljak) also appears in Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.) as the name of the second nocturnal hour between xawarakan and mt’ac’el (see A. G. Abrahanyan 1944: 113; Aelayan 1986: 80-81).

●DIAL Ačāryan (HAB 1: 135b, 335-336) does not record any dialectal forms of *alf-. In 2.1.33.2, I argue that alfamulj has been preserved in Larabal ժոմաց-են-կ’. It can also be found in some Western dialects: Muš, Xian, Č’nkil, *ašmuš ‘twilight’ [Ačārean 1913: 115b], Sasan ašmuš (glossed by alfamulj) and verbal ašmšil [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443]. This word is reminiscent of alfamulj ‘darkness, twilight’ and mšš ‘fog’ (see s.vv. mšš ‘fog’ and *muž ‘fog’). According to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 330b), Muš, etc. ašmuš ‘twilight’ belongs with aršalarš-k’ (q.v.).

●ETYM Meillet (1898: 279) treats alfamulj as a combination of two types of reduplication, namely u- (cf. spar-spur ‘entièremment’, etc.) and m- (cf. arh-a-m-arh, xarín-a-m-arin, etc.) reduplications, seen also in *helj-a-m-ulj ‘drowning, suffocation’, on which see s.v. heljamulj-uk. The example of hawrut and mawrut is wrong; these are Iranian loans (see HAB 3: 139-140). Meillet (ibid.) connects the root *alf, found also in alf-alj, with Gr. ἀχλύς, -ίος 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 alfamulj in the same way, but reconstructs *al(gh)lu- for Armenian and the cognate forms, connecting the word with Lat. algeō ‘to be cold, fill chilly, endure cold’, etc.

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 335-336) rejects the etymology on the following grounds: (1) arjın ‘black’ and *alt- ‘dark’ are not taken into account, and their relationship is not clarified; (2) *g > Arm. j is uncertain; (3) the connection between Gr. ἀχλύς and OPr. aglo ‘is not firmly accepted’. These arguments are not strong, however. Arm. arjın ‘black’ (q.v.) and probably *alt- ‘dark’ are hardly related to *alf- [Jahucyan 1967: 171-175; 1982: 216-217]. Further, Meillet’s etymology is nowadays accepted by most of the scholars: Pokorny 1959: 8; Frisk 1: 201-202; Jahucyan 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, 171q. Others consider the connection of the Armenian word with OPr. aglo and Gr. ἀχλύς 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 alfamulj as m-reduplication, comparable to arhamarhem ‘verachte’. These examples are usually compared with sar-su ‘Zittern, Beben’ [this example, in my view, is unclear], spar-spur ‘ganz und gar’, ašx-a-m-āl a ‘Kramwaren, Trödelwaren’, arh-a-m-arh-em ‘verachten’, etc. [Karst 1930: 109; Leroy 1986: 71-72]. Next to alf-a-m-alj, Pedersen and Karst also cite alf-a-m-alj. I was not able to locate this form. If it really exists, one may link it
directly to Łarabaļ *žamaž-ayn-k' (see above). Otherwise, *žamuž-ayn-k' > *žamaž-ayn-, and the by-form *žamaž- is secondary.

Jahukyan (1967: 303) regards altamult vs. aljamulj as a case of alternation t : j, giving no other examples and mentioning also arjn ‘black’. Although in 171:25 and in later works he rightly rejects the connection with arjn. Jahukyan 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 “Čaràntir”. While accepting Meillet’s etymology of *alj-, Jahukyan treats *mulj and *mult as independent roots and connects them with Arm. *moyg ‘dark’, Russ. smuglyj, etc. (1967: 171; 1982: 58; see also H. Suk’iasyan 1986: 204 [see s.v. *muzj]), and later (Jahukyan 1987: 138), although with reservation, with Arm. melc ‘soot’ (q.v.). Greppin (1983: 272-273) considers Meillet’s explanation of alt-a-m-alt as less likely and derives *amulj from PArm. *omulgh-. Gr. ὠμίχλη ‘fog’; Lith. miglā ‘fog’. This seems impossible in view of the vocalism. One might rather think of Gr. ὠμολόγος n. ‘darkness’.

The etymology of Meillet is very plausible. The metathesis of *-g-j- is regular, but -j- requires *-g-i-. We have, thus, to assume either a by-form *h-egj-l-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 avg ‘morning’ from locative *h-egj(e)us(s)i, suggested by Clackson (1994: 2239); see s.v. Another possible example of a frozen locative is amurj-k- ‘dream’ (q.v.). The meaning ‘twilight, darkness’ is frequently used in locative/adverbial meaning: “at dawn, at twilight!”, cf. e.g. ἀρδῆς alj a-m-alt ‘at twilight’ (see s.v. altamult ‘darkness, twilight’). Thus: loc. *h-egj-l-i > PArm. *aŋ-gj-l-i > *aŋ-g-i (regular metathesis) > *alj-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 alt-o-y (Lazar P’arpec’i, John Chrysostom), AbhSg y-alt-o-y, ISg alt-o-v (Bible+), GDPl alt-o-e’ (Grigor Narekac’i), AbIPl y-alt-o-e’ (Hesychius of Jerusalem); i-stem: ISg alt-i-w (Paterica), GDPl alt-i-e’ (Anania Širakac’i) ‘dirt, filth, uncleanliness (also of soul)’ (Bible+), ‘skin enclosing the foetus, afterbirth’ (Deuteronomy 28.57, Cox 1981: 188-189, rendering Gr. χώριον); alt-el-i ‘dirty, filthy, foul’ (Bible+).

ISg alt-o-v and AbhSg y-alt-o-o are attested in Job 9.31 and 14.4 respectively: Sashtac’ eal altov nerker zis : یکانیی یاں وتو یئر ہے “you have dyed me thoroughly with filth”; Isk ard ov ic’ė surb yaltov : یک جیہر کاہراً ہے یاں وتو یئر “Now, who can be free of filth?”. [Cox 2006: 97, 118]. Arm. alt renders Gr. βόσκο “filth, uncleanliness”.


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

*ETYM Since Bugge 1889: 35, compared with Arm. e/altiwr ‘marsh-meadow, swamp’, Gr. ἀρδός f. ‘dirt’, ἀρδώλος ‘dirty’. Acharyan (1937: HAB 1: 136a; cf. Hübenschmann 1897: 415) accepts the connection of alt with the Greek word and
alt. *t-* t-k'salt; s.). Further see s.v. alt- *sal-...

The PIE word for ‘salt’ has been reconstructed by Kortlandt and others as a HD l-stem: nom. *seh₂-l-s > Gr. ἁλς, Lat. sāl, Lith. sōlymas ‘brine’, etc.; acc. *sh₂-ēl-m > Gr. ἁλ-α, Lat. sal-em, cf. OCS sols; gen. *sh₂-l-ōs > Gr. ἁλ-ις, 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.


Klingenschmitt (1982: 149) interprets *alč- as reflecting an original *je/o-present. However, a QIE *ṣfdl-je- would rather yield Arm. *alče- (see 2.1.22.1). One might posit an analogical nominative *alč < *ṣfdl-s, compare anic ‘nit, louse egg’ from *ṣjkl(o)mid-s, cf. Gr. κόνις < κονιδ-, 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. l-less form, viz. al, is only found in the singular, whereas al (mostly API alt-s and GDPl alt-i-c’) is limited to the plural. It is therefore tempting to reconstruct PArm. nom.sg. *sal-s vs. pl. *sal-d-. The element *a-l- 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. *alč beside al (the latter from *sal-s or *salds, with loss of the cluster in absolute auslaut) vs. obl. *alt-i-. This can explain why the Biblical place-names have been rendered in Armenian by alt and not by the ‘normal’ word for ‘salt’ al. See also above on references to ‘salt mines’ and s.v. place-name Alt-k’. We may conclude that the basic meaning of alt is something like ‘salt deposits, salt mines, salty place’.

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

alt-a-muht ‘darkness, twilight’. Attested only in Ephrem/John Chrysostom, referring to the evening twilight or darkness.


ETYM See s.v. *al-f- and bazalt’n.

altiwir ‘marsh-meadow, swamp’.

See s.v. etewwr, ettiwir ‘id.’.
ahuës, u-stem: GDSg ahues-u, GDPI ahues-u-c’ (Bible+), o-stem: GDSg ahues-o-y (Grigor Narekac’i, 10-11th cent.) ‘fox’.

- DIAL. Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 135a]. Karčewan álvest [M. Muradyan 1960: 188b] has an epithetic -a after the sibilant, cf. Axale’xa and Xotorjur 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: 27–42; Meyer 1892: 328; Hübschmann 1897: 415), connected with Gr. ἀλώπηξ, -εκος f. ‘fox’ and cognate forms continuing the PIE word for ‘fox’:

  - Skt. lopāśa- m. ‘a kind of jackal’, probably ‘fox’, Proto-Iranian *raupa- ‘fox’:
  - Sogd. rwps- f., Khwar. rwbs f., Shughni rūpec(ak) f. [Morgenstierne 1974: 68a], Ishkashimi urvesoḵ, Yazghulami ṛp, ṛbc, Yidgha ṛū, Munji ṛwsa, etc. [Edelman 2003: 123];


  - 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. *Raupāca- is “nicht zu trennen” from Arm. ahuës and Gr. ἀλώπηξ. The above-mentioned standard dictionaries and Clackson 1994: 96 are positive, too. Beekes (1969: 40) points out that “the relation of ἀλώπηξ to the related words is not clear. Arm. ahuës < *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: 187–189; de Vaan 2000: 288.

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

alk’at, a-stem: GDSg alk’at-i, GDPI alk’at-a-c’ (abundant in the Bible); o-stem: ISg alkat-o-v (once in the Bible), GDSg alkat-o-y in BrsVašx (apud NHB 1: 45c)
'pauper, beggar, homeless; indigent, needy' (Bible+), 'poor, miserable' (Book of Chries, Neršēs Lambroac'ī, etc.) (Bible+).

- **DIAL** Dialectically 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. ligótį 'to be ill', OIr. līach 'elend, unglücklich', OPr. licuts 'small', etc., and containing the suffix -at as in hast-at 'firm' [HAB 1: 137b; Pokorny 1959: 667; Jahukyan 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. aɫk'at from *ə3likudā-, leaving the problem of Arm. -a- from *-u- without an explanation. Tumanjan (1978: 204) connects with Arm. aɫkaɫk 'indigent, poor, miserable' (q.v.). All uncertain.

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

- **DIAL** Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 141a].
- **ETYM** From PIE *h2eug- 'to grow', with loss of *-u-: Lat. augē, augēre 'to increase, augment', Goth. aukan 'to increase, augment', Lith. augti 'to grow', etc.; other forms reflect an original s-present: Gr. aŭţō 'to increase, strengthen', ᾠ(F)έξω < *h2u̯egs- 'to increase, grow', Skt. vavākṣa 'to grow, become big', OAv. waxšiieitī 'grows', waxš 'lets grow', MPers. waxšidān 'to grow', Goth. waxsjian '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. jāgoda 'berry', SCR. jāgosa '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; ÉtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 57-59; Greppin 1983: 275; Mallory/Adams 1997: 63b; cf. Jahukyan 1987: 141, 183; for the etymology, see also Derksen 2008: 27). This is very unlikely. Most probably Arm. ačem belongs with Lat. augeō, etc. and derives from PArm. *awcēmi < *aug(-ije)-mi = *h2eug(-ij)-e-mi through loss of *-u- in pretonic syllable, cf. QIE *hnng-o-o-il-o- > PAr. *ančul-o- > *a(w)cilo- > acuł 'coal' (q.v.). Note also the vacillation aw : a in e.g. ačar vs. awečar '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-v in Grigor Narekac’i, etc. ‘ash’.

●ETYM Meillet (1908-09: 357) compared the word with Gr. ἀσβόλος f. (m.) ‘soot’, ἀζω ‘to wither’, Goth. azgo, OHG. asca ‘ashes’, for Armenian positing *azg-y- (cf. Skt. āśa- m. ‘ashes, light dust’, etc.). Bugge (1892: 445; 1893: 1) connected Arm. azaz- ‘to become dry’ to Gr. ἀζω, etc. Accepted by Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 82). Sceptical Greppin 1981b: 3-4. Scheftelowitz (1904-1905, 2: 32) relates to Arm. ostin ‘dry (land)’ (see HAB, s.v.), Gr. ἀζω, Czech ozditi ‘darren’, etc. Ačaṙyan (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. /gasag/. The dialectal form is cited in plural: ačuk-k’ (NHB 2: 1060b).

Now more attestations are found in MidArm. sources, such as “Bžškaran jioy” (13th cent.), Č’ugaszyan 1980: 154-8, 15818, 178 (note), etc.; MijHayBrB 1, 1987: 36a.

●DIAL In Polis, Aslanbek, Rodost’o, Nor Naxijewan, Axalc’xa, Hamšen, Ararat, Karin, Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir, Adana, Zey’t’un [HAB 1: 141-142]. In Muş and Alaşkert, in a compound with tak ‘under, below’: Muş ačx-tak-ner, Alaşkert ajx-dag (HAB 1: 142a); cf. *y-ant’Viak, s.v. an(u) ‘armpit’. See also below, on Sasun.

As is pointed out by Ačaṙyan (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 ajug denotes ‘pelvis’ (rendered ModArm. konk’) [Danielyan 1967: 185a], and Xarberd: ‘thigh’ [HayLezBrB 1, 2001: 46a].

Sasun ajug ‘the joint between the abdomen and the upper thigh, groin; armpit’, ajf-dag ‘armpit’ [Petoyan 1954: 104; 1965: 443-444].

Dersim (Berri) ajug aunil ‘to have pain in groins’ [Bahramyan 1960: 112a].

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


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 aċ- ‘to grow’. Jāhukyan (1982: 216r) considers this less probable. M. Hanneyan (1979: 173) mentions the former etymology (from *pogio-) 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 *pʰə̞ɡi-o-, the belief and its influence must then be reckoned with.

**am, a-stem:** GDSg *am-i, AblSg *ya-am-e̞, LocSg *ya-am-i, GDPi *am-a-c’, IPl *am-a-w-k’ (widely attested in the Bible onwards) ‘year; age’.  

●DIAL. Preserved in the dialects of Ararat (Lori), Larabał and Goris in a derivative form, namely *amlik ‘a lamb or child of/ under one year age’, q.v.

It is remarkable that there is Georgian *erḵ’emali ‘a male sheep above one year of age; ram’, attested twice in the 18th century and which, according to Šanjie (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. *amlik and bearing in mind that Arm. diminutive -l-ik is quite productive (cf. barak ‘thin’; dial. (Ararat) baralik [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 167], etc.), one may treat the Georgian word as wholly borrowed from Armenian. Moreover, the -l- of *amlik could be old; see below.

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1897: 416 Nr17), *am has been connected to Skt. sám-a- f. ‘year, season’. The other forms have shifted the semantics to ‘summer’: YAv. *ham-, OIr. *sam, etc.; cf. s.v. *amairn. The semantic relationship between *am ‘year’ and *amairn ‘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. Tumanjan 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)-h2-/ *sm-ųh2-ó- is reconstructed, see Hamp 1981: 13; Mayrhofer EW.Aia 2, 1996: 704; Olsen 1999: 60; cf. also Frisk 1944: 32 (= 1966: 280); Tumanjan 1978: 204. The initial a- is due to the generalization of the oblique stem: PIE *s(RH)V- > Arm. *aRV- (compare Beckes 1988: 78).

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

The dialectal *amlik (q.v.) can surprisingly be equated to the Scandinavian words with the basic meaning ‘one-year-old animal’, which are of the same origin: Olt. *simull, Norw. simla, etc.; see Pokorny 1959: 905. The derivational basis could be *(s)m-ųh-<, whence Arm. dial. syncopated *amlik < *(s)m-ųl-ik. Typologically, compare Lat. vitulus ‘calf’ and Gr. ἐτάλος, ἐτάλον n. ‘young animal, yearling’ (etymologically: ‘yearling’; cf. Gr. ἐτός n. ‘year’; Skt. vatsá- m. ‘calf’ (RV+), etc.), with the same suffixal element *(s)-. 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 Ābaev 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
amanak

am (a-stem) and orb (o-stem), respectively. However, Arm. orb is not attested with such a suffix. See also s.v. *lucalli and 2.3.1.

ETYM Frisk (1944: 32 = 1966: 280) connects the word with am ‘year’ (q.v.) through contamination with synonymous życmanak. This is accepted by Greppin (1983: 276), who mentions amanak among other derivatives of am. Neither refers to Ačaryan’s etymology, according to which amanak is an Iranian loan; cf. Pers. *amān ‘time’ [HAB 1: 145]. Jāhukyan 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 Ačaryan’s etymology, arguing that Pahl. unattested *amānak would yield, as Ačaryan himself notes, Pers. *amāna, which does not exist. However, this is not a solid argument since, for instance, in the case of žamanak, ‘time’, Persian has both zāmān and zamān; 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’.

Ačaryan 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’.

amaṙn, an-stem: GDSg amaran (Cyril of Jerusalem, Yovhan Mamikonean), amarun (according to NHB, but without evidence), API amaruns (Philo) ‘summer’ (Bible†).

DIAL Dialectally widespread. An initial h- is found only in Ozim, hamaṙ [HAB 1: 146; HayLezBrBaṙ 1, 2001: 47b], while in its closest dialects, that is Van, Moks and Šatax, it is absent; see Ačaryan 1952: 243; M. Muradyan 1962: 191b. Jāhukyan (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. Larabal aměṙna [Davt’y’an 1966: 306] and Goris amēṙna [Margaryan 312b] are probably due to the influence of jmeṙn ‘winter’. This form may be seen in the place-name Amern-a-p’or in Syunik’, Sot’k’, as attested by Step’anos Orbelean (see 4.9).

ETYM Since Hübschmann (1897: 416N179), aṃaṛn is connected to the family of am ‘year’ (q.v.); cf. Skt. sāmā- ‘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; Jāhukyan 1967: 212; 1982: 115; 1987: 147) or from an old IE accusative *smh₂er-m [Kortlandt 1985: 21N177]. The latter is more attractive. The idea about contamination of the two alternants of the original heteroclitic paradigm, i.e. *-r- and *-nt()- (see Mayrhofer, KEWA 3, 1976: 437; Olsen 1999: 128, 141, 410, 855), is improbable; cf. also Greppin 1983: 277: *sm̥r-n-.

Mentioning the plural forms of jmeṙn ‘winter’ and k’ırt ‘sweat’ going back to *-on(t)h₂-, Olsen (1999: 128) writes: ‘No doubt aṃaṛn ‘summer’, which is
amis

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 amaryin (adj.) and amarani ‘in the summer, during summer’, see Olsen 1999: 276-277 and 306, respectively.

ambol], i-stem: GDPl ambol-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 ambol by his vernacular form hambolf [HAB 1: 152a].

●ETYM Composed of olj ‘whole, integral, complete, solid; sound, healthy, unhurt’ (q.v.) and the prefix *amb- from PIE *h2mbh2i ‘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; Jähukyan 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. amlik.

amis, o-stem: GDSg amis-o-y, GDPl amis-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. mēnis ‘month’, etc. See also Tumanjan 1978: 167-168; Gamkrelidze/ Ivanov 1984: 424; Jähukyan 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 ast ‘star’; cf. Hovdhaugen 1968: 120. Solta (1960: 67) 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. Jähukyan (1967: 245) treats this a- as a “prothetic” vowel before sonants comparable to those found in elbayr 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, 361₁₀) 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 *mēh,ns-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. mēnis (-is rather than -us), one may perhaps reconstruct the following tentative paradigm:

NSg. *mēh,ns-s
AccSg *(m)ēh,ns-ės-m
GSg *(m)ēh,ns-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. mēnis (cf. nāris ‘nostril’, pl. ‘nose’, alongside nās(s)us ‘nose’) and perhaps in Latv. mēnēsis. In the next stage, the thematic form arose, from which Arm. a-mis, -oy and Ilr. *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: 61. This is comparable to Armenian, where the thematization is combined with the loss of the original meaning ‘moon’. In Iranian *māha-, the meaning ‘moon’ could have been restored secondarily.

It is remarkable that the further developments of the Armenian and the Latin 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 *mēh,ns-s ‘moon; month’ (cf. Lat. mēnis), that a dialectal (Arm.: Ilr.) thematic form *mēh,ns-os ‘month’ arrose, 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.

amlık (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 Larabal; see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 49b, as well as in Goris amlık ‘a new-born lamb’ [Margaryan 1975: 375a]. Aćryan (HAB 1: 156b) cites only Larabal ąmlık ‘a new-born little lamb’. It is also used in a famous fable of a modern fable-writer,
Xnko-Aper: amlik gai ‘amlik 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 Ačāryan (HAB1: 156b) places the Lārabal form under Classical amik ‘a one-year-old male kid or lamb’ (q.v.), which is obviously derived from Arm. am ‘year’ (< IE *sm̥-H-), but then he adds that it seems to have been borrowed from Turk. amlik ‘sucking lamb’. I think this is unnecessary, since amlik can easily be derived from Arm. am with the suffixal element *-li(h2)- and diminutive -ik: *sm̥H-l- > Arm *amal-ik > dial. amlik 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. ὀμή-αίς, ὀμή-άη ‘young cow’ from ὀμήνυμι ‘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 Ačāryan 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’ [Malxaسئان‘ 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, GPI amp-o-c’ [In 2 Paralipomenon 5.13-14 (see Xalat‘eancʻ 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. ampard) and ‘thunder’; see NHB 1: 24 s.vv. ampaharim, ampaharut‘iwn, ampamman, ampawor, amporot. Bible (numerous attestations), Agat‘anγelos, 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’ [Balramyan 1960: 73b].

ETYM Hübschmann (1897: 417) connects amp in the first instance to Skt. abhrā- n. ‘thunder-cloud, rain-cloud, blanket of clouds’, Av. aśra- n. ‘cloud; rain’, etc., and only thereafter mentions Skt. nābhas- n. ‘moisture, thunder-cloud, mass of clouds’,

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 *nebhoś (cf. Jahakyan 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 *mhbrο-, which is continued in Arm. amprop ‘thunder(bolt)’ (q.v.). Thus, one might accept the explanation of amp from *mhbrο- (< *mhbrο- through labial assimilation), “a compromise between *mhbrο- 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 *nébhos, GSg *nbhès-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. ámbhas- ‘water’ and Gr. ὀμβρος ‘shower’ remain obscure, see Szemerényi 1964: 241f; Beekes 1969: 74, 79, 92, 93, 140; Euler 1979: 110; Schrijver 1991: 64; cf., however, Olsen 1999: 459. Despite this criticism, Clackson (1994: 133) takes Skt. ámbhas- 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. ὄμφη· πνοή ‘whiff’ (Hesychius), which is semantically remote. The relation between *Hnebh- (but Gr. νέφος points to the absence of an initial laryngeal) and *HVnbh- can be confirmed when the so-called Schwebenablaut 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. *mp [namp/b] ‘dew’, see Gharib 1995: 240a) point to *nembh- and may be regarded as a reduplicated formation *ne-nbh-, or *ne-n-bh-, 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. glīnda from *gnind-, next to the basic *K/Gnīd- (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 abhrā- 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: 45*9, cf. also 70*145, 97*203]. Szemerényi (1964: 242) 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 Pedersen1906: 361= 1982: 139; Olsen 1999: 70*145, 97*203. 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. ὄμβρος and *amprop (as well as Skt. ambu- ‘water’ and *ámbara- ‘Luftraum’?; see above) point to *bh instead of *bh. For the Greek word, this is explained by regular deaspiration after the sonant in an accented syllable; cf. Olsen 1999: 45*89 in the context of the Greek word and Arm. *amp (referring to Schweyzer). 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, *-mbhro- > *-mbro- (> Arm. *-mpro-, since p is the regular outcome of *bh). 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 *nebh*os is ‘sky’; cf. Hitt. *nēpiš-, OCS nebo, etc., as well as some forms going back to *qbʰ*ro-: Oss. arv, Khot. L.Sg. o(r)iño. 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*: ‘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 asteلك ‘the seven planets’, from an unspecified author, who in turn is said to have taken it from Elišè, probably “Meknut’iw’ngroc’n cnndoc” (Commentary on Genesis), as is the previous citation of Ališan’s text.

**ETYM** The interpretation of the word as an-par ‘motionless’, suggested by the same author, is not accepted by Ačāryan (HAB 1: 163), who gives no comments. The inclusion of par into this etymology seems attractive, since par refers to the movement of the stars, too (see NHB 1: 383b; 2: 625b), and Ališan himself is aware of that, cf. Ališan 1910: 118. However, the meaning ‘motionless’ is the opposite of what one would use describing the planets. Note also *ampar*, 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. Olc.
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 Xač’ikyan 1941: 162d₁, 166d₁²); 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: amprop-a-goyn ‘cloud-coloured’ or ‘cloud-like’ (in Greppin 1983: 281: ‘like a cloud’). In 2 Maccabees 1.22, referring to ל in aregakn ‘sun’. Thus, amp would make sense here with the meaning ‘shiny sky’ or the like. However, the Greek text has ἐπινεφής ‘clouded, dark; bringing clouds’ (from νέφος ‘cloud’), and amprop-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. amparažé (Ararat) ‘light blue’ [HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 50b]; for the component *ze cf. karimir-zeř (Bulanax of Muš), with karimir ‘red’ [S. Movsisyan 1972: 20a];

dial. ampik (Papen) ‘a kind of bluish grape’ (see HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 50b).

amprop, a-stem: GDPl amprop-a-c’ in Job 38.25 (Astuacaturean 1895: 60a has amprap-ac’, but cf. Cox 2006: 245), Book of Chries, Yovhannč Drasxanakerc’i ‘thunder’.

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

etym From PIE *ghb’r-o-: Skt. abhrá- n., rarely m. ‘thunder-cloud, rain-cloud, blanket of clouds’, YAv. aśra- n., ‘rain-cloud’, Khot. ora- ‘sky’, Lat. imber, GŚg. imbris ‘shower’, etc. [Dervischjan 1877: 94; HAB 1: 163; Alabekyan 1979: 47, 55; Jāhukyan 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 Ačaṟyan, one should note that, in fact, the etymology was first recognized by NHB and Jāx’xaxean.

The thematic vowel *-o- was accented [Jāhukyan 1982: 132], and the metathesis of r is blocked by the preceding nasal (ibid. 218,103). 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 *ghb’r-o- (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’ub/t’uxp ‘cloud; fog’. However, the direction of the possible influence is hard to determine in view of the etymological uncertainty of t’ub/p. One may therefore merely assume a perseveration (see 2.1.28): PIE *ghb’r-o- > PArm. *amb/pro- > ampro-p.
**amul, o-stem:** GDSg *aml-o-γ*, GDPl *aml-o-ς* (Bible+) ‘sterile, childless’ (Bible+; 18 attestations in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 58a), ‘barren’ (Agat’angelos, Yovannēs Ōjneći, Nersēs Snorphali, Čarantir).

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


The alternative derivation from IE *n̥-putlo-* with Skt. *a-pūta-* ‘sonless’ (Olsen 1989: 235) is improbable; one rather expects Arm. *amuwl > *amu* 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 Ačaryan (HAB 1: 160).

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

In 1 Corinthians 7.8 *amuri* and *ayri* render Gr. ἁγάμος ‘unmarried’ and χήρα ‘widow’, respectively: *amureac’  enumerable asem : λέγω δὲ τοῖς ἁγάμοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις.

In Job 24.21 we find *amul* and *amuri* rendering Gr. στεῖρα ‘infertile (woman)’ and γυναιὸν ‘woman’, respectively: zi amloyn bari o č arar, ew amurwoyn o č ‘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 Barigirk’ hayoc’ (see Amalyan 1975: 219⁴ Ne110) one finds *mori* rendering *amuri*; in some manuscripts (408⁴ 410) *mori*: *amuri*, kam ankin mard “unmarried, or wifeless man”. I think this form betrays a dialectal form in Łarabal 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 > r̥* in Łarabal and Melri, see Davt’yan 1966: 68 and Alayan 1954: 93, respectively.

**ETYM.** Ačaryan (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 other otherwise unattested word *moyri* ‘wife, woman, girl’, cf. Gr. μοῖρας ‘girl’, Lat. maritā ‘wife’, Lith. merga ‘girl’, marte 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. Mkrt’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 Jahukyan 1987: 145, 188 (with hesitation); Ravnaes 1991: 146-147; Beekes 2003: 172. However, this etymology is formally uncertain; Skt. putrā- ‘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. vyras ‘man, husband’, OHG wer ‘man, husband’, Lat. vir ‘man, male; husband’, Skt. vīra- ‘man, husband’, etc. 8 In view of the absence of the development IE *-nu̯- > Arm. *-ng- we may assume that the compound has been made at a later stage: *an-wir-iyā- ‘husbandless’ > *am(w)uiríya- > amuri, -ea-. This proto-form is structurally and semantically parallel to QIE *n̥-Hnēr-īeh2- ‘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).


● DIAL Dialectally preserved almost exclusively in derivatives and compounds: *ayguan, *ayguc’, etc.; see HAB 1: 165-166; HayLezBrbBaṙ1, 2001: 52b. In Hamšen ākvən, ākvənā, ākvənc’u ‘in the morning’; ɛkuc’, ɛk’unc’ ‘tomorrow’ [Ačaṙyan 1947: 220]. According also to HayLezBrbBaṙ1, 2001: 33a, Hamšen ākvon means ‘morning’, but the textual illustration has ākvnc’ (adv.). In view of CIArm. y-ayg-uc’, MidArm. y-eg-uc’, Ɂula ʰ’ekuc’ and Agulis ʰwq’üć’, ʰwq’üć’ (HAB 1: 165-166) may be reconstructed as *y-ayg-uc’.

The compound ayghaṭol is attested in Arak’el Davrižec’i (17th cent.) and is represented in a number of dialects: Bulanx ɛk’hol, Zeyt’un, Muṣ, etc. ak’xk’ < *ayg-hol-k- ‘ceremony at the next morning after the funeral’ [Ačaṙean 1913: 90b; HAB 1: 165ab], Siwri-Hisar ek’xk’ or agolk’ [PtnSivHisHay 1965: 454, 460a]. Composed of ayg ‘morning’ and hol ‘earth’ (HAB); cf. also MidArm. and dial. hol-k- ‘cemetery’ [HAB 3: 112a]. Some Eastern dialects have an epenthetic -n-: Larabal ik’navset, Ararat ek’nas’ek’ (< *ayg-n-a-hol-ay-k’), etc.

Bəfraṇyan (1960: 110a) interprets Xarberd (K’i) akxk’, agxk’ ‘ceremony at the next morning after the funeral’ as composed of akn ‘eye’ and olxk’ ‘supplication’.

8 This etymology partly coincides with that of Eazće in ‘Patker’ 1890: 198-209 (I cite from HAB 1: 162a).
This view cannot be accepted. The word is certainly identical with *ayg-hol-k’ above.

The initial nasal of Jula nagnaxol (see Ačar 1940: 79, 159, 352) is perhaps due to anticipation. Samaxi ink’nahol (HAB) may be explained by anticipation and/or folk-etymological reinterpretation as containing ink’n ‘himself’; the loss of the initial in- in k’nahol (HAB; Balramyan 1964: 186) may be due to reinterpretation, as being composed of k’un ‘sleep’ and hol ‘earth’. Further, see 2.1.37.

For the epenthetic nasal also seen in Larabal ik’narol ‘taking the cattle to pasturing before the dawn’ [HAB 1: 166a], see 2.1.30.1.

Remarkable is Van sk’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; Ačryan 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-Mkrt’yan (1970: 183a) reads: eg pärew, a’y eg pärew. As is explicitly interpreted by Ter-Mkrt’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 Ačryan (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. aiow ‘Leben(szeit), Zeit(dauer), lange Zeit’, Skt. ayu- ‘lifetime’, etc. The phonological development seems impeccable: PIE NSg *h₂(e)iu̯-ōn > Arm. *aygu(n) > ayg, -u, cf. LSg aygun ‘in the morning’ (cf. Olsen 1999: 108 222; 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- (= *h₂e₁-i) ‘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.

Ačryan compares ayg with Gr. Att. ἔος, Ion. ἕος ‘dawn’, but rejects the connection for phonological reasons. (On the other cognates and the reconstruction, see s.v. ariawat ‘morning’). Clackson (1994: 223m) developed the same connection, without a specific reference to Ačryan’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: *h₂áusós > *ʌju- > *ʌju- (through dissimilation) > *ʌju- > *aygu-. This is not convincing. Perhaps a later thematization would solve the problem: PArm. *aujo- > ayg seems to be easier (cf. also s.v. ẽg and 2.1.27.1). It would also explain the
o-stem, which cannot otherwise continue a PIE *-os, since this word is not a neuter. Cf. also (z)aygoy ‘in the morning’, which seems to be a secondary locative in *-i, based on the same thematic form; thus, *aygo-* > z-aygoy, or simply GDPI functioning as an “endungslos” locative without preposition i/- cf. de Lamberterie’s explanation of erekov, q.v. The influence of erekov ‘evening’ is perhaps not excluded (cf. Olsen 1999: 108-109). Note, however, that the morphology of z-aygoy and erekov 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) *h₂e₂u-s-ós; cf. Clackson 1994: 226130.

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. *aηj-; cf., particularly, the above-mentioned hypothetical *h₂j-sijjo- > Arm. *aygo-, a thematicization based on the old locative.

I conclude:
NSg *h₂e₂u-s-ós > PArm. *awu > *aw, u-stem (cf. ar-aw-awt)
GSg *h₂j-s-s-ós
LSg *h₂j-s-s-i > PArm. *aw(h)i > (thematization) *awj-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-ofj, GDPI ayge-a-c’, AbPlI y-ayge-a-c’, LocPlI 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’ (diai.); ayge- < *aygi-a- and ayg-a- in a number of compounds (Bible+).

Abundant in the Bible, rendering Gr. ἁμπέλος f. ‘grape-vine, Vitis vinifera’ or ἁμπελών m. ‘vineyard’. A textual illustration from Deuteronomy 8.8 (Cox 1981: 112): erkir c’orenov ew garoy aygeac’ : γῆ πυροῦ καὶ κραδής, ἁμπελών. For the full passage, see s.v. gari ‘barley’. For the meaning ‘grape-vine’, note Hosea 10.1: Aygi tata'ow ptilic’ Israyel’ : ἁμπελός εἰκελησματοῦσα Ἰσραήλ.

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

• DIAI Widespread in the dialects, mainly meaning ‘garden’: Erznka ek’i [Kostandyan 1979: 128a], Agulis ğ’i (for the paradigm, see Açařean 1935: 333), pl. ąg ąnàni, ąg ąndik’; Aslanbek, Rodošt’o, Xarberd, Tigranakert, C’nà ek’i, Akn ąg’i, Marala, Salmast ek”i, Hačova ąg’i, Zeyt’un ąg’i, T’iflis ąg’i, Jula ąg’i, Van ıki, Ararat ıki [HAB 1: 166b].

Next to Van ıkiy one finds Ozim hège [HAB 1: 166b; Açařyan 1952: 244], Šatax hikyi [M. Muradyan 1962: 191b], Mokshek’ı [see below], as well as Muş h’ęgi (HAB, ibid.), Aštarak hık’i, which has been replaced by bar’ in the village of Osakan (see Balıdeşaryan-T’ap’al’c’yan 1971: 218). These forms seem to point to a by-form *y-aygi (see 2.3.1).

Moks hek’sı, 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 sírun t’up’ kalızo’ [Orbeli 2002: 120168]; Orbeli (op. cit. 182110; 1982: 118116) translates it as follows: “Из любви к винограду лижет и куст!”.
ayl, o-stem: GSg ayl-o-y, DLlocSg ayl-um, AblSg y-ayl-m-ė, ISg ayl-o-v, GDPl ayl-o-c’, IPL ayl-o-v-k’. ‘other; alien, foreign; also; but, however; then’ (Bible+).

For abundant evidence for ayl, ayl im/n/in’ok’, and the like, for reciprocal or distributive expressions ayl ayl, ayl ew ayl, ayl ayl, ayl ew ayl, ayl oly, ayl wdy ayl, ayl ñd ayl aylow’ (cf. Gr. άλλος άλλον, Lat. alius alius, alius alium ‘one another’, Skt. anyó anyā-, etc., Mawet 1990: 64; 1992: 157), as well as for numerous derivatives and compounds, see NHB 1: 82-90; Astucaturean 1895: 64-66; Mawet 1990.

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


On the problem of l: ã and the spelling variant ayl, see NHB 1: 83a; Meillet 1911: 209; 1936: 47; HAB 1: 168b; Alayan 1961: 75, 81; Jāhukyan 1982: 25.

For an extensive discussion and references on the problem of *l: ãy- instead of *l: ãy- see HAB 1: 168b; for a further discussion and other examples, see Schmitt 1981: 77; Jāhukyan 1982: 71-72; Ravnaes 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 off ‘whole, sound’ (q.v.) from *ol-ijo-, cf. OIr. uile ‘whole’. Further see s.vv. da(y)l ‘colostrum, beestings’, jawn ‘voice, sound’. Note, however, gulf ‘lukewarm’ if from *gl-iY- 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. *hawl, 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). 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; Schnitt 1981: 126-127; Clackson 1994: 63, 212b. For an extensive philological (in particular, semantic) discussion of Arm. ayl and the PIE term, see Mawet 1990 and 1992, respectively.

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

GDPI ayc-eac’ is attested in the Bible more than 30 times, whereas ayci’ – only a few [Astuacaturean 1895: 66ab], and NSg ayc-ı 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 ayc-e-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 CIArm., ayc refers to the female (3+ years) [HAB 1: 170a], The same holds for Šatax ecx, which refers to the mother-goat according to M. Muradyan (1962: 83), probably also for Moks ec, glossed as ‘коза = nanny-goat’ in Orbeli 2002: 224. Moks ecni ‘of goatskin’, found in a riddle describing the shoes (see Orbeli 2002: 126N1644i), is comparable with classical ayceni ‘id.’.

ETYM Since NHB (1: 90b), linked with Gr. αἴξ, αἰγός f. ‘goat’, YAv. ęzānna-‘leathern’, etc. [Hübschmann 1881: 176-177; 1897: 417; HAB 1: 169b]. Probably ayc, i-stem derives from fem. *h2(e)i ğ-eh2- and ayci-k’ (ea-stem) – from *h2(e)i ğ-eh2-; 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)įğ-ięh2 [Orel 1994: 358; Demiraj 1997: 160]. See also s.v. gor and 3.5.2.1. Note that Arm. ayc mostly refers to ‘she-goat’ in CIArm., 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 *h2įģ- > *Hyğ-, with -y- analogically after NSg *h2eįģ- (see 2.1.5). We may be dealing with a Kulturwort (for the discussion and references, see Kortlandt 1986: 38 = 2003: 68; Clackson 1994: 218b).

CIArm. ayc-emi and Moks ecni ‘of goatskin’ can be compared with YAv. ęzānna-‘leathern’.

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

ays
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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 Açařyan (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), 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. āyu- n. ‘life, lifetime’, time’ (gen.sg. OAv. yaoš, dat.sg. OAv. yauuž, yavue, YAv. yauue), OAv. yauuējī- adj. ‘living forever’ (cf. Arm. yawēž, i-stem, Iranian loanword), Gr. αἰών m. ‘lifetime, time, duration’, Lat. aevo m. (also aevo m.) ‘lifetime, eternity’, etc. Intervocalic *-i 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. *kenok (lit. IPl of kean-k ‘life’), Modern Colloquial Armenian *kenk’um ‘never’ (< *‘in the life, in lifetime’).


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 Zöhrapelian 1805, 3: 21). This passage seems to correspond to Psalms 11.6 in RevStBibl (“a scorching wind shall be the portion of their cup”) and 10.6 in Septuaginta (Rahlfs): πνεῦμα καταιγίδος ἡ μερὶς τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτῶν.

In his commentary on Psalms, Vardan Arewel’ci (13th cent.) comments upon this passage: ays, or ἢ holm “ays, that is holm ‘wind’. Elsewhere in Psalms, namely 106.25 and 148.8, the same πνεῦμα καταιγίδος is rendered as holm ev mrrik. In these three passages, thus, πνεῦμα corresponds twice to holm and once to ays. For the parallelism between ays and holm, 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 Kolbac’i (5th cent.): Yoržam mek’ asemk’ t’e sik’ šněć’ e, storneayk’ asen – ays šněć’ e “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: 307-308. 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 holm ē, ew holmn – ogi ‘the ays [‘evil spirit’] is holm [‘wind’], and the holm [‘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 (87,35): “The ‘southerners’, storeayk’, are the Syrians”, which is in conflict with the form storeayk’ (and not asorneyk’) 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; Ačaṙyan, HLPatm 2, 1951: 125; Jähukyan 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 Kolh, one may take this evidence as a historical testimony reflecting the dialectal contrast between groups which might be conventionally named as the Muš/Alaštêr/Karin-group and the Van/Agulis/Larabal-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 yaysoyn ē’arē “struck by an evil spirit”.

See also s.v. zaysaysem.

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

On aysahar, see s.v. zaysaysem.

ETYM Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 172a) rejects all the etymological attempts, including those relating ays to Skt. āsura- m. ‘god, lord’ and Etrusc. ais ‘god’. Jähukyan (1983: 87-88; 1987: 450, 462-463; 1988, 1: 64) is inclined to connect the word with Skt. āsura- m. ‘god, lord, name of a group of gods’, āsurā- ‘godlike; demonlike’ (RV+), Av. ahu- m. ‘lord, overlord’, Hitt. haš- ‘to procreate, give birth’, P Germ. *ansuz ‘Gott, Ase’, etc. For Armenian, he assumes *h2(e)nsu-i [Olsen 1999: 958], 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, Jähukyan (1987: 450) also mentions Arab. hanzab ‘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), Ačaṙyan (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: GDPI ayt-i- célibe in Nersès Lambronac’i (12th cent.), etc. ‘cheek’ (Bible+); aytunam, aor. aytayav (Bible+) ‘to swell’.

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

● DIAL. No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 172b. In Svedia, however, one finds utc’/udc’ ‘swelling, tumour’, utic’il/udic’il ‘to swell’, which Andreasyan (1967: 265) derives from aytoc’ (better: aytoc’y) and aytoc’il, respectively. Further: K’esab utc’ and utc’ sg (from aytoc’y and aytoc’y-k’), and verbal utc’im (< aytuc’anem) and utc’ ‘swelling’ (< aytuc’anem) [Čolak’ean 1986: 195b]. Ačarayan 2003 vacat.

● ETYM Since de Lagarde, connected with Gr. οἶδέω ‘to swell’, οἶδος 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. īkstis ‘kidneys’, Lith. īnkstas ‘kidney’, Plb. jaisto ‘kidneys’ from *h2(o)id-st- [Derksen 1996: 259-261]. Lat. aemidus ‘swollen’ probably reflects *h2eid-sm- [Schrijver 1991: 38]. Arm. ayr may be treated as a regular s-stem like Gr. οἶδος 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 aṁ, AblSg y-arn-ē, ISg aram-b, NPl ar-k’, API ar-s, GDPI aran-c’, Ipl aram-b-k’ ‘man; husband’. Widely attested since the Bible. Classical derivatives based on both ayr- and aṁ.. 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 (ka-group), as well as in Marala and Salnast [HAB 1: 174b]. Trapizon talar < *tal-ayr ‘husband’s sister’s husband’ is composed of tal ‘husband’s sister’ and ayr ‘husband’ [Ačarayan 1913: 1008b; HAB 1: 174b]. Xarberd aṁ-ë/ank’, Nor Naxijewan aṁ-ak’ ‘husband’s relatives’ [Ačarayan 1913: 133b], and *aṁ-tak’ ‘id.’ are considered by Ačarayan (HAB 1: 174b) to be ‘new words’. The fact that aṁ is not present in dialects rather suggests that these formations are relatively old.

The archaic genitive aṁ has been indirectly preserved in Larabal gen. têrna < ClArm. te-āṛn, GDSg of īr < *ti-ayr ‘master, lord’ (see Dav’t’yan 1966: 483). For a clear textual illustration of this Larabal 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. ἄνηρ (ἄνδρος, ἄνδρα, pl. ἄνδρες, ep. also ἄνερ, ἄνερος, etc.) ‘man (opp. woman/god/youth); husband’; cf. also Lat. Nerō, nerōsus ‘strong’ [Schrijver 1991: 21], Skt. nār- ‘man, human, hero, warrior’ (RV+), etc. Kuiper (1951) posits a Greek old abstract *αὐρέπ, *αὐρεπ’ ‘vital energy’ on the basis of -ŋýov and -ŋýov-ovy (PIE *h-ner-; cf. Skt. sū-nār-, etc.); cf. Frisk 1: 107 (“wenig wahrscheinlich”)).
Meillet (1896: 151; 1900: 184; 1936: 55, 83, 143, 149) correctly rejects the alternative derivation of Arm. ayr from PIE *rsen-: Gr. ἄρσην, -ενος ‘male’, etc. (Hübbschmann 1897: 417-418) and equates Arm. NSg ayr, GDSg arn and API ar-s with ἄνδρος, ἄνδρός and PIE acc.pl. *anrns respectively, assuming for ayr a development comparable to that of Gr. ἥμαρ vs. Arm. awr ‘day’ (q.v.). Thus: PIE *h2nēr (cf. Gr. ἄνδρος) > PArm. *anir > *aynr or *ayn(i)r > ayr (Meillet, ibid.; J̌ahukyan 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).


Hamp (1966: 12-13) proposed the following scenario. Genitive *arnos (< *anros, cf. Gr. ἄνδρός) 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 anurǰ ‘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. Jahukyan 1982: 118; 1987: 182, 287; A. Petrosyan 2002: 85-95) is possible, albeit unnecessary.

**ayr**, 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, Muş, Alaškert as cr and in Van, Ozim, Moks, Salmast as hcr, with an initial h-; see HAB 1: 175a; Ačarliyan 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 *yu*- gives ū- in Van (Ačarliyan’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, Ačarliyan’s Law was anteriour to the development ay > ē. It seems, thus, that in Van hcr < *yu ayr the initial h- has been preserved because Ačarliyan’s Law did not operate in this case.

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

ayri

(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. ḫarīya- ‘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. kohl ‘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. sort ‘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 ψώρᾳ ἀγρίᾳ “with malignant itch, scurvy”. For the passage, see s.v. k’os ‘scab’.

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


Jasanoff (1979: 145; see also Viredaz 2005: 85) proposed a connection with Gr. aitho ‘to kindle; to burn (with light)’, Skt. edh- ‘to set alight, kindle; to shine’, etc. from PIE *h₂eidh- (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 267; Cheung 2007: 157). However, the sound development of Arm. -r- from PIE *-dh- is uncertain; see also s.v. ur ‘where (to)’. I would expect *ayd- from *h₂eidh- (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 ayrem (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, Astucaturencean 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 erigənog < *ayri-knik, as well as folk-etymological erig-guig (< *ayrik-knik ‘husband-wife’ or ‘man(ly)-wife’) ‘widow’ in Tigranakert [HAB 1: 176b].

Interesting is ərk’əveri in the village of Čšara of Hamšen ərp’əveri. This can be explained through dissimilation of labiality: p’əv > k’əv. Nor Naxijewan ərfari, əfari (older ərp’əvari) is due to haplology.

As stated by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 176b), *orb-ew-ayri refers to women. In a fairy-tale recorded in Suši (Larabal) in 1926, however, one finds ərp’əveri referring to a man (see HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 59). One also finds Xnus-Bulanx orbewari ‘widower’ (E. Melik’ean 1964: 20614), as well as Muş orbewernal (said of a man) ‘to become a widower’ in a fairy-tale originated in the Muş-region [HŽHek’ 12,
ayc’

1984: 257L1]. Note also Zeyt’un ayr-mard ‘a man whose wife has been died (= widower’) [HayLezBrbBai 1, 2001: 54a].

See also s.v. orb ‘orphan’.

\*ETYM Ačar’yan (HAB 1: 176b) does not accept any of the etymological attempts, including the one (Emin) that derives ayr-i from ayr ‘man, husband’. This idea presupposes a basic meaning like ‘woman connected with a husband’ [Clarkson 1994: 93, 219-220;1]. It has been assumed that we are dealing with a privative *n-formation based upon ayr, thus: *h-nēr-iyā ‘having no husband, manless’ (Dumézil 1940: 69; see also Saradževa 1986: 263-264; Jähukyan 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-ēr-iah2- > PArm. *ananir-ia- > ayr, ayea- ‘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)’, ayrı ‘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 ayce’ armem, etc. (Bible+); in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.27 (1913=1991: 288L12), ayce’ ew xndir. Later, verbs ayce’em in John Chrysostom, Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc., ayce’-el-em in Yovhannēs Draxaxedarte’i, etc., and derivatives based on ayce’-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; Scheffelowitz 1927: 225]. Ačar’yan (HAB 1: 177a; 3: 32b, pace Hübschmann) correctly identifies ayce’ with hayce’em, q.v.


Alternatively, ayce’ 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. hē-. PIE *h₂is-sk- could be realized as *h2i-sk- > PArm. *ayce’- analogically after full-grade hayce’ 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 ţanāyān, Moks hānākyān, Ozim hangyān [Ačāryan 1952: 244] (for the textual evidence, see Ter-Mkrt’yan 1970: 151, 185a), Šatax hānākyān [M. Muradyan 1962: 33, 70, 192], Muš y’ank’an [Baldasaryan-Ţ’ap’al’yan 1958: 245a]. See 2.3.1 for more details.

●ETYMA Ačāryan (HAB 1: 178a) leaves the origin of the word open. Jahukyan (1987: 113, 269) hesitantly connects to aganim ‘to spend the night’; very uncertain. Clackson (1994: 223-224) 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’ and aygn; oč’ kanux).

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

analut’ien, GDSg anlβ’t’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 onj-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: ôφιο-μάχης: oj-a-mart, μυ-γαλῆ: mkn-ak’is, χαμαι-λέων: getn-aṙewc. 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, agrawv, 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: 21-32; Eremyan 1972-73, A: 230): kendani inc’ nman analst’oy, mardamart ew anušahot “a certain animal resembling an(al)ut’, “man-fighting” and aromatic’. In the short recension one finds the following readings for analst’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: 344-130]). In the version of T’ovmas Kilikec’i (14th cent.): nalut’ [Anasyan 1967: 282-132].

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, orš mardamart ē ew anušahot. Note that Hewsen (1992: 51A) translates the corresponding passage of the short recension in the same way, without emendation: “an animal like a giraffe, that is ferocious but aromatic”.

For anlt’oy, Hewsen (1992: 99-112) 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: 34-1-1 (French transl. “la girafe”, p. 46); MovsXorenMaten 1865: 610; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 350-31; Eremyan 1963: 110; Hewsen 1992: 65, 65A]. The 1944 edition again has analut, with an unaspirated -t.

•DIAL As convincingly demonstrated by Ačar’yan (HAB 1: 179a; Ačar’yan 1947: 12, 220; see also Eremyan 1963: 92a), Hamšen onlut’ (in Čanik: onlut) ‘hind’ undoubtedly continues ClArm. analut’. The word belongs to the 4th declension of the dialect of Hamšen: GSG onluton, AbStg onlută [Ačar’yan 1947: 46, 96, 220].

The GDSg form onlut’on occurs in a tale told by Arak’si Lazaryan-P’ač’āyan (a survivor of the Genocide, a former inhabitant of Trapizon) and recorded by B. T’orlak’yan (1986: 35.260) in 1966: onlut’on pes t’rav gnac’ tuta: “(he) flew like a deer and went home”. Here (241b) onlut’ is glossed as ebnık, paxra, jeyran.

As we have seen, analut’ is attested in Ašxarhac’oyc’, among others, in readings anlst’-oy, with syncope of the medial -a-, and analut, with unaspirated -t. Both features coincide with Hamšen onlut. 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
analut’

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: 99–112), 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 (*oncult*) 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 *oncult*) 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: 21]. 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: 204–238, 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 *elferu* and *ehn*. Next to this, Arm. *erė* is the generic term for ‘deer’. In the same list (Deuteronomy 14), next to *analut’*, one finds *elferu* rendering Gr. ἔλαφος. In Ašxarhac’oyc’, we encounter *erė* several times, and *elferu* 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’orlak’yán 1982: 25f, 31, etc.), the Hamšen area would have provided the fallow deer with these favourable conditions. The beech-tree (hačaracar) is mentioned in Asxarhac’oc’, next to analut’, see below. As far as the oleander is concerned, note that Arm. ēp’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).


The development was, then, as follows: PIE *h₁(o)-Hn-th₂-o- > PArm. *alom’o- > *alant’ (apocope). The -u- in analut’ can be explained as an analogical restoration, as in ant’ : anut’ ‘armpit’ (see Jähukyan 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- νέβρος.
‘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 > *anali, etc.; (2) $l...n > n...l$ (cf. šlni > šlik’, etc.); (3) $n...n > l...n$ (cf. anamux > *anlux’, 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’, Mfr. ailit l. ‘doe, hind’, etc.) with metathesis (seen also in Gr. ėvēlōç) 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. Mkrtčjan 2005: 257-258 treated analut’ as a Semitic loan, cf. Akkad. naiā̯̄lu, 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. ēln : analut’ vs. Gr. ėlêlôç : ėvēlôç : 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-urnished -aran-útū and PArm. (< Sem.) *nalut-.

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

In Eznik Kolbac’i 1.25 (1994: 84): jkunk’ anarik’ covakank’ “monstrous sea fish (pl.)”.


In Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyam 1944: 22834], about a hunted wild boar: ev vasn zi anari ēr tesleamb, kšec’ “and since [the boar] was anari by appearance, I weighed [it]”.


Two later attestations quoted in NHB 1: 116b: orj vișap’ anarwoy “Lair of the enormous dragon” (“Çaṙəntir’); sparazineal anari nizakôk’ “armed with enormous spears”.
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’, aṙem (1SgAor arari) ‘to make; to create’, y-arem ‘to put together’, ard ‘shape’, from PIE *h2er- ‘to fit, to make; to create’, y-arem ‘to put 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-.

Yet another etymology is provided by Łap'anc'yan 1961: 161-162.
angti

• DIAL Karin angti, Łarabāl ang [HAB 1: 184a], Goris ang [Margaryan 1975: 75, 111, 313a]. See further below.

• ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 1: 184a. Jahukyan (1982: 105; 1987: 412; see also A. Petrosjan 1987: 60-61) derives the word from *ank̡-g̡- (*h₂-enk̡-)* to bend’, motivating the semantics by the form of the beak. For the *-l- he compares Toch. onkalâm ‘elephant’, B onkolmo/a ‘id.’, Toch. ačāc ‘bow’. Different etymologies have been suggested for PToch. *onkolmo, among them also a derivation from PIE *h₂-enk- ‘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. ang (angl in Geponica, API angel-s three times in Paterica) ‘handle of a pot or basket’. This word is considered an Iranian loan by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 184a), cf. Pers. angal(a), angil, angūl(a) ‘button, button-hole, loop’ (for the forms, see also Steingass 115ab). In my view, Arm. angl ‘handle’ can better be derived from *h₂-enk-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 angl lack the final -l, as those of angl ‘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 ęngiil ‘handle’ [HAB 3: 604a; Ačaryan 2003: 559] or ąngol ‘the bowed handle of a pot or basket’ [Andreasyan 1967: 220, 353b].

I conclude that Arm. angl (API angel-s in Paterica; dial. *ang and *angl) ‘handle of a pot or basket’ and Arm. angl ‘vulture’ (Bible+; dial. *ang and *angl) derive from *h₂-enk-u-l-, cf. Gr. ἀγκύλος ‘curved, bent’, OIc. ǫngull ‘fishhook’, OHG angul ‘fishhook, prick, hinge’, etc. Pers. angal(a), angil, 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(c) ‘curved’ > kor ‘gryphon, vulture’, which renders Gr. γρύψ, γρῡπός ‘gryphon, vulture’ in Deuteronomy 14.12. Note also dial. (Van) kor-c’ənk ‘kite’ (see s.vv. kor ‘vulture’ and c’in ‘kite’). The same semantics is also seen in the above-mentioned Greek match of Arm. kor(c), namely γρύψ, which also means ‘anchor’ or the like, and may be related or associated with γρῡπός ‘hook-nosed, curved, hooked, aquiline’.

angl, ‘handle of a pot or basket’.

• ETYM See s.v. ang1.

angti ‘prostitute’.

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

• DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded.

11 A contamination is possible too.
I hypothetically suggest a connection with Moks äng'üüt [Orbeli 2002: 202], äng'üüt ‘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 Jahakyan 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 HayLezBrbBar 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 *-t'i(-o/eh2)- appears in Armenian as -ti, -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, T’iflis, Ararat hand, Axale’xa hant, Larabah händ, etc. [HAB 1: 186b]. Ačāryan (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: Larabal händ-ä-vär ‘estate, landed property, house with all possessions’ and Muš hand-a-vor-ɛk ‘house-interior with courtyard, etc.’ [Ačārea 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 Džejranov 1898: 69.  

Udi händ ‘cornfield’ and händä-vär ‘surroundings’ are considered as Armenian loans [HAB 1: 186b]. One can be more specific: they are obviously borrowed directly from Larabal.  

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

Textual illustrations for Larabal händ-ɛ ‘in a pastureland’: In HŽHek 5, 1966: 538-106: toesnum min händi min č ‘oban več’ar a wesc’nom: “sees (that) a shepherd
grazes sheep in a pastureland”; at 540 and 609 – håndin. In a riddle (Barxutareanc’ 1898: 51): Mi kov unem – håndi a “I have a cow, (which) is in pastureland”. Further: HŽHek’ 7, 1979: 209L3, 215L1, 464L5. In a fairy-tale, it is said that a man goes to die in the field – håndi maerine [NmušLeinLarab 1978: 81L6].

In Lori, e.g. in a fairy-tale from the village of Šnoł (recorded by Hm. Mažinyan; see Nawasardeanc’ 5, 1889: 64L-9, 69L4; = HŽHek’ 8, 1977: 16L13, 19L2), where the Calf (Mozi gnmm a handa racelu “goes to the pastureland to graze”.

The meaning ‘pastureland’ is also seen in Ľ. Ałayan 1979: 626L17: Mi aravot, tavar hand tanelu žamanak, <...>: “One morning, at the time of taking the cattle to pastureland, <...>”.


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

Ačaryan (HAB 1: 186a) notes that Larabāł hånd-ă-vär ‘estate, landed property, house with all possessions’ and Muš hand-a-vor-ɛk ‘house-interior with courtyard, etc.’ point to a collective meaning ‘house and properties’. He (ibid.) takes ũnd to be identical with and- ‘door-frame, threshold, vestibule’ (q.v.) which has also developed the meaning ‘house’, cf. dial. *andrwor ‘house-personal, family’.

Ačaryan’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 dvor ‘court, courtyard’, Lith. dvâras ‘estate’, Av. duuar- ‘door, court’, etc., cf. the PIE word for ‘door’ (Arm. duûn, dur- ‘door’, cf. i dur-s ‘outdoors, outside’). Note also Av. adâhuwa loc.pl. ‘house’ which probably derives from the PIE word for ‘doorframe, doorposts’ (cf. YAV. qîthiâ- 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 təṙnart ‘cornfields that are close to the village (“близкие к деревне поля”)’ [Orbeli 2002: 335], obviously composed of duûn ‘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-t ‘grains’ which is usually compared with PIE *h:ent-; see Illi-Śvityć 1964: 4; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 873; Jahukyan 1987: 450. Since the semantic relationship ‘cornfield’ : ‘grains’ is plausible (cf. Av. uruwarā- ‘flora’, Mlr. arbor ‘grain, corn’ vs. Gr. ἄγωνα ‘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 *h:ond-os-, with h- from zero-grade oblique stem. Alternatively: from Sem. *hunf-.
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 h2nd- and obl. *h2nd-), respectively. However, the vocalism of Larabal händ cannot be explained from *hand. I suggest to derive it from *y-and or *y-(h)and, through A caractère’s Law, see 2.3.1. This form may have arisen due to the generalization of the CIArm. locative y-and-i, seen in Larabal händ-i (see above).

The vocalism of Larabal händ cannot be explained from *hand. I suggest to derive it from *and- or *y-and, through A caractère’s Law, see 2.3.1. This form may have arisen due to the generalization of the CIArm. locative y-and-i, seen in Larabal 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-drand-s, GDPI drand-i-c’ (as a reading variant); dr-and-i (ea-stem): GDsg drand-w-oY, LocSg aṙ drand-w-oY, NPI drand-i-k’, GDPl drand-e-ac’ (as a reading variant); dr-and-i (ea-stem): GDSg drand-w-oy, LocSg aṙ drand-w-oY, NPl drand-i-k’, GDPl drand-e-ac’ (all in the Bible) ‘space before a door, porch; threshold’ (Bible); dial. (Muš/Bulanax, Hamšen, etc.) *dr-and-i ‘the upper horizontal part of the door-frame or at a balcony’, in Bulanax also *dr-and-oY ‘id.’.

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

In Saucle (8) 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 GDPl drand-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/Bulanax: drandi ‘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 aṙ drandwoy dran tan aṙ nn <...:...> ew jeṁ iw i veray drandwoy : ἐπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ϑύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος τοῦ ὀίκου τοῦ ἀνδρός <...:...> καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἐπὶ τὸ πρόϑυρον (“fell down at the door of the man’s house <...:...> with her hands on the threshold”). As we can see, here παρὰ τὴν ϑύραν τοῦ πυλῶνος (with πύλη ‘house-door; entrance; one wing of a pair of double gates’) is translated as aṙ drandwoy dran, and in the second part of the passage drandi corresponds to πρό-ϑυρον.

In aṙ drandwoy dran, *dur- ‘door’ appears twice. The same is also seen in dialects: Bulanax dran drandi (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/Bulanax dr’andì ‘the upper part of the door-frame’ [HAB 1: 186b; Amatuni 1912: 172b], Van tərmdì [A caractère 1952: 257], Hamšen desrdì ‘the
horizontal beam at a balcony’ [Ačaryan 1947: 226] (according to T’orlak’yán 1981: 152b, terenti, terentia).

In Muş/Bulanax one finds the following contrast: drndi ‘the upper part of the door-frame’ vs. šem-k’ ‘the lower part of the door-frame’ [S. Movsisyan 1972: 15a]. See also HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 351b, where the meaning is represented as ‘the upper wood of the door-frame’. This meaning of drndi can be corroborated by textual illustrations from folklore.

In a fairy-tale told by Fidan Makaryan (native of Muş/Bulanax, the village of Kop’ in Leninakan in 1930-36, the spouses Nóno and Dánno close the door, put the key ‘above the drndi of the door’ (dṙan dṙandwoy dran and leave (HŽHek’ 10, 1967: 365L12; cf. also 365L-11). Then someone approaches the door and stretches his hand above the drndi (jerk’ gerkon’u dṙanu verew) and finds the key (365L-1f). In the glossary of this collection of fairy-tales the word is represented as follows: dṙan dṙand-ew “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. 85L-4f):

es kɛɫnim ɔj, ko k’ašvim dṙan drnden, axperd ɔr gika, zpuučak ko xeć’im, merc’um “I will turn into a snake, I’ll go to the dṙand 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 dṙandu. In the above passages, the word occurs in GDSg dṙandu/dṙandu 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 dṙan dṙond-, as in Judges 19.26-27: aṙ dṙando vɔoy dṙan (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 Ašekyan (< 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: dṙan dṙond/din.

We may conclude that in Muş (Bulanax, Alaškert) the meaning ‘the upper horizontal part of the door-frame, lintel’ of drndi (as correctly given by Ačaryan in HAB) is reliable. A similar meaning is seen in Hamšen. As to the form, in Muş/Bulanax one finds both *dr-and-i and *dr-and-ay.

Melik’ean (1964: 484b) represents the meaning of Xnus (also belonging to Muş-group) drndi as follows: “threshold, wooden poles at the four sides of the door (/čardara/).” The actual meaning seems to be, thus, ‘door-frame’.

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

Note also Ararat, Lori, Širak drind, usually described as ‘the upper/inner, soft part of the hand’ [Amatuni 1912: 171b; Ačārean 1913: 289a; HayLezBrbBr 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 čerac’ tanis ’поверхность кисти руки’, lit. ‘roof of the hand’ (see Orbeli 2002: 253). Surmalu andvor ‘family’, Van andvor ‘family’ > (euphem.) ‘wife, spouse’ [HAB 1: 186b]. A curse formula from Van (Şêrenc’ VanSaz 2, 1899: 159121, cf. also 16114b): Aneck’ k’e tan
*and-

telac’, ancek’ 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 ankaj, 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. Muş, 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 oncs’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 < oncs’av ‘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<sup>12</sup>-7f; unclear.

12 In the same dialect of Akn [Čanikean 1895: 153<sup>1186</sup>], one finds a phrase hanterk’i e 菀ast 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 *handep-k’ ‘an illness caused by spirits’ found in Akn, Ašlanbek, Polis, Partizak, etc. Cf. CIArm. handip- ‘to meet, occur’ [Ačařean 1913: 637b; Tēr-Yakobean 1960: 508; HAB 1: 660-661; 3: 39b]. Note also Xarberd *hampert-k’ ‘evil spirits living on thresholds’ (see Ačařean 1913: 634), the structure of which is unclear. Somehow related with the metathesized form of handip- ‘to meet, occur’, namely dial. hampet (found e.g. in HZHenk’10, 1967: 103<sup>15</sup>; also hambadel 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. ḍā- ‘door-frame’. We have seen that PArm. *and- is also found in other formations in dialects (perhaps even independently, in Akm), as well as in and-astak ‘vestibule’ (John Chrysostom). Further, see s.v. and ‘cornfield’.

According to Olsen (1999: 677-69, 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. Ašak’elyan (1984: 88) takes -and in the word dr-and as a suffix, which is untenable.

**ANDI**

O-stem: GSG and-w-o-y, GDPl and-w-o-c’ (Bible+), andeay, mostly pl. andeay-k’: API andeay-s, GDPl and-ē-o-c’ (Bible+), GDPl andeay-c’ (Afrahat/Zgōn), andē-i-c’ (Aristakēs Lastiverte’s) ‘cattle; cattle herd’.

In the Bible, we find a few attestations of GDPl andw-o-c’ (also with prepositions y-, z-); in Numbers, AbiSg y-andw-o-y is attested many times, in the following pattern: zuarac mi/erkus ‘one/two’ (or pl. zuarak-s) yandwoy [Astuacaturean 1895: 93a]. [Thus, andi (coll.) ‘herd’?]. As for andeay, the following forms are attested in the Bible: NPl andeay-k’, API andeay-s, GDPl andē-o-c’ [Astuacaturean 1895: 92-93]. For other forms, see NHB 1: 132. A collective form without the plural marker -k’ in the meaning ‘cattle herd’ is found in Genesis 18.7 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 219), in allative y-andeay: yandeay int ‘ac ‘aw Abraam ew airt mi matal ew hari: ‘And Abraham ran to the herd, and took a calf, tender and good’.

andeord, a-stem ‘herdsman’, usually occurring in apposition with hoviw ‘shepherd’, as in Moversēs Xorenac’i 2.38 (1913=1991: 164+), in GDPl andēord-a-c’.

**ETYM** According to NHB (1: 132a), derived from and ‘cornfields, etc.’. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 188b) does not accept this explanation, but cites no other etymologies. Jāhikyan (1963a: 89; 1987: 112, 157) develops the etymology of NHB; and for the structure compares vaq ‘field, uncultivated grounds’ > vaq ‘wild’. See also s.v. art-i-

**ANDRUAR** ‘cart, wagon; horse or mule yoked to a cart’, attested in Agat’angelos, Lazar P’arpee’i, Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom, etc. Spelled also as andr(u/a)var.

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

L. Hovhannisyan (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 *zan-war ‘palanquin’ and *eris/war ‘fine horse’. As to *andr, one might assume that it meant ‘cart, wagon’ and is connected with Skt. ádihvan- m. ‘road’ (RV+), OAv. aduan-, YAv. aðfhan- m. ‘road’ from PIE *h₁ndh₁-o-ner-. (probably, an original heteroclitic noun *adhvar-/adhvan- ‘(holy) road’); cf. Ocl. ondurr ‘snow-shoe’ < PIE *h₁ondh₁-ur-o-, Gr. ἐνϑεῖν (aor.) ‘come’ < PIE *h₁ndh₁-e/o-.

Thus, perhaps, *h₁ndh₁-ur- ‘road’ > PArm. *and(u)r ‘cart, wagon’. For the semantic relationship, cf. PIE *ue gḥ- (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 488a). Compare especially OIc. ǫndurr ‘snow-shoe’ (< PIE *h₁ondh₁-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; HayLezBrbBar 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 o-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; Jăhukyan 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’dunt, Alakṣert h’antut (in HAB 3: 39a – h’andud), Šatax h’ändūtk’y, Moks händűtk’, Nor Bayazet handund, Agulis ā’ändūtk’, Salmast, Urmia (Xoy) ľändūtk’ [HAB 1: 191a; Ačāryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 94 (the paradigm of Šatax h’ändūtk’y),192a; M. Asatryan 1962: 191b].

According to Baldašaryan-T’ap’alc’yan (1958: 245, 245), 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 Alakṣert h’andovel ‘to get lost underground’, Ačāryan (HAB 3: 39a) also mentions Muš h’andandel ‘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: Alakṣert h’antut (in HAB 3: 39a: h’andud), T’iifl is andut’k, Šatax h’ändūtk’y, Moks händűtk’, Salmast, Urmia (Xoy) ľändūtk’ [HAB 1: 191a; Ačāryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 94, 192a; Asatryan 1962: 191b]. Larabal andōxts [Davt’yan 1966: 310] may belong here, too (see below). The isogloss sets off the dialect group 7 (Van – Urmia – Larabal area), and the Northern (T’iifl) and Eastern parts of the dialect group 2 (the line runs between Muš and Alakṣert; cf. Muš h’andundh k’ vs. Alakṣert 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 Meři area of group 6.
It has been argued that, if initial ClArm. a- corresponds to Šatax ʰə-, Van ə- and Muš ʰə-, 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 Ačaṙyan 1952: 245). However, the remaining evidence seems sufficient to corroborate the reconstruction. The forms with y- can be explained from prefixation with ʰy-< PIE *h₁enʰ-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’arō of Hayoc’ jor (Van) and first published in 1909, we find hantüt’k’ [Sasna cṙer 1, 1936: 1062]. More evidence is needed. If reliable, this h- requires a separate discussion since ya- and ha-yield Van ə- and xa-, respectively. A few such examples can be found in Ačaṙyan 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 Melri area belonging to group 6 one finds *dund instead of andund(k’): Melri diund [Alayan 1954: 295]; Karčewan diund [H. Muradyan 1960: 192a], Kak’avard diund [H. Muradyan 1967: 169b].

•ETYM Armenian andund-k’, o-stem ‘abyss’ is a privative compound of PIE *bhud’n-no- (probably from older *bhud’n-mno- which resulted from an original paradigm NSg *bh’d-mēn, GSg *bhud’-mn-ōs): Skt. budhnā- 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. πυθμήν, -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: 11L13f. Not included in Greppin 1983.

The metathesis *-dh-n- > -nd- may be old since it is also found in Lat. fundus ‘bottom’, OIr. bond ‘sole’, MInd., Dard., Prakr. bundha- n. ‘root’, FPerm. (< Iran.) *punata- ‘ground, bottom’ [Schrijver 1991: 501; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 228-229; Olsen 1999: 288] (Gr. πυνάζ, -αξος m. ‘bottom of a jar, cup, or other vessel’ is problematic).

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; Jahukyan 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 \( *n̥-bhudhno- \) comparable with Skt. \( a-budhná- \) ‘bottomless’ (RV 1.24.7; 8.77.5) seems plausible. Note also Pahl. \( a-bun \) [‘bwn] ‘baseless, bottomless’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 4). However, one cannot be absolutely sure whether we are dealing with a shared innovation or independent developments in Indo-Iranian and Armenian. Compare also Gr. \( ἄβυσσος \) ‘bottomless, unfathomed’, subst. f. ‘the great deep; the abyss, underworld’ beside \( βυϑός \) m. ‘the depth (esp. of the sea)’, \( βυσσός \) m. ‘depth of the sea’, 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 \( *n̥-budh'-io- \), 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 Larabal \( an-d̡xta \), its possible protoform \( *an-duft- \) is reminiscent of Alb. \( det \), dial. [dɛt] m. ‘sea’ (< \( *Meerestiefe \) < \( *d̡’eb-eto- \); cf. Goth. \( diuþpa \) ‘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 Larabal form can be explained in a simpler way; see below.

The form \( *dund \) in the Melri 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 \( *d'ub-. \) I am not even sure that \( *dund \) belongs to \( andund-k' \). Muradyan does not specify the meaning of the forms of Karčewan and Kak’avaberd. As regards the Melri form, Alayan glosses it as meaning ‘small hillock’ (stressing that this is the root of \( andund \)), and I do not understand the semantic motivation. Note also Melri \( dend \) ‘hill’ [Alayan 1954: 295].

Larabal \( an-d̡xta \, an-d̡xt(n)ə \) is explained by Davt’yan (1966: 56) by a metathesis \(-ndk' > -k'ndn \), 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 Balramyan 1964: 187), which is one of the closest to Larabal, also in Burdur (see N. Mkr’t’yan 1971: 177a), the speakers of which migrated from Larabal in the beginning of the 17th century. (The word is not recorded in Goris; see Margaryan 1975). An alternative explanation that Larabal \( *an-duft- \) 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. Larabal \( *andox(t)nə \) and \( *andox(t)nə \) might be explained by a folk-etymological reinterpretation as \( *and ox(t)nə \) *at the seventh layer of the Underworld’. According to the Armenian folk-beliefs, the Underworld consists of seven layers; cf. also the curse: \( getnin oxt ɫat’ə anc’nis \) ‘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 [Xem’yan 2000: 246b]. The variant *andox(t)ns shows an additional -n (for which see Weitenberg 1985); cf. Ľaranab oxns (< oxt ‘seven’) ‘funerary rite on the seventh day after the death’ (see Lisić’yan 1981: 52; Davt’yam 1966: 349). For the reflexes of ənd in the dialect of Ľaranab, see HAB 2: 124b; Davt’yam 1966: 352.

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

aner, o-stem: GDSg aner-o-y (widespread in the Bible; Mŏvsës 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 (Nersës Șnorhali, 12th cent.), GDPl aner-a-c’ (Vahram Vardapet, 13th cent.) ‘father-in-law, wife’s father’ (P’awstos Buzand, Mŏvsës 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: 11.14; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 71): ew minè der vASN aynorik zuučin zna anerk’ nora: “but while his in-laws oppressed him on account of this”. Other attestations can be found in Mŏvsës Xorenac’i 2.82 (1913=1991: 225.2), etc., Vahram Vardapet (13th cent., Cilicia), and Step’anos Ȣrbelean (13th cent., Siwnik’), see NHB 1: 139b; HAB 1: 193a; for the attestation in Step’anos Ȣrbelean, 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, Marala, 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’ [MijHayBaf 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, Larabal, Goris, Šamaxi, Kiţen, etc., one finds hánɛr, with an initial h- [HAB ibid.; Balramyan 1961: 174b; 1964: 187; Davt’yam 1966: 310; Margaryan 1975: 313b].

Marala aner, Zeyt’un anir, and Hačan 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 kakọ and Turk. keynát’a in Marala, and by zak‘anë hbb (= zok‘anë ‘wife’s mother’ + pap ‘father’) in Zeyt’un [HAB 1: 193a; Aćarean 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’aşa, in 1912 in Laznafar [HΖHek’ 9, 1968: 211.14]. İncë anastrvac mard en im anerik: ‘What kind of ‘god-less’ people are my in-laws!’.

MidArm. aner-jag ‘brother-in-law, wife’s brother’ is present in Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Arabkir [Aćarean 1913: 97b], Širak, Ararat, Muş, etc. [Amaţuni 1912: 30-31]. Note Moks änercak’o, gen. änercak’-u, pl. änercak’-ir and -ir ‘шурин, сын

13 For the typology of such compounds cf. skesr-ayr ‘husband’s father’ = skesur ‘husband’s mother’ + ayr ‘man’.
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testia' vs. anir, gen. ānir-uč', pl. āner-k ordeal, gen.pl. āner-k ordeal-u 'testia' [Orbeli 2002: 202, 203].

*ETYM Dervishjan (1877: 35-36) connects aner with Gr. ἀνήρ '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 *aʔ-ero-, a derivative of the PIE word for 'ancestor' with the comparative *-ero- seen in Skt. āpara- '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. Ačányan (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. jā́mahār- '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; Jahukyan 1987: 111, 259, 260 (hesitantly); Olsen 1999: 32-33.

This etymology implies a connection with Arm. han(i) 'grandmother', cf. Gr. ἀνήρ 'mother-in-law', Lat. annus 'old woman', etc. That this PIE word for 'ancestress, grandmother' would develop a meaning 'wife’s father' is not impossible, cf. Lith. anytą '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. aw 'grandson', Lith. avinias 'maternal uncle', Hitt. ḫuḫḫaš 'grandfather', etc. vs. Lat. avia 'grandmother', Goth. awo 'grandmother', etc. (see Szemerényi 1977: 47N, 48N, 11; Lehmann 1986: 53; Huld/Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 238a, 239a). Compare also Bulg. džado, deda, dědo 'grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife’s father', d’ado 'grandfather; father-in-law, husband’s father', děda 'elder sister', Maced. dodo 'grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife’s father', Lith. dēdė, dēdis 'uncle', Gr. τήϑη 'grandmother', τηϑίς 'father’s or mother’s sister, aunt', τηϑία 'old woman', Lith. tetà, Russ. teťja 'aunt', etc. (see s.v. *tat(a) 'grandmother; father').

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

*anec: anicanem, 3sg.aor.act. anêc, imper. anêc (Bible), 3sg.aor.mid. anic-a-w (Grigoris Aršaruni) ‘to curse’ (Bible+); anêc-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.
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ant′, ant′-i-tak ‘armpit’ is given in NHB 2: 1043c as a dialectal word. Indeed, this compound is recorded in a number of dialects; see below.

ant′-a-tak ‘armpit’, compound with tak ‘below, under’: Van (h)ant′-i-tak, ant′-a-tak, verb hant′el, Moks hant′-a-tak [HAB 1: 29, 130, 207-208; Ačāryan 1952: 245; M. Muradyan 1962: 192a], Bulanax hant′etak [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a]. According to Orbeli (2002: 226), Moks (the village of Anmac′) ant′etak refers to ‘pešpo’ (= ‘rib’). For a textual illustration of Van ant′i tak, see Ter-Mkrt′yan 1970: 149a. The voiced h′ in Bulanax, Šatax, etc. point to *y-, see 2.3.1.

Zeyt′un ant′ ‘embrace’, Hačan ant′ ‘bundle’, Maraš ant′ ‘shoulder, back’ [Ačāryan 2003: 298].

Hamšen ant′, ant′ ‘embrace, grasp’, ant′uš, anttuš ‘to embrace’, ant´i-tag ‘armpit’ (with tak ‘below, under’) [Ačāryan 1947: 12, 35, 177, 221].

Apart from Hamšen and Van-group, the compound ant′-a-tak is also found in Muš (h′and etak) and Alahkert (h′ant′etak) [HAB 1: 208a]; according to Baldasaryan-T′ap′aleyan (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 -i/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, Baldasaryan-T’ap’ale’y 1958 and Madat’y 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’nt’VTak, as if reflecting NSg *yunt’ vs. oblique and compositional *y(s)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. áks-a- m., Lat. ax-is, Lith. aš-is, OHG ahsa f., etc.), assuming a development *uksn- > *asn-ut’. For the semantics, cf. Lat. axilla ‘armpit’, OHG uohsana, OEIng. óxn ‘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 Jahuhyan (1983: 88).

Jahuhyan (1983: 88) compares Lith. ačiš ‘bosom’, už-ačiš ‘bosom; armpit’, Latv. ažuôts ‘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, Jahuhyan reconstructs a by-form *ant’- (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 explain by additional factors such as the influence of a following PIE laryngeal or the reconstruction of another consonant between the sonant and the dental. The former factor would help to reformulate the etymology of Jahuhyan by assuming a thematic formation based on fem. *h2(V)nt-eh2-. Thus: *h2(V)nt-h2-o- > PArm. *ant’-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. áncati ‘to bend’, anıká- m. ‘hook, clamp’, ánkas- n. ‘curve’ (RV+), Gr. ἄγκ- ‘to curve’, ἀγκάλη f., mostly pl. ‘curved arm, armfull’, ἀγκωλος ‘curved, bent’, ἀγκών m. ‘elbow’, Lat. ancus ‘with crooked arms’, OHG anguld ‘fishhook’, SerbCS škots ‘hook’ f., ORuss. f. ukots ‘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)l’- > ant’ regularly; see 2.1.22.13. Note that the suffix *-ti- is frequently found in Sanskrit body-part terms, cf. śipti- ‘shoulder’ (RV), etc. [Mayrhofer EWAia 2: 647].

One wonders whether Lith. ačiš, etc. point to a “primitive” root *h2en- from which *h2en-k- has been derived. Cf. also *h2ens- > Lat. ánsa ‘handle, grip’, OPr. ansis ‘hook of a kettle’, Lith. qsa ‘ear of a jug, eye of a needle, button-hole’, Latv. iūosa ‘handle, ear, eyeflet’, 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 arm'i?

*ant'ayr*- in Bağırık' hayoc', one finds ant' ayr 'spark' [Amalyan 1975: 21N[455]].

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

Dial. ant'-<r>-oc' (see s.v. ant'el 'hot coal, ember') may belong here, too.

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

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects; also with the suffix -oc': ant'(-e)l-oc' and ant'-<r>-oc' (both attested also in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1060c). The variant ant'-<r>-oc' has been preserved in Bulanx, Van, T'avriz [HAB 1: 194a], Urmia, Salmast [GwUrSalm 1, 1897: 546]. See also s.v. ant' ayr 'spark' (probably from *ant'-ar-i).

**ETYM** Ačaryan (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. Lap'anc'yan (1961: 163-164) adds Hitt. ant- 'warm'. See also Greppin 1978-79: 435, who points out that the function of the final -el is not clarified. Further, see Schultheiss 1961: 225-226.

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

One wonders whether Hitt. ḫandāš '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 -l, cf. other semantically similar examples: Lat. candēla 'candle', Arm. xand-al-, xanj-oř 'half-burnt wood' (Bible+), etc. (see s.vv. xand, xanj-); Gr. αἰθ-αί-η 'soot' from αἴθω 'to kindle; to burn'; Arm. gaz-al 'ash' vs. *gaz- 'to burn' (q.v.). For the *-r- element seen in dial. *ant'-r-, Gr. ἄνθραξ and perhaps ant' ayr, cf. xanj-r- (Agat'angelos), xanj-ar 'spark' (Grigor Magistros, "Geoponica"), see s.vv. xand, xanj-. Note also Muš pj-ēl, Alaškert pēj-il 'spark' from *pec 'spark' (see HAB 2: 507a) next to Van pc-ar 'spark' [Ačarean 1913: 908] : paye-ar 'shiny, clear, splended' (Bible+; dial.) [HAB 4: 17-18]; cf. also acul/x. Thus, ant'-el 'ember' and *ant'-r- 'spark' may be seen as derivations from substr. *ant'- with alternating *-l- and *-r- suffixal elements as in *xand-al : xanj-(V)il; Muš *pc-el : 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’ čarakawk’ ) 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 APl ‘useful birds’ without a specification [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349].


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. āti- ‘a water bird’, Lat. anas, GSt anatis (also anit-) ‘duck’, Lith. āntis ‘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: 170-171 (on PGerm. *anúdi-); Schrijver 1991: 94-95; Rix 1991; M. Meier-Brügger 1993; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 171; Cheung 2002: 111, 149 (on Oss. acc/acce ‘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. vĩσσα, Boeot. ἕσσα ‘duck’ is related.

From the zero-grade form, one would expect Arm. *and-, s.v. (dr)and-i ‘threshold’. In the hypothetical paradigm NSg *and, GSt *and-i, the nominative might have been reshaped analogically (after words like ak’is, GSt ak’i ‘weasel’; karič, GSt karići ‘scorpion’, etc.) to one of the possible forms, namely *anid 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’ čarakawk’ (see above) are mentioned in (a part of) the same province of Barjr Hayk’, gawaṙ 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 (Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 522): 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 ancoy) appears after lu and oǰil and before kic (see s.vv.). For the passages, see also Greppin 1990: 70α, 70β. For a semantic discussion, see below.
initial *ha-*. Goris *hanic*, *hanec* [Margaryan 1975: 313b, 424a], Łarabal *hánic*, *hánec* [Davit’yan 1966: 310], Šamšadin and Krasnoselsk *hanic* [Mežunc’ 1989: 184a], Melki *hánic* [Alayan 1954: 262];


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 *ananag* (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, *marmajołakan* ‘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, oflov, ancov. This is unconvincing since *anic* ‘nit, louse egg’ here forms a logical pair with qjil ‘louse’. In both passages, thus, *anic* is represented as a 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; Ačaṙean 1913: 101ab).


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

For the initial alternation *k/gh-* 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- > a-*, which is uncertain; cf. 2.1.6. (For his idea about the possible folk-etymological influence of anēc-’, see below). Besides, in view of the Albanian form, here we have *k*- rather than *k-,* although Jahukyan (1982: 73, 74; in 1987: 133, with a question mark) reconstructs *knid-s* for Armenian. Earlier (1967: 245, 245b), 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- < *k̂-* before the final affricate -c (see Hulûd 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-/*kanid- > *konid-/*tid. Then, *anid- (< *tid)* 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: *thoni- > *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 *konida-*, since the nominative of the paradigm was *konid-s*. Further, EArm. *h-* requires an explanation.


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

NSG *skōnid-s > *c’ónico > *sánic, analogically after the oblique stem, perhaps also due to contamination with anicanem.

oblique *sk(n)id- (loss of *k- in the cluster, as in Irish) > *sonid- (with analogical *-o- from the nominative, as in Gr. GSG kovīkoς) > *sanitV- (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)w’t’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: 223 223), 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, GPl anu-o-c’ (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 100a); there is some evidence also for a-stem: GDSg anu-i, AblSg anu-ē, GPl anu-a-c’ (NHB 1: 156bc; Ritter 1983: 1941) ‘wheel’ (Bible+), ‘axle of a chariot’ (rendering Gr. ἄξων in Exodus 14.25, see NHB 1: 156b; Ritter 1983: 1941) ‘wheel as a torture instrument’ (Bible+, see below), ‘sun’ (Eznik Kolbaci’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 J.̌ahukyan 1959: 321-322.

● DIAL. Preserved in Muš. The rest of dialects have replaced aniw by akn ‘eye, etc.’ or Turk. t’ek’ir, etc. [HAB 1: 109a, 196a; AČarėan 1902: 130].


This comparison was revived by Ritter 1983 who posits a vrddhi-derivation *h3nēbh-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 *h3nēbh-i- directly equating with Skt. nābh- f. ‘nave’. However, the Sanskrit form is usually derived from *h3nobh-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 *h3nēbh- 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 *h-e/önid-s is involved.
and a-stems may be derived from PArm. masculine thematic *-o- and fem. *-e₄- proteo-forms respectively. The initial *h₃nV- regularly yields Arm. *anV- (pace Lindeman 1997: 56; see s.v. 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. snāa ‘to wind, twist (yarn), twine (thread)’, etc. (on the etymology, 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: 194f.

Witczak (1999: 181) compares aniw with Skt. nem₁- ‘felloe of a wheel’ positing *neim-. This would yield Arm. *(a)nēm-, however. One might assume an original HD i-stem with nom. in *-ōi (cf. 2.2.2.4): *Hneim-ōi, gen. *Hnim-i-ōs > PArm. *anēm’(u), *snim-i-ō- > *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. ḫurmač-n. ‘a kind of crime’ or ‘abomination’, usually derived from ḫurk- ‘wheel’ < PIE *Huerg₂- ‘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: 494., 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-o- and gel-an, 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: 150f.): Apa kraman tayr t’agaworn Parsic’ Šapuh, <...>, ew zamenayn zkin ew zmanuk hanel ənd 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 (120f., transl. 157). In Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.35 (1913=1991: 300f.): Zors gereal handerj ganjiwk’n ew tiknawn P’aṙanjemaw xalac’uc’in i yAsorestan; ew ənd sayli c’ic’ haneal satakec’in “Taking them captive with the treasures and Queen P’aranjem 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-uc ‘the weaving,

For *m₄- > *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’, cadēver, -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’əngənəl (perhaps also Agulis hongən̂əl) 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 *sn̥gw- ‘to sink, fall’, cf. Goth. sigqan, 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. ankenum ‘to cause to fall, throw down’.

ankiwn, an-stem: GDsg anyan, Ablsg y-ankiwan-ə (once), ISg ankean-k’, NPl ankiv-k’; 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 Aćaır (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. Larabal əŋgın ‘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 qgołb ‘corner’, Olc. 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. ariven ‘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 *h₂eng- (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 anjaw is attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.16 (1913= 1991: 5419; transl. Thomson 1978: 101), in the wonderful description of the rock of Van: *Išk zondədəm aregakən kohn anjawin, ur ew oč’ gic mi erkə’ov ayəzəm veragrel ok’ karə, zayspiṣi karkrut’iwn nisɨ’ı pəs pəs təca’r ew seneaks ūt’ic’ ew tuwən ganjuc’ ew viws erkars, oč’ gîtə ok’, t’ə oprisəc’ irac’ patrasət’iwn hrašakertəc’ “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, ayr2 and daran (see HAB s.v.v). The context which unifies these three words can be illustrated by a passage where palanjaw (a hapax composed of pal ‘immovable rock’ [HAB 4: 4a, 13, 90a], q.v., and anjaw) appears in an impressive description of ‘inaccessible caves’ (yamur ays) of Manana; see Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.45 (1913= 1991: 314L7-19; Thomson 1978: 307-308).


•ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 1: 202b) mentions the connection to anjuk ‘narrow’ (q.v.) suggested implicitly in NHB 1: 190b. Jahukyan (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; Bedrängnis’ : ‘stoney/cliffy place’, cf. vax ‘fear’ vs. vax ‘precipitous/cliffy place’.

The problem of -aw is more intriguing. Basing herself on Skt. aṁhati- f. ‘Bedrängnis, Not’ and OCS ozota ‘Enge’ and restoring an old “s/t-stem”, Olsen (1999: 355-356, 784-785) derives anjaw < *(h)ənə-OTA- through vowel assimilation ə-e/o-a > a-a-a. However, the formation of Skt. aṁhati- is “ungewöhnlich” [Mayrhofer EWAl 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 Jähukyan (1987: 112) from *aŋə̱nə|- (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)nə|-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 Jähukyan, argues against this point of view with two objections: first, there is no external evidence for a root-final
laryngeal; second, an intervocalic *-u̯- 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)ngʷ-H-u-, probably analogical after the IE antonym *plth₂-u- ‘wide’; see s.v. yalta. Next to PArm. *-w is the regular development in the Classical auslaut; see 2.1.8. The PArm. form could have been *h₂(e)ngʷ-H-u-, which is continued in anjuk (q.v.), and the oblique stem *anjw-i/a- may go back to QIE *h₂(e)ngʷ-H-u-eh₂-, with analogical *-Hu̯> -aw- after unattested *halt-aw-V. Compare y-olov, i-stem ‘abundant’ vs. Skt. purú-, i. pārvi- ‘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.


The meaning ‘body’ is seen, e.g., in derivatives like anj-n-‘l large-bodied’ in John Chrysostom, and koptar-anjn in Movsēs Xorenaci’s 2.8 (1913=1991: 114-115), translated by Thomson (1978: 141) as ‘monstrous’. It has been preserved in the dialects (see below).

The derivative anjin-‘ay ‘personable, large-bodied’ is attested in I Kings 9.2 (rendering Gr. εὐμεγέϑης and in Movsēs Xorenaci’s 1.12 (1913=1991: 41-115); transl. Thomson 1978: 91); zayr sēg ew anjneay “a proud and personable man” (on Sisak); also 1.10 (32-115); transl. 85): gelapatsač ew anjneay “handsome and personable” (on Hayk).

The meaning ‘ipse’ can be illustrated, e.g., by the following passages. In Lazar P’arpec’i (5th cent.) 3.82 (1904=1985: 150-152; transl. Thomson 1991: 209): oē’ tayr dul anjinn “he permitted himself <...> no delay”. In T’ovma Arcruni 2.7 /10th cent./ (1985: 192; transl. Thomson 1985: 188): Ew en gazanabaryok’, arivnahrub’, a’ oē’inč’ hamarelov zspanumn elbarc’ 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 anjin-awor ‘subsistent; breathing’ (< ‘body/soul possessing’) is attested in EzniKołbac’i, Philo, etc. In his “Refutation of the Sects”, EzniKołbac’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.

● DIAI. 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 Larabal (HŻHek’ 6, 1973: 636-637).

Van any means ‘the vulva of a pregnant cow’ [Açarya 1913: 104a; HAB 1: 204a] or ‘the vulva of an animal’ [Açarya 1952: 248].

Açarya (HAB 1: 204a) does not cite any dialectal form continuing ClArm. anjnahor. 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 crēr” In SasCt 2/2, 1951: 821, 965a, it has been explicitly treated as a result
of a wrong interpretation of *anjoy hrelen* ‘fiery with body’. Note also Gomer *aznahur* ‘giant’ [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 8a]. This seems unnecessary in view of the following forms: Sasun *anjavur* ‘animate, living, corporeal’ [Petoyan 1954: 103; 1965: 443]; Moks *anjavur, anjnahur* ‘animate, giant, mighty’ [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 63b]. Also *azn-avor* can be derived from *anjnavor*, with the sound development -njn- > -zn-. See s.v. *azn-avor* 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: 256b; H. Mkrt’yan 1987: 56, 5617; cf. also dial. (Adana) *hrɛ̄ik* ‘giant’ (see Ačaṙean 1913: 676a), *hurnik-hre* (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. Mkrt’yan 1987: 57]. Note also Širak, etc. *aǰbay-huri* (vars. *hav-a-huri, abra-huri*), an epithet of the rain-bringing doll Nuri(n) (see Mxit’areanc’ 1901: 273; Ṙ. Grigoryan 1970: 325-326), obviously composed as *ačp-* or *aǰb-* ‘amazement’ + -a- + *huri* ‘fairy’. This is implicitly suggested by Abelyan (1941: 91) who renders *aǰbahuri* “wonderful fairy” (*hrašali haveržahars*); see also HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 96a.

**anjuk**, o-stem: GDG anjk-o-y (a homily ascribed to Elišč; “Yačaxapatum”), ISg anjk-o-v (Lazar P’arpec’i, John Chrysostom, Grigor Narekac’i); a-stem: ISg anjk-o-w in Movsês Xorenac’i 3.68 (see below) and “Yačaxapatum” 6 (although in 10 and 11: GDG anjkoy) adj. ‘narrow; difficult’; subst. ‘narrow passage; mountainous place which is hard to traverse; anxiety, affliction; desire, longing’.


**ETYM** Since de Lagarde (1854: 15L35) and Hübßchmann (1897: 420424), derived from IE *h₂(e)n̥-gʰ- ‘narrow’. Skt. *aṁh₄-, MPers. *anzuk, Goth. aggw Gala, etc.; cf. also PIE s-stem: Skt. *āṁhas- n. ‘Angst, Bedrängnis’, Lat. *angustus*, 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. gaɫ-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.

anǰrdi, o- or ea-stem ‘(adj.) arid; (subst.) arid place, desert’.

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

● DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB. In 2003: 13, 298, ACałyán mentions Zeyt’un forms continuing anǰrdi (anj’y’d’a ‘thirsty’, anǰ’y’d’il and anǰ’y’d’nol ‘to get thirsty’), stating that the word is absent in other dialects. However, it has been preserved in Goris: anচerdi, an çiftidi (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 ‘ọvọpọ’ and jrem ‘to water, irrigate’. Olsen (1999: 371) hesitantly derives the suffix -di from IE *-tio- or *-tʰh₂-tio- (from *dʰeh₂- ‘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 yuᵢt’i ‘fertile, watered’ < y- (<*h₁en- ‘in’) + *uᵢr + *t’i and naww’i ‘hungry’ < *nᵢ + *aw + *t’i (q.v.). See also 2.3.1.

Compare also Svedia *an-apur-d/t ‘uninhabited (place)’, with apur- ‘to live’.

antaɾ, a-stem: GDsg antaɾ-i, LocSg y-antaɾ-i, GDI Pl antaɾ-a-c’ (all attested in the Bible; the alleged IPl antaɾ-o-v-k’ in Job 40.17/22 is in fact antaɾ-a-w-k’, see Cox 2006: 259); later i-stem: GDI Pl antaɾ-i-c’ (Paticurca), IPl antaɾ-i-w-k’ (Nersős Lambronac’i) ‘forest’ (Bible+).

● DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB and HayLezBrB. But antaɾ is present in a number of E dialects, e.g. Larabal antaɾ [Davt’yan 1966: 312]. Besides, it is the principal word for ‘forest’ in Modern Armenian. Note also Meli place-name Andaɾ [Afayán 1954: 262b].

● ETYM The component *-taɾ has frequently been compared to IE *doru- ‘wood, tree’ (see s.v.v. targal, tarr, toɾn, torg). Bugge 1890: 85-86 compares the phonological alternation caɾ ‘tree’ vs. an-taɾ ‘forest’ (with an- from *sm-; see also
Saradževa 1986: 367, with *cic : tit ‘teat’ (q.v.). Ačaryan (HAB 4: 671) connects *anta-
'elementum' (q.v.), although here the alternate *tair is relatively young. The semantic
relationship between *cic and 'elementum' is well known, cf. Lat. silva, Eng. wood(s), Russ. les(á), Fr. bois, etc. (see also s.v. mayri). Arm. *anta-
'elementum' is attested once (Basil of Caesarea).

One the other hand, one can alternatively suggest an etymological connection
with *cic 'tree'. It is tempting to suggest a direct comparison with tarr/tair
'elementum' (q.v.), although here the alternant c/t is relatively young. The semantic
relationship between 'wood, material' and 'woods' is well known, cf. Lat. silva, Eng. wood(s), Russ. les(á), Fr. bois, etc. (see also s.v. mayri). Arm. *anta-
'elementum' is attested once (Basil of Caesarea).

The reconstruction of *smt-ru- would be possible if we assume a contamination
with smt-ru- *smt-ru- with a question mark.Earlier, he (1967: 182, 303; cf. also NHB 1: 243a) equated the component *ta-r with Arm. cair
'tree', placing *anta-r in the list of words with alternation c/t.

The reconstruction of *smt-ru- would be possible if we assume a contamination
with smt-ru-. It is tempting to suggest a direct comparison with tarr/tair
'elementum' (q.v.), although here the alternant c/t is relatively young. The semantic
relationship between 'wood, material' and 'woods' is well known, cf. Lat. silva, Eng. wood(s), Russ. les(á), Fr. bois, etc. (see also s.v. mayri). Arm. *anta-
'elementum' is attested once (Basil of Caesarea).

If Arm. *anta-r 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-ro- > PArm. *anta-r- > Arm. anta-r-.

The formulation neuter *-s- + *r- cf. *kérh- >/ Lat. cerebrum 'brain' from the s-stem found in Skt. s ēr 'head', Gr. kérh '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-č, ISg anuan-b, NPl anuan-k-', GDPI anuan-č '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 'οὐ̃ ἐϑηκεν τὸ ὀνόμα αὐτοῦ Ισραηλ'), one might assume a Greek calque. This is unnecessary because of other examples, e.g. Genesis 4.17 (Zeit'sunyan 1985: 162): Ew šinēr k'alač 'ew dnēr anun k'alač in yamu undinwv ëlogy Ḟpok'ay : καὶ ἐν οἰκοδομών τούτων καὶ ἐπωνομάζειν τὴν πόλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ὀνόματος Ενωχ. Furthermore, the formula is corroborated by dialectal evidence.

DIALECT Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 208-209]. With generalization of the oblique
stem *anu-{a}: Van anun, GSG anuav, NPl anuav-, Ozim anu-{a}- france 'famous' (= ISg), see Ačaryan 1952: 128, also 103, 245.

In some peripheral NE, E, SE dialects (T'iflis, Ararat, Łarabal, Goris, Žula [HAB 1: 209a], Agulis [Ačmaean 1935: 127, 335], etc.), one finds anum or anum. Note also anum 'famous', etc. (HAB, ibid.).

anum dnem 'to put a name' in Polis, Nor Naxijewan [Ačmaean 1913: 107a], and elsewhere (HayLezBrBbr 1, 2001: 69a; Malxaseane HBB 1: 166ab). For a textual
illustration, see SasC 1, 1936: 406.
ETYM Since Klaproth, NHB, etc., linked with the IE forms of the word for ‘name’: Gr. ὄνομα, -ατος n., Lat. nomen, -inis n., Skt. nāman- n. (RV+), MPers., NPers. nām, Goth. nām, OCS ime, etc. [Häbschmann 1897: 420; HAB 1: 208].


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 Jähukyan (1959: 177; 1985: 157; 1987: 278; see also Dav’tyan 1966: 66; N. Simonyan 1979: 230-231), too, dial. *anum originates from *anumn when the development *-umn > *-wn > -un had not yet taken place. He (ibid.) alternatively admits the possibility of a dissimilation anumn > *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 > ClArm. anun : anuan, with generalization of *-w-; (2) *anumn : *anman > anum, with the generalization of *-m-.


The ‘name’ functions as an accusative of specification in constructions of the type Skt. āsīd rāja Nalo nāma “there was a king Nala (his) name”, etc. (see Hahn 1969; Beekes 1973e). This construction is also found in the original Armenian literature since the oldest period, e.g. in Korin (1981: 92L3, transl. 277): Ėw na արաքեր zo nn Vahrič anun “He then dispatched a man named Vahrič”. For examples from Elishe, 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-č in Job 31.22 (Cox 2006: 201) ‘collarbone, clavicle’ (rendering Gr. κλείς ‘collarbones’ in Job 31.22).

A textual illustration from Job 40:26: Et’e kapič’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. ānis, i m. ‘ring, circle; ring, link; anus’18, Ofr. dinne ‘ring’. Aćaryan (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- (= *h₃néh₃-no-)

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

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. Jahukyan (1987: 112, 235, 439; cf. 1998: 35-36) posits *an-ō-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. οἶδος ‘swelling’, etc. (see s.v. ayt-k’ ‘cheek’) suggested by Aɫayan 1974: 20-22 is untenable.

anur-k’, i-stem: GDPl anr-i-c’ (Philo, Book of Chries, Gregory of Nyssa, Yovhannēs Drasxanakert’i, etc.); o-stem: GDSg an(o)r-i-y (Paterica), GDPl anr-i-o-c’ (Grigor Narek’ac’i) ‘dream, day-dream, prophetic vision, vision’. The oldest attestation is found in Matthew 27.19: ɿ-anur-k’-s ‘in a dream’. The meaning ‘prophetic dream’ is seen e.g. in the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 76) and in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.88 (1913=1991: 238 L5; transl. Thomson 1978: 243), in the derivative anur-akan. Note also Book of Chries 8.2.2 (G. Muradyan 1993: 189 L34; Russ. transl. 2000: 179): yastuacayin anr-i-c’n “в божественных снах”.

● ETYM Since NHB (1: 223c), connected with Gr. ὄναρ n. ‘dream’, especially ‘fortune-telling dream, vision’, ὄνειρος m. ‘god of dreams, dream’, ὄνοιρος m., Cret. ὄνιορον, ὄνωρ, ὄνωρ (Hesychius), Alb. ādërrē (Geg.), āndērrē (Tosc.) from *andërrē < *h₃n-ir-o- (Kortlandt 1986: 38, 44 = 2003: 68, 74). For references and a discussion, see HAB 1: 209-210; Pisani 1934: 180-182; Clackson 1994: 150-152. Arm. anur, o-stem, comes from QIE *h₁n-ir-o-. The alternative i-stem probably points to *ih₂-


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

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 Snorhali, 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’na has ǝšk, GŠg, aški [HAB 1: 223a; Ačarean 1935: 21, 331, 336].
Hamşen *ačʾōk* anel ‘to give (a sign with) a wink’ [Ačařeň: 1913; 117b] derives from IPI ačʾawk. GDPI ačʾacʾ is represented in Van ačʾacʾ-bažin ‘a small share of food given just to ease the hunger a little bit’ (lit. ‘the share of the eyes’) and ačʾacʾ-ulnik ‘eye-bead (amulet)’ [Ačařeň: 1913; 116b].

More abundant is the evidence for GDPI ačʾicʾ (frequently assimilated to ačʾicʾ), mostly in petrified expressions and derivatives: Hamşen ačʾicʾ hilun ‘eye-bead (amulet)’ [Ačaryan 1947: 221], Partizak ačʾicʾ ‘a prayer against the evil eye’, Čenkiler (Nikomedia) ačʾicʾ ʾallah ‘to be struck by the evil eye’, Kʿli *ačʾicʾ-čuk ‘stricken by the evil eye’, *ačʾicʾ-čfur ‘a kind of medicine for the disease of the eye’ [Ačařeň: 1913; 116b], Van ačʾicʾ-ulnik ‘eye-bead (amulet)’, Moks ačʾicʾ tʿartʿap ‘winking, moment’, Xotorj *ačʾicʾ-ulnik ‘to get sick being struck by the evil eye’ (see also Yušam:Xotor 1964: 429b), Karin, Balu *ačʾicʾ-čhat (see s.v. hat), Xarberd ačʾicʾ anel ‘to pray against the evil eye’, Sebastia *ačʾicʾ-čerwutʾ-kʾ ‘ghost’, Larabal *ačʾicʾ / ačʾicʾ līnəl ‘to get sick being struck by the evil eye’ [HayLezBrB1 1: 2001: 77a], Dersim ačʾicʾ ʾllil ‘to become free of the evil eye’, ačʾiğag ‘small shell-amulets sewn on the hats of children against the evil eye’, ačʾicʾ ‘spectacles, eye-glasses’ [Brahmyan 1960: 111b], Erzinka ačʾicʾ kʿar ‘eye-bead (amulet)’ [Kostandyan 1979: 151a]. Particularly rich material is recorded for Sebastia by Gabikean (1952: 74-77). Note also Xarberd *ačʾicʾ hanel ‘to fulfil one’s wish’ (see HayLezBrB1 1: 2001: 45b).

Van ačʾicʾ is still a part of the paradigm [Ačaryan 1952: 128]. Some illustrations can be found e.g. in a folk-tale recorded in 1915 [HZHek 14, 999: 13-39]: mečʾ parvā ačʾicʾ (18, 19) ‘into the eyes of the old woman’; ver mer ačʾicʾ, ver mer gylixan (35) ‘onto our eyes, our head’. This GDPI ačʾicʾ can hardly be secondary since almost all the other examples of archaic GDPI forms of Van listed by Ačaryan (1952: 128), even those not belonging to the a-declension, have -ačʾ. The only exception is CIArm. van-kʾ, -ačʾ, which has GDPI vanicʾ in the dialect of Van. For ʾo-tʾkʾ, -icʾ ‘feet’ (q.v.), another form continuing PIE dual, I would also expect a GDPI form with -icʾ in Van. The actual form is, however, votacʾ, probably analogical after ceracʾ < CIArm. jeracʾ.


Armenian dual ačʾ- reflects the PIE dual form *h₂(ə)kw*-i in n. ‘both eyes’. It is tempting to assume that Arm. *ačʾ-i- (post-classical; dialects) directly continues the PIE dual in *-h₂-, whereas classical ačʾ-a- reflects the neuter plural in *(e)h₂-*. Further see s.v. singulative akn ‘eye’.

aj. o-stem: GDSg aj-o-y, AbLSg y-aj-o-y, ISg aj-o-v; u-stem: GDSg aj-u, GDPI aj-u-e’; note also LocSg y-aj-u and y-aj-am, AbLSg y-aj-m-e (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 150-151) ‘right’.

See also s.v. araf ‘front’.

A textual illustration for *af-o-y and *y-af-m-ē in one and the same sentence can be found in Movsës Xorenac’i 1.11 (1913=1991: 36[12]; transl. Thomson 1978: 87): *en nizak anari i jerín iwrum afj, *en yahekunn vahan, *en antirk yawmē *en 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 *af has been replaced by *sal of Turkish origin [HAB 1: 247a].


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

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

I do not know of a dialectal form that would be derivable from a PArm. *hač’. Even if there are dialectal forms with an initial h-, it might be regarded as a relic of the IE *s- of our *seh-<d'>-yo- (compare the cases of e.g. *arbi- ‘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. *af from *patyo-.

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

The prefixed forms see under corresponding entries.


The first person form, viz. āris/ārēs, continues ClArm. ār is (cf. z-is, AccSg of ex ‘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.


It is not entirely clear whether the second -a- of the by-form arāa- has an etymological value. A combination ar + 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. araspel ‘myth, fable’, arastal ‘ceiling’). Different is the case of aratik ‘rope’ (q.v.), which may contain tik *goat’s leather’, and arapar ‘raggy place’ (q.v.), if containing *par ‘foot’.

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

aråagast i- and a-stems ‘curtain, (nuptial) canopy; bridal chamber; tent; sail’, dial. ‘wine-press’ (< ‘room for wine-pressing’) (Bible+).
In Movses Xorenaci’s 3.68 (1913=1991: 361¹⁴; transl. Thomson 1978: 352): *yusayak’ harsaneac’ parsel, anveher eragut eamb krt’ealk‘; ew aragastu asel ergs “we hoped to dance at marriages, being bold and nimble of foot, and to sing wedding songs”; cf. 2.50 (179¹⁴).


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

DIAL Preserved only in the dialect of Ararat: əṙák’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 Baldasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan (1971: 218), the word hnjan in the village of Öšakan is equivalent to arak’ast in Aštarak. See also s.v. hnjan.

ETYM Composed as aṙ- + ag- ‘to put on (clothes)’ (see also s.v. awt’oc’) + -ast [NHB 1: 281c; HAB 1: 248b; J̓ahukyan 1987: 123]. Meillet (1936: 77) and J̓ahukyan (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. ū-e-eš-ta ‘wears’, Gr. ἑννυμι, -μαι ‘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) vστία ‘clothing’ < *ues-th2- or οὐδής ‘clothing’ < *ues-th2- (cf. also έσϑος n.). One may therefore propose an alternative solution: NSg *uēs-t-eh2-, GSG *us-t-h2-ós (and/or NSg *uēs-t-ih2-, GSG *us-t-ih2-ós) > PArm. NSg *gest-a/- (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. οὐδής (with a -θ- from *-u-k-ti-) has arisen in the same scenario as Skt. pānthās (NSg *pōnt-eh1-s, GSG *pnt-h1-ós, see s.v. hun), and Gr. vστία goes back to *uēs-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’. 
aṙac, o-stem and i-stem (both attested late) ‘proverb; vision, prophecy, prodigy, etc.’ (Bible+); cf. also aṙ-ah-ac-im ‘to turn around’ (Eznik Kobac’i, John Chrysostom).

In (late) medieval dictionaries, aṙac is glossed by the following words: patgam ‘command, etc.’, arhest ‘craft, skill, art’, margarētw ‘prophecy’, ban ‘thing’, testil ‘vision’, xōsk ‘speech, word’, azdumm ‘effect’ [Amalyan 1971: 189-192].

●DIAL. Agulis, Axalc’xa aṙac, Alaškert aṙaj [HAB 1: 249a]; Melri aṙskav ‘metaphorically’ < aṙac-k’-ov ‘with proverb’ [Aɫayan 1954: 262b].

●ETYM. Since Maksoudiantz 1911-12, Arm. aṙac is treated as composed of the prefix aṙ- ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ and the verbal stem ac- ‘to bring, lead, drive, move, encircle, beat, pour, etc.’ (q.v.), cf. Lat. adagió, -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. ᾧ (athematic imperfect) < *h1e-h1e-ĝ-t ‘he said’, and Arm. asem ‘to say, speak, tell’ (q.v.), the -s- of which is usually explained from a perfect formation *Hg-t (Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 12, 24-25; Ernout-Meillet 1959: 18-19; Pokorny 1959: 290; Jāhukyan 1967: 184, 308; 1987: 121, 163; Ravnaes 1991: 64; Schrijver 1991: 26-28, 31; Mallory/Adams 1997: 535a; Anttila 2000: 118; Meillet 1892: 164; Brugmann 1904: 506). Arm. -ac has been derived from *-h1o-ĝ (Schrijver 1991: 26; cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 138).

According to another explanation, the *aĝ-., represented in Latin and Armenian, derives from PIE *h2e-ĝ- ‘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. adagió.

Ačaryan (HAB 1: 249a) prefers interpreting aṙac as a derivative of aṙnum ‘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: 137138 and Olsen 1999: 238s6. However, the connection with Lat. ad-agió is more attractive.

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


●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. pād ‘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. ἐμποδό-ν, ἐμποδό-νος (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 ḫur ‘foot’, etc. (see HAB 1: 90a). It is unclear whether *aṙapar is in a way related with *apaṙaž ‘rock, craggy place’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects, HAB 1: 228b).

*aṙa* ‘front part; front, anterior’; *aṙa*-i ‘in front of, towards; against’; *aṙa*-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 *prHu̯- or the like (Klingenschmitt 1982: 165, 165-166; Hamp 1996) are improbable and unnecessary.

*aṙaspel*, a-stem: GDSg *aṙaspel-*i, GDPi *aṙaspel-a-c’ (Bible, Movsēs Xorenac’i), ISg *aṙaspel-a-w* (Plato), IPl *aṙaspel-a-w-k’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i); *aṙaspel-i-k’*, GDPi *aṙaspelac’ 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).


In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.6 (1913=1991: 226; transl. Thomson 1978: 77): *orum oč’ zok’ onndimanal karcem i mits unolac’n: bāyc’ et’ ē zčšmartut’eann ok’ xorhelov k’ākel zōc yāraspels zčšmarit bāns 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: 192²; transl. Thomson 1978: 204), for which see s.v. *darbin ‘smith’.

Other attestations from Movsēs Xorenac’i:

2.7 (1913=1991: 111²; transl. Thomson 1978: 138): *T’ohum zaṙaspelac’n (var. zaṙaspelac’n) bajahans, or i Hadamakertin patmin “I omit the nonsensical fables that are recounted in Hadamakert’.*
The stories about the power of Turk’ Ange are characterized as follows: Oh!, kari è araspełs, ayl ew auraspelac’ auraspeł “O, this tale is too much – it is the tale of all tales”.

2.24 (140L12; transl. 161): ēnd‘er patirmk’ zruc’ok’ vaβnjuć’ ew pařauwal auraspełök’ “Why do we deceive ourselves with ancient tales and old wives’ fables?”.

2.42 (168L2f; transl. 183): Bayc’ ays kam eic’ sut ew auraspel, 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: 42V87f, 150-154), the bard Ismenias approaches Alexander “with devilish words” (diwabnak baniwk’), and Alexander becomes annoyed by all these “fairy-tales” (aṛaspelak’n) and says angrily: Aṛaspels xawsis “Are you telling fairy-tales?”


In a poem by Aṛak’el Siwnec’i /14-15th cent./ [Poturean 1914: 234, stanza 117], the verb aṛaspel occurs in an enumeration of pejorative designations for verbal activities: barba[n]el, xełkatakel, parap nastel aṛaspelel.

‘infamous subject for public talkings’: In Gregory Nazianzenus (see NHB 1: 292c): Zi aṛaspeł ziř aрасье’es i kenc’ahums.

‘fable’: T’ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent., Vaspurakan) 1.10 (V. Vardanyan 1985: 108): Aṛ sa inj i čax elanē k’er’tolakan aṛaspełn or asē: bazum angam aluesk’ t’agaworl xorhec’an, bacye šunk’ oc’ arin yanın : “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 aṛaspel by aṛak, 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 aṛak, cf. Sksayc’ aṛak, oc’ aṛaspelekan, ayl or ē čimarit aṛakeal (Philo).


Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.12 (1913=1991: 40L4f; transl. Thomson 1978: 90): Vasn oroy t’ui ardaranal aṛaspełin (dativus cum infinitivo), or asi i mēj geljacak’: “t’el k’o Šarayi orkorn ē, asen, mer Širakay ambark’n ē’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’ ri inč’ āreawwk’ aṛaspelewan varil part ē, etē <...>.

‘enigma, riddle’: In Judges 14.12: Arkic’ jez aṛaspeł “Let me now put a riddle to you”: Προβαλῶ ὑμῖν πρόβλημα. In Judges 14.18: oć’ ganēk’ zaraspełim “you would not have found out my riddle”: οὐκ ἂν εὑρέτε τὸ πρόβλημα μου. Adjectival usage in Cyril of Jerusalem; cf. below on dialects.

On the notion of aṛaspeł ‘myth’ : ‘fable’ : ‘proverb’ in Movsēs Xorenac’i, see Abelyan 1985: 72; Thomson 1978: 10-11. For the meaning ‘riddle’ of aṛaspeł, aṛak
and *banka* (q.v.), see S. Harut’yunyan 1960: 7-9; Mnac’akanyan 1980: 6-7; Odabaşyan 1987: 64*10.

Denominative verbs *arispelem*, *arispelabanem*, *arispelagorcem*, *arispelastelcem* and numerous other derivations, like *arispelabar*, *arispelaxaws*, *arisapelakan*, *arispelakoc*, etc.

Some illustrations, beside the passage from Movses Xorenac’i 2. 61, demonstrate that the mythical tales were often performed by singing, cf. Movses Xorenac’i 2.50 (1913=1991: 179; transl. Thomson 1978: 192-193): Zays teli arispelabanelov vipasank’n yergeln iwreanc’ asen: < ... >. Doynpēs ew zharsaneac’n arespeleal 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 *arispelem* occurs in Ašxarhac’oyc’ (Soukry 1881: 42).

In Bağirk’ hayoc’ (see Amalyan 1975: 31*10*26); *arispelem* hrašaban, kam sut patmut’twn “miraculous or false story”.

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

Sebastia *arispelem* ‘extraordinary (blasphemy); licentious (girl)’ [Gabikean 1952: 80].

●ETYM The word is composed of the prefix *a* (rather than *a*- as suggested in Olsen 1999: 72), the anaptyxis -a- before s (cf. Greppin 1983: 297; Jähuyan 1987: 243; see s.vv. *arastal* and *a*- ), 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. fjālē 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 *p-pelnō”). The appurtenance of Toch. B pāl-‘to praise, commend’ is uncertain [Adams 1999: 376-377]. According to Ačayan (HAB 1: 253-254), Tumanyan (1978: 204) et al., only the Germanic words are related. Greppin (1981b: 3) notes that the correlation Arm. *arispelem* ‘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. *arispelem* is parallel to that of OE *bi-spell* ‘fable’. Compare also Arm. *aɾacak* (HAB s.v.).

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. palat- ‘supplication’.

aṙastał a-stem (GDPl aṙast-al-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 zge ɫ ec’ik aṙastał s?; yorzam gišern žaman ē, tes zardareal zerkins aste ɫō k’

“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 jełun (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, 194; in the glossary: 223]; “Bžškaran jioy ew aṙhasarak grastnoy” (13th cent.): aṙast-k’ [Ćugaszyan 1980: 148]; in the glossary: 180]. For other attestations (Mxít’ar Herace’i, Oskip’orik, Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i), see NHB 1: 293c; MijHayBar 1, 1987: 77a.

DIAL Preserved in SW dialects: Akn āröstdx [HAB 1: 255a], Zey’t’un ayosdx [Aćąayan 2003: 299], Aramo āröstł, NPl āröstdha [Laribyan 1958: 28, 59a, 120b], Malat’ia arastł [Danielyan 1967: 186b], K’esab āröstuc’v/k [Ćolak’ean 1986: 196b], Svedia ārösdul, loc./all. āröstad < *y-arastal [Andreasyan 1967: 33, 354b]. In these descriptions the semantics of the word is not specified. Only Aćąayan (HAB 1: 255a), citing the forms from Akn, Zey’t’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. arastal is glossed in Gabykean 1952: 80 by Turk. arastal. Note also Turkophone Enkürı arastak’ ‘ceiling’ [S. Mxít’arean 1898: 789a].

On Persian, see below.

In the Armenian dialects of Syria, arastal ‘ceiling’ seems to have been contaminated with astł ‘star’ (q.v.); for the association ‘ceiling’ : ‘palate’ : ‘sky’, see 3.7.1. A curious word is found in the dialect of Satax (Van-group): asthünk’y, glossed as katik, šnc’ap oł, 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. astl ‘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), asthünk’y ‘uvula, windpipe’ may be derived from arastal ‘palate’ with loss of -ń- and/or contamination with asthunk’ ‘stars’.

}\n
case, the word should be discussed within the semantic framework of ‘ceiling’: ‘palate’ : ‘(starry) sky’ (see 3.7.1).

ETYM


Both Ačayan 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. *stala 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 (*staln̥ā, cf. Dor. στᾱ́λᾱ, Lesb. Thess. στάλλᾱ, Rix 1992: 67) is *stl̥̥n̥２, which is perfectly suitable for Arm. *stala with words presented in Pokorny 1959: 1019-1020 s.v. *stel-ɔ́.

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

In NHB 1: 293c, arastal is glossed by Pers. arast’ag, Gr. ὀροφός, 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 drastagi ‘ornament, embellishment, decoration; order, arrangement’. Whether or not this word is somehow related with Arm. arastal ‘ceiling’ is uncertain. The semantic relationship seems possible, cf. a(w)čar ‘roof, ceiling’ vs. a(w)čar ‘equipment, harness, make-up, ornament, material’.

*aṙatik (or *aṙatuk), a-stem: GDPI aṙat-k-a-c’ (Yovhanneş Draxnakertc’i), IPl aṙat-k-a-w-k’ (Agat’angelos § 102, Yovhanneş Draxnakertc’i) ‘a cord for binding up a criminal’s feet’.


DIAL

No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 255-256; 4: 655. For Melri oṙate, see s.v. *aṙa-ti ‘cord’.

*aṙati (dial.) ‘cord’.

DIAL In the glossary of dialectal words, Alayan (1954: 297) records Melri oṙate, glossing by aṙatik ‘cord’, although the latter is missing in the vocabulary from CIArm. to the Melri dialect.

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

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

It seems more likely, however, that the second component is tik ‘wineskin’. Remarkably, both tik and *aṙatik 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. aṙ- ‘at, etc.’, aṙaspel ‘myth, fable’, aṙastal ‘ceiling’, *aṙormi ‘a log or wooden framework that supports the wall or the ceiling of a house’.

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

DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Many forms display contraction or allegro-variants, e.g. Nor Naxiaw aṙadun (next to aṙavudun), Van aṙatun, aṙat-man, etc., Polis aṙdu, etc. Šamaxi aṙəxt or aṙr reflects a contraction peculiar to this dialect, cf. baxtwor ‘lucky’ > Šamaxi baxtɔr, etc. [Balramyan 1964: 35].

The Aṛtial forms show an irregular absence of the second -w-: aṙavudun(τ) (Suč’ava, Hungary) and aṙavadanc (Romania) [Ačāryan 1953: 50, 259]. Ačāryan glosses these forms as corresponding to CIArm. (Loc. adverb?) aṙawawtu. He does not cite any Aṛtial reflex of the ‘pure’ form aṙawawt.

ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 1: 256) does not accept any of numerous etymological proposals, of which only that of Patrubánya (StugHetaz 1906: 341) is worth of consideration. He analyzes the word as aṙ- + *aw- + -awt and compares the root *aw- with Lat. aurōra f. ‘dawn’, Gr. ἀοὐς, ἀοὖς f. ‘dawn’, Skt. ०स- 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 Jāhuκyan (1987: 114, 159, 383); cf. also Eichner 1978: 152 34; Clackson 1994: 223v, 224v; Olsen 1999: 959v. See also s.v. ayg ‘morning’.

Alayan (1974: 24-27) derives *aw- from the root of PIE *sāu-el- ‘sun’. This is improbable, since, as stated by Jāhuκyan (1987: 159), the “pure” root *sāu- is not attested in any cognate language. Alayan (ibid.) identifies the -aw- with the hapax awt (meaning ‘time’ according to Ačāyan [HAB 1: 363a], and ‘the time of sun-rise’ according to Ė. Alayan), also found in šāl-awt (with šal ‘dew’ as the first member) and kam-awt attested in Anan Asirakci’i (7th cent.) as the names of the 4th and 5th nocturnal hours respectively, aṙ-awt itself being the 10th (see Alayan 1974: 24-26; 1986: 80-81, 83; see also Greppin 1983: 298). For the list of the hour-names in Anania Sirakac’i, see A. G. Abrahamseny 1944: 113. For the suffix -awt, see 2.3.1.

aṙawušt ‘urinary bladder; watery pustule, blister’.


I found another attestation in “Saks bač’ayayut’ean t’uoc’” by Anan Anišırakac’i (7th cent.), published by A. G. Abrahamseny (1944: 237-250) on the basis of the Matenadaran manuscript Nr 3710. Here (245ḷ228) aṙawušt froy (froy = GSg of fur
‘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 aṙa- as a prefix and compares the second component with Skt. vas-ṭi- ‘Blase, Harnblase’. Ačaryan (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 aṙawušt, since the intervocalic *-bh- yields Arm. -w-. As for the first part, see s.v. bušt.

*aṙ-zel (dial.).

**DIAL In DialAdd apud NHB (2: 1060c): aṙzēl “a bed for workers made at the ceiling (aṙ jehun) or with straw (celiwk’) in stables or cattle-sheds”, which is identified with Muš, Aparan arzel [Amatuni 1912: 57a], or Van, Muş aṙzel, Aparan, Bulanx arcел [Ačaryan 1913: 132b]. This dialectal word mainly refers to a high wooden bed between two posts. According to Ačaryan (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 aṙzel ‘an immovable wooden bed (t’axt’)’ (see Petoyan 1954: 104; 1965: 203, 444). The -č- in Sasun arcел [HayLezBrbBa 1, 2001: 99b] must be a misprint for -z-.

**ETYM NHB implicitly suggests an interpretation as aṙ jeḥun ‘at the ceiling’ (see above). This is probable. CIArm. jehun ‘ceiling’, also with a o-vocalism, johun’ in Severian of Gabala, etc. and in the dialect of Akn, contains *je/ol ‘log; pole’, cf. Georgian jeli ‘log’ and Arm. jol ‘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 aṙ and a word meaning ‘log, pole, etc.’, see s.v. aṙ-a-staɫ ‘ceiling’. For -ṙ- > -rz- cf. arjak ‘free, loose, etc.’ > Larabal hārzāk, etc.

aṙēǰ (spelled also aṙēč’), o-stem: GDSg aṙiǰ-o-y (Leviticus 13.59), aṙič’-o-y (Hexaemeron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 190L1); i-stem: GDPl aṙič’-i-c’ (Plato), cf. AblSg y-aṙiǰ-ē (Leviticus 13.56) ‘threads running along the length of cloth, warp’ (Bible+).

In Leviticus 13.48-59 aṙēǰ ‘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 *aṙēǰ-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 hārečk’*, Gen. hārečk’-s’, GPI hāreč-ūc’ ‘окно, window’ (which see Orbeli 2002: 275; a textual illustration in 821-14, transl. 154: kmeń hārečkve irišic’, k’xa: ur yar č’s’ "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 Lisc’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 hārček’, GPI hārč–uc’, is directly corroborated by hārč–uc’ ē’al referring to the window-grating, glossed as ‘оконная решетка (рама), заклеиваемая на зиму бумагой’ in Orbeli 2002: 275. It is quite possible that Moks hārček’ 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’ārček’ and Alaškert h’ārčık it probably reflects an older *y-arēj-k’ (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 aṙ- ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ and the verbal root ēǰ- ‘to go down’ (HAB 1: 257-258; Olsen 1999: 17).

*aṙč, *aṙič ‘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; Ľahukyan 1987: 336-337, 582).

I tentatively propose a composition of the prefix aṙ- ‘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-i, ē, Att. ἀρχ, ἀρχης ‘male’ (see also HAB 1: 261; Ľahukyan 1982: 111; 1987: 123; Greppin 1983: 299). Not to be confused (as it sometimes happens, see Hübschmann 1897: 417-418; HAB 1: 173b; È. Tumanjan 1978: 271-272, 305-306) with ayr, gen. aṙn ‘man’, which derive from PIE nom. *h2mēr and gen. *h2mēr-ōs, 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: 182 for references).
In view of the vocalic discrepancy in the Greek forms ἀρσην and ἀρην, two different roots may be posited: *h₁frs-en-* (with Arm. aṁ and Indo-Iran. *Hṛṣan-*) and *h₁�ṛsen-* (with Skt. vṛsan- ‘manly; male animal, bull, stallion, etc.’, Lat. verrēs ‘boar’, Lith. vėrės ‘bull, ox, ox calf’, etc.), respectively. For a discussion, see Frisk s.v.; Chantraine 1968-80: 116a; Beeves 1969: 91; Benveniste 1969, 1: 21-25 = 1973: 19-22; E. 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: 15b, 22, 33b; Lindeman 1997: 56-57; Vine 2005: 262-267. Note that Arm. aṁ cannot be derived from *h₁yṛsen- (I rather expect *gar(i)ṁn from it), unless one assumes that the *-u dropped in GDSg and plur. aṁ- from PArm. *et(w)ars-en-V- due to contraction in a pretonic syllable (cf. 2.1.33.1).

Whether a QIE *h₁frC- would yield Arm. *erC- or *arC- is uncertain. Kortlandt (2001: 12 = 2003: 132) assumes a *ha- mentioning Gr. ἀρνειός ‘ram’. This leaves Gr. ἀρην unexplained. If we must reconstruct *ha-, the initial a- in Arm. aṁ would favour the development *h₁frC- > 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 *h₁frs-u- > PArm. *aṙan- in ISg -b and GDPl -c’) or contamination with *h₁yṛsen-.

With few exceptions (e.g. Lindeman and Kortlandt), the Armenian aṁ and its etymology by Meillet remained unnoticed by most of scholars outside Armenia. The appurtenance of aṁ to IE *Hṛsen- 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. vṛṣan- and its cognates are indeed unrelated, we are here dealing with a word belonging to the Armenian-Greek-Aryan group: *h₁frs-en- ‘male, male animal (bull, stallion, ram)’: Arm. aṁ ‘wild ram’, Indo-Iran. *Hṛṣan- ‘male, male animal’, Gr. ἀρην vs. ἀρην ‘male’.

aṁenm. 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].

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

   • DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 248b].
   • ETYM Derived from PIE *h₁r-nu-: Gr. ἀρνημα, aor. ἀρήμων ‘to win, gain’, probably also Av. ἀρημαüoú ‘to grant, allot, provide’ (for which see de Vaan 2003: 371); the appurtenance of other forms is uncertain; for the Armenian paradigm and an

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

aṙoge(n) (Paterica+), aṙoganem (Agat’angels /5th cent./, Yovhannēš Drasxanakertc’i /9-10th cent./, etc.). oṙoge(n), oṙoganem (Bible+) ‘to water, wet, sprinkle, irrigate’. Once as a noun: aṙog ‘well, irrigating water’, in Knik’ hawatoy (‘Seal of faith’, 7th cent.). In Agat’angels § 103 and § 111 (1909=1980: 625, 651), oṙog- and aṙog- appear as variant readings.

In Grigor Narekac’i 9.2.34 (Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 278): erkir oṙogeal c’awlov: ‘the earth sprinkled by dew’.

For aṙoganem Greppin (1983: 301) also cites the meaning ‘to pronounce carefully’, and among derivatives mentions aṙoganut’iwn ‘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. ῥεω ‘to flow, stream’, Gr. ῥόος (Cypr. ῥόϝος) ‘stream’, etc. [Bugge (1892: 451-452; HAB 1: 263, 264). According to Witczak (1999: 184), aṙoganem ‘seems to be a denominative formation’, which is improbable and unnecessary. For a morphological discussion, see Klingenschnitt 1982: 204. See also s.v. aṙu ‘brook, channel, ditch’.

The initial a- is prothetic, although this (together with aṙu) is the only unambiguous case of a prothetic vowel before the trilled ᵇ, aṙewc ‘lion’, probably being of onomatopoeic origin. The absence of a prothetic vowel in ḗun‘g ‘nose, nostrils’ suggests a loan or a substratum origin. It has been suggested that aṙu derives from *eṙu (see Greppin 1983: 301), and the a- of oṙoge(n) is due to assimilatory influence of the root vowel, see Klingenschnitt 1982: 204; Beekes 2003: 160-161 (from *e-ṙoge(n)). The variant aṙog- is much better attested than aṙog-, so one might think that it is due to the influence of aṙu. 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 oroĉ- vs. dial. *aroĉ (q.v.). However, *aroĉ is found in SE dialects (Agulis, Larabał, 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).

aṙolj (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 aṙ- ‘at, to, near by, before, etc.’ and olj ‘whole, integral, complete, solid; sound, healthy, unhurt’ (q.v.), see HAB 1: 263b; 3: 558.

*aṙ-orm-i (dial.) ‘a log or wooden structure that supports the wall or the ceiling of a house’.
aṙu

DIAL. Acar'yan (1913: 136a; HAB 3: 583b) records dial. aṙ-orm-i as equivalent to Turk. k'iriş, not specifying the dialectal location. For the semantic description, see Malxaseane' 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:


The Goris and Meiri forms seem to point to *aṙa-orm-i > *aṙa-h-ormi, with the glide -h- (on which see the discussion on the place-name Karahunj in 4.8). The by-form ṛa- of the prefix may be corroborated by aṙaspel ‘myth, fable’ and arastad ‘ceiling’ (see s.v.). In these words, however, the -a- can be explained as an anaptyctic vowel before -sC-. It is possible that *aṙormi has been replaced by *aṙ-horm-i in Meiri, etc. through restoration of the initial h- of the word for ‘wall’ in Meiri (hurm ‘wall’), and the cluster -r- is simplified through insertion of an anaptyxis. Nevertheless, there seem to exist also words with aṙa- where the second -a- can hardly be of anaptyctic origin, but the etymology of these words (see s.v. aṙətitk ‘cord’) is uncertain.

Describing his paternal hut, Xa'catur Abovyan (see G. D. Asatryan 1990: 50) describes how the hail, rain, etc. penetrate i taneac’ i yolormoc’ i čelk’ac’ lusamic’t ‘from the roof, from the *olorm-k’, and from the holes of the windows”. I was not able to find this *olorm- or *(y)olorm- in dictionaries. Apparently we are dealing with the oblique stem *aṙorm(wo)- of our word. For dissimilation r...r > l...l, see 2.1.24.2.

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

The word aṙ-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 aṙ- 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.

aṙu. i-stem, o-stem, a-stem ‘brook, tributary; channel; ditch, trench, furrow, passage’ (Bible+).

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.62 (1913=1991: 194³): ew zaygin mec, yor mtaner aṙun get, haneal i covēn Gaylatuay. Thomson (1978: 206) translates the passage as follows: “and the great vineyard which is irrigated by the canal that branches out from the lake of Gaylatu”. Jhanyan (1991: 231) adheres to the view that aṙun, 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 aṙun(n) get refers to a large artificial irrigating channel that is taken/drawn out from the lake of Gaylatu (nowadays Balık’ç’ay); this is exactly how Malxaseane’ (1990: 126) translates the passage.
aseln

DIAL. Preserved in numerous dialects: Nor Naxijewan, Aslanbek, Hamšen, Zeyt’ün, Mūs, Van, Agulis, Lărabal, Jula, etc. In all the dialects the meaning is ‘brook’, and only in Nor Naxijewan ‘the path of rain or flood water’ [HAB 1: 265a].

Xarberd has arūn, with an additional -n (ibid.). This form is also found in K’esab arī̈n, 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-aṟu : Mūs, Alaškert h ‘arū, Van āṟu, Ozim häɾu [HAB 1: 265a; Āc’ar’yan 1952: 247], as well as Moks häɾu, GŚg hāvō ‘kanana, apuk’; see Orbeli 2002: 275; a textual illustration: 118\15\ (Russ. trans. – p. 179).

ETYM Since Bugge (1892: 451-452; see also HAB 1: 263, 264), derived from PIE *sr(ə)o(u)- 'to stream, flow': Gr. ἄγω 'to flow, stream', Gr. ἕξος (Cypr. ἕξος) 'stream', Skt. sra̱v- 'to stream, flow', OHG sraum 'stream', Lith. sraveti 'to seep, flow slowly', etc. See also s.v. 'stream', Skt. ṛṝṝṃ 'stream'. The Armenian form presupposes *sr(o)u-i-o/eh2- 'thread' (Bible+) [Weitenberg 1985: 104], or *sr(o)u-i (Bible+). Derivatives based on *sr(o)u 'to stream, flow': Gr. ἐκέρκος 'flowing', etc.), or *sr(u)-to- (cf. Gr. ἐκέρκος 'flowing'), or *sroutos- n. (cf. Skt. sṝtōs- 'stream, current' (cf. Skt. sṝtōs- 'stream, current') /RV+/, OPers. rautah- n., Pahl., NPers. rōd 'stream'). Witzczak (1999: 184) derives arū from *srówos m., which is formally improbable. For the prothetic vowel, see s.v. aroq(-) and 2.1.17.4. According to Āc’ar’yan (HAB 1: 265a), Georg. ru, ruvi 'brook, channel' was borrowed from Armenian before the addition of the prothetic vowel.

The dialectal prefixed *y-aṟu (with y- from *h₁en- ‘in’) can be understood as ‘in-flux, in-flow’, cf. Lat. in-flāxiō ‘influx, tributary’, etc.

As we saw above, Jiñanjan (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 *sr(u)nə-a- (cf. Av. rauvan-, etc.). It is tempting to identify this form with Xarberd arūn and K’esab arī̈n. However, one cannot be sure that the final -n of *Aṟu-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), GŚg getarš-i in Lazār P’arpec’i.

GŚg aslan (Bible), ISg aslan-b (Ephrem), API astu-n- s(“Čąrantu”) ‘needle’ (Bible+). Derivatives based on astan-, aseln-, astn-, etc. Also without -n : astl-a-kurc ‘a kind of sea bird’, literally: ‘having a’ needle-beak’, in Ananias Širakac’i, 7th cent. (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 308-26, Abrahamyan / Petrosyan 1979: 362); MidArm. axer, asel [MijHaj Bair 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,15), in a list of sorceries: asleni karmir ‘red thread’, between acut ‘coal’ and erkar ‘iron’. Compare aslanik’ın kaxardac’ ‘the threads of sorcerers’ in John Chrysostom.

DIAL. Dialectically ubiquitous. All the forms lack the final -n except for Agulis āysāhā (next to āysāh) [Āc’ar’yan 1935: 35, 337], Lărabal āseln (next to āsel) [Dav’t’yan 1966: 317]. Next to āsel (see below), Melri has a trace of -n in the derivative aštnāvur < aselnawor (see Alayan 1954: 263a). Other compounds, namely astl-a-ben and astl-aman (loc. cit.), lack the -n-. Moks usually preserves the
'needle'. Note also irregular and is only paralleled by ● 299). 'laughter' > Agulis A
reckon with rounding effect of the final -u- remains unclear. One therefore may also think of vocalic metathesis (see 2.1.26.4): *asih (if this form is reliable; see below) > *tsal(n), which would yield Agulis áysäl(n), as can be seen from e.g. cical 'laughter' > Agulis cáyçil (see Aćără 1935: 60).

Interesting is Nor Jüla asol 'needle' (attested since 1788), the -u- of which is irregular and is only paralleled by taser 'woodshaving' > Nor Jüla taser (see Aćără 1940: 61). The third example is jualan 'brain' > şul (next to şeh). One must reckon with rounding effect of the final -l 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 -el(n) yielded -el (see Aćără 1940: 61). A similar case is found in Melri, Karčewan, and Kak’avberd, where we have āsıl [Alayan 1954: 263a; H. Muradyan 1960: 190a; 1967: 166b]. Next to āse/i ‘needle’ (see above), Moks has āsıl, GŞg āsula in different semantics, namely ‘two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole’ (see Orbeli 2002: 206). This word is identical with the word for ‘needle’, as can be seen from Nor Bayazet āsel, which denotes the same part of a plough (see Aćără 1913: 138-139 s.v. asel ‘needle’, with a detailed semantic description), as well as Muş (see HayLezBrBBr 1, 2001: 104a). For the semantic development cf. t’ür ‘sword’, which in some dialects seems to denote the same or a similar part of a plough (see Amatuni 1912: 219b; Aćără 1913: 379a; Bdoyan 1972: 209a, 218a, 220b, etc., especially 223ab). Note that Aćără (1913: 140a) records Van āsol “a part of the plough which elsewhere is called t’ür” and asks: “that is āsol?” Jāhukyan (1972: 281) is more positive and presents Van āsol (not mentioning the others) as a dialectal by-form of āsên ‘needle’.

Note also net ‘arrow’ > Moks nīl ‘the pole of a plough’ (see Orbeli 2002: 299).

ETYM Since de Lagarde (1868: 14) and others, connected with Lat. aciēs, -ēī f. ‘edge, point’, acus ‘needle’, etc. [HAB 1: 268]. For *-I-, cf. OCS osla ‘whetstone’, Slh. ôšla ‘whetstone’, ÖEng. egle ‘awn’, Germ. Achel ‘tip of an ear’. The explanation, according to which the Armenian form comes from an older *asilan (>). NSg āsên, GŞG āstlan, which is allegedly corroborated by Slavic *os-i-la- (see Jāhukyan 1987: 157), cannot be maintained since, in fact, the Slavic has no *-I-; cf. Kortlandt 1985: 22 = 2003: 65. Thus, Hübschmann (1897: 421 No 46) and Aćără (HAB 1: 268) are right in reconstructing *ak-l- (= *hēk-l-).

Since Arm. āsên appears in Agulis and Łarabal with and without -n (see above, also Weitenberg 1985: 104), whereas neighbouring dialects such as Jüla, Melri, etc. (as well as Moks) have āsol, 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 *hēk-ölı > *hēköl, with zero grade in the root analogically after the oblique stem > Nor Jüla, Melri group,

19 According to Amatuni (1912: 60b), Moks (the village of Knekanc’) has asol ārōrī mač.
asem

and Moks dial. asul (see also s.v. acul ‘coal’), AccSg *h₂k-él-m > aseln, GSg *h₂k₁-l-ós-. This is this well-known case of the word for ‘milk’, where Melri group and Agulis reflect the old, archaic form with the nominative *-s (*kuč’), whereas all the remaining dialects and Classical Armenian have the form derived from the PIE accusative, namely kai’n (q.v.). Remarkably, asem and *asul are both represented in Moks, but with semantic differentiation: ase’il ‘needle’: asul ‘two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole’.

The vocative loss in gen. aslan and compositional astn- presupposes an analogical nominative by-form *asuhn (cf. dial. *asul) or aseln (in HAB 1: 268a, as a variant spelling of asehn). For *astn, see also above, on Agulis.

One of the principal verbs for speaking. Also refers to the singing of birds, cf. i žam havun aseloy ‘in the time of speaking of the birds or the rooster’ (Lazar P’arpec’i), cf. hav-a-xōs [Alayan 1986: 83, 85], dial. hav-xus-oe’ (see Srvanjtyane’c 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 Lòvèc’i Sak’on by H. T’umanyan (3, 1989: 174-L88, 186-L157), a speaker of the Lori sub-dialect (the village of Dsel), 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 Aça’yan 1913: 140a) has developed a religious meaning: ‘rite’ (in Urmia) [Asatryan 1962: 212b], ‘religious service’ (Ararat, Łarabal, Muš, Van) [HayLeyBrbBar 1, 2001: 106a], and ‘magic formula’ in Svedia (c/ásmonk’, see Andreasay 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 Aça’yan 1947:134-135); e.g. mek’ astak ‘we said’ [Aça’yan 1947: 245]. According to Aça’yan (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 enymgmic; 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 xalam ‘to move, play’: xal(a)c’i, xal(a)c’ir, xaluc’, xal(a)c’ak’, xal(a)c’ik’, xal(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’.
askn

*aśc’ik’, *aśc’in. For an attestation of e.g. 3pl.aor. aśc’in in MidArm, see Yovhannēs T’lkuranc’i, 14–15th cent. [Mnac’akanyan 1941: 189; Pivazyan 1960: 165].

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

For the development -sc’- > -st- (desaffrication) compare šč > št found in šičuk ‘whey’ > Muš, Alaškert şdug. The distribution in Muš is remarkable: šijag and şdug. Thus, the -st- is found only in the syncopated form, where it immediately follows the sibilant š.


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, Ačāryan (HAB 1: 269) concludes that askn is equivalent to sutak of the corresponding list in Exodus 48.17 (a misprint for 28.19; cf. also 39.12), which is a kind of karkehan, found in both lists. Greppin (1983: 303) translates askn as ‘garnet’. See also HAB s.v. sutak(n).

ETYM The only etymology I know of is that of Ałayan (1974: 29) who derives it from PIE *h₁eHs- ‘hearth; ash’. For the cognates, see s.v. aẓazim and ačiwn. With the exception of Greppin (1983: 303), this etymology is unknown to the Western scholars. Even in Armenia proper it remained unnoticed, except for Alabekyan 1979: 63. The word is absent in J̌ahukyan 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. kaye ‘spark’ vs. ‘ruby’, Gr. ἄνθραξ ‘charcoal’ vs. ‘ruby.

21 Note the etymological problem of -s- in asem from PIE *-g- instead of the expected -c-. Thus one might alternatively suggest a development 3sg.aor *Hg-t > PArm. ast. This is attractive but very risky.
astem 'to look for a bride, ask in marriage' and *ast-ōɫ ‘suitor, fiancé, bridegroom’, both only in Timot’ēs Kuz (Timothy Aelurus, 5th or 6th cent.) and in Knik’ hawatoy (Seal of Faith, 7th cent.); the dictionary entitled Aṙjeēn baēran (1865, Venice) has hastim ‘to be engaged, be betrothed (said of a girl)’; see Aṙjeēn 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 Aṙjeēn 1908-09a, 1: 368aNw7. For the semantics cf. Gr. πενϑερός ‘father-in-law, son-in-law’, etc. from PIE *bhn̥dh- ‘to bind, fasten’.


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 *peh2g̣ḳ- ‘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’, pactīō ‘agreement, compact; marriage settlement’ (OxLatDict), pacta ‘fiancée, bride’ (Dvoreckij 1986: 546c). A QIE *ph2ḳ-ti(h)̣-or *ph2ḳ-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 Xaṙatyan 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 *ph2ḳ-ti(h)̣-or *ph2ḳ-teh2- (⇒ PArm. *ast-‘fiancée, bride’ is possible. If this is accepted, the connection with Hurr. aštī carbuncle, etc.’. The absence of an initial h- is perhaps due to the zero-grade form and the possible influence of aċiwn ‘ash’ (if this is indeed related), where the initial syllable of the historically polysyllabic form was unstressed. The suffixal element -ḳ- can go back to QIE *-g̣- which is probably attested in OIC. aska ‘ash’, Gr. ἀσβόλος, ἀσβόλη ‘soot’ (if from *aś_bg̣lo-); perhaps also in aċiwn < *aściwn ‘ash’.

See also s.v. ašči ‘food’.

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

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

**astl.** l-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+). Astlik, GŠg Astikan (in "Patmut'ıwn srboć Hrip'simeanc" : Astıkay) 'the planet Venus; the goddess of love'.

•DIAL. Ubiquitous in the dialects.

Some dialects display a final -n : Axalc’xa, Ararat, Polis [HAB 1: 279a]; for Polis this is not corroborated in Ačar yan 1941: 74, 90, 204: assx. The -n probably betrays an old -n, cf. especially Ararat astlo : pl. astbner. The same holds for GŠg astl-an in Van [Ačar yan 1952: 124], although this is not corroborated by data from Moks: NSg astl, GŠg astl-š', NPl astl-ir (see Orbeli 2002: 206; a textual illustration for NPl: 7416). Šatax has GŠg astl-i [M. Muradyan 1962: 94], although NPl is astl-ner (op. cit. 87). A direct reflex of -n in the nominative is seen in Goris: astn̤a alongside with astl [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 -n in Axalc’xa, etc., note also Mušt astlan calik ‘a kind of flower’; Arabkir astlitik ‘étoile filante = falling star’; Van, etc. pl. astltunk (see Ačar yan 1913: 140b). Arabkir astlitik is cited by Ačar yan as astl-nitik. The component -nitik is unclear, however. I prefer to interpret the word as a petrified plural astn-ti-k' (cf. below on Hamšen).

In some dialects, the dental was lost: Polis a sx [Ačar yan 1941: 74, 90, 204], Zey’tunt sx, Hačn sx [Ačar yan 2003: 137, 299], Malat’ia a sxn [Danielyan 1967: 187a], Salmast ast' [HAB 1: 279a], Marala ask [Ačar yan 1926: 106, 123, 385; Dav’y’an 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', as well as NPl astl-k' has been petrified into NSg astsxt' [Ačar yan 1947: 93, 221]; cf. above on Arabkir.

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

For Svedia, next to usdt, Ačar yan (2003: 431, cf. 560) records a curious form, arsxlag, which, as he points out, is unclear ("ori inč linela hayatə čē"). For astl in this dialect, Andreasyan (1967: 354b) has usdt, but also arxstig from astl-ik, with the same "epenthetic" -r-. Note also K’esab arxtslək [Č’olak’e’an (1986: 227), K’abusive arxtšk, pl. arsx(ə)lənnir or -məyər [Laribyan 1958: 121a]. In Aramo, Laribyan (1958: 59a) records sg. astła and pl. arxtšnir. The same author has also sg. uslt, pl. astltsvar (op. cit. 27).

We see that the -r/ɨr 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 arxtšal 'ceiling’, taken metaphorically as ‘starry sky’; see 3.7.1. Remarkably, Č’olak’e’an (1986: 227) derives K’esab arxtstål.
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 (Sweden, Kesab, K’abusie, Aramo), and Arm. astəlit has been directly recorded only in and around the same area, namely Syria and Cilicia. Thus, the co-existence of forms like e.g. Kesab astəlit-ek ‘star’ vs. astəl-ət ‘ceiling’, or of such plurals like e.g. Aramo astəlt-ət ‘stars’ vs. astəlt-nə ‘ceilings’ is hardly due to chance.

On Şatax astəhunk’y ‘uvula, windpipe’, see s.v. astəlit ‘ceiling; palate’.

Also the final -ət of Aramo NSg asta is interesting (unless it is a misprint). It cannot go back to old *-ət since *astəlit-ay would yield Aramo *astəl-bu or *astəhəc, cf. baklay ‘bean’ > pagulus, tlay ‘child’ > dlbu, p’esay ‘son-in-law’ > p’isəcu (see Laribyan 1958: 59b,72b, 73a). Instead, it can reflect *astəl-i, cf. agi ‘tail’ > akka, aygi ‘garden’ > okka, mək’i ‘ewe’ > mək’a, oski ‘gold’ > xəka, etc. [Laribyan 1958: 20].

ETYM Since Klaproth (1823=1831: 105b) and NHB (1: 319c), compared with Gr. άστηρ, -έρα, Skt. NPl śatāra (the absence of the s- is unexplained), instr. śiṣṭ-bhīḥ, Av. star-, Pahl. stārag, Pers. sīrā, Lat. stella < *stēr-lā or *stēl-nā, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 421; HAB 1: 278-279]. Hitt. ḫāstera /hsterz/ (see Watkins 1974a: 12-14) clearly points to PIE *h₂ster- ‘star’, and the “prothetic” -ət in Greek and Armenian is the regular outcome of PIE *h₂st- [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. astl, see Meillet 1936: 81; Godel 1975: 96; Jahukyan 1982: 92, 137; Olsen 1999: 159-161.


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 *-n-> -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; Alabekyan 1979: 98. Since the PIE word clearly had an original *r-, I prefer the

'astl' from *arastal-ik, although he does not mention explicitly that the word for ‘ceiling’ is meant.
former alternative, namely *h₂ster-l-. This solution is also advocated by others: Mayrhofer 1952: 316; Bombhard 1986: 191 (Lat. < *ster-elā). For a discussion, see also Scherer 1953: 25-27. Note Celt. *stírla- ‘iris of the eye; eye’ (OIr. sell, etc.) from PIE *h₂ster-lo-; cf. PCelt. *ster- ‘star’ (Schrijver 1995: 421-422, cf. 423\[1\]).

For Armenian, we may reconstruct *h₂stēr-lo-; cf. PCelt. *ster- ‘star’ (Schrijver 1995: 421-422, cf. 423\[1\]). 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\[1\]). For Armenian, we may reconstruct *h₂stēr-lo-; cf. PCelt. *ster- ‘star’ (Schrijver 1995: 421-422, cf. 423\[1\]). 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. *astel-a- from *h₂ster-leh₂- may be corroborated by Lat. anguilla ‘eel’ and Arm. əngɫ-ay-k’ (q.v.), possibly from IE *H(V)nghur-leh₂-. Arm. dial. *astel-n (see above) may represent the old accusative *-m, see Weitenberg 1985; Kortlandt 1985: 21, 23 = 2003: 65, 67; Beeakes 2003: 142-143.

PIE *h₂ster- ‘star’ has been compared with the Semitic word for ‘deified Venus’, cf. Ištar, etc. [Ilić-Svityč 1964: 6-7; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 685-686, 875, 876, 967; Takács 1997: 337-337]. On the other hand, it was also derived from PIE. *dās- (= *h₂el(s)-) ‘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; Bombhard 1986; Beeakes, 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: 875-876, 967), 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: 289d-ee) 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‘argmanc‘), AblSg y-asu-ē (Basil of Caesarea); o-stem: AblSg y-asr-o-y (Hexaemeron, Nersēs Lambroac‘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-ef ‘shaggy, woolly’ (said of a ram in Eznik Kolbac‘i, A. A. Abrahamyan 1994: 126\[17\]).

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 πόκος n. ‘fleeces’ vs. πόκο- ‘to comb, card, shear’, Lith. pečū ‘to pluck, pull out’, MPers., NPers. pām ‘wool’, Oss. fašm/fašn ‘wool’, fašyn/fašun ‘to comb’, cf. Skt. pāksman- 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. pāśu-, paśū- n., paśū- m. ‘cattle’ (cf. Lubotsky 1988: 45 on these

\[22\] These are interpreted as ‘double genitive’ or adjective ‘of wool, woolen’ in NHB 1: 333c. The form *as-u with gen. as-u-i is rather comparable to mel-u, gen. mehu-i ‘bee’ vs. mehr, gen. mel-u, also mel-u-i ‘honey’ (q.v.); cf. also É. Tumanjan 1978: 299, 301, 306; Olsen 1999: 106, 435.


Thus, Arm. asr, gen. as-u morphologically corresponds to the u-stem neuter forms Skt. pāśu-, pāśi-, OHG fihu, etc. ‘cattle’. However, the relation of this group with Arm. asr ‘fleece’, Gr. πόκος m., πέκος n. ‘fleece’ and the verb *pek- ‘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/ok- ‘to comb, shear; fleece’ and *pek- n. ‘cattle’ (see Solta 1960: 125; E. Tumanjan 1978: 299-300; Jahukyan 1982: 120), just like meɫr ‘honey’ (q.v.). Or else, we are dealing with a metonymic development ‘fleece’ > ‘sheep’, and Arm. asr < *(p(e/o)k)u- ‘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: 378535; Ravnaes 1991: 11-13; Olsen 1999: 202; Matzinger 2005: 60260; see also the references above and those s.v. alik’ ‘waves’). One may depart from a QIE PD neuter *pōku-, gen. *pōk-óu- > PArm. *osu-r, gen. *(h)as-ú. The nominative would then analogically become *asu-r > asr. A similar scenario may be suggested also for barjr ‘high’, caɫr ‘laughter’, tarr ‘substance’ (see s.v.y.) 23.

Recently, a connection with Toch. B yok n. ‘hair; wool’ and Skt. yāstu- n. ‘pubic hair’ has been proposed, with a reconstruction like *ioku- or *iēh-ku- n. ‘body hair’ (Stalmasczyk/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 *i- 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 EW1a 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*, NPl *atamun-k’*, API *atamun-s*, GDPl *ataman-c’*, IPl *atamam-b-k’* (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astucaturean 1895: 201c) ‘tooth’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL** Present in Ararat, Muš, Van-group, Salmast, etc. In the other dialects the word has been replaced by *akṙay or kerik’* [HAB 1: 286].

The Armenian word has been explained in different ways: *h1dn̥t-m̥ > PArm. *atanan > *ataman (“Anschluß an die m(a)n-Stämme und gleichzeitig Dental-dissimilation”) > atamn (Schindler 1975: 61v), or *odmn > *otamn (Beekes 2003: 186), or *h1dn̥t-yn > PArm. *atan(ay)m > *atanm > atamn, or *ydn̥tny > *atan(ay)m > atamn (see Ravnaes 1991: 95, 100). For a further discussion, see Polomé 1980: 27-28; Greppin 1983: 305; 1988-89: 477-1; Olsen 1988-89: 481-482; 1999: 505; Clackson 1994: 34-35, 210-211; 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 Ravnaes): *ata(n) + -mn, cf. kol-mn ‘side’ vs. kol ‘rib’ (q.v.); see also s.v. gelmn ‘wool, fleece’.

**atta** (dial.) ‘mother, mummy’.

- **DIAL** Akn atta ‘mother, mummy’, cf. Muš, etc. ade; Zeyt’un até (vocative) ‘mum, mother’ [Aćaranean 1913: 46b].

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.

arahet

aracem (trans.) ‘to pasture’ (Bible+). aracim (intrans.) ‘to browse, graze’ (Bible+); arawt, i-stem (GDStg arawt-i in the Bible, GDPl arawt-i-c’ in Yovhannēs Draxanakete’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. τρόφων ‘to gnaw, nibble (especially of herbivorous animals)’, τρεφός 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 Aćāryan (HAB 2: 210a), but accepted by Frisk (ibid.), and, with some reservation, Jahukyan (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 Alayan (1974: 74) and seems most acceptable (see s.v. t’urc’i). Alayan’s (op. cit. 25) analysis of arac-/arawt as containing the suffix -awt is improbable, however. Hambjarjumyan (1995: 234-235; 1998: 42-45) identifies arawt ‘pastureland’ (< *trōg-) with a non-existent art ‘to graze; pastureland’, distinct from art ‘field’ (he refers to AćārLiak 3, 1957: 37, but there only aracel is mentioned), and *art and *arc- appearing in xaw-art and xavarci in a mysterious passage Movšēs Xorenac’i 1.30 (see H. Martirosyan 1996), which is untenable.

The equation of Arm. arac- with Gr. τρόφων and τρεφός would be possible if one assumes *treh₂- for Armenian (with a prothetic a- as in artawsr ‘tear’, q.v.; see also 2.1.17.4), *trh₂- for τρεφός, and *tρh₂- for τρόφων. 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. *er- or, perhaps, *ert-”; see also Greppin 1987: 395. This objection cannot be maintained because, unlike *Dr and *Dr’, 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. τρόφων. Klingenenschmitt (1982: 153) interprets it as a compound of an unattested *ar- < *pf- (cf. ar-) and *hálti- ‘flock of sheep’, etc.’ (see s.v. hawt). Olsen (1999: 92-93, 775, 811) derives it from PIE *srHu-d-iw/o- (cf. Lat. servō ‘to serve, preserve; to protect; to keep, observe; to look after’, Av. hauruaa- ‘aufpassend’, etc. Both etymologies are improbable, since neither the nature of *d- nor the alternation c – w is explained. Furthermore, in my view, *-dj- would yield Arm. -c- 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 deverbal noun in *-ti- based on verbal arac-. If, e.g., one accepts the connection with Gr. τρόφων, Arm. arac- would derive from *treh₂-, while arawt (i-stem) would imply *trh₂-ti- (cf. Gr. τρεφ-ιδός 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 Ījneč’i (7-8th cent.) ‘road; path’.

Eznik Kołbac’i (5th cent.), Yovhannēs Ījneč’i (7-8th cent.), John Chrysostom, etc.
• ETYM Aćāryan (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.). Lāp’anc’yān (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 Acaryan’s analysis is reminiscent of a folk-etymology and treats arahet as borrowed from unattested Iran. (MMed.) *arahēti, an old compound of *raθa-*raθai- ‘car’ and *iit-/ītī (from *yā-/ī- ‘to go’). She points out that the Armenian word has preserved the Iranian thematic vowel -i in the declension. L. Hovhanissian (1990: 262-263, 287ャ, 287ざ) mentions this etymology and notes that it is not clear whether arahet is of Iranian or native origin.

While P'erixanyan’s etymology is not impossible, I see no reason to abandon that of Acaryan. A clear typological parallel to the compound ar-a-het “path of men/people” is Šamšadin (Łarabał-group) mard’skocan ‘path’ < *mard-a-kacan which is found in a fairy-tale (HiZHek’ 1980: 58ャ) and is composed of mard ‘man’ and kacan ‘path’.

**arastoy** (arazdoy, erastoy), API arastoy-s, AblPl i yarastoy-c’; NHB 1: 338с has GDPl 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ょ, transl. Thomson 1976: 307): i glxoy leṙnēn aṙeal vēms arastoyos, antašs, ankop’s, yalt’s, <...> : “From the summit of the mountain he took solid stones, unworked, unhewn, immense, <...>” In Book of Chris: AblPl i yarastoy-c’ vimac’. In Philo: arazdoy vēm. Acaryan (HAB 1: 297α) cites also Eznik Erēc’ (7th cent.) without giving the passage.

In Yovhanēs Draxanakerc’i (9-10th cent.), one finds erastoy vimōk’ [NHB 1: 671ב], 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. erēk-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. pryṣṭh- n. ‘back, mountain-ridge, top’ (RV+), prṣṭi- 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. leṙn ‘mountain’ : dial. (Ararat) leṙ k’ar ‘hard stone’ [Amatuni 1912: 246α]; pal/pal k’arer [HAB 4: 4α, 13α], etc. The word combination leṙ 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 (HiZHek’ 4, 1963: 182-183, three times).

**arat**, GSg aratay ‘stork’?

Attested only in Vordan Arewelic’i (13th cent.), in the commentary on Psalms 103[104].17: Boyn aragl: 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 τά ξύλα τοῦ πεδίου,
ai kêdrou to Lυβάνου, ãs ñphýnsoyn.
17 ãkĩ ñrɔwɔtʰia ñmnɔsɔsɔsɔsɔ,
\[
\text{The Armenian translation: } \langle \ldots \rangle, \text{ boyn aragli apaw\text{\textemdash}en } \varepsilon \text{ noc'a.}
\]

Identifying \textit{ariovd} with ‘the fir tree’ of the Hebrew text, A\c{c}\c{a}ryan (HAB 1: 316b) interprets \textit{aratay} as GSg of \textit{arat} ‘stork’ (\textasciitilde{aragil}, GSg of \textit{aragil} ‘stork’), although in 1: 298a he puts a question mark and characterizes the word as uncertain. The declension with GDSg -\textit{ay} and GDPl -\textit{ac’}, apart from some proper names and foreign words, is unknown in Armenian (see A\c{c}\c{a}r\c{L}iak 3, 1957: 470-480; Jahukyan 1959: 281-282; Weitenberg 1989: 57-58), so that \textit{aratay} is puzzling (hardly a corruption for GPI \textit{aratac’}?). According to Jahukyan (1965: 251), it points to a foreign origin of the word.

In the Greek text, \textit{t\ddot{o}u \textit{\i}\textit{r\ddot{o}di\ddot{o}}t} (GSg) disagrees with \textit{\alpha\upiota\tau\omicron{\nu}} (GPl) 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’.

A\c{c}\c{a}ryan’s cautious suggestion concerning \textit{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, \textit{ariovd} is a mere transliteration of Gr. \textit{\i}\textit{r\ddot{o}di\ddot{o}}z ‘heron’ which in the passage under discussion, as well as in Deuteronomy, Leviticus and Galen, corresponds to Arm. \textit{aragil} ‘stork’. In Codex Alexandrinus and in the commentary of Hesych of Jerusalem, the Greek word is spelled with \textit{\alpha}\textit{p} [Rahlfs 1931: 259]. The -\textit{i-} in \textit{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 (-\textit{i-}), which is not attested in the Septuagint though (see Frisk 1, 1960: 572), and erroneously inserted an \textit{-i-} not after, but before \textit{ov=\omega}.

Thus, \textit{ariovd} turns out to function here in the meaning ‘stork’, and this makes the interpretation of \textit{arat}, which is a hapax and has a strange genitive form, even more complex.

\textbf{Etym} The only etymological attempt known to me is that of Jahukyan (1965: 251; 1967: 207, 305; 1987: 113), who derives the word from IE *\textit{ar\ddot{\textcircled{d}}t} - (*\textit{ar\ddot{\textcircled{d}}t}) with some hesitation; cf. Gr. \textit{\i}\textit{r\ddot{o}di\ddot{o}}z ‘heron’, Lat. \textit{ardea} ‘heron’, SCr. \textit{r\ddot{o}da} ‘stork’, OIc. \textit{arta} f. ‘kind of teal, garganey’ (see Pokorny 1959: 68). Then he mentions \textit{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 Lap’anc’y an 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. \textit{ardea} (= *\textit{hardea}, cf. Span./Portug. \textit{garza}, etc.), see Vennemann 1998: 353\textsuperscript{19}. The IE forms have been compared with Turkic *\textit{örd/täk} ‘duck’ [Servashidze 1989: 82]. For a criticism of this view, see Tatarincev 1993, 1: 122. Sometimes, Hitt. \textit{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, *\textit{h}.), 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 \(^*h₁r(e)oH₂d\)-, since neither \(^*h₁r(e)oH₂d\)- nor \(^*h₁rH₁d\)- 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 “Arjeän baräran”, in the meaning ‘unploughed soil’. The verb arōsānam 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’ (arɔs), and Baberd (harɔs), 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 arawrt ‘pasture-land’ (see s.v. aracem ‘to pasture’), suggested with some reservation by Jähukyan (1967: 184; 1972: 251), is formally problematic.

N. Simonyan (1979: 220) suggests a connection with Gr. ἀρώτρον f. ‘tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields’; Mlr. arbor (< *argry), NPl arbanna, Olr. gen. arbe (< *argyens) ‘corn’; and Arm. harawunk’ ‘arable land’ (q.v.), an old r/n-stem noun based on the PIE verb \(^*h₂er₃\)- ‘to plough’. She derives Arm. araws from \(^*arɔw-ns\)- (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, armenä ‘oberflächlich gepflügte Erdschicht’ (see Pokorny 1959: 62) is meant. According to Derksen (1996: 154), Lith. armenä means ‘aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächer’ (cf. also Arm. arawunk’ ‘arable land’) and comprises the verbal root of ėrti ‘to plough’ (from the same PIE \(^*h₂er₃\)-) and the suffix \(^*men₃\)-. 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’, boyɔs ‘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, Muș, 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; Açařyan 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\textsuperscript{N67}; see also HAB 1: 350a), connected with Gr. ἄποτπω f., Lat. arātrum, Mlr. arathar, Welsh aradr, Olc. arôr, Lith. ėrklas, 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 \(^*h₁rH₁trom\) (also in Gr. ἀποτπω; the zero grade of this type also seen in Lith. ėrklas ‘oar’ from \(^*h₁r₃\)-),
whereas the variant harawr, as Lith. ārklas and Lat. arārum, adopted the e-grade of the verb. This is accepted by Beekes (2003 1183, 193). 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. *harₐrₜ 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.

*aarb- aorist stem of əmpem ‘to drink’ (q.v.), 3pl. arb-in, etc. (Bible+); arbenam, 3pl.aor. arb-ec ‘to get drunk’ (Bible+), participle arbeal ‘drunk’ (arbeal ic’en = μεϑύουσιν in the Bible, on this and on the -e- of arbenam, see Clackson 1994: 230207); jr-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 Muş harb’ınal, Tigranakert hɑrp’ɛnal, Zeyt’un hayb’ınsl [HAB 1: 299b]. The initial x- in Salmast and Marala confirm the original h-.

Şatax čorārpin ‘irrigated soil’ continues CIArm. jr-arb [M. Muradyan 1962: 213b].


The Armenian form derives from aorist in zero grade *(e-)sr̥bʰ-o/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 *(e-) (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, ārpnek ‘assistant heir son’ [Aćařyan 1952: 248], and in Şatax 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-e₂ye-. 

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. ὀρφάνος ‘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 parm-ani, both ‘youth, youngster’ on the one hand, and of Gr. ὀρφ-αν-ος ‘orphaned’ on the other. For the structure of arbaneak note especially the synonymous pataneak.

The connection with arban-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.), GDPl arbun-c’, LocPl y-arbun-s, IPl arb[m]am-b-k’ ‘vigour, maturity (of age)’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Book of Chries, Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Nilus of Ancyra, Yovhannēs Drasxanakerte’i, etc.); sg. uninflected arbuń (Philo, Grigor Narekac’i, Čašoc’).

For attestations and a philological discussion, see Weitenberg 1989a. GDPl 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 Azrahyan (HAB 1: 300-301) rejects all the etymological attempts, including those connecting arban-k’ with Arm. arbaneak ‘servant’, orb ‘orphan’ (q.v.), Skt. ārba- ‘small, young’, OCS rabm m ‘servant’, etc. (on which see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 119-120).

The word arban-k’ has been etymologized with Goth. abrs ‘strong’ as *abhro- = *h₂(e)bhro- (Jāhukyan 1982: 74; 1987: 111; cf. Weitenberg 1989a: 109-111). Weitenberg 1989a suggests a connection of arban-k’ with burn ‘strong, violent’ positing *bHrH-n- (sg.) and *bHrH-on- (pl.), respectively, belonging with the root *bHrH-, cf. Skt. bhar ‘to move rapidly to and fro, hurry, quiver’, Skt. bhūrni- ‘zealous, wild’, bhūrana- ‘active, quick, lively’, φυρμός ‘Verwirrung’, etc., for the forms, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 250.


argand, a-stem (later also o-‘) ‘womb’ (Bible+).

DIAL Akn, Jula arg’and’, Alaškert arkant (according to HayLezBrBař 1, 2001: 121b, also argan; Madat’yan 1985 vacat), Agulis, T’iflis, Šamaxy ark’and (also with an initial h-), see also Balramyan 1964: 59, 189), Axale’xa ark’ant’ [HAB 1: 303a]. Further, Larabal argand (Mehtišen arg∧nd) [Davt’yán 1966: 319]. The d-less form of Alaškert is also seen in another dialect of Muš-group, namely Bulanax (the village of Kop’), as found in a fairy-tale recorded in Leninakan/Gyumri in 1930-36 [HZHek’ 10, 1967: 96115]: im argan-en ‘from my womb’; glossed as argan’ argand (op. cit. 604a).
In Larabal, one would expect *ărk'änd, through Ačaryan’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 Ačaryan’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 ārk’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 knyğä] ārk’änım el mi tla, im ārk’änım el 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 ārk’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.12).

Lidén (1906: 21; cf. Pedersen 1982 [< 1907]: 297b) derives it from IE *arkw-, cf. Welsh arffedd ‘gremium, Schoss’, Gael. arcuinn ‘udder of a cow’. This etymology is accepted by Ačaryan (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. ὀρύα ‘intestine’, restoring *(o)rwn̥t-. Pedersen (1949: 1-2) proposed a connection with the Slavic *grôdb ‘breast’: Russ. grud’, etc., adducing parallels for the semantic relation between ‘belly; womb’ and ‘breast’ such as Fr. sein, etc. A protoform like *gʷr(V)nd̥- 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 *gʰroud̥- ‘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. ἄργος ‘arrogance’ and Lat. grandis ‘great’ (see Pokorny 1959: 485) make Pedersen’s etymology problematic since *gʷra- 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.  ὀρύα and others is rejected on semantic grounds.

The ‘prothetic’ vowel a- of Arm. argand is also unclear. Although Pedersen adds 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. sarḫwvant- c./n. ‘uterus, placenta’ < IE *srHu-wnt- h2, literally ‘full of sausages’, cf. Gr. ὀρύα ‘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, *srHu- 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 *-nd̥-.
How to explain the loss of the final -d in Šamšadin ārkʿān? One might think that this is due to the final weakening as a result of the accent retraction. According to HayLezBrbBar 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. GDPl salamb-a-cʿ ‘francolin’ (q.v.). It is tempting to reconstruc 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. MjHayBar vacat. In Bārgirk’ hayocʿ it glosses urʿ ‘branch’; 3 urʿ · cil kam argat [Amalyan 1975: 261].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1060c: argat · ur hateal yortʿoy; čiw yateal; yōt.

● DIAL. Preserved only in the dialect of Ararat [HAB 1: 304a], according to Amatuni (1912: 75a), also in Murš: arkt, arktand, and used by modern Armenian writers Perē Proshyan (1883-1918) and Stepʿan Zoryan (1889-1967), born in Aštarak and Larḵilisa (later called Kirovakan, nowadays Vanajor), respectively [HayLezBrbBar1, 2001: 137]. For these and some other textual illustrations, see Amatuni 1912: 75a. Further: Xanʿtʿang Ananyan (the village of Polosťilisa, Dilijan) (see HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 432); Xažak Gyulnazaryan (1984: 85), all of them being native speakers of the Ararat dialect. For Kʿanakʾe arktʿ, see G. D. Asatryan 1990: 54.

● ETYM. No etymology in HAB 1: 304a.

Lapʿancʿyan (1961: 166) connects Hitt. arkt- ‘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’.


This etymology is the most probable one, although the evidence for *preh₂- > Arm. *pr̥h₂- is scanty and inconclusive; see also Jahukyan 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 *pr̥h₂- 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.
argel, uninflated [Greppin 1983: 309 gives -i, -oy, probably by mistake] ‘hindrance, obstacle’ (Agat’ang’los, John Chrysostom, etc.), ‘ward, prison’ (Revelation 18.2, rendering Gr. φυλακῆ ‘watching, guarding; ward, prison’); more frequent with verbs such as airon ‘to make’, linim ‘to be’, tan ‘to give’, etc. (Bible+), argelum ‘to forbid, hinder, etc.’ (Bible+), argolem ‘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, Ača’yan (1952: 248) only records Ozim arg’iil. M. Muradyan 1962: vacat (on Šatax). In my view, we do find a relic of the word in Moks šrāk’il’ ‘здержание мочи’ (= ‘retention of the urine’), e.g. šrāk’il’ of ‘у него здержание мочи’ (see Orbeli 2002: 302), which must be interpreted as *šr-ar(g)il-k’ = š’er ‘urine’ + argel-k’, with loss of -r- (2.1.33.3) and with a regular reflex of Ača’yan’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 [Ača’ean 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. räktas ‘key’, Hitt. ḫar(k)- ‘to hold, have, keep’, etc. [Osthoff 1898: 54-64, 65; HAB 1: 304-305; Pokorny 1959: 66; Jáhukyan 1967b: 69; 1987: 113; Klingenschmitt 1982: 236-238]. On Hittite, see Kloekhorst 2008 s.v.

Ača’yan (HAB 1: 304b) treats -el as a suffix comparable to -il (Greppin 1975: 79; 1983: 309) compares Lat. arcula ‘small box, casket’. Jáhukyan (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 aye’-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 *h₂r-eₖₙₙ- seen in German Riegel ‘bolt’, cf. Lith. rāktas ‘key’. On Germanic, see Lindeman 2003. For a discussion of the zero grade form *h₂rₖ- with

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. ἀρκος. Arm. dial. *arg may corroborate this assumption. Alternatively, -el- may be relatively recent (cf. aye-’el- and vay-el- above).

ard₁, u-stem ‘shape, order’; *ard(i), eu-stem ‘work’: ardea-w-k’ ‘indeed’ (instrumental); ardiwn-k’, API ardiwn-s, GDP 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 ard₂ ‘(just) now’ (q.v.).

●ETYM From PIE *h₂r̥-tu- and *h₂r̥-ti- based on *h₂r̥- ‘to fix, put together’: Skt. ṛt ‘correct time; order’; Gr. ἀρτύς ‘σύνταξις’ (Hes.), ἀρτύω ‘to equip, prepare’; Lat. artus ‘joint, limb’ [Hübschmann 1897: 42365; 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. ṛt- ‘truthful; (world-)order’), see Hübschmann 1897: 423-42465. Olsen (1999: 33860, 868) assumes that ard-ar more probably is “a loanword from a Mfr. counterpart of Av. ardra- ‘getreu, zuverlässig’”, which seems unnecessary. Besides, I wonder if an Iran. -dr- would not develop into -dhr- > -hr-. For another attempt to interpret Arm. ardar as an Iranian
loan (from *arta-δα-), 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. *ardwän-k’, GDPl ardanc- ‘(agricultural) products; deed’ may be seen in the place-name Ardean-k’ (q.v.).

● DIAL No dialectal records in HAB 1: 309a.

Here, in my view, may belong Me *ri particle of time ärđāk, cf. te*ln ärđāk ‘immediately, on the spot’ (see Aлейyan 1954: 292); Karčewan a`rdâk ‘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; Aлейyan 1941: 179; Gabikean 1952: 341]. Thus, it may be identical with arđak ‘flat (adj.)’ from ard-1, since the latter is etymologically related to ard. For the semantics, cf. Germ. eben ‘flat’ and ‘just now’. The Me*ri expression *te*ln ärđāk ‘immediately, on the spot’ is also found in Łarabaɫ, in a different meaning: təte*ln-ārt’āk ‘completely’ (see HŽHek’ 7, 1979: 736b); see arđi.

H. Muradyan (1960: 16, 190a; see also 219b) glosses ardi as Karčewan hârdâ, not specifying the semantics. This is identical with Melri hârdā ‘now’ (see Aлейyan 1954: 313, in the glossary of dialectal words). Note also Areš ärťā ‘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 Łarabaɫ fairy-tale recorded by Afak’el Bahat’ryan in 1860 (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 69913): šemk’in ärťāk nstac “seated upright on a threshold”.

● ETYM Since NHB (1: 345c, 349a), compared with Gr. ἀρτί ‘just now’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 423Nr51; HAB 1: 309a]. From IE *h(e)rti: Gr. ἀρτί ‘just now’; Lith. ar̄t̄i ‘near’ (referring to proximity of space rather than time). Probably, an ancient locative formation from the root *h2er- ‘to fix, put together’ (see aɐnem, 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, 22399.

The absence of the initial h- may be due to zero grade possibly seen in ardi < *ardiyoh < *h2e̬ritio: Gr. ἀρτιος ‘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-, than the problem becomes easier since derivatives in -ti- generally have a zero grade root. Also other -i- 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’alak* ‘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’alak’i : ιερέως Ἡλίου πόλεως; areg, gen. aregi ‘the 8th month’ (Bible+); areg ‘eastern’ (Agat’angefos, Grigor
areg-akn. an-stem: GDPl aregakan, AblSg y-aregakan-ě, ISg aregakamb (Bible+), NPl aregakun-k’ (epic song of Vahagn apud Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.31 [1913=1991: 86L4], Eznik Kolbaci’, etc.; later AblSg y-aregakn-ě in Grigor Narekac’i 38, 10-11th cent. (Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 403L45) ‘sun’ (Bible+); a number of derivatives based on areg-, areg-n-a-, aregakn-a-.


Note the denominative verb y-arag-em ‘to expose to the sun’ (2 Kings, Cyril of Alexandria, Grigor Astuacaban, etc.) rendering Gr. ἐξ-ηλιαζω ‘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].

There are a few derivatives, e.g. Trapizan, Arabkir, Akn, Dersim, Xotorǰur, Kesaria *areg-i ‘sunny place, sunny side or slope’ (see Gabri’elean 1912: 242; Ačaréan 1913: 146a; Bahramyan 1960: 73b; HayLezBrBaɾ 1, 2001: 122a).

● ETYM. Arm. arew/g- ‘sun’ derives from IE *h2reu-i-: Skt. ravi- m. ‘sun, sun-god’ (Upaniṣad+), ravi-putra- m. ‘son of the Sun’ (Kāṭhaka- Brāhmaṇa); according to Eichner 1978, here belongs also Hitt. ḫarua(ya)mae- ‘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’ < *h1regwōs-, the initial a- of arew/g- points to *h2-. This is corroborated by Hittite ḫ-.


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. *ṛηreu-ōi- > PArm. *arew-u(y) , gen. *ṛη(e)i-ōi- (rather than *ṛηe-oi-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 (Jahukyan 1959: 253; for a discussion, see also É. Tumanjan 1978: 227-236; Olsen 1999: 109-110). Some scholars (Solta 1960: 407-408; Xač’aturova 1979: 353, cf. 360,ə) 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; Xač’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 pana ‘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. patangā- 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 sacraally 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. ēk ‘donkey’, ji ‘horse’, and 3.12).

The assumption that Larabal rēk’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 Larabal mostly as ərɛk’nak, ərhynak [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-oǰ-, see 2.2.1.5.

The vocalism of y-arag-em ‘to expose to the sun’ (Bible+, rendering Gr. ἐξηλιάζω 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. ὀφίλεομαι and Skt. vasnayáti, from *uosno- ‘price’: Skt. vēnum, Arm. gin ‘price’, cf. also *uoğʰ-eie- from *uoğʰ-o- ‘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. *ərow­ey-mi > *ərowêmi (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)’ (Gabriélean 1912: 242), which clearly derives from arew ‘sun’.

Culturological excursus

We saw that Arm. arew­g- 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 [Gabriélean 1912: 242], and an oath formula from Larabal (Laziyani 1983: 165b-89); en irk’ynak “(may that sun (witness for me)”. Further note aregag < aregakn in a T’iflis version of this type of formulae (Tēr-Alek’sandran 1885: 198[11]).

For further evidence from folklore supporting the veneration of Arew and Aregak, see Vardumyan/T’oxat’y’an 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 ariwn, AblSg y-aren-č, ISg ariwn-b, GDPl ariwn-c ‘blood’ (Bible+). Note ariwn xaloboy ‘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. ἐαρ (also εἰαρ, ἥαρ) n. ‘blood’, Skt. āsṛ̥jan., NSg āsṛ̥k (RV+), GSG āsṛ̥k (AV+) ‘blood’, etc. by Tervišjej 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- > *eḥar- > *ear- > *ar- [Hübschmann 1899: 44; HAB 1: 317a] or *esar- > *eḥar- > *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. ašun ‘summer’ and jme ‘winter’.

Jahukyan (ibid.) alternatively suggests *əsr- (if, as he points out, Gr. ḫap is an ancient form), and, for the word for ‘spring’, *wesr-, with the shwa secundum *b. Hitt. čehar n., GSG isčanás, points to *h₁eš₂r. What Jahukyan in fact seems to suggest, is *h₁šk₂r, although such a form is not found elsewhere. Lat. asser cannot be used as evidence for *h₁š- (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 *h₁r 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. κρέατος < *kreuhn̥₂t.

The best solution seems to be: *h₁eš₂r > *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: GDG arcat’-o-y, ISg arcat’-o-v (rich evidence in the Bible) ‘silver; silver ware; money; wealth’; arcat’-i ‘silverly’; 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; Klaproth 1831: 105a; NHB 1: 360c; de Ladrade 1854: 30811, etc.), connected with the PIE word for ‘silver’: Lat. argentum n. ‘silver’, Skt. rajatā- ‘silver-coloured, shining white, made of silver’, n. ‘silver’ (AV+), YAv. arzata- n., OPers. ardata- ‘silver’, etc., see Hübschmann 1897:
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: 229; Olsen 1999: 868) explains arcat’ ‘silver’ from Iran. *ardzata- in the same way as arcui ‘eagle’, q.v. (consonant shift as in parté ‘garden’). Viredaz (2005: 89) 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, GDPl arcue-a-c’ (Bible+) ‘eagle’.

For attestations, see NHB s.v. and Greppin 1978: 43-48. Later: arcw, a few times in the Alexander Romance, see H. Simonyan 1989: 94 (a late kafa-poem), 348 (twice), 428 (the earliest edition); also MidArm. (see Greppin 1978: 46, 48; MijHayBat 1, 1987: 93a).

- DIAL Widespread in the dialects, reflecting *arciv [HAB 1: 320b].

Godel (1975: 76) treats arcui as a by-form of the original arciv. Arguing against this point of view, de Lamberterie (1978: 251) considers arciv 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, 189, 19 with lit.

Georgian arciv- 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’ (Jahaljyan 1963: 133; 1967: 328; 1976: 109; 1985a: 369; 1986a: 49, 50, 54, etc.; see also A. Petrosyan 2002: 6731; 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. šuś ‘(inland) sea’ (see below).

On the other hand, Arm. arcui has been treated as borrowed from Urartian [D’jakonov 1983: 151] (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: 185b, 1985: 602; Greppin 1991b: 725b, 725b, 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 (Movses Xorenac’i 2.50, 1913=1991: 179), the horse of King Artašēs is compared with arcui srat’ew ‘sharp-winged eagle’, cf. Skt. ṛṣṇ-patvā ‘swift-flying’ as epithet of śyenā- ‘eagle’ (cognate with Arm. c’in ‘kite’, see below), Gr. ὄκο-πέτης ‘swift-flying’ (used of horses and hawks), ὀκό-πτησ ‘swift-winged’; cf. also Av. arzshfiô.paršna- ‘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, Movses Xorenac’i 1.26 (1913=1991: 76L11f), the dragon-riding hero was dashing with eagle’s wings: arcuoy imn ardarew slac’eal t’ewovk’. In a kafa-poem to the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 94 L-1) we find srənt’ac’ arciw ‘sharp-riding eagle’. The horse of the Armenian epic “Sasna cṙer” is flying as an aɫavnik ‘little dove’ (SasCṙ 1, 1936: 744L61). Note also Aristakēs Lastivertc’i (Yuzbaşyan 1963: 64L23).

It is remarkable that, as has been noted by de Lamberterie (1978: 261), in RV 4.38.2, etc. (Elizarenkova 1989: 404, 746; Watkins 1995: 170) the horse Dadriki- is compared with ṛjitam śyenām. Vedic ṛjitam- is an epithet of śyenā- ‘bird of prey, falcon, eagle’, which is cognate with Av. suēna- ‘a big bird of prey’, Gr. ἱκτῖνος m. ‘kite’ and Arm. c’in ‘kite’ (q.v.). Thus, both *ṛğipto- ‘epithet of a bird of prey’ and *ṭhtiH-(i)no- or *ṭhtiH-enö- ‘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.v.v.; 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. *ṛğipto- (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 Mسيرانتز 1904: 129, Arm. cov ‘sea’ is compared to Urart. šiw ‘(inland) sea’, which is interpreted as cō(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 Jāhukyan (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 Pahuγ-) 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. particle 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. dargn ‘potter’s wheel’ for more detail).

arm-anam ‘to be astounded’ (P’awstos buzzand, etc.), z-arm-anam ‘id.’ (Bible+), and-armanam ‘to be astounded, stricken with amazement; to render senseless, benumb, deaden’ (Bible+).

●ETYM Ažašyan (HAB 1: 327) derives from armn ‘root’ (Bible+), cf. ModArm. p‘ayt/k‘ar ktrił ‘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’, ἀρμόζω ‘to join, fit together; to bind fast’, etc. from PIE *h2-er- ‘to fit’. For the semantics, cf. papanjim ‘to grow dumb, speechless’: *panj- from QIE *bhn ַ dh-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 ārmug, Zeyt’un āyumg, Hačan āyumg [HAB 1: 330a; Haneyan 1978: 183a; Ažašyan 2003: 300].

●ETYM Since Hübschmann (1897: 425 Nr59; see also Osthoff 1898: 60; HAB 1: 329b), connected with Skt.िर्मा- 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. râme ‘shoulder’, etc. (from PIE *h2-erH-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-ar-m-ar ‘fitting’ belonging to PIE *h2-er- ‘to fit (together), to put together’ (cf. Arm. ārinem ‘to make, prepare, create’, q.v.; Gr. ἀριστόν ‘joint; limb’, ἀρισθάζως ‘union, friendship’, ἀριφω ‘junction’, etc.), and, thus, has nothing to do with the PIE word for ‘arm’ or represents a synchronically different formation of the same *h2-er- ‘to fit’ (see Hamp 1982; Jâhukyan 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’.
Jahukyan (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 *h₂erHmo- or, 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: 208, 68138, 7568), 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 > armukn (regular syncope). Then he notes: “Because the *A here fails to appear as Arm. h- it must have been IE *h = h²; 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: 425N59) 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 Acharyan (HAB 1: 329b) suggests. The structure goes parallel with krukn ‘heal’ (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-kn ‘muscle’, un-kn ‘ear’, etc. [Jahukyan 1987: 238]; see also s.vv. akn ‘eye’; cung, dial. *cunkn ‘knee’.

aršalurš-ḵ’, aršaluš-ḵ’, ašalurj-ḵ’ ‘the last part of the night which is followed by the dawn’, prob. ‘twilight’ (Bible+), ačʃʃalurj-ḵ’ in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.42 [1913=1991: 167-207; and ayaganal ač’alrj’oc’ (variants ajljoc’n, ašalrjoc’n, ač’alrjoc’n, ajalrjoc’n, aqljrcjn); “at daybreak”, transl. Thomson 1978: 183]; aršaluš (Grigor Skewrāc’i, 12-13th cent.), aršaloys, aršaluš (Martiros Lirmeč’i, Mkrtič’ Nalaš, see MiHHayB’a 1, 1987: 96a), ašaloyes, ašaloys (Bağirk’ hayoc’; see Amalyan 1975: 26N66, 39N917), ModArm. aršaluys ‘dawn’ [HAB 1: 330a].

● DIAL Next to Axale’xa aršalu-s-in ‘at dawn’, Acharyan (HAB 1: 330b) also introduces Muš, etc. ašm ‘twilight’. The latter rather belongs with aʃmanuʃ ‘twilight’ (q.v.).

● ETYM Acharyan (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 lur ‘half-dark’ (q.v.). The first component remains uncertain. Later, he (HAB 4: 655-656) posits arʃ(n) ‘black’ +
lurj ‘blue’ (see s.vv.) comparing the compound with dial. *mut’n)-u-loys ‘twilight’ = mut’(n) ‘dark’ + loys ‘light’. For the atmospheric sense of arjn ‘black; dark’ cf. arjn-a-bolor ‘very dark’. [Alternative: *alj- ‘dark, darkness’ + lurj ‘light, bright’: *alj-a-lurj-k’ > *arlurjak’ through assimilation lj...rf > rf...rf].


arj. o-stem: GDsG arj-o-y (Bible, Eznik Kolbac’i), GDPl arj-o-c’ in the Bible (var. arj-u-c’ and Anania Şirakac’i (7th cent., A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 39L3), AblPl y-arj-o-c’ (Grigor Narekac’i 67.5, Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 519L89); u-stem: GDsG arj-u (Bible); GDPl arj-u-c’ (Agat’angeš); i-stem: GDPl arj-i-c’ (Grigor Magistros, 11th cent.) ‘bear’.

As an asterism, attested in Anania Şirakac’i (7th cent.), see A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 39L3, 1944: 331L1.

DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 334b]. For Van *arj-a-plo ‘ghost’ and *arj-a-pap-o ‘bogy’, see s.v. * bo/u- ‘spider, ghost’. Tigranakert arë ref ers to ‘male cat’. Here, this designation for ‘bear’ has been replaced by ayu of Turkish origin, found also in Polis and Nor Naxijwian [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. r̥kṣa- m., YAv. arša- m. ‘bear’, Hitt. ḫartagga- ‘bear’ or ‘wolf’, etc. [HAB 1: 334]. The word is now reconstructed as *h2rtk̂o (Schrijver 1991: 56, 68-69, 71-72; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 247-248). Despite the troublesome -j- probably to be explained by tabu (see 2.1.36), the appurtenance of Arm. arj to the PIE word for ‘bear’ cannot be rejected [Meillet 1906: 8]. On a discussion of -j- by Pedersen and Meillet, see 2.1.12 (on ruki-rule). For a further discussion and references, see Greppin 1983: 315; Clackson 1994: 233-236, Olsen 1999: 184.

An influence of arjn ‘black’ has been assumed (Pokorny 1959: 875). Earlier, Scheffelowzow (1904-05, 1: 293, 2: 17) had connected arj ‘bear’ with arjar ‘cattle’ and arjn ‘black’ (see s.vv.). Winter (1997) analyzes arj as an original feminine in *-ih2- seen in Skt. r̥kṣī- ‘she-bear’, thus assuming *-r̥j- > -rf.

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.

arjař. o-stem (paradigm abundantly attested in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 231bc); a-stem: GDPl arjař-a-c’ in Eznik Kolbac’i (5th cent., but the form is considered an emendation, HAB 1: 335a) and Yovhannës Draxanakerc’i (9-10th cent.) ‘cattle’.

An illustration of the semantics: Isaiah 7.21: erinj mi varjařos’ : դայալից բծոն. Arm. arjař corresponds to Gr. βοῦς and clearly refers to ‘neat, bovid, any bovine
animal’ as a generic term, whereas erinj renders δίαμ-αλις ‘young cow’ and, in this context, refers to one young cow taken from/of bovids.

**arjas.** Nor Bayazet arč-ar, Marala arč-ar (with preservation of the medial -r), Hamšen, Nor Nasijewan, Šamaxi, Jula ač-ar, Muš, Alaškert, Ozim ač-ar, etc., all meaning ‘male calf of two years, young bullock that has not yet been yoked’ [HAB 1: 335a]. The medial -ā- in Moks ačār, gen. -u ‘byak, two-hoofed animal, else not hooved’ [Orbeli 2002: 201], Šatax ačār ‘a bull of two to three years’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 83, 193a], Van ačār [Ačāryan 1952: 248], and Mužambar (T’avriz) ajc/n [HAB 1: 335a], is due to Ačāryan’s Law (see 2.1.39.2).

Some resembling forms are found in East Caucasian languages: Andi Rājē ‘calf’, etc. (see Starostin 1985: 76) for the forms). According to Jāhukyan (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- in Yovhannēs Erznarac’i (Pluz), 13th cent.; arjaspn. AblSing y-arjaspn- in Mxīt’ar Aparanc’i (15th cent.), compounds with ar/j(a)spn- (see HAB 335a; MiḥHayBar 1, 1987: 97a) ‘vitriol, sulphate of iron or copper, used especially as black ink’.

Attested since the 7th century, in Vrt’anēs K’ert’ol, in an enumeration of scribal liquids: det groc’ ē arjasp, ev gxtor, ev křiz [NHB 1: 375a]. Also in compounds: arjasp-a-nerk ‘painted with vitriol’ in “Tōmar”, arjaspn-a-goyn ‘vitriol-coloured’ in Grigor Tat’evac’i (14-15th cent.), etc.

**ETYM** Contains arj-n ‘black’ (q.v.) [HHB and NHB]. Ačāryan (HAB 1: 335ab) accepts this and compares Lat. āder ‘black’ > ātrāmentum ‘writing-ink; blacking’, noting that the component *asp is unknown. See also Jāhukyan 1981: 21-22; 1987: 517, 609. Georgian arjsp’i and Tušian arjasp ‘vitriol’ are considered Armenian loans (see HAB 1: 335b).

art or arj ‘black’. Independently attested only in P’awstos Buzand 3.14 [HAB 1: 335b; HovAnnaianyian 1990a: 151]; not in NHB. The passage reads as follows (1883=1984: 32L-2; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 87): *span- (with anaptyctic a in Armenian, cf. s.vv. arəspel ‘myth, tale, fable’ and araštual ‘ceiling’) or *d-span-. The form arjaspn should be considered original, so that we are dealing with loss of the final -n in the 7th century.

The compound also Mi-


The compound arjn-a-bolor ‘very dark’ refers to the night in Čaronti (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. Scheftelowizt (1904-05, 1: 293, 2: 17) connects arjn ‘black’ with arj ‘bear’ and arjal ‘cattle’ and links them with Gr. ὀρφνός ‘dark, murky’, ὀρφνή f. ‘darkness, murk, night’, ὀρφν-αίος ‘dark, murky’, ὀρφν-ινός ‘dark colour, dark red’. The apprunence of the Greek word to ὕπόθος ‘the dark of the underworld’ (see s.v. erēk ‘evening’) and Toch. B erken- ‘black’ is uncertain (see Pokorny 1959: 334, 857; Frisk s.v.; Adams 1999: 95). Theoretically, Arm. arj- should reflect QIE *Hrgwh-n(e)-, *Hrj-e-n, or *Hrj-, thus a direct connection with erēk, etc. is hardly possible. Arm. arj-n and Gr. ὀρφ-ν may reflect *hrgwh-n(e)-. One might think of an Iranian mediation, cf. Khot. rrās ‘dark-coloured’, etc. (Bailey 1979: 362; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 424), or OAv. rajj- n. ‘darkness’ (Mayrhofer op. cit. 426), but this is less probable. The inner-Armenian relation with arj ‘bear’ and arjal ‘cattle’ is possible.

Ačařyan (HAB 1: 335-336; cf. AčaHLPatm 1, 1940: 181) connects Arm. arjn ‘black’ with *adj- and *adj- ‘dark’ and assumes a borrowing from North Caucasian languages: Chechen ārži, 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 apprunence of *adj- and *adj- is improbable (see s.v. *adj-).

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 yagaraki: φυλάσσειν καλάμην ἐν ὕπόθοι. 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: 148L35; transl. Thomson 1991: 208): ew kamec’ealk’ yezer helatatin ař vayr mi hangē’el, ur ew hnjołk’n artorayoc’n šarj zelōk’n gorcēn: ‘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/arēay(k’).
DIAL. Widespread in the dialects. All the dialectal material (including also derivatives and compounds; see Ačarean 1913: 154-155; HAB 1: 337b; Amatuni 1912: 74b; HayLezBrbBar 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/aṙt is glossed by ‘поле, нива, пашня’ in Orbeli 2002: 205. Textual illustrations: aṙt värəc’in “вспахали поле” (58L-7, transl. 133); taran c’anic’in aṙtəɛ’mɛč ‘попесли, посеяли на ниве’ (59L, transl. 134); aṙt xasɛr; məšakun esc‘: ’к’эндя art anję – “Поле поспело, он сказал батраку: ‘пойди сожни поле’” (80L6f, transl. 152).

For attestations with a clear reference to ploughing or sowing or mowing/harvesting, see e.g. HŽHek’ 6, 1973 (Łaraba-Tavuş region): 184L11f, 289L4 (mi tap’ a varum, art anum “ploughs a field and makes it a cornfield”), 529L12f, 584L14, 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 Lazar 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 ténigmatique au lieu de c”) and treats Arm. art-ak’- ‘dehors/outside’ (Bible+) as a locative of it, as Lith. loc. laukė ‘draußen, im Freien, außerhalb’ from laũkas ‘field’. Ačarean (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 Jáhukyan 1990a: 11.

A *heγ-ro- (cf. also Skt. āfr- m. ‘field, plain’, Lat. a(gr)er m. ‘field’, etc.) would yield *hare-. 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 *heγ- (see s.v.v.). The QIE (analogical) proto-form of Arm. art might then have been *heγro-. On the semantics and the problem of derivation of *heγ-ro- from *heγ- ‘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: 86ff.

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: 22n (?). Sceptical: Greppin 1987: 395. [Note, however, PIE *meγ(s)-i > Gr. μέγη and Arm. merj ‘near’, q.v.]. The same anomaly is seen in barți ‘poplar’ (q.v.) from PIE *bʰ(e)rH-g- ‘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 *hɜɣro-): *-rHg- or *Hɣr- > 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’.


**arti** (uninflected), NPl *artasu-k*’, *a*-stem (GDPl *artasu-a-c’*) ‘tear’ (Bible†+).

- **DIALECT** 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. आश्रु- n., YAv. अश्रृङ्ग- n. pl., Lith. आशरा, आशरा f., Toch. आकृर. 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 neutrals, see Clackson 1994: 126; Olsen 1999: 166-169, and on the plural stem *“artasu-a”- reflecting an old neuter plural *“drak-h2”, see Clackson 1994: 47-48, 20812, 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 Pänullima”, thus: *artawsr* ‘tear’ < *drák̲uru* vs. *artasu-k’* (pl.). As aandr means ‘wild male sheep’, it seems that the pair *andr* and *arti*, like that of *k’*als (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; Hewsen 1992: 15318]. This seems attractive, since there are some other designations of female animals formed with the suffix -i < *“-ieh”-, 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. Aca’yan (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 ἄγριος ‘wild’ < ἀγρός ‘Feld, Acker’; see Frisk 1: 16), referring particularly to animals for hunting, cf. vayr ‘field’: vayri ‘wild’ > ‘wild sheep’, dial. (Zeyt’un) ‘hind’ [HAB 4: 300-301], also verik ‘wild sheep’ in the epic “Sasna čṙer”. Note in Psalms 103[104].11 [Rahlfs 1931: 258]: τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἄγριον ‘wild animals’, literally ‘beasts of the field’; see Dahood 1970: 38. Cf. also Hitt. gimraš ṣuwar ‘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. ἄγριος ‘wild’, which is etymologically related. However, one cannot be sure whether we are dealing with the suffix -i derived from *-io- (cf. kogi, -way, -wow ‘butter’: Skt. gavya-, gavyā- ‘aus Rindern bestehend’, etc.) or *-ieh2 (cf. *h₁oiHu-ieh₂ > aygi, -way, -eac’ ‘grape-vine; grape-garden’, etc.) unless new evidence is found. The above-mentioned parallel vayr-i represents the latter type, in view of GDPl 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 (HayLezBrBrBa 1, 2001: 135b), in which art functions in the basic meaning of ‘(animal) of art, belonging to art’, that is ‘wild, undomesticated (animal)’: artn ŋnak čun (Larabal) 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-te art ŋlla ‘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-at ’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. ὁφρύς m. ‘leader’, ὁφηγή f. ‘beginning, origin’, ὁφτον, -οντος m. ‘commander,
archon’, ἄρχω ‘to be the first’ (see HAB 1: 346-347; Açaırian himself rejects the etymology). Jahukyan (1987: 272) points out that the IE origin of Arm. ark’ay is highly doubtful. Matzinger (2000) posits *h₂-er-s-ke/-o- ‘Akt des Fügens’ which is formally uncertain (I would expect Arm. *arc’- from *h₂r- and semantically unattractive. A similar form has been reconstructed by Klingenschmitt (1974: 274f.; see also Matzinger 2000: 288f.; Vine 2005: 260) for Gr. ἄρχει, deriving it from a root to which ἄριστος ‘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 Jahukyan 1987: 439-463; 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’- or *arg’. For Arm. -ay, Patrubány (StuHetaz 1908: 152a) compares Arm. caṙay ‘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: 295).

Arm. *ark’-un may be equated with ἄρχων, -οντος, from *arkh-ont. Compare Arm. cer-un ‘old’ (also cer-un-i): Gr. γέρων ‘old man’ (see s.v. cer ‘old’). According to Açaırian (1913: 155b; not in HAB 1: 347a), Gr. ἀρχ- ‘to begin’ can be connected with Larabał *arc’ ‘the beginning of a weaving’, *arc’el ‘to begin weaving’ from older *arj-. For the phonological correspondence, cf. Arm. orj > Larabal vәrс vs. Gr. ὀρχή ‘testicle’. Neither the semantics is problematic, cf. the semantic field of ἄρχη: ‘beginning, origin; first principle, element; end, corner, of a bandage, rope, sheet, etc.; origin of a curve’. It is theoretically possible that Gr. ἄρχη and Arm. *arj-a- (survived in Larabal) derive from QIE *arj-eh2- ‘beginning’, whereas Arm. *ark’- 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. Larabał has hăvaz, with an initial h- [HAB 1: 351b; Davor’yan 1966: 322].


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. ezr ‘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, Teich’.

26 I wonder if Melri hārg aril ‘to finish, make an end’ (recorded in Alayan 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 Häbschmann 1897: 111-112; HAB 1: 352; and, especially, Jahuhyan 1987: 517, where Sogd. āwaẕa ‘lake’ is mentioned, too).

I wonder if these words are related with Arab. (> Turk.) havz ‘basin’, borrowed into Arm. dialects: Polis havuz, Larab. kovuz, Van avuz (see Açařean 1902: 210). Even if not, a contamination seems probable, cf. Jlu havizaran ‘font = Taufbecken’ next to hvz ‘garden-basin’ (see HAB 1: 352b; Açařyan 1940: 355a). The initial h- in Larab. hāvaz ‘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. hnrjan ‘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 otič’n hnrarowen zjew kawškac’ ”for footwear they use a form of boot”.

•ETYM Apparently related to Lith. aũtas ‘foot-cloth, rag’, Latv. āuts ‘cloth, bandage’ [HAB 4: 607b-608a; Jahuhyan 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’ < *aũt- + verbal stem *oy-e- or *oy-i- “mit der Wz. *syo- oder *syo- (Bekleidung) anziehen” [Untermann 2000: 112].

Arm. awd goes back to QIE *H(V)u-d-. Av. aodra- ‘footwear’ hardly bears testimony for the voiced aspirated suffixal element, most probably reflecting *Hou-tleh-. (cf. Lat. subūcula ‘woolen undertunic’, Lith. aūčkë ‘shoe-lace, cord, foot-cloth’, etc.; see Mallory/Adams 1997: 109a). It has been assumed that Arm. awd contains the suffix *-dh- also found in Gr. ἔσϑος n. (cf. ἐσϑής f.) ‘clothing’ [Klingenschmitt 1982: 173-174; Clackson 1994: 224̂9].

If reliable, this explanation of d can serve as a counter-example for the sound development Arm. -r- < PIE *-dh- (see s.v. ayrem ‘to burn’). The same also holds for awd ‘air’ (q.v.).

awd₂, o-stem: GDSg awd-o-y, ISg awd-o-v, GDPI awd-o-c’. in the Bible (Astuacatun 1895: 1554), Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 43̂12, 195̂19), frequent in “Yałags ampoc’ ew nšacac”’ by Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahmany 1944: 304f); later also i-stem; ‘air’, dial. also ‘breath’ and ‘wind’ (Bible+).

•DIAL Preserved in Axalc’xa, Karin, Muš, Alaškert, Jlu, etc. (also in the compound *öđ-u-hava ‘weather’); cf. also Van *tak'-öđ-k’ (with tak’ ‘warm’) ‘fever’, Nor Bayazet *öđ kpnil ‘to catch a cold’ [HAB 4: 609a], Larab. haste’k’ (erroneously printed ći’t’k’, see HAB-Add 1982: 19) < *y-öđ-k’ ‘the warm breath/expiration of the mouth’ [Açařean 1913: 807a; HAB 4: 609a]. Jlu h’WS’ (see Açařean 1940: 98-99, 161, 390) may continue the prefix y- ‘in’ seen in the reflex of the Larabal form. This by-form *y-awd would have basically meant ‘inhalation’ with a subsequent development to ‘breath’.
The compound *bal-ōd preserved in Bulanal b'alōt‘ 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. ἀϋτμή f., ἀϋτμήν, -ένος m. ‘breath, scent’. Petersson (1920: 66) reconstructs *audho- comparing Lith. áudra, audrà ‘storm (usually accompanied by rain or snow)’ < *audh-r-ā, OIc. veðr n. ‘Wind, Luft, Wetter’, OHG wetar ‘Wetter, Witterung, freie Luft’ (< *uedh-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?”.

One may reconstruct a neuter s-stem *h₂eu(h₁)-dh-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), GDPR awt’-i-c’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.16) ‘sleeping place, lodging place, spending the night; evening, night’ (Bible+), awt’evwan < *awt’-a-van or -awan ‘lodging place, inn’ (Bible+); erek-awt’, i-stem: IPl erekawt’-i-w-k’ ‘passing the night’ (Agat’angolos, 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’ (Yovhanēnēs Ōjnec’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: 54³⁰; transl. Thomson 1978: 101); pēs pēs tačars ew seneaks ēt’ic’ ew tuns ganjuw ‘various temples and chambers and treasure houses’ (see s.v. anjew for the full passage).

IPI erek-awt’-i-w-k’ is found in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.66 (1913= 1991: 202⁴¹, transl. Thomson 1978: 213).: anjewicut in hiwark’ erekōt’iwk’ “be received as guests for the night”. Further attestations of this compound: erekōt’s arareal and ŏl evans narareal (in Patmut’iwn srboc’ Hip’simeane’, see MovsXorenMaten 1865: 300¹⁳ and 301¹⁴, respectively); ew and erekawt’s arareal in Yovhan Mamikonean (A. Abrahamyan 1941: 113¹⁴).
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 Bargrék ‘hayoc’ we find a伊朗 glossed as minč’ew erekoy ‘till the night’ (Amalyan 1975: 32N599), which is correctly interpreted by Jalukyan 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 ɔt’il [HAB 4: 610b]. An illustration of imperative ɔt’ɛ (cf. the literary awt’ea) can be found in an incantation (Čanikean 1895: 167; S. Harut’yunyan 2006: 153N205); S. Sargis, mer tuns ɔt’ɛ “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. ɔt’eki kerakur ‘yesterday’s food, stale food’. This form is identical with Meɫri ɔt’ɛky ‘id.’ (Aɫayan 1954: 291a, cf. 336; Weitenberg 1996: 99); cf. Լարաբայ ɔt’ɛ [HAB 4: 610b; Davt’yan 1966: 501], Hadrut’ ɔt’ [A. Polosyan 1965: 31], Goris ɔt’ [Margaryan 1975: 501a]. Note also Լազակ ɔt’änal ‘to become stale, old’ [HAB 4: 610b], which is formally identical with awt’anal attested in Yovhannēs Draxanakertc’i as a reading variant (see NHB 2: 1023c).

Durean 1933: 114 records an illness caused by the demon (dew) called գիշերութ’կ, 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, 54f).

The underlying PIE verb seems to be found exclusively with *s-., thus *h2ues-. A QIE *h2(e)us-ti- would yield Arm. *awst-. 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. aganım ‘to spend the night’.

awt’-oc’, a-stem (GDPl awt’oc’-ac’ in Plato) ‘cover, coat, garment; blanket’ (Bible+).


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. avcea ‘to anoint’ (Ephrem+), awc ‘anointment, unguent’ (Paterica, etc.; cf. dial. Marala).

● DIAL. The verbal forms *ōcel (widespread) and *ōcanel (T’iflis, Muş, Svedia, Zeyt’un, Jula, Salmast) are considered literary loans. The noun őc ‘anointment, unguent’ is present in Marala. Note also Van *őc-uk ‘baptized, anointed; Armenian’ [HAB 4: 611b].

Zeyt’un presents structural and semantic contrast: uznel ‘to smear, grease’ < őcanel vs. ujil ‘to anoint, baptize’ < őc (Ačaṙyan 2003: 143, 344).

27 The *awt’ is not to be equated with the suffix -awt’ in akawt’ ‘prayer’, amawt’ ‘shame’, etc., as in Greppin 1975: 66; 1986: 289.
awji-k'


- DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 612b]. For Lăraba əxə, 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 *arıngʷ-ion-i- (read *h₁ngʷ-ı̆-i-) > Parm. *arıng-gi > *awggi (with *g̥ > *g̝ before *u/w) > *awji-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; Jāhukyan 1982: 43, 57; Ravnaes 1991: 40-41; Clackson 1994: 54, 107-108; Olsen 1999: 78-28. For this development, see 2.1.27.1. In this particular case, the involving of the tabu (HAB 4: 612a; AČa Liak 6, 1971: 722; Jāhukyan 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’ < P Germ. *arıng- < IE *h₁ngʷ- generics (see Schrijver 1991: 43-44, 60; for a discussion, see also Lubotsky 1988: 29). The full-grade *h₁ngʷ- would yield *hanj-.

For a further discussion, see s.v. īč, i-stem ‘viper’ which belongs to the nasalless PIE by-form of ‘snake’ reflected in Skt. ā́hi- m. ‘snake, adder’, YAv. ači- m. ‘snake, dragon’, Gr. ὀφίς ‘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. anglay prob. ‘eel’.


- awj, i-stem: DGSg awj-i, GDPI awj-i-c’, AblSG y-awj-i- ‘snake’ (Bible+).

- DIAL No dialectal forms in HAB 4: 612b. According to Andranasyan (1967: 389b), Svedia anjnak’ represents CL Arm. awjik’. Note also K’esab anmek’, glossed by ḍjik’ [HayLezBṛbBarf 1, 2001: 63b].

28 Perhaps old HD nom. *-ži can also be taken into consideration.
awj

**ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 612b.

Adontz (1937: 10; see also Pisani 1950: 188-192) connects with Gr. αὐχήν. -ένος m. 'neck, throat; isthmus’ (II), Aeol. literary ἄμφην, -ένος '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 *_h2u_ - (for the phonological development, see e.g. s.v. _acut_ ‘coal’); (2) Arm. _awj-i-k’_ is a derivation of _awj_ ‘snake’; (3) Gr. ἄμφην may be connected to OHG _anka_ ‘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, 224.106.

The derivation from _awj_ ‘snake’ (see NBH 2: 1026c; Hiwñk’ earpëyentean apud HAB 4: 612b) is uncertain [Clackson 1994: 108].

De Lagarde (1854: 26.486) and Scheffelowitz (1927: 249) connected Arm. _awj-i-k’_ and Viz (<< _*vek’_ ‘neck’, gen. _*vek’-i_ with Gr. αὐχήν. 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 _xayzak_ ‘back of the head’, and, in compounds, *_xiz_ or *_xuz_ in Larakab, etc., *_xoyz_ or *_xiwz_ in Jula *_xuz-a-tak_. See s.v. _viz_.

I tentatively suggest to treat Gr. αὐχήν and Arm. _awj-i-k’_ and _viz_ (dialect also *_xiz, _xuz/xoyz/xiwz_ as words of substratum origin, tentatively reconstructing something, which in Indo-European terms can be represented as NSg *_h2u_ > PArm. *_h2u_ (-w- analogical after the nominative) would explain Arm. _awj-i-k’_ (perhaps also dial. *_xuz, via an unknown language) whereas nom. *_h2u_ > 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 *_huèz_, 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. ἄμφην, -ένος 'neck' remains unclear. It is tempting to derive it from *_ang_>-en- connecting with Arm. dialect. (Svedia, K’esab) _*anjo-Vn_. Arm. _j_ points to *_g_’, however. One may tentatively reconstruct the following paradigm: nom. *_h2ngwh_ > obl. *_h2ngwh_ > SNsg *_h2ngwh_ > PArm. *_aug_ - (with regular palatalization of the velar after _u_ > Arm. _awj_-, whereas the former retained the nasal and can be seen in Gr. ἄμφην and Arm. _*anjo-Vn_. Arm. _j_ is analogical after _awj_. This is reminiscent of Arm. _acut_ ‘coal’ < *_aucitlo_ from *_h2(o)ng_ -öl- (cf. Skt. _āṅgāra_, etc.) vs. dial. *_anjol_ (see s.v. _acut_ ‘coal’). If Gr. ἄμφην and Arm. _*anjo-Vn_ are not related to Gr. αὐχήν and Arm. _awj-i-k’, Arm. _j_ can be explained by contamination.

**awli** (GDSg _aurbwoy_ in NBH 2: 1027b, but without references) ‘a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage’ (Bible+); in Modern Armenian = _arad_ and Russ. _vodka_.

In Judges 13.4-7,14 and Luke 1.15: _gni ew awli_; _âivon_ kai _sîshap_.

Later: _ull_ in Knîk’ _hawatoy_ (Seal of Faith), 7th cent.; _awli_ in “Girk’ t’lt’oc” [HAB 4: 613a]. Compounds in Canon Law: _ambrâw-awli_ (with _ambrâw_ ‘date’) and _mebr-awli_ (with _mebr_ ‘honey’).

The actual source of the compound _gar-awli_ ‘beer’, lit. ‘barley-liquor’ (Maltsasean) HBB 1: 416b; mentioned also by Mann, 1963: 4, 33, without any reference) is unknown to me.
Ačarjan (1908: 121a) compares *awl-i with Balto-Slavic and Germanic words for ‘beer’ (cf. Lith. *alùs ‘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 *awl-i from *olui- or *alui-. These forms would yield Arm. *elgi or *elgi, however. Olsen (1999: 443, 799) suggests a better analysis: *(h)alu- > Arm. *awl- + derivational suffix *-io- or *-iah2- > -i. The sound change *alu- > Arm. *awl- may be due to *w-epenthesis [Beekes 2003: 205] or, perhaps better, metathesis.

jahukyan (1990: 71, sem. field 5) considers *awl-i to be a word of unknown origin. In my view, the above etymology is worth of consideration, and *awl-i is best derived from *(h)alu- + -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. *awl-i and Russ. CS olъ ‘a kind of fermented drink’); (2) they point to *alut-: Oss. øluton ‘a kind of beer’, Georg. (a)ludi ‘beer’, PSlav. *olъ ‘a kind of fermented drink’, Russ. CS olъ ‘хмельной напиток из ржи, ячменя и т.п.’, OPr. alu ‘mead’, OEngl. ealu(þ), 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; Xa‘aturopa 1987; Mallory/Adams 1997: 60; ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 32, 2005: 76, 80-81).

*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’ (Ya‘axapatum); MidArm. *unēr ‘owner’ (Law Code by Smbat Sparapet); unclear is *ger-awneal corresponding to Gr. ἐπιπολάζων.


MidArm. *unēr ‘owner’ may contain un- ‘to take, have’, MidArm. ‘to possess’ (q.v.).

*DIAL. No dialectal record in HAB 1: 362a.

It is unclear whether hun/yn/on ‘individual share of a mower’ (Amatuni 1912: 401-402; A‘acarjan 1913: 667; M. Asatryan 1962: 224b) belongs here and reflects *hawn, *(ty)awn.

Ačarjan (HAB 1: 361-362) connects awn with Skt. āpas- n. ‘produce, property, possession’, Yav. afnāy-hant- ‘rich in property’, Gr. ὧμη ‘food, corn’, ὧμιν(υ)ος ‘pertaining to corn, nutritious, fruitful’, Olc. efni ‘material, goods’, efna ‘to carry out, work’, Lat. opēs f. pl. ‘wealth; resources, assistance’, etc. (see also Alabekyan 1979: 58; hesitantly Jahunyan 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 uōben ‘to start to work, practice, worship’, Hitt. ḫāppar- ‘trade, business’, ḫappinant- ‘rich’, etc., for the forms and a discussion, see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 746 = 1995, 1: 649-

---

29 The relation with Semitic *ḥ-l-w ‘sweet; sweet drink’ (see Illi–Svityč 1964: 5) is uncertain.
A QIE *opn- would yield Arm. *own > *un (cf. Jahukyan 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 (Jahukyan 1987: 267).

The connection of Arm. awn to Gr. ἄφενος ‘wealth’ (Lindeman 1978-79; 1990: 201; 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 ‘palin of the hand’.

On the whole, the etymology of Ačaryan 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. avur, instr. awur-b, etc. ‘day; time, age’ (Bible+).

For the meaning ‘age’ note e.g. P’awstos Buzand 3.12 (1883=1984: 26), transl. Garsoían 1989: 83: Zi awurbk’ manuk, tōk’ āroyg : “For he was young in years, vigorous”.
● DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 617a].
● ETYM Connected with Gr. ἑμαρ, Arc. Ἀμαρ, -ατος n. ‘day’, ἡμέρα, Dor., etc. ἀμέρα ‘id.’; *āmōr > PArm. *amur < *a’mur > *awur (see Meillet 1922d: 59; 1936: 55; HAB 4: 616-617; Clackson 1994: 96-97; Olsen 1999: 176-177). Probably to be reconstructed as *Hēm-ār. For further discussion and references, see s.vv. ayr ‘man’, amur ‘dream’.

*awre(a)r, GDPl awrer-a-c ‘disgrace, insult, taunt, curse’.

Attested only in P’awstos Buzand 5.3 (1883=1984: 160); transl. Garsoían 1989: 188):

Apa patmec’aw t’agaworin Papay yalags ōrerac’n (var. ōrinac’n), zor ed Hayr mardpetn tiknojn P’arānjemay, mör t’agaworin Papay, t’šnamans jalanc’i berdargel pašarmann; zi ihrew zhoz mi, aynpēs t’šnamaneac’ zna i žamanaki, ihrew emut andr galtuk, ew ed anargans tiknojn, 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’arānjem; 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”.

Garsoían, thus, translates the word *awre(a)r as ‘curses’. Malxasyanc’ (1987: 293) renders it as viravorant’ ‘insult’.
● ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 4: 617b) rejects all the etymological attempts, including the comparison with Gr. ἄρα ‘prayer, curse’ suggested in NHB 2: 1032b. Jahukyan 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. ἄρα, Ion. ἄρη f.
'prayer, curse' < PGr. *arγâ < *h₂ru-ēh₂> 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-ēh₂- in Greek), or an old *u-stem *h₂(e/o)ru-u- or Mediterranean substratum *arw-. Thus *arw/ur > *aur- + -ear = awrear. For the development *arw- > *aur-, see s.vv. ayr 'man', awl 'a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage', awr 'day'.

The Greek word (cf. also the verb ἀράομαι 'to pray') has been compared with Hitt. aruu₃₀ æ-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. ḫirun, ḫirut- 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, 82₃₀).

awriord, a-stem: GDSg -i in EpArm.; GDPl -ac’ in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.); IPI -aw-k’ in Grigor Skewrāc’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 ֵiord-i), recorded by the great Armenian historian Mōvseṣ Xorenāc’i (2.50 : 191=1991: 178₁₂₀, 179₁₂₄; transl. Thomson 1978: 192).


According to Olsen (1999: 531), the second component in awri-ord is the suffix -ord (verbal noun/adj.), and *awri- may derive from *ātério- 'fire-' as a parallel of Lat. ātēniēs ‘house servant’ from ātērium. The compound would correspond, as she points out, to Av. ātra-kares- ‘der sich mit dem Feuer zu tun macht, dabei tätig ist’.

As far as the second component is concerned, Łap’anc’yān’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. āhūr- adj. ‘with regard to Ahura(mazdā), stemming from Ahura(mazdā)’ vs. ahura- m. ‘god, lord’: *ahur- ‘lordly’ or Gsg *ahuryō- ‘of lord’ > OArm. *a(h)ur-i > 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’. For the semantic shift, see 3.8.1.

ap’, o-stem: GDSg ap’-o-y, GDPl ap’-o-v ‘palm of the hand; handful’ (Bible+).

DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 364a].
The vocalism of Van āp’s et’al (frozen AP 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 āp’s may then be interpreted as *y-ap’-s ‘on hands’ through Ačaryan’s Law; cf. y-ap’-s-i-t’er-s (Bible+), ē’orek’-y-ap’-k’ (Alexander Romance), etc.

Some dialects have forms with -uṙ, Axalc’xa ap’-uṙ, Ėraba ēr, Hadrut’, Goris hap’-uṙ [HAB 1: 364a; Dav’tyan 1966: 322]. Compare t’at’-uṙ from t’at’ ‘paw’ (on which see HAB 2: 138-139; Lusenc’ 1982: 147, 206b). One may also think of contamination with CLArm. buṙ ‘palm of the hand, handful’ (widespread in the dialects; Ėraba has the verbal form: p’ran-); further note CLArm. aγuṙ ‘palm of the hand, handful’ (preserved in Xotor ğur).

For the initial h- of Ėraba, etc. hap’uṙ 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).


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 *hēps- 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; Žahukyan 1967: 242), Arm. hapax *hap’em ‘to kidnap’ (q.v.) has been derived from ap’ ‘palm of the hand, handful’; note the initial h- in Ėraba, etc. (N. Simonyan 1979: 221). The relation with unim ‘to take, have’ (Žahukyan 1967: 242; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 276) is uncertain (see also Greppin 1983: 322).

*ap’i, *ap’u, etc. (dial.) ‘father’.

● DIAL Ararat (Ošakan, P’arpi) ap’i ‘father’ [Amatuni 1912: 77b], Agulis ap’i ‘father’ [M. Zak’aryan 2008: 60], Metri ap’i ‘id.’ [Alayan 1954: 292], Larakel ap’i honouring address to old people; Lazax, Ararat etc. ap’u voc. ‘father’, ap’un ‘father’ [Ačarean 1913: 160ab; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 139-140], Širak, Muş, Alakert, Xoy ap’o [Amatuni 1912: 77b; Ačarean 1913: 161a]; Lazax ap’n(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 Žahukyan (1972: 300; 1987: 56, 112, 275) interprets these forms as nursery words of IE origin, cf. Gr. ἂπφος hypocoristic ‘daddy’, ἂφρα, a hypocoristic addressing form between brothers and sisters, and beloved ones, also other hypocoristic forms, ἂφριον, ἂφριμον, ἂφριδιον, ἂφρια. Note unaspirated ἂφθα ‘father’, Toch. B āppo ‘father’, dimin. ἄππακκε ‘dear father’ (for the forms see Frisk
ak'is


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. ἄφια, ἄφιον, ἄφυς, etc., as independent creations.

The forms apar, ap’er and the like probably represent a blend of ap’i/u ‘father’ and ap’er etc. < etbeyr ‘brother’, cf. Ačaréan 1913: 44, considering the resemblance accidental. On the other hand compare Gr. ἀπφάριον.

ak’alαt, o-stem: GDPl ak’alαt-o-c’ (Hamam, Hesychius of Jerusalem) ‘rooster’ (Bible+); agαlαt ‘id.’ (Ašxarhac’oyc’); ak’αlαl (Samu’el Anec’i, 12th cent.).

● DIAL Various forms: T’iflis, Hamšen, etc. ak’lαr (Bağirkı ‘hayoc’, Amalyan 1975: 44Nr1069, glossed by ak’la and xoroz), Axal’c’xa, Ararat ak’l’r, Van ayhlőr, etc. [HAB 1: 369b]. The form *ak’lör may be due to contamination with lor ‘quail’.

● ETYM Patrubány (1906-08 /1908/: 152b) treats the word as composed of *k’a-k’ (cf. French coq ‘cock’) and alα- ‘shout’ (q.v.), thus “shout of a cock”, which is untenable. Ačaréan (HAB 1: 368-369) posits broken reduplication from *k’a-l-k’ał > *k’ałαl and compares the root with Gr. καλέω ‘to call, summon; to invite; to invoke; to name’, Skt. uṣā-kal- ‘rooster’, OIr. cailech ‘rooster’, cf. Gr. ἠϊκανός· ὁ ἀλεκτρυών ‘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 substrate 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 ἄι, both cognate with Arm. ayg-. The Armenian compound *a(y)g-k’ał would develop to *ak’k’ał > *ak’ał, cf. *h2(e)us-k’- + -kn > PArm. *ak’-kn > *akkn > akn ‘eye’. See also s.v. k’akor ‘dung’.

ak’iś, i-stem ‘weasel’ (Bible+). dial. also ‘rat’. In Leviticus 11.29, where it is listed among uncanny animals, the word renders Gr. γαλῆ ‘weasel’; cf. also mkn-ak’iś in Leviticus 11.30, the exact match (perhaps a calque) for μυγαλῆ ‘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’iś stands for γαλή [Greppin 1985: 29].

The only evidence for the declension class is GDAblPl (y-)ak’s-i-c’, found in John Chrysostom: Zmardik i krov’, ew yak’sic’, ew i kokordi løsac’ zercuc’. As stated in NHΒ 1: 398b, ak’iś corresponds to ‘cat’ in the Greek original. For the semantic relationship between the cat and the mustelids, cf. Arm. kuz (HAB s.v.).

Ereweal oj, kam mkn, kam ak’iś (Nonnus of Nisibis).

In Bağirkı ‘hayoc’ (see Amalyan 1975: 44Nr1068), ak’iś is glossed as follows: titerin, kam mknak’iś, kam getnařiwc, kam xlurđ. 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’wis, Moks ak’is ‘weasel’ [Acaryan 1952: 25, 249]; with a final -t: ak’ist ‘weasel’ (Xotorjur), ‘rat’ (Axalc’xa) [HAB 1: 370a; YušamXotor 1964: 432a; HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 140b] (for the pathetic -t, see 2.1.31).

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Elia Muşelyan Karneč’i (Karín/Xotorjur) one finds agist rendering Turk. xaxum [Čugaszyan 1986: 52\(^{14}\)]. Čugaszyan (op. cit. 97) points out that ak’ist is found in the dialect of Axalc’xa.


The existence of and the relation to Toch. *kiš, the alleged source of Turk. *kiš/ *kél ‘Zobel’ is quite doubtful [Servašidze 1989: 85].

If Arm. ak’is is related, one might reconstruct a QIE *Hkek-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 *-k-: *k – k’ > 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 *Hkek-s alongside of the oblique *Hkek-. 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. álúk̕s ‘fox’).
A similar problem of Arm. īz ‘viper’ (q.v.) can be solved in the same way. Note that both ak’is and īz 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 *Hēkēs, obl. *Hēke-. See further s.v. īz ‘viper’.

Whether the *k-/ of the word was a suffixal element or was reanalyzed as such at a certain stage is hard to assess. This probable correspondence 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 *k- or *g-, especially those which are to some extent comparable to mustelids, or are chthonic; see HAB s.vv. āluēs ‘fox’, īsun- ‘lynx’, īn(y) ‘panther’ (Arm.-I Ar. *singh-), kāz ‘cat; marten’, mol-ēž ‘lizard, xl-ēž ‘lizard’, etc.; see 2.3.1.

Bearing in mind these considerations, one might have a fresh look at Arm. k’ak’um ‘white weasel = mustela alba’, a late hapa x (q.v.), which is considered a dialectal kind of ichneumon’, also ‘a reddish-brown cow’ from PIE *bhe-bhru- (see s.v.), etc. In theory, *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-/ (cf. s.v. t’az ‘fig’) is spirantized to *-x-, and the medial vowel became -a-. Ĵahukyan (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. kn gum, k’ak’um, and Pahl. kākom, etc., there is Turk. qāğum 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)k̑k̑-, one may wonder whether this is somehow related with Tsez. *dāq̑ ’mouse’ (see Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 523), Skt. ākhu- ‘mole (RV +); mouse (Lex.)’, Hebr. ‘aqbār ‘mouse’ (cf. Arm. ak’bak’, in Barģirk’ hayoc’; see s.v.), etc. In theory, ākhu- could be a reduplication of the type babhru- ‘a kind of ichneumon’, also ‘a reddish-brown cow’ from PIE *bhe-bhru- (see s.v. *bor), thus: *He-Hk- > ākhu-. The semantic relationship ‘mouse, rat’ : ‘weasel’ is impeccable, cf. above, on the dialect of Axalc’xa; Gr. γαλέη ‘weasel’, Skt. gir(i)kā- ‘mouse’ (Lex.), etc.; see also below on *c’asum. The whole idea, however, is very hypothetical.

To my knowledge, Pahl. kākom [k’kwm] ‘stoat = the European ermine especially in its brown summer coat’ (cf. kākom i spēd ‘ermine, white weasel’; see MacKenzie 1971: 48) has not been yet discussed in this context; cf. Arm. kn gum (only in P’avstos Buzand 6.2: kn gumenī ‘fur of kn gum, Hermelinpelz’) and unattested k’ak’um [Hübßmann 1897: 278n1066, HAB 2: 607; 4: 568b]. For Turk. qāğum recorded by Elia Karnec’i as xaxum, see above. The initial kn- in kn gum is puzzling; perhaps, contamination with Iran. *gauna-ka- ‘haarig, farbig’ > Gr. γανονός, “Bezeichnung eines persischen Pelzes”, Assyr. gunakkī “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 satam 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. ayč, lusanc-, 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. ahiēs, -es-u ‘fox’, etc.).

**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. bȁjati ‘to practise sorcery, exorcize’, Bulg. bȁja ‘to whisper incantations’, CS basn ‘tale’, Russ. bāsna ‘fable’, SCr. bāsma ‘incantation’, Bulg. bāsna ‘fantasy, fable’, etc. (see s.vv. bam ‘to speak, say’, bankn ‘myth, fairy-tale, riddle’).


In the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance, AblSg i balēn (see H. Simonyan 1989: 439L15): i balēn oč karēk’ tesanezmimean “because of the fog we could not see each other”. A similar attestation is found ibid. 439L16. On the next page (440L8), the very same context is represented by synonymous vasn šamandačin.

According to NHB and HAB, bal is an i-stem: GDPl bal-i-c’ in Aristakēs Lastivertc’i (11th cent.), Chapter 10 [Yuzbaşyan 1963: 56L2]; cf. AblSg i bal-ē in the Alexander Romance. One also finds GDsg bal-a-γ (o-stem, thus) in Anania Širakac’i/7th cent./, see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 319L4, as well as in the title of one of the following chapters: Yatlags baloy “About the bal” (op. cit. 319L22).

In Gregory of Nyssa (translated by Stepannos Siwec’i in the 8th cent.): bal-a-jew, var. bal-a-jew “fog-like” (with jew ‘shape’).

In the dictionary by Rivola (1633: 52, see HAB 1: 383a): bal-cēš ‘humidity originated from (or caused by) fog’. For the suffix, cf. perhaps xarteaš (Bible+),
xartēš (John Chrysostom), xartēš (Lazar 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 *pāl-ēš, literally “frozen donkey” (and later > Balēš), after a donkey which was stuck and frozen in the snow (see Lanalanyan 1969: 160(11)). For the alternation -l/ɫ- cf. bal-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 Bulan əx), 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/ɫēš ‘fog, foggy weather’ and only later was re-interpreted as “frozen donkey”. A similar folk-etymological traditional story is found in Lanalanyan 1969: 153-154 Nr395B on Muš, as if named after the Goddess Astḻik.

In Baṙgirk’ hayoc’ bal is glossed by gišer ‘night’ (see Amalyan 1975: 46(Nb90)).

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; Aćarøy 1952: 249], Sebastia bal (and baʃ) ‘white dirt on one’s tongue when one’s stomach is disordered’ [Gabikean 1952: 101]. Aćarøy (1952: 19) mentions Van pal as one of the few exceptions to Aćarøy’s Law. One expects *pāl. The compound *bal-ōd preserved in Bulanax b’alst‘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’ārk’ān (Samaxi), in the extreme east of the Armenian-speaking territory, where we have pal, as well as pāl (with Aćarøy’s Law), see Balramyan 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 Balramyan (op. cit. 283) as t’ub t’ain ‘rain-cloud’ and amp ‘cloud’.

ETYM Since Patrubány (HandAms 1903: 150) and Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 2: 37), connected with Gr. φαλός· λευκός ‘white’ (Hesychius), φαλιός ‘having a patch of white’, Lith. bãlas ‘white’, Latv. bãls ‘pale’, Lith. bātās ‘white’, OCS blato ‘swamp’ (from *bhōlH-), OCS bělbs, Russ. bělj ‘white’ (from *bhōlH-, see also s.v. bil ‘light blue’), Lith. balā ‘swamp’ (from *bhōlH-eh2-), Bel. bel’ ‘swampy meadow’, etc. For the semantic relationship ‘white, pale’ : ‘swamp’, see Pârvulescu 1989: 294.

The etymology is accepted by Aćarøy (HAB 1: 383) and Jāhukyan (1987: 115, from *bhōlH-). Arm. bal (i-stem) goes back to PIE *bhōlH-i-. If the o-stem is old, it may be interpreted as a by-form from *bhōlH-o-.

Arm. bal and the cognates are sometimes mentioned in connection with Skt. bhāla- ‘shine; forehead’ (cf. bhāti ‘to shine, be bright’ from PIE *bhēH-), 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 *bhōlH-eH-i/o-. However, *bhēH- 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): *bazumk’ i darbnac’, <...> *baxen zsln* “many smiths, <...> strike the anvil”.

*Acāryan* (HAB 1: 389b) argues that the late spelling *bax-* reflects an emphatic */baxx-/, where -ɫ- corresponds to /ɣ/ rather than to *l. Compare dial. (*Larabal*) *uxay*, interjection of joy (AČārean 1913: 866b), which is found in the form *Uxay* numerous times in e.g. HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 633-636.

*ETYM* AČāanych (HAB 1: 389b) does not accept any of the etymological suggestions and leaves the origin open. Schu ltheiß (1961: 221) compares Hitt. *u̯al-ḫ* ‘schlagen’. J̌ahukyan (1987: 317) rightly rejects the comparison since the initial *u̯-* does not correspond to Arm. *b-, and the -ɫ- 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. *babax-* ‘to beat’, although AČāanych (HAB 1: 389b) treats them as Armenian borrowings. Lap’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.

**batbaj-an-k’** (API *batbaj-an-s* in Severian of Gabala), *batbanj-umm* (GDPI *batbanj-man-c’* in Anania Narekac’i) ‘senile fables, sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsense (of fables), silly prattle, maundering’; *batbajem* (Grigor Magistros), *batbanjem* (Mattićos Uřhayec’c) ‘to talk nonsense, chatter, jabber, etc.’

*ETYM* Onomatopoeic word [HAB 1: 397b]. Further see s.vv. *barba(n)* ‘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 e’ruac’ic’ znosa : ἥξα Διασπερῶ αὐτὸν* : *εἰπα Διασπερῶ αὐτόν*.

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. Arak’elyan 1979: 41; cf. also *ba, bas* ‘of course, then, thus’ (AČārean 1913: 162a; HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 142, 165b). Note especially the expression *ba ě’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’ (HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 165-166); compare however Kurd. *bałs, bás* (f.), *bās* ‘рассказ, разговор; снор’ considered an Arabic loanword (se Cabolov 1, 2001: 110).

See also s.vv. babič’, bambasem, bay₁, ban, banč, bař, barbařem.

bambasem ‘to malign, backbite, gossip’ (Bible+), bambas ‘backbite, gossip’ (John Chrysostom, Nersēš Šnorhali, etc.), bambas-ankʰ ‘backbite, gossip’ (Bible, Movsēš Xorenac’i, Gregory of Nyssa, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.). For attestations and derivatives, see NHB 1: 430; Astuacaturean 1895: 260.

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. as-kač (3sg.pres. of asem ‘to say’), ssi-axav (1sg.aor. + 3sg.aor. of asem ‘to say’), etc. [HAB 1: 385, 401b].

bay₁, i-stem: GDSg bay-i-c’ (Dawit’ Anyaht, Nersēš Lambronac’i, etc.), IPl bay-i-w-k’ (Sargs Šnorhali, Grigor Tlay) ‘speech, word, verb’ (further attested in Movsēš 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 *bʰh₂-ti-, a derivative of PIE *bʰeh₂- ‘to speak’, cf. Gr. φάσις, φάτις f. ‘declaration, enunciation, rumour’ vs. φημι ‘to say’ [Hübsschmann 1897: 428; HAB 1: 386a; Meillet 1936: 154; Jahukyan 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 “Olb Edesioy” of Nersēš Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia) [M. Mkrt’yan 1973: 73Lte]: Aṙiwe goc’čer i yantarın, ew gikaxari arjın – i bayin “A lion was roaring in the forest, and the flesh-longing bear – in the lair”. Spelled bah in Vordan Aygekc’i (13th cent., also Cilicia). Older attestations: bay-oc’ ‘lair of a bear’ (Eznik Kolbac’i, 5th cent.).


Since both “pure” root forms bay and bah (considered dialectal!) are attested in authors from Cilicia, and bayoc’ (Eznik of Kolb) has been preserved in Xotor’ur, we
may hypothetically assume that bay is an old dialectal word restricted to the Western (ko) speaking areas.

ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 402b).

V. Ačaryan (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 Xotor ğur (see above).

Ačaryan (1974: 35-36) connects the word with OIr. both ‘hut’, Welsh bod ‘dwelling’, Lith. būtas ‘house’, etc. from *bh(e)uH- ‘to be’; see s.vv. boyn ‘nest; den, lair’, boys ‘plant’, etc. According to Jahuksyan (1987: 116, 160), the IE proto-form may have been *bh̥̄uH-t- (= *bh̥̄eH-t-), and the closest cognate – Alb. bōvē, -a f. ‘Lehmsorte (zum Polieren); Boden; Erde; Welt’ (< *bh̥̄eHā-t-). 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. bhūvāna- n. ‘Wesen; Welt’ (RV+), etc.

ban, i-stem: GDSg ban-i, ISg ban-i-w, GDPl ban-i-c’, IPl 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-ol ‘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: 1115; transl. Garsoian 1989: 71, see also note 248): azateal lin ēr 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 Ačaryan 1908-09a, 1: 368N11.

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; Ačaryan 1913: 169-175; HAB 1: 403; HayLezBrbBrB 1, 2001: 157-161, 162a, 163-164.

In Nor Naxijewan, Polis (Ačaryan 1913: 169b), as well as in contemporary dialects and in the modern colloquial language, ban is used as a euphemism for ‘penis’ (and ‘vulva’).


bankn ‘myth, fairy-tale’ in John Chrysostom (spelled also bangn), Barsel Čon; APl 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); bankn ‘idle talk’ (Mxit’ar Aparanc’i, see HAB 1: 408a).
In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Elia Mușel'yan Karneč'i (Karın/Xotorjur) one finds *bunk* which, together with *sənjət/*ənn, renders Turk. 

**ba+jai-** ‘to tell fables, talk nonsense, talk idly, chatter, jabber, etc.’ (Movsës Xorenac’i, Hexaemeron, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Nersës Lambronac’i, Vanakan Vardapat, etc.), **bajai-an-k’** (API bajai-an-s in 4Kings 9.11 rendering Gr. ἀδολεσχία, Eznik Kolbac’i, Movsës Xorenac’i, John Chrysostom, etc.), a-stem: GDPI bajai-an-a-’ (Yovhannes Öjne’i), **bajai-an-mun** (Hesychius of Jerusalem), NPI bajai-an-mun-k’ (Vardan Arewelc’i), API bajai-mun-s (John Chrysostom), GDPI

---

32 In Lori, Zangezur, Laradal, this word for ‘riddle’ occurs also in riddles themselves (S. Harut’yunyan 1965: 194b\(^5\)1996AB).
bajařel

bajař-man-c’ (Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc.) ‘sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsensical fables, garrulity, silly prattle, maundering, bagatelle’.

A textual illustration from Movsès Xorenac’ı 2.7 (1913=1991: 1112f; transl. Thomson 1978: 138): T’ohum zarəspelac’n ajafu’m “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. bajařel- and especially barba(n)’id.’.

bajařel, only in a late medievel glossary, glossed by araspelel ‘to tell myths, fables’ [Amalyan 1971: 266].

**ETYM** Amalyan (1971: 266) hesitantly links the form with -aɫ-(q.v.). Further see s.v. barba(n).

bar, i-stem: GDSg bar-i (Yovhannēs Draxanakert’e), IPL bar-i-w-k’ (Dionysius the Areopagite, Yaçaxapatum) ‘word’ (Philo, Dawit’ Anyalt’, Dionysius Thrax), ‘language, speech’ (Yovhannēs Draxanakert’e, Yaçaxapatum), ‘melody, tune’ (Paterica), etc.

**DIAL** T’illis (Sayeat’-Nova) bar; Žula b’ar, Moks pår [HAB 1: 413a], Zeyt’un b’or [Açārēan 2003: 301], Šatax pår [M. Muradyan 1962: 193b], Ararat, Muš, Larabat, etc. *bar ‘word, speech, talk; the way of singing’ [Amatuni 1912: 90b; HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 165a].

According to Ačāryan (1952: 53, 250), Van p’ar is a loan from the literary language of Polis, hence the initial aspirated p’-.

**ETYM** Related with ham ‘to speak, say’ (q.v.); perhaps from *b’eh₂-s-ri- [Jahukyan 1982: 126]. One may wonder whether there is a connection between this *b’eh₂-s- and Skt. bhīṣāj- m. ‘healer, physician’, etc. (on which see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 264-265). Semantically compare Slav. *badlʲiː : OCS balit; bali ‘physician’, ORu. balit; balija ‘physician, enchanter’, SCR. bǎjalo m. ‘sorcerer’, Russ. dial. bǎjala ‘talker, chatterer, story-teller’, Lat. fābula ‘story, tale, fable, play talk’, etc., from the same PIE root *b’eh₂- (ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 1, 1974: 150; Derksen 2008 s.v.).

See also s.vv. bābič’ ‘sorcerer’, bāknu ‘myth, fairy-tale, riddle’, barbar ‘human voice, speech, word’.

bārnam, 3sg.aor. e-barj, 3pl.aor. barj-in ‘to lift, lift up, extol, raise, bear away’ (Bible+).

**DIAL** The verb bārnam (somewhere also *barj-) is widespread in the dialects. In some of them it has been contaminated with hein ‘load’ [HAB 1: 415a].

**ETYM** See s.v. barj ‘high’.

barbaž (Hexaemeron), barbaž-an-k’, API -an-s (Eznik Kolbac’i, John Chrysostom, Philo, Yovhannēs Draxanakert’i), barbaž-umn, API barbaž-mun-s in Movsès Xorenac’ı 2.70 (1913= 1991: 206L12) and Gregory of Nyssa; barbanj (Hexaemeron, Yovhan Mandakuni, John Chrysostom), barbanj-umn (Yaysmawurk’), NPl barbanj-mun-k’ (Łazar P’arpec’i, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.), API barbanj-mun-s (Philo), GDPI barbanj-man-c’ (Łazar P’arpec’i, Yaçaxapatum) ‘senile fables, mythic stories, whisper of sorcerers, sorcerous or delirious talk, nonsense (of fables), silly prattle, maundering’; the verb: barbažem (John Chrysostom, Philo, Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc.), barbanjem
(Eznik Kolbac’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-25a); zsatanayakan barbanjs barbanjel (alongside with yuřt’s yuřte’l). Here the word refers, thus, to ‘sorcerous or delirious words’.

ETYM Treated as an onomatopoeia by Ačaṙyan [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’, ham, ban, banča, 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. balbūtiō ‘to stammer, stutter; to speak obscurely, babble’, Engl. babble, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 217-218), see s.vv. baɫba(n)ǰ- ‘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 *baɫǰ- (a hypothetical root of balba(n)ǰ-) from IE *bheh2-dhl-: Lat. fābula ‘story, tale, fable, play talk’; Slav. *badli- m. i ‘enchanter, healer, physician’: OCS balić ‘physician’, ORuss. bali; balija ‘physician, enchanter’, cf. also SGr. 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. *bheh2-dhl-ieh2 would yield PArm. *baɫdi̯a- (through regular metathesis) > Arm. -ǰ-, see 2.1.22.1). Reduplicated *bal-balj- might yield *balbaj- through possible loss of *-l- before an affricate (see 2.1.22.9).

The simplex *ba(l)ǰ- ‘mythic story, fable, sorcerous or delirious talk, garrulous talk’ may also be seen in baj-al-im ‘to tell fables, talk nonsense, talk idly, chatter, jabber’ and baj-ar-Čel ‘to tell myths, fables’ (see s.vv.).

barbar, o-stem: GDSg barbar-o-y, ISg barbar-ov (rich evidence in the Bible, Astucaturean 1895: 272-273) ‘human voice, speech, word’ (Bible+), barbařem, barbařim ‘to speak, shout’ (Bible, Elišē, Ephrem etc.).

DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 420a. According to Ačaṙyan (1952: 53), Van p’aṟp’aṟ is a loan from the literary language of Polis, hence the initial aspirated p-.

ETYM A reduplicated form of bai ‘word, speech’ [HAB 1: 385b; Schmitt 1981: 87], see s.vv. 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 Axal’e xa, Ararat, Muš, Bulanx, Širāk, Aparan, etc. bard ‘heap of corn or grass consisting of 30, 36, or 30-40 bunches’, Muš, Aparan, Sip’an, Van bardoc’ ‘heap of corn or grass’ [Amatuni 1912: 91; Ačaṙean 1913: 177a; HAB 1: 421-422]; Šatax pārţ’, pārtyoc’ ‘heap of 20 bunches’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 193b, 215a], Van pār’t’, Moks pār’t’, Özim b’ārt’uc’ [Ačaṙean 1952: 250]; on Van, see below. Č’arsanēdag bard ‘30 eggs’ [Ačaṙean 1913: 177a].
bark

● ETYM Derived from PIE *bʰr̥-ti-: Skt. prá-bhr̥ti- 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. bhārati ‘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 pärt’ refers to a heap that consists of 30 bunches, and a mother which bore 15 children is called kes pärt’ ‘half heap’ [Ačaṙean 1952: 250].

bark ‘bitter’ (Agat’angełos), ‘angry’ (John Chrysostom+), ‘loud (about talking, especially laughing’, John Chrysostom+; on MidArm. attestations, see MjHayBar 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; HayLezBrbBar 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 = Ṛ. Grigoryan 1970: 54N21]. Note also Xarberd barkank’ ‘passion, strong desire’ [Ačaṙean 1913: 178b], Sebastia bark ‘very hot, strong, bitter (vinegar, pepper, etc.)’ [Gabikean 1952: 110].

Papen bark ‘(strong) desire’, barak-barak ‘with a strong desire’ (see HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 167b), if not a secondary creation based on barak(a)c’aw ‘tuberculosis’, lit. ‘thin illness’ (on which see HAB 1: 418a; HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 167b), this word may belong here, although the second -a- is not clear (see below on bark ‘lightning’).

● ETYM The connection with Skt. bhṛj- ‘to shine, to beam, to sparkle’ and Gr. φλέγω ‘entzünden, verbrennen, erleuchten; brennen, flammen, leuchten, glänzen’ and many other etymological attempts are rejected by Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 424-425). Lidén (1906: 57-60) compares Gr. (Cretan) φάγρος ‘whetstone’. Clackson (1994: 182) and Salmon/Niepokui (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)rgʷ- ‘unfriendly’, cf. Oic. berkja ‘poltern, toben’ (< Germ. *barkjan ‘prahlen, poltern’), Latv. bargs ‘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 barqāh ‘lightning’. The Aramaic word is cognate with Hebrew bārāq ‘lightning’ (cf. also Arab. barq ‘lightning’) which is reflected as barak in the encomium on Maštoc’ by Karapet Sasnec’i (12th cent.): barak yarp’woyn, 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. bhárgas- 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 *bhérg(w)-os and oblique *bhrg(w)-és. Arm. bark may have generalized the zero-grade of the oblique stem, exactly like in the case of another s-stem neuter (PD), also with atmospheric semantics, almost synonymous amp/b ‘cloud; (late) lightning (and/or ‘thunder’), q.v. A similar case may be seen in ayt ‘cheek’ (cf. Gr. οἶδος, etc.; see s.v.); see 2.2.2.1.

According to an alternative etymology, Skt. bhárgas- 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’args- 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’args- ‘radiance, splendour, light’ and Sem. *b-r-q ‘glänzen, blitzen’ may be related. Perhaps an old Armenian – Aryan – Semitic correlation?

barjr, r/a-declension: GDSg barj-u, NPl 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, etc. (see HAB 1: 414-415, 427a), connected with cognate forms representing the PIE word for ‘high’, *h₁erg₂-, *h₁erg₂-ur-, *h₁erg₂- (e/o)ant-: Hitt. parku- ‘high’, Skt. bhṛánt- (f. bhṛaññ-) ‘large, wide, abundant, lofty, high, strong, dense, loud’, YaV. bhrzant- (f. bhrzant-) ‘rising high, high, loud’, Oss. bærzond ‘high’, MPers. buland ‘high, big’, Germ. Burgund, etc., see Hubschmann 1897: 428; Pokorny 1959: 140-141; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 232; Mallory/Adams 1997: 269ab; Cheung 2002: 173.


Further, see s.vv. *burgn 'tower' and *durgn 'potter’s wheel'.

*barti* 'poplar'; Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia; see below on *Arevordik’)+.

In Amirdovlat’ Āmasiaic‘i (medical scholar, 15th cent.), *barti* 'poplar' is equated with *č’inar ‘plane’ (see Vardanjan 1990: 91, 268, 466); on the correlation between the poplar and the plane, see below.

● DIAL. Preserved in Alaškert, Muş, 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. *joɫ(-a)-har-.

● ETYM. Lidén (1905-06: 490-491) compares Slav. *bersto- 'elm' (cf. Russ. bérest, etc.) and derives *barti from *bhrstiia̯, assuming a development -rst- > -rt-. He does not cite any parallel for this development, however. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 430) rejects the connection. In my view, PIE *-rst- would rather yield Arm. -rt‘-; see 2.1.22.13 and s.v. *yuɾt‘-i.

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. βράϑυ n. ‘savin, Juniperus sabina; Juniperus foetidissima’ (also βόρατον n., βορατίνη); Lat. bratus (Pliny) ‘an Anatolian cypress'; Aram. b'rā’, Hebr. b'rāš, Assy. burāšu ‘cypress' < Proto-Semitic *brāhu (see Huld 1981: 303). See also 1.12.1 on b'rânc ‘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‘eht ‘elm’ (q.v.), Gr. πυξέ-α, Ion. -η 'elm, Ulmus glabra', Lat. tilia ‘linden’ > Gr. (Hesychius) τιλία· αἰγείροι ‘poplar’ (see HAB 2: 171b); Bolgar. dial. jusika ‘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 *bʰreHg- ‘to shine’ (cf. Skt. bhráj- ‘to shine, beam, sparkle’, etc.), I refer to Mayrhofer EW Aia 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 Arewordik’ (see below) can be compared with Heliades, the daughters of the Sun in Greek mythology, which have been transformed into poplars (Ovid. Met. 2: 340-366; see Taxo-Godi apud Mi NArMir 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 Mi NArMir 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 Alisian 1910: 79-80, 100-104; Karst 1948: 69-70; Bartikjan 1967; Russell 1987: 530.

As noted by P. Friedrich (1970: 157-158; 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 berezu
Sjadu pokačausja.
S kotoroj miločkoj guljaju -
S toj i povenčausja.

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’ın 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 Ōdabaşyan 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 Loři (Noyemberyan) [HZHek’ 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 (Mayrum 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 carer). Again, we are dealing with the motif ‘bride and the tree’.

This preliminary discussion shows that the semantic relationship between the poplar and some other trees, as well as the derivation of Arm. bārt-i ‘poplar’ from PIE *bhřH- ‘birch’, should be viewed in a larger culturological framework. Further, see H. Martirosyan 2008.

bawi, 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); bawilo-ak ‘a dark, covered place’ (John Chrysostom), bawilo-a-jew ‘bawlak-shaped’ (Eusebius of Caesarea).


ETYM Ačａrayan (HAB 1: 433b) rejects all the etymological attempts, including the connection with Babylon proposed by Hyunk’earp’ēntiyan, and leaves the origin of the word open.

Jahukyan (1991: 36-37) derives the forms bawel and bawil from QIE *bh\(\text{u}H\)-el and *bh\(\text{u}H\)-lā respectively, from PIE *bh\(\text{u}\)H- ‘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 *bh\(\text{u}\)H-\(\text{u}\)l-\(\text{e}\)h₂ > PArm. *baw(a)l(a), whence a secondary nominative bawi in a way more or less comparable with the explanation of lusin ‘moon’ and kalin ‘acorn’ (q.v.). However, Gr. φωλείς ‘den, lair’ and Olc. ból ‘id.’ have been derived from *bh\(\text{u}\)l-\(\text{a}\)- (cf. Alb. botë ‘earth, world’ < *bātlā, see Rix 2003: 365), which makes the explanation of Arm. bawi more difficult.

Recently, the old connection of bawil with Babylon has been revived (Arcrun Sahakyan apud L. Abrahamyan 2004: 17, 17\(_\text{b}\); L. Abrahamian 2006: 217; A. Petrosyan 2007: 18-21). Note also babel glossed as šp’ot’umn, xarnakumm ‘confusion’ in Onomastica sacra (Wutz 1914: 96\(^\text{N97}\)). For the notion of Babylon ‘labyrinth’, see L. Abrahamyan 2004: 17\(_\text{a}\) (with lit.); de Freitas 1987: 413b; and especially A. Petrosyan 2007: 18-19\(_\text{s}\) 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 Larabal pêk ‘pit; ruined place’. Margaryan (1971: 218-219; cf. 1975: 317a, 458a) adds also Goris pâk ‘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 T’iflis *bokel ‘to fist, punch; to push’ (Ačaṙeian 1913: 200), see below.


According to J̌ahukyan (1985: 155; 1987: 115, 255), T’iflis *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).

bel-un, o-stem: GDsg betn-o-y ‘product, harvest, semen, fruit’ (Book of Chries, Philo, Yovhannēs Draxanakertc’i, Vardan Arewelc’i), glossed by sermn ‘semen, seed’ and ptuɫ ‘fruit’ in Barqirk’ hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 55Nr274), adj. ‘fertile’ only in ModArm., an-betun ‘fruitless’ (since Lazar P’arpec’i, 5th cent.), bazm-a-betun ‘fecund, fertile’ (Book of Chries, etc.); beln glossed by berk ‘harvest’ in Barqirk’ hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 55Nr272), beln-awor ‘fecund, fertile, fruitful’ (Book of Chries, Philo), belmnaworem ‘to fecundate, impregnate’ (John Climachus, Nersēs Lambronac’i); betn-man, GDsg belman ‘semen, sperm’ (Timotēkos Kuz = Timothy Aelurus), belmn-a-bet ‘fecund, fertile, abundant’ (T’ēodoros K’rt’enawor), belmnaworm ‘to fecundate, impregnate’ (Grigor Narekac’i); later bazm-a-bet ‘fecund, fertile’ (Ganjk’, Karapet Vardapet).

According to Ačaṙyan 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 bel-un in synonymous 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 bel-un in bazm-a-betun.

*ETYM Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 439a) accepts none of the etymologies and leaves the origin of the word open. Adontz (1937: 9) derives the word from PIE *bhel- ‘to blow, grow, swell’, cf. Gr. φαλλός m. ‘penis’, φαλλάριζω ‘to have an obscene conduct’ (Chantraine 1968-80: 1175), OIr. bōl ‘bull’, etc. Further see s.v. bōl ‘whole, entire; round, spherical; circle; bud, etc.’.

The independently unattested root *bel may be regarded as a noun (see above) meaning ‘product, harvest, semen, fruit’ and derived from QIE *bhel-no-; note Gr. φαλλός, which points to zero grade, however. For synonymous bel(-n) vs. bel-nn cf. kōl vs. kōl-nn ‘side’, jev vs. jevnm ‘warm(th)’, etc. If one prefers to posit an underlying PArm. verbal *bel- ‘to impregnate, fertilize’, a nasal present *bh-el-ne-
may be posited. For *bel-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. bīrtā, Akk. birtum (see HAB 1: 442; Jáhkchmann 1987: 476). Further, see Ravnaes 1991: 97-98.

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. bīrtā, Akk. birtum (see HAB 1: 442; Jáhkchmann 1987: 476). Further, see Ravnaes 1991: 97-98.

The connection with Syriac merdā ‘castle’ is rejected by Hübcschmann (1897: 301) because of the anlaut. Eilers (1953: 73; 1971: 62) discusses this in the context of b-/v- alternation. On the other hand, he (1971: 62, 1974: 49) involves Iran. bard ‘stone’.

berem, 3sg aor. e-ber ‘to bring, bear, give fruit’ (Bible+).


- DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 1: 441b].
- ETYM Since Acoluthus (1680 apud HAB 1: 441a), etc., linked with the PIE term for ‘to bring, bear’, *bhər-: Lat. ferō ‘to carry, bear’, Gr. φέρω ‘to carry, bear’, Skt. bhárati ‘to carry, maintain, foster, bring’, Goth. bairan ‘to carry’, etc. [HAB 1: 440-441; Hübcschmann 1897: 429; Pokorny 1959: 128, 129; Schmitt 1981: 48; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 246-249; Mallory/Adams 1997: 56].

For 3sg.aor. e-ber < *ē-bhər-et, also present in a number of dialects such as Moks, etc., cf. Skt. ā-bhar-at, Gr. έφερε.

-berj ‘high’ in compounds barjr-a-berj ‘very high’ (Bible+), erkn-a-berj ‘himmelhoch’ (Eznik Kolbac’i, Agat’angelos, etc.), lefn-a-berj ‘berghoch’ (Eznik Kolbac’i), etc.

In the late medieval dictionary Bārgirk’ hayoc’ [Amalyan 1975: 55] [Amalyan 1975: 55] we find berj glossed as barjr ‘high’ and sēn ‘building, village’.

- ETYM See s.v. barjr ‘high’.

bzel (John Chrysostom), bzzal (Grigor Magistros) ‘to buzz’, said of flies, bees, beetles and other insects. Derivative nouns bzz-ank’ and bzz-umn (Nersēs Snorhali).

- DIAL The verb bzzal is widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 445a; HayLezBrbBrBař 1, 2001: 189b].
- ETYM According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 444b), this is an onomatopoic verb which is etymologically unrelated with other similar forms found in IE (Engl. buzz, etc.) and non-IE (for Caucasian parallels, see Jáhkchmann 1987: 588, 602) languages. However, the onomatopoic nature of the word cannot categorically exclude the etymological connection. Further see s.v. bżę/z ‘beetle’.

bźez, a-stem: GDSg bześ-oj in Geoponica; i-stem: GDSg bześ-i Oskip’orik (both attestations are late) ‘beetle, dung-beetle’ (API bźē-s in Hexaemeron, see K.
The Armenian word renders Gr κάνϑαρος ‘a kind of (dung-)beetle, Scarabaeus pilularius’ in Hexaemeron [K. Muradyan 1984: 259L4, 372b].

- **DIAL** Muş bzz, Xarberd b'ez [HAB 1: 445a], Sebastia bzz [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, -īm. ‘drone’, Slav. *bučati ‘to buzz, hum’, OCS *bučela ‘bee’, etc. go back to IE *bh(o)ukw- ‘a kind of buzzing insect’ (see Gamkrelidze Ivanov 1984, 2: 602 = 1995, 1: 516L1), 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'ék'lek (see Tër-Yakobean 1960: 472); perhaps ‘drone’ or ‘hornet’. The ending -ēz is also found in some insect- and lizard-names, such as xlēz and molēž/s ‘lizard’ (HAB s.v.v.), dial. dzez ‘beetle’ (HAB 1: 445a), *dl-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. plus ‘blue’, Ital. blu, etc. Abelyan and Acaryan (see HAB 1: 450) reject the meaning ‘light-blue’. After an extensive discussion, however, Alayan (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 bēl, Russ. belyj ‘white’, etc. from PIE *bhēlH-, 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 Jáhukyan (1987: 115, 160, 270). For the semantics cf. lurt’/’light, shiny; light-blue’. Saradževa (1986: 37518) wonders if Arm. plus ‘blue’ (Ararat pliz, Aguš pliz, see HAB 4: 87b) is related to Engl. blue, etc.; cf. the idea of NHB above.

  Compare also *bl-ēt (see HAB 1: 456a).

**bl-bl-am** ‘to chatter, jabber, babble, prattle, talk nonsense, sing (said of nightingales), etc.’.

- **DIAL** Ararat, Łorí, Łazax, Łarabal, Muš blbl-al, blbl-ac’nel, see Amatuni 1912: 104b; Acařean 1913: 192-193 (with derivatives).

- **ETYM** Onomatopoeic verb, cf. Engl. babble, etc. See also s.vv. ba(ba)nij-, barba(nij) ‘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 Daw’tak (7th cent.) apud Můvšes Kalankatuac’i 2.35 (1983: 228-23): blt’aks oč’xarac ‘‘soft meat of sheep’
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(oč’xarneri p’ap’uk mis) [V. Arak’elyan 1969: 178]) or “choice morsels of sheep” [Dowsett 1961: 147].

● DIAL. Preserved in the dialects of Xarberd, Xotorjur, T’iflis, Axalc’xa (b’lint’), Labaral, Van, Moks, etc., basically meaning ‘a kind of cake’ [HAB 1: 454]. The meaning in Moks (poł’t’), GŠg poł’t’) 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. J̌ahukyan (1971: 49-50; 1987: 117, 161) derives from PIE *bhl-ei- ‘to swell’ (cf. Gr. φλιδάω, etc.). This proto-form would yield Arm. *e- bł-, 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’hel- (see 2.3.1). Since boyl is an i-stem comparable with Ir. *bhel-i- ‘abundant’), one wonders whether the vocalism of the suffix in bl-it’ can be explained by the same *i-; thus: *bul-i-t’V- > blit’.

blur, o-stem: GDSg blr-o-y (frequent in the Bible; also e.g. in Mvos’ Xorenac’i 2.39, 2.86, 1913=1991: 165, lines 3 and 11, 233L8), LocSg i blr-i, IPl blr-o-v-k’ (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 296); a-stem: IPl blr-a-w-k’, var. blrōk’ (Zeno, see Xač’ikyan 1949: 81L11); r-stem: GDSg bler (Zenob, Yovhan Mamikonean: HAB 1: 455b), ISg bler-b (Oskip’orik) ‘hill’ (Bible+).


● ETYM. Since Thomaschek (see HAB) and Petersson (1916: 260-262), linked with OIC. bali ‘Erhöhung entlang dem Uferrande; kleine Erhöhung auf ebenem Boden’, Welsh bâl f. ‘Erhöhung, Berggipfel’. Accepted in HAB 1: 455-456; J̌ahukyan 1987: 115, 235 (on the suffix), 582-583. See Pokorny 1959: 120-122, the root *bhel- ‘to grow, swell’, with Arm. bl-ur ‘fertile’. Arm. bl-ur is considered to reflect *b’hōl-. For the formation, see s.v. anur ‘ring’ and Olsen 1999: 33.

Uncertain.


● ETYM. No etymology is known to me. See s.v. bol-ok ‘loud complaint, cry’. The form *bl-aw- is reminiscent of Larabal, Ararat onomatopoetic kř-aw-el ‘to croak’ (said of crows) vs. dialectally widespread kr-kř-al ‘id. (said of birds, particularly crows, as well as of frogs, snakes, buffalos, etc.)’; see HAB s.vv. agraw ‘crow’, ka(r)kač’, and krunk (q.v.).

bolor, o-stem: ISg bolor-o-y (8 times in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 301c), i-stem: ISg bolor-i-w (Plato), GDPl bolor-i-c’ (Book of Chries, Grigor Narekac’i) ‘whole, entire; round, spherical; circle’ (Bible+), ‘calyx of a flower, husk, rosebud, an
ornament’ in IPI *bolor-i-w-k’ (Wisdom 2.8, rendering Gr. κάστος, and Book of Chries), *bolor-ak ‘round, circular’ (Bible+), *bolorem ‘to twist round, coil, plait, gather’ (Bible+); *bolor-ek-‘eun/-in, -ec’-un(-c’), -ek’-um-b-k’ ‘the whole of’ (Eznik Koltac’i, Elišė, Philo, Book of Chries, etc.); *bolorši ‘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]. Hamšen *pszydietk’ ‘environ, neighbourhood, surroundings’ is from *bolor-i-k’ [HAB 1: 462a; Aćaryan 1947: 223], cf. Akn bolorši or bolorš ‘id.’ [Gabriellian 1912: 248]. See also s.v. *boyl ‘ball of dough’.  

● ETYM. Connected with Gr. φηγός f. ‘oak’, Lat. fagus f. ‘beech’, OIr. ból ‘id.’ (< *bhøle-, etc.), OIr. *bolor-ti-k’ ‘ball, testicle’, etc. The Armenian form points to *bolor-t-i-k’ ‘swelling, abscess, tumour’, bolor-ši ‘id.’ (< *bol-or-ši, etc.). OIr. *bol-or(-k’) ‘ball, testicle’, etc. The Armenian form points to *bol-or(-k’) ‘ball, testicle’, etc. The Armenian form points to *bol-or(-k’) ‘body part’, OHG boilla f. ‘Wasserblase, Fruchtblase oder Knoten des Flachses’, bilorn ‘gum (in mouth)’, Sax. bealluc m. ‘testicle’ < *bol-n-, OIr. *bölir ‘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. betan ‘product, harvest, semen, fruit’ (q.v.), etymologized by Adontz (1937: 9). Further see s.v. blur ‘hill’, bol of ‘swelling, tumour, wound’, *boyi ‘ball of dough’.  

For the structure of bol-or(-) and Hamšen *bolor-t-i-k’ ‘surroundings’ compare ol-or(-) nd olor-i ‘winding, etc.;’ for bol-or-ši cf. gol-or-ši ‘vapour, steam’ vs. gol ‘warm’ (q.v.). layn-i s. vs. layn ‘broad’, see HAB 1: 461; 3: 551-552; Greppin 1975: 116, 130; Jahukyan 1998: 29; Olsen 1999: 509-510, 524-526. The pattern bol-or : blur ‘hill’ is reminiscent of kotor : ktur ‘cut’ [Olsen 1999: 525̃66].  

According to Aćaryan (HAB 1: 461b), here belongs also MidArm. and dial. Axalk’alak, Sirak, Ararat, Muš, Van pl-or ‘testicle’ (Amatuni 1912: 278; Aćarean 1913: 913b), cf. OIr. bolir ‘ball, testicle’, etc. The Armenian form points to *b-, thus one may think of Skt. buly- f. ‘buttocks; vulva’, Lith. bulis (-iēs), bulē, bulē ‘Hinterer, Gesäß’; cf. also MidArm. pilpl-k-el ‘to blossom, bud’, Erznka pilk ‘vulva’, Larabał, Ararat pupul ‘penis’, etc. The fluctuation b-/p- (PIE *bh/-b-) may be due to soundsymbolic nature of words, note further piljak ‘bubble’ vs. bolboj ‘blossom, sprot’.  

*boxi. *buk’i ‘hormone’ (dial.).  

● DIAL. Lori, Lazax boxi. Larabał pxsi, rural piāk’i ‘hormone’ (Amatuni 1912: 112a; Aćarean 1913: 200a; Ališan 1895: 96), Burdur boxi ‘id.’ [N. Mkrtč’yan 1971: 198]. Larabał pxsi/- and pxi (Dav’tyan 1966: 328) regularly reflect *boxi by Aćaryan’s Law (see 2.1.39.1), whereas pāk’i presupposes *buk’i.  


Jahukyan (1972: 317-318) 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. kaɫamax, metex, and 2.3.1) and -k‘-i (cf. Lori kal:no-k‘-i vs. ClArm. kaɫn-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 (*bʰeHug-i, *bʰoh-g-i?) remains unclear.

*boxoxiċ, Bağirk‘ hayoc‘ (Amalyan 1975: 113N10), ankičěal (unclear word, see HAB 2: 129) is glossed as follows: xrtuilak, kam xočič, kam boxoy xē (var. xic). As is clear from the equivalents xrtuilak and xočič (also as a separate gloss: Amalyan 1975: 145N224), boxoy xic must have meant ‘scarecrow’.

I propose to interpret it as composed of *bo- ‘bogy’ and *xoxiċ. 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 *xoč-ič may be corroborated by Sebastia xoxič. See 1.12.4 for more details.

**bok** adj. and adv. ‘barefoot’ (Bible+), **bokanam** ‘to become barefoot’, **bokac’eal** (Bible); **bok-ottu** ‘id.’ (Grigoris Aršaruni, Yovhanness Draxanakerte‘i, etc.), a compound with ott ‘foot’; MidArm. **bok-ik** ‘barefoot’ (MijHayBar 1, 1987: 128a).

**DIAL** The pure forms bok and bok-ik are not recorded. The MidArm. diminutive form *bobik in practically all the dialectal areas (in a few of them: *bob-l-ik), and tépeg in Łabarab (HAB 1: 463a). The form *bobik is explained through a simultaneous process of assimilation and dissimilation, and Łabaràbl *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.


**bol** ‘a kind of plant’ (Galen, etc.).

**DIAL** In several dialects, in the meaning ‘a kind of bitter field-plant, = Turk. ič ‘ašur’ [HAB 1: 464b]. The plant plays an important role in the epic song “Karos xa‘” (see Harut‘yunyan/Xač’atryan 2000, passim). In a Moks version: pôle xač’ [Yovsęp'eanc’ 1892: 12]. In Orbeli 2002: 315, Moks pōl is glossed in square
bołk

brackets as ‘rpaž’ = ‘hornbeam’. This seems to be due to confusion with *boxi 'hornbeam' (q.v.).

●ETYM See s.v. bołk.

bołboj, o-stem: GDPl bolboj-o-c’ (Agat’angełos, Book of Chries), IPl bolboj-o-v-k’ (Agat’angełos, 5th cent.); i-stem: GDPl bolboj-i-c’ (Yovhannës Drasxanakerc’i), IPl bolboj-i-w-k’ (Gregory of Nyssa, and a homily attributed to Mvšës Xorenac’i); a-stem: GDPl bolboj-a-c’ (Gregory of Nyssa), IPl bolboj-a-w-k’ (Hexaemeron: K. Muradyan 1984: 129.8, and Gregory of Nyssa) ‘sprout, offshoot, blossom, bud’ (Bible+); denominative verbs bolbojem ‘to germinate, bud, sprout’ (Bible+), bolbojanaam ‘id.’ (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa).

   In Job 15.30 (Cox 2006: 127) and Song of Songs 2.13 Arm. bolboj renders Gr. βλαστάς and δάνδας, respectively.

●DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 464-465.

V. Arek’el’yan (1984a: 142) derives dial. (the village of Kotayk’/Elkavan) bhaxpuč ‘bubble-like formation on the bread called lavaš; bubbled bread’ from bolboj, and pałzčak ‘bubble’ from plpjjak, and states that bolboj and plpjjak are confused in HAB. Indeed, Aćăryan lists this and related forms below under the entry plpjjak ‘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 *bhbuč is also found in Nor Bayazet (Aćărean 1913: 194a); note also the verb bhbc- ‘to bud, germinate’ (of flowers), for a textual illustration see P’iloyane’c 1888: 25.8. Further cf. some forms recorded in Aćărean 1913: 194a. Probably here belongs also Larabál pxpxótil ‘to germinate, bud’ (cf. HAB 1: 481b).

●ETYM Aćăryan (Adjarian 1918: 162; HAB 1: 464-465; see also Jáhukyán 1987: 115; cf. Olsen 1999: 936), treats bolboj as a reduplication of the type of doloj ‘quivering’, from the root seen in bol ‘a plant’, bolk ‘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. bolboj is to be treated as a reduplication of *bolʃ- from QIE *b’il-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. flās, flāris m. ‘blossom, flower; youthful prime’, etc. Further see s.v.v. bolk ‘radish’, bolʃ ‘swelling, tumour’. Thus: *bol-bolʃ > bolboj.

   There seems to be some kind of relationship between bolboj ‘blossom, sprout’ and plpjjak ‘bubble’.Interesting are pl(pl)puk ‘bud, gemma’, Trapizón bumbulak < *pumul-ak ‘bud’, etc., astonishingly reminiscent of Lith. bumbulas ‘bud’, etc. The fluctuation b-/p- (IE *b’-/b’-) may be, apart from reasons mentioned in the dialectal section, due to soundsymbolic origin; cf. Engl. bubble, etc.

bolk ‘radish’. In the later literature: Galen (= Gr. ῥαφον [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 bolk-uk, with a diminutive suffix -ak, attested in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 304-5): bolkukk’ eljerac’ ort’uc’ kam
Further, see s.v. 462) he asks: “is it possible to suggest a Semitic loan from Armenian?”.

\*ETYM Acaryan (HAB 1: 464–465) derives \*bölk from *bol ‘plant, sprout’ (see s.vv. bol and bolboj), which he connects with Lat. *flōs, -ōris m. ‘blossom, flower’, etc., for the semantic development comparing with Gr. ῥάδις ‘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 it from Arm. dial. (Hamšen) (see 2.1.39.1).

In his ClArm. > Hamšen glossary, A. Ararat (1938: 457 = 1972: 391) hesitantly compares the Armenian and Georgian words with Akkad. \*puglu ‘radish’. On the other hand, he points out that Arm. \*bölk can be originally identical with Gr. βολβός m. ‘onion; purse-tassels, Muscari comosum’ and Lith. bumbulyst ‘Steckrübe, Wasserblase, Kalbsauge’. The latter etymology is represented in Pokorny 1959: 103. Jähkukan (1987: 115, 461–462, 467) accepts Acaryan’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. bol.

**bołk**

\*ETYM Connected with OIC. belja ‘to roar’, OHG bellan ‘to bark, resound’, etc.; see Meillet 1900: 391–392; Peterson 1920: 74–75 (together with batba(n)j ‘delirious talking’). A. Ararat (HAB 1: 465–466) does not accept the comparison and leaves the origin open. Jähkukan (1987: 115) is positive, representing \*bołok’, batba(n), and dial. *bl-bl-al ‘to babble’ under the entry *bl-el, of Pokorny 1959. One might also think of Arm. dial. (Van, Larab, Ararat, etc.) *bl-, *bl-bl-, *blaw- ‘to shout’, q.v.

**bołf** ‘swelling, tumour, wound’, **blj-un** having a swelling’; **boľn** ‘ball’ (all MidArm, see HAB 1: 466a; M. Muradyan 1972: 188; MijHayBarā 1, 1987: 128).

**bołf**-\* ‘swelling, tumour, wound’ [HAB 1: 466a].

*garanc* ‘little horns of calves or lambs”. Here *bolkukk* has no correspondent form in the Greek text; *bolkukk* efjerac’ renders Gr. τὰ κέρατα [NHB 1: 504a; K. Muradyan 1984: 372b]. Arm. bolk-uk should be interpreted as ‘newly grown horn’ (as is suggested by Acaryan [HAB 1: 465a]) rather than ‘radish-like small horn’ (as in NHB 1: 504a). This might imply an etymological meaning ‘*growing*’.

**bol** ‘radish’ is ubiquitous in the dialects. In Muş and Alaşkert, one finds b’ot, without the final -k [HAB 1: 465a; Madat’yan 1985: 185a]. Larablar pazxk/pōxk and pex (see HAB and Dav’t’yan 1966: 328), Moks pōlk (see HAB; Acaryan 1952: 251; Orbeli 2002: 315), etc. point to Acaryan’s Law and subsequent consonant shift (see 2.1.39.1).

**bołk**-\* stem: GDSg bołok’-o-y, ISg bołok’-o-v in Łaz̄ar P’arpeć’i; a-stem: GDPI bołok’-a-c’ in “Ganjaran” ‘loud complaint, cry’ (Bible+); bołok’em ‘to cry, complain loudly’ (Bible+), ‘declaration of a herald’ (Athenasius of Alexandria); dial. (Hamsen) *bołok’-e’ ‘to shout loudly’ (with -l-).

**bołok’-e’** in “Ganjaran” ‘loud complaint, cry’ (Bible+); bołok’em ‘to cry, complain loudly’ (Bible+), ‘declaration of a herald’ (Athenasius of Alexandria); dial. (Hamsen) *bołok’-e’ ‘to shout loudly’ (with -l-).

**bołok’-e’** in “Ganjaran” ‘loud complaint, cry’ (Bible+); bołok’em ‘to cry, complain loudly’ (Bible+), ‘declaration of a herald’ (Athenasius of Alexandria); dial. (Hamsen) *bołok’-e’ ‘to shout loudly’ (with -l-), with no further comment. The appurtenance to bołok’em seems obvious to me.

**bołok’-e’** in “Ganjaran” ‘loud complaint, cry’ (Bible+); bołok’em ‘to cry, complain loudly’ (Bible+), ‘declaration of a herald’ (Athenasius of Alexandria); dial. (Hamsen) *bołok’-e’ ‘to shout loudly’ (with -l-), with no further comment. The appurtenance to bołok’em seems obvious to me.
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*ETYM No etymology in HAB 1: 466a. Jahukyan (1965: 252; 1987: 115; see also H. Suk'iasyan 1986: 147-148) derives the word from IE *b'el- ‘to blow, swell’, whence also bol-or ‘whole; round, spherical’ (q.v.). For bolf he reconstructs *b'oldjo- or the like, cf. Old Swedish *bolde ‘swelling, tumour’, etc. Further see s.v. *boyl ‘ball of dough’.

*bo(y/v), *bu(y/v) ‘spider, tarantula; ghost’: Larabal *bov ‘spider’ [Ačarean 1913: 202b]. Next to bov – also bo, see HayLezBrbBär 1, 2001: 211a (with a textual illustration). Davt'yan (1966: 392) presents Larabal, Hadrut', Šašax, Marala bőv as equivalent to ClArm. karič ‘scorpion’; cf. Areš bőv, bōvā ‘an animal resembling the scorpion’ [Lusec' 1982: 201b]. One may also add Polis pū (spelled piw) ‘ghost’ = Nor Naxijewan pi ‘a poisonous spider’ (see HAB 2: 229b, 369a);

*b/polо : Van *p(o)lo ‘insect, bogy, monster’, *arj-a-plo ‘ghost’ (according to Durian 1933: 110, arjâbl ‘a šiwal = monster’), Surmulu *boloł ‘insect’. Next to *arj-a-plo, Van also has *arj-a-pap-o ‘bogy’ [Ačarean 1913: 154a]. Ačaryan does not specify *arj- and *pap-. The latter is, apparently, identical with pap ‘grandfather’, cf. *pap-uč ‘old man’ > Van, Alaškert ‘an insect’ (see Ačarean 1913: 896b). The component *arj- can be equalled with arjin ‘black’ or arj ‘bear’. The latter alternative seems more probable; cf. Russian Veles, the adversary of the thunder-god, which is associated with the bear and lešiğ, the forest spirit (Uspenskij 1978: 114-125).

*bolbol : Van *bololan, T’ılış *bololay ‘bogy, ghost’;

*b/bo : Ararat, İgdır, Bałeš, Nor Bayazet bobo ‘bogy, ghost’;


*b(p)olоč, *b(p)oloč : Ararat, Astapat *bol, Şirak bolx, LORI, Muş *boloč [Amatuni 1912: 105b], AKN *polū, Bałeš, Van *polоč, Larabal *polоč ‘insect, beetle’, Nor Naxijewan *polоč ‘bogy’ [Ačarean 1913: 913a, 919a].

All these forms are dialectal, except for poloč ‘insect, worm’, which is attested in “Lucmunk sahmanc’n” [HAB 4: 95a].

A trace of *bo- ‘scarecrow’ may be seen in *bo-xačiğ (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-‘spider, tarantula; scorpion; ghost’, ranging from Polis and Nor Naxijewan to Larabal, 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©. Secondly, the spread of this word in the neighbouring languages, as we shall see, is much wider. Thirdly, these words may all be onomatopoetic.

Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (15th cent.) mentions Turk. /pō/ as an equivalent of Arm. mōr ‘tarantula, phalangium’ (see S. Vardanj 1990: 134, § 616). This Turkish word is compared with Arab. bū, abū ‘tarantula’ [S. Vardanyan 1990: 613, note 616/2].


Further, see Nocentini 1994: 401 ff.

For the semantics, see 3.5.2.1.

boyt‘, a-stem (Bible), o-stem (Ephrem); boyt’n, GDSg but’in, AbIsg i but’anē, ISg but’amb (“Maštoc’” of Jahkek‘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 (būt‘) and Kak’avaber (b/püt‘), ‘finger’ (for Kak’avaber, see H. Muradyan 1967: 167b). Ararat and Jula have b’it‘; note also T’inflis bit‘ next to but‘, as well as Xotorjurt bit‘ [YušamXotor 1964: 434b]. The form boyt’n can be traced in Larabal püt‘n and in Akn b’it‘-iŋ (see HAB 1: 466b). Commenting upon Jula b’it‘, Aćaryan (1940: 87; see also 356b) states that there is no other example with -oyt‘. Note, however, ćkoyt‘ ‘little finger’ > Jula čk-iŋ, rural čk’it‘ [HAB 3: 205a; Aćarēan 1940: 375a].

In bearing mind the classical meaning ‘a soft lump of flesh, lobe’, one may add more dialectal evidence: Muš but‘-iŋ gdal ‘young of a frog’ (with gdal ‘spoon’); Ararat, Larabal but‘ ‘hump’, Ararat, Lazax but‘-iŋ ‘hump-backed’ (see Aćarēan 1913: 204a).

In Larabal, püt‘n seems to refer also to ‘(round) hill or rock’, as attested in a folk-tale (L.. Harut’yunyan 1991: 521-523; K’yanum en, tem aţnum min saru, k’şanum min cōr, min pūl’ pūt’n ay pam, min k’račelk’ ay ni mmnum təp en taka “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 Larabal *xul-a-boyt’n ‘rugged’ with xul ‘rugged’ < xovl ‘swelling, spot’, q.v. (see Aćarēan 1913: 488h; HAB 2: 392a) and cited as xlapu’t‘n ‘rugged’ in L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 362. The component *boyt’n may be identified with püt‘n ‘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’.

ETYMO 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 *bʰeH- ‘to grow’. For the meaning ‘thumb’, cf. Oic. jumall, OHG dümo, etc. ‘thumb’ from PIE *teH- or *teHu- ‘to swell; crowd, folk; fat; strong’. Aćaryan (HAB 1: 466b) is sceptical and leaves it open as 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. poyt‘ ‘pot’, although these forms presuppose *b-. See also s.vv. boyl ‘fellow’ and boyl ‘group’.
The suffixal element *-t- is also found in Gr. φῠτόν n. ‘plant’, Skt. bhūti-, bhūti-.

The suffixal element *-t- is also found in Gr. φῠτόν n. ‘plant’, Skt. bhū́t-i-, bhū́ti-.

Similarly, boyt’ is probably composed of *bu- (from *bhū́ti-) and -it'. The same suffix is also found in ēkoyt ‘the little finger’ next to ēk-ik, etc. (see 2.3.1, 1.12.5).

● ETYM No etymology is recorded in HAB 1: 467a. According to Jahukyan (1965: 252), the word may have resulted from a semantic development of boyt’, although he does not specify the motivation. For a suggestion, see 3.9.4.

boyl, i-stem: GDPl bul-i-c' in Laz'ar P'arpec'i, 5th cent.; MidArm. a-stem ‘group (of people, deers, stags, etc.)’; MidArm. boylt-k ‘Pleiades’.


The astral term boylk’ is reflected in the dialect of Malat’ia as p’ɔrk’, with regular developments b->p' and -oy->-ɔ [Danielyan 1967: 43, 188b]; Sasun > T’alin purk’ (Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan FW 2003, September 6); see also HayLezBrbBar 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 Ač‘aryan (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. boj ‘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’.

The semantics of Arm. boyl in general and the meaning ‘shrub’ of dial. *boyl(k)’ in particular agree also with OCS byljie ‘herbs, plants, grass’, Czech. bylí ‘weed’, SCr. bīj ‘plants, grass’ (Slav. < *bHu-l-jo-) and Gr. φίλον n. ‘race, tribe, class’, φιλή f. ‘tribe, group of tribes, community’, as the l-suffixation of PIE *b'euH- or *b'Hu-<. Cf. Gr. φίλος ‘I grow, I become’, φυή n. ‘growth, plant’ < *b'Hu-to-; Arm. boyn, o-stem ‘nest; den; hut’, boys, o-stem ‘plant’ (q.v.) from *b'euH-kos, etc.

For the problem of the laryngeal in this root, see Schrijver 1991: 512-518, 534. Arm. boyl, i-stem derives from *b'euH-l-i-. The diphthong oy, seen also in boys and boyn, points to *b'euH-rather than *b'Hu-

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 Ačaṙyan (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 *bhHu-l-i(e)h2-.

The -r- in Malat’a p’ɔrk’ < *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'euH-l-, *boyr-k’ reflects an old *-r- suffixation seen also in Lith. būris ‘multitude, crowd’, Latv. būris ‘heap, mass’; 2) *boyr-k’ is borrowed from MIran. *būr-, cf. OAv. būri– ‘abundant’. The latter alternative seems more probable.

See also s.vv. *boyl ‘ball of dough’. DIAL. Larabal, Hadrut, Šaṙ-Scbarb pūl ‘ball of dough’ [Davt’yan 1966: 329].

*boyl (dialect) ‘ball of dough’. ETYM: Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 461b, 462a) presents this dialectal word as bul ‘ball’ and derives it from *b'ol- ‘to swell’, together with bol–or ‘whole; round, spherical’. To these have been connected also MidArm. bolf ‘swelling, tumour, wound’ and bolfn ‘ball’, q.v. (see M. Muradyan 1972: 188; Jahukyan 1987: 115). However, Larabal, etc. pūl rather requires *b'ol 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'ol-JV > *boyl as in ayl ‘other’ vs. Lat. alius. The form bolf points to *b'ol-JV- or, less probably, or *b'olg-JV-, which see Mallory/Adams 1997: 45a, 561a. It is unclear whether Arm. bolf ‘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'euH-l-i- (see s.v.). If indeed belonging here, bolfn, bj– may reflect a thematic *b'euH-l-jo- or fem. *b'euH-l-jeh- > *boylj-.
*boyce*: *bucanem* ‘to feed’ (Bible+); -*boyc* (as the second member of a number of compounds, e.g. *nd-l-a-but*, which see s.v. *undy*; *but* ‘food’ (Bible+), on which the denominative *btem* ‘to feed’ (Ephrem+) is based.

*DIAL* Aćařyan (1953: 193) mentions Aćial *bužan* ‘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 Bulanx, meaning ‘hibernal food for domesticated animals’ [HAB 1: 487b].

**ETYM** Since Hübschmann (1897: 430), derived from PIE *bheug*- ‘to enjoy’; Skt. *bhoj- ‘to (make) enjoy; to make use of’ (RV+), *bhóga- m. ‘Genuß, Freude, Nutzen’ (RV+), *bhukti- f. ‘Genießen’ (Br.+), OAv. *búj- f. ‘penalty’, Khot. *bújsana- ‘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. *bhakṣa- 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. *boyce* ‘to feed’ < *bheug-) is best explained by *bhug-ti-, cf. Skt. *bhukti- f. ‘Genießen’ (Br.+).

I wonder whether Aćial *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 *bh-euH- ‘to be, grow’, see HAB 1: 470 (Aćařyan himself does not accept the etymology); Pisani 1934: 186; Jāhukyan 1987: 116. Note Skt. *bhūvana- 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*, GDPl *bus-o-c’ (Hexaemeron) ‘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, Ľarabaľ, Van, etc.) : *bus- (Ararat, Muš, Alaškert, Ozim). Next to verbal *busnil, 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’, *φῠτόν n. ‘plant, growth’, *φύσις f. ‘growth, descent, nature, being’, etc. from PIE *(-)VuHC > Arm. -VuČ rather than with vocalization of the laryngeal (see s.vv. *boyl, boyn*).

**bosor** ‘blood-red, crimson’ (Cyril of Jerusalem, Grigor Narekac’i, Neršēs 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. Aćařyan (HAB 1: 473; AćařHLPatm 1, 1940: 181), however, separates *bosor* from *boc’ and identifies it with the Biblical place-name *Bosor, Bosoray, transliterated from Greek *Bomōj, cf. Genesis 36.36 (Zeyt’unyan
*bor
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*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 Ačyan (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’.

Lori 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 [HzHeck’ 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.


Further, see s.v. boreni ‘hyena’.

bor ‘leprosy’; late attested. Much older and widespread is bor-ot ‘leprous’ (Bible+) > ‘bad; unpure, dirty; heretic’ (for the semantic field, see 3.5.2.2).

● ETYM Considered to be a loan from Iran. *bor ‘leprosy’, only preserved in Sogd. bôrvk ‘brûk’ ‘leprous’34 [HAB 1: 474b; Jahukyan 1987: 520]. Bearing in mind the Iranian alternation b- : v- (cf. e.g. the word for ‘violet’, see 2.3.1 on -awš, see also s.v. mîrîwm ‘ant’), one may assume that Arm. uruk ‘leprous’, which, to my knowledge, has not received an etymological explanation, is borrowed from Iran.

*vorûk- through an intermediary *wuruk.

34 Is the Sogdian form reliable? In Gharib 1995, I could only find bîrvk ‘brûk’ ‘eyebrow’ (p. 107a) and bîvor [bôr] ‘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 Larabal p'is 'dirty': Pers. pis 'leprous; dirty' (see HAB 4: 84b; Ačarean 1902: 352); cf. also Gr. ἀλόγος m. 'dull-white leprosy' (Hes.) from 'white' (cf. Lat. albus 'white, pale, bright, clear', etc.). The above-mentioned Sogdian form may be derived from *bher-u- (or *bhe-bhr-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(23)): borb šol lusoyn 'bright shine/ray/reflection of the light' (cf. ModArm. translations in HAB 1: 475b; Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 98); borbor-ok' 'aflame' (Movsēs Xorenac'i 1.1, 1913=1991: 6L4 and the Letter to Sahak, NHB 1: 507c), 'kindling, flame' (Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, see Yuzbaşyan 1963: 78-14, 80L19); 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'ɔrb'ənk'. The noun borb has been preserved in Ararat b'ɔrb'[HAB 1: 476b], cf. Areš-b'ɔrb'[Lusenc' 1982: 201b]. For Łarabaɫp'ɛ́rp'ɛl 'to fan the fire, provoke', see below.

● ETYM Since long, connected with Lat. fervere, -ēre 'to steam, burn, glow, be heated, ferment', etc. from *bher-u- (for a discussion of these forms, see Schrijver 1991: 252-256). This is followed by Ačaṙyan (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, *bho-bhr-o-. It seems best to interpret bor-b as a broken reduplication, cf. PIE *phreb > ampro-p 'thunder', *ptεr- > t'εr-t' vs. t'εr- 'leaf' (see s.v.v.); for -ak', compare e.g. atok' 'full, fat', barwok' 'good, well', etc; note also the verbs kelek'em 'to tear, rend', olak'em 'to supplicate' (see s.v.v.). Alternatively, QIE *b'or-b'or- > *borbo(r)-k'-. Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 476a; AčaṙLiak 3, 1957: 56) points out that borb represents an *o-grade root whereas the *e-grade is seen in Larabal pērp'el. This view is widely accepted (Jahukyan 1972: 278; N. Simonyan 1979: 247; Ervandyan 2007: 29). As has been shown by A. Xačaṙyan 1984: 321-322, however, this form is to be explained from borb- through Ačaṙyan's Law (see 2.1.39.1).

boreni, wo-stem: GDSg borenwoy in Jeremiah 12.9; AblSg i borenwoy (Paterica); borean, i-stem: GDPi borenic' in P'awstos Buzand 4.13, etc.; borē (Grigor Magistros, etc.) 'hyena' (Bible+). In P'awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95L38): ew dadark' gazanac' ew orj' gazanac' ew orj' borenic' 'lairs and dens for wild beasts and hyenas', translated by Garsoian (1989: 138L4).

Further, Ačaṙyan (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 boreni/*boren < borean. The same *boreni was synchronically analyzed as boreni, 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' [Ačaṙean 1913: 203a; HAB 1: 477b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 21L1b].
boreni

ETYM Aēçāryan (HAB 1: 477) and, independently, Jahukyan (1965: 253; see also 1987: 116, 160) derive the word from the o-grade of PIE *bʰer̥- 'brown' (also characterizing animals), cf. Lith. bėras 'brown', OHG bero 'bear', etc. The only cognate in o-grade cited by Aēçāryan and Jahukyan is Slav. *bobr- 'beaver', but this in fact is a reduplicated form. Jahukyan (1972: 284; 1987: 116) adds here also dial. (Karin) borek 'grey, white cow' (see s.v. *bor 'brown animal, etc.').

Jahukyan (1987: 160; cf. Olsen 1999: 414) alternatively suggests an Iranian origin of boreni, cf. YAv. baβram. 'beaver'. As is pointed out by Jahukyan, 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. sābō'a 'hyena' < 'coloured' (see HAB 1: 477b; Aēçāryan does not accept the idea). Jahukyan (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, Wakhı pas 'leopard', which is compared with Skt. piśa- 'deer', piśāṅga- 'tawny' (RV+), Av. paēśa- 'scab', Kurd. pis '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. tusan '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 dialetcal evidence (see above). In view of cases like ašē, ašteay < from Iran. *a(r)šti- (cf. Av. aršti- f. 'spear, lance', Ved. rṣṭi- 'id.'), bazē vs. bazay 'falcon', kray vs. dial. *kur-i 'tortoise', etc., the variant bore may presuppose an earlier *bor-i. Weitenberg offers a different explanation for bore (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 -ani (cf. NAccSg iš-an-c’ (Łazar P’arpec’) rather than *iš-an-ic’. 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. borenti ‘coat made of

35 Or else, cf. lus-an ‘lynx’ (q.v.). For -eni cf. also k’awt’aṙ and k’öt’ar-inē in “Bāgirk’ hayoc’", both meaning ‘hyena’, Amalyan 1975: 58[369], 337[332].
hyena fur'); or else, we might posit a petrified adjective like Av. baḥraine- 'of beaver', cf. Jāhukyan 1987: 160; Olsen 1999: 414. Of some interest may also be Oss. bi'reag 'wolf'. It has a certain resemblance 'with Turkic 'wolf', cf. Chagatay, Turkm. bōrî, etc., but final -eğ does not have a reflex in any Turkic language' [Cheung 2002: 173]. Abaev suggested a borrowing from Khotanese birgga < PIr. ur̥̥̋ ̥̇ k̆̅-i̇̊̋. However, the Khotanese -gg- = [g] does not agree well with Oss. fricative -ğ- (ibid.).

Conclusion: Iranian *bōr- 'brown, multicoloured, etc.' (< PIE *bhebhru-) 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. *bara- from *bauru). There is no vocalic problem in all the forms within Armenian. If, nevertheless, Arm. bor 'leprosy' is originally distinct from Armenian *bōr '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: 86L2). 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 Kolbac’i, Nilus of Ancyra; numerous derivatives [NHB 1: 508-510; HAB 1: 478a].


● ETYM. Patrubány (1902-03a: 163) links Arm. boc’ with Lat. focus, -i m. ‘fireplace, hearth; hearth, fireside (as the symbol of home-life); home; family, household; brazier; sacrificial hearth or altar’ and posits *b’ok-sk-o-. Petersson (1916: 285) accepts the comparison and includes also Arm. bosor ‘blood-red, crimson’, deriving boso-r from *b’ok- and boc’ from *b’ok(so)-; see also Pokorny 1959: 162; Afabekyan 1979: 65; Olsen 1999: 51, 51-o. 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). Jāhukyan (1987: 117, 218 [15.66], 236, 269; cf. 1982: 131, 224g) accepts the reconstruction *b’ok-so- for boc’ and is hesitant on the appurtenance of bosor. Olsen (loc. cit.) alternatively assumes *b’ok-jo-, which is improbable.

Açağyan (HAB 1: 478; see also E. Tumanjan 1978: 156; H. Suk’iasyan 1986: 149) prefers a connection of Arm. boc’ to Gr. φῶς, 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. žvâkė ‘candle’ as formally impossible, and the interpretation of
focus as a back-formation to foculus 'small stove' < *fweklo- < *dʰgʷə-h-e-lo- as chronologically difficult. He leaves the origin of the Latin focus open. Schrijver (1991: 277-278, 448) treats focium 'fire-pan' as a deverbal of fovère 'to warm' < *dʰgʷə-h-ei-o, cf. Skt. daḥāyati '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. *bōnc' ‘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. bünd'.

brdoṙ 'lammergeyer / Gypaetus barbatus' (Greppin).

Attested only in Vanakan Vardapet Tawusèc'i (13th cent.): Ayl haw kay, brdoṙ asen, or zayn jagn (znkè'eal yarcuoy) aını ew snuc'an [NHB 1: 518b] : "They say there is another bird, the brdoṙ, which takes in and nourishes the young (which the Eagle casts out).” [Greppin 1978: 40]. Or rather – “There is another bird, which is called brdoṙ, <...>".


Greppin (1978: 41, 42; cf. also 1979: 216) suggests a derivation from brdem ‘to shutter, crumble’. Then he notes that the suffix -oṙ is unknown, and brdoṙ should be derived “from the unknown Armenian substratum”. (Against this etymology: Hovsep’yan/Simonyan 1981: 220b). Elsewhere, Greppin (1977: 205-206; 1983: 663) suggests a comparison with Rum. barzá ‘stork’.

These suggestions seem unnecessary, since brdoṙ is transparently composed of burd ‘wool’ and oṙ ‘buttocks’, meaning in fact ‘with wooly buttocks’; see HAB 1: 489a; 3: 564a.

buzaɫt'n, only in Bargirk' hayoc', glossed by aljumufj 'darkness' (see Amalyan 1975: 58:"). Ačaryan (HAB 1: 479a) identifies it with bazoxt ‘darkness’ (P’èstamalëan’s dictionary) and another gloss from Bargirk’ hayoc’, namely bazuit · aljumufj. For the latter, the reading bazuxt’ is preferred in the critical edition (Amalyan 1975: 46:"). Ačaryan (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 Bargirk’ hayoc’ also has bazakac’, bezek, and buzi (var. bozi), all glossed by aregakn ‘sun’ (see Amalyan 1975 s.v.; Jahukyan 1976a: 4). According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 435b, 460a), these forms are linked with bezək ‘lightning, sun’ (Evagrius of Pontus, Grigor Magistros and Hebrew bāzāq ‘lightning’. LAP’anc’yan (1975: 368-369; see also Jahukyan 1973: 18; 1987: 594, 597) treats bozi as a West-Kartvelian borrowing, cf. Megr. bəz’a-, 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 buzalt’n as composed of *bo/uz- ‘sun, light’ and *al’t- ‘darkness’ (on which see s.v. alt-a-mult). In this case,
we are dealing with a compound of the type mut'-u-lus (dial.) ‘twilight’, lit. ‘dark-and-light’.


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 Adonec 1915=2008: 24124, cf. bzak ‘he-goat’ in 240L15, an Iranian loanword, see HAB 1: 444b). For the meaning ‘lamb’ note also Georg. buc’i ‘lamb’, considered an Armenian loanword (see below).


This IE word is probably related with some North Caucasian forms, such as Lak bucca 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; J̌ahukyan 1987: 555].

**bušt**, o-stem (GDSg bšt-oy in Yakob J̌ahkec’i), cf. also GDSg p'ālap'st-i in Abusayid (see below) ‘urinary bladder; blotch, pustule, abscess; bubble’:

‘urinary bladder’ (Plato); ‘blotch, pustule’ (Kirakos Ganjakec’i, 13th cent., Ganjak [Melik’-Ōhanjanyan 1961: 40L6] = Russ. ‘прыщ’ [Xanlarjan 1976: 59], etc.); ‘bubble’ (Yakob J̌ahkec’i); bštim ‘to swell’ in Ar’ak’el Davrižec’i (17th cent., Tabriz); p'ōšt ‘the inner bag of testicles’ (ŁcNiws, etc.).

In the 5th century, only in the composite p'amp'ušt, p'amp'uşt ‘urinary bladder’ (Eznik Kolbac’i, Anania Širakac’i, etc.), next to which there is a late attested synonym in numerous variant spellings: balab/p'ust, p'altabušt, p'altap'ušt ‘urinary bladder’. Of this term, three attestations are cited in NHB 1: 426c and HAB 1: 485a: Nersēs Palianc’, 14th cent. (balabušt), Oski’orik (balap’uşt), Grigor Tat’ewac’i (p’alabušt). Older attestations may be found in Abusayid (12th cent.; Cilicia), see S. Vardanyan 1974: 134L18, 164 (p’alap’uşt, GDSg p’alap’sşt), 205 (p’alap’uşt, GDSg p’alap’uşt), in the glossary: 230; see also S. Vardanyan 1971: 209. In Grigorios, one finds p’alaybušt (see MijHayBař 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’ [MijHayBař 2, 1992: 5a]. The word is also attested in “Bžškaran antreal tarrakan maxc’-i” by Yovasap’ Sebastac’i (16th cent., Sebastia): halabšušt, 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 aravušt ‘urinary bladder; watery pustule, blister’, see below and s.v.


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 [Sargisian 1932: 366].

Among new derivatives, Acaryan (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; HayLezBrbBar 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 century onwards) by authors that are native of Sebastia and Amasia; see above.

**ETYM** Arm. bušt and p’amp’ušt have been compared with Lith. būnas, būnas ‘counterpart, kugel’, būnulis ‘Steckrübe, Wasserblase, Kollsausage’, būnulis ‘Pupille, burūnas ‘water bubble’, Latv. būnuls ‘water bubble’, etc., and, on the other hand, Lith. pampti ‘to swell’, CS pūn ‘navel’, SGr. piup ‘bud’; Lat. pastula ‘blister, pimple, pustule’, etc. (see HAB 1: 484; 4: 475; Jahuayan 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 Acaryan (HAB 1: 485b), Georg. busti ‘urinary bladder; bubble’ and Laz budi ‘urinary bladder’ are borrowed from Armenian.

Arm. aravušt ‘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 ar--. One might alternatively assume: (1) an old variant with *r- as in Lith. burūnas ‘water bubble’; (2) an Iranian or Caucasian form *arabušt as a rhotacized variant of Arm. *(h)alabušt, with *ara- > Arm. -ara- as in Iranian loans such as pāraw ‘old woman’ (cf. Pers. pārāv), etc. In this case, we might be dealing with a back-loan. But this is all uncertain.

Compare also plpjak ‘bubble’.

**buṛn** (i-stem, cf. adv. bṁ-i-u ‘violently’ in Eusebius of Caesarea) ‘strong, violent’, ‘violently’, ‘violence, strength; tyrant’ (Bible+).

**ETYM** Acaryan (HAB 1: 486; see also Olsen 1999: 123-124) equates this word with buṁ, -i-/an-stem ‘hand, fist’ (Bible+, widespread in the dialects) and does not accept any of the etymologies. More probably, buṁ ‘strong, violent’ is related with
Skt. bhārṇi- ‘zealous, wild’, etc. (Jahukyan 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, “Čaṙəntir”), API brguns (Bible) ‘tower; pyramis’ (Bible+).

*ETYM For the etymology and a discussion, see s.v. durgn ‘potter’s wheel’.

G

*galaroč

*DIAL. Sebastia galaruč ‘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-ooroč > *gal-ororoč (~ro-ro- through haplology). Originally, thus, it had referred to the shell-fish with a spiral shell. See also s.v. galtakur.

gaļjn ‘a kind of convolvulus’ (Agat’angelos, Yovhan Mandakuni, etc.).

*ETYM See s.v. gelf ‘id.’.

galf (i-stem according to NHB 1: 524b but without evidence) ‘warmish, lukewarm’ (Revelation 3.16, Elias on Aristotle), galfanam ‘to become lukewarm’ in Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent.), Vanakan (13th cent.), caus. galfac’uc’anem (Philo).

The meaning is very clearly seen in Revelation 3.16: galf es, ew oč jerm, ew oč’ c’urt “you are lukewarm, and neither warm nor cold”. Arm. galf stands for Gr. χλιαρός ‘lukewarm’.

*ETYM See s.v. gol ‘lukewarm’.

galtakur. LocSg i galtakr-i in Caṙəntir ‘shell-fish’ (Alexander Romance, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, Philo; galtakray. AblSg i galtakray-e in Sargis Šnorhali Vardapet (12th cent.), GDPI galtakray[e] in Gregory of Nyssa ‘shell-fish’; galtakr-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: 426-14): berin inj ew erku galtakur, yoroy měį linǐ margaritn “they also offered me two shell-fish in which the pearl is (produced)”. In the corresponding passage from the other edition (29714, Engl. transl. Wolohojian 1969: 131): API galtakurs.

*ETYM According to Ačaryan (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 galvruc ‘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, *gltorem) + oroč ‘shell-bead’, see s.v. *gal-ororoč. 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].

The comparison with Gr. κιχᾱ́νω ‘to reach, arrive, meet’ (Hübschmann 1897: 441; Klingenschmitt 1982: 86) is untenable since this root has an initial palatovelar *ĝh-*, cf. YAv. za-zā-mi ‘to leave’, Skt. já-hāti ‘to leave, abandon’, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 813-814).

gayl (spelled gayl in the famous palimpsest of Agat’angeɫos, see Galēmk’ecarean 1911: 128bl2f), o-stem: GDPl gayl-o- (Bible), u-stem: GDSg gayl-u (Movs ɛm Xorenac’i 2.70, 1913 = 1991: 207L3), AblSg i gayl-u- (Vark’ Grigori Astuacabani) ‘wolf’ (Bible+), ‘muzzle, cover for nose and mouth, bit’ (Bible; Agat’angeɫos § 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’ark’ānān) represents an exceptional sound change ay > u [Bahramyan 1964: 33, 192]; cf. also K’ark’ānān p’oc’cx from p’ayc’ahn ‘spleen’ (q.v.). Almost everywhere in Larabah one finds this form with irregular vocalism, k’ul, kül, next to regular k’el and k’il in a few locations only [Davt’y an 1966: 45, 332]. Further: Mel’r, Kak’avberd, Karčewan gül [Alayan 1954: 60, 265a; H. Muradyan 1960: 45, 191a; 1967: 61, 168a]. This EArmenian dialectal form is testified in the form gayl (beside goṙi vs. gan’r ‘lamb’, q.v.) by the 13th century author Vardan Arewelc’i, who was native of Gannak or surroundings (see Jahukyan 1954: 247). Note also gûl in the famous material of Schröder (see Patkanov 1868: 54; Sargseanc’ 1883, 1: 23).

Alayan (1954: 85) explains this aberrant form through tabu and compares it with Mel’r n’ij (beside the regular form a’rj ‘bear’), which was used by hunters, or by people when supposing a danger; for a further discussion, see 2.1.36.

MidArmenian, gayl-agraw ‘a kind of black raven, Corvus corone’ [MiǰHayBar 1, 1987: 138a] is continued in Larabah k’ulûkrov, k’ulâklav, karâklav [Davt’y an 1966: 332].

MidArmenian, marnd-a-gayl ‘hyena’, lit. ‘man-wolf’ (cf. were-wolf), attested in Fables by Mxit’ar Goş [MiǰHayBar 2, 1992: 116-117], is present in Axta’kalak’, Ararat, Larabal, Van [Aca’afan 1913: 761-762], Bulanx, Alâskert, etc. [Ama’tuni 1912: 467a]. The hyena was considered a werewolf and was also called k’awt ar-k’ossi ‘hyena; old witch’ (see Ananyan HayKendAšx 1, 1961: 421-433). For the werewolf and other related issues, in particular on gayl-fori, gayl-forek ‘hyena’ in Amirdovlat’ Amasiacı’i and dial. (Büt’anıa/Nikomedia) *gayl-fori ‘a kind of predator’ composed as gayl ‘wolf’ + fori ‘mule’, see 3.5.2.
Gayl

Muš pl. g’il-an, g’il-an-k’ [HAB 1: 512b].


In order to explain -yl satisfactorily we have to start with *yljo- or *tai-lo-. It is therefore preferable to link Arm. gayl with Mfr. fael ‘wolf’ (Hübßchmann 1897: 431 referring to Fick Wb. II, 259; Mann 1963: 132; Mallory/Adams 1997: 647a; hesitantly: Jahukyan 1982: 35, 41). Arm. gayl and Celtic *gai-lo- are usually interpreted as ‘the howler’ and derived from PIE *tai-., cf. Mfr. fae ‘alas’, MWelsh gwae ‘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 *yail-an-‘wailer’ (Schrijver 1995: 115-116).

It is remarkable that both the Armenian and Celtic terms formed anthroponyms, cf. Arm. Gayl, Gayl-uk, etc. (Ačaṙ Anjn 1, 1942: 445-446) and Gaul. Vailo, Vaillico, 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 Hübßchmann 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: 103. 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.


One may conclude that PIE *ulk-o- ‘wolf’ has been replaced by (or contaminated with) *tai-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.

gan

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].

Arm. gan, i-stem, has been derived from *gʷn*-n-ti- (see Winter 1966: 206; Viredaz 2005: 97) would rather yield *gan*- (k’san ‘twenty’) is not a decisive counter-example since it may be due to the influence of -suns in eresun ‘thirty’, etc., the former solution seems more probable. The verb *ganem* is likely deverbative.


gārn, in/an-stem: GDSg gārín, ISg gāram-b, NPI gārin-k’, API gārin-s, GDIPI gāran-c’ (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 321-322) ‘lamb’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL.** The principal Classical Armenian words for ‘lamb’ and ‘kid’, viz. *gārin* and *ul*, both of IE origin and practically ubiquitous in Armenian dialects, in the dialect of Hamšen have been replaced by *arák* and *ulay*, borrowed from Turk. *qızı* and *oğlak* respectively (Açaryan 1947: 188). Some eastern dialects have an unexplained o-vocalism: Agulis-C’na *körn*, Melri *görn*, etc. [HAB 1: 519b; Alayan 1954: 265b]. The EArm. and Zeyt’un *gōrn* is recorded as goñe by Varden Arwelec’i, 13th cent., Ganjak (Jahukyan 1954: 247); see also s.v. gayl ‘wolf’.

Meillet 1936: 43 derives the Armenian form from *wʷren-* and considers the trilled -r- analogical after the nominative gārn 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. arīnem ‘to make’, dur-k’ vs. dur’n ‘door’ (see s.vv.); for a further discussion, see s.vv. aṁ ‘wild ram’ and jer- ‘hand’ (both with original trilled *-rr- reflecting PIE *-rs-* and *-sr-, respectively). The derivation of gen. gārin and instr. gāram-b from *yər-un-os and *yər-ud-b₁i, respectively (see Stempel 1993 < 1987: 149) are not thus satisfactory. It seems better to posit PArm. *yrr(e)n < *yrl(e)n- (*-H(n)-) > Arm. -
garš


gari, ea-stem: GDSg garw-o-y (or garoy, see below), ISg gare-a-w, GDPl gare-a-c’ (abundant in the Bible); o-stem: ISg garw-o-v (once in the Bible), GDPl garw-o-c’ (as a measure, in Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent.) ‘barley’.

Attested in the Bible (see Astuacaturean 1895: 322c; Olsen 1999: 439), Eusebius of Caesarea (garwoy), etc.


● DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 522b].

Next to the regular Łaraba k’āri, one finds k’ārvi/i, with an irregular labial vowel, in the village of T’aɫot [HAB 1: 522b], as well as, according to Davt’yan (1966: 24, 28, 332), in most of the villages of Hadrut’. Not mentioned in Polosyan 1965: 16, in the list of Hadrut’ words displaying an irregular development ā > ā. The same inexplicable labial vowel is found in Jula g’ori [Ačarean 1940: 52, 357b].


The Armenian and Greek forms presuppose something like *gʰrίV-/*gʰrίdh- whereas the rest of cognates are usually derived from *gʰerfd- (see the above references, also Jāhukyan 1982: 133; 1987: 128, 310; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 656). Arm. gari is explained from the Lindeman variant *gʰriom [Olsen 1999: 439], through depalatalization *gʰr– > *gʰr– [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov, ibid.]. In view of formal difficulties, one may assume a Mediterranean substratum word.36

garš, i-stem: GDPl 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. hars- ‘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

shudder at’. In 1896: 151, he mentions Lith. *garssus with a question mark. Pedersen (1906: 413 = 1982: 191) explains Arm. -pearance from *-rs- from Skt. hrsyati (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. ‘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 Jahukyan 1987: 171.

The formal argument against the connection of *garšim with the Sanskrit and Latin forms is not crucial. In Indo-Iranian one finds *fjars- and *gjars-, probably due to conflation of two roots; cf. Skt. hars- vs. ghṛṣ-; Av. zaraśtianna- ‘excited’. Pashto zīz ‘rough, stiff’ and Khot. ysirā- ‘rough’ vs. Parth. gē- ‘to be happy’ and Sogd. wš ‘to be glad’ [Mayrhofer EWAia 2: 807-808]. It has been assumed that the variant *gjars with an initial velar stop arose after depalatalisation of the palatovelar in the zero-grade *g(rs)- (Weisse’s Law), and Arm. *garšim is an Iranian loanword (see Cheung 2007: 471).

The Sanskrit verb (hārṣate, hṛṣyati) displays the following semantic range: ‘to be delighted, excited or impatient; to thrill with rapture, rejoice, exult, be glad or pleased; to become erect or stiff or rigid, bristle (said of the hairs of the body, etc.); to excite violently’, 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 *fjars- and *gjars-, 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 Mīrān. *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 Jahukyan (1995: 183) who identify *par with Parth. pāδ ‘foot’. For the meaning ‘footstep’ Jahukyan (ibid.) compares Av. pāδa- ‘footstep’. He leaves the origin of *garš open.

For the component *garš-, Perixanjan (1993: 43-44) suggests a comparison with Mīrān. hypothetical *garš- ‘rough, stiff’, on which see s.v. garš ‘abominable’. The basic meaning of the compound would be, then, ‘the rough/hard part of the foot’.
**gelum**

201

garun, GDSg *garn-an* (more often: *garnayn-o-y*) ‘spring, springtime’ (Bible+);

* *garn-ayin*, GDSg *garnayn-o-y* ‘vernal’ (Bible+), *garn-an*, GDSg *garnanw-o-y* (Agat’angels), *garn-an-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].


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 *-ān or *-ōn(t) as in Gr. γειμόν, -ῶνος m. ‘winter’. We can also posit an old by-form *garun-n (cf. Viredağ 2000: 302) < acc. *wesar-on-ŋ, which would explain the oblique and compositional garn-an(-).

* *gez* ‘road, way’.


gelum ‘to twist; to squeeze’ (Bible+). In Agat’angels § 69 (1909=1980: 39f-5): *gel-oč* ‘and gel-arakan, GDPi *gelarana-ač*’, ‘rack’; see HAB 1: 530; 2: 404.

In T’ovmay Arcruni /Ananun/ 4.7 (V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 450-2-55); *zi ayr arcats’)or ov gelul zparanoc’n lawagoyn hamari, k’an et’e 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, 528t) translation: “to twist the neck”.

**DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Muş *gel el* ‘to press/squeeze something putting it between two hard things’, and gelaran is found in gelörnak (see DialAdd
apud NHB 2: 1061b) = gelaran-ak (Norayr, Fr. ‘bille’), and Moks k‘älärün [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’, ἐίλω ‘to press; to contract his body, draw himself together’ (said of a man or an animal, e.g. an asp in Ilias 20.278), ἐίλῡμα ‘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; Hübbschmann 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’, εἰλεός m. ‘intestinal obstruction; lurking place, den, hole’, ἕλιξ, -κος f. ‘anything which assumes a spiral shape; whirl, convolution; tendril of the vine, of ivy (a climbing evergreen shrub, Hedera Helix); coil of a serpent; convolution of a spiral shell’, ἑλίκη ‘winding; convolution of a spiral shell; of the bowels’, in Arcadia: ‘crack willow, Salix fragilis’.

Arutjunjan (1983: 278, 342) takes Arm. plant-name gelj ‘bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree’ (q.v.) and Gr. ἕλιξ, ἑλίκη 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. gelj. Arutjunjan (1983: 342) asserts that gayl, gayl-uk ‘bindweed’ corroborates the development *li > Arm. l in gelj. However, a trace of *i in gayl would not necessarily imply its presence also in gelj, 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-ĝ- may be corroborated by the Germanic word for ‘willow’; see s.v. gelj ‘bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree’.

For gelumn = Lat. volūmen = Gr. εἰλόμα, see Olsen 1999: 595-596.

gel, o-stem ‘beauty’ (Bible+); ‘(beautiful) appearance, look’ in Yovhannēs Draxana-kertc‘i (9-10th cent.) and Grigor Narekac‘i, as well as in compounds. E.g., in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.8 (1913–1991: 114-12), Turk’ is described as xožoṙ-a-gel, translated by Thomson (1978: 141) as ‘deformed’. Then, the historian states that Turk’ was called Angelev because of his great ugliness (vasn aravel žahadimut‘eann), and the name of his family (Angel tun “the house of Angel”) derives from it. Movsēs assumes, thus, an apppellative an-gel ‘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]:
zwavelče’ ut’iwn gełoy.

Movsēs Xorenac’i has yet another compound (also a hapax): bare-geł ‘good-looking’ (1.12: 41L5).

In Sebēos/Ananun 1 (Abgaryan 1979: 51 L4f):
yoyž t’r p’eal ēr i véray anjin ew gełoy nora gełec’kut’eann: (literal transl.) “[The queen Šamiram] very much lusted for his [of Aray Gełec’ik] person/body and for the look of his handsomeness”.

●ETYM Aćāryan (HAB 1: 532-533) derives from PIE *uel- ‘to see’, cf. Lat. voltus, vultus, -ūs m. ‘countenance, facial expression; face; looks, features’, Bret. guelet ‘la vue’, etc. See also Olsen 1999: 51.

As we have seen, Thomson (1978: 141 17) considers Movsēs’ etymology of Angeleay as “fanciful”. However, mythical creatures and giants are often characterized as ‘unshaped, deformed’ or the like, containing the privative prefix an-, e.g. s.v. ard. The basic meaning of *gel is ‘appearance, shape; seeing’ (cf. PIE ‘to see’), and the interpretation of Angeleay 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-gel may also be understood as ‘the Un-seen’; cf. Gr. ‘Aīōn, etc.

*gel- ‘to sing’; gel-awn ‘song’ (John Chrysostom); gelgetem ‘to sing beautifully, quiver, vibrate’ in Hexaemeron (said of ĺpún, next to the participle gelget-eal, see K. Muradyan 1984: 279, lines 12, 14-15), Severian of Gabala, Vardan Arewelc’i, etc.; participle gelget-eal in Hexaemeron 4, referring to singing and musicians: jaynk’ erg’ac’n pēsēs nuagawk’ gelgetealk’ (K. Muradyan 1984: 101 L5), for other passages, see above, as well as in 132 L3. For the passage from P’awstos, see below; nouns gelgel, o-stem: ISg gelgel-o-v in Canon Law; gelgel-an-k’, a-stem: GDPl gelgel-an-a-c’ in John Chrysostom.

A passage from P’awstos Buzand 4.15 (1883=1984: 103 L18f; transl. Garsoian 1989: 144), not cited in NHB and HAB: jaynikv’ n rmtnjoc’ i veray spaneloy in měj kocoyn barbaračin gelgel-eal xandalatut’eamb: “They sang with moaning voices in the midst of their laments, quavering with compassion over the victim”.

●ETYM Aćāryan (HAB 1: 534) derives from PIE *gēl- comparing with Oic. gala ‘to call’, OHG golan ‘to sing’, naht-gala ‘nightingale’, etc. Accepted in J ĕhukyan 1982: 172; 1987: 127. On the other hand, the Armenian word has been considered a Hittite loan, cf. galgal-in-āi ‘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.

gelj ‘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: gelj ‘convolvulus’ (81, Nrs. 385-386), gelj-i ‘yew-tree, Taxus baccata L.’ (30N15), gelj barjrajig ‘Smilax excelsa L.’ (34N05).

●ETYM From PArm. *gel- ‘to twist; to squeeze’ (q.v.) < PIE *uel- ‘to twist, wind, turn’, cf. Lat. con-volulus ‘bindweed, convolvulus’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 433];
also Arm. *galjn ‘id.;’ see s.v., and HAB 1: 505-506, 534b. On the semantics, see V. Arak’elyan 1984a: 146-147. For the discussion, in particular on *j-, see s.v. *gelum ‘to twist’. QIE *uel-g̣- may be corroborated by the Germanic word for ‘willow’: MDutch wilghe (13th cent.), Dutch wilg, OLG wilgja, OEngl. welg, NEngl. willow, etc., derived from the same root *uel- ‘to twist, wind, turn’ (see Vries/Tollenaere 1993: 430a).

gelj-k’ ‘glands’. Attested only in Gregory of Nyssa (twice).

*ETYM Connected with Slav. *žeža ‘gland’ and Lith. gégežuonys ‘submaxillary gland’ (Bugge 1892: 448-449; 1893: 5-6; Hübschmann 1897: 433; 1899: 45; HAB 1: 535ab; Pisani 1950: 175; Saradževa 1986: 132-133; Jáhukyan 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 gelj ‘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 gelj-k’ ‘glands’: Arutjunyan (1983: 342-39).

geɫmn, an-stem: GDSg geɫman, GDPl geɫm-c’ ‘wool, fleece’ (Bible+).


The Celtic forms may have preserved the archaic syllabification *HulHn- > Celt. *ulan-: OIr. olann m., MWelsh gwlan m., Bret. gloan m. (*ulan- > *uлан- > *ulan-) ‘wool’, etc. (Schrijver 1995: 177).


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 *h₂uel₁-men-, obl. *h₂uel₁-mn-os- >> PLat. *vel(m)n-os-, cf. Gr. πυθμήν ‘bottom’ vs. Skt. budhnā- and Lat. fundus (see s.v. andund-k’ ‘abyss’). Schrijver 1991: 181 assumes *yel₄d-mn. For *-men- in a synonymous word cf. MPers., NPers. pašm ‘wool’, Oss. fæsm ‘wool’ vs. Skt. pāksman- n. ‘eyelash’, YAv. pašna- n. ‘eyelash’, etc. (for the etymology, see s.v. asr ‘fleece’). Note also *Hdp(t)-mn > PArm. *atan(t)mn > atamn ‘tooth’ (q.v.).

*ge-n/c’- ‘to put on clothes’, *gest ‘dress, garment, clothes’ (dialect).

See s.v. z-genum ‘to put on clothes’, z-gest ‘dress, garment, clothes’.
getaṙ(u)

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).


The PIE root is mainly represented in heteroclitic *u̯ed-r, GSg *u̯ed-n-s: Hitt. u̯atăr/u̯eten- n. [Starke 1990: 565-568], Gr. ὕδωρ-, etc. In this respect, Arm. getoray seems important to me since, if from *u̯ed-or-eh2-, it can shed some light upon the origin of the Arm. coll. -oray(-k’).

getaṙ(u), GDSg getaṙ-i, getaṙu-i ‘river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river’.

Not in NHB. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 537) only cites Step’anos Orbelian 42 (1250/60-1303/5): i Halēc’ getar’in. Amatuni (1912: 129a) translates getaṙ as ‘the former river-bed which is ploughed’, which coincides with his record for the dialects of Muš and Ōšakan. This is accepted by Ačaryan (HAB 1: 537). Elsewhere, Ačaryan records other semantic nuances in Ararat (and Jūla); see below. “Arfēm bārara” interprets as get-eṙ ‘river-shore’. This agrees with the testimony from the dialects of Ararat and Mełri (see below). A. A. Abrahamyan (1986: 211) translates as jor-a-hovit ‘ravine-valley’.

In Baṙgirk’ hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 183N22), getaṙ glosses an otherwise unattested word havawr (vars. hawar, havawr, havareli; see 396222). Here, Ačaryan (HAB 3: 69a) points out that in the dialects of Ararat and Jūla getaṙ 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 1990b: 156) is found in Lazar P’arpec’i (5th cent.) 3.82 (1904=1985: 15015; transl. Thomson 1991: 209): karcēr i telsn urek’ anyayts getaṙuin (var. getaṙ) t’akč’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 ᾠτάπα) which obviously contain this word; see s.v. Getaṙ(u).

● DIAL Ararat getaṙ ‘river-shore’ [Ačaṙean 1913: 224a]; Mełri getaṙna ‘river-shore’ (see Alayan 1954: 293, in a glossary of purely dialectal words); Muš, Ōšakan getaṙ ‘the former river-bed which is ploughed’; Ararat and Jūla getaṙ ‘a mother river, of which a brook/rivulet branches out’ (see above).

Both literary (since Lazar 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 (aṙnul getoy zac’i’s).
There can be no doubt that getaṙ derives from get ‘river’ (q.v.). Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 537) does not specify the component -aṙ. 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 -aṙ can be derived from PIE *sr(o)u- ‘to stream, flow’, cf. Skt. srav- ‘stream’, Russ. strujà ‘stream’, Latv. strauja ‘stream’, etc. In this case, it is identical with Arm. aṙu ‘brook, tributary; channel; ditch, trench, furrow, passage’ (q.v.). The fact that in the oldest attestation we find getaṙu, 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 Днѣстръ (cf. Δάναστρις, etc.) has been interpreted as of Iranian origin, containing the word for ‘river’, cf. Av. dāu- 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-aṙ-i which is represented in Baṙgirk’ hayoc’ as synonymous to getaṙ (see above) seems to follow the same pattern, with the same *aṙ. I suggest to derive the first component *haw from PIE *h2ep- ‘river, water’: Luw. ḫāpa/i- ‘river’, Skt. āp- ‘water’ (cf. dvīpā- ‘island, island in a river, sandbank’ (RV+) < *dui-h2p-ō-, lit. ‘having water on two sides’), Toch. AB āp f. ‘water, river, stream’, etc.

Note also kawain ‘brook, canal’ (Cyril of Alexandria; several dialects [HAB 2: 561b]), if composed of kaw (= the word for ‘clay’?) and *aṙ-.

getin, o-stem: GDSg getn-o-y, AbISg i getn-o-y, AllISg i getin, LocISg i getn-i (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 328c), a-stem: ISg getn-a-w (Hexaemeron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 276[43]), IPl getn-a-w-k’ (Agat’angelos); API getin-s (Grigor Narekaci) ‘earth, ground’ (Bible+).

DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 538b].

ETYM Scheftelowitz 1904-05, 2: 44 suggests a connection with Gr. οἶδας ‘ground’. Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 538) rejects this and other etymological suggestions and leaves the origin of the word open.


Since the Hittite word is neuter, we may tentatively reconstruct a PD neuter n-stem (for this declension see Beekes 1995: 186); nom. *gēd-ₙ, obl. *gēd-ₙ. This paradigm would develop into PArm. *gēd-an, obl. *gēd-aₙ, *gēd-en, whence *gēd-en-o- > Arm. *gēt(o) : *gēt(n)ō(yo) > ClArm. getin : getnoy. For a discussion on -in see s.vv. lusin ‘moon’, kalin ‘acorn’; further cf. Olsen 1999: 464-465. If Gr. ὄδαξ ‘ground’ is related, we might reconstruct *h₂u(ₙ)id-, but this is uncertain (see Kloekhorst ibid.).

The Armenian (see Patrubány StugHetz 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 (Hexaemeron) and pl. getn-a-w-k’ (Agat’ange). 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 Naxijewen, for example, we often find kedin contrasted with ergink’ ‘sky’ (P’ork’šeyan 1971: 92aNrs7-8, 106bL13), also in a compound form ergink’-kedin ‘sky-earth’, with the verb in singular (op.cit. 32aNr3).

ger ‘above, higher, over, more than’ (Book of Chries, Porphyry, Yovhanness Ūjnecci, Xosrovik T’argmanić, Anania Narekac’i, etc.; the oldest attestation is ger i veroy in Eznik Kolbaci’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; Jahukyan 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; Jahukyan 1987: 156, 199. The relation with PIE *(h)u̯- 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, Ačařyan (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 geraniwêl kuraceal es ‘you have become
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blind by that geran" (Yovhannēs Erznkac’i); hbrew zgeran hreēn “like a fiery geran” (Var旦 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].


The etymology of Lidén is commonly accepted; see HAB 1: 540a; Pokorny 1959: 1169; Jähukyan 1987: 156; Olsen 1999: 297. In order to explain Arm. -a-, unclear forms are reconstructed: *uēr-nna̯-, *uēr̄n-.

The etymology of Lidén is commonly accepted; see HAB 1: 540a; Pokorny 1959: 1169; Jähukyan 1987: 156; Olsen 1999: 297. In order to explain Arm. -a-, unclear forms are reconstructed: *uēr-nna̯-, *uēr̄n-. Probably reshaped under the influence of the suffix -an (on which see Jähukyan 1998: 11-12; Olsen 1999: 287-301).

● 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’. Ačaryan (HAB 1: 540b) does not accept these and other etymologies and leaves the origin of gerandi open. Jähukyan (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, χέραδος n. ‘Geröll, Kies, Geschiebe’ (in Liddell/Scott/Jones ‘silt, gravel, and rubbish, brought down by torrents’) and reconstructs *g’erēt-tiom 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 *dābra-), Parācī dēs ‘sickle’ (< Iran *dābrī-), 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: *dābrī- ‘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’ (Iǰewan and Šamšadin mārāndu), which is considered to have been introduced by Persian Armenians (see Bdneyan 1972: 348b21, 352, 356-357, 367a).


In Luke 12.42, the word renders Gr. ἰθανασία (in coll. sense) ‘body of attendants, retinue’; i veray gerdastani iwroy : ēnī thē ἰθανασιαζ (Nestle/Aland 203).

●DIAL Alaškert, Axalc’xa g’erd’astan, etc.; according to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 542a), from the literary language.
●ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 1: 541) derives from PIE *g’erd-* : Skt. gṛhā- m. ‘house, residence’ (RV+), YAv. gṛṣṭhā- 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: 309-310, cf. 58; Jahukyan 1987: 171, 272, 520; Olsen 1999: 333, 333n20]. For the semantic development ‘house, household, estate’ > ‘servant’, cf. especially OPers. *garda- ‘Diener, Hausgesinde, oïkētēs’, Pahl. gāl [g’l] coll. ‘the gang, the villeins labouring on the estates of the kings, the satraps, the magnates, etc.’; see s.v. afaxin ‘female servant’.

geri, ea-stem: GDSg gerw-o-y, GDPl gere-a-c’ (Bible+) ‘captive’, *gerem* ‘to capture, take prisoner’ (both are richly attested in the Bible, see Astucaturean 1895: 330); late diminutive *gerēk* ‘miserable, poor’ (Yaśmawurk’, see HAB 1: 543b).

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 gerec’ in znosa: καὶ ἐλϑόντες οἱ ᾐχμαλώτευσαν οἰκτίς: “And captors came and carried them off” (Cox 2006: 52).

● DIAL Van, Moks, Salmast, etc. [HAB 1: 544b]. According to Ačaṙyan (1913: 226a; HAB ibid.), Manisa, Čenkiler, Čarsančag, 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. εὑρίσκω ‘to find’, OIr. -fúar ‘I found’ < IE *u̯-e-u̯r-īōnis < IE *u̯-er-ē-ˌōnis ‘inventum est’ < IE *u̯-er-ē-ˌs < IE *u̯-er-ē-ˌ-, etc., assuming that the original meaning of the Armenian word is ‘nehmen, ergreifen’. Though largely accepted (Pokorny 1959: 1160; Frisk, s.v.; J̣ahukyan 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 Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 544), who connects Arm. geri to Gr. ἀείρω ‘to bind together’, συν- ὑστερ, -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: 154-60. For the semantic relationship compare MPers. band-ak ‘servant, slave’ from band-, bastan ‘to bind, fetter, fasten’, cf. Skt. bandha- m. ‘bond, fetter’ (RV+), etc. (see ÈtimSlovIranJaz 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 Jahukyan 1987: 602.

Further, see s.v.v. ger ‘above, higher, over, more than’.

gēj, o-stem: GDSg giǰ-o-y, GDPi giǰ-o-c’ (Philo, Aristotle, Gregory of Nyssa), LocSg i giǰ-i (Bible+) adj. ‘moist; lascivious’, subst. ‘moisture’ (LocSg i giǰ-i). In the verb giǰ-anam and in the compound giǰ-akn(-eay), refers to eye-pus.

In Movsês Xorenac’i 2.6 (1913=1991: 108\textsuperscript{13}; transl. Thomson 1978: 135): i giǰin ew i maraxlut telis mayreac’ ew i lōrawēs “to the wet and foggy regions of forests and moss”.

● DIAL Muš, Bulanav, T’iflis, Ėarabal, Moks, Hačan: ‘moist’. Lazax gej means ‘very dirty’, and Xian gejril ‘to mould’ [Ačaṙean 1913: 227b; HAB 1: 551a].

● ETYM From QIE *gʷ-e̞/oidh-īo-, cf. Russ. žídëk, SCr. źidak, etc. ‘liquid, watery’ [Liden 1906: 74-75; HAB 1: 551a; Jahukyan 1982: 62; 1987: 128]. The connection with Gr. δεῖσα f. ‘slime, filth’ is phonologically problematic and is therefore disputed (cf. Frisk s.v.; Jahukyan 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. Note also Russ. žīža < *žižā, 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. žīži 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 geɫ-k' ‘glands’, ak'is ‘weasel’, keč'i ‘birch’ (see 2.1.14), which seems plausible.

Armenian *žiž- in Žak (‘ovmay Arcruni 1.3 – 9-10th cent.), žīžmak, ž(i)žmunk’, *žuank’ ‘insects, worms; hallucination, mirage; nightmare’ and žiži ‘dragon-fly’ is considered to have onomatopoeic origin by Ačaṙyan (HAB 2: 229-230). I tentatively propose an alternative etymology. If ĝēt- indeed reflects an o-grade, one may assume that *žiž- is related and goes back to *g(e)idh-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 (*čipṙ, čpuṙ ‘eye-pus’; čpuṙn ‘dragon-fly’, etc.).

*ĝēt- ‘to know’: giem, 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-)ĝēt as the second member of a number of compounds (Bible+); ĝēt, 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 Larabal recorded by M. Mxit'aryan in 1961 (ItZHek' 6, 1973: 103) one finds a numeration of various specialists, sorcerers and hakeems/medics, which tried to cure the mute princess: häk'yim, gyidac'o, derviš, p'alč'i mart'ik'y. Of these, gyidac'ol reflects *git-ac'-ol and can be compared with CArm. ĝōt ‘wizard, magician, sorcerer’.


On the relation between the two PIE roots *ūid- ‘to know’ and ‘to find’ as well as on the phrase ‘to find favour’, see de Lamberterie 1978-79 (on the phrase, see also Clarkson 1994: 180-181); Saradževa 1986: 163-164.

gi, o-stem: GDGs gi-o-y 'juniper' (Bible+); with h-glide gi-h-i ‘id.’ (lex.).

● DIAL. Zeyt'un g'e 'juniper’, Binkean g'i 'cypress’ [Ačaṙyan 2003: 107-108; HAB 1: 554b]; Xotor ǰur g'hi 'juniper' [HAB 1: 556b; Ačaṙyan 2003: 108; YuşamXotor 1964: 437b]; *gi-h-enti > Larabal kēne, Lori keni, etc. [HAB 1: 554b]. For the latter form cf. gin glossed as geni ca'r in the glossary Barqirk' hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 66̊). Amalyan (op. cit. 357) 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 Malxaseane’ HBB 1: 435b, gi, gihi refers to ‘yew, taxus’. For a further discussion, see Alişan 1895: 122-123.


The Armenian word is often mentioned under the derivative *yei-s- (Pokorny 1959: 1133; Mallory/Adams 1997: 644a). In fact it belongs with *yei(H)-t- (thus also P. Friedrich 1970: 55; Campbell 1990: 266a).

Klimov (1989: 23-24; 1994: 76-78; 1998: 226-227) relates this IE tree-name with also P. Friedrich 1970: 55; Campbell 1990: 174). Klimov 1994: 77 rejects the direct comparison on phonological grounds. However, Kartv. *yei- can be regarded as the reflex of PArm. *g’i-t- < IE *gii(H)-t-. Exactly the same is seen in another early armenism in Kartvelian: *wino- ‘wine’ < Arm. *g’imio-: gini, gen. ginwoy ‘wine’, cf. Gr. ποίον, Lat. vīnum, Hitt.  GLES, etc. Besides, Klimov’s idea on Kartv. *yei- vs. PIE *Hye- is unconvincing because neither of these PIE lexemes has in fact an initial laryngeal.

gil, a-stem or a-stem: IPl gl-a-v-k’, var. gl-a-w-k’, in Yovhan Mamikonean (A. Abrahamyan 1941: 199b; A. Abrahamyan 1944: 214); k’arambk’ ew gloit’/glokw’ yaxnay kotoroc’in); API gil-s in 1 Maccabees 2.36 ‘stone for throwing’; gil ‘rolling’ (Grigor Narekac’i, etc.), see NHB 1: 554b; 4: 627 for Georgian yvi-a, etc. The semantics corroborates this assumption. Klimov 1994: 77 rejects the direct comparison on phonological grounds. However, Kartv. *γwi- can be regarded as the reflex of PArmen. *g’i-t- < IE *gii(H)-t-. Exactly the same is seen in another early armenism in Kartvelian: *wino- ‘wine’ < Arm. *g’imio-: gini, gen. ginwoy ‘wine’, cf. Gr. ποίον, Lat. vīnum, Hitt. giyan-, etc. Besides, Klimov’s idea on Kartv. *γwi- vs. PIE *Hye- is unconvincing because neither of these PIE lexemes has in fact an initial laryngeal.

gil, a-stem: IPl gl-a-v-k’, var. gl-a-w-k’, in Yovhan Mamikonean (A. Abrahamyan 1941: 199b; A. Abrahamyan 1944: 214; a Rammbk’ ew gloit’/glokw’ yaxnay kotoroc’in); API gil-s in 1 Maccabees 2.36 ‘stone for throwing’; gil ‘rolling’ (Grigor Narekac’i, etc.), see NHB 1: 554b; 4: 627 for Georgian yvi-a, etc. The semantics corroborates this assumption. Klimov 1994: 77 rejects the direct comparison on phonological grounds. However, Kartv. *γwi- can be regarded as the reflex of PArmen. *g’i-t- < IE *gii(H)-t-. Exactly the same is seen in another early armenism in Kartvelian: *wino- ‘wine’ < Arm. *g’imio-: gini, gen. ginwoy ‘wine’, cf. Gr. ποίον, Lat. vīnum, Hitt. giyan-, etc. Besides, Klimov’s idea on Kartv. *γwi- vs. PIE *Hye- is unconvincing because neither of these PIE lexemes has in fact an initial laryngeal.

In Bagir’k hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 66-67): gil’ virg. Amalyan (op. cit. 357) 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’ün, Salmast), one finds an epenthetic -d-, *gl-d-or- from *gl-t-or- [HAB 1: 555a, 556a]. Note also Larabal *gl-an ‘a wooden
gind

For the latter, cf. gāy-i 'to roll, fall down; to err' (Bible+).

Açaryan (HAB 1: 556a), with reservations, also mentions Van *gil 'a kind of soft stone'. (Açaryan 1952: 253 vacat). Note also Kızên gīl 'a stone to wash with' [Balramyan 1961: 177b], Areš gīl 'id.' [Lusenc' 1982: 202a], both represented as from CIArm. gīl. Açaryan (HAB 1: 556a) alternatively compares Pers. gīl 'clay'. This is more probable, since V. Ananyan (1978: 105; 1984: 447-448, 456, 463), native of Dilijan region, repeatedly and thoroughly describes gīl 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 gīl (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 ongâyık' (q.v.), which is improbable. A. Petrosjan (1987: 57) mentions gelahmay-k’ as belonging to the root *ṭel-, to which he ascribes an exaggerated value.

gin, o-stem: GDSg gn-o-y, GDPI gn-o-c’, IP1 gn-o-v-k’ (Bible+); later also i-stem: IP1 gn-i-w-k’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i, 12th cent.) ‘price, purchase price; buy; hiring price’ (Bible+).

DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 557a].


The Armenian form is usually derived from *yeşno-, but this seems unnecessary; gin can be regarded as the regular outcome of *yesno- (see Ringe 1984: 51; Morani 1991: 178-179; Beeckes 2003: 170; cf. Ravnæs 1991: 7; Clackson 1994: 111).

gind, a-stem: GDPI gnd-a-c’ (Bible+); later: o-stem: IP1 gnd-o-v-k’ in John Chrysostom (see Hac’uni 1923: 132-133), i-stem: GDPI gnd-i-c’ (Čarıntir) ‘earring’ (Bible+); gnd-ak ‘vine’ in Genesis 49.11 (z-gndakk, Zeyt'unyan 1985: 385), Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 145L11, 147L3), Philo, etc.


DIAL The form gind is present in Muş, Alašker, Ararat, Van-group, Salmast, etc. [HAB 1: 558a]. A textual illustration in a folk-song from Muş (R. Grigoryan 1970: 169N284): gnder akanjīn ‘(wearing) rings on his ear(s)’.


gini, wo-stem: GDSg ginw-o-y, AblSg i ginw-o-y, ISg ginw-o-v, LocSg i ginw-o-y; ea-stem: ISg gine-a-w, GDPl gine-a-c, IPl 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].


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- > Kartv. *yw- 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 *uː- > PArm. *y̞- > Kartv. *y̞w- is practically impeccable. Note also PIE *ui(H)- > Arm. *y̞i- ‘juniper’ > Kartv. *y̞wi- ‘juniper’ (see s.v. gi ‘juniper’).


gišer, o-stem: GDSg gišer-o-v 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 (Eɫiš, 5th cent.; Aristakēs Lastivertc’i, 11th cent.), GDPl gišer-a-c’ (Isaiah 26.9, Gr. ἐκ νυκτὸς) ‘night’ (Bible+); Gišer-a-yan adv. ‘at night’ (Bible+); Gišer-a-var (later also Gišer-a-vaṙ, folk-etymologically associated with vaṙ- ‘to light up, kindle’) ‘planet Venus, Evening Star’ (Job, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc.; renders Gr. Ἑσπερος ‘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, 179, 191. For the parallelism between o- and a-stems, see below.

DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 1: 560b]. Interesting are Meɫrišken-raku ‘morning-evening’, k’šan-k’šɛrav ‘early morning’, k’šan, k’šanac’ ‘in the morning’ [Aɫyan 1954: 335-336], practically the same in Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 234a], Kak’avaberd k’šánac’ ‘in the morning’ [H. Muradyan 1967: 208b].

ETYM Connected with Gr. Ἑσπερος m. ‘evening; evening-star, Venus; of evening; Western’, Ἑσπέρα, Ion. ἤη f. ‘evening; the Western Empire’, Lat. vespere, -eris, -eri ‘evening; evening-star; west’, vespere-e, vespere-ī ‘in the evening’, vespera f. ‘evening’, Lith. vâkaras m. ‘evening’, OCS večern, 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) ušcer (see Loewenthal 1928, with refer.). According to Winter (1969: 207), precisely the same source form can be reconstructed for Arm. gišer. Pisani (1950: 170-171) assumes *sk > ʃ before front vowels. Schrijver (1995: 159-160; see also Beekes 1996: 232b) 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 *gei- > *geiš (see Beekes 2003: 203). The vocalic development e > i has been explained by the following palatal ʃ, see 2.1.2. However, the ʃ remains unexplained. Earlier, Beekes (2000: 24, 27) mentioned the irregular correspondence *-sp- : *-k- and derived Arm. gišer from *ue(a)k- (with a question mark); see also Pokorny 1959: 1173 with ref. For *ue(i)kuero-, see Katz 2000: 72, with references. Blažek 2004: 66 posits *yek ero- and compares with the case of iž ‘viper’ (q.v.). Ĥahukyan 1984a: 160 posits *geišk ero-, with *sk- > Arm. ʃ-, but this is unsupported.

One also assumes *ksp- > *kš(p)- comparing with veštasan ‘sixteen’ (Normier 1981: 23-24; Beekes 2003: 201; 2004). However, this would result in Arm. -sp-, as the very same veštasan shows; see 2.1.12. I therefore assume *ueksepero- through contamination with *ksep-rn- ‘night’ (cf. YAv. *xšapar-, xšafr-, Skt. kṣap- f., Hitt.

The assumption of a compound (see Hamp 1966: 13-15; Olsen 1999: 179-192, 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: 232-233.

The parallelism of o- and a-stems of giser is comparable with that of Gr. ἆσπερος : ἀσπέρα and Lat. vespere : vespera (Olsen 1999: 179).

*git- in gtanem (aor. gt-i, e-git) ‘to find’ (Bible+); givt, 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 givt is based on: GDSg giwt-i (Agat’ange ɫ os, Łazar P’arpec’i), GDPl giwt-i-c’ (Agat’ange ɫ os), IPl giwt-i-w-k’ (Agat’ange, Philo).

DIAL The verb gtanem is widespread in the dialects. In the Van-group, we find *gntn-.

According to Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 564b), here also belonged Akn git ‘the time of abundant food, when everything is found in abundance’. Gabriēlean (1912: 251) records git in the same dialect, as the root of gtanem, “more original than the form giwt”.

ETYM From PIE *u(e)id-: Skt. aor. āvidat (= e-git ‘he found’), pres. vindāti ‘to find’ (RV+), Pahl. wind- ‘to find; to desire’, etc. [Hübschmann 1897: 437; HAB 1: 564; Schmitt 1981: 49, 54].

According to Meillet (1936: 44), giwt (i-stem) derives from *uid-. For this and the “epenthetical” explanations I refer to Clackson 1994: 108, 221, 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 2.1.2.12 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- ‘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, i/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 (giwl, geomet, geawd, geōd, gut, gel) of the word; cf. A. A. Abrahanyan 1976: 57; Schmitt 1981: 95, 108; Jāhuksyan 1982: 96, 118, 119; L. Hovhannisyan 1991: 16-17, etc. In general, I accept the paradigm reconstructed by V. Arakelyan (1984: 25-26), based on solid textual evidence (cf. also Meillet 1913: 58; Olsen 1999: 172). NSwg ge(a)wl, GSg gelj, GDPl giwlict, although I disagree with his diachronic interpretation of -e- in gelj and -iw- in giwlict directly from the -eaw- of the nominative form, as well as with *gewejl > gelj, suggested by Ačaṙyan (HAB 4: 628a) and Jāhuksyan (1982: 119), and gewjl > gel, assumed by S. Avagyan and H. Muradyan (see below).
The -a- of *geawl* may be secondary, see s.v. *e(a)w't*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 *geawl*/geawl is merely a variant spelling of what was pronounced as /giwl/: A question arises, however, why all the dialectal forms derive from *gel*, whereas in the case of the word for 'seven', *eawl*n seems to be the only form present in dialects. The reason for this may be, as we shall see, that the -w- in *geawl* did not originally belong to the etymon.

I agree with V. Arak'elyan that *giwl* is analogical after GDPl *giwlic*. According to Astuacaturean (1895: 332), the latter is attested in the Bible four times rather than three times, as Arak'elyan says, although in the fourth attestation, namely Acts 4.34, one finds *gewlic* cited in NHB 1: 559a. It is important to note that, except for this ambiguous case, *gewlic* is not attested in the Bible, so *giwlic* seems to be the actual Classical form for GDPl. The pair *gewl* : *giwlic* leads to an opposition *-ew-/*-iw-(*), on which see Meillet 1913: 17-18; Weitenberg 1993a: 67. Compare e.g. *ariwc* vs. oblique *ariwc*-'lion'. See also s.v. *ewl*-'oil'. If GDPl *gelic* is reliable (see below), it could have been older than *giwlic*: *gelic* > *gewlic* (analogically after NSg *ge(a)w* > *giwlic*).

It has been customary to treat *gel* as a dialectal form. However, in NHB 1: 534c one finds a special entry *gel*, with six attestations (*gels*, *gelic*, *gelwik*, etc.), two of them already in the Classical period (Elišē and Eusebius of Caesarea). Besides, according to Astuacaturean (1895: 332a), *gel* is found twice in the Bible, namely in Nehemiah 6.2 (*i gel* and Mark 11.2 (*i gel-d). V. Arak'elyan (1984: 26) notes this, not specifying the locations, and states that this *gel* is dialectal. The latter attestation seems to have a variant reading *i geawl-d*, see NHB 1: 559a, where, moreover, Luke 13.22 is cited, too, with variants and glosses *gewls/*geawl.

More examples can be added. Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.57 (1913=1991: 187) has IPl *gelīwk*; next to GDPl *givlic* (2.56: 186) and nom/loc. *geōl* = *geawl* (*i geōnh T'ordan* "in the village of T'ordan", in 3.11: 269L.15). IPl *gel-i-w-k* is also attested in Elišē (1989: 138L.18). In the oldest manuscript (Nr 10151 of Matenadaran; 13th cent.) of the Alexander Romance, which is the initial edition, one finds NPl *gēawl-k* and IPl *gel-iv-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)wl* and *givlic* (H. Simonyan 1989: 126, 128). GDPl *gel-i-c* is also attested in Book of Chries 8.6.2 (G. Muradyan 1993: 198L.3).

Note also some derivatives:

*gelak'at* : *κωμόπολις* (Mark 1.38); *k'alak'aget-f* (GSg), composed of the same components as the previous compound, but with a reverse order: *ew annun k'alak'agetfin koč'ec'aw T'ɔmnis* "and the name of the κωμόπολις was called T'ɔmnis" (in 'Patmut'iwan srboć' Hrip'simeanc'; see MovsXorenMaten 1843: 300); *gelastaneawk* (Movsēs Kałankatucc'i); *getōrik* (Mxit'ar Goś, Law Code, 12th cent.; cf. dial. (Goris) *kúl-ar-ank* , etc.; see below). A number of derivatives with *gel-* is found in MidArm.; see MjiHayBar 1, 1987: 141-143; *gel-a-bnak* 'villager', lit. 'dwelling in a village' (Paterica 19).

I shall try to bring these data into a coherent set below.
DIALECTALLY TRAVELLED. REMARKABLY, MOST FORMS (INCLUDING ALSO, I THINK, TP'HIS GIL AND TIGRANAKERT K'IL) DERIVE FROM GEL, SHOWING NO TRACES OF THE -W-. SVERIA G'IL (OR KIL), TOO, REPRESENTS GEL, SINCE GIWL WOULD NOT DEVELOP INTO *GIL; CF. *CIVL > JED, SIVL > SEOT (NOTE ALSO EWL 'OIL' > IL, Q.V.) [ACARYAN 2003: 399; ANDREASEAN 1967: 26, 32, 357A]. THE FORM *GIL IS FOUND ONLY IN SOME EXTREME EASTERN DIALECTS: GORIS K'IL (S), K'ILARANK (S) (SEE MARGARYAN 1975: 320A), AREŠ GYUTARANK (S) [LUSENC' 1982: 202A], ŠAMAXI K'IL [BAHRAMIYAN 1964: 192]. ACCORDING TO S. A. AVAGYAN (1973: 201), GEL IS ALSO PRESENT IN IJEWAN-SAMSAĐIN, ALTHOUGH FOR THIS SUBDIALECT, MEŽÚNC (1989: 186) ONLY HAS K'IL. IN LARABÁL, HADRÁT, AND ŠALAX, GILW HAS BEEN REPLACED BY ŠEN, WHEREAS Ć'AYLU, MARIŁA AND MEHTIŠEN HAVE K'EL [DAV'TYAN 1966: 335]. GORIS K’ILARANK (S) SEEMS TO BE A COLLECTIVE FORM (CF. GEĐOREK 'ABOVE').


IN ZET'IUN, THE CLASSICAL ABISG I GEJŠIŠI EIXIŠIŠI HAS BEEN PRESERVED AS GEJŠIŠIŠI [ACARYAN 2003: 190].


40 IN JAHUKYAN 1990: 72 (SEM. FIELD 19): OF UNKNOWN ORIGIN.
Arm. *gewl has also been treated as an East-Caucasian borrowing, cf. Tabasaran *γιβλά 'village', Agul *γεβλά 'id.' [Saumjan 1935: 423; Jahukyan 1987: 609, 609-13]. If *gewl is of native origin, the direction of the borrowing might be reconsidered. The resemblance with Finn. *kyla 'village' is probably accidental; cf. Jahukyan 1987: 296. The connection with Oss. *γεβλά 'village, settlement', Skt. *ghóśa- '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 *gewl.

Meillet (1894: 157-158) explains Arm. *gewחלק from *gewlyos treating the i-stem as a relic of the old locative (see also Clackson 1994: 213-17). 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 r”, 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 *gewל and some other words still awaits an explanation. Feydit (1979: 60) assumes gen. *γεβλά, with a hiatus, with a subsequent addition of f- “for the sake of clearness”. Neither this analysis is convincing.

The isolated paradigm ge(a)gew, gegewl 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-ōs. Thus, Arm. gegewl easily derives directly from *gelyo-, rather than from *gewlyos, as Meillet had to assume. See also Clackson 1994: 64, 68, 127, 213-17; 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 *u̯él- ‘zusammendrängen’: Gr. εἰλέω ‘zusammendrängen, -drücken, -ziehen, einengen, einschließen’ (cf. s.v. gelum), ólint, Dor. óλιτα ‘assembly of people’, (φ)αλίς adv. ‘in crowds, in plenty’ (< *u̯el-i-s, vocalized according to Lindeman’s Law, or, as Hamp assumed, due to a laryngeal), ιλιν, Dor. ιλα ‘band, troop of men’, Russ. валом ‘in Menge’ (see Frisk 1, 1960: 71-72, 74, 117, 456-457, 722). Thus: NSg *γέλ-όι > *gelu(i) > gegewl, GDSg *u̯ēl-i-ōs (with analogical full grade) > gegewl. 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. ग्राम- m. ‘procession, military host, village community, inhabited place’, Gr. ἀγεῖρω ‘to gather’, Russ. громада ‘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 gewl 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: 660; Jahukyan 1987: 429; 1988: 143). In this case, the Urartian, which remarkably represents an intermediate stage in the semantic development of
gewl 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 *g- > Arm. g- 41 (cf. Velhuni : Gelo: 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 *wel-ōi > *gelu or *gelv > allophonic variants A. gel and B. gewl (through anticipation)
GSG *wel-j-ōh > gelj
GDPI *wel-i-skа > gelic'
IPI! *wel-i-bli - > geliwk'

All the forms without asterisks are attested. At some point, the -w- of the nominative form was perhaps a facultative feature of the final -l. 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, GDPl glx-o-c’ (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astucaturean 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; Aćaryan 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'olHu-ko> *g(u)luxo- treating the -x- as a suffixal element found also in alaxin ‘female servant’ (see, however, s.vv.). Saradževa (1986: 124-125) posits *g'olHu-ko- 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'olHu-(e)h2- and, for Armenian, something like *g'olHu-k-h2-o- (with inclusion of a suffixal element *-k- and thematization) or simply *g'olHu- + substratum suffix *-xo- (cf. e.g. the tree-names kalumax, metex, tawsax) > *goulaxo- (with anticipation of the labial vowel, see s.vv. acu ‘coal’, awr ‘day’, etc.) > *g(u)luxo- > glux, obl. glx-o-. Perhaps a European substratum word.

41 *u(o)ik-x-l(h3)- > gi/gwel : oblique *gewel- > gel- 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 Kolbac’i, Elišè, Movsès Xorenac’i, etc.), gof infinitive ‘to be, exist’ (Philo, Cyril of Alexandria, etc.); goy, i-stem ‘essence; God; property’ (Bible+).


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-oše ‘suberat’. However, *upV- would have yielded *vV-, as we can see in ver from *uperi ‘above’ (q.v.).

gog- (defective verb), imper. gog, gog-ōk’, gog-ēk’, subj. gog-c’- (Bible+), instr. case of infinitive gogel-o-v (Cyril of Alexandria) ‘to say’ (Bible+).


godi, ea-stem: GDSg god(w)oy in Paterica, GDPi gode-a-c’ in Canon Law, Kirakos Ganjakec’i (Melik’-Ohanjanyan 1961: 324-13) ‘leprous person’ (attested also in Athenasius, Vardan Arewelc’i, Yaysmawr’).

● DIAL. Muş g ḍd’i ‘leprous; bedridden, weak, flaccid; ugly’, Ararat g’sṭi ‘lazy’, Van ky(e)sti, kōti ‘disabled, invalid; useless, good-for-nothing’ [HAB 1: 570-571; Ačařyan 1952: 55, 254], Ṣatāx gyot ‘paralytic’ (with no consonant shift, Muradyan 1962: 45, 209b), Xotorj’ godi ‘ilky; stupid’ [YušamXotorj 1964: 438b], Aḵn *godi ‘lazy’ [Gabriiełean 1912: 252], Arabkir id. (Ačařeăn 1913: 247a), Atap’azar *got’enal ‘to boast’ [Ačařeăn 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 Mûš-Bulanax (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 xelâr-got’i (op. cit. 141, lines -6 and -15) and xirpuk-got’ec’uk (34-115), which contain xelâr ‘mad, crazy’ and xirpuk ‘mad, senile’ respectively.

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (ca. 1720 AD) by Elia Muslimyan Karnec’i (Karın/Kotorjur), Turk. jutam is glossed by gôt’i, çutam, 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. jutam ‘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 cař-a-got’i ‘tree-worshipping’ (Movsês Kahankatuač’i 2.40, see V. Arak’élyan 1983: 240\textsuperscript{115}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 155, 155\textsuperscript{5}). 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 Larabal (godi. Łaziyan 1983: 156\textsuperscript{a}v1; see also T’. Hayrapetyan 2004: 220-221) and Kapan (gödi, K’a’beruni 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 cař-a-got’i (vars. cařagot’i, cařoy got’i, cařagodi, cařakodi, etc.) ‘tree-worshipping’, attested twice in Movsês Kahankatuač’i 2.40 and 2.41: K’anzi satanayakur cařagot’i molorut’ eambn aľcâteal azgn ayn, …: “For that tribe, demented in their satanically deluded tree-worshipping errors …” (V. Arak’élyan 1983: 240\textsuperscript{156}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 155, 155\textsuperscript{3}); Ew bařnam zkarcic srtc’ jeroc’ ew zcařagot’i molorut’ ivnd, or oč’ inę’ isk en “I shall dispel the doubts of your hearts and your tree-worshipping error concerning things which are nothing in themselves” (V. Arak’élyan 1983: 254\textsuperscript{178}; transl. Dowsett 1961: 163, 163\textsuperscript{2}). NHB vacat; found by Ačâryan [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.\textsuperscript{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 Movsês Kahankatuač’i) > ‘ pagan goddesss, witch, sorceress, mythical being, fairy’

\textsuperscript{42} A problem is that Łarabal, 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.

Pokorny probably meant *gol-i- *worship, pagan cult’ may be derived from PIE *gʷok-e/od-. Gr. ὄχοντος ‘to ask, pray’, denominative ὀχοῖος ‘to desire, long for, miss’. OIr. guidid ‘to ask, pray’, OCS ždati ‘to wish, long for, desire’, 1sg. žždy, 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 *gʷok-e-ieh₂-, cf. Gr. ἐπι-ζοῦ-ια ‘longing’ and OIr. guide ἐ- ‘prayer’, as well as Gr. ποῦç in ‘desire, longing, love’, ποῦç ἐ- ‘id.’, etc.


Uncertain.

gol, prob. i-stem or a-stem (GD SG gol-in in NHB 1: 566b, but without references)

‘warmth, lukewarmness’ (John Chrysostom), jerm-a-gol ‘warmth, heat’ (Agat’angełos, 5th cent.); *gol ‘lukewarm; steam’ (see dial.), gol-a-xain ‘warmish’ (Ephe'm, etc.), golanam ‘to grow warm’ (John Chrysostom); golotriši, ea-stem: GD SG golotriš-o-y (from the expected *golotrišwowy, unless one posits *golorš, o-stem) in Gregory of Nyssa, Abliš i goloršowy in Eznik Kolbac’i 5th cent., GD PI golotriš-o-a-c’ in Philo, Abliš i goloseac’ in Paterica; (wo-stem: GD SG golotriš-o-y (see above), PI golos-o-o-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’ (Sučava, Axalc’xa, Ararat, Muš, Xarberd, etc.), ‘lukewarm’ (T’ifiš, Ararat), ‘vernal equinox’ (Muš), ‘burning, flaming’ (Hamšen [kōl, Ačařyan 1947: 225], Rodost’o, Tigranakert, Sebastia), etc. (see Ačařyan 1913: 247; HAB 1: 572a; for some illustrations, see Amatuni 1912: 147a);


Compounds with amp ‘cloud’ and arew ‘sun’: Polis, Č’arsanēag, Arabkīr *amp-gol ‘cloudy and warm summer day’ (= Van *amp-sol, with sol ‘ray, shine; warm(th)’); Nor Naxijewan *arew-gol ‘lukewarm (said of e.g. water)’; Č’enkiler (Nikomida) *arew-ekk ‘lukewarm (said of e.g. water)’ [Ačařyan 1913: 88a, 147-148]. Reduplication: Muš *gol-gl-uk ‘warmish (e.g., rays)’ [Ačařyan 1913: 247a].

cool’ (Rick Derksen, p.c.). There is no agreement on the appurtenance of some cognate forms.

Ačarjan (HAB 1: 506a, 571-572) also adds Arm. gaf ‘warmish, lukewarm’ (q.v.), not specifying “the determinative (ačakan)” -j-. According to Jahukyan (1987: 199), the latter comes from *-k- (cf. *uelk*- ‘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 *uöl-ih2- ‘luke-warmness’ (cf. Aɫabekyan 1998: 73; Olsen 1999: 642; Viredaz 2001-02: 30). This is attractive since it may explain gol and gaf within a single paradigm, treating gaf as a frozen genitive. If we posit a PIE PD ih2-stem (cf. Beekes 1995: 185), nom. *vól-ih2, gen. *ul-̯i̯-̯éh2-s (alternatively, HD i-stem, cf. Beekes 1995: 180-181: *uól-(ō)i : *uöl-īʊ̯), the paradigm would yield PArm. *gól-(u)i, gen. *galyV- > gol: *gafj-. 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, šoɫ, c’ol.

NHB (1: 566b, 2: 487c) identifies golorši with šogoli ‘steam’ (Philo, etc.). In fact, the latter is a derivative of šog, o-stem ‘heat; steam’, cf. also Muš dial. šog’-il- ‘steam’ [HAB 3: 528b]. As to -orši, Ačarjan (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. yarša- ‘fog, mist’, Gr. ἐέρση, ἀέρση, ἔρση f. ‘dew’, etc. (for the root, see s.v. yurt’i ‘watered, irrigated, fertile’). Thus: QIE *uol-HuVrs-ieh2- ‘warm vapour’ > PArm. *wol-(w)oršíya- > golorši, -ea-c’ ‘vapour, steam’, with the ruki-rule (see 2.1.12).

**gom**, a-stem: AbPl i gom-a-c’ in 1 Paralipomenon 17.7; o-stem: AbPl i gom-o-c’ in John Chrysostom 43 ‘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 NPI gom-k’ and four times API 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 makaɫateɫ xašanc’: ἐκ τῆς μάνδρας ἐξόπισϑεν τῶν ποιμνίων.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.6 (1913=1991: 10843; transl. Thomson 1978: 135), gom seems to refer to some flat and wooded areas with mountains, which the king Vaharšak 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 ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν, in a passage from Judges 6.2 which is translated in RevStBible as follows: “And the hand of Midian prevailed over Israel; and because of Midian the people of Israel made for themselves dens which are in the mountains, and the caves and the strongholds”. However, this is ambiguous since the people
As a component in place-names, see Hübschmann 1904: 382 (also s.v.v.);
● 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'om-, only found in Germanic (gemination
presumably from *-mm-): Dan. gomme 'sheepfold', Swed. dial. gomme 'crib,
manger', OIC. cammi m. 'Lappenhütte, Erdhütte', Swiss gämmeli 'Viehhütte', etc.

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'os-mo/-eh-2-, 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'om-eh-2- > PArm. *goma-, cf. don 'a kind of bread', if from PArm. *dona- < PIE
*d'0H-neh2- 'grain; bread' (see s.v.). Of borrowings, note com 'fasting, abstinence
from food' < Syriac ṣōm or ṣōmā. We may assume a European substratum word
*g'om(m)-.

On possible Armenisms in Caucasian and other languages, see HAB 1: 575a;
Jahukyan 1987: 602, 602a.45

goč'em, 3sg.aor. goč'ea 'to shout, cry out, call out; to bellow, roar; to
murmur, purl' (Bible+), goč'iwn, GDSg goč'man, ISg goč'man-b 'cry, sound,
roaring' (Bible+), goč' ‘shout’ (Siméon Aparanc’i, 18th cent.).
● DIAL. Axalc’xa, Xarberd g’eč’al ‘to murmur, purl’. In other dialects: compound
gorun-goč’em 'shouting' [HAB 1: 580b].
● ETYM From QIE *uok-je: Lat. vocō, -āre 'to call, call upon, summon', vōx, vōcis
f. 'voice, sound, word, speech', Skt. vāvakti, aor. āvocat 'to speak, say, call', vāc- f.
‘voice, sound, word, speech’, Gr. ἀγ- f. ‘voice, sound, word’, ἀσσα 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:
Clackson 1994: 211; Mallory/Adams 1997: 535a; Olsen 1999: 488, 811; Beekes 2003: 201; for the
eytymon, see also Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 489-491, 539-540.

Ačar'yan (HAB 1: 580a) does not accept the etymology and treats the Armenian
word as an onomatopoeia. The derivation of goč’em from *uok-je is impeccable,
however. For the o-grade and *je-present compare the synonymous verbs koč’em 'to
call, invoke' < *g'ot-je, yorjorjem 'to call', see s.v.v. 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. ḥumma- (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.) lov ‘praise’ [HAB 1: 583a].


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. γαίων. Elsewhere (1906: 389 = 1982: 167), he suggests a connection with goh ‘satisfied’, comparing with the case of aruest vs. arhest ‘art’.


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 govēti, see Schrijver 1991: 442; Mallory/Adams 1997: 418a; Olsen 1999: 789 (although in 416-417 and 873 govēst ‘praise’ is treated as an Iranian loan), etc. The Armenian is rightly excluded in Pokorny 1959: 453; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 803-804). 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+); gorcí, ea-stem: ISg gorce-a-w, IPl gorce-a-w-k’ (Bible+); wo-stem: IPl gorcú-o-v-k’ (Philo, Čaṙəntir) ‘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 kovjuš, caus. kovjéc’mnú ‘to weave’, Agulis gárcil ‘to weave’ [Ačārean 1935: 66, 345; 1947: 225; HAB 1: 584a]. Agulis has gurc ‘weaving, embroidery’ vs. gorc ‘work, opus, composition’, the latter being a literary loan (see Ačārean 1935: 64-65, 345), cf. 2.1.38.

- **ETYM** From PIE *us/oṛgom, cf. Gr. πάργω n. ‘work, labour, work of art’, OHG werc ‘work’, Av. voraz- ‘to do, work’, etc. (perhaps also Lith. varžas ‘hardship, misery’, etc.; see Derksen 1996: 73-74); see de Lagarde 1854: 16 2375; 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. OEEngl. werk, Gr. πίπτειν, etc.; further, cf. Schmitt 1981: 135; Klingenschmitt 1982: 142; Olsen 1999: 440; Viereck/Goldammer 2003: 405-406. See also 2.2.6.4.


gort, i-stem, o-stem (both Bible+); later also u-stem, e.g. GDSg gort-i-u in Step‘annos Siwnec‘i /8th cent./ (see Adonc 1915: 1861247); MidArm. gortn, GSg gortan, NPl gortn-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’ [Čugaszyan 1980: 187], gortn-burd/t ‘a plant’ (lit. ‘frog’s wool’), gortan mamuṙ ‘green moss on the surface of morass’ (lit. ‘frog’s moss’), gortn-uk ‘wart’ [Miǰ HayBaṙ 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). GDPl gort-o-c’ is found in Wisdom 19.10, as well as in the later literature: Yovhannēs Ōjnec‘i (8th cent.) and Nersēs Lambronac‘i (12th cent.). ISg gort-i-w : also in Psalms 77.45. Note also GDSg gort-i in a homily ascribed to Ėlišē.

● 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 [Ačaṙyan 1913: 252-253; HAB 3: 244b] and the genitive of dialectal forms in the Van-group: Van kyōrt, gen. kyōrt-an [Ačaṙyan 1952: 125], Moks kūrt/kōrt, gen. kūrtan or körtəɛ [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 Ačaṙyan 1913: 252b). Compare especially the folk-belief/saying, recorded by L. Harut‘yunyan (1991: 161 Nr5): kyert’nuk spano ɭen cerk‘en kyert’nuk ver kkya : “a wart will appear on the hand of the one who kills a frog”.

Ačaṙyan (1913: 252b) records Manisa (close to Zmūrnia/Izmir) kcrnc‘uĉ ‘a wart on the hand’, which he derives from *gortn-c’oc’, apparently assuming c’oc ‘show’ as the second member (assimilation t > č or influence of koc?). 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‘i) kortnij ‘wart’ [Bahramyan 1960: 146a], which seems to derive from *gortn-cic ‘frog-nipple’. For the semantics, cf. Germ. Warze ‘wart’ : ‘nipple’. Dersim (K‘i) kɔrdɔpurt and kɔrdɔmp’arp’ur ‘water-plant’ [Bahramyan 1960: 145b] are from gortn-burd, lit. ‘frog’s wool’ and *gortn-p’rup’ur, lit. ‘frog’s foam’.

● ETYM Since de Lagarde (1854: 29 Nr780) connected with Lith. varlė̃, varlė̃ ‘frog’, Latv. varlē ‘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; Jähkuyan 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. udrā- m. ‘otter’, Gr. ὕδρας m. ‘watersnake’, ὕδα 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 [NHB 1: 587a; HAB 1: 605b; Greppin 1978: 103]).

Adams (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 214b, 523a) connects these words with the word for ‘wart’ or ‘abscess’: OEngl. wearte, etc. ‘wart’, Latv. ap-vērde ‘abscess’, Russ. ведр ‘abscess, ulcer’, Pers. балū ‘wart’, reconstructing *uord- 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. балū ‘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 ṿaraba.

Olsen (1999: 182) notes: “The original derivational type underlying gort is obscure (root noun?)”. Jähkuyan (1987: 157) mentions only the o-stem and reconstructs *uordo-.

According to Kipšidze, Megrel. gordi ‘frog’, Tuš. *y/q warti ‘frog’ and Georg. მ/ქ ṣari ‘toad’ are borrowed from Arm. gort (see HAB 1: 585b).

In view of the absence of cognates outside Armenian and Baltic, Լապ’անչ եր (1975: 354; 1961: 80, 320) considers the IE etymology of gort unconvincing, argues against Ačar’yan’s (in fact, Ačar’yan 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 gray ‘crane’, only attested in Grigor Magistros (11th cent.), GDPl grē-i-c’ [NHB 1: 587a; HAB 1: 605b; Greppin 1978: 103].

grē or gray ‘crane’, only attested in Grigor Magistros (11th cent.), GDPl grē-i-c’ [NHB 1: 587a; HAB 1: 605b; Greppin 1978: 103].

The development of the oblique form in Arm. *grē* (q.v.) in view of the absence of the consonant shift in Arm. *gre(ajy, Greppin (1978: 103; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 140b) assumes an intermediation of MPers. unattested *grē or another neighbouring language. Uncertain.

gun ‘effort’, in the idioms gun gorcem, gun dnem ‘to make an effort’ (Bible, Agat’angelos, etc.).

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 *u(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(a/o)-*, etc.

See s.v. *s(a/o)- ‘this’.

dada, dado (dial.) ‘sister, elder sister; uncle’s wife; nurse, midwife, tutor; grandmother’, ‘father’.


ETYM Nursery word probably of IE origin (see Jáhukyan 1972: 300); for IE and non-IE comparable forms and a discussion, see s.v. *t(a)it(a) ‘grandmother; midwife; father, etc.’.

dal (no evidence for the declension class) ‘colostrum, beestings’ in Ephrem, Vardan Arewelci [NHB 1: 590c], Amirdovlat’’ Amasiac’i (see S. Vardanjian 1990, p. 46 § 90, p. 98 § 426, p. 163 § 799); spelled also as dayl (NHB and HAB, without specified references).


Açarâyün (HAB 1: 611b; cf. Jáhukyan 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 > e (see H. Muradyan 1972: 90-94; 1982: 155-162). Note that Van, Moks, etc. tāl regularly reflects dal through Açarayan’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’orlak’yan 1981: 145b with a thorough description of preparing this food; for the compound, see also HayLezBrbBår 1, 2001: 299b). In a number of dialects one finds a semantic contrast: xiž ‘colostrum’ vs. dal ‘a food made of cooked colostrum’ (Amatuni 1912: 158a, 278b; Aćavean 1913: 469a; Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan 2003 FW passim; see also Nawasardeanc’ 1903: 25; HAB 1: 612a; Gabikean 1952: 159; HayLezBrbBår 1, 2001: 298; 2, 2002: 325a).

Derivatives: Moks, etc. *dal-eni ‘ferment for cheese’ (Amatuni 1912: 158a; see also Malxaseanc’ HBB 1: 482c); Karin, Javan h̄avak’ dal-ot ‘thick and fat (milk)’ [Malxaseanc’ HBB 1: 483a; HayLezBrbBår 1, 2001: 299b]; Ararat, Karin, etc. dîlama, Polis, Partizak deleme ‘ferment for cheese’ [HayLezBrbBår 1, 2001: 299a], Moks däläma ‘молоко, затвердевающее в процессе варки сыра, перед тем как он сварился’ [Orbeli 2002: 217], probably a back loan from Turkish dialects (cf. Bläsing 1992: 73 on Sivas tel-me).


The PIE verbal root is reconstructed as *dheh₁-. The cognate l-formations are: Umbr. FELIUF ‘lactentes’, Latin filius ‘son’ from *d(h)ēh₁-i-l-io- [Schrijver 1991: 242; de Vaan 2008: 219-220]; Mfr. del ‘nipple’, Ofr. deil ‘female pig of two years old’, delech ‘having udders, milch cow’ from *d(h)ēh₁-l-; Gr. ὅψιν ‘mother’s breast’ from *d(h)ēh₁-l-éh₁-; Lith. dėlė, dial. diele ‘leech’, pirm(a)dėlės ‘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(h)ēh₁-l- vs. dīle ‘sucking calf’ from *d(h)ēh₁-i-l-eh₁-; OHG tīlī f. < *deljō, tila f., OEEngl. delu, etc. ‘teat’, probably from *d(h)ēh₁-l-ēh₂- [Schrijver 1991: 139, 242, 344-345, 352]; Kurd. dél, dālik f. ‘female; female dog’ (> Arm. dial. del ‘female dog’, Aćavean 1913: 271b), etc., probably from an old *lu-formation (see Hübschmann 1883: 26; Cabolov 2001: 301-302; ĖtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 447)46, Skt. dhārī- adj. ‘suckling’, possibly from *d(h)ēh₁-ū- > PAlb. *deiilā [Demiraj 1997: 127-128].

As we can see, there are l-formations based on both *d(h)ēh₁- and *d(h)ēh₁-i-. The latter probably represents an i-present (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 789 with literature); Alb. dele f. ‘sheep, ewe’ from *d(h)ēh₁-il-eh₁- > PAlb. *deiilā.47

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. OIr. dilkr ‘lamb’, Ofr. dinu ‘lamb’, etc.

The form dal points to a QIE *dhh1-l-i(e)h2- or, possibly, *dhh1-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 *dʰh₁-l-i(e)h₂ > *daly through metathesis or y-epenthesis (compare ayl, o-stem from *aλ-jo-: Lat. alius, etc.; for a discussion, see Godel 1975: 87; Ravnæs 1991: 33-35; Olsen 1999: 796, 796b). The formation is comparable to that of Lat. filia ‘daughter’ and Alb. dele f. ‘sheep, ewe’; for the semantics note also Alb. dhálé ‘skim milk; churning’. As far as dayl is concerned, the possibility of *dʰh₁-l-i (cf. *dʰ-i-li- in Jahukyan 1987: 119) should not be ruled out completely. The presence of the doublet formations *dʰ(e)h₁-l- and *dʰh₁-l- in one and the same language is not impossible, cf. Latv. dēls ‘son’ vs. dîle ‘sucking calf’ (Schrijver 1991: 242). However, it is not certain whether *dʰh₁-l- would be realized as PArm. *dogi- 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: 570-571 = 1995: 487-492.

dalar, o-stem (Bible+) ‘green, fresh’; dalar-i, dalarw-o-y, -o-j ‘greenery, grass, herb’ (Bible+).

Some textual illustrations:


dalarí, LocSg dalarwoǰ in Movsés Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913=1991: 359-361; transl. Thomson 1978: 350); i vayri dalarwoǰ ‘in a verdant place’.


GDPl dalare-a-c’ in Book of Chries 8.7.3 (G. Muradyan 1993: 200-211). See also s.vv. acuí ‘coal’ and place-name Dalarí-k’.

● DIAL dalar is widespread in the dialects [HAB 1: 613a].

For *-lh₁- > Arm. -l- (not -l-), see s.vv. alawunk’ ‘Pleiades’, yolov ‘many’, etc.
If the PIE origin is not accepted, one might think of Mediterranean substrate
(see 3.11).
To explain Arm. del, one may perhaps assume an old n-stem: nom. *dḥél(H)-n-,
gen. *dḥl-nós. Arm. del ‘herb’ and ṭoḷḷōz 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’.
NHB 1: 592a cites dakur, with no attestation, cf. dagur ‘plane’ in Koylaw’s dictionary [HAB 1: 613b]. See below on a dialectal correspondence.
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 čkuṙ ‘axe’. Note also Ararat akur ‘pick, hoe’ (see HayLezBrbBaṙ 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’èodoros K’rt’enawor, 7th cent. (NHB 2: 1050a), Grigor Narekac’i ‘tomb, grave’; a few derivatives: dambanakan ‘mourning song’ in Dionysius Thrax (6-7th cent.): ew zdambanakann užgnaki : tā dē ḥlēγa ḥēγa ḥēgaž (AdonDion 2008: 21f), see also A. Muradyan 1971: 159-160; dambaran ‘tomb, grave’ in Yovhannēs Draxnakertc’i (9-10th cent.), etc.
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).
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. *dëmb/-ro/-rehr- ‘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’, durgn ‘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-.

dayek, a-stem: GDSg dayek-i (P’awstos Buzand), GDPl dayek-a-c’ in the Bible and Eliš [Ter-Minasyan 1989: 404] *‘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: 168L5; transl. Thomson 1978: 184). MidArm. dayek ‘nurse, wet-nurse’ [MijHayBař 1, 1987: 164b].

DIAL The MidArm. form dayek is present in a number of ko-dialects, in the meaning ‘midwife’. In Polis, Axale’xa, Karin, Sebastia and Akn, one finds *dahek, with the glide -h [Ačarean 1913: 265a; HAB 1: 619a].


137; N. Arutjunjan 2001: 450-451), which might be regarded as a loanword from PArm. conjectural *iar-an ‘shrine’ < PIE *iš,ro- ‘holy’, cf. Gr. ἱερός ‘holy, divine’, ἱερόν n. ‘consecrated area, temple’, Skt. iśtrā- ‘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 Nazianzaci, 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 Ačāryan (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, 569a, 571; Lubotsky 2002b: 35), one is tempted to assume that the resemblance of these two words is not a mere chance. Note also Vedic dhēnā- 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.

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' (‘Čaṙantir’).
According to Ačaryan (HAB 1: 636a), the basic and oldest meaning is ‘artisan, craftsman’, which is seen in darbin phinay ev erkavoy (Genesis 4:22, see now in Zeyt'yunyan 1985: 163). However, the Greek text here has χαλκεύς χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου, and Arm. darbin simply renders Gr. χαλκεύς 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:transl. Thomson 1978: 204): Vasn oroy ev ar meroy isk žamanakaw bazumk' i darbnac', zhet ert'alov atraselin, yawur miśabat'woj eric's kam č'oric's haxen zsaln, zi zorasc'in, asen, št'ayk'n Artawazad. Bayc' è čmartut' 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: Ev zays noyn ergič'k'n yāraselin asen ayspēs “This the same singers express in the fable as follows”.

In Pataxani t'ì'oyn Sahakay (Response to the letter of Sahak) ascribed to Movsēs Xorenac'i (MovsXorenMaten 1843: 294–295; see also Ališan 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: APl darbin-s, GDPl darbn-a-c') are explicitly described in the context of a heathen cult and are called goralneayk' č'arìn “ministers of evil”. The shrine of Anahit was replaced by a small church Surb Astuacacin, and the place was renamed Hogeac' vank’, note traditional stories (Łanalanyan 1969: 246–247) where we also encounter the Kal dew ‘lame demon’ (cf. Russell 1987: 205), the demon called Kudrut’, and a bear. On Hogeac’ ‘Hogwoc’ vank’, see Hübschmann 1904: 342–343.


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 *dabʰros ‘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 (Beebes 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. νήσυς f. ‘craftsmanship, handiwork, art’ vs. Skt. tāksati ‘to form by cutting; to fashion, form’, etc. (see s.v. *τ*i’si ‘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-, kalin ‘acorn’ from *g*lth:eno- (q.v.). For the suffix -in, see Jahukyan 1987: 234; Olsen 1999: 463-473. Note especially abx : alatin ‘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. dr̥bhāti ‘to tie together’, Lith. dārbas ‘work’, darbti ‘to work’, etc. (Mann 1963: 58, 94; Blažek 2008: 77, 79). Note especially Lith. dial. darbinýkas ‘worker’ (on this and related forms and on the suffix -i/enýkas, 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 Alabekyan 1979: 56. However, this is less probable.

Gordon Whittaker (2004: 389; 2005: 414, 414a) compares Arm. darbin and Lat. faber with Sumerian tabira ‘joiner’ and Hurrian tabiri ‘Metallgießer’, probably also ‘smith’. Ilya Yakubovich (apud Blažek 2008: 79) 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 in the NW parts of the historical Armenia, in and around Hayaša, ‘the land of metal/iron’ (see s.v. Hay-k’ ‘Armenia’).


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; OIr. ljoðasmiðr ‘poet’ and galdhrasmiðr ‘Verfasser von Zauberliedern’ vs. smiðr ‘artisan, smith’, etc. 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 MiNarMir 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. avarospel ‘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: 715).  

darj, i-stem ‘return, turn’ (Bible+), and aor. stem of dašn ‘to go/come back, return; to turn, become’ (q.v.).

●ETYM See s.v. dašn ‘to return, turn’.

del, o-stem: ISg del-o-v (Bible), GDPl del-o-c’ (Lazar P’arpec’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i); a-stem: IPl del-a-w-k’ (see below) ‘herb; medicine; poison, etc.’ (Bible+), deltem ‘to cure, poison’ (e.g. P’awstos Buzand, see below), del-in (gen. deln-i) ‘yellow’ (Plato, John Chrysostom, etc.); del-j ‘peach’ (Paterica, Geoponica, etc.), karm-r-a-delj ‘red peach’ (Agat’angels).

In Lazar P’arpec’i, 5th cent. (1904=1985: 9:33f; transl. Thomson 1991: 42): And gταντιν εω αζζι αζζί αρμακ’ βυσοκ’ ι πές ογτακαρτ’εαν δελοκ’, αστ καρταργέτ’ χανακ’ ολετ’ εαν στυγαμματ βεζκακ’ ι νορινακοε’ : “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. Garsoïan 1989: 145) one finds IPl del-o-v-k’ and del-a-w-k’ “by poison” in the same passage; see the lines -10 (figura etymologica: delel zna mahuan delok’n “to infect her with a deadly poison”) and -15.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.11 (1913=1991: 37L7f; transl. Thomson 1978: 88): Βαυκ’ ζδιακν Βελαν παχιεθαλ δελοκ’ (var. delok’, see readings at pp. 37 and 418a), ασῆ, ηραμαγή Ηάκ ς ηελ ανελ ι Ηάρκ’, εαν τ‘αθελ ι βαρζιωλαθακ τκελω, ι τεσλ κανακ’ εαν ορδωκ’ ιβροε’ “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”.

GDPl del-o-c’ is found in Mmovsēs Xorenac’i 2.31 (1913=1991: 149L9c; transl. Thomson 1978: 169): σαςν βεζκυτ’εαν, ορ λινι εαν κ’ο αρανζ’ δελοκ’ εαν άρματοκ’ “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: 220; 1987: 119, 255, 277; see also H. Suk’iasyan 1986: 155), here also belongs Van *del-d ‘the root of a plant used in hair-washing’ (on which see Acarane 1913: 272a).

Further, see s.v. del-b ‘yellow’.

●ETYM See s.v. dal’r ‘green, fresh’.


The variant delb 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 Acarane (HAB 1: 650a) stresses, the existence of delb is
corroborated by detb-a-goyn (attested by the same author, Anania Širakac’i) and dial. *detb-el (see below).


- DIAL Muš d’xb’el ‘to grow yellow by dirt (said of clothes)’ [HAB 1: 650b].
- ETYM According to Aĉaṙyan (1898b: 371b; HAB 1: 648b, 650; J̌ahukyan, ibid.), detb is composed of *del (see HAB s.v. del ‘herb’ and del-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)l-ez ‘bee; bumble-bee’.

- DIAL Muš, Van, Sip’an dtz ‘bee; bumble-bee (“wild bee”)’ [Amatuni 1912: 166-167]. According to Aĉaryan (1913: 1033b), Van dtz ‘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 *dtz- isamehu ‘bumble-bee’ in her glossary of purely dialectal words.

Van/Arčak (the village of Šahgeldi) dtz occurs, e.g., in the following saying (V. Ananyan 1980: 379b3): Matd mi tana dtz ponin “Do not take/put your finger (on)to the bee-nest”. In a footnote, the author (379t) renders dtz by ModArm. mehu ‘bee’.

- ETYM No etymology is known to me. I wonder if the word derives from *del- ‘yellow’ (see s.vv. delin, delj). For the semantics cf. Šatax zaṙ-ke’t ‘bumble-bee’ and dial. zṙ-kœc ‘yellow bumble-bee’, if containing zaṙ ‘yellow’ (see s.v. kœc). The suffix -ez may be compared with the -j found in det-j ‘yellow’ and many other words, as well as with -(e)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: 209L18, 241L8).

- ETYM Probably to be identified with ji ‘horse’ (q.v.), see NHB 1: 611c; J̌ahukyan 1967: 184; sceptical HAB 658c.

*di-di-k? ‘newborn, child’.

- DIAL Sivri-Hisar tētik ‘newborn, child; pupil of the eye’ [Aĉaṙean 1913: 1025a; N. Mkrt’yan apud PmtSivHisHay 1965: 455].

- ETYM N. Mkrt’yan (PmtSivHisHay 1965: 455) compares Russ. temu (written in Armenian characters) ‘children’. Obviously, this form is a misprint for Russ. det’ = 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. Mkrt’yan (ibid.) notes that
the word cannot be considered a Russian loan and derives directly from Indo-European.

PSlav. *dětē (Russ. ditjá ‘child’, Czech dítě, Bulg. дете ‘id.’, etc.) goes back to *dʰeʰ₁-t- from PIE *dʰeʰ₁- ‘to suck’; cf. Latv. dēls ‘son’, Lat. filius ‘id.’, etc. [ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 5, 1978: 12-13]; see s.v. diem ‘to suck’. IE *dʰeʰ₁-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 Nasijewan) ‘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. dháyati (RV+), etc.; also Arm. da(y)l ‘beestings’, dayeak ‘nurse, tutor’ [Hübschmann 1883: 26; 1897: 437; HAB 1: 668]. Godel (1975: 88-89) directly equates diem with the Sanskrit verb and writes: “The parallel implies divergent developments of the PIE present stem *dhəye-. I assume that PA *ṛ 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 *ghəyo-.”

However, Skt. dháyati may be derived from *dʰeʰ₁-e- (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 776; or, rather, *dʰ₁-ie-), and there is no laryngeal in the root of hāya- (see s.v. ji ‘horse’). Armenian has more possibilities, such as *dʰeʰ₁-, *dʰeʰ₁-i-, *dʰ₁-i-, etc. (see HAB 1: 668b). Jahukyan (1987: 119) reconstructs *dʰeʰ₁-i-e. See also s.v. *dal.

di-k’, GDPl di-e’, IPl di-a-w-k’ ‘god’ (Bible+).


As is pointed out by Lubotsky (1988: 129), Greek has preserved the athematic noun in compounds (θο-,) so that θὸς is a Greek denominational form. 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 *dʰeʰ₁-s-s, GSG *dʰ₁-s-s. Both *dʰes-s-s and *dʰ₁-s-s would result in Arm. di-k’.

The derivation of the Greek and the Armenian words from *d(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 *dʰwēs-. He admits, however,
that the Greek word can hardly belong here. This would imply separating Arm. *di-k-' from Gr. θυεις, which is improbable and unnecessary.

According to Georgiev (1974: 11-14; 1975: 19, 35; see also Blažek 2001: 355), Thracian ḍon-, ḍom-, ḍoša- 'god', as well as the second component of the Thracian name Ζηλυ-δεσα ἡ belong to the Greek and Armenian words. He (1974: 12) is inclined to the derivation of Gr. θυεις from *ḍwesos- and treats Arm. *di-k-' and Thracian ḍon- as a contamination of *ḍwesos- and *diw- (on which see HAB s.v. tiv 'day'). In general, this is implausible (see above on Myc. te-α) and unnecessary since the paradigm *ḍ'ehr-s-s, GṢg *ḍ'hṛs-ōs offers a satisfactory explanation.

However, a similar contamination might be viable with respect to Arm. compositional *diwːc-. According to Hübschmann (1897: 439), the epenthetic -w- in *diwːc- is due to contamination of *diː- 'god' with *diwː- 'demon-', cf. e.g. *diwː-apašt vs. *diː-apašt 'Götter-verehrer'. If the PIE word had an original s-stem with NSg *ḍ'ehr-s-ōs, the 'epenthetic' -w- of Arm. *diwːc- could somehow reflect PArm. hypothetical NSg *ḍ(h)-u. One might also think of contamination with PAr. *tiw 'god' (see s.vv. ciacan 'rainbow', kahtn 'acorn', tiv 'day').

It has been assumed that Arm. *di-k- 'god' is reflected in the Urartian theonym ᾯριστε-ди-μι (see s.v. arcui 'eagle').

**don** ‘*a kind of bread*, attested only in Yaysmawurk’. In Barğirk hayoc’, *don* renders *paksimat* [Amalyan 1975: 273\(^{N227}\)]. In this form, the word has been preserved only in the dialect of Lazax (see below).

In Knik’ hawatoy= “Seal of Faith” (7th cent.), one finds *doniw hac’iwk’, where *hac’iwk* is IPl of *hac’* ‘bread’. Ačařyan (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 *don* [Amatuni 1912: 173b], Širak *donik ‘*a longish thick bread* (= *matnk’aš hac’*) [Mxit’areanc’ 1901: 311], Muš, Bulanx *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 *došik ‘*a kind of longish bread with a hole in the middle*’ (mentioned as *došik* by G. Srvanjtyane’ in his “Groc’u broc’”, see 1, 1978: 40). As far as semantics is concerned, this form is reminiscent of Muš, Bulanx *donik*. However, *došik* derives from Van *dol ‘*frame around a wheel*’ [Ačařyan 1913: 282-283].

T’emurčyan (1970: 86b and 92b, 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 sūmin*. 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 Ačařyan (HAB 1: 679-680) connects Skt. *


Jahukyan (1987: 162-163) presents three objections to this etymology: (1) PIE *

\[\text{\textit{dʰōH}}\] - 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.). Jahukyan (1987: 254) interprets these two and some other words as reflecting an old dialectal variation next to the regular development *\textit{e/oN} > Arm. *\textit{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 *gōm(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 *dH-neh2-, also found in Toch. B tâno f. ‘seed, grain’ (Lubotsky, p.c.).

PIE *d*ōH-neh2- ‘grain; bread’ has been compared with Sem. *dūn- ‘millet’ (see Illič-Svityč 1964: 5; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 873; Jahukyan 1987: 450; cf. Cuny 1937: 229-231).

Pârvulescu (1988: 51) derives the PIE word from *d'eh₂- ‘to put’, with the basic meaning ‘wealth, treasure’ from earlier ‘what is put, deposited’. Thus: *d'oh₂-neh₂-. This idea has been considered semantically unlikely (Mallory/Adams 1997: 237a; Adams 1999: 286).

Jahukyan (1987: 426) points out that Arm. don resembles Hurr. tuni ‘a kind of bread’, but is sceptical about this comparison, since: (1) Ačaryan is inclined to ascribe native (< IE) origin to Arm. don, (2) Hurr. tuni may be derived from tuni ‘Fußschemel’; thus “baked in the shape of tuni”. He refers to Haas/Wilhelm 1974, not indicating the page. This work, however, is missing in Jahukyan’s bibliography. I assume that he meant the same Haas/Wilhelm 1974 as is found in the bibliography of my present study. In this book, one finds Hitt. tūni- ‘ein bestimmtes Brod’, NINDA ďūni-c. ‘ein Gebäck’ (pp. 12, 104, 106, 150-151, 179, 286b) and Hurr. tūni ‘Fußschemel’ (104, 1061). There is also Hitt. NINDA tūnik n. / tunik-, which is interpreted as (n)k-derivation from *NINDA ďuni- [Neu 1970: 5737; Haas/Wilhelm 1974: 179].

Jahukyan’s objections are not decisive. Firstly, the meaning ‘a kind of bread’ could be original. Then, tūni ‘Fußschemel’, if indeed related, may be seen as “shaped as tuni-bread”. Remarkably, next to the very Arm. don ‘bread’, one finds don ‘an architectural ornament/detail’, probably ‘architrave’, attested twice in Zak’aria K’anak’ec‘i (17th cent.), in the description of the monastery Yovhannavank’. Ačaryan (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 ďūni-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 ďūni- 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*ōH-neh₂- ‘grain; bread’ (although the problem of Arm. -o- needs further examination), and Hitt. NINDA ďūni-, NINDĀtunik ‘ein Gebäck’ is borrowed from Armenian; (2) Arm. don/donik derives from PIE *d*ōH-neh₂-, but its resemblance with Hitt. NINDA ďūni-tunik is accidental; (3) Arm. don/donik has been borrowed from Hitt. NINDA ďūni-tunik and has nothing to do with PIE *d*ōnā- (note that the Hittite word cannot be derived from PIE *d’ōH-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, Marala, etc. [HAB 1: 681b; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 58-59].


It has been assumed that du-k’ substituted *ju-k’ (from PIE *iuH-: Skt. yuvām, Lith. jūs, Goth. jūs, etc.), and jez represents *jeji < *jeji < *jeg’i- through assimilation, see Meillet 1920: 251; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 56-57; Jáhukyan 1967: 264; 1982: 147; 1987: 173; Schmitt 1981: 117; Ravnaes 1991: 65, 65; 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; Pokorny 1959: 513; Winter 1965: 113-114; Stempel 1994: 15-16; Alabekyan 1998: 72. However, the development *ji > Arm. j- is disputed (see 2.1.6), thus one may alternatively posit *jeji > *jeji > jez.

On AblPl jēn-j, see s.v. mēk ‘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. ῥοϑυ, etc.

dūr, GDSg dran, AbIsg i dran-č, ISg dram-č, Npl dram-č’, API dram-č’, LocPl i dram-n-č, GDPl dram-č’, AbIspl i dram-č’, IPl dram-b-č; 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, Mowsēs Xorenac’i, etc.), ‘retinue’ (P’awstos Buzand 4.15 [1883=1984: 99L-1], Elišē, etc.); i durs- ‘outside’ (Bible+); dur-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, GDPI drac’e-a-c’ ‘neighbour’ (Bible+); dram-ik, GDPl drank-a-c’ ‘palace guardian’ in Mowsēs Xorenac’i 3.37, 1913=1991: 303L1 (cf. Bediryan 1962: 141-142); droyl ‘yard-keeper’ (Basil of Caesarea); a number of compounds with dṛn(-a)- or dr- as the first member, or -dūr as the second member.

● DIAL. The form dūr, mostly with loss of the final nasal (except for ḽarabal, Goris, Šamaxi), is ubiquitous in the dialects; dur-s is widespread [HAB 1: 685-686]. A frozen pl. đurk’ ‘door’ has been preserved in Agulis [Ačarean 1935: 347; M. Zak’aryan 2008: 89], Melri [Aļayan 1954: 267b], Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 192a], Kak’avberd [H. Muradyan 1967: 107, 112, 169b, 211L1]; also as the first member of compounds, đork’-a- (e.g. in Karčewan, see H. Muradyan 1960: 212b).
Some plural forms represent a dual dī-vi (also MidArm., see MījHayBāf 1, 1987: 181b), connected with cognate forms of the PIE word for ‘door’, *dhu(o)r- (< Skt. *dhumr-). The forms *dhu(o)r-eh2- (Viredaz 2001-02: 25), the paradigm of Svedia: NSg dīr, AccSg z-taur, GDsg trum, NPl trúa (Andreasian 1967: 56); according to Ačaryan 2003: 464: NStg d:’ōr, GDsg d:’on, ISg d:’in-um.

Muš d:’verk ‘the threshold with the yard and surroundings’ [Ačaryan 1913: 288b] comprises not only the original dual *-u-, but also coll.-pl. -er and -k’.


The forms dur-k’, dr-a-w-k’ show that the nasal of dūrn is an original singulative, and the form cannot go back to an old n-stem; dūrn reflects PIE acc. *d’ur-mn (Schmitt 1981: 199; Kortlandt 1985b: 9; 1985: 19, 23 = 2003: 57, 63, 67; Beekes 2003: 166) or *d’uor-mn (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; AčarLik 3, 1957: 414; Ravnas 1991: 101; E. Mkrtčyan 1992: 71-72).

As is suggested by Hübschmann (1894: 115; see also O. Haas 1940: 98), Arm. dur-k’, as Skt. dvārā, 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 *d’u-i with Skt. dvārā. PArm. *dur-a- appears only in plural and points to fem.pl. *d’ur-eh2-., cf. Gr. fem. θύρα, ὑπαί, pl. θύρα, etc. (see Frisk ibid.; Beekes 2003: 174).


**dustr**, GDsg dster, NPl dster-k’, GDPl dster-c’ or dster-a-c’, IPl dster-aw-k’ ‘daughter’ (Bible+).

**DIAL** In almost every dialect replaced by alj-ik ‘girl’. Preserved only in Suč’ava: d’ustro, GStg d’asder, or d’rusd, GStg d’arsder ‘daughter’ [HAB 1: 686b].

**ETYM** Since Klaproth (1831: 105b), equated with the PIE word for ‘daughter’: Skt. duhitār-, Gr. ἡδικήτης f., Lith. dukktė f., etc.; NStg *d’uğh₂-iēr > PArm. *dust(2)ir, NPl
dur gn

Durgn, GDSg dr g (Bible), MidArm. AbI SG i dr g-ə ‘potter’s wheel’.

In the late medieval dictionary Barğirk’ hayoc’ one finds dr gan glossed as brrni ə’rx “potter’s wheel” (Amalyan 1975: 82N274; MiHayBar 1, 1987: 184a), formally identical with the genitive of dur gn (cf. Amalyan 1975: 362274).

● DIAL According to Ačaṙyan (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 (aṙu) turned the water-mill, then šuṙ ə’r talis ankana u turg baneč’not p’řan u ćaxaraka “turned the ankana and p’řan which makes the turg work, and the ćaxarak (‘spinning-wheel’)”. The word ankana 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’ř-an which appears in the same sentence we are discussing. The latter in Łaraba ɫ means ‘scraper’ (= šeč’an, foratalx, see Ačaṙean 1913: 1086b). Also turg probably denotes a kind of turning implement.

To this Ačaṙyan does not add any other dialectal evidence.

Now the word is found in extreme NW and SW. Xotor ǰūr has durg ‘the main tool of a potter’ (see YušamXotorj 1964: 442a, with the names of its parts). Č’olak’e’an (1986: 200a) glosses ClArm. durg by K’esab dörg, not specifying the meaning.

The word is probably found also in Ararat, dörg, see Ananyan 1984: 353L2.

● ETYM Related with Gr. τροχός m. ‘wheel; potter’s wheel’ and OIr. droch ‘wheel’, cf. also Gr. τρέχω ‘to run’, Arm. daṙ- nam ‘to turn’, etc. [NHB 1: 156b (s.v. aniv); Hübschmann 1897: 440; HAB 1: 687; van Windekens 1986: 222]. Arm. dur gn is formally problematic. In order to explain it, a form with lengthened grade has been assumed, with a subsequent metathesis: *dhrōgh- > *drug- > *durgn (Hübschmann; HAB; Makaev 1974: 57). However, such a metathesis is difficult to explain [Meillet 1894: 155]. *dr- > *dur- is not probable for Armenian. One would rather expect *dr- > *(V)rdu-. To avoid this problem, Hamp (1982a: 145-146; 1983b: 65) reconstructs nom. *dhrōgh-s > *Vrdogn > *Vrdugn (analogically after the vocalism of the nominative), gen. *drgōhs > *(V)rdu-, 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’org-, see Clackson 1994: 20963, cf. also Jahukyan (1987: 120, 253-254), who hesitantly tries *dr- and *d’rg-. 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: 147155; 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: 147155; 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’ōr-g-’, GSG *d’r-
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’, Abzax a-dards, etc.) with PIE *te/ork- ‘to turn’ (cf. Skt. tarka- ‘spindle’ from tark- ‘to turn, to move to and fro’, Lat. torquère ‘to turn, twist; to spin, whirl; to wind (round)’, Hitt. tarka- ‘to turn oneself; to dance’, etc.). I wonder if the Caucasian is rather related with PIE *dʰorg/*dʰorgan- ‘wheel’51. Nikolaev (1985: 72) considers Gr. ἄτρακτος m. (f.) ‘spindle’ and Skt. tarka- ‘spindle’ as borrowed from the same Caucasian word.

Arm. burgn (GSG brgan) ‘tower; pyramid’ (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. bûrgû ‘tower’, see Hübschmann 1897: 392-393 (with reservation); HAB 1: 488. In view of the final -n, Jahukyan (1985a: 366; 1987: 430-432 and espec. 432n, 466 /with reservation/; 1988: 141, 141s4, 141s6) prefers tracing burgn to Urart. burgana ‘fortress’; see also D’jakonov 1983: 165. Diakonoff (1971: 84s3) also mentions Udi buruñh, bûry ‘Berg’. Further, compared with Caucasian languages: Inkhoqwari beɣ ‘stable’, Akhwakh boryo ‘shed’, Karata beywa ‘shed’, Abkhaz a-ba < *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. baki ‘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: 99ADD3) point out that Urart. burgana 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 (Kirovbad), geographically close to East Caucasian languages of Dagestan.
ezn, GDSg ezin, NPl ezin-k’, API 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 Larabal, etc. yezna, Agulis izna, Hamšen yız, gen. ezna, T’iflis yiza, etc. [HAB 2: 6a].

Larabal *astucoy ezn ‘Lady-bug’. Names of the Lady-bug usually display a feminine connotation (see 3.5.2.1). In this respect, Larabal *astucoy ezn seems peculiar. One might suggest that ezn earlier had feminine (or generic) semantics. This might be supported by Van, Moks *le/ezn ‘female buffalo’ (if my interpretation is accepted; see 2.1.7) and by the etymology (see below).

It has been assumed that Hamšen ezn is a dual form, ‘a pair of bullocks’ (Artašes Ėk’suzean, apud Acařyan 1947: 86).

● ETYM. Since long (de Lagarde, Müller, etc.; see HAB 2: 5-6), connected with Skt. ahī- f. (vṛk-inflection) ‘cow, female of an animal’ (RV), Av. azī- (devī-inflection) ‘milking (of cows and mares)’; the appurtenance of OIr. ag n. ‘cow, cattle’ (< *g2ez-) 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: 64. Olsen (1999: 121) assumes a lengthened grade of the root *h2ēgʰ-(V)- > *iz-V- (Eichner’s Law) with subsequent dissimilatory umlaut *izin- > *ezin-, which is not convincing. In view of the development CHC > Celt. ČaC and HHC > aC (see Beekes 1988: 93), one may hypothetically assume the following original paradigm: nom. *h2h1ēgʰ- (> Ir. and Arm.), obl. *h2h1ēgʰ- (> Celt.).

Arm. ezn (cf. gen. ezin) may be seen as a frozen accusative *(H)h-tegʰ-ih-t-m (devī-inflection).

ezr, r-stem: numerous attestations in the Bible: NomSg ezr, GDSg ezer, AllSg y-ezr, LocSg y-ezer, IPl ezer-b, API ezer-s [Astuacaturean 1895: 422ab]; note also IPl. ezer-a-v-k’ in Gregory of Nyssa and Vardan Arewelc’i, ezer-o-v-k’ in Sargs Şnorhalı 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: 51131; transl. Thomson 1978: 99); y-ezr covakin awoy; <...> ař ezerb covun ‘at the edge of the salt lake. On the shore of the lake <...>, also y-ezr covun (51L16), ezerb covakin (53L12); in 1.12 (39L16 and 42L3f, transl. 90 and 92); ař ezerb getoy ‘on the bank of the river’, in 2.50 (178L12): y-ezr getoy ‘to the river-shore’; 3.59 (338L15, transl. 332): ezerb.
mōrin : “along the edge of the marsh”; 3.32 (296L10f): ʾar ʾezerb pʾosoyn “by the edge of the ditch”.

In 2.8 of the same author (114L10, 115L7; transl. 141), ezr refers both to the edge of the world and to the sea-shore. Note also the compound cos-ezer-euykʾ “those who dwelt by the see” (2.53: 182L18; transl. 195). Referring to ‘plain’: ʾar <..<> ezerbʾ daštin : “at <...> edges of the plain” (1.12: 39L5).

In Lazar Pʿarpecʾi (5th cent.) 3.81 (1904=1985: 148L35; 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 yerz [HAB 2: 6b]. Both watery and non-watery aspects are seen in the derivatives (see Ağaşian 1913: 292a; HAB 2: 6-7).

In a folk-prayer from Muš/Bulanx (S. Movsisyan 1972: 55a, 130aN10), hʾezr refers to the edge of the world (ašxarkʾ, ašxarkʾ).

● ETYM. Since de Lagarde (1854: 35L983f), connected with Lith. ežià ‘boundary(-strip)’, etc. [Meillet 1898: 282; Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 2: 6b; Beekes 2003: 181]. The BSl. forms derive from *h1eĝh- ‘balk, border’: Lith. ežė ‘border, frontier’, Latv. eža ‘boundary(-strip)’, Russ. ḣež ‘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. *h1eĝh-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. ežeras ‘lake’, OCS jezero n. ‘lake’, etc. [Pokorny 1959: 291-292; Toporov, PrJaz [1], 1975: 131-133; EtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 33-34, 59-60; Saradževa 1986: 26-27; Jahukyan 1987: 163; Olsen 1999: 146-147; Derksen 2002: 10-11; Blažek 2003: 246-247].

The connection with the Greek mythological river Ὲγέρων 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 *-d̥- 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: 85); 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. ʾezera-w-kʾ) possibly points to neuter pl. in *-h2.

elanem, 3sg.aor. el, 3pl.aor. el-in, imper. el, pl. elēkʾ (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-
ek-
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kidnapper’ in 1 Timothy 1.10 (GDPl mardeluz-a-c’) and Grigor Narekac’i, y-el/huz-ak, a-stem: GDPl -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: GDPl 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: 96].


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, GDPl ek-a-c’ (Bible), IPl ek-a-w-k’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.10) ‘stranger, proselyte’ (Bible+); i-stem: GDPl 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): ew aylovk’ andocn ōk’ ew ek ōk’ “and [with] other domestic servants and the outsiders”. 1.3 (12L2f; Thomson 1978): óv ok’ i c’elic’ os oçelec’ ontani ew meraznac’ ealk’ ew óyk’ omank’ ekk’ ōtaneec’ 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. Łarabad aor. yēke, yēker, yēka < eki, ekir, ekn, imper. yek < ek, etc.


Arm. 3.sg. aor. ekn reflects the original root aorist PIE *h₁ē-gʷ-em-t, cf. Skt. ágan, with g- analogically after the present. Other cognate forms are based on *gʷeh₂- (on

It has been assumed that Arm. ka- ‘to stay, stop, rest, stand, dwell’ belongs here too and reflects *gʷeh₂ (cf. above), with an original meaning ‘to step, put the foot, arrive, establish oneself’, cf. Skt. gā-: pres. jígāti, aor. ágāti, perf.opt. jágāti ‘to put down the foot (while going), step, stride’, Gr. βιβᾶς ‘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. gūti ‘to go’, at-gūti ‘to arrive’, etc., see Scheftelowitz 1904-05: 2: 15; Pedersen 1906: 481 = 1982: 259; Pokorny 1959: 463; Godel 1975: 124; 1979: 101; Klingenschmitt 1982: 85, 87-89; Jahukyan 1982: 175-176; 1990: 65 with hesitation; Olsen 1999: 295; for the forms, see also Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 482. Ačašyan (HAB 2: 504-505) does not accept this etymology of ka-m and leaves the origin of the word open. 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 *gʷeh₂-mi (athematic present) and *gʷeh₂-ske-, respectively, and the deverbal noun kay, i-stem ‘standing place, station, site’ clearly derives from *gʷá-h₂-ti- (cf. Olsen 1989: 222; 1999: 783); cf. Gr. βάσις ‘step, base’, Skt. gáti-, Goth. gumps from *gʷm-ti- (see e.g. Rix 1992: 89, 146).

For a discussion of the PIE verbs *gwem- and *gʷeh₂- 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 ēhal, Partizak iyal (see also Tër-Yakobe 1960: 498), Aslanbek, Byut’ania, K’li, Moks iāl ‘to go’ [Ačašyan 1898: 32a, 35a; 1913: 396a; HAB 2: 54a]. For numerous textual illustrations from Aslanbek, see Ačašyan 1898: 85ab, 87a. Partizak iyank’ ‘may we go’, k-iyas ‘you are going’ [Tër-Yakobe 1960: 265, 415-416].

It seems that Moks has *yə-. In folklore-texts from Orbeli 2002 one finds the following forms: inf. yəl (123Nd42), yāl (66L9, 78L2); pres. yāl (93L1); subjunctive present: 1sg yām (93L12, 95L12, 96L12, 99L5), 2sg yās (97L9, 98L4), 3sg yā (55L17, 58L4, 63L17, 64L4, 80L2), 1pl yānk’ (58L4, 62L18, 66L12, 68L12, 70L13, 80L14), 3pl yān (86L14, 95L14); subjunctive past: 1sg yām (74L8), 3sg yer [from *yayr] (66L10, 93L11), 52 One wonders whether Arm. dial. *eku(-) is archaic and reflects *gʷom- or zero-grade *gʷm- with a labial effect of *gʷ- (cf. Alabekyan 1979: 101-102).

In HAB 2: 12a, s.v. ek- ‘to come’, Ačašyan notes Arm. imper. plur. e-kay-k’ as reflecting *gʷeh₂-.

Formally, aor. ka-c’- can also go back to *gʷm-sk- with loss of the nasal before *-sk- > -c’-.

53 In HAB 2: 12a, s.v. ek- ‘to come’, Ačašyan notes Arm. imper. plur. e-kay-k’ as reflecting *gʷeh₂-.

54 Formally, aor. ka-c’- can also go back to *gʷm-sk- with loss of the nasal before *-sk- > -c’-.
The etymology of Tervišyan deserves more attention. This dialectal word may be a vowel derived from PIE *h₁ei- 'to go': Skt. ētī ‘to go’, Gk. ἐλθεῖν ‘to go’, Lith. ėiti ‘to go’, etc. See s.v. ītanem ‘to go down’. Note also PIE *h₁i eh₂- (derived from *h₁ei-): Skt. yā- ‘to drive (fast), speed’, 3sg.act. yāti (RV+), 3sg.med. iyate. Lith. jōtī ‘to drive, to go’, ToA yā- ‘to go, to travel’, etc. Armenian, as Sanskrit and Baltic, shows reflexes of both *h₁ei- (T’iflis chal, 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.

With particles (especially with t’ax ‘let’ and neg. č’a) one often finds forms with a vowel -i-: t’ax-iyā (56L1), 3sg k-iyā (91L-9, 93L-11, 127L-15), 3pl k-iyan (95L16), 1sg č’om iyā, 2sg č’ax iyā (81, lines -6 and -8, cf. 1sg č’om ērt’a, in line -13), 3sg č’iyā (127L-15). These forms cannot be used as evidence for the form *ial since this ē’r- hardly belongs to the verbal stem. Thus, the verb in Moks is *ya- rather than *t’iyā-

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. 56L1 (3sg t’ax-ert’a ‘let him go’ vs. t’ax-iyā ‘id.’ in the same sentence); 57L-10f (1pl k-ert’ank’y vs. ka-yānk’y in the same sentence); 67Neap (3pl k-ert’an in line 4 vs. ka-yān in line 8); 81L-15 (1sg č’om iyā vs. č’om ērt’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. yānk’y vs. 3pl.aor. k’ac’in.

Aĉaryan (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-glise, on which see 2.1.32.

T’iflis chal ‘to go’ is attested in the work of the 18th-century famous poet Sayat’-Novā, who spoke in and wrote in the dialect of T’iflis (see Ko’o’eyan 1963: 71). The form suggests *eham, cf. ert’alk’y ‘iron’ > T’iflis ērkat’, eraz ‘dream’ > ēraz (see Aĉarean 1911: 53).

I conclude that the verb appears in the following basic forms: *e(h/y)am, *t(h/y)am, *yam. The -h/y- is a hiatus-glise.

*ETYM Aĉaryan (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, 61L-11, 63L9). Tomson (1890: 33, § 61.1) cites T’iflis k-ēham ‘I shall go’ as belonging to ert’am.

On the other hand, Aĉaryan (HAB 2: 54a; see also 1913: 396a) mentions the etymology suggested by Tervišyan 1887: 91t, linking *tial with Skt. ēti ‘to go’, etc., but does not specify his opinion. Elsewhere (HAB 4: 12b), he, albeit with a question mark, mentions ert’al > chal 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 Tervišyan deserves more attention. This dialectal word may be derived from PIE *h₁ei- ‘to go’: Skt. ētī ‘to go’, Gk. ἐλθεῖν ‘to go’, Lith. ėiti ‘to go’, etc. See s.v. ītanem ‘to go down’. Note also PIE *h₁i eh₂- (derived from *h₁ei-): Skt. yā- ‘to drive (fast), speed’, 3sg.act. yāti (RV+), 3sg.med. iyate. Lith. jōtī ‘to drive, to go’, ToA yā- ‘to go, to travel’, etc. Armenian, as Sanskrit and Baltic, shows reflexes of both *h₁ei- (T’iflis chal, 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 *h₁H₁H₂- (cf. Skt. ēti vs. ṣātī), although, admittedly, one needs further philological evidence for the establishing and precise reconstruction of the Armenian by-forms.

**Ebayr,** GSg ebавr, NPI elbars-k’, GDPI elbars-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 *albayr*, with initial a-. To the forms recorded in HAB 2: 16b (and Greppin 1981: 138) we can now add Dersim axp/bar, al(i)bar, Mirak' albara [Bahramy 1960: 78a], Malat’ia axp’ar [Danielyan 1967: 190a], Svedia axb’ar [Ačárny 2003: 565]. Beekes (2003: 143) notes that “Class. *elbayr* stands against *axpar* of all modern dialects”. In reality, not all the dialectal forms can be derived from *albayr* (see also Greppin 1981: 138; Clackson 2004-05: 157).

The form *albayr* (albayr, bar, 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 *elbayr*, with the initial e-, is Zeyt’un: cxb’yā (cf. also Maraš exper [Galustean 1934: 377]), vs. Hačn axb’yā, GSg axb’ey [HAB 2: 16b; Ačárny 2003: 39, 80, 307]. This e- of the Zeyt’un/Maraš form seems to be secondary (see 2.1.17.4 for the prothetic vowel).

- **Etym.** Since Petermann, derived with the PIE word for ‘brother’ with regular metathesis, dissimilation r...r > l...l (2.1.24.2) and subsequent addition of prothetic e- before l : Skt. bhrāta-, Lat. frater ‘brother’, Gr. φράτηρ ‘member of a brotherhood’, etc., [Hübbschman 1897: 441-442; HAB 2: 16a]. Nom. *bʰrēsōr > elbayr, gen. *bʰrēštrōs > elbowr.

**Eleamn,** an-stem (GSg eman, Isg elemam) ‘hoarfrost’ (Bible+). In “Yaçaçapatumi” and Vardan Arewele’i (13th cent.), dial. elemn. A meteorological description of eleamn (var. elemn, eleam) is found in Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 321).5

- **Dial.** Hamšen elım ‘icicle’, Lazax elm-a-kal-el ‘to be covered by hoarfrost’ [HAB 2: 17a; Ačárny 1947: 227]; Xotorjör elım ‘hoarfrost’ [YuşamXotor 1964: 459]. Also Dersim yelvam [Bahramy 1960: 78b].

- **Etym.** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 16-17. Alayan (1980: 142) analyzes as *el- *[amn, for the formation comparing ayceamn ‘gazelle, roe’ < *ayci- + -amn (see s.v. aycey) ‘goat’ and 2.3.1). Olsen (1999: 376, 943) mentions it as a word of unknown origin, containing the suffix -amn.

I propose to compare Arm. *el- with BSL. *h₁H₁H₂- ‘hoarfrost, rime’ (cf. Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 287a); Russ. inej, Czech jíní, SCR. īné, Bulg. inej, Lith. įnis (dialect), etc. The full grade of the word, namely *h₁elH₁H₂-, may have yielded PArm. *eini- > *ei(e)i > *eni-, with assimilation (see 2.1.23) and subsequent loss of *e-. Alternatively, one may assume a zero-grade root: *h₁H₁H₂- > PArm. *ini- > *(i)imi displelocation n... n > *i... n, and loss of word-initial pretonic i-, see 2.1.33.2) > e-leamn, with a regular prothetic e- before l. For the suffix cf. saćamanik ‘ice’. Thus: *eni-am(a)n > eleamn with nasal dissimilation.
The second part of *tehna- is unexplained. I wonder if the word is composed of eln 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).

The Armenian expected form *elin- < *hel-(h)en- became eln, with a dark -l-, analogically after the nominative eln (see Meillet 1936: 47, 80), perhaps also a theoretical by-form *el- from *hel-(h)en- (cf. Gr. ἔλαφος) through the development *eln- > Arm. -l-. Further see s.v. analut ‘a kind of deer, hind’.


ehtiw-r-k4, etelw-r-k4 (mostly in pl., acc.-loc. (y)-etelwi-), a-stem: GDPl etelw-a-c’ (John Chrysostom), AbPl y-etel-a-c’ (Sargs Snorhali, 12th cent.) ‘marsh-meadow, swamp, moist or irrigated place’, attested also in Isaiah 35.7 (with reading variants atelwi, alter-), Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom [NHB 2: 657c; HAB 2: 24b].

The word renders Gr. ἕλαφος m. ‘deer; deer-cow, doe’ in the Bible (for a textual illustration, see Job 39.1, Cox 2006: 249) and Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 295160, glossed in 373a).


The place-name Yełın aspür < *Elin altiwır, lit. ‘spring of hind’ (Łarabal, close to the village of Kusapat, see Lisic’an 1981: 56b, 59) may be regarded as a relic of the classical genitive eln.

Interesting is also Č’arsančag *èhnär [HAB 2: 22a] = yehnar ‘deer-cow, hind’ [Bahramyan 1960: 78b]. In a colophon from the same region, Akn (1676 AD), we find a female anthroponym Elınar (Canikean 1895: 91; cf. also Elınar in a folk-song, R. Grigoryan 1970: 81160), which must be identified with the local dialectal yehnar ‘deer-cow, hind’ [AćafAnjn 2, 1944: 118; Jähukyan 1984: 39]. The initial h- of the by-form Nehnar [AćafAnjn 3, 1946: 81] seems to be due to influence of Helinę. Note also Nehnar, a widespread cow-name in Hamšen (see T’orlak’yın 1981: 144a).

elni, NPl elin-k’, GDPl etan-c’ ‘deer-cow, hind’ (Bible+); eln-ort’, u-stem: GDPl elnort-’u-c’ (Mxit’ar Gös, 12-13th cent.) ‘young of the deer, fawn’ (Evagrius of Pontus, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.).

The Armenian expected form *elin- < *hel-(h)en- became eln, with a dark -l-, analogically after the nominative eln (see Meillet 1936: 47, 80), perhaps also a theoretical by-form *el- from *hel-(h)en- (cf. Gr. ἔλαφος) through the development *eln- > Arm. -l-. Further see s.v. analut ‘a kind of deer, hind’.


elni, NPl elin-k’, GDPl etan-c’ ‘deer-cow, hind’ (Bible+); eln-ort’, u-stem: GDPl elnort-’u-c’ (Mxit’ar Gös, 12-13th cent.) ‘young of the deer, fawn’ (Evagrius of Pontus, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.).

elni, NPl elin-k’, GDPl etan-c’ ‘deer-cow, hind’ (Bible+); eln-ort’, u-stem: GDPl elnort-’u-c’ (Mxit’ar Gös, 12-13th cent.) ‘young of the deer, fawn’ (Evagrius of Pontus, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.).
Singular eštiwār is glossed in the medieval dictionary Bařgirk' hayoc' as 'moist place, watered soil, small spring' [Amalyan 1975: 88].

The oldest attestation is found in Isaiah 35.7: Elie' i anfurn yeherwrs (vars. yalitiwrs, yaltiers) : kai ή άνυδρος έστη εις έλη.

• ETYM Ačaryan (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. aļt 'dirt, filth'.

The ending -eůr probably points to an old neuter, cf. aļewr 'flour' vs. Gr. ἀλεύρον n., mostly in pl. ἀλεύρα 'flour' (q.v.); aļbewr 'fountain, spring' vs. Gr. πηγή, -ας n. 'an artificial well; spring; tank, cistern' (q.v.). I tentatively assume an underlying *e/a- derived from PIE neuter s-stem *sél-e/os-:. Gr. έλος n. 'marsh-meadow, swamp', Skt. sárás- n. 'lake, pool', cf. sarasi- [Teich, Pfuhl, Sumpf', etc. (see Euler 1979: 213; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 708; Beekes apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 370b). A theoretical *e/aļewr 'marsh-meadow' may have been replaced by e/aļawr based on a form with a dental determinative, *a/-t- formed as (or etymologically identical with) aļt 'dirt, filth' (q.v.).

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 25a) claims that the doublets e- and a- point to a prothetic vowel. If the reading variant aštiwār proves reliable, and if my interpretation above is accepted, one may explain the alternation e : a in PArm. *e/a- : *a/-t- through the underlying case forms of the PIE PD neuter paradigm: nom. *sél-os, gen. *sél-és-(o)s > *sél- vs. *sλ- >> Parm. *el-č, *a/-t-.

The a-stem in plural of e/aļewr 'marsh-meadow' and aļbewr 'spring' (GDPI -a-/c) may go back to the neuter plural *h₂, cf. Gr. ἀλεύρων 'flour', etc.

cļunγ, an-stem: Sg cļegam-b (Paterica, spelled as ștəŋamb), NPl cļequn-k'. API cļequn-s (Bible), IPl cļeqam-b-k' in Movsš Xorenac'i 2.8 (1913=1991: 115) '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. Larabāl kŋna, kňna [Davt'yan 1966: 344], Goris kŋol (on which see s.v. bankn 'myth, fairy-tale'), Dersim sľng vs. slŋ, ũŋ [Batraqyan 1960: 78b], etc. This vocalism is attested already in Middle Armenian, cf. e.g. IPI reading variants sľŋam-b-k', kŋambk', kŋǝŋk', etc. in Nersēš Snorhali, 12th cent., Cilicia (see K'yoškerayan 1987: 250). For a further discussion, see s.v. c̩ńg-k' 'knee'.

The by-form *a-tlung (see AčarHL.Patm 2, 1951: 415; Ałahan 1965: 8; Peters 1986: 378), is not supported by unambiguous evidence. Further, note Hāčn ūlung, Zey't'un ūlung [Ačaryan 2003: 39, 307], Malat'ia ūlung [Danielyan 1967: 190a], etc. [HAB 2: 23b].

• ETYM Derived from PIE *h₂.sŋukʷ- or *h₂.sŋokʷ- 'nail': Gr. ὄνυξ, -oχος 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', unguula f. 'hoof', OHG nagui 'nail', Toch. A muku, B. mksu 'nails' < PToch. *mekɔw < *meków through assimilation (see Krause/Thomas 1, 1960: 66; Szemerényi 1960: 461; Adams 2995: 467; cf. Blažek 2001a; compare Arm. magal '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 *enungn to this PIE etymon is accepted practically by everyone, though details are unclear. One often assumes *nogh-lo- > *long-lo-through metathesis > *enongn (anticipation) > *enungn > etlung (dissimilation). Beekes (1987b: 7) writes: “perhaps from *enong- > *ongh-”, which could be a contamination of *nogh- and *long- from *hɔŋh- ‘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-łungn. 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 է, pl. enk’ էխ ‘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. *h₁es-énti, etc., cf. Sg. áasi átsi, 3pl. sánti, OAv. ahm, hant, Gr. ēnti, ūl (Dor. ęnti), ęnti, Hitt. eñnti eži, Lat. sum est sunt, OCS jesmu, OLith. esmì, 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.

ērānd. AblSg y-ērānd-ē (which precludes an o-stem), GLocSg (v/z)ērānd-i, etc. (Bible+) ‘the day before yesterday’.
Austacaturean 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-erandeun adj. ‘of the day before yesterday’ in Paterica, Grigor Magistros and Čarantir [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 *h- since the initial h- would drop in y- and z-forms: *y- he- > y-e-, *z- he- > z-e-;

2) the dialectal form herând in Moks, with an initial voiced h- (note that CIArm. 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 Muš group (see 2.3.1 on y-).

●DIAL. Van yeänd, Moks heänd [Ačaryan 1952: 257], cf. also herek č‘e herand ‘pozačera’ [Orbeli 2002: 277]; Marata yarand (with a sound change er- > yar seen also in ēram > Marata yrārāl ‘to boil’), gen. yrātvā ‘the day before yesterday’ [Ačarean 1926: 39, 90-91, 392], Salmast yeänd [HAB 2: 32a].

●ETYM Since NHB 1: 662a, derived from ēr- < err- (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, etc., see s.v. erēk ‘three’), cf. Gr. τιππη ἕνεπα, Lat. nadius tertius ‘it is the third day since, three days ago, i.e. the day before yesterday’. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 32a) hesitates to accept this because the form er- 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 ēr-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. πόρο ‘forth, forward, for, before’, πόρσο, Att. πόρσο ‘forward, beyond, away’, Lat. pōrō ‘onward, further (off), besides’, Arm. a‘ ‘at, by, before’, her-i adv. ‘far (of time and space)’, heru ‘last year’, heruin- ‘two years ago’ (see s.vv.). The trilled r- as in ar and her- points to IE *rs-. For the suffix we can compare time-terms such as Gr. χαυν ‘Fire’ and Arm. hēman- ‘Hemantā-’ ‘winter’, Hitt. ḫašant- ‘night’, etc. See also s.vv. ašun ‘autumn’, garun ‘springtime’, erēk(o)y, erik-un ‘evening’.

If we assume a QIE *pers-o(n), PArm. *her- and-i (cf. loc. (y/z)-er- and-i) may reflect QIE *pers-qi-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. *h₂eḡ³h-om : *h₂eḡ-oH, cf. Skt. ahám, OAv. ažm, YAv. azom, Gr. ēγ, Lat. egō, Goth. ik, OCS azn, 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).


Dat. inj derives from *h1m(e)-gī, cf. Hitt. ammun, Venetic mego, Lat. mihi, Goth. mi-k, OHG mi-h, etc., further cf. Gr. ἐμε γέ, the same particle is also found in Gen. ἐμε γέ; the same particle is also found in *tu̯e-ĝi > k‘ez ‘dir’, cf. Hitt. tuk, Goth. þuk, OHG dih (see Pedersen 1905: 226 = 1982: 88; Meillet 1936: 28; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 45, 56; Pokorny 1959: 702; Ernout/Meillet 1959: 391b; Schindler 1966b: 73-22; Schmitt 1981: 115-117; Hamp 1981: 13-14; Jähukyan 1982: 141-142, 147; Vireddaz 2005: 95; Kloekhorst 2008, chapter 2.1). It has been assumed that these forms are all modified on the analogy of nom. *eğō (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 < *in-s < *h1m(e)-s. The *in- here was extended to abl. y-in-ën and instr. in-ew. For a discussion of these issues, see Meillet 1936: 92; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 45, 56; Pokorny 1959: 418, 702; Jähukyan 1967: 184; 1982: 147; Godel 1975: 110; Schmitt 1981: 115-116; Klingenschmitt 1982: 212; Ravnæs 1991: 19; Beekes 2003: 168; Vireddaz 2005: 95. On the other hand, abl. y-in-ën is considered to represent earlier *im-ën, cf. Goth. gen. meina of ik ‘I’ (see Pedersen 1905: 226 = 1982: 88; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 56; Kortlandt 1984a: 104 = 2003: 50).

etl, gen. etel ‘site, place’ (Bible+); zetel’m, causs. zetel’ec’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+), zetel ‘established, constant’ (John Chrysostom, Book of Chries); later with assimilation zt- > st-: stel’em ‘to take a rest’ (Paterica), stel’anam ‘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+).

erastan-k’, a-stem: GDPl erastan-a-c’ ‘buttocks’. Several attestations in the Bible, rendering Gr. ἕδραι: ἕδρα ‘seat; rump’. Singular usage: in Philo. **ETYM** Compared with Gr. πρωκτός m. ‘anus’, Skt. pr̥ṣṭḥ- n. ‘back, mountain-ridge, top’ (RV+), pr̥ṣṭ-, type *pont-eH-; Arm. -n from acc. *-m (see Hamp 1991); *pr̥ṣṭ-s-: *pr̥ṣṭ-ós [Beekes 1969: 247]; *perh3k- [Beekes 1988: 77]; *preh2k-: *preh₂k- [Beekes 2003: 152, 166, 171, 173, 191, 195]. Hamp (1991) argues against *perh3k- in view of the absence of Arm. initial h-, and alternatively assumes *pr(e)Ok- (= *pr(e)h3k-). Noting that *prh3k- 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 *srban-k’ with eran-k’. The latter is attested in Zgōn (Afrahat) and is found in a number of dialects, as a frozen plural: *srban-k’ ‘placenta; prenatal liquid of a cow’ (see s.v. surb ‘pure; holy’). For further analysis and references I refer to Clackson 1994: 166-167.

There can be no serious objection to the following paradigm: nom. *pre/oHk-: *prHk- > PArm. *erast-: *(h)jarast- (or *erast-: *(h)jarast-, if it was *-e/oH-). From here, one easily arrives at erast-an-k’ by levelling, and influence of eran-k’. The form *(h)jarast- may be seen, in my view, in arastoy (also erastoy) ‘solid, hard stone’, q.v.

erbus, o-stem ‘breast of animals’.

Frequent in the Bible, referring to the breast of sacrificial animals and rendering Gr. στήϑυνιον (dimin.) ‘breast’. For apposition with βραχίων = eri ‘shoulder of animals’, see there. **ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 2: 42b.

Lidén (1937: 92) derives from IE *hbru-go- or *bbru-go- with Gr. φάργυς, gen. -υγος, -υγγος ‘throat; dewlap of a bull’, and Lat. frāmen ‘throat’ < *frēg-smen. He is sceptical about Goth. brasts ‘breast’, Russ. brjuxo ‘belly’, etc. The etymology is
The metathesis *bhr-* > Arm. erb- is regular, see 2.1.26.1. Olsen (ibid.) derives erbuc from nom. *bhrug/ĝ-s assuming that *ĝ and *ĝs would merge in Arm. c. If the -c' in erēc ‘elder’ (q.v.) reflects *sg- (cf. Gr. ἀρχής), 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-strem: GDSg erg-o-y, GDPl erg-o-c’ ‘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).


DIAL Ačaṙyan HAB 2: 43a considers the dialectal forms as literary loans.

ETYM Since long (de Lagarde 1854: 151, see further HAB 2: 42-43; Hübischmann 1897: 443), connected with Skt. arkā- m. ‘ray, light, shine; song, magic song’, cf. also ṛc- f. ‘song of praise, poem, stanza, verse’, ārcati ‘to shine; to sing, to praise’. To this PIE etymon belong also OIr. erc ‘sky’; Toch. A yrēk ‘worship, reverence’, Hitt. ārku-2, arku- ‘to chant, intone’ (see Duchesne-Guillemin 1940: 172; Mayrhofer EWAl 1, 1992: 114-115, 249-250; Adams 1999: 484; Kloekhorst 2008: 205).


erek ‘evening’ (Job 7.4, rendering Gr. ἑσπέρα in contrast with ἡμέρα vs. ἡμέρα, see Cox 2006: 83), ‘west’ (Philo), ‘Evening Star’ (George of Pisidia); ereak ‘evening’ (Paterica+); prepositional constructions such as ař ereks ‘at/towards evening’ in Genesis 49.27 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 388) rendering Gr. εἰς τὸ ἑσπέρας in contrast with z-avg-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’angełos, Movsēs Xorenac’i, etc.); ere/ikanam ‘to spend the night; to stay by the evening’ (Bible+); ereko-, GDSg erekoy-i, LocSg y-erekoy-i ‘evening’ (Bible+), ere/ik-un ‘evening; in the evening; of the evening’ (Leviticus, Elišė, 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 (*perkw-*) and be interpreted as an elliptic phrase ‘abode of the Thunder God’.
erek. GDSg erenorn-o-o, GDP erenkore-a-e ‘evening’ and a few derivatives based on *erek-o-r- (Bible*); see also s.v. erèk ‘yesterday’.

For some Biblical attestations and derivatives of erenko(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’s irigun beside irigun, Nor Jula y’araku, Laradaž aruku, etc. [HAB 2: 46a]. Interesting is especially Nor Jula y’araku (Açarèan 1940: 56-57, 137-138, 360b; for a textual illustration from a folk-song, see Ereman 1930: 56/1) with prothetic y’- and a-vocalism. This y’, together with Muš, Alâskert and Moks h’- and Havarrak’, Ozim h- probably points to a prefixed by-form, frozen locative *y-erekun(n).


The PIE reconstruction would then be *h₁regw-e/os-, s-stem neuter. Toch. A orkäm ‘darkness; dark’ and B ork(a)mo ‘id.’ reflecting a PToch. *orkmo from QIE *h₁(o)rgw-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. arjən ‘black’).

Arm. erekoy, i-stem ‘evening’ is interpreted as an original genitive of time (de Lambarterie 1990, 1: 162, 162/1; Clackson 1994: 223-224/1; Olsen 1999: 511-512; Matzinger 2005: 23/11, 42)56. The form erērikun 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. ἄργωνος ‘dark’ < *h₁regw-es-no-; ἄργων ‘id.’ < *h₁regw-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.
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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-ieh2-; structurally compare another time-word, Gr. ὀξύων ἐπέτειλα, Lac. ὀξύων 'end of the summer, beginning of autumn; harvest, fruit' < *op-osar-eh2-., a fem. to *h2-os-τ- 'after the summer'. Further note Gr. χειμών 'winter' vs. Arm. jm-eř-εν 'winter'; Gr. ἔαρ n., OCS vesna 'spring', Skt. vasanta- 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. *ereko-r-ia- vs. *o/rek(o)- reflecting *r-ieh2- vs. *-e/ont- (more or less like Gr. ἐσω-π-α f. 'evening' vs. YAv. *xšap-αr-, *xšaf-n-, Skt. kšāp- f. and Hitt. isp-αnt- 'night' (on this ety whole, see s.vv. gišer 'night').

The vocalism of erik-un 'evening', in the evening' and erēk 'yesterday' < 'at evening' vs. regular erēk(o-) < *h1regwos is synchronically inexplicable. I assume an anticipation of the locative marker -i, or simply a frozen locative *erek-i > *ereik : *erik- (gen. ereiık-i and Larabal, etc. loc. *er(e)k-i, see s.v. erēk 'yesterday') just like in Arm. avg. u-stem 'morning' (q.v.): LocSG *h2̣is-s-i > PArm. *aw(h)i-i (thematization) *awj-εν- > *awyo- > avg. o-stem >> u-stem, generalized from old nom. *aw-u. For other time-words reflecting frozen i-locatives, see s.vv. *af- 'twilight, darkness' and amurj 'dream'. On the i-locative reflected also in the dialect of Larabal, see 2.2.1.5.

EREK *, inflected only in plural: API eri-s, GDPI eri-č, IPI eri-w-č 'three' (Bible+). The form *eri- is found in e.g. erić's (or erić's angam) 'three times' (Bible+). In Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.61 (1913=1991: 192-10, transl. Thomson 1978: 204): erić's kam č'oric's boxen zsaln "strike the anvil three or four times". Compare eric's from erku 'two', q.v.

On erir 'third; for the third time' (Bible+) and erēk-kin 'threelfold, 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: 53-5), transl. Thomson 1978: 100): aparans <..> krknayark ws eriyarks “palaces <..> of two and three stories’. The form er- is derived from err-, as in tarr 'element' > ταίρ [HAB 2: 50b]. I wonder whether it can be analogous after k'ar- (q.v.).

*DIAT Ubiquitous in the dialects. Note Antioık' ärk' and Hačan żek' (cf. Nor Naxįjewan żek') vs. Zeyt'un iyik' [Ačārany 2003: 307]. The Hačan form is exceptional since there are no other examples of the development VrV > ZV (cf. erēk 'yesterday' > Hačan iyeg, etc.) [Ačārany 2003: 130], whereas it is regular in Nor Naxįjewan (see Ačārany 1925: 53, 154-155).

Sivri-Hisar śek/šek' ‘three’ (see PtmSivHisHay 1965: 469a; N. Mkr't'yan 1995: 207, 210). N. Mkr't'yan (1995: 210) takes this word as one of the isoglosses shared by the dialects of Nor Naxįjewan and Sivri-Hisar.

On Moks irik'čin 'for the third time' (apparently a relic from ClArm. *erékk-in 'three times') and irik'čr 'id.', see s.v. krkin.

ClArm. erēk'čin, erēk'čaun 'all the three' (Bible+) has been preserved in Larabal erēk'an, irēk'an [Dav't'yan 1966: 347], Melri irēk'k'ın [Alayan 1954: 179-180, 268a], Karćewan irik'čen [H. Muradyan 1960: 110, 192b], Kak'avaberđ erık'k'an [H.
erēk

Muradyan 1967: 127-128, 170a]. See also AčarLiak 1, 1952: 325-326]. On these forms, see 2.2.4.2.

- **ETYM** From PIE *treies* m. ‘three’: Skt. trāyas, Gr. τρεῖς, Lat. trēs, Lith. trūs ‘three’, etc.; cf. also Arm. API eris < *trins : Goth. prīns, instr. *eri-w- < *tri-bʰi- : Skt. DAbIPl tribyādās [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; Beeckes 2003: 153-154].

It has been assumed that erir ‘third’ continues the inherited *triyo- influenced by *(k')turo- ‘fourth’, i.e. a contaminated *trīro- [Szemerényi 1960: 95; Kortlandt 2003: 101]. On erkir ‘second’, erir ‘third’, etc., see also Meillet 1911-12c: 294 (comparing Tocharian r); Jahukyan 1982: 223ba, and s.v. krkin.

erēk, i-stem: GSg erēk-i in Joshua 3.4 (rendering Gr. ἀρξ’ ἐγρήγετ), Psalms 89.4 (awr erēki : ἡ ἵππα ἐγρήγετ), in homilies by Eusebius of Nemesa (found by L. Hovhannisyan 1987: 132), erēk-i (Cyriol of Alexandria), cf. also z/y-erēk-i (Cyriol of Jerusalem, Zgōn-Afrāhat, Severian of Gabala), AblSg y-erēk-e, y-erēk-i (a few times in the Bible, e.g. Exodus 4.10, y-ere/ik- : πό τιν ἐγρήγετ) ‘yesterday’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 52]. Some E and SE peripheral dialects have forms reflecting er(e)jk-i, Havarik’ ħrēkji, Jūlā ārkē [HAB 2: 52b], Agulis yarkē, C’ina arkē [Ačarēan 1935: 45, 349], Łarabal ārkē/g-i and yark/g-ě [Dav’tyan 1966: 200, 347].

- **ETYM** Derived from erēk(oy) ‘evening’ (q.v.). Ačarēan (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’tillis irigun ‘yesterday evening’. Compare also ayg ‘morning’ > *ayg-un/c- ‘tomorrow’ (q.v.).

L. Hovhannisyan 1987: 132 treats erēk as an old dialectal form and compares it with Łarabal yarkē, etc. In my opinion Łarabal arēk/g-i and yark/g-ě [Dav’tyan 1966: 200, 347] point to *erēk-i and *er(e/i)kī, respectively, and the form erēk-i (beside o-stem erēk) should be regarded as a frozen locative (see s.v. erēk ‘evening’ and 2.2.1.5; cf. also the cases of *alj- ‘twilight, darkness’, ayg ‘morning’, anurj ‘dream’).

erēc’, GDSg erēc’-u, AblSg erēc’-u-ě, NPl erēc’-un-k’, GDPl erēc’-an-c’ [Astuacatu- rean 1895: 460ab]; a-stem: ISg erēc’-a-w as a variant reading in Mvōsēs Xorenaci’3.63 (1913=1991: 347l23); o-stemm: GDPl erēc’-a-y in Elišē and Lazăr P’arpeči [NHB 1: 683a]; pl. erēc’-anik’, -an-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+).


In the Eastern areas, the word is only found in the compound *erēc’-a-kin ‘wife of the priest’: Agulis arc’ākin [HAB 2: 53a; Ačarēan 1935: 349]. A possible trace of the unstressed *ārc’- is also found in the toponym Arcevan < Eric’-van-ik (Kapan region), see s.v. the place-name Arciv.
ETYM Connected with Gr. πρέσβυς m. ‘old man; the elder; ambassador; president’, perhaps also Lat. priscus ‘ancient’, see Bugge 1889: 12; Meillet 1894b: 296; Hübschmann 1897: 444; HAB 2: 52-53; Jahukyan 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’.

ertia(ana)rm ‘to go; to set off’. The indicative of the aorist is supplied by čogay, but the moods are formed from ertia-, see Meillet 1936: 135; Szemerényi 1964: 53 (Bible+). The substantive ertura, i-stem ‘going, journey’ is attested in John Chrysostom (GDSg ertia), Lazar P’arpeci (GDPI ertia’), Movsēs Xorenac’i, and Grigoris Aršaruni [NHB 1: 683a].

DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 54a]. Karin ertia’-u-gal ‘the going and the coming’ (see HayLezBrbBat 2, 2002: 34b; HZHek’ 4, 1963: 120).

ETYM Usually linked with Gr. ἔρχομαι ‘to set out; to walk; to come or go’, for which different proposals have been made: *h₁ér- or *h₁r-t’-sk- or *ser- + *-t’, *-d’, *-g’, or *-k’ (see Meillet 1898: 276-277, 278; 1936: 135; Hübschmann 1899: 47; HAB 2: 53-54). For *h₁r-sk- cf. Skt. pchátii ‘to reach, come towards, meet with’, Hitt. ar-sk- iter. ‘wiederholt gelangen, Einfälle machen’, etc. Since the sequence *-rt- yields Arm. -rd-, a *-t’ suffix is usually reconstructed for Arm. ertia’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; Jahukyan 1982: 68; 1987: 165; Matzinger 2000: 285. However, there are no cognate forms with a dental suffixal element *-t’. 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 ertia’am as a denominative verb derived from ertia’-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 > ertia’, 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-oyn three times in the Bible, IPl 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’ (dialect. also for humans); aeri (also y-eri) ‘near, at the side’ (Āxšarhac’oyn), Eusebius of Caesarea.

In Deuteronomy 18.3, the priest shall receive the following parts of a sacrificed ox or sheep: eri, cnōt-k’, xaxac’oc’ (see Cox 1981: 149) = Gr. βραχίων ‘(upper) arm; shoulder of beasts’, σαγώνα ‘the parts under or near the jaw’, ἐνυστρόν ‘fourth stomach of ruminating animals’, respectively. In some passages on the sacrificial instruction, a reference is made to the right eri = βραχίων : 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* = βραχίων occurs in apposition with *erubuc* = σφακίον (dimin.) ‘breast’.

**DIAL.** Ararat *eri*, Larabal, Marala *hiri*, Salmast *neri* (sic! n- is reliable? – HM); Larabal *hrot‘at‘* < *er-a-t‘at‘*, with *t‘at‘* ‘arm, paw’ as the second member [HAB 2: 55a]. For Larabal *hrot‘at‘um* ‘in/on the back, shoulder-blade’, see Laziyan 1983: 146b-18, glossed as *hrot‘at‘* ‘shoulder-blade, back’, *hrot‘at‘-en* (186b). In another illustration from this book (85a L-18), glossed as *mi yar* (a pitchfork) onto its *hrot‘at‘* (hrot‘at‘-en). Here, the word clearly refers to ‘shoulder-blade’. The same is found in L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 331-3, where the hero is seated on the *hrot‘at‘ en* of a dragon.

In a story written in 1884, L. Alayan (1979: 623-64) describes a buffalo named Dursun as having horns stretching along the neck and reaching the *hrot‘at‘*-s. Probably, Xotorjur *zrel‘at‘* ‘shoulder-blade’ [YušamXotor] 1964: 447b belongs here too, although the nature of the internal -l- is obscure.


If the initial *h*- in Larabal, etc. indeed has an etymological value, one should give preference to Ačaryan’s etymology.

**erinj.** o-stem: GDPI *erunj-o-v-k* (5x in the Bible), IPI *erunj-o-v-k* (in Genesis 41.3, see Zeyt’yan 1985: 339); u-stem: GDGs *erunj* (4x in the Bible), GDPI *erunj-o-c* (once in the Bible, also in the Commentary upon Judges ascribed to Elišė); a-stem: ISG *erunj-a-w* (Philo) ‘heifer, young cow; cow; bride’ (see also s.v. *erunjak*) (Bible+). In Isaiah 7.21: *erinj mi yarja‘oc* “one young cow from/of bovids” : σύμφων Ἰωάν. See also s.v. *arja‘.

**DIAL.** Widespread in the dialects. With initial *r*-. Nor-Naxijewan, Axalce‘xa, Hamşen, Karin, Ararat, Alaškert, Muş, Van, Moks (see also Orbeli 2002: 225), Şatax (see M. Muradyan 1962: 195b), Salmast; diphthongized *ye*-: Ozim, Šamaxi, Jüla; *he*-: Larabal, Goris, Mužambar (a village of Tavriz/Tebriz) [HAB 2: 56b]; he is also found in Kızên [Balramyan 1961: 180b], Melri [Alayan 1954: 268a], Karčewan [H. Muradyan 1960: 192b], Kak’avaber [H. Muradyan 1967: 170a], although Agulis, closely associated with the Melri group, has áravj [HAB 2: 56b; Ačaryan 1935: 44, 349].

In all the dialects, *erinj* refers to ‘a two-year old female calf’ [HAB 2: 56b]; Ararat *erinj* also to ‘a three-year-old sprout of grapes which is replanted separately’ (see Amatani 1912: 182a; HAB 2: 56b). For the semantic shift, see 3.5.1.

**ETYM.** Patrubany (1906-08 /1908/: 152a) derives from QIE *qrendjo-*, connecting OHG *hrind* ‘bovine animal’, Germ. *Rind* ‘id.’, etc. See also Adontz 1937: 7-8. Ačaryan (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 *kr-*. 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. *(u)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 *krenti-.

Petersson (1916: 257-258) links erinj with Gr. ἵππος m. f. ‘kid’, Lith. éras, dial. jéras m. ‘lamb’, Latv. jēre ‘one-year-old sheep, mother lamb’, OPr. eristian (see Euler 1985: 87), Olt. hiarp f. ‘deer’, erb ‘cow’ < *er-bh-, Lat. ariēs, -etis m. ‘ram’, etc. For Arm. -j, he compares orajj ‘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. ἵππος; 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 *h1eri-Hn-i̯eh2-, composed as *h1eri- (seen in Gr. ἵππος m. f. ‘kid’ and Lat. ariēs, -etis m. ‘ram’) + *-Hn-i(e)h2- exactly like PIE *h1e/ol-Hn-ih2- ‘deer, hind’: OCS alji, SCr. làne ‘doe’, Russ. lani ‘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, xunf-n ‘snail’, dial. *mormonj ‘ant’, etc., all probably original feminines (cf. s.vv. morm ‘tarantula’, mriwn ‘ant’, and 3.5.2.1; on xunf-n ‘snail’, see also 2.3.1, under the suffix -j/z.

Megrelian orji, orįji ‘neat’, orji ‘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 Aćarean 1913: 657b).

Alternative 1): Ararat erinj ‘a three-year-old sprout of grapes which is replanted separately’ is reminiscent of Gr. θρίνια · ἄμπελος ἐν Κρήτῃ ‘vineyard’ (Hesychius), perhaps from *trisnii̯eh2-, cf. Alb. trishe < *trisjezh2- ‘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: *trisnii̯eh2- > 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-inje2-, cf. Skt. paryārinī- f. ‘cow which has its first calf after a year’.

erkan, i-stem, a-stem : GDSg erkan-i (Bible), GDPl erkan-i-c’ (Yovhannēš Erznkac’i, 13-14th cent.), ISg erkan-a-w (Vardan Arewlec’i, 13th cent.), erkan-a-c’ (Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent.) *(hand-)mill’ (see Clackson 1994: 92) (Bible+).
erkayn

DIAL. Preserved in numerous dialects; everywhere as a frozen plural *e/ar kan-ka'; except for Agulis är kan [HAB 2: 61b; Ačarean 1935: 349]. The a- is only found in E and SE margins, Agulis, Larabal, Jula, etc.


Meillet (1894: 159-160) suggested a complicated scenario: *gwerwnā > Arm. *kergan > *kerkan > erkan. Later he rejected this view (apud HAB 2: 61a) and derived erkan from *gwrāwanā with the development *-awa- > -a- [Meillet 1908-09: 354-355]. The protoform *erkawan is unnecessary, since, in view of Lith. gîrna, etc., Arm. erkan can go back to PIE *gwr(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 *i-h₁-. See also s.v. alawri() in the dialects. Šatax hɛrkɛn [M. Muradyan 1962: 195b], Moks, Ozim hɛrkɛn, and Muš, Alaškert h’ergn (HAB 2: 61a; Ačareyan 1940: 361a) cites two late attestations (both in Elias, comm. on Aristotle): ISg erkar-i-w (i-stem), GDPl 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 : sīs μακρότητα ἡμερῶν.

For the spatial aspect, cf. the following passages from Movsēs Xorenac’i: vihs erkars “wide caverns” (1.16 – 1913=1991: 54L9; transl. Thomson 1978: 101; see s.v. anjaw for the full passage); merj i leaṁ mi erkar yerkr̆ barjut’ eamb “near to a mountain that rose high from the earth” (1.26: 75L11; transl. 115); andamovk’ erkar “with long limbs” (2.5: 107L16).


DIAL. Ararat, T’iflis, Rodost’o ergar ‘long’, Haštarxan erkar ‘far away’, Jula y’etkar or yetkar ‘far away’ [HAB 2: 61b; Ačarean 1940: 361a]. Ačareyan does not account for the abnormal -t- in the Jula form. In 1940: 55, he compares the
erkiw

development ye- > ye't to that found in yet ‘back, behind’ > ye't, but does not specify the origin of -t.

●ETYM Since Meillet (1924: 1-4), connected with Gr. ὑντος, Dor. δοῦτος ‘lasting long’, Lat. dūrō ‘to make/become hard; to endure, last out, survive’, Skt. dūrā- ‘far’ (RV+), etc., through the sound change *du(-) > Arm. -rk- (< *dueh2-ro-); also related with erkkayn ‘long’ (see HAB 2: 60-61; Jahukyan 1982: 75), cf. Gr. ὑήν ‘long, far’ < *峨ήν< [de Lambertiere 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 *er-i-dwāros (cf. Gr. ἵππος ‘very’, etc.). The other etymology which connects erkar with Lith. erdvas ‘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 *-d̥- [Clackson 1994: 113; Beekes 2003: 200].

Pisani (1934: 184; 1950: 178) derives Arm. erkar and erkkayn from *grā- (cf. Lat. grandis) and compares the formation of erkkayn with that of layn ‘broad’. Sceptical: Clackson 1994: 113. Cf. also Kortlandt 2003: 93, 95. The irregular -t- in Juła ye'tkar or ye'tkar ‘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 ye't ‘back, behind’).

erkiw, i-stem: ISg erkiw-i-w, GDPl erkiw-i-c’, etc. ‘fear’ (Bible†). There are variant spellings with -iw/ew alternation, or without -w. For instance: ISg erkiw (vars. erkiwiv, erkewliw) in Deuteronomy 28.22 (Cox 1981: 184): harc ‘ez t(e)l(r) <...> ew xti’wv’ en erkiw (vars. erkiwiv, erkewliw) en xorśakaw : πατάξαι σε κύρος <...> και ἱσταθμός καὶ φόνος καὶ ἄνεμοφϑορίᾳ. For the full passage, see s.v. xēt’ ‘bite, pain’. Here, Arm erkiw威尔 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 yerkul, Juła yergud, Ararat yergud, T’iflis yirgud, Muš y’ergud, Ozim yetk[ [HAB 2: 65b; Acaşyan 1940: 361a; 1952: 258]. (Some of) the dialect forms may be literary loans, as is suggested for e.g. Juła yergud (see Acaşyan 1940: 56).

●ETYM Belongs to erkn ‘labour pains; fear’ (q.v.). Klingenschmitt (1982: 79, 822) derives erkiw, i-stem ‘fear’ from *dwi-il-i-, and de Lambertiere (1992: 257) from *dwi-il-o-; whereas Olsen (1999: 101-102, 270a) prefers reconstructing *dui(e)l-plo- or *dui-plo- (cf. the Germanic word for ‘doubt’: OHG zwifal, etc.), which is more attractive.

See also s.v. erku ‘two’ and 2.1.22.6.

erkn, mostly pl.: NPl erkun-k’, API erkun-s, GDPl erkan-c’ ‘labour pains, pang (of childbirth); fear, grief, sorrow’; erknem ‘ο잎ίον’; erknč’im ‘to fear’ (aor. erkevay, imper. erkir); erkč-’ot ‘coward’. See also s.v. erkiw ‘fear’ (Bible†). For the two
The basic meanings of *erkn* cf. e.g. the following passages: ὀρπῆς *erkn* ἐλθων : ὀδηγρ ἀδίκος ἐν γαστρι ἐργον (1Thessalonians 5.3); σὺε μὲν πῖν ἐν ἀδίκω *erkunk* μαθα : πορίσων μὲ ἀδίκος ἰδιώτα (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 Movsess Xorenaci (1.31: 1913=1991: 85-86; transl. Thomson 1978: 123):

Erknēr erkin, erknēr erkir, erknēr ew covn cirani; erkn i covun un ēr ew zkarmrikn egnēr : “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 Acharian (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. dirus ‘fearful’, Skt. dvést ‘to hate’, Av. dvaēdh ‘threat’, MPers. bē- ‘grief, sorrow, enmity’, etc. For -nē- cf. mart-nē- ‘im ‘to fight’ vs. mart (i-stem) ‘fight, war’ (both Bible+), etc. On the verb morphology, see Tumanjan 1971: 337; Jahukyan 1982: 182; Klingenschmitt 1982: 78-79.


Clackson (1994: 116) states that Acharian (HAB 2: 64-65) connected the nouns *erk*, o-stem ‘work, labour’ (Bible+) and *erkn* ‘(labour) pains’. In reality, Acharian (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; Jahukyan 1987: 163, 525; Viredaz 2003: 652). 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** (NP1 erku-k’, API erku-s, GDPI erku-c’, IPI erku-k’) ‘two’ (Bible+).

Numerous derivatives, some of them meaning ‘to doubt’: y-erkuanam ‘to doubt, hesitate’ (Bible+), y-erku-umm ‘doubt’, (y-)erku-an-k’ ‘doubt’ (John Chrysostom), y-erku-akan ‘doubtful’ (Eznik Kolbac’i), erk-mi-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.
On these forms, see 2.2.4.2.  

Others postulate a sound change *erko- in *erko-tasan ‘twelve’, *erki- in *erki-am ‘two years’ (Bible+), *erkeriwr < *erki-hariwr ‘two hundred’ (Bible+), *erkewan (see above), etc.

On erkie’s ‘twice, again’ (Bible+), see s.v. kic ‘conjoined’. On erkir ‘second’ (Dionysius Thrax, Philo; the dialect of Moks?), see s.v. krkin.

For erkti and erk-ōr, see s.v. ti ‘day’.

DIAL. erk is ubiquitous in the dialects. When declining, the Western dialects use erk-u-k’ and the Eastern ones erk-u-s [HAB 2: 67b]. For Marã, Mêlik’-Dawit’pék (1896: 230a) records erk ‘two’, irkušabt’i ‘Monday’, as well as harku, which he considers to be “another distortion (atawalumn) of the numeral erku”.

In definite usage: *(erk)ku-erku, or kic’ ari im t’ep’ urneras erkuna “take two of my feathers”.

On Moks erkin (and *erkir?) ‘for the second time’, see s.v. krkin.

ClArm. erk’ok’in, erk’ok’ən ‘both’ (Bible+) has been preserved in Larabal erkk’ən, e/erkk’ən, Melri erkk’ən [AčarLiak 1, 1952: 325-326; Davt’yan 1966: 348; Aylan 1954: 179-180, 268a]. Karčewan has yərkən [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 *dau̯, cf. Skt. NADu d(u)vāu m. ‘two’ (RV+); *erko- (in *erko-tasan ‘twelve’, erkok’ən or erkok’ən ‘both’) and erki- (see above) go back to *du- and *dai- respectively [HAB 2: 66-67; Jahukyan 1959: 253; 1982: 75, 127; 1987: 119]. On erk-, see also Meillet 1903: 227; Viredaz 2003: 621. Wetteberg (1981: 87-88) assumes that erko- is an inner-Armenian development from *erku-tasan, as ontocin from *ontucin (see s.v.).

The development of PIE *dwe- in Armenian has been extensively discussed; see 2.1.22.6. Bugge (1889: 42; 1890: 121; 1892: 457; 1899: 61; positively: Meillet 1894: 160) assumed that PIE *du- yielded Arm. *ku, to which er- from erkek ‘three’ was added; see also Pisani 1934: 185; Szemerényi 1985: 790-792, 794. Meillet (ibid.) also connects krkin ‘double, again’ and kul ‘Doppelung, das Doppelte’ (q.v.). Others postulate a sound change *dwe- > 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 *dwe- > *k-. Viredaz (2003: 631) 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, kul, kic’. On erkie’s ‘twice, again’ and erkir ‘second’, see s.vv. kic’ and krkin respectively.
*ernjak* 'spider'.

**DIAL** Axalc’xa *ernjak* ‘spider’ [Amatuni 1912: 149b], Karin *ernjak* ‘id.’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 392a]; cf. also Erznka *ernjek* ‘spider-web’ [Kostandyan 1979: 152b].

**ETYM** Ačařyan (HAB 2: 68b) cites s.v. *erunj* ‘heifer, young cow’ (q.v.), not specifying the semantic motivation.

If indeed from *erunj*, *ernjak* ‘spider’ may refer to the Mother Goddess Anahit-Astār, 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. *erVn-† ‘spider’ from a Mediterranean substratum, cf. Gr. ἀράχνη f. ‘spider; spider’s web’, Lat. arāneus m. ‘spider; cobweb, spider’s web’, perhaps also OEEngl. renge, rynge ‘spider; spider’s web’ < *rənja (on these forms, see Beekes 1969: 34). One reconstructs substr. *(a)rVk-†-eh2* or *(a)rVKn-†-eh2*. Arm. *e-rVn† may reflect *raKn-i† > *e-ran†, with regular prothetic e- before initial r-. Attractive, but risky.

Other alternatives: Compare Pahl. ērxtan, ēranj- ‘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 Xotor *xran* ‘spider, etc.’, see 3.5.2.5.

*ernjak* (spelled also as ernjay, ernjan, erñnak, erinčan, erinčak, erižnak) ‘a thorny edible plant’. MidArm. medical literature (see HAB 2: 68; MjHayBař 1, 1987: 203-204).

**DIAL** Relatively widespread in the dialects, mostly reflecting the forms *ernjak* and *ernjak-uk* (Ararat also ērjanuk), see HAB 2: 68b; also Moks ērjanuk ‘съедобное колючее растение’ [Orbeli 2002: 225]. For the semantic description, see Amatuni 1912: 184 (also 177a, s.v. ēršnak?); HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 392a. On Axalc’xa ērnak ‘spider’, see s.v. *ernjak*.

**ETYM** Ačařyan (HAB 2: 68b) derives from *erunj* ‘heifer, young cow’, introducing semantic parallels from Turkish and Megrelian. Compare also Gr. ἐρίφιον (gloss) ‘Rubus agrestis’ [blackberry or the like], dimin. of ἔριφος ‘kid’, possibly related to Arm. *erunj* (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 ĀcarHLPatm 2, 1951: 403; Weitenberg 1996: 96-99; Ervandyaw 2007: 33.


Note that the form ewart’n has not been preserved in any form of Armenian, and the non-classical ewart’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’.

ewart, o-stem: GDSg iwɨ-y ‘oil’ (Bible+); dial. almost exclusively *e.t.

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 iwɨ in 28.18 (var. ewart, 3x el) and 35.14 (2x el), see Zeyt’unyan 1985: 274, 311.
- Deuteronomy: AccSg el in 28.51 and 32.14 (vars. ewart, iwɨ), z-ewart in 7.13 and 11.14 (vars. z-ɨwɨ, z-ewart), GSG el-u in 8.8 (var. iwɨoy, once ewt), z-eloy in 14.22 (vars. zelowy, zelhoy, ziwlo, ziwło) and 18.4 (vars. zelhoy, zelowy, ziwlo, ziwło), ISg ɨto in 28.40 (vars. ewt, iwɨ). See Cox 1981: 187, 205, 109, 124, 112, 137, 149, 186, respectively.
- Daniel: Sg ewt in 10.3 [Cowe 1992: 209].

It appears that Deuteronomy is more inclined to NAccSg el and GSG el-u or eloy. In view of the form *el in almost all the dialects, one is tempted to treat el- as archaic. But it is not certain that the manuscripts which underlie the basic text of Cox are reliable. It is remarkable, for instance, that the basic text in Cox 1981: 214-215 has iwɨ ‘his own’ in Deuteronomy 33.24, although the variant reading allative y-ɨwɨ-y-elot appears to be original since it exactly corresponds to en elaios of the Greek text. Further, note the conflicting evidence within the same text: gen. el-u vs. gen. (z)-el-a-y and instr. il-o-v. The only occurrence of el-u is in 8.8 (Cox 1981: 112): erkir jit’e neac’ elu wine me : γῆ ἐλαιός ἐλαιον καὶ μάλιτος. One might think of the influence of mel-u ‘of honey’ in the same passage. Gen. el-u is also found in Nersēš Snorhali (12th cent.).

The classical paradigm is usually reconstructed as follows: nom. ewart, gen. iwɨoy [Meillet 1913: 18, 180a; 1936: 63; Matzinger 2006: 72]. See also s.v. giw ‘village’.

DIALECTAL ubiquity. All the forms represent *el, apart from Jula el [HAB 2: 252].

ETYMOLOGY Since NHB, Petermann, Windischmann and others, connected with Gr. ἐλαία, Att. ἐλαία, Ion. ἐλαῖα. ‘olive-tree, olive’, ἔλαιος m. ‘wild olive’, ἐλαιον n. ‘olive-oil; anointing-oil; any oily substance’ and Lat. oliva [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; Jahukyan 1985: 158]. Ačareyân (1937: 3) treats the Armenian and the Greek words as borrowed from Phrygian or from the Aegean civilization. Mentioning the Mediterranean theory, Jahukyan (1987: 307, 307n, 466, with ref.) also notes Akkad. ulû(m) ‘fine oil, butter’.

As is shown by Lat. *olīva*, the Greek word must be reconstructed as *ēl(e/a)iw-*. 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. ἔλαιον and derives the Armenian from QIE *se/oib-lo-*, a derivative of PIE *seib- ‘to pour, rain, sift’, cf. Gr. σифω ‘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. -ɫ-, although all the known examples are with *-r- (see Jahukyan 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).


On the whole, the Mediterranean origin (with Gr. ἔλαιον ‘oil’) of Arm. ewt seems more plausible, although the details remain unclear.

**Z**

**Zaysaysem** ‘to fear’, attested only in Timot’ěos Kuz (Timothy Aeluirus), see Ačareyân 1908-09a, 1: 370a. According to Ačareyân (HAB 2: 78a), identical with zaysel, which is found in Bağirk’ hayoc’ rendered as *zangitel, kam apšil, kam yimaril* (see Amalyan 1975: 98Nr21). 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 ʔys ‘an evil spirit, demon’ (q.v.). This is corroborated by z-aysot, which is glossed in Bağirk’ hayoc’ by CLArm. div-a-har ‘struck by a demon’ (see Amalyan 1975: 98Nr24), and ays-a-har ‘id.’, ays-ot, glossed as div-a-har and div-ot, respectively (ibid. 17Nd33f). 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/Loři glossaries that are available to me, is still in use in Loři and in colloquial Armenian of, for example, Kirovakan (nowadays named Vanajor), in the meaning ‘to be frightened’. See also s.v. *t’it’-ot.

zatik

●ETYM Interpreted as prefix \(z\)- + prefix \(a\)- 'year, age' (q.v.); similarly: za\(\text{r}\)\(\text{c}\)c\(\text{em}\) 'to be delirious (of drunkenness or especially of senility)' = \(z\)- + \(a\)- + \(\text{anc}\)- 'to pass' [HAB 1: 143a, 213a; 2: 80b; M. Muradyan 1975: 63, 64; Jahukyan 1987: 243].

It is possible that za\(\text{r}\)\(\text{am}\) contains \(\text{anc}\)- 'year, age'. Similarly, za\(\text{r}\)\(\text{anc}\)- may contain \(\text{anc}\)- 'to pass, surpass, be destroyed, etc.' (Bible+; dialectally ubiquitous); typologically cf. anc'eal zawurbk' 'become old, aged', rendering Gr. προβεβηκότες ἡμερῶν in Genesis 18.11, προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις in Luke 1.18 and 2.36. Besides, next to za\(\text{r}\)\(\text{anc}\) there are also other formations such as \(z\)-anc'- and \(a\)-anc' (see HAB 1: 213a).

Nevertheless, the first part *za\(\text{r}\)*(especially in za\(\text{r}\)\(\text{am}\) ) is unlikely to be a combination of the prefixes \(z\)- and \(a\)-. It could rather mean 'old'; cf. cer-aware 'of old days/age' (Ephrem, see NHB 1: 1014b). One may therefore revive the old attempts (rejected in HAB 2: 80b), interpreting Arm. za\(\text{r}\)\(\text{am}\) as borrowed from the Iranian word for 'old, senile, decrepit', cf. Pahl. zarmān 'old man; old age, decrepitude', Oss. zærond 'old', etc. Probably, the Armenian forms comprise that Iranian word, but have been reinterpreted as containing the prefixes \(z\)- and \(a\)-.

za\(\text{r}\)\(\text{anc}\)\(\text{em}\) '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. Garsoïan 1989: 216): k'əj arbeal ic'ë ew mtōk' zatanc'eal yarbec'ut'enê <...>. Ew elew ibrew anc'in za\(\text{r}\)anc'in i ginwoyn, əst əq' 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. za\(\text{r}\)am.

zatik, a-stem: GDSg zatk-i, abundant in the Bible [Astuacaturean 1895: 508-509]; only in Cyril of Jerusalem: GDP1 zatk-a-c' 'sacrifice; Passover; Resurrection feast, Easter; feast'; dial. also 'ladybug' (Bible+). According to Ačařyan (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 zatik (see Ačařyan 1913: 958b).

●SEMANTICS For a deeper understanding of the semantic field of zatik, one should consider the following two patterns of the formation of ladybug-names: (1) 'cow of God': Russ. bož'ja korovka, Lith. diēvo karvytė; Roman. vaca domnului, etc.; (2) '(bug of the) Virgin Mary': Lith. diēvo marytė; Germ. Marienkäfer, Engl. ladybug, etc. (see Toporov 1979; 1981a; and Toporov apud MiNarMir 1: 181-182).

Both patterns are represented in Armenian dialects: (1) Łarabal *astcuoy kov'eznak [Ačařyan 1913: 141]; (2) Arčak (Van) mayram xat'un 'the Lady Mariam' [Ser. Avagyan 1978: 150].

Concerning the evidence from Łarabal, 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, zatik 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 zatik 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 Açaṙyan has taken it from Lalayan. This is improbable, however. Besides, note the variant with en ‘bullock’. Finally, there is also Larabɫ kavkav [Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan, FW 2003].

Comparing these data with the semantic field of zatik 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, zatik was indeed a public mataɫ; cf., e.g., Lisic’yan 1969: 272.●

ETYM Since Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.), associated with zat(an)em ‘to divide, separate’ (a z-prefixification 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, 459*545) advocates this etymology, treating zatik as a verbal noun (“gerundial derivative”) with the suffix -ik; cf. martik, a-stem ‘fighting / contesting place, stadium (John Chrysostom); fighter, warrior’ from martnc’m ‘to fight’. I accept this analysis, although the type is rare. However, the semantic development is not explained properly. No wonder that Açaṙyan 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), zatik ‘sacrifice’ is an Iranian borrowing; cf. Pahl. zadan, zan- ‘to hit, beat, strike, smite’, the present stem zan of which is seen in Arm. zenum ‘to slaughter an animal, to sacrifice’. In HAB, a different etymology for zenum is given: YAv. ziżăna- l. ‘Schaden’, Pahl. zyán ‘loss, harm, damage’ (on these, see MacKenzie 1971: 100; Mayrhofer EW Aia 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-i, 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+); a-stem: Isg zgest-a-v (Pataragamatoyc’k’), Grigor Narekac’i) ‘dress, garment, clothes’ (Bible+); dial. *ge-n/c’- ‘to put on clothes’, *gest ‘dress, garment, clothes’

DIAL Šamaxi skes, Suč’avɑ sg’esd ‘church garment’, Žułə ašg’ic’ ‘id.’; Agulis ask’ani, Larabal, Lazax kenas ‘to put on clothes’, imper. kec’, Šamaxi kce’(v)il ‘id.’; Alaškert, Muş, Xlat’, Nor Bayazet g’est [HAB 2: 88b].


The verb (z-)ge-nu- derives from IE *ues-nu-, cf. Gr. évwyo ‘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 λεπία ‘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 ar-ag-ast ‘curtain’.

zign ‘a kind of marine predator’.

Only in Hexaemeron; see K. Muradyan 1984: 245, 257, 373b.

ETYM J̌ahukyan (1967: 183, 308) derives it from IE *ǵʰ-ju- (as opposed to *ǵʰ-y-; cf. s.v. jukn ‘fish’) in the context of a deviant development of the PIE palatal *ǵʰ into Armenian fricative ž. 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 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).


zut, o-stem: ISg zt-o-v (3 Kings 6.21) ‘clean, pure, unmixed’ said of gold, thoughts, etc. (Bible, Agat’ange ɫos, 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’ange ɫos, Eznik Kołbac’i, John Chrysostom, etc.).

In Job 22.25: Ἐω ἐλι’ Amenakaln awgnacon k’ez i t’šnameac’, ew ystak hatusc’ ē k’ez ibrew zarcat’ zteal: ἔσται δε σοι ὁ παντοκράτωρ βοηϑὸς ἀπὸ ἐχϑρῶν, καθαρὸν δὲ ἀποδώσει σε ὡσπερ 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].


The basic meaning of dial. and ModArm. zut(r) is ‘pure, unmixed’ said of e.g. silver, gold, spirit, etc. (Malxaseanc’ HBB 2: 37b; HayLezBrbBaṙ 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 meň ‘honey’.

A different meaning is found in Hungarian, zutr ‘always, continuously’ [HAB 2: 109b].


Jähukyan (1967: 184, 307-308) derived zut from QIE *ǵʰ-u-d-o-, cf. Lat. fundō, fidī ‘to pour out, shed; to cast (metals)’, in-fundō ‘to pour in’, etc., for the etymon cf. Gr. γέω ‘to pour, spill’, χυτός ‘spilled’, etc., see s.v. jew ‘shape’. For the initial z-
instead of j- Žahukyan (ibid.) lists some comparable examples, such as the dialectal doublets jot and zol 'stripe of leather' (on which see Ačārean 1913: 323; HAB 3: 157b). The example of zign 'a kind of marine predator' should be abandoned (see s.v.).

Though not maintained in Žahukyan 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+), havīs- n. 'libation, sacrificial liquid, sacrificial substance' (RV+), hav-, pres. juhōti 'to sacrifice, offer, pour (an oblation, ghee, etc.)'.

ēg, i-stem: GDSg ig-i, several times in the Bible; GDPl ig-i-c’ in Ephrem, Plato; a-stem: GDPl ig-a-c’ in “Šarakan” (note that GDSg ig-i presupposes an i- or a-stem, and GDPl ig-i-c’, pointing to an i-stem, is better attested) ‘female’ (Bible+).

• DIAL. Widespread in the dialects. Note also T’išlis *eg hac’ ‘a kind of ritual bread for New Year’ [HayLezBrbBaf 2, 2002: 7b], Van ek’y, gen. ek’yu or ik’yu ‘female buffalo’ [HAB 2: 116a; Ačārean 1952: 119, 259].

• ETYM. Considered to be a word of unknown origin [HAB 2: 116a; Žahukyan 1990: 71 (sem. field 2); Olsen 1999: 946].

I suggest a comparison with Skt. yōśā- f. ‘girl, young woman’ (RV+), yōṣī- f. ‘id.’ (RV), MInd. yōśā- f. ‘woman’; of unclear origin (connection with yāvān- ‘young’ is doubtful, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2: 421). PArm. *eig-i- can be derived from *ieus-iti- or *ieus-it-; > *eyw(h)-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].


Hurr. ešši, iššia- ‘horse’ has been compared with the PIE word for ‘horse’ (Žahukyan 1963: 132; Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 34; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2:
ampem


Dial. NPl *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-nev in the dialect of Van (see Aćāryan 1952: 109).

*ēǰ- ‘to come/go down, descend; to stay overnight; to calm down’: ījanem, 1sg.aor. īj-i, 3sg.aor. īj, imper. īj (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 619-621); īj-awor ‘guest’ (Bible); īj, i-stem: GDSg īj-i, GDPl īj-i-c’, IPl īj-i-w-k’ ‘the coming-going down, descent’ (Koriwn, Ephrem, etc.), ‘page (of a book), column’ (Jeremiah 36.23); see also s.v. ai-ēǰ ‘threads running along the length of cloth, warp’.

DIALECT The verb is ubiquitous in the dialects. Kusget (Motkan) īšivil refers ‘to go’, since the area ist mountainous, and going is equivalent to going down [HAB 2: 119b; 4: 655b].

ETYMOLOGY Probably from PIE *h1e/oi-gh--: Gr. οἴχομαι ‘to go (away), leave, disappear’, οἰχνέω ‘to go, come, walk, approach’, Lith. eigà ‘course’, OIr. óegi ‘guest’ < *oigh- īt-, perhaps also OCS iti, 1sg. idp ‘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 *e-, cf. Gr. οἰγνέοι vs. οἴχων. For the etymology and a discussion, see Scheffelowitz 1904-05, 1: 311; Pedersen 1906: 425 = 1982: 203; HAB 2: 119a, 4: 655b; Pokorny 1959: 296; Frisk s.v.; Klingenschmitt 1982: 207-208; Īahukyan 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’.

ampem (spelled also as amp/bem several times in Ephrem), suppletive aor. arb-i ‘to drink’ (Bible+; for the paradigm, see Lāragyulyan 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).

DIALECT Xarberd, Nor Naxi īewan ump ‘sip, drink’ [HAB 3: 600a], Arabkir *ump ‘drop’, *ump-ik > ambig ‘a small drop’ [Dawit’-Bēk 1919: 68; HAB 3: 600a], Svedia (nursery words) amb-āg, ambu ‘drink’ [HAB 3: 600a; Andreasony 1967: 220, 360a].

ETYMOLOGY Meillet 1892: 164 derives ampem from IE *pimbō ‘to drink’ with Skt. pibhati, 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 *ænd-hipem with a question-mark. Similarly, Jahukyan (1987: 144, 187; see also N. Simonyan 1991: 291) assumes *pibeti > *hipeti and a subsequent addition of *ænd-, thus: *ænd-hipe- > əmpem-. For a criticism of this view, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 156; Ravnæs 1991: 161; 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, 76s3). Later, Meillet 1936: 134 regards əmpem as an obscure present, which is difficult to separate from Skt. pibatī, Lat. bibō,

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-mn ‘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. pībati, 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; Ermout/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; Jahukyan 1982: 228-225; Clackson 1994: 181. Aćarjan (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: 161; Clackson 1994: 216-217, 106). 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. ar-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-budhno- > 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 *ænd 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 Hübbschmann 1897: 447; 1899: 45. However, ump may be analogical (see Meillet 1892: 164; Vogt 1938: 337; Klingenschmitt 1982: 156; Ravnæs 1991: 161; N. Simonyan 1991: 291; Clackson 1994: 235-243; Praust 1996: 188-189; cf. e.g. nunj vs. ninj and nnjem ‘to put’, junj vs. jinj and jnjem ‘to clean’.


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 *h1-en-pi-pl(e)h1- or *h1-en-pi-
pl(h1)-ne- (cf. the nasal epenthesis or infix in Gr. πι-πλημ-μι and ἐμ-πίμπλημι ‘to fill’, which is reminiscent of that in ἀμπεμ ‘to drink’).

anglay-k’ ‘a sea-monster or -devil’ (probably female) or ‘eel’, ‘water-snake’.

The only attestation is found in John Chrysostom: Ἰβρευ zdews halacakans: Ἰβρευ ἀγλαγκ’ κ’ αυυ νασακάρσ. The word renders Gr. Ἐρινύες, 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 ankmem, anklum ‘to sink into the water’. Ačāryan (HAB ibid.) leaves the origin of the word open. The root is considered identical with ĝil/ĝil- ‘to roll, stumble’ (q.v.) by M. Muradyan (1975: 57). A. Petrosyan (1987: 59, 61, 70) sees in anglay the conjectural theonym *Ge- (cf. Angel-), which is interpreted by Petrosyan himself as a reflex of the IE theonym *gel- (on which see especially Ivanov/Toporov 1974). According to Lap’ancyan (1975: 365), anglay 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 *anguilla, influenced by anguis ‘snake’), suggested by Durean (1933: 118) in passing, with a question mark. Compare Gr εὐγέλος, ἱμβηρις, Lith. ungynis m. ‘eel’, Russ. úgor’ m., etc. For a discussion of this etymon I refer to Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 48; Toporov, PrJaz 1, 1975: 88ff; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 526, = 1995: 444; Mallory/Adams 1997: 176; Katz 1998. Note also Georg. ankar- ‘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. a- is parallel to ankenum, 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 *ang(a)ka-. Preciser, perhaps, NSg *h1-ungd̂̄-ur/l- > PArm. *ung(u)l, pl./coll. *ung(u)l-āy-k’ > angl-āy-k’. The r-l fluctuation can perhaps be solved by assuming IE *H(V)nghur-leh2-, cf. Lat. stella and Arm. astl ‘star’ (q.v.), probably from *Hster-l(-)eh2-, cf. Arm. Pl *astel-ā-. Otherwise, substratum vacillation *-r/l-?

Arm. anglayk’ can be explained either as a collective formation in -ay-k’ on the basis of *a/ungu- or as an archaic fem. plural like kanayk’ ‘women’, see s.v. kin. The latter alternative is risky, but attractive. First of all, anglayk’ renders Gr. Ἐρινύες, the name of female chthonic deities, so it might denote female sea-monsters. Next, in the Armenian folk tradition recorded in Lalab[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. 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 alanak, etc.).

58 Note p’otš ‘muraena, moray eel’ (Step’anos Lehac’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 chthonic deities with “snaky-hair” (and sometime metamorphosing into a snake), patronizing the Motherhood. This reminds the Armenian (< Iran.) al-k’, which, too, are female 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-k’ (spelled also as anter-k’), pl. tant. a-stem: GDPl ant/der-a-c’, IPl -a-w-k’ ‘entrails, intestines, bowels’ (Agat’angelos, John Chrysostom, Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.).


änkenum ‘to cause to fall, throw down’ (Bible+); cf. also zänkenum in Job 40.8 (Cox 2006: 256): mi zänkenur zdatastan im “do not shrug off my judgement”.


ant/ð-o-cin, a-stem (later also o-stem) ‘a slave that is born in the house of his master’ (rendering Gr. οἰκογενής), opposed to arc’at-‘a-gin ‘(slave) bought with money’ in Genesis [Weitenberg 1981], and to ek ‘outsider’ (< ‘comer’) in Movsës Xorenac’i 1.10 (1913=1991: 33ii); transl. Thomson 1978: 85): ew ayyolvk’ ñndocnok’ ew ekkók “and with other domestic servants and the outsiders”.

ETYM Composed of *snd- (cf. Gr. ἔνδον ‘within’) and *cin- ‘to give birth; to be born’ (q.v.); for a thorough philologial and etymological analysis I refer to Weitenberg 1981.
t'arp' 

T' 

t'arp' 'a large wicker fishing-basket, creel', in Anania Širakac'i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 228[2]), allative/directive i t'arp' : Ew or yr'kanën zercaw, i t'arp' ənkaw :

T'arp' 'withered' in Łazar Parpec'i (5th cent.) and Sargsi Šnorhali (12th cent.), an-t'ar' aam 'unwithered, evergreen' from the Bible (three times) onwards, t'aršamim 'to wither', late attestations, apart from the participle t'aršameal (1x in the Bible, and in Paterica) and caus. t'aršamec'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, Movsès Xorenac'i, Paterica, Nilius, etc.); t'ošmil 'id.' (Geoponica, 13th cent.), t'ořšt(o)mil 'id.' (Mandakuni, Geoponica).

A textual illustration: In Movsès Xorenac'i 3.68 (1913=1990: 363Loś; 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'aršam- (Hacņ, Tigranakert, Xarberd, Agulis, Šamaxi), *t'ořom- more widespread: Polis, Axalc'xa, Hamšen, Sebastia, Karin, Muš, Van, Moks, Ararat, Marala, etc. 'to wither' [HAB 2: 156b]; an-t'ar' aam 'a flower' in Zeyt'un, Ararat [Ačaranean 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'işmil, although Ačaryan (2003: 396, 416, 568) derives this form from t'ošnil.

In a prayer from Jávask', one finds an adjectival an-t'ar'-akan (see Laleyanec' 1892: 10 = 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. tarṣ- : tṛṣyang- 'to be thirsty, to crave', YAv. tarṣu- 'dry, not fluid', Gr. τέρσομαι 'to become dry', Hitt. tarṣ- 'to dry', etc. (see HAB 2: 155-156).

Pedersen (1906: 413 = 1982: 191) explains Arm. -rš- from *-rsi- (: Skt. tṛṣyati), comparing garš- : Skt. ḍṛṣyati (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'aršamim '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'ar' am and an-t'ar' am, 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'aršam- 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'aršam-. We may hypothetically reconstruct the following original distribution: PArm. *t'ar- am (adj.) : *t'aršam-ēmi (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. *tarṣ- 'to be thirsty' (cf. Av. tarṣā- 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.
“and which (of the fish – HM) got rid of the fishing-net, fell into the fishing-basket”; 

\textit{t'arp} ‘a large wicker fishing-basket, creel’ (for a thorough description, see Amatuni 1912: 206b; Aćaṙyan 1913: 352a), Zeyt’un \textit{t'arp} ‘a hunting basket or net (for fish, fox, etc.)’ [HAB 2: 162b; Aćaṙyan 2003: 131, 310]. It is practically impossible to determine whether the forms point to \textit{t'arb} or \textit{t'arp}; since the voiced \textit{b} is usually aspirated after \textit{r}. Only Zeyt’un seems to be relevant, since here \textit{rb} mostly yields \textit{yb}’ (although the evidence is not entirely straightforward, see Aćaṙyan 2003: 91). This dialect, thus, probably points to \textit{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 \textit{t'arp}. One might postulate, thus, the presence of the word in Karin/Širak speaking areas for at least 13 centuries.

\textbf{ETYM} Aćaṙyan (HAB 2: 162b) connects Gr. \textit{táρπη} ‘large wicker basket’, also \textit{táρπος}, \textit{τερπός} m., \textit{ταρπόνη} f. ‘id.’. The Greek and Armenian words are usually derived from PIE \textit{*tu̯erH-} ‘to grab, enclose’, cf. Lith. \textit{tvérti} ‘to seize, form’, OCS \textit{tvoriti} ‘to do, make’; see Pokorny 1959: 1101 (without Armenian); Jahukyan 1987: 154, 302. According to Clackson (1994: 183), we are probably dealing with a common borrowing from a lost source.

The QIE cluster \textit{*rp-} regularly yields Arm. \textit{-rb-}. In this case, the by-form \textit{t'arp} presents us with the problem of \textit{-p’}. One might assume a non-IE \textit{*tarph’-}, with aspirated \textit{-p’-}, or assimilation \textit{t’...b > t’...p’}, especially after \textit{r} (on the latter circumstance, see above). However, the by-form with \textit{-b} seems to be reliable. I therefore propose an alternative solution, which can explain the allophones \textit{p’: b}.

Gr. \textit{táρπη} derives from QIE \textit{*t(a)rp-eh2-}. If we may posit a HD laryngeal-stem, the paradigm would have been as follows: nom. \textit{*t̯örp-eh2-} (or \textit{*terp-eh2-}, if the vocalism of \textit{τερπός} is old), gen. \textit{t̯erp-ḥ-ós}. This would yield PArm. \textit{*thṛb-a-}, gen. \textit{*thṛb’-ó-} ‘large wicker basket’. Then the oblique stem \textit{*thṛp-} would be generalized. One might also posit a thematic \textit{*trph-ó-}, as in Gr. \textit{ta prá̯s}; but Arm. abl. \textit{t'arb-ē} precludes the \textit{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 \textit{*a} and the Armenian vacillation \textit{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
t'ezan, o-stem: AblSg i t'ezan-o-y (Leviticus 13.56); later a-stem: GDsg t'ezan-i (Cyril of Alexandria, Čaṙəntir), GDPR t'ezan-a-c' (Čaṙəntir) ‘the weft, the transverse threads which are woven across to make cloth using the warp as a base’ (Bible+), ‘long sleeve’ (Čaṙəntir); t'ezan-i-k' (Cyril of Alexandria, Čaṙəntir), GDPR t'ezan-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 aṙēǰ ‘threads running along the length of cloth, warp’ (Gr. στήμων).

● DIAL The syncopated form t'ɛznik' ‘long sleeve’ is found in a number of western dialects: Nor Naxi ģewan, Trapizon, Muš, Zeyt'un, etc. [HAB 2: 168a]. Note also Moks t'ɛznink'y 'широкий, длинный, открытый (распоротый) обшлаг рукава' [Orbeli 2002: 230].

● ETYM The derivations from IE *tek- (Lat. texō ‘to weave’, NHB 1: 803c) and *(s)tegh- ‘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-, and the word is considered to be of unknown origin [HAB 2: 168a; Olsen 1999: 300, 947].

t'elawş ‘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'ange ɫös § 644 (1909=1984: 330 L11), in an enumeration of tree-names, between yakri and kaɫamax. In “Bžškaran” (apud NHB 2: 995a; cf. S. Vardanjan 1990: 86, § 356), where k'araxunk is described as t'eloš caroyn xiž patuakan “valuable pitch of the tree t'eloš”. 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 Larabal, and it is not mentioned in any of the other provinces, and that the word t'elawš has been preserved only in Larabal.

In Baṙgirk' hayoc' (see Amalyan 1975: 118r10q), which seems to show special affinities to the dialects of Larabal and adjacent areas (see H. Martirosyan 2008), t'eloš is used to gloss t'eli 'elm-tree': t'eli 'car apntut, or ê t'eloš “a fruitless tree that is t'eloš”.

The word is also attested in Agať'angolo § 644 (1909=1984: 330 L11), in an enumeration of tree-names, between yakri and kaɫamax. In “Bžškaran” (apud NHB 2: 995a; cf. S. Vardanjan 1990: 86, § 356), where k'araxunk is described as t'elōš caroyn xiž patuakan “valuable pitch of the tree t'eloš”. 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 Larabal, and it is not mentioned in any of the other provinces, and that the word t'elawš has been preserved only in Larabal.

In Baṙgirk' hayoc' (see Amalyan 1975: 118r10q), which seems to show special affinities to the dialects of Larabal and adjacent areas (see H. Martirosyan 2008), t'elōš is used to gloss t'eli 'elm-tree': t'eli 'car apntut, or ê t'elōš “a fruitless tree that is t'elōš”.

In Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Elia Mušelyan Karneč'i (Karın/Xotorjür), Turk. ė'am yemişi is glossed by t'elōši, t'elōši [Çugaszyan 1986: 72r10].

● DIAL Ačaṙyan (1913: 357b; HAB 2: 172a) records only Larabal t'el'ūši ‘a kind of mountainous tree’. Dav't'yan (1966: 356) cites Larabal t'el'ūši and t'el'ūši, as well as t'el'ūši in Hadrut' and Šalax-Xcaberd (other dialects in the territory of Larabal). He, too, does not specify the meaning. HayLezBrbBağ (2, 2002: 99a) has Larabal t'el'ūši ‘a kind of mountainous tree’. This seems to reproduce the entry t'el'ūši in Ačaṙyan 1913: 357b, with a misprinted -m- instead of -ô-. In this case, however, the alphabetical order would be disturbed. If t'el'ūši is correct (which is very uncertain),
one would be tempted to compare it with Georg. Ėlamuši ‘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 Şuş in 1946), the pro-rector of Step'anakert University, whose parents are born in Zardaraşen (a small village in the district of Martuni, close by T'alavard) where they lived by 1945, and Hát'äm, the forest-guard of the village Kusapat, who in 2003 was ca. 55 years old. According to them, Larabal Ėluši denotes a kind of Ėtəli ‘elm-tree’ (q.v.) with yellowish wood (which is good as fuel) and leaves that are smaller than those of the Ėli and, when green, serve as fodder for the goats. It is present in Xcaberd, T'alavard, Martakert. Armen Sargsyan himself saw one near the spring called Çirakno (5-6 km up from Kusapat).

In the dictionary by Malḵasian' (HBB 2: 96a-b), Ėlōš 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** Bárgirk' hayoc' (see above), NHB (1: 806a), and Uļurikean (see HAB 2: 172a) treat Ėlōš as identical with or a kind of Ėləsi (note also the description of Ėlōš by informants from Łarabaɫ as a kind of Ėləsi), assuming, apparently, an etymological identity. This is accepted by Jáhukyan (1987: 145) with some reservations, and by P. Friedrich (apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 178b), where teši is represented as meaning ‘wood’, which is incorrect. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 172a), however, leaves the origin of Ėlawš open. Olsen (1999: 938) gives Ėləš as meaning ‘oak’ or ‘pine’ and as a word of unknown origin.

Jáhukyan (1987: 380) mentions Ėləwəš as the only example of the suffix -awəš, and presents a separate entry for the suffix -oš found in the adjective dandal-oš vs. dandat ‘slow’, etc.

Perhaps ptəlow- + ū-i (cf. Myc. pte-re-wa), see s.v. mori/*mo(r)- ū. For this and for the suffix -awəš in general, see 2.3.1.

**təli** ‘elm’. Late and poorly attested (see HAB 2: 171; Greppin 1982: 350; 1985: 93). The variant *tələnɨ (preserved in the dialects of Ararat and Zeyt'un) appears in the place-name Təkenik' (11th cent.+), see Hübschmann 1904: 430.

**DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Hamşen, Ararat, Łarabəl, Van, Muş, Zeyt'un [HAB 2: 171b].

**ETYM** Bugge (1893: 39) connected təli ‘elm’ with Gr. πτελά-α, Lon. -təli ‘elm, Ulmus glabra’. Ačaryan (HAB 2: 171b) considers the anlaut problematic (see also Hübschmann 1897: 449) and prefers linking təli 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; Jáhukyan 1987: 145, 188, 302 – with some reservation), although others (Ałabekyan 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’eši(k) as Greek loan word. However, Hübschmann, in fact, considers only Arm. *pt(e)-’elm’ (HAB 4: 111b) a Greek loan, and mentions the connection of Arm. *t’eli with Gr. πτέλα, not accepting it. Although Ačāryan (HAB 2: 171b) already showed the misunderstanding, the idea still remains ascribed to Hübschmann (as in P. Friedrich 1970: 89; Greppin 1982: 350; Jāhukyan 1987: 188; Clackson 1994: 234-283). 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’eši with Gr. πτέλεω, not accepting it. Although Ačāryan (HAB 2: 172a) already showed the misunderstanding, the idea still remains ascribed to Hübschmann (as in P. Friedrich 1970: 89; Greppin 1982: 350; Jāhukyan 1987: 188; Clackson 1994: 234-283; 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. Ačāryan (HAB 2: 172a) adds Georg. *t’elamuš ’elm’. See also s.v. *t’elawš.

*’t’elik

● DIAL. Only in Zeyt’un *t’őḵ ‘snow-pile, avalanche’ [Allahverdian 1884: 186; Ačāryan 1913: 368b].
● ETYM. Ačāryan (2003: 287) hesitantly reconstructs *t’elik and treats the word as of completely unknown origin.

I think Zeyt’un *t’elik reflects an -ik suffixation of Arm. *t’el ‘pile’ (see HAB).

*’t’en (dialect) ’vulva of a cow’.

● ETYM. Ačāryan (1913: 363a) does not mention any etymology. Jāhukyan (1972: 310) derives from IE *tu-ên- (from *tēu- ‘to swell’) comparing Gr. σάϑη f. ‘penis’, σάννιον ‘id.’ and Lith. tvainytiš ‘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. 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 Ačāryan (1947: 189, 267b), is borrowed from Turkish. For the semantic shift cf. Arm. marmin ‘body’ > dial. ‘vulva’ (Karin), ‘vulva of an animal (Nor Bayazet)’, anjīn ‘person; body’ > Van anj ‘vulva of a pregnant cow’, etc.

*’t’eši(k)

● DIAL. Ararat *t’esi ‘spindle’ [Nawasardeanc’ 1903: 41a], Axalc’xa, Karin *t’eviš ‘id.’ (Ačāryan 1913: 357b; also Mxit’arc’anc’ 1901: 306, glossing Širak arč’un ‘spindle’). For attestations of *t’esi and gen. *t’esi, see Amatuni 1912: 57a.
● ETYM. Amatuni (1912: 57a) marks *t’esi as from Kurdish (abbrev. k’t’), not specifying the Kurdish form. He obviously means *teši, *tešiš ‘spindle’, cf. also tešil ‘bobbin’, teširēs ‘prāxa, fem. spinner’; tešwē ‘reclao’ = ‘adze’ (see Kurdoev /

59 Gabikean (1952: 202) asks: “Turkish?”, not specifying the details.

Formally, Arm. *t’es-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 dëhse ‘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’es-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 tešī, tešū ‘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’es-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-či- (see the literature above), which would not yield Arm. *t’es-. If at least some IE cognate forms point to a PIE *teks- (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 37-38), this proto-form might also explain the Armenian form through the ruki-rule (see 2.1.12): QIE *teks-i> Arm. *t’es-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, IPl t‘ert’-i-w-k’ (var. t‘ėrt’-o-v-k’) in Paterica, GDPl t‘ert’-i-e’ 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’ – Barğırk’ hayoc’ [Amalyan 1975: 215].

● DIAL Hamšen, Trapizon t‘ir ‘leaf’, Łarabāl, Ararat, Jūla t‘er ‘petal, leaf’, Axale’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 -t : Agulis bskat’el ‘leaf of radish’ < *bolk-a-t‘el, which corresponds to Łarabāl bskát’er [HAB 2: 176a] and Ararat boltkat’er ‘id.’ (see Amatun 1912; 112b). Note also Nor Naxijewan *t‘el-hac’ ‘thin leaf of dough’ (see Tigranean 1892: 111; Amatun 1912; 209a; HAB 2: 176a).

The form t‘ert’ is present in: Alasbērt 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’ēn ‘butterfly’ (see s.vv.), from PIE *ptеr- ‘feather; wing’, probably derived from *pet- ‘to fly’ (see Bugge 1893: 40; Ačaṙean 1918: 161; HAB 2: 175-176, 183, 184-186; Pokorny 1959: 826; Greppin 1982: 348-349; Jāhakyan 1987: 144), cf. Gr. πτερόν n. ‘feather (mostly in pl.); bird’s wing; wings of a bat and of insects; any winged creature, as the Sphinx; a beetle’, πτάρας f. ‘wing of a bird; winged creature, bird’, Gr. πτός-o-mai, 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. kuṁ ‘back’, dial. also ‘arm’, ‘side’. See also HAB 2: 185a on this. Further, note that, according to Alayan (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 Jahukyan (1987: 144, 187).

In view of the semantic field 'feather; leaf' : 'wing' represented by this set of words, one wonders whether t’ew ‘arm, ving’ is somehow related with Moks t’av, gen. t’av-j, pl. t’av-ir 'ясч = leaf', ḳōkānšt 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; Yovsèp'ënc' 1892: 125, gloss: 12. Also in Van, Sasun, Muş (Ačarean 1913: 352b).

t’er, i-stem according to NHB 1: 806a, but only AbilSg i t’er-č (Eznik Kolbac’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, a-stem: GDPl t’ew-o-c’ (very frequent), ISg t’ew-o-v, IPl t’ew-a-v-k’ (Bible); also IPl t’ew-ō-k’ (formally: a-stem – t’ew-a-w-k’), twice in the Bible, as well as in Grigor Narekac’i, etc. ‘wing; arm’.

- DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 177-178].
- ETYM See s.v. *t’er ‘leaf’.

 t’it’eln, ‘leaf of metal’ (Bible+; NSg t’it’eln, API t’it’lüns). Greppin (1982: 349) says that the meaning of t’it’eln 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’er ‘leaf’, etc.

t’it’el’n, ‘butterfly’.

The only attestation mentioned by Ačaryan (HAB 2: 183a) comes from the fables by Mxit’ar Gōş (12-13th cent.). Here the word is used in NPl t’it’lünk’, which, as
Açaryan points out, presupposes NSg *t’it’eln [and/or *t’it’el, cf. the problem of asehn ‘needle’].

Now we find this form in poems by Yovhannēs T’lkuranc’i (14-15th cent.; T’lkuran in Mesopotamia, between Amid and Hromkla): zēk’an sēt’it’el/n ‘like a butterfly’ (see Pivazyan 1960: 132113, 155140). The two passages (Mxt’ar Gōsh and Yovhannēs T’lkuranc’i) are cited in MījHayBar 1, 1987: 259a.


The form t’it’ēn (with -ē-) is only found in Barqirk’ hayoc’, where t’it’elh is glossed as follows: t’īt’ramay, kam t’it’ēn, or ē t’it’ēnik (see Amaln 1975: 120N155; MījHayBar 1, 1987: 259a). This is mentioned by Greppin (1982: 3496) as the only evidence for t’it’elh ‘butterfly’ (with -I-), which is incorrect.

The anthroponym T’it’ēnik (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’ērin and *t’it’elh.

*t’it’ērin


The suffixed forms are:

*t’it’ērin-ak : Agulis t’i’t’ārnāk [Açaryan 1935: 57 (§ 57), 353]; Dersim t’orr’ēniug [Bałramyan 1960: 14]; cf. Xarberd t’orr’ēniug [HAB 2: 183b];


*t’it’ērin-ak : Ç’ału and Marala (in Lārabał) t’itt’ēnǎk [Davt’yam 1966: 357].

Dersim t’i’t’g’ina [Bałramyan 1960: 80b] probably reflects a metathesis of the ē and g. Perhaps this has been supported by the folk-etymological association with gēniug (see Bałramyan 1960: 88a) from kuṁ ‘back’, dial. also ‘arm’, ‘side’. For the auslaut, cf. also Dersim (K’li) t’i’t’na (see below).

*t’it’elh

Zeyt’un t’i’t’ex [Açaryan 2003: 13, 122, 310]; Svedia t’it’ix ‘butterfly of the silkworm’ [Andreasian 1967: 224, 361b]; K’esab t’i’t’ex [HayLezBrBrBař 2, 2002: 110a]; Akn t’orr’ex [HAB 2: 183b; Gabriłean 1912: 268]; Xarberd [HayLezBrBrBař
t'it'eln

2, 2002: 110a] and Xotorj ur t’it’el [YušamXotorj 1964: 451b] (both meaning ‘a lung illness of animals’); Č’emikler (Nikomedia) t’i’el [HAB 2: 183b] (meaning ‘butterfly of the silkworm’ [Aćean 1913: 363a]); Mehr t’it’xna > t’it’eł [Alayan 1954: 92, 269b].

The ending of Dersim (K’li) t’it’xna [HayLezBrbBa 2, 2002: 110b] is not clear to me; cf. also Dersim t’it’gna (see above).

With the suffix -e/ik: Muš t’it’əɫnik, cf. the form recorded by Rivola, namely t’it’xnik [HAB 2: 183b]; Aparan, Moks t’it’xnek [Amatuni 1912: 6b]; Tigranakert t’it’elg [HAB 2: 183b; Haneyan 1978: 186b].

On the meanings ‘a kind of illness’ and ‘spirit’ and on t’it’-ot, see below.

It is remarkable that some dialectal areas (Svedia, Xarberd, Muš, Agulis and Kak’avaberd vs. Mehr, etc.) represent both the - and -forms side by side. The -variant (Ararat, Agulis, etc.) may have once been present in Larıba and adjacent dialects, too; cf. also Burdur (t’it’ė), the speakers of which have migrated from Larıba in the 17th century. It has been preserved in *t’it’er-malı : Larıba t’it’irmādet, t’ot’ərmādet, in Mehtišen : Dav’tyan 1966: 357], Goris t’it’rimali, t’ot’armali, t’it’ilmali [Margaryan 1975: 327a], Karčewan and Kak’avaberd t’it’irmali with semantic nuance ‘a butterfly that flutters around the light’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 214a; 1967: 192b]. Particularly transparent is Ararat t’it’rimali [Markosyan 1989: 301b]. Aćaryan (HAB 2: 183b) treats *t’it’er-mali as a compound containing t’it’ėr ‘butterfly’ and mal- ‘to sift’ and compares it with Larıba, etc. *aliwr-mal(ik) ‘butterfly = aliwr ‘meal’ + mal- ‘to sift’ (see Aćaryan 1913: 51-52, 365a; HayLezBrbBa 1, 2001: 18a). Note an interesting word-play found in a folk-song of the type jangvulum (see Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 105):

Amarın a t’ot’ərmali,
Axtə er allür mali,
K’u ləşvəngy türür kyəłst
Sirol szerts kodati.

“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’irma and the like, particularly interesting is t’it’ramay which is used in Bağırk’ hayoc’ alongside t’it’er(ik) to render t’it’eł (see Amalyan 1975: 120). Another trace might be Larıba (Ganjak) t’it’a, used as an epithet to luş ‘bird’ in meaning ‘light’ (see HayLezBrbBa 2, 2002: 110b) or ‘fluttering’ and the like.

60 Compare Russ. pekelėk ‘butterfly’, if from peklevát’ ‘to sift’; cf. also Russ. pépel ‘ash’; Gr. παλη ‘the finest meal; any fine dust’, παι-παλη (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. *piperēn, etc.
On the other hand, given the existence of t’it’eln in Melri (t’it’año̊), one might look for traces of the form also in Larsabal.61 Indeed, on a cross-stone in the vicinity of the village of Dahrav there is an inscription from 1071 AD (ȘI/520 + 551 = 1071) where one finds a female anthroponym T’it’eln (see M. Barxtutareanc’ 1995 < 1895: 101; Aca’Anj 2, 1944: 309; DivHayVim 5, 1982: 144[N386]). Es Ohan kangi:ki zxa’es inj ew amusin im T’it’elnikay: alawi’s yišecek ‘I, Ohan [= Yovhannex/John – HM], erected this cross to myself and to T’it’elnik, my spouse; remember/mention in your prayers’.

Moks t’ax’omurik’ (GSg t’ax’omorkə), NPl t’ax’omorket’i (-kanir), see Orbeli 2002: 231) is considered by Ačaryan (HAB 2: 183b; cf. also Ačaryan 1952: 261) as isolated and independent. Ačaryan does not specify its structure. Given the association between the butterfly and the meal (aliwr), one may suggest that t’ax’omurik is a folk-etymological reshaping of an underlying *t’ax’er-mal-ik or *t’ax’al-mal-ik under the influence of Moks t’ax’omur ‘drojki, czakaska tsecta’ = ‘yeast, leaven’ (see Orbeli 2002: 230-231). Here it is difficult to give preference to one of the variants *t’ax’er- and *t’ax’al-. The latter explains the anlaut better (*t’ax’- > t’ax’-), with the same contact metathesis as is seen in t’ax’omur ‘yeast, leaven’ < t’ax’mor). Alternatively, one may assume the following scenario: *t’ax’er-mal-ik > *t’ax’ermarik (with distant metathesis of r and l, cf. ularkem ‘to send’ > Moks hörötkil, höröthayr ‘father’s brother’ > Larsabal bér’er, plior ‘dirty’ > Larsabal, Goris, Agulis *prtol, etc.) > *t’ax’omarik. For *t’ax’al-, cf. also Goris t’i’ilmal. It should also be borne in mind that the form with -l- does occur in Moks (t’ix’nekm [Amatuni 1912: 6b]), although both Orbeli and Ačaryan record only t’ax’omurik’.

Despite the variation seen in the forms of such closely related dialects as Van (t’ax’t’ernekm), Ozim (t’ax’t’erneyk), Şatax (t’ax’t’ernekm) and Moks (t’ax’t’ernek, t’ax’t’omurik’), 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 -l-. To my knowledge, Van and Ararat *t’it’xot ‘angry, quick-tempered’ (see Amatuni 1912: 165-166; Ačarean 1913: 365b; HayLezBrbBa 2, 2002: 110b) has not received an etymological explanation. Compare Xotorj 1913: 16b ‘a kind of poisonous herb that is harmful to the lungs of animals’ [YušamXotorj 1964: 451b], from t’it’el ‘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 Jahukyan 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 Larsabal *k’ajk’-ot ‘angry, quick-tempered; lunatic’ (see Ačarean 1913: 1099a). For a textual illustration, see Ananyan 1978: 359 (k’ajkot). In Barıgırk ‘hayoc’ one finds ays-ot and z-ays-ot glossed as diw-ot and diw-a-har ‘stricken by a demon’, respectively (see Amalayan 1975: 17[No34], 98[No28]). The forms are composed of ays ‘an
evil spirit, demon’ and the same suffix -ot. All these examples suggest that t’it’x-ot, too, can contain a root that means ‘spirit, demon’. Bearing in mind the semantic field expressed by words like Arm. xipilik ‘a (night-)spirit; nightmare; butterfly’ and Gr. ψῡχή ‘soul; departed spirit, ghost; butterfly or moth’, one may safely interpret t’it’xot (< *t’it’l-ot) as an ot-suffixation based on *t’it’el(n) ‘butterfly’, here meaning ‘spirit, demon’.

According to Norayr (s.v. French douve; see HAB 2: 183b), t’it’e, t’it’nek means ‘a wingless worm that arises in the heart or the liver of the sheep as resulted from eating too much trefoil’. Ačarjan (HAB 2: 183b) compares this form to Mush t’it’elnik, t’it’lonek also means ‘a kind of worm in the liver of the sheep’ according to HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 110a. Cf. also Sasun t’it’elnık ‘a kind of butterfly, here meaning ’spirit, demon’.

ETYM The lexicographers and scholars usually cite t’it’e, t’it’lonek ignoring t’it’e, t’it’lonek ‘butterfly’. Whenever they mention the form t’it’lonek, they mean the one which means ‘leaf of metal’ (see t’it’e). Of the two forms meaning ‘butterfly’, only the latter, namely t’it’lonek is attested in the literature. The form t’it’eln has become full, namely *t’it’eln (see HAB 2: 185a). The use of t’it’eln ‘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 Šuši (İarakba) we read: “<...> the heart of Simon <...> is fluttering like a bird (<luši mnan t’it’erəṙəm>)” [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 307]. In the variant of the famous fairy-tale “Hazaran Blbul” written by Xnko Aper, t’it’eln appears alongside t’it’e, t’it’eln ‘butterfly’.

A question arises: what about t’it’eln? Ačarjan (HAB 2: 182ff) admits the etymological identity of t’it’eln ‘leaf if metal’ and t’it’elni/t’it’eln ‘butterfly’. Further, he (HAB 2: 183ab) twice states that *t’it’eln ‘butterfly’ (derivable from NPl t’it’lunk’) is secondary. Similarly, Jahukyan (1984: 36, 42) treats the anthroponym

62 It will be remembered that the female evil spirits named al-k’ (see Ačarjan 1913: 53b) threaten the heart and the lungs of an embryo.
**t’it’eñ**

*t’t’ëñik* (11th cent.) as a dialectal (SW) variant of *t’i’t’ëñik* reflecting the sound-change *r* > *l*. However, the female anthroponym *T’t’ëñik* is also attested in L’arabal at the same period (see above), and the sound-change *r* > *l* is not specified any further. The priority of *t’i’t’ëñ* seems to function even in such an early attempt as that of Gabriêlean (1912: 268), who assumes that Akn *t’ëx* comes from older *t’rt’-ex*, with the suffix *-ex* also found in other animal-names. To my knowledge, *t’i’t’eñ* ‘butterfly’ is nowhere else mentioned when *t’i’t’eñ* is discussed, see (apart from references already cited) Pedersen 1982: 126-145 (= 1906: 348, 145); Tumanjan 1978: 257-258; Greppin 1981b: 5; Jahukyan 1982: 72; 1987: 144; H. Suk’iasyan 1986: 163, etc.

The dialectal spread of *t’i’t’eñ* ‘butterfly’ is not smaller than that of *t’i’t’eñ*. Moreover, *t’i’t’eñ* is the only variant attested (although late) in the literature. In NHB, we find neither *t’i’t’eñ* nor *t’i’t’eñ* ‘butterfly’. Only the former is recorded in an addendum of dialectal words, s.v. *t’i’t’eñik* (see NHB 2: 1062b). For NHB, thus, the *-r* variant is dialectal. I therefore fail to see criteria which would demonstrate that *t’i’t’eñ* is secondary. The only argument in favour of the priority of *t’i’t’eñ* 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’i’t’eñ* (although not necessarily) can be secondary, whereas *t’i’t’eñ* can not, since there is no synchronical basis for such a reshaping (in other words, there are neither a verbal *t’el- ‘to fly, flutter’, nor *t’el- ‘wing’). Instead, one finds some sporadic evidence for *t’el ‘wing’ and *t’el ‘leaf’; see s.v. *t’er* ‘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. πτιλ/o (mentioned also by Açâryan himself) and others strengthen the status of *t’i’t’eñ*.

For *t’i’t’eñ* ‘butterfly’ we have first to mention Gr. πτιλ/o n. ‘soft feathers; down; wing (properly of insects); the wing-like membrane in a kind of serpents’, probably with a hypocoristic -ιλο suffix, which may be linked with the Armenian suffix -il/i (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 *ptilom* as a word of substratum origin (cf. sivn, etc.), which has later been contaminated with the native PArm. *t’er-* < PIE *pt’er-*. The form *ptill(o)m would yield Arm. *t’el/n (from *t’il/n; cf. aseln ‘needle’ from older *asiln* and, with subsequent reduplication. *t’i-t’eñ*. Note that, both formally and semantically, *t’i’t’eñ* corresponds to πτιλ/o just like *t’i’t’eñ* does to πτιλ/o. In the case the second component of Lat. vespertil/iō ‘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. *māskat’t’ëñ/hn*. Note also Gr. τίλα f. ‘plucking; (pl.) flocks or motes floating in the air’, τίλ[β]α : πτερα (Hesychius).

Açâryan (HAB 2: 182f) identified *t’i’t’eñ* (API tî’t’ëns) ‘leaf of metal’ with *t’i’t’eñ* ‘butterfly’. Petersson (1916: 259) derives *t’i’t’eñ* from *t’el- ‘flat, flat ground, board’, cf. Gr. τέλω f. ‘board or table with a raised rim or edge, baker’s board, etc.’, Lat. telliis, -āris f. ‘Erde’, etc. Pokorny (1959: 1061) is sceptical about the etymology (“sehr unsicher”), but Jahukyan (1987: 153, 186-187) accepts it. Earlier, he (1982: 112) was inclined to the etymology proposed by Bugge (1893: 40)
who brought t’it’eñ into connection with Gr. πέταλον n. (also πέτηλον) ‘leaf; leaf of metal’. The Greek word, as well as OHG *petel-gold ‘Blattgold’, are represented in Pokorny 1959: 824 under the root *pet- ‘ausbreiten’. Olsen (1999: 410) suggests that t’it’eñ “may once have been an instrument noun *pt(h)etlo- deformed by such factors as dissimilation, reduplication (cf. titeṙ n. ‘lizard’, siseṙ n. ‘chick-pea’) and secondary n-stem inflection”.

I prefer Ačaryan’s etymology. The semantics of t’it’eñ ‘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’eñ is formally identical with t’it’eñ ‘butterfly’, so there is no need to separate these words.

Arm. t’it’eñ, ‘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 χρυσὸν: Arm. z’it’eñ 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’eñ ‘leaf (of metal)’ with the homonymous and etymologically identical word for ‘butterfly’. This would imply that the meaning ‘butterfly’ of Arm. t’it’eñ 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’eñ. This alternative is less probable.

We encounter a similar problem in a medieval song entitled “Govasanun’t’iwn Solomonī 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. 233220) we read: Haw t’it’uns aṙnēr zayn margartašarern. We are obviously dealing with API t’it’uns of t’it’eñ ‘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’eñ ‘plate’ has been confused with t’it’eñ ‘butterfly’, which in a certain way is associated with the compounded designation of the bat, cf. mask-a-t’it’eṙ ‘bat’ (q.v.). It is remarkable that mask-a-t’i’t’ 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 Lanalanyan 1969: 343-344

Lith. peteliškë, peteliuškë, peteliuškà ‘butterfly’ (also ‘flatterhaftes, leichtsinnges Mächchen’) and Latv. petelīgs ‘beweglich, lebhaft, flatterhaft’ are usually derived from *pet-tel- (with the root *pel- ‘to fly, flutter’). On the strength of the pair *pet-Vr- (cf. Skt. pátra- n. ‘wing (of a bird), feather’, LAv. pataro-ta- ‘winged’, Hitt. pattar n. ‘wing’, gen.sg. paddan-aš, Arm. p’etur ‘feather’, with phonological problems; from NSg n. *-őr?) next to *pter- (cf. Arm. t’er(t’), Gr.
"t'i't'ot

πτερόν, πτηρός), one might perhaps revive the derivation of the Baltic form from *pet-el-. In this case, Lith. peteškė ‘butterfly’ would be an important cognate of Arm. t'i't'en ‘butterfly’.

*t'i't'ot ‘angry’.

● DIAL Van t'i't'xot (see Ačarean 1913: 365b), Ararat (HayLezBrBr 2, 2002: 110b), etc.

● ETYM See above, s.v. t'i't'en ‘butterfly’. For the suffix, cf. *diw-ot ‘mad’ from dew ‘demon’ [Ačarean 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’) [Ačarean 1913: 92a].

On ‘butterfly’: ‘soul; spirit’, see HAB s.v. xipilik.

*t'i'- ‘to fly’, independently only in Step’anos Orbelean: t'i' (noun) ‘flying; t'i'-č'-im ‘to fly’ (Bible+), t'i'-an-im ‘id.’ (Proverbs, etc.), t'i'-n-un ‘id.’ (Cyril of Alexandria, etc.).

● ETYM See s.v. *t'er ‘leaf’, etc.

*t'k'i, dlk'i ‘maple’, spelled also as t'lk(en)i, t'xki, dlk'i, txki [Ališan 1895: 190\textsuperscript{Nrn4}].

According to Béguinot/Diratzouyan (1912: 66, Nrs 303 and 304), t'k'ki/txki (with synonymous bclti) denotes ‘Acer campestre’, whereas ‘Acer platanoides’ is represented by *ka-t'nerew/b-i, on which see 2.1.15. See also Malkaseanc’ HBB 4: 418a.

NHB (2: 1061c), only in the dialectal addendum: dlk ‘a tree with valuable wood of which spoons are made’.

According to Ačarjan (HAB 2: 188b), attested in “Yalags cačc’” (“On trees”), in the form dlk'i. I cannot identify this source, since it is absent from the bibliography of HAB.

● DIAL Loři, Lazax, Išaral, Išaral t'xki, Lazax t'lk-eni, Muš, Bulanax dlk ‘maple’ (with an initial d’- rather than d’-, as Ačarjan points out) [HAB 2: 188-189].

Dersim t’xki (perhaps a misprint for t’xgi), t’xki, t’xkli [Balramyan 1960: 80b].

Although almost unattested in the literature and more widespread in the Eastern dialects (cf. also Ališan 1895: 190\textsuperscript{Nrn4}), the word is also present in the Western dialectal area (Muš-Bulanax 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'ad- + the tree-suffix -k'i/-ki (cf. hačar-k/k'i ‘beech’, dial. kačk'i vs. class. kačni ‘oak’, etc.). The root resembles *t'et- found in t'eti ‘elm’ and t'etam (see s.v.v.). For a semantic association, cf. Oss. wis-qæd ‘maple’ from PIE *wīṅg- ‘elm’ (see P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1987: 178b; see also s.v. knjini ‘elm’), if the connection is accepted.

In this case, Dersim t’skli (next to t’skli) would be considered a metathesized form of t’k’i, which seems strange. Therefore, one may alternatively assume that t’k’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 Bachian stağar and Chechen staţr ‘Acer platanoides’, which have been connected with Hurr. taskar-inna ‘box-tree’ (see Diakonoff/Starostin 1986: 25). Perhaps, a Caucasian form of the type *tagar/- is responsible for the Armenian word. The latter may have
been formed with the suffix found in tree-names like kalamaxi, 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’ɫki ‘maple’ can be compared with Oss. tulʃtulʃe ‘oak’ and Hung. tögy ‘oak’ (on which see Cheung 2002: 232). For the semantics, cf. Basque azkar, which, depending on the dialect, denotes ‘maple’ or ‘oak’ (see P. Friedrich 1970: 66).

t’uz, o-stem: GDSg t’z-o-y, AblSg i t’z-o-y (Bible); i-stem: GDPl t’z-i-c’ (Plato) ‘fig’ (Bible+), ‘a fig-like tumour’ (“Bžškaran” apud NHB 1: 820c) [cf. Gr. σῦκον ‘fig; a large wart on the eyelids, also tumours in other places’]; dial. also ‘vulva’, see below; t’zeni, ea-stem: GDSg t’zenw-o-y, AblSg i t’zenwoy, LocSg i t’zenwoj, ISg t’zen-e-a-w ‘fig-tree’ (Bible+).

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects. With -n: T’iflis t’uzə, gen. t’zan, Agulis, Larabał, etc. t’żna. The -n is seen in t’z-n-eni ‘fig-tree’, attested in 1788 [HAB 2: 202a]. Note also Lor’i t’z-(e)n-k’-i ‘fig-tree’ e.g. in a fairy-tale from the village of Šno (recorded by Hm. Mažinyan; see Nawasardeanc’ 5, 1889: 67, lines 9, 15 = HŽHek’ 8, 1977: 17L2, 18L3; t’znk’u terew “leaf of fig-tree”.

No trace of -n in the Van-group; see Açaıryan 1952: 261 (not listed in 124-126, under an-declension); M. Muradyan 1962: 196b, cf. 102; Orbéli 2002: 232.

In Aslanbek and Ozim, t’uz also means ‘vulva’; cf. Gr. σῦκον ‘fig; pudenda muliebria’, Germ. Feige.

● ETYM Since de Lagarde (1854: 3013), compared with Gr. σῦκον, Boeotian τῦκον n. ‘fig; a large wart on the eyelids, also tumours in other places; pudenda muliebria’, female genitals’, σῶκη, Dor. σῶκα, Heraclean Dor. σῶκα f. ‘fig-tree, Ficus Carica’.

The Armenian and the Greek words cannot be separated from Lat. ficus, i and i̯, 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 pfak); J̌ahukyan 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. тýkva ‘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. σῦκες ‘cucumber’, Slav. *tyky ‘pumpkin’, etc. (on which see s.v. sex ‘melon’) is untenable; see also Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 492. Gr. σῶκη and Mycenean xi-za < *stukya have been compared with Hitt. šigga- ‘a plant’ without a mention of Boeotian τῦκον and the Armenian and the Latin forms (see Hoffner 1967: 43a). This is not convincing either.

The phonological correspondences, in particular Arm. -z vs. Gr. and Lat. *-ē, and Lat. fi- vs. Arm. and Gr. *f-, are not easily explicable. De Lagarde (1854: 301320) compares the case of Arm. xoz ‘pig’ vs. Pers. xīk ‘id.’. Patrubány (1908: 278a) assumes that Arm. *t’us- yielded t’uz under the influence of ṣŋkoyz ‘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. lībra < *lībra '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 *þ-. 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 *tuq-, with an impossible root structure for an Indo-European word (a combination of a voiceless stop and a voiced aspirated one), unless *-g- is a determinative. He (op. cit. 466) also mentions the Semitic parallels (Akkad. tīttu(m), Aram. tēn/tā, Arab. tīn, etc.; cf. Adonec' 1938: 460-461 = 1972: 385-386) considering them to be formally remote.

In view of the Latin vocalism, one may tentatively reconstruct Mediterr. *tʰuůik- or *tū(i)k-. The final voiced -z of Arm. t'uz points to (or has been influenced by) the suffixal element j/z which abounds in plant-names, animal-names, etc. (see 2.3.1). Alternatively: *tʰūk-, which would also explain the Greek anlaut vacillation t-/s- (cf. Beekes 2008: 48, 52).

Arm. dial. (T‘iflis, Loĉi, Agulis, Larabal, etc.) *t’uzn probably reflects *t’uz-(o)m ‘fig’ (the fruit), cf. Gr. σῦκον n. ‘fig’ (the fruit) vs. συκῆ, σῡκέα, σῡκία f. ‘fig-tree’. See also s.v. mor ‘blackberry’.

**t’unni**. Bağırk’ hayoc’: t’unni ‘darkness’ (var. t’urnn), t’unnanal ‘to become dark’ (see Amalyan 1975: 123N225), cf. also t’uz ‘night’ or ‘dark’, t’usi ‘darkness’ (ibid. Nrs. 216, 227; see also p. 373).

- **DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects, in the meaning ‘cheek’. In Xarberd, Polis and Suc‘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 (orì t’uš); see Alayan 1974: 73 (footnote), 74.

- **ETYM** No etymology is mentioned in HAB 2: 207-208.

Alayan (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 -ɾ and -rš Alayan mentions t’aram-ʣ-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. tvor ‘appearance’, Pol. twór ‘creation, creature’,

The semantic basis of t’uš might have been ‘appearance’ (cf. ORuss. tvor, ‘appearance’), which would then have developed into ‘face’ (cf. Arm. eres ‘face’, if indeed related with erevim ‘to appear’) > ‘cheek’. However, the whole semantic field seems to be as follows: ‘to grow, swell; to become solid, 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’oř ‘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 Alayan (ibid.) and accepted by scholars from Armenia proper (Suk’iasyan 1986: 164; Jahyukan 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. oïdos n. ‘swelling’, Arm. ayt ‘cheek’ from verbal oïdeō ‘to swell’ and Arm. ayt-n-um ‘to swell’). From this *tuHr-os n., a form with *s-o- was created as in Skt. útsa-m. ‘spring, fountain’ < *ud-s-a- from PIE *yed-os- n. ‘water’ (cf. Gr. οίδος n. ‘water’, Arm. get, o-stem ‘river’, q.v.). Thus: *tuHr-so-.

Alternatively, t’uř (but not t’uš) may have been formed by the suffixal element *-r- on the basis of *t(o)uH-s- (cf. Skt. táviṣi- f. ‘strength, power’, etc.). Thus: *(t)o(u)H-s-r- > t’uř (and, perhaps, *touH-s-r- > PArm. *to(w)ar > t’oř). For other possible cases of such formations, see s.vv. antar, getar.

t’uř probably ‘cheek’ and/or ‘bite, a mouthful’, ‘swelling, fullness’.

Attested in Philo. In compounds: t’-a-lir (with lir ‘full, replete’) and hask-a-t’uř (with hask ‘ear (of corn)’), both in Agat’ange ɫ.os. For a philological discussion I refer to HAB 2: 208a; Alayan 1974: 71-74. In Bağgirk’ hayoc: t’ušs t’ušs (see Amalyan 1975: 123N225). Here, thus, t’uř is taken as synonymous to t’uš ‘cheek’.

Some lexicographers present t’uř 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’.


•ETYM Usually linked with arac- ‘to browse, graze’ and Gr. σπόγυο (see s.v. for more detail). More probably, t’urc ‘cheek’ is comparable to Lat. turgeo ‘to swell out, become swollen or tumid’ and the other Armenian words for ‘cheek’, namely
t'uš and t'uṛ [Ałayan 1974: 74; Jähukyan 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'reces'uk' zayn hrov = ὀπτήσωμεν αὐτὰς 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. tvìrtas ‘strong, firm, solid’, OCS tvrьдь ‘firm, solid’, etc., from PIE *turH-t/dh-. The Armenian form would require, then, *turH-d-s- (from the sigmatic aorist?) or *turH-ğ-, cf. Lat. turgeo ‘to swell out, become swollen or tumid’. In the latter case, t'urc- is identical with t'urc2 ‘cheek’ (q.v.).
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* i- ‘thing’ and interrogative indefinite pronoun ‘what’: ace. z-i, gen. ē-r, dat.-loc. i-m, hi-m, abl. i-m-č, instr. i-w, pl. i-k’, gen. i-rr-i-k’, dat.-loc. i-m-i-k’, abl. y-imel-č (and imel’ in Eznik Kołbac’i, see Meillet 1913: 63), instr. i-w-i-k’ (an interesting form is imel’i var. lect. in Sirach 41.19, 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. πτύω. 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’umak’ ‘dry; earth, dry land’, p’uk’ ‘bellows’, etc.

I

*iraw ‘true, truly’ has been preserved in Ararat, Ozim, and in a number of NW, W and SW dialects [HAB 2: 251a]; *čer is present in a few SE peripheral dialects: Marala, T’avriz her and Astapat ner ‘why’; cf. also Ararat xi and Larabał xe ‘why’ [HAB 2: 119b; 3: 92a].
The initial h- of Larabal hínē ‘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 *kwi-*. 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 inē’ has been directly compared with Skt. kíṁ-cit (Meillet 1892: 162; Pedersen 1924: 224b = 1982: 307b; Tedesco 1945: 132₁₂; Pisani 1950: 166-167; Ravnaes 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. ὅσ-τε, etc. (Jahukyan 1982: 149). On relation with i-br, iw-r, etc., see Meillet 1896b: 53.

The development of initial *k’- 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, 327; 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.

ţi, i-stem: GDsg tž-i, GDPl tž-i-c’ ‘viper’ (Bible+).

For a philological discussion, see s.v. k’arb ‘basilisk, asp’.

**DIAL** Alaškert tž ‘poisonous (snake)’, Sebastia tž ‘a malicious person’ [HAB 2: 239a].

**ETYM** Related to Gr. ἕχις, -εως, GPl ἕχεων m. (f.) [GSg ἕχιος; plural: dat. ἕχεων, gen. ἕχιον, acc. ἕχις (also ἕχεως); cf. also ἕχεως ἓ] ‘viper; name of a monster’, Skt. áhi- m. ‘snake, adder’ (RV+), YAv. aži- m. ‘snake, dragon’, MP až ‘dragon’ (LW from Avestan), etc.; cf. also Gr. ὃψ, gen. ὁψος, -εως, Dor. and Ion. ὁψος m. ‘serpent’ [Hübschmann 1897: 450; HAB 2: 238-239; Meillet 1936: 75; Pokorny 1959: 44; Jahukyan 1987: 112].

Compared with Gr. ἕχις first by de Lagarde 1854: 29L779. For the problem of *é* vs. *o* in Arm. tž vs. Gr. ὃψ, see Schindler 1994: 398.

Hardly of Iranian origin (see L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 215).

In view of the Armenian ź, the PIE root probably had labiovelar *-gʷh* rather than palatovelar *-gʷ*. The association with ozni ‘hedgehog’ will then be secondary. The sibilant -ž- of Arm. ź instead of the expected affricate -ǰ- is troublesome. The vocalism is usually considered to point to lengthened grade: *h,égʷu*-i- (see the references above). This is possible, cf. the alternation *-ē* : *-e- seen in the following animal-names: Gr. ἀλώπηξ, -εκος f. ‘fox’ vs. Arm. ahēs ‘fox’, obl. ahēs-; Arm. ak’s ‘weasel’ vs. Skt. kāśikā- f. ‘Ichneumonweibchen’ or ‘weasel’, kāsta- ‘weasel’ (see s.vv.).

---

64 Olsen 1999: 884 suggests a comparison with Olc. iđ ‘deed, doing’.

We may explain QIE *h₁ēgʰw-i- by positing an older monosyllabic root noun (cf. Beekes 1995: 189-190): nom. *h₁ēgʰw-s, obl. *h₁ēgʰ-. 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: *ēgʰw-i- > *ēji- > *ēyji- > *ēž-, cf. *medʰ-jo- > Arm. mēj, cf. Lat. medius ‘mid, middle’, see also s.vv. ēš ‘donkey’ and ġišer ‘night’, as well as 2.1.2.

The sibilant ž instead of the affricate j in intervocalic position (cf. Meillet 1936: 28) is not explained satisfactorily. I therefore propose to start with a PIE HD i-stem: nom. *h₁égwh-(ō)-i-, gen. *h₁(e)gwh-i̯-ós, cf. Gr. gen. ēχιος. An assimilation *gʰw[i- > -yy- > -yž- seems very likely. We arrive at PArm. nom. *e(y)ǰ-i-, gen. *ēžyo- > *ēž(i) : *iž- > īž, obl. īž-, with the nominative īž analogically reshaped after the oblique īž-, 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. άτρακτος ‘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 Larabar compound (ŋəlapūtik tal ‘to walk continuously’ < *ŋ-ə-putik tal ‘to twist like a spindle’ [HAB 2: 239b].

According to Jähukyan (1972: 282; 1987: 122, 214, 277), Marạš65 illel ‘to twist’ (see Ačarınan 1913: 396b; Galustan 1934: 387-4) 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 olore, which, indeed, is regularly reflected as ilol or illil in the dialects of Cilicia and Svedia, see HAB 3: 552a; Ačarınan 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 xrel [Danielyan 1967: 204a].


The Armenian dialects of Polis and Akm have ilika-clika ‘the essence of the subject (with all the subtle details)’ (see Ačarınan 1913: 396b; HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 166). Ačaryan (ibid.) does not specify the components. In view of the existence of the synonymous ułn u cuca ‘the true nature, the essence’ (Modern Armenian; see Malxaseane’, HBB 3: 597a), literally “the brain and marrow” (see ulet), one may identify the components of ilika-clika as ilik ‘spine, marrow’ and cl-ik ‘clitoris’ (see Ačarınan 1913: 516b). The latter is a diminutive form of cıl ‘sprout,

---

65 Misprinted “Marala”.
shoot, bud’. In the corresponding expression from Sebastia (see Gabikean 1952: 216), one finds ildo eila ‘every detail’. The semantic shift ‘marrow’ > ‘essence; basis’ is well known, cf. Engl. marrow, Germ. Mark, Fr. moelle.

According to N. Mkrtčyan (1971: 202), the second meaning of Burdur ilik ‘spindle’ is ‘marrow’ (ohnacuc). Acařyan (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. āṇi- m. ‘axle-pin, linch-pin; part of the leg above the knee’ (RV+); Gr. ἀλακτή f. ‘spindle’, and connects il ‘spindle’ with ohn ‘spine, etc.’ and uli n ‘spine, etc.’ and uln ‘neck’ (pl.) backbone, spine; neck; joint; circular whorl which balances and twirls a spindle’, etc., he points out that the older meaning of ili(ik) could have been ‘spine, spinal column’. Pokorny (1959: 307-309, s.v. *el- ‘to bow, bend; elbow’) and J̌ahukyan (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 ili(ik) (in a number of dialects; see above) in the meanings ‘marrow’, ‘spinal column’, etc., which is considered a loan from Turk. ilik ‘marrow/moelle’ (Aćàrean 1902: 141; HAB 3: 594b). Is the resemblance accidental? Turk. and Azeri ilik ‘marrow/moelle’ 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 ohn ‘spine, etc.’ and uln ‘neck’ can be accepted only if the internal laryngeal of the PIE root (see s.v. ohn) is a *-h₁- (*Heh₁l- > Arm. il), which is uncertain.

ilj, i-stem: GDPl əḻj-i-c’ in Daniel 2.27 (Cow 1992: 160); a-stem: IŠg əlj-a-w in Eusebius of Caesarea, ‘desire’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.18, Book of Chries, etc.), ‘witch, sorcerer’ (Bible+); āljam, āljanam ‘to desire, pray; to cast a spell’ (Bible+).

For the semantic shift of ilj, cf. Skt. yā- ‘to request, implore’ > yāti- m. ‘sorcery, witchcraft’ (RV+), Arm. ītak ‘sorcerer’ (Iranian loan).

● DIAL Acařyan (HAB 2: 241a) questions the appurtenance of Ľarabał *ilj-at-v-il ‘to be angry with someone’. One may assume that the word originally referred to the ecstatic fury of prophets or sorcerers.

● ETYM Acařyan (HAB 2: 240b) rejects all the etymologies including those comparing ilj with Skt. eh- ‘to strive for, desire’ (AV+), YAv. izieiti ‘to desire’, āḍzah- n. ‘desire’, Gr. ἰγαίνω, etc. This etymology is worth of consideration. Arm. ilj, i- or a-stem ‘desire’ may be derived from *Hīg₂-l- > PArm. *(h)ij₁-l- > ilj through regular metathesis. The absence of cognates with *-l- is not a decisive argument against the etymology, since ilj may have been influenced by synonymous balj (also i-stem) and gelfj.

im ‘my’, etc.: see s.v. es ‘I’.

inn, NPl inn(n)un-k’ in Luke 17.17, GDPl inn-c’ in Genesis 17.24 (vars. innuc’, innuce’, innuc’, etc., see Zeyt’ūnyan 1985: 218), IPl innam-b-k’ (John Chrysostom); GDPl inn-uc’ (Grigor Narekac’i), AbPl y-inn-a-c’ (Grigor Astuacaban), IPl innu-k’ (Eusebius of Caesarea); sg. rare and late: gen. inn(n) (Socrates, Elias on Aristotle),
loc. *y-inann (Socrates) ‘nine’ (Bible+); *inn-erord, a-stem: GDSg innerord-i, AblSg *innerord-ē (Bible+), ISg innerord-a-w (Eusebius of Caesarea) ‘ninth’ (Bible+); *inn-em-tasn or *inn-u-tasn ‘nineteen’, lit. ‘nine and ten’ (Bible+); *inn-sun ‘ninety’ (q.v.).

DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly as *ina or *inn- [HAB 2: 244a].


An interesting and plausible scenario has been proposed by Peters (1991; see also Viredaz 2001-02a: 1-2; sceptical Clackson 1994: 225-226): *h₁neun > *inowan > inoan > inon (contraction and subsequent fixation of the penultimate accent) > inn. Beekes 2003: 165 posits *h₁neun (not *-u-) > *enuan > inn with loss of the diphthong in last syllable. However, the simplest solution is to start with PArm. *enuun- < *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.).


inn-sun, i-stem: GDSg innsn-i (Philo), inns-n-i (Nersēs Šnorhalli), GDPi innsn-i-c’ (Plato) ‘ninety’ (Bible+).

DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 244b]. In a number of k₂-dialects (Nor Naxjewan, Polis, Hamšen, Karin, Xarberd, Zeyt‘un, Van, etc.) inn-sun has been replaced by djsxan < Turk. dogsan [Aćarca 1902: 342; HAB 2: 244b]. Goris innásun, Marala innanc’e’un and others are analogical after eawt’anasun ‘seventy’ and vak’sun > vac’c’un ‘sixty’. 

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 *h(unēkomth). PArm. *m(m)nisun with penultimative 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'ean-b, NPI ink'ean-k', GDPi ink'ean-c' ‘self’ (Bible+).

Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 246a].

See s.v. iwr ‘his own’.

Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 254a; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 118-131].

Rasmussen (1985: 46-48 = 1999: 124-127) suggests *eter-eter-ā-, cf. OCS źeron ‘someone’, Skt. yata-rā- 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. AčarLiak 2, 1954: 118).

iwr, GSg iwr-o-y, DSg iwr-um, ISg iwr-o-v, GDPi iwr-o-c', IPl iwr-o-k' refl. pron. ‘his own, etc.’ (Bible+).

Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 254b].


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 *s(e)ye at a relatively younger stage; iwr probably represents the unstressed form of *ev-r (for a discussion of these issues, see Meillet 1936: 45, 92; Godel 1975: 111-112; Schmitt 1981: 117-118, 184; 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 *s(e)ye-, cf. Skt. svar- ‘his, his own’, etc.), although details remain unclear; see HAB 2: 245-246 with references and a discussion (Ačaryan himself does not accept the etymology); AčarLiak 2, 1954: 118-120; Pokorny 1959: 882; Klingenschmitt 1982: 28-29 (‘wohl *im suēm ‘ihn selbst’’); Jähkuyan 1982: 148; 1987: 146.
lanj-kʰ

L

lanj-kʰ, a-stem ‘breast’ (Bible+), ‘mountain-slope’ (Lazar P’arpec’i; dial.).

GDPl lanj-a-c’ in Job 39.20 (Cox 2006: 253), referring to the breast of a horse; GDPl lanj-a-c’ in Movsês Xorenac’i 1.11 (1913=1991: 361a), referring to ‘breast (of a man)’; IPl lanj-a-w-k’ in Movsês Xorenac’i 2.85 (1913=1991: 230LB), referring to the chest of a horse. GDPl lanj-a-c’ occurs also in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vaĉ’e (king of Aɫuank’) apud Movsês Kaɫankatuac’i 1.11, referring to ‘breast (of a man)’ [V. Arak’elyan 1983: 231a].

DIAL. Present in several dialects, in the meanings ‘bosom, lap’, ‘mountain-slope’, ‘precipice’, etc. [HAB 2: 265b].


lar, o-stem: GDGg lar-o-y (Čaṙentir), Isg lar-o-v (once in the Bible); i-stem: GDGg lar-i (Nersēs Lambronac’i), Isg lar-i-v (Ephrem, Grigor Narekac’i), GDPl lar-i-c’ (Paterica; Yovhannēs Erznkac’i); a-stem: GDPl lar-a-c’ (Grigor Aršaruni), IPl lar-a-w-k’ (T’ovmay Arcruni) ‘rope, rein, cable, cord, string’ (Bible+), ‘plumbline of stone-masons’ (Agat’ange ɫos+), ‘snare’ (Paterica, Grigor Narekac’i), ‘mile’ (Alexander Romance), ‘tendons of the neck’ (Philo), ‘string of a musical instrument’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i, Yovhannēs Erznkac’i), etc. [NHB 1: 879-880]. Refers to the rope of a bridge in T’ovmay Arcruni 2.3 (1985: 150L18; transl. Thomson 1985: 161): hramayeac’ zlar kamur ǰac’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 larī ‘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 Su’cava [Açařyan 1953: 267] and ‘to chase away’ in Muş, Ałaşkert, Aparan, Xoy [Amatuni 1912: 241-242].

ETYM. Compared with Gr. εὔληρα, Dor. αὔληρα, Hesychian ἀβληρά ‘reins’ and Lat. lōrum, i. 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 *ylo-, *ylo-, and *ylor- 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, 849, with *h₂-). A QIE *h₁ulhr-o- would develop to Parm. *uláro- > lar, o-stem. Beside this form, one also may posit a dual *h₁ulhr-(h₁) > lar-k’, -i-c’ ‘reins, tendons’. See also s.vv. aławri ‘mill; female grinder’, erkan ‘mill’.

In view of phonological difficulties (see Beekes 1969: 64-65; Clackson 1994: 207-212 with references and a discussion; de Vaan 2008: 349), I posit a Mediterranean substratum term (see 3.11).

*law-/lap’, *la/o/-, *lap’ ‘flat (hand, stone, etc.)’ (dial.), MidArm. lawš ‘a thin flat bread’ (Geoponica+, see MijHayBar 1, 1987: 315), dial. *law(a)š ‘a thin flat bread’.
In Bağırk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 181, 252; Amatuni 1912: 243), lōš glosses hasteay and őš', respectively.

**DIAL.** The forms for 'palm, flat of the hand': Muš *lup', Ozim *lap', Akm *lov-az, etc. (Ačărğyan 1913: 439b).

Širak lap'ok, Ararat lēp'(uk) 'a flat, polished stone for playing' [Amatuni 1912: 243a], Kotayk'/Elkavan lēp'ok < *lap'uk 'a palm-sized flat stone' (see V. Arak'elyan 1984: 147), etc. DialAdd apud NHB (2: 1062c) has lēp' and lēp 'flat roundish stone' as connected with Lat. lapis 'stone'.


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** Ačărğyan (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. lāpo ‘paw’, Russ. lāpa ‘paw’, etc. (see ĖtimSlovSlavJaz 14, 1987: 26-27; Saradževa 1986: 130), Kurd. lap ‘lap’, Zaza lap/b, etc. (see Cabolov 1, 2001: 577). Jḥukyan (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 Jḥukyan (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. Mkrţjan 2005: 248-249; A. Petrosyan 2007: 8-10); none of them is entirely convincing. Ačărğyan (HAB 2: 308a) notes that the form *lavaš is found in Persian, Kurdim, 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. lāvāš (the Armenian forms are not mentioned) are loans from Turk. lāvāš.

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. mat-aš from mataš ‘young, fresh’, etc. (see HAB 3: 267b). Note that both *law-aš and mat-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 Ačărğyan (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, lāvāš is seen as characteristic for Armenian hospitality whereas the Kurdish entertain with sačī 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. *lóHp-eh₂- or *léh₂p-eh₂-, gen. *Hp-eh₂-ós. This would yield PArm. nom. *luv-, obl. *luv-. 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.

leaṙn, GDSg lerin, LocSg i lerin, AllSg i leaṙn, AblSg i leaṙn-ē, GenSg *lHp-eh₂-, obl. *léh₃p-eh₂-, (e.g. i leranc’ ṣjuc’ : ʕanó օրիեոն նարդաջեսու in Song of Songs 4.8), API leram-b’ (abundant evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 643-647); API leṙn- (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 leṙ refers to ‘hard stone’ [HAB 2: 270b], leṙ-k’ ‘hard stone’ [Markosyan 1989: 303a]; cf. also a textual illustration for Širak leṙ-k’ar [Mxit’areanc’ 1901: 180L3]. For the typology of this type of compounds, see s.v. pal ‘rock’.


Hamp 1967: 16-17 compares leaṙn with OIr. lie and Gr. ἁρακ ‘stone’. For the Armenian form he posits *lēsə-re/ēn, “which would be a nominalization in -en of *lēsə-ro- ‘stony’ ”. Olsen 1999: 122 accepts the comparison and assumes a hetero-clitic *-ser/sen- stem where the -n of the oblique cases (loc. -en) has somehow been added to the NAccSg *lēh₂sr̥. 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. ‘Steinalde, Geröllhalde; Felssturz’, lēr m., lēre f. ‘id.’ (derivative leránë f. ‘Steinalde, Steinfeld; steiniger Bach’), which has been derived from *leh₁-ur or *leu̯-r̥ (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’. 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: 260²). Here, the gem called etungn (cf. Gr. ὄνυξ, see s.v. etungn ‘nail’) is described as spitak (‘light, white’) lerdagoyn. 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

In Karin, лерт’ refers to clotted blood [HAB, ibid.; H. Mkrt’yan 1952: 146a]. According to HayLezBrbBär 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 Jαβακ’ [Lalayeanc’ 1892: 7 = 1, 1983: 336], where Mary is described as having Хač’м ср̣ти̣н, xač’м лер̣дин : “a cross on her breast, a cross on her back”.

For the semantic shift from an internal body-part to an external one, cf. сирт’ ‘breast’ < ‘heart’ in the passage just mentioned.

●ETYM Since Petermann, de Lagarde, Dervis chjan et al. (see HAB), connected with Skt. याक्र-/याक्रन- n. (RV+), NAccSg याक्र (AV) ‘liver’, YAv. याकरा n. ‘liver’ (on the vocalism, see de Vaan 2003: 68-69), NPers. याकरों n. ‘liver’, OCS икра ‘roe’, Russ. икра ‘roe, spawn, caviar; calf of leg’, etc. [Hübenschmann 1897: 452; HAB 2: 270-271]. For the semantic relationship ‘roe, spawn’ : ‘calf of leg’, see 3.7.3. The PIE word is heteroclitic: *Hiekwr(-t), gen. *Hiekw n-ós.


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 лер̣д is connected or has been contaminated with Gr. λιπαρός ‘oily, shiny with oil, anointed; fatty, greasy’, λιπαρία f. ‘fatness’, OIc. ли́ф ‘liver’, etc., and luc ’yoke’ has been influenced by Lucanem ‘to loosen’ (see Hübenschmann 1893: 32 = 1989: 15; HAB 2: 271a; Jakuhyan 1982: 40; Clackson 1994: 210-97; Kortlandt 1998: 15-16 = 2003: 122; Beekes 2003: 162]. Arm. лер̣д is also compared with Hitt. ли̥ш̣и n. ‘liver’ [Schindler 1966; Olsen 1999: 191-192].

Alternatively, one may explain the initial l- of лер̣д by influence of ле̥т ‘gall, bile’, although the origin of this word is obscure, and/or лан̣ф ‘breast’, etymologically ‘lung’.

lezu, o-stem: GDSg lezu-i, AblSg i lezu-ě, 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 *лизу instead of lezu [HAB 2: 272b].

●ETYM The word is a blend of PIE *leiẓu(e)h- ‘tongue’ (Olr. tengae, Goth. tuggō, OHG zunga, Skt. jihvā-, jhū- f., Av. hizuna-, hizū- m., etc.) and PIE *leig̣a- > Arm. лизем ’to lick’ (q.v.); cf. especially Lat. lingua vs. OLat. lingua and Lith. liežūvis ’tongue’. See Hübenschmann 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. *лизу vs. ClArm. lezu, see Meillet 1894: 164; 1896b: 53; 1936: 11, 55; Pedersen 1906: 419 = 1982: 197; HAB 2: 272b;

The QIE reconstruction of the Armenian words may be \(^{\ast}l(e)ng\,\,^\prime u\,- e-h, \, _{r} > \) PArm. \(^{\ast}l(e)nu-a\) - ‘tongue’ and \(^{\ast}leiz\) - > \(^{\ast}leiz\) - ‘to lick’.

**lerk** (i-stem in Gram.) ‘hairless’, dial. ‘smooth’ (Bible+). In “Adamgirk’” (Arak’el Siwnee’i, 15th cent.): lek (with loss of \( r \); cf. dial.).

- **DIAL** Alaşkert lerk **‘smooth (leather or mountain)’**; Alaşkert, 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 olork (i-stem in Philo) ‘smooth, polished’ (Bible+), derived from PIE \(^{\ast}le/org\) - , cf. Mlr. lerg f. ‘sloping expanse, hill-side, bank, plain, surface’ < \(^{\ast}lerg\,\,\, a\,\,\, lergg\) ‘pasture’, Mlr. learg ‘a plain; field’, MWelsh lhwrw ‘track, trail, path’, etc.; the initial \( o- \) in olork is traced to \(^{\ast}po-\) [Lidén 1906: 60-64; HAB 2: 277; 3: 556; Pokorny 1959: 679; Jāhukyan 1987: 136]. Makaev (1974: 59-60) considers the correspondence “more than doubtful” and proposes a derivation from \(^{\ast}(s)leg\) - ro- < PIE \(^{\ast}seig\) - ‘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 / olork ‘smooth’ and Mlr. lerg f. ‘sloping expanse, plain, pastureland, surface’ deserves consideration.

The only formal problem with olork 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 \(^{\ast}h_{1}l\) - , the initial \(^{\ast}h_{1}\) - 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 \( f \) is realized as a dark lateral \( l \)); see 2.1.17.2. The reconstructed form would be, then, \(^{\ast}h_{1}lerg\) - . This is, of course, hypothetical.

See also s.v. merk ‘naked’.

\(^{\ast}leiz\) ‘to lick’: liz(an)em, lizum ‘to lick’ (Bible+); \(^{\ast}lez\) - in lezum ‘id.’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 278].

- **ETYM** From PIE \(^{\ast}leig\) - ‘to lick’: Skt. reh-/leh-, YAv. riz-, Gr. ἕξιον, Lith. ličti, OCS lizati, liž, Lat. lingō, etc., see NHB 1: 886b; Hübbschmann 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 li-ri-w ‘plenitude’ (Bible+); Iman or Imanam 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’ (Yovhannés Ōjneč’i /8th cent./, Grigor Narekac’i, Nersēs Lambronac’i); MidArm. Iman, i Iman ‘entire; entirely, fully’, various verbal forms in Iman ‘to fill, fulfil, etc.’ (Mī Hay Bar 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 *le(-n)- ‘to fill’ are widespread in the dialects. Remarkable are Van ilin [Ačaryān 1952: 263], ƶatak ʰ’lin [M. Muradyan 1962: 197a] (note also hlin in a riddle, S. Harut’yunyan 1965: 9b[1965]a, Polis, Nor Naxijewan ilink’, Zeyt’un ilenk’, etc. ‘full’, which point to a prepositional *i Ilin(-k’). The preposition i is also seen in Sebastia Ilin = i + the verb Iianal (cf. Polis Ienal from Iional), Muş, etc. ʰ’ənəl, Nor Naxijewan ilink’-nel, etc. Further note Polis, ʰədost’o Iman ‘entire’, etc. [HAB 2: 279-280].

• ETYM Since NHB 1: 884c, etc. (see HAB 2: 279), compared with Gr. πίπλημη, -αμα to fill, make full’, intr. ‘to fill oneself, become full’, πλήρης ‘full’, πλέος, Ion. πίλος ‘full’, Lat. pērē ‘to fill’, pērūs(que) ‘most of, majority, composing the greater part’, Skt. pari ‘to fill’, pres. piparti, "piprati (cf. 3sg.impf.med. āpiprati ‘hat gefüllt’), participle prātā- ‘filled’, MPers. hambāridan ‘to fill’, etc. The verbal stem is reconstructed as PIE *pelh₁: > *plēh₁- (see Schrijver 1991: 139-140; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 89-90; Mallory/Adams 1997: 201b; Rix 2003: 373; Cheung 2007: 295-297).


The dialectal construction *i-lin / y-lin is etymologically identical with y-li ‘pregnant’, q.v. (for a discussion, see Weitenberg 1986: 96, 96a, 97h). Both contain reflexes of PIE *h₁en- ‘in’. The derivatives are thus comparable with Lat. im-plēō ‘to fill, fulfill; to make pregnant’, etc. (see also s.vv. yēc’ ‘full’, yēp Iman ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled’, yōlov ‘much, plenty’, all probably from the same etymon).

As to the form *lin, it is tempting to link it with Lat. plēmus ‘full’. The latter form derives from *pleh₁:no-, which reflects the PIE *plh₁:no- (cf. Skt. Pūrinus-, 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.
*lik’-

MidArm. and dial. lman ‘entire; entirely, fully’ is reminiscent of Skt. pārīman-‘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 HNB 2: 908c), imper. lik’ (Ephrem) ‘to leave, let go, release, abandon’ (Bible+). *lk’anem, 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’ (Bible+), cf. also lk’ linel (Ephrem); lk’anam, 1sg.aor. lk’-a-y, 3pl lk’-a-n (Bible+) ‘to be left, become weak or depressed, be dissolved, be desperate, desert’ (Bible+), cf. also lk’ linel (Ephrem); lk’anam ‘to become weak or depressed’ (Zgōn-Afrahat); das-a-lik’, i-stem: 1sg dasalk’-i-w (Ganjk’), 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]. Ačaṙyan HAB ibid. hesitantly adduces also Ararat, Lazax, Šulaver lk’-lk’al ‘to become frightened, start trembling’, lk’-lk’ac’ ‘tremble, fear’.


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: 174-175); logan-k’, a-stem: logan-a-c’ (Alexander Romance), IPl 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 lok- ‘to swim’: Muš, Alaškert lọkənal, Moks lōkənal vs. lōkənal ‘to bathe’, etc. [HAB 2: 291a; Orbeli 2002: 239]; Moks -kā- is from -ga- through Ačaṙyan’s Law.

ETYM Related with Gr. λαύω, λαβρέ-σαυ ‘to bathe, wash (the body)’, Lat. lavō, lavere ‘to wash; to bathe, soak’, lavāre ‘to bathe’, etc., see Hübsschmann 1897: 452; HAB 2: 291; Pokorny 1959: 692; Mallory/Adams 1997: 108b.


67 The comparison with Lat. linguō has first been suggested in NHB 1: 908c.
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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’ (Eznik Kolyb’ci, Lazar P’arpec’i, Hexaemeron, etc.).

Illustration: In Lazar P’arpec’i 1.16 (1904=1985: 27.155); transl. Thomson 1991: 63): i *loyc ara*jnordac* ‘through dissolute leaders’ (see the passage s.v. *me*ɫk ‘soft, weak, slack’).

**●**DIAL Ju*la*, Axal’c’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’, *λῦσ* (ι)-, etc., Lat. *luo*, perf. *lūī* ‘to pay, acquit oneself’, so-*luo* ‘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]. Klingenschmitt (1982: 184) accepts the connection and posits a nasal present *lu-n-g-* seen in Celt. *tunga* ‘loslassen freilassen’ (cf. the structure of Skt. *yunáj-*: *yuj-* ‘to yoke, harness, join’; see also s.v. *lu* *yoke*).


**loys**, *o*-stem ‘light’ (Bible+).

**●**DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 2: 296a].


*loyc*-: pres. **luc-anem**, 1sg.aor. *luć*-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: GDPl *luč’ke-a-c* (Yovhanës Draxxanakertc’i, 9-10th cent.) ‘burning material, fuel, warming material, poultice’ (Eliš, Afrahat/Zgön, Nersës Snorhali, etc.); **luc’-umn** (Barsel Ğon), GDsg *luc’-man* (Nersës Lambronic’i, Yovhannës Erznkac’i), lIsg *luc’-nam-b* and NPl *luc’-mun-k* (Grigor Narekac’i) ‘lighting, kindling, ardour’; *-loyc* in compounds (Zgön-Afrahat, Movsës Kalankatuc’i, etc.).


**●**ETYM Together with *loys*, *o*-stem ‘light’ (q.v.), connected with Skt. *röcate*, aor. *aroci, rucänē*, *arociša* ‘to shine, be bright, be radiant’, *röka* m. ‘light’ (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 463-464), Gr. *rökoς* ‘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- or inchoative *l(o)uk-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; Jähukyan 1982: 74, 179, 229, 45; 1987: 136, 178). In the case of harc’anem, the *-sk- is assured by cognate forms: Ved. prccha, Lat. poscī, 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: 51, 197-198, 236, 534, 811, 813, 129) 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 Erasx/Arak’s from the Caspian Sea.

•ETYM No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 2: 297a.


PIE *lok-s- 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 ‘corpses’. 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’ (Hexaemer, 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 Hexaemer (NPI lor’k’), rendering Gr. ὄρτυξ m. (f.), -ῠγος ‘quail, Coturnix vulgaris’ (see K. Muradyan 1984: 137-138, index 374a). The compound lor-a-marg(-i) renders Gr. ὄρτυγο-μύτρα 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 AČar’yan (HAB 3: 276a; see also Olsen 1999: 689), the second component is *marg ‘bird’ (Iranian loan, cf. YAv. mərəya-, Oss. mərg, etc. ‘bird’, see Cheung

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 298a].

In a number of the Eastern dialects, with “prothetic” (h)ü- or (h)ə-: Areš հուլոր [Lusenc’ 1982: 210b]; Šamaxi հուլոր, (Meysari) հուլոր [Bahlamryan 1964: 201]; Goris լոր, տոր, ուլոր [Margaryan 1975: 330a].

On orlor, see V. Afak’elyan 1984a: 145-146.


The IE origin of Arm. լոր 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. քարի ‘scorpion’, dial. also ‘crayfish’ : Gr. καρίς ‘Crustacea’ vs. Arm. լոր ‘scorpion’ : Gr. κορις, κωρίς ‘Crustacea’ (see s.vv.).

The meaning of Hitt. lari(i)- c. is unknown (ChicHittDict [-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. լոր, տոր, ուլոր, Gr. λαρίς, Hitt. lari-.

EArm. *(h)ուլոր, *(h)աոր: Lusenc’ (1982: 159) mentions the Areš form in the list of very archaic words deriving it from *օոր, but he does not offer any motivation. Bahlamryan (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 ու- 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’, ուր ‘kite’, cf. especially Malat’ia ուհուրիկ, with dissimilation ռ...ռ > ռ...ռ. 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. լոր 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/lor- 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. լու-a-, imper. լու-r (very rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 667), new aor. իեակ’ > իեք’ Grigor Narekac’i (10th cent.), etc. ‘to hear, listen; to
obey’ (Bible+). *lu-a ‘obedient’ in Timot’ès Kuz = Timothy Aelurus, 5th or 6th cent. (Achar.-Armen. 1908-09a, 1: 371a-b24), Grigor Narekaci’; *lu aṣem ‘to make hear, proclaim’, *lu nīnim ‘to be heared, proclaimed’ (both Bible+); *lu i lu ‘in hearing, to one’s hearing, hearable’ (Bible+), e.g. Job 13.17 (Cox 2006: 115): zi patme’ic’ jεz *lu i lu ‘for I will declare in your hearing’; *hlu ‘obedient, compliant’ (Bible+), an-∗lu ‘disobedient’ (Cyril of Jerusalem, Dionysius the Areopagite); *lu-r ‘hearing, fame, report, preaching, obedience’ (q.v.); *lu-ɾ, a-stem: GDP ḻ-ɾ-a-c’ (Book of Chries) ‘silent’, *ḻem ‘to be silent’, ḻi-ḻu ‘silent, silently’ (all Bible+), ḻi-muɾ ‘silent, silently’ (John Chrysostom).


**DIA**. The verb *ḻem with a generalized paradigm is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 307b]. The root *lu has been preserved in Larabar ḻi ‘listen, wait!’, e.g. ḻi kac’, ḻi asem ‘listen, wait, let me say’ (HAB 2: 307b); according to Davt’yan 1966: 368: ḻi kenal, imper. ḻi kac’.

See also s.v. ḻiur ‘silent’.

**ETYM**. Since long (see HAB 2: 307 for references), derived from PIE *kḻe-u- ‘to hear’: Skt. śrav-, aor. a śravam, a śrōt ‘to hear’, śrō-ta ‘heard, famous’, Gr. κλεό ‘to hear, obey’, κλόη ‘famous’, Lat. cluedo ‘to be called, be named, be reputed’, OCS slit ‘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 *kḻu-s-s > *kḻu-k- through assimilation like in kesur ‘husband’s mother’, cf. ḻur which requires *kḻu-s-s-r- vs. ḻu-r- from *kḻu-ro- (Meillet 1908-09c: 338; HAB 2: 307a; Pokorny 1959: 605). The derivation from *kḻu-sk- (Hübschmann 1897: 453-454 with hesitation) is untenable; one expects *lu-s- from it. Others explain *lus- from a present form *kḻu-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; Gödel 1975: 78, 114, 122; Schmitt 1981: 154; Klingenschmitt 1982: 157-159; Jähkuyan 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), *ḻem represents a sigmatic aorist stem with a secondary nasal infix *kḻ-n-s-s, just as ampmem ‘to drink’ (q.v.). We can also start with an old present *kḻe(n)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 redundant present *(pi-)ph-s-e-ti > *(h)ipmep > new present *(h)ip-ne-mi > ampmem ‘to drink’; *sk-present *gnH-sk- + present *-te > čanač’em vs. aor. can-i ‘to know, be acquainted’ (see s.v.v.).

Arm. hɾč’ak ‘fame’ has no satisfactory etymology (cf. HAB 3: 128b; Alayan 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-srauwah-, MPers. 314 Isem
*lu

hu-sraw ‘of good repute, famous’, Skt. su-śrāvas- ‘id.’, śrūya- ‘to be heard, famous, glorious’, su-śrūta- ‘gern erhörtend’, su-śrūta- ‘gute Erhörung findend’, Gr. κλοῖος ‘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 *-tyr- > -ēr-, one may assume a very old Iranian borrowing, compare the well-known problems of arcat ‘silver’ (q.v.), partēz ‘garden’, etc. Thus: *hu-srūtva-ka-‘good repute, fame’ > Arm. *hurūč ‘āka > hēč ‘ak ‘fame’. Structurally compare also h-ex ‘obedient’ (q.v.) composed of *hx- < *sr- ‘good’ and *x- ‘hearing, heard’ from *kl-u-‘flea’, although the semantic correspondence is not straightforward.

Further, see s.vv. *lu ‘hearing’, lué ‘silent’, lur ‘hearing, fame, obedience’.

**Lu**, o-stem: GDSg lu-o-v (1 Kings 24.15, Grigor Narekaci’i), AblSg i lu-ē (Fables by Vardan Aygek’i), Isg lu-o-v var. lv-o-v in Eznik Kolbaci’i (A. A. Abrahamyan 1994: 118<sup>1-2</sup>); NPl lu-an-ki’ (Afr’el Siwnc’i, 14-15<sup>th</sup> cent.) ‘flea’ (Bible+).

Renders Gr. γύλαζο ‘flea’ in the only Biblical attestation, viz. 1 Kings 24.15.


• **DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects. Xarberd has lu-n, gen. lv-an, pl. lv-n-er, cf. also Nor Naxijewan lu, pl. lu-n-er [HAB 2: 2996]. T’iflis khvōr (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. plāṣ̐i- m. ‘flea’, Gr. γύλα f. < *psul-ja, Lat. pulex f. (*psula-), OHG flōh m., Lith. blusā, Russ. bloxā ‘flea’, etc. (Pokorny 1959: 102; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 197-198; Mallory/Adams 1997: 206a).

As far as the anlaut is concerned, Skt. plāṣi- is the closest to the Armenian form (Bugge 1889: 11); cf. also γύλα f. < *psul-ja which seems to reflect *psulas. Since *hblus- or *hblus- would yield Arm. *xblu- and *xblu-, respectively, Arm. lu, o-stem, is derived from QIE *pluso- (Meillet 1922g; cf. 1936: 47; HAB 2: 299; Jáhukyan 1982: 72; Olsen 1999: 20). For an o-stem insect-name, possibly feminine in origin, and for -iē, see s.vv. mun ‘itch; gnat, midge’; for the problem of gender compare also mun ‘daughter-in-law’ (q.v. (see Meillet 1922g: 143; Olsen 1999: 820).

For the irregular alternation *p̥b̥- (cf. Lubotsky 1988: 30) compare *kb̥- in the word for ‘nit’ (see s.vv. anic ‘nit’); cf. Meillet 1922g: 143.


*lu ‘hearing, heard’, see s.vv. Isenm ‘to hear’.

considered possible too (Hübschmann 1897: 453; Godel 1975: 78). Further see s.v. lsem ‘to hear’.

**luanam**, 3sg.aor. *luac*’, imper. *luac* ‘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).


  Alternatively, *luanam* is connected with Gr. λούω, λο(ϝ)έ-σαι ‘to bathe, wash (the body)’, Lat. lavā, lavere ‘to wash, bathe’, etc. and thus identified with Arm. *loganam* ‘to bathe’, see NHB 1: 893c; Hubschmann 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, IPl 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’oliks, 9th cent.), ‘pair’ (Geoponica); lecm ‘to yoke’ (Bible+).
  luc-l-il-k’ ‘a pair of veins of brains’ (Oskip’orik).

- **DIAL** luc ‘yoke’ and lecm ‘to yoke’ are dialectally ubiquitous. In Larabal, 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. yugā- n. ‘yoke, team, race, tribe’ (RV+), Gr. ζυγόν n. (also ζυγός m.) ‘yoke of a plough; 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; Jahukyan 1982: 40-41, 57, cf. 213; 1987: 173]. See also s.v. leard ‘liver’ and 2.1.7.

  Some of the cognate languages have derivatives in *-lo- or *-leh2-: Skt. yogāta- m., yogalā- 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. ζύγη f. ‘loop attached to the yoke, through which the beast’s heads were put’, etc. These derivatives have been compared with Kartvelian *uyel- ‘yoke’: Georg. uyel-, Mevr. uy-, Svan w/wa, uyval, cf. also the derivatives Georg. uyel- : Mevr. uyul- ‘team of oxen’, Georg. me-uyl-e ‘spouse’; see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 723, 723; 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’ (Osip’orik) with double l is reminiscent of Georg. uyel- ‘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-ali ‘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 nátría (perhaps Thracian), probably contains the same suffix -(a)lih₂-; compare also Georg. elli (see s.v. sayl).

luca[t]li ‘the constellation Orion=Hayk’.

● **DIAL** Only in “Arżeñ bararan” (a dictionary published in Venice in 1865), see HAB 2: 301b.

● **ETYM** According to Ačarğyan (HAB 2: 301b), composed of luc ‘yoke; Libra, Orion’ and unknown -ali.

In view of the resemblance between the Armenian characters a and t, lucatli 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-r, a-stem: GDPI l-r-a-c’ (Book of Chries) ‘silent’, lrem ‘to be silent’, lir-lur ‘silent, silently’ (all Bible+), lur-mur ‘silent, silently’ (John Chrysostom).

For derivatives (apart from NHB and HAB), see Olsen 1999: 394-395, 456.

● **DIAL** Axalc’xa lur u munč, T’iflis lur ‘silent’, Xarberd l-r-ank’ ‘patience’, Zeyt’un l-ril ‘to be silent’ [HAB 2: 302b]. Interesting is Xian an-l-ţi ‘garrulous, chattering, talkative’ < ‘who does not become silent’ (Açarğyan 1913: 100a); for -ti compare lk-ti ‘licentious’ from lkim ‘to be licentious’, an-fr-di ‘arid, not watered’, etc.

● **ETYM** From QIE *k̡luš-s-r-, see Bugge 1893: 9; Hūbschmann 1897: 454; Pokorny 1959: 606; Jahukyan 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 (NPl lusanunk’), in a list of wild animals, after varazk’ ‘wild boars’ and followed by injk’ ‘panthers’, vagerk’ ‘tigers’, etc. (see H. Simonyan 1989: 2874). 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 Açarğyan (HAB 2: 302-303), the NSg must have been *lus-an-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 Hūbschmann 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** Lazax lisam ‘a fox-like animal with whitish fur, black round spots and a long thin tail’ [Amatuni 1912: 249b], Łarabal lissemnə ‘marten’ [HAB 2: 303a]. According to Açarğyan (HAB, ibid.), Lazax lisam, apart from ‘marten’ (for this meaning he cites Amatuni, but the description of the latter seems to point rather to
*lus-an

‘lynx’), also means ‘a white quick mythical beast which kills people by cutting their throats’. Goris *lisemna* ‘a wild animal smaller than the fox’ [Margaryan 1975: 398a].

In a tale written by V. Ananyan (1984, 3: 693), *lisam* seems to refer to ‘lynx’; in the footnote, glossed by *lusam* ‘lynx’. This is explicitly corroborated by Ananyan, HayKendAş 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 Gyozal Xač’atryan and recorded by E. Pezazyan in 1915 (HZHek’ 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) 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’avt’ar*, etc. (see 3.5.2).

The meaning ‘hyena’ is clearly confirmed by the following. In the tale “Bruti ɫaraba” (“The potter’s son”) written in 1931/1933 by Aksel Bakunc’ (1976: 225, 229), a native speaker of the Goris dialect, *lisemna* 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 Elia Muşelyan Karnec’i (Karın/Xotorjur), *lusam* renders Turk. *varšal* (vāšak) [Ćugamyan 1986: 81, 118-119].

ETYM Since Müller 1890: 3, connected with Gr. ἱγκός, GSG ἵγκος (-γος) ‘lynx’, Lith. liūsis, dial. (Žem.) lyūsis, OPsr. lujsis (Euler 1985: 91), Russ. рёс, Mr. lig, OHG luhs ‘id.’, etc.; perhaps also Khowar ṛūśk ‘marten’ and Yidgha ḫā, lī ‘marten’ [Hübbschmann 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 Larabal and Lazax. The connection of these forms with Lat. lupus ‘wolf’, etc. (Speirs 1984: 411-412) can hardly be maintained.

Ač’atryan (ibid.) derives Larabal *lisemna* from *lus-emn* < *lus-amn*. Compare Larabal *xešemna* vs. Lori, Lazax *xašam* ‘dry leaves’ (see Amatuni 1912: 266a). Note also Larabal *sālāmno, sālēmna*, Goris *sālāmno* vs. ClArm. *salam(b) ‘a kind of partridge, francolin’ (q.v.). According to .LookAndFeel’anc’yan (1961: 330), here we are dealing with the same suffix as is seen in *aycəm* < *ayci-amn* ‘roe-buck’ (see s.vv. *ayc* ‘goat’, mrjvun, mrjmn ‘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. ἱγκός and Lith. (Žem.) lyūsis (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 *lusənunk* must be treated as the original n-stem plural form, and EArm. *lusənam* 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
*lusamn* of *bʰudʰ*-men-: *bʰudʰ*-mno- (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/*an 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. *rukmá-m* ‘golden or silver plate which is worn as an ornament’ (RV+), *rukmant-* ‘glänzend’, OIc. *ljōmi* ‘Glanz, Licht, Schwert, Zwerg’ < *leuk-mfn-*, etc., or Lat. *lūmen* ‘light, daylight; lamp, torch; glory’ < *leuk-s-men-. The latter can be linked with Av. *raoxšna-* adj., n. ‘light’, Lat. *luna* f. ‘moon’, OCS *luna* ‘moon’, Gr. *λύχνος* ‘lamp’ which would then be derived from *leuk-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 *-k* of the word for ‘lynx’. Note, however, the fluctuation seen in Skt. *ruśant-* ‘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. *λευκός* ‘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. *rýs* ‘lynx’ the initial *r-* of which is explained by the influence of *rysl* ‘blond, light brown’.

This animal-name is more likely a European substrate 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: 19L6). Aćayan (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 *lung-kn-* which is to be compared with PArm. *lu(n)is-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’osuray* ‘glow-worm, firefly’ (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 40E') 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)k-g(n)-*, and the association with ‘shine, light’ (an animal with shining eyes or a shiny fur) is folk-etymological. A by-form *lu(n)k-mm* may be posited for EArm. *lus(e)amn*. 
lusin ‘moon’ (Bible+; dial.); ‘month’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Vardan Arewelc’i; dial.), i-stem: GDP I lusn-i (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 657), ISg lusn-i-w (Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.77 [1913=1991: 216]), Movsēs Vardapet on Xosrov Anjewac’i); o-stem: AbISg i lusn-o-y (Eznik Kołbac’i), ISg (z-)lusn-o-w in Anania Širakac’i (7th cent., A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 58L25f). 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 (58L25f and several times in 40), Anania Širakac’i has GDSg lusn-o-y on the same page, 58 L8. Similarly, in Hexaemeron (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: 26L6; transl. Thomson 1978: 80): dadarē ār getovn erklusneay 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 Meiri, one finds lisen ‘moon’ and lsnigolōx ‘the end of a lunar month’ (see Alayan 1954: 271b, 301). The latter, a compound with gluē ‘head’, points to the meaning ‘month’ of lusin, as we have seen in Vardan Arewelc’i (13th cent.; Ganjak, Tavuş, 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; Jahukyan 1987: 136) reconstructs *loukeno-, cf. Skt. rocanā- n. ‘luminous sphere, firmament’ (Lubotsky 1988: 111), YAv. raocona- 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; Alabekyan 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. kālin ‘acorn’, place-name Duin, etc.

lusn, NPl lusun-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: 39, 65, 83, 85).


The root lusin is also seen in Arm. haw-a-lusn ‘pelican’, a compound with haw ‘bird’. For lusn here, cf. especially Slav. *lun ‘a bird’, of the same origin (see ÕtimSlovSlovJaz 16, 1990: 176-177). Note also Lith. laukas ‘having a white forehead or snout, having a bald forehead, bald’, dial. Žem. lūkas, Latv. lūks
lusnakay

‘having a white spot on the forehead, blazed’, läucis ‘Pferd, Ochs mit Blesse auf der Stirn, schwarzes Bläb-, Wasseruhn’, etc. (see Derksen 1996: 221-222).

lusnakay ‘moonlit night’ (Eznik Koɫbac’i, Anania Širakac’i); MidArm. lusnka (Nahapet K’uč’ak), lusnka (Geoponica, Nahapet K’uč’ak) ‘moon’, lusnka (moonshined (night)) (Geoponica) [MiJHayBar 1, 1987: 313b].

●DIAL. Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 296a].

In folklore, lusnakay frequently refers to the full moon. In a wonderful Ascension folk-song (“jangyulun”) from Lărabał (probably Šuši) [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 219, Nr 1348]:

Lüsəngyän el ašk a tirəł
Lüış čəkatis vaeske p,ošin.

“And the Moon has put his eye
On the golden coin of my forehead”.

In a traditional story [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 339-341], a girl named Vart’it’er is described as resembling tasnəhing ɔrva pulloɾvac lüsnəngyi “the rounded moon of 15 days”. Then (340-341), Arsen was working lüsnəngyin lüsin takin “under the light of the moon”; and (340-341), lüsəngyän and the stars make a wedding for Arsen and Vart’it’er.

In a folk-song (R. Grigoryan 1970: 352):
- Lusanka k’eri, uskuc’ kugas?
- Abrahamu covu veren.
- Dun delin, jinad delin,
- Moruk’d eker gotetelin.

“- 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 lusnakay 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 [R. Grigoryan 1970: 300].

In a song from Partizak [Tēr-Yakobeian 1960: 314-315], as an adjective: Lusnka u erkan gišer: “moonlit and long night”. As a noun, op. cit. 375.

As is pointed out by Aćaryan (HAB 2: 296a), Nor Naxijewan has preserved the semantic distribution between lusin and lusnakay: lusin ‘moon’ : lusnka ‘moonlit night’. In this very dialect, lusnka/lusnka also refers to the Moon as the sister of the Sun, as is seen in children folk-songs (R. Grigoryan 1970: 297-298, Nrs. 631-632a; P’ork’šeyan 1971: 32).


●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’eh₂- ‘to come, step’, and reflects a deverbalative *g’h₂-ti-. For the typology of the compound, cf. Gr. ἱκάβας, -αντος probably ‘new moon’, Skt. svarga- m. ‘heaven’ from *sh₂ul-g’m- ‘going to the sun’. For the morphology compare barjr-a-gnay lusin, lit. ‘high-going moon’ in a late medieval folk-song (see Abelyan 1940: 111). Note also lus-a-ćem (with ćem- ‘to walk’), the name of the
9th nocturnal hour followed by arawid ‘morning’ (Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent.; see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 113). A variant of the hour-name lus-a-ĉem is lus-a-gay, from the root go- ‘to come’ [Alayan 1986: 80-81].

**lu-r**, imperative of lsem ‘to hear’ (q.v.); also o-stem: GDSg lro-y (Bible), ISg lro-v (Nersês Lambrac’i); GSG lro (NHb 2: 903b without evidence) ‘hearing, fame, report, preaching, obedience’ (Bible+).

**ETYM** From QIE *klo(o)ro-, see s.v. lsem ‘to hear’; comparable to tu-r (cf. Gr. δοῦνα n. ‘gift, present’) vs. tam ‘to give’; cf. also di-r vs. dnem ‘to put’, li-r vs. lnun ‘to fill’ (Hübßrmann 1897: 453-454; Meillet 1908-09c: 338; Schmitt 1981: 197; Jahukyan 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. aršaluřšj-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’ (Elišè, 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 lrjac’ (Eznik Kolbac’i /5th cent./, ‘Čarántir’), i lrjuc’ (Oskip’orîk) ‘in one’s waking hours’; cf. also lrf-j-am adj. & adv. ‘serious/sober/bright-minded’ (John Chrysostom), lrf-a-mt-ank’ (Severian of Gabala), lrf-mi-ur’own ‘cheerfulness, light-heartedness, sober-mindedness’ (Romans 12.8, Lazar P’arpec’i, Elišè, Movsês Xorenac’i, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Paterica, etc.); aċ’-a-lurf ‘serious-eyed’ in John Chrysostom, etc.; lurj ‘light blue’ (Plato, Paterica, etc.), ‘blue’ in Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1940: 401-12; NHB 1: 903c has lurt’ in this passage; cf. s.v. deth ‘yellow’), several times in Arak’el Dawrižec’i, 17th cent. [Xanlaryan 1990: 447 (lines 18, 19, 26), 450 (lines 29, 31), 45114]; lurj ‘blue’ in Anania Širakac’i (see above), Mambre; lrt’anam ‘to grow (greyish-) blue’ in Hexaemon and Anania Širakac’i; compounds: lrt’-a-loys (with loys ‘light’ as the second member), var. lrt’-a-goyn, with goyn ‘colour’, in Hexaemon (K. Muradyan 1984: 431-3); lrt’-a-tesil, with tesil ‘vision’ (T’ovmay Arcruni), etc. [NHb 1: 907b].

In Job 33.26: Yakač’el ivrum aţ Tër onduneli elic’i nma: mtč’e lurj eresawk’, dawanan’embeh “When he prays to the Lord, it will be acceptable to him; he will enter with a serious look, with a declaration”: εὐξάμενος δὲ πρὸς κύριον, καὶ δικτά αὐτῷ δέσαι, εἰσελεύσεται δὲ πρόσοψις καθαρῷ σὸν ἐξηγορίᾳ [Cox 2006: 215].

As is correctly assumed in NHB 1: 266a and HAB 1: 330a, the compound aċ’-a-lurf in Movsês Xorenac’i 2.42 is distinct from the homonymous aċ’-a-ĉem ‘serious-eyed’ and rather belongs with aršaluřšj-k‘ (q.v.).

**DIAL** The form lurj has been preserved in a few dialects: Muš lurj ‘a kind of blue canvas that is made in Haleb (= Turk. zal)’; T’iflis lrc’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 břč ‘blue’ [Ačar`yan 2003: 570], or rač’č ‘violet (colour)’ [Andreasyan 1967: 149, 363b]; K’esab lbrj ‘light blue’ (also in derivatives)
[Č’olak’eän 1986: 204a, 244]; Aramo laurč ‘blue’ [Laribyan (1958: 54, 65a). The Muš form has probably been borrowed from the Syrian dialects, see 1.5.

Mehri larjí, lirjí ‘in one’s waking hours’ < *trj-i [Alayan 1954: 271b]; compare literary I lrē and i lrēnc above.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 304b. Still considered a word of unknown origin in Jahukyan 1987: 436; 1990: 63, 72 (semantic field 15). Olsen (1999: 205-206, 771) derives lurč from PIE *k̩leuH-: Lat. cluere, cloāre (both only attested by grammarians) ‘to clean’, Welsh clir ‘light, bright, clear, joyful’ < *k̩luH-ro-, Lith. šlúoti ‘to wipe’, Gr. κλύζω < *klu-d-io ‘to wash (of the sea), cleanse’, etc., positing QIE *k̩luH-r-i̯ o-, or *k̩luH-r-i̯ e2-. 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 APl m. hlutrans) ‘pure, clean’, OHG luttar, hlūtar ‘bright, limpid, clear, pure’ < *k̩luH-d-ro-, OIc. hlēr ‘sea’ (see Pokorny 1959: 607; Lehmann 1986: 188b; Schrijver 1991: 394, 447-448; Mallory/Adams 1997: 108b).

For the variant lur’t, Olsen (1999: 20630b, 846) posits *k̩luH-tr-o-. 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 *k̩luH-d-ro- (cf. the Germanic forms), which would yield Arm. *lurt. Subsequently, *lurt might become lur’t under the influence of art’- ‘awake’, zuart’ (beside zuarč) ‘joyful, cheerful’, lazuart’ (beside laj/cuard) ‘azure stone’. On the other hand, the alternation lurj : lur’t is reminiscent of that of surj ‘around; circle’: surj’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 *k̩luH-d-ro- or *k̩luH-d-je2- ‘light, bright, clear, clean, joyful’. The by-form lur’t (not found in the old literature and the dialects) is not entirely clear; perhaps *k̩luH-d-ro- > *lurt > (secondarily) lur’t.

X

xacanem ‘to bite, sting’, iterative xac-at-em (Bible+).


●DIAL Widespread in the ka-dialects. The verbal suffix -(a)n- is missing in Axalce’xa, Karin, Alaškert, Hamšen, Polis, Řodost’o and Sebastia xazn el, 1sg aor. xaji [HAB 2: 318a; Ačałyin 1941: 144, 216].


In order to explain the voiceless affricate -c- of Arm. xac- ‘to bite, sting’, Klingenschmitt (1982: 210) suggests a few possibilities: *-g-; *-dj-; 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 *-dj- would yield Arm. -ĉ- (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 partez ‘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; Ačarən 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 Pfran. *xad- ‘to beat, inflict a wound, hurt’ and Skt. khidāṭi ‘to tear; to press down’, going back to Iran. sigmatic aorist *xad-s- > *xaz- (cf. Skt. a-ḵāṭ-s-ūr).

xayt’ ‘sting, bite’ (only in 2 Corinthians 12.7), xayt’em ‘to bite (of insects and snakes), xaytoc’ ‘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. xaytoc’.

● ETYM Since Scheffelowitz (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. khidāṭi ‘to press down’ [HAB 2: 325a; Pokorny 1959: 917; Jahukyan 1987: 147, 191; Clackson 1994: 224]. 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 *khegi- and excludes Skt. (sj)khidāṭi. The latter is considered unrelated since it seems to belong to Skt. khāḍ- ‘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.vv.; Jahukyan 1987: 147, 191; on xit’, see also Olsen 1999: 210), namely:
*xayt’, o-stem ‘pain, colic, twinge; rock, reef; (Paterica+) crocodile’, *xt’em ‘to bite; to goad, push, shove’ (Bible+), dial. ‘to poke, shove’;

*xt’em ‘to bit; to push, shove’ (Ephrem), *xt’ ‘scowling gaze’ (Bible+), *xt’-k-em ‘to bit; to bite; to butt’ (Bible; Eznik), *xt’ umn ‘bite of conscience’;

*xet’, i-stem ‘bit; to push, shove’ (Bible+), dial. ‘to poke, shove’;

*xet’m ‘to bit; to push, shove’ (Ephrem), *xet’-k-em ‘to bit; to bite; to butt’ (Bible; Eznik), dial. ‘to poke’;

*xet’umn ‘bite of conscience’;

*xet’ ‘scowling gaze’ (Bible+), *xet’-k-em ‘to bit; to push, shove’ (Ephrem),

*xet’t ‘to look with a scowling gaze; to bite, shove’ (Philo, Ephrem, Eusebius of Caesaria, etc.), dial. ‘to poke’;

*Xet’t ‘rocks (under feet); reef’ (Bible+),

*Xoyt’ ‘crocodile (Paterica), Łarabałxüt’ (<Xoyt’) ‘hillock’. See s.vv.

Also in Sanskrit there are similar forms with unclear vocalic alternations. Next to the above-mentioned khidát ‘to press down; to tear’ and khā̰dati ‘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’.

The meaning ‘crocodile’ (Paterica+) of xit’ and xoyt’ is corroborated by Georgian xvithkhi ‘crocodile; lizard’, which is considered an Armenian loan, and by the same semantic relationship seen in Gr. κροκόδῑλος ‘lizard, crocodile’, composed of (or folk-etymologically reinterpreted as such) of κρόκη ‘Kies’ und δρῑλος ‘Wurm’ (thus, “Kieswurm”, see Frisk, s.v.), perhaps also in Skt. kr̥kalásā 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 maɫtam, p’ut’am, etc. (see 2.1.22.12-13), according to which xayt’ (with an unknown declension class), xit’ (o-stem), xet’t (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. *xit(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 *kh2j(aj)(d)-t’.

The words xayt’em ‘to bite (of insects and snakes)’ and, especially, its ablauted form xit’, o-stem ‘pain, colic, twinge’ can also be connected with *šit’(-) ‘bite; wound’ (q.v.), cf. šit’-ol (present participle) ‘biting’ (5th or 7th cent. +), šit’ael ‘bitten’ (Paterica), šit’-oc’ ‘bite (of a bee)’ (11th cent. +), šit’ ‘*pain of a (swollen) wound’ (Bağırk’ hayoc’ and the dialect of Łarabal). On the alternation š- / x- cf. 2.1.22.3. If this is true, šit’ comes from *škhj(d)(e)d-t’. One wonders if xawt’ in a way derives from *khj(d)(e)d-t’.

---

68 One might assume that MIran. *xīd- or *xud-, 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 Movsês Xorenac'î (see below); later o-stem ‘a strong emotion (with love, mercy, envy or other passions)’; xandam ‘to envy, be jealous’ (John Chrysostom, Movsês Xorenac'î).

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.


See also s.v. xanj.

● DIAL Dialectal forms only with xanj (q.v.).

● ETYM Usually connected with Gr. κάνδαρος· ἄνθραξ ‘charcoal’ (Hesychius), Skt. cand- (also ścand-) ‘to shine, glitter’, candrá adj. ‘shining, light’, Lat. candor, -ōris m. ‘dazzling whiteness, brightness; beauty; candour, brilliance’, 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 śant’, which see s.v.); HAB 2: 330a. Jahukyan (1987: 130, 318) presents this etymology with a question mark, pointing out that the aspirated *kh- is nowhere attested, and comparing xand with Hitt. ḫand-āš ‘warmth, heat’, not specifying the relationship. On the Hittite word, see s.v. ant’ēl.

The final -j of xanj is difficult to explain. Theoretically, it may have resulted from *-dh-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 *khV́nd-ōs > PArm. *xV́nd-u, GSg *k̑nd-s-ōs > PArm. *xanjó-. But xand is an i-stem.

See also s.v. ŋant’/d.

xanjem ‘to scorch, singe’, xanj-ol ‘half-burnt wood’ (Bible+), xanj-r- (Agat’angelos), xanj-ar ‘spark’ (Grigor Magistros, “Geoponica”).


● DIAL Ubiquitous [HAB 2: 331].

For xanj-ol, Ačaryan (1913: 451a; HAB 2: 331) records only Łarabal compounds *xanjol-a-kot ‘half-burnt wood, one edge of which is not yet burnt’ (with kot ‘handle’) and *xanjol-a-mayr ‘ember buried in ashes to be used for making fire next day’ (with mayr ‘mother’?wood, material’, q.v.), and Mertkêţoz (a village of Nikomidia), Trapizon *xanjol-at ‘half-burnt wood’, with -at as in xand-at-at. Although not recorded in Ačaryan 1913 and 1947, *xanjolat seems to be present also in Hamşen: xonjolod ‘scorched wood’ (glossed in JaynHamş 2, 1979: 220a). One also finds independent evidence for xanjol in various dialects: Łarabal xanjul(m) [Davt’yanyan 1966: 370], Goris xanjul [Margaryan 1975: 331a]; K’esab xincil [Ćöläk’ean 1986: 204b]. Thus: xanjol (Bible+) is dialectally present in extreme NW (Trapizon, Hamşen, etc.), SW (Syria), and SE (Łarabal, etc.).
On Larabal -f-, see s.v. xonf ‘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 xet'ig ‘a kind of wound’ [HAB 2: 432b], apparently from *xēt'-ik.
● ETYM See s.v. xayt'.

xaws-k', i-stem ‘speech; words’, xawsim ‘to speak, say, tell; to sing (of a rooster)’ (Bible+).
● DIAL Akn, Arabkir xawsim ‘to speak, say, tell, to sing (of a rooster)’ (Bible+).
● ETYM See s.v. xawt'.

xawt', i-stem ‘speech; words’, xawsim ‘to speak, say, tell; to sing (of a rooster)’ (Bible+).
● DIAL Akn, Arabkir xawsim ‘to speak, say, tell, to sing (of a rooster)’ (Bible+).
● ETYM See s.v. xawt'.

xe, xet' (or xet', as presupposed by xet'um) renders Gr. ἐρεϑισμός ‘irritation, provocation’.
In Deuteronomy 28.22 (Cox 1981: 184): harc'ē zk'ez tfējr tarakusanōk er jermamb er sarsov; er xt'iwk (vars. xet'iwk', xet'iwk') er erkliw (vars. erkliw, erkliw) en xoršakaw en gunon; πατάξαι σε κύριος ἀπορίᾳ καὶ πυρετῷ καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεϑισμῷ καὶ φόνῳ καὶ ἄνεμοφϑορίᾳ καὶ τῇ ὤχρᾳ [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 xit'um) renders Gr. ἐρεϑισμός ‘irritation, provocation’.
In Canticum 1.5/6: vASN zi xet'iw hayec'aw yis aregakn: ὅτι παρὰβλέψεις με ὀ ἠλίος. Here xet'iw hayim ‘to scowl, look/regard with hate, suspicion, etc.’ renders Gr. παρὰβλέπω ‘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): and orum xez’w hayēr Aršak: “Aršak regarded him [Sahak] with suspicion”.


Looking through the attestations of the word in NHB 1: 942-943, one notes that nom.-acc. mostly occurs with -ē (xēr’, xēr’-k’/s), whereas the oblique stem chiefly appears as xet’-. This is reminiscent of cases like aduēs, nēr, etc. (2.2.1.2). Thus: nom.acc. xēr’, obl. xet’-. Since the classical pattern is -ē : -i-V, obl. *xet’-i- is sometimes replaced by analogical xit’-i (as, e.g., in the passage from P’awstos Buzand 3.17 cited above).

● DIAL Jūla xit’ ‘spite, vengeance’; Jūla, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Ararat, Łaraba, Šamaki, Salmast *xēr’ ‘scowling (gaze)’; T’iflis xit’l ‘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 (Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 346): 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, shave’, 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, 224.

*xt’l ‘knag on a tree, a swelling in tree’.

● DIAL Ačaryan (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’ anknel ‘to stumble’ (probably to be understood as ‘to become knotted’ said of feet), xilt’ ‘very dense, crowded’ [HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 325b].


xot’(ot)em ‘to look with a scowling gaze; to bite, shave’ (Philo, Ephrem, Eusebius of Caesaria, etc.).

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the meaning ‘to peck’ (also ‘to eat to much’) [HAB 2: 384b].

● ETYM See s.v. xayt’.

---
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despise’. The same is also found e.g. in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.43 (1913=1991: 312); transl. Thomson 1978: 306): and orum xez’w hayēr Aršak: “Aršak regarded him [Sahak] with suspicion”.


Looking through the attestations of the word in NHB 1: 942-943, one notes that nom.-acc. mostly occurs with -ē (xēr’, xēr’-k’/s), whereas the oblique stem chiefly appears as xet’-. This is reminiscent of cases like aduēs, nēr, etc. (2.2.1.2). Thus: nom.acc. xēr’, obl. xet’-. Since the classical pattern is -ē : -i-V, obl. *xet’-i- is sometimes replaced by analogical xit’-i (as, e.g., in the passage from P’awstos Buzand 3.17 cited above).

● DIAL Jūla xit’ ‘spite, vengeance’; Jūla, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Ararat, Łaraba, Šamaki, Salmast *xēr’ ‘scowling (gaze)’; T’iflis xit’l ‘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 (Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 346): 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, shave’, 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, 224.

*xt’l ‘knag on a tree, a swelling in tree’.

● DIAL Ačaryan (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’ anknel ‘to stumble’ (probably to be understood as ‘to become knotted’ said of feet), xilt’ ‘very dense, crowded’ [HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 325b].


xot’(ot)em ‘to look with a scowling gaze; to bite, shave’ (Philo, Ephrem, Eusebius of Caesaria, etc.).

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the meaning ‘to peck’ (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. (USMJinHbast 2, 1987: 355 L80), **xolorj**n, DGSg **xolrjan** (in the song by Grigor Narekac’i called *Szylík* ‘Little wagon’, K’yoškeryan 1981: 61L18, 64L49) ‘orchis’.

Corresponds to Orchis, Russ. ятры́шник, Germ. Knabenkraut (Caturyan 1970: 84; R. Lazaryan 1981: 42a Ne49), 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 Ačaṙyan (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 yɔnča.

I am not sure whether the MidArm. plant-name *xoyl* prob. ‘Hesperis matronalis (see Č’ugaszyan 1980: 200; MijHayBar 1, 1987: 347a) is related.


**SEMANTICS** The Middle Armenian and dialectal designations for species of this plant mostly contain ‘testicle’ as a compound member:


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’-əl-saylap and xusat’-əl-k’alp, respectively, see S. Vardanjan 1990: 636, notes to §§ 940, 941.

Note also loč’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/rčik, 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; Ačaṙean 1913: 896a), lit. probably ‘grandfather’s testicles’. For other names of Orchidaceae, see Suk’iasyan 1967: 626c; R. Lazaryan 1981: 42a Ne49. For orj-a-tak and orj-armat (both basically meaning ‘having testicle-like roots’) and the corresponding denotata, see Málxaseanc’ HBB 3: 584-585.

The pattern is also seen in other languages, cf. e.g. Russ. jatrýšnik, jadríšnik ‘Orchis maculata’ from játrо n., pl. játra ‘entrails, eggs, testicles’, jadro ‘kernel, testicle’ from Slav. *jet/dro, cf. Vedic Skt. अंडाः- n. ‘egg’, dual अंडाः m. ‘testicles’, अंडः- f. ‘testicles’ (see Vasmer s.vv.; EtumSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979: 65-66, 72; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 162; Černyx 1999, 2: 466-467). A well-known example is Gr. ὀφίς 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’anos Lehac’i, 17th cent., glossed by Lat. stīrūma and scrūfūla, NHB 1: 961b); MidArm. xul ‘swelling, tumour, gland’ in Bēškaran 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’ōs Uhfayec’i [HAB 2: 391; MijHayBař, 1, 1987: 347]; MidArm. adj. xol-ayin ‘swollen’ in Miċit’ar Herac’i [MiċiHayBař, 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 (xoṙoč’ac’) of a gem (A. G. Abrahamyian 1940: 40f). Here xoyl may be understood as ‘asperity, roughness of surface, a rough spot’ (cf. ModArm. xorobordut’yun in the translation by Abrahamyian/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.


Goris xil displays several meanings: ‘a small oval swelling’, ‘a rugged swelling, projection’, ‘dry twig’ [Margaryan 1975: 403b], and adj. ‘rugged’, cf. also Łarabał xil ‘rugged’, and the compound *xul-u-boyt’n ‘rugged’ (see Aċāɾeane 1913: 488; HAB 2: 392a), cited as xilp’ut’ns ‘rugged’ in L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 362ab; see s.v. boyt’n ‘thumb’. Textual illustrations for Łarabał xil in the meaning ‘swelling in the body’ can be found in a proverb (L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 211L2: janen ‘in the body’), and in a phrase (225f: angučum ‘in the ear’). The meaning ‘a swelling on a tree’ (see above) is represented in another phrase: kalbe xil ‘stubborn’ (231L2), with kalbe ‘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 Larabal forms with the literary testimony of Anania Sirakac’i (see above). Note also Lori xít’ ‘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. šuljáty ‘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 *kʰeuH- (or *kʰ'ouH-, cf. ayl vs. Lat. alius) or the like.


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. *khul-i̯a- (for *kH > Arm. x, see 2.1.18.1) > *xuyl (cf. ayl vs. Lat. alius), graphically = xoyl.

In Bžškaran jioy (13th cent.) one also finds xoyl ‘army’, which has been treated as an Arabic loanword (Çugaszyan 1980: 441, 200; MiǰHayBar 1, 1987: 347a). One may wonder whether this word is related with our xoyl ‘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 Larabal pūl ‘ball of dough’ from boyl ‘group’ (see Davt’yán 1966: 329). If this is true, the IE etymology of xoyl must be given up.

The derivation from IE *skūl- with Swedish skyl ‘haycock’ (Mann 1963: 132) is untenable.

The relationship with xurud ‘mole’, ‘tumour, ulcer’ (on which see HAB 2: 374) is unclear.

xonj, ‘tired, exhausted’, xonjim ‘to be tired’ (Bible+), xonj ‘tiredness, fatigue’ (Yovhannès Drasxanakertc’i), xonj-an-k’ ‘id.’ (Grigor Magistros), etc.

DIAL The verb has been preserved in Arabkír, Xarberd, Manisa xonjinal, Tigranakert xonjinal [HAB 2: 394a; Haneyan 1978: 188a]. Next to xonjinal, 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 xonj, ‘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-n-. From here: (1) *xog>n- > *xong-*yV- (with metathesis) > xonj, (2) *y-(h/x)og-Vn- > y-ogn, pl. y-og-an-k’.
xonj: ‘low, down’ (attested only in Eusebius of Caesarea), ‘inside’ (only in “Arjetn bararan”, 1865, without textual evidence).

DIAI. No dialectal evidence in HAB 2: 394a.

According to Davt’yan (1966: 375), Łarabal, Hadrut, Šalax xonj/če’-a-xārav ‘roasting inside’ is composed as xonč ‘inside’ + -a- + xorov ‘roast’. This is attractive, but risky. The first component may rather be identified with xonj- ‘to scorch, singe’ (q.v.). Although, according to HAB (2: 328-331), the root xanj- displays literary and dialectal (amongst others, also in the Łarabal-area and the surroundings) forms only with (or derivable to) -j-, one does find -j- forms in the Łarabal area, cf. Hadrut’ xonjār-d-vot ‘smell of roasting/barbecue’, with vot < hot ‘smell’ as the second member [A. Polosyan 1965: 69; Davt’yan 1966: 370], Łarabal *xonj-n-a-vot ‘smell of roasting’ [HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 342b].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1063b, one finds dial. xonč ‘trunk of a tree’. In view of the semantic field of e.g. PIE *bhudhno-: 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 the trunk of root of a tree [ÈtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 187-189]), one may identify xonč ‘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; J̄ahukyan 1987: 527; Olsen 1999: 885].

xorť 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 xorť-, see below).

Evidence for declension: GDPl xorť-o-c’ in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913=1991: 35914); GDPl xorť-i-c’ in Severian of Gabala (see the attestation in NHB 2: 381c, s.v. yōray); GDSg xorť-u (“Naxadrut’iwnk”’ Leviticus).


Among derivatives: ēstar-a-xort’ ‘foreign/ alien and step-’, in Elišē (5th cent.), Ephrem, Sargis Snorhal’i Vadapet (12th cent.).

DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly in the adjectival meaning ‘step-’. In Ararat and Łarabal: xorť(-a)-p’ort’ ‘step-’ [Ačarean 1913: 485-486; HAB 2: 408a; HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 361a]. Clear textual illustrations can be found in a fairy-tale recorded in Debed, a village in Lori, in 1978 (T’. Geworgyan 1999: 45a, lines 15-16 and 31), where xorť-a-p’ort’ refers to ‘step(sisters), not from the same mother or father’.

Marala xorť’abs’ort ‘rough’ [Ačarean 1926: 63-64, 400; HAB 2: 408a; Davt’yán 1966: 376] is identical with xorť-a-bort-k’ ‘hard, rough, stony places’ (Movsēs
Xorenaci 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 Ačarian 1967: 117) proposed a connection with OIc. *skratti ‘Zauberer, Troll’, skrydda ‘alte Lederjacke’, Germ. *skrattaz ‘Schrat, Waldteufel’, Lith. *skriaudùs ‘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.).

● 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.


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 *xort(t)-t’. See 2.1.22.13.

xstor, i-stem: Isg xstor-i-w (Zgön/Afraghat); o-stem: Isg xstor-o-v (Nersës Lambronac’i); attested also in Numbers 11.5 and Mxit’ar Gōš; later: xstor, attested in Geoponica (13th cent.) and Galen [NHB 1: 988c; 2: 718b; Greppin 1985: 102] ‘garlic’.

In Numbers 11.5: zuox ew xstor : tā krṓmysa kai tā skôrāa.

● DIAL The later form, namely xstor, marked in NHB and HAB as ‘dialectal’, is widespread in the dialects, whereas the older form xstor is restricted to Aslanbek (extreme NW) and Larabal, Goris (extreme SE) [HAB 2: 428a].

● ETYM Ačarian (1908: 123b; HAB 2: 428a) connects Gr. skôr(o)dòn n. ‘garlic’ and Alb. hûrdhë, also hûdhër (Schriftsprache) f. ‘garlic’. As Ačarian points out, the comparison with the Greek word seems to have been suggested already in NHB 1: 988c; 2: 718b. According to Jahukyan (1987: 302), we may be dealing with common (probably independent) borrowings.

Ačarian’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, Beeckes (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/xstor ‘cannot
simply be derived from *skeord-, so we are probably faced with a cultural loan”. This seems to be a word of Mediterranean origin.

Açaryan (ibid.; cf. also 2003: 422) reconstructs *skodoro- > *sxtor (if reliable, Alb. hûlhêr, too, points to this form) with subsequent metathesis to sxtor 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 *skodoro- yielded PArm. *ks(o)doro- with a metathesis which is probably seen e.g. in another Mediterranean word, namely Arm. sunkn vs. Gr. σκύνης; etc. (q.v.). For the metathesis, cf. also *selt-ik > Cilicia xibig (see HAB s.v. šelb ‘knife-blade’). Then sxtor became sxtor probably due to association with sax ‘onion’ (cf. the Biblical passage above; proverbs with sax : sxtor in e.g. Culfartean 1880: 147; Čunikean 1895: 265[106]; Lanalan 1960: 21a, 144a; YusMusLer 1970: 240; a folk-song sung by Mannik Hayrapet, Svezlyan 1994: 143b; a Partizak jocular dancing song, Tër-Yakobean 1960: 360[108]; a superstition, Durean 1933: 149, etc.), but has been preserved in the opposite corners of the Armenian-speaking territory, namely Aslanbek and Larabal.

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 Larabal. This solution, albeit economical, seems less probable.

For a thorough discussion on Arm. sxtor, see now Greppin 1998a.

*xt-il- ‘to tickle; to excite’: xt-t-em (Ephrem), xt-t-em (Bible/Sirach 43.18/20, EzniK Kolbac’i, Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.), xt-t-k-im (Grigor Magistros), xt-t-em (Jacob of Nisibis/Afrahaf, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Yovhannes Draschanakert’i /9-10th cent.), xt-t-ot-em (Jacob of Nisibis/Afrahaf), etc.; also deverbal nouns in -an-k’ and -umann. The stem *xt(1)-il- is seen in a compound with akn ‘eye’, akn-a-xtii (Book of Chries, T’ovmay Arcruni, Step’anos Ôrbelean), and in the noun *xt(t)il, o-stem (ISg xt-il-ov and xt-t-lov in Ephrem).

The only Biblical attestation (Sirach 43.20) reads as follows: gevec kat’iwn spitakut’em nor xtê za’s : κάλλος ἰματίσμος αὐτῆς ἐκπαιδεύει ὀρθάλμοις.

The compound akn-a-xt-it and some dialectal forms (see below) point to a l-less stem *xt(1)-ut-.

According to Açaryan (HAB 2: 428b), Udi xitil ‘tickling’ is an Armenian loan.

• DIAL Widespread in the dialects. Verbal: Ararat, Xarberd, Polis, Haçan *xt-xt-, Sučava xototcl, Aslanbek, Sebastia *xt-xt-. Nominal: Ararat xut-ut, T’iflis lut-ut, Muš, Alaškert, Nor Naxijewan *xt-i(k), Šamaxi laš-št, Larabal ldi, ldiik, Agulis ldiik [HAB 2: 428b]. Note also Salmast l’di l’dì and Polis godagadô (ibid.), which seem to be “tickling-interjections”, as I frequently hear in e.g. my native city Kirovakan (nowadays Vanajor): xotlot or ladobado. On Polis ge-, see below.

It is not always easy to determine whether the formations like *xtxt- represent reduplicated *xt-xt- or a t-formation *xt-il-. Still, there are forms that reliably point to a l-less stem *xt- or *xt-.

One wonders if Larabal, Agulis ldiik(k) can be explained as follows: *xt-il- > *xt-il- (cf. marixl- vs. maraxut ‘fog’, etc.) > *xt-il- (late metathesis) > lïd-ı, through voicing, on which cf. *sil-il(k) > Larabal, etc. sildi(k) (see s.v. šil ‘squint-eyed’).
Next to \textit{xədəxədəl}, Polis also has \textit{gədəg \textit{anəl}}, which is reminiscent of Turk. \textit{gədəg-ləmuq}.

\textbullet \textbf{ETYM} No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 2: 428b.

Together with \textit{kt-} ‘burning desire’ and \textit{katalim} ‘to be furious’, Jahukyan (1967: 140, 306) connects with OIC. \textit{hvatu} ‘arreizen, sich eilen’, etc. from *kʰ\textit{ed}-.. The comparison with \textit{kt-} is possible, although that with \textit{katalim} is highly improbable. More attractive is P Germ. *\textit{kɪt-ɪ} ‘to tickle’. For further discussion, see s.v. *kɪc- ‘to bite’.

\textbf{xut'}, \textit{o-stem ‘impediment (under feet); reef’ (Bible+); xo\textit{yt'} ‘crocodile’ (Paterica). See also s.v. place-name \textit{Xoyt’/Xut’}.

\textbullet \textbf{DIAL} \textit{Łarabał xut’} ‘hillock’ [HAB 2: 414b; Davt’yan 1966: 376]. The -\textit{u̯}- points to \textit{xoyt’}.

\textbullet \textbf{ETYM} See s.v. \textit{xayt’}.

\textbf{xuc'}, \textit{i-stem: GD\textit{ xc’-i}, LocSg \textit{i xc’-i}, ISg (uncertain) \textit{xc’-i-w} ‘small chamber, cell’, attested in Paterica, Sargis Šnorhali, etc. (for a philological discussion of uncertain attestations in a homily ascribed to \textit{Elišē} and in John Chrysostom, see HAB 2: 422b with references); \textit{xc’-ik}, \textit{an-stem: GDSg \textit{xc’k-an}} (\textit{P’awstos Buzand /5th cent.}, John Chrysostom), LocSg \textit{i xc’k-an} (\textit{Elišē}), AblSg \textit{i xc’k-an-ē} (Kirakos Erznkac’i) vs. \textit{i xc’k-ē} (Paterica) ‘small chamber, cell; hut’


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 \textit{xunc’} ‘a part of a room for the young couple separated by a curtain’ [Amatuni 1912: 292a]; Hamšen \textit{xunc’} ‘school’, etc. [HAB 2: 423; \textit{Ačaṙyan 1947: 234}].


The Germanic word for ‘house’ has been compared with Yeniseian \textit{qus} ‘tent, house’ (see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 742, 939 = 1995, 1: 645, 832 with ref.). Arm. \textit{xuc’} might be related with Germ. *\textit{tʰus} if one posits a PIE *kʰ\textit{ut-s-} of substratum origin. Jahukyan (1980, 1: 117) hesitantly posits *kʰ\textit{ut-sk-}. Olsen (1999: 811) derives \textit{xuc’} from *kʰ\textit{uh\textit{t̚}iah-}\textit{r}, cf. Germ. Hütte. However, *-\textit{t̚ij-} would give Arm. -\textit{c’}- rather than -\textit{c’}- (see 2.1.22.1).

*ca-`flower, blossom' (see on the dialects); *calẗ, an-stem: GDsg calk-an, NPl calk-un-k’; GDPl calk-a-n-c’ in Agat’angelos §§ 643, 645 (1909=1980: 329-330), etc.; a-stem: AbiSg i calk-ə and IPl calk-a-w-k’ in the Bible, etc.; o-stem: GDPl calk-o-c’ in Cyril of Alexandria ‘flower, bloom’.

●DIAI. Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 2: 438-439]. In Nor Naxijewan, Crimean: ‘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 [Açarean 1913: 504b, 505b: 2003: 316].

Larabal cal’k’, caxk’ ‘the blossoming of fruit-trees’ is interpreted by Davt’y’an (1966: 380) as *ca-l’k-. Compare Me’ri caxk ‘blossom (only of a tree)’ (see Alayan 1954: 304). Alayan (ibid.) derives this word from *ca-l’k- not specifying the root *ca-l’. This might be an important evidence for the root *ca-l- ‘to blossom’, unless it is a back-formation after cax/kel < calkel (*calẗ-el) ‘to blossom’, thus *ca(k)-k’.

Further possible traces for the root *ca-l-. Goris xonjala/xonjala, Larabal xonjala ‘snowdrop’ is derived from m-calẗ ‘id.’, lit. ‘snow-flower’, through c- > x by assimilatory influence of l [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 e’onjali ‘snowdrop’ [Margaryan 1975: 487a]. Margaryan (1973: 133-134) assumes a loss of the final -k, and a vocalic change i-i > -a, which (especially the latter) are uncertain.


●ETYM NHB (1: 1003c, 1015c) suggested a connection between calẗ ‘flower’ and calr, cical ‘laughter’. In NHB 1: 1001c (s.v. calẗ ‘flower’) we read: orpès i’e cicalẗ; orpès vardn yayl lezus e ibr catrik : “as cicalẗ (dimin. of cical ‘laughter’); as the rose in other languages is cattrik (dimin. of catr ‘laughter’)


catr. GSG cal-u (later also caler and calr-u) ‘laugh, laughter; joke, mockery’ (Bible+); catrem (Lazar P’arpec’i, Movses Xorenac’i), cattr a’inem (Bible+) ‘to deride, mock, ridicule, laugh at; to joke’.

See also s.vv. cattru ‘meme, buffoon; mocking (words)’ and ci-calẗ ‘laughter’.

The compound k’m-catrel ‘to smirk, simper’, attested in Smbat Sparapet [M]HayBa˘r 2, 1992: 445b] and “Vark’ Ilarioni”, contains k’m-k’- ‘palate’ as the first member and actually means ‘to smile/laugh in the palate, under the nose’; cf. k’m-cical ‘smirk, simper’ in ModArm. [HAB 4: 579b] and dialectal forms below. Compare k’m-a-cr’el ‘to smile, simper’, with ci’- ‘to curve’, found in Turkish-Armenian dictionary (ca. 1720 AD) by Elia Muśelyan Karnc’i (Karın/Xotorjur), and k’m-ci-el ‘to grimace mockingly’ in the dialect of Manisa [Ç’ugaszyan 1986: 42N22, 173].
In Arak’el Siwnee’ci (14-15th cent.) one finds the compound with a reversed order of the components: 3pl.pres. *căr-a-k’om-in* (see Poturean 1914: 235[123]). This form is present in the dialect of Moks; see below.

**k’mk’a-cicut** - In a fairy-tale from Larabal recorded by Arak’el Bahat’ryan in 1860 (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 80-86), *k’mk’acicul* refers to a smile with opening of the teeth. Further, of a woman who tries to seduce: *xuselis teh n el k’omk’'ecucul talav*: “and smiling while speaking” (rec. by M. Mxit’aryan in 1961; see HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 192[125]).

●**DIAL.** While *cical(-)* is dialectally ubiquitous (see s.v.), *cātr* is recorded in several dialects only: Van-group [Açar’yan 1952: 267; M. Muradyan 1962: 198a], Muš, Alaštērt, Ararat, Axal’ça [HAB 2: 440a]. In Larabal, etc. found in the compound *căr-a-tel* ‘an object of derision, mockery’ (Larabal, Lazax, Ararat), with *tel* ‘place, spot’ as the second member [Açar’yan 1913: 505b]. Independently: Larabal *cātor* ‘mockery’ [Daut’yyan 1966: 380], Goris *cātro* [Margaryan 1975: 334a].

In DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1063b, one finds a bird-name *căr’ik haw* (“bird cātr-ik”, dimin. of *cātr*), glossed as *azg čayt* “a kind of mew-gull,” and by Turk. *mart’i*, *mart’o gušu*. On *mart’i* ‘mouette’, see HAB 3: 372a, s.v. *martim.* AÇar’yan (1913: 505b) has exactly the same: *cär’ik 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-ca-trel* ‘to smirk, simper’ and ModArm. *k’m-cical* ‘smirk, simper, ironical smile’ note the following forms: Ararat and Larabal *k’mcicat*, *k’mk’acicat* [Amatuni 1912: 675a], Goris *k’omk’acicat* [Margaryan 1975: 371b]; Muš *k’njtal = Axalk’alan’, Axal’ça, Alek’andrapol (Leninakan/Gyumri), Sirak *k’omc’axtal < *k’m-cical-or* ‘to smirk, smile ironically’ [HAB 2: 456a; 4: 580a].

The opposite, namely *cātr-a-k’om* - (Arak’el Siwnee’ci; see above), is present in Moks: *cātr’k’om* ‘ตล้ก, nasmēṣka’, *cātr’k’amil*, aor. *cātr’k’-m-āv ‘ţulbāt’aśća’ (see M. Muradyan 1982: 137; Orbeli 2002: 252).

See also s.v. *cātracu*.


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 *caɫ- is seen in calɛ ‘to deride, laugh at’ (HHB), cal-k-u ‘buffoon’ (John Chrysostom), cal-bast ‘laughable’, if these forms are reliable, as well as in ci-caɫ ‘laughter’ (q.v.) [HAB 2: 439a]. NHB (1: 1001c, 1003c, 1015c) suggested a connection between not only calɛ and cical, but also with calik ‘flower’ and jaɫ ‘derision, mockery’ (see s.vv.). For a possible dialectal evidence for the root *cal- ‘to blossom’, see s.v. catik.

calɛ ‘mime, buffoon’; dial. ‘mystery, riddle’ (John Chrysostom+). In expressions like calɛ 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. šiša.

dial. No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 2: 440a.

In a fairy-tale recorded by V. Bdoyan in the village of Olǰaberd (in Kotayk’) in 1945 (see HŽHek’ 1, 1959: 561-571), where the king wants to find out why the fish laughed, calɛ is found several times referring to the mystery/riddle of the laughing fish: the king says: Ari es jkan caɫracu xan “Come (and) solve (literally: take out) the calɛ of this fish!” (567L-16); t’oɫ gan, jkan calɛracun xanen “let them come (and) solve the calɛ of the fish” (567L-13); jkan calɛracun dus beri “(that he) solves (literally: takes out) the calɛ of the fish” (568L-7); es kpatmem jkan calɛracun “I will tell you the calɛ of the fish” (569L8); et jkan calɛracun jेr k’aša “give up the calɛ of that fish” (569L-8). The meaning of the word can be, then, ‘mystery, riddle’ or ‘riddle-solution’ or ‘(the reason of the) laughter’.


*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: 98-207.

dial. The verb čanač’em (q.v.) is dialectally ubiquitous, whereas canawt’ is recorded only in Marala. In this dialect, the synonyms čananc’ and canot’ ‘acquainted’ make a contrastive pair: čananc’ ‘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 *ǵnh-sk-je-> > *canač’em > čanač’em (see Meillet: 1936: 109; Clackson 1994: 40); on canawt’ cf. 2.1.22.12.

Possible traces of the meaning ‘sign, omen’ (cf. Russ. znak ‘sign’, etc.):
ciacan, a-stem ‘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-әрак ‘disgrace’, niš ‘sign, spot’: nәswәk ‘disgrace’.

canak-
See s.v. *can- ‘to know, be acquainted’.

cer, o-stem ‘old man; old’ (Bible+), cer-un (Book of Chries), cerәn (Philo) ‘old’, cer-әuni (ea-stem) ‘old’ (Bible+), cer-әnam ‘to become old’ (Bible+).
  ●DIAT. Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 452b].

ciacan, a-stem: GDSg әciaça-ә (Lazar P’әrpec’i, Philo apud NHB 1: 338c s.v. Aramazday әәt), ISg ciacan-ә-w (Cyril of Alexandria) ‘rainbow’.
  The oldest attestation is found in Revelation 10.1 (rendering Gr. әәrіs).
  Zәәn im edic’ yәmpәs ew edic’i i әsnәk yәwәтәnәkәn uxtин әnd әn әwәd әmenәnәy әәrkәr “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. әәln ‘bow’ (rendering Gr. τόξον) stands for the rainbow which is to serve as a divine sign, әsnәk ‘sign’ (rendering Gr. ῥιτόν ‘sign, mark’). Remarkably, both әәln and әsnәk came to denote the rainbow in Armenian dialects. For the former cf. *әәln-әk ‘rainbow’ (see s.v. әәln ‘bow’); as for the latter, note Akn әsnәk ‘rainbow’ [HAB 3: 461a; Gabikean 1952: 425]. See also Andranik 1900: 170 (Dersim); Mxit’әrәcәnә’ 1901: 193 (әәrin); G. Hakobyәn 1974: 276 (Nerk’in Basen); Gyozәlayan, 2001: 227 (Musa Lәr).
  Quoting this passage, T’әвәmәy Ӓrсruni (9-10th cent.) adds (V. Vәrdәnәyan 1985: 32Lәd; transl. ҹәәmәn 1985: 81): or әә ciacәnd, zor әmәnәk әә mәnәkә yәmрәy asәc’in, ew әrdәk’ tәrrәpәәńt’ әәt – әәt 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 әәt is attested in Philo (apud NHB 1: 338c; see also Thomson 1985: 81s.).
  In әәmәntә, ciacan ‘rainbow’ is put in contrast with ciacәnd ‘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’әвәmәy Ӓrсruni (see above); cf. also ciacan-d in Hin bәrk’ apud NHB 1: 1015b, and especially ISg ciacәnәw-d (Cyril of Alexandria, ibid.).
  ●ETYM Considered to be a word of unknown origin; see HAB 2: 454b; Ѩәhuکәn 1990: 71 (sem. field 1); Olsen 1999: 943. Olsen (1999: 299) lists ciacan among nouns in -әn 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’, ‘Cәvәәn ‘lightning/thunder Goddess of the celestial Purple Sea’, ‘Orot-әk ‘little Thunder’, etc. (Bәnәyәn 2001), as well as the above-mentioned әәt 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 *dious) + 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 Ačyan 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].

*ricat* ‘laughter’ (in the dialects, see below); cicatim ‘to laugh’ (Bible+).

The noun cicat 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]: jür manuacoy cicat cawal (69L43); cawal cov cicat (114L15).

- **DIAL** According to Ačyan (HAB 2: 456a), the verb cicatim is dialectally ubiquitous, whereas the noun cicat is present in several dialects only. On k’m-cicat ‘smirk, simper, ironical smile’ and comparable forms, as well as on synaesthesia, see s.v. cahr ‘laughter, mockery’.

- **ETYM** On the etymology, see s.v. cahr ‘laughter; mockery’. On the type of reduplication cf. Latv. paipala ‘Wachtel’ from *pelpalo, etc. (see Meillet 1903b: 217; Klingenschmitt 1982: 147-148; Clackson 1994: 127-128). Note also aquatic bird-names of onomatopoetic nature such as Lith. gaigals ‘mew’, Latv. gaigals ‘mew’, etc., which are structurally (and etymologically?) comparable with Arm. ci-cal ‘laughter’ (cf. Meillet 1903b: 217; Toporov, PrJaz 2, 1979: 188). Note also cabrik haw ‘a kind of mew/gull’ (see s.v. cab-r ‘laughter’). For another bird-name of the same type of reduplication cf. Arm. ci-ce/ärn ‘swallow’ (q.v.).

As we have seen, the noun cicat is practically unattested in the literature and is present in several dialects only (note also that cicat is represented in NHB 1: 1015b as a dialectal [ranbōren] word), whereas the verb cicatim is widely attested since the oldest period of the classical literature (e.g., 25x in the Bible; see Astuacaturean 1895: 733-734) and is dialectically ubiquitous. However, the reduplication of the type Ci-Ce/aR is found mostly with nouns (see 2.3.2), and one would rather expect cicat to be original. This seems to be corroborated by the fact that the noun cicat is represented in the Northern (ko-class: Suč’ava, Nor Naxijewan, Axalc’xa; um-class:
T’iflis), Eastern (um-class: Ararat, Larabat, Šamaxi, Agulis, Ėula), and South-Western (ka-class: Haçan) peripheries and should be treated as an archaism.

On the other hand, one may think of a reduplicated present *ʁi-giherent-, see etc. *ampem ‘to drink’, ništ ‘seat’. Alternative: cicāt is an onomatopoeic word, cf. Magr. ʒic-, Laz zic-, etc. ‘to laugh’ (on which see Klimov 1998: 268).

cicān ‘swallow’. For attestations, see Greppin 1978: 180-182.

- DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 2: 456-457].

- ETYM Usually connected with Gr. γῆρυς f. ‘voice, speech’, etc. For the type of reduplication (*gōi-ğar-n-), see AčarLiak 3, 1957: 91, with parallels. Note cicēr̄n ‘‘twittering of swallows’, with c : ē [Jahukyan 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’érn ‘‘butterfly’ (note cicēr̄n ‘swallow’ vs. cicān), cicāt ‘laughter’ (q.v.) and perhaps dial. *titrak from ‘turtle-dove’. Elsewhere, Greppin (1981b: 6-7) is positive on the example of siser̄n ‘chickpea’ vs. Lat. cicer, etc. Here (p. 5) he notes that *gōi-ğar-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.


cil, verbal clem (Geoponica, etc.), cil, o-stem, i-stem (Step’anos Tarōneč’ti /10-11th cent./) ‘sprout, bud, haulm’, cil-awt, i-stem, u-stem ‘haulm’ (Dawit’ Anyal’t, etc.), ciw (in Elišē, as a reading variant, and with uncertain meaning), anc/jiw ‘blossom, sprout’, anc/iwem, etc. ‘to germinate’ (Bible+).

In Elišē 2 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 104236, ModArm. transl. 105; Engl. transl. Thompson 1982: 104): ciwk (vars. ciwkle, ciwrk’, ciwk’, ciwrk’) 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 Bağırk’ hayoc’ (ciw c’an, see Amalyan 1975: 152465) and is considered a loan from Georg. c’iva ‘dried dung’ [HAB 2: 461a]. But the alternative reading ciw in the passage from Elišē is taken as an independent word meaning ‘brushwood’ [HAB 2: 455a]. The existence of the form may be corroborated by Jula cut’ ‘a piece of straw’ (as Ačar’yān stresses in HAB 2: 455b), and, if related, by on-ciw ‘blossom, sprout’ and ciw ‘branch’. Further, in the following entry of the same Bağırk’ hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 152466) one finds ciw · xot kam čed “grass or branch”.

- ETYM IE proposals are not convincing (see HAB s.v.). On possibly related Caucasian forms, see Jahukyan 1987: 597, 611 (with hesitation).

On the ending of cławt, see Olsen 1999: 93-94.
*cin-: cnanim, 3sg.aor. cn-aw ‘to give birth, procreate; to be born’ (Bible+); cin, i-stem ‘birth, origin; base; womb; spot, sign’ (Bible+): IPl cn-i-w-k’ in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.12 (see below); in Bible: AblSg i cn-ē [Astuacaturean 1895: 734a; Olsen 1999: 99\textsuperscript{20}, cnw or cnwál, a-stem ‘parent’ (Bible+); cn-und, o-stem, also cnund-ean ‘birth, origin, generation’ (Bible+); -cin as the second member of numerous compounds.

In the meaning ‘base’, cin (IPl cn-i-w-k’) is attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.12 (1913=1991: 39\textsuperscript{2}; transl. Thomson 1978: 89): aṙsahmanōk’ noc’a, cnwk’ lerambk’ ew ezerōk’ daštin: “At the borders by the base of the mountains and edges of the plain”.

\(\text{ant/d-o-cin, a-stem (later also o-stem)}\) ‘a slave that is born in the house of his master’ (rendering Gr. \(\text{oikogenēs}\)); see s.v.

\(\text{● DIAL}\) 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, klānem ‘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 *ənknil, but some Eastern dialects have preserved the -an-, cf. Melri nānil [Alayan 1954: 262a], Areš ŋanganel [Lusenc’ 1982\textsuperscript{197a}], J̌uła ŋanganel [1940: 353a], Agulis (ŋ)ānganel [Ačarean 1935: 335; HAB 1: 199b].

In ČIArm., cnanim has both transitive and intransitive meanings; 3sg.aor. cnaw means, thus, ‘he was born’ or ‘he gave birth’ (see AčarLiâk 4b, 1961: 315); cf. e.g. Polis jnil which has both transitive and intransitive meanings [Ačaryan 1941: 220] whereas e.g. in J̌uła we see a formal distinction: trans. cnel (aor. cn-ec’i) vs. intransitive cn-v-əl (aor. cn-ə-ec’-i) [Ačarean 1940: 367b].

The noun cin is found in several meanings: ‘birth of each year started with the fourth (of cow)’ (Karim, Bulanax, Alaškert, Van, Ararat, etc.), ‘four-year-old cow or bullock’ (Karim), ‘womb of a cow’ (Larabal), ‘birth-mark’ (Alaškert, Van), ‘a kind of spotted wound’ (Van), ‘time for giving birth (of cow)’ (Nor Naxijewap), ‘age of cattle’ (Larabal) [HAB 2: 458a; Amatuni 1912: 308a], ‘skin enclosing the foetus, afterbirth (of animals)’ (Ararat) [Amatuni 1912: 308a; Ananyan 1984: 457\textsuperscript{13}, Chapter 3.16].

\(\text{● ETYM}\) Since NHB (1: 1016b), linked with Skt. jan- ‘to be born; to produce, create’ (spelled in NHB as čan-), Gr. γενεσις, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 456; HAB 2: 457-458. The noun cin is usually derived from PIE \(*\text{genh}h\text{os}, s\text{-stem} neuter ‘birth, origin, race’; Gr. γένος, Lat. genus, Skt. jānas- (see Meillet 1936: 41; Pokorny 1959: 375; Schmitt 1981: 49; Jahukyan 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 \(*\text{genh}h\text{-ti-}, cf. Gr. γενεσις (for a discussion, see Jahukyan 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. μοιογενής. However, miacin is an a-stem: GDSg miacn- (Bible), ISg mian-cn-a-w (John Chrysostom, Yovhannēs Ōjneck’i); cf. also ant/docin (see above, and s.v.).
Arm. cunwāl ‘parent’ is usually derived from *γeṇh₁-tlo- (Jahukyan 1987: 125, 240; Matzinger 1997: 11). The word is an a-stem, however, and presupposes *γeṇh₁-1l-eh₂-. In this case, it may have originally been feminine referring to ‘mother’. As to the variation -awl and -ol, it has been noticed that, in our oldest texts, agent nouns have -awl, and adjectives show -ol (see Weitenberg 1996: 95, with lit.), Jahukyan ibid. points out that the variants -awl and -ol may be due to early monophthongization of *-āllo- > -awl and *-olo- (cf. Gr. -οπης).

cung-k’ (pl.), a-stem (Bible+); later o-stem: IPl cnk-ov-k’ twice in Grigor Narekac’i, 10-11th cent. (in his famous “Matean”: 14.2 [1985: 297[21]]); uninflected cunn (Bible+; later also cundr); dial. also cungn (GSw cnagan), seen in late attested compounds as well (HAB 2: 472b; MiHayBar 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: NPl cung-k’; API cung-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).


In “Bžškaran jioy” (13th cent.): pl. cnkvi [Čugasly 1980: 93L-40).

DIAL. Widespread [HAB 2: 473b]. The final -n is seen in Larabal, Goris, etc., as well as in the paradigm of Van cungy, GSg cngyun [Açaryan 1952: 125], Moks cungen, GSg cnggân, NPl cung’nîr [Orbeli 2002: 255], Šatax cungy, GSg cngyyan (M. Muradyan 1962: 198b; the genitive is not recorded here, but it is found e.g. in a folk-song in 163L9).


Next to cûndar < cunn, and cung’, in Agulis one finds cûny (HAB 2: 473b; Açarean 1935: 361). Açarean (1935: 111) derives cûnyo from cunkn, although this development is exceptional; cf. eluhn ‘nail’ > čunk’, sunkgn ‘mushroom’ > sângan. In p. 73 he notes that the development u > œ is found only in cunk > cênya, and p’unfj ‘stalk; bunch’ (Genesis 41.5, 22, etc.; dial.) > p’enj. The vocalism of the latter may be due to the influence of the hushing affricate f, cf. examples with č’, š, ž, etc. (Açarean 1935: 77). Besides, it may somehow be compared with that of p’inj ‘stalk, stem’, as well as Skt. pînjavařam ‘a bunch of stalks or grass’ next to pûñjavam ‘id.’ and pûñjā- ‘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. pînçak, etc., considered to be Armenian loans (Dankoff 1995: 152), Tat p’enjäk ‘heap of 5 or 10 bundles’ (Ananyan 1978: 96, deriving the word from p’enj ‘five’); Larabal Arm. pûnjač’ (L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 10L23).
Thus, Agulis p’enj does not seem to be a good parallel to cěyną. Note also that cunkn ‘knee’ and sunkn ‘mushroom’ yielded Larabal cëngnə ‘knee’ and sëngnə ‘mushroom’, respectively [Davt’yan 1966: 385, 472], thus Agulis cěyną ‘knee’ vs. sōngnə ‘mushroom’ may be remarkable, although one must admit that here we are on shaky grounds, and other explanations may be possible too. As for ehungn ‘nail’ > Larabal këngnə ‘knee’ (see Davt’yan 1966: 344), we are dealing perhaps with metathesis e...u > u...e. Here Agulis has cuhnk rather than s(u)engn, so the vocalism of cěyną can hardly be interpreted by the influence of an unattested Agulis *kynə.

ETYM Since the dictionary by Gëorg Dpir (publ. in 1826) and NHB, compared with Pers. zănă, Gr. γόνϝ, etc.; cf. Skt. jānu-, MPers. zănūg, Lat. genu, Goth. knu ‘knee’, etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 457; HAB 2: 473). Meillet (1903: 147; 1936: 84) derives *cunγ- from PIE nom.acc. dual neuter *gonu-i- or *gonu-i (that is, *gōnu-i-hi). See also AČarLjak 3, 1957: 442; Eichner 1978: 147, 151; Clackson 1994: 47, 125. The idea that Arm. -k/g- comes from a guttural determinative (cf. Gr. γυόζ ‘with bent knee’, MPers. zănūg, 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- (< *gonu- + 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)vāw 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 γόνϝ-ατος (if from *gonu-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 *cengan reflects the same PIE oblique stem in -*n. The theoretical PArm. paradigm would have been then: NSg *cun(u)r, GSg *c(u)ngan. 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-ko, with the same suffix as in akn ‘eye’, mukn ‘mouse’, unkn ‘ear’, etc. (see s.vv.).

If Agulis cěyną ‘knee’ reflects an old e (which is very uncertain; see above), one may compare it with Hitt. tku- genu- ‘knee’ and Lat. genu.

K

ka:- 1sg.pres. ka-m, 3sg.pres. ka-ı, 1sg.aor. ka-c-ı, 3sg.aor. e-kac, 3pl.aor. kac ‘in, imper. ka-c’, plur. ka-c-ık, 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: GDGk kavan-i (Esay Nc’ec’ti), LocSk i kavan-i (Bible), GDpl kavan-i-c’ (Gregory of Nyssa, Yaçaxapatum, etc.), IPI kavan-i-w-k’ (Book of Chries) ‘standing (still), place to stand, station, site’ (Bible+); kavanam ‘to stand, stand still, halt, establish oneself’ (Philio, Paterica, Grigor Narekač’i, etc.).
kat'n

● DIAL. The verb kam kas kay is ubiquitous in the dialects. Many dialects have also *kenal < *kay(an)al [HAB 2: 505a].

● ETYM See s.v. ek- aor. 'to come'.

kat'n, GDSg kat'in, AblSg i kat'an-č, ISg kat'am-b (all in Bible) ‘milk’ (Bible+).

● DIAL. Ubiquitous in the dialects. The nasal is seen in Suč'ava gat'a, gen. gat'ni, T'iflis kát'č, gen. kát'ni, Larabal, Goris, Šamaxi kát'na [HAB 2: 481a], Lori kát'č [M. Asatryan 1968: 80, 184b].

Remarkable are Agulis kaxc’ (also in a number of compounds: kxc’-), Havari kaxs [HAB 2: 481a; Ačărans 1935: 362], Areš kaxs [lusenc’ 1982: 214a], Melri kaxc’ [Alayan 1954: 81, 274b], Karčewan kaxc’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 196b]. In Kaz’avaberd, kaxc’ is found only in the village of Varhavar, whereas the other three villages have kát'na [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). Bangānin lakti ‘milk’ (Zoller 1989: 198; see also Schrijver 1991: 480) is unreliable [Driem/Sharma 1996: 135]. The various reconstructions with initial *g- (based on Nūristāni *dzara ‘milk’, see Mallory/Adams 1997: 381-382), or *d (see Hamp 1998: 242; cf. Szemerényi 1977: 90138), or *m- (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 98) should be rejected particularly in view of the Armenian, which is neglected in these works.

One reconstructs *gelgt-, without an internal laryngeal; see Schrijver 1991: 479-480. According to Szemerényi (1977: 90, 90138), Lat. lact- was borrowed from Gr. γάλακτος. Schrijver (ibid.), however, takes the Latin word as native. The appurtenance of Hitt. galaktar n. ‘soothing substance, balm, nutriment’ (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 568; Mallory/Adams 1997: 381-382; cf. Szemerényi 1977: 90138) is uncertain. On the etymology of this Hittite word, see Kloekhorst 2008 s.v. The peculiar structure of *gelgt ‘milk’, as well as its restriction to Greek, Latin and Armenian point to Mediterranean origin. For a further discussion on this etymology, see Orel 1994a: 39. Note also Chinese *lak ‘Kumys’ (Furnée 1972: 379; Witzel 2003: 174).

The *x- of some SEArm. dialects (Agulis, Melri, etc.) is remarkable. Gr. Vanc’c’an (1899-1901, 1: 149a; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 192a) assumed that Agulis xac’ is older than CIArm. 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 finals, as in evat’n ‘seven’ > xatx, 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 Ačayeran (1901: 79-80; 1935: 23; HAB 2: 480-481; AčayerHLrm 2, 1951: 430-431). He convincingly showed that the development a > Agulis i has been blocked in position before t, and Agulis kaxc’ derives from *kaka’t; otherwise we would have *kaxc’. He correctly treats the t as an archaic relic of the IE *l- seen in the Greek and Latin forms; see also Javakyan 1959: 187-188; 1972: 272; 1985: 157; 1987: 126, 254; N. Simonyan 1979: 232; A. Xač’atravan 1982: 51.

The development t’ > c’ is exceptional in these dialects (see Ačayeran 1935: 99; H. Muradyan 1967: 80). Ačayeran (HAB 2: 480-481; AčayerHLrm 2, 1951: 431) assumes *kalt’ > *kaka’t comparing with cases like xayt : xayc (q.v.), etc.; see also N. Simonyan 1979: 232. Javakyan (1987: 126), with reservation, reconstructs *galki-. 
However, *-ti- would probably yield Arm. c’ 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. *kaτ’c’ from acc. *gλgt-m and nom. *gλgt-s respectively.

It remains unclear why the *l has been preserved in *kaɫc’, but dropped in kat’n. Kortlandt (1987a: 521 = 2003: 811) takes kat’n as a case of loss of -l before an aspirate. I tentatively propose the following solution. In 2.1.22.13, I argue that *RCt yields Arm. R’t’. 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. *gλkt-s > *κατ’c’ vs. acc. *gλkt-m > *κατ’-n. In ClArm., the paradigm *κατ’c’ : *κατ’-n, and the accusative was generalized, whereas in the SE periphery the opposite development has taken place: the paradigm was levelled to *κατ’c’ : *κατ’-n, and the nominative was generalized.

**kakal(ay)** (dial.) ‘walnut; testicle, etc.’.

- **DIA**. *kakal ‘walnut (together with the shell)’: Karin, Xotorjur, Hamšen, T’iflis (in T’iflis – also ‘eye-ball’) [Ačarean 1913: 540a], also Ararat, Urmia, Sebastia [HayLezBrbBr 3, 2004: 21a].
- *kakalay : ‘walnut; testicle’ (Karin) [Ačarean 1913: 540a]; ‘testicle’ (Polis, K’li, Amasia), ‘unripe fruit’ (Sebastia), etc. [HayLezBrbBr 3, 2004: 21-22].
- **ETY**. Ačaryan (1913: 540a) compares with Georg. Ḫakali ‘piece’ and Kurd. kɑkɛ ‘the kernel of the walnut’, not specifying the nature of the relationship. According to Lap’anc’yan (1961: 90; 1975: 369), the Armenian has been borrowed from Laz-Megrelian.

Arm. *kakal and the Kartvelian forms (Georg. Ḫakal- ‘walnut’, Laz Ḫakal- ‘walnut’, Megr. Ḫakal- ‘grain; piece’, etc.) may be treated as a reduplication of *kɑl-; cf. dial. *popɔk’, see also s.v. kɔkɔv-. In that case, *kɑl- ‘round small object; walnut, etc.’ may be related with the PIE word for ‘acorn’ (*gʰλh₂-(e)n-; cf. Alb. gogel f. ‘acorn; small and round object’, if indeed belonging to this IE word); see s.v. kɑtin ‘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, Lәralbal, Lorı, Lәzax) *kalaṭ ‘unripe, green walnut to make sweets with’, q.v.

**kalaṭ, i-stem or a-stem according to NHB 1: 1036c, but only LocSg i kalaṭ-i (Movsēs Xorenac’ı 2.77) is cited ‘den, lair’.

Movsēs Xorenac’ı, Philo, Irenaeus, Aristakēs Lastivertc’ı, etc. Often in apposition with synonymous orj, etc. (see NHB 1: 1036-1037).

ETYM Probably with the suffix -al (cf. kenc-‘at ‘living’, etc.) and the root *kal-
connected with Lith. guolis ‘den, lair, (coll.) bed’, guolus ‘bed, lair’, guol ‘to lie
down, fall ill’, Latv. guol ‘nest, den, lair, (coll.) bed’, etc., probably also Gr. γωλεός
m. ‘hole’ [Liden 1906: 48-49; Peterson 1916: 280; HAB 2: 492a; Pokorny 1959:
402; Jahukyan 1987: 126, 169]. Arm. *kal- is usually derived from a zero-grade
*guol-, with the loss of *u (cf. jayn, i-stem ‘voice, sound’ vs. OCS zvon ‘sound’) and the development *o in open syllables > Arm. a (on which see 2.1.3).

See also s.v. koť ‘rib, side’.

*kaɿal (dial.) ‘unripe, green walnut to make sweets with’.

DIAL Agulis, Łarabal [Ačarean 1913: 541b], also Łaz and Lori [Amatuni 1912:
326a].

ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

It is hard to determine whether there is a relation with kalin ‘acorn’ and/or *kakal
‘walnut’ (see s.vv.).

Perhaps more promising is to compare Pers. čayāla ‘unripe fruit’ (on which see
Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 12Ne2).

kalamax (Isaiah 41.19, 2 Paralipomenon 2.8), kalamax-i, ea-stem: GDPl kalamax-
eac’ (Hosea 4.13), NPl kalamaxi-k’ (Hexaemeron); ‘white poplar, Populus alba;
aspen, Populus tremula’, probably also ‘pine’.

In Isaiah 41.19 and Hosea 4.13, Arm. kalamax(i) renders Gr. λεύκη ‘white poplar,
Populus alba’.

In 2 Paralipomenon 2.8 (Xalat’eanc’ 1899: 57a): Ew tac’es berel in’ p’ayts
saroy mavr ew kalamax i Libahan leinē : 2.7 και ἀποστείλον μει δενον και
ἀρκεύθος και πεύκη. Thus: Arm. saroy, mavr, and kalamax match Gr. κέδρος
‘cedar-tree’, ἀρκεύθος ‘juniper, Juniperus macrocarpa’, and πεύκη ‘pine’,
respectively. If this set of correspondences is original, Arm. kalamax here refers to
‘pine’, thus. This seems to be corroborated by Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984:
1422-17, cf. also 1442-3) where kalamax, according to the editor’s comment (K.

In Agat’anjos § 644 (1909=1984: 330-11), kalamax (vars. kalamat, kalmax,
kamalax) is found in an enumeration of tree-names, between gi ‘juniper’ and urı́
‘willow’.

Further: kalamah/x in Galen (rendering Gr. λεύκη, see Ališan 1895: 285-286;
Greppin 1985: 71), and kalmxi (syncopated) in Geoponica.

DIAL Muš kalmxi, Xotorjur gaxmxi [HAB 2: 492b]. Ararat kalama cař, k’alambor
[Markosyan 1989: 305a].

ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 2: 492) treats as borrowed from an unattested Urartian
source and mentions Salmast Turk. k’alamb’hár or k’alamb’ur ‘aspen’, T’avriz/Tebriz
Turk. gqal mà ‘poplar’, as well as in Daghestan languages: Lak kalaχi, Rutul kalaχ
‘aspen’. Then he notes that the homeland of this tree is not known, and posits an
eastward spread in view of Tehran Persian tâbrizi ‘aspen’, lit. ‘of/from Tebriz’.

Now we can add two Hesychian glosses: καλαμίνδαρ· πλάτανος ἡδονιεῖς ‘plane’,

obviously with *dar ‘tree’, καλαδία· ῥυκάνη ‘plane’, see Saradževa 1981a (referring
to Jähukyan p.c. for κολαμίνθορ). See also Jähukyan 1987: 310, 437, 612 (Lezg. կնաբար 'aspen', etc.). For the possible tree-suffix -ax, see 2.3.1.

Olsen (1999: 936) cites no etymology and considers kalamax to be of unknown origin.

For the semantic relationship 'poplar, aspen': 'plane', cf. էանդար 'poplar', 'plane' (see HAB 3: 183-184), which obviously contains the same component *dar 'tree' we saw above, and օպ 'poplar, aspen': Làrabal *հոփ 'plane' (see HAB 3: 619-620); see H. Martirosyan 2008.

That κολαμίνθορ contains *kalam- and *dar 'tree' is seen in Arm. Ararat kalama cař, which is taken as equivalent to k'älämboř (see above). The form must be closely linked with Salmast Turk. k'üllämbör or k'üllämbur 'aspen'. Probably an assimilation has taken place: *kalam-dar > *kalam-bar.

Conclusion: kalam-ax(-i) 'white poplar, aspen' is a Mediterranean/Pontic tree-name composed of *kalam- (cf. Hesychian κολαμίνθορ 'plane', Turk. qalâm 'poplar', etc.) and the tree-suffix -ax.

**kalin**, o-stem 'acorn' (Bible+); **kalni-i** 'oak-tree' (Bible; P'awstos Buzand, etc.).

Note ar'ark'yan kalin (Cyril of Jerusalem), ar'ka-kalin (Galn) 'hazel-nut', literally 'royal acorn'; xoz-kalin '*pig-acorn', in Asar Sebastac'i (16-17th cent.), see D. M. Karapetyan 1993: 211; in the glossary: 349. See also Ališan 1895: 65-66, 287-288.

DIAL. Widespread in the dialects [HAB 2: 496a].

Next to kalin 'acorn', which is usually considered xoz-kalin, that is acorn for pigs, in the dialect of Làrabal one finds tk'îłen 'hazel-nut' (and metathesized kt'îlen, cf. Làradal t'âkuho, with an unexplained -t and with irregular change of a to ə (see HAB, ibid.; Ališan 1895: 342, 611, treating Làrabal tkolın as synonymous to ar'akalin, on which see above). Also Hadrut տակեն 'id.' [Polosyan 1965: 16].

For Svedia, Ačāryan (HAB, ibid.) cites galәn (read /galәn/). Later, he (2003: 573) also records g'âhәnd, noting (p. 378) that the change ClArm. ə > Svedia eə is irregular in this position. This form with epthetic -d is corroborated by other authors: güәnd or güәhund (see Andreasyan 1967: 36 and 367a, respectively), güәnd [Hananyan 1995: 53, 187b]; K'esab kâlent vs. kâlen [Č'olak'eän 1986: 206b].

The final d is exceptional since the other examples of the epenthetic or epthetic d (Ačāryan 2003: 431; see also Hananyan 1995: 53) apply to specific conditions: -nd > -nr and -s(-) > -sd(-). Andreasyan (1967: 36, 373b) adds another example: čapat 'spread', cf. verbal fâhәl and fâhәddil. The latter form is probably a misprint for *fâhәddil (note the resemblance of the Armenian characters for d and f); cf. K'esab čapptil 'to spread, scatter', perhaps also čapptil 'to scratch with nails' (see Č'olak'eän 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. glâns, glandis f. 'acorn, beach-nut; missile discharged from a sling', Russ. зêlûd', SCr. žêlûd 'acorn', Lith. gilė, dial. gilė 'acorn', Latv. žile 'acorn', etc. [HAB 2: 495-496].

Arm. dial. *kakal 'walnut; testicle' (q.v.) must be related with Georg. ქაქალ- 'walnut', Laz ქაქალ- 'walnut', Megr. ქაქალ- 'grain; piece (Russ. 'urryka')', etc. (on which see Klimov 1964: 105). If we are dealing with reduplication of *kal-, one
It is tempting to identify the final dental stop of Arm. Svedia (on which see 2.1.26.4) and can be derived from QIE *ka’a- '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 *ka- '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; AÇafer 1913: 540a; HayLezBrbBar 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.

Alternatively, one might assume a contamination with Svedia *tuka ‘day’; see also s.v. *diuos *g ’divine acorn’, cf. Gr. *διϝός βάλανος ‘chestnut’ and Lat. iūglāns ‘walnut’ (on which see Walde/Hofmann 1, 1938: 727; Schrijver 1991: 273). On *tuv-, see HAB s.v. tīv ‘day’; see also s.v. cicanc ‘rainbow’. As is pointed out by Laufer 1919: 369, 369 1, the pattern of Gr. Διος βάλανος ‘acorn of Zeus’ is comparable to that of Pers. šāh-bal(i)ūt ‘the edible chestnut’ < "acorn of the Shah, royal acorn’; cf. Pahl. šāh-balūt ‘id.’, Arm. šahpalut ‘id.’, an Iranian loan, Larabal šmālūt ‘chestnut’ [Hübschmann 1897: 272; HAB 3: 486a]. Compare also ar’k’a-kalin above. For vocalic assimilation *tukālin > *tukūlin cf. erdunn ‘oath’ > Larabal ūrtūmn. Unlike in *tukalin, with voiceless stops, here we are dealing with voiced d, consequently, with AÇafran’s Law: rdu > rda > rt u (see 2.1.39.2).

It is tempting to identify the final dental stop of Arm. Svedia g’ākənd (on which see above) with that seen in Russ. zēlūd’, SciR. zēlăd ‘acorn’, etc., and Lat. glāns, glandis. Alternatively, one might assume a contamination with Svedia hćeând from Arm. (h)und ‘edible seed, grain’ (q.v.), although this seems less probable.

kalkanjal ‘to yelp, make a supplicating yelp as of hunger (said of dog)’ (Lex., see NHB 1: 1037c), MiArm. kalkacel, kalknal ‘id.’ (MiJHayBar 1, 1987: 378a), kalkanjal-ot-akan ‘yelping’ (Grigor Narekaci 35.4, see Xac’atryan/Lazinian 1985: 394 (1)), knja-jayn ‘with voice of a fawning dog’ (Yovan Mandakuni/Mayragomec’i); MiArm. k$kncal and knj-kñul ‘to yelp (said of wolf)’ in Fables by Vardan Aygeke’i (MiJHayBar 1, 1987: 395a, 402a).

• DIAL. Muš, Alaškert k$žonjál ‘to yelp (said of dog)’, T’avriz k$kñjál ‘to murmur, mutter’, Akn kalkonjal ‘to speak timidly and unclearly when beseeching for something’; Ararat konjal, konkñjal, Larabal konkñjal, T’iflis, Karin, Van, Žula konkñjal, etc. ‘to yelp’ [HAB 2: 496]. NHB 1: 1037c records dial. *kalknjal and *knkñjal.

There are forms in the nasal suffix *-neh₂-, too: Russ. glîna ‘clay’, Gr. γιαθνί ‘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 *kalı̇n- and *kalj-, it would be possible to explain kaljîn as a contaminated form. Strictly speaking, the IE *gli-neh₂- would develop into PArm.
*alkin. However, a contamination presupposes a mutual influence. Thus, the anlaut of PArm. *kalın is perhaps influenced by *kalj.

I cannot offer an explanation for -r- of the dialectal (Salmast, Marafa) form *karčin. Perhaps, cf. Lat. crēta ‘clay, clayey soil, chalk’, Fr. craie, Germ. Kreide.

**kamurj**, a-stem: GDG kamr-ı (Bible+), GDPI kamr-ă-c’ in Agat’angeloğlu § 33, kamr-ă-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: 227.151). Later also karmun-ı and karmu-ı.

In Agat’angeloğlu § 33 (1909=1980: 22-23), one finds several attestations of kamurj, including GDG kamr-ı and, twice, GDPI kamr-ă-c’.

In T’ovmay Arcruni 2.3 (1985: 150.1-17); transl. Thomson 1985: 161: Ew Xosrov ark’ay p’axstakan gnac’, ew anc’eal zDekɫat’aw i Vehkawat, hramayeac’ zlar kamurj’ıc’ krel: “King Xosrov fled. Crossing the Tigris at Vehkawat he ordered the rope of the bridge to be cut”.

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects (Sebastia, Muş, T’iflis, Ararat, Łabaraba, Agulis, Jula, 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 kārmunj, H. Muradyan (1967: 104, 175a) records also kármi-ı in the village of Varhavar. It is tempting to treat kármi-ı 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: *karmunj > *karmujj > kármi-ı, cf. PIE *medh-i-o- > PArm. *meiğa- > mé’j (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”.

Hamsen (Čaniğ) karmunj (read garmunj, Ačaɭyan 1947: 236) means ‘a long thick pole with teeth on one side, used as a ladder’ (see KiwlHamş 1899: 753b, cf. 1900: 62b). One also finds Hamsen gârmâj ‘a pole of a fence’, used three times in a traditional story recorded in Krasnodar region and published by Andranik Zey’t’unyan (see JaynHamş 2, 1979: 30, glossed in 219b). The vocalism of the latter form is unclear to me.

**ETYM** Since Müller, connected with Gr. γέφῡρα f. (Boeot. βέφυρα, Cret. δέφυρα, Lac. /Hesychius/ διφωρα) ‘bridge’ [HAB 2: 503]. According to Ačaɭyan (HAB 2: 503a), the development *g’ebh- > 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, Ačaɭyan (Ačaɭyan 6, 1971: 722) explains the phonological irregularity by tabu, which is unlikely (cf. 2.1.36); cf. also Clackson 1994: 135. Viredaz (2001-02: 29; 2005-07: 10-11) assumes that *kawurj became kamurj through an influence of karmar ‘arch, vault’, which is possible, but unsatisfactory.

Jahukyan (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 Jahukyan 1967: 127, 291-292; cf. 1994: 15) compares with awr ‘day’ : Gr. ἄρρις n. ‘day’, which is, however, a different case (see

Also Beekes (1969: 194; 2002 [2004]; see also 2003: 153) assumes that Gr. γέφῡρα and Arm. kamurj are of substratum origin. Showing that the older meaning of γέφῡρα is ‘beam’, he puts forward Furnée’s (1972: 223) suggestion about the connection with Hattic ḫamuru(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 *-mbh- would yield Arm. -m- as in camem ‘to chew’.

On the other hand, Hatt. ḫamuru(wa) ‘beam’ (see Dunaevskaja 1961: 88) has been connected with CAkhaz *q’əmbər-ra ‘beam over the hearth; cross-beam’ [Arzinchba 1983: 170; Chirikba 1996: 423], cf. Abkhaz (Bzyp) a-x’əblrə, a-x’əbrolə, a-x’əbrolə, Abaza (Tapanta) q’əmbə, Abaza (Ashkar) q’əbls, 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. γέφῡρα and Arm. kamurj. With the basic meaning ‘beam’ and with the -mb-, the Abkhaz form, probably derived from something like *q’əmbər-, can be crucial for the discussion.

In the Imeretian and Rachan dialects of West Georgian there is a word k’ip’orči ‘a log that serves as a bridge’, which is compared with Arm. kamurj [Beridze 1912: 23a]. According to Acharjan (HAB 2: 503b), k’ip’orči is borrowed from an older form of Arm. kamurj with the labial stop. This involves the development *g’ebh- > 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’əmbhər > PArm. *kom(μ)urj > kamurj, there was perhaps a by-form *g/q’əbrə > PArm. *kəbrə > Georg. *kəpurj > dial. k’ip’orči. Alternatively, one might think of Turkic *kōpur / *kōpt(r)ig ‘bridge’ (treated as borrowed from Gr. γέφῡρα, see Šervašidze 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. γέφῡρα ‘beam; bridge’, Arm. kamurj ‘bridge’ (perhaps of wood, cf. 2 Kings 23:21; cf. also dial. Xotorjur ‘a wood in water that serves as a base for the wheel’), Hamsen ‘a pole used as a ladder; a pole for a fence’, Hattic hamuru(wa) ‘beam’, Abkhaz *q’əmbər- ‘beam’, and West-Georg. k’ip’orči ‘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’əmbhər, 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’orči ‘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, *gʷqʷə(m)bʰ or ‘beam’ > PGr. and PArm. *gʰə(m)bʰur-ih2- ‘beam, log serving as a bridge’ > Gr. γέφῡρα ‘beam; bridge’ and Arm. kamurǰ ‘(wooden) bridge’.

The PArm. by-form *kabur- 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 kamurǰ is gratuitous.

kayt prob. ‘mark on marble’, attested only in Barsel Maškeroneč’i/Čon (13-14th cent.): NPl kayt-er.

kask ‘chestnut’ in Evagrius of Pontus; T’ovmas Kilikec’i (see Ališan 1895: 303; Anasyan 1967: 2832; Hewsen 1992: 323), kask-eni ‘chestnut-tree’ in Fables by Mxit’ar Goš (HAB 2: 509b) mentions this suggestion with a question mark and leaves the origin of the word open.

I propose a connection with kayt ‘mark; spotted’ and kėt ‘point, dot’, q.v. The above-mentioned kayc ‘spark’ may be related, too. For further discussion, see s.v. *kič- ‘to bite’.

karb ‘aspen’, attested in a medical work [Ališan 1895: 306, Nr 1358; HAB 2: 547b].

kardam ‘to shout, call, recite loudly’ (Bible+), ‘to read’ (Lazar P’arpec’i+).
DIAL Widespread in the dialects, in the meanings ‘to read’ and ‘to learn’ [HAB 2: 549b]. Note Larabal kart’ 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 hūr’tāvo tiš kya/k’ynā : “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].

Aṭṭial g’ard’al ‘to read’, g’ard’alu (Pol.), kardal (Hung.) ‘to sing’ [Ačaṙyan 1953: 272]. This is interesting with respect to ‘sing’: ‘dance’. For bird-singing, see also Srvanjtyanc’ 1, 1978: 259.


We are dealing with PIE *gw(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. gir̄ti, gyr̄iau, girit ‘to praise, boast’, etc. Arm. kardam probably derives from *ḡ rh-d’h-, cf. Skt. gir̄ ḍ hā-, OAv. gar̄ ḍ ā- ‘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.).

Larabal – Aṭṭial; if the meaning ‘to sing’ is directly comparable to the IE cognates, one should treat this as a semantic archaism preserved in Larabal and Aṭṭial 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): Aył zayn utic’ k’i ze k’i ze k’i ze k’i ze k’i ze. 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’ar’i, k’arsi ‘tendon; calf of leg’, which is considered an Armenian loan (see HAB 2: 550b).

DIAL Preserved in the dialect of Ozim: kart’ ‘fish-hook’ [HAB 2: 550b].


On the reflex of the consonant cluster, see 2.1.22.13.

karič, a-stem: GDSg karč-i, GDPI karč-a-c’, IPI karč-a-w-k’ (Bible+) ‘scorpion’ (Bible+), ‘the zodiacal constellation Scorpio’ (Eznik Kolbac’i, Hexaemerons, Nonnus).
karkut

DAL Dialectally ubiquitous. On Aslanbek gargarnd, see below.

ETYM Since Klaproth (1831: 101b), connected with OCS gradh ‘hail’, SCR. grąd ‘id.’, Lith. grisodas ‘frozen dirt or earth’, Lat. grandō, -inis f. ‘hail, hail-storm’, etc.

Tervišean (see HAB) and Meillet (1898: 280) independently interpreted the Armenian form from reduplicated *ka-krut < *ga-gródo- (cf. mamul, etc., see 2.3.2), through regular metathesis. This is largely accepted, see HAB 2: 556a; Pokorny 1959: 406; Ėjukyan (1987: 126, 128-129, 1982: 64) assumes *gr-gródo-i- > *kar-k(r)ut-i, through dissimilation rather than metathesis.

The PIE root is reconstructed with an internal laryngeal: *groHd- or *greh₂l-; the Latin may be derived from *grH-n-d- or *greh₂-n-d-, with a nasal infix [Schrijver 1991: 223]. Rasmussen (1999: 153-154) assumes *gr-groHd-i- > *kar-k(r)ut-i, through dissimilation rather than metathesis.

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. hrádiṇi- f. ‘hail-stones, hail’ (RV+), Sogd. žöhn ‘hail’, etc. are formally problematic. If related, they point to *gHroHd- or *greh₂l-. The initial *gH- would be depalatalized due to the following *r as in mawru-k ‘beard’ and Lith. smakras, smakra ‘chin’ vs. Skt. smáśra- n. ‘beard’ (see s.v.). The only remaining problem is that an IE *gH- would yield Arm. g. Neither this obstacle is crucial, however. The root of the structure *gH...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)nt-nt-oc' ‘spectrum, fiddlestick’ (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Yovhannē Draskanakert'i, etc.; see HAB 2: 611a), dial. kt-kt- (see Amatuni 1912: 376a; Aća'eten 1913: 619a; Malxaseanc', HayBac'Bał 2: 497b; Alayan 1976, 1:769) and *kt-kut- (HayLezBrbBa3, 2004: 180-181) ‘sound of intensive beating’.

Aslanbek gargūnd with -n- is reminiscent of the Latin form. Ačarṇ (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'-k' 'life, living, manner of life; the course of a life; existence; property, wealth' (Bible+); derivatives based on ken- (Bible+), ken-s- (Agat'angelos, Lazar 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 kendaw-o-y, ISg kendane-a-w, GDpl kendane-a-c', IPl 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].


Arm. kea-m probably reflects (athematic) *g'eih3 together with Gr. βιομαι, although further details are unclear (see Klingenschmitt 1982: 85 with references; Klein 1988: 258, 272; Clackson 1994: 183, 216a). A direct derivation *eih3 > Arm. *e(i)a- is difficult, so the a-conjugation seems to be secondary, unless one assumes *g'ih3- or the like (cf. Hübschmann 1883: 35; 1897: 459; Meillet 1936: 45; Schmitt 1981: 64; Jahukyan 1982: 60, 176; Lindeman 1981; Olsen 1999: 772).

The absence of palatalization of *g' in Armenian is unclear (see Jahukyan 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'h3- (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. Larabel *karka-t- t'ak, *karkut t'akel, etc. (see Aća'eten 1913: 558a), with reversed order of the same components.
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(2003: 12) he derives keam from *g"u[ih]r- with metathesis from *g"h,iu-. Klingenschmitt 1982: 148 assumes an analogical influence of the nominal forms such as Skt. gáyà-, etc. 71


keł, o-stem: GDSg keł-0-y, ISg keł-0-v (Bible+). Later: IPl keł-0-k’ (Sargsi Šnorhali /12th cent/ and “Talaran”), which formally presupposes a-stem (-a-w-k’) ‘wound, sore, ulcer’ (Bible+); kelem ‘to torment, torture, afflict’ (Bible+): renders Gr. κατοδυνάω ‘to afflict grievously’ in Exodus 1.14; kel-ek-’em ‘to tear, rend’ (Bible+): renders Gr. διασπάω ‘to tear asunder’ in Hosea 13.8.


The compound ē’ar-a-keł is mentioned in P’awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95-115) as synonymous to žant: Ew sksaw hatanel zor ē’arakeln inn koč’en, īsk kēsk’n żand anuānān; elanêr i veray mardkann ev anasnoc’n “What some call evil pustules and other plague began to strike, and they appeared on men and beasts”; translated by Garsoian (1989: 138).

For -ek’- ē’Açā’yan (HAB 2: 567b) compares bārek’- (< bari ‘good’ + -ak’) and armat-ak’-i (with armat ‘root’). Note especially bol-ok’-em ‘to complain’, ol-ok’-em ‘to supplicate’.

DIAL According to Açā’yan (HAB 2: 567b), preserved in Łarabād keł ‘the outer hard part of a wound’, kel-a-kalel ‘to become covered with kel’.


Lith. gēlī points to a laryngeal after *-l-. If the Greek forms are related, one assumes *g’elhi-, ‘hit by throwing’. For the semantic development ‘to hit, strike’ > ‘wound’, see s.vv. xayt’, xit’, etc. Note also hatanem ‘to strike’, pertaining to ē’ar-a-keł in the above-mentioned passage from P’awstos Buzand 4.13.

Arm. kel, o-stem, may be derived from IE e-stem neuter, cf. Gr. βέλος, -ους ‘missile, especially arrow, dart; weapon; the sting of a scorpion’, ἐλαστίγον ‘arrow, javelin’, βελον ‘needle’; Arm. žal ‘grief, pain’, etc. From *g’elhi- one expects Arm. ī rather than ī, one may explain the -ā as analogical after the verb kelem from a nasal present *g’el-n-H-, cf. Ion.-Att. βέλος and Arc. δόξιο, with geminate -si-. (For *-nt- > Arm. -ā, see 2.1.22.8.) See also Olsen 1999: 52.

According to Jahukyan (1963a: 91; 1967: 197; 1982: 60 [misprinted as keler]; 1987: 128 [with a question mark], *kelerj ‘complaint, grievance, pain’ (q.v.) belongs here too. For the semantics he compares Russ. žal’ (’complaint, grievance’ vs. žalē’t’ to begrudge, pity’ and žālī’t’ to bite, sting). If indeed related, kel-erj may be derived from *g’elH-r(i)-h2-j- or *-r- jeh2-.

71 One may also think of an influence of kam ‘to stay, rest, dwell’.
For the meaning of Ľarabal *kæt ‘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. Jahukyan (1982: 59-60), however, considers the palatalization of *g and *k to be facultative.

Earlier attempts treating *kæt as borrowed from Gr. κήλη, Att. κάλη ‘tumour, especially rupture, hernia; hump’ are rightly rejected by Ačåryan (HAB 2: 567b). A word which is richly attested in a variety of forms (kæl-ek’-*, kæl-erj, etc.) and has been preserved in an extremely Eastern dialect can hardly be a Greek loan.

*kæt ‘crooked’, only in the compound kæl-a-kær ‘doubtful’, attested in Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i (8th cent.) onwards. Spelled also as kæl-a-kær.

● ETYM According to NHB (1:1081b), kæl-a-kær, kæl-a-kær is composed of kæ ‘lame’ (cf. xel ‘mutilated, lame, crooked’) and kar ‘opinion, supposition’: xel kam kal karceok’. Basically the same is assumed by Ačåryan (HAB 2: 490-491), who treats the compound as containing *kæl ‘crooked’, identical with kal ‘lame’ and etymologically perhaps related with xel and šel (see s.vv.), and kar. For the vocalic difference he mentions Georg. k’eli ‘lame’ which he takes as a loan from Armenian kal ‘lame’ and *kæl ‘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. kæl ‘false’?”.

Pedersen (1906: 379 = 1982: 157), with reservation, identifies *kæl 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. *kæl ‘two’ or ‘double’ elsewhere, and PIE *dwel- is not corroborated by any cognate form. The “internal” etymology (NHB, Ačåryan), therefore, seems preferable.

See also s.v. erku ‘two’ and 2.1.22.6.

*kærj probably ‘complaint, grievance, pain’: only in kærj-akan, which is frequent in Grigor Magistros (11th cent.).

● ETYM See s.v. kæl ‘wound, sore’.

*kæči ‘birch’, perhaps also ‘larch’.

As a dialectal word in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1064a. In Galen, kæči/kæč’i corresponds to Gr. λάριξ ‘larch, Larix europaea; Venice turpentine; coagulum’ (see Ališan 1895: 310; Greppin 1985: 69).

● DIAL Ararat, Lori, Ľarabal (kič’i), Širak, Muš [Amatuni 1912: 337b; Ačåean 1913: 563b]. See also Ališan 1895: 310 (also kæči).

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 kæč’i kindles easily is seen in e.g. G. Hakobyan 1974: 264.

● ETYM Jahukyan (1987: 296, cf. 264) considers *kæči to be a loan from a Finno-Ugric source, cf. Finn. dial. kaski ‘offshoot of birch’, Kare. kaski ‘birch’, Udmurt. kyž-, etc. This is uncertain. The meaning ‘birch’ is recent here (Petri Kalio, p.c.).

72 Any relation with Finno-Ugrian *kæçne or *kæčž ‘juniper’ (on which see Campbell 1990: 155)?
I alternatively propose a derivation from PIE *gwetu- 'resin': Skt. jatun- n. 'lac, gum', NPers. dial. žad 'gum', Pashto žāwā 'resin', Lat. bitūmen (< dial.) 'a kind of mineral pitch found in Palestine and Babylon', PWGm. *kew-. OEEngl. cewidu 'resin', Germ. Kitt, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 480; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 565; Mallory/Adams 1997: 500a), and especially OIr. beithe 'box-tree' (< dial.) 'a kind of mineral pitch found in Palestine and Babylon', PWGm. *kwe-δ: 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]

● 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-at, -awt 'eating, devouring' (Bible+), for a discussion, see Clackson 1994: 214a; Olsen 1999: 649-650); ker, o-stem: GDSg ker-o-y, GDPl ker-o-c' 'food (especially of animals); bait' (Agat'angos, John Chrysostom, Philo, Zgōn-Afrahat, T'oymay Arcruni, Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, Nersēs Lambronac'i, etc.); -ker in a number of compounds; kerakur, o-stem: GDSg kerakr-o-y, ISg kerakr-o-v, GDPl kerakr-o-c', IPl kerakr-o-v-k' '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'sandrapol in 1915 (HZHeK' 13, 1985: 218, lines 1, 17, 26).
● ETYM Derived from PIE *gwerh3- 'to swallow, devour': Gr. βόρα 'fodder (of a predator)', βιβρώσκω 'to devour', Lat. vorō, -āre 'to devour, engulf, eat greedily' (a denominative, see Schrijver 1991: 217), Skt. gar', girāti 'to devour, swallow', YAv. garō f.pl. 'throats', aspō.garom norā.garom 'who swallows horses (and) who swallows men' (for Iranian forms, see Cheung 2007: 109), Lith. gēriti, gerū 'to drink', OCS po-žrēti 'to eat (of animals), devour', ORuss. žrāti, 1sg. žru, Russ. žrāt', žru 'to eat (of animals), gobble', etc., see Hübbschmann 1897: 459-460; HAB
The aorist Arm. *ker-a- has been derived from the IE athematic root *gʷerh₂-: 3sg e-ker < *e-ker(a-t) < *e-gʷerh₂, and 3sg ker-a-w is considered analogical after the medial aorists (Klingenschmitt 1982: 211, 279, 279; 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-gʷerh₂-e-t (Beekes 1969: 234; Lindeman 1982: 40; K. Schmidt 1990: 43; Olsen 1999: 650). Further see s.v. *utem ‘to eat’.

Arm. ker, o-stem ‘food’ derives from *gʷorh₃-o-: Skt. gará- ‘drink, liquid’; cf. also Gr. βόρά ‘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 *gw unpalatalized in Armenian, see Clackson 1994: 55.

The reduplicated form ker-a-kur ‘food’ probably reflects an older iterative reduplication of the type of aɫǰ-a-m-u ɫǰ ‘darkness, twilight’ (q.v.), etc., see Klingenschmitt 1982: 211-212, 279, 279; Weitenberg 1989a: 111-112 (a slightly different type is reflected in karkut ‘hail’, mamul ‘press’, mamuṙ ‘moss’), thus *gʷer₃-gʷorh₃ > 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 ὕδωδυ ‘food, meal’ (see s.v. *utem ‘tom eat’). Further see Olsen 1999: 757 and 757, with a comparison with Skt. garagir- and an explanation of kur through the rounding of *r- caused by the neighbouring labiovelar *gʷ, as in kul ‘swallow’. For a further discussion on kerakur and kur cf. mamul and *mul/ (see s.v. *malem ‘to grind, crush’).

A reduplication of the zero-grade root (cf. Gr. βόρα, etc.) is seen in kokord ‘throat’, which can be derived from *gʷorh₃-t/d(r)V- or the like, cf. OHG querdar ‘bait’, Gr. βάραϑρον n. ‘gape, cleft, gorge’; further note Czech hrdlo, Russ. gòrlo, etc. ‘throat’ from *gʷrh₃-t/d(r)V-, with a comparison with Skt. garagir- and an explanation of kur through the rounding of *r- caused by the neighbouring labiovelar *gʷ, as in kul ‘swallow’. For a further discussion on kerakur and kur cf. mamul and *mul/ (see s.v. *malem ‘to grind, crush’).

**kēs**, o-stem: GSp kis-o-ya, GPI kis-o-c’, LocSp i kis-um (Eznik Kolbaci, 5th cent.); later also i-stem: GDPl kis-i-c’ (Grigor Magistros, 11th cent.) ‘half’ (Bible+).


● ETYM Pedersen (1906: 398, 400 = 1982: 176, 178) derives from the PIE word for ‘two’ reconstructing *duwoik-, next to *dwoukā- > Arm. koys ‘side’. This is not accepted by Ač’yan (HAB 2: 582a), and the word is mostly viewed as of unknown origin [Jahukyan 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 *duw- > Arm. k- (on this see 2.1.22.6).

The semantic relationship ‘side, part, region’ : ‘half’ is possible, cf. Skt. ārdha- ‘side, part, region’, ardhā- ‘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: 642]. Earlier, Jähukyan (1967: 143) suggested a derivation from PIE *ken- ‘to rub, scrape off’, which is untenable.

**kēt₁**, i-stem: GDSg kit-i in Agat’angolos, Plato; GDI kit-i-c’ in Dionysius Thrax and Grigor Magistros (here, in the same passage, -kit-a-v-k’ in compounds [HNB 1: 1094c]) ‘point, dot (in various senses, such as of time, appointment)’ (Agat’angolos, Elišč, etc.), ‘goal, purpose’ (Philippians 3.14 = Gr. σκοπος), ‘target’ (Book of Chries), ‘centre’ (Plato), ‘odd’ (Arak’el Vardapat, 15th cent.); kit-uac, o-stem ‘stigma, dotted ornament’ ([PI k]ituac-o-v-k’ in Canticum 1.10/11: handerj kituacovk’ arecat’oy ‘muća atµugatov toû áppugioû’; kitak ‘canon, rule’ (Dawit’ Anyalt’), etc.

DIAL. Ėļa ket ‘time’ (e.g. č’ur es kets ‘by now’); Łarabal kets, Zeyt’un, Suč’ava ged (the meaning is not specified; I assume ‘point, dot’; for an illustration in Łarabal, see Dav’t’yan 1966: 395); Akn ket ‘obstacle’; Bulanox ket ‘odd’ (cf. kēt ‘odd’ attested in Arak’el Vardapat, 15th cent.), in Northern and Eastern dialects (T’iflis, Lori, Ganjak, Łarabal, 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 Goš (12-13th cent., Ganjak).

DIAL. Łarabal ket ‘a kind of fly that chases calfs’, Łarabal, 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 Melri, Alayan (1974: 275b, 307) records kēt’il ‘to run away swiftly’, with geminate -it-, and koč’il.

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 583b) questions: “is it identical with Muś knet ‘biting fly’?”

M. Muradyan (1962: 210a) records Šatax zor’ket: išameh ‘bumble-bee’ in her glossary of purely dialectal words; see also HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 409b. I think this is a compound with kēt ‘a biting fly’. The first member can be identified with dial. zař ‘rude, uncivilized’ (HayLezBrbBr 1, 2001: 409b), meaning also ‘step-’ in e.g. Moks zař-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 iš-a-mehe ‘bumble-bee’, literally ‘donkey-bee’.

Next to zor’ket one also finds dial. zřēč ‘yellow bumble-bee’, with a final -c (Malxaseanc’, HayBac’Bař 2: 38b). Apparently, the first component is taken by Malxasyanc’ as identical with zař ‘yellow’ (see s.v. *de-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 Jähukyan, the word belongs with kēt₁ ‘point, dot, etc.’ and *kic- ‘to bite’ (see s.vv.).

Note that dial. zřēč ‘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. *kic < kavc ‘spark’). Note also kic ‘an annoying insect’.
*kt* - ‘to faint, become weak, feeble’: *kt*-uc’eal ‘weak, feeble, faint’ (Bible+), ‘to faint from thirst’ (Yovhannès Drasxanakerc’i), *kt*-ot ‘faint, weak’ (Bible+); dial. ‘to become tired’.

● **DIAL** Marala k’it’el ‘to become tired’ (Garegin k’h. Petrosean apud Ačean 1926: 100 and HAB 2: 584a).

● **ETYM** No acceptable etymology (see HAB 2: 584a; Jahukyan 1967: 301; 1987: 262).

Perhaps related with nk’t’em ‘to starve, faint from hunger’ (q.v.).

*kie-, kcanem*, 3sg.aor. (e)kic, imper. kic ‘to bite; to sting’ (Bible+), kcem ‘to feel sting/pain’ (Eznik K’otači, 5th cent.), ‘to torment’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i, 12th cent.), ‘to become tired’ (Garegin k’h. Petrosean apud Ačean 1926: 100 and HAB 2: 584a).

● **ETYM** No acceptable etymology (see HAB 2: 584a; J̌ahukyan 1967: 301; 1987: 262).

Perhaps related with nk’t’em ‘to starve, faint from hunger’ (q.v.).

*kt*- ‘to faint, become weak, feeble’: *kt*-uc’eal ‘weak, feeble, faint’ (Bible+), ‘to faint from thirst’ (Yovhannès Drasxanakerc’i), *kt*-ot ‘faint, weak’ (Bible+); dial. ‘to become tired’.

● **DIAL** Marala k’it’el ‘to become tired’ (Garegin k’h. Petrosean apud Ačean 1926: 100 and HAB 2: 584a).

● **ETYM** No acceptable etymology (see HAB 2: 584a; Jahukyan 1967: 301; 1987: 262).

Perhaps related with nk’t’em ‘to starve, faint from hunger’ (q.v.).

*kie-, kcanem*, 3sg.aor. (e)kic, imper. kic ‘to bite; to sting’ (Bible+), kcem ‘to feel sting/pain’ (Eznik Ko’tači, 5th cent.), ‘to torment’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i, 12th cent.), ‘to become tired’ (Garegin k’h. Petrosean apud Ačean 1926: 100 and HAB 2: 584a).

● **ETYM** No acceptable etymology (see HAB 2: 584a; J̌ahukyan 1967: 301; 1987: 262).

Perhaps related with nk’t’em ‘to starve, faint from hunger’ (q.v.).

*kie-, kcanem*, 3sg.aor. (e)kic, imper. kic ‘to bite; to sting’ (Bible+), kcem ‘to feel sting/pain’ (Eznik Ko’tači, 5th cent.), ‘to torment’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i, 12th cent.), ‘to become tired’ (Garegin k’h. Petrosean apud Ačean 1926: 100 and HAB 2: 584a).

● **ETYM** No acceptable etymology (see HAB 2: 584a; J̌ahukyan 1967: 301; 1987: 262).

Perhaps related with nk’t’em ‘to starve, faint from hunger’ (q.v.).
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Though some formal details are not clear, the group \( \text{kít-l-} \) of OIr. *kít-<gen. *kít<an-c'\) and can be compared with Arm. *kit-l- ‘a novel root based on the cuchy cuchy (Dutch kieke kieke) 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. *kit-l- and, especially, xt-t-t- (nowadays the Armenian pronounce e.g. եստուռա) when tickling the children; see s.v. *xt-tt, 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'ange xayc ɡə̄n-a-c'). See also Astuacaturean 1895: 784-230, “contains an element of sound symbolism” and can be compared with Arm. *xitil (read *xitil) and Udi xitik.

Though some formal details are not clear, the group kērt ‘point, dot’ : *k(i)te- ‘to bite, sting; to torment; pain; bitter, sharp’ : *kac ‘spark’; *kt- ‘burning desire’ : xt-t ‘to torment’; *kayt ‘vivid, energetic’ : *kayc ‘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 ‘tickles’, etc.

According to the etymology proposed by Lidén (1934a: 1-4) and reflected in Pokorny 1959: 356 (see also Jahunyan 1982: 60 and 61, representing both etymologies), Arm. *kic- ‘to bite’ derives from PIE *gei₂- : Oss. ə̄n̥ezun ‘gären’, lith. giži ‘sauer werden’, gižiš, gižiš ‘ranzig’, bitter, mürrisch’, gažtī ‘bitter werden’, etc. Neither this is totally convincing. The semantics matches ke-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 kērt ‘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’, kētī- 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. ēka ‘one’ vs. Mitanni āika-). See also s.v. *kit ‘shine’ or ‘clear’.

kin.

GDsg knoj, AblSg i knoj-ē, Isg kn-a-w, NPI kan-ay-ē-k', API kan-ay-s, GDPI kan-an-c', IPI kan-am-b-k' (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 784-790); GDPI kan-a-c (Book of Chries, etc.); Isg kn-aj-a-w, GDPI kn-aj-an-c' (John Chrysostom) ‘woman; wife’ (Bible+).

**DIAL** Ubiquitous in the dialects, everywhere (apart from Svedia gen) hypocoristic kn-ik [HAB 2: 590a].


According to Kortlandt (1975: 44 = 2003: 11; see also Klingenschmitt 1982: 148; Beebes 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)’.


*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 akan-a-veit ‘clear, limpid’, attested twice in T’ovmay Arcuruni /Ananun/ referring to abliver ‘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. Ableg y-akan-e) ‘spring, source’. Given the structural and semantic parallelism between akan-a-kit and akan-a-veit, one may interpret them as reflecting ‘limpid as a spring’.

Açaryan (HAB 2: 592-593) assumes that *kit means ‘shine, reflection’ and does not offer an etymological explanation. Jahukyan (1967: 187) suggests a connection
with Skt. śvetā- ‘white, bright’ (RV+), etc. listing *kit among words that, according to him, show an aberrant absence of palatalization of *k-, 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; Jāhukyan 1987: 510, 565]; cf. also MPers. and Parth. wcīd ‘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.


Alternatively, *kit is somehow related with Skt. keta- ‘mark, sign’, ketū- m. ‘appearance, mark’ (RV+), Arm. kayr ‘mark on marble’, etc. (see s.v. *kic- ‘to bite’)?

Uncertain.

kie‘ ‘together, united, conjoined’ (Bible+), ‘close, near’ (Cyril of Alexandria); kc’em ‘to join, unite’ (Bible+). Later: kuc‘ ‘handful, two palms joined’ (Yāsmsmawurk’; see also dial.).

●DIAL The verb is present in numerous dialects. As for kiec‘ and kuc‘, the former has been preserved in Hamšen, Larabal, Łazax, Muš, Akn, Sebastia (in Muš: kie‘k‘, a frozen plural; Larabal has both kiec‘ and *kie‘-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: 64-22. Discussing the counter-evidence for the development *dw- > Arm. -rk-, Beekes (2003: 200) considers kiec‘ < *duis-kze ‘most convincing’ and takes erkie‘-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 kiec‘ “therefore developed a more remote meaning (from ‘two together’)”.

The derivation from *g‘i-sk- [Jāhukyan 1987: 249] < PIE *gei- ‘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) Jāhukyan treats kiec‘ as an ECAuc borrowing, cf. Tindi kunths ‘knot’, etc.

kiw, o-stem ‘tree pitch, mastic, chewing-gum’, perhaps also ‘pine-tree’ (see below); ku-eni ‘pine-tree, larch’: Galen (= Gr. πῖτυς), 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 kɾēz “pitch of *kiw” in a medieval dictionary. Since kɾēz means ‘pitch’, *ku-oy kɾēz 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 *kiw, Xotorjur, Hamšen *giv ‘chewing-gum’; the tree: Hamšen govəni, Trapizon *kuəni = Turk. /sagəz alačə/ [Ač̄ařeăn 1913: 600-601; 1947: 238, 239]; Xotorjur kui ‘Abies excelsa, = Turk. /sagəz alačə/ [YušamXotorj 1964: 473a], or, more precisely, gvi [HAB 2: 597a]. In Xotorjur, the tar of this tree is called *p’is.

- ETYM Lidén (1906: 68) derived from *gieu- ‘to chew’: Slav. žvati, Pers. jāvīdan ‘to chew’, etc. Note especially Russ. živica, etc. ‘tree pitch, soft resin’ [Saradževa 1981: 162; 1986: 64] and OIr. bī ‘tree pitch’ < *gʷi̯e̯h- [Thurneysen 1937: 301-302; Pokorny 1959: 400, 482; Jahukyan 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 *gʰi̯e̯hə̯- ‘pitch’ and note: “presumably a derivative of *gʰi̯ehə̯- ‘live’ as the tree’s ‘living matter’.”

If an old *u-stem (*gʰiH-u-), note synonymous PIE *gʰet-u- ‘resin’, on which see s.v. *keč- ‘birch’. Pisani (1950: 170) derives Arm. *kiw from *gʰit-u-.

- ETYM These three words are recorded by Ač̄ařeăn (1913: 574a) as separate entries. Jahukyan (1972: 287-288; 1987: 124, 275) connects them to each other, as well as with dial. *kl-or ‘spheric, ball-shaped; round’ (q.v.), etc. and derives from *gel-, ‘clamp, clasp’. Uncertain. For a further discussion, see Bläsing 1995: 64.


knjni ‘Ulmus campestris L.’ (according to Béguinot/Diratzouyan 1912: 37\textsuperscript{North}), attested only in Hexaemeron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 144\textsuperscript{LT}, 374b). Ališan (1895: 320) also mentions knj-eni ‘elm’.

- DIAL Ač̄ařeăn (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 HayLezBrBrB 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
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*gnj/cni. It is uncertain whether Havarik' knjin ‘the core of an acorn or a walnut’ (see HayLezBrbBar 3, 2004: 120a) is related.

●ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 2: 609b) does not mention any acceptable etymology.


 On the semantics of the Ossetic form, see s.v. t’lk’i ‘maple’ (from ‘elm’?).

 A PIE *gün- would yield Arm. *ginc/j. One would expect, thus, *g(i)mcni 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 ng > nj due to the nasal, and/or by the influence of the plant-suffix -j/z, on which see 2.3.1.

 kogi, (w)ο-stem: GDsg kogw-o-γ, ISg kogw-o-ν (Bible+) [in NHB – also GDPi koge-a-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-Yakobe (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. *gwoy-io- (or *g‘huy-yo-); Skt. gavya-, gavya- ‘consisting of cattle’ (RV+), ‘coming from or belonging to a cow (as milk, curds, etc.).’, Yav. gaaioa- ‘coming from cattle, consisting of cattle’, Gr. -βοιος, see Hübchschmann 1897: 461; HAB 2: 612-613; Pokorny 1959: 483; Euler 1979: 80; cf. Bonfante 1937: 19.

 *kokoy(v) (diaI.) ‘testicles; round; eye; walnut, etc.’, kokov-ank* ‘testicles’ (LeNiws according to HAB 2: 618b); kakhv‘ ‘testicles’ (Physiologus).

 ●DIAL Xarberd, Polis, Rodost’o, Sebastian, Sučava gəgəv ‘testicles’ (pl. kəgyvə) [Aćaréan 1913: 588a]; without the final -v : gəgəv ‘testicles’ (Nor Naxijewan), ‘eye’ and ‘walnut’ (Akn), ‘fruit’ (Sivri-Hisar), ‘cheese’ (T‘iflis), ‘round’ (Xarberd) [HAB 2: 618b]. Ačaréan (HAB, ibid.) points out that the meaning ‘round’ is the original one, and for the semantic development compares with kakał and plor.

 The meaning ‘walnut’ is also found in: Šatax kək‘yov [M. Muradyan 1962: 213a], Moks kək‘ov [Orbeli 2002: 273].

 ●ETYM Ačaréan (HAB 2: 618b) considers the resemblance with Ital. coglioni ‘testicles’ (NHB) as accidental and leaves the origin of kokoy open.

 One may compare with Arm. an-koy-z and Pers. gəz ‘walnut’, interpreting them as *gouz- = *gou- + -z “plant-suffix” (on the latter, see 2.3.1). See also *kəč-. With reduplication: *go-gou- > kokov. For the semantic field (cf. also Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 11-12Nɔ) and reduplication, see s.v. *kakal(ay) (diaI.) ‘walnut; testicle’ and below.
If the absence of the final -v in dial. ggor is not due to loss, one may treat koko-va 'testicles' as from *koko 'round; walnut, etc.' with the dual suffix *-vi, on which see the following.

The form kôkôv 'testicles' (attested in Physiologus) may have resulted from contamination with kakôl 'walnut; testicles' (q.v.). Alternatively: *koko- (cf. kakôl) + dual *-vi > *koko(ℓ)vi-. Note also kl-or 'round'. For the semantics cf. Pahl., NPers. gond 'testicle', Xurâsâni 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. gogôl f. 'acorn; small and round object'.

See also s.vv. kakôl, kâtin.

kôkôv-an-k', a-stem: IPl kôkîvan-a-w-k' 'boastful/vainglorious words' (John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria). Verbal kôkôv-têl is found in Bargirk' hayoc', glossed as Coxabanel 'to speak eloquently' [Amalyan 1975: 169].

**ETYM** No etymological attempt is recorded in HAB 2: 618b. The comparison with Skt. śvâvatì 'to swell, become strong' [Jahukyan 1967: 188] must be given up.

I propose to treat kôkôv-as a reduplication of *kôv- which can be connected with Skt. gav- 'to call, invoke, praise' (RV+), intensive jógu- 'to call, to announce', jógu- 'singing loudly, singing songs of praise' (RV), Germ. *kawjan 'to call', OCS gôvor 'noise, shout, rumour, murmur', Russ. gôvor 'sound of voices, talk', etc., perhaps also Gr. γοάω 'to groan, weep', γόης, -ης m. 'sorcerer'. For the structure, see 2.3.2.

kôkôrd, GDSg kôkôrd-i (Job 20.13, see Cox 2006: 148) 'larynx, throat' (Bible+).

**ETYM** See s.v. kâr- 'to eat' < 'to swallow, devour'.

do, i-stem 'rib; side (of a mountain, etc.)' (Bible+), 'spouse' (Ephrem, Vardan Arewelei, etc.); a-stem (once in the Bible: GDPI kôb-a-c', see NHB 1: 1111a); later o-stem: and kôb-on in Zak'aria Kat'olikos (9th cent.); *kôn : IPI kolâmbk' (or kolmâmbk') in Ezekiel 34.21, API kolûn-s in Zak'aria Kat'olikos (9th cent.); also seen in derivatives, e.g. an-kôn 'bed'; kolmân, an-stem: GDSg kolman, AblSg kolman-ê, NPI kolman-k', GDPI kolman-c', etc. 'side, region' (Bible+), 'rib-bone' (Ephrem).

In the Bible, kol occurs always in plural (apart from Genesis 2.22): nom. kol-k', acc. kol-s, gen.dat. kol-i-c', instr. kol-i-w-k' [Astuacaturean 1895: 795c]. Renders Gr. πίξπαρ 'rib, side'. Here are some of the Biblical attestations.

In Genesis 2.21 (Zeyt'yunyan 1985: 154): ew ar mi i kolic 'nora ew elic' and ayn marmin : καὶ δίπλας μὲν τῶν πλευρῶν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνεπλήρωσαν σάρκα ἄντ' αὐτῆς "and took one of his ribs and closed/filled up its place with flesh".

In Ezekiel 34.21: kolâmbk' (or kolmâmbk') ew usovk 'jervik' : ὕπι ταῖς πλευραῖς καὶ ταῖς ὀρέχων ὑπὸ "with your ribs/sides and shoulders".

For kol 'rib, side': an-kôn 'bed' cf. the passage from Proverbs 22.27: zankolins, or and kolvik 'k ovik kave'en : τὸ στρώμα τὸ ὑπὸ ταῖς πλευραῖς σον "that bed (that is) under your ribs/sides".

**DIAL** kol'k') is widespread in the dialects, while ankôn and kolmân are present in a few of them [HAB 1: 201a; 2: 621a, 622b]. Jula kol means both 'rib' and 'side' [Açaferan 1940: 370b; HAB 2: 622b].
Some forms of an Kodín are without the prefix an-: Karin golínk', Axal'kxa g'žîn', Tiflis golónk'; Van g'žênk'-. N. Simonyan (1979: 242-243) takes these to be "root" (armatakan) forms as opposed with the classical one. As is demonstrated already by Açaïyan (1952: 64), however, the initial voiced g- clearly indicates that these forms derive from *angolin-k', with regular voicing -nk > -ng, through the loss of the prefix.

Georgian logini ‘bed’ is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 1: 201], although Açaïyan does not specify the details. If this is true, the Georgian form should be derived from *golin through metathesized *login. Remarkably, such a metathesis is indeed seen in Zeyt'ün (Cilicia) utungan ‘bed-blanket’ (see Açaïyan 2003: 137, 298). The borrowing must have taken place at an old stage anterior to the development *l > Arm. l.

● ETYM Meillet (1911-12c: 294) connects kol(mn) with Toch. kalymi ‘direction’. This is accepted in HAB 2: 621a; Jahukyan 1987: 126, 169. However, Toch. A käylme, 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 kolmn is compared with Gr. κλίμα in NHB 1: 1112b).

Olsen (1999: 91-92, 147, 506) does not mention Meillet’s etymology and relates kol/kolmn with kofr ‘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 kof in relation with *i/r- paradigm, see s.v. kofr.

Patrubány (StugHetaz 1908: 153) derives kof from PIE *gol-: Gr. γολός ‘hole’, Lith. guolís ‘den, lair, (coll.) bed’, etc. See s.v. kalal ‘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: kol ‘rib, side’ > (an)kohnim ‘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.).

kofr, no attestations are cited for GDPI koler-c’ and koler-a-c’ [NHB 1: 1113c]; the only attested form (apart from NSg kofr) is API koler-s in Leviticus 23:40, “Yâlag vardavarín xorhdroy” attributed to Movsês Xorenac’i [MovsxorenMaten 1865: 330[i] and Vardan Arewelec’i (13th cent.) ‘branch’.

In Leviticus 23:40: koler sarwaweac’ : κάλλυνϑρα φοινίκων “branches of palm trees” Here kofr renders, thus, Gr. κάλλυνθρον ‘sweeper, duster made of palm-leaves’ (cf. κάλλυνθρον ‘broom, brush’). Astuacaturean (1895: 795c) gives the entry as koler which is not correct. API koler-s is regular for NSG kofr.

In Hexaemeron, homily 5 (K. Muradyan 1984: 145[16]): armastk’ ew urk’, kofr ew terew, xawaraci ew catlik, <...> : “roots and branches, kofr and leaf, xawaraci and blossom, <...>“. Here, ur’ and xawaraci render Gr. κλήματις ‘vine-branch; branch’ and βιοστάτος ‘offshoot’, respectively, and kofr has no Greek match [K. Muradyan 1984: 374-377].

● ETYM Meillet (1900b: 185) connected with Slavic *goleje (cf. Russ. gol’já ‘twig’, Sln. goljé ‘twigs without leaves’, etc.) assuming heteroclitic *i/r stem from earlier
*koč-

*r/n, cf. Skt. nákti- vs. Gr. νικτός, 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; Jähkuyan 1987: 126. In EtimSlovSlavJaz 7, 1980: 18, the Slavic is derived from *gohi *naked*, and the Armenian word is not mentioned.

It has been assumed that the Armenian and Slavic words are related with Arm. koš ‘rib, side’ [Olsen 1999: 147], q.v. The i-stem of koš seems to corroborate Meillet’s *-i/-r-.

It is uncertain whether there is any relation with Zaza kölī ‘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(-l) ‘beam, door-post, trunk of a tree’ (Bible+), koč-ak ‘button’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i; en in the Bible) [HAB 2: 624-626, 627-628].


ETYM: Pedersen (1906: 398, 400 = 1982: 176, 178) derives from the PIE word for ‘two’ restoring *dwoukā-, next to *dwoūk- > kēs ‘half’. This etymology is not accepted by Meillet (1908/09: 353) and Açarýan (HAB 2: 630b). Kortlandt (1989: 2.1.22.1 and 2.2.6.1).

koys, a-stem ‘side’ (Bible+).

DIAL: Jula kus (cf. nes-kus < ners koys) ‘inside’, Łarabal kūs, Samaxi gūs, Łzlar gus (cf. min gūs ‘aside’); also in T’iflis, only in a proverb [HAB 2: 630b].

According to Açarýan (HAB), Łarabal kūs is found only in the following pronouns: es-kūs ‘this side’ (< ays koys), en-gūs ‘that side’ (-nk- > -ng-), maš-kūs ‘inside’ (*mēǰ-koys : -jk- > -sk’-). Several illustrations from folklore show, however, that kūs does exist independently; cf. bales č’ors kyūsə vart’a “in the four sides of my garden there is rose” [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 15N26]. Other attestations: č’ork’ kyūsə “the four sides” (op. cit. 15N29, 58N305), č’ors kyūsən “from the four sides” (427bN372), sarin kyūsə “at the side of the mountain” (92N27), en kyūsīum “at that side” (401bN25).


Łarabal and Şalax-Xcaberd kūs is recorded also by Dav’tyan (1966: 399).

ETYM: Pedersen (1906: 398, 400 = 1982: 176, 178) derives from the PIE word for ‘two’ restoring *dwoukā-, next to *dwoūk- > kēs ‘half’. This etymology is not accepted by Meillet (1908/09: 353) and Açarýan (HAB 2: 630b). Kortlandt (1989: 2.1.22.1 and 2.2.6.1).
48, 50 = 2003: 92, 95) is more positive and takes the word as yet another case reflecting the development *duh-* > Arm. k- (on this, see 2.1.22.6).

However, koyṣ is an Iranian borrowing, cf. Parth. kws [kōṣ] ‘district, region, countryside’ (see Nyberg 1974: 121b; Boyce 1977: 53), Sogd. kws ‘side’, etc.; see HAB 2: 630b (although Ačaryan does not accept it); Benveniste 1945: 73-74; Russell 1980: 107 (= 2004: 1); Jāhukyan 1987: 574 (though not included into the list of Iranian loans); 1995: 184; Hovhannisyan 1988: 132; 1990: 244-245, 266c; Olsen 1999: 888; Viredaz 2003: 6422. See also s.v. kēš ‘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 *gʷot-je-, connecting with PGerm. *kweþan ‘to say, speak, call, name’: Goth. ājan, OIc. kveða, OE kweþan, etc. He (op. cit. 69) is sceptical about the appurtenance of Skt. gādati ‘to speak articulately, say, relate, tell’ < *gad-. Meillet (1936: 108; 1950: 110) accepts the connection and posits a *je-present: *gʷot-je- > koč’em (see 2.1.22.1 and 2.2.6.1).

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 635) rejects the etymology and treats Arm. koč’em as an onomatopoeic word comprising the elements k- and -č’, cf. kanč’, ka(r)kač’, etc. However, the onomatopoeic character of a word should not automatically exclude the possibility of external comparison.


The noun koč’ is “eine postverbale Bildung” (Lidén 1906: 68).

kostl ‘twigs on which bird-lime is smeared to entangle birds’ (Lex.), MidArm. ‘cover of a book’ (MijHayBarf 1, 1987: 406b).

DIAL. On Ararat kɔstl and vɔstl [HAB 2: 639a] see s.v. ost ‘branch’.

ETYM Usually connected to ostl ‘branch’ (q.v.), although there is no consensus on the initial k- (for different views, see HAB 2: 639a; Jāhukyan 1967: 272; Ašayan 1974: 87-88; Saradževa 1986: 124). One may think of ORuss. kostl’ (костл) ‘rod, stick or spike with a curved edge’, Russ. ‘rod, stick’, dial. ‘stalk of sorrel with raceme’, Sl. kostlja (Celtis australis; whip-handle made of this tree’, etc. (for the forms, see EtimSlovSlavJaz 11, 1984: 167), though the nature of relationship is not quite clear. Further, see s.v. kɔstl-i ‘aquifolium (holly), ilex (holm-oak)’.

kostli ‘aquifolium (holly), ilex (holm-oak)’, only in Step’anos Rošk’a, 17-18 cent. (see Alšan 1895: 330; HAB 2: 639a).

ETYM No etymology in HAB 2: 639a.

This tree-name can be interpreted as composed of kostl ‘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. вишня ‘cherry’ and OHG višna ‘black cherry’ beside Gr. ἰξός ‘mistletoe; bird-lime prepared from it; sticky substance’ and Lat. viscum ‘mistletoe; bird-lime’ (see Pokorny 1959: 1134; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 644 = 1995: 555; P. Friedrich apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 384a). Note also синь ‘sticky substance’ vs. синь ‘sorb, service-berry’ (q.v.).

Arm. kostli is reminiscent of Slн. kostilja ‘Celtis australis; whip-handle made of this tree’, etc. (see s.v. kost ‘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 kalamax(i), see s.vv. and 3.11.

cov, *u-stem: GDPl ков- ‘cow’ (Bible+).

*ETYM Since long, connected with Skт. гаkh, acc. гам, DSG гоñe, GPI гавёт/gёнам, etc. ‘cow, bull’ (RV+), Gr. βόœës f.m., AccSg βων, GSG βερός ‘bovid, cow, bull, ox’, Lat. бœс, gen. bovis (a loan from an Italic language, see Schrijver 1991: 447), Latv. гоњ ‘cow’, OCS гоњ-го, 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 *gʷeh3 seen in Gr. βόσκω ‘to graze’, βωτόν ‘head of cattle’; thus: nom. *gʷeh3-u-s, gen. *gʷh3-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 *gʷh3-eu-explains Skт. гв-V-, Gr. фл-, etc., as well as Arm. ков: ког-i (q.v.).

The PArm. paradigm may have been: nom. *квu, obl. *кв- > *ког-. The shortening of the vowel of *квu to -o- is perhaps an inner-Armenian development (note the absence of CIArm. words ending in -uv), unless one assumes an influence from obl. *ков-.

covadiac’ (Leviticus 11.30), kovidiac’ (Commentary on Leviticus), ‘a kind of lizard’; according to NHB 1: 1117b: = дöдöш, etc. ‘toad’.

In Leviticus 11.30, kovadiac’ and мо/дэз render Gr. καλαβώτης ‘spotted lizard, gecko’ and σαύρα f. ‘lizard’ (see Wevers 1997: 154), respectively.

In later literature (Nonnus, Galen) and dialects replaced by ков(ac)cuc ‘a kind of lizard’, composed of ков ‘cow’ and cuc ‘sucking’. In Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (15th cent.), ковccuc (with an epenthetic -r-), as equivalent to Turk. к‘арт’анк’алай and Pers. сöсмар (see Basmajean 1926: 511; Nr 3035). See below, on dialects.

*DIAL In dialects, replaced by ков(ac)cuc (see above): Axalce’xa and Nikomidia-region *кв-ccuc, Muś *кв-cc-uk, Arabkir *корсuc ‘a large greenish lizard, toad’; Karin ‘a kind of harmful animal’ [Açareane 1913: 596a], Sasun гоњj ‘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 Elia Mušelyan Karneč’i (Karin / Xotorj): k‘арт’анк’араз yёшіл · ковccuc, сalamandr [Č’ugaszyan 1986: 85Nє].

According to Bläsing (1992: 50), Turkish dialect of Hamśen гоњвлç ‘a kind of salamander’ is borrowed from WArm. говajuj. A corresponding form in Arm.
Hamšen, namely *gyjud ‘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 Xotorǰur: *kopec ‘green lizard’ [YušamXotor 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 gɔvjuj ‘a big lizard’ [Bahranyan 1960: 125a]. For this form, Bahranyan (ibid.) records also a second meaning described as follows: *mi karič, kanač moxes “a scorpion, green lizard”. If this is reliable, Dersim gɔvjuj 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 *čiš-xranj ‘a poisonous insect’ (see 3.5.2.5). The description seems to corroborate the meaning ‘toad’. See also Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan FW 2003 Łarabał, on jumping kaŋnak’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 *korcuc, if reliable, derives from *kovrcuc with loss of -v-.

The form *kov-r-cuc is found, thus, in a small group of adjacent dialects: Sebastia, Partizak (migrated from the province of Sebastia beg. 17th cent., see Tēr-Yakobeian 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. zāba ‘toad’, etc. is uncertain. Compare e.g. XuratorPers. boččos (= preverb bi + čōš- ‘Sauger’) ‘eine Art Eidechse, die nach dem Volksglauben nachts in die Hürden schleicht und den Ziegen am Euter saugt’; see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 45-46, mentioning the Sanskrit and 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 *gou-ḏeh-eh-ž- (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. *kor, with final -r, in several dialects [HAB 2: 645a].
ETYM Ačaṙyan (HAB 2: 574a, 644-645) connects with keṙ ‘curved, crooked’ (q.v.) rejecting all the external comparisons, including that with Gr. γύρος ‘round, curved’, γῦρος m. ‘rounding, circle’. One is more positive about the latter comparison, for Armenian positing *gou-e/oro- [Pokorny 1959: 397; Jahukyan 1987: 126, 169] or *gouh₁-ro- [Olsen 1999: 199]. For *gouh₁-ro- > PArm. *kouro- > *ko(w)oro- > kor, see 2.1.33.1.

Alayan (1967; 1974: 105-106) derives keṙ, kor and dial. koṙ from QIE *ger-s- (cf. OHG kresan ‘to creep, crawl’, etc.; for the root, see s.v. kart’ ‘fish-hook’). Jahukyan (1987: 125) accepts this etymology of keṙ and *koṙ, 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’, kart’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.). Ačaṙyan (HAB 2: 643b) cites also Fables by Vardan Aygeke’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 MijḤayBal 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. Vardanian 1990: 193, § 1061.

In a medieval riddle [Mnac’akanyan 1980: 261] written by Nersēs Šnorhal’t (12th cent., Cilicia), the Northern cold wind parxor is said to bite the eye of the man as a kor (xaют’ ḗ 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 (mž ɫuk)”a little mosquito”. In fact, I think, this is our word for ‘scorpion’.

The edition of Anania Širakac’i cited by Ačaṙyan is not available to me. I find kor, GDSg kor-i ‘a constellation’ in A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 3291,0, 3301,2. 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 – 3231,3, 3301,8f; Kor – 3291,10 ) are mentioned in the same place of the list of the zodiacal constellations, between Kšiṙ ‘Libra’ and Akhenawor ‘Sagittarius, Archer’. Note especially the occurrences of Kor and Karič in almost neighbouring sentences, 3301,2, 3301,8, respectively. Given the parallel occurrences of Kor and Karič in the same text, Alayan (1986: 90) disagrees with Ačaṙyan’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, Hačan, Akn Arabkir, Marala, etc. Ačaṙyan (HAB 2: 644a) especially calls attention to Č’arsanc’ak’ goṙ’, not commenting upon it. Note that in Dersim one finds both gor ‘scorpion’ and gorf ‘scorpion’ (see Bahramyan 1960: 87b, 125a).
Perhaps cf. also Urmia, Salmast kormžik, rendered as šanačanč ‘bumble-bee, dog-fly’ and mžeł ‘a small mosquito’ [GwUrSalm 2, 1898: 96], which is apparently composed of kor ‘*biting insect’ and mže-ik, the latter being etymologically identical with mže- 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 ka-dialects, from Karin/Širak and surroundings (Anania Širakac’i, etc.) to Cilicia (Nersē Šnorhal, Varden 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 Larabah below).


Acaryan (HAB 2: 551ab) rejects the connection of kor ‘scorpion’ with karič ‘scorpion’ (Larabal also ‘crayfish’), since the latter must be connected with Gr. καρίς, -ίδος ‘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. καρίς, -ίδος ‘Crustacea’, which also displays forms with a labial vowel, namely korpič, koric (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. korpič/korpič has not been borrowed from (or contaminated from) Arm. kor, perhaps *kor-u- (if GDSg kor-u is old).

---

**kord**. A-stem (only later; AblSG i kordov) ‘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; Jahukyan 1987: 598).

- **DIAL** Preserved in Van, Moks (see also Orbeli 2002: 272: verbal kurt’il, kurt’ vüril), Muš, Xarberd, Salmast, Lori, Gajjak, etc., basically meaning ‘unploughed, hard (ground); hard’ [HAB 2: 646b]; also in Kotorj (Yušam Xotor 1964: 472).

- **ETYM** Acaryan (HAB 2: 646) rejects all the etymological attempts including the comparison with Germ. hart, etc. and the place-name Korduk’ (Tervišyan). Jahukyan (1985a: 367; 1987: 432, 598; 1990: 68.), albeit with hesitation, treats Arm. kord and its Kartvelian correspondents as borrowed from Urart. guld(e)n ‘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 Alternatively, one may derive kord from *g’ord-: cf. Lith. gądas m. ‘fence, enclosure, (sheep’s) pen’, OCS grad m. ‘stronghold, town, garden’, etc.; cf. also *g’or-t-: Gr. χύπτος
In view of the vocalism it is hard to relate korč with MPers. 'gyrd 'unbearbeitet, unbestellt (Land)', ManParth. 'gyrd 'verlassen, vernachlässigt, verwildert' (on which, see Colditz 1987: 281). Similarly uncertain is korč (hapax; see HAB 2: 647-648).

korč 'gryphon, vulture'.

Renders Gr. γρύψ, -γρῡπός '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').

The derivation from korč 'curved' is worth of consideration. Compare also korč 'curved, crooked, rough' (Grammarians), and *korč 'scorpion', q.v. For the semantic shift 'curved, bent' > 'vulture' (i.e. 'having a curved beak, hook-beaked') cf. Gr. γρύψ, -γρῡπός 'gryphon, vulture': 'anchor', see s.v. angļ 'vulture'.

Olsen (1999: 958) mentions korč in her list of words of unknown origin.

krit'-un-k' (pl.), gen. krit'-an-c' '(anatom.) back’ in Zeno (transl. into Armenian prob. in 6-7th cent.), Anania Širak’aci (7th cent.), etc.; dial. *krit'n-il “to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support’.

Ačaryan (HAB 2: 669b) cites only NPl krit'-un-k’ in “Tōnakan matean, and GDPl krit'-an-c’ in Anania Širak’aci (7th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329].

Further attestations of NPl krit'-un-k’ are found in Zeno [Xač’ikyan 1949: 84a], rendered as ‘спина’ by Arewšatyan (1956: 325), and in “Vasn ǝnt’ac’ic’ aregakan” (“On the course of the sun”) by Anania Širak’aci [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 316].

In all the attestations from Zeno and Širak’aci, krit’unk’ is mentioned as the body part associated with the constellation Kše/iṙ’ Libra’.

Dial Akn, Polis (according to Amatuni 1912: 372b, also Ararat and Nor Naxijewan) krit’n-il “to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support”, Ararat knt’n-il [HAB 2: 669b].

ETYM Ačaryan (HAB 2: 669b) posits an unattested nom. *krit’n or *kurt’n and offers no etymology.

Next to krit’nel, Amatuni (1912: 372b) cites also Lori kɛrɛl and points out that the root of krit’nel seems to be identical with kuɛn ‘back’ (q.v.). This suggestion, not mentioned by Ačaryan, is plausible. Alayan (1974: 106-107), independently, offers practically the same explanation. He posits *kuɛ-t’-n < *görpta, connecting with ker, koɛ ‘crooked’, kart’ ‘fish-hook’, etc. (q.v.). Alayan’s *görpta is not convincing. More probably, *kuɛ-t’: krit’unk’ is directly comparable with kuɛn ‘back’, with suffixal element -t’en, on which see 2.3.1.

m. ‘enclosed place; farmyard, in which the cattle were kept; pastureage; fodder’, Lat. hortus m. ‘garden; (pl.) pleasure-grounds’, Osc. hūrɛz, acc. hūrɛt’um ‘lucus, Hain’ (< ‘Einziehung’), etc. The basic meaning of the Armenian would be, then, ‘(enclosed) pasture-land, pen, etc.’. The form *g’ord– might give *kord- through Grassmann’s Law (see 2.1.24.1).
křnuk

kř-ki-al 'to croak (said of birds, particularly crows, as well as of frogs, snakes, buffalos, etc.)' in MidArm. [MijHayBar 1, 1987: 413b], widespread in the dialects [Ačarėan 1913: 613b]; kř-č- 'to croak, shriek (said of cranes, crows, and other birds)' in Agat'angelas, Philo, etc.; dial. Ľarabal křč- 'krič- al 'id.', etc. [HAB 2: 670]; kř-ne- 'to shriek, cry, etc.' (Bible+), Muš, Alaškert krińę - '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. křnuk 'crane'.

křnuk 'crane' (Hexaemeron, Yovhannēs Erznkac'i); dictionaries have also křnkn, gen. křnk'an, both without attestations. MidArm. křęk, křnük' (Vardan Aygekc'i, see MijHayBar 1, 1987: 414a).

For attestations and a philological discussion, see Greppin 1978: 100-103.

DIAŁ Axalč'xa křńk', Muš, Alaškert, Salmast körung, Ti'lıfs krońg, Van, Moks krońg', Ozim krońk', Xarberd, Nor Naxijewan, Rodost'o grńng. In Nor Naxijewan the word refers to a different bird. Interesting is Ararat krlńong [HAB 2: 673b].

ETYM Since NHB 1: 1128c, linked with Gr. γίπανος m., Lat. grās m., and other forms continuing the PIE word for 'crane': OHG krani/uh m., Lith. gėrvė, Latv. dzērve 'crane', ORuss. žeravļu, 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. grās, GŚg grūs f. 'crane' is based on *grh₂-u- metathesized to *gruh₂- [Schrijver 1991: 246].

QIE *geru-n-g, *gurūn-g, and similar proto-forms have been assumed for Armenian křnuk (see references above). According to Kortlandt (1985b: 10-11; 1986: 42 = 2003: 58-59, 71), křnuk 'crane' may be derived from the metathesized form of AccSg *grHu姆 (cf. OHG krani/uh 'id.'), with oralization of the laryngeal as in juka 'fish' and mukn 'mouse'; see s.v. 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. γίπανος rather than with Lat. grās. Olsen (1989a: 18) reconstructs *grē/ōrōn- (= *gē/orhōn-) explaining the -i- by a neighbouring laryngeal. Ravnaš (1991: 158, cf. 88.1) 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-k- (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. krāt- m. 'Kranich, Wanderkranič', which is “sicher lautnachahmend” [Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 413], and Pahl. kalang 'crane' [MacKenzie 1971: 52]. On the other hand, Jáhukyan (1980, 2: 103) compares Arm. křnuk with Akkad. kurakkī 'a kind of bird'. One may also think of a ‘broken reduplication’ seen e.g. in Arm. ampro-p ‘thunder’ (q.v.) from PIE *ŋbʰ-ro-: Skt. abhrā- 'thunder-cloud, rain-cloud', YAv. aflra- 'rain-cloud', Lat. imber 'shower', etc.

See also s.v. grē or grey 'crane'.
**ktlim**, spelled also as *ktlm*- ‘to burn with furious desire’ (John Chrysostom, several times), *kt-an-k’* ‘burning desire’ (GDP! *kt-an-a-e*, in Book of Chries), *kt-uoc’k’* ‘id.’ (Severian of Gabala).

● **ETYM** Ačaryan (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, Lazar 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. *gual* ‘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; J̌ahukyan 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’: *jválana- m. ‘fire’, jūr- f. ‘glow, glowing fire’, *jvala* ‘coal’ [Lubotsky 1988: 38; 1992: 262-263], Pers. *zuār* [Cheung 2002: 167] and, therefore, presuppose an initial *ĝ-, which would yield Arm. c- (also see s.vv. *acul* ‘coal’).

More probably, *krak* is an Iranian loan, cf. Pers. *kūra* ‘furnace, fire-place’, etc. [Eilers 1974: 317-318, cf. 321; Ivanov 1976: 815]; 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 Xotor *ǰur* *k'urak’* ‘a small hearth of stone, buried in the ground’, recorded by Ačaryan s.v. *k'uray* [HAB 4: 595b], as well as in YušamXotor 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'onir* (see Lisch’yan 1969: 104). Note also Georg. *ḳera-, Ḷira-, Ḷeraq-* ‘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/Lazinyan 1985: 528-544; Russ. transl. 1988: 225): *and kangał – ew krkin glorim* “having hardly stood up on my feet, I fall down again” (“я падаю вновь”). In his English translation, Khachaturoonian (2001: 338) omitted the word ‘again’.

● **DIAL** Ararat *krkin anel, Larabal 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 *duo-* ‘two’ was *ku* which subsequently took over the initial er- of *erek’* ‘three’ (see s.v. *erek* ‘two’), Bugge (1890: 121; 1892: 457; cf. 1889: 42) reconstructs *kir* < *didente-s* in *erik* ‘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 erkin after syncope”. Discussing the counter-evidence for the development *dv- > Arm. -rk-, Beeckes (2003: 200) considers krkin “quite convincing” noting that *kir is also found in erkin ‘second’. Others start with a sound change *dv- > 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; Jahukyan 1974: 526]. For other references and a discussion, see HAB 2: 67; Schmitt 1972/74: 25; Szemerényi 1985: 791-792; Leroy 1986: 67, Kortlandt 2003: 92-93, 95. Viredaz (2005: 89) 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 > erkin suggesting the following scenario: *dwi-dwi(s)-(i)no- > *(V)rkrkino- > (dissimil.) krkin. Harkness (1996: 12) points out that this dissimilation “would be completely unremarkable”. Viredaz (2003: 64) 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: 64]. 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; (dialect.) heel’, Russ. pjata ‘heel’: at-pent ‘again’, etc. (see Vasmer, s.v. onóms). Compare also the dialectal meaning ‘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; Jahukyan 1998: 22; Olsen 1999: 404-405, 502) or, as suggested by Olsen (1999: 502), it is the starting point of the suffix.

On erkin ‘second’, etc., see also s.v. erk- ‘three’. Moks krkin вторично, во второй раз (‘for the second time’) [M. Muradyan 1982: 137; Orbeli 2002: 225] seems remarkable. It may represent the unattested *erk-kin > *erk- > (reshaped after erku ‘two’) *erku-in. In the same dialect one also finds irik’in for ‘the third time’ [M. Muradyan 1982: 137], apparently from er-kin ‘threefold, triple, three times’ (Bible+). Orbeli (2002: 236) has irik’ir ‘а третий раз instead, with a final -r. If not a misprint, irik’ir may go back to *erek’-ir, which can be interpreted as reshaped after ClArm. er-ir ‘third; for the third time’ (Bible+) or analagical after erkin ‘second’ (Dionisyus 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 kran, NPl krunk’, GDPL krkanc’) ‘heel’ (Bible+). Spelled also as kruk and krunk(n).

DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly as *kruk, with anticipation of the nasal; the older, non-anticipated form krukn seems to have been preserved in Larabal, which, alongside with kiryna and kireng (for more variants, see Davt’yan 1966: 404), has also kir’na [HAB 2: 684a]; note also Akn pl. goray-vi (ibid.), a dual form. Xarberd (Berri) gorangel means ‘to turn back on one’s heel’ [Bahramyan 1960: 123a].
Composed of *kur and -ukn. The root is compared with Gr. γύρος ‘round, curved’, γῦρος m. ‘rounding, circle’; Arm. կուր ‘back’ (q.v.), etc., although the etymological details are not clear, see HAB 2: 684a (with literature); Alayan 1974: 88-91, 102-108; Jāhuksyan 1987: 126, 169; Olsen 1999: 208.

According to Ačaṙyan (HAB 2: 684b), Laz կուռ ‘heel’, borrowed from Armenian, shows that the root of կռուն is *kur. In view of Urart. qur and Hurrian ukr ‘foot’, which, according to Diakonoff/Starostin (1986: 57), are connected with Proto-East-Caucasian *kwirV (apart from Laz կուռ, here represented with the meaning ‘foot, hoof’, cf. also Archi կվիր ‘animal’s foot’, etc.), the relationship between the Armenian and Laz words seems to be deeper, however.

See also s.v. արմուկ ‘elbow’.

*kul-: klun (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-kɫ-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].

ETYM Since long, connected with Lat. gula ‘gullet, throat’, Slav. *glъtъ ‘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 *gwel-: *gwul-, cf. Lat. gula (see HAB, ibid.; Klingenschmitt 1982: 211-212: “lautsymbolische Wort schöpfung”); zero-grade (Godel 1975: 126; Jāhuksyan 1982: 179, 215); ənd-kul- ‘to swallow’ (late attested), and variously in the dialects.

ETYM Since long, connected with Lat. gula ‘gullet, throat’, Slav. *glъtъ ‘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 *gwel-: *gwul-, cf. Lat. gula (see HAB, ibid.; Klingenschmitt 1982: 211-212: “lautsymbolische Wort schöpfung”); zero-grade (Godel 1975: 126; Jāhuksyan 1982: 179, 215); ənd-kul- ‘to swallow’ (late attested), and variously in the dialects.

The appurtenance of ənklem ‘to sink’ is disputed; see Jāhuksyan 1987: 124, 167 (with references and a discussion). Klingenschmitt (1982: 211) accepts the connection with *kul- ‘to swallow’ and assumes a denominative to *ənd-kul-mo- ‘hinunter verschlungen, untergetaucht’.

kul. GSG kli or kloy 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.


In Mxit’ar Aparanc’i (15th cent.) apud NHB 1: 1122c, kul refers to the cord of a fish-hook: kul kart’in.
The oldest attestation of the word is in the compound erek'-kul or erek'-kl-i, in Ecclesiastes 4.12: arians erek kul (vars. erek'-kl-i; erek'-kin) oč' valvaki szesc'i: "a threefold cord is not quickly broken". Arm. erek'-kul could actually mean 'consisting of' three threads', and arians erek'kul can be understood as "a three-threaded cord". Nersês Lambronac'i (12th cent.) seems to have understood it the same way since he rephrases the passage as follows (NHB 1: 1122c): zayspisı saramaneal erek' kuls oč' karë valvaki szel "(one) cannot break such plaited threads quickly".

Combining this with the dialectal evidence (see below) I conclude that the basic meaning of the word is 'braid/plited' cord, string, lace, thread' rather than 'fold, ply'.

DIAI In dialects mainly refers to 'lace of foot-wear' (Larabal) or 'a tie/cord of plough (samit p'ok)'; also Larabal kol-an 'a leather strap, thong (to tie the yoke to the plough or wagon)' [Dav'tyan 1966: 401], Ararat, Bulanax, Xian kiel 'to fold the cord', etc. [Ačađean 1913: 578b, 603b; HAB 2: 657a; HayLezBrbBar 3, 2002: 109, 206a].

V. Arak'elayan (1979: 43-44) argues that both in the literature and the dialects kul basically refers to 'rope, cord' rather than 'fold, twisting, plait'.


Since the basic meaning of kul seems to be 'rope, cord, string, etc.' (see above, also V. Arak'elayan 1979: 43-44), and in view of the resemblance with k'ut 'plaited' thread (Bible+); dial. also 'cord; lace', I consider the derivation of kul from *duoplo- as improbable. The connection between kul 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', erkiw 'fear', and 2.1.22.6.

*kumb* ‘emboss (of a shield)’: kmb-eay ‘embossed (shield)’ (John Chrysostom); oski-kmb-e in Pawstos Buzand 5.32 (1883=1984: 196L12; transl. Garsoian 1989: 214); oskimbē vahanōk 'n “with gold-embossed shields”; cf. oskembeay vahanōk in the letter from Bishop Giwt (5th cent.) to Vae'ē (king of Atuank') apud Movsēs Kafankatuac'i 1.11 [V. Arak'elayan 1983: 21L14]. The compound is also attested in John Chrysostom; in published editions: IPl oski gmb-ē-i-w-k', GDPl oski gmb-ē-i-c'. Further: kmbravor or kmravor, perhaps for *kmb-avor ‘embossed (shield)’ in Mxit'ar Goš (Law Code, 12th cent.), Snbat Sparapet (Law Code, 13th cent.).

DIAI Preserved only in Bulanax gimb ‘hump on the neck/back of people and especially of an ox or buffallo’ (S. Movsisyan, p.c. apud HAB 2: 659a). That in this dialect a word has no “full” vowel is not uncommon; cf. šīsk 'from šīl-k ’neck’ (q.v.).

If reliable, the reading variant in g- (John Chrysostom, see above) can be compared to the Bulanax form. An influence of gmbet’ ‘cupula’ (Hexaemeron, etc., widespread in the dialects; Iranian loan) is possible, too.
kuṙ


One wonders whether we are dealing with a word of substratum origin, which can also be compared with Gr. κύβη ‘head-foremost, tumbling; crown of a helmet’, next to κύμβη ‘head’, etc. (cf. Furnée 1972: 176, 284-285; de Vaan 1999: 11).

kuṙ, GDSg kṙan ‘(anatom.) back; side’ (Canon Law, John Chrysostom, etc.), ‘joint between the shoulder and arm’ (Grigor Tat’ewac’i); dial. also ‘arm’, ‘pelvis’, etc.


ETYM If the basic meaning is ‘curved/bending body-part’, the word may be related (see Aɫayan 1974: 88-91, 102-108) with kor ‘curved, crooked’, kṙ-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 hɔ and Van-group xá [HAB 3: 3a].

ETYM Onomatopoeic word. See s.v. ayo ‘yes’.

hamr, GDPi 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-: μυρατός, μυροφόρος.

On the other hand, cf. Pahl. xämös ‘silent’ (see MacKenzie 1971: 93).

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; Ačārı́ Anjın 3, 1946: 31-36; Ermenyan 1963: 62a; Adontz 1970 passim; Garsoyan 1989: 379, 480-481; Hewsen 1992: 187, 1999: 946.


The theory on the relation between Hay-k’ and Hajaša- (N. Martirosyan 1972: 164-166 < 1921-22; Roth 1927: 743; Jahukyan 1961: 386-369, 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 Hajaša-, but there is no reason to exclude it either, since nothing from the language(s) of Hajaša- 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 Hajašan onomasticon:


Takšanaš ‘Weather-god’ : Skt. tákašan- 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. hıwsn ‘carpenter’). The Hittite theory on the origin of this theonym (Forrer 1931: 8; Jahukyan 1964: 54-55; 1976: 95) is semantically less attractive.


For further discussion, references and theories see also s.v. hoy ‘fright’.24
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 Haiasa- 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 Corox and its surroundings (Forrer 1931; Łap’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; Areşyan 1975: 22). According to D’jakonov (1984: 117, 162, cf. also 172, 184, 194), 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: 27-28, 1983b: 53-56; Toporov, PrJaz (2), e-h, 1979: 200-203; Vartanov 1983; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 710-1; 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 Haiasa- with the PIE word for ‘metal, copper, iron’, proposed by J̄ahukyan (1961: 388-389; 1964: 67, especially 67-122; 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 hiranya- ‘Edelmetall’], ‘copper’, later ‘iron’, áyasá- adj., f. áyasi- ‘made of copper/iron’ (RV+), OAv. aiaih- n. ‘ordeal metal (at the last judgement)’, YAV. aiaih- 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 neutrals are reflected as Armenian o-stems (see 2.2.2.1). PIE *h₂ei-e/os- would regularly yield Arm. *hay- ‘metal, iron’. The Hittite rendering Haiasa- 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. pança ‘five’. Thus, Hay-k’, Haiasa- 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 Haiasa- with h 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 ajha ‘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 (Ardzinja 1988: 267) solutions have been proposed. According to Colarusso (1997: 144), Abkhaz a-ayxa and Abaza ayxa ‘iron; metal’ go back to PNWCauc. *a-yəxə, which he relates to our PIE word (here reconstructed as *ə̯a-yəxos/*ə̯a-ya-xos - *h(ə)yəxə) 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 ‘Metalgiüßer’, probably also ‘smith’ (see s.v. darbin ‘smith’).

Other names of the Armenians


hayt’- ‘to attach, adjust, put together’ (Lex.), hayt’aytem (or hayt’-haytem in Yov-hannèš Ōj nec’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: GDPl -an-a-c’, IPl -an-a-w-k’ ‘contrivance, way out, effort’ (Eznik Kolbaci’i, Elišè, Movsès Xorenac’i, Lazar P’arpec’i, John Chrysostom, etc.); probably also privative an-het’et’ or an-heded ‘deformed, shapeless, hideous, monstrous, gigantic, enormous’ (Eznik Kolbaci’i, P’awstos Buzand, Movsès Xorenac’i, Lazar 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. nivt’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-heded, 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\textsuperscript{15}; Russ. transl. G. Muradyan 2000: 115). Alongside anheded is found also an-ar-l ‘monstrous’ (q.v.) in P’awstos Buzand 5.37 (1883=1984: 202L16f), 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 Sebèös (7th cent.), Chapter 20 (Xač’atryan/Elihazaryan 2005: 104\textsuperscript{11}; transl. Thomson 1999: 39): Ew ēr sa ayr anheded (var. anhet’et’ in 1851: 89\textsuperscript{12}) anjamb ew geleć ’tkleslemb, ew barjr ew layn hasakaw, ew burn jew c’amak’ marmnov 'He

76 Theoretically, gelni(k) could reflect *ga-nil-ik through Ačaryan’s Law. One may consider a comparison with the Celtic ethnonym Galli, etc. from *gal-n- - *gɔl-n-, cf. Celtic *gala ‘valor, ability’ (for consultations on the Celtic material I am indebted to Ranko Matasović).
hayim

was a man gigantic in stature and handsome of appearance, strong and of solid body".

● ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 30.

Jahukyan (1963a: 92; 1987: 146) derives *hayt'-' from PIE *sai-t- (see below on this etymology). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of an-*het'et' (Jahukyan 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-t-, *sh2i- from PIE *səi-t- (see below on this etymon). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of an-het'et' (Jahukyan 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-t-, *sh2i- from PIE *səi-t- (see below on this etymon). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of an-het'et' (Jahukyan 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-t-, *sh2i- from PIE *səi-t- (see below on this etymon). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of an-het'et' (Jahukyan 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-t-, *sh2i- from PIE *səi-t- (see below on this etymon). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of an-het'et' (Jahukyan 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-t-, *sh2i- from PIE *səi-t- (see below on this etymon). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of an-het'et' (Jahukyan 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-t-, *sh2i- from PIE *səi-t- (see below on this etymon). He is sceptical on the appurtenance of an-het'et' (Jahukyan 1990: 74, noting only the privative prefix an-). This etymology is quite acceptable, though it has remained unknown to Indo-Europeanists.
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. Jahukyan (1987: 284-285) independently suggests a semantically similar explanation, deriving *hay* ‘Armenian’ from PIE *pōi-ipoi-* ‘to pasture, guard, keep’. Jahukyan based this etymology upon Herodotus 5.49 where the Armenians are characterized as “having plenty of sheep” (*ploypōbatoi*). The passage reads as follows: Κιλίκων δὲ τῶνδε ἔχοντι Ἀρμένιοι οἵδε, καὶ οὕτω ἐόντες πολυπρόβατοι. For a ModArm. translation and commentary, see Krkyašaryan 1986: 305, 603-39.

If one accepts the derivation of *hayim* ‘to watch’ from PIE *p(e)Hi-*, *hay* practically coincides with that of Patrubány.

Earlier, Jahukyan (1967: 106) suggested a connection with Arm. *hoy* ‘fear’ and *hi-anam* ‘to admire’ (q.v.), deriving all from PIE *kwei-* (cf. Skt. *cay-/cāy-* ‘to perceive; to observe’, Gr. τίω ‘to esteem, deeply respect’, etc.). which cannot be accepted.

See also s.v.v. *y-ay-t*, *nayim*, *vayel*. *hayr*, GSg *hawr*, ISg *har-b*, NPI *har-k’, GDPl *har-c’, *har-an-c’* ‘father’ (Bible+). Numerous derivatives with *hayr* or *hawr-*. Alongside with *ham-a-hayr* ‘having one father’ and *ham-a-mayr* ‘having one mother’, there is also *ham-hawr-eay* = f. ὁμο-πατρία in Leviticus 18.11: *hamhōreay k’oī ē : ὁμοπατρία ἀδελφή σοῦ ἐστιν*. The same structure is found in *ham-mawr-eay* (cf. ὁμο-μητρία), only in Mxit’ar Goš (Law Code, 12th cent.), apparently analogical after *ham-hawr-eay*, since the passage is identical: *hammōreay k’oī 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. ClArm. *hōr-elhayr* ‘paternal uncle’, *hōr-a-k’oyr* ‘paternal aunt’, etc. are represented by variegated types of allegro-forms; see 2.1.35.


MidArm. *hawr-u* ‘stepfather’ (genitive *hōru-i*, hapax, 12th cent.) is considered analogical after *mawr* ‘stepmother’ (q.v.); cf. Gr. πατρωός, πατρυιός 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. aye’.

han, o-stem: GDAblSg han-o-y (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Canon Law, etc.; cf. below)

‘grandmother’ (attested also in John Chrysostom, Philo); han-i, wo-stem: LocSg 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 Giwit (5th cent.) to Vačē (king of Aluank’) apud Movsēs Kafankatuce’i 1.11 (V. Afark’elyan 1983: 26) ‘id.;’ hypocoristic han-ik, GDsg hank-an (in a colophon; cf. the dialect of Įul) ‘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 = ἐν τῇ μάμμῃ. In Grigor Narekac’i 36 (1985: 397), reading variants: 770b: han-oy-n, vars. hanwoyn, hangoyn, etc. NHB (2: 45c) also cites Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.22 for han-i, GDsg hanwoy. In the critical edition (1913=1991: 138), 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 Įul: xanik ‘grandmother’ [HAB 3: 33b], with a regular shift h > x [Ačaṙean 1940: 112]; belongs to the 4th (-an) declension class of the dialect: GSg xang-a, AblSg xang-an-ic’, ISg xang-an-v, NPl xan-k-n [Ačaṙean 1940: 190, 372a]. Compare hankan above.


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. anýta.

On the initial h-, see s.v. haw ‘grandfather’ and 2.1.16.1.

*hang ‘breath, rest’ (dialect); hangē’im, 3sg.aor hang-e-aw ‘to rest’; hangi-st, GDsg hangist-ean ‘rest, peace; resting place, grave’ (Bible+).

● DIAL Both hangē’im and hangist are widespread in the dialects. The root-form is represented in Aparan, Alaškert, Ararat hank’, Muḥ hang’, Moks xang’, Van xank’, etc. ‘breath, rest’ [HAB 3: 35-36]. The meaning ‘grave of hangist can be seen e.g. in R. Grigoryan 1970: 320-7. For the semantic shift ‘rest’ > ‘grave’ cf. e.g. andorr ‘quiet’ > Areş āndörk ‘the Otherworld’ [Lusenc’ 1982: 197a].

● ETYM A connection with Lat. quiescō ‘to rest’ was suggested by Pedersen (1905: 219 = 1982: 81). Ačaṙyan (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-kWn-, cf. Lat. quiēs, -ētis f. ‘rest, quiet, peace; sleep, death’, quiescō ‘to rest’. For the absence of palatalization of the labiovelar after nasal he compares Arm. king ‘five’ from *penk’e. For references and a discussion on hangi-st, -ean, see Olsen 1999: 480-482.

hask


Remarkably, *sm̱-kʷH- is found also in Iranian languages: Oss. æncad ‘quiet, tranquil, quietly’ from *ham-čyāta, Sogd. ‘ne’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-dr-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. ḫan- ‘to draw, scoop’ has been proposed, see Łap'anc'yan 1961: 187-188; Schultheiss 1961: 225; Greppin 1973: 71; Polomé 1980: 21.


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’aw = καλάμη ‘stalk, stubble’: kaiw ibrew zhask ink’nin ankeal i c’anthon’ ‘or as an ear of corn, fallen off the stalk of itself’: ḫ ṭe ṣe ṭe ŋσwμσ άπωσeβσν ʰpό καλάμμσ (Cox 2006: 172); according to Rahlfs: ḫ ṭe ṣe ṭe ŋσwμσ ʰpό καλάμμσ ʰpό καλάμμσ άπωσeβσν.

DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 48b]. The Van-group has with an irregular -š-: Van, Moks, Ozim xašk [Ačāryan 1952: 274], Šatax xašk [M. Muradyan 1962: 57, 200a]. Orbeli (2002: 243) has Moks xāšk, GŠx xāšk, NPl xōšk ‘колос (головка)’. Ačāryan (1952: 85) hesitantly assumes an influence of Pers. xāška, GSg xåškəɛ, NPl xåškir ‘колос’. Nevertheless, the etymology is worth of consideration. The PIE root is *h₂e kim ‘sharp’ which would yield Arm. *has-. For the semantics cf. also OEngl. egl f. ‘awn’ < *h₂ek-iH-2, Gr. akōf f. ‘point’, Lat. aciēs f. ‘sharp edge’, Lith. akūotas ‘awn’, etc. Most of these cognates are feminines, thus the i- and a-stems of Arm. hask probably point to fem. *ih- and *eh-. Goth. ahs, OHG ahr n., etc. ‘ear of corn’, etc. Later he abandoned the etymology since it is not included in Ąahułkian 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-iH-2, Gr. akōf f. ‘point’, Lat. aciēs f. ‘sharp edge’, Lith. akūotas ‘awn’, etc. Most of these cognates are feminines, thus the i- and a-stems of Arm. hask probably point to fem. *ih- and *eh-. Goth. ahs, OHG ahr n., etc. ‘ear of corn’, etc. Later he abandoned the etymology since it is not included in Ąahułkian 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.

For the -k- alternative solutions can be offered: (1) derivaton on *h₂ek-u-, cf. Lat. acuō, -ere ‘to sharpen’, Lith. akūotas ‘awn; fish-bone; cutting edge’ (from *aku-ōt- or *ak-ōt-, R. Derksen, p.c.; the absence of palatalization is unclear), etc.; thus:
hast

*h₂ek-y- > *hask-; (2) an old suffix *-k-, cf. Lith. ašaka ‘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'eu(I)-; thus: *h₂ek-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 *k-ś-, 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: GDPl hast-i-c’ (Dionysius the Areopagite), IPl hast-i-w-k’ (Cyril of Alexandria, George of Pisidia, Anania Narekac’i), loc. hast-i (Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom) and 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’, hastoj ‘decisive’, hastay 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 Aćar 1913: 639-640; Maksaceanac’ HBB 3: 60-62; HayLezBrBař 3, 2004: 246-247). This meaning is attested in Yaysmawurk’ and is marked as dialectal (rmk.) in NHB 2: 54b.


The Armenian i-declension is secondary (see Žahukyan 1982: 126-127; cf. 1987: 142), unless it points to an older *past-i(h₂)- in a way reflected in OHG festi, festi, 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 *ph₂k-to-. A contamination is more probable. For more detail, see s.v. astem.
Łap’anc’yan (1961: 188-189) connects Arm. hast to Hitt. haštai- ‘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).

**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 arımın zmarmınn surb: uten zhasteays ew and šišaks ew and surbs zsrbut’ivnn “And they take the holy body: (they) eat the hasteay-s with demons (šiša-) and the holiness with saints”.

In Bàrgirk’ hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 181N166), hasteays (API) is glossed as barak hac’, kam lōš “thin bread, or lōš”. Not mentioned in NHB and HAB.

- **ETYM**. The etymology is uncertain. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 50) hesitantly compares with Gr. ἄκτη ‘corn’ and πάστη > 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. pascō ‘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. ἀζο ‘to dry, parch’, Czech ozd ‘dried malt’, ozditi ‘to dry malt’, Armn. ostin ‘dry’, ačiwn ‘ash’ (q.v.); it can be derived from PIE *h₂Hs-d- or *h₂es-d-, or a deverbative noun *h₂H(e)s-t-. For the semantics compare Lat. fer(c)rum ‘a kind of sacrificial bread’ vs. Skt. bhṛṣṭa ‘to fry, roast (grains, etc.’), bhṛṣṭa- ‘fried, roasted, baked’ (Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 643, 699; Schrijver 1991: 255; Mayrhofer EWAlia 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-il(h₃)-, cf. Gr. ἀκτή ‘corn’; QIE *peh₂s-ti-, cf. Lat. pānis ‘bread’ < *pāstni-, pastillum ‘a form of sacrificial cake’; QIE *h₂(H)e-s-d-i(h₂) or *h₂H(e)s-ti-, cf. Czech ozd ‘dried malt’, etc. Also possible is *has(i/ü)t- or *hac’(i/ü)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. καίρος ‘coming at the right place, decisive, deadly’ [NHB 2: 56c].
hat


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-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 (Čaṙəntir).

See also s.v. hawt, i-stem ‘flock of sheep, etc.’.

hatanem ‘to strike’ (about plague) in P’awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95L-15f); for the passage, see s.v. keɫ.

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: 365L-12): 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- (< *sp, cf. Gr. prep. ἄτερ ‘without, far from’ < *sp-tér) and *tane- < *dā-ne/o- ‘teilen’, which is improbable. Alayan (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. pjāju, pjauti (*pēui̯ō) ‘to cut, mow’, Lat. paviō, -ire ‘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’.


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. *ḫattāī* ‘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 -ti- points out to PIE *-t-* rather than *-d-*. Thus, if Arm. *hat-* indeed belongs to PIE *h₂edos-*, the Hittite verb is not related (unless one considers it an Armenian loan).

Citing reliable semantic parallels for ‘to cut, divide’ > ‘a division of the flock’ > ‘flock of sheep’ (3.9.1), A. Xač’atryan (1993: 107) convincingly connects *hawt*, i-stem ‘flock of sheep, etc.’ (q.v.) with *hatanem* ‘to cut’ and *y-awt* ‘cut-off branch’.

Morani (1991: 178) cautiously mentions the alternative i-stem of Arm. *hat* in relation with Toch. *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. *h₂édōi* > PArm. *hata(i) > hawt*, GSg. *h₂d-i-ōs*. This is attractive since an original PArm. genitive *hač-* (with a regular -č- from *-di-*) 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-*. Oś sort of cereal, grain’. The verb *hatanem* ‘to cut’ should not be separated from *hat*. Not everything is clear, however. Synchronously, *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- > 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.


See also s.v. *zatik*.

**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+).

- **DIAIL** Preserved in the dialects of Sebastia, Muš, Karin, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Ararat, Jula, Salmast, etc. [HAB 3: 56-57].
- **ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 56b.


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-k(y)α-, with the basic meaning “qui se trouve à l’opposé”.

On the reflex of the internal laryngeal, see 2.1.20.

harawunk’ ‘sowing, seeds; sowing-field; arable land’, attested (Bible+) in APl Harawun-s. See also s.v. haruanc’.

- DIAL Muš harvɔnk’, Maškert, K’li harmunk’ ‘soil that has been softened by rains in spring and autumn and can be ploughed’ [HAB 3: 57a; Balramyan 1960: 147a], also Sasun harvɔnk’ ‘the appropriate time for sowing’ and a verb harvɔnk’l 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)araver ‘plough’ (q.v.) and derives harawunk’ from *aramon-, citing Lat. aramentum as a cognate. Ažâryan (HAB 3: 57a) does not accept this and other attempts which, too, considered a derivation from PIE *h₂erh₂- ‘to plough’ (see, among others, Scheftelowitz 1904-1905, 2: 58), and leaves the origin of harawunk’ open. Jahukyan (1967: 241; 1987: 113), Alabekyan (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 *h₂erh₂-uər-n-, cf. Gr. ἀροῦπα f. ‘tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields’; Skt. urvārā- f. ‘arable land, field yielding crop’, Av. uruvarā- f. pl. ‘food plant, plant, ground covered with plants, flora’; Mfr. arbor, NPl arbanna, OIr. 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 Erdoberflächer’ (cf. also Armenà ‘right tributary of the Nēmanas’) from PIE *h₂erh₂-menā- (see Derksen 1996: 154).

 Apparently, the initial h- of harawunk’ 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 *h₂ar₂- ‘plough’ fairly obvious’. The idea of sowing is inseparable from that of ploughing/cultivating. Note, e.g., Gr. ἀρουρά 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. armuò ‘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-môn dissilimiert?” To my knowledge, however, such a dissimilation is unparalleled.

The above-mentioned argument of Olsen is not essential, since *harawunk’ (pl.) can be analogical after the unpreserved NSg *harawr (cf. Gr. ἀρουρά). 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 mrjiwn, NPl mrjmunk’ ‘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. Kalzi(o)a/wan > Kal(i)zman (on which see HayTelBar 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. armuò ‘arable land’ (cf. the above-mentioned interpretation of Bugge), armenà ‘aufgepflügte Schicht der Erdoberflächer’.

The latter solution seems to be slightly preferable.

**harsn**, GDG harsn, ABlG i hars-n-č, 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+).

Both harsn and harsanik’ are ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 62b]. Larabāl has vocative häś-i vs. nominative härt’na. The pl. tant. harsani-k’ is represented in the Van-Marala 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’-ak, a-stem: GDPi harc’-a-e’ (Canons) ‘sorcerer, magician’ (Bible+); harc’, i-stem: GDSp harc’-i, GDPi harc’-e’ ‘question, inquiry, interrogation’ (Agat’anges, Philo, Severian of Gabala, Gregory of Nyssa, etc.).

- **DIAL.** Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 63b]. T’iflis has harc’nəl ‘magician’, cf. ClArm. harc’uk ‘sorcerer, magician’ [HAB 3: 63b].


Here belongs also Arm. harcn ‘bride’ (q.v.), cf. Lat. procos, ī m. ‘suitor, wooer’, Lith. persū ‘to ask for a girl’s hand in marriage’, OCS prositi ‘to ask’, Skt. praśna- m. ‘question, point at issue, inquiry’, YAv. fraśna- m. ‘question’, etc. See also s.v. p’esay ‘bridegroom, son-in-law’.


**hac’**

i-stem: GDSp hac’-i, AblSp i hac’-ē, ISg hac’-i-w, AblPl i hac’-w-k’ (rich evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 868-870) ‘bread; food, meal’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL.** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 65a]. Interesting is Jūla axanc’ from an-hac’ ‘bread-less, without bread’, with metathesis (see Ačaṙean 1940: 162, 373a). On the compound hac’-a-han see 2.133.2.

In Larabal (Ačaṙean 1913: 647a) and Modern Armenian (Malxaseanc’ HBB 3: 76b), hac’ refers also to ‘honey with honeycomb’; cf. also *mehr-a-hac’ ‘id.’, composed of mehr ‘honey’ and hac’ ‘bread’ (Ačaṙean 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 mehr-a-hac’. This shift is quite old since it is attested by Nersēs Lambrunac’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. sasyā- n. ‘corn, grain’ (Bugge 1889: 17, 1893: 41; rightly rejected 78 One might also think of a QIE root noun fem. *pr(e)k̑̂-s with extension to i-declension, cf. Lat. prex, -ecis f. ‘prayer; curse; good wishes’.

---

78 One might also think of a QIE root noun fem. *pr(e)k̑̂-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 *pekw- ‘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’ < *kwekwō < *pekwō (see Schrijver 1991: 466), Gr. πέσσω ‘to bake, cook; to ripen’, OCS pekō ‘to bake’, etc. A -ti-derivative QIE *pokw-ti- has been assumed, cf. Gr. πέψις f. ‘the cooking; the ripening’, Ved. Skt. paktí-, 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 *-kti- > Arm. -c'- is untenable; 3) *-ti-derivatives usually require zero grade in the root. The explanation of Mann (1963: 83-84; cf. Jahukyan 1982: 217 78) assuming *-ts()s-om ‘baked’ assumed by Patrubány (apud HAB 3: 64b). Olsen (1999: 83, 827; 2000: 404) posits *pəkw-tih2- > *-ti̯a-, a vr̥k̥-derivative, with *-kwti̯- > -c' as ‘a potential parallel of the regular development *-ti̯- > -c’-. I believe, however, that a *-ti̯- would yield Arm. -c’ rather than -c- (see 2.1.22.1). Furthermore, *k’ti̯- is more likely to develop into Arm. -wč- beside the regular change *-pi̯- 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-k'i- with a question-mark, Arm. hac’ ‘bread’ derives from *pāsk- or *pə-sk-i- (read *p(e)h2-sk-i-), with the inchoative present suffix *-sk-, and is linked with Lat. pānis ‘bread’ < *pāstnīi, 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 knowledge, however, there are no cognates pointing to a form with *-k-. The Germanic forms (OHG ascā ‘ashes’, etc.) and Arm. ac-ivn ‘ash’ and askn ‘ruby’ point to *s-. Nevertheless, this etymology is worth of consideration. We 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 moxrač (moxrat’al) karkandak ‘ashed cake’ (see Tér-Yakobean 1960: 464); Tavuš karkeni ‘a cake’ that is baked moxri mič’in “in the ashes” (Xemč’yan 2000: 217b(N68)). Compare also hasteay ‘a kind of pastry, cake’
hac'i

(q.v.), possibly from the same etymon (if derived from *has-t- 'ash’ rather then 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. ḫazziτa- 'a kind of cake' (cf. also Hitt. ḫarzuτu- 'a kind of oily bread'). I suggest a connection between Hitt. ḫazziτa- '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 *pokwti- (or *pəkw-tih2-) 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. *pāst- and Arm. hac’ (possibly also hasteay 'id.' (q.v.)) do not derive from PIE *pāst-s- '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 < *κονιδ (see s.v.). The consonant stem *pāst- was changed to an i-stem of hac’, cf. Arm. sirt, i-stem 'heart' (q.v.).


● DIAL The forms hac’-i and hac’-eni ‘ash-tree’ are widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 65b]. Note also Ozim xac’acăr [Ačaryan 1952: 275]. For Salmast xac’ik (HAB ibid.) with a diminutive suffix, see s.v. place-name *Hac’eak-k’.


The root is usually reconstructed as *Hh3-e/os- beside full-grade *Heh3- 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 *Hh3-os-k-eh2- > PArm. *hoskiyā, with pretonic *-o- > -a- (on which see 2.1.3), or zero-grade (possibly also Germanic, see Schrijver 1991: 77-78), *Hhs-k-eh2-. Olsen (1999: 813) posits *-osk-, which is improbable and unnecessary.

For Gr. δεύκα, -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, GDPl 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, Lazar P’arpec’i, Eusebius of Caesarea, Porphyry), ‘rooster’ (Bible), ‘hen’ (Bible).
For a thorough philological analysis, see Strohmeyer 1983 who concludes that, in contrast with the generic term t'רכ'ין '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. ὄρνις 'bird', 'rooster', 'hen'.

The word is widespread in the dialects as *haw 'hen', whereas the frozen plural *haw-k' (T’iflis, Muș, Van, etc.) means 'bird' [HAB 3: 66b].

According to Orbeli 2002: 245, Moks xafk’/xavk’, gen. xafk’-u refers not only to 'bird' (see also 63\[14\] and 116\[11\] for textual illustrations), but also to ‘screpē = hawk’. For the semantic shift compare Gr. αἰετός 'eagle' from the very same PIE etymon 'bird' (see below). Moks also has xav, gen. xav-u 'hen' [Orbeli 2002: 244].

The word is reconstructed as a PD i-stem: nominative *h₂éu-i- (cf. Lat. avis 'bird' and Arm. haw 'id.') vs. genitive *h₂u-ěi-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: 110\[30\]).

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; Ịjavukan 1982: 127; Olsen 1999: 109-110, 790, 828); note also that the u-stem is frequent with animal names, cf. ahvēs 'fox', arǰ 'bear', gayl ‘wolf', inj 'panther, leopard', ul ‘kid’, etc. On u-stem animal names, see A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 42-43; Ịjavukan 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 Bafē-Bitlis.

haw₂, o-stem: GDSg haw-o-y (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Eusebius of Caesarea), IPl haw-o-v-k’ in the letter from Bishop Gwūt (5\[th\] cent.) to Vāvē (king of Ałuakh’) apud Movsēs Kalankatauc’i 1.11 [V. Asked’yian 1983: 20\[14\]]; u-stem: GDSg haw-u (Plato, John Chrysostom) 'grandfather, ancestor' (Bible+).

In some colophons, also 'uncle' [Mahē 1986-87a]; see below.

The word is connected with Lat. avus 'grandfather', OIr. aue 'grandson', Goth. awō 'grandmother', Lith. avynas 'maternal uncle', OPr. avis 'id.', Russ. у, Pol. woj 'maternal uncle’, Hit. ụhůhās ‘grandfather’, etc. (NH2 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. ḫuḫḫaš and Scr. iāḏ, one reconstructs two laryngeals: *h₂eH-[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. ḫ-, 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).

hawti, see s.v. getar(u).

hawt, i-stem ‘flock of sheep, etc.; group’ (Bible+). GDPI hōt-ı-e’ is attested in the Bible, as well as in P’awstos Buzand 4.13 (1883=1984: 95ff): čarak hōtic’ “pastures for flocks” [Garsoïan (1989: 138)]. From hawt several designations for ‘shepherd’ have been formed: hōt-arac (Lazar P’arpec’i+), hōt-erēc’ (Philo, “Vkayk’ arewelic’”, etc.), as well as dial *hōt-at.

● DIAL Dialectally attested only in *hōt-al ‘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’. Jahukyan (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(j), which is not convincing; see 2.1.22.12. Olsen (1999: 95; 2000: 406) alternatively derives hawt from *p₂h₂d- (cf. Lat. pecus, -udis) > *hawt-, but this is improbable.

The best solution is offered, I think, by A. Xač’atryan (1993: 107), who derives hawt from hatanem ‘to cut’ (q.v.). For the semantic relationship, see 3.9.1.

*p₂h₂t₂-at ‘shepherd’.

● DIAL In the dialects of Axalc’xa, Łori, Ararat, Łarabal, Van, Alaškert, Muš [ Açagean 1913: 676-677; HAB 3: 139a], Bulanax, Şirak, Aparan [Amatuni 1912: 407-408]. A secondary meaning is ‘ploughman’, also in the compound (Baberd) *hōt₂-k₂-’ar, with k₂-’ar ‘stone’ [ Açagean 1913: 676-677; HAB 3: 139a].


The word hōt₂ contains 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 Açogyan (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'-al ‘living’. Nevertheless, I tentatively propose a derivation from PIE *peh₂(s)- ‘to protect, pasture’, cf. OCS pasti ‘to pasture’, Lat. pāscō ‘to protect’, etc. This verbal root is found in Arm. hoviv ‘shepherd’ (q.v.). A suffixed *peh₂-lo- (cf. Skt. avipāḷa- ‘shepherd’, gopāḷa- ‘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 *hōta may be old.

For *hōtal(i)-ast ‘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 иылдызы, 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’, pāṭār- m. ‘defender, protector’ (RV+), YAv. pāṭra-vaṃ - ‘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 hoviv ‘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 hapax, namely pahran, which seems to mean ‘pastureland’: ‘Weide’ (Karst) = ‘пастбище’ (Galstyan); see HAB 4: 12b; Galstyan 1958: 167. Ačaryan (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. *pāṭ(a)-, 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’.

*hap'ap'em

- 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 Ačaṙyan (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’.

Bediryan (1956: 44-45) and Jahukyan (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 geran- ‘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 -ano-, see Greppin 1975: 43-44, 113; Jahukyan 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+), hecel, o-stem: ISg hecel-o-v, GDPI hecel-o-c‘, IPl hecel-o-v-k‘ ‘horseman, rider, cavalryman’ (Bible+), hecel-a-zawr ‘cavalry’ (Bible+); MidArm. hec-n-um ‘to mount a horse’ (Barsel Ėon, 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. [MiHAYBa 2, 1992: 32-33].

For attestations of the verb and derivatives, see Astuacaturean 1895: 878; NHB 2: 81-82; Klingenschmitt 1982: 195u; Barton 1989: 147. For 3sg.aor. hec-a-w ‘mounted (a horse)’ and 2sg.subj. hec-c‘i-s (et‘ 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: 179L2, 192L2f; 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-Ěrrzrum region (Basen, Naranman-Ěk‘reň) told by Hakob Sanosyan and recorded by Ervand Pezazyan in Alek'andrapol-Gyumri in 1915 (HŽHek 4, 1963: 269L18) we find hecan gyanmir ‘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. ἕζομαι, Lat. sedère, Goth. sitan, Lith. sėdėti, etc. (HAB 3: 75a; Pokorny 1959: 885; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 692-693); further see s.vv. nis‘ seat, site, location, abode’, tel‘ site, place’.

hecanoc', a-stem: GDSg hecanoc'-i (Grigor Narekac'i, 10-11th cent.), ISg hecanoc'-a-w (Šarakan, Čaṙəntir) 'winnowing fan; Milky Way' (Bible, Hexaemeron, John Chrysostom, etc.), 'Milky Way' (Alişan 1910: 129-130 without source indication).

As is pointed out by Alişan ibid., the second meaning must be due to the association of the Milky Way with 'straw' (see 3.1.3).


See s.v. hecan 'beam, log'.

heljat', a-stem: GDSg heljet-a, ISg heljet-a-w, GDPI heljet-a-c' 'flood, torrent' (Bible+), heljetat, a-stem: GDSg heljetat-i, AblSg i heljetat-č, ISg heljetat-a-w, GDPl heljetat-a-c' '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. olof(anem) 'to overflow, inundate, flood; to rinse' (Bible+).

A textual illustration for the verb helum from Elišč, Chapter 5 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 2141225): minč' ew hraman tual erknayin covun heļul i veray c'umak' is 'He
The verb *hef-* refers not only to ‘torrent’ but also ‘ravine, torrent-bed’ is seen e.g. from the following attestations: Job 28.4 (Cox 2006: 182): *xram heletat i p’ōswy* “a cleft of a ravine, away from dust”; in Lazar P’arpec’i (5th cent.) 3.81 (1904=1985: 1481-15); transl. Thomson 1991: 208): yezer heletatin “at the edge of the ravine” (for the full passage, see s.v. art ‘cornfield’).

**ETYM** The verb *hetum* is usually derived from QIE *pel(H)-nu-mi* (cf. Lith. *piliā, pili* ‘to pour’, etc.) and connected with reduplicated *helet* and *okol-* (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: 406-435. Further see s.v. hū ‘full’ (note the verb *baum* ‘to fill’ with the same verbal suffix *-nu*).

Greppin (1981b: 6) notes that a proto-form *pēn-peln-* is not agreeable. The solution may be simpler, however: reduplication of *hel-* ‘to pour’ on the Armenian ground (cf. Meillet 1936: 38; Klingenschmitt 1982: 244-15; Olsen 1999: 72, 406; on *helet-at*, see Olsen 1999: 335). Elsewhere Greppin (1981c: 121 3) notes the derivation *hetum* < *pel(nu)-mi* and adds: “However, an o-grade form, Arm. *okol-* ‘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 *helet* from *okol*-. The latter may be regarded as an o-grade verbal iterative-extensive reduplication (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 244-15), cf. *kokov-* ‘to boast’, *yorjorjem* ‘to call, name’.

*hef-* ‘far’: *hef-* adv. ‘far (of time and space); isolated, foreign’, adj. ‘distant, far off, of long duration’ (Bible*+*), ‘without, except’ (Movsēs Xorenaci Gregory of Nyssa), *hef-ust, i hef-ust* adv. ‘from a distance, at long range’ (Bible*+*), *hef-oy* ‘far’ (John Chrysostom), dial. *hef-u* ‘far’ (NHB 2: 89a; see also the dialectal section); *hef-anam*, 3sg.aor. hef-ac ‘aw, 3pl.aor. hef-ac ‘an ‘to leave, go away, move off, be far’ (Bible*+*), *hef-avor*, a-stem: GDP1 hef-avor-a-c’ adj. ‘distant, far off, of long duration’ (Bible*+*), *hefewor* < *heri-avor* ‘id.’ (Ephrem), *hefstan* adv. ‘far, far off, from a distance, at long range’ (Bible*+*).

**DIACL** The forms hef and heru are widespread in the dialects. With a final nasal: Xarberd hārım (beside hārī), Muš, Aŝaṅkert hčrun, Aslanbek hārīn, abl. hčrovan, cf. Akn hčrovan, etc. Rodost’o hčrung with the suffix -unk, cf. xor-un ‘deep’, etc. [HAB 3: 82a]. The dialectal form heru is recorded already in NHB 2: 89a.

**ETYM** Since de Lagarde 1854: 14\textsuperscript{1} 295 et al. (HAB 3: 82a) connected with Goth. fārrom ‘far’, OHG ferro ‘far’, Skt. parās ‘far, further’, etc. See Klingenschmitt 1982: 121 17, 165 on the morphology of hef-i (derived by him from *persiyo-*) and the verb het-anam. For references and a discussion, see s.v. ar ‘at, by, to’.

*hes-*

**DIACL** Mēri hisnīl ‘to look at’ [Alayan 1954: 314].

**ETYM** According to Alayan (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-), even ordered the sea of heaven to flow over the dry land” (transl. Thomson 1982: 158-159). 
het, *hert’ ‘turn, queue’ (see dial. section); MidArm. hert’-ov adv. ‘in turn, by turns, in consecutive order’ (Grigor Tat’ewac’i, see MiHayBař 2, 1992: 36a).

*DIAL Ararat hert’ [Amatuni 1912: 169b], T’iflis, Łazax, Larabal *hert’ [Ačařeăn 1913: 656b].

*ETYM According to J̌ahukyan 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’, serēs ‘row, succession, series’, etc.) and thus related with y-ērum ‘to tie, fasten or join together, link together in a series’ (q.v.).

spaṣṭa- ‘(clearly) perceived, clear, visible’, Gr. σκόπτειν ‘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 Melri hisnil ‘to look at’ is not simply due to contamination of hayim ‘to watch, look at’ (which would be contracted in Melri to *hi-; cf. hayeli ‘mirror’ from the same verb > Melri hille [Alayan 1954: 277a]) with tesanem ‘to see’ (> Melri taśnil [Alayan 1954: 288a]).
For the determinative -r̥-, see e.g. s.vv. boj- ‘thumb, lobe’ probably from PIE *h₂-*/wH- ‘to grow’, xil-‘knag on a tree, a swelling in tree’ vs. xoyl ‘swelling, tumour, gland’, k-r̥-ank ‘back’ vs. ku̯-n ‘back’. In these dialects the sequence -r̥- may reflect both -r̥- and -r̥l- (see Tomson 1890: 66; Dv’yan 1966: 55; M. Asatryan 1968: 63; Markosyan 1989: 66). The OArm. form may have been, then, *her-ْ or *ḥer-d< QIE *ser-ْ.

heru ‘last year’ (Severianof of Gabala, John Chrysostom, Paterica, John of Damascus, etc.); i herun hetē ‘since last year’ (2 Corinthians 8.10 and 9.2, rendering Gr. ἁπό πέρυσιν, 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); herwine* i ver ‘since last year’ (in a late medieval folk-song, Abelyan 1940: 9g). ●

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 hārvē, C‘ina hārvē [Aćarean 1935: 370; M. Zak‘aryan 2008: 185], Areš-Havarik hervēnai [Lusenc‘ 1982: 220b], Larabal herinē, horinē vs. hērvu [Dv’yan 1966: 412], Goris ḫeine [Margaryan 1975: 343b], etc., cf. also T’iflis heru, gen. hervan [HAB 3: 89a], Moks xeru, gen. xervan, abl. xervane [Orbeli 2002: 246], Marala xewrű, gen. xewva [Aćarean 1926: 44, 408], Artial Suč‘ava heru, Polish her-w-s with the deictic article, gen. herowan [Aćaryan 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 hervnēk (erinj ‘heifer’) [Mx‘it‘areanc‘ 1901: 281-282], Sasun hervānig ‘one-year-old (animal)’ [Petoyan 1954: 139; 1965: 496], Šatx xervonek ‘a calf of one to two years’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 83], Bateš-Bilitis xervanek [Taronnean 1961: 33], Van, etc. xērnik and xēr ‘a male or female calf between one and two years’ [Aćarean 1913: 657b], Moks xeînik, gen. xeînāk-u, pl. xeînāk-tîr ‘goddaysal telenyk’, ‘youthful milovementi baba’ [Orbeli 2002: 245].

Interesting is Van, Moks, Salmast, Marala, 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 *herun-z-am (q.v.). ●

ETYM Old adverb from PIE *peruti ‘last year’, cf. Gr. πέρυσι, Dor. πάροι, Skt. parut ‘last year’, OIt. fiora, MHG ver ‘last year’, etc. (see Hubschmann 1897: 467; Meillet 1936: 101; HAB 3: 89a with earlier references to Windischmann, de Lagarde, Müller, Pokorny 1959: 1175; Olsen 1999: 209); *peruti > PArm. *herūjī > heru (Meillet 1936: 57; Klingenschmitt 1982: 98).

The PIE adverb *peruti derives from an earlier phrase with the locative *pér yeti, with *per- ‘forward, through’ and *yeti- ‘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 *atu when unaccented, cf. *me gür- (Arm. mery ‘near’, q.v.) from the phrase *me gës(ë)ri, 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 southwestern to eastern and north-eastern peripheries, cf. Sasun hervānig, Bateš, Satax, etc. xervonek on the one hand, and Areš-Havarik herunai, Larabal horinē, etc. on the other. The forms may be directly compared with Gr. ξηρωνύς ‘from last year, last-
yearly’ (on which see Frisk 2: 518-519; Chantaine 1968-80: 889-890): *perutinos > PArm. *heruwindo > heruini, loc. *perutin-ı > PArm. *heruw(j)ni > *heruni. For the accented locative marker -i > Larabar -i, see 2.2.1.5.

For other adjectives and adverbs of place with -in from IE *-ino- or *-ino- such as ariaj-in adj. and adv. ‘first’, arawawi-in ‘pertaining to morning’, erekoy-in ‘pertaining to evening (adj.)’, ‘in the evening (adv.)’, etc., see Meillet 1936: 76; Greppin 1975: 101; Jahukyan 1998: 26; Olsen 1999: 466-468.

Next to *per- + *ut-e- ‘year’ one also reconstructs *per- + *h1(e)n- ‘year’: Lith. pérnai ‘last year’, MGH vern ‘id.’, etc. (Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 654).

Further see s.v. (y)eṙ and ‘the day before yesterday’.

*herun-z-am or *heruin-z-am (dial.) ‘two years ago’.


- ETYM Ačaryan (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-ě ‘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)ızam > *herznam through metathesis.

hec*, i-stem in NHB (only GSg hec’-i is attested) ‘felloe’.

Eznik (5th cent.), Ananía Širakac’i (7th cent.), Step’anos Siwnec’i (8th cent.), etc. In Eznik, with an initial x-: xec’.

- DIAL Muš hec, Bulanx 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’angešos+) and c’oyc’ (i-stem) ‘show, indication, example, proof’ (Bible+). I propose a derivation from PIE *pelk-: OHG felga, OEIng. 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. pletstsi, etc. [Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 706.]. 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 *helc’. 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. hia’s-a-w, 3pl.aor. hia’c-an ‘to be astounded, stricken with amazement, terror or admiration’ (Bible+); a deverbal noun hia’c-umn ‘astonishment, numbness, terror, etc.’ (Bible+).

**DIAL** Nor Naxijewan, T’iflis hia’c’k ‘admirable’ [HAB 3: 92a].

**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 92a.

Jähukyan 1967: 106 suggests a connection with hoy ‘fear’ (q.v.), which is possible but uncertain; his ultimate derivation of them from PIE *k’ei- (cf. Skt. cay-/cāy- ‘to perceive; to observe’, Gr. τίω ‘to esteem, deeply respect’, etc.) is untenable. Alayan 1974: 102 connects hi- to Lat. pius ‘pious, religious, faithful, devout; dutiful’, etc. This etymology is unconvincing both formally (the Latin word seems to reflect *pūlos < *pHuio-, see Schrijver 1991: 322-323, cf. 247) and semantically. Neither convincing is the derivation from *hi ‘what?’ < *k’i’d, suggested by Klingenschmitt 1982: 126.

I propose a derivation from PIE *sēh₂i-, *sh₂i̯- ‘to bind’, cf. Av. hi- ‘to chain, bind’, Khot. hīyā adj. ‘bound’, Skt. syāti ‘to bind, fasten, fetter’, siṭā- ‘bound’, Lith. sićti ‘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 *sh₂i̯-jo-/-jo- or *sih₂i̯-jo-/-jo-.

The semantic development is trivial, cf. e.g. Russ. o-cepeněť ‘to grow torpid, freeze with e.g. fear’ < cep ‘chain’. Note also Arm. arm-anam ‘to be astounded’, and-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. ἀρµόζω ‘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, GDP! hn-o-c’, etc. ‘old, ancient, worn-out’ (Bible+), note loc. i hnumn in Eznik Kolbaci’i, Elišė, John Chrysostom, etc. (see NHB 2: 98b; Meillet 1936: 91); hn-anam ‘to become old’ (Bible+), a denominative verb on which see Jähukyan 1982: 183; Klingenschmitt 1982: 120.

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 94b].


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

**hiwt** (mostly uninflected, Meillet 1936: 100; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 66), i-stem: GDPi *hng-i-č* (Bible+), IPl *hng-i-w-k‘ (Eusebius of Caesarea); later also IPl *hng-a-w-k‘ (Šarakan) ‘five’, *hingerord*, gen.-dat. *hingerord-i* ‘fifth’, *hng-tasan* ‘fifteen’, *hngetasan-erord* ‘fifteenth’ (all Bible+).

● DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 95b].


See also s.v. *yisun* ‘fifty’.

**hiwt**, o-stem: GDSg *hiwt*-o-y, GDPi *hiwt*-o-č [later also i-stem] ‘moisture, sap; deepness; element, matter, essence’.

Attested in the Bible, Eznik Kolbaci, Agat’angeši, etc. For attestations, derivatives and a thorough semantic discussion, see Dowsett 1965: 120-124. For Biblical attestations, see also Olsen 1999: 53-110.

● DIAL Alaškert, Muš *hut* ‘material, substance’, said of e.g. wheat, grapes: “The wheat/grave 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 Tervišean) with Skt. *suta-*, ‘pressed out’, etc. Pedersen (1906: 437 = 1982: 215) connects *hiwt* with OHG *fuđt* ‘damp, wet’, etc.


Not mentioning the etymology of Ačāryan, Dowsett (1965: 126) rejects Pedersen’s interpretation and proposes a derivation from QIE *pi-n-t-, cf. Skt. *piṇvita- ‘swollen (with liquid)’. He assumes a phonological development as in *giwt ‘find’ (allegedly) from *ti-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 *pe(i)(H)-, namely *pi-tu-, cf. Skt. *piṭā- m. ‘nourishment, food’ (on which see Lubotsky 1988: 45), Lith. *pičius* ‘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 Ačar'yan: *hiwt', -o- < QIE *sip-to-.

For the problem of the relation with niwt' 'matter, material, etc.', see Pedersen, ibid.; HAB 3: 455; Jahukyan 1987: 245; Olsen 1999: 55; and, especially, Dowsett 1965.\(^8\)

**hiws**, i-stem (IPl hiws-iv-k’ in Bible) ‘plait’ (Bible+), **hiwsem** ‘to weave, plait’ (John Chrysostom; “Zgōn”; Movsēs Xorena’ci), **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 fesl, and Larabal has lūsil, with an initial l-.

● **ETYM** Ačar’yan (HAB 3: 101b) accepts none of the numerous etymological attempts. He (ibid.) explains the initial l- of Larabal lūsil as resulted from contamination with the unpreserved *lesem* ‘to weave’ < PIE *plek̂-*, cf. Gr. πλέκω, OCS plesi, OHG flechtan ‘to plait’, etc. According to Jahukyan (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 Larabal lūsil as a result of contamination of hiwsem ‘to weave, plait’ with lesum, note especially Muş lūsel ‘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 hīwsn ‘carpenter’, Ačar’yan (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. ṭākṣati ‘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. hiwsem ‘carpenter’, directly equated with Skt. ṭākṣaṇ- m. ‘wood-cutter, carpenter’ (RV+) and Gr. τικτόν m. ‘carpenter, artist’; see also Mayrhofer 1986: 155. For the root, see s.v. *ṭ’siṭ(k)* ‘spindle’ and HAB s.v. t’ek’em ‘to fashion, forge, make’. Jahukyan (1987: 81, 265, 436, 440) rejects the etymology and treats the Armenian words as potential Uralian 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-ṭk-e/o-*) of PIE *pek-, cf. Gr. πεκα, Lat. pectō ‘to comb’, Lith. pėsi, pėštį ‘rupfen, ausreißen, an den Haaren ziehen’, etc., and then proposes an alternative derivation from PIE *peuk-, cf. Av. pəsk- ‘Diadem’, Arm. psak (< Iran.), Gr. πεκως ‘dense, solid’, etc. The latter etymology is also discussed by de Lamberterie who assumes a regular development of inherited *-eu- to -iv- rather than -oy- (on this, see Clackson 1994: 233-234, 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. sūkį ‘drehen, wenden, kehren, betrügen, betören’, Slav. sukati ‘to turn’, ORuss. sukati ‘zwirnen, aufwickeln’, russ. skatu (sku, skeš) ‘aufwickeln (Fäden), zwirnen’, Russ.

\(^8\) Alternative: Arm. hiw’, o-stem ‘moisture’ < QIE *sik’-to-: Skt. sikā ‘poured out, poured upon’ (RV+), cf. OHG sihan ‘to strain’, etc. (on these, see Mayrhofer EW Aia 2, 1996: 744-745).
*hiwsi(n)‘avalanche’.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.62 (1913=1991: 194-195): ew mεraw i čanaparhi jean hiws soy (vars. zhiwsisoy, hissosoy, hiwsisoy, etc.) kaleal. Apparently, Thomson (1978: 206) based himself on the readings zhiwsisoy, 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 zhiwsisoy and the others are not the most reliable readings, and the meaning ‘avalanche’ makes more sense in the context, so one should follow Ačaryan (HAB 3: 101b) in positing here the word for ‘avalanche’, which is attested in some later sources too (in the spelling forms hos(ī)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 Bulanax in having a final -in [Ačaryan 1952: 65].

DIAL. Preserved in a number of dialects of the ka-class: Xotor jur husi (according to YuşamXotorj 1964: 478b, häsi /hiwsi/), Muš, Bulanax husin, Van usi, Ozim وضوع, Moks uső (according to Orbeli 2002: 305, uső/usö, GŚg usu, NPl usik ř, GPl uso-k*-tir-u) [HAB 3: 102a; Ačaryan 1952: 276], Şatax usi [M. Muradyan 1962: 68, 200b].

Uwe Bläsing informs me that in Hamshen there are several place-names containing the Armenian plural marker -er, among them Huser. I assumed that the root can be identified with Arm. *hiwsi ‘avalanche’, which has been preserved in a dialect neighbouring with Hamšen, that is Xotorj, 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: hiwsac jeanc‘ dizac‘ 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 hivsem ‘to weave, plait’ (q.v.) and hovsem ‘to make flow, pour down, winnow’ (Bible; dial.) is suggested’. The latter is interesting especially if one takes into account the forms with the ū-vocalism in Xotorj, etc., as well as the meaning ‘snow-storm’ of Ararat ūsan (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: 32-4th; transl. Garsoian 1989: 87): yoržam kuteal dizeal zmecut’iwn bazmut’iwn t’anfrut’ean jeanc’ n katakeal hiwseal jeanc’ n i veray jmerayin leranc’
“when a great thickness of snow was piled on the wintry 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.).

hiwsi (spelled also as hiwsiws, hiwsiwsi, hisis, etc.), o-stem: GDSg hiwsi(o)-w; hiwsi, ea-stem: GDSg hiwsi(w)-o-y, ISg hiwsi(w)-a-w ‘north; northern wind’ (Bible+).


DIAL Axalc’xa, Karin, Salmast hisis; T’iflis, Ararat husis; Sebastia hüsüs; Muš husus; Farberd 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. šiurė ‘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.

Jahukyan (1986-87; 1992: 18-19) derives hiwsi(i) ‘north’ from *seukoi-k(y)o-, a compound of PIE *seuk-e/oi- (the locative form of *seuk-o-, cf. Lith. sukti ‘to wind, turn’, Slav. sukti ‘to turn’; see s.v. hiwsem ‘to weave, plait’ on the etymon) and PIE *kei- ‘to lie, be somewhere’; thus *qui se trouve à l’opposé”. He treats it as “côté inverse”, in opposition with haraw ‘south’, etymologically “côté du devant” (q.v.). Olsen (1999: 960) lists hiwsi among the words of unknown origin and does not mention Petrosyan’s and Jahukyan’s etymologies.

The interpretation of Jahukyan is plausible. Nevertheless, the derivation from PIE *seu- ‘left’, also mentioning Russ. séver ‘North’ and Lith. šiurė ‘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.

The left side is associated with ‘north’ (Volpe apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 349, concerning also the etymon *seu-), cf. also Mbr. tuath ‘left; northern’ (see Pokorny 1959: 1079-1080). The second part of the Armenian word may be equated with *keik- ‘cold wind; northern wind’ (: Russ. čiĉer ‘cold wind; northern wind’, Gr. καικίας, -ου ‘northeastern wind’, etc., see EtimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 132). The vocalic alternation seems to point to a substratum word. Thus: PIE *seu-keik- (perhaps based on locative) ‘northern cold wind’ > PArm. *seu-keikiV- (with regular palatalization of the velar after *-u-) > *seu-keik- (assimilation of velars) > *hewis- > hiwsi(i) ‘northern wind’. This is, of course, highly hypothetical.


In Movšēs Xorenac’i 1.32 (1913=1990: 88L31, transl. Thomson 1978: 124): Oč’ unimk’ asel, imastun kam anhančar astanōr linel mez hiwson, patkanawor kam oč’, zaynoc’ik ayžm uren zm hiwssan bans, zkarewosn ev merosv aržani šaradru’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”.

hiwsi
DIAL: Dial. *xus is attested in an inscription from 1591. Present in Van *xur, GSG *xsan, NPI *xner, Ozim *xws, Salmast *xus [Ačaryan 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+).


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 *hnjan.

Several attestations in Agat’angelos, referring to special wine-pressing buildings/rooms in gardens in NE side of Varatašap=Norak’alak’ (nowadays ӖӁiәn):

mtan i hnjayaṟks aygestanwoyn, or kan šineal i hiwsoy yarewelic’ kusę (1909=1980: 851L5f, § 150);
gtel linęń nok’a i hnjans šimuac’oń (901L1, §161);
hasue’ińeń ań durs hnjanin, ur ēiń vank’ noc’a artak’oy k’alak’in (911L15f, § 166);
erṭ’eal ař hnjanək’a (= hnjan-a-w-k’-n; vars. hnj/canawn), ur ēiń isk yaraj vank’ iwreac’ (104L9f, § 192);
ev mi omn or andeń i nerk’s spanin in hnjani and, ur ēiń vank’ noc’a (108L3f, § 201);
ev amp’op’εuc’, ar gnac’ i hnnann, ur vank’ isk leal ēiń noc’a (118L1f, § 224).

On the ancient wine-presses of Armenia, see Tiracjan 1983: 57-58.

DIAL: Ararat, Muş, Bulanx *hnjan, Agulis *njun, Melrî *njân (see Aḥayan 1954: 243, 278a), Zeyt’un *njân, all meaning ‘grapes basin, wine-press’; Xarberd, Akm, Tigranakert (h)*njjan ‘garden-hut’; Ararat *hnjanapat ‘ruin of a wine-pressing building’ [HAB 3: 105-106]. Note that Ararat *aṙaṙast is a part of a *hnjan, but,
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hnoc'

according to Bałdasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan (1971: 218), in Aštarak aṙak’ast is synonymous to Ōšakan hnjan (see s.v. aṙagust).

In a fairy-tale recorded by Sero Xanzadyan in Goris in 1947 (HŽHeK’ 7, 1979: 414-22), 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: 105Nr26).

● ETYM Ačaryan (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 Jahukyan (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 suggested in NHB, pointing out that it is semantically remote, unless hnjan previously had a different meaning. According to a tradition, a guarding snake lives’ (see s.v. awazan), with the n-epenthesis (on which, see 2.1.30.1).

For the semantics, see s.v. aṙagast.

hnoc’, a-stem: GDSg hnoc’-i, AblSg i hnoc’-ē, ISg hnoc’-a-w ‘oven, furnace’ (Bible+).


● DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 3: 106. According to V. Aṙak’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 *Hepn- with Hitt. happina- ‘baking kiln, fire-pit’, OEngl. ofen ‘oven’, etc. The Hititite form points to *h,ep-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’rc- ‘to burn bricks or pots of clay to make them stiff’.

*hol-an)- ‘uncovered, naked’: hol-ani ‘uncovered, bare, naked’, hol-an-ē/īm ‘to bare, uncover’ (both Bible+), hol-an- ‘id.’ (John Chrysostom, T’ovmay Arcruni, Mesrop Erēc’, Nersēs Snorhali); hol-a-t’ew-em ‘to stretch one’s arms’ (Sahak catholicos Jora/op’orec’i, 7th cent., etc.), etc.
holani renders Gr. ἁκατόκάλυπτος ‘uncovered’ in e.g. 1 Corinthians 11.13 (referring to a woman), and the verb holane/im – ἁπατόκαλυπτο to uncover’ in 2 Kings 6.20, 22; further: holaneal = adv. ἁκάλυπτος in 3 Maccabees 4.6.

The form holaneal ‘openly, uncovered’ is also found in e.g. P’awstos Buzand 3.17 (1883=1984: 39-46): holaneal gorcēn zmēts: “they committed sins openly” (transl. Garsoian 1989: 92). For the full passage, see s.v. xēt’ ‘bite, pain, etc.’. For holanenem ‘to strip naked’, see e.g. P’awstos Buzand 4.58 (150-15; transl. 178).

holaneal = adv. ἁκάλυπτω in 3 Maccabees 4.6. The form holaneal ‘openly, uncovered’ is also found in e.g. P’awstos Buzand 3.17 (1883=1984: 39-46): holaneal gorcēn zmēts: “they committed sins openly” (transl. Garsoian 1989: 92). For the full passage, see s.v. xēt’ ‘bite, pain, etc.’. For holanenem ‘to strip naked’, see e.g. P’awstos Buzand 4.58 (150-15; transl. 178).

ETYM Since Meillet (1894: 154), connected with OCS polje, Russ. poľe ‘field’, poľyj ‘open, bare, empty’, etc., and Arm. hol ‘earth, ground’. See s.v. hol for more detail.

hol, o-stem ‘earth, ground, soil; burial plot, cemetery’ (Bible+); ‘plot, estate’ in P’awstos Buzand 5.31 (1883=1984: 194-195; transl. Garsoian 1989: 212), and Step’anos Orbelean. MidArm. derivatives in the meaning ‘cemetery’: hol-va(y)r-k’, hol-vrd-i, etc. [Miǰ HayBaṙ 2, 1992: 45b].

As a component in place-names, see Hübschmann 1904: 384; Ḫahukyan 1987: 413.


The x- in Van and adjacent dialects regularly comes from h-. In others: through assimilation h...l > x...l, see e.g. Aḵahyran 1947: 51 and 2003: 411, for Hamšen and Svedia, respectively.


Meillet (1894: 154), followed by Aḵahyran (HAB), Saradževa and Ḫahukyan (ibid.), connected also Arm. hol-an-i ‘uncovered, bare, naked’, verbal hol-an- ‘to bare’ (both Bible+), later hol-on-; see s.v. *holl-an-). Olsen (1999: 310) considers holani to be etymologically unclear.

As is clear from het: otn ‘foot’ (q.v.), PIE *p-y yields Arm. h- when followed by *e and is lost before *o. This makes the etymology of hol problematic. Discussing this phonological development, Pedersen (1906: 370 = 1982: 148) rejects Meillet’s etymology and suggests a connection with Lat. solum, -i 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. hol cannot belong to it since *su- would yield Arm. k'- [HAB 3: 111b; Olsen 1999: 53112].

The traditional etymology may be justified if one accepts the following explanation for the problem of Arm. h-. Lat. plānus probably reflects an original *plh2-nó-, a no-adjective with a zero-grade root, whereas Lith. plōnas and Latv. plāns introduced full grade *pleh₂- from the verbal forms [Mayrhofer 1987: 103, 10373a; 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 *of ‘earth’ < *pol(h₂/n)- may have become holan- and hol 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 Ačarjan (HAB 3: 112a), Kurd. xöl(f) ‘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.

holm, o-stem ‘wind’ (Bible+); also *holm, NPI holmunk’ frequently in Aristotle [NHB 2: 117c]; In view of the absence of compounds which would corroborate *holm, Ačarjan (AčarHLPatm 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- > -lm- through dissimilation, cf. nman ‘like’ > dial. lm-); see also Meillet 1936: 48; Pokorny 1959: 39; Mallory/Adams 1997: 82a (< *hōnmon); 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. holm 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 > lm, which cannot be demonstrated elsewhere (though it cannot be refuted either by a case with -nm-preserved)”. Schindler (1994: 397) derives holm from *h₂onh₁mo-, and compares it with the case of hoviw ‘shepherd’ (q.v.).


One wonders if a contamination of *h₂onh₁mo- with Skt. anila- m. ‘wind, air’ < *h₂en₁lo- (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 hrašakerin tesleamb), see AčarAnjn 3, 1946: 94. In compounds: hoy-a-kap ‘superb, wonderful, famous, praiseworthy’, with kapem ‘to tie, construct’ (Bible+); hoy-anun ‘famous’, with anun ‘name’ (Book of Chries).
For the semantics of *hoy-a-kap* Āčāryan (HAB 3: 113a) compares *ah-a-gin* ‘terrible; enormous’ from *ah* ‘fear, terror’. Note the use of *ahagin* and *hayakap* 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[1/]); transl. Thomson 1985: 146): *xoyakap ew yakanawor k’ajamartut eamb* “with splendid and outstanding bravery, fought <<...>>”.

**ETYM** Āčāryan (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, Āčāryan (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 Āčāryan himself; see above), which seems improbable and unnecessary.

Jāhukyan (1967: 106, 106a) considers Āčāryan’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 *kwe-*: 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, -ire* ‘to hit’), OIr. *úath* ‘fear’ < *pou-no-, Welsh *offn* ‘fear’ < *pou-to-*, (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 deverbal *hoyt* ‘lost its *-t*-analogically after the unattested verb *huyem* ‘to fear’ which can be interpreted as a *je*-present with zero-grade in the root, of the type Gr. *βαίνω* ‘to go’ and Lat. *veniō* ‘to come; to go’ from *gʷm-i*- (see also 2.2.6.1); thus: *pu-je-mi > *huyem.

Uncertain.

**hoyl, i-stem:** GDPl *hoyl-i-e* ‘in Plato ‘group (of people, animals, etc.).’

Plato, Lewond, etc. As the second member of compounds: Hexaemeron+. Later also *hol-, holan- ‘to collect, gather, assemble’.

**ETYM** Schcetelowitz 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. *pāls* ‘Haufe, Herde’, etc. The separation of *hoyl* from *hol- can hardly be accepted. Āčāryan (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.*
hoyn

Olsen (1999: 778, 808) treats holonem ‘to collect, gather’ as a denotative from *plh₁-ˌno- ‘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 (*plh₁.C- > Arm. -oloC-) is uncertain; see 2.1.20.


The idea about PIE *plh₁- ‘full, abundant’ can be maintained only if one attempts a derivation from PIE feminine *plh₁-ˌu-ih₂- (cf. Skt. f. pūrvi-,) assuming a metathesis. Thus: *pelh₁-ˌu-ih₂- > PArm. *helow-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’anglos+). Spelled also as hivn (Grigor Magistros). For Galen, see Greggin 1985: 56.

In Agat’anglos § 644 (1909=1984: 330ABB), hoyn is found in an enumeration of fruit-names, following muin ‘pomegranate’ (the fruit) and t’at ‘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 Kilikec’i’s addendum to Ašxarhac’oyc’ (Armenian Geography), as a product of Cilicia. (J. Anasyan 1967: 283; Hewsen 1992: 323). Also *hivn-i in the place-name Hivmeac’ jor in Siwnik’ (see Hübschmann 1904: 445).


Hačan ġin [Ačaryan 2003: 89, 324] could also be from hivn, cf. jīvn ‘snow’ > Hačan j’in, etc. (see Ačaryan 2003: 87-88). Note that ClArm. *ho- regularly yields Hačan fo- [Ačaryan 2003: 106-107] or fü- (Gasparyan 1966: 41, 56). Two possibilities: (1) Hačan ġin derives from *hiwn and therefore does not show the sound change ho- > fo-; (2) Hačan ġin derives from hoyn, and the sound change ho- > fo-postdates the development of the diphthong -oy-.

Hamsen ćni ‘a kind of tree (= Russ. grab)’ is mentioned by V. 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’ > ažri. Phonologically this is not problematic, cf. kori > gori, mozi > mazi, ofíl > lığa, ġzí > ġżni, etc.

The dialectal distribution (Cilicia, Hamšen, Ti’iflis, Łori, Larabal) corroborates the botanic evidence (compare FlTurk 4, 1972: 539-541, 497Map74, 549Map75).


I propose to derive Arm. hoyn ‘cornel’ from PIE *HoHs- (or perhaps better: *HH₁es-enko-) ‘ash-tree’: Lat. ornis f. ‘mountain-ash’ < *ōsēno-, cf. OIr. uinnuis ‘ash-tree’ < *ōsno-, Balto-Slavic *Hohs- ‘ash’: Lith. ėsės, Russ. jāsen’, etc. For references and a discussion of this tree-name, see s.v. hac’i ‘ash-tree’. A development *HH₁es-enko- > PArm. *hohéno- > *hoh(lij)o > hoyn is formally impeccable. If the i-declension is old (which is uncertain), one might posit a QIE feminine *HH₁es-enko-.

The semantic shift ‘ash’ > ‘cornel’ may be explained by functional and cultural similarities; compare OIr. askr m. ‘ash-tree; spear’, OHG ase m. ‘ash-tree; spear’,
OEngl. æsc ‘ash-tree; spear’ on the one hand, and Gr. κράνος, n. ‘cornelian cherry’, κράνεια f. ‘cornelian cherry, Cornus mas’ also meaning ‘spear’, on the other. Note especially κρᾱν ‘cornel; ash’ (late attestations; probably preserved in the dialect of Muš), which must be 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)tn-. 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.; Balramyan 1960: 90a).

In chapter 3 of the famous fairy-tale “Anahit” by Ė. Aţayan (1979: 349-40), 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. hāyi-, Gr. ὀίς, ὀίος and οἰός ‘sheep’, Lat. ovis, etc.) and *peh2(s)- ‘to protect, pasture’ (cf. OCS pasti ‘to pasture’, Lat. pāscō ‘to pasture’, Hitt. paḫš- ‘to protect’, etc.). For the compound, cf. Skt. ga-pā- m. ‘herdsman’ < *cowherd’ (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 499-500), avi-pālā- ‘shepherd’, perhaps also *hawit-al (q.v.).

Although much debated, the etymology cannot be abandoned. Schindler (1994: 397) reconstructs strong *h3eui- vs. weak *h4aui- (acrostatic), deriving Toch. B ā(u)w, avi ‘ewe’ from the latter form, and for the Armenian h- comparing the case of hołm ‘wind’ (q.v.). On Toch. B ā(š)w ‘ewe’ and eye ‘sheep’, see Adams 1999: 35, 92; Kim 2000.

The vocalism of hoviv is in contrast with the rule according to which *o in initial *Ho-, *xa-, 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 hoviv ‘shepherd and loganam ‘to bathe’. Jahukyan (1990a: 5) assumes an influence of the once-existing word *howi- ‘sheep’ from *huyiyo-. However, the PIE word is represented in the form *h3euis and there are no cognates which would point to *h3eui-o-. If Jahukyan 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: *how), gen. *hogi. It seems therefore more natural to assume that the -u- 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**

**hot**, o-stem ‘smell, odour’ (Bible+); **hotim** ‘to smell’ (Bible+); also redupl. **hotot-** ‘id.’ (Bible). As pointed out by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 118a), both in CIArm. 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(s)ød** refers to ‘bad smell’, opposed to **høm** ‘pleasant odour’ (< **ham** q.v.); see HAB 3: 118b; Ačaryan 1947: 240-241. On the semantics of the verb, see below.

**ETYM** Since NHB (1: 123b), connected with Gr. ὀδηγός ‘smell’, Lat. odor, odōris m. ‘smell, scent, perfume’, etc. [HAB 3: 118; Hübshmann 1897: 468]. Earlier, Hübshmann (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; Hübshmann 1897: 468; Kortlandt 1980b: 128; Schrijver 1991: 48; Olsen 1999: 47]. This would be possible if the Latin was originally neuter (see Olsen 1999: 47a). 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. ὀδωδή 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: NPl **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.

Jähukyan (1987: 146, 259, 436) hesitantly derives **hor** from the PIE reflexive pronoun *s(e)u̯e- (Arm. iwr) and posits a QIE *sou-ro-. This is uncertain.

Recently, the word has been derived from IE *stē(a)ro-, cf. Skt. svālā- m. ‘wife’s brother’ and OCS šur, šurim, ‘wife’s brother’ [Hul 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: 663-67; 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 Chrries), ‘an open balcony’ (Zak’aria Sarkawag/K’anak’erč’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. Ačaryan (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. πρόον m. ‘protruding rocks, mountaintop’ and Skt. pravānā- ‘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 Āruandu (in Media) and derives both from PIE *perȗ̯-n̥-to-, cf. Skt. pārvata- ‘rocky, rugged; (m.) mountain, mountain-range’ (RV+), YAv. paurnuata- 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 Jāhukyan 1987: 558), although the details are not clear. A theoretical *fraw(a)wan- ‘rock’ (cf. the above-mentioned Gr. πρόν, etc.) is thinkable. If one starts with the meaning ‘balcony’, one may assume an Iranian formation with the prefix *fra- and b/wand- ‘to bind, weave’, borrowed into Arm. vand(an)ak ‘net, basket, cage’, and, especially, ‘upper floor, terrace’. Note also Goris and Larabał čöravan ‘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 ĖtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 71. For a designation of an upper construction in a house based upon a pillar as containing the prefix ‘at, by, for, before’ cf. YAv. fra-skəmba m. ‘porch’ next to Skt. skambha- m. ‘prop, support, pillar’ (RV+) and Arm. pat-šgam ‘balcony’ (borrowed from Iranian, cf. MPers. pdy-škm ‘space’, NPers. pa-škam ‘summer-house’), as well as Arm. aṙa-sta ‘ceiling’ < *a’at/on the pillar’ (q.v.).

hu ‘purulent blood’; hapax, in Mxit’ar Herač’i, 12th century: Apa t’ē ivr ēut’iwnn avirt, na herje zeraksn ew i yandam min vat’i, hu ew šaraw Encayi iwrm (see HAB 3: 120b; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 48b).

●ETYM Since Müller 1890: 4, compared with Skt. páya- ‘pus’, púti- (AV) ‘stinking, putrid’; Gr. πυός n. ‘purulence’, Lat. pūs, pūris n. ‘pus’, pūteō ‘to rot’, Lith. pūtī ‘to rot’, etc. This etymology is accepted by Hübbschmann (1897: 468). However, A.Charšyan (1897a: 169b; 1898b: 371b; HAB 3: 120-121) considers Arm. hu a loan from Pers. hū ‘pus’ (cf. Kurd. heu ‘gangrene’).

Hübbschmann (1899: 45, and p.c. apud HAB 3: 121a) agreed with A.Charšyan 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: 913; 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].

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'; 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’ (Τ'ovmay Arcruni 3.8), ‘passage, way’ (Evagrius of Pontus, Dawit' Anyalt', Book of Chries), ‘opening, gap’ (P'awstos Buzand 3.1, see below); also GDPl anhun-c' (Dawit' Anyaɫt').

The two Biblical attestations of **hun** are found in:

- Joshua 2.7: ὁδὸν τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἐπὶ τὰς διαβάσεις. Compare hunn Yordanan getoy in Zgōn/Afrahat [NHB 2: 124b].

The word occurs in Sebēos (7th cent.) several times [G. Xač’atryan 2004: 284 s.v.], very clearly referring to ‘ford, a shallow place in a river where it can be crossed’. In Chapter 17 (Xač’atryan/Eliazaryan 2005: 96; Chapter 3.7 in 1851: 84; transl. Thomson 1999: 35): ἐν αὐταὶ ἐνεκτὶ τοῦ κατακόμβου τῆς Τράχας, τὰ ἔθνη τῆς διαβάσεως καὶ τὰ ἑλέπεια τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ τῶν διαβάσεως τῶν ἰσχυρῶν. Ew ibrew ērin hun, <...>, asen nma: “C’ōyc' mez zhun getoys, apa t’ē oē' spanc’uk’ zk’ez”. Ew nora ařeal zawn, 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 will kill you’. He led the army and pointed out the ford below”.

Two more attestations in Sebēos, Chapter 38 (Xač’atryan/Eliazaryan 2005: 174, 176, 177, transl. Thomson 1999: 82, 83); anc’anē and hun getoyn Erassay, yawann Vrnjunis ew banakin yandastans norā “he crossed the ford of the Araxes river at the town of Vrnjunik’ and camped in its fields”; anc’eal and Sirak hasanē i hun getoyn Erassay, ew anc’ē getawv aŕ Vardanaartewn 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 Łewond (NHB 2: 124b); anc’uć’anēin and getin Erass, and hunn Juhayu “they made them cross the River Erasx (Araxes)
through the ford of Úlula”. 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: 260-263; transl. Thomson 1985: 232): Èw è zi i nurb ew i hun telis juc’ n ankeal, i nmin xreal kan aŋšar, ew diwraw ankanic’i i iers 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”.

Armič’joy hun and Evanakac’ hun, villages in Getark‘unik’, in the province of Siwnik’, attested in Step’anos Stepanelian (A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 397ab; see Hübbschmann 1904: 384, 402, 426). The meaning ‘opening, gap’ is attested in P’awstos Buzand 3.1 (1883=1984: 5:1-55): <...> zugeal hamemat ānhun t’woc’ aɾarkut’eanc’s aɾ i hawasarel ēšmartuṭ’eann “<...>, could he make them equal to the limitless numbers of these proposals”; i mēj bazmakoyt skayic’n, anhun xōlac’ ew užaworac’ “amid the multitude of infinitely ferocious and strong giants”; anhun sksaw ołolan yanarč c’ankut’iwns, minče tattkanal i nnanē amenayn naxarac’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 later literature we find hun-awor ‘limited, having a limit’, in contrast with an-hun ‘limitless’ (Oskip’orik, see NHB 2: 124c).

DIAL Acāryan (HAB 3: 123a) records an independent hun, with unspecified semantics, in Muš and Bulanox. Balasasaryan-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’e’an (1964: 510b), Xnis-Bulanox hun refers to ‘ford, shallow of a river’. Note also the compound naxr-hun ‘ford for cattle, herd’ in Melik’e’an 1964: 293:122: hasank’ getap’ ew naxrhamnć geta nc’elov mtak’ K’arablurneru mēj : “we reached the river-bank and, crossing the river through the cattle-ford, entered the ‘Stone-hills’”.

The derivative an-hun ‘unfordable, impassable; bottomless, broad; infinite, endless, limitless’ is first attested in Amos 5.24: ḥēṛẹ̄l ḥēn oṣ̣ gēmāppoṛ ṣ̣ōj̣aṭ.” A number of attestations are to be found in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.4, 1.10, 3.63 (1913=1991: 14:21, 32:208, 346:121; transl. Thomson 1978: 71, 85, 339): <...>, zugeal hamemat ānhun t’woc’ aɾarkut’eanc’s aɾ i hawasarel ēšmartuṭ’eann “<...>, could he make them equal to the limitless numbers of these proposals”; i mēj bazmakoyt skayic’n, anhun xōlac’ ew užaworac’ “amid the multitude of infinitely ferocious and strong giants”; anhun sksaw ołolan yanarč c’ankut’iwns, minče tattkanal i nnanē amenayn naxarac’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 later literature we find hun-awor ‘limited, having a limit’, in contrast with an-hun ‘limitless’ (Oskip’orik, see NHB 2: 124c).

DIAL Acāryan (HAB 3: 123a) records an independent hun, with unspecified semantics, in Muš and Bulanox. Balasasaryan-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’e’an (1964: 510b), Xnis-Bulanox hun refers to ‘ford, shallow of a river’. Note also the compound naxr-hun ‘ford for cattle, herd’ in Melik’e’an 1964: 293:122: hasank’ getap’ ew naxrhamnč geta nc’elov mtak’ K’arablurneru mēj : “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 Erêz.

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; Aloyan 1976, 1: 910c]. The meaning ‘ford, shallow’ is seen e.g. in the proverb *Huna č'gete'ac geto minel* “To enter the river not knowing the ford” [Malxaseanc’ HBB 3: 137b].

The meaning ‘way, direction, course’ is particularly seen in phrases such as *hun meǰdnel* ‘to put into the right order or course, to give an adequate course or direction’, *hun meǰənknel* ‘to fall onto the right direction, to begin with an ordered work’, *hunic' hanel* ‘to take out of the right order’, etc. [HayLazzaDarjar 1975: 374].

T’iflis *hunk'-u-bunk’, Ararat *hunk' u b'unk’, Širak *an u b‘una, Van an-bun, Lazax 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: 179L-6f; HAB 1: 484b; 3: 123a].

The derivative *an-hun* ‘unfordable; bottomless; endless(ly)’ is found in a late medieval folk-song (Aloyan 1940: 111Nöö):

 Im barjragnay lusin,
 Yu r kert'as gišerə 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* [Baframyan 1960: 73a], Xarberd *anahun* ‘bottomless (sea)’, Aparan, Bulanx ‘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 *hun garun hanel* “to accomplish, fulfill 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’ [Ačaryan 1952: 276]. See also in what follows.


Comparable dial. (inmk.) forms are recorded in NHB 2: 124bc: *hn-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 kno oč’ elanē i hun* “one cannot cope with a quarrelsome woman”; *bınu‘eamb ban i hun č’elanē* “one cannot succeed by force”. The former illustration is similar to that from the fables of Vardan Aygeke’i (see MiHayBar 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-ka* ‘the essence of something, all the details of a deed; the entire family/tribe and origin of somebody’, with hun ‘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-a-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-ui* ‘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’ (Ačean 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. *yola gnal/ert’al* ‘to cope in a way’ vs. *yol* ‘way, road’ from Turk. *yol* ‘way; manner’ (see Ačean 1902: 251; HayLezBrbBr, 4, 2007: 117); cf. also Engl. *way* ‘way, road’ : ‘way, manner’.


The PIE word was a hysterodynamic *h1*-stem: NSg *pónt-i-h1-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 *-h1-*: 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 202b33; Beekes 2003: 171. It is remarkable that
The variety of meanings represented by cognate forms and the semantic nuances of Skt. pāṇthā 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).

*huṛ- 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-huṛ, oske-huṛn ‘gilded, adorned with gold’ said of garment, coat, silk, cover, collar, tassels, etc. (Bible, Lazar P‘arpec‘i, Elišē, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, Philo, Hesychius of Jerusalem, etc.), margar-ta-huṛn ‘adorned with pearls’ (Paterica).

*DIAL No dialectal record in HAB 3: 124-125.

According to Lusenc’ 1982: 152-153, 221b, 229b, here belong Areš huṛ ‘bracelet’ and oskiya-huṛ. The latter obviously continues the Classical Armenian compound oskehuṛ(n) < *oski-a-huṛ(n), with secondary restoration of the conjunction -a-.

*ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 124-125. See s.v. yeṛum ‘to tie, fasten or join together, link together in a series, string together, put around (said of gems, etc.).’

huṛ (singulative), o-stem: gen.-dat. hr-o-y, instr. hr-o-v (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacutearean 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.).


82 According to Hübschmann (1897: 397), the resemblance is accidental.

Also Germanic languages have preserved both stems, cf. OIc. fūrr, fyr m. 'fire', OHG fuir, German Feuer, etc. beside Goth. fún < *pyón, gen. funins 'fire', OIc. funi m. 'fire', OHG funcho 'spark', German Funke 'spark' (see Lehmann 1986: 120; K. Schmidt 1987: 45; Matzinger 2005: 61). For a discussion of the Germanic material and, in particular, of the etymology of Funke 'spark', see Beekes 1996a.


J

jag, u-stem: GDPl 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’.


For dialectal evidence of MidArm. aner-jag ‘brother-in-law, wife’s brother’ cf. e.g. Moks ṡerćák‘, gen. ṡerćák-‘u ‘῾yurın, slaughtery’ [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: 114798, 291804.
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**jagar**


Perhaps a substratum word of the shape *ĝ̌hā*- or the like.

**jagar**, a-stem according to NHB 2: 144c, but without evidence ‘funnel’; attested in Agat'angelos § 109 (1909=1980: 6512); for the passage, see s.v. tik ‘winebag’. In "Čafontir": Jagar edin i beran nora “They put a funnel into his mouth”.

**DIAL** Preserved in a number of ko-dialects [HAB 3: 142b].

**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 142.


Ačaṙyan (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. MIr. *vagr, Arm. vagr, Skt. vyāghra- ‘tiger’.

**jat** (u-stem in NHB 2: 145b, but without evidence) ‘derision, mockery’ (Lazar P’arpec’i, John Chrysostom, etc.), ja-an-k’, a-stem ‘id.’, jatem ‘to deride’ (Bible+), ‘to conquer’ (Eusebius of Caesarea).

GDPl ja-an-a-c’ is attested in Jeremiah 51.18 (not 11.18, as is missprinted in HAB), John Chrysostom, Yovhannēs Ōjnec’i, etc., as well as (not cited in HAB) in P’awstos Buzand 5.3 (1883=1894: 1604; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 188): tšnamans jaanac’i berdargel pašarmann “of his taunts during the siege of the fortress”; see the full passage s.v. *awre(a)r.


The appurtenance of the Armenian is accepted by Hübschmann (1899: 48: from *ǧȟľu- with a question mark), Aćaṙyan (HAB 3: 143b), Jähukyan (1987: 127: from *ǧȟľ - with a question mark). In etymological dictionaries, however, the PIE form is usually reconstructed as *ǵʰle/ou-, with a non-palatalized guttural, and the Armenian form is not included (see Pokorny 1959: 451; Mallory/Adams 1997: 255-256). Jähukyan (ibid.), albeit with reservation, includes also jhem ‘to watch’ (only in HHB and Bārgirk’ hayoc’ [HAB 3: 155b; Amalyan 1975: 19449, 39849]), which is highly improbable.
jałk, a-stem: ISg jałk-a-w (Eusebius of Caesarea); later: i-stem (GDPl jałk-i-c’ in Mxit’ar Aneci’; 12-13th cent.) and o-stem (ISg jałk-o-v in Çağantir) ‘rod, stick, staff, whip, switch (often for beating)’ (John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea, Dawit’ Anyalt’), ‘twig, branch’ (Mxit’ar Aneci’), subst. ‘beating, whipping’ (in a homily ascribed to Elišè).

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, Xač’ikyan 1949: 84b152, rendered as ‘прямой’ by Arewšatyan 1956: 326); cf. the compounds jałk-a-her (Severian of Gabala) and jałk-a-maz (Plato) ‘having jałk hair’.

In the oldest stage of Classical Armenian we only find the verb jałk-em ‘to beat with a rod’, jałk-im ‘to be beaten’ (2 Corinthians 11.25, also in Eusebius of Caesarea, Çağantir, Zamagirk’). The attestation in 2 Corinthians 11.25 reads: *erics jałkेक’ay : τρὶς ἐρραβδίσϑην “three times I was beaten with rods”. Though attested late and absent in the dialects, the noun jałk is original, and the verb jałk-em is clearly denominative exactly like Gr. ῥαβδίζω ‘to beat with a rod’ from ῥάβδος ‘rod, twig, staff’. This is corroborated also by the etymology of jałk. Note that this very same Greek verb corresponds to Arm. jałkem in the passage from 2 Corinthians 11.25.


Further see s.v. *jał-t-el ‘to beat’.


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. CIArm. 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 *jałg-k- would be simplified to jałk-.

Note also another iterative form of this word, *jał-t-el ‘to beat’ (q.v.).
*ja(t(k)-t-el

Arm. *jaɫ, a-stem, points to fem. *ĝh(a)lĝ-eh₂-, cf. Olc. gelgja ‘pole, stake’ from *-ieh₂-

IE *ĝhalĝ- ‘long thin pole’ has been borrowed into PFUgr. *šalka, Finn. salko, Mordvin salgo (Koivulehto 2001: 238; Witzel 2003: 11).

*ja(t(k)-t-el (dial.) ‘to beat, whip’.

*DIAL Karin (j’aɫdɛl, H. Mkrt’yan 1952: 157a), Alek’andrapol, Arabkir, etc. *jal(tel ‘to beat wool with a rod to make it soft’, jal(i)č ‘rod’ [Açarean 1913: 679a; HAB 3: 144a; Gabikean 1952: 187; Witzel 2003: 319a].

*je- obl. stem of du-k’ pl. ‘you’: acc.-dat. jez, gen. jer, abl. i jēnʃ, instr. je-w-k’

See s.v. du ‘you’.

*jelun, an-stem: GDSg jeluan in Eznik Kołbac’i, Gregory of Nyssa, Eusebius of Caesarea, etc. ‘ceiling; palate’.

In the main meaning (‘ceiling’), jelun is attested since the Bible. For references and a discussion see Thomson 1992: 198.

ISg jelunam (Anania Sanahnee’i, 11th cent.) presupposes a (probably the original) by-form *jelunm [NHB 2: 149c; HAB 3: 148a]. For -u/wn : -mn, see 2.1.22.11.

In John of Damascus, jelun refers to ‘palate’: verin jelunk’ beranoy ‘upper ceiling of the mouth’.
In Eznik Kolbaci's I.3 (1994: 12), the sun is metaphorically described as "crag mi i meci tan i měf jetvan ey 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 jetvan "the sky <...> like a ceiling".

The by-form john-k' is attested in Severian of Gabala, as well as, in API john-s (var. jehn-s), in "Vark" S. Görgay zōrāwarin". It matches the form of the dialect of Akn (see below).

**DIAL.** Akn j'zhunk' (see also Gabriēlean 1912: 309), Trapizon c'xink' [HAB 3: 148b], Hamšen c'xink'; gen. c'xonk'-i [Ačâryan 1947: 35, 242]. On Trapizon/Hamšen, see below.

**SEMANTICS** For 'palate' : 'ceiling' : 'sky', see 3.7.1.

**ETYM** The connection with Gr. χείρ 'hand', etc. Hübschmann 1877: 25; 1883: 40; 1897: 470; HAB 3: 148-149; Adams 1999: 649-650. The root is -a- (note an archaic instr. -a of Gabala, etc.; dialect of Akn). For the suffix -a, see also s.v. *aïr-zel*. Note the intermediary form johnk' (Severian of Gabala, etc.; dialect of Akn). For the suffix -un cf. c'aw-l-un 'stalk, straw', q.v. For an attempt of reconstructing the original paradigm, see s.v. jol.

According to Ačâryan (HAB 3: 148b), Megr. cxwi/ni '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'xwin-k' (a contamination of jehn and c'uit) would be impossible since Arm. -x- comes from -t- which is not compatible with Kartvelian *g (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 jehn ‘ceiling’ and be treated as borrowed from Megr. cxwen(d)-, cxwi(d)- ‘ceiling’.

**jeř-** 
NAccSg jeř-n, AllSg i jeř-n, GDSg jeř-in, LocSg i jer-in. AblSg i jeř-an-č, ISg jeř-am-b (note an archaic instr. jer-b- in compounds); plur. a-stem: NPl jeř-k', AccPl z-jeř-s, LocAllPl i jeř-s, GDP 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- in, jeř-a- and jer-b-, see HAB 3: 149b.

**DIAL.** Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly as a frozen plural jerk' [HAB 3: 149b].


---

84 The comparison with the Greek word has been suggested already by Awgerean, Klaproth, Brosset, et al., see HAB 3: 149.
Arm. singulative jeṙ'n derives from PIE acc. *ǵʰesr-ṇ. The trilled -ṙ- is not due to the following nasal but reflects *-sr-, as is clearly seen from pl. jeṙ-k’ < *ǵʰesr-es. The old genitive *jeṙ- < *ǵʰesr-os (cf. Hitt. kišraš, Gr. γειρός, Dor. γηρός) has been reshaped after n-declension. Archaic instr. *jeṙ-b continues *je(h)ar-b < *ǵʰesr-b’i. 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; Ravnes 1991: 101-102; Olsen 1999: 174-175; Viredaz 2000. For a discussion of the PIE paradigm, see Beekes 1973: 90.

Arm. plur. jeṙ-a- may be explained by the original feminine gender (Olsen 1999: 175); for a possible *ǵʰes-r-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), GDPl 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 buṙn harkanic’ē zšan jetoy : ὡσπερ ὁ κρατῶν κέρκου κυνός.

The MidArm. meaning ‘penis’ is attested in Datastanagir’ (Law Code, 1265 AD) of Smbat Sparapet. One of the two attestations (Miǰ HayBar 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].


The Armenian word is usually derived from s-stem *ǵʰed(os)- (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). Jḥuhkyan (1987: 127) posits *ǵʰed-o-.

For the semantic shift ‘rump’ > ‘tail’ cf. Gr. ὄφρος ‘rump’, οὐρά ‘tail’, OEngl. ears ‘arse’, OIr. err ‘tail, back of chariot’, etc. (see s.v. or ‘rump’). For ‘tail’: ‘rump’ : ‘penis’ cf. ÉtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 479-481, s.v. Iran. *dum(b)a- ‘tail’. Note also MidArm. ag-at ‘castrated’ (Grigor Tat’ewac’i, see Miǰ HayBar 1, 1987: 12b) from agi ‘tail’ (q.v.).

Jew, o-stem: GDPl 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. χέϝω, -ομαι ‘to pour, spill, gush, shed, douse’, χύλος m. ‘smelting furnace; funnel’, χύδαν ‘in streams, by heaps, disorderly’, χυδάιος ‘abundant, ordinary, common’, Lat. fundō- n. ‘libation, sacrificial liquid, sacrificial substance’ (RV+), havo-, pres. jihótí ‘to sacrifice, offer, pour (an oblation, ghee, etc.)’, etc., from PIE *g̥h₁-eu- ‘to pour’ [Hübischmann 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 *g̥h₁-ey-os [Olsen 1999: 47] or thematic *g̥h₁-ey-o-.

See also s.vv. zut ‘pure’, jagar ‘funnel’, joyl ‘molten (mass)’, for ‘ravine’.

ji, o-stem: GDSg ji-o-y, ISg ji-o-v, GDPi ji-o-e’, IPl ji-o-v-k’ (abundant in the Bible, Astucateurean 1895: 932-933) ‘horse’ (Bible+).

See also s.v. dzt ‘horse’.

DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 152].

ETYM Since Windschichman et al. (HAB 3: 151-152), connected with Skt. RV+ háya- m. ‘horse’ (see also Gosche 1847: 72N°201, de Lagarde 1854: 27L°737; Hübischmann 1877: 17, 25; 1897: 470; Meillet 1936: 142).


The vocalism of the Armenian form is problematic. Hübischmann (1899: 45) reconstructs *g̥h₁-ei-o- for Armenian and *g̥h₁-ey-o- or *g̥h₁-ey-os for Sanskrit. Godel (1975: 88-89) assumes *g̥h₁-ya-, read *g̥h₁-H-to-. See, however, s.v. diem ‘to suck’. One might also think of *g̥h₁-eiH-o-, with loss of the laryngeal as in Skt. páyas- n. ‘milk’ (RV+) from *pēiH-os-. The problem with these explanations is that Skt. háya- is usually derived from hāy- 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 *g̥h₁-ei-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 *jēy(o)jyo- > ji-ey. A similar analysis has been applied to ǐz ‘viper’ (q.v.).

A substantivized *to-participle *g̥h₁-i-to- as opposed to Skt. háya- < *g̥h₁-oi-os (or *g̥h₁-iH-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. *h₁ekuo- > Arm. ės ‘donkey’ (Güntert 1921: 160; Watkins 1970: 7); for more detail, see s.v. ės ‘donkey’ and 3.12.

See also s.v. jori ‘mule’.
jiwn, an-stem: GDGijan (Bible+), AbelSg i jiw-č (John Climacus), IPl jeam-b-č’ (Hexaemeron) ‘snow’ (Bible+)

• DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 155a]. In Suča and Nor Naxijewan, jiwan ‘snow’ has been replaced by b’uk and p’uk ‘snow’, respectively, which continue CAr. buč ‘snow-storm’ [HAB 1: 490a; 3: 155a; Ačarjyan 1953: 261].

• ETYMP Together with jmérn ‘winter’ (q.v.), derived from the PIE word for ‘winter, snow’. Gr. ἔνων, -όνος f. ‘snow’, χειμ, -α-ος n. ‘winter, storm’, χειμύν, -ονος m. ‘id.’, χειμέρος ‘hibernal, stormy’, -ερνάς ‘concerning the winter, hibernal’, Skt. himā- m. ‘cold, frost’, himā- f. ‘winter’ (both RV+), OA V. G SG zimō ‘winter’, YAv.


The PIE word is reconstructed as a HD m-stem: nom. *gels ‘snow’ matches Gr. χιων ‘snow’ both formally and semantically (Meillet 1936: 142; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 295-296; J̌ahukyan 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: 122; for Hittite, see Kloekhorst 2008: 475.

Arm. nom. jiwn ‘snow’ matches Gr. χιων ‘snow’ both formally and semantically (Meillet 1936: 142; C. Arutjunjan 1983: 295-296; J̌ahukyan 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: 122; for Hittite, see Kloekhorst 2008: 475.

Both languages have generalized -n < nom. *-m throughout the paradigm. The genitive jeam-n 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. *gels-os has analogically been replaced by *gelom and instr. jeam-b < *gelom-b. For a further discussion, see Grammont 1918: 244; Jahukyan 1959: 176; Szemerényi 1959-60a: 109; É. Tumanjan 1978: 264-265; Schmalstieg 1980; Ravnaes 1991: 99-100; Stempel 1993 < 1987: 151; Olsen 1999: 135; Matzinger 2005: 22108, 103. Further compare šun ‘dog’, stin ‘breast of a woman’, tun ‘house’.

Arm. jmeṙ-n ‘winter’ < *gelom- is comparable to Gr. χειμερινός ‘hibernal’ and Lat. hibernus ‘of winter, wintry’; compare also Arm. am ‘year’ and amarn ‘summer’ (q.v.) vs. Skt. sàmà ‘year, season’ and OHG sumar (for a discussion, see Hübschmann 1897: 470-471; HAB 3: 156a; Szemerényi 1959-60a; Alabekyan 1979: 86; Stempel 1993 < 1987: 151-152; Olsen 1989: 225; 1999: 128, 276-278; Clackson 1994: 137-138); Vanséveren 1998.

The PArM. original genitive *gelom- < PIE *gelom-ós may have been preserved in dial. *jim-er or *jim-et ‘snow blindness’ (q.v.).

*jlem* ‘to furrow’, attested only in Commentary on 1 Timothy by John Chrysostom, in infinitive jél [NHB 2: 159a]. Another manuscript has c’elul instead, thus Ačaryan (HAB 3: 155a) considers jél an uncertain word.

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. *ĝ lh1- (cf. Lith. žūolis, possibly also Arm. *jit-), acc. *ĝ lh1-el- (cf. Skt. hala-, Arm. *jet-, perhaps also Goth. gil-ja), probably also analogical *ĝ lh1-ol- (cf. Arm. jol). For further details, see s.vv. jalt ‘rod, branch’; jetun ‘ceiling’, jol ‘log, pole’.

The semantic relationship between ‘pole, branch’ and ‘plough’ is impeccable, cf. e.g. Skt. śā́śkhā- ‘branch, twig’, Goth. hoha ‘plough’, Lith. šakà ‘branch’, Russ. soxá ‘plough’, Arm. c’ak ‘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** Baleš, Nor Bayazet *jmet* [Ačarean 1913: 691a], Xotor jur *jmet* [Yuşam Xotor 1964: 480a], Xnus-Bulanx *jmet* [Melik’eun 1964: 512a]. K’li cmat’ [Hay Lez BrbBar 2, 2002: 415b], Urnia, Salmast cmet [GwUrmsalm 2, 1898: 97].

K’esab cmet’ < *cm-oyt* ‘pinch’ vs. cmat’ ‘to pinch’ [Č’olakean 1866: 249] obviously belongs to kcmt’el, kcmt’el ‘to pinch’ (see s.v. cm- ‘to squeeze, press’) and is hardly related with our word for ‘snow blindness’.

**ETYM** Obviously derived from PArm. original genitive *jim-* < PIE *g̣h1i-m-ós of the word for ‘snow, winter’, see s.v. jiwn ‘snow’ (J̌iāhukyan 1972: 281; 1987: 127). The component *-et’ or *-ayt’ remains unclear.85

*jme* (Paterica, T’ovmay Arcruni), GDPl *jmer-a-c’* (var. lect. in Elišē), NPI *jmer-n-’* in John Chrysostom and Grigor Narekac’i and LocPl *jmerun-c’ in John Chrysostom, Severian of Gabala, etc.; GDPl *jmer-a-c’* (var. lect. in Elišē, see below), loc. adv. *jmer-i ‘in the winter’ *jmer-a-c’* (Pitarut’iwnk’, NHB 2: 160a) ‘winter’ (Bible+), ‘snow-storm’ (John Chrysostom, Philo, Ephrem, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.).

Derivatives include: *jmer-a(i)n, gen. jmeryn-o-y, loc. i jmerayn-i winter, cold season, snow-storm‘ (Bible+); jmer-ayin or jmeren(i)-ayin, gen. -aynoy ‘hibernal’ (Lazar 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:


Hraman tay jean t’e ler yerkri ew jmeraynoy anjrewac’ ast zoru’t’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 herac’eal getn Erasx, ew i yerkarel jmeraynoyn, ew i dañahot p’č’marē ľiwsisoy palac’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).

● DIAL. Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 156b].

Next to cmēr 'winter', the regular reflex of jmeṁ (gen.-dat. cmērə, abl. cmērnə, Ačäryan 1947: 94-95, 242), Hamšen also has zemer 'December' (see T’orlak’yan 1986: 219a).

● ETYM Since NHB 2: 159b, compared with Gr. χειμών, Lat. hiems, Skt. hímā-, Russ. zima, etc. 'winter'. Note especially Gr. χειμερινός 'hibernal' and Lat. hībernus 'of winter, wintry'. For more details, see s.v. jiwn 'snow'.

jmeruk, gen. jmerk-i 'water-melon' (MidArm.), see Miǰ HayBaṙ 2, 1992: 61b.

● DIAL. Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 157a]. Agulis cmbərak, gen. cmbərək-i, cmbərk-i, pl. cmbər(n)ətik' [HAB 3: 157a; Ačäyan 1935: 148, 372; M. Zak’aryan 2008: 156] has an epenthetic -b- after -m-, cf. hamarem 'to count' > Agulis, etc. hmbəril.

● ETYM Derived from jmer-, oblique stem of jmeṁ 'winter' (q.v.); cf. Georg. sazmətr'o, etc. (see HAB 3: 157a).

jol, 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) *jol, in ISg jol-w-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, Larabal, as well as (see Ačyan 1954: 315) in Mehri. Axalc’xa j’ol means ‘back (of the human body)’.

‘jol’ : Ararat joli [HAB 3: 157b], Melri jule < joli [Ačyan 1954: 278b].

● ETYM Probably connected with Lith. žūolis 'dickes Stück Holz, Baumstamm' and Skt. m. n. hala- 'plough' (Gobh+), as well as with Arm. jlem 'to furrow' (hapax; uncertain), and, especially, with jelun 'ceiling'. For the literature, see HAB 3: 155, 157b; Fraenkel 2, 1965: 1323; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 808. Mayrhofer (ibid.) does not mention Arm. jol. Fraenkel (ibid.) is sceptical to this view, and, with some reservation, connects Lith. žūolis to žãlias 'grün, roh, ungekocht' and žélti 'grünend wachsen, bewachsen, aufgehen (von Pflanzen)’. 86 He considers the etymology "unsicher".

On the strength of the relatedness of Arm. jol 'log; pole’ with jelun ‘ceiling’, jolunk’ (Severian of Gabala; dialect of Akn), and, possibly, Georgian jel ‘log, bar’ etc, one may tentatively propose the following reconstruction: NSg *gh2h1-l(o)l (> Lith. žūolis ‘dickes Stück Holz, Baumstamm’); probably also Arm. *jul ‘plough’ (> jlem ‘to furrow’; cf. arawr ‘plough’ > aravrem ‘to plough’); AccSg *gh2h1-el- > Skt. m. n. hala- ‘plough’; Arm. *jel- ‘log (supporting the ceiling)’, and, with o-grade, jol ‘log; pole’ (from analogical *gh2h1-ol-). Skt. hala- 'plough’ and Arm. *jel- ‘log’, jol, o-stem ‘log; pole’ can be interpreted as a shared innovation by means of the thematic *-o-: *gh2h1e/ol-o-, cf. the cases of erg ‘song’ and surb ‘pure’. For the semantics cf. Russ. sox’, etc., see s.v. Arm. ᵐ’ax.

*jol(a)-har-i

86 Joachim Matzinger (p.c. apud Olsen 1999: 54) derives Arm. jol from the same colour root.
joyl

● DIAL Melri ḷṣḥāre ‘a kind of poplar-tree’ [Alayan 1954: 278b, 314], Karčewan ḷṣḥāri ‘a tall tree of which logs/beams (jol) are made’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 221a].

   Among the villages of the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik’) Step’anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1303/5) mentions ḷḥayreank’, of which no etymological explanation is known to me. It seems to reflect the above-mentioned Melri form: *jolhāri + -an-k’.

● ETYM Alayan (1954: 278b) reconstructs *jolhari not specifying the structure and the origin.

   As is implicitly suggested by H. Muradyan (see above), the compound seems to contain jol ‘log; pole’ (> Melri júłe). The second component is har- ‘to beat, strike’, represented in another compound, namely Melri *tirvhrā [Alayan 1954: 332], Kak’avaberd tirvhrā ‘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 *jol-har-i, an agentive meaning. The actual meaning of *jol-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 joyl, jiwl), o-stem: GDSg jol-o-y (Genesis 24.22, see Zeyt’unyan 1985: 247: note joyl vs. juloy in the same sentence), i-stem: IPl jul-i-w-k’ (Hamam Arewelic’i, 9th cent.), cf. LocSg i julei (julealk’ i julin in 3 Kings 7.24) ‘molten, solid, cast (in particular said of metals); molten mass’ (Bible+), julen ‘to smelt, cast; to make solid’ (Bible+), julecoy ‘molten’ (Bible+).

   Some textual illustrations: ew ohn iwr joyl (= Gr. χυτός) erkat’oy “and its spine is of cast iron” (Job 40.18, see Cox 2006: 258); in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.39 (1913=1991: 165t14); transl. Thomson 1978: 181): i dārnat p’č’măng hīwsoy palac’al juleal vtakn : “the stream froze over from the bitter north winds”. For further references and philological analysis, see Olsen 1999: 36.

● DIAL Muś 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 jol 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; Jahukyan 132; Clackson 1994: 229yv; and especially Olsen 1999: 36, with an elaborate discussion on alternative solutions with *-lo- or *-tlo-. Both jewem and julen are denominative verbs [Jahukyan 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: *g̣ue- ‘to pour, spill’: Gr. χέϝω, -ομαι ‘to pour, spill, gush, shed’, etc., see s.vv. jew ‘shape, form, mould’, joyl ‘molten (mass)’: *g̣’ero- > *g̣’oro- > jor, with loss of *-y- as in e.g. nor ‘new’, sor ‘cave’ (Pettersson 1920: 106-107; Pokorny 1959: 447; Eichner 1978: 150t27; Jahukyan 1987: 128; 1990a: 9).
Despite the scepticism of Ačaryan (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 *kouH-r-o- ‘to pour, fill, flow over’, *heleH ‘flood, torrent’ > *heleH-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. χῶρος m. ‘(free, empty) space, region’, χώρα f. ‘(free, empty) space, interspace, region, estate, land’, Toch. B kure ‘pit, hole’, etc. from *ĝhoh1ro- ‘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 *ĝh/ou- and *ĝhoh1ro-. However, this solution is less probable than the former etymology.

ju, o-stem: GDPi ju-o-c’ (Deuteronomy 22.6, Cox1981: 162), AbPl i ju-o-c’ (Lazar P’arpec’i); a-stem: IPl ju-a-w-k’ (Zgōn-Afrahat) ‘egg’ (Bible+).

DIAL Widespread in the dialects. MidArm. juacet, juvacet, juvace ‘omelet’ (MiǰHayBar 2, 1992: 62-63) is widespread in the dialects as well [HAB 3: 159b]. In MidArm. ju also refers to ‘testicle’ [MiǰHayBar 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. ὄν n., Lat. ōvum n., Celt. *āwyo- ‘egg’ (Matasović 2009: 50), OCS aice, Russ. jajcó, Pers. xāya, etc. Hübschmann (1883: 40; 1897: 471) rightly considers the etymology uncertain because the initial j- is unexplained. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 159) is sceptical, too.

The PIE word for ‘egg’ is now interpreted as a vrddhi-formation derived from the word for ‘bird’ (see s.v. haw ‘bird’): *h₂ōuiom. The Armenian form is usually explained from *jōwjo-, with assimilatory addition of *j- (see Pedersen 1906: 406 = 1982: 184; Pisani 1950: 180, 182; Henning 1954; Pokorny 1959: 784; Frisk 2: 1150; Schindler 1969: 160; Jāhukyan 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: GDGs jkan, ISg jkm-b, NPl jkn-k’, API jkun-s, GDPi jkan-c’, IPl jknbk-k’ (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 935) ‘fish’ (Bible+).

DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. Eastern peripheral dialects have preserved the final nasal: Larabal čǐkna, Samaxi čiğ na, etc. [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. *žuvìs*, Latv. *zuvs*, Gr. *ἰχϑῦς*, -*ύος* 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*- or *-*g/g*- 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. *ἰχϑῦς*”. 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 *dęp*-H-m. The laryngeal origin of -*k* is unconvincing. Likewise implausible is the assumption on acc. *gʰ eŋm* vs. gen. *gʰ hu-es* > PArm. *jegan* vs. *ju*- (see Eichner 1978: 152a). For a further discussion, see Lindeman 1987: 97-98; 1997: 154-157; Rasmussen 1989: 158, 170-171, Ravnaes 1991: 143-2. The simplest and most attractive explanation is *ju*- + the suffix -*kn* (see 2.1.19).


**ju 북한*‘roe, spawn’.


I tentatively propose to derive *-*lb from *adb* ‘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; Ačārean 1913: 1058ab), *cirt* ‘dung (of birds and flies)’ vs. *crt-* ‘to spawn’ (see HAB 2: 460b).

Č

čanāčem, aor. *caneay*, imper. *canir* ‘to know, recognize; to be acquainted, aware’ (Bible+); see also s.vv. *can*- ‘to know’, *can-ak* ‘disgrace’, *ciacan* ‘rainbow’. 
The verb ćanač’em is ubiquitous in the dialects. Apart from Karin, Axalc’xa ćanč’ el and Hamšen jınč’ uś, there are two basic forms: ćananič’ el (n-epenthesis, on which, see 2.1.29, 2.1.30.1; infinitive in -el): T’iflis, Ararat, Lralab, Agulis, Jula, etc.; and more widespread ćanč’ nal (+ -n-; infinitive in -al) in the rest. On Aslanbeg, see below. T’iflis has both: ćaninič’ il and ćanč’ nal [HAB 3: 182b].

The form ćanč’ nal seems to represent ćananič’ al or ćanč’ enal. The latter is attested in Cyril of Alexandria (see NHB 2: 169b, with a note ćmk. = ‘dial.’).

Dial. secondary c’-aorist is already attested in John Chrysostom (see NHB 2: 169b, with a note ćmk. = ‘dial.’).

Acaryan (1898: 32b13, 35a, 85a) represents Aslanbek köšnal (aor. köš’a < ćanč’ c’u) as showing exceptional developments a > o (> o, and ĉ > k. In HAB 3: 182b, he has göšnalj. See also Vaux 2001: 41, 42, 50: göšnal, aor. göš’a.

Acaryan does not specify the origin of the initial guttural.

Acaryan (HAB, ibid.) notes that in this meaning (i.e. ‘to recognize, be acquainted’ – HM) g’idänil < gitenal ‘to know’ is used in Svedia.

On Maraňa canawl, see s.v. ćan- ‘to know, be acquainted’.

● ETYM Since NHB (2: 169ab), linked with Gr. γιγνώσκω, γινώσκω ‘to come to know, perceive’, Lat. co-grúsko ‘to learn, get to know’, Skt. jñā- ‘to know, recognize’ (RV+), etc. Remarkably, Skt. ěnali is mentioned in NHB 1: 109c; obviously jñāt- m. ‘close relative’ (RV+) is meant. Meillet (1894b: 296; 1936: 29) is undoubtedly right in deriving ćanač’ em from *canem, through assimilation. Hühschmann (1897: 455-456) rejects this and separates ćanač’ em from Arm. *can-, Skt. jñā-, etc. However, Meillet’s interpretation is commonly accepted (see HAB 2: 443-444; 3: 182; Jahukyan 1982: 168, 180; 1987: 125, etc.).

Meillet (1936: 109; 1950: 110) links the present -ć- with Gr. -σκ- and Lat. -sc- of cognate forms and assumes a combined *sk-ye-. Jahukyan (1982: 180-181) points out that the -ć- can go back to either *kṣ- nor *tṣ- but not to *ṣk-. In view of the -t’ of canawt’, he is inclined to *-t-je-. However, *gnh,kj-je- > *canač’em > ćanač’ 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 *gnh3,kj-ie- and *gnh3,kj-ti-, respectively (Pedersen 1906: 348 = 1982: 126; Godel 1975: 80; Weitenberg 1980: 212). Jahukyan (1987: 168) points out that in this position *k should drop. With loss of the intervocalic laryngeal, *gnh3,kj-ki- 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-ḥ ‘Erkenntnis, Kunde’ (Pokorny 1959: 376-377 and Jahukyan 1987: 125, 168, with refer.) is improbable.

*člo/upur ‘nut’.

● DIAL Larabal *člopur ‘nut (ripe, with hard shell)’ [Acârean 1913: 723a], or čolupur (also in Nuxi), čtupur [Ahatuni 1912: 151a, 439a]. The actual forms are: Larabal čolupur, ččupur, ččupur, Hadrut’; Saĥax ččupur, Mehtšen ččupur [Daviyan 1966: 352]; Goris ččuper, ččuper [Margaryan 1975: 433a].


For the addition of -l- one might think of contamination with unattested *čel- ‘acorn’ from *g*’eh₂-; Russ. žělǔd’, SCr. žěli̯d’ ‘acorn’, etc. (as vs. *g*l’h₂-; Lith. gilė, Arm. kalin, q.v.); this is highly hypothetical.

Jahukyan (1967: 167) mentions čolopar ‘opex’ next to kalin, in the list of words with alternation k : č.

*čm- (< *čem-) ‘to squeeze, press’; dial. also ‘to knead’, ‘to trample down’, etc.

čem-l-em ‘to squeeze, press’ (Bible+).

DIAL čem-l-em has been preserved in Sučava, Moks, Tigranakert; with metathesis: Muš čemil. Widespread is *čem-ı-(t’)-em (with metathesis: Aslanbek, Sebastia, Akn *jaırmel; Salmast měrɛl (for mě-, see also below, on *čemil); with epenthetic -b-: T’iflis čemiril) [Açarayn 1913: 725-726; HAB 3: 207a]. Also widespread is the noun *čemr. In Xarberd, Baberd, T’iflis, Lori, Larabal: čembrur, with epenthetic -b- [Açarayn 1913: 725]. In Marafa, Moks, Ršunik: mčur, with metathesis; cf. Salmast mčrel above. The verb *čem-ı-el is, then, denominative. See also below, on a secondary denominative verb Larabal *čem-u'-el.

Some other forms which belong here too: Larabal *čem-il ‘to bend down under a burden’ (see below), Łazax čem-ı-ul ‘to stretch oneself’; Van *čem’il ‘to be pressed’; Ararat, Larabal, Muš čem-l-k(o)t- next to Ararat, Łazax, T’iflis čem-k-o-t- (with metathesis ‘to stretch oneself’; Larabal *čmp’el ‘to seize, snatch something out of smb.’s hand’ (on the semantics, see below), etc. [Açarayn 1913: 718b, 724-726]. Compare also Van, Bulanax, etc. kemi’t’el and Ararat čemk’tel, čemk’el (Amatuni 1912: 348b) which, together with MidArm. këmt’el, kĕmt’el, kmič’t’el ‘to pinch’ (also kemptil in Grigoris, see MijHayBaır 1, 1887: 401a), are derived from kíc- /kič- ‘to bite, sting’ [HAB 3: 587ab], but some of the forms, especially čem-t’-el and čem-k-t’-el, may in fact belong to (or influenced by) čem- ‘to squeeze, press’.

Larabal, Hadrut’, Şafax, Mehtišen čam-el or čam-il (see Dav’t’yan 1966: 421) represents the “pure” stem. According to HayLezBrbBaır 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.

Açarayn (1913: 725a) records Larabal čamril ‘to trample down’ as identical with *čem-ı-el, distinguished with a semantic nuance. Strictly speaking, this form reflects *čem-u’-el (with regular development -u- > Larabal -ı-) and is secondarily based on the noun *čem-u’ : Larabal čemr’ina [Dav’t’yan 1966: 421]. Since Larabal has both the verbs čamr’el (Dav’t’yan 1966: 421) and čemr’el and the noun *čem-u’, the relationship of the forms should be explained as follows: Larabal čamril reflects the old, dialectally widespread *čem-ı-el, which is probably a denominative verb based on *čem-u’ (also present in Larabal) and comes therefore from *čem-u’, whereas čemr’el must be treated as due to secondary restoration of the vowel -u- (> -ı-).

malem

ma (dial.) ‘mother’, ‘food, eating’ (a nursery word).

● DIAL Van (voc.) ma ‘mamma’; Polis ma ‘eating’ [Acañean 1913: 740a, 747b]; Partizak, Hamşen, Muş, Moks ma ‘mamma’ [HayLezBrbBa 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’, IPl magl-a-w-k’ ‘claw’ (Bible+).

● ETYM See s.v. ethung ‘nail’.


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’a, Karin mal ‘cattle’ [HAB 3: 224b]; the same is found in many other dialects [HayLezBrbBa 4, 2007: 10b].


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-a- (a-stem in NHB 2: 283a without evidence) ‘miller, corn-grinder’, a compound with al- ‘to grind’ (Ephrem, Nersēs Lambronac’i), and in ml-ml-em ‘to rub’ (Nilus of Ançyra, Paterica).

See also s.vv. mamul ‘pressing machine’; *ml-i/uk, *ml-ak ‘midge; bed-bug; nit’; mat ‘sieve’; ml(m)et ‘chaff, mide, etc.’, *mut ‘the grinding of corn’, *mlmio/ul ‘moth’.

● DIAL HAB has no dialectal records for malem, mamul, mlmlem, ml-alač’.

According to Acañyan (HAB 3: 225a), here belongs Maškert (Xarberd-Arabkir region) mud ‘the grinding of corn’ (see also Gabikean 1952: 412).


87 The comparison of Arm. ml- with Gr. μῦλη has been suggested already in NHB 2: 283a.
mah


Litli. málti and Skt. mr̥ṇā́ti < *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 δόξαρον ‘flour’), Myc. meryu ‘flour’, meretriya ‘females who turn the mill’ (Chantaraine 1968-80: 662a, 721; Klingenschmitt 1982: 145; 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 màl- ‘to crush, repress, oppress’, mêly- ‘to crush, squeeze, lay waste’ (on which see Adams 1999: 456-457, 470). For the reduplication type, see further s.vv. aɫǰ-a-m-u ɫǰ ‘darkness, twilight’, mamu ṛ ‘moss’, cf. also kerakur ‘food’ from ker- ‘to eat’ (q.v.).88 The simplex *māl/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/ 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. mr̥ṇa- and PToch. *ml-nH-ske/o-, see Adams 1999: 456-457) with analogical (ne-)conjugation (cf. aṅinem ‘to make’ vs. aor. ar-ar, k’anem ‘to press’, etc.), unless one treats it as a denominative verb based on mal, 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. melh ‘soft, weak, slack’, melhm ‘soft, mild, gentle’. At any case, there are forms which probably show an association (either etymological or contaminational) between these two sets of words, see s.vv. melhm ‘soft, mild, gentle, calm; softly, gently’, dial. *m(e)lmel ‘quiet, calm, fine; moth, midge’, ml(m) nel ‘fine chaff, dust’, *ml-mo/ud ‘moth, clothes moth’.

mah, n-stem: GDISg mah-u; an-stem: GDSg mah-u-an, AblSg i mah-u-an-č, ISg mah-u-am-b, NPl mah-u-an-k’ (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895:

88 Note also Skt. intensive marmartu ‘er soll zermalmen’ (see Klingenschmitt 1982: 146d); on this word see, however, Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 319.
956-959) ‘death’, ‘massacre; pestilence’ (Bible+); mar* ‘death’ (several times in Ephrem, see HAB 3: 223b); mahl-oy ‘mortal’ (in a homily attributed to Elišē, see HAB 3: 233b).


● DIAL Widespread in the dialects. A genitive *mah-man is present in Polis and Akn [HAB 3: 234a].

● ETYM Arm. mahl has been considered a native word related with Skt. mṛtyu- m. ‘death’, Av. mərəϑiiu- m. ‘death’, Goth. maur ‘murder’, etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 472; Pokorny 1959: 735; Alabekyan 1979: 93-94); for the forms, see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 371-372; Lehmann 1986: 249). Further see mard ‘human being’, merəntim ‘to die’.


malt, i-stem: GDSg mal-i (Plato), IPl mal-i-w-k’ (Paterica); n-stem: i malin-s (Sirach 27.4/5); o-stem: GDPl mal-o-c’, IPl mal-o-v-k’ (several attestations in Hexaemeron with the meaning ‘honeycomb’, see K. Muradyan 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; malem ‘to sieve’ (Bible+).

● DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 237a].

● ETYM Tērvišean and Müller (see HAB 3: 237a) connected malt to the group of malem ‘to grind, crush, break’ (see there for more detail). Aćāryan (HAB ibid.) does not accept the comparison and leaves the origin of the word open.

malt’, i-stem ‘prayer, supplication’ (IPl malt’-i-w-k’ in Plato and Nersēs Šnorhalii); mal’t’em ‘to implore, prey’, in Wisdom 13.18 (rendering Gr. ἰκετεύω, etc) (Bible+).

In ModArm., malt’el means ‘to wish something to someone’ [Malxaseanc’ 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 Kolba’i 1.27. Schmid (1900: 86) renders by begünstigen.

● ETYM Bugge (1889: 15) connected with Lith. maldyti ‘to implore’. This and other cognates which are added later (OCS moliti ‘to ask, pray’, Hit. måld-/mald- ‘to recite, make a vow’, OS meldōn ‘to report, tell’, etc.) point to *me/ol’d- 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 Jahukyan (1967b: 71-57; cf. also 1987: 138, 181), the form malt’ beside PIE *mel-dʰ- implies that either the Armenian word is a loan, or the *-dʰ- is a determinative, and Arm. -t’- goes back to a parallel form with *-th-.

However, the existence of this PIE phoneme is usually rejected, and the restoration of a determinative *-th- is uncertain. Furthermore, the problem of the vocalism is stil unsolved.
I propose to treat *maλ’em* as a denominate verb based on *maλ’*, *i*-stem, which can be explained as a *ti*-deverbative with a regular zero-grade: *maλ’*-ti- > PArm. *maλ’(d)i*- > *maλ’, -i*. See 2.1.22.13.

**mam**, *u*-stem ‘grandmother’ (Middle Armenian), hypocoristic *mam-ik* [HAB 3: 242a; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 194]; dial. *mam(a), mam-ik* ‘grandmother, mother’.

The plant-name *mamxopop* mentioned here by Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 242a) belongs rather with *mamux* ‘a kind of wild plum’.

*ETYM* Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 242) considered a borrowing from Gr. μάμμη ‘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 [J̌ahukyan 1972: 300; 1987: 56, 136, 179, 275, 427; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 386a]90, cf. Lat. mamma ‘mother, nurse, grandmother, mother’s breast’, Lith. mamà, Russ. мама, 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’.

*ETYM* Polis mäm(m)a ‘food’, Ararat mama ‘eating’ [Aĉaṙean 1913: 747b], Sebastia mama ‘bread’ [Gabikean 1952: 386], etc. [HayLezBrbBar 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, GDPl -o-c’ NHB 2: 200c without evidence) ‘squeezing implement, pressing machine’ (Agat’angelos, Anania Şirakac’i, etc.), ‘the essence or purpose of a book’ (Evagrius of Pontus, etc.).

*ETYM* See s.v. *malem ‘to crush, grind’.*

**mamuṙ** (o-stem according to NHB 2: 200c without evidence) ‘moss’ (Hexaemeron, Gregory of Nyssa, Paterica, etc.); *mam-l-a-xndir* ‘moss-searching’ in Łazar P’arpec’i (1904=1985: 105).

*ETYM* Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 244b].

---

90 Jahukyan (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), native of Lori, one finds mwr referring to the green moss on stones in a river. 

**ETYM** Since Bugge 1893: 17, connected with OIC mosis m. ‘moss, moorland’, OHG mōs n. ‘moss, marsh’; Russ. mox ‘moss’. Lith. mūsai pl. m. ‘mould’, mūsos ‘id.’, Lat. muscus m. ‘moss’, etc. HAB 3: 244 with references (Ačaryan himself does not accept the etymology); Pokorny 1959: 742; cf. Mallory/Adams 1997: 385b without Armenian.


For the type of reduplication cf. ka-rkut ‘hail’ vs. OCS grad ‘hail’, ma-mul ‘squeezing implement, pressing machine’ from malem ‘to crush, grind’ (see s.vv.).

If reliable, dial. mwr may be an archaic relic of the simplex *mwr < from *mus-ro-.

*mawr* ‘mud, marsh’

**DIAL** Preserved in Axalc’xa, Karin, Van, as well as in the meaning ‘to mew (of the cat)’ – in Zeyt’un, Karin (with -ö-), Van (mayyel), Akr (meyyan ‘a cat that mews a lot’), Šamaxi màyov ‘e’ ‘miaow’ [HAB 3: 245a]. The Van form has an initial p-: pavel (see also Ačaryan 1952: 279), which represents bayel (cf. HayLezBrbBaṙ 1, 2001: 156b) and may be linked with /sheep-imitating/ baaa, beee.

**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 3: 245a) correctly treats the word as onomatopoeic. Consequently, he considers the resemblance with Skt. māːː- mimāti ‘brüllen, blöken, meckern’, āṁːet ‘brüllte’, mémyant- ‘meckernd’, māyā- 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 Ilar. *mašá- ‘sheep’ (Skt. mēṣā m. ‘ram, male sheep’, f. mēṣī- ‘female sheep’; YAv. maša- m. ‘sheep’), of which no deeper etymology is recorded in Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 380 (the cognate forms have secondary semantics: ‘skin of sheep’). Ilar. *mašá- ‘sheep’ can reflect *meh2i-so-.

For a possible k-suffixation, see s.vv. mak’i.

**mayr** : 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].

---

Note also the synonymous lavř ‘moss’.

---

91 Note also the synonymous lavř ‘moss’.
mayr

ETYM From PIE *meh₂ter- f. 'mother': Skt. mātār, GŚg mātār, Gr. μήτηρ, μητέρ-α, Dor. μήτηρ 'mother', Lat. māter, OEngl. mōdor, Lith. mōtē 'wife; (diaл.) mother', etc., see Hübbschmann 1897: 472; HAB 3: 246-247 with lit.

See also s.vv. mawru 'stepmother' and mayr̂ 2 'cedar, etc.'.

mayr̂ 2, i-stem: GDPl mayr-i-c̣ '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 ἀρκεύϑος 'juniper, Juniperus macrocarpa' (see s.v. kaɫamax for the passage). Elsewhere in Paralipomenon, however, it corresponds to Gr. κόδρος 'cedar', κόδρινος 'of cedar-wood': p'ayt mayr: ξύλα κέδρινα in 1 Paralipomenon 14.1, i taçars mayrakop'eays: ἐν οἴκῳ κεδρίνῳ in 17.1, taçars mayrkop's: οἰ̃κον κέδρινον in 17.6, p'aytameyr: ξύλα κέδρινα in 22.4, zmaṿ p'aytn: τάς κόδρους 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'aytic̣ mayric̣: δύο ϑύρας ξύλων πευκίνων (3 Kings 6.32); ewnap'aytiwḳ ew p'aytiwḳ mayric̣: ἐν ξύλοις κεδρίνοις καὶ ἐν ξύλοις πευκίνοις (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-c̣ 'cedar' is distinct from mayri, -e-a-c̣ 'woods both formally and semantically, note giaḳ: zna i dašts mayreac̣: εὕρομεν αὐτὴν ἐν 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. κόδρος 'cedar', δρυμός 'bush, thicket', and πίτυς 'pine, fir, spruce', see K. Muradyan 1984: 142L17, 151L5 (on these passages see 340 57, 34172), 162L7; glossed 375b.

jahukyan (1987: 137, 212, 231, 398) keeps citing the word as mayri (semantic paragraph 8.64), and once (264) – mayri(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. mayri, and mayrị 2, 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. mayr, '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'.

mayri, ea-stem: GDPI mayre-a-c' (Bible+), cf. also DLocSg mayr-w-oj (Alexander Romance) 'woods, forest, thicket' (Bible+).

Some textual illustrations:


In Movsês Xorenac'i 2.41 (1913=1991: 166L14): *Tnk ėw mayri mec <...>. Ėw anuanã zantał Cndoc' : “He also planted a great forest <...>. And he called the forest Cndoc’ (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 (kalîn).

Similarly, the passage from 2.49 (177L1), *Jeþtu lini nma ew Erass p’aytwok' mayreac', is translated by Thomson (1978: 190) as follows: “The Araxes [river] provided him with pine wood”. In fact, p’aytwok' mayreac' should be understood as “with wood of forests”. Note also 2.6 (1913=1991: 108L5), *i giin ēw 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: 423L12, 463L12, 476L14): gazank' bazunk' elin i maywroc'n “numerous beasts came out of the woods”; p’axean ēw mtin i møj mayroj” “they ran away and enter into the forest”; banakec’an i møj mayrwoc mjøy “they camped in a forest”. Note also Job 38.40 (Cox 2006: 248).

•DIAL. Preserved in the dialects of Aṙtial, Xotjrur, Karin, Alâskert, T'iflis, Ararat, Moks [HAB 3: 248b]. Of these the Aṙtial form mori deserves particular attention. It is recorded from Sučava, Poland (see Ačaryan 1953: 279), and Hungary (p. 194). For textual evidence, see op. cit. 251 (twice). The development ay > ã is not regular for Aṙtial (cf. Ačaryan 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 ‘woods’.

In other dialects the word has been preserved in compounds, e.g. *mayri-a-haw lit. ‘bird of woods’ > Larabal mir(ih)hâv, Hadrut mirihâv [Dav't'yan 1966: 423], and Goris mãrhâv [Margaryan 1975: 443a], probably referring to ‘a kind of pheasant’ (Ananyan HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 184; Margaryan 1975: 443a; Bakunc’ 1, 1976:
mayri

72ff, 177ff, note by Ř. Íšxanyan in 630) or 'heath-cock, black-cock' (see Lisic'yän 1969: 141, glossing mirhav by Russ. mëterav).

●ETYM Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 247b) compares the word with Lat. mätēria, mätēriēs 'material, building materials; timber; subject-matter', which is possibly derived from the IE word for 'mother' (see s.v. mayr1, '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. matax, 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 bors and relatives (see Tolstoj 1969: 22-43; EtmSlovSlavJaz 2, 1975: 216-217). Another example can be found in Chirikba 1985: 102.
maškat’ew has been replaced by the “more normal” čəɫǰikan (op. cit. 290f-1); some verses further (op. cit. 291f): t’ew maškē uwein “they had wings of skin”. It is also attested in “Govank’ t’ē’noc’” (see Mnac’akanyan 1980: 252f, 222), written, according to Mnac’akanyan 1980, by Kirakos Episkopos (13-14th cent.):

Maškât’ew in p’etur č’kay;
Zinč’ or gorcē zēkēn kawškar.

Further: in Asar Sebastac’i (16-17ch cent.), see D. M. Karapetyan 1993: 2119; 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: 58f), allows to postulate the existence of the word in the Armenian Hamšen. Bläsing says: “Für das Armenische von Hemčin ist dieses Wort nicht belegt, <...>”. However, we do find it in a fable in the form maškant’ew, see Ačaryan 1947: 213, although it is not listed in the glossary of the monograph. See also s.v. *maškat’it’erīn. Note also Xotorur maškt’ep’ ‘bat’ (see YuşamXotor 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 Ačaryan 1913: 549a and 959b, respectively.

The word seems to have been borrowed into Georgian (mac’kha’t’ela) and Udi (māškātil) [HAB 3: 261a; AčarHLPatm 1, 1940: 206-207; Jahuṣyan 1987: 591]. Ačaryan 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’el ‘butterfly’ (dial. *t’el) as the second member; see s.v. *maškat’it’erīn.

*maškat’it’erīn ‘bat’, *maškat’it’el’n ‘butterfly’.

DIAL The word is found in a traditional story (see Łanalanyan 1969: 343-344). The place is not specified; the analysis of the text shows, I think, that it originates from Bulanx. Here the bat appears in the form of mašk-a-t’i’er, with t’i’er ‘butterfly’ as the second member. In Sip’an one finds maškát’i’el in the meaning ‘butterfly’ (see Amatuni 1912: 6b). For the relationship between names of the bat and the butterfly cf. Larabal alakusuš (see HayLezBrbBa 1, 2001: 12a, 18a). Note also that Gr. πτερόν n. ‘feather; bird’s wing (< PIE *pter- ‘wing’, see s.v. t’er) refers to wings of both the bat and insects.

ETYM The compound *mašk-a-t’i’erīn is composed of mašk ‘skin’ and t’i’er or t’i’el’n ‘butterfly’ (q.v.). This is reminiscent of mašk-a-t’ew ‘bat, literally: ‘(having) a wing of skin’ (q.v.). On Georgian mac’kha’t’ela and Udi māškātil, see s.v. maškat’ew.

mat- in mat‘iım, matnum (aor. matøyay) ‘to approach, come close’ (Bible+); mawt ‘near, close’, also i mawtoy and mawtim ‘to approach’ (Bible+). mutoyc’ (cf. caus. mutuc’anem) is found in numerous derivatives, also as the second member of
matn

compounds, such as džuar-a-matoye ‘hard to access’ (Bible+). For matoyc’ (GSG matuc’-i) ‘access’, see s.v. matn2.

● DIAL mōt (=mawt) is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 373].


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 büt’ < boyt’ ‘thumb’ (q.v.) [HAB 3: 270b].

● ETYM Usually compared with the Celtic word for ‘thumb’: Welsh maut, Bret. meut ‘Gesellschaft, Versammlung, Zusammenkunft, feindliche Begegnung’, etc. [HAB 3: 266, 373]. See 2.1.22.12.

matn2 ‘hill-side’; dial. ‘hill; slope’. Geoponica (13th cent.).

According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 271a), the oldest attestation of teh root is found in Joshua 15.7: ḫanen i ġalgal, or ḫ handēp matuc’in Odomimay : kai kataphlaiē ēpi Ｇαλγαλ, ἢ ἐστιν ἑπάνω τῆς προσβάσεως Αδόδαμ. RevStBible here has: “turning toward Gilgal, which is opposite the ascent of Adummim”. Ačaryan points out that matoyc’ corresponds to Hebr. ‘ascent’ and therefore means zaṙiver ‘precipice, ascent’. However, Arm. matoyc’ (GSG matuc’-i) renders Gr. πρόσβασις f. ‘access’ and belongs with Arm. mat-č’-im (mat-uc’-) ‘to approach’, as correctly suggested in NHB 2: 215c (“yarija mat‘ımm”).


● ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 271a). He points out that the resemblance with Arab. matn ‘plateau’ and Syr. maḏā ‘earth, land’ is accidental. Bediryan 1956: 43 derives matn from mat- ‘to approach’, which is semantically unattractive.

Jahukyan (1972: 282; 1973: 21) compares matn with Avest. mati- ‘Vorsprung des Gebirges’, which derives from PIE *mn-t- ‘standing before’: Lith. pirštas ‘finger’, OCS pršta ‘finger’ : Skt. pṛṣṭhā- n. ‘back, mountain ridge’ (RV+), YAv. paršta- m. ‘back, spine, support in the back’ (see s.v. erastan-k’). Note also Arm. Łarabal pīt’no ‘hill or rock’ (L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 52L17) vs. boyt’n ‘thumb’ (q.v.).

mard, o-stem: GDSg mard-o-y, GDPl mard-o-c’, pl. more frequently mardik, gen-dat. mardik-an, abl. i mardkan-ē (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 971-986) ‘man, human being’ (Bible+). In the Bible, Arm. mard usually renders Gr.
mawru

ἄνθρωπος ‘man’, but in Job it several times stands for βροτός ‘mortal man’ (NHB 2:
191b; Cox 2006: 92 et passim).

● DIAL. Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 279-280]. Next to the meaning ‘man, human
being’, widespread is also ‘husband’ [Aamatuni 1912: 196, 467a; Aćarean 1913:

mr̥̣-tá- ‘died, dead’, a-mr̥̣ta- ‘immortal’, etc., Hübschmann 1897: 472-473; Pokorny
1959: 735; Meillet 1936: 74; Clackson 1994: 237 4; 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:
meṙanim ‘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,
Zgön-Afrahat, Cyril of Jerusalem), MidArm. ‘female bee’ (Geoponica).

● DIAL. Goris, Larabal már ‘female turkey’ [Aćarean 1913: 763b; HayLezBrbBal 4,

● ETYM Since Patrubány (StugHetaz 1906 : 344a), connected with Gr. μεῖραξ
‘bride, young woman’, Welsh morwyn, OCorn. moroin ‘girl, maiden’, Skt. márya-
‘young man, young warrior’, etc.

The Armenian form can be derived from *mərih2- teh2- (Jahukyan 1987: 139; cf.
HAB 3: 284a) or *mərih2- > *məriya-. In view of theItalic and Celtic forms
possibly pointing to o-grade (see Schrijver 1991: 459-460; 1995: 248, 356-357), one
may alternatively posit *morih2- 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-ov-ē (Yaysmawurk’), GDIPI mōr-ēc’ (Basil of Caesarea: “T’ult’k’”) ‘stepmother’. (Severian of Gabala, Eusebius of Caesarea, Plato, Aristotle, Philo,
John Chrysostom, etc.)

● DIAL. Šatax muru mer ‘stepmother’, Muš muri ‘step-’, Muš, Bulanax xor’tumuru (<
xor’t-u-mōru) [HAB 3: 247a, 375b]. The type of the compund *xor’t-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 Hamsen moru ‘stepmother’ [Aćařyan 1947: 12, 246], and
Xotorjur *moroy ‘grandmother’ and moru ‘step-mother’ (see YuşamXotor
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).
mawruk


For the element *-u- cf. Arm. GPl mi-a-mōr-uc’ (see HAB 3: 246b).

See also s.v. yawray ‘stepfather’.

mawruk’, a-stem: GDPl mawru-a-c’ (Bible+); muru-k’ (P’awstos Buzand, 5th cent.), gen-dat. muru-a-c’ (Lazar 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/ō ru (Weitenberg 1997c: 340) ‘beard’ (Bible+).

●DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 375b]:

mawruk’ in Polis, Xarberd, Sebastia, Tigranakert, etc. (also Zeyt’un and Hačən muɣuk’ probably represents mawruk’, Ačaṙyan 2003: 84).

mawruk’ in Muš, Alaskert, Samaxi; see also below.

mawruk’ in Aṙial, Axl’aşa, T’iflis, Hamšen, Karin, Juli. The dialectal form *miruk’ is found in inscriptions since the 13th century: miru(k’), IPl miru-a-w-k’ (S. A. Avagyan 1973: 190-191), as well as in Baṛgirk’ hayoc’ (1975: 220 Nr425): morus·miruk’. Given the fact that Baṛgirk’ hayoc’ abounds in dialectal forms peculiar to Łarabał and adjacent areas one may treat miruk’ of this gloss as the regular proto-form of Łarabał marok’, etc. Note that these areas have penultimate accent, and marok’ presupposes *miruk’ or *muruk’ rather than mawruk’.

As has been shown by Ačaṙyan (1935: 60, 84), Agulis máyruk’ comes from an old dialectal *miruk’ rather than mōruk’. Similarly, Melri mıruk’ points to miruk’ [Alayan 1954: 63]. Nor Naxijewan has both miruk’ and mırük’ [Ačaṙean 1925: 65-66]. For a thorough philological analysis I refer to Weitenberg 1997c: 343-345, who concludes that miruk’ is of respectable antiquity and may represent the e-grade *smek₁u.-

Beside Aṙial miruk’ (also Hung.), Ačaṙyan (1953: 279) also mentions Pol. mirug ‘chin’ glossing it by Arm. cnaevt ‘chin’, Pol. broda, Fr. menton ‘chin’.


It is remarkable that in the famous epic songs recorded by Movišš Xorenac’i in Gölt’n (a district that is geographically very close to the region Van-Parskahayk’), one finds frozen nominative used as accusative, z-miţ-k’ ‘back’, also allative i mőj-k’ (Movišš Xorenac’i 2.40, 1913-1991: 179;1, see AčaṙHLPatm 2, 1951: 72, Jahnukan 1987: 368, 376-377), whereas the word for ‘beard’ is found in the ‘correct’ accusative form mawrus (Movišš Xorenac’i 1.31-32, 1913-1991: 86). 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 meć-k’ vs. gen. mėcæc’, 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 čer” 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. śmáśru- n. ‘beard’ (RV+), Lith. smakras, smakrā ‘chin’, Alb. mjekër ‘chin, beard’, Hitt. zama(n)kur ‘beard’, etc. Irish smech ‘chin’ from *smekā-.

The Armenian -w- resulted from the depalatalization of *-k̆- 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 Artial (see above).

The by-form *muru-k’ may reflect PIE *smokr̥-u- > PArm. *mowru- (see Pedersen 1906: 351 = 1982: 129; Weitenberg 1997c: 342). Also miruk’ is of respectable antiquity and may represent the e-grade *smekŗu- (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). I tentatively propose the following scenario: nom. *smokur vs. pl. *smokru-eh2- > PArm. nom. *mac’ur (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 Kolbac’i, Hexaemeron, etc.)

In a 14-15th-century addendum (describing Cilicia) to Ašxarhac’oyc’ written by T’ovma Kilikec’i we read that Cilicia has mak’is vayri (APL) ‘wild sheep’ (see Anasyan 1967: 283; 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’ ahēs [cnon].

● DIAL Widespread: *mak’i. For the -g’- of the form of Svedia (mag’a), see Aşçaryan 2003: 428. According to Andreasyan (1967: 374b), however, it is maka. In the meaning ‘ewe’: Muš, Alaškert, Karin, Ararat, Ararat, Van, Ozim, Şatax (see M. Muradyan 1962: 202a; for the semantics, 83), Salmast, Maral (cf. Davt’yan 1966: 426), whereas Zeyt’ün [Aşçaryan 2003: 327], Svedia [Aşçaryan 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. *miru-k’ probably reflects the form with *e : -ew- > -iw- > -i-.
In his glossary of purely dialectal words in the Šamaxi dialect, Balramyan (1964: 243) records *mak'yaǰ 'female wild boar'. One wonders whether it is related with mak'ĩ.

**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: Kanna ḍëkē 'the bleating of sheep or goat(s)', ṭēke 'she-goat'. The absence of palatalization of the velar in Armenian is not explained; cf. Olsen 1999: 808. The solution may lie in the onomatopoeic character of the root, see 2.1.14. Note onomatopoeic mk(m)kal (of goat, kid) [Ačaryan 1913: 785a; Jahukyan 1972: 299; 1987: 137]. Alternatively, one may assume a feminine *méh2k-eh2- (cf. Gr. μηκάς), gen. *mh2-k-h2-ōs. The -i is secondary. See also below.

Formally, Arm. mak'ĩ and Gr. μηκάς can derive from *meh2-κ-, whereas the others may continue *m(e)h2-i-k- or *mek-. The underlying root may be *m(e)h2-κ- (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. Jahukyan (1987: 137) posits *mek- / *mekiJa- > mak'ĩ, which is unconvincing.

As mak'ĩ 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, mak'ĩ can be seen as an i-derivation from onomatopoeic *mvk- 'to bleat'; thus: *'bleating one'. Cf. typologically the i-derivation expressing the semantic development 'field' > 'wild animal' (see s.vv. art-i, and-i; cf. also vayr-i in Zeyt'un).

**mglamandi** 'spider-web'.

**DIAL** I find the word only in Goris maklamandi < *mglamandi 'spider-web' [Margaryan 1975: 440a]. There are also forms with a final -i, see Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan FW 2003, Goris and Łarabal.

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

I propose to treat the word as follows: *mgľ- 'mould/Schimmel' (see s.v. *mglim) + -a- + *mandi 'yarn or web', probably a -di- < *-tii̯V- formation based on manem 'to spin' (class., widespread in the dialects, among them also in Goris). The voiceless *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. unj3, 'soot' (q.v.), which refers to to the (sooty) spider-web in Łarabal, Hin Jula, probably also Goris and Šamaxi. The semantic relationship 'soot'
*: ‘spider-web’ is also paralleled by Akn ʿmlul/r [HAB 3: 352b]. However, this seems more complex and unnecessary.

The forms *mknunmandil, etc. may be regarded as folk-etymological reshaping as ‘kerchief of a mouse’.

**mglim**

‘to rot, spoil, mould (verschimmeln)’.

Only attested in the compounds mglahot (Geoponica, 13th cent.) and mgrahoh (Arakel Dawriţec’i, 17th cent.), both meaning ‘smelling like mould’ (adj.). The former is also found in “Bžškaran jioy” (13th cent.) in the meaning ‘smell of mould’ (subst.); see Čugaszyan 1980: 82L-7, 216; MJHayBař 2, 1992: 121. It is preserved in Muš mok’lahod (see Baldasaryan-T’ap’alec’yan 1958: 264b; the meaning is not specified), and in Ⱦaralab, etc. in a different meaning, see s.v. *mglim2.

● **DIAL** Preserved in the dialects of Sučava, Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Řodost’o, Aslanbek, Sebastia, Aqan, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alashkert (for Muš, see above), Axale’xa, Ararat, Zeyt’un, Hačen (māğ’lel) [HAB 3: 293a], as well as in Arabkir, Xian and Sivri-Hisar [Ačarean 1913: 765]. For Svedia, see Andreasyan 1967: 374b (the meaning is not specified). In Axale’xa, Atap’azar, Polis, etc., one finds *mgl-ot-im [Ačarean 1913: 765b].

In Xotr’ur one finds aregkmel, aregmknel ‘to rot, to spoil under the sun’ [HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 122a], the second component of which might be related, too.

Another interesting and unexplained compound is Goris moklamandi < *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- < *-tiiV- 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 Elia Mušelayan Karnec’i (Karin/Xotor’ur) one finds muk’l with borbas ‘mould’ and ʿort’ rendering Turk. ˈkuf ‘mould, rust’ [Čugaszyan 1986: 86Nd, 140]. Čugaszyan (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 Ačarean (HAB 3: 293a), related to *mglim2 ‘to scorch, singe’ and *mglim3 ‘to cloud’ with the basic meaning ‘to become black’. The connection with mglim3 suggested in NHB 2: 234a is semantically problematic.

**mglim2** ‘to scorch, singe’.

● **DIAL** Only in dial. compound *mglahot ‘smell of singeing’: Larabal [HAB 3: 293a; Davt’yan 1966: 426], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 348a, 440a], Șamilad and Krasnoselsk [Mežunc’ 1989: 212b]. For written attestations of mglahot with a different meaning, see s.v. mglim1.

● **ETYM** According to Ačarean (HAB 3: 293a), related to *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, Şatax, Muš, Alashkert [HAB 3: 293a; Ačarean 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 Ačaṙyan (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. meghá- m. ‘cloud, gloomy weather’, Av. maēya- m. ‘cloud’, etc. PArm. *mig-la- ‘cloud, fog’ may be derived from IE *h3migh-leh₂-, cf. Gr. ομίχλη ‘fog’, OCS мьгла ‘frost, haze’, Lith. miglą ‘fog’, Dutch dial. miggelen ‘frost’.

The absence of metathesis of *-ghl- suggests perhaps an older *mig-il or -ul, perhaps from HD l-stem with NSg *-al, see 2.2.2.5. Alternatively, one may assume that the metathesis was blocked by the sensed association with the unsuffixed form mēg. For the structure of the derivation cf. an example with the same semantics: Gr. νεφ-έλη ‘cloud’ next to νέφος n. ‘id.’. One also might think of the verbal -l- seen e.g. in cm-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 Ačaṙyan (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. *amulf found in alfjamuf ‘darkness, twilight’, which is improbable; see s.v. *alf-.

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. пlesen’ etc.

In some of them a dental suffix appears: *mgl-t- (Alaşkert, Nor Bayazet) and *mgl-ot- (Muş).

● ETYM According to Ačaṙyan (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. meghá- m. ‘cloud, gloomy weather’, Av. maēya- m. ‘cloud’, etc. PArm. *mig-la- ‘cloud, fog’ may be derived from IE *h3migh-leh₂-, cf. Gr. ομίχλη ‘fog’, OCS мьгла ‘frost, haze’, Lith. miglą ‘fog’, Dutch dial. miggelen ‘frost’.

The absence of metathesis of *-ghl- suggests perhaps an older *mig-il or -ul, perhaps from HD l-stem with NSg *-al, see 2.2.2.5. Alternatively, one may assume that the metathesis was blocked by the sensed association with the unsuffixed form mēg. For the structure of the derivation cf. an example with the same semantics: Gr. νεφ-έλη ‘cloud’ next to νέφος n. ‘id.’. One also might think of the verbal -l- seen e.g. in cm-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 Ačaṙyan (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. *amulf found in alfjamuf ‘darkness, twilight’, which is improbable; see s.v. *alf-.

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. пlesen’ etc.

**mglum₄ ‘to struggle’.

Only attested in John Chrysostom: ὦς ογορι'ι ϵω ογ' χαναγ'ε, ϵω ογ' mglic'i, ayl diwrav heştaw imn zmarrin t'óluc'u.

● ETYM In NHB 2: 234a, the above-cited passage is represented under mglum, ‘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 magic'em ‘to climb’ and mak'arim ‘to struggle’, too.

**mec, a-stem: GDSg mec-i, ISg mec-a-w, GDPl mec-a-c’, etc. adj. ‘great, big, large’, adv. ‘much’ (Bible+); mec-a-rm ‘to honour, esteem highly’, mecær-an-k’, a-stem: GDPl meccaran-a-c ‘honour’, mecær-oy ‘much respected, honorable’ (all Bible+; see Astuacaturean 1895: 997; Clackson 1994: 230206; on mecær-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 Žula has also venj, the initial v- of which may be due to nasal dissimilation [Açarean 1940: 125, 376a]. Goris and Larabal have forms with geminate -cc [HAB 3: 295b; Margaryan 1975: 348].


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, 1847: 72, etc., see HAB 3: 295b), connected to the cognate forms going back to the PIE word for ‘great’: Skt. NAccSg máhi 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.


Jahukyan (1987: 137, 180) introduces also Arm. post-classical *moz ‘great, much, mighty, increased’, positing *moğ- with a question-mark. One may assume that the genitive *mēh₂-ōs developed into a secondary o-grade form *moğH- 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. y-olov ‘much, plenty’). The PIE paradigm nom. *mēh₂-s vs. gen. *m(o)h₂-ōs may have developed into PArm. nom. *mēc-a- (ClArm. mec, a-stem) vs. gen. *mozh₂- > post-classical *moc, as well as EAArm. *moc (on which see the dialectal section) with -c- after the nominative. It should be borne in mind, however, that *moc is not reliable, and *mozh₂- would rather yield *mogj (something like *mogh₂o- may be assumed, cf. comp. μογj from *mēgh₂os/n-, Beekes 1976b: 90). Thus, the whole idea is highly hypothetical.

The dialectal form *menc may be explained by a nasal epenthesis (e.g. AÇârene 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.

**melex, o-stem:** ISg melex-o-v (Ephrem); i-stem in NHB 2: 247b with no evidence, but cf. AblSg i melex-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): evw ankanic’i erkat’n i melexē : καὶ ἐκπεσὸν τὸ σιδήριον ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου. Arm. melex renders Gr. ξύλον ‘wood; piece of wood; peg, lever; cudgel, club’ (here, said of ἄζινη = p’aytat ‘axe’) and refers thus to a ‘handle of an axe’.

In Ephrem melex refers to the handle of a tapar ‘axe’.

**ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 299b. Jahukyan (1987: 355, 438), with reservation, treats it as comprising PIE *me- ‘to hit grind’ (cf. Russ. mólot ‘hammer’, etc.) and the Urartian suffix -ḫi/ə. However, melex 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. melex may reflect PArm. *mel(i) ‘ash-tree’ related with Gr. μελία, Ep. -ίη f. ‘manna ash, Fraxinus ornus; ashen spear’ from QIE *mel-‘to hit grind’. For the semantic development cf. the Germanic forms of the PIE term for ‘ash-tree’: OIc. askr, OHG asc, OEngl. æsc ‘ash-tree; spear’; Gr. ἄζινα ‘beech; spear-shaft made from its wood, spear’; see s.vv. hæc’i, hoyn, usi/*hoši. See especially Dumont 1992: 326;

The Greek word has no secure etymology (see Frisk 2: 201-202). PArm. *mel(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. mēr.

The Armenian tradition usually relates manna with tamarisk, cf. Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (S. Vardanjan 1990: 190, § 1012). This also follows from the origin of the term gaz-pēn ‘manna’ < MPers. *tamarisk-honey (see HAB 1: 499b). In ethnographical descriptions of Sasun, however, we learn that there is also another kind of manna which is set on leaves of lɔupil’i ‘oak-tree’ and other trees [Kalant’ar 1895: 30-31; Petoyan 1965: 101-102]. Also in Dersim the kazpe ‘manna’ is said to be set on oak-trees [Halajyan 1973: 57a].


**ETYM Ač’ariyan (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 alt/ale vs. Gr.
ārpā f. ‘dirt’. However, this is improbable, as is the etymology of alt/c (q.v.). On Jahukyan’s view, see s.v. *af- ‘dark’.

melk, i-stem in HNB, but without evidence ‘soft, weak, slack’: Eznik Kołbac’i (5th cent.) onwards; melkanam ‘to grow weak, loose, dissolute’ (Bible+), rendering ἐκ-λύω in Jeremiah 4:31: melkaseʿi = ἐκλυϑήσεται; melkim ‘id.’, melkem ‘to make loose, soft’: Bible (in Joshua 18.3: miniʿew verb melkicʾekʾ: ἐκτὸς τίνος ἐκλυϑήσατος: ‘how long will you be slack?’), Lazar P’arpec’i (5th cent.), etc.; intensive z-melkem or s-melkem (Vardon Arewelc’i, 13th cent., HNB 2: 724a).

In Lazar P’arpec’i 1.16 (1904=1985: 27L15f; transl. Thomson 1991: 63): K’anzi aha dei τ’ulac’eal melki i lovč araʃnordac‘ knik’ awandoc ‘aranat 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 melkea is attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.11 (1913=1991: 34L3; transl. Thomson 1978: 86): ayl jēuc’eal melkea ze’rtu’t’iwn saruc’eal k’o hpartac’eal baruc’d: ‘now warm and melt the freezing cold of your haughty conduct’.

• ETYM Related with Skt. myd-. fem. mydvī- ‘delicate, weak, soft, mild’ (AV+), Lat. mollis ‘weak, soft’ < *moldu-i- etc.; see Hübbschmann 1897: 473; HAB 3: 300b; Pokorny 1959: 718; Mallory/Adams 1997: 532b. As is shown by Meillet (1900: 394; 1936: 51, 184), melk derives from *meldwi-; see 2.1.22.6; see also Jahukyan 1982: 75; 1987: 137; Weitenberg 1984a: 211; Szemerényi 1985: 791-792; Olsen 1999: 270L16; Viredaz 2003: 64. Lat. mollis is explained as "Umbildung eines u-Stammes auf Grund des Femininums (*mld-w-i-)") (Solta 1966: 46; cf. Schrijver 1991: 20). If the i-stem of Arm. melk proves reliable, we can interpret it the same way; see 2.2.3.

Further see s.v. malem ‘to grind, crush, break’.

melm, o-stem: GDSg melm-o-y, ISg melm-o-v ‘soft, mild, gentle, calm; softly, gently’ (Bible+); dial. *m(o)mel ‘quiet, calm, fine; moth, midge’; cf. also ml(m)el ‘fine chaff, dust’ (q.v.).

• DIAL The form melm has been preserved in Muš, Moks, as well as in a Larabal and Lazax derivative melm-cr-e’uc’ ‘softly burning’ [HAB 3: 301a].

For a deeper relation, note Agulis *mlmēl ‘moth’ (HAB 3: 225ab; for the correction to 225a, see HAB-Add 1982: 14) or mlmēl ‘gnat, midge’ vs. mlmel ‘quiet, calm’ (M. Zak’aryan 2008: 224); Larabal *mlmēl ‘softly, quietly (said e.g. of the blowing of a wind and of the process of boiling’ [Ačarean 1913: 786b]; cf. Ararat mlmel ‘very fine straw; the smallest kind of mosquito, midge’ [Amatuni 1912: 483b].

Compare *ml-m-o/ud ‘moth, clothes moth’ (see s.v. *mul- ‘grinding, crushing’).

• ETYM According to Ačareyan (HAB 3: 225ab), belongs with malem ‘to crush, grind’, ml(m)el ‘chaff’, etc. (see s.vv.). Olsen 1999: 27 posits muel-a,mo-.

The Agulis and other forms corroborate (both formally and semantically) the etymological or folk-etymological association between melm ‘soft, quiet’ and *mlme/o/ud ‘moth, midge; fine straw, chaff; quiet, calm’.

mehr, r/u-declension: GDSg mel-u (Bible); *r-stem: GDSg meler (Hexaemeron, see K. Muradyan 1984: 263L16, 265L3, 265L18, 266L18); later also: *r-stem: ISg meh-o-v; *melu, GDSg mehu-i, ISg mehu-a-w (cf. as-u-i vs. asr, gen. as-u ‘fleece’, q.v.) ‘honey’ (Bible+).
Ubiquitous in the dialects. In a number of N, NW, W and SE peripheral
dialects a metathesis has taken place: Aslanbek *merb, Axalc'xa, Karin, Xarberd
merl, Sebastia merl, Salmast merl, Marala *merl. Some dialects display forms with a
final -ə, Sūč'ava métrə, Aslanbek métrə, Zeyt'un métr/rya, Goris, Šamaxi métrə
[HAB 3: 303a].

Hamšen *xelaṙ meɭ or *xent' meɭ 'wild intoxicating poisonous honey' (lit.
'crazy honey') made of *eɭr, a shrub with yellow flowers resembling laši (Aćažē
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. Krkyašaryan 26548) the Greeks who had eaten honey
somewhere between the lands of Macrōnians and Colchians seemed like
exceedingly drunk or even crazy.

 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. miliþ,
Alb. mjáltë, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 473; HAB 3: 302; Pokorny 1959: 723; Starke
Kloekhorst 2008: 580. One usually reconstructs a heteroclitic paradigm nom. *mel-i-
t, 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

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 *medhu- n. 'mead, sweet
drink, honey'93: Skt. mádhu- n. 'sweet drink, anything sweet, honey, soma', Yāv.
maðū- n. 'wine made of berries', Gr. μέθυ n. 'intoxicating drink, wine', Toch. B mīt
n. 'honey', OHG mito 'mead', OCS medъ 'honey', etc. (Meillet 1890: 401; Gauthiot
É. Tumanjan 1978: 300-301; Clackson 1994: 126, 161; Olsen 1999: 168-169; Matzinger 2005: 59256; for

The direct derivation of Arm. *mėhu- from *mėd-u- (see Matzinger 2005: 59256
with refer.) is untenable.

mu, a-stem: GDG μu (Georg 13th cent.), GDPI μu-a-c' (twice in the Bible)
'bee' (Bible+).

 Widespread in the dialects. In T'iflis, Ararat and Łarabal μu has been
replaced by μel-a-čan lit. 'honey-bee'; note also Ozim meli ttc vs. Van ttc
'bumble-bee' [HAB 3: 301b]. Marala has diminutive forms mel-ak, mel-il [Aćažē
1926: 412], cf. also Salmast mel-ak, through contamination with melr 'honey'
[HAB 3: 301b], Kak'avaberd méič-ak 'wild bee' [H. Muradyan 1967: 179b].

 Derived from melr, gen. mel-u 'honey' (q.v.). For mel-u 'bee' vs. mel-r, gen.
mel-u 'honey' compare eʃer-u 'stag' vs. eʃewr 'horn' (see HAB 2: 24a; Jähukyan
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. melr 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. *mēth, 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 *melut-ā- after PArm. *melu- ‘honey’ and/or after the pattern of efjer-u ‘stag’ vs. efjewr ‘horn’.

me₃t-k`) a-stem (mostly pl. tant.) ‘sin, crime’ (Bible+).

● DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 299a].


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 (Ačaṙyan is sceptical about the connection with *mol-); J̌ahukyan 1987: 138; Olsen 1999: 64-65, 338. For the o-grade cf. also the Baltic evidence.


me₃r anim, 3sg.aor. me₃r-a-w, partic. me₃r-eal ‘dead’, etc. (abundant evidence in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1006-1010) ‘to die’ (Bible+); an-mēr̂ ‘immortal’ (Agat’angělos).

● DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 304b].


merk, o-stem: GDsg merk-o-y, GDPl merk-o-c’ (Bible+); GDPI merk-u-c’ in Mark 14.51 (Astuacaturean 1895: 1012e; Olsen 1999: 54), later also o-stem ‘nude, naked; mere, bare’ (Bible+).

● DIAL The basic form merk is present in Nor Naxijewan, Axalc’xa, Karin, Ararat, Moks, Hačan, 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 [Ačaṙean 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' + āryan 'naked' through haplology (Ačāryan 1913: 804a).

The Armenian compound literally means ‘naked (as born) from the mother’; compare P’awstos Buzand 4.59 (1883–1984: 152Lff; transl. Garsolian 1989: 179): merkac’uc’in zna ibrew i mōrē “stripped her naked as she had come from her mother’s [womb]”; 5.3 (160L-8f; 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 *negw-no-: Skt. nagná- ‘naked’ (RV+), YAv. mayna- ‘naked’ (< *magna-), Khot. būnaa-, Oss. bægnæg ‘naked (< *bagnaka-), Gr. γυμνός ‘naked, unarmed’ (from *nogw-no-, with -υ- due to the following labiovelar), Lith. núogas ‘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. *nogw-s, Gen. *negw-s (see Beekes 1992: 183; 1994: 91-94; 1995: 196, 198).

The initial m- of Arm. merk has been linked with the Iranian (Meillet 1921: 227; 1922b: 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 *megw-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 *megw(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: 55-56). 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 *negw-no- > *negw-no- would be comparable with *negw-no- > *negw-mo- 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 *hognā- ‘nail’ > Toch. *mekwā ‘nails’, perhaps also Arm. magil ‘claw’.

Arm. merk may be somehow associated with lerk ‘hairless’. From PIE *negw-no-, we might arrive at a PArm. *lerk through dissimilation n...n > l...n (cf. Gr. ἀκμών), 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’.


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 Ačaréan 1913: 1031b); QIE *nog*-no- > PArm. *nuk-no- > *tklor. Alternatively: *nog*v*o*-os- (cf. Lat. nádus, OIr. nocht, 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. λυμός. This etymology is, of course, highly hypothetical.

Orel 1994a: 38 derives Arm. merk from IE *mer*əg-'shine, shimmer' (cf. Lith. margvas 'motley', etc.), which is unconvincing.

mek', gen. mer, acc.-dat. mez, abl. i ménj, instr. me(a)wk' 'we' (Bible+); *mer- in compounds [HAB 3: 309b].

The Armenian translator of the Grammar of Dionysius Thrax records a dual monk' 'we both' (Adonc' 1915=2008: 28; see also Jahukyan 1954: 98). According to Karst (1901: 134-135 = 2002: 135-25), monk' in fact must be seen as a plural form found in the dialect of Larabal as munk'.

*DIAL. Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly with a nasal epenthesis, *menk' [HAB 3: 3109; AčarLiak 2, 1954: 58, 60]. The nasales form is found in Hamšen mek', mekk' (e.g. mek' astak' 'we said', see Ačaréan 1947: 72, 245), Agulis mk' [Ačaréan 1935: 147, 374], Melri mei/ik' [Alayan 1954: 181, 280a], Šamaxi mk' [Balramyan 1964: 105, 214]; note also Hadrut' and Šalax-Xcaberd muk' vs. Larabal munk' [Davt'y'an 1966: 427]. Further see H. Muradyan 1982: 327-328.

On Larabal munk' (Patkanov 1869: 69; Davt'y'an 1966: 427; cf. Cirbied 1823: 753), see also above. The labial vowel may have been taken from duk' pl. 'you'; typologically compare OCS my next to Lith. mës and Arm. mek', with -y taken from vy pl. 'you' (cf. Lith. jús, etc.).

*ETYM Compared with Lith. mës; Latv. mës, OCS my, etc., see Meillet 1894: 161; 1936: 92; Hübbschmann 1897: 474; HAB 3: 309b with further references; Schmitt 1981: 115, 117; Jahukyan 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 *ps-me,

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; Jahukyan 1982: 147; 150; Weitenberg 1983a: 113, 115-117; Kortlandt 1984a: 100 = 2003: 47.


mēg, o-stem: ISg mig-o-v in the Bible (three times); Movsēs Kalankatuar’c’i (7th cent.) [V. Arak’el’yan 1983: 188L9]; Yovhannēs Draxanakert’c’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+).


● DIAL See s.v. *mg-l-im3 ‘to cloud’.

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: *h[^m]n- > PArm. *om- > *(u)m- (see 2.1.17.3).

mēǰ, o-stem: GDSg mij-o-y, LocSg i mij-i, etc. (Bible+); later also a-stem: ISg mij-a-w in Plato (cf. also GDPl mij-a-c’ in a number of dialects) ‘the middle; (anatom.)
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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 mēj’ 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[26]), but in some dialects one still finds GDPl *mif- a-č’ 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’ > mɛč [Ačaṙyan 1947: 243]. Traces of the old paradigm may also be found, cf. e.g. Sasun > T’alin mičvu ‘of my back’ attested in a famous folk-song (see Ṯ. Xačyan 1999: 118a, three times) vs. ClArm. gen. mif-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 mindź ‘female genitals’ as a borrowing from Armenian, see Clackson 2004.

- ETYM From PIE *medhi-: Skt. mádhya- adj. ‘middle, located in the middle’, subst. n. ‘the middle’ (RV+), madhyā adv. ‘in the middle’ (Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 303), OAv. maidiia-, YAv. maḥiia- ‘middle, the middle’, Gr. μέσος, Aeol. μέσσος, Cret. Boeot. μεττός ‘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 *medjo- > PArm. *meido- through regular palatalization *-d̪j- > -j- (2.1.22.1) and anticipation of of *-i- or development *-e- > *ei- before palatal (2.1.2). For the etymology and a phonological discussion, see Klaproth 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, 211; Mallory/Adams 1997: 380b; Olsen 1999: 25, 811, 830, 911.

PArm. *meidya- > *mif-a- ‘the back’ (vs. *yo- ‘middle’), pl. tant. in practically all the dialects, possibly points to a neuter noun (cf. Skt. mádhya- n. ‘the middle’, Lat. medium n. ‘middle’) and may be derived from neuter plural *medj(e)h2- Less probably, it can be traced back to fem. *meidjeh2-, 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-č ‘one’, ‘a’ (Bible+); compositional mi-o- (Bible+), me- < *mi-o- in me-tasan, i-stem: GDPl metasan-i-c’; IPl metasan-i-w-k’ ‘eleven’ (Bible+), me-kin ‘single, only, simple, mere, clear, explained’ (Hexaemon, 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); minam ‘to be united’ (Bible+); miyan ‘only’ (Bible+), compositional men-a- (Bible+), miyan-ak ‘alone’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, etc.); “menean- ‘each other’, acc. menean-s, gen.-dat. menean-c’, instr. menean-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, Akin postposed indefinite article m. Reduced indefinite article m (m’ before a vowel) in Polis, Hamšen, Sebastian, Xarberd, Tigranakert, Zeyt’un, etc.; note also postposed -əm in Axalc’xa and Karin. The form min is found in Larabal, Jula, Polis, etc. The forms měk ‘one’ and miyanak > *menak, etc. ‘alone’ are ubiquitous [HAB 3: 319a]. Interesting is Jula měkn ‘correctly, right, upright’, referring e.g. to the way of sitting or holding a book ( Aç’ra’an 1940: 376a).

An exceptional and obscure form is found in Agulis, muyn, C’hna mun, which is not explained by Aç’ra’yan (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. m’is ‘meat’ > mays, mít-k’ ‘mind’ > maytk’, etc. The final -ən 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 -əyn > Agulis -ayn, thus min > *mayn > *muyn is uncertain, too. One is tempted to consider Larabal mu- in mu-xrek ‘a bit’, which Aç’ra’yan (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 Larabal munk’ and hellen. monk’ vs. basic mek ‘we’ (q.v.).


It has been argued that the oblique forms miyo and mium on the one hand and mijo 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; Larabal has mi, mir, móér, míl, mél (see Davt’yan 1966: 428), pl. mrék’; with a final -n : Agulis, Melri mán [HAB 3: 316a].
All the forms cited by Ačar'yan (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. μῆ, 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: 137), Toch. and Phryg. or Thrac. are included, too.

mic, AblSg i maccē (Philo) ‘(fetid) mud’ (Philo, Gregory of Nyssa, Dawit’ Anyalt’); mceal ‘dirty, dark’ (in the dictionary entitled Arje'n bāran, Venice, 1865); with expressive -z-: z-mceal ‘impure, sinful’ in 2 Paralipomenon 27.2 (Xalat’eanc’ 1899: 96b): ev takawin žolourdk’n zmceal ēin : καὶ ἐτὶ ὁ λοῦς καταφθείτο. For philological analysis of this Biblical form (unknown to NHB and Astuacaturean 1895), see Ačar'yan 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 Vāčē (king of Aluank’) apud Movaš Kałankatuc’i i 1.11, the passage see NHB 2: 286a. The critical text by V. Arak’elyan (1983: 2214) has here mjuk’ut’iwn (var. mjut’iwn), however. The passage runs as follows: zmjuk’tiwn cxoyn i spitakut’iwn šušani šrjec’er “you turned <...> the darkness of the smoke into the witeness of a lily” (transl. Dowsett 1961: 13). We may posit thus a by-form *mlij- probably metathesized from *mic-l- (or contaminated with mjuk-k- ‘to strangle, suffocate’, on which see s.v. helj-a-mlij-a’uk ‘drowned, suffocated, oppressed’); see also s.v. *melc/j prob. ‘soot’.

**ETYM** Scheftelowitz (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 Armenian and Germanic forms under *smėi-d- ‘to smear’ and adding OCS smēch ‘dark, swarthy, dusky’ (see also Saradževa 1986: 95). Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 528b considers this connection uncertain.

The sound development *-dʒi- > Arm. -c- is untenable. One rather expects -c- (see 2.1.2.1). 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 alc- vs. alt ‘dirt, filth’, pilc ‘filthy, abominable’ vs. p’lt-or ‘id’. One may also assume a connection to (or contamination with) Arm. *melc/j prob. ‘soot’ and PIE *smerd- ‘to stink’, cf. Lith. smirdžiu, smirdėti ‘to stink’, etc. (see above on the by-form *mlij-).

mis, o-stem: GDSg ms-o-y, AblSg i ms-o-y (abundant evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1885: 1018-1019), a-stem: GDPI ms-a-c’, AblPl i ms-a-c’ (Plato, Yovhaněns Sarkawag) ‘flesh, meat’ (Bible+); ms-an, an-stem: IPl msan-am-b-k’ (a few attestations in Leviticus, rendering Gr. ἰμπίον, 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’, *mēmso-: Skt. mēṃsā- n. (vs. mās, acc.sg. n.), Goth. mimz, OCS meṣo, Opr. menso, mensā, Toch. B miṣa n., f. pl. tant., Alb. mish, etc. (Hübbschmann 1897: 474; HAB 3: 323-324; Pokorny 1959: 725; Jahukyan 1987: 138; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 343-344; Demiraj 1997: 269-270; Mallory/Adams

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. μῆψεν ‘skin, cuticle’, but the appurtenance of this Greek word is disputed.

According to Ačařyan (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 *misr- < *mēms-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. mēs has two stems: o- and a- (cf. Jahukyan 1959: 321b). It is remarkable that none of the 70 Biblical attestations listed in Astu acaturean 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 miti 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.) [MJ]HayBař 2, 1992: 138a], and in ModArm.: mitk’(s) dnel, mtk’in dnel, mtk’um (loc.) dnel ‘to decide, intend, aim’ [Mlmtaseanc’ 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 Naxiğewan, Polis mtok’a dnel ‘to intend, decide to do smth.’ [Ačařean 1913: 782b].

● ETYM Related to Gr. μήδεα ‘counsels, plans, arts’ (pl. of the unattested *μήδος, -ς; s-stem neuter), μέδο ‘to protect, rule over’, μέδωμαι ‘to provide for, be mindful of; to plan, contrive, devise’, μέδομαι ‘to be minded, intend; to take care, keep watch’, Lat. medears ‘to heal, cure’, Umbrian mers ‘law, justice’ < *medos, etc. (Hübschmann 1883: 43; 1897: 474-475; HAB 3: 325). From PIE *mēd-: *mēd- or *mēd, -d-; 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: 229).
The phrase ‘to put (in) mind’ (mit dnem, etc.) which is present in ClArm, MidArm., ModArm. and dialects, seems to continue PIE formula *mens- dheh₁- ‘to put in the mind’, replacing the first member by mit < *mēd-.

*ml-i/uk, *ml-ak (dialect.) ‘midge; bed-bug; nit’


- **ETYM** Together with mllem ‘to rub’, etc., related with malem ‘to crush, grind’ (q.v.), see Lidén 1906: 82-83; Meillet 1924: 4-5; HAB 3: 328b; Jahukyan 1987: 138.

mšuš ‘fog’, a MidArm. word [HAB 3: 336a; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 142b]. Recorded in Bar’girk ‘hayoc’ [Amalyan 1975: 219N391]. In this dictionary it is found also as mšoš, rendering măraxd ‘fog’ (209N147). As is pointed out by Amalyan (1975: 405N147),
this is a dialectal form. One may assume that mšōš reflects an Eastern dialectal (probably Larabali, etc.) form with u > ū, although the word is not recorded here.


● ETYM Ačarjan (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. *aš- ‘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 -ɫ- and -ṙ- instead of -z-. Therefore the word should be regarded as uncertain [HAB 3: 337-338].

● ETYM No etymology is accepted by Ačarjan [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 Kolsan’s 1.22 (5th cent.): ‘a kind of sorcerer’ (see Garamanian 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 wrenn haraw i k’ez? “Are you mad, has some devil gotten into you?” (transl. Garsoian 1989: 236-1). For the semantic field cf. šiša. On the ecstatic fury of the the prophet and/or poet, see Thieme 1968 (< 1954); Schmitt 1967: 302ff; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 835-836; Toporov 1995: 607ff.

In T’ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 2.1 [V. M. Vardanyan 1985: 124-1ff]: šin <...> zormzdakan meheann, ew zkrakapašt ‘en molu’ōn 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. malvā- ‘unbesonnen, töricht’ (cf., however, Mayrhofer EWAlia 2, 1996: 334), etc. [HAB 3: 339-340; Finck 1903]. See also mel(-k).

moš ‘tamarisk; blackberry, bramble’: moš-a-vayri ‘wild tamarisk’ in Jeremiah 17.6, rendering Gr. ἐξηραμμένη γ. ‘tamarisk’ (lit. ‘wild-tamarisk’), also in Commentary
mošanam on Genesis by Vardan Arewelc’i (in contrast with moreni ‘bramble’), moš vayri ‘id.’ (“Girk’ t’lt’oc’”); moš-i ‘tamarisk’ in Galen rendering Gr. murik = μυρίκη ‘tamarisk’ [NH 2: 297a; Greppin 1985: 78], in MidArm. mostly ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’, cf. gen. sew mošoy ‘of black bramble’ in the 13th-century “Bžškaran jioy” [Č’ugaszyan 1980: 125^1], and moš described as mirg sewe ‘black fruit’ of the thorny shrub moši in Bağirk’ hayoc’ [Amalyan 1975: 219^2]; moš also in Geoponica; moš-eni, GDPl mošeneac’ ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’ (“K’art’lis c’xovreba”). See also Ališan 1895: 443; Malxaseanc’ HBB 3: 358b.

●DIAL Agulis, Larabal moši ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’, Agulis, Larabal, Laradal, Larak’ilisa, Şamaxi moš ‘blackberry’; Muš moši ‘a bush from twigs of which besoms are made’, Xarberd moši ‘a kind of tree’ [HAB 3: 346a]. The actual meaning in Xarberd may be identical with that of Muš, namely ‘a bush from twigs of which besoms are made’ (cf. Bahramyan 1960: 154b on Dersim). Sasun moši seems to refer to ‘bramble’ since it is described as giving the fruit/berry moš (see Petoyan 1954: 146; 1965: 506).

The frequently cited mošay seems to be a ghost form deduced from moša-vayri. Note, however, that Haneyan (1978: 193a) glosses ClArm. mošay by Tigranakert moši ‘a bush from twigs of which besoms are made’, Xarberd moši ‘a kind of tree’ [HAB 3: 346a]. The actual meaning in Xarberd may be identical with that of Muš, namely ‘a bush from twigs of which besoms are made’ (cf. Bahramyan 1960: 154b on Dersim). Sasun moš-i seems to refer to ‘bramble’ since it is described as giving the fruit/berry moš (see Petoyan 1954: 146; 1965: 506).

●SEMANTICS Since MidArm. and dial. moš-i refers mostly to ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’, and the meaning ‘tamarisk’ occurs practically only in the compound moš-a-vayri (Jeremiah 17.6 and one or two Bible-depending texts), one might assume that the basic meaning of Arm. moš-i is ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’, and the compound moš-a-vayri ‘tamarisk’ should be understood as ‘wild bramble’.

Syntactically, the compound moš-a-vayri is reminiscent of š-š-a-vay-r-i ‘onager’ (Eznik Kol-İoc’i, Movşes Xorenac’i, John Chrysostom, Paterica, etc.), cf. ὀναγρος = ὄνος ἄγριος. Its Greek match ἄγριο-μυρίκη, however, reflects a reversed order of the components.

●ETYMY No etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 345-346.

Jahukyan correctly connects with mor ‘blackberry’, q.v.

mořanam, 1sg.aor. mořac’a-y, imper. mořa ‘to forget’ (Bible+).

On mořac’a-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 mainel (vs. Hačen mainel, mainel), Svedia mainil, Xarberd mainal [HAB 3: 346b], Dersim mainal [Bahramyan 1960: 93a]. This -a- is difficult to explain within the dialects (cf.
e.g. Aćaryan 2003: 75 and 388 for Zeyt'uni-Haçon and Svedia, respectively); further, see below.


Arm. mōrana- ‘to forget’ (Adams 1999: 455-456), thus *mōrs(a)- > PArm. *mōrna- or *mōr(s)na > *mōrna- (cf. Meillet 1936: 40, 185; Kortlandt 1983: 10 = 2003: 40; Beekes 2003: 157) > mōrnanam as (or after the type of) loganam ‘to bathe’ < *louH-, cf. Gr. λύω, λο(τ)ék-o-sar, Lat. lavó, lavere ‘to wash; to bathe, soak’, lavare ‘to bathe’, etc. On the other hand, the a-grade has been explained from an underlying unattested noun *mor-so- ‘einer, der vergüht’ (Klingenschmitt 1982: 126-127) seen in Lith. maršas ‘oblivion, forgetfulness’, Skt. dur-mārṣa- ‘unforgettable’, etc. (cf. also Skt. mārṣana- ‘enduring, forgiving’, see Olsen 1999: 653-654, 840); note gōlanam ‘to steal’ vs. gol ‘thief’ and galem ‘to hide, conceal’. In view of the absence of a noun *mor, this solution is less probable.

According to N. Simonyan 1979: 247-248, the Armenian dialectal by-form *mār-(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. mṛṣya. However, the dialectal -a- may still be secondary, even though it is not easily explicable at this stage.

mor, ‘blackberry (the fruit of bramble)’, GDSg mor-i in Cyril of Alexandria, mor-eni ‘bramble, blackberry (the plant, shrub)’ (Bible+), mor-i ‘bramble’, GDSg mor-o-y in Thomas Aquinas, Book of virtues (transl. into Arm. in the 14th cent. by Yakob Jáhke’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 Vardanjan 1990: 142, § 667, 322, § 2030; comment: 616, 710); the meaning ‘blackberry’ is corroborated by Malxaseanc’ (HBB 3: 360c, referring also to Sepetçian) and by dialectal evidence (see below); morm ‘strawberry’ in Simčen Kamb(a)rkac’i, 17th cent. [Ališan 1895: 445, Nr 2116; HAB 3: 347a]; according to Galen, ‘nightshade, hound’s berry, or the like’, corresponding to Gr. στρύχνον, τρύχνον (see NHB 2: 298c; Ališan 1895: 445, Nr 2117; Bégunot/Diratçouyan 1912: 82; Maksasanc’ HBB 3: 360c; Greppin 1985: 104, 108).

Arm. mor-eni (GDSg moren-o-y, LocSg i moren-o-j) frequently occurs in the Bible always rendering Gr. βάτος, m. ‘bramble, Rubus ulmifolius’.

**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].


Hamşen *mür*, gen. *mär-i* ‘blackberry’ (the berry), *mërni* (the shrub) [Ačarıyan 1947: 245]. According to A 1947: 245, however, one can assume that Polis had čmormik *mor-ik* ‘blackberry’, etc. (see below) clearly show that the second *mormeni* vs. *mormeni* (HAB 2: 202).

Zeyt’un *muy*, *mër* ‘blackberry’ (the berry) vs. *mormine* (the shrub) from *mormeni* [Ačarıyan 2003: 329]. The same distribution: Tigranakert *mor* vs. *mërmeni* [Haneyan 1978: 193a].

The form *mormeni* is also seen in Polis *mërmeni* which denotes both the berry and the shrub [HAB 3: 347b; Ačarıyan 1941: 93, 102, 232]. The trilled Ṳ of this form is strange since, as Ačarıyan (1941: 93) assures, “the pronunciation of *r* as Ṳ is very odd for this dialect” whereas the opposite, namely Ṳ > *r* is very common and tends to be generalized even in the position before the nasal n. In this particular case, Ačarıyan (ibid.) explains *mormeni* > Polis *mërmeni* (borrowed into Turk. *mormen* by influence of Turk. *mër* ‘dark blue’. This is not impossible. More probably, however, one can assume that Polis had *mor* (the berry) vs. *mrômeni* (the shrub) which was levelled to *mor* vs. *mërmeni* (exactly like in Tigranakert above).

Subsequently, *mor* was lost in Polis. Note that *mor* seems to be the only case of Ṳ > *r* in Tigranakert except for the position before a consonant (see Haneyan 1978: 51, 62, and the glossary). I posit an old *mor* since it is found in peripheral dialects from both Western and Eastern areas.

In Svedia, next to *mërmina* (the shrub), the form for the berry has been replaced by a compound *mormn-t’üöüt* [Andreyasyan 1967: 375b; Ačarıyan 2003: 580], with t’üt ‘mulberry’ as the second member.

According to Ačarıyan (1941: 102), the medial -m- in Polis *mërmeni* is an apenthes 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 *mormlig* ‘blackberry’ (both the berry and the shrub), Č’enkler (Nikomidia) *moremuk* glossed by *šn-xalöl*, lit. “dog-grapes”, Muş *moremuk* ‘bramble’ (or *morimuk*, see Amatuni 1912: 489a), Akin *morm-ik* ‘raspberry’, Binkean, Mertkőz (Nikomidia) *mormorik* ‘blackberry’, Aslanbek *morm*, *morm* ‘blackberry’, *morm* p’tuş ‘blackberry, bramble (the shrub)’, lit. ‘thorn of blackberry’ [HAB 3: 347b].

In Hamşen, also ‘wild strawberry; wild grapes’ (see Ačarıyan 1913: 793b).
In a folk-song of the “Antuni” type from Akn (see Palean 1898a: 394a-ff) one finds mor:

_Inci ur gini pitnar,
Es tatis karsen xmei:
<...>:
_Inci ur xaloł pitnar,
Es mors moren k-ut-ci_.

“When I needed wine, I would drink from the jar of my grandmother; when I needed grapes, I would eat from the mor of my mother”.

Ačārían (1913: 793a; see also Malxaseane 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 Čequiv (Nikomidia) *moremuk “dog-grapes”, as well as *mori xaloł ‘a kind of grapes’ (see Amatuni 1912: 489a).

On Arabkir mamur ‘bramble, wild mulberry’, see below.

**ETYM** Since NHB 2: 298a, linked with the Greek and Latin words for ‘mulberry, blackberry’: Gr. μόρον n. ‘black mulberry; blackberry’, μορέα, -ή f. ‘mulberry-tree, Morus nigra’, Lat. mōrum, it. n. ‘fruit of the black mulberry’, mōrus, it. f. ‘black mulberry-tree’, Welsh mer-wydden ‘mulberry, blackberry’, OIr. smër, 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)mőr- and a Central European (Carpathian?) *(s)mőrjor-.

Jahukyan (1987: 72, 139, 255) adds also dial. *moš (< *morš-) and *mor deriving them from *mor-s-, but does not specify the origin of *-s- and the distribution of r: (r)š. On this, see below. It should be noted that *moš ‘tamarisk; blackberry’ is not purely dialectal (see s.v.).


The appurtenance of Gr. μορίαι f. pl. (with or without ἐλαῖαι) ‘the sacred olives in the Academy’, generally ‘olives that grew in the precincts of temples’, and μυρίκη f. ‘tamarisk’ is considered to be questionable (Heubeck 1949-50: 282, 282; see Frisk s.v.v.; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 646 = 1995: 556). In view of the semantic relation ‘tamarisk’ : ‘blackberry’ reliably testified by Arm. moš, the derivation of Gr. μυρίκη ‘tamarisk’ from QIE *mor-*/*mōr- ‘blackberry, black mulberry’ seems probable. The aberrant vocalism of μυρίκη points to non-IE origin and can be compared with that of Finno-Ugr. *murā ‘berry’, probably also Hittite mu-uri-us ‘grape’.

Structurally, Gr. μορ-ικ-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. momari ‘blackberry’ are reminiscent of Arm. dial. *mor-mor-i, etc. Note also Finn. maamurain, etc. ‘a kind of blackberry, Rubus arcticus’, from where Russ. mamira ‘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 mamur ‘bramble, wild mulberry’ (for which see also Ačačian 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, i, n. ‘fruit of the black mulberry’ and mōrus, i, 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. ἰπέα, -εις 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, Lazax, Šušı) and Western (Tigranakert, Aḵn) 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 *mōr 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. μορέα, -έη f. ‘mulberry-tree’, Lat. mòrum, ì, n. ‘fruit of the black mulberry’ vs. mòrus, ì, 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

mor; ‘tarantula, phalangium’ in Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’ì (15th cent.), see S. Vardanjan 1990: 134, § 616; comment: p. 613; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 145b), mor-a-har ‘bitten by a tarantula’ in Geponica /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 Ayekeç’i /12-13th cent./ [HAB 3: 347b; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 146a]. morm ‘a small lizard’ (Step’anos Lehac’i), mentioned in NHB 2: 298c s.v. plant-name morm (q.v.), probably belongs here, too.

●DIAL Ararat môm, Žula 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 Łẓl’amir (a village in the vicinity of Ėǰmiac’in) šrisun. The latter seems to be composed as šrisun ‘dog of stony places’; cf. iric’i šun ‘caterpillar’, lit. “dog of a priest” (see L. Atyan 1979: 641L-4, footnote 6411).

Andreasyan (1967: 252) records Svedia čićo-mura, ţiço-s-mura ‘spider’, čiči’omus payn ‘spider-web’, lit. ‘the nest (boyn) of a spider’. He (ibid.) reconstructs *ći-mori, composed of čći ‘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 Larak’îlisa mor by ModArm. ark‘ayamor ‘raspberry’, Açaïyan (1913: 793b) cites two other equivalents, namely malina and znavaula. The former is certainly Russ. малина ‘raspberry’, but I cannot identify znavaula. In which language is this form found? Whatever the answer would be, the form seems comparable with Romanian zmeură ‘raspberry’ and Modern Greek σμέουρα (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'.

\[ \text{ETYM } \text{Łap'anc'yan (1927: 108; 1961: 359-360) derives from IE *mer- 'to die' linking with Pers. mēr 'snake'.} \]

As we have seen, MidArm. mor/morm 'tarantula' is dialectally represented in extreme peripheries: SW (Svedia/Syria) mor vs. E (Ararat, Jula) morm. The word may thus be old.

M. Ałabekyan (1980: 162-167) proposed a connection with mri'wun 'ant' (q.v.), cf. especially dialectal forms such as Lori mormoj, 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, Μορμώ-όνος f. 'she-monster, bogy' (also used by nurses to frighten children), generally 'bugbear', and Lat. formidō, 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, μύρμηξ-ίδος m. 'ant; fabulous animal in India' (by-forms: μύρμος, βόρμαξ, βόρμαξ), etc., probably also with *mōrə-: Oic. mara, OHG māra '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 Lathrodectus or malmignatte', μυρμήκ-ιον n. 'a species of spider'; note also μόρμορος and μύρμος, both glossed by φόβος 'panic fear' in Hesychius.

Arm. Polis/Stambul *mormo'toz, Crimea and Nor Naxijewen *mirmi'as 'Easter bogy' (see Āčarēan 1913: 54a), of which no etymological attempt is known to me, strikingly resemble μήριμορος 'panic fear' (see also Durean 1933: 102). One might treat these Armenian dialectal forms as recent loans from Greek. However, μήριμορος 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. *mōr-mōr-əz can easily be interpreted as reduplication of *mōr- (identical with μήριμορος, 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 mormowinj (full reduplication of *mōr-, see above) and Lori mormojnj deserve particular attention; see s.v. mri'wun 'ant'. Since Gr. Μορμόν is feminine, one can identify it with Lori mormojn which probably reflects QIE fem. *mormon-jeh-. For the structure compare another insect-name of Mediterranean origin: karič, a-stem 'scorpion' < *karid-i, cf. Gr. καρίς, -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 mri'muk 'little ant' [Abeghian 1899: 31] (cf. mri'm-oc', on which see a thorough comment in Ćugaszyan 1980: 219). For the latter cf. Gr. μορμη'κα 'wart that spreads under the skin, also the irritation caused thereby, which was compared to the creeping of ants' < μύρμηξ-ηκος 'ant'.

\[ \text{mor} \]
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 μόρμορος ‘panic fear’ and Arm. dial. *mor-mor-oz ‘Easter-Bogy’ and *mor-mor-in ‘ant’ reflect full reduplication.

mori1 ‘woods, forest’ Step’annos Siwnec’in (8th cent.), MidArm. and dial. Ačaṙyan (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’in (8th cent.) mentions mori in the following list: <...>, draxt, antaṙ, mori, čaɫag, art, <...> [Adonc’ 1915=2008: 210L24f]. 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 Ōlax’ erkir (the country of Olax’s = Walachia, in Romania) written by the 16th-century emigrant poet Minas T’oxat’c’i (UšMiǰnHBnst 1, 1986: 429L97, 431L134, 431L138).

This is corroborated by two straightforward attestations in Simēon Lehac’i, lit. ‘of Poland’, 17th cent. (SimLehUlegr 1936: 200L159f): Isk morin amēnēm eōmē ē: xncor, tanc <...>. “And the forest is completely (full of) fruit: apple, pear, <...>”; (201L180):

Ew ayl i vayr en xorū mōrīk ‘ew lerink’, or en Sasunk’ “And in the place there are also deep forests and mountains, which are Sasunk’”. Glossed by Akinean (SimLehUlegr 1936: 442) as mōrī, mori ‘forest’. Note also a direct dialectal evidence from Aṙtial (Suč‘ava, Poland, Hungary), mɔri, see s.vv. mayri ‘woods’.

Further attested in medieval folk-songs recorded by Xač’ğrüz Lrmec’i, of Crimea (early 17th cent., Matenadaran, manuscript Nr. 7709), with spelling variants mori and mōrī (Mnac’akan yan 1956: 124L11f, 126L9), as well as in Govank’ třič’noc’ (Mnac’akan yan 1980a: 249L133), Nahapet K’uč’ak (MijHayBar 2, 1992: 146a).

In Ołb Edesioy by Nersēs Snorhalı (12th cent., Cilicia): Afrič goč’ēr i yantarīn, ew gišaxanj arju – i bayin (see M. Mkrič’yan 1973: 73L466). 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 (Erzrum) 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 Aṙtial mɔri ‘forest’ (see above), here belong also Hamšen mɔri (in a folk-song: kac’in aṙa ma mɔrin “I took an axe and entered the forest”, T’orlak’yan 1986: 88L1; the context with blood from the tree points to a medieval song of the type Avetis, see Mnac’akan yan 1956: 333-334, cf. 590-594); Dersim mɔri ‘id.’ (Balramyan 1966: 28, 93a), Erznka mɔri ‘small forest’ (Kostandyan 1979: 142a), Svedia mīra ‘id.’ (Andreasyan 1967: 331, 375b). Laribyan (1958: 58b) glosses ClArm. antar ‘forest’ by Aramo mura, murastšin. Apparently, mura continues mɔri (or mőri, see op. cit. 21), and murastšin 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. mayri1 ‘woods, forest’, mayri2 ‘den, lair’, and mori ‘den, lair’.
mrmunj, o-stem: GDPI mrmnj-o-c’ in P’awstos Buzand (5th cent.), John Chrysostom (note also late IPl mrmnj-ök’ = -a-w-k’ in Grigor Narekac’i, formally pointing to a-stem) ‘mutter, mauntering, lamentation, mourning song, whispered song’ attested in P’awstos Buzand, Elišè, John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea, Grigor Magistros, etc. (NHB 2: 308b), also in Dionysius Thrax and in the Commentary on it by Dawit’ P’ilsop’ay (see Adonc 1915=2008: 5915, 7913); mrmnjem ‘to moan, mutter, maunter, mourn, say or sing in an undertone’ (Bible+), later also mrmnjal ‘to sing a magic song, recite a magic spell’ (see below).


In the late medieval dictionary Bargirk’ hayoc’ edited/compiled by Eremin of Melri (Amalyan 1975: 22113c) mrmnjal is glossed as kardal ‘to shout, call, recite loudly; to read’, which in the dialect of Larabal refers to ‘to sing (said of birds)’, ‘to sing a religious song for magic purpose’, ‘to recite a magic spell’ (see s.v.).

That mrmnjal 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 ‘Gelo = ‘The wolf’, see H. T’umanyan 5, 1994: 10613).

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, mrmunj refers to the hissing of a snake (Ark’ayik 1910: 115a13, S. Harut’yunyan 2006: 85a12c). Combining these data with the evidence from Bargirk’ hayoc’ and Hovhannes T’umanyan (see above), we may tentatively posit an EArm. form mrmnjal ‘to recite or whisper a magic spell’.

The word is also recorded in HayLezBrbBa 4, 2007: 89a with no indication as to the dialectal distribution. Amatuni 1912: 492a and Ača’yik 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. mîrmil.

mrmunj, AblSg i morw-o-y, LocSg i morwo and i mori-s ‘den, lair of beasts, especially of lions’ (Bible+).

For the attestations in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895 vacat), Eznik Kołbac’i and Yovhannis Draxanakertc’i, see NHB 2: 298.

Further attestations: Dawt’ak (7th cent.) apud Movsès Kałankatuc’i 2.35 (1983: 22613); transl. Dowsett 1961: 146): orpês zarivce i morwo ‘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.
mrjwn

ETYM NHB 2: 308b and Dervishchan 1877: 33-34 compare mrmunj with munj 'dumb, mute, silent, speechless' and its cognate forms (see s.v. munj for more detail). Godel 1975: 81 suggests a *je-present, *mrmunj-je > *mrmunjje-, with a regular development *-nj- > 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, maundering', ššu-nj vs. ššu-k 'whisper'. For further examples of -nj-, see HAB 3: 369b, where Ačaṛyan treats Arm. mrmunj as an etymologically isolated onomatopoeic word. In my opinion, however, the relation with munj 'dumb, mute; mutter, murmur' is at least quite plausible.

For the semantic field of mrmunj- 'to moan, mutter, maund; morn, 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-sounds', cf. Otc. rūn 'secret, magic sign, rune', rūna 'sich vertraulich unterhalten; Runenzauber ausüben', OEngl. rūnian 'flüstern; sich verschwören', OHG rūna 'confidential talk, secret, whisper, advice', Ofr. rūnan 'secret', etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 867-868; Lehmann 1986: 287-288; Herkwört 1997: 576a, 605). Note also Pers. zamzam 'a low, whispering, buzzing sound made by the fire-worshippers' (see Steingass 621b).

On the semantic field of PIE *mũ-, see Toporov 1988: 6083.

mrjwn : NAccSg mrjwın (Proverbs [twice], Philo, John Chrysostom), GDSg mrjewn (Eznik Kolbac'i, Hexaemeron, Anania Širakac'i), AblSg i mrj-w-ë (Anania Širakac'i), GDPl mrjew-a'c ("Čačarit"); mrjimn : NAccSg mrjimn (Oskip'orik, cf. MidArm. mrjum, see MijHayBař 2, 1992: 155b, 159b), NPl mrjmun-k' (Elišè, Ašxarhac'oyc', Vardan Arewelc'i), API mrjmun-s (Anania Širakac'i), GDSg mrjmın-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 mrjwn is reliably attested whereas mrjimn : mrjum is Middle Armenian. On the other hand, plural forms are based exclusively on the -MmN-, the only exception being GDSg mrjeän-c' in "Čačarit".

The original distribution thus may have been: sg. mrjwın (< *mrjimn, gen. *mrjman, although analogically replaced by mrjewn) : pl. mrjmun-k'. The obvious reason for this is that the final *-mn yields -mN in Armenian, cf. paštawn vs. paštumun-k' 'service' (see 2.1.22.11).

Spatial. Widespread in the dialects, mostly as *mrjwn or *mrjum [HAB 3: 371b]. Next to the initial m-, Larrabal also has remarkable forms with v- (South) and b- (North): va/rč'émna, berc'ümna, berc'émna (see Dav'tyan 1966: 64-65, 433). Note also berc'ım, NPl berc'ümni (next to the variant mrmunj) in a fairy-tale recorded in Şamşadin in 1979; see Xemč'yan 2000: 38a. See below for the IE comparable cognates.

Artial (Hung.) mørj 'ab'ün, too, is remarkable; see HAB 3: 371b. Ačaṛyan (1953: 127) assumes that this word of strange formation is actually the compound mrjboyn 'ant-nest' with semantic shift to 'ant'. I alternatively propose the following
The triple representation in *brjimn (present in Ḭarabal) was *brjimun-k'. Analogically after this, a secondary nominative *mrj'bn has been formed, which in turn could yield Airtial *mrj' ob 'un through metathesis.

Further, see s.v. vam्रā-, namely the word for 'ant', note Gr. βόρμαξ, Arm. manušak, Svedia miř′om are irregular [Ačar'yan 2003: 88, 329, 399, 580]. They probably reflect what was pronounced as /mrj(l)um/ rather than /mrjium/ or /mrjwim/. For CIArm. -um > Svedia -om cf. hum 'raw' > hom, ddum 'pumpkin' > d′ed′om, erdumm 'oath' > ud′om [Ačar'yan 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 mřjumě it is attested in a late medieval folk-song recorded by Xač'gurž Lrmec'i (early 17th cent., Matenadaran, manuscript Nr. 17709): Sék mřjumě afaré degal [Mnc'a'kanian 1956: 114-116].


-ETYM Since long (see HAB 3: 371), connected with the PIE word for 'ant': Gr. μύρμος, -ής, Dor. μύρμαξ, -άκος m. 'ant; fabulous animal in India' (by-forms: μύρμος, βόρμαξ, βόρμαξ, ὀμαξακας), Lat. formica f. 'ant', Skt. vamrā- m. 'ant' (RV+), YAV. moauri- m. 'ant', MPers., NPers. mör 'ant'; etc. One usually assumes tabu-forms *morm-: *mory- (cf. Jáhukyan 1982: 109). L ori mərmənj is particularly interesting (see Alabekyan 1980: 162-167; Jáhukyan 1985: 157; 1987: 139, 276). Further, see s.v. morm 'tarantula'; on tabu, see 2.1.36.

The triple representation in Ḭarabal, m-'/b-/, is reminiscent of e.g. the word for 'violet': Arm. manušak < *manušawk < MPers. *manušak : Zoroastrian vanafaša, Pahl. vanafšag : Pers. bunafša, Kurd. bunašt (see 2.3.1, on -awš). In this particular case, namely the word for 'ant', note Gr. μύρμος, Arm. mřjwn, *mormonj : Skt. vamrā-, Gr. ὀμαξας : Gr. βόρμαξ, βόρμαξ.

-μuž (dial.), *muž 'fog' (?).

-DIAL Xarberd muž-ik 'fog' [Ačar'yan 1913: 795a], Manisa (close to Zmür'nia/ɪzmɪr) məž-ik 'fog' (op. cit. 778-779), Moks məž-marjamux 'fog' (HAB 3: 262b; see s.v. marjamul 'fog'), [məž/məz], GSc məži 'fog' [Orbeli 2002: 290]; məž, recorded in the prison of Van (T'oxBař apud Amatuni 1912: 703a). Perhaps also Ç'cnikler (Nikomidia) *mžal 'to rain slightly', Xarberd *mžel, Maškert *mžəl 'to knead preliminarily and slightly (immediately after pouring water into flour)' [Ačar'yan 1913: 778].

Note also Moks məžəvǐl 'uzatūnatisya; oslabnüt, tər_ję ostromu (o zrenni)' [Orbeli 2002: 290], according to Ačar'yan (1913: 813a): Moks *məžəvǐl and *nəvǐl (with initial n- and different order of of -v- and -ś-) 'to grow dim, gloomy (said of light, star'). This Moks word can be explained, I think, through contamination of *muž 'fog' and mušim 'to become dim; to faint, swoon, grow weak' (Bible+; dialects of T'iflis, Ararat, Agulis, Marala), a metathesized form of which (*nuvǐl) is found in the dialects of L ori, Łazax, etc.

-ETYM H. Suk'iasyan (1986: 88, 204) connects *muž with *muʃ found in ali-a-muʃ 'darkness, twilight' but treats these two words as different formations of a single root: *(s)muʃ- /- (cf. Russ. smuglyj 'dark'; suggested by Jáhukyan, see s.v. *aʃ-) > *muʃ vs. *mu-s- > *muž. The latter is impossible, however. Dial. *muž might rather derive from *muʃ, which seems to have been lexicalized from ali=a-muʃ, a
reduplication of *alj- (see s.v.). However, an Iranian origin seems more probable (cf. Kurd. *muz < maf, etc., J. Cheung, p.c.). On Jahukyan’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-ɣ (Matt’ēos Urfayec’i, 12th cent.) ‘smoke’ (Philo, Sebēos, Matt’ēos Urfayec’i, Mixayēl Asori).
- DIAL. Widespread in the dialects [Ačâran 1913: 795b; HAB 3: 355b].

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. mūś- m. ‘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: 378a.

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.

*mul- ‘grinding, crushing’; *mtmeļ. *mtmo/ul ‘moth, clothes moth’ (dialectal).
- DIAL. For mid ‘the grinding of corn’, see s.v. malem ‘to crush, grind’.

Larabal, Łazax molmɔl ‘moth’ [Ačâran 1908-09: 244; 1913: 787a; HAB 3: 225ah]. According to Amatuni (1912: 484a): Łarabal, Łazax, Zangezur, Łap’an molmɔl vs. Bananc’ (a village in Ganyak) mtmɔl. The latter form is also seen e.g. in a curse from Tavuş-Šamšadin [Xem’yan 2000: 229b, Nr. 113/1015]: Oskoñik’d mtmɔl uıt: “May the mtmɔl eat your bones”. From the material represented in Ačâran 1913: 787a one concludes that the concrete meaning is ‘clothes moth’. In the curse formula from Tavuş-Šamšadin it probably refers to ‘worms’.

For Agulis *mtmeļ ‘moth’, etc., see s.v. melm ‘soft, fine, calm’.
- ETYM Ačâryan (see the references above) treats *mtmo/ul as a reduplication of *molt and links with malem ‘to grind, crush’ (q.v.), for the semantics comparing OCS mol ‘moth’, Goth. mala ‘moth’, OIC. molr ‘moth’, etc. He (1908-09: 244) points out that Larabal molmɔl represents *molmɔl according to the law of reduplication of Larabal.
An alternative *m(u)ndul is possible, too. See also s.vv. miele ‘dust, chaff, ash’, mlelem ‘to make turn to dust, incinerate, destroy’, melm ‘soft, fine, calm’, *mimel ‘chaff, quiet, calm’.

*mutf- ‘fog, darkness’, Only in derivatives and compounds, as mlt-ut’īon ‘darkness’ in Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.), etc. See also s.v. alt-a-mul ‘darkness, twilight’.

●DIAL. See s.v. alt-a-mul.

●ETYM For the etymology, see s.v. *alj-.

mun, o-stem: ISg mu-o-v in Deuteronomy 28.27 (see below), Eznik Kolbaci’i (A. A. Abrahamyan 1994: 118), GDPI mu-o-’c in Grigor Narekaci’i 67.5 (Xaq’atryan Lazinyan 1985: 519); cf. also GDSg mun-i (in a work attributed to Eliša) ‘itch; gnat, midge’ (Bible+).

In Deuteronomy 28.27 (Cox 1981: 184): ἁρκέε ἔτζες ήγε κελευ ἐγγυτας ‘...’ εν έκκα Αἰγυπτίῳ <...> καὶ κνηψ. Arm. mun renders Gr. κνήψ ‘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. σκηψ.

●DIAL. The form mun is present in various semantic nuances: Zeyt’un (m’dn), Ararat, Larabul, Goris ‘small louse or the like’, T’iflis, Moks ‘a kind of small fly’ (according to Orbeli 2002: 294, Moks mun ‘κλευτ (= tick’), Alaškert ‘a small insect’ [HAB 3: 358b]; Polis, Axal’xa, Karin dimin. m(’un)-ik ‘nit, small louse, etc.’ [HAB 3: 358b].

Interesting are Polis mn-el ‘small louse’ and mnič ‘a kind of louse’ (ibid.; also Jahukyan 1972: 280), Sasun mun-ij ‘ant’ [Petoyan 1965: 506], Urmia, Salmast mn-uč’, glossed as havu, alawnyoy of ‘louse of hen or pigeon’ [GwrUrMalm 2, 1898: 98]. For -ič cf. insect-names such as gruič, luč, xarncič, karič, ūtič, etc.; for -el cf. borel, mžel, etc.

Orbeli 2002: 291 records Moks mndiČ ‘древесный червь, arboreal worm’ without a comment on its origin. Aćaryan (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 Šatæx. The same does M. Muradyan 1962: 58, 64, 70, 193b for Šatæx mndiç, 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(undot (nasal assimilation b...n > m...n) > mndiç (Aćaryan’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 mndiç is likely to be a blend of mun and botot.\footnote{Alternatively, mndiç 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-122): *mun-bot > *mundot, a sound development that would be parallel to that in IE *h-bud’no > *un-bund- > andund-k’ ‘abyss’ (q.v.).}


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 *mum/mun, i-stem or a-stem, from QIE *m(o)us-n-ih2- or *m(o)us-n-eh2- respectively, compare Gr. μυῖα 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’.

Ačaryan (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), munč ‘to moan, mutter, murmur’ (Bible, Lazar P’arpec’i, Hexameron); note also munč ‘fool’ (Lex.).

•ETYM See s.v. munj ‘dumb, mute, silent, speechless’.

munj ‘dumb, mute, silent, speechless’ (Zgõn-Afrat, Barseľ Čon, Čaṟanṭir), dimin. mnj-ik (Eliše), mnj-ak (Ireneaus); prob. also *munj- ‘to mutter, murmur’ in k’rt-munj-em ‘to mutter, murmur, to complain whispering’ (Bible+), with an obscure k’rt- (cf. Dervischjan 1877: 33-34, comparing it also with mrmunj ‘to mutter, mumbling, lamentation, mourning song, whispered song’).97

•DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 359b]. Note also Axalc’xa lûr u munč [HAB 2: 302b] with lûr ‘silent’ (q.v.).


According to Bugge and HAB ibid. (see also Petersson 1920: 108-109), here belongs also the synonymous mûr (q.v.), which can be regarded as a rhyme-formation from lûr ‘silent’, cf. lûr-mûr ‘silent, silently’; note also mûmûm ‘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; Jāhukyan 1987: 139, 182; Ravnaes 1991: 169; cf. Schmitt 1972-74: 10). More attractive is the derivation of munj from *munjo-1, a thematization of *muni-seen in Skt. mun- ‘ecstatic person, ascetic, hermit (especially one who has taken the vow of silence)’, cf. also Czech muña ‘speechless, fool’ (Schmitt 1981: 70;

97 It is unclear whether k’rt- is related with *k’ort- of šolok’ort- ‘to flatter’. Łap’anc’yan 1961: 150 compares Arm. k’rt’-mnj- with Hitt. kartinniュー/α- ‘to be angry’.
yal’t ‘wide, large, broad, spacious (land, space, territory)’ (Bible+), ‘mighty’ (Agat’angolos+); y’alt’em ‘to conquer, win, defeat’ (Bible+); yalt’-k-u ‘victorious, mighty’ (Philo+), yalt’-u ‘id.’ (e.g., in Grigor Maškuori, 12th cent.), an-yalt’-u ‘unconquerable’ (Alexander Romance, see H. Simonyan 1989: 77L11).

According to NHB 2: 315c, i- or o-stem, but the only evidence is with the substantive yalt’ ‘victory’: skizbn aını yalt’oyn i yasparizin (Grigor Skewacr‘i, 12-13th cent.).

Some attestations:

In Deuteronomy 8.7: tēr astuc k’ex tarc’i zk’ez yerkirn i bari ew i yalt’ [Cox 1981: 112]; ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἰσάγει σε γῆν ἀγαϑὴν καὶ πολλὴν. Here yalt’ renders πολλὴ. The basic meaning seems to be ‘wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory)’; cf. also anc’in and covn yalt’ ‘(they) passed the broad/spacious sea’ (Agat’angolos, see NHB 2: 315c), etc.

In Agat’angolos § 767 (1909=1980: 398L106), yalt’ refers to ‘immense (stones)’; see the passage s.v. arastoy.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.37 (1913=1991: 162L6), Eruand is described as srteay ew andamovk’ yalt’ ‘courageous and strong limbed’ (transl. by Thomson 1978: 179). Here, yalt’ may also refer to ‘broad’; cf. layn ‘broad’ used next to yalt’ in Agat’angolos § 123 (1909=1980: 71L123) describing the king Trdat: burn oskerok’ ew yalt’ marmnov, <…>, barjr ew layn hasakaw; cf. also yalt’ahasak, yalt’amarmin, yalt’andam. Compare with layn ‘broad’ in, e.g., layn-a-t’ikunk’ ‘broad-backed’ [MijHayBar 1, 1987: 299b], etc.

- **DIAŁ** The verb yalt'em is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 379b].
- **ETYM** Scheffelowitz (1904-05, 2: 27) compares yalt' with Skt. pythi-, f. *pythi- ‘broad, wide, expansive, big, numerous, large, extensive’, Av. *pyrəθu-, f. *pyrəθβi- ‘broad, wide’, Gr. πλατύς ‘broad, wide, flat’, Lith. platus ‘broad, wide, extended’, etc. Meillet (1950: 81) and Ačaryan (HAB 3: 379) are sceptical because of the semantic difference. For a discussion on -h‘ and for other references, see Lidén 1933: 44, 444. For a discussion on this etymology of y-alt’ notes: “The analysis of the Armenian word is uncertain”.

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 633-634) proposes a connection with Lat. saltō ‘to dance, jump’, saltus m. ‘leap, spring, jump’, in-saltō ‘to leap, jump; to behave insultingly, mock (at)’, assimbolō ‘to jump at; to attack’, assultus ‘attack, assault’, etc. Greppin (1983b) accepts the etymology and interprets the development *sl-t- > *haɫt’ > 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. pythi-, etc. The semantic development ‘wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory)’ > ‘mighty, victorious’ > ‘to win, defeat’ is more probable than ‘jump’ > ‘attack, assault’ > ‘victorious, mighty’ > ‘wide, spacious’ involved in Ačaryan’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: 74f). Even if one accepts the derivation from *sl-t-, the initial y- should be identified with the prefix; cf. Lat. in-saltō.


yalt’, i-stem: GDPl yayt-i-c’ in Grigor Skewr'ac'i (13th cent.), “Tōnac’oyc’”, Mxit’ar Aparanc’i ‘known, evident, clear, visible’ (John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.); yayt aınem/acem ‘to make public, make appear’, yaytnem ‘to make public, known; to inform’, (Bible+). Numerous compounds.

- **DIAŁ** The verb yaytnem is present in Su'c'ava, Karin, Ararat, Šamaxi, Agulis, as a literary loan, as Ačaryan (HAB 3: 382a) points out. He (ibid.) then notes Zeyt'un ayid èn ‘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-alt’ and PIE *ai- ‘to born, shine’, or, the root of ayc’ ‘visit, inspection’. Olsen (1999: 208) connects with *aŋış- ‘obvious’ assuming **en- + *-ā-īd with secondary association to *iid- ‘know’, or even *en- + *aŋış-īd (*-ii- > -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-alt’ ‘to see, watch’ + *-iij- for. 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 Asturacaturean 1895: yatakac’ erkri in 1 Paralipomenon 19.13 [Xalat’ean’ 1899: 36b]; see Ačaaran 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 āndey in Svedia. However, this seems to be the dialectal āndey(n) ‘otherworld’ (see HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 57a) with the prefix y-, although the conditions of the development of the initial y- into Svedia ā- are not clear; cf. Andreasyan 1967: 33, 376.

**ETYM** Āčaārāyan (HAB 3: 386b) derives yatak from PIE *pe/od- ‘foot’. This etymology does not seem convincing. The semantic relationship is not straightforward (though Āčaārāyan compares Gr. δάπεδον ‘bottom’, etc.; cf. also Saradźeva 1986: 225-226), and the formal obstacles are not easy to surmount. Neither is Āčaārāyan’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 Ālayan: Lat. pavimentum ‘a paved surface or floor, pavement’ < paviō ‘to thump, pound, strike; to ram down (earth, etc.).’ The suffix -ak, generally restricted to Iranian loans, also makes both etymologies dubious.

Jahukyan (1987: 142, 185, 551) mentions Āčaārāyan’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: 248 102), I do not see any reason to separate Arm. yatak from tak.

In order to explain the first -a-, Jahukyan 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. ā-bun ‘bottomless’. Thus, yatak is composed of y- and Iran. priv. *a-tāk ‘bottomless’, exactly like *y-an-dund-k’ (see s.v. āndand-k’).

The textual parallelism between the two Armenian synonyms is obvious. The basic meaning of āndandk’ is ‘abyss’. In Armenian folklore it refers to one of the lowest parts of the Underworld, as well as to the Abyssal ocean – Sew ājor ‘Black water’ [S. Harut’yunyan 2000: 9-12, 16-17]. Moks āndand(k’), too, appears in such contexts; see e.g. in the epic Sasna cṙer 1, 1936: 14, 131, 436 (in the latter passage – with Siv ājor ‘Black water’, for which cf. also 282), 1062 (Van āntūt’k’). For a similar use, see HŽHek’ 1, 1959: 328 (Ararat, village of Īskan): covi āndand ‘(to) the abyss of the sea’; HŽHek’ 13, 1985: 11, 60: Muş āman’undk’, āndund.

Similarly, yatak ‘bottom’ can be used in relation with: (1) the Underworld, cf. yataks ājoroc’ (with ājor-k’ ‘hell’) = eis pòthuia ᾅδον 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 “Čarąntir”), yatakabac’ refers to āndndayin cov ‘abyssal sea’. For such a joint occurrence of the two synonyms note also yataks āndandoc’ and anyatakeli āndundk’ in Grigor Narekac’i 25.3 and 48.5 [Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 341139, 4351131]; on an-yatakeli ‘the bottom of which
cannot be found’, see below. Also MidArm. atak referred to the sea-bottom (see Mi\H\HayBar 1, 1987: 85b).

From the dialectal data recorded by Açar\yan (HAB 3: 387a), the Zeyt’un denominative atkenal ‘to dive’ is worth mentioning; cf. also Svedia äggil ‘to dive’ < *yatakel [Andreasyan 1967: 376a]. Further, Açar\yan says that Udi atak ‘hell’ seems to have been borrowed from Arm. yatak. This can be directly corroborated by Melri étak ‘underworld; hell’ [Alayan 1954: 280b] and especially Larabal atak ‘hell, underworld’ [Hay\LezBrbBar 1, 2001: 116a] and Šam\sdadin-Dilijan atak ‘abyss’ [Mežunc’ 1989: 201b], which were unknown to Açar\yan.

The Larabal word is illustrated in Hay\LezBrbBar 1, 2001: 116a by atako k’\omac ‘he went to hell’; cf. also the curse: staken taka k’\inyinis [Laz\iyani 1983: 164a] ‘may you go to the bottom of the Underworld’. Here, staken taka is equivalent to antak covi taka et’as (see Hay\LezBrbBar 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. Luma\ Av\yan and recorded by M. Grigoryan in Šu\i (1922), se\e\ atak ‘Black Underworld’ appears in a very impressive enumeration of words denoting ‘hell’, next to johändäm-gyo\ and istibu\ [see HŽ\Hek’ 5, 1966: 37].

The verb atak(v)el ‘to get lost (into hell)’ is recorded in Larabal and Sasun; cf. also atakuk ‘lost, vanished’ and atakum ‘peace, riddance’ [Hay\LezBrbBar 1, 2001: 116b]. The semantic field of this denominative is comparable with h’and\(n)del.

Compare Russ. za-propast-ít’sja ‘to get lost’ from própast ‘abyss’. Arm. dial. *an-tak ‘bottomless’, with the Armenian privative prefix an- and the same root tak, is a perfect typological match of the Iranian *a-tak ‘bottomless’. It can mean both ‘very deep, bottomless (sea)’ (Nor Nax\iej\an, Karin, Ararat, Larabal, Van, Muš) and ‘sea-bottom; abyss’ (Ararat, Van) [Açar\ean 1913: 110b; HAB 1: 190b; Hay\LezBrbBar 1, 2001: 67b]; see also S. Harut’y\unyan 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 taka et’as (see Hay\LezBrbBar 1, 2001: 67b) ‘may you go to the bottom of the bottomless sea’, which is to be compared to Larabal staken taka k’\inyinis [Laz\iyani 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 yanato\tkh tli t\an er’\as [S. Harut’y\unyan 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-yata\ ‘the bottom of which cannot be found’ (in Grigor Narek\’i, with andund-k’ ‘abyss’; see above); MidArm. anat\ ‘bottomless’, twice with cov ‘sea’ [Mi\HayBar 1, 1987: 47b]; dial. (Ararat, \av\x’, Sivri-Hisar) an-atak ‘bottomless’, also anat\ gnal, anat\vel ‘to disappear’ [Hay\LezBrbBar 1, 2001: 55a]. Note *sew-anatak ‘Black-Bottomless’ in curses of allative structure from Karin [H. M\r\t’yan 1952: 177b] and Bulanax of Muš [Movs\ivan 1972: 131a]; cf. *sew fur and *sew atak.

98 Some confusion with atak dial. ‘leisure’ seems to have taken place here; cf. Açar\ean 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’yanyan 2000: 10-12].

Note that spells and curses of allative structure (cf. i yan(y)atak covn ‘to the bottomless sea’ [Ōdabaşyan 1976: 121; S. Harut’yanyan 2000: 12]) could have played an important role in the process of the prefixation.

*yawn-k’, a-stem: GDPI yawn-a-c’ (Philo, Severian of Gabala), IPl yawn-a-w-k’ (Isaiah 3.16 [var. yawn-i-w-k’], Ephrem); i-stem: GDPI yawn-i-c’ or yun-i-c’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.42 [1913=1991: 167l10], 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 *yāvun-k’, vi-stem in NHB, but only GSg yōray-i (Severian of Gabala) is attested ‘stepfather’: attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913=1991: 359l11), Severian of Gabala, Philo.


Arm. yawray is treated as a native term (see Clackson 1994: 146) that has later been replaced by hôru (hapax, 12th cent.), analogical after mawr-u ‘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. πάτρω from *ph2tr̥-h3i̯- (Normier 1981: 27_access; 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. πάτρ-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’, caṙay, i-stem ‘servant; captive’, p’esay, i-stem ‘bridegroom; son-in-law’ (q.v.); see also 2.3.1.

ye̊c’ ‘full’ (a medieval dictionary), ye̊c’el ‘filled’ (Book of Chries), -ye̊c’ ‘full of’ as the second member of a number of compounds (Hexaemeron, Philo, John Chrysostom, etc.).

**ETYM** Bugge 1893: 15 connects ye̊c’ with helum ‘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 ye̊c’, 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. ylp’’nam ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled, be satiate, luxuriate’.

ye̊rum, imper. yer (= Gr. παίδου in Proverbs 7.3), partic. ye̊real, GDSg yer-el-oc’ (Bible+), 1sg.aor.act. yer-i (Severian of Gabala), 3.sg.aor.pass. yer-a-w (Čaṙntir), instr. of inf. ye̊r(u)l-ọ-v (Philo) ‘to tie, fasten or join together, link together in a series, string together, put around (said of gems, etc.)’ (Bible+), ye̊rum zban ‘to compose, put together word/speech’ (Severian of Gabala, John Chrysostom, Eusebius of Caesarea); later ye̊rem ‘to tie, fasten or join together’ (Ban xratu attributed to Grigor Narekac’i; Nersēs Lambrinac’i, etc.), ye̊r adj. ‘joined together, stringed’ (Tōnakān matean).

**DIAL.** No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 3: 396a.

I wonder if Van *er ‘line’ (gic), *erel ‘to draw a line’ (see Ačaṙan 1913: 296ab; Amatuni 1912: 176a, 690; HayLezBrbBăr 1, 2001: 370ab; Srvanjtyane’ 1, 1978: 570) belongs here.

**ETYM** Ačaṙan (HAB 3: 396a) derives ye̊rum from PIE *ser- ‘to put/bind together, link together in a series’: Gr. eůpo ‘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: 50; Barton 1989: 150-152). For the PIE etymon (without Armenian), see Pokorny 1959: 911; Chaniatche 1968-80: 325; Mallory/Adams 1997: 354a.

Arm. *(h)j鸢- with trilled -r- points to *ser-s-, for which Açaı yan (ibid.) compares Gr. ἑκμαίης. The latter comes from *-ɒ-, however (Jahkyan 1987: 190-191). One might assume an s-present or sigmatic aorist (see also the discussion s.v. *merianim' 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-na-m, jer-na-m, etc. may be due to secondary restoration. Note that the present suffix -nu- is analysable in cases such as anke-na-m vs. aor. anke-c-, z-ge-na-m vs. z-gev-ı. In yerım the nasal was probably not restored on the strength of the absence of the simplex *yer (unlike the pairs such as ar-na-m and fer-na-m vs. ar and fer, respectively). For a further analysis, see Barton 1987; 1989: 150-152.

For yerım zhan 'to compose word/speech' cf. Gr. εἴρομένα λέξις (HAB 3: 396a; Barton 1989: 151_s). From the same etymon are, probably, orm, o-stem ‘wall, fence’ from IE *sor-mo- (cf. Gr. ὅρμος m. ‘chain, necklace, lace’), and *her-t- ‘turn, queue’ (see s.vv.). Here may belong also, in my opinion, PArm. *hu Ionic ‘gilded, adorned by gems, linked together in a series, encrusted, embroidered’ or the like (q.v.), preserved in CIArm. oske-hu Ionic ‘gilded, adorned with gold’ said of garment, coat, silk, cover, collar, tassels, etc. (Bible+) and possibly reflecting a QIE *sör-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-at ‘incantation’, which he interprets as ‘magic beads’. The form y-ırem ‘to join together, insert, etc.’ (q.v.) theoretically requires *sêr-.

yisun, i-stem: GDSg yisn-i, AblSg i yisn-ı (Bible), IPI ysn-i-w-k’ (Ephrem); GDPI ysn-i-c’ is cited in NHB 2: 361b, but without evidence; later: yisun-c’, etc. ‘fifty’ (Bible+).

DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. The forms with -ı-s-, -c-c’, -ı-j-, etc., as well as those with geminate -ss- are analogical after vatı’sun ‘sixty’ and utı’sun ‘eighty’ [HAB 3: 400b].

ETYM Since Petermann and others, derived from the PIE word for ‘fifty’ [Hübbschmann 1897: 477; HAB 3: 400], *penkˇékomthı; Gr. πεντέ-kovıa, Lat. quinquagintá, Skt. pàñca-sát-ı, 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. Jahkyan (1987: 147) connects yirem with the synonymous yerım, q.v. (cf. NHB 2: 361c), hesitantly positing a lengthening grade *sêr-. The connection is plausible, but the vocalism remains uncertain.

yli, ea-stem: GDSg ylı-o-a-y, GDPI yłe-a-c’ ‘pregnant’ (Bible+), yıl-ı’tıwın. GDSg ylı’tıan, GDPI ylı’tıan-c’ ‘pregnancy’ (Bible+), yıl-anam and yıl-enam < *yli-anam ‘to become pregnant’ (both Bible+, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 121_s).

The initial y- of the eastern dialectal forms (Larabal, Goris, etc.) is remarkable (see the references above). For the anlaut of this form, see also H. Muradyan 1982: 226-229; Weitenberg 1986: 96, 9615, 9718; L. Hovhannisyan 1991: 251. Danielyan 1967: 168, 213 records Malat’ia anal’ɔk’ ‘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; Jahukyan 1967: 236, 236a; Ravnæs 1991: 91; Olsen 1999: 448-449. See further s.v. li ‘full’. For the semantics, Ačaryan (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. yeɪc’ ‘full’, yɫp’anam ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled’, yolov ‘much, plenty’.

Malat’ia anal’ɔk’ ‘pregnant’ obviously contains the suffix -ɔk’ ‘with, having’ < ClArm. IPl -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 ‘full’. The preposition may be identical with ClArm. an(a)- (on which see Jahukyan 1987: 245, cf. Gr. ἀνά ‘up along’, Av. anā, OPer. and’a ‘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. al(o)j and ul. This explanation is, of course, highly hypothetical.

yɫp’anam ‘to be filled to repletion, be overfilled, be satiate, luxuriate’ (Bible+); yɫp’-ut’iwn ‘satiety, repletion, abundance’ (Bible+).


ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 3: 401a.

I tentatively suggest a derivation from PIE *pleh₁- ‘to fill’. The underlying *h₁pɪ ‘probably reflects the reduplicated present *pi-pleh₁- seen in Skt. piparti, *piprati and Gr. πιέρημα, -ημα (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, fulfill’ and especially Gr. ἰμ-πλήματι ‘to fill’; see also s.vv. li, dial. *i-lin ‘full’, yeɪc’ ‘full’, yli ‘pregnant’, yolov ‘much, plenty’.

The problem with this etymology is that the cluster *pl- would yield Arm. -w- rather than -lp- 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-pl₀-e-mi ‘to drink’ (see s.v. əmpem ‘to drink’), with simplification of the cluster to *plH- (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. πιέρημα, whether with nasal infix or epenthesis). Another possible example of a similar reduplication is ci-cal- ‘to laugh’ from *g(e)i-gH- (q.v.).

yog(a) (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 Chrystosostom, Xosrov Anjewac’, etc.); derivatives: yog(a)-goyn ‘very many’ (Agat’angelos+), yog(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: yognegaw żoovurdn i čanaparkin : ωλιγοψύχησαν ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ : “the people became discouraged on the way”. Arm. yognim renders Gr. ὀλιγοψῡχέω ‘to be faint; to become discouraged’.


As is pointed out by Ačaṙyan (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’earp but rejected by Ačaṙyan (ibid.) without comment.

To the best of my knowledge, the origin of the Greek is uncertain. I hypothetically assume a common borrowing of substratum origin, from a *(H/w)ogh- or *(H/w)ogwh-. The Armenian prefix y- < PIE *h₁en- ‘in’ is frequent in words expressing the idea of ‘multitude, etc.’ (see 2.3.1). Note the structural, semantic (and etymological?) identity of Arm. *y-ogn ‘plenty’, ‘to be tired, overburdened’ and Gr. ἐν-ὀχλέω ‘to trouble, annoy; to be troubled, annoyed; to be unwell, overburdened with work’.

Arm. yogn- ‘to be tired’ resembles xonj, ‘tired’. If they are related, this would be another argument against the IE etymology of yogn. See s.v. xonj, ‘tired’. Compare the case of viz : Agulis, Larabat, Jula, etc. *xi/uz ‘neck’ (see s.v. avji-k’).

eyolov, i-stem: GDPl yolov-i-c’ in Movsēs Xorenac’i (see below), Movsēs Kałankatuac’i/Daxsuranc’i 1.27 (see below), Grigor Astuacahan, Xnosv Anjewac’i; IPI yolov-i-w-k’ in Book of Chries [NHB 2: 366b]; GDPl yolov-i-c’ is also found in a colophon by Dawit’ K’obayrec’i from 1178 AD [HayJe Hiš V-XII, 1988: 222L15] ‘much, plenty, numerous; many people’ (Bible+).


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’olm ‘to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)’ (q.v.): *h₁en-(H/w)ok/gʷ-ol- (cf. Gr. ἐν-ὀχλέω) > PArm. *inuk/gʷ-ol-, with -u- because of the labiovelar (cf. 2.1.17.3) or from lengthened *-o- > *nu-k’ol- > nk’ol-. 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.
Brigands have come in abundance and from all sides’. Another attestation of *yolov-i-c’ : Movsēs Xorenc’i: 2.7 (10914).

In Movsēs Kałankatua’c’i/Dasxuranc’i /7-10 cent./ 1.27 (V. Arak’el’yan 1983: 9714; transl. Dowsett 1961: 55): *Ew yolovic’n lin ēr bžškut’iwn i tełwoj : “Many were healed in this place”.

The word is found in Xotor j’ur (see YušamXotor 1964: 491b): *lov ‘abundant’, with the following illustration: *lov a ‘the water is abundant’; also verbal *lovnal, caus. *lovnc’ul.

Since Tervišean, Bugge, etc., connected with Skt. purú-, f. purūvī- ‘much, abundant’ (RV+), purū (adv.) ‘often, very’ (RV+), OAv. pouru- ‘much’, etc. [Meillet 1894b: 2802; Hübschmann 1899: 48; HAB 3: 402-403].

Bugge (1893: 22) 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, Jáhukyan (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 *plh₁hi (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, 380a): *polw- > PArm. *(p)olw > y-olv. For the assimilation, implied also in Meillet’s, Bugge’s and Jáhukyan’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. *paruii̯ ̯ain ̯, 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 *plh₁-u-ih₁-.

See 2.2.3. See also s.v. hoyl, i-stem ‘group’.

*yoldoldem to shake, move, cause to totter, waver’ (Nahum 3.10, John Chrysostom, Ephrem, etc.), *yoldold, a-stem: GDPl *yoldold-a-c’ (2 Peter 2.14, Alexander Romance) ‘not firm, tottering, unstable, mutable, vacillating, wavering, fickle’ (2 Peter 2.14, 3.16), John Chrysostom, Hesychius of Jerusalem, T’ovmay Arcruni, etc.).

*Etym Ačāryan (HAB 3: 403b) treats this verb as a reduplication of an otherwise unattested *yold- and does not record any acceptable etymology.

The basic meaning seems to be ‘to move’. Note the apposition anšarž himn ‘immoveable base’ : anyoldoldeléi vēm ‘immoveable wall’ in John Chrysostom apud NIH 1: 209a. Thus, anšarž ‘immoveable’ is synonymous to an-yoldoldeli. Note Agat’angelos § 767 (1909=1980: 39814), where the huge blocks of stone are said to be impossible to move (šaržel); cf. dial. Javak’ an-žaž from the above-mentioned anšarž : anžaž k’ar ‘immoveable stone’ (see Lalayeanc’ 1892: 1112 = 1, 1983: 34115).
I propose a tentative connection with Gr. πέλομαι (intrans.) ‘to move’, Skt. cárati ‘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. τελέϑω < *kwelh1-dhe/o- vs. τέλομαι (see Harðarson 1995: 206). We are probably dealing with another trace of the old present suffix *-dh-, cf. πλήϑω ‘to fill’ (see Beekes 1995: 231). Thus QIE *h1en-kwolh1-dh- > PArm. *ip(g)old- > y-old- (cf. s.v. yisun ‘fifty’).

yorjorjem 497

yorjorjem ‘to name, call’ (Movsēs Xorenaci, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ephrem, etc.): yorjorjem-an-k’ (Hesychoius of Jerusalem), API -an-s (Severian of Gabala), a-stem: GDPl yorjorjem-an-a-c’ (Eusebius of Caesarea), API [> adv.] yorjorjem-an-a-w-k’ (Cyril of Jerusalem) ‘name, naming’, yorjorjem-umn ‘name’ (Movsēs Xorenaci 2.63 [1913=1991: 196L4], etc.), yorjorjem ‘id.’ (Nersēs Snorhali /12th cent./).

In Movsēs Xorenaci’s I.4 (1913=1991: 16L4; transl. Thomson 1978: 73): Ew ndēr ardeik’ zsa miayn ordhoy amamb yorjorjec’an? “Why then did [Scripture] bestow on him alone the name of son” (concerning Noah). Further: or Ewt’ atloṣ yorjorjēr : “which was named Euthalius” (2.80: 219L16); oroy koč’mamb yorjorjec’an ew balunik’n : “by which name the baths were also called” (2.88: 238L34, transl. 244).

ETYM Ačarjan (HAB 3: 408b) treats this verb as a reduplication of an otherwise unattested *yorj- and does not record any acceptable etymology. Jahukyan (1990:...
76) points out that *yorjɔrj is obviously a reduplication, but the origin of the root is unknown.

I propose a connection with Gr. ἐλπίο < *ewire < *wyo ‘to say, speak, tell’ and Hitt. yerișa- ‘to call, name, summon’, reflecting a je-present of the root *yper- (see Pokorny 1959: 1162-1163; Frisk s.v.; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 1: 231, 361; 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. erwçek ‘to call, invoke’ (see Toporov, PrJaz 2, 1979: 59–60); also Lat. in-titulāre, Engl. entitle, etc.

Thus: QIE *h₁en-yor-je- > PArm. *ingɔrj- > *(ŋ)ɔrj- > *yorj-, cf. yisun ‘fifty’ (q.v.) vs. hing ‘five’ from PIE *penk-e(k)omth; ‘fifty’ and *penk’e ‘five’, respectively. For *je-present in o-grade cf. synonymous koc’em ‘to call, invite, invoke’ from QIE *gʷot-je- (cf. PGerm. *kweþan ‘to say, speak, call, name’. Goth. qipan, OIc. kveda, OEngl. cweþan, etc.), as well as goč’em ‘to shout’ from *uokʷje-.

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 jóguate ‘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-koc- ‘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.

yuɾt’i ‘watered, irrigated, fertile’ (Genesis 13.10, Gregory of Nyssa, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.), yuɾt’anam ‘to increase’ (NersēŠ Sńorhali); without the initial y-: uɾt’em ‘to sprinkle, irrigate’ (Lazar P’arpec’i, 5th cent.), uɾt’anam ‘to be watered, prosperous’ (Anania Narekac’i, 10th cent.).

In Genesis 13.10 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 201): zamenaŋ kołmans Yordananu, zi amenaŋ yuɾt’i ēɾ : pāsan tīn periχwroν toî L乔丹άν 姣 pāsan ḩy pοτίζoμvēŋ. Arm. yuɾt’i renders Gr. ποτιζωμένη, from the verb ποτίζω ‘to give to drink; to water, irrigate’.

In Bağirk’ hayoc’: urt’i : parart [Amalyan 1975: 261⁷²]. Compare also urdl’eçał (‘filled’) (op. cit. 262⁷²); but see s.v. urd.

●DIAL Nor Bayazet sirt’ınal ‘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 *tı-o-<e̊h₂-<, found also in an-jr-di ‘arid, wet-watered’ (with privative an- and jw ‘water’), n-aw-t’i ‘hungry, fasting’ < ‘not having eaten/drank’, etc.; see s.vv. and 2.3.1, on -t. Typologically compare OHG durst ‘thirst’ from Germ. *þurs-ti- ‘thirst, drought’. Whether the root is identical with ur-č- ‘to increase’ (cf. Jahuşyan 1967: 304) or ur’ ‘to swell’ is uncertain.

I tentatively propose a derivation from PIE *Huers-: Skt. vars- ‘to rain’, vṛṣṭi- f. ‘rain’ (RV+), Hitt. yarša- ‘rain-shower’, Luw. yarša- ‘drips’, Gr. ἐξρηθα, ἐξρηθη, ἐρηθ f. ‘dew’, oβρηθo ‘to urinate’, Mlr. frass ‘rain-shower, torrent’, etc. (see Mayrhofer
nan

EW Aia 2, 1996: 522-523). Arm. *y-ur-t’ can be derived from QIE *h₁en-h₁urs-ti-V-; for the structure cf. Skt. vrṣ-ti-, as well as Mr. frass < *h₁urs-t- (see Schrijver 1991: 497-498). A PIE *-rs-t- would yield Arm. -(r)št-. One may therefore treat y-ur-t’ 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. *vaṛ in vard-a-vaṛ ‘folk festivity of water-pouring’ (see also s.v. urḍ ‘a small canal/brook to water gardens with’).

\*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, Řodost’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 Patrubiny 1897a: 234 (from *ni-hayim) and Dumézil 1997: 3 (from *ti-hayim). Ačaryan (HAB) and Jähkuyan (1987: 245) accept the derivation from *ni- ‘down’, seen also in ni-st.

nan, nana, voc. nan-e, nene, nan-i (dial., nursery word) ‘mother’, ‘grandmother’, ‘lullaby, sleep’.


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-sat’un ‘snail’, fem. anthroponym Ana-sat’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-č, LocSg i naw-i, AllSg i naw, ISg naw-a-w, GDPi naw-a-c', AblSg i naw-a-c', IPI naw-a-w-k'; u-stem: ISg naw-u, LocSg i naw-u, GDPi naw-a-c', IPI naw-a-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+).


Armen. nawaz ‘boatman’ is certainly an Iranian loan, cf. Parth. nāwāz ‘skipper’, YAv. nauwāz- m. ‘id.’, Skt. nàvāj- 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. nāvrolet, canal, aqueduct, roof-gutter, the sluice of a mill-dam, boat’ (Steingass 1382a), Pashto nāwā ‘gutter, tube’, Ormuri nāwa ‘valley’, Parachi nāx ‘roof-gutter’, Oss. nuk/nokæ ‘gutter’ prob. from *nay(a)kā-, Munji nawago, Yidgha nawogō ‘mill-race’ (see Cheung 2002: 209).
nawt'i

Georg. *navi* ‘boat’, Svan *nāv* ‘id.’, etc. are considered as borrowed from Armenian (HAB 3: 434a; Ilić-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. *νῆστις* ‘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 Łaraba *nɔ́t'əɛ* [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 Łarabal and adjacent dialects which have penultimate accent. A trace of the initial a- can be seen in the following by-forms: Łarabal *anɔ́st'i* [Davt'yan 1966: 313], Goris *anɔ́st'i* [Margaryan 1975: 314b].

● **ETYM** Ačaryan (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.


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. *νῆφω* (whether with. Lat. *ēbrius* and others or not) and derive it from *n-H(H)gwh-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: 167-163 ("eine Verdeutlichung als negativer Begriff nach Komposita mit an- privatum in *η-"); Clackson 1994: 155, 231, 222; 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, moist-wetted’ (with privative an- and jur ‘water’), y-u-r’t-i ‘watered, irrigated, fertile’; see s.v.v. and 2.3.1. It is uncertain whether there is any connection with nk’t’em ‘to starve, faint from hunger’.

neard-k’, obl. net(a)rd-, nard- [or nom. nēard-k’ in Agat’angeli vs. obl. niard- in Gregory of Nyssa]; i-stem: GDPl nert-i-c’ (twice in Plato), nard-i-c’ (Nerses Lambrontaci), niard-i-c’ in Gregory of Nyssa (but here also niard-a-c’, which points to a-stem), IPl neard-i-w-k’ (Cyril of Jerusalem) ‘sinew, tendon’.


● ETYM Connected with Gr. νευρά f. ‘string, sinew’, Lat. nervus m. ‘sinew, nerve, string’ (since NHB 2: 417b, s.v. nerd-eay), YAv. snāva(var)bāzura- ‘having sinews as arm’, Oss. nwar/nawer ‘sinew, tendon’ (see Cheung 2002: 209), Hitt. ishnuqar n. ‘sinew, string’, etc. [Hübshmann 1883: 43; 1897: 149]. From PIE neutral heteroclitic *s(h2)neh1ur/n-. For -d, see s.v. leard ‘liver’. Thus: *sneh1ur-t- (cf. Olsen 1999: 3460, 156, 192) > *ne(H)ur̥-t- > *ne(w)r̥-t- > neard. See 2.1.33.1. On -ti-, the loss of -w-, influence of leard, etc., see Clackson 1994: 55, 97, 219p7; Kortlandt 1980: 102; 1993: 10; 2001: 11 = 2003: 30, 102, 131.

net, i-stem: ISg net-i-w, GDPl net-i-c’, IPl 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 nst, Muš ned, Moks, T’iflis nit, Zeyt’un ntd, etc. [HAB 3: 442b]. In Larrabal and Goris, the word denotes a wooden part of the loom, see HAB 3: 442b; Lisic’yan 1969: 156-158. Moks nst, Gsg nts/nstän, Npl nsṭi-r ‘the pole of a plough’ (see Orbeli 2002: 299).

 وسلم *net-øj ‘a kind of snake’, lit. ‘arrow-snake’ [Açarean 1913: 811b; HAB 3: 442b], cf. Dersim (K’hi) ned-ig ‘a poisonous snake’ (see Balramyan 1960: 155a), on which, see 1.3.

MidArm. (Smbat Sparapet, etc.) denominative verb netem ‘to throw (arrow, etc.)’ is present in many ka-dialects [HAB 3: 442-443].

On the compound *net-u-alehn ‘arrow and bow’, see s.v. alehn ‘bow’.


As is pointed out in Mallory/Adams 1997: 481a, “the Armenian meaning reflects the widespread use of of certain kinds of reeds for the making of arrowshafts”. The meaning ‘arrow’ is also found, probably, in Hittite: nāta- c. ‘reed, arrow, drinking straw’ (cf. CLuw. nātta-ta- n. ‘Rohr’, see Starke 1990: 201L66, 418). Next to this form, going back to QIE *nōd-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,
nert’akn ‘rat’.

Not attested. Only in K’ažuni [HAB 3: 446a].

ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

The status of the word is uncertain. Nevertheless, it seems obvious that nert’akn is a compound the second member of which is t’akn ‘mouse’. Aćaryan (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 ēagu ‘mouse’ suggested by Mar 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 nīr-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 nīr-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 nēro. 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 nēro-oy and notes that later the word also has i-stem. This is not quite accurate. As we have seen, nēro is attested only once, in Ephrem, whereas nīr-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 nīr-i (as well as dial. *nīr-oj) and NSg ner are analogical after NSg nēr and oblique ner-, respectively.

The word nert’akn ‘rat’ (only in K’ažuni) probably comprises Arm. ner ‘husband’s brother’s wife’ and t’akn ‘mouse’ (cf. Georgian ēagu ‘mouse’); see s.v. and 3.5.2.9.

dial. Widespread in the ko-dialects. Zeyt’un (and Hačan) nēy (with diphthong e) is irregular; one expects *niy [Aćaryan 2003: 42]. One might derive nēy 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 dşy (ibid.).


ETYM Since Tərvišean and Bugge, connected with the PIE word for ‘husband’s brother’s wife’: Gr. εὐνύμφος f. pl. ‘wives of brothers or of husbands’ brothers, sisters-in-law’, NSg ēnātšp, voc. ēnātsp, gen. ēnātšp, Skt. yātar- ‘id.’, Pers. yārī < *yādr-ī-, Lat. pl. iamīricēs, Lith. jentė (17th cent.), intē ‘husband’s brother’s wife, wife’s sister, daughter-in-law’, Latv. iētaļa, etc. (HAB 3: 443a; Pokorny 1959: 505;

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 (Lap’anc’yan 1951b: 582-583; 1961: 109; see below). Not included in Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 760. The following solution has been suggested: *
yineter > *inêy(e)r > nêr [Bugge 1889: 37; HAB 3: 443a]. For other references, see Jahykakan 1982: 214a, Jahykakan (1982: 41, 49, 214a; 1987: 130) assumes the same but with zero-grade *in- and not *yen-. As is clear from Greek and Baltic, however, the word contained an internal laryngeal, which, in view of Greek -α-, must be *h2 (see Beekes 1969: 195; Schrijver 1991: 97), thus one expects Arm. *nayr, gen. *nawr. Hamp 1966: 11-12 assumes *jenatêr > *ji(nayr > *njayr > nêr.

Schmitt (1996) independently suggests a scenario similar to that of Bugge and Aćaryan (HAB), but he derives *yenetêr from *yenatêr 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 *mir, *iner- beside *mayir, *ma(w)r- ‘mother’ and *ér ur, -x(e)(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 nêr completely? (2) how exactly do we arrive at NSg *ineyir? (3) how to explain the actual CIArm. paradigm, which, despite the scarce evidence, seems to point to NSg nêr 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. Thus, Schmitt’s idea on assimilation is worth of consideration. A paradigm nom. *iênh2-têr (cf. Gr. ἐνάτηρ): acc. *iênh2-têr-m would give PArm. *înêyr > *înayr : *înêy(ern) > *înê(t)ër, whence analogical nom. *îne(t)ër > *neyr > nêr. This way we can understand the paradigm nom. nêr vs. obl. ner-. GDSg nir-i is analogical after the well-known classical rule -ê : -i-V-. 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 ê in Ephrem. For a certain stage, thus, one may reconstruct an (old or recent) feminine in *-ih2-, namely *(H)ienh2-ter-ih2-; cf. Iran. *yâhr-ī-. Note the unspecified *neteri- in Hübschmann 1897: 478; Jahykakan 1959:

\[101 \text{[One may be sceptical about this hypothetic sound development. Note that, in this particular case, the *ə has more chance to be assimilated, since both the preceding and the following syllables contain front vowels].}\]
278a. IE *ienh₂-ter-ih₂- would produce PArm. hypothetical *ináti and would strengthen the basis for the unaccented *a (see above).

The evidence for the o-stem is meagre: AblSg i ner-o-y in Ephrem next to AblSg i ner-i 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 alaxin.

Nom. -ē vs. obl. -e- is reminiscent of the paradigm of ahēs, obl. alues ‘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’y an (Kapancyan 1951b: 582-583; 1961: 108-110) rejects the IE etymology of Arm. ne/iér 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/iér is mainly represented in Western and Southern dialects corroborates, he claims, the Asia-Minor origin of the word. Jāhukyan (1985a: 366; 1987: 423, 425) is justifiably sceptical about this connection. Since ner, despite the scepticism of Łap’anc’y an, is certainly of PIE origin, the resemblance with the Hurrian word should be treated as accidental.

níst, o-stem: GDSg nst-o-y (Gregory of Nyssa, Step’annos Ĭrbelian), 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, Movošēs Xorenac’i, Ephrem, etc.), ‘royal residence, capital, royal palace’ (Agat’angélos, Asolik, 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 some Biblical attestations, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 88.

● DIAL. The verb is dialectally ubiquitous. Zeyt’un daš’deš’l is due to assimilation n...d > d...d (HAB 3: 454a; Aćāryan 2003: 114).

In the dialect of Hamšen the paradigm of the verb is synchronically aberrant and certainly archaic, cf. aorist nsta, nstar, nstav, nstak’, nstäk’, nsṯmn < nstan, imperative nist, nst ek’ [Aćāryan 1947: 134].

In Hamšen one finds *alnist ‘a kind of drowsiness-somnolence caused by a spirit’ (HayLezBrbBar 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). The word seems to be composed of al ‘a female spirit supposed to settle on young people and suffocate them’ (see Aćāryan 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 MitNarMir 1: 58; ÈtimSlovIranJaz 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. nīḍa- 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. sī́dati, MPers. nišāstan ‘to sit’, etc. on the other (Hübschmann 1897: 178; Meillet 1936: 39, 108; HAB 3: 453-454; Pokorny 1959: 885, 887; Lagragyulyan 1961: 73; Jahukyan 1982: 67, 129; 1987: 146; Greppin apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 393a).


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 deverbal rather than a direct continuation of *nisdos (Godel 1982: 20-21; Olsen 1999: 173; cf. also Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 50).

Further see s.vv. *aṙ-ič ‘settlement, village’, z-ist ‘the fleshy parts between the loins and knee’. Note also unji, dial. also *tuč ‘soot, rust’ (q.v.), if from *sōd-iV- ‘soot, sediment’.

nu, o-stem: GDSg nu-o-y (a number of attestations in the Bible), AbīSg i nu-o-y in Severian of Gabala, ISg nu-o-v in Yovhannēs Drasxnakertc’i (9-10th cent.); a-stem: ISg nuaw in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.67 (1913=1991: 3567); Yovhannēs Drasxnakertc’i (9-10th cent.); n-stem: NPl nu-an-k’, API nu-an-s (Ruth 1.6-8), API 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 νυός.

●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 nun ‘tender’ (epithet to harsnak) [Açärean 1913: 816b], Sebastia, Akn nunuk ‘a plant’ [HayLezBrbBar 4, 2007: 178b], Sebastia nunuk glossed by harsnak, lit. ‘little bride’ [Gabrkean 1952: 426].

Further, see s.vv. maik ‘arum’, *muin ‘(nuptial) bed’, *nurin ‘Rain-Maiden’.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 2: 447a; de Lagarde 1854: 311; Hübschmann 1897: 479; HAB 3: 467a), connected with the IE word for ‘daughter-in-law’: Gr. νυός f.


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 (NAPl *nu-an-k'/s* in Ruth 1.6-8, with *erkok'/sin* ‘both’) may be analogical after the plural type *kus-an-k’* of *koys* ‘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. *ērē* ‘elder’, pl. *ērēc’unk’*; for this paradigm, see Tumanjan 1971: 231). In what follows I nevertheless offer a tentative explanation of the nasal stem of *nu*.


Regardless of its relationship with Lat. *nūbō*, etc. on the one hand, and with PIE *snusós*, on the other, Gr. *vīgē̱*) may be linked with an Armenian theoretical form *nuw-n-* reflecting a QIE *nubʰ⁻n-*: nom. *nubʰ⁻ōn* > PArm. *nuvw(n) > nu, gen. *nubʰ⁻n-os > Gr. *mump*-.. It is possible that this *nubʰ⁻n-* ‘bride’ was of substratum origin and has been contaminated with PArm. *nu(h) < PIE *snusös* ‘daughter-in-law’. Compare another possible substratum word with the same paradigmatic explanation: nom. *pfh²-h⁻-ōn* > PArm. *atlawun*, gen. *bʰ⁻n-os* > Lat. *palumb*- with metathesis as in Gr. *mumpʰ-* (see s.v. *alawun* ‘pigeon, dove’).

467a; see also Jähkhyán 1987: 601\(^{\text{Ni12}}\), 607\(^{\text{Ni29}}\), Kabardian nəsə, Laz nusa and others have been borrowed from PArm. *nu-.

A possible derivative of Arm. "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 viyug Φ 'bride; daughter-in-law; nymph, goddess of lower rank', then the connection between Arm. nu-ik 'arum, arum lily, Arum dracunculus L.' and Gr. voyp-aix Φ 'water-lily' would not be merely a semantic one.


nuik, nvik, nuič ‘arum, arum lily, Arum dracunculus L.’, only in late medieval medical writings: Kamarkapc'i, Amirdovlat' Amasiac'i, etc. (NHB 2: 451a; Ališan 1895: 467-468; S. Vardanjan 1990: 165, § 810; Miǰ HayBaṙ 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 yilan kavi, lit. 'snake’s tinder' (S. Vardanjan 1990: 165, 626810.3). According to a folk-belief recorded in Arčak (S. Avagyan 1978: 45a), snakes settle in the neighbourhood of nuik.


Svedia lvįğ < *nuik is described as a plant belonging to the family of šušan 'lily' with flowers resembling šušan [Andreasyan 1967: 152-153]. According to Ć'olak'ean (1986: 244), the roots of K'esab lvįğ was used against biting of poisonous insects (cf. Ačaṙyan 1913: 816a on Muş and K'li). Urn̄ia, Sal̄mast nuik refers to a plant that was used as spice [GwUrṁSl̄m 2, 1898: 98]. Sebastia nviğ '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. narin̄j 'orange' > Svedia lařan̄j (nasal dissimilation, Ačaṙyan 2003: 415); as is pointed out by Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 431b), this sound change is totally identical with that in Spanish naranja, laranja;

ClArm. nern̄ 'antichrist': dial. Laran̄da lč [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.
nuik

ClArm. *niog* ‘bolt, bar of a door; crowbar’ > dial. *ling* ‘id.: 1) nasal epenthesis; 2) nasal dissimilation [HAB 3: 450-451];


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’ banjdar*, lit. ‘Armenian herb’ (Ališan 1895: 358 Nr1622; Malxaseanc’ HBB 3: 483b; HayLezBrBaf 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 -i*č* cf. *alawn-ič* ‘a plant’ from *alawn* ‘tree’ [HAB 1: 122b]; *bot-ič* the resin of the plant *bot* [HAB 1: 464a]; *dərn*-*ič* ‘a plant’ from *dərn* ‘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 Siyāvaš’, reflecting the name of the resurrecting hero of the Iranian epic, viz. Sīyāvaša; cf. Pers. *sīn-i-siyāvašān* ‘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 Sīyāvaš was desired by her stepmother, but he rejects her advances; the stepmother succeeds in turning the king against his son; Sīyāvaš 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 cṛer” (Daredevils of Sasun), Davit’.

Sahak Movsisyan (Bense) has recorded a traditional story, according to which the flower *numnfar* ‘water-lily’ originated from the blood of Davit’, which was killed by Č’msik Sult’an in the river Mefraget (see Lalananyan 1969: 113N513; S. Movsisyan 1972: 51b). That *numnfar* is an aquatic plant is clearly illustrated by late medieval folk-songs (see Abelyan 1940: 142, Nrs. 232 and *232; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 198b, 201a).

In “Govasank’ cālkanc’” (Praise of flowers) by Davit’ Salajorc’i, 17th cent. (USMjHnHayBnst 2, 1987: 357-312) we read:

*Ayn nunnfar calik or kay, busni vezers žerun,*
*Ōjern zink’n ku pahen, mard č’i k’atel noc’a ahun.*

“That flower *numnfar* 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 *numnfar* ‘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. Lanalanyan 1969: 113 on lula 'tulip, poppy', always crying for the brothers). Note that Svedia lväg < *ńuik 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. νυμφ-αία f. 'water-lily' from νύμφη f. 'young wife, bride; marriageable maiden; daughter-in-law; nymphe, 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. kɛlinčik 'tulip, poppy', always crying for the brothers). Note that Svedia lväg < *ńuik 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. νυμφ-αία f. 'water-lily' from νύμφη f. 'young wife, bride; marriageable maiden; daughter-in-law; nymphe, goddess of lower rank, esp. of springs; doll, puppet; pupa'.

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 *snu-, cf. Gr. νυός f. 'daughter-in-law, bride', Lat. nurus, uš f. 'daughter-in-law, young woman', etc.; see s.v.).

*nuin (dial) '(nuptial) bed'.

If the hypothesis on the theoretical Armenian *nuw-n- 'bride, daughter-in-law' vs. Gr. νυός f. 'daughter-in-law' is accepted, and if the Šatax meaning 'nuptial bed' is original, one may posit an old Armenian *nuw-n-* and derive it from *nuw-n- (for the -i- compare the cases of lusin 'moon' and kalın 'acorn', see s.vv.). An interesting parallel would be Gr. νυμφών, -όνος m. 'bride-chamber', derived from the same νύφη (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'.

If the hypothesis on the theoretical Armenian *nuw-n-* 'bride, daughter-in-law' vs. Gr. νυός f. 'daughter-in-law' is accepted, and if the Šatax meaning 'nuptial bed' is original, one may posit an old Armenian *nuw-n-* and derive it from *nuw-n- (for the -i- compare the cases of lusin 'moon' and kalın 'acorn', see s.vv.). An interesting parallel would be Gr. νυμφών, -όνος m. 'bride-chamber', derived from the same νύφη (see Frisk 2: 326). This is, of course, highly hypothetical.
For a collection of versions of this ritual song, see Ř. 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.

vehicles 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’ (Lap’anc’y an 1945: 86-87; see also Bdoyan, HayŽo Xaɫ 1, 1963: 163-164; Bdoyan 1972: 493b, 495b; A. Petrosyan 2002: 8, 81) is uncertain. Likewise uncertain is the Sumero-Akkadian etymology (N. Mkrtčyan 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-rik (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): ἥψησεν δὲ Ιακωβ ἠ̃λϑεν δὲ Ησαυ ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου ἐκλείπω. Here nk’t’eal em renders Gr. ἐκλείπω ‘to leave out; to die; to faint’.

vehicles No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 3: 477a.

According to V. Arak’elyan (1979: 38), here belongs Ararat (Abvoyan, the village of Kotayk’) *n̥xt(ə), as the root of nk’t’em, occurring in the expression n̥xta kadarvel ‘to faint, become weak from hunger’, lit. “one’s *n̥xt 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: oj̥ ‘power’; *s-oj̥ > žoy̥ ‘endurance’. Dial. n̥xt- can rather be derived from Arm. niwt ‘element, material, subject, properties’, dial. *sap; nourishment; subject; essence’. This is corroborated by Urmia/Xoy n̥xt’em katarvel ‘to be/become exhausted’ (see M. Asatryan 1962: 229b) which is identical with Kotayk’ n̥xta kadarvel ‘to faint, become weak from hunger’.

vehicles Meillet (1908-09: 356) connects nk’t’em ‘to starve, faint from hunger’ with nk’odim ‘to be dried, parched, tired, unwell (e.g. as resulted from hunger)’ deriving them from PIE *n̥t-k-: Skt. n̥c̥a ‘downwards’, OCS n̥ca ‘face downwards’, ORuss. n̥c̥ati ‘to bend, bow, droop’, Byel. dial. n̥cy ‘болезненный, слабый’ = ‘ailing, sickly, weak’ (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 25, 1999: 109-110). Not accepted in HAB 3: 477ab, and not included in Jahukyan’s monographs and Olsen 1999.

The etymology is worth of consideration. For the semantics cf. the Byel. form; see also Arm. xonf ‘tired, exhausted’ vs. xonf ‘low, down’ (see s.vv.). Formally Arm. nk’t’em can be interpreted as *nik’t- (with intensive -t-) > *nik’t- through assimilation.
The form nk’oleal is also attested in Paterica, and nk’olealim occurs in Yovhanen’s Drasxanakertc’i.

On semantic grounds Mayrhofer (EWAia 2: 617-618) treats the derivation of Skt. śărīra- from śar- ‘zerbrechen, zertrennen, zerschmettern’ to be uncertain. He does not mention the Armenian form.

Olsen (1999: 941f) 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: *sālīlo- > Arm. *salīlo- > šālıt, obl. ša(l)i(o)-. Note that also the synonymous marmin, o-stem ‘flesh, body’ can be regarded as an Aryan loan.103

šalim ‘to be mistaken, confused’. Ners’eš Lambranac’i (12th cent.).

103 Bearing in mind that Skt. śărīra- is neuter, one may interpret Arm. GDPl šatl-a-c’ (vs. ISg šatl-o-v) as reflecting an older neuter plural *-a- inherited from PIE *-eh2-. The evidence for šatl-a-c’ is scanty, however.
šant'

● DIAL T‘iflis, Ararat, Agulis, Łarabal *šal- ‘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 Elišē, IPI šant’-i-w-k’ in Yaysmawurk’ and Vordan Areweleci’i, GDPI šant’/i-c’ in Philo and Movsēs Kafankatuac’i 2.40 [1983: 241f]; 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’ (Elišē; 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 Baṙgirk’ 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 erknahar, kam kaycaknahar “struck by heaven or lightning”; šant’ik’ kaycak, kam xaroyk “lightning, or camp-fire”. See also Abeghian 1899: 89 (“vom Himmel herabgestiegenes Feuer und Eisen, ferner glühendes Eisen und auch Dreifuss”).

Among compounds: šant’-a-har in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.37 (1913=1990: 304L106): orrpēs zšant’ahar yerkir korcan ēr zk’a ğn “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. Abrahmanyan 1944: 321L7f) enumerates the following atmospheric visual phenomena: šant’, kayc ‘spark’, hur ‘fire’, p’aylakn ‘lightning’, sivn hroy ‘pillar of fire’, yardagol ‘Milky Way’. Here, thus, šant’ and p’aylakn are taken as non-identical notions.

● DIAL The dialects have only the verb *šant’em : Hačn ‘to strike (of devils)’, Ararat, Agulis ‘to bite, cause a burning pain’, Šulawer ‘to burn’ [HAB 3: 494b; Ačāryan 1935: 379; 2003: 99, 331]. According to Amatuni (1912: 510b), Ararat šant’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 Elišē (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 Hačn) 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 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 *kṛyati- 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\textsuperscript{a}, cf. 272b\textsuperscript{a}, Arm. šant' is discussed in connection with the Luwian theonym Šanta, see also Roth 1927: 744; N. Martirosyan 1972: 165, 175; Schultheiß 1961: 221; Jahukyan 1987: 319, 424. If of IE origin, Arm. šant'/d may be regarded as the source of Šanta (Jahukyan 1992: 22-23).

Luw. Šanta (vocative **Šanats, 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 Ζας, *Ζαντ 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 [Lap'anc'yän 1951b: 592-593; 1961: 120]. Pointing out that Arm. šant'/d, being probably of native origin, may be seen in the basis of Šanta, Jahukyan (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: 191-192, 2008: 83;). 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). Šanta, 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, 30, (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- ‘erzünt’ (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. māt’, 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· ἄνϑραξ ‘charcoal’ (Hesychius), Skt. cand- (also ścand-) ‘to shine, glitter’, candrā- 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 xel vs. šel, 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 deverbal noun in *-ti- may have been formed. Thus, *skhnd-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. perūt ‘to beat’, etc. – Ukr., Czech perun ‘thunder’, Slav. *Perūnti ‘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.
šēl ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’, šēlem ‘to crook’, šēlim ‘to go astray’ (derivatives: šēlīč, šēlītewn, etc.). Mostly late attestations. First attested in ăr-i-šēl ‘sloping(ly), crooked(ly)’ (Bible+).

- DIAL Polis, Axalc’xa šēl [HAB 3: 508a; Aćaṛyan 1941: 235]; Moks šēr ‘slanting, skew’, šēx-ā-k’ā ‘obliquely’ (šēxåk’ā əɛrt’äl ‘to go obliquely’) [Orbeli 2002: 301]. In view of the Moks k’ā, it seems that the second component, namely *kyəɛ, represents the hypothetical *gi- ‘to go’. More probably, however, šex-å-k’əɛ reflects the Modern Armenian šēlaki ‘obliquely’ (see Malxaseane’ HBB 3: 510c), and the k’ā is erroneous or of other nature.

- ETYM Together with xel ‘mutilated, lame; sore (eye); crooked (also morally); abominable’, dial. *xel- ‘to become spoilt, undisciplined; to make silly jokes; to scoff; ridicule grimacing’; šil ‘squint-eyed’, dial. ‘mad’, Łarabaļ ‘mistake’, *šilənknel ‘to be mistaken, confused; to err’; *šel- (12th cent.; dial.) ‘to err, to be mistaken, confused; to see badly; to become spoiled (of milk)’; sxal ‘mistake, failure; crime’, sxalem, sxalim ‘to err, be mistaken; to stumble; to fail, miss’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects) (see s.vv.), connected with Lat. scelus, GSg sceleris n. ‘misdeed, crime’; Gr. σκάλος n. ‘leg (from the hip downwards)’, σκῦλος ‘crook-legged’, σκολίος ‘wicked, crooked’; Skt. skhālati ‘to stumble, stammer, fail’, MPers. škarwīdan, NPers. šįkarfidan ‘to stumble, stagger’; OIC. skyalgr, OHG skjalgr ‘squint-eyed’, etc. (Bugge 1893: 57; HAB 2: 490-491) also compares, albeit with some reservation, with kal ‘lame’, *keļ ‘crooked’ (q.v.). The alternation x : k, however, does not apply normally to native words. The meaning ‘mistake’ of Łarabaļ of šil is remarkable since it combines the form šil ‘(squint-eyed)’ with the semantics of sxal (cf. Jahu’kyan 1972: 292; 1987: 278). Elsewhere, Jahu’kyan (1987: 148) separates šil ‘squint-eyed’ (grouped with šel ‘crooked’, etc.) from Łarabaļ šil, connecting the latter only with Arm. sxal and Skt. skhālati. This is improbable.

If the etymology is accepted, we must reconstruct a root *skh₁el-, in view of Skt. škhl- and Arm. sx- (see Schrijver 1991: 433; cf. also Kortlandt 2003: 1, 6, 31), as well as Arm. š-. According to Olsen (1999: 195, 813), Arm. šil ‘squint-eyed’ is a vṛddhi derivative *skelo- or *skelī-. Given the possible reconstruction with an internal laryngeal, one might alternatively suggest an ablaut form *skel₁-. In this case, the initial š- would be analogical after šel and others, if the š- in these forms is from *skH-.

According to another etymology, Arm. sxalim and Skt. skhālati belong to a different root, namely *skʰəel- (or *skʰa₁el-, 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 show; HAB 4: 224-225; Xačatur’yan 1979: 365; Klingenschmitt 1982: 144; 169; Viredaz 2005: 91). Sometimes an exclusively Armeno-Indoaryan isogloss is suggested, see Pokorny 1959: 929; Jahu’kyan 1987: 148; Olsen 1999: 195 show; Beekes 2003: 169, 202, 211. Beekes (op. cit. 202) notes: “very doubtful Gr. σφάλλω, which would require -k-”. It is uncertain, however, whether the outcome of PIE *skʰH- would be distinct from that of *skH-.
The twofold development of *skH- as Arm. š- and sx- is puzzling. Jahukyan (1987: 192) assumes that *skh- yielded Arm. š- before front vowels, and sx- elsewhere. Olsen (1999: 195-202) only speaks of the development *sk- (unaspirated) > š- before a front vowel. Kortlandt (2003: 10) mentions šel (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- > Arm. *šV-.

Arm. sxalim is the only case demonstrating the development *skh- > Arm. sx-, and, therefore, may be an old Aryan borrowing (see Jahukyan 1987: 192).

In page 551, Jahukyan (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. sikhálate and Arm. sxalim to Georg.-Zan *sxal- : sx (on which see Klimov 1964: 167, comparing with PIE *(s)leidh- ‘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 xel and šel, can be corroborated by xayt'/xet'/xit' vs. šit’- ‘to bite’ (see s.vv.).

The problem of šel – šil is different from that of aselh / *asilh (GSg aslan), etc., since neither sel nor xel appear in vocalism -i-. Note also the alternation šl-

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 *sil- ‘twisting’; see also 3.7.2.

See also s.v. šiša ‘a kind of demon’.

šerep’, o-stem (only 1Sg šer-e-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 GŠg šerbi next to NSg šerep'; see HAB 3: 511a. Bakdasaryan-T’ap’alc’yan 1958 vacat.

ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 511a). Jahukyan (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 (Jahukyan 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’erep’; see also s.vv. šert, še/ér. 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: *(s)ker-ep’ > šerep’. In either case, the -ep’ can be compared with another tool-name, namely šalap- ‘borer, gimlet’. Note the dependence of the vowel before *p’ upon the root vowel: šer-ep’ vs. šal-ap’ (cf. 2.1.23).
The root may be identical with šēr; thus: ladle made of storax-wood.

šert, i-stem: GDPl 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. στυραξ ‘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’iit- ‘to cut, split, scratch’.

šēr, šer ‘storax-tree’, possibly also ‘manna-ash’.

The only classical attestation is found in Genesis 30.37 [Zeyt’unyan 1985: 286]: Ew aṙ Yakob gawazan šēr (vars. šer, šert, ššēr, er) dalar ew ənkuzi ew sawswoy ew keleweac’ znosa Yakob, ew ewel spitak, ew ek’erc zdalarn i gawazanc’h, ew erewēr i gawazansn spitakn, zor k’ercyoyn, 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. στύραξ, -άκος ‘storax-tree, Styrax officinalis; the fragrant gum-resin of the storax-tree’.

In Yaysmawurk’, the Biblical passage is rephrased as follows: Ai’rul p’ayt dalar ənkuzi, ūşi ew sōsi. Aća’ryan (HAB 3: 606b) points out that ūşi does not have a correspondent form here and is therefore unknown. This is somewhat surprising because the collation of the set šēr : ənkuzi : sawsi with ənkuzi : ūşi : sōsi points to identification šēr = ūşi, although the order is not the same. See s.v. ūşi.

● 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 širxišt (Mxit’ar Herac’i) ‘manna’ [Seidel 1908: 210-211; HAB 3: 515b; S. Vardanjan 1990: 346, § 2206; MjHayBar 215a, 217a]. It has been assumed that Pers. šīr-x/ūšt ‘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. στύρας, -άκος ‘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. melōç; note also Arm. šer-ep’ ‘ladle’ which can derive from šēr/šer- ‘storax-tree’; (2) Gr. στύρας ‘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. melep ‘handle of an axe’). See also s.v. uşi/*hoši.

*št(-) ‘bite; wound’, the oldest attestation comes from šit’-ol ‘biting’ (present participle), in homilies attributed to Yovhannēs Mandakuni (5th cent.) or Yovhannēs Mayragomec’i (7th cent.). “Vark’ haranc’” (Paterica) has šit’-ol, as well as ši’t’eval ‘bitten’. The latter is rendered in Baq’girk’ hayoc’ by harel ‘struck; bitten’ (see Amalyan 1975: 249[34]). This (late) medieval dictionary also has the only evidence for the noun šit’, rendered as c’aw ayuc’eval, literally: “pain swollen” (see Amalyan
The noun *šiš* has been preserved in the dialect of Łaraba (see below). Combining the evidence from Baṛgirk’ hayoc’ with that of the dialect of Łaraba one may represent the semantics of *šiš* as *‘pain of a (swollen) wound’. Aṛistak’ēs Lastivertc’i (11th cent.) has *šiš-oc’* ‘bite (of a bee)’.

**DIAL** Preserved only in the dialect of Łaraba: *šiš* *‘the warmth of a wound’* [HAB 3: 516b], see above.

**ETYM** NHB (s.v.) seems to identify with *šiš* *‘the warmth of a wound’* [HAB 3: 516b], see above.

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects, in the meaning ‘squint-eyed’. In Łaraba: *šil* *‘mistake; disorder’, *šil-ənknel* *‘to be mistaken, confused; to err’*. In some other dialects – ‘mad’: Īula [HAB 3: 517a; T. Abgcoloren 1966: 94]; Melri [Ałącz 1954: 322]. Illustrations from Łaraba/Goris, e.g. in ĢZHek’ 7, 1979: 464, lines 10, -1 (‘disorder, confusion’).

Among new dialectal words, Aćarāy (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 Baṛgirk’ hayoc’ and in the dialects of Ararat and T’iflis [A衽ane 1913: 831b]. In some dialects the -t- is voiced: Łaraba *šildi*, Šulaver *šildik* [A衽ane 1913: 829a], Ararat and Lalt’ač’i *šildik* [Aätzlich 1912: 515b]. For the voicing cf. also Łaraba, Agulis *ildi(k)* ‘tickle’, if from *xt-ɫ-i > *xtl-ɫ-i > *xlt-ɫ* (see s.v. *xti ɫ* ‘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’.

*šiša* ɫ ‘a kind of demon’ (both Bible+).

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects, in the meaning ‘squint-eyed’. In Łaraba: *šiš* ‘mistake; disorder’, *šil anknel* ‘to be mistaken, confused; to err’. In some other dialects – ‘mad’: Īula [HAB 3: 517a; T. Abgcoloren 1966: 94]; Melri [Ażycz 1954: 322]. Illustrations from Łaraba/Goris, e.g. in ĢZHek’ 7, 1979: 464, lines 10, -1 (‘disorder, confusion’).

Among new dialectal words, Aćarāy (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 Baṛgirk’ hayoc’ and in the dialects of Ararat and T’iflis [A衽ane 1913: 831b]. In some dialects the -t- is voiced: Łaraba *šildi*, Šulaver *šildik* [A衽ane 1913: 829a], Ararat and Lalt’ač’i *šildik* [Ażycz 1912: 515b]. For the voicing cf. also Łaraba, Agulis *ildi(k)* ‘tickle’, if from *xt-ɫ-i > *xtl-ɫ-i > *xlt-ɫ* (see s.v. *xti ɫ* ‘to tickle’).

**ETYM** See s.v. *šel* ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’.

In view of the alternation *š*- / *x*- (see s.vv. *še, 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 *šiš(-)* ‘bite; wound’ practically combines the meanings of *xayt’em* and *xit’*, and *šiš-oc’* ‘bite (of a bee)’ goes parallel with *xayt’-oc’* ‘bite, sting’.

I wonder if *šil-ti* can be viewed as a deverbative formation in -ti (see 2.3.1).

**ETYM** See s.v. *še* ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’.

1975: 249\(^{105}\). The noun *ʃiš* has been preserved in the dialect of Łaraba (see below). Combining the evidence from Baṛgirk’ hayoc’ with that of the dialect of Łaraba one may represent the semantics of *ʃiš* as *‘pain of a (swollen) wound’*. Aṛistak’ēs Lastivertc’i (11th cent.) has *ʃiš-oc’* ‘bite (of a bee)’.

**DIAL** Preserved only in the dialect of Łaraba: *ʃiš* *‘the warmth of a wound’* [HAB 3: 516b], see above.

**ETYM** NHB (s.v.) seems to identify with *ʃiš* *‘the warmth of a wound’* [HAB 3: 516b], see above.

**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects, in the meaning ‘squint-eyed’. In Łaraba: *šil* ‘mistake; disorder’, *šil anknel* ‘to be mistaken, confused; to err’. In some other dialects – ‘mad’: Īula [HAB 3: 517a; T. Abgcoloren 1966: 94]; Melri [Ażycz 1954: 322]. Illustrations from Łaraba/Goris, e.g. in ĢZHek’ 7, 1979: 464, lines 10, -1 (‘disorder, confusion’).

Among new dialectal words, Aćarāy (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 Baṛgirk’ hayoc’ and in the dialects of Ararat and T’iflis [A衽ane 1913: 831b]. In some dialects the -t- is voiced: Łaraba *šildi*, Šulaver *šildik* [A衽ane 1913: 829a], Ararat and Lalt’ač’i *šildik* [Ażycz 1912: 515b]. For the voicing cf. also Łaraba, Agulis *ildi(k)* ‘tickle’, if from *xt-ɫ-i > *xtl-ɫ-i > *xlt-ɫ* (see s.v. *xti ɫ* ‘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’.

105 Aćarāy (HAB 3: 516b) cites it as *šiš ac’aw· ayuc’eal*, but the critical edition of Amalyan (1975) helps to clarify the gloss.
of Emesa and Ephrem Asori. The passages read respectively: *Zdews halaceac*, *žišats xrovecac* “(he) drove away the devils, harassed the šišal-s” *; Ew ārīnum zmarmim surb: uten zhastays and šišals ew and surbs zsrbut’twmm “And they take the holy body: (they) eat the hasteay-s with šišal-s and the holiness with saints”. For the take the form šišay-k’; see s.v.

**ETYM** No acceptable etymology is known to me (see also s.v. šišay kv’).

In my opinion, šišal is a reduplicated form of the root *šal- (< PIE *škHl-*) ‘to err, to be mistaken, confused; to see badly’, cf. šel ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’, šelom ‘to crook’, šelim ‘to go astray’, xel ‘mutilated, lame, sore (eye); crooked (also morally); abominable’, dial. *xel* ‘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 cical ‘laugh’, cica ‘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 of 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’, molī ‘a kind of sorcerer’ (Eznik Kolbaci’i), etc. (see s.vv. *mol-*)

šišal (šišal), probably *šil*, GDPi šal-a-c’ ‘neck’, a MidArm. word in forms of šišal, GDSg šli-oy, šli, pi. šli-k’ (API šlin-s and šlin-k’-s, GDPi šlinc’), šli-k’ (GDPi šlec’), šlneckst, etc. [HAB 3: 522b; Lazaryan/Avetisyan, MiJHayBař 2, 1992: 218]; on šlneckst, prob. collective, see Weitenberg 1997: 330.

Here must belong also GDPi šal-ac’, found in a competition-joke by Nersē Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia): *Brinem šlāc’d ēw tam olor* “(May) I take (subj.) your neck and twist it” [Mnač’akanyan 1980: 342[10]].

The form šli (also widespread in the dialects) comes from šni. The nasless forms šli-k’, šlec’ (apparently from *šlec’*), and šslac’ seem to be old rather than simplifications of the geminate -ll-. Theoretically, one may reconstruct *šil* or *šul* (a-stem, cf. šal-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: šli (Akn), šlin’, šlink’, šllik’, šlins (Rivola), etc. ‘neck’ [HAB 3: 522b], Bulanax šalak’ [S. Movsisyan 1972: 71a]. Interesting is Hamše šnlık’, šnlink’ ‘face’ [Ačaryan 1947: 73, 248]; for the metathesis, see 2.1.26.3. Ačaryan (HAB 4: 658a) describes the meaning of Bulanax šalak’ 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 Jahučyan 1967: 262. Ačaryan (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. šel, 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-û (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‘î, 12-13th cent. (MîjHayBar 2, 1992: 225b). On the asterism ‘Dog-Star’, see below.

Dial. Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 535a].

Remarkable is Kurd-P‘alan (Nikomialia) šovon [HAB 3: 535a]. Note also Dersim šun, Mirak’ sun, pl. səv-di, səv-ni [Balramyan 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; for more references, see HAB 3: 534), derived from PIE *kuon- ‘dog’: Skt. śvan-, m., NSg. śvā́, AccSg śvā́nam, GSg śūnas, śvā́- 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 < *šuun < PIE *kuon- and skund ‘dog, puppy’ < *kuon-to-/ā-. For a discussion, other proposals and references, see Lidén 1911: 381-385; Bonfante 1937: 21; Pisani 1950: 172; Jahuykan 1982: 69, 75, 134, 218, 218-219, 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 *kun-ōs (the Armenian reflex of which would be identical with the nominative šun) has been reshaped as *kuon-ōs analogically after the nominative šun < *šuun < PIE *kuon-. For a discussion, see Jahuykan 1959: 175; 1982: 108; Schindler 1975: 55; de Lambarterie 1978: 263; Greppin 1984: 92-95; Stempel 1993 < 1987: 150-151; Olsen 1999: 133-134; Matzinger 2005: 71-323). A similar explanation may be assumed for jiwon ‘snow’, tun ‘house’, etc. Compare also the problem of Lat. canis ‘dog’ (see Schrijver 1991: 461).

Arm. dial. Kurd-P‘alan (Nikomialia) šovon has been treated as an archaic form (Jahuykan 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 *šūn- or a relation with e.g. Skt. śvā́-.


Culturological excursus

Arm. pl. šn-û/wi comes from dial (see Jahuykan 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 svā́nau, referring to the two dogs of Yama in RV X.14.10-12 (see Ivanov 1977: 189, with a Germanic parallel).

The asterism Šn-ast, lit. ‘dog-star’, mentioned by Anania Širakac‘î in the list of stars or constellations which indicate zanjrewac’ sastkut’îwn “abundance of rains” (A. G. Abrahanyan 1944: 331), 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 ast’ refers to ‘Polar star’.

In folk-games šun refers to a playing dice (stone), see Aça’ean 1913: 840-841; Bdoyan, Hay’ZolXa’l 3, 1983: 204-205, 209; Hay’LezBrbBa’r 4, 2007: 290a. Combining this to the dialectal expression šan baxt uni ‘he/she is very successful’, lit. ‘has a dog’s fortune’ (Hay’LezBrbBa’r 4, 2007: 295a), one may think of a comparison with Skt. (RV+) śva-ghnín- ‘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: 591 2; Falk 1986: 100-101, 108-111, 188; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 674).

šunč‘, o-stem: GDGg šnč‘-o-y, ISGg šnč‘-o-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 Aça’yan (HAB 3: 535b) treats šunč‘ as an onomatopoeic word composed of š- and the suffix -ńč‘ 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. švankštį ‘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; Pokorny 1959: 632; Klingenschmitt 1982: 69; Ravnae 1991: 147, 166; Olsen 1999: 162; 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-nč‘ and ššu-kč‘ ‘whisper’ can be regarded as reduplicated forms of *šu- containing -ńč‘ (see s.v. munč‘- ‘to mutter, murmur’) and the diminutive -(u)kč‘, respectively.

O

*o- interrogative indefinite pronoun (cf. o ok‘, etc. Agat’angelos+), gen. oyr, dat. um, abl. y-um(m)-č‘, plur. nom. oy-k‘, gen.-dat. oy-c‘ ‘who’, also ov ok‘ ‘who, which person’; o-v uninflected ‘who’, also ov ok‘ ‘who, which person’; o-r, gen. or-oy, dat. or-um, abl. y-or-m-č‘, 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‘-č‘ (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 Movsės Xorenac’i 1.3 (1913=1991: 1117); Thomson 1978: 69-70): erkar ew šahavor gorcov zagis meryo kargel zpatmut’ıwın čśiwi, zı agavorac’ın ew znaxararakanac’ azgac’ ew tohmic‘, t‘ı ĭw yummě, ew zınc‘ ıwrañanč’ıwv ok‘ i noc’anč gorceac’, ew ıw ok‘ i c’elic’s orošeloc’ antani ew meraznevă, ew ıvč’ omank‘ ec‘k antane’c’alq‘ ew meraznevălq‘‘: ‘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 Larabal hu ‘who’ and Nor Naxijewen rural vɔ, only in vɔ gina ‘who knows?’ [HAB 3: 549a]. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 571-572) points out that the Larabal pair hu before a consonant vs. hav before a vowel reflects the original distribution of the OArm. forms o and ov. In Alāškert and Muš, ov ‘who’ has been replaced by v/wor [HAB 3: 549a].

Šatax, Moks, Muš vir, and Melri 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 Larabal has hür ‘whose’, whom’, see textual illustrations in Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 24 (hūr heti ‘for whom?’), 326 (hur ‘to whom?’), 331 (hūr cī ‘whose horse?’), 331 (hūr ‘to whom?’).

The form omn has been preserved in J̌ǔľa mi vomn ‘someone’ [HAB 3: 559b; Ačāryan 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’min < ok’ min ‘someone, a person’; J̌ǔľa vorɔk’ < or ok’ ‘whichever’; Sebastia več’ več’ < oc’ ok’ ‘nobody’; cf. also Agulis uşman, uşman, uşman, Melri ūnk’ēn, etc., probably blends of ok’(-min) and omn [HAB 3: 620b].

ClArm. y-o ‘where to’ is reflected in Svedia yɛɔ ‘where to’ (see HAB 3: 549a, 613b; Ačāryan 2003: 581; in Andreadsyan 1967: 376, yeu).

● ETYM. Usually derived from PIE *kwo-; 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 *i-o-. 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.v. i- ‘thing, what’, ur ‘where’.


In the late medieval dictionary Bārgirk’ hayoc’ we find xozni glossed by kozni (Amalyan 1975: 144). 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 kžni, kžnī [Ačāryan 1935: 381], Tavuš küznī ‘hedgehog’ [Xem’yan 2000: 222b, Łarabal kžni, Łazax káz, J̌ǔľa konjī, Lōrī kanjina, etc., as well as kžnī in Sarafean 1798 apud HAB 3: 550a. Ačāryan (1935: 149; HAB 3: 550a) explains the initial k- through metathesis from diminutive ozni-k (note Šamaxi kznīg’, with both the prothetic k- and the diminutive -ik), which is unconvincing. J̌ahukyan (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/azni and xozi are due to contamination with other ‘culturally’ related animal names, viz. kuz ‘marten’ (cf. especially Lazax kuz ‘hedgehog’, formally identical with kuz ‘marten’; for similar suggestions, see Musheghian 2000: 64; Ervandy 2007: 35), and xo, ko- ‘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. x̂ikar(apia) ‘hedgehog’ from x̂ig ‘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” [LANALANYAN 1960: 46a]. In the Ararat, Agulis, and Larabal versions of this proverb we find *kozni ‘hedgehog’ instead of xoz ‘pig’ [Amatuni 1912: 351a; LANALANYAN 1960: 46b]. This proverb is present in Tavuš with both xoz ‘pig’ and kuzni ‘hedgehog’, see Xemč’yan 2000: 221b and 222b, respectively.

As to the vocalism of the Agulis and Larabal forms, Ačaryan 1899: 84 notes the absence of o- > vae- in Larabal which would imply that the k- is old; otherwise we would have *ka/azni. But this cannot explain the Agulis vocalism. Ačaryan 1935: 70 points out that the expected forms of *kozni or (k-)jozni in Agulis would be *ka/azni or *kezni. In the dialect of Agulis the accented u in monosyllabic and disyllabic words regularly yields ⟨⟨ sometimes u⟩⟩, cf. kupr ‘tar’ > kopr, mut‘ ‘dark’ > muł‘, mukn ‘mouse’ > mokna, mürn ‘pomegranate’ > nuřna, urag ‘adze’ > orag’, urax ‘happy’ > orax, unim ‘to have’ > onim, uri ‘willow’ > ḥr̄i, uteł ‘to eat’ > ọtile, etc. (see Ačaryan 1935: 72, 76-77). This holds also for Larabal (see Dav’yyan 1966: 41-42). Hence, in my opinion, Agulis and Larabal kozni, kuzni reflects *kuzni, which corroborates the association with kuz ‘marten’.

Some dialects display forms with an affricate ⟨j-⟩: Alashkert xčni, Muš øjni [HAB 3: 550a] and Bulanax øjni [S. Movsiseyan 1972: 72b, cf. 52a]; or -nj-: Moks wonjno [Ačaryan 1952: 285; Orbeli 2002: 339], Jula konjni, Loći kunjina, etc. [HAB 3: 550a].

According to Ačaryan (1940: 72, 101), Jula konjni does not directly come from ClArm. ozni but reflects an old dialectal by-form. A similar view is expressed by Jahuukyan 1972: 272 who assumes an IE by-form with a ‘supplementary’ -nj-. 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’ < Larabal stźna, 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. Jahuukyan 1972: 272) and the prothetic k- are certainly recent. The affricate ⟨j⟩- may be explained by the influence of awj = ọj ‘snake’, which is particularly clear from Muš, etc. øjni. For the association of the hedgehog with the snake, see the etymological section.

106 There is yet another variant, with kɔt’is ‘dung-beetle’ (Xemč’yan 2000: 222b).
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. vozankan or vozankan, see A难过 1952: 126; ŞԵրեն’ VanSaz 2, 1899: 100[13]), compare the Greek plant-name ἐχίνος derived from ἐχίνος ‘hedgehog’.


Arm. ʿozi has been derived from *ozini (Hübschmann 1899: 46), with intervocalic *g > Arm. z (see Clackson 1994: 107). One may also assume that the change of *g to -z- is regular in intervocalic position and before a nasal (see Meillet 1896b: 54, with ʿozi as an example of *-jm- > -zm-). For a further discussion on this issue and on the Armenian vocalism, see Considine 1978-79: 357; Greppin 1988-89: 479; Ravnsen 1991: 11, 38; Olsen 1999: 508-509. The prot-form would be *h1og̡ɨni-o-s (Matzinger 2005: 20) or, perhaps better, *h1og̡i-Hn-ɨeh2-, 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. ɨ (q.v.) since these forms point to *-gwh-. (cf. Lubotsky 1988: 29,). 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 ɨjni, etc. in the dialectal section; see also S. Movsisyan 1972: 52a). In a folk-tale recorded by Arak’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 ՕՇԿ-ամՈՒԽ ‘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 (ŞԵրեն’ 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 ըն < *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 xozi 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).
olo'rn, an-stem (obl. -an(c'), NPl -Ian') ‘pea, been; globule’ (Bible+). In Paterica: olern (cf. dial.).

● DIAL. The plant-name has been preserved in several dialects: Muš olo'r, Nor Naxijewan ulti, rural ulti, Xotorjur ulti, Goris hule'ro', Larabal hule'ro', Aram. ušur ‘millet-sized hail; a kind of abscess (palar). Most of the forms are identical with olerin attested in Paterica. Aça'ryan questions whether Juła (rural) horal ‘a kind of plant resembling olo'rn = Pers. holar belongs here too [HAB 3: 551b]. Other forms, if related, have an initial x- or k'-: Dersim (K'li) k'olur ‘a kind of corn resembling oats’ [Brahmany 1964: 175b], Dersim, Balu xolur ‘millet-sized hail; a kind of millet-sized useless grain’ [Sargesian 1932: 426; Brahmany 1964: 140b] (see N. Mkrt'yan 1983: 31-32).

● ETYM. Aça'ryan (HAB 3: 551b) rejects all the etymologies (among them also the comparison with Gr. ὀλυράι f. pl. ‘spelt, etc.’).

Olsen (1999: 139, 778, 808) proposes (with reservation) a connection with olo'r ‘twisting’ and derives them from PIE *k'elh₁-r-n-, as an old heteroclitic from *k'elh₁- ‘to twist, turn’. This view is hard to accept since the assumed development *k'elh₁-r-n- > Arm. *oloC- is uncertain, and olo'r ‘twisting’ is probably of a different origin. Besides, the plant-name has been compared with Semitic forms: Akkad. ḫallūrū, ḫi/ullūrū, Aram. ḫurlā, Arab. ḫullar, ḥaral, Hebr. ḥarül, also Pers. heler [Adonc' 1938: 463 = 1972: 388; N. Mkrt'yan 1983: 31-32; Jahukyan 1987: 459, 470; Greppin 1989a: 79].

If Gr. ὀλυράι 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 sisern ‘pea’ (see s.v.).

In view of related forms in different languages with alternating vocalism as well as with the sequence r...l, it is difficult to assess the nature and exact origin of the forms olerin (Paterica; dialects) and *ořel (Xotorjur, Nor Naxijewan). An influence of sisern, GSG sis(e)ran ‘pea’ (Agat'angelos+); widespread in the dialects should be taken into account, too.

olo'k, a- or o-stem: GDG olo'k-i (Agat'angelos+), GDPI olo'k-ac' in Agat'angelos (as a reading variant, see below), Plato; olo'k-ac' (Philo), API z-olog-s and z-olok'-an-s (both in Yaysmawurk') ‘shin’.

In Agat'angelos § 102 (1909=1980: 61\footnote{1}, transl. Thomson 1976: 119): ḫw et hraman berel kočel p'aytic', ḫw arnel ast olo'k'i (var. olo'k'ac') xoτ'ac' (vars. xoτ'ac', xoτ'oc', xoτ'ac'n, xo'ac', etc.) otic' nora; ḫw dnel eł pndel užgin aɾat'ok' : “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 olo'k'i xoτ'ac' by ModArm. srunk'neri oskorneri “of the bones of the shins”. This would imply that xoτ'ac’ refers to the lower part of the leg in general, whereas olo'k' to a part of it, perhaps ‘shinbone’.

In Bārgirk' hayoc’-: olo'x čur’ [Amalyan 1975: 338\footnote{2}].

● 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; Aça'ryan 1925: 444; 1940: 380]. In the 19th-century dictionaries of K'ajuni and Gabama'c an the word means ‘stalk of a flower’, which can be
compared with the meaning of the dialect of Bulanx, namely ‘stalk of wheat’ (see HAB 3: 552).

Ararat "bol" ‘shinbone’ and Adana (Turkish speaking) "bol" ‘shin’ (see HAB 3: 552ab) have an epenthetic -r-. Particularly interesting is "cok-bol" ‘(anat.) calf’ in the dialect of Ozim (see Ačyan 1913: 522b; HAB 3: 552b). Ačyan (1913: 522b), with some reservation, treats it as a compound with "cak" ‘hole; hollow’ ("*cak-bol"). This is possible; cf. Nor Bayazet "cak-oskor", lit. ‘hollow bone’, described by Ačyan (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: "cag-olok", lit. ‘to be/become voracious’. Nor Bayazet "cak-osko" occurs also in P’iloyeanc’ 1888: 39-39, 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 havan "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 "juk" ‘fish’. According to Ačyan (1952: 277; HAB 3: 160a), the Ozim form of "juk" is "jöuk". 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/ǰ regularly yielded p/t/k/c/. In this case, the Ozim form of the word for ‘fish’ would have been "cöuk". Thus, "cok-bol" ‘(anat.) calf’ can easily be interpreted as a compound of "cöuk" ‘fish’ and "bol" ‘shin’. For the semantics, see 3.7.3.

---

ETYM Compared with OCS "laktъ", Russ. "lókot'", Czech "loket" ‘elbow’, etc.; Lith. alkūné, elkūné ‘elbow’, Latv. ėlks ‘elbow, bend’, ėlkūns ‘elbow, bend’; Gr. ἀλένη ‘elbow’, etc. (see Lidén 1906: 95-97; HAB 3: 552; Pokorny 1959: 308; Saradževa 1986: 131-132; Jahukyan 1987: 122; 165); see also s.vv. "ōn ‘spine, uln ‘neck’, etc. Skt. ṇṣālā- 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. uolekštis, Latv. uoleksts ‘ell’), which requires "HōHl-" or "Hēh3l-". Note that this alternation of "*o-" and "*ō-" is also seen in "olok" ‘shin’ and "uluk" (in Larabał, also "*huluk", 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 "ōn" 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. "HōHl-ōk" (or "Hēh3l-ōk"), acc. "HōHl-ōk-m", gen. "HHl-ōk-s" (cf. the HD paradigm of "*nép-oť ‘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).

**obl,** mostly plural, -o-stem: GDSg **obl-o-y,** GDPI **obl-o-c,** ‘wail, lamentation’ (Bible+), **oblum** ‘to wail, lament’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL** Widespread in the dialects. In Sivri-Hisar, it means ‘to long for’ [HAB 3: 553].


**obl-anam** ‘to wail, lament’ (John Chrysostom), **otol-anim** ‘id.’ (John Chrysostom), **otol-ank** ‘wail, lamentation’ (Ephrem); dial. *ulul-* ‘to lament, cry’.

- **DIAL** Axalc’xa *ululal* ‘to weep, cry, lament (said of women)’; Erznka *ulul-ikanel* ‘to cry, shout’ [HAB 3: 555b]. The appurtenance of dimin. *ul-ik* is uncertain (see Amatuni 1912: 527a; Ačarén 1913: 1134b; HAB 3: 555b; Ž. Xač'atryan 1975: 56b, 56b67). NHB 2: 511a suggests a relation between *ulik* and ClArm. *oko* ‘supplication’.

- **ETYM** Ačarén (HAB 3: 555) interprets the verb *otol-* as reduplication of *ol-* and connects it to Gr. ὀλολύζω ‘to cry out loudly, call, moan’ (said especially of women), ὀλολύγ 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’, ālūka- m. ‘owl’, Lat. *ululăre* ‘to hawl, yell, shriek’, *ulula* f. ‘the tawny owl’, Lith. *ulūlōti* ‘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 Ėjmcar (apud HAB 3: 593a). Jahukyan (1987: 121, 154, 164) separates *ul-* from *ol-,* but this is not compelling; the vocalic vacillation may be due to the onomatopoeic nature of the etymon. The etymology of Arm. *ol-*/*ul-* remains unknown to scholars outside Armenia.


**otolem** ‘to overflow, inundate, flood; to rinse’ (Bible+), **otolancem** ‘id.’ (Bible+), **otolamin** ‘to plunge (into licentious pleasures)’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, etc.), **otolecan** ‘licentious’ (John Chrysostom); **otol** ‘inundation, flood’ (Agat’angelos).


  In Bārgirk ‘hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 254N04f) *otol* and *otolel* are glossed by *helel* ‘flood’ and *orogel* ‘to irrigate’, respectively.

- **DIAL** The verb **otolem** is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 555a].

- **ETYM** Belongs with *hetum* ‘to pour, fill’ and *helel* ‘flood, torrent’ (q.v.).
olorm o-stem: ISg olorm-o-v in Yohvan Mandakuni ‘compassion; supplication’ (Bible+); olormim (Bible+).

- DIAL. The verb is widespread in the dialects (note also the deverbal noun *olormis, which reflects the frozen API form *olormi-s), but the noun is not recorded in HAB 3: 557a. Traces of the latter may be found in Larabal, e.g. in the formula (L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 367f) Astvac uturma toni murtin srutum “May God put the compassion into the heart of the man”.

- ETYM Compared with OHG arm ‘poor, miserable’, etc., as from reduplicated *or-arm- (see Hübbschmann 1899: 48-49; HAB 3: 556-557; Pokorny 1959: 306; Solta 1960: 427f). Jähukyan (1987: 121, 164), however, prefers the connection to *elór ‘trouble’, etc. (from PIE *el-). (One might also consider *el-.) Olsen (1999: 961) mentions as a word of unknown origin.

If, nevertheless, the derivation from *or-arm- is accepted, one notes a remarkable resemblance with the dissimilation which has probably taken place in *(y)olorm from *or(a)-orm-i (q.v.). See also 2.1.24.2 on this kind of dissimilation (salawart, etc.).

olok', o-stem: GDSg olok-'o-y; ISg olok-'o-v (Agat’angélos, P’aastos Buzand) ‘supplication; fawning, flattery’ (Bible+), olok’em ‘to supplicate, flatter, coax’ (Bible+), olok’-an-k', pl. tant. a-stem: GDPl olok’-an-a-c', IPl olok’-an-a-w-k’ ‘supplication; flattery’ (Bible+).


More probably, olok’ derives from PArm. *ot-/al- ‘to supplicate, pray, lament’ (see s.v.v. atač’em ‘to supplicate, beseech, pray’ and olol- ‘to wail, lament’, cf. Pedersen ibid.; Jähukyan 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 kel-ek’-em ‘to tear, rend’ (see s.v.v.).

ohn GDSg oln, in Elias (6th cent.) olan, ISg olamb, NPl olunk’, GDPl olanc’ ‘spine, back(bone); spine with spinal marrow; marrow’; dial. also ‘hill-side, etc.’ (Bible+). Mxit’ar Herac’i (12th cent.) has ol-o-šar ‘spinal column’, which is considered dialectal by Ačaryan (HAB 3: 554a).

If the placenames Ol-akan and Olin (q.v.) belong here, the meaning ‘hill-side, etc.’, although attested only in the dialects, must be considered very old.

- DIAL Muš, Alaškert ə (GSG əlan or əñ) ‘back; slope of a mountain’ (cf. Muš, Sasun vor əlan ‘on back’); Xotorjor vel əl ‘slope of a mountain’; Hamšen (yjẽy, yox (GSG ãłan < əlan, NPl ãłunk) ‘long hillock’ (according to KiwlHamš 1899: 560a, eðən ‘high summit of a hill’), etc. [HAB 3: 554b; Ačaryan 1947: 12, 24, 248]; Melri ətən ‘the upper part of a hill’ [Alayan 1954: 45, 282b]. The an-stem seen in GDSg olan in Elias corresponds to data from Muš, Sasun, and Hamšen. Muš, Bulanx, Aparan əlm-(k-)iš ‘to lie, lean on one’s arm’. Ačaryan (HAB 3: 554b) compares this *ol-m- to end-ohn-eal (John Chrysostom), although in the lexicological section he points out that nedo(meal) should be read as endo(meal).
One wonders if the forms *ołmil and *andołmil reflect a contamination with the
synonymous kolmanim and on-kolman-im (with the root kolm ‘side’).

In sayings from the village of Xult’ik (Baleš), AblSg yim yolen ‘from my back’
is used referring to a mule and a donkey (see Tarónean 1961: 183).

According to Hananyan (1995: 195ab), Svedia (Xtrbek) has kəl for ulet, and
təβləg for oln. Formally, təβləg, too, seems to derive from ulet. The form is
mentioned s.v. oln because təβləg, 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/Yoł
mentioned s.v. oln). In page 250, Andreasyan (1967) mentions only one kəl (həl), meaning ‘marrow in bones and skull’, vs. beyn
‘mind, brains’ (< Turkish < Arab. beyn [Ačārean 1902: 290]). In his description of
the dialect of Svedia, Ačārean (2003: 373, 583) represents (a)jəeł, həl ‘marrow’ s.v.
ulet, in the same opposition with ben < Arab. beyn ‘brain’.

Akn ošəar ‘spinal column’ reflects MidArm. ol-o-šar ‘spinal column’ (see
above). Note also ošəar found in Turkish-Armenian dictionary (ca. 1720 AD) by
Elia Mušelyan Karnec’i (Karín/Xotorjur) [Č’ugaszyan 1986: 4193, 175].

The curious compound Bulanx šarəl ‘spinal column’ (see S. Movsisyan 1972:
71a) must represent the opposite order of the components: *šar-ol(n).

ETYM Despite the semantic difference, derived from the PIE word for the elbow:
Gr. οὐσάνα f. ‘elbow, underarm’; Lat. ulna f. ‘elbow’; OIr. ulen ‘angle’ < *ol-en-;
uločis ‘ell’, etc., as well as Arm. uln (GDSg ulan, NPl ulunk’, GDPi ulanc’) ‘neck’
(Bible+; dialect of Jula), utan ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’
(Bible+; dialect of Larabał, with an initial h-), and ił(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 Jula, the actual meaning of ulan ‘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 šil(n)-i ‘neck’, if indeed
related with *šil- ‘crooked, twisting/bending’; see also s.v. šel and 3.7.2.

Important is also Muš pəɾeķi hulunk ‘spinal column’ which actually means
‘vertebrae of back’ and can be considered an important intermediary between oln
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’ol(h)+)-so- > PArm. *ol-),
assuming a contamination “with the almost homonymous word for ‘elbow’”. This
seems unnecessary. Besides, the development *k’a- > Arm. o- is uncertain.

The ablaut *ol- vs. *ől- seen in IE forms (see especially Schrijver 1991: 78-79) is
reflected in Armenian oln < *Həhəl-en- or *HHot-en- vs. uln < *Hehəl-en- or
*HoHl-en-. See also olok’ and uhuk. The connection with il(ik) ‘spindle’ can be accepted only if the internal laryngeal of the PIE root is a *-h₁- (*Heh₁,l > Arm. ll), 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 ul-et ‘brain; marrow’ (q.v.). See also aleln ‘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’.


olj, o-stem: GDPI olj-o-c’ (Bible+); GDSg olj-i (Paterica) ‘whole, integral, complete, solid; sound, healthy, unhurt’ (Bible+); ai̯-olj ‘sound, healthy, unhurt’ (q.v.).

DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 558b].


For the semantic relationship ‘whole, integral, complete, solid’ vs. ‘sound, healthy’, see Toporov 1979a: 218-220. See also s.v. amb-olj ‘whole, intact’.

oč ‘not’ (Bible+).

DIAL Preserved in Zeyt’un, Muş, Hamşen, T’iflis, Ararat, Łarabal, Agulis, etc. Note also Muş mač only in a proverb (cf. on-e ‘how’ > dial. *monc’). More widespread is č-č [HAB 3: 562a].

ETYM Since NHB (2: 516a), linked with Gr. oik, oikí, oījī ‘not’ <*hoi-kʷi(d). See also Meillet 1936: 143; Cowgill 1960; Jāhukyan 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-č as an inner-Armenian creation: pronoun o-(as in o-k’ and o-mn ‘someone’) + simple negative č- < *kwi(d, originally used in conjunction with *ne which later fell out of use; cf. the fossilised phrase č-ik’ ‘(there is) nothing’. A全校 (HAB 3: 561b < Meillet) connects the first component o- of oč ‘not’ with Skt. ātī ‘beyond, over’, etc.

The inner-Armenian interpretation is most probable. That č- functioned as a negative also without the o- is seen not only in č-ik’ but also in čč ‘not’ which is dialectally ubiquitous.

or, i-stem in Geoponica, ‘rump’ (Paterica, Geoponica, etc. HAB 3: 564a; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 231-232).

DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. In the village of Hasknǐaws of Moks, yeř, which, as is pointed out by A全校, is reminiscent of PIE e-grade, cf. the Celtic form below [HAB 3: 564b]. Svedia voii ‘vulva (/bunoc/)’ [A全校 2003: 436, 583].

For Lat. dorsum, see s.v. *toṙ ‘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. Jāhukyan 1959: 237-238).

DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects:

with anlaut diphthongization: dialects with penultimate accentuation (Larabal vaške, Goris vēsk, Ararat, Šamaxi vɔski, etc.) and Van-Salmast group (Van, Jula, Salmast vɔski, etc.);

without diphthongization: Nor Naxijewan, T‘ilis, Hamšen, Karin, Muš, Tigranakert ɔski, Hačen, Polis, Sebastia ɔsgi;


Agulis ɔski (see Ačarėan 1935: 63) seems to show that the change ClArm. o- > Agulis ɔ- in disyllabic words antedates the diphthongization.

ETYM Ačarėyan (HAB 3: 565-566) rejects all the etymological attempts, including those comparing Arm. ɔski with Sumer. guškin ‘gold’ (Patkanean 1880: 97; Bugge 1892: 444; Jensen 1898: 108; Vycichl 1965)\(^\text{107}\), Finn. vaski ‘copper’, etc., as well as that of Patrubány (1908: 278a) who links ɔski with Lat. aurum, etc., deriving the Armenian form from *aus-g-iyos, a derivative of PIE *aues- ‘to light, shine’ (read *h₂eus- ‘to shine’, cf. Lat. aurōra, etc. [Pokorney 1959: 87; Mallory/Adams 1997: 148], see s.v. avg ‘morning’), and considers Finn. vaski ‘copper’ and Hung. vas ‘iron’ as loans from PArm. *yoski. Ačarėyan (ibid.) leaves the origin of Arm. ɔski 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. Jāhukyan (1987: 296, 452) treats ɔski as borrowed from Finno-Ugric languages and mentions the Sumerian form.

The IE forms of this word for ‘gold’ are Latin aurum, Lith. aukas, Old Lithuanian ausas, and Old Prussian ausis, from IE *h₁eui-s- (Schrijver 1991: 47), and Toch. A wās m., B yasa n. ‘gold’ < PToch. *wāsā f., from IE *h₁u-eu-s-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 *vas/ske ‘copper, bronze’ and Sumer. guškin ‘gold’. For a discussion and references, see Aalto 1959; Pokorney 1959: 87; Lane 1970: 76, 81; Toporov, PrJaz [a-d] 1975: 168-

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. *awsk-i(yo)- or *awsk-i(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 *HyV'-yields Arm. əv'-, 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 *h₂ustu̯- ‘leuchtungsfähig’, cf. Skt. kr̥tvya- (trisyllabic) ‘leistungsfähig, arbeitsvoll’. The development *-stu̯- > 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 Hitt. ḥapal-ti-, Akkad./Hurr. ḥabal-ginnu ‘iron’, Georg. ḵkina ‘iron’, etc. The nature of -k- in Lith. āuksas ‘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 Elišė) NPl osker-k', GDPi osker-a-c', IPl osker-a-w-k' (Bible+) ‘bone’ (Bible+).

● DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 567-568].


Arm. oskr points to *Host-u̯er- (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 /-u/- 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’ (óst, q.v.). He (op. cit. 198) explains Arm. oskr ‘bone’ through the following development: *ostur > *ostkar > *oskar > *oskr > oskr. For a discussion, see also Polomé 1980: 26; van Windekens 1990-91. Viredaz (2003: 73, 73₃) derives oskr from *ost-wr and notes: ‘*-wr probably added on the model of *ghr̥wṛ ‘horn’ (eljewr) because *ost was too short a word (or was about to be reduced to *os). Hitt. ḥaštrer ‘weed, waste’ is unrelated’.

ost, o-stem: GDPi 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 *vɔst- and *ɔst-, and Sebastia has *xor- [HAB 3: 569a]. For the obscure k- in Ararat cf. *kost ‘a twig on which bird-lime is smeared to entangle birds’ (HAB 2: 639a; for an explanation, see Alayan 1974: 87-88).


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. *ot-in, loc. *ot-an, abl. *ot-in, instr. *otam-b; plur. *ot-k'; i-stem: acc. *ot-s, gen.-dat. *ot-i-c', abl. *ot-i-c', instr. *ot-i-w-k' (Bible+; rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1177-1179); MidArm *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 GDPl *ot-i-c' in Agat’ange ɫos §§ 102, 103, 221 (1999=180; 61L17, 62L1, 62L8, 116L15) next to singular *otn, e.g. zmioy *otan-ē (41L16f). In Sebėos Chapter 20 (Xač’atryan/Eliazaryan 2005: 104L1f; transl. Thomson 1999: 39-40), one finds GDSg *ot-i-n and ISg *otam-b on the one hand, and API *ot-s and IPl *ot-i-w-k' on the other. The plural forms thus lack the nasal; further, see the Concordance of Sebėos (G. Xač’atryan 2004: 357-358).


In compounds *ot sometimes displays o-stem forms, cf. star-ot ‘foot (of a mountain)’: ISg storo-t-o-v, several times in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 1376a), IPl storo-t-o-v(-k') in Movsės Xorenac'i 1.12: 1913=1991: 38L18 (aɾ storotovk' leranc'n), 2.49: 176L11; cf. aɾ otamb lerinn (1.12: 41L17) and i lerinoj mium (1.10: 33L9). Paterica has i kolm 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 at’k', pl. advi, advanc’r. The final nasal of *otn is present in Agulis, Larabal, etc. [HAB 3: 574a].

The ColArm. GDPl *ot-i-c' has been preserved in Malkara [Rōdost'o], in a frozen substantive meaning ‘shoes’ (see Ačarėan 1913: 857b). Instead of this form (cf. Van GDPl ač'ic' < ač'ec', see s.v. ač’-k'), Van represents MidArm. *ot-a-c'; which is probably analogical after cerac' < ColArm. jeř-a-c' vs. jeř'n 'hand' (see Ačarėan 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 C’arsanc’ag *otac’-šor ‘pants’ and *otac’-aman ‘shoes’ (see Ačarėan 1913: 856-857).

The PIE word is reconstructed as a root noun of static inflexion: nom. *pād(s) ‘foot’ vs. acc., etc. *ped-: Gr. ποδός, ποδες, Lat. pēs, 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-m, 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; Ravnaes 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 GDAblPl *pod-isk̩o- > otic’ (Olsen 1999: 175) is not convincing. I tentatively posit PArm. dual *ot-i- < QIE *pod-īhi, where the *-ihi1 was taken from neuter duals denoting body-part terms such as ač-k’ ‘eye’ < PIE *h3(o)kw-ih1 n. ‘both eyes’: Gr. ὀσσε, OCS oči, etc. Thus, singulative ot-n vs. pl.tant. ot-k’, -i goes parallel with ak-n ‘eye’ vs. ač-k’ (see s.v.v.). It is tempting to compare Arm. dial. dual ‘ot-u-i with Skt. dual pādau.

Further, see s.vv. het ‘foot, footstep, footprint, track’ (< neuter *pedo-, see above). For heti ‘on foot’ cf. Lat. pedes, -itis m. ‘pedestrian, foot-soldier’, OCS pěšь ‘pedestrian, on foot’, etc.; for het ‘after’ and y-et ‘after’, cf. Gr. ποδά ‘after, with, amid’, etc.

orb, o-stem ‘orphan’ (Bible+).


ETYM From PIE *Horbh-o-: Lat. orbus ‘orphaned, parentless; childless; bereaved; deprived or destitute (of anything)’, orbó ‘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.); Viercek/Goldhammer 2003: 406. According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 575b), Georg. ob-ol’ ‘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. arba- ‘small, young’, arbhaka- adj. ‘small, weak, young, being the age of a child’ (RV+); OCS raba m. ‘servant, slave’, Czech m. rob ‘slave’; Hitt. harp- ‘sich absondern’, ḫarpu-‘gesondert’ (on which see Weitenberg 1984: 100-101; Olsen 1999: 184), etc.; as well as Arm. arbaneak, a-stem ‘servant’ (Bible+), q.v. [HAB 1: 299-300; 3: 575;
ordi


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: 310-316, 868), Iranian origin should be viewed as possible. However, the Iranian forms are not attested (apart from the personal names *arbakka-, *arba-miša-, etc., EtimSlovIranJaz 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, EtimSlovIranJaz 1, 2000: 215) and ‘servant’. In this case, Lat. orbō would be denominative.


● 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’eɫanc’ = Gr. νεβρῴ ἐλάφων. That ort’ also refers to the young of ὑν(ικ) ‘hind’ is corroborated by later attestations too, see, e.g., Mnac’akanyan 1977: 12, 14, 18. Cf. also ὑν-ort’ in Evagrius, etc. In the Alexander Romance: y-ehn-ort’-unc’ [H. Simonyan 1989: 172 ²].

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects (mainly with dimin. -ik or -uk) with initial: (1) v-: Moks, Van, Salmast, Larabal, Marafa; (2) h-: Aslanbek, Hamišen, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Ardvin, Karin, Xarberd, Muş, Alaškert, Svedia; (3) f-: Suč’ava, Nor Naxijewan, Sebastia, Ararat [HAB 3: 579a].

Agulis ārī ūk reflects *ort’uk, cf. other ‘feet’ > ātnar, oski ‘gold’ > āski [Ačařean 1935: 63].

Kak’avaberd has ks’ur’t in three villages and vær’t only in Agarak [H. Muradyan 1967: 181b]. Karčewan has vær’t [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’, πόρταξ f. ‘calf’, Skt. prthu-ka- m. ‘boy, the young of any animal’, etc., see de Lagarde 1854: 27 L730f, Hübschmann
ori, wo- or ea-stem: GSg. orwoy in Hexaemeron 8 (according to NHB 2: 531a, also GDPl ore-a-c’, but without ref.) ‘raven’ (Bibe+).
A few attestations in Hexaemeron: NSg ori, GDSg (z-)orw-o-y, NPl ori-k’ (K. Muradyan 1984: 27311, 28010, 26811, 26810 respectively). Also here ori renders Gr. κόραξ “raven” (K. Muradyan 1984: 359a).
●ETYM AČarjan (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, Olc. orn ‘eagle’, Olr. irar ‘eagle’, Lith. erėlis ‘eagle’, OCS orvē ‘eagle’,

One may reconstruct an original root noun of static inflexion (cf. PIE nom. *pōd(s) ‘foot’ vs. acc., etc. *ped-: Gr. ποίς, ποδίς, Lat. pēd, pedis, Arm. het vs. ot-, etc.; PIE nom. *tuk-‘s ‘voice’ vs. *uok-‘: Lat. vōx vs. Gr. acc. ὁνα, dat. -ί, see Beekes 1995: 189, cf. Schrijver 1991: 121, 135): nom. *h3ōr-s, obl. *hēr-. 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. *hēr-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 A čaṙyan (HAB 3: 581a; cf. V. Arak’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. Areš hūlör, Šamaxi həlör, Goris ulör, 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: GDPI orj-i-c’ (Geoponica, 13th cent.) ‘male’ said of people and animals (Bible+), ‘very hard, rugged, fruitless’ (Step’anos Orbelan, etc., cf. also orj-a-k’ar below); mi-orj-i ‘having one testicle’ (rendering Gr. μονορχίς in Leviticus 21.20); 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]; orj-i-k’ ‘testicles’ in Ašxarhac’oyc’ (Soukry 1881: 44L-6); MidArm. orj-i-k’ ‘uncastrated men’ in Mxit’ar Goš, ‘uncastrated animals’ in Geoponica [NHB 2: 532b; HAB 3: 582b; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 236b]; xol-orj(n) ‘orchis’ (q.v.); dial. *am-orj-i-k’ ‘testicles’ (q.v.).


DIAL. The adjective orj ‘male’ is dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 3: 583a]. In Larabal 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 Larabal vorc’atu ‘a fruit tree that has become fruitless’ (Dav’tyan 1966: 448; cf. A čaṙean 1913: 864a), and Melri orj’utu ‘fruitless, sterile’ (Alayan 1954: 283a). Moks vorc’ means ‘озорник, mischievous person’ [Orbeli 2002: 340].

Ararat, Sirak, Muš, Van *orj ‘a two-year-old male sheep’ [Amatuni 1912: 534a] may be compared with ClArm. y-orj ‘ram’ (see below and s.v.).

Zey’t’un *orj is the name of a star = Turk. evk’ik’ [A čaṙean 1913: 863-864]. On literary testimony for orj ‘male’ and ēg ‘female’ stars, see NHB 2: 532b.
In a version of the epic Sasna črer (SasC 2/2, 1951: 657), a thin but very strong brook that penetrates throughout the river Murad-Aracani is characterized as vörč ’jor ‘male water’.


Slavic *kъnorţ ‘boar’ has been interpreted as composed of *kъrn(o)- ‘maimed, mutilated’ (secondarily associated with *krH- ‘to cut’, see Derksen 1996: 226-227) + independently unattested *orţ ‘testicle’, thus ‘with amputated testicles’ (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 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’, Bankowski 1989 is sceptical about the first component of the compound. Compare, however, Georg. werj- ‘ram’, dial. ‘a sexually immature or a castrated ram’ (see below).


Alb. herdhë f. ‘testicle’ reflects *e-grade (Hirt 1899: 58) and is now mostly derived from *h₄orgʰ- (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 *h₄orgʰ-i- (Beekes 1988: 77) or, more probably, *h₄orgʰ-i-, as Gr. ὀρχίς, OIr. uirgge, etc. (see Rix 1970: 93-94; Kortlandt 1983: 12; 1986: 40, 44 = 2003: 42, 70, 73; Greppin

108 The connection with Gr. ὀρχίς has been suggested already in NHB 2: 532b.
...
orm, o-stem: GDSg orm-o-y, ISg orm-o-v; GDPl orm-o-v-k (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1205); *orm (1 Kings 18.11), NPl ornum-k ‘wall’ (Sirach 23.26), API ornum-s (Paterica) ‘wall’; *orm dial. ‘fence’.

Derivatives: orm-ac ‘fence’ in P’awstos Buzand 4.15 (1883=1984: 102L-16; transl. Garsóian 1989: 143): mot yormacs argelöc‘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’, Īula vorm, Xotorjür vorm, Agulis úrm [HAB 3: 583b], Mehri ērm [Alayan 1954: 45, 96, 283a], Kārčwān haērm [Aug 1960: 37, 66, 202b], Kak’avaberd hurms, ērm [Muradyan 1967: 50, 98, 182a]. Note that the last three dialects show an initial h-. The Kārčwān, Kak’avaberd, and Agulis forms point to *(h)ormn.

See also s.v. *aṙormi (dialect.) ‘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; J̣ahukyan 1987: 113, 233-234; Olsen 1999: 27, 765f). Olsen (ibid.) posits *h-ork-(s)mo- with a question-mark. This etymology is uncertain.

Jahukyan (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. ώρμ/ώρμα ‘hole-pit; cellar’ (on which see Cheung 2002: 241).

Jahukyan (1990a: 3-4) alternatively derives Arm. orm from QIE *sork-mo-, cf. Gr. ὅρμος, ὅρκαν ‘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’ærpréyênente apud HAB s.v.) who links Arm. orm, o-stem ‘wall, fence’ with OCS xram ‘temple’ and Gr. ὅρμος m. ‘chain, necklace, lace’ (cf. also ὅρμαδὸς 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. εἰρω ‘to knit together’, Lat. serō ‘to line up, join, link’, Ofr. sermaid ‘arranges’, sreth (⟨ *xṛtā-⟩ ‘row’, etc. (see s.v. ye ḫum ‘to line up’).

Hübschmann (1897: 483) rejects this etymology pointing out the problem of the Slavic initial x- and not mentioning Gr. ὅρμος m. ‘chain, necklace, lace’. Aćaría (HAB 3: 583b) likewise rejects the etymology and leaves the origin of Arm orm open. Presenting the etymology of Bugge, Aćaría confused this Gr. ὅρμος ‘chain,
necklace’ with the homonymous ὅρμος ‘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’ goes back to IE *sor-mō- (cf. Gr. ὅρμος m. ‘chain, necklace, lace’). For the semantic relationship cf. ModArm. and dial. Nor Bayazet patašar ‘waller’ (Malxaseanc’ HBB 4: 58a; Açărean 1913: 899b) from pat šarel ‘to line up a wall’, pat ‘wall’, in Larabał: ‘coil, skein, row’ [ Açărean 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. ὅρμος there also was pl. *her-mun-k’ < *hermn < QIE *ser-mn, cf. Gr. ἕρματα pl. ‘earhangers; sling’ from *ser-mn̥-t-h2. Subsequently, *her-mn (pl. -mun-k’) was analogically replaced by ormn (pl. ormun-k’) and dial. *hormn.

oročam, oročě/im ‘to chew, ruminate’ (Bible+).

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects mostly as *oročal. Some peripheral dialects have initial a-: Ararat, T’iflis ārće, Agulis, Larabał ārúc [HAB 1: 584-585].

●ETYM Patrubány (1908: 26a) connected with Skt. ṛādati ‘to gnaw, bite, dig, scratch’, Lat. rōdere ‘to gnaw’, rádere ‘to scratch, shave, smooth’, etc. The Armenian form has been explained by *rod-je-, see HAB 3: 584b (with some reservation); Jāhukyan 1982: 62; 1987: 145, 188; Kortlandt 1994: 27 = 2003: 104. Olsen (1999: 764) considers the connection to be phonetically impossible ‘as *-dj- regularly yields -c-’.. However, I subscribe to the view of Jāhukyan and Kortlandt who consider *-dj- > Arm. -c- to be the regular development (see 2.1.22.1).


On the whole, the derivation *Hreḥ₁d-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 *oročařoč instead of *aruč is due to lowering influence of *a- onto *u-. On the initial a- in *aroč, see s.v. aroğ(-) 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 ṛātsi 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 QIEsgn. 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 ka- and um-classes. Polis has orđum, orđum 'noise, fight' [HAB 3: 587b; Ačačyan 1941: 237]. Further, note Svedia girdil, Larabal and Goris orstå, and Agulis orstå [HAB 3: 587b; Ačačyan 2003: 583]. According to Ačačyan (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'ordadil 'to thunder', which Ačačyan (2003: 304; HAB 1: 581a) derives from goram.

For textual passages, see in a fairy-tale from Larabal (HŽHek' 5, 1966: 370L1, 372L-4):

ergyink'yərotac' “the sky thundered”.

On Agulis, see below.

ETYM Lidén (1906: 88-91) links with Slav. *Perun 'Thunder-god', Ukr., Czech perun 'thunder', Lith. Perkūnas 'Thunder-god', peršti 'to beat', YAv. parat- f. 'battle, strife, fight', 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 ‘blitzen’, 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; Jahukyan (1987: 144, 258, with reservation). For a further extensive discussion, see de Lamberterie 2006: 223-231.

orj, i-stem: GDPl orj-i-c’ (in Vlak’ arewelie’), AblPl orj-i-c’ (Gregory of Nyssa, Yovhannēs Ūjnci’); o-stem (NHB 2: 537c without evidence) ‘den, lair’ (Bible+); denominative verbs orjānem ‘to live in a hole, hibernate, hide oneself as if in a lair’ (Movses Xorenaci’i, Philo, Gregory Nazianzenus, etc.), orjem ‘id.’ (Paterica), orjim ‘id.’ (Mxit’ar Gōš).


In Movses Xorenaci’i 2.77(1913=1991: 216 L1f; transl. Thomson 1978: 224): orjac’eal yamurn Ani, ibr i kalati handartut’ean ɫōɫ ěal “He had ensconced himself in the fortress of Ani, as if hidden in a tranquil lair”.

ETYM Ačačyan (HAB 3: 587-588) rejects the comparison (Dervischjan 1877: 84) with Gr. ἔρηξ, ἔρηξ ‘lair of wild beasts’, ἱέξ m. ‘ambush, childbed’, Germ. Lager, OCS lože ‘bed, den’ from *log(i)-o-, ṢCr. 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- ‘to lie’ (Mallory/Adams 1997: 352a). A QIE *leg- ‘to (cf. OCS lože ‘bed, den’) or fem. *leg-ì(e)i₇ (cf. Gr. ἔρηξ ‘lair’) would yield Arm. *e/o-õj-. One might assume a back loan from a substratum language with *-l/-r- vacillation and speculate on a HD i-stem: nom. *rōg-òi, gen. *rg-ì-i-ós > PArm. *rowg-u, gen. *orj- >> *or(u)- (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. πέρποτο ‘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-ih2- > PArm. or-i-., obl. *orj-a- > *orj-i-. The etymology may be considered at least as possible.

ors, o-stem: GDSg ors-o-y (Bible, Lazar P’arpec’i, etc.); later also i-stem: GDPi ors-i-c’ (Aristotle) ‘hunt, catch; hunted animal, game’ (Bible+), orsam ‘to hunt’ (Bible+).

- DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Muš, Hamšen, Agulis, Larabal, etc. T’iflis has hurs and vurs, Ararat – fors < *hurs. The verb: Svedia irsíl ‘to hunt’ [HAB 3: 588b]. Note also Šamšadin, Krasnosnorsk va’rs vs. Ijewan, Dilijan fo’rs, fös [Mežunc’ 1989: 196a]. For Šamšadin, Xemé’yán (2000: 301b) records furs 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 Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 588a) and Jáhukyan (1987: 144, 187) accept it with reservation. Clackson (1994: 164) criticizes the etymology and advocates the suggestion of Ačaṙyan, who connected ors with Lat. porcus ‘pig’, etc. (see HAB 3: 588, with criticism of Meillet). The semantic development would have been ‘(young pig)’ > ‘animal for hunting’, or ‘game’ (preserved only in Armenian) > ‘(young) pig’ (see Clackson, ibid.).

I propose an alternative etymology which seems semantically more attractive. Arm. ors (o-stem) may be connected with the Greek and Celtic words for ‘roe’: Gr. δορκάς, -άδος f. (Herodotus 7.69), ζορκάς (Herodotus 4.192), δόρξ, δόρκος, ζόρξ, ἱορκος, 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 ‘roe deer, Capreolus capreolus’ and on the archaeological evidence for its denotatum, see Mallory 1982: 212, 216-217.

If one assumes a QIE *jor-k-o- (with a palatalized *-k-), 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 naxcîr, Fart. nxcyr ‘game, quarry, chase’ [MacKenzie 1971: 58] > Arm. naxcîr ‘slaughter (in hunt of war)’ (P’awstos Bazand, Elišê, etc.) [HAB 3: 422a] : Pers. naxcîr ‘hunting, the game; prey, chase, a wild beast; a mountain-goat’ [Steingass 1391b]. Wakhi naxcîr, naxsîr ‘fox’ borrowed from Tajik naxcîr ‘wild animal’ (for these and other Iranian forms, see especially Edelman 2003: 122, 123).
*č’asum probably ‘blind mole-rat’.

DIAL I find the word only in the dialect of Svedia: č’ässum. According to Andreasyan (1967: 161-162), it reflects Armenian (otherwise unknown) *č’asum and denotes a mouse-like animal bigger than the mouse but smaller than the rat, which, unlike the rat, has a short tail, burrows like the mole, gathering the dug-out earth here and there in earth-heaps, and feeds on vegetables and crops. Very often it is used to reprove children caressingly, as well as in a curse. Further, Andreasyan points out that few people saw or can specify *č’asum, so this animal is considered mostly as mysterious.

I think, this animal fits in well with the description of the kind of mouse called kuramuk (see Ananyan, 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’ërämuk, in Barjirk’ hayoc’ as synonymous to zšiwš and xårud ‘mole’ [Amalyan 1975: 103\textsuperscript{N153}, 368\textsuperscript{N153}], *koivr-muk ‘mole’, lit. ‘blind mouse’ (Sebastia), cf. Kurd. maškikor [Ačarèan 1913: 591b]. For the semantic relationship between ‘mouse and the like’ and ‘mole’ cf. also ambewt, wich in Xotorjur means both ‘mole’ and ‘field-mouse’.

I conclude, that *č’asum probably means ‘blind mole-rat’.

ETYM Stating that this animal is in fact unknown and mysterious to many people, Andreasyan (1967: 161-162) suggests a connection to Arm. ġasm, a hapax used in Anania Narekac’i (10\textsuperscript{th} 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, Hay KendAšx 1, 1961: 163-171. In some respects, however, such as the size (both are smaller than the rat; pertaining to the weasel, see Ananyan, op. cit. 164), there is a certain resemblance. If *č’asum refers indeed to the ‘blind mole-rat’, one might add more resembling characteristics such as being fierce and having a (more or less) valuable fur. For the semantic relationship between ‘mouse; rat’ and ‘weasel’ cf. ak’is ‘weasel’, dial. also ‘rat’, also mkn-ak’is, the exact match (perhaps a calque) for μυγαλῆ ‘field mouse’; see s.v. ak’is.

Bearing in mind what has just been said, I propose to relate *č’asum to *Hkek-‘weasel’ (late IE and/or of substratum origin), from which, I think, Arm. ak’is and Olnd. kaščā-, kāša- originated. Pahl. kākum ‘white weasel’ (cf. also Arm. kngum and k’ak’um) may be derived from the same etymon via a centum intermediary. For more detail, see s.v. ak’is. The regular Iranian satəm outcome of this *(H)kekVm would be *časum, which amazingly coincides with Arm. *č’asum. Even if no trace of such a satəm form is found in Iranian languages, Arm. (< Iran.) *č’asum would prove the existence of the Iranian form and may testify the reconstruction of *Hkek-
based on the Armeno-Indo-Iranian material, as well as on the indirect centum evidence. (Cf. Arm. vaz- vs. va(r)g- ‘to run’).

One wonders why the velar is palatalized in Iranian, whereas in Armenian and Indo-Aryan it is not. The answer might be that in Armenian and Indo-Aryan, the palatalization 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: AbShg i č’or-o-y (Aristotle), GDPl č’or-o-c’ (Philo); i-stem: GDPl 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. ξερόν n. ‘terra firma’, ξηρός ‘dry; withered, lean; fasting’, Skt. kṣāra- ‘caustic, biting, corrosive, acrid, saline’, etc. (see Hübschmann 1897: 485; Pedersen 1906: 429 = 1982: 207; Grammont 1918: 215; HAB 4: 629, 630; Kortlandt 1995: 15 = 2003: 108).

Hübschmann (with a question mark) and Ačaryan (ibid.) posit *ksēro- and *ksoro-. The etymology has been doubted because one traditionally expects Arm. č’ from PIE *ks or *sk (see Olsen 1999: 965, 965a). Clackson (1994: 182), too, considers the etymology to be doubtful. In order to solve the problem, J. J.ähukyan (1987: 133, also with a question mark) posits *ksie- and *ksiero-, which is not corroborated by any cognate form. Mayrhofer (EWAia 1, 1992: 430) considers the connection of the Sanskrit with the Greek to be ‘unglaubhaft’. 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+), IPl č’or-i-w-k’ (Eusebius of Caesarea) ‘four’ (Bible+); frozen acc. č’ors ‘four’ (Cyriel of Jerusalem, etc.); č’or-ir ‘fourth’ (Ezekiel 5.12, etc.), č’or-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’a- ‘four’ and k’a- a-w (q.v.).

● dial Ubiquitous in the dialects, mostly as a frozen acc. č’ors. The form č’ork’ is reflected in Antiok’ č’ok’, Jula č’ok’, Larabal č’ork’, Agulis Meč’urk’ [HAB 3: 632a].

● ETYM From PIE *k’etoures ‘four’: Skt. NPl. m. catvāras (-ā- due to Brugmann’s Law), API catāuras, NAPI n. catvārī, NAPI f. cāturas < *k’etesres, YAV. cattfărō, ManSogd. čīf’r, Buddh. čīf’r, MPers. čahār, Toch. A śōvar and B śōver < PToch. *ś(ā)vər, Gr. τίσκος, Dor. NWGr. τίσκος, Lat. quattuor; Ofr. celt(a)ir, Goth. fidwor, Lith. keturi, OCS če’tre; note also Arm. k’a- (q.v.). See Klaproth 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.
č'u


PArm. zero-grade form *k'etu- > *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-amay ‘quadrennial’ (attested in Eusebius of Caesarea) = *k'r-tu- + *sph- (> Arm. am vs. Skt. sámà-). Others posit a ‘long sonant’ *-f- (for references and a discussion, see Clackson 1994: 37-38, 41, 47). None of these explanations is satisfactory. Jāhukyan 1982: 42 does not offer a clear explanation. One might consider an influence of fem. *k'teseres.

č'u, o-stem: LocSg i č'u-i in Łazar P'arpec'i (5th cent.). GDPl č'u-o-e' in Grigoris Aršaruni, 7-8th cent. [NHB 2: 580b], Grigor Narekaci 25.2 [Xaē'atryan/Lazizyan 1985: 340-345], IPl č'u-o-v-k' (var. č'wovk') in Hexaemeron 8 [K. Muradyan 1984: 260(14)] ‘setting out, departure; campaign, expedition; military camp; journey’ (Bible+), ‘transmigration of birds’ (Hexaemeron, see above, also 278L16); č'uem, 3sg.aor. č'ueac’, 3pl.aor. č'ueac’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'ogol, etc.

According to Aça'yan (HAB 3: 632a; see also Jāhukyan 1959: 321), č'u is an a-stem (later: o-stem). He obviously took into account IPl č'uök’ (= č'uaok’) in Hexaemeron and LocSg i č'u-i in Łazar P'arpec'i (see NHB 2: 580b). However, the critical edition of Hexaemeron 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’, cyautnā- ‘undertaking, action, act, work’, hásta-cyauti- f. ‘quick movement of the hand’, OAv. šauuitė ‘to move’, YAv. fra-šāiti- f. ‘approach’, OPers. šiyav- ‘to set forth, go, march’ (see Kent 1953: 211a; Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 143), Gr. σταμα ‘to be in violent motion; to walk, rush (to)’. Arm. č'uem, č'og- and č'u are usually derived from *kju-, *kju- and *kju-ı-ı-, respectively [Huśschmann 1883: 48; 1897: 485-486; HAB 3: 632b; Pokorny 1959: 538-539; Schmitt 1981: 63, 70; Jāhukyan 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: 328s, 788.

Arm. č'u is usually derived from *kju-ı-ı- (apart from the references above, see also Jāhukyan 1982: 58, 215s; Beekes 2003: 206). In view of o-stem, however, one
should posit *kju-to- (see also Olsen 1999: 41 and 41a2, 783, 849, with literature and a discussion). Even an OArm. *č’u- must have been reflected in writing as č’u.

A QIE thematic *kjeu-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 *kjeu-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’ulikosac’ Alt’amaray’; GDSg pali(-n) [HAB 4: 4a]; *pal* ‘stone, rock’ (confused with pal ‘ice, cold’ in NHB 2: 589b, correctly in HAB 4: 13), only in a compound with anjaw ‘cave’ as the second member: pal-anjaw ‘stone-cave’, attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.45 (1913= 1991: 314.11ff; Thomson 1978: 307): ēw aṙaĵi drac’ ayin sep ēr utford miapakal. ēw i verust palanjaw k’awor, or hayi yandunds xorajoryn: “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”;


I conclude that the basic meaning of dial. pal is ‘rock’, which is corroborated by the literary attestations of pal and *pal. 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, vêm ‘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. Alashkert žer pal in SasC 2000: 156.2.

**DIAL** Muš, Bulanax, Arčeš, Aparan, Nor Bayazet, Van, Old Jula pal ‘large, immovable (stone, rock)’; pal-pal k’arer ‘large, immovable stones, rocks’; Bulanax pal čakat ‘large, projecting forehead’ [Ača’ean 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/ is a dialectally restricted word since the Classical period.

**SEMANTICS** Ača’yan (ibid.) mentions only the adjectival meaning of pal, whereas Amatuni (1912: 546b) records Muş, Bulanax, Alashkert, Aparan, Širak, Sip’an, Van pal (subst.) ‘large stone, rock; cliff’. Glossed as ‘rock’ also in SasC 2/2, 1951: 791a; SasC 2000: 276; Madat’yan 1985: 236b. Textual illustrations for this substantival meaning: Haykuni 1902: 189.14, Baladaryan-T’ap’alc’yan 1958: 245, SasC 2000: 156, 240 (several times); Amatuni, ibid.
pałat, ‘entreat, supplication’ in Ephrem and dial. (see also s.v. pałat); pałatam ‘to entreat, supplicate’ (Bible+); pałatank, GDP paišat-an-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: aiać’ ank’ éw pałat.\(^\text{110}\) In this form, it has been preserved in the dialects of Ć’a’yul and Marala; elsewhere in the dial. compounds aiać’-pałat and aiać’-pałat.

In classical sources such as the Bible and Agat’angeloś (§ 773), pałat- is frequently used next to aibor’k ‘prayer’ (etymologically related with aiać’-); perhaps also with ait-at; cf. also aibor’ éw palatans matuc’anēm arija’ sribhwoyn

---

\(^{110}\) For another possible attestation, see s.v. pałat.
“Patmut’iwn srboc’ Hrip’simeanc’”; see MobsXorenMaten 1843: 299; zalōt ‘as surb zor palatik’ (“Talaran”), etc. From these and some other passages (see NHB 2: 589-590) one may conclude that palat- also referred to ‘prayer’. The association between ‘supplication’ and ‘prayer’ is trivial.

In Joel 1.14 and 2.15, palat-an-k’ refers to ‘solemn assembly, religious service or ceremony’. These two similar passages read as follows: k’arozec’ēk’ palatans : Gr. κηρύξατε θεραπείαν [in RevStBible: “call a solemn assembly”]. Here Arm. palat-an-k’ renders Gr. θεραπεία ‘service, attendance’. This usage seems to be parallel with that of the hitherto unnoticed palat- (q.v.), which, if my interpretation is correct, should join palat-1.

One finds palēt twice in “Zgōn”/Afrahat: zpaɫēt aɫač’ anōk’ and zjerme paɫētk’; note the parallelism of the synonyms aɫač’-’ank’ and xndruac (both in IPl). It also appears as scribal variants to palat in Ephrem. The -ēt can be explained by contamination with aɫēt ‘grief, disaster, compassion’.

● DIAL Preserved in the dialects of Nor Naxi ľewan, T’iflis, Axalc’xa, Ararat, Šamaxi, Łaraba, Łaraba, Ĉ’aylu, Marala, Salmast, Jula, Svedia, Sebastia. For (aɫač’-)palat, see above. The “pure” root palat is only recorded in Č’aylu and Marala; see Davt’y an 1966: 456. Compare also Łarabal *aŋč’-plen’k’ ‘curses’. See s.v. aɫat- ‘to lament, supplicate’.

● ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 14a.

Lap’an’yan (1951b: 593-594; 1961: 115) compares with Hurr. pal- ‘to ask’. Ėruhukyan (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: palat is a deviant form with absence of the consonant shift, going back to IE *(s)pel- (see s.v. ľaspel), and the latter is connected with Hurr. and Urart. pal- ‘to know’; see Ėruhukyan 1967: 128, 128, 128; 1967a: 24, 178, 15. This all is uncertain.

palat2 prob. ‘religious / ceremonial recitation’.

Only in “Patmut’iwn srboc’ Hrip’simeanc’” (see MobsXorenMaten 1843=1865: 301): ew nok’a gnac’in i glux lerinn Palatoy, zor asēin sastik yoyž i nna leal divac’n, tun Aramazday ew Astikay mecarēin. Ew ya’aḵ paštamanb’k’ tōn kardayin, or ē Palat : “And they went to the summit of the mountain of Palat which, they said, abounded in devils, [and] they worshiped the sanctuary [lit. house] of Aramazd and Astik. And they frequently recited ceremonial recitation (with religious service), which is (called) Palat”.

Ališan (1910: 53; see also Russell 1987: 159) cites the passage with significant differences. Here Palat is replaced by Pašat, which, according to Ališan, seems to be the correct reading. Russell (op. cit. 179, 90) 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 palat2 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 palat1 ‘entreaty, supplication; prayer’ (q.v.), which in Joel 1.14 and 2.15 seems to refer to ‘solemn assembly, religious service or ceremony’.
The semantic shift ‘prayer’ > ‘religious service performed by recitation’ is typologically comparable to that of *tawn ‘feast’ (q.v.). The original meaning of the latter must have been ‘sacrificial meal’ (cf. OIC *tafn ‘sacrificial animal’, etc.). In the above-mentioned passage from “Patmut’iwn srboc’ Hṙip’simeanc’”, *tawn, directly equated to *pašt-šat, is used with the verb kardam ‘to recite’ and, therefore, refers to the religious service performed by recitation.

Note the mountain-name *Pašat of the same passage. Russell (1987: 179a) 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 Paṣatu and modern Bašet’-dalt.

**pap, a-stem:** GDPl *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 Örbelean, 13th cent.); voc. *pápa* ‘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. pab grandfather*. Vocative: Goris *pápi*, Lăraba *páp*, Agulis *p̂̂̂̄pi* [HAB 4: 25b].


The forms *apopap, pap* in religious sense, and voc. *pápa* 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. πάππος 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. *mam(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 *pompanjvel* [HAB, ibid.; Margaryan 1975: 358b], see 2.130.1. Aslanbek *babonjil* [HAB, ibid.] is perhaps due to contamination with *pal ‘cold’.

● **ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 1: 26a) treats as reduplication of *paj- ‘to bind’ linking it with *pind ‘tight’, *pdem ‘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’, xeld- : helj- ‘to drown’, etc. but does not specify the origin of j.
Jahukyan (1982: 60-61) posits *bʰdʰ₁j- or *bʰdʰ₂s-. I think the former alternative is improbable. A possible trace of PIE *bʰdʰ₂s- may be seen in Iran. *bad-s-, cf. Khwar. passive *fṣ-, *fṣ- < *bad-s-ya-; *pəfṣ-/*pati-bad-s-ya- ‘to be/become bound’ (see EtimSlovIranJz 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. *bhītātsa- 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 ṣ-arm- ‘fitting’, cf. Gr. ἁρμόζω ‘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 Ṙodost’o it means ‘dense’, said of e.g. porridge [HAB 4: 83a].

The initial p- points to Grassmann’s Law. Although we have no further secure examples of this law in Armenian (for a discussion, see Jahukyan 1969: 66; 1978: 176; further, see 2.1.24.1), I see no compelling reasons for rejecting this etymology.


**ptuk** o-stem (later GSg ptka [HAB 4: 646a]) ‘bud; nipple; ptke/im ‘to bud, germinate’ (Bible+).

- DIAL Widespread in the dialects, mostly in the meaning ‘nipple’ or ‘the udder of a cow’. Van, Goris, Larabal: ‘bud’. Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Rodost’o, and Turkish-speaking Adana have *ptu ‘nipple’ or ‘the udder of a cow’. Note also Urmia, Salmast *ptul ‘nipple’ [GwUrSalm 2, 1898: 97]. According to Acaryan (HAB 4: 112a; 1941: 69f), this is due to contamination with *ptul ‘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, *ptul ‘nipple’ or ‘the udder of a cow’ can directly belong to *ptul (q.v.).

- ETYM According to Acaryan (HAB 4: 112a), from PIE *bud- ‘to swell’, cf. Engl. bud, etc. See above, and s.vv. ptul and put.
ptul, o-stem: ‘fruit (Bible+); pupil (of the eye); grape, etc.’. Nerses Lambranac’i (12th cent., Cilicia), etc. have a form with -n (GDSg pțan, AbISg i pțanē), in the meaning ‘fingertip, pinch’. Given the existence of Hačın (Cilicia) bādēl < *ptel ‘id.’, one may reconstruct *pīen (see HAB 4: 112b).

●DIAL. Widespread in the dialects, mainly referring to ‘fruit’ and ‘eye-apple, pupil’. Polis budut (on which see below) also means ‘bubble’. In Svedia (bdec’h) the meaning ‘fruit’ has been specialized to ‘olive-fruit’ [Ačaryan 2003: 586].

Ačaryan (HAB; Ačaryan 1947) does not record any form in Hamsen. One may wonder, however, if Hamsen *ptel ‘fruit of wild trees; wild acorn’ (see Ačaryan 1913: 910) belongs here. See above for *pīen.

For the semantic field particularly interesting are the data from Moks. Ačaryan (1952: 289) records Moks ptul not specifying its meaning, probably because he only knew the basic meaning ‘fruit’, which is represented by the corresponding form in Van (ca-i-a-ptul ‘tree’ fruit’ (ibid.). But Moks potul (NPl potošnir) also refers to ‘pupil of the eye’ (ač’ič’ potul ‘glaznoye ýblio’ko’) and ‘rain drop’, putul-om ‘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-om ‘a little bit (of liquid)’ (op. cit. 316), for instance: put-put ārun (= ClArm. arīwn blood’) (op. cit. 101a). Given the meaning ‘dot, spot’ of put, as well as the above-mentioned by-form *ptel(n) of ptul, one can also introduce another word from Moks, namely potel, GSg potol, NPl potoš-nir/-k ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’ (see Orbeli 2002: 314). Note also Satax ptotel ‘to bud, germinate’ (see M. Muradyan 1962: 215b).

Moks *ptel basically means ‘dirty spot of boiling, bubbling oil’. A similar meaning can be seen in verbal *ptl-t-al (Van, Şirak, etc.) referring to the appearance of bubbles of oil on surface of food or water (see Amatuni 1912: 570b). Note also Ganjak ptl-at-el ‘to feel sick/nausea’ [Amatuni 1912: 570b]. Polis bt’xil (< ptül) has two meanings: ‘to darken (of eye)’, and ‘spread on paper (of ink)’ [Ačaryan 1941: 240]; cf. Sebastia *ptil [Gabikean 1952: 478]. This verb presupposes here a nominal root *ptul ‘eye-pupil; ink-spot’. Polis also has budul (< ptul) ‘nipple’ and ‘fruit’, usually represented as belonging to different lexical items (see HAB 4: 112a; Ačaryan 1941: 69a, 240). All the three, however, may belong to one word. For *ptul ‘nipple’ (also in other dialects), see ptuk. Note also Sebastia *ptul ‘pupil (of the eye); nipple’ [Gabikean 1952: 478].

●ETYM. See above, and s.vv. ptuk and put.

Next to ptul, as we saw, there is some evidence for *ptel(n) – Nerses Lambranac’i (12th cent., Cilicia) *pteln and Hačın bādēl ‘fingertip, pinch’; Moks potel ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’; and, perhaps, Hamsen *ptel ‘fruit of wild trees; wild acorn’. Old, hypothetical paradigm: NŠg -ol > ClArm. ptul; AccŠg *-el-m > *pteln. See s.vv. acul ‘coal’, aseln ‘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: ptul ‘fruit; rain drop’ : potel ‘a spot from splashed boiling food in oil’; ase/ül ‘needle’ : asul ‘two small planks that tie the handle of a plough with the pole’.
put1, 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 ὄj-kakawi (vars. ὄj-kayy, ὄj-kkwi, ὄjktawi, ὄjkkop', etc. (see Ališan 1895: 653\textsuperscript{13}b; Greppin 1985: 10). Vanakan Vardapet (13\textsuperscript{th} 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 ṿarabal – Ṽp, with metathesis (see especially Margaryan 1977: 161-164), see also 2.1.26.2.

The meaning 'poppy' of ṿarabal Ṽp (see Ačaréan 1913: 1042a) can be corroborated by folklore texts. In a fairy-tale (see HŽΗek' 7, 1979: 116\textsuperscript{11}b) it is narrated that a boy sees a beautiful, red poppy (min lišānγγ, kārmur 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\textsuperscript{12}b: \textit{min top ārin} “one drop of blood”) and ‘poppy’. In an Ascension-Day ritual song of the type jangylum (see Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 57\textsuperscript{13}bb): \textit{K'anc' top kyārmur č'ika, /Pec' anis sverto sev a.} – “Nothing is redder than the poppy; but when you open (it, you will see that) the heart is black”; cf. also 157\textsuperscript{25}b. The context clearly shows that this is the poppy; see also in the glossary (p. 471b). Compare Mxit'areanc' 1901: 277: \textit{sewsirt-karmir kakač} ‘black hearted red poppy’. In other jangylum-s one finds a reduplicated form, namely top-top.

It is not excluded, however, that in ṿarabal the word also refers to some other flowers. Ališan (1895: 613\textsuperscript{14}b) states, that top is a word used in Eastern Armenia, and it denotes harsumuk or eric'uk.

Sišak has a reduplicated form, namely putput ‘a kind of edible poppy’ (Mxit'areanc' 1901: 277\textsuperscript{4}, 331; Amatuni 1912: 566b. Note T'iflis pučpuča ‘a flower (digitalis)’ (see Ačaréan 1913: 925b), ‘poppy’ (< Georg.), attested by the 18\textsuperscript{th}-century famous poet Sayat'-Nova, who spoke and wrote in the dialect of T'iflis (see K'oč'oyan 1963: 18, 155).

● ETYM Ačaréyan (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? Ačaréyan 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 onomatopoetic 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’, *nilotpala* ‘blue lotus, Nymphaea Cyanea’, probably from *ut-puṭ* ‘to tear up or out, pluck, pull out, break out; to root up, eradicate, extirpate’ (< *pal/pa-ṭ* ‘to burst open’).

In this case, Arm. *puṭ₁* ‘poppy; a sky-blue lily’ derives from *puṭ₃* ‘a small swelling’ and is etymologically identical with *pt-uk* ‘bud, gemma’ and *ptu* ‘fruit; pupil (of the eye), etc.’, which are probably connected with Engl *bud* ‘bud’, Skt. *budradaḥ* ‘Wasserblase, Blase’, etc. (see Pettersson 1916: 252-254; HAB 4: 103b, 111-113; Jahukyan 1987: 115), as well as, perhaps, with Arm. *puṭ₂* ‘drop; dot, spot’. For the association ‘fruit’ – ‘drop’ : *(oily) splash*, see especially Moks data s.v. *ptu*. The basing meaning of Arm. *puṭ* (from PIE *b(e)u-d- ‘to swell’) would have been ‘a small round/swollen formation (of water, plant, or other substance)’.

**put₁** ‘drop; dot, spot’.

In the meaning ‘drop’: Arak’el Davržec’i (17th cent.). In Bağırık’ hayoc’ (see Amalyan 1975: 249⁷¹⁶), *put* and *tup* (with metathesis) are mentioned as synonyms of *sit* ‘to tear up’ and *kat* (i) ‘drop’. The second meaning is represented in reduplicated *tptiṅ* ‘spotted’ (cf. dial. *tptp-ur-ik*), attested in Arak’el Siwnec’i (14-15th cent.), see HAB 4: 103a; 3: 457b.

● **DIAL** Nor Nasxjewan, Polis, Rodost’o, Alaškert, Muş – ‘drop’; Xarberd – ‘dot’; T’iflis, Polis – ‘a bit’ [HAB 4: 103]. Lăbaral has *taḥ* < *tup*, with metathesis, in both meanings. In the glossary of HZHek’ 7 (1979: 736b), *top* is rendered as ‘drop’; for a textual illustration, see p. 63¹¹⁶. *min top ārūn* “one drop of blood” (= NmušLe/Larab 1978: 16 /lines 1 and 3 from the bottom/; glossed in 218b). In HZHek’ 7, 1979 (189, 736b), one finds *tptaporiṅ* ‘spotted’. See also Ačaṙe 1913: 1043b (s.v. *tptpūrīk*), where only Lăbaral is mentioned. Further attestations: L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 264¹²⁰. Aškan *top ē’i kat’um* “No drop is dropped from his eye” (proverb); Xemē’yən 2000: 210b⁽¹¹⁵⁾ Tavuş / Šamšadin) – *tptpūrīk bolaz* “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 *put₃*, 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(t)(u)p-(t)(u)p* are confined to Lăbaral. See also s.v. *put₃*. Note that the only attestation comes from Arak’el Siwnec’i, who is from Siwnik and, therefore, a speaker of what will become the (sub)dialects of Lăbaral and Goris. This allows to date the metathesis at a stage anterior to the 15th century. See also Ačaṙe 1913: 1043b (s.v. *tptpūrīk*), where only Lăbaral is mentioned. Further attestations: L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 264¹²⁰. Aškan *top ē’i kat’um* “No drop drops from his eye” (proverb); Xemē’yən 2000: 210b⁽¹¹⁵⁾ Tavuş / Šamšadin) – *tptpūrīk bolaz* “spotted throat” (of a goose).

● **ETYM** See s.v. *put₃*.

**put₂** ‘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’; Lăbaral *pūt* ‘fried wheat flour that has been kneaded with honey, and dried in the form of fist-sized balls’ [HAB 4: 103b]. According to Ačaṙe (HAB 4: 103b), both forms come from *put*. The -ū- of
the Łarabal form, however, points rather to *poyt. A *put would give *pot in Łarabal.

- **ETYM** The combined evidence from MidArm. and dialects, as well as the semantics of the two previous homonymous words, namely puti 'poppy, etc.' and putu 'drop; dot, spot', and that of pt-uk 'bud, gemma' and putd '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. puti.

- **DIAL** Nor Naxijewan, Polis, Ararat, Łarabal *puc' 'vulva' [Ačaṙyan 1913: 926b].

- **ETYM** Ačaṙyan (HAB 4: 105) derives from QIE *bul-sk-, cf. Skt. bul- 'buttocks; vulva', Lith. bulis (-iš), bulė, bulė̃ 'Hinterer, Gesäß', as well as Arm. Erznka pllik 'vulva'. For the loss of *-l- before the affricate, see 2.1.22.9.

- **DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Suč'ava j'anal, Jula j'ananal. Note also Suč'ava glix jalal 'to do harm, damage', with glix 'head'; T'iflis jan-k'as 'diligent, zealous (person)', lit. 'zeal or effort taker/puller' [HAB 4: 122b].

- **ETYM** Connected with Gr. ζῆλος m. 'zeal, emulation, jealousy', Dor. ζάλος, Skt. yā- '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+), pātū- m. 'sorcery, witchcraft' (RV+), etc. Pokorny 1959: 501; Jahukyan 1982: 40; 1982: 130; Klingenschmitt 1982: 90; Olsen 1999: 90; Cheung 2007: 174).

The development *JV- > Arm. JV- is uncertain, however, unless we assume an Iranian intermediary; cf. Arm. jatuk 'sorcerer' from the same Iranian root. I therefore tentatively propose to treat Arm. jen as a loan from the Iranian forms deriving from the same *ieh2- (a different etymology is represented in Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 155), cf. Av. yāna-, OP yāna- 'request, favour'. The Armenian meaning is remote. However, it may reflect an unattested MIran. form with closer semantics, cf. YAv. ahuva-itā f. 'penance', Gr. ἡγιάζω 'zeal', ἡγία 'loss, damage, penalty', etc. Interesting is the meaning 'to do harm, damage' in the dialect of Suč'ava.

- **DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Suč'ava j'anal, Jula j'ananal. Note also Suč'ava glix jalal 'to do harm, damage', with glix 'head'; T'iflis jan-k'as 'diligent, zealous (person)', lit. 'zeal or effort taker/puller' [HAB 4: 122b].

- **ETYM** Connected with Gr. ζῆλος m. 'zeal, emulation, jealousy', Dor. ζάλος, Skt. yā- '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+), pātū- m. 'sorcery, witchcraft' (RV+), etc. Pokorny 1959: 501; Jahukyan 1982: 40; 1982: 130; Klingenschmitt 1982: 90; Olsen 1999: 90; Cheung 2007: 174).

The development *JV- > Arm. JV- is uncertain, however, unless we assume an Iranian intermediary; cf. Arm. jatuk 'sorcerer' from the same Iranian root. I therefore tentatively propose to treat Arm. jen as a loan from the Iranian forms deriving from the same *ieh2- (a different etymology is represented in Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 155), cf. Av. yāna-, OP yāna- 'request, favour'. The Armenian meaning is remote. However, it may reflect an unattested MIran. form with closer semantics, cf. YAv. ahuva-itā f. 'penance', Gr. ἡγιάζω 'zeal', ἡγία 'loss, damage, penalty', etc. Interesting is the meaning 'to do harm, damage' in the dialect of Suč'ava.

- **DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Suč'ava j'anal, Jula j'ananal. Note also Suč'ava glix jalal 'to do harm, damage', with glix 'head'; T'iflis j'an-k'as 'diligent, zealous (person)', lit. 'zeal or effort taker/puller' [HAB 4: 122b].

- **ETYM** Connected with Gr. ζῆλος m. 'zeal, emulation, jealousy', Dor. ζάλος, Skt. yā- '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+), pātū- m. 'sorcery, witchcraft' (RV+), etc. Pokorny 1959: 501; Jahukyan 1982: 40; 1982: 130; Klingenschmitt 1982: 90; Olsen 1999: 90; Cheung 2007: 174).

The development *JV- > Arm. JV- is uncertain, however, unless we assume an Iranian intermediary; cf. Arm. jatuk 'sorcerer' from the same Iranian root. I therefore tentatively propose to treat Arm. jen as a loan from the Iranian forms deriving from the same *ieh2- (a different etymology is represented in Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 155), cf. Av. yāna-, OP yāna- 'request, favour'. The Armenian meaning is remote. However, it may reflect an unattested MIran. form with closer semantics, cf. YAv. ahuva-itā f. 'penance', Gr. ἡγιάζω 'zeal', ἡγία 'loss, damage, penalty', etc. Interesting is the meaning 'to do harm, damage' in the dialect of Suč'ava.

- **DIAL** The verb has been preserved in Suč'ava j'anal, Jula j'ananal. Note also Suč'ava glix jalal 'to do harm, damage', with glix 'head'; T'iflis j'an-k'as 'diligent, zealous (person)', lit. 'zeal or effort taker/puller' [HAB 4: 122b].

- **ETYM** Connected with Gr. ζῆλος m. 'zeal, emulation, jealousy', Dor. ζάλος, Skt. yā- '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+), pātū- m. 'sorcery, witchcraft' (RV+), etc. Pokorny 1959: 501; Jahukyan 1982: 40; 1982: 130; Klingenschmitt 1982: 90; Olsen 1999: 90; Cheung 2007: 174).

The development *JV- > Arm. JV- is uncertain, however, unless we assume an Iranian intermediary; cf. Arm. jatuk 'sorcerer' from the same Iranian root. I therefore tentatively propose to treat Arm. jen as a loan from the Iranian forms deriving from the same *ieh2- (a different etymology is represented in Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 155), cf. Av. yāna-, OP yāna- 'request, favour'. The Armenian meaning is remote. However, it may reflect an unattested MIran. form with closer semantics, cf. YAv. ahuva-itā f. 'penance', Gr. ἡγιάζω 'zeal', ἡγία 'loss, damage, penalty', etc. Interesting is the meaning 'to do harm, damage' in the dialect of Suč'ava.
uk, a-stem: GDPI jermk-a-c’ ‘hot spring’ (Hexaemeron, Eusebius of Caesarea, Ašxarhac’oyc’, etc., see below), jermn, an-stem: GDSg jerman, ISg jermam-b ‘fever’ (Bible+).

jermn : ISg jermam-b = Gr. πυρετός 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: 30L5; MovsXorenMaten 1865: 607; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349 L8; Hewsen 1992: 59, 59A, 153 25], the province of Barjr Hayk’ ‘Upper Armenia’ has jermuk-s ‘hot springs’. Certainly the same location is meant in Sebēs (7th cent.) Chapter 17 (G. Xačʿatryan 2004: 387 s.v.; Xačʿatryan/E. Žiažaryan 2005: 94L-3f; Thomson 1999: 34), where jermuk (allative i jermk and loc. i jermk-i [var. i jerm-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 (Ereman 1963: 98a; Hewsen 1992: 15325).

DIALECT The form jér ‘warm; warmth, warm and bright weather’ and corresponding verbal forms have been preserved in Muš jér ‘warm and bright weather’, Van čér ‘bright night’, Loṙi čér ‘id.’; Van čerm ‘to become bright and clear (said of weather)’ [HAB 4: 126a; A. G. Abrahamyan 1952: 289], Šatax čér ‘bright, clear’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 204b]; T’iflis čiranal ‘to become warm’ [HAB 4: 126]; Svedia čir ‘warm (weather)’ [Andreasyan 1967: 27, 381].

The form jerm ‘fever’ is found in Nor Naxįjewan, Aslanbek, Axalc’xa, Karin, Sebastia, Agulis, Šamaxi; Łaraba and Goris have čerm ‘to have fever’; note also Evdokia čermug ‘hot spring’ [HAB 4: 126].


111 The Armenian verb may reflect an older form in zero-grade, *gʰr-n(e)u-: Skt. ghṛṇātī ‘to glow, light’, the -e-grade being analogical; cf. ārnum ‘to gain’ < *Hr-nu-, but zgenum ‘to put on clothes’ in full grade.
jil, *jil. a-stem: IPl *jl-a-w-k’ (Bible 2x, Ephrem), GDPl *jl-a-č’ (Elišč, Yovhanněš Ōjneč’i); i-stem: ISg *jl-i-w, IPl *jl-i-w-k’ (Plato) ‘sinew, tendon’; a number of derivatives, with either l or l

●DIAL. Widespread in the dialects. We find *jl in T’iflis, Axalc’xa, and a number of E and SE peripheral dialects, whereas the rest have jil. Interesting is Muš *j’el vs. *j’il-k’ [HAB 4: 127b].

With a semantic shift: Maškert (Xarberd-Arabkir region) and Akn jet ‘shin, shank’, Svedia pl.-dual *jil-a-hva ‘the part of the leg above the knee’ [HAB 4: 127b)].


Here belongs also Lat. filum, i n. ‘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; Emrouz/Meillet 1959: 235a; Godel 1975: 75; Toporov PrJaz [e-h] 1979: 250; Alabekyan 1979: 65; Schmitt 1981: 51; Saradževa 1986: 122; Schrijver 1991: 220. The appurtenance of Alb. dell ‘sinew, tendon; string’ is improbable (see Demiraj 1997: 128 with a different etymology).

Arm. jil, -a- derives from *gwhiH-(s)le2h- (Stempel 1994: 12-13). There is also some evidence for an i-stem. In order to explain the -l/ɫ alternation and the twofold declension, one may tentatively posit a neuter NSg *gwhiH-(s)lo- as in Lat. filum vs. neuter plural *gwhiH-(s)-loh2, or feminine *gwhiH-(s)-eh2 as in Balto-Slavic > PArm. *jil-a- > Arm. jil (with a final dark -ɫ due to the following back vowel, *-slo- or *-slā-) vs. fem. *gwhiH-(s)lih2- (or dual *-ih1?) > *jil-i-, with a palatal -l- between front vowels112.

As far as the problem of ɫ vs. l is concerned, one might also assume the following original distribution: -l in nom. jil 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. *jil-k’, acc. *jil-s, instr. *jil-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’el vs. *j’il-k’.

jín, a-stem: IPl *jín-a-w-k’ ‘staff, stick for beating’ (Philo); jnem ‘to beat’ (Book of Chries, Timothy Aelurus, Grigor Narekac’i, etc.); o-jín ‘bunch of sticks’ (Paterica).

●ETYM Since Patrubány (1904: 427-428), connected with jín ‘to annihilate, destroy’ (q.v.).

The anlaut of o-jín is unclear, cf. (h)o-sín vs. sin ‘empty’ (q.v.). One may tentatively assume an old and unproductive prefix *o- from *h-po-, cf. Gr. αἰνεῖν ‘from, away

---

112 Greppin 1986: 285 treats -l as the expected reflex of a post-consonantal *-l- (cf. *-sl-) and considers jil “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-ǰin would then be Russ. pú-sox ‘staff’ from soxá ‘wooden plough’. Thus: QIE *h₂po-gʷen-V- > *hwójiñ-V- > *0(w)ójín- > ojín.

*jinj* - ‘to annihilate, destroy’; *jnem* ‘to efface, wipe clean; annihilate, destroy’ (Bible+). -ǰinj as the second member of a number of compounds (Bible+); *jínj* ‘clean’ (Bible+); -ǰunj ‘annihilated, destroyed’ in a few post-classical compounds (John Chrysostom, Yovhan Mandakuni/Mayragomec’i, etc.).

● DIAL. The verb *injel* is widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 128b].


Beekes (2003: 161) presents the Armenian verb *ǰinjem* ‘to wipe clean’ in this context, but then notes: “etym. unknown (not cognate with Gr. théíno, Lith. geniu)”. 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 -ǰunj ‘annihilated, destroyed’ is relatively old, one may assume an underlying o-grade form *gʷon-īeh₂- > *günj- or the like (cf. Gr. φόνος m. ‘murder’, -φόντης ‘murdering’) with a subsequent analogical change to -ǰunj.

*jmar* ‘male person’.

● DIAL. Laradaļ *jmar* (AČařean 1913: 938a, glossed as ayr mard ‘male person’). Jahukyan (1972: 282) has “Larabal”, not indicating the source. However, he obviously took the word from AČařean 1913, so the -b- in Larabal must be a misprint.

● ETYM. Jahukyan (1972: 282) compares with Skt. jāmātar- ‘son-in-law, husband of the daughter’ (RV+) from PIE *gémHt-. For the phonetic side he (op. cit. 282a) compares with the case of jambhemb, 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 jāwān-mard ‘a young man; a generous youth; brave, generous, manly’, jā-mard(tum) ‘a liberal or generous man’ (see Steingass 376b, 379a); cf. also Arm. dialect of Ararat jomard ‘generous’ (see Nawasardeane 1903: 102a). For loss of the final -d cf. argand ‘womb’ > Šamšadin ārk’än and Alaškert argan (see s.vv.).


---

Beekes (2003: 161) presents the Armenian verb *ǰinjem* ‘to wipe clean’ in this context, but then notes: “etym. unknown (not cognate with Gr. théíno, Lith. geniu)”. 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 -ǰunj ‘annihilated, destroyed’ is relatively old, one may assume an underlying o-grade form *gʷon-īeh₂- > *günj- or the like (cf. Gr. φόνος m. ‘murder’, -φόντης ‘murdering’) with a subsequent analogical change to -ǰunj.

*jmar* ‘male person’.

● DIAL. Laradaļ *jmar* (AČařean 1913: 938a, glossed as ayr mard ‘male person’). Jahukyan (1972: 282) has “Larabal”, not indicating the source. However, he obviously took the word from AČařean 1913, so the -b- in Larabal must be a misprint.

● ETYM. Jahukyan (1972: 282) compares with Skt. jāmātar- ‘son-in-law, husband of the daughter’ (RV+) from PIE *gémHt-. For the phonetic side he (op. cit. 282a) compares with the case of jambhemb, 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 jāwān-mard ‘a young man; a generous youth; brave, generous, manly’, jā-mard(tum) ‘a liberal or generous man’ (see Steingass 376b, 379a); cf. also Arm. dialect of Ararat jomard ‘generous’ (see Nawasardeane 1903: 102a). For loss of the final -d cf. argand ‘womb’ > Šamšadin ārk’än and Alaškert argan (see s.vv.).


**DIALECT** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 132].


For the sound change *jy-* > Arm. *ṳ-, see 2.1.22.2. For the development *-etor- > *-or- cf. Arm. *čor-* ‘four’ from *kwetuores*. 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. A V+aśvatarī́- f. ‘female mule’. Thus: *gʰi-ter-i(h2)-os* and *-ieh2- > PArm. *j(i)yoria- and *(j)i)yoria- > jori, wo- and ea-stems.

On *joreak* ‘locust’ and ‘hyena’, see 3.5.2.2.

*R*

---

* rõng, an-stem: only ISg rõnkg/gam-b in Šarakan apud NHB 2: 682a; also -rungn as the second member of a few compounds (such as šn-rungn in John Chrysostom, etc., with šun ‘dog’); pl. tant.: nom. ūng-un-k’ (Philo), acc. (also with prepositions) ūng-un-s (6 times in the Bible, see Astuacaturea 1895: 1309c and Clackson 1994: 176, as well as in Elišē and Mxit’ar Gōš), GPI ūng-am-b-k’ (Elišē, Philo, Yovhannēs Ōjnc’i); * uğng-k’, a-stem: GDPI ūng-a-c’ (Philo, Grigor Magistros, Sisianos, Yovhannēs Sarkawag, Mxit’ar Gōš) ‘nostrils’.

**DIALECT** Āčāryan (HAB 4: 148a) wonders whether Agulis rõng ‘the edge of a roof’ (see also Āčārean 1913: 948b; Āčārean 1935 vacat) is related. For the semantic shift cf. pru(n)k/g ‘lip’ > ‘edge’. Note, however, Melri (š)əŋgn-a-k’ar ‘corner-stone’, and some other compounds in (š)əŋgn-a- with bänd ‘tie’ and kap ‘id.’ as the second member, recorded by Alayan (1954: 297, 327) in the glossary of dialectal words, without any reference to a ClArm. correspondence (in 297: from unspecified *rōngun*).

That the nasal before the velar is epenthetic is corroborated by Karčewan (a dialect that is practically identical with Mełri) uşk’na ‘the big corner-stone of the wall’; in compounds: ašk’na- (see H. Muradyan 1960: 213, 232a).

Since Agulis is closely related to Mełri, Agulis ṛung ‘the edge of the roof’ can hardly be separated from Mełri ṛungn ‘corner-stone’. For the meaning in Agulis cf. Aparan, Bulanx ṛuk ‘the corner of a wall from outside’.

I conclude that the Agulis and Mełri forms derive from *ro/u(n)k’-n ‘corner-stone’ and are thus unrelated with ṛungn ‘nose, nostrils’, although contamination is possible.

*ETYM Since long (Gosche 1847: 24; Müller 1890: 6N55; for further references, see HAB 4: 148a), connected with Gr. ῥύγχος, ῥύγχεος n. ‘snout of a pig, snout, muzzle, beak’. Gr. ῥ- and Arm. trilled ṛ-point to a proto-form *srungh-; 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; Jähukyan 1982: 114-115; Arutjunjan 1983: 302; Olsen 1999: 139; and especially Clackson 1994: 176-177.113

In view of the limited geographical distribution and the absence of a prothetic vowel in Armenian (cf. a-ṙu ‘brook’ from the PIE root *sreu-)114 one may assume a common or independent borrowing from a non-IE language (see Jähukyan 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 (Jähukyan 1982: 114-115; Clackson 1994: 177; Olsen 1999: 123, 614). The original Proto-Armenian form may have been a neuter *srung-o from *srung-e/os- (cf. Gr. ῥύγχος, -εος n.). It is tempting to assume that the Armenian form without the final -n, viz. ṛung-a- pl. tant., cf. gen.-dat. ṛng-a-c’ (Philo+), reflects an old neuter plural *srung-(e)h2.

113 Whether Arm. pru(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 -manë, instr. ays/d/n-u or -nik; 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’(-anë) or y-ays/d/n-oc’ik, instr. ays/d/nok’sm-a’/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; AćarLiak 2, 1954: 188-240].

•ETYM From PIE *ko- along with *ki-: Hitt. kā-, ki- ‘this here’, Gr. κι- ‘here, this’, cf. τῆματον, σήμερον < *κα-άμερον ‘this day’, Lat. ci- ‘on this side of, within’, OCS sn, f. si, n. se ‘this’, Lith. šis, Goth. hi- ‘this’, PIE *to-: Skt. tā- ‘this’, Av. tu- ‘this’, Gr. τό ‘the’, Goth. ṣa-, Lith. tās ‘the, this’, etc.; PIE *(h-)e-no-, cf. Skt. anā- ‘this’, OCS ons, f. ona, n. ono ‘he, she, it’, Lith. ans‘that’, prob. Hitt. uni, ini ‘that (one)’, etc.


The element -m in dat. sma < *sum-a < *sm-a vs. gen. so-r-a is related with PIE *sm-: Skt. tā-sm-ai ‘diesem’, Goth. pa-mm-a ‘them’, etc. (Schmitt 1981: 119, cf. 122, 126); cf. also ays-m etc. (Meillet 1894: 161).
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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 *gus < *gans < PIE *gʰ₂h₂(e)ns-: Skt. hamsā- m. ‘goose’, Gr. γῆ, Dor., Boeot. γῆ m. ‘goose’, Lat. ānser m.f. ‘goose’, OHG gans ‘goose’, OE gōs, pl. gēs > NEngl. goose, pl. geese, Lith. žąsis, Latv. žiūs, Russ. гусь, etc. (for this PIE etymology, 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. Aćaryan HAB 4: 152 does not accept it either.

Lidén 1906: 81-82 derives Arm. sag, -a- from IE *kayā- with Russ. совá, Czech sova, SCR. sōva sōva, etc. ‘owl’, Welsh cuan, Bret. kaouenn, kaouann ‘owl’, Lat. cavanus ‘owl’ (Celtic loanword), cf. also OHG hüwo ‘owl’; he assumes an onomatopoeic root seen in Lith. šaukti ‘to cry, call out, name’, etc.; thus, both the goose and the owl are named as ‘crying/shouting bird’. For this etymology 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. śūka- 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; Jähukyan 1982: 41, 135; 1987: 131, etc. Eichner 1978: 151 and Olsen 1999: 788 posit *kahuH₂. 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 *guns 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 *kauH₂ (or perhaps *kōuH₂, obl. *kū-h₂- > PArm. nom. *sōwa- vs. obl. *sag-V- > analogically sag, sag-a-). If Skt. śūka- ‘parrot’ and others are not related, then we might be dealing with a European substratum word.

sal. i-stem: GDG i sal-i (Bible+), GDPl sal-i-c’, IPl sal-i-w-k’ (Lazar P’arpec’i) ‘a large flat block of stone; anvil’ (Bible+); salanam ‘to be as of stone, turn to stone’ (Bible+); sal-(a)-yark ‘paved with stones’ (Bible+); sal-a-yatak ‘paved with stones’ in Elišè, Anania Sirakac’i [A. Abrahamyan 1940: 9\textsuperscript{13}], etc. On *sal-ar-, in compound sular-a-kap ‘paved with stones’ (Yaýsmawurk’, Minas Vardapet Hamdec’i), see below.

Some illustrations:
*bażunk* ‘i darbac’; *...* ِeric’s kam ē’oric’s buxen zsaln “many smiths; *...* strike the anvil three or four times”.


In 2 Paralipomenon 7.3 (Xalat’eanc’ 1899: 65a): *sal-a-yark* (with *yatak-a-č*: *yatak* ‘bottom, floor’), rendering λιϑό-στρωτος ‘paved with stones’. The second component is *y-ark*, from *ark-* ‘to throw, put, stretch, etc.’ (see HAB 1: 320-321).

Later: *sal-ark-* ‘id.’, *salark-em* ‘to pave with stones’ [NHB 2: 684a].

● DIAL Widespread in 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. [Ač’rean 1913: 950; HAB 4: 155b]. Note also Van, Sip’an, Rštunik’, Aparan *sal* ‘the back of a knuckle-bone’ [Amatuni 1912: 581]. The verb *salel* ‘to pave with stones’ is found in Łazax [Ač’rean 1913: 950b]. One also finds Maraš *salel* ‘to become silent, to cut the voice of himself’ in Ač’rean 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 Ač’rean 1913: 1101b).

Van *salars* ‘paved with stones’, *salarsel* ‘to pave with stones’ [Ač’rean 1913: 950b; Amatuni 1912: 581]. According to Ač’rāyn (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 collophon (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.


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 Jahukyan 1987: 590). In Lazar 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: 10124) ‘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; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 305a). According to Ananyan (HayKendAšx 3, 1965: 89-90, especially 89), however, it refers to the grey partridge, i.e. ‘Perdix perdix’. For attestations, see Greppin 1978: 85-86; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 305a; in “Govank’ t’rčnoc’” (Praise of birds): Mnac’akanyan 1980a: 255L330.


•DIAL Łarabal sâlmäna, sâlemna [Dav’t’yan 1966: 466], Goris sâlëmna [Margaryan 1975: 362a]. Acařyan (HAB 4: 156b) records only Muš compound salam-kak’av (with kak’aw ‘partridge’), in the expression salam-kak’av p’es man kig’a “(she) is walking like the francolin-partridge”. Orbeli (2002: 320) records Moks saläm kak’av ‘птица вроде курочки, но вдвое больше, пестрая, вкусная, живет на горах’, and (in the village of Arńanc’) sâlëmp’ar ‘язычник’ (noun ‘heathen’).

In a folk-song (R. Grigoryan 1970: 142Nc210a): 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 Ḏahukyan 1987; L. Hovhannisyan 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-bh- 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”.

On the other hand, Lat. columba has been linked with PSlav. *golǫbo ‘pigeon, dove’: OCS golǫbo, Russ. golubь, Czech holub, etc. (see ÈtimSlovSlavJaz 6, 1979:

---

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(om)b(-e)h2-→*PArm. *salamba- (*-*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. *alawni* ‘dove’.

*sayl*, i-stem: GDSg *sayl-i*, GDPl *sayl-i-c’* (Bible+); o-stem: ISg *sayl-o-v* (‘Cabrantit’), IPI *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).

IPI *sayl-o-v-k’* is attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.32 (1913=1991: 296l6). Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of manuscripts has *saylovk’* whereas the reading *saylōk’* (cf. also *sayawk’*) is found only in a few manuscripts, one keeps on following NHB citing IPI -ōk’ = -awk’ (HAB 4: 169a; Jāhukyan 1959: 310a).

In Job 9.9, Gr. Πλειάδες ‘Pleiades’, Ἰέσπερος ‘evening-star, Venus’, and Αρκτοῦρος ‘the star Arcturus, Bearward’ are rendered by Arm. Bazmaste-k’, Gišer-a-var, and *Sayl*, respectively (Cox 2006: 93).

In Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.): *sayl’ aste ṣac’d* (in relation to the North Pole), see A. Abrahamyan 1940: 38l11f. Elsewhere (62l13), *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: 331l6). Next to *Sayl*, Anania Širakac’i also mentions *miws Sayl* “the other Sayl” (331l1), probably referring to Ursa Major and Minor. But in the same list one also finds Arj, cf. arj ‘bear’.

*ETYM* Compared with Gr. σατινή f. ‘chariot’, σάτιλλα-πλειὰς τὸ ἀστρον (Hesychius), the constellation being regarded as a car; considered to be of Phrygian (Liden 1905; 1933: 45a; HAB 4: 169b; Scherer 1953: 145) or, given that σ- vs. Arm. s- probably points to a satem feature, Thracian (Schmitt 1966) origin. See also Jāhukyan 1987: 311, 346; Olsen 1999: 956.

Arm. *sayl*, i-stem, and Hesychian σάτιλλα (perhaps Thracian) can be derived from Mediterranean-Pontic substratum *kati-lih2-. For *-lihχ-, see s.vv. *luč ‘yoke; the constellation Libra’, *luč-a[l]li ‘the constellation Orion’ and 2.3.1 s.v. -*a[lt]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 solu, etc.), did not take place in *sayl*. This implies that the original form contained an initial palatal comparable to PIE *k* (cf. Arm. *sisirn ‘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 σάτιλλα without serious argumentation and treats Arm. *sayl* as a native word derived from PIE *k’el-
sanduk-k', API *sandul-s (spelled also as sandux-k', -s); o-stem (GDPI sandl-o-c') according to NHB (2: 693c), but without evidence 'ladder, stairs', 5 attestations in the Bible; Eliš (see NHB 2: 693-694; Astuacaturean 1895: 1318c); sg. *sandul in Grigor Narekac'í 92.11 (Xač'atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 618L198); *sandux in Paterica; with epithetic -t : sandudd, sanduxt, sandux-t-k' (and API -s) in Cyril of Alexandria and in Middle Armenian (and GDPI sandd-o-c', sandst-o-c' in Yaysmawurk', see NHB, ibid.); sandux and sanduxt in Ephrem, etc. (HAB 4: 173b; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 311). A number of derivatives, in sandl-t(a) - (NHB, ibid.).


DIAL sandul@ > Zeyt'yun sandux. Haçan sandux [Açaryan 2003: 78, 337]. From petrified plural sandul-k': Juła sanduk'; Svedia sandst' (HAB 4: 173b; cf. Açaryan 2003: 414, 586), or sant/dâug/ [Andreasyan 1967: 273, 382a], or (sub-dialect of Xtkbek) sandux [Hananyan 1995: 197b]; K'esab sant/sx/k [Ç'ok'ak'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 sandul-t (see above for literary evidence) as a dialectal form. This is seen in the T'iflis dialect sänduxt. According to Açaryan (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 gâdëo sandaul lit. 'cat's ladder' refers to a kind of chain-like embroidery.

ETYM Since Dervisçhan (1877: 27), connected to Lat. scálæ, -ārum f.pl. (rarely sg. scâla, -ae) 'ladder; a scaling ladder; flight(s) of steps in a building stairway(s)', scandō 'to climb, mount, ascend', ascendent, -ere 'to go up (on foot or in a vehicle), climb, mount, ascend', Skt. 3sg.pres.act. skándati 'to leap, spring, fall off, squirt out, to run out', etc. In view of Mr. scendid 'to jump', etc., Lat. scandère could be reconstructed as *skend-. [Schrijver 1991: 431-432; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1992: 749].

Although accepted by Açaryan (HAB 4: 173), this etymology of Arm. sanduk-k' remains largely unknown to Western scholars. The word is considered to be of unknown origin in Jähkuyan 1990: 72, sem. field 7; Olsen 1999: 951. Nevertheless, the etymology is worth of consideration.

Arm. sandul- probably comes from *(s)knd-sle ذ (cf. Lat. scâla 'ladder, etc.') or *sknd-(x)l-o- > Par. *sand-(a)l-ö-. The nominative in -o- might be from QIE HD NSg *-öl, 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.

saf /saɾ̥/ (several times in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1319b), ISg sarim-b (Theophilus, Yovhannēs Erzncak'ì [or sar-mam-b], Talaran), GDPI saɾañ-
c’ (Oskip’orik) ‘ice’ (Bible+), later ‘cold’ (Nersēs Lambronacci’i, 12th cent., etc.), sahr-aman-i-k’ (pl.) ea-stem: GDPl sahrānāne-a-c’ (Theophilus), IPl sahrānāne-a-w-k’ (Cārāntir) ‘ice, frost’ attested also in API sahrāmāni-s in Job 37.10 (rendering Gr. πάγος ‘ice, frost’, see Cox 2006: 237) and Eznič Kolve’a (i in meaning ‘cold wind’); sahr-n-aman-i-k’; ea-stem: GDPl -eac’ ‘ice, frost’ (Agat’angelos, Elišē, Movsēs Xorenacci’i, Aristotle, Anania Širakacci’i, etc.), rarely in sg., instr. ISg sahrānāne-a-w ( Barsel Con); sahrim (Bible+), later also sahrūnum and sahr-E-im ‘to freeze’, sahrānum ‘to grow cold’ (Nersēs Lambronacci’i, Varden Marat’acci’i, etc.); caus. sahr-ae’-anem (Elišē); sahr-oye’-ic’ (John Chrysostom, Anania Širakacci’i); sahr ‘cold’ (gen. sahr-i in Barsel Con); numerous derivatives [NHB 2: 695-696; HAB 4: 176b].

A few textual illustrations for sahr-aman-i-k’ ‘ice’:


Larabal, Goris sārno is also a noun, ‘ice’ [Dam’tyan 1966: 468; Margaryan 1975: 466b]. A textual illustration is found in Larabal folk-songs of the type jangylum (Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 219, 220): Arev āzee’i, sarnu t’vin ‘I asked sun, but they gave ice to me’.


*satak 569

*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-*tə ‘destroyer, killer’, *satak-umm ‘dying miserably’ (all widely attested since the Bible, NHB 2: 697-698; Astucaturean 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’. It has been preserved in some Western ka-dialects: Karin, Polis, Č-enkiler ‘dead body or corpse of a Turk’; Nikomidia ‘ghost appearing as a corpse’, Aynt’ap ‘a weak, idle person’ [Açarèan 1913: 955b]. According to Açarèyan (1941: 240), Polis sadog is pejorative. Further:

116 NHB mixed this word with the homonymous satak ‘clear, mere, simple’; cf. HAB 4: 178b.

The verb *satakim is widespread in the dialects, in the meaning ‘to die (about animals); to die (pejorative)’. Turkish speaking Adana has sadgil *slmak ‘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. sad- ‘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. padar ‘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+).

*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. śṛṣān- (ISg śṛṣānā, AblSg śṛṣṇaśās, LocSg śṛṣān, LocPl śṛṣāsuv) n. ‘head, top’, YAv. sarah- n. ‘head’, MPers., NPers. sar ‘head’, Oss. sar ‘head, top’, Gr. καρ n. indecl. ‘head’, κορά, GSg κρήας- n. ‘head’, pl.n. κορηνα ‘head, top’, κέρας n. ‘horn’, Lat. cerebrum n. ‘brain’ < *καρ-θ-ς-ro-, OHG hirnu < *kerθ-θ-nio-, etc. For the forms and a discussion of the original paradigm *κ(e)rh-o-s, gen. *κρθ-θ-n-o-s, see Frisk 1:

117 For the contextual framework of this development note an illustration from a folk-tale told by the illiterate Nanuxas Alekyan (native of the Alaškert region, village of Garak’illas) and recorded by Nazaret’ Martirosyan in Yerevan in 1915 [HZHek’ 9, 1968: 200]: Mard mi keln, gelni kert’a sar koč hanelu. <...>, ko zarke kac’in : “There was a man. He goes to sar to bring a beam. <...>, he hits (with his) axe.”
sarik


Hübschmann (1883: 49; 1897: 236, 489) treats sar ‘tip, top; mountain’ as a native Armenian word directly comparable with Skt. śíras- 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; Jahukyan 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 *krr-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 *khr2-oe/os- ‘head, top’ exactly like Skt. śíras-, etc., although the Iranian origin cannot be excluded either.118

sarem

●ETYM See s.v. sari-k’.

sarik ‘starling’ (Hexaemeron, see below), ‘blackbird’ (Philo, rendering keřnex in the margin); MidArm. sarek ‘starling’ (see NHB 2: 700bc; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 316b); MidArm. c’ax-sarek ‘a small kind of singing bird, Troglydtes troglodytes’ containing c’ax ‘shrub’ (MijHayBař 2, 1992: 401a).


The Modern Standard Armenian form sareak is only found in dictionaries [HAB 4: 187a].

---

118 According to Ačaryan (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 *khr2-os. This is, of course, highly uncertain.
Some dialects have compounds with *sweł ‘black’ or *t’ux ‘dark, blackish’: Moks *sivsärík, gen. sivsärík-u, pl. sivsäríkotér ‘skvorec ili drvo’ = ‘starling or blackbird’ [Orbeli 2002: 326] < *sweł-sarek [HAB 4: 187b]; Svedia *sxsråg, t’xssåråg reflects *t’ux-sarek ‘dark starling’ (see Andreasyan 1967: 161, 163, 382b), note also Svedia-Musa Let dxašärík which refers to a blackish bird presumably from the family of starlings (Gyozalyan 2001: 85).


Some dialects have compounds with *sweł ‘black’ or *t’ux ‘dark, blackish’: Moks *sivsärík, gen. sivsärík-u, pl. sivsäríkotér ‘skvorec ili drvo’ = ‘starling or blackbird’ [Orbeli 2002: 326] < *sweł-sarek [HAB 4: 187b]; Svedia *sxsråg, t’xssåråg reflects *t’ux-sarek ‘dark starling’ (see Andreasyan 1967: 161, 163, 382b), note also Svedia-Musa Let dxašärík which refers to a blackish bird presumably from the family of starlings (Gyozalyan 2001: 85).

NHB 2: 700b records dial. čarek as equivalent to sarì/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]⁷⁹. For this type of compounds cf. Zeyt’un jagráv ‘a bird’ probably composed as *čay ‘gull’ + agráv ‘raven’ [HAB 3: 181a; Ačaryan 2003: 325]; Muš, Alaskert c’urur [HAB 3: 618b], possibly composed as c’in + urur. Alternatively, čareg reflects *č̀ı-sarek, with č’ti ‘wild’, cf. Muš *čt̄ır-kak’aw ‘a kind of bird’, with kak’aw ‘partridge’ (see Ačaryan 1913: 716a).


The Armenian word has been treated as an Iranian loanword (Hübschmann 1897: 235-236; HAB 4: 187b; 543, 569, 571; Periyanjan 1993: 26; Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 630). Others directly link it with Skt. sàrî-, Russ. soroka, etc. (Peterson 1916: 270; Pokorny 1959: 569). One should at least be aware that the Iranian origin of sareak is not compulsory (see also L. Hovhannisian 1990: 216-217; cf. Jahukeyan 1987: 208, with a question-mark), unlike dayeak ‘nurse’, which most certainly is an Iranian loanword. For Iranianisms in -ik and -eak, see Jahukeyan 1987: 569; 1993: 263. An Armenian origin is probable for arbaaneak ‘servant’ and tatrak ‘turtle-dove’ (q.v.).

Greppin (1978: 189; apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 362a) distinguishes two Armenian words, sarìk ‘starling’ and sarek ‘blackbird’, and assumes that sarek directly derives from IE, whereas sarìk came via Iranian. However, the semantic distribution between the Armenian forms is not straightforward since sarìk 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. *sàrì- may be derived from *kori- (cf. Skt. śàrî-), *kṛhɪ- (h2)-, *kèhr̥- (h2)-, or *kṛhṛ- (h2)-. ClArm. sarìk consists of *sàr- or *sàrī- and the diminutive suffix -ik, and MidArm. sarek derives from *sareak < sàrī + dimin. -ak. Note other such diminutive formations based on Armenian bird-names that are definitely of non-Iranian origin, e.g. *alawne-ak, *atun-ak, *atun-ik, *alawon-ik, etc. from alawni ‘pigeon, dove’; *cicèr̥n-ak and *cicèr̥n-ik from cice/ärn ‘swallow’.

---

⁷⁹ However, note Megr. čàro- ‘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. ψήρος m. 'starling', Hesychian ψάρις 'a kind of sparrow', etc. Aćačyan (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': OIC. spēr, OHG sparo, OEngl. spearwa, Engl. sparrow, Gr. σπαράσιον, etc. (Frisk 2: 1130; Chantaine 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 Beebes 1977a: 5). For such a metathesis cf. another substratum word, Arm. sunk 'mushroom', probably from *psong- vs. Gr. σπόγγος, σφόγγος '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 IPl sar-i-w-k', as a spelling var. of sar-ea-w-k') 'chain, fetters, bands'.

5th cent.+. In P'awstos Buzand 4:16: kapēr patēr erkat'i sareik 'he chained and bound it with iron bands' (transl. Garsoian 1989: 147); P'awstos Buzand 5.7: ew arjakeac' zAršak <...> ew yanroc' paranoc'ēn šht'ayic'n sareac'n “And he freed Aršak from <...>, and from the bonds of the iron yoke upon his neck” (transl. Garsoian 1989: 199).

●ETYM Usually linked with Gr. καῖρος m. 'the row of threads connecting the warp-threads to the loom', κειρία (also καιρία, etc.) f. 'girth of a bedstead; swathing-band, bandage', καιρόσων (Homer) 'close-woven', καφόω 'tie the καφού onto the loom'; Skt. śriṅkhalā- 'chain, fetter', śriṅkhalā- 'a chain, fetter (esp. for confining the feet of an elephant); a man’s belt; a measuring chain'; Alb. thuw 'fence, knit', as well as with Arm. sar, i-stem 'spider' (Bible+; dial.), see HAB 4: 187-188; Pokorny 1959: 577-578; Frisk 1: 756; Jahukyan 1987: 132, 175. On Skt. śriṅkhalā-, 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', i-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 etydon, 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, καριά can be derived from the following paradigm: NSg *ker-i-h₂-; GSG *kr-i-h₂-oś. 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-dʰ-eh₁- > PArm. *sar-di-.

If IPl 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. givt. This is, however, uncertain.

sex, o-stem: GDSg sex-o-y only in Hexaemeron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 134L.18), but the attestation is not reliable, see NHB 2: 704c; ‘melon’.

Attested in Numbers 11.5, Ephrem, Zgön/Afrahat (sβk), Mxit’ar Goš (sεkt or sexl), etc. Derivatives: sex-eni, GDSpl sex(l)xene-a-c’ (Bible+) and later sex-astan = Gr. σικύα ‘bottle-gourd, Lagenaria vulgaris; round gourd, Cucurbita maxima; gourd used as a calabash’, σίκυα (Hesychius), σίκους m., σικοῦς f. ‘cucumber’, σίκος πέπων ‘a kind of gourd or melon, not eaten till quite ripe’; cf. also Lacon. σκοναία ‘a kind of olive’ (Hesychius). Further, cf. Slav. *tyky, cf. Russ. τύκα ‘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/’u-. 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 Zgön/Afrahat, and in Middle Armenian: Geoponica, Minas T’oxat’c’i, Grigor Tat’ewac’i, Yovhannēs T’lkuranc’i, Nahapat K’uč’ak [NHB 2: 708b; HAB 4: 321b; MijHayBař 2, 1992: 321b].

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 204b]. In some dialects replaced by erez ‘face’ (Larabal erez, Agulis kəc’-iris lit. ‘milk-face’) and recent loanwords such as əxəmyq, əymat, aražan (see HAB 4: 204b; Ačařeán 1902: 162; Dav’t’yan 1966: 469, etc.). Orbeli (2002: 326) glosses Moks sir as ‘пенки, сливы 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’ [Ačařeán 1913: 961a], Aslanbek serunq, serušq [HAB 4: 204b], Ararat serešk 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** Ačāryan (HAB 4: 204b) rejects the connections with Lat. serum ‘whey’ (NHB 2: 708b) and Skt. sārua- ‘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 *k̂er-e/os- would regularly yield Arm. ser, o-stem (see 2.2.2.1). The inflection-class of ser is unknown. The only infl ected form known to me is the ISg ser-o-v in Yovhamnēs T’ikarac’i, 14-15th cent. (Pivazyan 1960: 221; Russell 1987a: P App. III) and Nahapet K’uč’ak apud MiǰHayBār 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; Ė. Mkrt’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.

**sin**, o-stem: AblISg i sn-o-v ‘empty’ (John Chrysostom, Ephrem), snanam ‘to become empty’ (Bible+). sn-oti, wo-stem: GDPl snotw-o-c’, IPl snotw-o-v-k’; ea-stem: GDPl snotw-o-c’, IPl snotw-o-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, Bulanax hasin ‘unmown dried grass’, verb hasnil ‘to wither’ [HAB 4: 215a; Melik’e-an 1964: 510b].


Greek and Armenian seem to show disagreement in the suffixation. The Greek word may be regarded as a thematized u-stem*keny-o-, which would yield Arm. *sing or *sin-r (for a discussion, see Chantraine 1968-80: 514b; Eichner 1978: 152c; Clackson 1994: 138-139). Perhaps a Mediterranean substratum word (cf. Jahukyan 1987: 301). The Armenian form points to *ken-o- or *keneo- (or *aγo-, Viredaz 2001-02a: 2; 2005: 94-95) through contraction, cf. another Mediterranean word with a similar problem, Arm. t’el-i ‘elm’ vs. Gr. παλάς(α) ‘elm’.

The anlaut of (h)o-sin is unclear, cf. o-jin vs. jin ‘staff’.
sin 2. ‘sorb, service-berry’ (“Bžškaran”), sinj ‘sorb, service-berry; haw, etc.’ (Geoponica, Ya’ymsawurk’, Amir dovlat’, 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 (Lazax, Šamaxi, Larabal, Agulis, Jula, 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 snjginja (the tree) (HAB, ibid.), the guttural suffix of which can be identified with hačar-uk, hačar-k-i ‘beech’ (see 2.3.1). Svedia has snjäg (the berry) and snjginja (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]. Ācāryan (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).

sise (GSg sisean in Fables of Mxit’ar Goš; also sisäran in NHB 2: 714b, but with no evidence) ‘chick-pea’, attested in Agat’angeso, Paterica, Galen; sisän in the Fables of Varden Aygekc’i (13th cent.).

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 218]. The final -n is seen in Larabal, Hadrut’, etc. sisëna, sisë [Dav’t’yan 1966: 470], Agulis sáveis in [Ācāryan 1935: 388], as well as in the paradigm of Van: sisë, gen. sisän [Ācāryan 1952: 126].


The reconstruction of the vocalism of this term presents us with difficulties: *-e/i-. For Armenian, *-e/o/- has been assumed [Hubschmann 1883: 13; 1897: 490; HAB 4: 218a; Ājukyan 1982: 112]. In view of irregular phonological correspondences, this etymon should be treated as non-Indo-European [Ājukyan 1987: 49]. Beebes (2000: 29) mentions the irregular alternations k/k̆, e/i. One might assume a borrowing from a ‘Mediterranean’ source [Clackson 1994: 143]. For possibly related North Caucasian forms, see Ājukyan 1987: 601, 612.


sirt, i-stem: GDSg srt-i, AblSg i srt-ê, Isg srt-i-w, AllSg i sirt, LocSg i srt-i, GDP! srt-i-c’, IPl srt-i-w-k’, AllLocPl i sirt-s (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astauacaturean 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), srtim ‘id.’ (Nersês Lambranac’i).


Excursus: ‘to put in one’s heart’

In the Bible one finds a considerable number of attestations of the formula δενεμ 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: ἰσк et’ε du surb edir i sirt k’o ‘If you have made your heart pure’: εἰ γὰρ σῷ καθαρὰν ἔδωκεν τὴν καρδίαν σου (Cox 2006: 105).


The formula is also found in Middle Armenian, e.g. Vardan Aygek’c’i: i srτums 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 Barğirk hayoc’ [Amalyan 1975: 296], the verb sp’op’em ‘to comfort, console’ is rendered by sirt dnel and kazdrel (see also MiHAYB 2, 1992: 329b). Note also ModArm. sirt(a) dnel ‘to hide emotions in oneself; to be devoted to something, work zealously’ [HayLezDarjaBar 1975: 523b, 525a] and dialectal sirt dnel ‘to encourage’ (Aknl, Malat’ia, Larabal), ‘to work zealously’ (Xarberd), ‘to satisfy’ (Nor Juła), see HayLezBrbBar 5, 2008: 335a.

A textual illustration for *sirt dnel can be found in a Larabal folk-tale (1929, Šuši) in the meaning ‘to give hope, encourage’: Iti ink’a ürûn szert tinelav aspasom
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: 30714: Astvac āhumō tōni marťń srtumā “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’ange ţos § 690 (1909=1980: 35813; transl. Thomson 2001: 223): tal zHogin Astucyo 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 səṙ ti 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 *k̂̆red-džedh₁ ‘to put heart’, ‘sein Herz setzen auf etwas’, cf. Skt. śrád dhá ‘to trust’, śraddhá- 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: 3215).

● ETYM Ačāryan (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. sarāta- ‘cold’, Lith. šaltas ‘cold’, etc. from IE *k̂̆olh₁to- (see s.v. saṙn ‘ice’ on this word).

One may assume a connection with OCS sěvern ‘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. sārd/sārdæ ‘summer’, YAv. sarzd- f. ‘year’, Skt. śarād- f. ‘autumn; year’, possibly from ‘warm season’ if a derivative in *-(e)d- from *k̂̆H₁: 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 *k̂̆H₁ur-d- through contraction *-eœ- > *-eœ- > *-iœ- > -i- (cf. 2.1.33.1), and a zero-grade form QIE *k̂̆H₁ur-d- could be reflected in c’urt. Note that in the latter case we may be dealing with the possible development *k̂̆H > 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. sarāta- ‘cold’, etc. above), with a regular voicing *-rt- > Arm. -rd-, or *-d- (see s.v. awd ‘air’, another atmospheric word).
siwn. *siwn, an-stem: GDSg sean, ISg seam-b, AblSg siwn-ē (Exodus 26.32), NPl siwn-k’; API siwn-s, GDPl 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 Movsēš Xorenač’i 2.33 (1913=1991: 1524). Dersim: form GDSg sean, ISg seam-b, AblSg siwn-ē (Exodus 26.32), NPl siwn-k’; API siwn-s, GDPl 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’.

The form *siwn is found in most of the Western dialects (k-branch); Xarberd has 闩 (HAB 4: 222a). Dersim: *sun, sḥn, sḥn [Bahramyan 1960: 99b].

**DIAL.** Agulis sūn [A. Polosyan 1965: 34], Hačan sīn [A. Polosyan 2000: 38, 338], Č’angayn sīn-ē (Bačyren 2001b: 14; 2002a: 323b; accepted in Beekes 2000: 211b; Pokorny 1981: 598; J. Hübschmann 1980: 99b) and a pillar’ (see Clackson 1994: 140), *kīyôn should be regarded as the correct reconstruction.

It has been assumed that the -w- was lost before -u-: acc. *siwun > *siwan > siwn [Kortlandt 1993: 10; = 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, NPl *kīwōmes or NDu *kīwōm(e)h1, assuming that the plural (dual) form might be reflected in Arm. seam-k’ (pl.) ‘doorpost’. Beekes (2000: 21) points out that the reconstruction *kīwōmes for seam-k’ is unacceptable, and that ‘it may have generalized am < q before consonant’. Then he notes that the absence of the w could be analogical after the nominative siwn (= *siaun, cf. above).

The attempts to find an Indo-European etymology for *kīyôn were unsuccessful (see Clackson 1994: 141-142, with a thorough critical analysis). Likewise unconvincing is the assumption that *kiH-yon- ‘derived ultimately by laryngeal metathesis from *kHi-yom- which would derive from *keH(i)- ‘sharpen’, i.e., a pointed pole or stake’ [Volpe/Adams/Mallory apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 442a].

According to Clackson (1994: 141, 142-143), *kīyôn 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 túa (see Jähukyan 1987: 298-300, 304, with ref.). The correspondence between Gr. k- and Armenian s- suggests that the borrowing took place at a quite early period, before the Armenian ‘palatalization’ (i.e. assimilation of PIE *k- into Arm. s-), see Clackson 1994: 142-143; cf. also Jähukyan 1978: 129; Arutjunjan 1983: 303; Beekes 2000: 21.

Recently, however, K. Praust (apud Lubotsky 2001b: 14; 2002a: 323b; accepted in Beekes 2003: 152-153, 165) suggested to derive Gr. κίον and Arm. siwn from
slak’


slak’, a-stem: IPl 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, Čaṙəntir) ‘arrow, pointed arrow, javelin, pike, point of arrow or lance’.


Arm. slak’ may be interpreted as PArm. *su(o)-l > *sul- + -ak’ or *sula- (from QIE fem. *k̂o(u)l-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 (dialect.) ‘cold, coldness’.

● Dial. Ararat, Van, Muš, Č’enkiler-Nikomidia slul, Širak slɔl subst. ‘cold, coldness’ [Amatuni 1912: 592b; Ačaṙean 1913: 972a]; Ararat, Van sll-a-tar ‘sensitive to cold, chilly (person); damaged by cold’ [Amatuni 1912: 592a; Ačaṙean 1913: 972a], lit. ‘taken by cold’.

● ETYM See s.v. saṙ ‘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, J̣uła, Marała): slal, with voicing of the -x-, Akn and Nor Naxijewan have zll, with an initial z-, cf. also Muš verbal zalal ‘to be mistaken’ (a misprint for zlale?) [HAB 4: 225a]. On the literary evidence for zl-, as well as the semantics of the Nor Naxijewan form, see s.v. sxalak.

Ačaṙean (1926: 96) points out that the development x > Marała l is exceptional. Tigranakert zaloxvil ‘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 *zal-+x-l, with metathesis.

● ETYM See s.v. šel ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’.

sxalak ‘drunken, tipsy’ (Isaiah 24.20), sxalakim ‘to become drunken, tipsy, inebriated’ (Philo), sxalakim ‘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).


- **DIAL**. Preserved in the dialect of Nor Naxijewan: *zatel* ’to become drunken, tipsy’ [HAB 4: 225a]. For the initial *z*- cf. *zxalakam* (Chrysostom), as well as the dialectal forms s.v. *sxal*.

- **ETYM**. Belongs with *sxal* (q.v.). According to Menevischean (1889: 62), “wahrscheinlich dem griech. μεθυ-σφαλέω nachgemacht”. As demonstrated by Ačaryan (HAB 4: 225a), however, the dialectal (Nor Naxijewan *zatel* ’to become drunken, tipsy’) evidence suggests an inner-Armenian semantic development rather than a literary influence.

**sxstor** ‘garlic’ (Geoponica, Galen).

- **ETYM**. See s.v. *sxstor* ‘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 Kolbac’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 (Barsel 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’ Ačaryan (HAB 4: 228b) mentions Žula *skesr-ar* and Xarberd *gesar*. In other dialects it has been replaced by recent compounds, such as Zeyt’un *sxgtray-bab* ‘husband’s father’ = *skesur-pap* lit. ‘father at husband’s mother’ vs. *zak-anč-bab* ‘wife’s father’ = *zok-anč* ‘wife’s mother’ + *pap* ‘father’, thus ‘father at wife’s mother’ (HAB 1: 193a; Ačaryan 2003: 308, 338).

- **ETYM**. Belongs with PIE *suek-ur*-h2- f. ‘mother-in-law’: Skt. śvaśrū-, NPers. xusrū, Pashto xwāšē, Gr. ἕκυρα, Lat. socrus, OHG swigar, OCS svekry, etc.

Arm. *skesur*, -a- and Gr. ἕκυρα derive from QIE fem. *suek-er-(o)h₂-*, with *-ur-*, which has been taken from the PIE form for ‘father-in-law’, *suek-o₂*-: Skt. śvāśrū-, YAv. xasura-, MPers., NPers. xusur, Pashto xaar, Gr. ἕκυρα, Lat. socer, OLat. socerus, OHC svehr, CS svekr (*swešur-* was replaced by *swekr < *svekr- analogically after svekr ‘mother-in-law’, see Derksen 2008: 475), Lith. šešuras, etc. The Armenian, Indic and Baltic forms are explained through a distant assimilation *s...k > *k...k*. The Armenian word for ‘father-in-law’ was replaced by *skesr-ar*, a compound with awr ‘man, husband’; cf. Lat. socer-pater, Germ. Schwiegervater, etc.

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 *kujon-to-, cf. also Arm. սուն ‘dog’ (Hübschmann 1877: 17, 21; 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’.


*šɫ- (dial.) ‘ice, frost’.

- DIAL. Dial. *šɫ-on ‘ice pieces on river’ [DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1066c], Muš sľon ‘id.’ [Amatuni 1912: 594a]; *šɫ-i(n) ‘ice pieces on river, icy layer on river, hoarfrost’: Muš sli, Margari-Êjmiacin slin ‘ice pieces on river’ [Amatuni 1912: 594a], Nor Bayazet slin ‘very thin icy layer on river or water’ [Ačāryan 1913: 974b], Alašker (Aparan-Aragac) sɫin ‘id.’ [Amatuni 1912: 594a], Nor Bayazet sɫin ‘very thin icy layer on river or water’ [Ačāryan 1913: 974b], Alojan (Aparan-Aragac) sɫin ‘ice pieces on river’ [Amatuni 1912: 594a], Nor Bayazet sɫin ‘very thin icy layer on river or water’ [Ačāryan 1913: 974b]. Amatuni (1912: 705b) records also slin ‘frozen fruit (said of apple, pear, grapes)’ in the village of Zeyva, Êjmiacin district.

- ETYM. See s.v. saṙn ‘ice’.

smk’im ‘to grow dry’: Ačāryan (HAB 4: 234-235) only cites dialectal forms and MidArm. caus. smk’ec’um ‘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’.

solim ‘to crawl, creep; to move smoothly on, steal, glide’ (Bible+), solam ‘id.’ (John Chrysostom, Nersēs Šnorhali, “Čafentir’, etc.), sol-m-im ‘id.’ (hapax, John Chrysostom); solun, o-stem ‘reptile’ (Bible+; see Olsen 1999: 602-606), sol-osk-, in the verb soloske/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.); sol ‘creeping’ (noun) in Lazar P’arpec’i (5th cent.), ‘creeping’ (adj.) in the Alexander Romance.

- DIAL. The verb solam is widespread in the dialects. The root sol is present in Lazax, in the compound verbs *sol linel ‘to glide’, *sol tal ‘to creep’. Ḥaḵan turkized nsl ŏl ‘to creep’ (or ntsulmiš nsl, see Ačāryan 2003: 338). Derivatives: Van *sol-an ‘creeping (animal)’, Van *sol-sol-iq ‘lizard’, Larabal, etc. *p’or-a-sol ‘creeping on one’s belly’ (HAB 4: 240-241).

According to Andreasyan (1967: 35), Svedia has c‘udil, 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 juhum ‘to crawl, creep’, juhum ‘reptile’ (see Čolak’ean 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)jd (cf. Lat. ad ‘to’) + *sel- (cf. Lith. seléti ‘to creep’, etc.); see Pokorny 1959: 900; Jähkhyán 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 sol ‘creeping’ attested in Lazax. P’arpec’i (5th cent.) and in the Alexander Romance, and preserved in the dialect of Lazax. Compare gaf- ‘to hide, conceal’ (late attestations; dialects) vs. gol ‘thief’ and golananum ‘to steal’ (both: Bible+, widespread in the dialects), golam ‘to hide’ (Afrahat/Zgōn, Paterica, Michael the Syrian). Or else, the verb sol- 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’ol- as an archaic reflex of IE *ts-. Alternatively, the Armenian word may belong to PIE *k̥el-: Skt. sárman- n. ‘cover, shelter, protection’, OIr. celid ‘to hide’, Lat. cellare ‘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 Bulanx sor-sor-ik ‘belly of animals’ [HAB 4: 244b].

● ETYM AČaryán (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. Bkor 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: GDPl 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 Sebços (7th cent.), Chapter 20 (Xač’atryan/Eliazaryan 2005: 102-103; transl. Thomson 1999: 39): ew in’c’ank’ aysr ew andr sorsoreal xusap’e’in “Then they dispersed here and there and stole away”.

sor 583
DIAL. Preserved in a few dialects referring to the continuous outflow of something from a hole [HAB 4: 246a]. T'iflis soro ‘hole, den, nest’ is a back loan from Georg. soro ‘hole, den, lair’ < PArm. *soro- [HAB 4: 246].

ETYM Related with Gr. κύαρ n. ‘a hole, as the eye of a needle; orifice of the ear’, Lat. caverna ‘cavern, grotto, cave, hole’, Skt. śāna- 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: 96a.122


According to Adams (1999: 203-204), PIE *kuHr ‘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. κύαρ n. ‘hole’) + thematic *-o-, as Arm. hur, o-stem ‘fire’ (q.v.). Thus: *kouH-r > PArm. *sówor > *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 *-u̯- 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 Ačaryan (HAB 4: 266-267; see also Jāhukyan 1959: 234), belongs with MidArm. sprik ‘clean, pure’ and CIArm. 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. spaṙ and spuṙ [HAB 4: 260-261].

stin, an-stem: GDsg stean, AblSg i sten-č, ISg steam-b, GDPi steam-c’, AblPl i stean-c’, IPI 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), viśā-psnya- ‘providing milk/food to all’, YAv. stāna- m ‘breast of a woman’, MPers., NPers. pestān ‘breast’, Gr. στήνων-στήδως (Hesychius), Lith. spenys ‘nipple’, etc., cf. also Gr. στήδως-σςες n. ‘breast (of both sexes)’. See Hübschmann 1897: 493; Meillet 1978 (< 1923, BSL 23: 96): 192;

122 On the identification of Gr. κυαρ 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.
srun-k’

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; Jahukyan 1959: 177-178; Ravnaes 1991: 7, 171; Clackson 1994: 99; Olsen 1999: 135-136; Beekes 2003: 198.


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+).

srun-k’ i-stem: GDPl srôn-ic’ (note -î-, = -aw-) once in the Bible and in Paterica; n-stem: GDPI srōn-ec’ (twice in Nonnus of Nisibis), srōc’ (John Chrysostom, Anania Širakac’i), o-stem: GDPI srōn-o-c’ (Anania Širakac’i), etc. ‘shin, shank; the leg’, in Acts 3.7, perhaps, ‘ankle’, see Olsen 1999: 79 (= Gr. σφυδρά) (Bible+). Spelled also as srungn, srunkn, srōn-k’ (in Vardan Ayegekc’i; see above on GDPl srōn-ic’), etc. The compound sīn-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 Golliath: sīnapank’ phnjik’ i veray barjic’ noray = Gr. καὶ κοινάς χαλκᾶς ἕπαν τῶν σκέλον
“And he had greaves of bronze upon his legs” (note barj ‘thigh, leg’ = Gr. \(\digamma \kappa\lambda\omicron\omicron\zeta\)). Note also the denominative verb \(\text{srng-em}\) in different meanings.

● DIAL. Preserved only in Moks: \(\text{srung}\) ‘the stem ends of wheat remaining attached to the soil after mowing (stubble)’ [HAB 4: 286a] (see also Orbeli 2002: 325, \(\text{srung}\)). Ačāryan (HAB 4: 286a) questions whether Karin, Axale’xə \(\text{srnk}'-\text{t-il}\) ‘to slip and fall down’ belongs here, too.

● ETYM Hübschmann (1881: 176; 1897: 493-494\(N^{382}\), see also Scheffelowitz 1904-05, 1: 285) derives from PIE \(*\text{kru}\̄\text{s-ni-}\), connecting with Lat. \(\text{crūs}\) ‘shank’.


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. \(*\text{srū-n}\) ‘shin, shank’ is related with \(\text{srū-il}\) ‘a kind of musical instrument’ and \(\text{srng}\) ‘pipe’ (q.v.). In view of synonymous words containing the suffix -\(\text{un}\) (see s.v. \(\text{c'aw}', \text{c'aw}-\text{un}\) ‘stem, stalk; straw’), one may interpret Arm. \(\text{srun-k’}\) as \(*\text{srū-\text{un}}\) or \(*\text{srū-\text{vn}}\). In this respect, note especially GDPl \(\text{srūan-c’}\), which presupposes nom. \(*\text{srū-w/mn}\) (see 2.1.22.11).

sulem ‘to whistle’ (Philo, Yovhannēs Ūjneč’i, etc.), \(\text{slem}\) ‘id.’ (Grigor Magistros).

● DIAL. Zeyt’un, Svedia, Hamšen redupl. sl-vl- ‘to whistle’, Sved. sl-vl-\(\text{uk}\) ‘flute’, Van sul-sul- ‘to whistle’ [HAB 4: 242]. Hamšen slvluš refers to the whistling or hissing of people, birds and snakes [Ačāryan 1947: 253].

● ETYM Compared with Skt. \(\text{śvasiti} ‘to hiss, pant, snort’\), Lith. \(\text{švaikšti} ‘to wheeze’\), Olc. \(\text{hvæsa} ‘to hiss, snort’\), Engl. \(\text{whistle, etc.}\), as well as Arm. \(\text{šunč} ‘breath, blowing, wind’ (q.v.); a possible proto-form of Arm. \(\text{soyl-}\) is QIE \(*\text{k̆eul-}\); see Petersson 1916: 255; Pokorny 1959: 632; Jahukyan 1987: 133.

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 242a) does not accept the etymology and leaves the origin of the word open. He points out that the resemblance with Georg. \(\text{sivili}\) ‘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 \(\text{snkan}\) in “Tōnanakak” and Yaysmawurk’ (both – in the second meaning) [NHB 2: 732a; MijHayBar 2, 1992: 339a]. Dial. ‘(tree-)mushroom’.

\(^{123}\) On a discussion of Gr. \(\kappaλόνις\), etc. see Huld 1997.
DIAL Dialectally ubiquitous. The final nasal has been preserved in Jula sungn, Ararat sung, Agulis sīngon, Larabal sīng’ən, sīnən. In a number of Western dialects: sunk/g [HAB 4: 252a]. The final -n is also absent from the paradigm in Van-group, cf. Moks sung’, GSg sung’ə, NPl sung’-ir [Orbeli 2002: 326].

Ararat (Valarsapat/Ĕjmacin, Borč’alu/Lori) sokon [Amatuni 1912: 595b]; according to Nawasardean c’ (1903: 108b), also soks. 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. 52; see also Jahukyan 1967: 214-215; 1982: 222c) 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 [Jahukyan 1982: 113; Clackson 1994: 183]. Beekes (2003: 197-198) notes: “this is no doubt a non-IE word”.

Ačarjan (HAB 4: 252a) treats Georg. soko ‘mushroom’ as an Armenian loan, and Arm. dial. sokn 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). Jahukyan (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 Armenian. However, the absence of the nasal requires an explanation. Possibly related forms are to be found in Uralic languages: Mordvin pango ‘mushroom’, etc. (see Gamsuklidze/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; Hübßchmann 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’hongo-/*p’hongo- (and *(p’h)songo-?) ‘mushroom, fungus; sponge’.


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].

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 (Afrahat), dial. *srb-an-k’ ‘placenta’.

For a non-religious context, see e.g. Hexaemeron [K. Muradyan 1984: 76119]. For a general discussion of literary and dialectal data, see Mesropyan 2001.

In atmospheric context, surb ‘clean, bright’ is frequent in “Yaɫags ampoc’ ew nšanac’” by Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 304ff).

MidArm. sprik, sprik, spik, srbkik, etc. (Nersēs Lambronica‘i, Ansizk’, etc.) [NHB 2: 740ab; HAB 4: 256a; MiǰHayBal 2, 1992: 344ab]. In “Bžškaran jioy” (13th cent.), e.g.: spkik (Čugaszyan 1980: 66 [three times], 71116 [twice]); sprkik (52L-4); 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.


In Sivri-Hisar124 one finds surf ‘a kind of small frog that lives in humid holes’ [Ačārean 1913: 981b]. Obviously, Ačaryan considered the resemblance with surf pure; holy to be accidental since he does not mention this dialectal animal-name in HAB 4: 256b, s.v. surf. On the contrary, N. Mkrt’yyan (PtmSivHisHay 1965: 455; N. Mkrt’yyan 2006: 152, 584; cf. also Mesropyan 2001: 119) identifies surp’ ‘frog, toad’ with surp’ < ClArm. surf ‘pure; holy’ treating the animal-name as a relic of an archaic belief. Note Partizak marium-gort ‘a big frog’ [Tēr-Yakobeanc 1960: 512], containing the name of the Virgin Mary. On this issue, see 3.5.2.1.

Xut’ *srb-or-ék’ ‘saints’ [Ačārean 1913: 986b], probably from coll. srb-or-ay-k’.

ETYM Connected (since de Lagarde and Müller) with Skt. śubhrā- ‘shining, glimmering, beautiful’, śobh-/śubha- ‘to be beautiful; to shine’, śābh- f. ‘beauty, splendour, ornament’ (all RV+), as well as Skt. śodh-/śudh- ‘to purify, cleanse; to be/make clean’ (RV+), and derived from PIE *k̄u-bʰ-ro-. Mostly treated as a native Armenian word [Hübschmann 1883: 50; 1897: 492; HAB 4: 256; Pokorny 1959: 594; Jahukyan 1987: 132; 1992: 21; Stempel 1988; L. Hovhannisyan 1990: 213-214, 215; Mayrhofer EWAr 2, 1996: 647, 658; Olsen 1999: 31; Beekes 2003: 206]. Also Hitt. šuppi- ‘purified, sacred’ has been connected to these forms (see Jahukyan 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; Jahukyan 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 *-bʰr- > -rb-, Xač’aturova (1973: 192) treats surb as an old inheritance rather than an Iranian borrowing or Armeno-Aryan isogloss. More probably, I think, the addition of two elements, namely *-bʰ- and *-ro-, points to a shared innovation. Later, Xač’aturova (1979: 368) is inclined to the loan theory. Jahukyan (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 Abaraev 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).


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. sprık, sprık, sprik, 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. sprık directly reflects an OArm. unmetathesized by-form *subr-, cf. Skt. śubhrā-. Since the development *-bʰr- > Arm. -rbo- is unobjectionable and unvariable, one has to assume a by-form like *kubʰ-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 sprık, the latter reflecting srb-k-ik (simplification of the cluster).

According to Aćaṙyan (HAB 4: 266-267), hapax spri-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. spar and spur [HAB 4: 260-261].

I conclude that Arm. surb, o-stem ‘pure, clean; holy’ and Skt. śubhrā- ‘shining, glimmering, beautiful’ (probably also Khotanese suraa- ‘clean, pure’), go back to
*(s)ku-bʰ-ro- rather than *ḳu-bʰ-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-bʰ-ro- compare Arm. sandul-k’ ‘ladder, stairs’ vs. Lat. scālæ ‘ladder’, scendo ‘to climb, mount, ascend’, etc. (see s.v.; compare also 2.1.22.5).

tsuk’ ‘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 Ačaryan (HAB 4: 257), who does not record any etymology for it. The connection of suk’ with Gr. αὐχμός ‘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’, sūt- f. ‘birth, origin’, sūtu- m. ‘pregnancy’, OIr. sugh ‘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: g-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 *p-suH-k- ‘sterile, not capable of begetting or impregnating’ > *n)su-k’ > 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 *p-pōlo- vs. ul ‘kid’, and ayr, ayrea- ‘widow’ which synchronically seems to reflect an i-derivative of ayr ‘man, husband’ but should in fact be regarded as ‘husbandless’: *ₚ-Hn̥r-ieh₂- > PArm. *ananir-ia- > ayrea-.

V

vat’sun, i-stem: GDPl vat’sn-i-c’ ‘sixty’ (Bible+).

*ETYM Belongs to vec’ ‘six’ (q.v) probably from QIE *suwekš. 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; Ravnaes 1991: 13; Clackson 1994 126-127, 206(21, 226(33) is disproved by PIE *peruti > Arm. heru ‘last year’ (q.v.); for further references and a discussion, see s.vv. asr ‘fleece’, caṯr ‘laughter, mockery’, kamurṭ ‘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.

**vay**, i-stem: GDSg *vay-i* (Ezekiel 7.26, John Chrysostom, etc.), ISg *vay-i-w* (vay-z-vayjiv twice in Pāmtuś'iw srboc' Hrip'śimeane', see MovsxXorenMaten 1865: 302.<ref>il</ref>), IPl *vay-i-w-k'* (Agat'āngelos, Lewond, Aristakēs Lastivertc'i, Grigor Aršaruni); o-stem: GDSg *vay-o-y* (Agat'āngelos, John Chrysostom), GDPl *vay-o-c'* (Paterica) ‘cry of woe, disaster’ (Bible, Agat’āngelos, Elišē, John Chrysostom, etc.); *vāy* ‘ah! alas! woe!’, abundant in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 1391-1392), attested also in Eusebius of Caesarea, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Nersēš Lambronac'i, etc.; **vayem** ‘to lament, utter a woe’ in the Bible, P’awstos Buzand, Paterica, etc. [NHB 2: 775-776, 777-778].


*Ew ı̞nkenk' andrēn darjeal, vayiwk', čč ovk' ew ı̞bovk', ew amenyn erkirn žoal zt'agaworn ašxarē in*: “They themselves then returned with cries of woe and lamentation, and the whole land gathered to mourn the king”.

● **DIAL** Widespread in the dialects [Açiārean 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. οὐαί ‘alas!’, Lat. vae ‘ah! alas! woe!’, Mr. fæ ‘alas’, Goth. vai ‘alas’, etc. The preservation of *y*- in Armenian and Greek is undoubtedly due to the onomatopoeic/expressive nature of the word (Pokorny 1959: 1110; Ėchukyan 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 *y*- > Arm. g-.

**vayel** ‘decent, worthy, proper’, vayel ē (+ dat.) ‘it is proper’ (Bible+), **vayel-k’** ‘enjoyment, delight’: i-stem: GDPl *vayel-i-c’*, IPl *vayel-i-w-k’* (Book of Chries, “Yaçaaxapatum”, Grigor Narekac'i, etc.), ‘use’ (Eznik Koloac'i); **vayel-em** ‘to enjoy’ (Bible+), **vayel-叔叔** ‘decent; pleasant, delightful’ (Bible+); for *-u-, 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-.

● **ETYM** Compared with Skt. *vay* ‘to pursue, seek, strive after, seek or take eagerly, accept, enjoy’ [Dervischjan 1877: 49-50], Av. vaiia- ‘wish’, Gr. ἰέμα ‘to strive after; to wish, hurry’, etc. [Scheftelowiz 1904-05, 2: 42-43]; cf. also YAv. vaiieiti ‘pursues’, Oss. wajyn/wajan ‘to hurry’, Lith. viti ‘to drive, pursue, chase’, etc. (see Mayrhofer EWAia, s.v.). This etymology is rejected by Aciar (HAB 4: 299-300), who leaves the origin of the word open. A reason for this is that the initial *y*- would yield Arm. g-. Ėchukyan (1967: 265), therefore, lists this word as an example of the irregular reflex *y*- > Arm. ṣ-. One may treat *vay-el* as an (old) Iranian loan. For *-el(-) compare ayc- ‘visit, inspection, investigation’ (Bible+): *ayc-’el-em* in Yovhannēs Drasxanakerte'i, etc., and derivatives based on *ayc-’el-; arg-el* ‘obstacle’, *argel-un* ‘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.

vandem ‘to drive away, destroy’ (John Chrysostom, Book of Chries).

-ETYM The verb has been compared with Goth. wunds ‘wounded’, etc. from *u-en- ‘to hit, wound’, see Scheffelowitz 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; Ravnes 1991: 71).

veš-tasan, i-stem: GDPl veštasan-i-c’ ‘sixteen’ (Bible+).

-ETYM See s.v. vec’ ‘six probably from QIE *suwek. The development *-ḵs-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. versí-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’yan 1985: 146, 147): i mēǰ royn, 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 Ačar Link 5, 1965: 174-177.

DIAL ClArm. i ver and i veray are very widespread in the dialects (HAB 4: 331b; Ačar Link 5, 1965: 127, 176), but the preposition i has been lost almost everywhere, except for Svedia i vir and ārva (HAB 4: 331b; Ačar 2003: 588; Hananyan 1995: 198b) or yarvan (Andreasyan 1967: 384a), K’esab i vir, ārva(n) (Č’olak’ean 1967: 218a). For textual illustrations, see Svažlyan 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 Larabal, Hadrut’, Goris, etc. yer and yara, ya/irā, yēr/ī [Davt’yan 1966: 69-70, 477; Margaryan 1975: 95]. This development v- > y- is irregular [Ačar 1899: 131] and is not easily explicable through a recent process, although there are also a few other examples, such as Verginē > Yeg’inā [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 yog vs. vēg ‘a playing bone’, *yušap vs. višap ‘dragon’, etc. On the other hand, it is tempting to treat Larabal, etc. yer as an archaic reflex of i ver > *i(w)er (cf. A. Polosyan 1974: 129-131).

ETYM Since long (HAB 4: 330-331 with rich literature and a discussion), connected with Skt. upāri ‘above, over, upwards’, āpāra- ‘below’, Nā. uparā- ‘upper, higher’, Gr. ὑπέρ ‘over, plenty; beyond; above’, ὑπάρχει, pl. -α 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’,

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 *"ger"*-; 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 the top of, upon, over, above’, and *in-suprā* adv. ‘in addition, besides’.

**verj**

i-stem: GSg *verj-i* (Eliša), AblSg *i verj-ē* (Bible+), GDPI *verj-i-w-k’* (see on *verj-k’*); o-stem: i *verj-ay(s)* (Book of Chries, John Chrysostom) ‘end, limit, edge’ (Bible+); *verj-k’*, i-stem: IPI *verj-i-w-k’* in Exodus 28.22, Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.11 [1913=1991: 352], Thomson 1978: 87 pl. ‘tassels, fringe’ (Exodus 28.14, 22, 30), ‘plumes (of a helmet)’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.11); *verj-ay-k’* ‘the last days of one’s life’ (Sirach 2.3, 30.1: *i verjasay k’o*: εἰ ὀργάνον σου; i verjasay nora: εἰ ὀργάνον αὐτοῦ; *verijn*, o-stem: GSg *verj-n-o-y*, AblSg *i verjn-um*, GDPI *verjn-o-c’* ‘last, latter, utmost’ (Bible+). If reliable, *verj’* ‘end’ (only in Aǰerēn baǰaran, 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. J.̌ahukyan 1987 vacat. Godel (1975: 81) and Klingenschmitt (1982: 165-166) independently connect *verj* with *ver* ‘upper brim’, i *ver* ‘above, up, upwards’ from *upērī* (the same comparison has been suggested earlier by Patrubány and Pedersen, see HAB 4: 332b) and posit *uperj* for *verj*.

This etymology seems quite acceptable both phonologically, as far as *uper- > ver-* is concerned, and semantically (*‘upper brim’ > ‘end’*). As to *-jo*, note that *verj* basically has an i-stem, although there is also some evidence for o- and a-stems. Olsen (1999: 84) posits a *vrk*-derivative *uperij* based on the thematic stem *uperj*. This can explain the i-stem, and the ending -j would be due to influence of the oblique *rijeh- or the parallel formation *uperj- > verj-o-.*

One may also think of an old dual in *-ih/, referring to the two edges/tassels of something (cf. acc. erku-s verj-s vs. Gr. δύο κροσσωτὰ in Exodus 28.14, instr. *verj-i-w-k’* in 28.22), and the *j- of the i-stem verj may be due to a possible influence of *araj-in ‘first’*.

For *verijn, -jnoy* ‘last, latter, utmost’ from *-ino- (cf. Lat. *superius* ‘situated above’), see Olsen 1999: 466-468; cf. also *araj-in *first, prime, prior* from *araj* ‘front part, front’, q.v. (see also Kortlandt 1994a: 253 = 2003: 98). For *ver-ust*, cf. *ver-ust* (see s.v. *ver ‘up’*).

Arm. coll. *veray-k’* ‘the last days of one’s life’ probably derives from *uper-i-eh-i > *uperjai, ci, Gr. ὀργάνα t. 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 *verj-ay-k’*. 
The derivation of *ver- and their connection with *ger 'above, higher, over, more than' (Jahucký 1967: 267, 305) is untenable.

**vec** (generally uninflected, rarely i-stem) ‘six’ (Bible+), note also več’ic’s ‘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’sun-i-c’ ‘sixty’ (Bible+).

●**DIAL** The form vec’ is ubiquitous in the dialects. In the dialects of Svedia, Maraš, Salmast, Lărabal, 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. ṣáṭ, ṣáṣ-, Pāli+ cha, YAv. xšuuaš, MPers., NPers. šaš, Gr. ἕξ, Dor., etc. Ϝέξ, 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 *suek̂s, *sek̂s, and *uek̂s would yield Arm. *k’ec’, *ec’, and *gec’, respectively. Lubotsky 2000 reconstructs Proto-Indo-Iranian *šuac̣̄ ́š.


The development *suek̂s > *suuek̂s > vec’ suggested by several scholars is plausible, but one must find a motivation for it. Szemerényi 1960: 78-79 starts with *uek̂s assuming a secondary *s- added on the analogy of *septm̥ ‘seven’. More probably, we may posit *suu̯ek̂s as a Lindeman form or with a secondary *u from the ordinal *suk̂s, 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-č 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: 218121; transl. Thomson 1978: 226): vzč ewet’ kaleal yalt’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 jaxjasmamb (218125).

●**DIAL** Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 338a].

Next to viz, some Eastern dialects also have forms with an initial x-, which, as Ačaṙyan hesitantly notes, may be identical with viz : Agulis xázyak ‘back of the head, occiput’, also compounds Lărabal *xz-a-kot’ (with kot’ ‘handle, stem’), Lărabal, Agulis, Šamaxi, Lazax *xz-a-tak’ (with tak’ ‘under, bottom’), Lazax *xz-i-tak’, Julia *xz-a-tak, next to “normal” vz-a-kot’ and vz-a-tak in other dialects [HAB 4: 338a].

Agulis xázyak presupposes *zizak, cf. siseṙn ‘pea’ > sáysaṙn, spitak ‘white’ > spáyṯi₅, cical ‘laughter’ > cátži₅, etc. (see Ačaṙean 1935: 61-62). Lărabal, etc. *xz-
implies *xiz or *xuz. Jūla *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

*tal - / *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’-ə, imper. tu-r, pl. tu-k’ (extremely rich evidence in the Bible, see Astucaturean 1895: 1412-22); tu-r (imper., see above), mostly pl. tur-k’, o-stem: GDPl tr-o-c’ (Bible+); i-stem: GDPl tr-i-c’ (Basil of Caesarea, Paterica, Nersēs Lambraonac’i), IPl tr-i-w-k’ (Nersēs Lambraonac’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 ənd is, sa et inji caroy 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].


tal ‘husband’s sister’, attested only in Yovhannēs Erznkac’i (13th cent. Gram., NHB 2: 837c) and in a 15th cent. colophon (MiHayBaṙ 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


Jula 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 Jula taln. However, dalnug should be considered analogical after haysnug (note the rhyming context of the proverb), unless new evidence is found.


•ETYM Since Bugge (1893: 27-28), connected to the PIE word for ‘husband’s sister’: Gr. γάλως, Phryg. γέλαρος· ἀδελφοῦ γυνή, Φρυγιστί (Hesichius; perhaps to be read as *γέλαϝος), Lat. glōs, OCS zъlъva, Russ. zolóvka, etc. The expected form *cal was influenced by tatgygr ‘husband’s brother’ (Bugge ibid.; Meillet 1936: 144).


Next to this, there is some evidence for an i-stem, which seems to corroborate Arm. tal, i : Gr. γάλις · 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 *glh₂-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 ‘Schwiegerson’, cf. Russ. zjat’. However, the dental r- 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 Ačaṙyan (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)μ- (Tarōnean 1961: 34; Jahukyan /1972: 272; 1985: 157; 1987: 167, 254; N. Simonyan 1979: 227; A. Xaṙ’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. (Jahukyan’s and Simonyan’s statement that the dialectal form with -w is more archaic than that of the Old Armenian is not technically accurate since the word is attested since the 13th century). One should look for a distribution.

I see two possibilities:

(1) NSg *ĝ(ō)lh₂-ō-s > PArm. *tāluw > *talw; in this case, however, the absence of -w in tal would be hard to explain. From GSg *glh₂-μ-ōs one expects Arm. *talaw(o).
tac (i-stem in NHB 2: 838ε 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)’ (Eznik Kolbac’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, Grigor Narekac’i, Grigor Magistros, Xosrov Anjewac’i); agent noun tac-ič (Eusebius of Caesarea, Philo, Paterica, Talaran); action noun tac-umn, ISg tac-mam-b, GDPl tac-man-c’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Book of Chries, Grigor Narekac’i).

Textual illustrations from Movsēs Xorenac’i:
1.16 (1913=1991: 51ί; transl. Thomson 1978: 99): ew zayls ews eris orošmuns odoc’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 (279L20f; transl. Thomson 1978: 274-275): Sahmanē ew yamenayn givds vans sinel, z linic’in ētaranoc’k’, ew teh snudean orboc ‘ew ceroc’, ew anunolac’ 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 (358L16f; transl. Thomson 1978: 350, cf. foot-note 5 on this paragraph): Oċ’ ews tesanem zhanavor k’o hōt i varyi dalarwof ow oć’ 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: 360α. Ėahukyan 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, -onis f. ‘proverb’, adagium n. ‘proverb’ (see s.v. ar-ac ‘proverb’). The Latin word seems semantically remote; but cf. below on ar-ac. Note another (though highly

(2) NSg *ðH-ōi > *tālu(i) > *talw, oblique *ðH-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. sarī ‘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. taloc’ [M. Muradian 1962: 108, 205], and Moks talv (NPl talv-ir), GSG taliič’ (see Orbeli 2002: 330), and not *talvič’. I conclude that Arm. *tal(u)w reflects the PIE nominative *ð(é)lh2-ōu-s; the form tal may be explained by loss of -w or from the alternative i-stem (if Gr. γαλέη 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: 838ε 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)’ (Eznik Kolbac’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i, Philo, Grigor Narekac’i, Grigor Magistros, Xosrov Anjewac’i); agent noun tac-ič (Eusebius of Caesarea, Philo, Paterica, Talaran); action noun tac-umn, ISg tac-mam-b, GDPl tac-man-c’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Book of Chries, Grigor Narekac’i).
hypothesical) similar Armeno-Italic correspondence with the same preposition: Lat. dorsum ‘back’ (if from *d-h,orso-) vs. Arm. dial. *to’r ‘neck’ (q.v.).

Here the verb acem figures with the meaning ‘to move (around), circumbine’, cf. also aṙ-ac-im ‘to turn around’, y-ac-im ‘to move in a circle, walk around’; compare Lat. circum-a-gō, with the verb a-gō 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 *štā- ‘to stand’ (Cheung 2007: 358-360) vs. Lat. pa-stem ‘to serve, care, worship’ (see Meillet 1922k: 217; HAB 4: 23-24), as well as Gr. ἀρχιπέλος, Lat. ancilus, Skt. abhi-cara-, pari-carā-, all meaning ‘servant’ and composed of a preposition ‘at, around’ and the IE root *kwe/olH- ‘to move, walk around, wander’.

tal, i-stem: GDSg tal-i (Nersēs Šnorhali, see V. Lazaryan 1991: 226L12), ISg tal-i-w (Nersēs Šnorhali, see NHB 2: 839bc), GDPl tal-i-c’ (Philo, Yovhannēs Erznkac’i), ISg tal-i-w-k’ (Nersēs Šnorhali, see NHB 2: 839bc), GDPl tal-i-w-c’ (Philo, Yovhannēs Erznkac’i), ISg tal-i-w-k’ (Book of Chries 2.4.2); later a-stem: IPL tal-a-w-k’ in a kafa-poem to the Alexander Romance, in juxtaposition with aṙaspel ‘myth, fable’ (H. Simonyan 1989: 170L11) ‘poem; song, melody; epic song’.

In Dionysius Thrax (6-7th cent.): ew ztaɫ n k’aǰoloraki: τὸ δὲ ἐπος εὐτόνως [AdonDion 2008: 2L23]. Arm. tal renders Gr. ἐπος ‘word, speech; song, epic poem’. In 58L1 tal is glossed as č’ap’ov greal, which points to the meaning ‘poem’.

In Book of Chries 2.2.1 (G. Muradyan 1993: 47L11, cf. 271 21; Russ. transl. 2000: 49): yiwr diwc’azanakan taɫsn ‘своими героическими поэмами’. IPL tal-i-w-k’ is found in 2.4.2 (51L19).

IPL tal-i-w-k’ in Grigor Narekac’i 61.1 (NHB 839b) is in fact tawɫ-a-w-k’, IPL of tawɫ ‘harp’ (see Xač’atryan/Lazinyan 1985: 486L5, 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 tal, see also T’ahmizyan 1985: 94-95, 116.

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 362b].

● ETYM Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 2: 27) presents the word as tal ‘Einprägung, Eindruck, Zeichen, Vers’, thus confusing it with the homonymous tal ‘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. tal, dat ‘mark’ has been borrowed from Pers. dāv ‘mark’ and is thus unrelated (see HAB 4: 362-363; MijHayBar 1, 1987: 163b).

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 362) rejects all the etymological proposals and leaves the origin of tal ‘song, poem’ open. The appurtenance of Arm. tal with Gr. δαιδάλλω126, 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’, OEngl. talu, 'Zahl; Erzählung', OIc. tal ‘Zahl; Erzählung’, 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).

The etymology has been proposed by Aţayan (1974: 137-140) and is accepted by Ačāryan (p.c. apud Aţayan 1974: 140a3). He further assumes a connection with another Armenian word, *tāl*, i-stem ‘line, rank, row of pearls, people, words, etc.’, *tālem* ‘to line up, organize in rows, plait together’, said of e.g. *alōt’s* ‘prayers’, *araspels’* ‘mythic stories’, *bans’* ‘words’, etc. (q.v.). Further, Arm. *tal*, *tol*, and the Germanic word have been compared to Hitt. *tulii* ‘assembly’ (see J. ̌ahukyan 1987: 117, 161, 319-320; cf. lap’anc’yan 1961: 200-201). Note also Hitt. *tallije/a-ži* ‘to pray to, invoke (a deity)’ (Jahukyan 1987: 320-321), which is compared to Otc. *telja*, OEngl. *talan* ‘to tell’, Gr. *δόλος* ‘list’ (see Kloekhorst 2008: 819), or with Otc. *pulr* ‘Kultredner, Dichter’ (see Polomé 1975: 660-662; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 808i = 1995, 1: 708i4; Tangherlini 1990: 88-89).

The semantic field (cf. Aţayan 1974: 138) can be represented as follows: ‘line of words’, ‘enumeration of deeds’, ‘count, account’, ‘narration, story, epic’, ‘epic song’. Compare Arm. *t’am* ‘number; epic story, narrative’; Gr. *στείχω* ‘to march in (in order), *στίχος*’ file, rank (of words, soldiers, trees, etc.), line (in verse and prose), *στοίχος* ‘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 *tal* and *tol* may be derived from *dλ-(s)nih₂- and *dλ-(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-oj* in Proverbs 25:24; probably also *tamali* ‘roof, house-top; building’ (also ‘ruins’?).

In Proverbs 25:24: Law e bnakel aā nkeyan tamaloy yepi γονίας δόματος ὥπε γονακος λοιπόν εν οἰκία κοινή. In RevStBible: “It is better to live in a corner of the house-top than in a house shared with a contentious woman”.


In the Alexander Romance: *i tamalss* [var. *i tamaks*], on which see HAB 4: 367a, with Ačāryan’s general contextual translation “in unknown marginal regions” (yancan’s cayragawaɾnærmæ). NHB and HAB also cite *tamali* (GSG *tamalwoy*). Jahukyan (1987: 462) even has GDP1 -euc’. However, no attestations are referred to. Olsen (1999: 952) cites *tamalwof* for the Biblical passage, but NHB and Astuacaturean (1895: 1425c) have
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 Təmbäläsk [A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 470, 677] (perhaps better: Təmbäläsk). 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 Muşelyan Karnec’i (Karın/Xotorjur), Turk. gumpē’t is rendered by Arm. gmpē’t and tamali tun [Č’ugaszyan 1986: 42°626].

● DIAL No dialectal form is cited in HAB 4: 367a.


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 Muşelyan Karın’c’i (Karın/Xotorjur), see Č’ugaszyan (1986: 82°625).

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. *tagyr (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°16f), transl. Thomson 1978: 289-290): Ew k’anzi eín dsterac’ noro taygerk’ i mec naxararut’eanc’n, i korovi ew i k’ aj ażgēn Apahuneac’e, <...>: “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
Since long (NHB 2: 837b; Lagarde [Boetticher] 1850: 362 Nr256; Dervischjan 1877: 54; Hübschmann 1881: 176; 1883: 52N208, 1897: 496), *ta*ygr is linked with IE forms of the word for 'husband’s brother': Gr. δᾶερ m. Acc. -έρα, voc. δᾶαρ (but see Szemerényi 1977: 87; 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.

The PIE term is usually reconstructed as *deh-i-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.

Svedia

Some dialectal forms are ambiguous (cf. e.g. Kak’avaberd ṭāḡir, H. Muradyan 1967: 60; on Łarabal, see below). A few of them may go back to *ta*ygr. For instance, Agulis ṭāḡir (see AČařeăn 1935: 391) seems to reflect *ta*ygr, because Agulis accented a is not a regular reflex of ClArm. ay (see AČařeăn 1935: 79-81).

Several dialects preserve the classical declension, e.g. Van tekʿyr, gen. tekyer (secondarily also tekʿyroč’) [AČařeăn 1952: 47, 56, 294], Nor Jula tekʿr, gen. teɡʿer [AČařeăn 1940: 94, 386a]. Note that these nominatives have -kʿr, whereas in the genitive forms, ClArm. -g-, being in intervocalic position, has regularly yielded -kʿ- and -g- respectively.

Further, note Marafa nominative tekʿer (from ClArm. gen. tayger), gen. tekʿer-i, with addition of the new genitive marker -i (AČařeăn 1926: 172); Łarabal nom. takʿir [HAB 4: 356b] or takʿer or takʿer, Northern takʿer (Davtʿyan 1966: 103, 480).

I conclude that dialectal forms mainly represent *ta*ygr, but a few of them (e.g. Agulis and Łarabal) possibly point to *ta*ygr. Remarkable is the vocative contrast in Łarabal 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, dakʿrāre (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 -ě (cf. the material in AČařeăn 2003: 375). For the -ė-vocative, see 2.2.1.1. Thus: vocative *ta*ygr-ayr-ě.

●ETYM Since long (NHB 2: 837b; Lagarde [Boetticher] 1850: 362N256; Dervischjan 1877: 54; Hübischmann 1881: 176; 1883: 52N208, 1897: 496), *ta*ygr is linked with IE forms of the word for ‘husband’s brother’: Gr. δᾶαρ m. Acc. -έαρ, voc. δᾶαρ (but see Szemerényi 1977: 87; on this form), GPI δᾶαρo, Skt. devar-, Lat. deīār, OHG zeihhur, OCS de✈er-а, diēvris, etc. (see also Pokorny 1959: 179; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 84b).
Summarizing the literary and dialectal evidence, I hypothetically reconstruct the following original paradigm: nom. *táygr, gen. *tagér from PArm. *dáywēr, gen. *da(y)vēros. Hence the vacillation between -ay- and -a-. For a similar scenario involving the change of pretonic *-aw- to -a-, see s.v. acu ‘coal’.

taṙatok, a-stem: ISg taṙatok-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’. Ačayan (HAB 4: 377a) does not accept this etymology and leaves the origin of the word open.

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), GDPI tasan-c’ (Bible); i-stem: GDPI tasn-i-c’ (Grigor Magistros, 11th cent.); -tasn in me-tasan ‘eleven’, erko-tasan ‘twelve’, etc. (see Meillet 1936: 100; Schmitt 1981: 130-131); tasnerord, GDSg tasnerord-i, LocSg tasnerord-am in the Bible (a-stem according to NHB 2: 849a, but no evidence for GDPI tasnerord-a-c’) ‘tenth’ (Bible+); tasanord, a-stem: GDPI 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. Jula has preserved tasn intact. A number of dialects have a geminate -ss-: Karin, Ararat, Łarabał, etc. tāssə, Agulis tāssə, Svedia dūssə, etc. [HAB 4: 379a].


Hübschmann ibid. derives tasn from *tesn with the unexplained development *e > a, on which see 2.1.1. Many scholars assume an assimilation *tesan > tasan, cf. s.v. garun ‘spring’. More probably, however, tasn reflects a zero-grade form taken from the ordinal *dkmto-, cf. also the compositional -tasan (for a discussion, see Pedersen 1906: 416 = 1982: 194; Grammont 1918: 245-246; Meillet 1936: 42; Szemerényi 1960: 21, 103-104; Jahukyan 1982: 37, 210a; Kortlandt 1994a: 255 = 2003: 100; Clackson 1994: 20621).

tat (dial.) ‘scorpion’.

*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. [AćařAnjın 5, 1962: 140].

- **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. [AćařAnjın 5, 1962: 140].

- **DIAL** Ararat, Łazax, Larabal tat 'grandmother', Łazax voc. tati 'id.', Ararat tatik 'grandmother', Tigranakert tata 'grandmother'; Akm. Adana tat 'father'; T'iftis tat 'midwife'; Svedia tata 'elder brother', voc. tätö [Aćařan 1913: 1016-1017]; Svedia ďad 'father' < tat [Andreasyan 1967: 385a]; K'esab tātē [Č'olak'ean 1986: 218b]. Widespread is also the compound *tat-mayr' 'midwife', with mayr 'mother' [Aćařan 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** Aćařyan (1913: 1016b; HAB 4: 379) links the word with IE and non-IE nursery words: Skt. tätā- m. (RV+), Gr. τάτα, Lat. tata, Luw. tati(-a)-, Lyc. tedi, dđedi, Lith. tētis, all meaning 'father, daddy', Alb. tātē-a 'father, grandfather', etc.; OCS džē 'grandfather', Czech děd 'grandfather; forefather; old man', děda m. 'grandfather, old man', děda f. 'old woman', Russ. ded 'grandfather', dđjāđja 'uncle', Bulg. дъждо 'grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife's father', dedá, děđo 'grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife's father', d'ādō 'grandfather; father-in-law, husband's father', děđa 'elder sister', Maced. dedo 'grandfather; old man; father-in-law, wife's father', SCr. dđedo 'grandfather', dđēdo hypocoristic 'grandfather; father-in-law, husband's father', Dēđo anthroponym, dial. dēđa 'father; grandfather; father-in-law, wife's father', Lith. dđēđa, dēđis 'uncle'; Gr. γίγας 'grandmother', γίγις 'father's or mother's sister, aunt', γίγια 'old woman', Lith. tětā, Russ. tētja 'aunt' (on these forms, see Pokorný 1959: 1056; Szemerényi 1977: 61-62; EitimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 227-228; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 616; Demiraj 1997: 382-383; Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 195); Georg. deda 'mother', Turk. deda '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. attā 'mother' (q.v.) vs. Hitt. attaš, Gr. voc. ᾂττα, etc. 'father, papa, daddy'. Remarkably, all the three Anatolian nursery words for 'father', viz. Hitt. attaš, Luw. tattis, Pal. papaš (see Szemerényi 1977: 7; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984, 2: 765, = 1995, 1: 667a4) 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, Aćařyan (1902: 332, 334) treats Arm. dial. Polis tata 'wet-nurse' and tet '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 ċitt 'nipple, udder of a cow', MHG zitte 'Zitze', Swedish titt '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. [Aćarean 1913: 262a, 1016-1017].

tatrak, a-stem: GDSg *tatrak-i, GDPl *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. τρυγών, -όνος 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’ange ɫos §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 tatərk-ik (see below) are not cited in NHB and HAB.

Also attested in Book of Chries 5.5.20 (G. Muradyan 1993: 123L22); rendered by Russian горлица ‘turtle-dove’ (G. Muradyan 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: 144L40): tatrak k’aɫc’raxaws “sweet-speaking turtle-dove”. In Aristakēs Lastivertc’i, 11th cent., tatrak appears as a singer beside alawni ‘dove, pigeon’ (Yuzbaşyan 1963: 56L13; 1968: 80; Greppin 1978: 134). In “Govank’ t’rčnoc” (Praise of birds), composed by Kirakos Episkopos (13-14th cent.) rather than by Yovhannēs Kiprac’i or Tēr Yovhannēs, təarkik, with diminutive -ik, is described as a messenger that spoke sweetly and joyfully, prophesying the Spring (Mnac’akanyan 1980a: 256L338f; MiǰHayBaṙ 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 Ř. Grigoryan 1970: 355N759, tatrak-ik and artut-ik (artoyt ‘lark’) are mentioned as sweet singers. Compare the descriptive name arteri ašəɫ ‘a singer/minstrel of the fields’ given to the larks and turtle-doves in Nerk’in Basen [Hakobyan 1974: 86].

DIAL Moks tatrak, Muš tadrag, Ararat tatarak (if the second -a- is not a misprint). With an epenthetic -u-: Zeyt’un daduyɔ (see also Aćariy 2003: 126, 340), dadurog [HAB 4: 381b]. With an aberrant vocalism, ictrak, in Ľarabal [Aćarean 1899: 45], Hadrut’, Šalax [Dav’tyan 1966: 24, 482], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 366b], Šamaxi [Balramyan 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- > -ɛ- follows a voiced consonant and may thus be explained through Aćariy’s Law. It is therefore probable that this EArm. dial. form *retak is old.

MidArm. GDSg *tatrak-u (see above) occurs e.g. in a number of versions of a famous proverb from the Muš and Van regions (see Lalalanyan 1960: 229a; Orbeli 2002: 121N105). In the Šaxat version of this proverb: tatrak-i (M. Muradyan 1962: 172).
MidArm. diminutive tatrak-ik is seen in Svedia dädrgåg (Ačaryan 2003: 365, 379, 589), although Andreasyan (1967: 385a) and Hananyan (1995: 199a) record only dädrg. Note also Aslanbek dädrg < *tatrɪk < tair(a)-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. tittirá-m. ‘partridge’, tittíri m. ‘id.’, Iran. *tadarg (or *tatra?) > Arab. tadraj ‘Fasan’, NPers. tažarv (Eilers 1971: 585; according to Steingass 290b: NPers. taḍarv ‘a cock pheasant, the jungle cock’), Gr. τέτραξ, -ακος ‘black-cock’ or ‘guinea-fowl’ or ‘large bustard’, τίτρας, -ης f. ‘a bird’ and other bird-names from Hesychius, such as τετράδοιον, τετράδος, τατύρας, etc., Russ. têterev ‘Birkhahn’, etc.

The appurtenance of tatrak to this PIE bird-name of onomatopoeic origin (cf. Gr. τετράζω ‘to cackle’, etc.) as a native Armenian word is accepted in Bugge 1893: 70 (assuming an assimilation *tetrak > tatrak); Pokorny 1959: 1079; Saradževa 1980: 106; 1986: 71; Jahukyan 1987: 154, 208 (reconstructing *tʰtʰr-, 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: 629b; Leroy 1986: 72) terms is accepted practically by everyone. Pedersen (1906: 374, 416 = 1982: 152, 194) separates Arm. tetrak from Skt. tittirá- and others and treats it as “eine andere onomatopoeische Bildung (eine noch andere ist gr. τρυγών)”.

However, the correspondence *t: Arm. t is not regular [Greppin 1981a: 505; 1981b: 629b]. Jahukyan (1967: 99; 1982: 51; 1987: 197) explains this by onomatopoeic character of the word, while Ačaryan (HAB 4: 381), noting also the ending -ak, follows Hübßchmann (1897: 39529b) 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 Łarabal 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. τέτραξ 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’el’rən ‘butterfly’, cica/cia ‘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 Ačaryan (HAB 4: 381a), Łarabal, etc. têtrak, comparable with Gr. τίτρας, derives from an unattested CIArm. form which has been borrowed from a corresponding Median form. Since CIArm. stressed i yields Łarabal, etc. ē (cf. cicai ‘laughter’ > cicel, ciran ‘apricot’ > céran, hing ‘five’ > heng, iţ ‘tick’ > tez, etc., see Dav’tyan 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.

Later forms: trgal in Step’annos Siwnec’i, 8th cent. [Adonc’ 1915=2008: 190], 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), dgal in Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i, etc., dk’al in a 14th century colophon and a 16th century inscription [MijHayBa 1, 1987: 171a, 184ab].

● DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects, almost everywhere with loss of the -r-. The only exception is Tigranakert tərk’āl [HAB 385a; Haneyan 1978: 47, 197b]. The forms are: Aṙtial (Hung., Pol.) dig’al [Ačara 1953: 23, 287], Polis, Nor Naxij’ewan t’kal, Xarberd d’g’al [HAB 4: 385a], K’esab dagal [Č’olak’ean 1986: 200a], Svedia d’ig’al [Ačara 2003: 589], Ağulis diğil, instr. diğil-āv [M. Zak’aryan 2008: 88], etc. The other dialects display a metathetic form: *gdal [HAB 4: 385a].


According to Ačara (HAB 4: 421b, 422; see also Saradževa 1986: 66; Jāhukyan 1987: 118, 162), here belong also tōrn ‘pestle’ and torg ‘loom, weaving of spider-web’. Meillet (p.c. apud HAB 4: 421b) accepted the etymology of tōrn. As is correctly pointed out by Ačara (HAB 4: 422b), the original meaning of torg was ‘wooden framework, loom’ (cf. the dialectal evidence), and the meaning ‘weaving, fabric, net’ (attested in Hexaemeron) has secondarily been derived from ‘wooden framework’ > ‘woven framework, weaving’.

Skt. dārvī f. and darvī f. ‘spoon’ are formally and semantically comparable to Arm. torg ‘wooden framework, loom’ and targ-al ‘spoon’ (HAB 4: 384b; Jāhukyan 1982: 71). We can reconstruct Armeno-Aryan fem. *dory (=h2) vs. oblique and compositional *dory- which would yield Arm. torg and targ-, respectively. On the other hand, Arm. torg ‘wooden framework, loom’ is amazingly close to HLuw. tarw-īfag-) prob. ‘wooden beam’ (see below), both formally and semantically.

The semantic shift ‘wood’ > ‘spoon’ is quite natural. In Svedia (Musa-lei = Musa Dağh), for instance, up to the Armenian Genocide in 1915, spoons were made only

127 Dial. drgal is certainly secondary (pace Dervishchjan 1877: 54.).

Usually no cognate forms are cited for Arm. -al- in targal. Eichner 1978: 151 posits *dry-ah₂- + *lah₂-, citing no cognates with *-l-. Klingenschmitt 1982: 238 posits *dry-ël-. One may think of Maced. δόρπολλος f. ‘oak’ (on which see Pokorny 1959: 215), but this is not very impressive. In my opinion, Arm. targal is astonishingly identical with Hitt. ḡ₃targ-āli-, which refers to an implement used for grinding or crushing, probably something like ‘pestle’, ‘Mörser’, ‘Stößel’, cf. CLuw. taru-āli-. 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. ḡ₃targ-āli-, which refers to an implement used for grinding or crushing, probably something like ‘pestle’, ‘Mörser’, ‘Stößel’, cf. CLuw. taru-āli-.

As to toṙn ‘pestle’, note especially Skt. dróṇa-n. ‘wooden vessel, trough, bucket’ (HAB 4: 421b). The Armenian word may be derived from *doru-no- ‘wooden implement’ (J̌ahukyan 1982: 111), with analogical o-grade from nom. *doru. One may also think of *doru-n-t- (cf. Gr. gen. δόρατος, if from *dorun-to-). For the meaning ‘pestle’ cf. Hitt. ḡ₃targ-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. dārvī f. and darvī f. ‘spoon’: HLuw. tarv-ī(ī)- prob. ‘wooden beam’;

Arm. toṙn ‘pestle’: Skt. drōṇa-n. ‘wooden vessel, trough, bucket’;

Arm. targ-al ‘spoon’: Hitt. ḡ₃tāru-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, Լարաբաղ, Surmalu, Van ‘stiff manure briquettes used for heating’ [Ačar 1913: 1018a], Muş, Alaşkert, Bulanax ‘id.’ [Amatuni 1912: 619-620]; Xarberd, Van ‘thick layer of dirt on a body’ [Ačar 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 *dr-₁̣-*. 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 *dmh₁li(h₂)-.*

For *-al(i) in designations for implements or the like cf. e.g. Hitt. ḡ₃ḫulāli- n. ‘distaff’ (see Starke 1990: 300-343; Rieken 1999: 434); Arm. tam-al(i) ‘building, roof’ probably from QIE *dmh₁li(h₂)-.*

* tarm  

607

*i-stem: GDSg tarm-i in Dawt’ak (7th cent.) apud Movsès Kalankatuač’i 2.35 (1983: 229,10); Dowsett 1961: 148; Dowsett 1992: 156-157), Nersès Šnorhali (12-13th cent.), GPDl tarm-i-c’ in Grigor Narekac’i 67.5, Xač’taryan/Lazinyan 1985: 519,10), Esayi Nēč’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 Nersès Šnorhali etc., cf. tarm-a-haw ‘id.’ (twice in Hexaemeron alongside with synonymous
sarik, rendering Gr. ὑψητ 'starling' and σελευκίς 'a bird which eats locusts, *Pastor roseus, the Rose-coloured Pastor*, K. Muradyan 1984: 260,111, 279,13; index: 377ab); reduplicated adverb *tarm-a-tarm* 'by flocks (said of birds)' in Eznik Kolbac'i (5th cent.), cf. adv. *tarm tarm* 'id.' (Ephrem); *tarm-a-ǰur* 'mythological water which is followed by flocks of locust-chasing birds' (Vardan Areweleci etc.).

The adverb *tarm-abar* is attested in Dionysius Thrax, 6-7th cent. [AdonDion 2008: 31.125]

According to Ačaryan (HAB 4: 387a, 422b), here belongs also *torm* 'group of ships' (q.v.).

 feudal word *tarm* 'a bird', with regular vocalic development [Ačaryan 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).

 The connection of Arm. *tarmajur* to Hur. *tarmani* and Urart. *tarmanlo* 'source' (see Greppin 1991b: 725b, 725bat; 2008: 1) 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 Jahukyan 1987: 425 (confusing with Arm. t'arm 'fresh').

---

128 The connection of Arm. *tarmajur* to Hur. *tarmani* and Urart. *tarmanlo* 'source' (see Greppin 1991b: 725b, 725bat; 2008: 1) 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 Jahukyan 1987: 425 (confusing with Arm. t'arm 'fresh').
αὐτὰ καὶ στοιχεῖα καλεῖται διὰ τὸ ἔχειν στοῖχον πινα καὶ τάξιν. Arm. taʳ-k’ and tarrum correspond to στοιχεῖα ‘letters; lines; (physical) elements’ and στοῖχος ‘file or column of soldiers, etc., row of trees, poles, etc.’ respectively. Also in Step’anos Siwne’s [AdonDion 2008: 199]


● ETYM Considered to be a word of unknown origin [HAB 4: 388b; Olsen 1999: 149, 961]. Jahukyan 1982: 106 in passing suggests a derivation from PIE *doru ‘wood’ and reconstructs *dəruro-. 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. *gontu- ‘knee’, etc. A number of such words display zero-grade roots, see s.vv. asr ‘fleece’, barjr ‘high’, calr ‘laughter’, etc. For a discussion of the r/u-declension, see especially s.v. asr ‘wool, fleece’. See also s.vv. artawsr ‘tear’, mehr, mel-u ‘honey’.

We may start with nom. *doru-r, obl. *dr-(-e)u-. The nominative becomes *doru-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. *tara-) 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/u-declension are reflected in different declension classes, note ὕδωρ, -άτος ‘water’ and ἔρως, -άτος ‘love’ on the one hand, and πῦρ, πύρός ‘fire’ on the other (see Rix 1992: 126-127).

For the semantic development compare Gr. ὕλη ‘wood, timber’, ‘material, matter’ > Arm. hivl(e) ‘matter, element, substance, principle’.

tawn, i-stem ‘feast’ (Bible+). See s.v. palat₂.

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects. [HAB 4: 442b]


The Armenian prototype may have been *dh₂p-ni- or *dh₂p-nih₂-, for which there is no direct comparative evidence; cf. Lat. damnium n. ‘financial loss’ and OIC tañ ‘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. ἔσκερων n. ‘meal’, which is usually regarded as a Mediterranean cultural word probably reflecting *daip-n-; its relationship with ἀσεῖς, ἀσεῖν 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; 339f., 352; Beekes 1975: 80).

Further, note Arm. tuar ‘neat, cattle’ (dial. ubiquitous *təwar, 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 Elišè), cf. also tuarac-akan ‘herdsman’ Bible+ [NHb 2: 890bc]; see also s.v. place-name Tuarac-a-tap’. Usually compared to OEngl. tiber, tifer n. ‘sacrificial animal, sacrifice’, OHG zebar ‘id.’, late MHG ungezibere, Germ. Un-g-e-ziefer n. ‘schädlisches Kleingetier: vermin’, actually, ‘impure animal, not fit for sacrifice’, etc.; see Frisk 1: 358; van Windekens 1966: 96; Chantraine 1968-80: 258; Furnée 1972: 325-326; 339f., 352; Pfeifer 1989, 3: 1873. This etymon has been compared to Semitic (< Afro-Asiatic) *ḏ-b-h ‘to sacrifice’, Ugar. ḫb ‘sacrifice’, Hebr. ḥبد ‘sacrificial animal’, Arab. ḏ-b-h ‘to sacrifice’, ḡḥl ‘sacrifice’, etc.; (see Illiš-Svityč 1964: 605); note possible Kartvelian parallels: Svan təbl- ‘to sacrifice’, etc. (ibid. 619). On the other hand, the Armenian dialectal form *təwar is reminiscent of Semitic *ḏawār- ‘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/ai-p-n- or *deip-r- ‘sacrificial animal, sacrificial meal’.

**tel.** a-stem: GDPl tel-a-c’, IPI tel-a-w-k’ (also o-stem in NHb 2: 862c without evidence) ‘site, place’ (Koriwa, Elišè, Aristotle, Zenob, etc.); telǐ, ea-stem: GDSg təbw-o-y, LocSg i təbw-o-i, AblSg i təbw-o-j-e, ISg təle-o-w, AccSg tel-i-x, GDPl tele-a-c’ (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1434-1436) ‘id.’; see also s.v. etl, GDSg etel ‘id.’ (Bible+).


● DIAL. The form tel is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 394a].

We can explain the forms etl and tel(i) from an ablauting paradigm: HD *séd-oł vs. acc. *sd-él-m, or PD *sed-l- (>> *sed-el-) vs. gen. *sd-él-s > PArm. *(h)et-l- > *tel-l- >> etl vs. gen. etel and *tel-. PArm. *tel-a- (cf. GDPl tel-a-c’; etc.) and *tel-
teřem

a- (cf. telī and obl. tel-e-a-) point to *s(e)del-h₂ (cf. Lat. sella ‘seat’ from *sed-l-h₂) and *s(e)del-e-h₂-, 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 zhanderiš aymu’e an izroy yink’enē, arkaw teř ew zardarec’aw “she put off her widow’s garments, put on a veil (= Gr. ἰδίαρσον) and adorned herself”.

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.26 (1913=1991: 75-13θ; transl Thomson 1978: 116): kin omn ciranazgest, erknagoyn 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 Ačāryan (HAB 4: 395b), Georg. t’eri ‘all kind of cover, rug, mattress, etc.’ is an Armenian loanword.

terates, GDSg terates-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 terates dialectally (ramkörén) refers to haemorrhoids of men.

ETYM Ačāryan (HAB 4: 395b) derives this compound (with tis- ‘to see’) from terem ‘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. Afayan (1974: 141-142) explains the semantics through the meaning ‘veil, cloth’ referring to the usage of a piece of cloth for menstruation, cf. dial. šor and halav referring to ‘menstruation’ (on these words, see Ačārliak 6, 1971: 762).

Olsen (1999: 966) places the word in her list of words of unknown origin without mentioning any etymological suggestion.

terem ‘to flay’ or ‘to become callous, be covered with hard layer of skin’ (Elišē, Vardan Arewec’i), otn-teř ‘wound on the back of a horse resulted from rubbing’ (Geponica, see NHB 2: 508b), teř, IPl teř-i-w-k’ ‘callus on skin of sole’ (Ptm. ař leh apud NHB 2: 865c, bibliography vacat); teř-a-zerc aɾinem ‘to plunder, rob, despoil’ (Eznik Kolbac’i, Eusebius of Caesarea, Canon Law), lit. ‘to flay, make skinless’, cf. the semantic development in Arm. dial. plskel, etc. [HAB 4: 395b], teř-a-zercem ‘id.’ (Book of Chries); tɾn-a-wor ‘callous’ (Gregory of Nyssa).

A textual illustration from Elišē, Chapter 7 (Ter-Minarsyan 1989: 354-56; transl. Thomson 1982: 223): Jerk’ mer p’apareal en i kac’ni, ew ołunk’ mer teveal en i p’ayakri “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. dēri, dūrē ‘to flay’, OCS dero, dorați ‘to flay’, Czech dráti ‘to tear’, Gr. δησω ‘to flay’, δισαζ ‘skin, leather’, Skt. dar- ‘to crack, split, break, burst’, MPers., NPers. darridan ‘to tear up’, etc. The Armenian verb is derived from *der-s- (see HAB 4: 395b; Pokorny 1959: 206, 210; Jalukyan 1987: 118). For the forms, see also Frisk 1: 368-370; Chantraine 1968-80: 265-266;
In view of the cognate forms referring to ‘leather garment’, ‘coat’, etc., Ačařyan (HAB 4: 396a; see also Jahnukyan 1987: 118) identifies this ter- ‘*skin, leather’ with ter- ‘veil, coat’ (q.v.). Further note tėrûtes ‘having an issue of blood’ said of menstruation (Bible+), which seems to contain *ter- ‘cloth’ (see s.v.), as well as tar-a-lok ‘coat’ (q.v.), probably composed of *tar- from zero-grade form *dpšV- and an obscure *tok. Note also törn ‘rope’ (q.v.) probably derived from *dors(s)-n-. Finally, dial. tar ‘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 Alayan (1974: 142-143), trn-awor ‘callous’ (see above) contains *tūn or *tum from *dêrs-en or *dôrs-en, respectively. The vocalism remains uncertain.

Olsen 1999: 780 derives têrem from *derh-<e- (cf. Gr. δέρμα ‘skin, leather’) assuming a development *rh<eV- > *r(V)-, which I do not share because none of the examples is unambiguous and convincing, see s.vv. kranv ‘crane’, an onomatopoeia, and merunim ‘to die’, probably from sigmatic aorist *mer-s-; further see Ravnaes 1991: 88a. More probably, Arm. ter- reflects *der-s- (see above), which may be identified with the sigmatic aorist *der-s-, cf. Skt. subj. darsasi, etc. If the trilled -r of the noun ter- ‘veil’ is not due to association with the verb têrem, then one might think of *der-s-<e-, cf. Gr. δέππας 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 erk<or < *erk-ôr ‘(for) two days’ e.g. in a fairy-tale recorded in Alek’sandrapol in 1915, see HZHek’ 13, 1985: 221. erk ma k’elec’in, kam erk<or “they walked for one day or two”. Note also Moks erk<ior found in a tale (Orbeli 2002: 58<5 [Nr 15]; transl. 134); erk<or mnac ‘prošlo dva dny’. In a folk epic from Xarberd (Hut’Sam 1895: 356<22): ṣor ma erk<or anc ‘av “one or two days passed”.


Arm. *ti- ‘day’, as Lat. diēs, may be derived from PArm. nom. *tih < QIE *diēs, with loss of the *-w analogically after the accusative.129

---

129 Alternatively, *ti ‘day’ may be derived from PIE *dih-tw(i)-: Alb. ditë f. ‘day’, cf. OCS don ‘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. dīum, Lat. diem, Gr. Zīv) has been compared to Old Chinese *thiim, *thiin ‘sky’; *tjaus ‘shine’; *tios ‘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: 3Nd12; 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 “Bžškaran jioy” (13th cent.) [HAB 2: 382b; Čugaszyan 1980: 104L1-3, 200; MijHayBar 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 *kalti(’) ‘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.

MidArm. dimin. tk-ik, tk-čor, dimin. tkčor-ak ‘id.’ [MijHayBar 2, 1992: 391b].

See also s.v. aṙatik ‘rope, cord’.

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 406a].
The irregular *gē in Agulis tag', tayg' points to an older *tīg [Ačæræan 1935: 115]. Note also Larabal tek', tēg', teyy' [Davitayan 1966: 483].

MidArm. tk-čor is reflected in Hačan dāgoy, Zeyt'ün dəygüy/[HAB ibid.; Ačæræan 2003: 340]; cf. also Larabal *tk-č♭-i[l] '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 the winebag made of skin of goat. Here are a few examples. It says in a riddle by Nersē šnorhali, 12th cent., Cilicia, that the he-goat (k'ōš) has nice winebags for wine: ginoy uni ałuor təker (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-Alek'sandrean 1885: 5260th): Ul vir u tik darar “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


The Germanic form is derived from PIE *dīg²- (Pokorny 1959: 222), which would yield Arm. *tīg, whereas the Laconian presupposes *ðỵ́-ja <*dig-iy-.

However, aǐça may be a corruption for *aǐcā (see Kortlandt 1986: 38 = 2003: 68; Clackson 1994: 89, with ref.). The Armenian form requires a PIE *dīg- (see Pokorny 1959: 222, hesitantly assuming “tabuische Entstellung”; cf. Jahukyan 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-/*-g-, unless one prefers an assimilation *dīg²- > PArm. *dīg- > Arm. tik (see further s.v. karkut ‘hail’). It is tempting to explain EArm. *tīg- (reflected in Agulis, etc.) from the proto-form *dīg²-.

On the other hand, the Armenian form is usually explained by linking it with Germanic diminutive geminate in -kk-: OHG zicki, OEEngl. ticcen ‘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 *dīg²- with PAndi *t'uka and P'Tsez *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. τράγος m. ‘goat’ from τρώγω ‘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 Jahukyan 1987: 607. On Georg. t'īk'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: 10216); transl. Garsoian 1989: 144). The passage reads as follows: Isk kinn spaneloyn
P’aṙanjemn zhanderjmn pataṙeal, zgëss arjakeal, merkatit i mëj aixoarının kocēr :
“As for P’aṙanjem, 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 Ačaryan (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 merkatit. 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’. Ačaryan (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 τοὺς μαζούς), and Vardiman 1982: 292, 296, and the inset following p. 128 (= Russ. transl. 1990: 288, 292, inset following p. 192).

**ETYM** For Ačaryan’s opinion and a philological discussion, see above. Bugge (1890: 85-86) compares the correspondence cic : (merkaj)tit with car’ ‘tree’ vs. an-iär ‘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.v.v.], derived from PIE *ǵeid- ‘to suck’ and/or *tēta, cf. Lith. žįsti, zidu ‘to suck’, OEngl. titt, Engl. teat, Germ. Zitze, etc. [Jahukyan 1967: 133, 174, 174, 182, 302; 1982: 61, 217, 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)’, titan(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 (AbPl i titaneac’ in Plato) ‘wet-nurse’; titanem ‘to nurse, nurture’ and titanean dayeak ‘nurturing nurse’ (Grigor Magistros).

**ETYM** Ačaryan (HAB 4: 409b) asks: “Made from Gr. τίτϑη, τιτϑίον ‘nurse’?” Note also räbjyn ‘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)’, titan(i)- ‘säugend’, etc. [Starke 1990: 229-230]), one might interpret tit-an as a deverbative noun with the suffix -an.
tiw, GDLocSg tu-onj-ean, LocSg i tu-anjean, i tu-ē (Bible+); later o-stem: ISg taw-o-v (Žamagirk') 'day' (Bible+); tu-anjean 'morning' (Hexaemeron); tu-anje-an-akan 'daily' (Philo, Anania Širakac'i, etc.), tu-anje-an-aon 'daily' (Movsēs Xorenac'i 2.39 [1913=1991: 165L18], etc.).

Frequently: i tu-ē 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 tu-ē ew i gišeri layi andadar “I always cried, at day and at night continuously”); Movsēs Kalankatuec'i/Daxsuranc'i 1.21 (V. Aṙak'elyan 1983: 70L1).

● ETYM From PIE *dieus 'heaven, day, Sky-God': Skt. NSg dyáuḥ, AccSg dyā́m, LocSg dyávi, diví 'heaven; Sky God, Father Sky; day', dívā 'by day', Gr. Ζεύς, voc. Ζευ̃, gen. Δι(ϝ)ός, dat.loc. Διϝεί, dat. also Διϝεί, acc. Ζῆν, etc., Lat. diēs, ēīm. ‘day', in diem 'each day', etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 498; HAB 4: 410 with lit.; Pokorny 1959: 185; Mallory/Adams 1997: 149b.


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', kalin 'acorn'. Further, see s.v. *ti 'day'.

tol, i-stem: GDSg tol-i in Aristakēs Lastivertc'i (11th cent.) and Yovhamnēs Erznkac'i, ISg tol-i-w in Grigor Narekac'i (10-11th cent.) ‘line, rank; row of pearls, people, words, etc.' (John Chrysostom etc.); tolem ‘to line up, align, organize in rows, plait together', said of e.g. ašōt's ‘prayers', araspels ‘mythic stories', bans ‘words', etc. (Agat'angełos, Eusebius of Caesarea, Severian of Gabala, etc.).

For attestations and a semantic analysis, see Alayan 1974: 139-140.

● DIAL Muš, Alaškert tol, Axace'xa, Ararat tol, Sutč'ava doľ ‘line'; Nor Naxijewan *tol ‘ruler (for drawing straight lines)'; Bulanox, Č'arsančag tol ‘necklace' [HAB 4: 418b].

● ETYM Since Scheffelowitz (1904-05, 2: 28) and Pedersen (1906: 372 = 1982: 150), connected with OHG zala, Germ. Zahl, OItc. tal ‘Zahl; Erzählung', Engl. tale, etc. (see also Pokorny 1959: 193). Alayan (1974: 138-140) connects these Armenian and Germanic forms with Arm. tal ‘poem; song, melody; epic song' (q.v.) and stresses the semantic identity of tol with Saxon toel, talu ‘row'. Ačāryan (1908: 122b; HAB 4: 418) links tol with Georg. t'olo, t'oli ‘equal, resembling' and assumes a common borrowing from an unattested Urartian source form. On this see, however, Alayan 1974: 138-140.
*toř ‘neck’.

- **DIAL.** A dialectal word recorded only in the (sub)dialect of Axta/Hrazdan, as informed by Sofia Ačaṙyan, the wife of H. Ačaṙyan (see HAB 4: 658a). Used only in phrases: toṙ le’vel ė “his neck is thickened (lit. filled)”; toṙ hastac’rel ė “he has thickened his neck”.

  Sofia Ačaṙyan 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. Ačaṙyan HLPatm 2, 1951: 388).

- **ETYM** Ačaṙyan (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’ (Bulan əx), q.v. For more examples, see s.vv. oɫ’n ‘spine, back’, uln ‘neck’, and 3.7.2. Lat. dorsum has been interpreted as *d-h-orso- (see Adams apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 88b), see s.v. or’rump’. See also s.v. tac ‘care, nourishment, remedy, cultivation’.

**toṙn,** ‘pestle’ (Nersēs Lambronač’i); sand-a-toṙn or sand-i-toṙn, ISg sanditoṙam-b (Čaṙntir) ‘pestle of mortar’ attested in Proverbs 23.31 (rendering Gr. ὑπερόν ‘pestle’), Evagrius of Pontus, Čaṙntir.

- **ETYM** See s.v. targar ‘spoon’.

**toṙn2,** an-stem: ISg toṙam-b, NPI toṙ-un-k’, API toṙ-un-s (Bible+); z-toṙan-ē (Hamam Arewelc’i, 9th cent.) ‘rope, cord, noose’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL.** Muš, Bulanax əṙ ‘leash, lead tied to a dog’ [HAB 4: 421b; Melik’ean 1964: 538b], Alakert, Ršunik’ əṙ ‘id.’ [Amatuni 1912: 634a].


  Alayan 1974: 149 derives toṙn from PIE *der- ‘to flay’ (see s.v. terem ‘to flay’) but reconstructs *dor(h)-n-, thus confusing it with the above etymon. The derivation of toṙ’n ‘rope’ < *leather rope’ from QIE *dor- (cf. Gr. ὄφρα f. ‘flayed skin’, ὄφρος m. ‘leather sack’, etc.) is plausible. For the final -n, see 2.2.1.3.


- **DIAL.** Larabal and Larak’iša (= Kirovakan–Vanajor) *torg ‘wooden framework on which rug is woven’ [HAB 4: 422b]; Goris tork’, tork’ (Margaryan 1975: 367b, 485b). A textual illustration is found in a story by Aksel Bakunc’, native of Goris (Bakunc’ 1, 1976: 176): mankamard mi ožik tork’i aṙaj gorg ər gorcum “a young girl was weaving a rug in front of the loom (tork’ )”. For more details on Zangezur tork’, see Lisic’yan 1969: 158-159. A textual illustration from Tavuş folklore can be found in Xemč’yan 2000: 17317, glossed in 299a. Samaxi tolk shows unclear sound developments [Balramyan 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. targar ‘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 beat with feet’ (Yovhannēs Erznkac’i), *tp’el* (Yaysmawurk’); top’an, a-stem (ISg *top’an-a-w* ‘beetle for beating clothes’ (Eusebius of Caesarea+); *top’ič*, a-stem (IPl *top’ič-a-w-k*) ‘id.’ (Gēorg vardapet Skewrác’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; J̇ahukyan 1987: 112]. According to Clackson (1994: 224 112), the etymology is not completely certain. For the problem of the aspirated *p* in the neighbourhood of *s*, see Clackson 1994: 100, 222 68; cf. also op’i ‘poplar’ (see Witczak 1991). One should also take into account the possibility of an onomatopoeic word; see J̇ahukyan 1987: 319, introducing, albeit with reservation, Luw. dup(p)i- ‘beat’. Perhaps related with *tap’* ‘earth, ground’.

For the formation of *top’-an*, see Clackson 1994: 112, 224 112.

tuar ‘neat, cattle’, see s.v. *tawn* ‘feast’.

tun, an-stem: GDSg *tan*, LocSg. *i tan*, AblSg *i tan-č*, ISg *tam-b-k* ‘house; stanza; family, tribe; land, region’ (Bible+); *tan-i-k*’, pl. tant. ea-stem: acc. *tan-i-s*, loc.-all. *i tan-i-s*, gen.-dat. *tane-a-c*’, instr. *tane-a-w-k* ‘roof’ (Bible+).


See also s.v. *tamal* ‘roof’.
c'ax

619

t-k'\un 'awake, sleepless' (Grigor Tat'evac'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. Haçn dəg'g'un 'awake, sleepless' [HAB 4: 592b]; Svedia d'k'nil 'to be awake, sleepless' [Andreasyan 1967: 386a].

● ETYM. Composed of the privative prefix t- and k'un 'sleep' (q.v.).

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', “Bžškaran jioy” [Č'ugaszyan 1980: 128b-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 [MiǰHayBar 2, 1992: 401a]. On c'agan 'harrow' (Grigor Tat'evac'i), see below. Dial. c'ax 'branch; firewood; brushwood', c'ak' 'a thorny plant; harrow'.

In Bağgirk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 318), c'ax is represented in three meanings:
(1) a coniferous tree, probably ‘fir, spruce’: cařn mar <...> kam elewin, (2) ‘brushwood, woods, forest’: mac'êr, kam antar, (3) ‘fuel (firewood)’: vařeli.

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'; Larabāl, Seċlecz (Nikomidia) 'bush or branches for silkworm' (note the Georgian semantics below); Binkean (Sebastia, Tevrik region) 'leaves of juniper used as fodder': Zeyt' un c'x, c'ax 'leaf, especially of vine' [Ačar'ean 1913: 1051a; HAB 4: 447a]; Svedia c'āx 'twigs to be burnt in sunk oven' [Ač'aran 2003: 589].

A compound: Van, Muš, Bulanax, Alaškert, Širak, Aparan, Ararat *c'ax-awel 'broom made of branches’ [Amatuni 1912: 640]. Agulis c'āvil shows an exceptional and unexplained sound change -x- : -l- (Ačar'ean 1935: 108, 393). This may probably be explained by contamination with jah 'a kindling oily stick, torch', cf. T'iflis, Şamaxi čal [HAB 4: 119b; Balramyan 1964: 223]. The same contamination may also explain the hushing č- in Larabal čëvil, perhaps also Georg. č'axi vs. č'axi 'branches of mulberry for silkworm'; cf. also Georg. č'axe 'a bush, былинка' (see HAB 4: 447a).

A derivative: Hamšen (c'axud), Trapizon *c'ax-ut 'woods, forest’ [Ačar'ean 1913: 1051b; HAB 4: 447a], also ‘mountain’ (see 3.4.1). On c'ax-an, see below.

c'ak' : Larabal (c'āk' in HAB 4: 447a and 452a, but c'ak' in Dav'y'an 1966: 487), Łaradal, Aqulis, Loři 'thorn; a thorny shrub, the branches of which are used for making hedges' [HAB 4: 447a]; Van, Muş, Bulanax, Sip'an, Aparan 'harrow made of thorny bushes or tree-branches’ [Amatuni 1912: 642a]; Moks c'āk' 'борона из хвороста’ (Orbeli 2002: 338; a textual illustration in 63Nd1, Russ. transl.)
Since PIE *k' regularly yields Arm. x, here one has assumed a QIE *k'- (perhaps secondary, through assimilatory influence of the *kH- in the root) or *sk- , with s-mobile (for a discussion, see Scheffelowitz 1904-05, 1: 288-289; Pedersen 1905: 204-205 = 1982: 66-67; Petersson 1920: 98) or *ks- (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 *kok'w'-eh2-, gen. *kok'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 Ravnaes 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. Jähukyan 1987: 130, 253) points to an archaic distribution between the nominative and oblique stems of the original paradigm: PIE nom. *kók'w'-eh2-, gen. *kk-h2-w- ós. The PArM. paradigm was as follows: nom. *sóká-, gen. *c'axó- (from *k'axó- [with assimilation, see above] < *kHk'-w-óso, 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. *skōk-eh₂-, gen. *(s)k₁k₂h₂-ōs > PArm. nom. *c’ok-, gen. *saxō- > *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 (GDG sg c’ac-o-y in John Chrysostom), according to NHB 2: 904c also i-stem (but there is only GDG sg c’ac-i in Sargis Šnorhali, 12th cent., which points to either i- or o-stem) ‘low; modest, moderate, obedient’ (Bible+); c’acum (aor. c’acey) ‘to become low; to subside; to cease, become calm’; c’ac-an ‘modest, calm’ (Bible+; on this derivative, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 257-8, Olsen 1999: 602, 604), o-stem: GDG sg c’ac-o-y in Eusebius of Caesarea, John Chrysostom, GDI c’acn-o-c* in John Chrysostom.

● DIAL The form c’ac is widespread in the dialects (mostly ka-group, but also Ararat, Salmast). In Van-group, T’isflis, Ararat: c’acr, analogically after barjr ‘high’. Maraďa 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 [Ačaṙyan 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. śaśāda, fut. śatasyanti), pary-śadüh- m. ‘fall of leaves’ (see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 607, without Iranian and Armenian). Ačaṙyan (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; Jahukyan 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; Jahukyan 1982: 61; 1987: 130 (sceptical: Klingenschmitt 1982: 258-9). However, *dy- would yield Arm. -c- rather than -c- (see 2.1.22.1). A better solution would be to envisage a sigmatic aorist formation *d-s- (cf. Jahukyan 1982: 185). The Indo-European root is reconstructed as *k̆eh₂d-, with loss of the laryngeal in Aryan (see Lubotsky 1981: 134). If this is accepted, Lat. cadō reflects *k̆h₂d-[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, 802[s], 966), with reservation, derives Arm. c’ac from *(h)uti-h₁kʷ-ı-jo- or the like, assuming dissimilation from *c’ac’, cf. Skt. ava- ‘off, away, down’, Gr. αὖσιος ‘in vain’, Goth. auþja ‘desert’. This is gratuitous.

c’amak*, a-stem: GDG sg c’amak*-i, LocG sg i c’amak*-i, ISG sg c’amak*-a-w (no evidence for the plural) ‘dry; earth, dry land’ (Bible+); c’amakim ‘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 noća i veray c’amak erkri “May their plants appear on dried-out earth”: ἄναφανείη δὲ τὰ φυτὰ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ψηφα (Cox 2006: 171).

In Genesis 1.10 (Zeyt’unyan 1985: 146): Ew koč eac’ Astuac ze’amak’n erkir : καὶ ἐκάλεσαν ὅ θηκε τήν ψηφαν γῆν.
In Jonah 1.9 (Weitenberg 1992a: 10): Ἀσῆ 

<ref>1913: 448b</ref>. The desaffrication of 

<ref>c'mk'il</ref> from 

<ref>c'amak'</ref> is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 448b], mainly in the meaning 'dry' [Amatuni 1912: 640b; Ačarian 1913: 1051-1052].

A denominative verb is found both with initial [s-]: Nor Namijewen c'mk'il, Polis c'amak'il, Hàmsen c'muk'uš 'to grow dry' [HAB 4: 448b], Muš, Aláxkert c'mk'il 'to shrivel, shrink', Širak smk'il 'id.' [Amatuni 1912: 594], Polis, Larakal *smk'il 'to grow dry', Aráxk, Ewodökia 'to shrivel, shrink', etc. [Ačarian 1913: 975b]. In Grigor, a 13th-century medical writer, we find both smk'- and c'mk'- 'to grow dry', in both cases said of a breast' (see MiHAY 2, 1992: 333b, 404b). The desaffrication of c'- into s- in the initial cluster is conceivable, and I see no solid reason to follow Ačarian (HAB 4: 234-235) in separating smk'im (q.v.) from c'amak'.

It is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 448b], mainly in the meaning 'dry' [Amatuni 1912: 640b; Ačarian 1913: 1051-1052].

A denominative verb is found both with initial [s-]: Nor Namijewen c'mk'il, Polis c'amak'il, Hàmsen c'muk'uš 'to grow dry' [HAB 4: 448b], Muš, Aláxkert c'mk'il 'to shrivel, shrink', Širak smk'il 'id.' [Amatuni 1912: 594], Polis, Larakal *smk'il 'to grow dry', Aráxk, Ewodökia 'to shrivel, shrink', etc. [Ačarian 1913: 975b]. In Grigor, a 13th-century medical writer, we find both smk'- and c'mk'- 'to grow dry', in both cases said of a breast' (see MiHAY 2, 1992: 333b, 404b). The desaffrication of c'- into s- in the initial cluster is conceivable, and I see no solid reason to follow Ačarian (HAB 4: 234-235) in separating smk'im (q.v.) from c'amak'.

It is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 448b], mainly in the meaning 'dry' [Amatuni 1912: 640b; Ačarian 1913: 1051-1052].

A denominative verb is found both with initial [s-]: Nor Namijewen c'mk'il, Polis c'amak'il, Hàmsen c'muk'uš 'to grow dry' [HAB 4: 448b], Muš, Aláxkert c'mk'il 'to shrivel, shrink', Širak smk'il 'id.' [Amatuni 1912: 594], Polis, Larakal *smk'il 'to grow dry', Aráxk, Ewodökia 'to shrivel, shrink', etc. [Ačarian 1913: 975b]. In Grigor, a 13th-century medical writer, we find both smk'- and c'mk'- 'to grow dry', in both cases said of a breast' (see MiHAY 2, 1992: 333b, 404b). The desaffrication of c'- into s- in the initial cluster is conceivable, and I see no solid reason to follow Ačarian (HAB 4: 234-235) in separating smk'im (q.v.) from c'amak'.

An illustration for the verb c'amak'im from Genesis 8.14 (Zeyt'unyan 1985: 180): c'amak ec 'eve erkir: ežirpavbeh ῃ γη.

***DIAL. The noun c'amak' is ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 448b], mainly in the meaning 'dry' [Amatuni 1912: 640b; Ačarian 1913: 1051-1052].

A denominative verb is found both with initial [s-]: Nor Namijewen c'mk'il, Polis c'amak'il, Hàmsen c'muk'uš 'to grow dry' [HAB 4: 448b], Muš, Aláxkert c'mk'il 'to shrivel, shrink', Širak smk'il 'id.' [Amatuni 1912: 594], Polis, Larakal *smk'il 'to grow dry', Aráxk, Ewodökia 'to shrivel, shrink', etc. [Ačarian 1913: 975b]. In Grigor, a 13th-century medical writer, we find both smk'- and c'mk'- 'to grow dry', in both cases said of a breast' (see MiHAY 2, 1992: 333b, 404b). The desaffrication of c'- into s- in the initial cluster is conceivable, and I see no solid reason to follow Ačarian (HAB 4: 234-235) in separating smk'im (q.v.) from c'amak'.

***ETYM Since de Lagarde (1854: 193461f) 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 *-ty-) and a root which is cognate with Skt. ks'am- f. 'earth, surface of the earth', NSg ks'as, GAblSG jm-äs and gm-äs, ks'amā 'on the floor', dual-dvandva dyává-ksámā 'heaven and earth', MPers. zamik 'earth', Hr. ḫḏōn, gen. ḫḏovez 'earth', ḫḏaw 'on the earth', Hitt. tēkan n. 'earth', Toch. A tkam 'earth', B kem 'earth' (< PToch. *tkem-, Adams 1999: 192), Lat. humus f. 'earth, soil, ground' (for the vocalism cf. Schrijver 1991: 204), Lith. zêmē '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'ĝk- (see Euler 1979: 167; Beekes 1995: 133-134). In Armenian, PIE *d'ĝk- and *tk- merged into a c'- (cf. Klingenschmitt 1982: 191, 19135, operating with *ĝp and *k̂p), see also s.v. c'in 'kite'. Compare, however, jukn 'fish' (q.v.).

This PIE word is an old HD m-stem: nom. *d'ĝk'-ōm (Hitt. tēkan, Skt. ksá-s, Gr. ḫḏōn), acc. *d'ĝk'-ēm-m (Gr. ḫḏōn-a, Lith. zēm-ē), gen. *d'ĝk'-m-ōs (Hitt. tāk-n-ās, Skt. jm-ās, Gr. ḫḏōn-ōc), see Beekes 1995: 178. Skt. ksamā and Gr. ḥawmart are derived from an ending-less locative *d'ĝk'-m-eh2 of a h2-collective/abstract formation, probably via a Lindeman-variant *ĝm-meh2 (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 *ĝpma-ko-ā- 'auf der Erde befindlich'; for the suffix, see Jahukyan 1987: 232; Olsen 1999: 71314, 852-854. I would prefer a form QIE *d'ĝkm-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. ksamā- 'versengt, ausgedörrt', ksamavant- 'verbrannt, verkohl't' (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:
c'aytem

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. ἔξων ‘terra firma’, ἔξως ‘dry; withered’, Skt. ksāra- ‘caustic, pungent, saline’, etc.) and 2.1.12.

Ačaryan (HAB 4: 448) rejects the IE origin of Arm. c'amak’ and treats it as a Semitic loanword, cf. Hebrew smq ‘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. kṣā-, MPers. zamīk, Gr. γῆ, Hitt. īkān, 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. kṣāmā- ‘versengt, ausgedörrt’). c'ayem ‘to rinse’, MidArm. according to Norayr (HAB 4: 449a).

● DIAL Nor Naxijewan, Čenkiler (Nicomidia), St’anoz, Xarberd, Sivrihisar č’el ‘to rinse’ (according to Amatuni 1912: 553b, also in Van); Baberd, Sebastia c’ay-u-k’ ‘rinsed water’. In Axalk’alak’ and Alek’sandrapol (Leninakan, now Gumri), 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-’ pl. ‘splash, spray’ (Canon Law); c’ayt-ak’ ‘splash, spray’ (Nersēs Lambronac’i, 11th cent.); c’ayt-umn ‘splash, spray, sparkle, flash’ (Lazar 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’ (Eliēš), ‘to shine, rise (said of the sun)’ (Geoponica, etc.); without -y-: MidArm. c’at’el ‘to rise (said of the sun)’, c’at’el, aor. c’at’ec’ay ‘to rise (of the sun); to ray, radiate, send out shine or reflection’ [MiǰHayBař 2, 1992: 401a]. In Amir dovlat’ Amasic’i (15th cent.): c’at’-k’el ‘to jump down’ [MiǰHayBař 2, 1992: 401a].

In 4 Kings 9.33: c’aytec’aw yaren ēnora zormovk’n ēn zjiovk’n: ἐρραντίσϑη τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν τοῖχον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἱπποὺς.

● 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’el (attested in Kostandin Erznkac’i), which, according to Ačaryan (HAB 4: 449b; Ačaryan 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. skästi (skantu, skatai) ‘to jump’, etc. (Meillet apud HAB 4: 449b; see also Alabekyan 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. skānda ‘to leap, spring, fall off’, Lat. scandō ‘to
climb, mount, ascend’, Mr. scendid ‘to jump’, etc., see s.v. sanduk-k’ ‘ladder, stairs’. None of the etymologies is formally satisfying. One might assume that PArm. *cʹat̂- and *cʹa(n)t̂- have produced cʹayt/tʹ- through influence of *cʹayem from *skot-é-mi, with *o- > -a- in the pretonic open syllable. Note MidArm. and dial. cʹayem ‘to rinse’ (see Alabekyan 1980: 159-162), q.v.

cʹank/g, o-stem: GDSeq -o-y, ISq -o-v, GDPl -o-c’ ‘hedge, fence’ (Bible+), ‘list, table of contents’ (Psalms, Movs Xorenac’i, see NHB 2: 908a); cʹank/gem ‘to hedge, fence’ (Agat’ange ɫ os, Philo, Ephrem, etc.).

● DIAL No dialectal forms are recorded in HAB 1: 197-199; 4: 450b. In 1913: 1052b, however, Ačarayan himself cites the verb *cʹankel ‘to fence’ in Akn (cf. *cʹankac partē ‘fenced garden’). The noun cʹank is found in an expression from Xian: *K‘o cʹankn 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 *cʹank-a-cak-i ‘a small bird that can even pass through the holes of a fence’, as a synonym of Łaraba ɫ-cep’ə-p’ə-cək-ɛ (see Ačarayan 1913: 1052), probably to be read as cʹəp’ə-cək-ɛ, with cʹəp’ar ‘fence’.

● ETYM Usually interpreted as cʹ- ‘to’ + ank/g- ‘to fall’ and identified with cʹ-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 cʹ- + *ank/g- < *pak̂- (see Pokorny 1959: 787-788), which is improbable. Likewise improbable is the connection with Skt. ṣəkə ḍ- m. ‘pointed peg’, etc. proposed by Scheftelowitz (1904-05, 1: 287-288).

The interpretation cʹ- ‘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 kæ m. ‘hedge’, etc. < Late Proto-British *kai < PCelt. *kayjo- < Pre-Celt. *kaĝ-; OEEngl. hege, MDutch hegghe, OHG heggga, hecka < WGerm. *hayjō, OEEngl. haga ‘fence’, OcL hagi n-stem ‘fenced land, meadow’ < *hayån (see Schrijver 1995: 306), OHG hagan ‘brier’, MHG hagen ‘fencing’ < PGerm. *hag-na-, probably also Welsh caen f. ‘Bedeckung, Haut’ < *kaĝ-n̂a- (Pokorny 1959: 518). 130 The Armenian form may be derived from *s-kaĝ-no-. The oldest form is thus cʹang. We seem to be dealing with a European substratum word.

cʹankam or cʹankanam ‘to long for, lust’ (Bible, Ezek Kołbac’i, etc.); cʹang-utʹiwn ‘wish, lust, desire’ (Bible+), cʹang ‘lust’ (Philo).

● DIAL Šamaxi c’anaganal ‘to long for’ [Balramyan 1964: 228], Xarberd c’anaganal ‘to lust’, Muš c’anaguten ‘wish’ < cʼang-utʼiwn [HAB 4: 450b].

● ETYM No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 450b.

One may wonder whether c’an(ə)nəm is composed of the prefix cʹ- and ankanim ‘to fall down’, which also means ‘to sin, prostitute’ (q.v.). See also s.vv. ang-ti ‘prostitute’ and cʹ-ank ‘hedge, fence’ (q.v.).

130 The derivation from *s-kaĝ- ‘to catch, seize’ (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 199b, 564a) is not evident.
c'awł (Hexaemeron, Ephrem; dial.), c'awł-un, o-stem: GDPl c’ōhν-ο-γ (Bible+) 'stem, stalk; straw'. The form c'awł-un (spelled also as c'ōhun) is more frequent in the literature (Bible, Agat'angelos, Hexaemeron, etc.), whereas c'awł/c’ōl 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' (= στάργας 'ear') fallen off the stalk (c'awłun = κααύης 'stalk; stubble'); for the full passage, see s.v. hask 'ear of corn'. Besides, dial. *c’ōl (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, Bulanax, Alaškert: *c’ōl ‘stalk; straw’ [HAB 4: 466b]. According to Ačaryan (1952: 49, 296), Van has both forms, with and without -un, namely c’ōl and c’ōlun. Note also Moks c’ōl ‘millet-straw’, GSG c’ōlš, NPl c’ōhir [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 ḏ (= aw) and o, reflecting them as o and o [wo], respectively (see Ačaryan 1952: 38-39, 48-49). As we saw above, the literary forms of the word for ‘stalk; straw’ show a fluctuation between ḏ (= aw) and o. Ačaryan (op. cit. 49; see also 296) explicitly points out, that Van c’ōl and c’ōlun, despite the fluctuation shown by their literary counterparts, always have an o. This implies that the spelling variant with the ḏ (= 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 Nelos (GDSg c’ōluan and Isg c’ōluamb) [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. śrōni- f. (most in dual) ‘buttock, hip, loin’, YAv sraoṃi- f. ‘buttock, hip’, NPers. surūn ‘buttock’; Lat. clānis ‘buttock, club, tail-bone’; Lith. slaunis ‘hip, thigh’, etc. It may also have been a dual form. For the suffix cf. also kot ‘stem, stalk; handle, shaft’ – kot-un ‘id.’; jol ‘log, pole’ – jatun/jotun-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’ōl 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; cavł-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. Jahuyyan (1967: 180) derives the word from PIE *koltH- ‘stubble’, cf. kozáym ‘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 *kehjulo-: Gr. καυλός m. ‘stem, pole’; Lat. caulis m. ‘stem of a plant), stalk, cabbage’; OIr. cíał f. 
‘faggot, bundle of sticks’; Lith. káulas m. ‘bone’, Latv. kaïls 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, wich 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 *k̂- rather than a *k-. This is not relevant here, however, since both *sk̂ and *sk result in Arm. c’. The PIE s-mobile is very unstable, thus we cannot rule out its postulation in c’aẉ (un) and some other words even if there are no traces of it in cognate languages (see also Jahukyan 1967: 177f). Thus: QIE *(s)keh₂u-lo- ‘stem (of a plant); bone’ > Arm. c’aẉ ‘stem, stalk; straw’. We may be dealing with a Mediterranean-European substratum word.

\[\text{*c’er (dialectal) ‘liquid excrements’; *c’er-d- ‘id., probably also ‘placenta, menstruation’ or the like (> ‘miscarriage, misbirth’).} \]

\[\text{● DIAL. The dialectal word c’er (recorded already in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1067bc) is present in Polis [Ačařean 1913: 1055a], Sebastia [Gabikean 1952: 541], Moks [Orbeli 2002: 338], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 368a], etc.; verbal c’er in many dialects [Ačařean 1913: 1058a]. Akn c’er refers to ‘uncooked egg’ [Ačařean 1913: 1055a].} \]

Some verbal forms have a dental determinative: c’er-t’- or c’er-d- and means also ‘to give birth (said of animals or, pejoratively, of women)’ and ‘to have miscarriage, give misbirth (said of animals)’ [Ačařean 1913: 1058a].


A semantically, formally and morphologically similar form *k̂ok-r/-n- is reflected in Skt. NAccSg śákti n. (RV+), GSg śaknáh (AV+) ‘dung, faeces’, MPers. sargēn ‘manure, dung’ Gr. κόπρος f. ‘manure, dung, faeces’, etc. This PIE word is probably a derivative of the root *k̂ek- ‘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 *sk̂er-no- (Jahukyan ibid.). For *c’er-T- < *sk̂er-T-compare Skt. śākṛt, Lat. -cerda, etc.

Further note MidArm. cirt ‘dung (mostly of birds)’ and ClArm. cretem ‘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 *sk̂er-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: AbIPl i c’n-o-c’ (Philo) ‘kite’ (Bible+); MidArm. c’inayn and c’nin ‘kite’ (HAB 4: 455a; MlJHayBut 2, 1992: 404b).**

Arm. c’in renders Gr. ἱκτῖνα ‘kite’ in Deuteronomy 14.13 (Cox 1981: 136; Wevers 1977: 195; Wevers 1995: 245) and in Leviticus 11.14 (Zöhrapetian 1805: 1: 214; Wevers 1986: 127; Wevers 1997: 148). In Isaiah 34.11 it corresponds to Gr. ἰβίς ‘ibis, Egyptian bird’. Further attested in Zgön-Afrafat, Philo, etc. (NH 2: 913b; Greppin 1978: 52-54). In a *kafa* to the Alexander Romance c’in appears as *sew haw ‘black bird’* (H. Simonyan 1989: 229). The word is now reconstructed as *tkiH-(i)no- or *tkiH-eno-, and the Armenian c’- is plausibly explained from *tk- > *ts-; see Clackson 1994: 45-46, 143-144 (with a thorough discussion); Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 662; Beeves 2003: 195, 196, 200; cf. also Greppin 1978: 54-55. One also may think of the ‘Hoffmann-suffix’ *-Hn-. The word is now reconstructed as *tiH-(i)no- or *tiH-eno-, and the Armenian c’- is plausibly explained from *tk- > *ts-; see Clackson 1994: 45-46, 143-144 (with a thorough discussion); Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 662; Beeves 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 < *tkiHn-ieh- (compare Arm. ozni ‘hedgehog’ (q.v.) < *h1oᵍ-i-Hn-ieh- vs. Gr. ἱκτῖνος ‘id.’ < *h1oᵍ-i-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 čxeni ‘horse’. For the association between ‘eagle or kite’ and ‘horse’, see s.v. arci ‘eagle’. The resemblance with Megr. čxwik-, Georg. čxiwk-, dial. čxwik-, etc. ‘jay’ (on which see Klimov 1984: 222) seems to be accidental.

Jahukyan (1987: 612) points out that the resemblance between Arm. c’in and some ECauc forms meaning ‘eagle’ (Avar  מתאים, etc.) is accidental if the Armenian word is of IE origin. One may perhaps treat these forms as borrowed from PArm. *tkiHn-. An opposite direction of borrowing (Nikolaev 1984: 71, *cc’iHma) is impossible in view of the impeccable IE origin of c’in.

**c’iř, o-stem: GDSg c’i-o-y (Job 11.12 [Cox 2006: 105], Canon Law, Grigor Narekac’i), GDFP c’i-o-c’ in P’awstos Buzand 4.13 (see below), T’ovmay Arcruni 3.29 (V. Vardanyan 1985: 392); u-stem: GDFP c’i-u-c’ (Isaiah 32.14, Ephrem, Physiologus) ‘onager, wild ass’.*
Several attestations in the Bible (Astuacaturean 1895: 1483b), where c’iṙ renders Gr. ὄναγρος ‘onager, wild ass’, e.g. Psalms 103.11, Daniel 5.21 [Cowé 1992: 189], or ὄνος ἄγριος ‘wild ass’, e.g. Job 6.5, 39.5 [Cowé 2006: 78, 250]. In Job 11.12: ἱαγούν ἐς τοὺς ἀναπατακαίνας “is like a wild desert ass”: ἵππον ὄνῳ ἐρημίτῃ [Cowé 2006: 105]. In Job 24.5: Διπεκ αὐτῷ ἰν αὐτῷ ἵνα ἑ θετήται “They proved to be like donkeys in a field”: ἀκήθρου ὄν Χ ἄγριος ἐν ἀγρῷ [Cowé 2006: 168].


According to T’ovmay Arcruni (9-10th cent.) 3.29 (1985: 392; transl. Thomson 1985: 316), there were herds of onagers (eramakk’ c’iṙ) 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’iṙptuk is mentioned by Ačac’yan (1913: 207b; HAB 1: 490b) as synonymous to břinč’, dial. *břo/oš-, *břinč’/j- ‘snowball-tree, guelder rose (Viburnum opulus) and/or Celtis australis or occidentalis’, and dial. tartalan without any comment on its origin and composition. It seems to have been composed of *c’ōř (a negative characterizer of plants, see Ačac’yan 1913: 1055a, 1058ab) and ptuk ‘shoot, a plant’ (see Ačac’yan 1913: 931b; HAB 4: 111-112).

However, Zeyt’un bɔdug (< ClArm. ptuk, q.v.) only means ‘nipple’ (see HAB 4: 112a; Ačac’yan 2003: 336). I therefore alternatively interpret *c’iṙptuk as c’iṙ ‘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 gac:ilin mam, lit. ‘mare’s nipple’ (see Nikolayev/Starostin 1994: 804).


I tentatively propose a connection with Ir. ciar ‘dark brown’ < *kʰei-ro- (the evidence for *h₁ is based only on this Irish form); Slav. *xoĩro- ‘grey’ < PIE *kHoiroː; RuCS sèrn, Ru. sèřyj, Ukr. sèryj, OCzech šerý, etc.; Olc. hår, OEEngl. hār ‘grey’ < *kʰo:i-roː; OPr. sasins ‘hare’; Skt. sáśa- ‘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 *k 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 *kʰ- from *kH- (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 *kH/ei-ro- + secondary *-ro- or *-so- > Arm. c’iṙ ‘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 Kalankatuac'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 'to split, break, cut off', Gr. σχίζω 'to split, cut, separate', Lat. scindō, scidi, scissum 'to split, cleave, tear apart; to separate', Lith. skiedžiu 'to separate, divide', Latv. šķiest '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 *sgiving.

Klingenschmitt (1982: 83, 144-145) reconstructs *sk̪ide/o- or *sk̪ideje/o- for Armenian. However, Arm. c'- points to *sk- or *sk- [HAB 4: 456a]. A voiceless aspirate *k̪-, 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. skiedarą ‘chip, sliver, splinter’, Latv. skāda ‘id.’, šķiedra ‘Holzfaser’, etc.) with hesitation, because the initial *sk-is regularly reflected as *sk̪- 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 *sk̪eid-r- > *seidr-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. AFAQ 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’ańc’yan 1961: 136; Schultheiss 1961: 221).

Ačārayan (HAB 3: 512a) points out that the resemblance with Syriac šråt ‘to tear’ is accidental. Note also Akkad. šertu (GİR.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 Arjiēn barāran 1865 and is unattested.

To conclude: Arm. c’tem ‘to cut, tear, scratch’ derives from IE *skeh₂i-d-. The etymology of šert ‘split wood, piece of wood, splinter’ is uncertain. If its appurtenance with this etymon is accepted, one may assume *sk̪h₁eid-r- with *skh₁- taken from a zero-grade form *skh₁id-. At any case, the resemblance with Lith. skiedarą ‘chip, sliver, splinter’, etc. is remarkable (a substratum intermediate?)

c’ncam 'to joy, rejoice' (Bible+); 'to shine' (dial.).

- **DIAL** T’iflis c’njal ‘to joy, rejoice’, Muş 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, Larabal, Úlu, etc. ‘to pay’ [HAB 4: 459].
Note also Zeyt’un c’ınjöl ‘to joy’ [Açaryan 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’ınjöl seems relevant. The infinitive ending -al of the Zeyt’un regularly derives from -al. Note that the verb c’ıcam (inf. c’ıcal) belongs to a-conjugation both in ClArm. and in all the dialects. The vocalic development *c’ınc- > c’ınjɔl is regular too, cf. targal ‘spoon’ > Zeyt’un d’ęg’al, sunda ‘to joy’ > Zeyt’un xunlobber, merkanal > Zeyt’un mıygonal vs. merk ‘naked’ > mıy, etc. (see Açaryan 2003: 24-25, 146, 198-201). This implies that Zey-t’un c’ınjöl 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+), chándu- ‘pleasing’ (RV), YAv. sahāiteiti ‘to appear’, etc. and derives the Armenian from *sk̡end-i-o-. Açaryan (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 *sk̡̄end-i-o-, however, would yield Arm. *c’(i)nč-. I propose to derive *c’inc- from the sigmatic aorist form *skend-s-, cf. Skt. (RV) 3sg.act. achān, 3pl.act. achāntsur, subj. chantsat, imper. chantsi (see Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 555-556; Lubotsky 2001a: 32; Baum 2006: 110). Note also Skt. (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, bogey’ (Bible+); c’norim ‘to be mad or furious, act crazily’ (Agat’angelos, Eznik Kolbac’i, Elišē, Movišē Xorenac’i, John Chrysostom, Evagrius of Pontus, etc.).

In an appendix apud Afak’el Dawrižec’i /17th cent./, c’nor’ seems to contextually correspond to vatrəz ‘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’ir-, comparable with Goth. skein(an), and the suffix -or. Açaryan (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) + *h₁nor-i(h₂) ‘to/at dream, fantasy’ (see s.v. anur-j-k’, i-stem ‘dream, daydream, prophetic vision, vision’). Thus: *h₁esk(w)eh₁h₁nor-i(h₂) > PArm. *sk̡̄en-(H)nor-i- > *c’ınor-i- > c’nor, i-stem.

**c’urt**

o-stem: GDG c’urt-o-y (Bible, Eznik Kolbac’i); i-stem: GDG 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. sarm ‘cold’ (q.v.), see apart from old attempts recorded in HAB 4: 463-464, also Jahykanyan 1967: 180. On the other hand, it is compared with OCS sěverъ ‘North, Northern wind’, SCr. sjěvěr ‘North’, Lith. šiaurė f. ‘North’ < *keh₁-wer-o-, Lat. caurus m. ‘northwestern wind’ < *kh₁-wer-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 *kH > Arm. c’ (see 2.1.18.1). Thus: QIE *kH₁ur-do- > c’urt. Further, see s.v. sird/t ‘hoarfrost-bringing wind’.

ul, i-stem: GDPl ut’-i-c’ ‘eight’ (Bible+); ut’sun, i-stem: GDPl ut’sn-i-c’ ‘eighty’ (Bible+); ut’erord, a-stem: GDSg ut’erord-i, GDPl ut’erord-a-c’ ‘eighth’ (Bible+).

DIAL The form ut’ is ubiquitous in the dialects; ut’sun is widespread, but in some dialects it has been replaced by sɛk’sɛn of Turkish origin [HAB 3: 591].

ETYM Derived from PIE *H(o)k̂t- ‘eight’: Skt. aṣṭā́(u), Gr. ὀκτώ, Lat. octō, OIr. ocht, etc. The absence of palatalization of the *-k̂- in Armenian is due to influence of *septm > evt’n ‘seven’; cf. the Greek by-form ὀκτώ. See Hübbschmann 1897: 483-484; HAB 3: 590-591; Meillet 1936: 32; Meilorny 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 *h₁k̂t- taken from the ordinal (Kortlandt 1983: 14; 1994a: 255 = 2003: 44, 99-100; Beekes 1987b: 7). This is plausible, although *Hokt- perhaps remains a possibility (cf. Schrijver 1991: 49, 147).

ul, o-stem: GDPl ul-o-c’ ‘kid’ (Bible+); 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 Larabal, 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. fūla, OHG folo ‘id.’.


Arm. ul ‘kid’ and al-oj ‘female kid’ (q.v.) may have belonged to the same original paradigm: nom. *pōH-s > PArm. *hūl, gen. *pH-ōs > PArm. *ul-ō-.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 Larabal and adjacent dialects have

ulln

(GDSg ulan, NPl ulunk', GDPl ulanc') ‘neck’ (Bible+). Spelled also as unlink and olun. Norayr records MidArm. yulanc' tal ‘to push (Fr. pousser)’ (see HAB 3: 592b).

DIAL Ačaryan records only J̌ula ulanc' tal ‘to push with one’s arm’ (HAB 3: 592b), which is identical with the MidArm. form of Norayr (see above). In Bağirk' hayoc' (see Amalyan 1975: 191[445]), hrel is interpreted as meržel, kam k'ri tal, kam ulans tal.

Note also Muš pařeki hulunk' ‘spinal column’ glossed in HZHek' 12, 1984: 641a. Since pařek-i means ‘of back’, uln here seems to refer to ‘vertebra’; see below.

ETYM Derived from PIE *Heh3l-en- or *HoHl-en-: Gr. ὀλένη f. ‘elbow, underarm’; Lat. ulan f. ‘elbow’; OHG el(i)na f. ‘ell’, etc., as well as Arm. əln (GDSg əlin, ISg olnamb, NPl olunk', GDPI olanc’) ‘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 J̌ula, 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. əln ‘spine, backbone, etc.’ and uln ‘neck’, cf. Gr. σφόνδῠλος m. ‘vertebra; (pl.) backbone, spine; neck; joint, etc.’. Note that the neck is, in fact, a part of the spinal column. Finally, Muš pařeki hulunk' ‘spinal column’ actually means ‘vertebrae of back’ and can be considered an important intermediary between əln and uln.

Lidén (1906: 129-130), albeit with some reservation, connects uln ‘neck’ with the homonymous uln (NPl ulunk', GDPI ulanc’) ‘a piece of pearl or glass, bead; knucklebone; collarbone, clavicle’ (Bible+). See also Jahukyan 1987: 165.

ulln (NPl ulunk', GDPI ulanc') ‘a piece of pearl or glass, bead; knucklebone; collarbone, clavicle’ (Bible+). See also Jahukyan 1987: 165.

uln (NPl ulunk', GDPI ulanc') ‘neck’.

*ulul- (dial.) ‘to lament, cry’: see s.v. otol- ‘to wail, lament’.

ulel, o-stem: GDAbSg y-ul-ə-q in Eznik Kolbac'i, Grigor Narekac'i; GDPI ul-o-c' in Hebrews 4.12, Anania Širakac'i [NHB 2: 544ab]; PIPI ul-o-v-k' in Elišē (see below); some late evidence points to an o-stem: GDSg ulv-i, uliwl-i, AbISg y-ulv-ə, ISg ulv-ə-w (Plato apud NHB, ibid) ‘brain’ (Ezinkolbac'i, P'awstos Buzand, etc.), ‘marrow’ (Bible+); renders Gr. μυελός ‘marrow’.

Biblical attestations:

In Job 21.24: *uθɛl nora šescėvė‘ ‘his marrow will become liquified’: μυελὸς δὲ αὐτοῦ διαχεῖται [Cox 2006: 156].

That *uθel also refers to the marrow of animals is exemplified by e.g. the passage from Elišė (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 404\textsuperscript{23}): *sneal ēin *uθlovc‘ ‘zuarakac‘ ‘had been raised on the marrow of the steers’ (transl. Thomson 1982: 246).


●DIAL. The dialects have two basic forms: *uθel and *uθwil. The latter variant which contains a labial vowel in the second syllable is also attested in later literature (see above). For Svedia (ο)θθɛl, ʰiθ ‘marrow’, see oθn. The initial *u of the form *uθel is mostly reduced to ə or zero. It has been preserved (or secondarily restored as in pɨtə̂l ‘fruit’ > Marala pɨtə̂l, etc.? in Marala and Ćaylu əl (see Acaryan 1926: 70, 107, 418; Davt’yan 1966: 449), Urmia (Χοy) əl (M. Asatryan 1962: 204a), Kak’avaberd əl (in two villages; in the other two – bɨl [H. Muradyan 1967: 182a]; Nor-Naxijewan əl ‘marrow’ (see AČarean 1925: 446; in 64 – as an exception to the rule u / unstressed/ ə or zero). There are alternating forms with and without an initial h- (Larabal əl, ʰoθl, hoθɨl [Davt’yan 1966: 449]; Karčewan əl, hoθɨl [H. Muradyan 1960: 202b]), and y*- (Muš y’leθ next to uθel).

Hamšen has uθel and əθ (GSg uθel, iθvi) for ‘brain’, and (əskri) yel for ‘marrow’ [AČarean 1947: 27, 54, 250].

The “pure” root *uθ ‘brain’ is found in Modern Armenian uθn u cuco ‘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 uθl. 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 uθel > uθ. At any rate, *uθ is found only in the expression uθn u cuco and seems to be merely a reduced form from uθel.

●ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 594. Considered to be a word of unknown origin, see Jahukyan 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 uθloy, the older NSg can be reconstructed as *uθil [Meillet 1913: 20].

The variants with a labial vowel in the second syllable, namely *uθil, and perhaps also uθwil (= /uθil/?), need an explanation. In view of the absence of reliable examples, Acaryan (1926: 70) points out that the sound change seen in Marala əl cannot be specified. H. Muradyan (1960: 30) explains the Karčewan form (b)əl from uθel by regressive assimilation (uθel > *uθil) 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 uθel and uθil, Jula əl and ʃθel (HAB), Mehtišen əl, əl (Davt’yan 1966: 449). Besides, the variant *uθil is widespread in many dialects ranging from Nor-Naxijewan and T’iflis to Syria, Persia and Larabal, and the spelling variant uθwil seems to have solid philological basis (cf. Olsen 1999: 56\textsuperscript{-57}, 120). Jahukyan (1987: 374), with some reservation, sees in uθwil a vowel palatalization. Olsen (ibid.) even treats uθwil as the original form, ascribing etymological value to -w-. She suggests a compound of uθ ‘road’, here the meaning ‘tube’ > ‘hollow bone’ (cf. in particular OPr. aulis
‘shinbone’) + *-plh₂-o- ‘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 *ultel and ignores the other forms, of which *ulet is indispensable. Therefore, one may tentatively suggest the following paradigm: NSG *ul-ut, Obl. *ul-et-. These doublets can theoretically betray an IE l-stem with *-öl in the nominative and *-el- elsewhere, cf. acut ‘coal’, aseln ‘needle’, etc. (see 2.2.2.5). It is interesting, that both aseln/*asul and *ulet/*ultel are represented in certain dialects by semantic differentiation. For aseln, see s.v. As for *ulet, note Van *ulet ‘brain’ vs. *ultel ‘marrow’ [HAB 3: 594b]. Hamsen ṣlu ‘brain’ vs. ye‘l ‘marrow’ [Ačaryan 1947: 27, 54, 250]. The semantic details of the correspondent pair in Jula and Mehtišen are not known. In Muš, such a semantic differentiation is represented by the doublets differing in anlaut: y‘el ‘brain’ vs. *ulet ‘marrow’ [HAB 3: 594b].

If my analysis is accepted, one may tentatively connect the root *ul- ‘marrow; brain’ with *ohn (GDSg ohn, ISg ohamb, NPI ohunk’, GDPI olane’) ‘spine, back(bone); spine with spinal cord; marrow’ (Bible+; dialects). The latter, despite the semantic difference, is usually derived from PIE *Heh₁l-en-: Gr. ὠλένη f. ‘elbow, underarm’; Lat. ulna f. ‘elbow’; OHG el(i)na f. ‘ell’; Lith. iuložtis, Latv. iuložts ‘ell’, etc., as well as Arm. uln (GDSg ulan, NPI ulunk’, GDPI ulanc’) ‘neck’ (Bible+; dialect of Jula) and uluk ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ (Bible+; dialect of Larabal, 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 aseln and acut, however, there is no ground for a PIE l-stem here. If the PIE word did have l-stem (*HIVH-l-, see Schrijver 1991: 78-79), it is already reflected in Arm. *ul-. The ending of the Armenian form can be a suffix. It is worth mentioning that Gr. μυ-ελός m. ‘marrow’ (Homer+), all the etymological attempts of which deal with the root *μυ- (see Frisk 2: 264; Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 818 with ref.; Watkins 1995: 531-, 535-536), has the same suffix *-elo-. Note also Gr. σπόνδ-ολος m. ‘vertebra; (pl.) backbone, spine; neck; joint; circular whorl which balances and twirls a spindle’. The Armenian by-form *ul-ul, then, can be due to influence of the proto-paradigm of aseln, etc. See also aleln.

I conclude: next to ol-n ‘spine; marrow’ and ul-n ‘neck’, there was also *ul-‘spine’, which, with the suffix *-elo-, formed *ulet, o-stem ‘brain; marrow’.

How to explain the later literary forms yil and yel, as well as dial. (Muš) y‘el (next to *ulet), the initial h- Larabal and some adjacent dialects? Since the initial u- is in a pretonic syllable, it can have replaced an older *uy- (in terms of the ClArm orthography, oy-). We arrive, then, at a *UYlilo-. In some of the dialectal areas and/or at some stages, the initial *uy- might yield i and/or iy-. In this particular case, however, one may prefer restoring of a by-form with the prefix y- < *Heh₁- ‘in’ (see 2.3.1). The etymological meaning of *ult- (if indeed related with ol-n ‘spine, etc.) is ‘spine’. In *y-ulet ‘marrow; brain’, then, the marrow (or brain) is seen as substance which is in the spine (or in the skull).

uluk ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ (Bible). Also ulk-ean ‘handbreadth’ (Bible+), see Olsen 1999: 501-502.
unayn

Dial. Larabał ʰaḥʾık, ʰaḥʾık’; Mehtišen ʰuḥuk [HAB 3: 597; Davt’yan 1966: 449]. Davt’yan (ibid.) cites ḵ’ēł, ḵēl, as well as ṭ’iz under the lemma ʰuḥuk, as if they are semantically identical. According to Malxaseane’ (HBB 3: 600a), the unit of length ʰuḥuk denotes not only the palm, but also the distance between the thumb and the forefinger (index finger), or the distance of four fingers. In Bargirk’ hayoc’ (see Amalyan 1975: 260\(^\text{N}^{226}\)), ʰuḥuk is glossed by ṭ’iz and ṭuḥuk. This implies that, in the 17th century, ṭuḥuk was a living form [HAB 3: 597b]. Bargirk’ hayoc’ also has ʰuṭkən, rendered as ṭ’zaw, 15g of ṭ’iz (see Amalyan 1975: 260\(^\text{N}^{226}\)), which should be linked with ʰuṭkən.

ETYM Ačařyan (HAB 3: 597) connects with Lat. ulna ‘elbow; ell’; Goth. aleina ‘ell (distance from elbow to finger tips)’; etc. (see s.vv.  coquine and uļhn). This is accepted by Jahukyan (1987: 122). Olsen (1999: 941), albeit referring to HAB 3: 597, does not mention this etymology and places ʰuḥuk in the list of words of unknown origin. For the semantics, cf. PToch. *ale(ə)n ‘palm of the hand’ (see Hilmarsøn 1986: 231-232).

In view of the cognate forms with a *-k-, namely Lith. uolektis, Latv. uolekts ‘ell’; Lith. alkäñė ‘elbow’, Latv. ēkūonis ‘elbow, bend’, etc. (see s.v. ołok’), one wonders if a PArm. *ul-k- underlies uḥuk. 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 Larabał ʰaḥʾık’ may become significant, and the internal -u- in uḥuk should be treated as secondary, unless uḥuk is from *HoHl-ök. Note also the identity of the root vocalism with the vowel preceding the -k’ in il-ık, ol-ık’, and ul-ık (cf. 2.1.23). If the word-initial aspiration of Larabał ʰaḥʾık’ is old, the corresponding EArm. proto-form would be *h₃eHl- (vs. uḥuk < *HoHl-?). See also s.vv. ołok’ and olkien.

Compare Oss. *ulVng ‘distance between the thumb and the index finger’, which is described by Gatuev (1933: 146) as follows: улынг ‘mera длины, равная расстоянию между концами расстоянных большого и указательного пальцев’ (vs. удлин ‘mera длины, равная расстоянию между концами расстоянных 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+).


The root is reconstructed as *u₀h₂- or, if Gr. ὀὖν ‘desolate, empty’ is related, *h₁u₀h₂-, 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/ouh₂-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)u₀h₂-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 -aynthia, see Greppin 1975: 68; Clackson 1994: 44; Jahukyan 1998: 10.
und, o-stem: ISg and-o- in Yovhan Mandakuni (2003: 1172a16); IPl and-o-v-k’ (var. and-a-w-k’) in Ephrem. ‘edible seed, grain’ (Bible+). In Daniel 1.12 and 16: APl und-s, AccSg und [Cowé 1992: 154], rendering Gr. σπέρμα ‘seed; seed-time, sowing; germ; race, origin, descent’. With an initial h-, und-o, o-stem, i-stem, attested in Nonnus of Nisbis (G5G hnd-o-y) and Plato. In NHB 2: 124c, o-stem; Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 601a) also has an o-stem, but he cites GDPl hnd-i-c’ (Nonnus), which points to i-stem. In John Chrysostom: del-a-hund ‘herb-seed’.

Compounds: and-a-but ‘feeding on seeds, herbs’ (P’awstos Buzand 6.16), und-a-ker ‘id.’ (Agat’angeś), etc.

● DIAL The form hund is widespread in the dialect s: Aslanbek, Axalc’xa, Muš, Cilicia, Ararat, etc. Without the initial h-: Xarberd and T’iflis [HAB 3: 601b].

● ETYM Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 601) rejects all the etymological attempts including those connecting with Skt. andhas- and Gr. ἄνϑος (Canini, Müller) and leaves the origin of the word open. J̌ahukyan (1990: 72, sem. field 8) considers a word of unknown origin. The connection with Skt. andhas-, 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. *m(d)-kal-: 1sg.aor. mkal-a-y, imper. mkal ‘to take (up), receive, accept’ (Bible+); late oyn ‘possessed vigour, condition, state, valour’ (Dionysius Thrax, Yovhannēs Draxanaķe’ti, Grigor Magistros, Mxi’tar Anec’i, etc.), un ‘id.’ (Ganjk’); MidArm. unenal, unnal ‘to possess, bear, sense’ (MijHayBar 2, 1992: 241ab).

For the ClArm. suppletive paradigm unim vs. aor. kal-a-, see Łaragyulyan 1961: 167-168; É. Tumanjan 1971: 401-402. Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 602a) considers the noun oyn/un a Greek calque, cf. ἕξις from ἔχω. Note, however, the dialectal evidence.

● DIAL The verbal forms unim and unenal are widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 602b].

Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 602b) records no dialectal form of the noun. According to Bahramyan 1960: 96b here belongs Dersim un ‘handful; vigour’.


The Armenian vocalism has been explained from *ōp-ne- (= *h₁op-ne-), cf. the type of ətem ‘to eat’ (Meillet 1929 = 1978: 2161936: 47-48; Beekes 1973: 95-96). For more references and a discussion, see s.v. ətem ‘to eat’ and Jahukyan 1982: 2281. Schrijver 1991: 29 posits a perfect stem *h₁e-h₁op- reflected in Arm. unim and Av. āpana-. For oyn 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-sonh₂)e 'ich erlangte', cf. Skt. sanāti 'to win, gain', OAv. hanaēmā(cā) 'mögen wir gewinnen', Hitt. šanḫ- 'to seek, look for', Gr. ἀκόο, ἀνώ, ἄνυμ 'to complete, accomplish, bring to an end', OHG simnan '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. Aćāryan himself does not accept the etymology. Sceptical is also Klingenschmitt 1982: 131-132, who identifies this verb with hēnum 'to weave'.

unkn (singularative; spelled also as ungan), an-stem: GDṣg ungan (abundant in the Bible), Abiṣg y-ungan-ē (Bible, Ephrem), Iṣg unkan-b in “Šarakan” (in plural, only GDPl unkan-u- ‘ear’: unkn ḏnem ‘to listen (to)’ (Bible+), e.g. in Genesis 18.10 [Zeyt’uncan 1985: 220]: ἠκούει>Sarrra unkn ḏnē a’d rān xorānīn : Σαμμα δε ἥκουσαν πρός τη θήρα τῆς σηνής. unkn ‘handle of pitchers, cups, etc.’: API unkan-s several times in Paterica).

●DIAL Preserved in numerous dialects, in the meaning ‘handle’: Hamšen, Tiflis, Ararat, Alakšert ung, Axale’xa vəng, Akn unk’, Svedia ung, etc. [HAB 3: 604a], Jūla ungn, gen.  BTN- [Aćāryan 1940: 381a], Larabat šagno, šyn [Dav’t’yan 1966: 450].

Aćāryan (HAB 3: 604a) points out that the basic meaning of the word, namely ‘ear’, has been preserved only in Šatax unk’tal ‘to hear, give importance, appreciation to what has been said’. In her ClArm. > Šatax vocabulary, M. Muradyan (1962: 203b) glosses unk [read unkn? – HM] by Šatax ungy ‘attention’. For the semantics cf. Arm. uš from the Iranian cognate of this PIE word (see below). Thus, Šatax unk’tal ‘to hear, give importance/appreciation to what has been said’ can be treated as unk’ig’ 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. οὖς, GṢg ousē, NAPḷ ousa, also GṢg oı̄ơsē, pl. -αου, Dor. and Hellenistic NSg ousē, ἄτα (Tarentinian gloss) n. ‘ear; handle of pitchers, cups, etc.’, Av. uṣi (dual) ‘ears’, Pahl. ōs, ōs-i-, ManMPers. and NPers. hōs ‘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-cultäre (> Fr. écouter) ‘to hear’, Olr. āu, GṢg aue n. ‘ear’ (s-stem), Lith. ausis f., OCS uo n., gen. uisė ‘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. ὀύατος < -*-ouis-, Ger. ausön, Goth. gen. ausins, OPert. ausins, etc., and with the suffix -n as in ašn ‘eye’, armun ‘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; Jahukyan 1982: 52, 113-114; 1987: 142). According to Meillet (1896a: 369, 369), the *-n- is comparable with the nasal found in other body-part terms such as Sкт. āksi-, GṢg aḵənās ‘eye’, širəs, širən ‘head’, etc. Compare also Arm. y-awn-k ‘eyebrow’, if it reflects PArm.
unč'-k'

*aun-‘eye’ from *h₂j₃n-‘nose’ (see s.v.). According to Kortlandt (1985b: 10 = 2003: 58), unkn consists of un-< AccSg *uw-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 ᾄτα< *άται [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- or 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 Łaraba expression *unč’əč’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. nāṣ-, nāsā f., Lat. nāris, Lith. nōsis, etc.); Jahukyan 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’i’t’, 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. *yawn-k’ ‘eyebrows’). I tentatively propose a derivation from QIE upo-(H)neh₂s- ‘[that] below the nose’, cf. Gr. ὑπήνη 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-jə- (regular loss of *-s- and haplology of *-eh₂-) > *uwnj- > *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’ Anya’lt’, etc.; widespread in the dialects, also meaning ‘nose’, ‘muzzle’, etc.), and dunč’ ‘the projecting part of the head, including the nose, mouth and jaws’ (Mafak’a Abela or Grigor Akanec’i /13th cent./, etc.; widespread in the dialects), unless this comes from *ʊnd-unc’, as is interpreted in Margaryan 1971: 219-221. Otherwise: QIE *upo-(H)neh₂s- > PArm. *upan(a)- > *un- + -č’ analogically after the above-mentioned dunč’ and pinč’.

Alternative: QIE *up-ōs-nieh₂- ‘that above the mouth’ (: Shughni bān ‘beard’, if from *upā(h)anā-, cf. YAv. āyhan- ‘mouth’; see s.v. yawn-k’.

unj₁, o-stem: GDSg onj-o-y in Gregory of Nyssa ‘bottom, depth (of a sea, etc.); root; the underground, Underworld’. P’awstos Buzand, Hexaemerons, Philo, etc.
In P'awstos Buzand 4.18 (1883=1984: 109\(^{3}\)):

\[ \text{zi ėr hareal xzorann i jor unj berdin :} \text{“for the tent was pitched in the gorge beneath the fortress”} \]

(transl. Garsoïan 1989: 149\(^{3}\)). In 4.8 (82\(^{3}\)) transl. 128: APl unj-s 'roots' and anj-ov-in 'with roots'.

In 4.54 (143\(^{3}\)): and unj “into the earth”. Further, see 4.8 on the place-name K'ar(ah)un.

L. Hovhannisyan (1990a: 153) has found an-un ‘bottomless’ (not in NHB) attested in Agat’angelo. Aća’ryan (HAB 3: 604b) records the word referring to “Arjeñ bafaran” (1865) but not mentioning any literary attestation.

\*ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 604b.

See s.vv. unj\(_{2}\) ‘treasure’, unj\(_{3}\) ‘soot’, and 1.12.6.

unj\(_{2}\) prob. ‘treasure, treasury, granary, barn’.

In P'awstos Buzand 5.6 (1883=1984: 171\(^{3}\)):

\[ i \text{ gawaṙn Ayrayratu i mec i gewin unj \text{in ark'uni, orum Ardeansn koč'en}.} \]

Garsoïan (1989: 196, cf. also 312\(_{2}\), 444-445) translates as follows: "to the large village named Ardeans, at the royal [fortress] of the district of Ayrarat". Malxasyanc’ (1987: 313) renders unj-\(\text{in by ModArm. kalvac 'estate'}.\)

\*ETYM Aća’ryan (HAB 3: 605a) identifies with Georg. unj ‘treasure’, of which unj-eba (verb) is derived, corresponding to Arm. ganj-em in the Bible. Then he (ibid.) notes that he does not know whether there is a connection with unj, ‘depth, bottom’ (q.v.). I think the connection is very plausible. The semantic development would have been **‘bottom, depth, the underground’ > ‘buried/underground treasure or granary’. Note that unj is attested in P’awstos Buzand in various senses: ‘bottom, below’, ‘depth’, ‘root’ (see s.v. unj\(_{1}\)), and ‘treasury, granary, barn’ (see the passage above). For semantic (cf. ganj) and etymological discussion, see 1.12.6. See also s.v. unj\(_{1}\).

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.).

unj\(_{3}\) ‘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 unj or unj (without an initial h-): Šamšadin/Dilijan [Mežunc’ 1989: 196a]; Areš [Lusenc’ 1982: 230a]; Šamaxi [Balramyan 1964: 220], Kržen [Balramyan 1961: 197a], Lazabal [Dav’t’yan 1966: 459], Goris [Margaryan 1975: 356], Melri [Ałayan 1954: 283], Karčewan [Muradyan 1960: 202b], Kak’avaberd [Muradyan 1967: 182a]. The basic meaning is ‘soot’. Aća’ryan specifies the semantic chain found in Lazabal etc. as follows: ‘soot; iron-rust; sooty spider-web near stoves’ [Aća’ren 1913: 867b; HAB 3: 605a]. Concerning the spider-web, see below (Hin Žula); cf. also s.v. *mglamandi. The semantic relationship ‘soot’ : ‘spider-web’ parallels Akn mlul/r [HAB 3: 352b]. In Areš the meaning is ‘iron-rust’. Important is the meaning in Kržen: ‘rust; sediment’ (see below).
Amatuni (1912: 536b) records Van unteers ‘rust of metals’. He refers to the word-collection of Țoxmæxeun published in the prison of Van, and one is not sure whether he had also an independent information for this word.

Šatax uć ‘soot’ (see M. Muradyan 1962: 203b) and Moks (the village of Sip) auć ‘soot’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 137-138), both unnoticed by Ačaryan, 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 J̣ułam ‘spider-web’, Van and Marałam unteers-mat’/muc-kat’ ‘dropping of sooty water from the chimney; sooty water that drops from chimneys’, Ararat mnj-ot ‘sooty’ [Ačarean 1913: 796b; Ačaryan 1952: 43, 82, 101, 286; HAB 3: 605a]. Ačaryan (1952: 43) explains this m- by a confusion with mnj ‘dumb’ (q.v.), which is semantically improbable. I think it should rather be explained by the influence of or contamination with mur and *mur- ‘soot’, as well as mocir/mocr ‘ash’. For unteers-mat’/muc-kat’ cf. the synonymous mr-kat’ in Alaškert (see Ačarean 1913: 802b). The variant muc-kat’ can provide us with additional (indirect) evidence for the nasalless form *uč (Šatax, Sip).

For an alternative explanation for the initial m-, see below.

- ETYM No etymological attempt is known to me.

The word may be related with unj, ‘bottom, depth’ (> unj ‘treasure’). Its basic meaning would then be ‘sediment/Bodensatz’ (< ‘settling, sinking down’); cf. mur ‘soot’ vs. mnur ‘sediment’. Remarkably, Kžen unj refers to not only ‘rust’ (žang), but also ‘sediment’ (mnur). The semantics is corroborated by mal-unč ‘sediment of grain left on the bottom of a sieve’ (with the first component mał ‘sieve’), attested in Oskip’orik (probably by Grigor Tat’ewac’i, 14-15th cent.). According to HAB (3: 604b), this compound contains unj ‘bottom’. This can serve as a semantic intermediary between unj ‘bottom’ and unj ‘soot (< sediment)’. Also the following seems relevant for the connection: unj ‘soot (< sediment)’ has been preserved only in SE dialects (Goris, Łarabaļ, etc.), and unj ‘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)unj), and Grigor T’at’evas’i (see above on mal-unč’) has lived in Tat’ew, in vicinity of Goris.

The etymology is uncertain. Besides, unj ‘soot’, being basically a dialectal word, has a by-form *uč in Šatax and Sip (as well as, indirectly, in Van and Marałam), 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 uć the nasal has dropped. This is not convincing, because the only other example, that is knunk’ ‘baptism’ > knuk’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 knk ‘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. *uč ‘soot’ can go back to IE *sød-iV- ‘soot’: PSlav. *sada (OCS sažda ‘doždorol’, Czech saze, Russ. sza, etc.), Lith. sūdžiai pl., OIr. ñōð ‘soot, Ofr. sūde f. (< *sōdā) (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. unįʒ ‘bottom, depth’ might be cognate, too. Compare e.g. MWelsh sawdd ‘Tiefe, Absinken’, also from *sed- ‘to sit’.

On the other hand, unįʒ ‘soot; rust’ is reminiscent of Arm. dial. *banj ‘mould; rust’: Xarberd, Manisa, K‘ii banjotil ‘to mould’ [Ačāryan 1913: 174b; Gabikean 1952: 107], Xarberd, Berri, Balu banj ‘mould’ and derivatives [Sargisean 1932: 368; Bahramyan 1960: 114a; HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 163ab]. The meaning ‘rust’ is present in Xarberd and Balu [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 163b].

Ačāryan (1913: 174b) notes that the root is unknown to him.

Bearing in mind the Iranian anlaut fluctuation v-/b-/m-, one may tentatively connect *banj ‘mould; rust’ (from an Iranian unattested form?) with unįʒ (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. στυράξ ‘storax-tree, Styrax officinalis’, which is a resiniferous tree (q.v.).

DIAL Ačāryan (HAB 3: 606b) records only Muš hɔši ‘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 hɔši, hoš-k-i ‘oak-tree’ [Petoyan 1954: 140; 1965: 140]. According to K‘i.lan’t’ar (1895: 53), the leaves of Sasun hɔši and lbp ‘i [also the latter refers to ‘oak’], see Petoyan 1965: 477] serve as fodder for sheep in winter.

Dersim (K‘i.l) hɔšgi ‘oak of sun-side’ (aregdemi ka ‘sun’) [Baḷramyan 1960: 148b].

Sasun and Dersim forms presuppose *hoš-k-i, with the tree-suffix -k on which see 2.3.1.

SEMMATICS 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‘elawš that refers to ‘holm-oak’ on the one hand, and to ‘cedar, pine’ on the other (q.v.). The Larabāl term continuing t‘elawš, 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 hɔši above.

As for the association with a willow-like tree, see the material s.vv. aygi ‘vineyard’ and gi ‘juniper’. Compare also Gr. σπίταζ ‘yew, or bindweed, or holm-oak’ rendered by Arm. gelj ‘bindweed, convolvulus; yew-tree’ (q.v.).

ETYM No etymology in HAB 3: 606b.

Jahukyan (1967: 255; in 1987: 141, with a question mark) connects with Lith. ūosis ‘ash-tree’, etc., and Arm. hac ‘i ‘ash-tree’, positing *ošk‘i̯a-. The *-sk‘- (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. ὀξύς, ἤ ‘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 ὀξίς ‘sharp’ (see P.

133 An alternative is: QIE *h1ongw-i̯-jV- (cf. *h1ongw-(o/ō)l- ‘coal'; see s.v. acu/x ‘coal; soot’) > unįʒ ‘soot’. 

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 hoši (which is our word) or lɔɫp’i. For more details, see s.vv. meɫex, šēr.

us, o-stem ‘shoulder’ (Bible+); ‘flank of a mountain’ (Movsēš Xorenac’i, see below); the latter meaning is present in the dialect of Larabal; note also us, us-ak ‘hill’ (Step’anos Ōrbelean, Siwnik’). The latter meaning is present in the dialect of Łaraba (Step’anos Ĭrbelean, Siwnik’) [HAB 3: 609b].

In Movsēš Xorenac’i 1.30 (1913=1990: 83L7f; 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’n”.

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects. With initial h’: Juňa h’us [Ačarean 1940: 381a]; γ-: Agulis xoms [HAB 3: 609-610]. Two textual illustrations of the Agulis form, transcribed as xoms, can be found in Patkanov 1869: 27.

Frozen plural instrumental: Larabal ɔs-uk’: min xurjina ɔsuk’a k’e ak’a a double-bag on/around the shoulders’ [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 398L15]; xurjina <= > ɔsük’a k’e’ (ibid. 109L14, 111L3). The same expression is found in singular: xurjina <= > ɔsav k’e’ [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 647L8].

● ETYM Since long (de Lagarde 1854: 26L689; Dervishjan 1877: 96; Hübschmann 1883: 47; 1897: 484), connected with Gr. Ṽμος m. ‘the shoulder with the upper arm’, Lat. umerus, i m. ‘shoulder’, Skt. āṃsa- m. ‘shoulder’ (RV+), Hitt. anašša- ‘part of the back’, Goth. API 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 *k to *š and to the raising of *o to u before a nasal consonant (Kortlandt 1976: 92; 1980: 101 = 2003: 2, 29; cf. Beekes 2003: 180, 209). It seems impossible to determine whether Arm. us continues the full grade as Skt. āṃsa-, or the lengthened grade as Gr. ὧμος [Olsen 1999: 21]. The vocalism of the Greek is troublesome (see Beekes 1972: 127; Nassivera 2000: 65L16 with ref.).


Lat. umerus, i m. ‘shoulder’ may point to QIE *Homes- [Schrijver 1991: 51; Adams 1999: 43]. In view of the Latin as well as Gr. Hesychian ἀμέσω· ὧμοπλάται ‘shoulder-blades’, one posits a PIE s-stem *h2/om-s-: *h2/m-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: 65L16.
I assume that the PIE word for ‘shoulder’ may reflect HD s-stem of the subtype 4, like the word for ‘nose’: nom. *néh₁₂-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. odr’. 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. *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. odr’. 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. *h₂om-s-s, acc. *h₂m-és-m, gen. *h₂m-s-ós.

In what follows I argue that, apart from Lat. *úmerus and Hesychian ἀμέσω, *h₂m-és- may be corroborated also by Arm. dial. (Agulis) *uns.

According to Ačaryan (HAB 3: 609b), the nasal in Agulis yons 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 archaisms in terms of (mutual) relationship between the old nominative and accusative parallels that of Agulis *kalc’ 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’, elung’n ‘nail’, yawn-k’ / *un-k’ ‘brow’, etc.), which could have influenced the Agulis form.

Note also Oss. Iron on, Digoron ona, iona ‘shoulder blade’ (on the vocalism, see Cheung 2002: 211-212). The initial i- in Digoron is compared with the article or the prefix *ui- (see Abaev, 2: 227-228; EtimSlovIranJaz 1, 2000: 152), and the final -e perhaps points to an old dual *-ā [Cheung 2002: 211-212]. One may wonder, thus, if yons 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 *kalc’ vs. ClArm. kat’n ‘milk’.

ustr. GsG uster, API uster-s, GDPl *uster-a-c’ ‘son’ (Bible+). Often used in opposition to dustr ‘daughter’. For textual illustrations, see NHB (s.v.) and Olsen 1999: 149-281.

Independently of dustr, e.g. in P’awstos Buzand 4.15 /5th cent./ (1883=1984: 104-105): Bayc’ cnaw apa P’aṙanjem t’agaworin ustir mi, ew koč’ ec’ in zumn nora Páp “But then P’aṙanjem bore a boy to the king and he was called Páp”.

ETYM Probably from PIE *su(H)k- ‘to suck’: OEngl. sūcan ‘saugen’, Latv. sūkt ‘to suck’, sunkā ‘juice’ (see Derksen 1996: 307), Lat. sūcus ‘juice, sap; vital fluid in trees and plants’ (next to sūgō ‘to suck’, presupposing PIE *-g-), etc. [HAB
The semantic development ‘sucker’ > ‘son’ is common; cf. Latv. dēls ‘son’, Lat. fīlius ‘son’, etc. The *-ter- in the Armenian is usually considered analogical after dustr ‘daughter’. Alternatively: *suH- (cf. Gr. οίς m. ‘son’, Skt. sānu- ‘son’, etc.); see Pokorny 1959: 914; Szemerényi 1977: 19 (and 19a, 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, 147-148, 149-150, 152.

DIALECT Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 3: 613a].

ETYMOLOGY Since long (Klaproth, NHB, Petermann, Gosche, etc., see HAB 3: 612-613), connected with Gr. ἔδω, Lat. edō, Skt. ad-, pres. āṭī, adānti ‘to eat’, OCS jasti ‘to eat’, etc. from PIE *h₁ed- ‘to eat’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 485; Meillet 1916: 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 ὕδωρ ‘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. epem ‘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’.


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 ὕδωρ ‘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 Ačarjan (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- > ur-. For the o-vocalism cf. Lith. dúodu < *do-dh₁- from *deh₁- ‘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 Jūla (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. uruk and T‘iflis uruk′-min ‘at some place’.

The initial h’- i Alaškert, Muš, Moks, Jūla, as well as, perhaps, h- in Larabašt, may testify for an old *y-ur (see 2.3.1). Zeyt’un yuy and Hačan yuy (see HAB 3: 613b; Ącaţryan 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 Ącaţryan 2003: 113-114). For Jūla h’-<y-, see Ącaţean 1940: 125-127.

Hamšen nir, ner, ner, nur, nur (see Ącaţyan 1947: 250) and Agulis nur (see Ącaţean 1935: 383) represent an initial n-. On this, see below.

● ETYM. Compared with Lith. ku ‘where’ (adv.), or with Iran. *ku-tra: Skt. kūtra (adv., in questions later) ‘where, somewhere (indef.)’ (RV+), OAv. kutra (adv.) ‘where, where to’, YAv. kutra ‘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 *ku-đe ‘where’ (interrog.): Skt. kūha ‘where’, OCS kśde ‘where, when’, etc. However, the development of Arm -r from intervocalic *d is uncertain.


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’or and *kwu(r) (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 456b). Ącaţyan (HAB 3: 548a) points out that Arm. o- (q.v.) has locative (allative) function in y-o (< *l-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-mm, i-mm, etc. Furthermore, ur also has a non-locative meaning, namely ‘why?’ (Nersēs Lambronaci’, 12th century; Jūla h’ur [HAB 3: 613b]).

Next to a number of dialects showing probable reflexes of *y-ur, as we saw above, Hamšen nir, ner, ner, nur, nur (see Ącaţyan 1947: 250) and Agulis nur (see Ącaţean 1935: 383) represent an initial n-. For other cases of addition of an initial n- in these dialects, see Ącaţyan 1947: 73 (eraz ‘dream’ – Hamšen ĭrez) and 1935: 147 (verbs starting with a vowel), without an explanation. Note also Astapat ner ‘why?’ next to Marašt, Van, etc. her from ěr (see HAB 2: 119b; Ącaţyan 1952: 101, 259). 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(š)ar ‘where to’ with many vocalic variants may be due to contamination with ěr ‘why’.
urd, lately: *h₂en-k’ur > PArm. *tigur (cf. yisun ‘fifty’ from *penk’); on this, see 2.3.1. Alternatively, one may treat *n-ur as *nmd-ur > *mnr > *(o)mur.136

I conclude that next to ur there was an old by-form *y-ur.

urd, a-stem ‘stepson or stepdaughter’; attested in Severian of Gabala (GDPI orji-ac’), Eusebius of Caesarea.

136 One wonders whether the n- is due to influence of Turk. nere ‘where’.
from PIE *putro- (cf. Skt. putrā- m., Av. putra- m. ‘son, child, young of an animal’, etc.), treating the -ǰ- as a genitive as in gel-ǰ (see s.v. giw ‘village’), cf. gel-ǰ-ak ‘peasant’. One misses here the origin of -ǰ-.

This etymology would become easier if one assumes an i-stem or *-io- suffix (cf. *putri.o- mentioned in Jähkäri 1987: 186 sceptically), or an original feminine: *putr-i(e)h2- > PArm. *u(w)r-ǰ-. The final -u is readily explained as analogical after mawr-u ‘stepmother’.

Jähkäri (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 urǰu is doubtful. The word has been explained as a vr̥ddhi-derivative from ordi [Pedersen 1906: 360 = 1982: 138; Olsen 1989a: 21; 1999: 21 34, 2237]. Note that Olsen (1989a: 21) derives *ōrtyo- > urǰu 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’aycān

p’aycān, an-stem: GDSg p’ayca(n) (Plato), p’aycǎn(n) (Geoponica), ISg p’aycālam-b (Socrates); spelled also as p’aycān (Socrates); p’aycēn (Grigor Tat’evac’i, Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i) ‘spleen’.

Attested in John Chrysostom, Philo, Plato, Grigor Magistros, etc. [NHB 2: 930b; HAB 4: 477; MijHayBār 2: 1992: 411a].

DIA: Agulis p’aycān, p’aycēl, Šamaxi p’ayc’āx, Łarabał p’ćečna, Moks p’ācēł (according to Orbeli 2002: 341, p’āceļ, pl. p’ācek’m’ir), Muś, Aškert p’ajel, Ararat p’ec’el, p’ijex, Lazax p’ic’āx, T’iflis p’iċ’ēl, p’ic’āx, Xotorjur sīpex, etc. ‘spleen’ [HAB 4: 478a].

Šamaxi has p’at’iċ’ēx, p’ācēža; in the village of K’ärk’yān: p’حساس, with an exceptional sound change ay > y [Balramyan 1964: 33, 229].

According to Hačean (YušamXotorj 1964: 508a), Xotorjur sīpex refers to ‘kidneys’. On the formal problems of the Xotorjur, see below.


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 *speḷih₂-, *speḷih⁻en-, etc.


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 Jahukyan (1967: 154-223), the internal -ɛ́ː- in some dialects, going back to *j- < *ŋ̣h₂-, points to secondariness of -ɛ́- in ClArm. p‘ayc’ən. One may rather assume an assimilation p‘...ɛ́ː > p‘...ɛ́ː, cf. p‘et’ur ‘feather’ > Marała p‘u’t’ur, Larabal t‘ep’ur, etc.

Aćaryan (ibid.) derives the dialectal forms from p‘aycən[n] and *p‘acəyfn] > *p‘ačeł, with the exception of Xotorjur sipex. According to him, the latter goes back to OArm. *sipeḷ or *sipayhn, an archaic form which is different from the classical one and goes back to a QIE form with *sp- rather than *spʰ- (the latter being responsible for the initial aspirated p‘- of the classical form p‘aycən), and with loss of *-ŋ̣- as in Gr. σπάλλω. This is accepted by Jahukyan (1982: 111), who posits dial. *spayhn, and H. Suk‘iasyan (1986: 231), who treats Xotorjur sipex as a root variant, without the determinative *-ŋ̣-.

The analysis of Aćaryan is not convincing. There is no evidence for variation *sp- : *spʰ-. Alongside PIE *pʰ- > Arm. (h)P-, we can speak of *sp- > Arm. sp- and *(s)p- > Arm. p- (for the material and a discussion, see Hiersche 1964; Jahukyan 1982: 47-48, 66-67; Beekes 2003: 197). Besides, the Xotorjur form, in my view, may be explained in a more plausible and attractive way.

Cappadocian Greek (Phária) σπιάζι ‘spleen’ is considered to be an Armenian loan; see Karolidès (Καρολίδης) 1885: 96; de Lagarde 1886: 60b; Bugge 1893: 11; Dinkws 1916: 196, 632-633; HAB 4: 478a. This form may have been borrowed into Xotorjur sipex through metathesis /labial...dental/ > /dental...labial/, cf. put ‘poppy’, ‘drop’ > Larabal t‘ep’ ‘id.’, p‘et’ur ‘feather’ > dial. (Zeyt’un, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alâşkert, Larabal, Agulis, Jula, etc.) *tep’ur, perhaps also Arm. *tep’ik ‘ape; jackal’ if borrowed from Gr. πίθηκος ‘ape’ (see 2.1.26.2). Xotorjur sipex ‘spleen’, thus, may be regarded as a back-loan: Arm. p‘aycən ‘spleen’ > Cappadocian Greek σπιάζι ‘id.’ > Xotorjur sipex ‘id.’ (on back-loans, see 1.10).

Arm. dial. Akn, Ç’arsançag, Tivrik *kayc-ar ‘tongs, fire-tongs’ [Aĉaraen 1913: 544b] has been borrowed into Cappadocian (Phária) kaîc’ip ‘tongs’ (see HAB 2: 507b for references and a discussion); according to Dawkins (1916: 605b): kaîc’ip. Arm. *ayc- is reflected here as -aîc- or -aît-, in contrast with -iía- in the word for ‘spleen’. The reason for this may be that Cappadocian σπιάζι ‘spleen’ has been taken over from Arm. dial. *p‘icex/*p‘ic’ex (with aspirated -ɛ́ː-; see above). One might posit the following distribution: Arm. non-aspirated -ɛ́ː- (> voiced -j- in the relevant dialectal areas) : Cappadocian affricate -ɛ́ː- or -ɛ́ː-; Arm. aspirated -ɛ́ː- : Cappadocian sibilant -σ-.
Laz pʰ'ane'ala ‘spleen’ (next to Georg. pʰ'ac'ali/a ‘id.’), which is considered to be an Armenian loan (see HAB 4: 478a), seems to point to QIE *(s)p(λ)ng-, cf. Gr. σπλάγχνον.

See also s.v. pʰ'j-uk ‘bitterness of heart’.

pʰ'ayt, i-stem: GDSg pʰ'ayt-i, AblSg i/z- pʰ'ayt-ē, ISg pʰ'ayt-i-w, LocSg i pʰ'ayt-i, GDPl pʰ'ayt-i-c', AblPl i/z- pʰ'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): mtnanic'ē nd ankeri iwrum i mayri harkanel pʰ'ayt “goes into the forest with his friend to cut wood”. Job 30.4 (Cox 2006: 192): zarmats pʰ'aytic' camēn i sastik sovoy “chewed on tree roots out of great hunger”. 2 Kings 23.21: pʰ'ayt kamrį (see Clackson 1994: 227, and s.v. kamur ‘bridge’). Genesis 40.19 (Ter-Minasyan 1985: 337): kaxesc'ē zk'ez zpʰ'aytē, ew keric'en t'ṙč ‘unk’ erknic' zmarmin k'o i k'ēn “(he) will hang you on a tree, and the birds will eat the flesh from you”.


Interesting is Muş, Alaşkert pʰ'ic'uk (ibid.), Van, Aparan pʰ'icuk (Amatuni 1912: 651b) < *pʰ'it-(a)c'-uk ‘dead’ (said of animals)’, based on the denominative verb pʰ'it-n-al ‘to die (said of animals)’, lit. ‘to turn wood’; cf. pʰ'aytanam ‘to freeze’ attested in Zgōn-Afrahat and Paterica [HAB 4: 478]. Compare Meři pʰ'ic'i ‘having paralysed hands’ (Aleyan 1954: 333), which seems to reflect *pʰ'ayt-ac'i.

Unclear is Hamšen pʰ'εc’ ‘board’ (see T'orlak'yan 1981: 148b); possibly a back-formation after the participle *pʰ'ayt-(a)c'-ac. Note also the infinitive pʰ'icɛl, pʰ'icul in Muş, Alaşkert, etc. (Amatuni 1912: 269b), but this may be due to a wrong analysis. The Amatuni’s textual illustrations point to causative (*kʰ pʰ'ic’t ‘will kill’) and past participle (bic'ac ‘killed’).

● ETYM No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 478b.


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 (GDPI *p’ast-i-c’ in Yovhannēs Draxsanakert’e) ‘proof, argument, reason, true cause’; attested in Yovhannēs Draxsanakert’e (9-10th cent.), etc. Earlier and more frequently found in compounds: Philo, John Chrysostom, Movsēs Kafkakat'aci, etc.

- **ETYM** No etymology is accepted in HAB 4: 484a. The connection with Gr. φά-σις f. ‘utterance, expression; statement; mere assertion, without proof’, Lat. fàs ‘divine law; right; obligation’, fàsti ‘list of festivals; calendar’, etc. from PIE *bheh2- ‘to speak’ (Jahukyan 1967: 122-123) is problematic both formally and semantically. From the semantic point of view, the other Greek φά-σις, meaning ‘denunciation, information laid; appearance’, would match better. Bailey (1986: 7) compares with Oss. fāst, fārst(ā) ‘question, counsel’, from Iran. fras- ‘to question (cf. YAv. frašna- m. ‘question’, Khot. braṣṭa- ‘questioned’, etc.). Neither this is convincing.

Patrubány (1908: 152a) derives Arm. *p’ast from QIE *(s)pə̄k-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 Čaṙyan (HAB, ibid.), is worth of consideration.

The PIE root is represented by Skt. (s)paś- ‘to see (paś-); to observe, watch, spy (spaś-), spaśtā- ‘(clearly) perceived, clear, visible’, Gr. σκέπτεται ‘to look around, to look at’, Lat. speciō ‘to see’, etc. (See also s.v. *hes-). Armenian spasem is an Iranian loan, but asem is hardly related. The i-stem of Arm. *p’ast is thus old. See 2.3.1 on *-ti-. The etymological meaning of *p’ast would be ‘what is seen, evident’; cf. c’oyc’ (i-stem) ‘show, indication, example’ (Bible+) : ‘proof’ (Philo, Athanasius of Alexandria, etc.), also apa-c’oyc’ : ἀπό-δειξις ‘showing forth, making known, exhibiting’ (on the latter correspondence, see Weitenberg 1997a: 449).

A possible parallel, both for the semantic development and the suffix *-t(i)-, may be yayt, i-stem ‘known, clear, evident’, if composed of y- and hay- ‘to see, watch’ (see s.v.).

**p’ap’a** (dial.) ‘bread, food’.

- **DIAL** Muš, Van, Agulis, Ararat p’ap’a, T’iflis baba ‘bread’, nursery words [Ačaṙean 1913: 1066a]. Note also T’iflis p’ap’a ‘a kind of porridge made of wheaten groats’, considered a loan from Georg. p’ap’a [Ačaṙean 1913: 1066a].

Further see s.v. *pap*, *papa* ‘father, grandfather’.

**p'esay**, i-stem ‘bridegroom; son-in-law’ (Bible+).

- **DIAL** Dialectically ubiquitous [HAB 4: 497b].
- **ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 497b. Patrubány (1908: 277b) treats as composed of *(s)b'end-s* (cf. Gr. πνεθποτ, etc.) and the ending -ay, seen also in car'ay, i-stem ‘servant; captive’. Jähukyan (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. *perk*). 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: 120) suggests a derivation from *spek-* ‘to look at’ semantically comparing Germ. *Braut-schau*, or an Iranian loan, cf. Manich. Sogd *pyš’k* ‘bridegroom’. Olsen (1999: 946) considers *p'esay* as a word of unknown origin.


**p'lj-uk** (spelled also as *p’lcuk*, *p’ljuk*) ‘bitterness of heart’ (John Chrysostom, Vardan Arewelc’i, etc.); *p’lj-k-am* (p’lj-k-ac’-eal and p’lj-k-al-ov in Lazar P’arpec’i, 5th cent.), *p’lj-k-im* (Mv’ses Xorenac’i, John Chrysostom, Ephrem), ‘to distress oneself, grieve, begin to sob’; *p’lj-k-umn* (Lazar P’arpec’i, etc.). For the attestation in Mv’ses Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913=1991: 361L10), see s.vv. *anjuk* and *hej-lam.*

The compound *p’lk-a-lie* ‘full of sobbing/grieve’ (used with šogi ‘steam’) and the derivative *p’lc-un* are attested in Anania Širakac’i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 319, lines 23 and 28) metaphorically, in atmospheric context.

- **DIAL** Muš *p’xckal* ‘to prepare oneself for sobbing’, Šamaxi *p’xckil*, T’iflis *p’xc’kil* ‘to distress oneself’ [HAB 4: 506b].
- **ETYM** No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 506b. Jähukyan (1967: 104) proposed a connection with Gr. πλήσσω ‘to beat’, πληγή, Dor. πλάγια 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 *pl*̥k/g-* would yield Arm. *phi*̥j-*k/*- or *hałK, 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 Jähukyan did not include this etymology into his monumental 1987.

I propose a derivation from PIE *(s)p(е)l’g-*-, the word for ‘spleen’, see s.v. *p’ayca* ‘spleen’. A lengthened QIE *(s)pēl’g-* would yield Arm. *p’i-hj-*-, of which regularly – *p’lj-uk* and *p’lj-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**

**p'oyt**, o-stem: GDSg p'ut'-o-γ, ISg p'ut'-o-ν ‘zeal, diligence’ (Bible+), ‘haste (Eznik Kolbac’i [ar p'ut’-i], Nersês Şnorhalii); adj. i-stem: GDPl p'ut’-i-c’ (John Chrysostom) ‘zealous, diligent’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i, Hexaemoner, 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’um ‘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; Dervisch jan 1877: 4, etc.), connected to Gr. σπουδή f. ‘haste, zeal’, σπεύδω ‘to hasten, hurry, strive’, MPers., NPers. pōy- ‘to run’, ManParth. p̲u̲d- ‘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.


**p'os**, o-stem (Bible, Movsēs Xorenac’i, Yovhannēs Draxsanakerc’i), i-stem (Agat’ange ɫ ọs, 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’ange ɫ ọs § 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]).


● **DIAL** Dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 517b].

● **ETYM** Since long, considered borrowed from Gr. φόσσα (< Lat. fossa ‘ditch, trench’, from fodē ‘to dig (up); to stab’) [HübSchmann 1897: 387; HAB 4: 517b; Olsen 1999: 928]. The Armenian o-stem is also seen in Georgian p’oso, which is considered an Armenian loan [HAB 4: 517b; JahuHy 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’oso), and the resemblance with p’or ‘hole; belly’, JahuHy (1967: 123, 123-124(125) derives p’os from PIE *bʰ’ed- (cf. Lat. fodē ‘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. pārśaṇa- ‘precipice, chasm’ (RV), etc. There are two problems here: the initial *p- would not develop into Arm. p’, and the loss of *-r- is not clear. PIE *pork- would yield Arm. *ors. Both problems are also seen in the etymology of p’esay ‘bridegroom; son-in-law’ (see s.v. and 2.1.33.3).
Hardly any relation with Pahl. pusyān ‘womb’.

*p’orj*, o-stem: ISg *p’orj-o-v* (3Kings 10.18, reading variant *p’orjel-ov*), AblISg *p’orj-o-y* (John Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, etc.); i-stem: GDg *p’orj-i* and AblIP *p’orj-i-c’* (Philo), AbISg *p’orj-ē* and ISg *p’orj-i-w* (Naxdrut’ivnk’) ‘proof, essay, attempt, test, experience; tried, essayed, experienced’ (Bible+), late ‘adventure, trouble’; *p’orjem* ‘to try, essay, 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, Marada [HAB 4: 521a].

**ETYM** Since NHB 2: 955c and 956b, connected with Gr. πεῖρα f. ‘test, research, experience’, πειράζω ‘to tempt, put the test, assault’, πειρ-ασμός m. ‘temptation’, Lat. perī-tus ‘experienced, practised, skilful, expert’, perī-culum ‘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; Jahukyan 1982: 129; 1987: 143; Mallory/Adams 1997: 36a. This etymology is semantically attractive but formally problematic. The assumption of a *pørh₂-o*- (Olsen 1999: 14) does not solve the problems.

On the other hand, one links Arm. *p’orj* with Skt. sparh-, pres. *aspərəzatā* ‘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 deverbal noun *(s)porh₂-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.); *planim* ‘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’/-* alternation (as an inner-Armenian development rather than a result of the Siebs’ Law), see Weitenberg 1992.

According to Ācārya (HAB 1: 468a, s.v. boyl), Ararat bulk ‘avalanche’ belongs here, too. Earlier (1913: 204b), he linked the form to boyl (q.v.).


According to Klingenschmitt (op. cit. 172), the original present PArm. *pal-< PIE *ph₁H₁H-* has been replaced by *p’ulani-< PArm. *pōl- analogously after aor. *p’ul(a)-< PArm. *pōla-. However, neither PArm. *pa- nor *pō- would yield *p’hV-. In order to explain the aspirated stop *p’* in the Armenian form, one needs an unambiguous sequence *p’HV-. The reconstruction of *p’ōl- (see Pokorny 1959: 851; Jahukyan 1982: 48, 181; 1987: 145) does not help much because, apart from
the fact that the existence of the PIE series of aspirated voiceless stops is not commonly accepted, the Armenian form is the only form suggesting such a stop. An alternative *pHōl- is cited in Mallory/Adams (1997: 191b), with a question mark. This too is unclear. Therefore, I tentatively propose an alternative explanation.

The nominal *p'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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NSg} & \quad * \text{pēh₃-hōl,} \\
\text{AccSg} & \quad * \text{ph₃-ēl-m,} \\
\text{GSg} & \quad * \text{ph₃-l-ōs.}
\end{align*}
\]

Then, PArm. *pōl became *p₃hōl > p'ul analogically after the accusative *p₃hōl-n (for *pH > Arm. *p, 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 *p₃hōla- is due to influence of the nominal *p₃hōl. 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.

\[\text{p'k'in}, \text{ a-stem: ISg p'k'n-a-w, IPL p'k'n-a-w-k' javelin’ (Bible+).} \]

Renders Gr. σχίζα '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'kin is attested since the 5th century, whereas the Iranian word reflects an older *patkān- > Arm. patkan- (see Dervischjan 1877: 6; HAB 4: 44a, 536b). Açaţyan (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. spīķis ‘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’.

\[\text{K'}\]

\[\text{k'akor, o-stem: gen. k'akor-o-y in Nersës Lambronac'i (11th cent.) 'dung’ (Bible+).} \]

\*DIAL Moks k'akur, Van k'akor, Salmast k'akor, Marala k'akor, Larabal k'ak'ur, Laradal k'ak'urna 'dung’ [HAB 4: 539b].

k'ålirt\(^t\), a-stem 'stomach of animals' (Bible+). Spelled also as k'aért (Gregory of Nyssa) and k'irt. For the latter, NHB has attestations from the Bible (once, in gen. k'árt-i), Hexaemeron and Geoponica. The critical text of Hexaemeron, however, has k'árt\(^t\) (in GDPl k'árt-ak'); no manuscript has -rd-, which appears only in Venice edition [K. Muradyan 1984: 308\(^{137}\)].

The connection with Gr. χολάδες, χόλικες f. 'bowels' and Lat. hira, hilla 'id.', treating -irt'/d as from *-tro- by metathesis. PIE *-tro-, however, would yield Arm. -wrt- (see 2.1.26.2). Ačāryan (HAB 4: 544a) rejects the connection and leaves the origin of the word open. The ending of Arm. k'árt\(^t\) needs a closer examination. Gr. καλίδια 'bowels', καλίδια·ἔντερα·Κύπριοι (Hesychius) and Lit. skil̃vis 'Bauch, Magen', with -rd after leard 'liver' (not mentioned in HAB); see also Fris k, s.v. Olsen (1999: 942) places k'árt\(^t\) in her list of words of unknown origin.

Pokorny (1959: 435) presents Gr. χολόδες, χόλικες f. (m.) pl. 'bowels' and Slav. *žoljdbkь 'stomach' (cf. Russ. želúdok, Pol. żołędek, etc.) under the root *g'el-(o)nd-. Beekes (2000: 31) connects these Greek forms with Gr. κόλον n. 'large intestine', καλίδια 'intestines', γάλλια 'intestines', and Arm. k'árt', noting that "Gr. -αδ- < *-d- should be given up". In view of phonetic irregularities (*g'el/g, e/o/a, l/l), he assumes non-IE, substratum origin. This, in fact, combines the etymologies of Dervishchan and Lidén.

The ending of Arm. k'árt' needs a closer examination. Gr. καλίδια seems to be the best match. The Armenian aspirated -t' goes back to *t\(^e\) rather than *d or *t (in

\(^{137}\) The Persian word has been compared with Arm. k'akor and k'ak by Hwnk'earpēyēnteante, 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'aḥirt and *k'aliwr, respectively). The scholars usually operate with k'ālird (Lidén, Frisk, Beekes) and assume an influence of leurd ‘liver’. This is improbable since the spelling k'ālird is secondary. I propose to start from a substratum proto-form *kaliθ ~ Arm. *k'aliθ-. The ending *-rā- has been taken from ander-k’ (a-stem) ‘intestines’ (cf. Gr. ἔντερα, etc.), q.v. Then, *k'aliθ-ra-was metathesized into k'ālirt’, 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 kalītu ‘kidney’, regarded as a seat of the feelings (see Meek 1913: 16, 55; see also Delitzsch’s note in 133).

*k'ār- ‘four’: k'ārasun, i-stem: GDPl k'ārasn-i-c’ ‘forty’ (Bible+); k'ār-a-kus-i ‘four-square’ in Revelations 21.16 (rendering Gr. τετράγωνος), Euclid, etc., with kōys ‘side’ as the second member; k'ār-amey ‘quadrennial’ (Eusebius of Caesarea), k'ārēēm = *k'ār-i-am ‘quadrennium’ (Movsēs Xorenc'i, John Chrysostom); a number of other compounds with k'ār- (Book of Chries, Philo, Anania Širakac'i, etc.); k'ār, i-stem, a-stem, ea-stem ‘four’ (Philo, T'ovmay Arcruni, Grigor Narekac'i, Grigor Magistros, etc.).

●DIAL The numeral k'ārasun ‘forty’ is ubiquitous in the dialects. There are forms with geminate -ṙṙ (Łarabaɫ, 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, NPl k'ar-in-k’, API k'ar-in-s, GDPl k'ar-an-c’, IPl k'ar-an-b-k’ (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacatruranean 1895: 1540-1541), NPl 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) [MijHayBar 2, 1992: 436a], is continued in a few dialects: Zeyt’un k’ar-tak ‘a big rock’ [Ačaľan 1913: 1106a]; Karēwan, Kak’avaber k’orātak ‘the bottom of a stone/rock; a small cave’ [H. Muradyan 1960: 234a; 1967: 208a], Goris k’əratak ‘a cave carved in a rock’ [Lisic’yam 1969: 96-98, 105; Margaryan 1975: 498b].

●ETYM See s.v. mountain-name K’ark’-ē.

k'arb, i-stem: GDSg k’arb-i, GDPl k’arb-i-c’ (Bible+) ‘basilisk, asp’.

In Psalms found twice with the synonymous iž : GDSg iži ew k’arbi (57.5); GDPl ižic’ ew k’arbic’ (90.13). In the former attestation the pair iž : k’arb renders Gr. ὀφίς ‘serpent’ : ἀσπίς ‘the Egyptian cobra, Coluber haie’, whereas in the latter: ἀσπίς ‘Egyptian cobra’ and βασιλισκός ‘a kind of serpent, basilisk, perhaps Egyptian cobra’.

In Hexaemeron, the same pair (GDPl ižic’ ew k’arbic’) renders Gr. ἔχις ‘viper’ and ἀσπίς ‘Egyptian cobra, Coluber haie’; see K. Muradyan 1984: 31314, 373b, 378a. Note also ižic’ ew k’arbic’ in a kafa-poem to the Alexander Romance (H. Simonyan 1989: 2364).

Armenian text has no word for ‘deaf’.⁴¹⁸ Note also օջկ’ էջկ’ էու կ’արբկ’ in 5.27 (187[21]), Garsoian (1989: 207) translates “adders, asps and basilisks”, as if three different kinds of snakes are meant. More probably, ավջ and functions here as a generic term for ‘snake’, whereas էջու and կ’արբ are specifiers; thus: *

\[\text{iž-awj}, \text{k’arb-awj}\]


That *կ’արբ-ավջ has been lexicalized is also clearly seen from the dialect of Svedia (see below).


In Baṙgirk’ հաուկ’ (Amalyan 1975: 128[^365]), էջ, as female, is contrasted with կ’արբ, a male.

※DIAL Preserved in Svedia, in a compound with օջ ‘snake’: կ’արբ(ս)ուկ’ [HAB 4: 561[^1]] or կ’արպուկ (< *կ’արի օջ) or կ’արպ’ա, կ’արպ’ուկ ‘a kind of very poisonous snake of gray colour with white spots, of the size to 1,5 m, = Turkish /boz yolan/’ [Andreasyan 1967: 163, 388b] (with a small head and narrow neck – Աչարյան). For the compound *կ’արբ-օջ cf. the above-mentioned attestations in P’awstos Buzand, etc.

※ETYM Derived from IE *(s)ker- ‘to cut’, see s.vv. կեր-(թ’)-, կեր-բ/փ’ ‘to scratch, chop, carve’; the closest cognate is Gr. σκορπίος m. ‘scorpion; a sea-fish, σκορπίς, -ίδος f. ‘a sea-fish’ [HAB 4: 561[^1]; Jahukyan 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. κᾱρίς, -ίδος f. ‘Crustacea’ : Arm. կարից ‘scorpion’, dial. ‘crayfish’ (q.v.), which is typologically comparable with σκορπιος: կ’արբ in several respects: (1) -ից, -ίδος (for -ից in Arm. կարից cf. also perhaps *կ’արբ-ից-, see s.v. *կ’արբբ’ոն); (2) the same semantic field; (3) restriction to Greek and Armenian.

The comparison of Arm. կ’արբ with Pers. karva (NHB, Hiwnk’арբերբ’եաթեան), albeit rejected by Աչարյան (HAB 4: 561[^1]), 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. ‘اقراب ‘scorpion’, Gr. κάραφος m. ‘horned or cerambycid beetle; a prickly crustacean, crayfish’, κάραβις, -ίδος f. ‘id., diminutive κάραβιον = εφόλκιον n. ‘small boat towed after a

---

[^138]: This (confusion?) is somehow reminiscent of Pers. کار ‘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’arpčon.

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. καρπάς 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 *(s)krp-i-, GSg *(s)kr̥p-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 *(s)krp-. 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’arpïčon ‘an uncertain kind of horny insect’ [Ačaréan 1913: 1106a]. One finds the word in a riddle recorded in Trapizon [Haykuni 1906: 351-1f., = S. Harut’yunyan 1965: 79b Nr799]:

Kov ma unim ɔni-ɔni,
Kotoš-vən iɾəɾi.

The answer is k’arpïčon, described as a eliwravor bəzɛ “horny beetle”.

It seems that the informant spoke the dialect of Hamšen rather than Trapizon. First of all, the -p- of k’arpïčon 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’arpïčon 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; gədošvəni [Ačarýan 1947: 84]. The tree-name ɾəɾi is identified with coreni, a thorny shrub [S. Harut’yunyan 1965: 79.]. This is quite possible since cor ‘barberry’, although not recorded in Hamšen, is present in the other side of the river ɾəɾi, namely in Baberd, also in a reduplicated form jnrjnr [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’ > ɑzři, hapa > aba [Ačarýan 1947: 51]. The sound change an > ɔn is restricted to few dialects, among them Hamšen (see Bahramyan 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 [Ačaréan 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. Bahramyan 1965: 90. Ačarýan (1911: 178; 1947: 5) informs, however, that the villages of Trapizon belong to the Hamšen dialect.
The form *k’arbijon can continue *k’arbiçon (or *k’arbiçawn). An old -p- would yield -b-, but a -rb- could indeed become -rp- in Hamšen; cf. Ačaryan 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’ [Ačaryan 1913: 1106a; Harut’yunyan 1965: 792]. It can refer to horned beetle or to a kind of scorpion with thorny “horns”. *k’arbičon 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. καρβιος m. ‘horned or cerambycid beetle; a prickly crustacean, crayfish’, Arab. ‘aqrab ‘scorpion’. For -ič cf. Arm. karič ‘scorpion’, dial. ‘crayfish’ vs. Gr. kāρίς, -ίδος ‘Crustacea’ (see s.v.).

**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. ὀξος ‘wine vinegar’), Plato, Barse Ėč; k’ac’axem, caus. k’ac’axec’uc’anem ‘to make sour’ (Paterica, Grigor Narekac’i, Barse Ėč). Some biblical illustrations: in Numbers 6.3: k’ac’ax i ginwoy : ὀξος ὑ α ν ο ν ‘vaccine made from wine’ and i c’k’woy : ἐκ σικερα ‘made from strong drink”; in Ruth 2.14: t’ac’c’es zpata ῥ k’o i k’ac’axid ‘dip your morsel in your wine vinegar’ : βάψεις τὸν ψωμόν σου ἐν τῷ ὄχει.

**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, m-reduplication k’ac’-ɛ-m’c’xil, k’as-msxil, k’ac’/sxmil ‘to become sour (said of heart)’ [Gabikean 1952: 567]; Ararat k’ac’axil means ‘to be very angry’ [Amatuni 1912: 671b], etc.

**ETYM** No etymology in HAB 4: 565b.


---

139 A considerable number of animal designations in the Hamšen dialect belong to the 6th declension with gen. -n and abl. -a (see Ačaryan 1947: 95-96). One may therefore wonder whether k’arbiçon 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. \( kvasina \) ‘vinegar’ (ÆtimSlovSlavJaz 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: 949–31) hesitantly posits *ku₂atʰih₂ko- 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, Jahuṣyan (1990: 70–75; cf. 1987: 354) lists some other examples and assumes a substratum (cf. Urart. -hi/e) origin.

Whether with Urartian intermediation or not, the suffix -ax probably points to a Mediterranean-European substratum origin, cf. kalam-ax ‘aspen’ vs. Hesyčian kalaμί-δαρ ‘plane’, met-ex ‘the handle of an axe’ (if related with Gr. μζία ‘manna ash, ashen spear’), possibly also šalax ‘mortar, solute’, tawsax ‘box-tree’, etc.

According to Ačařyan (HAB 4: 565b), Laz \( k'ac'axi, k'ac'axuri \) ‘sour water of unripe grapes (azox) that is used in food as vinegar’\(^{140}\) and Georg. \( k'ac'axi \) ‘sour, unripe’ are Armenian loanwords. Jahuṣyan (1987: 607; cf. 1967: 229s) relates Arm. \( k'ac'ax \) ‘vinegar’ with Avar etc. kvaŋula ‘vinegar’ (mentioned also by Ačařyan, 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. \( kve'- \) ‘ferment’ (‘сычуг, закваска’) and IE *ku₂at(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, *ku₂ats- or *ku₂aš- ‘ferment, leaven, sour wine’, reflected also in Slavic (OCS kvass, ‘leaven, fermented drink, kvass’, Slh. kvěš ‘leaven, ferment’, Scr. dial. kvásina ‘vinegar’, etc.), Lat. căsētus 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. awli ‘a strong fermented drink, intoxicating beverage’, Russ. CS obi ‘a kind of fermented drink’, Lith. alūs ‘beer’, Pruss. alu ‘mead’, OEngl. ealu(þ), Engl. ale ‘beer’; Oss. aļūton ‘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, Hačz, Svedia, Salmast, Ararat, Larabul, etc. [HAB 4: 567b].
- **ETYM** Connected with the PIE Lallwort for ‘excrement’: Russ. káka, Pers. kaka, Gr. κάκη, etc. [Ačařyan 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-gh₂i*. 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 aqaxua ‘grape-vine’ (see Akaba 1984: 65), according to V. Chirikba (p.c.), a-zaq’a.
**k’eni** ‘wife’s sister’ (Łazar P’arpec’i, Canon Law, Matt’êos Urhayec’i).

- **DIAL.** Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 570a].

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 *sgonja*- (HAB 4: 569b), *sgonijeh-* (Jahukyan 1987: 146), *sgoineh*- (Huld apud Mallory/Adams 1997: 85ab, 521-522) or the like would probably yield Arm. *k’ini*-.

Hübschmann therefore posits *k’ieni* < *svesanyo-* (1897: 503), or *svevnen–* or *svevny–* (1899: 46).

**k’eri, ea-stem:** GDSg *k’erw-a-y* (Leviticus 20.20), AblPl *k’er-e-a-c’* (Movsès Xorenac’i 3.48, 1913-1991: 319-316) ‘mother’s brother, maternal uncle’ (attested also in Yovhannës Drasxanakerc’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, *swesrîyos, is literally designated as ‘he of the sister’ (*ceulî de la soeur*), after his sister, who is the mother of ego. The same has been suggested earlier by Açaṭyan (Armenica apud HAB 4: 666-667; see also Olsen 1999: 443, 443, 435). This is somewhat unexpected, however; *ceulî de la soeur* could only refer to ‘sister’s son’, i.e. ‘nephew’ (Skt. *svasrîya*- m. ‘sister’s son, nephew’ [YV+], see Mayrhofer EWAia 2, 1996: 796; cf. also OSax. *swirî* m. ‘cousin’); to indicate ‘mother’s brother’ one rather expects *ceulî 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).

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 reciprocality, 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. *swirî* m. ‘Vetter’, OFris. *swire* f. *Vetterschaft*, etc., all going back to *syeur-ja* (cf. above on Hübschmann 1883: 55).

---

141 Jahukyan (1963a: 95-96; 1987: 146, 189) posits an independent creation of *sye-* ‘his own, etc.’.
k'erde(y) ‘scribe’. Only in Bar'girk' hayoc' (Amalyan 1975: 333b11), see also note 44211). k'erde gragir: Reading variants: k'erdey, k'erdoy, k'erdoyn.

● ETYM A Ça'ryan (HAB 4: 572a) mentions no etymological suggestion. Amalyan (1975: 442 111) assumes that k'erde(y), k'erdoy(n) is a corruption for k'erd/t'o. 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. caray ‘servant’. Compare also darbn-ay-k’, coll/pl. of darbin ‘smith’ (q.v.).

It is tempting to compare Arm. k'erd/ay/k'erdoy ‘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'ere-men ‘to scratch, rub, chop, skin’ (Bible+), ‘to write, carve’ (Grammarians, Ephrem, Nersēs Snorhali); k'er-em ‘to rub, chop, remove the skin from’ (Nersēs Snorhali), ‘to write a poem’ in Plato, etc. (in derivatives - also Movsēs Xorenac'i, Book of Chries, Philo, etc.); e-k'erc ‘to scratch, rub, chop’ (Bible+);

k'erp'-em ‘to rub, chop, remove the skin from’ in Parakanon šarakanner (cf. dial. Ewdo'kia 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.), redup. k'or-k'orem (A Ça'ryan Dawrižec'i).

On k'erel: grel ‘to write’ see AdonDion 2008: 4L14f, k'erakanut'iwn = Gr. γραμματική in Dionysius Thrax, 6-7th cent. [AdonDios 2008: 1L1]. Note also k'er-d in a number of derivatives in Dionysius Thrax [Adonc' 1915=2008]: k'er-ol (= Gr. ποιητής ‘creator, producer, poet’), a-stem: GDPR k'erdol-a-c’ (1L5, 2L29), k'erdol-akan [γραμμάτων εἰς τὴν καθεν λέξιν] = (ποιητής) κατὰ τὸν νόμον ποιητικῶς ἐκ τοῦ τέχνης. 1L14f, k'erd-ac (= Gr. ποίημα ‘poem’), a-stem:

GDPl k'erdac-a-c’ (1L21, 2L8, 4L4), APl k'erdac-s (4L9), k'erd-ut'iwn = Gr. ποίησις (2L24f, cf. 31L22), k'erd-o-c’-eal = Gr. ποιηϑέν (16L1), k'erdeal = Gr. πεποιημένον (21L18). Also in Commentary by Step'annos Siwnec'i, see Adonc' 1915=2008: 186L10, 190L19, 191L14f, etc.

On k'er(d/t')- in grammatical sense, see further AdonDion 2008: cxxiv-cxxiii; Jahu'kyan 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 Axal'ca, Ararat, Larabal; the forms k'or and k'orem are widespread [HAB 4: 572a, 573ab, 589a]; on k'erp', see above. See also Jahu'kyan 1972: 280.

● ETYM From PIE *(s)ker- ‘to cut, split’: Gr. καιρός ‘to cut (off), shave, mow off, ravage’, OHG sceran ‘to cut’, Lith. skiržiai, skiriti ‘to separate’, etc.; see HAB 4: 571, 572-573, 589 with literature; Pokorny 1959: 941; Mallory/Adams 1997: 143b.

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. *kėrd-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. kirtiš 'to chop, cut', Latv. cirpī 'to shave', Czech šerep (arch., dial.) 'broken piece of pottery', Russ. čerep 'skull', čerpút 'to scoop, draw, ladle (out), čerpak 'scoop, ladle', etc. (see ÉtimSlovSlavJaz 4, 1977: 70-74). See also s.v. k'ar'b '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)-ei, see Klingenschmitt 1982: 142; Barton 1989: 153. For a further discussion, see Pisani 1950: 165f; Ravnæs 1991: 136; Olsen 1999: 806f.

k'ist, o-stem: ISg k'st-o-v in Hexaemeron (K. Muradyan 1984: 135) and Ephrem 'seta (of wheat)'; attested in Koriwn, Hexaemeron, Ephrem, etc.; later also k'is (Grigor Tat'evac'i); k'st-umn 'bristling' (Eznik Ko'bac'i), k'st-mn-im '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'ist̄l and Jūla k'ist̄x (rural k'ists) point to *k'ist̄l [HAB 4: 580b].

I wonder whether the following forms belong here, too:

Hamšen k'ist 'weaver’s comb' (see Ačarjan 1913: 1115b). Larabal k'ist 'the penis of a child' (see Ačarjan 1913: 1115b). Note that Ganjak, where k'ist means also 'fish-bone', belongs to the dialect-group of Larabal. 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. kūlas 'bone', Latv. kaũls m. 'bone, stem', etc. (see s.v. c'aw̄-un 'stem, stalk; straw').

● ETYM Ačarjan (HAB 4: 580b) does not accept any etymological attempt.

Arm. k'ist is reminiscent of Slav. kist̄ displaying the following meanings: 'raceme', 'seta', 'brush', 'bunch', 'cluster', 'wrist', etc. (see ÉtimSlovSlavJaz 13, 1987: 276-277). Uncertain.

k'irt̄n, an-stem: AblSg i k'rtan-ē, GDPi k'rtan-c', IPI k'rtam-b-k' (Bible+), NPI k'rtun-k' (Luke 22.44), API k'rtun-s (P'awstos Buzand, Paterica), NPL also k'rin-k' (John Chrysostom, Plato) 'sweat', metaphorically 'toil, hard labour' (Bible+); denominative verb k'rtnem, 3sg.aor. k'rtnem- (Nersēs Lambromac'i, Nersēs Šnorhali), 2pl.aor. k'rtnem-ik' (Nersēs Šnorhali), k'rtnim, 1sg.aor. k'rtn-em-ay (Grigor Narekac'i), 3sg.aor. -ec'aw (Ephrem, Nersēs Šnorhali), 3pl.aor. -ec'an (Lazar P'arpec'i), 3sg.subj. k'rtnem-c' (Agat'ange, Nersēs Lambromac'i) 'to sweat; to toil, labour hard' (5th cent.+: Agat'angekos, Lazar P'arpec'i, etc.), k'rtnam (k'rtal-ov in Philo), k'rtnel inf. (Zak'aria Catholicos, 9th cent.) 'id.'; 3sg.caus. k'rtnac-uc'anē (Agat'angekos).

● DIAL The frozen plural k'rtnk' 'sweat' is widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 581a]. Hamšen has k'aydink' and k'aydnink' [Ačarjan 1947: 258]. Some E and SE peripheral dialects display forms reflecting k'rtnjunk' : Agulis k'rt'unk' and Jūla...
k'rt'unk' through assimilation k'...t > k'...t' [Açaréan 1935: 136, 398; 1940: 146, 390a; M. Zak'aryan 2008: 329]; Larabal, Goris k'r'tonk' [HAB 4: 581a]. Note also Larabal k'or*tonk'; k'or'punk', etc. vs. k'or'unk', k'or'ink' [Davit'yan 1966: 498]; Šamaxi k'or'unk' vs. k'r'tunk'/k'4 [Bahramyan 1964: 231].

Denominitive verbal forms: Marala k'orul (vs. subst. k'or'unk') [Açaréan 1926: 122, 430; Davit'yan 1966: 501], *Larabal k'or'dan'k'el, k'or'unk'el, k'or'ink'el, k'or'ynul, k'a'sonk'el [Davit'yan 1966: 501], Šamaxi k'or'unk'il [Bahramyan 1964: 232]; Hamšen k'yndns', k'yndn'us', caus. k'yndne'cus' [Açaréan 1947: 258]. For other verbal forms and for derivatives, see Açaréan 1913: 1129-1130.

*ETYM From PIE *ṣuid-r-: Gr. lōpōς, -ōtoς, ep. acc. lōpō 'sweat', Latv. pl. sviēdri 'id.', Alb. djeršë f. 'perspiration, sweat', djer 'to sweat'; stem *ṣuēid-: Skt. sved- 'sweat', svēda- m. 'sweat', YAv. x'aēka- m. 'sweat', MPers. xwistan 'to sweat', xwey 'sweat', NPers. xway 'sweat', Oss. xǔ/sxed 'sweat', Lat. südō, -āre 'to sweat, perspire', südor, -ōris m. 'sweat, perspiration; toil, exertion' (cf. the semantic development of the Armenian word), OHG sweiz 'sweat', Latv. svīstu 'to sweat', etc. Hübshmann 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; Beeves 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.


For the regular metathesis *-dr- > Arm. -rt-, see 2.1.26.2.

k'n-ae, i-stem: k'nc-i-č 'id.' (John Chrysostom, Evagrius of Pontus, Yovhannts Erzncac'i), k'nēuc 'sleepy, drowsy' (Bible+), k'n-ae-u 'sомнiferous' (Eznik Kolbac'i, 5th cent.; Maštoc' Jähkewoc', 14th cent.).

*ETYM Composed of k'un 'sleep' (q.v.) and the participle ending -ae, originated from acem 'to lead'. The form k'n-ae 'sleepy, drowsy' may be directly compared with Skt. ā-mānapaj- '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'o'y, k'ooyoy 'your'.

*ETYM The forms k'o (gen. of 2sg.pers.pron.) and k'o'y (gen. of 2.sg.poss.pron.) derive from *tye/ō(so) and *tyosjo, respectively, with the regular sound change *ty- > k-', cf. Skt. tvā-, Gr. aō, Lat. tuus 'thy', etc. (Hübshmann 1897: 504; Pedersen 1905: 197-198 = 1982: 59-60; Grammont 1918: 251-253; Açarliak, 2, 1954: 45, 56;

---

142 Lat. südor is ambiguous; *r-stem is possible, too (see Beeves 1972a: 35-36).

\textit{k'ot'anak} ‘linen garment’ (Evagrius of Pontus, Philo, etc.).

●\textbf{ETYM} No acceptable etymology is recorded in HAB 4: 585b. The word has been linked with Skt. \textit{kanthā} ‘cloth made of patches’, Pāli \textit{kathīna}-, Lat. centō ‘garment made of several patches’, OHG \textit{hadar} ‘rags’ (see Ravnæs 1991: 130, for the reference to Belardi 1958: 29ff, in \textit{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; Jāhukyan 1987: 464), however, Arm. \textit{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. \textit{ktn} ‘linen garment’ (> Gr. χιτών ‘chiton’), Akkad. \textit{kitū} (m), Pers. \textit{katān}, Engl. cotton, etc.; as well as Arm. \textit{ktaw} ‘linen, cloth, linen garment’143 (Bible+; widespread in the dialects), MidArm. and dial. \textit{k'(a)tan} ‘linen’, \textit{k’t’et’} ‘linen garment’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 308; Ačean 1902: 356; 1913: 1111; HAB 2: 675-676; 4: 577; Jāhukyan 1987: 452, 464, 467; Greppin 1989a: 77, 80). Whether the IE forms above (Skt. \textit{kanthā} ‘cloth made of patches’, OHG \textit{hadar} ‘rags’, etc.) are related with this migratory term is uncertain.

\textit{k'oyr}, GDSg \textit{k'ør}, AblSg \textit{i k'ør}, ISg \textit{k'er-ē}, NPl \textit{k'or-k'}, APl \textit{k'or-s}, GDPl \textit{k'er-c’} (rich evidence in the Bible, see Astuacaturean 1895: 1548-1549); later: GDSg \textit{k'uer}, \textit{k'ör} (Paterica, Step’anos Taronec’i Asolik, Nersēs Lambronac’i), ISg \textit{k'uer-b} (Law Code by Mxit’ar Goš), NPl \textit{k'ør-i-k’} (Canon Law), APl \textit{k'ør-s} (Ephrem), etc. ‘sister’ (Bible+).

●\textbf{DIAL} Ubiquitous in the dialects [HAB 4: 587a]. Beside the nominative \textit{k'ur}, Łarabał has a vocative \textit{á-k’ər}, genitive \textit{k’əvər}, \textit{k’uver}, \textit{k’vər}, etc. (HAB 4: 587a; Davt’yan 1966: 53, 79, 500, and especially, with paradigms, 108-109, 112). For the Agulis paradigm (\textit{k’vir}, etc.), see Ačarėan 1935: 209.


Arm. nom \textit{k'oyr}, gen. \textit{k’er}, instr. \textit{k'er-b} and nom.pl. \textit{k'or-k’} derive from PIE \textit{*suesōr} (= \textit{*-ehu-} > \textit{*-eu-} > -\textit{o}-)144, \textit{*suesr-ōs}, \textit{*sues-r-bʰ}, and \textit{*suesor-es}, respectively; for a discussion see, apart from the references above, Hübschmann 1883: 55, 87; Meillet 1936: 39; Jāhukyan 1959: 169-171; Kortlandt 1980: 100-101;

\begin{itemize}
  \item 143 It has been suggested that the ultimate source of Arm. \textit{kt-aw} ‘linen’ and related words may be Arm. \textit{kut} ‘seed’ (HAB 2: 675-676; N. Mkrt’yan 1970: 251; Jāhukyan 1976a: 46-47; 1980, 2: 104; 1987: 126, 437, 452, 467).
  \item 144 Klingenschmitt 1982: 154 suggests \textit{*hue’hūr} > \textit{*kʰog(h)ur} > \textit{*k’oyr}, with \textit{u}-epenthesis; cf. also Olsen 1999: 153.
\end{itemize}
The secondary forms GDSg k'u-er, NAPI k'uer-k', 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'ør (next to NSg k'ur) may be analogical after ClArm. pl. k'or-k', as well as genitives hawr ‘of father’, eɫbawr ‘of brother’, etc. (for a discussion, see Ačaṙ Liak 3, 1957: 539-540; Aɫayan 1958: 72-74; 2003: 78-80, 120; Jahanukyan 1959: 170; È. Tumanjan 1971: 226, 226; 106; A. A. Abrahamyan 1976: 56; Ervandy 2007: 37).

The vocalism of Ĺaraba nom. k'ør and k'vør (next to NSg k'ur) may be taken from the vocative á-k'ør. Here the change -oy- > -ɛ- may be due to the unaccented position. See also s.v. k'eṙi ‘maternal uncle’.

k'os, o-stem: ISg k'os-o-v in Deuteronomy 28.27; IPl k'os-o-v-k' in Čaṙəntir; uncertain: Hexaemeron 5 (K. Muradyan 1984: 150; note: 341), ‘a kind of leprosy, scab, itch’ (Bible+).

In Deuteronomy 28.27 (Cox 1981: 184): harc'ē zk'ez t[e]jr kełów egiptac'oc'n ew t'anč'iwk' ew zayrac'eal k'osov, ew mnom, zi mi karasc'es bžškel: πατάξαι σε κύριος ἐν Αἰγυπτίῳ ἐν ταῖς ἡδραῖς καὶ ψώρᾳ ἀγρίᾳ καὶ κνήφῃ ὥστε μὴ δύνασϑαί σε ἱαϑῆναι [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 ‘itch, scurvy; a disease of trees, scab; moth’. Refers also to a disease of trees (Evagrius) and to “stone-moss” (k'ar-a-k'os in Agat'ange Ĺos+).

● DIAL Widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 588a]. On *k'awt'aṙ -k'osi, see 3.5.2.2.

● ETYM The etymology of k'os is uncertain; derived from *kōsso- (cf. Lith. kasýti ‘to scratch constantly’, etc.) or compared with Arm. k'or ‘scratch, itch’ (see HAB 4: 588a; Jahanukyan 1967: 124; Olsen 1999: 44).

k'san, mostly uninflected (some evidence for i-stem) ‘twenty’ (Bible+).

● DIAL Ubiquitous in the dialects. Mara and Agulis have geminate -ss- [HAB 4: 599a].


145 Hardly from PIE vocative *suėsor > *k'elaṙ.
146 Gr. γψάρ ‘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 *euikosis 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 *h- (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 *y in the same way as *h- from *s-, e.g. in k'oyr < *sueso̞ as *sueso̞ r '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.

The noun k'un, o-stem: GDSg k'n-o-y, ISg k'n-o-y (Bible) 'sleep' (abundant in the Bible, Astuacaturean 1895: 1549-1550); k'nem 'to sleep' (Porphyry); k'unem 'to sleep' (Bible) 'to die' (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; Russ. transl. 2000: 47): Oč' ē part zamengan gišern k'unel : "Не следует спать всю ночь". For the Greek passage, see G. Muradyan 1993: 270c.

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; Jähkukan 1998: 17; Olsen 1999: 339-341).

● DIAL The noun k'un is dialectally ubiquitous [HAB 4: 592b]. Numerous derivatives and phrases [Amatuni 1912: 675; Acařeăn 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-i-uk', caus. k'un-e'n-el, Larabar iterative k'un-k'un-at-el, abusive compounds starting with *k'unac-a- [Açāreăn 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'nap' [Margaryan 1975: 496b], Larabar *k'nap' [Açāreăn 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', *swop-no-: Skt. sāpna- m. 'sleep, dream', Av. x'afna- m. 'sleep, dream', Gr. θάνος 'sleep', Lat. somnus 'sleep', Lith. sāpna 'dream', OCS sńŏ 'sleep', etc. (Hübschmann 1897: 504; Meillet 1936: 32; Benveniste 1967: 12-
For the aberrant vocalism of *k‘unem beside the regular *k‘nem see Hübschmann 1897: 504; de Lamberterie 1978: 281; Clackson 1994: 168, 234; 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. ho-rs ‘adulterer’, OEngl. hōr ‘adulterer’, höre ‘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 kāṁ- ‘to play’ and its derivation from *kōṁ-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. ‘beschlagen’ (see Gabikean 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; A ārean 1913: 1117b; HAB 4: 592b], also k‘n-er-k‘ in DialAdd apud NHB 2: 1067c.
PLACE NAMES

Alt'k’ or Tuzasar, a village in the vicinity of Sebasta [Gabikean 1952: 673].
- **ETYM** From **alt** ‘salt’ (q.v.). This is corroborated by the alternative name of the village **Tuz-asar**, lit. ‘mountain of salt’, with Turk. **tuz** ‘salt’ (cf. Arm. dial. **t’uz**, Açarayan 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: 171l-17f). The passage reads: *i gawaṙn Ayrayratu i mec i gewln anfin 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 NPl Ardean-k’ [Garsoyan 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. **unjin** ‘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, GDPl ardeanc’ ‘deed, work; (earth) products’ (Bible+), dial. **ard(i)umn** ‘earth goods, harvest’ (see s.v. *ardi*). 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 Širak, a district in Ayrarat, the famous barns of which are mentioned in the old saying recorded in Movsès Xorenac’i 1.12 (1913=1991: 40); transl. Thomson 1978: 90: *t’ē k’o Šarayi orkorn ē, asen, mer Širakay 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. araspel. The high quality and abundance of bread in Širak was famed even in the 20th century, cf. e.g. the story “Gelə” (“The wolf”) written in 1913 by H. T’umanyan (5, 1994: 118l-125). A similar fame is traditionally ascribed to Basen, another district of Ayrarat; see Hakobyán 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/Ajudu, South of Lake Van, the name of which has survived in the district-name Aytu-an-k’. In Aiduni/Ajudu there is a place-name Ardiumak which, according to Jahukyan (1988: 157, 159-160), derives from Arm. **ardiun-k’** ‘earth

---

products’. If this is correct, one wonders whether Urart. Ardiunak is identical with Arm. Mayeuk, 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 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: 34λ5]: Dēgik gawār, <...> Gawrē gawār, and ors ekeal Aracani xǎri yEp’rat i k’alak’n Lusat’ārči “the district of Dēgik, <...> the district of Gawrē, through which flows the Aracani [River] which joins the Euphrates at the city of Lusat’ārči” (cf. Hewsen 1992: 59). Then Aracani is mentioned three times in the context of the province of Ta(w)ruberan [Soukry 1881: 31; Hewsen 1992: 63].

The beginning of Aracani is described in the context of the province of Ayrarat [Soukry 1881: 34λ5]: Ez Aracani zskizbn uni i Calkotnē, i tebojēn or koč’t Oskik’, et gnalov and hiwisiwsi patelov zNpatakan lerambn, aẓ Bagwan dēlwjōn, xarni i Bagrewan get “The Aracani begins in Calkotn at the place called Oskik’, then flows north around Mount Np at near the village of Bagwan and enters the River Bagrewan” [Hewsen 1992: 65]. Further, abl. y-Aracanw-o-y is attested in Soukry 1881: 38λ14; Hewsen 1992: 71.

Several attestations in Yovhan Mamikonean: gen.-dat. Aracan-o-y, vars. Aracano, Arcnoy, Arcnoy, Araca(y)nu (A. Abrahanyan 1941: 113λ8, 210λ8, 233λ7, 263λ7, 270λ3); and yAracni (vars. and Arcni, and Aracani, etc.) ‘through Aracani’ (op. cit. 200λ14).

Aracani, gen. Aracany, is attested in the Alexander Romance, rendering Euphrates, also as the source of Ep’rat (see H. Simonyan 1989: 199λ3, 200 three times, 206λ8, 396 three times, and the note 564-565 234). It is also found in Lewond (see Ter-Lewondyan 1982: 118; Arzoumanian 1982: 136, 190a).

ETYM No etymology in Hübschmann 1904: 404 (considered ‘vorarmenisch’).

Arcat’albersn 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:

\[\text{*h₂(e)r̥g-: }\text{Hitt. ŉarki- ‘white, bright’, Skt. r̥jra- ‘shining reddishly, brightcoloured; quick’, Gr. ἀργος ‘shining white; quick’ (Caland-system *-i- vs. *-ro-, Collinge 1985: 23-27; Beekes 1996: 193-194; Kloekhorst 2008: 307; see also Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 253-254);}\]


\[\text{*h₂(e)r̥g-u: }\text{YAv. arzt- a-, OPers. ardata- ‘silver’, Lat. argentum n. ‘silver’, etc. (see s.v. arcat ‘silver’); on Skt. rajat-,-, see below.}\]

The PIE hypothetical paradigm *h₂er̥g-u vs. *h₂r̥g-e/ont- might produce PArm. nom. *(h)arc-u-r (cf. also Gr. ἀργυρος ‘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. bḥ̣̄́nt- (f. bḥ̣̄́nati-), YAv. barzanto- (f. barzantii-), Oss. bárzond, 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 Argantia (see Krahe AltFluß 3, 1951-52: 1ff, 236ff; 4, 1953: 37ff, 243; Krahe in 1959: 11-12; 1963: 316a).

Next to the root form *h₂(e)r̥g- (see above), in Indo-Iranian one also finds *h₂re̥g- : Skt. rajato- ‘silver-coloured, shining white, made of silver’, n. ‘silver’ (cf. Mallory/Huld 1984: 4-5\(^{150}\); 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’, arcu ‘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 Stepanyan’s Orbelean, died in 1303/5); also other derivatives [Hübschmann 1904: 404-405]. Note also *Arcoyboyn, lit. ‘eagle’s nest’, cf. Arco[v]byun S. Astuacacni vank’ in Rštunik’ (see Oskean 1939a: 162f). This compound toponym structurally parallels Persian Alamūt.

---


\(^{150}\) It has been suggested that Skt. rajatá belongs rather with raj- ‘to colour; to become red; to become excited’, cf. Gr. ῥεῖν ‘to dye, paint’, ῥῆγος 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, arcivi ‘eagle’ from *h₂r̥g̣ipio-:- Skt. r̥jipya-, etc.; cf. Av. arzišṭla-, see Hintze 1994: 416; for Iranian and other parallels, see Eilers 1987: 26 (note especially Indian mountain-name Gr̥dhr̥-k̥iša m. ‘Geierspitze’, structurally comparable with Arm. Arciv-ak).[1]

There are many Armenian place-names based on arcv- ‘eagle’ (see HayTe ɫ Baṙį, 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 AcanAnj 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: 431; HayTe ɫ Baṙį, 1986: 452), perhaps through contamination with arcivi ‘eagle’.

Arcurak, a river in the vicinity of Xarberd, paired with Sew getak ‘Black River’ (see Srvanjtyanc’ 1, 1982: 362).


Getaṙ(u), Ge/ētaṙ(u), a river (= Agri-č’ay) and a district in Ahaṙk’, attested in Ptolemy 5.11.2 (Ṭartápa) and Aṣxarḥac’-oyc’ [Eremyan 1963: 47b, 105a133; HayTelBar 1, 1986: 845c]. Read differently in Aṣxarḥac’-oyc’: Dēgaru [Soukry 1881: 29 L8; in the French transl. Degarou (p. 39)]; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 348l36. See also Hewsen 1992: 143-144, 145139. Eremyan (1963: 47b) also cites a spelling Dedarū, not specifying the manuscript. MovsXorenMaten 1865: 606 vacat.

Getaṙ, Getaṙ-Č’ay, a river in contemporary Armenia traversing the capital Yerevan, a left tributary of the river Hrazdan [HayTelBar 1, 1986: 845b-c; G. D. Asatryan 1990: 6-7, 17].

Getaṙ-su (Gadar-su), a river in the Urmiya basin, probably identical with Arax [HayTelBar 1, 1986: 845c; Hewsen 1992: 178137].

Getar, a village in vicinity of Kars [HayTelBar 1, 1986: 845c].

**ETYM Hewsen (1992: 178137) interprets the river-name Getaṙ-su (Gadar-su) as get ‘river’ + Ar[asx] (7). Ih my view, this and the others contain the appellative getar ‘river-bed; river-shore; outbranching river’ (in Laẓar P’arpec’i: getarû), q.v.

Gēn, *Gēn (Ginay get “the river of *Gēn”), close to Artašat (Movsės Xorenac’i). Perhaps identical with Gēn mentioned by Anania Širakac’i (7th cent.) [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 2281331] in an arithmetical excercise, as the hunting place of the Kamsarakian family.

Note also Gēn-akan get, a village (but with get ‘river’) in the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik’) mentioned by Step’anos Ōrbelean (1250/60-1303/5), as well as Ginoy blur, a hill in front of Duin (see Hübschmann 1904: 419).

**ETYM If originally a hydronym, Gēn may be derived from PIE *ueis- ‘to flow’ (cf. Lat. vīrus n. ‘slimy liquid; venom; poisonous fluid’, Oic. veiša ‘Schlamm, Sumpf’,
OEngl. wāse ‘Schlamm, Sumpfland’ < Germ. *waisā, Av. vīš n. ‘poison, venom, poisonous juice’, etc.) which is found in numerous river-names such as Celtic *Vis-, Lat. Vistula, Russ. Vechra, etc. (see Pokorny 1959: 1134) [Jihanyan 1991: 240]; see also HAB s.v. gēš ‘corpse; bad’.

As pointed out by Jihanyan (ibid.), *Gēn (a-stem) structurally corresponds to Lat. vēna ‘blood-vessel, vein; artery; (underground) stream’ < PIE *ueis-nā-. For the semantic field ‘to stream’ : ‘river-name’ : ‘blood-vessel, vein’ cf. Ilran. *rasā- f. ‘name of a mythical stream’ (RV), Skt. rāsa- m. ‘juice (of plants), liquid’, Plran. *r̥āha-ka- ‘blood-vessel, vein’, OCS rosa ‘dew’, etc. (cf. the Armenian river-name Erasx, on which see Jihanyan 1991: 241-244).

Gis, a village in the extremely Eastern province of Utik’ attested only in Movsēs Khakatiauc’i/Daxsuranc’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 Yampols’kii (apud Dowsett 1961: 5-6), Gis must be identified with Kīš (north of present-day Nukha), where he himself investigated an ancient (“round”) church. V. Arak’elyan (1969: 277b, without any references) states, however, that this Gis should not be confused neither with K’īš close to Nukha, nor with Gis in Lurabāl (in the district of Martuni). See also Ulubabyan 1971: 176-177.

In Movsēs Khakatiauc’i/Daxsuranc’i 1.27 (V. Arak’elyan 1983: 95L12f; ModArm, transl. 1969: 70): Anc’anelov and Hayastan, čanaparhord hasanel i sahmas arewelic’i, i gawān Utikān. Ew mteal bnakēn i čaxčaxut telis ei lōraboiys mōrwn, a’i teleawn, orum Gisn koč’en: “he passed through Armenia into the Eastern regions to the province of Utì; 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 (95L15, 97L7), allative/directive and locative i Gis (10L18, 214L19, 344L8), genitive Gis-o-y (275L1).

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-o-y points to a root *gis-, with etymological s, rather than to a frozen API *gi-s.

I propose a derivation from PIE *y(e/o)ik-: Skt. vīś- 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. ἴκος ‘house, dwelling-place; one’s household goods, substance; a reigning house’, Lat. vīcus ‘village; district of Rome; street’ (from *yōk-,), villa ‘rural dwelling with associated farm buildings’, OCS vǐs f. ‘village, terrain’, etc. (See also s.v. gīrw ‘village’).

PIE *yik- ‘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; HayTelBar1 1986: 17-20 (45 place-names); Gīrw-lāk, diminutive from gīrw ‘village’ (Hübschmann 1904: 419), etc.
Dalari-k’, a village probably in the district of Turuberan (API Dalari-s, allative i Dalari-s, GDPl dalarea-c’ in P’awstos Buzand 3.20; see below); Dalarink’ : a village in Çahuk, in the province of Siwnik’, attested in Step’anos Orbelean (1250/60-1303/5) [A. A. Abrahamyan 1986: 404a; Ališan 1893: 480a].

According to Hübschmann (1904: 420), the first place-name was situated in Aphanuni-k’ (in the province of Turuberan). However, the passage from P’awstos Buzand 3.20 (1883=1984: 45-46; transl. Garsoïan 1989: 97) reads as follows: ‘<…>, xalac’uc’in yerkrēn Aphanunēac’. Ibrev ēkin hasin i gewti mi, orum anun Dalaris koč’ēin; vorzam ekn emut zōravarn Parsic’ i nerk’s i gewhn Dalaris, acēr kapeal zar’ayn Tirān and iwr : ‘<…>, and carried of from the land of Aphanumeric’ ‘<…>.

When they reached a certain village called Dalarik’, the Persian commander entered into the village of Dalarik’ and took the chained King Tirān with him”. The village, thus, may be located in vicinity of Aphanumeric’ rather then in it.

Then we read: Ew asē Varaz: Ālē, tesēk’ acūl, orov erkat’ šotac’usc’ uk’, zi zač’s xaresc’uk’ zark’ayis Hayoc’. Ew andēn berin acūl, orov xarēn zač’sn Tirānay: “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 Tirān”. The text proceeds as follows: “Then Tirān 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 Acūl ['Coals'], and let this remain as a sign in remembrance of me”. In this last sentence, the toponym is put in GDPl dalareaic’ : p’oxanak Dalareac’s amuan “instead of this name of Dalarik”.

●ETYM Derived from dalar ‘young, fresh; grass, herbs’, dalari ‘grass, herbs’ [Hübschmann 1904: 420].

The two names of a place in the passage from P’awstos (see above) are treated as symbolic and fictitious [Garsoïan 1989: 264(18, 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 Tārōnec’i/Asolik (10-11th cent.) has Arjkat-n instead of Acūl, although he refers to P’awstos, and Vardan Areweli’i (13th cent.) – Arcūl-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 Aphanumeric 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 Arcul, see 2.1.30.2.

Duin a city in the province of Ayrarat.

Attested since Lazār P’arpec’i (5th cent.): Loc. i Duni in 3.77 [1904: 141144, 3.82 [14928], and abl. i Dunay – 3.71 [1904: 128L28]. Sebéos (7th cent.) has Dvin, Downay, i Dovnay (3.1, see 1851: 48); Down (Abgaryan 1979: 67L1, 91L23), Downay (74L24, 111L28, etc. In T’ovmey Arcruni (9-10th cent.): Dvnav (3.9), Dun (3.22); Ananun: Dunay (10); Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i (9-10th cent.): Dunay [1912=1980: 333L48], etc.; Ašxarhac’oye”’ : Dunay k’alak’ [A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 350L48].
The oblique stem Dun- should probably be read as Dvn- or Dwvn-. However, the attestations in folklore (Duna k’alak’, 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): minć’ew i daštn Mecamőri i blurn or anuaneul kóc’i Duin: or kay i hiwsoy kołmanę k’alak’in meci Artašat “to the hill in the plain of the Mecamőr called Duin, which is on the Northern side of the great city of Artašat” (transl. Garsoian 1989: 75). According to Môvšûs Xorenac’i 3.8 (1913=1991: 265), 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 antarın yost mi, aparanı hovanavors ťineal, or ast parsakkan lezuin Duin koc’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). 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: 145).

See also Hübßmann 1904: 422; Thomson 1978: 261; Garsoian 1989: 460-461.

●DIAL In a fairy-tale told in Aštarak in 1912 by Geworg Geworgyan, an illiterate old man, one finds several times (see HŽHek’ 1, 1959: 392-393, 398) Duna k’alak’, 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 Môvšûs Xorenac’i (see above), Duin is from Persian and means ‘hill’. Hübßmann (1904: 422) considers Duin as of unknown etymology. He states that the etymology of Môvšûs Xorenac’i is “ein Irrtum, der durch die Quelle des Moses, FB. 18-21 [that is P’awstos – HM], veranlaßt is”. This is not necessarily true.

Minorsky (1930: 117-120) identifies the underlying Persian word with -dûvīn which is “pleinment attesté dans la toponymie de la région clairement délimitée au sud-est de la mer Caspienne”.

The testimony of Môvšûs is placed under new light by the comparison with Irish dûn ‘hill’, OEngl. dûn ‘mountain’, etc., from PIE *d’eu- (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, thus, Môvšûs 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. fûnus ‘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/dûn ‘city on a hill’, OIr. dûn ‘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 Môvšûs Xorenac’i (1.11, 1.12).

152 An Iranian-European isogloss in terms of Abaev 1965?
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din, dinas ‘fort’; cf. also a Celtic loan in Germanic: OEngl. tun ‘enclosed place, homestead’, Engl. town, OHG zun ‘fence, hedge’, etc. (see the references above).

An Iranian *dūn or QIE *d'um- 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 kalim ‘acorn’ (q.v.), cf. also the hill-name Lsin and village-name Olīn (q.v.).


● ETYM In “Patmut’iwn srboc’ Hṙip’simeanc’” (see above), the origin of the place-name is traditionally related with the Flood story told among Syrians (asi y’Asorwoc’) and is interpreted as ut’ ogik’ elin i tapanēn “acht Seelen stiegen aus der Arche” (cf. Arab. ϑāmān or ṯāmānān ‘eighty’); compare the modern names of the village: Karye i Thmānin, i.e. “Dorf der Acht”, Kurd. Heshtāne, 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-i-jewan “erste Station” [Hübschmann 1904: 455; 1901: 73-79 = 1990: 99-105] (for the corresponding story, see Lanalanyan 1969: 157Neat[2]; Apnos as if from *aīr (z)Noys “take this Noah!” (Lanalanyan 1969: 24Neat5), 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] ē’ogaw dadareac’ i Hayes, ew c’ayžm sakaw inē’ 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”.

Jahukyan (1987: 416) derives T’mnis from PIE *tem(ə)- ‘dark’, cf. Mlr. 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. (Baṙgirk’ hayoc’) t’umni ‘darkness’, t’unnanal ‘to become dark’ (see Amalyan 1975: 123Neat23), q.v.

The IE root is also found in the suffixal element *-r-, cf. *temH-s-reh₂- ‘darkness’ (: Skt. tāmīsrah- f. ‘dark night’, etc.) > Lat. *temafrā- > tenebrae f.pl. ‘darkness’. Especially important is Illyr. Tōuspoç, which is a mountain-name, too (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 147a). One may also wonder if At-t’amar (a rocky island and fortress in Van Lake) is composed of *Al(i) ‘Van Lake’ and *t’amar ‘mountain’, identical with Illyr. Tōuspoç.

In these areas there was a district named Tmorik’ (see Hübschmann 1904: 336-337). According to Hewsen (1992: 170-175), this name is related with
T’man/T’omnis. If this is true, for the element -r- cf. the above-mentioned Illyr. mountain-name Tómaroς.

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: 102L21; see Čařyan 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. rūkā- m. ‘open space’ (RV+), Lith. laukas ‘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, “Aškarac’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. Ernį-a-tap’ = erinij ‘heifer’ + tap’ ‘plain’, etc. (see 4.4, also s.v. Tuarac-a-tap’). Note also Skt. gāvyūti- f. ‘pasture, cattle-meadow’, Skt. gāvyūti- f. ‘pasture, cattle-meadow’, YAv. gaoiaotaioti- f. ‘pasture’.

Kolb, a village in Ayrarat, in the district of Čakat’; now Tuzluca [Hewson 1992: 211N3]; also *Kolb- in Kolb-a-k’ar and Kolb-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. Qalhs-tarrini, Jahuqyan (1986a: 51, 51N3) proposed a connection with Gr. γήμαν n. ‘hollow, cavern’, γημερός ‘hollowed(ed)’. Jhanyan (1991: 248) independently suggests the same etymology referring to PIE *gelēbh- ‘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. δελφης, -ως f. ‘womb’, δολφός· η μήτρα (Hesychius) which comes from PIE *g’elbh’u- ‘womb’, cf. Skt. gārbha-, Av. garṣa- m. ‘womb’, with o-grade (Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 474-475; for o-grade, see also Oettinger 2000: 396L). 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 *Δελφης after the form of the land (see Frisk s.v.); Beekes 2009 s.v.; Gindin 1977: 113-115).
The derivation *gʷolbʰ-* > Arm. Kolb 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’eak-ac’, in Tarōn (Koriwn+); *Hac’i-k’ in Vayoc’ jor (Step’anos Črbelian, see Hübbschmann (1904: 444); Hac’eac* in various place-names (see below).

In Koriwn 3: <...> ēr Mašt’oc’ anun, i Tarōnakan gawaièn, i Hac’ekac’ getjê, ordi aîr er enelwovoy 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 get and Xasik are the Kurdish variants of the name of the village; the village Xas get was still in existence up to the Armenian Genocide (see Hübbschmann 1904: 326; Pivazyan 1981: 84, 275, 308s, 337s, 357s). Also in Movsês Xorenac’i 3.47: <...> Mesropay, or ēr i Hac’ekac’ Tarōnoy [1913=1991: 316L11]; Thomson 1978: 309. The GDPl Hac’ekac’ presupposes NPl unattested *Hac’eak-k’ (Hübbschmann 1904: 444). According to Inčicen (see Hübbschmann 1904: 326 = Hiwbšman 1907: 190; Lanalanany 1969: 275N798), 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 Pawstos Buzand 3.19 (1883=1984: 42): <...>, ayl ēr nora [i.e. Papay – HM] harč mi i gawaièn Tarōnoy, i Hac’eac’ getjē karčazat’ec’n; ev mnac’ or i harčē anti Hac’ekac’woyn, orum anun iwr ordivoy harčin Vrik koč’ēr. It seems that Hac’eac’ and Hac’ekac’i are alternating names of the same village and, as Malxasyanc’ (1987: 426-427) points out, are reminiscent of the village of St. Maštoc’, Hac’ekac’. In her translation of the passage, Nina Garsoïan (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. 262s, 427, 467). On Hac’eac’ draxt, see below. Hac’eac’ vank’ in Yovvannēs Draxanakertc’i, 9-10th cent. (T’osunyan 1996: 48L2).

**ETYM** Hübbschmann (1904: 444) interprets Hac’ekac’ as GDPI of *hac’eak-k’ (= *hac’i-ak-k’), namely ‘village of small ash-trees’. N. Garsoïan (1989: 467) translates Hac’ekac’ gewl 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’eleak = t’elî ‘elm-tree’ + -ak, etc. [Margaryan 1992: 137-138]. Note especially Xnjoresk, also formed with a plural marker: = xnjorî ‘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’arangēc’) below the site of the famous temple of Heraklēs = Vahagn (and Anahit and Astlīk, see Agat’angelos § 809, 1909–1980: 422) at Aštisat, 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\textsuperscript{17}, 37\textsuperscript{19}; Garsoian 1989: 87, 90, 467). See also Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.14 [1913=1991: 272\textsuperscript{18}, Thomson 1978: 267.].\textsuperscript{153}

According to HayTelBar (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 Aštisat there were also the shrines of Anahit and Astlīk (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 MitNarMir 2: 219, 549.

Remarkably, a similar association is seen in Łarabal, 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 Lanalanyan 1969: 98\textsuperscript{264} referring to Avagyan 1966, in “Hayrenik’i jayn”, Nr 32 [n.v.]).

Another traditional story on this spring is recorded in NmušLeńLarab 1978: 141, where Anahit was not only very beautiful and wise, but also skilful in making rugs. In a Łarabal 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 Ĉanač’i (Avetaranoc’), where Aždahak (Dragon) enters the room of a dragon (ɔšap’) 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’yohnä hay lüzvav).

From a traditional story recorded in 1958 in the same village of Hac’i (see L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 89\textsuperscript{No66}), 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, Órvalułk’ saran mote min vank’a əlāl, anumə Anahit. Vank’ə en a əlāl Órbunun tap’umə. Koxke hac’en el aseis an əlāl Órbunun hē. Hac’va Anahitin əxpran knanek’ə kuzavur an əlāl tneis, vank’en k’arərə lvanayis, hac’u t’or kya. Arašt taren ver vank’en k’arərə łac’ral an, t’or a ekal.

One might think that this Anahit is merely taken from the famous fairy-tale “Anahit” by L. Alayan, 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.

\textsuperscript{153} Hac’eac’ gəswl and Hac’eac’ purak are not exactly in the same location, see Hewsen 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 Astlık, 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).

**Mel**, 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 Meéro-get, lit. ‘honey-river’; = Turkish Kara-su, lit. ‘black water’ [N. Sargisian 1864: 226; Hübschmann 1904: 323; Jîhînyan 1991: 252-253]. Usually identified with Tyávbota mentioned in Xenophon, Anabasis 4.4.3 [2001: 326/327]; see Markwart, Philologus 10/1: 236 (n.v.); Eremyan 1963: 70b; Krkyaşaryan 1970: 260; Hübschmann 1992: 165.

In the long recension of Aşxarhaç’oyc’ we read on the district of Tarawn: yorum gay getn Mel ew ankani yEp’rat : “par où passe le fleuve de Megh (Me) qui tombe dans l’Euphrate” [Soukry 1881: 31, French transl. 41; Engl. transl. Hewsen 1992: 63].

●**ETYM** Probably derives from PIE *mel- ‘dark, black, blue’: Gr. μέλας ‘dark, black’, Skt. mála- ‘dirt, impurity, filth’ (RV+), Lith. mélas ‘blue’, etc.; cf. numerous river-names in the Balkans and Asia Minor, such as Mézâs, Mózâs, Mella, etc. (see S. Petrosyan 1991: 130-131; Jîhînyan 1991: 252-253; A. Petrosyan 2003: 207, 213, 215). On the Thracian, Pamphylian, and Kappadocian river-name Mólaç usually identified with Gr. μέλας ‘black’, as well as for numerous parallels and semantic discussion, see Pârvulescu 1989. Remarkably, the etymological semantics of Arm. mel is corroborated by the modern Turkish name: Kara-su, lit. ‘black water’ (see Jîhînyan, ibid.). Thus, the more common Armenian name, namely Meéro-get, lit. ‘honey-river’, must have been resulted from folk-etymology.154

**Ołakan**, the main fortress of the Mamikonean family in the district of Tarôn, on the bank of the Ep’rat/Aracani (mod. Murad-su) East of Aştîşat [Hübschmann 1904: 326, 459-460; Eremyan 1963: 74b; Garsoian 1989: 485]. Nowadays: village of Askán (Eremyan, ibid.). Usually identified with ’Ołâni (pro ’Olia[ka]vi) in Strabo (Geogr. 11.14.6); cf. also Volandum (Tacitus, Ann. 13.39). But Strabo’s ’Oliaâni is located near Artaşat (see Açaîyan 1940a: 59, 117; for a discussion, see H. P. Têr-Pîlûsian 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 [Tomashcek 1896: 11; Hübschmann 1904: 460]. Cuinet (2, 1891: 586-587) describes the place as follows: “A l’extrémité occidentale de cette plaine (i.e. the plain of Muš – HM), se trouvent deux grands rochers hauts de 60 mètres, au milieu desquels l’Euphrate oriental passe avec fracas dans sa course rapide vers le sandjak voisin. Au sommet de l’un de ces rochers, situé sur la rive droite, et entouré d’eau de trois côtés, il existe une plate-forme de 140 pas sur 120 où subsistent encore quelques restes du château-fort ’Oghgan’.”

154 How old is the association with ‘honey’? On the village of *Meéro-gom*, see Hübschmann 1904: 323. The rivername Mel seems identical with the place-name Melit by Zenob Glak and Yovhan Mamikonean [Hübschmann 1904: 323; Jîhînyan 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: 228L15); Elišē (1989: 138L1), etc. In Yovhan Mamikonean: Olkan, with syncope (see A. Abrahayyan 1941 passim).

For Olkan, see also Srvanjtyanc’ 1: 72; Petoyan 1965: 365-366; the map apud Petoyan 1954; Hewsen 2001: 55 (map 48 A5).

●ETYM Composed of an unclear *oɫ and the suffix -akan [Hübschmann 1904: 460]. By characterizing the fortress as ‘rundlich’, Tomaschek (1896: 11) probably suggests a compound with Arm. oɫ ‘ring’ which would be impossible in view of the vowel difference [Hübschmann 1904: 460].

Jahukyan (1987: 416) points out that the suffix -akan (of Parthian origin) occurs very seldom with native Armenian stems, and among examples mentions Oɫ-akan. He, thus, assumes a native Armenian appellative *oɫ not specifying it.

The stem *oɫ- may be derived from Arm. oɫ(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. pū́r ‘rampart, wall made of mud and stones, fortification, palisade’ (RV+), pū́rī ‘stronghold, fortress, town’, Lith. pilis ‘castle, stronghold’, etc. Note also Pulija(ni/a), a placename in the Western part of the country of Habhi (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. Oɫ-. An underlying *poli(V)n can be compared with Arm. Ol’in (q.v.); note that the loss of *p- before the vowel -o- is regular in Armenian.

(2) cf. Gr. Ὀλύμπος, name of mountains in Greece and Asia Minor.


●ETYM No etymology is known to me. Hübschmann 1904 vacat.

I suggest a tentative comparison with Arm. oɫ-n ‘spine, back(bone)’; dial. also ‘hill-side, etc.’ (q.v.); see s.v. Ol-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’, Urmî’ [Bittner 1896: 89No52], mentioned as a town of Arminia [B. Harut'yunyan 1989, 2: 34-35]. The lake (= Kaputan cov, Rezaye) is named after the town (see Hewsen 1992: 266; HayTelBar 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. ὅρμος 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, Marala and even Tabriz once lay on the shores of Lake Urmia [Hewsen 1992: 266]. One therefore is tempted to think of a close association with Gr. ὅρμος ‘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 HayTelBar 5, 2001: 214b), however, Lake Urmia was hardly navigable.

*Jerm-. Jerm, get Jerm-a-y ‘river of Jerm’, the Bohtan-su, a tributary of the Tigris; attested in Sebēos (7th cent.) Chapter 17 (Xač'atryan/Ehazaryan 2005: 96L24).
When they had arrived close to the fortress, they crossed the river called [river] of Jerm 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: 34-35]. Jel [Eremyan 1963: 78b].

Found also in Jerm-a-jor, lit. valley of the river Jerm, attested in the 7th century Armenian Geography, Ašxarhac’oyc’, in the context of the province of Mokk’ (MovsXorenMaten 1865: 607L1; Soukry 1881: 32L8; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349L17; see also Hewsen 1992: 63; Eremyan 1963: 78b). The version of T’ovmas Kilikeci (14th cent.) has reading variants Jerm-a-jor and Jer-a-jor [Anasyan 1967: 281L15]; see s.v. jer(m) ‘warm(th)’.

Further: Jermay, a k’at’ak’agiw probably in Mananali (in the province of Baryr Hayk’); attested in Chapter 23 of the “History” of the 11th century author Artak’eš Lastivertc’i (see Yuzbaşyan 1963: 129L6): i k’at’ak’agiw or koč’i Jermay.

Note also Jermuk, Kurd. Germav, a large thermal source in Sasun, the district of Šatax (see Thierry 1992: 332); Sebastia Bori Jermuk (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. jerm ‘warm(th)’ < PIE *gʷer(-m)- (q.v.); see Hübschmann 1904: 464-465; Jihanyan 1991: 255. From the same PIE root are: Γερμανία/Γερμαή < Thracian *germo- < IE *gʷermo- ‘warm’, Dacian Germi-sara, both denoting places with thermal springs (Wagner 1984: 127-128), etc.; see also Toporov PrJaz [e-h] 1979: 277-278

Saln-a-jor, vars. Saln-oy jor, San-a-jor: a district in the province of Aljnik’, according to Ašxarhac’oyc’ [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 607L8; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 349L17]; in the long recension: Sal-a-jor [Soukry 1881: 31L1]. The second member is jor ‘ravine’. The long recension also mentions Salnay lerink’, mountains of which the river K’alirt’ (= 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).


*ETYM Usually interpreted as containing an unknown *Salin or *Salun [Hübschmann 1904: 465; Hewsen 1992: 162L7].

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 Movsês Xorenac’i 2.8 (see below), Hewsen (1988-89: 297) points out that Sim(-sar) “is precisely the name given by the Armenians to the Taurus range where it bordered the plain of Muš on

---

the South separating it from Sanasunk’, the later Sasun”. Nowadays it is called Kurtik-da (Eremyan 1963: 80b), Kurtək/Kurtək’ (see Petoyan 1965: 363, also a photo between pp. 26 and 27).

In Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.6 (1913=1991: 26; transl Thomson 1978: 80-81), after Xisut’ra’s (= Noah) landing in Armenia, his son Sem went to spy out the land to the north-west, reached a long mountain, lingered by the river for two months (erkhusneay 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 yarəwmtiç’ harawoy əskərəs meroy “in the Southwest of our land”; i smanə ačiwn ew bazməserat’twn leal, le’in zSimm asa’c’ əl ərm “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: 212L6, 228L6): Simn koč’ec’əl lerinn “the mountain called Sim”. In 2.8 (116L15f; transl. 143), relating on Saraşan from the house of Sanasar (spelled as Sarasar – GSG Sarasaray): zleərin Tawros, or ew Sim “the Taurus Mountain, that is Sim”.

For the historico-traditional role of Sim, as well as for other attestations of the mountain-name, see Tomaschek 1896: 4-5; Hübschmann 1904: 310-311, 315-316.

●ETYM According to Łap’anc’yan (1945: 20-211), the mountain-name Sim originates from Sem. Sin ‘Moon-god’. This is accepted by Petoyan (1965: 381-383, with traditional stories around the mountain). However, this etymology is untenable. Improbable are also the comparison with Arm. sšam’ ‘Pfosten, Schwelle’ (see Tomaschek 1896: 5; Xačkon’ 1899: 82b), and the ancient association with the Biblical Sem (T’ovmay Arcruni 1.1, 1985: 16L-4; Thomson 1985: 70).

I propose a derivation from PIE *k̂iieh1mo-, cf. Skt. śyāmā- ‘black, dark-coloured’ (AV+), Av. Siāmakā- m. name of a mountain (see Hintze 1994: 83-84, 457; cf. also Arm. Sīmāk), Lith. šėmas ‘blue-grey’, etc. Note also Skt. river-name Śyāmā, literally meaning ‘black’ (see Pârvulescu 1989: 290). Mountain-names are frequently named ‘dark’ or ‘black’; see 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 c rêr 2/2, 1951: 870; Abelyan 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).
city of Artašat”; *ew anc‘uc‘in ast Tap‘ern kamurj, <...>, asen zōraglux‘n Parsic‘ e‘Zuit‘ erēc‘k‘alak‘i in Artašatu.

This bridge is called *Tap‘er-akan in Agat‘angelos § 33 (1909=1980: 231-6; transl. Thomson 1976: 49); *i Tap‘erakan kamrāc‘n getavēzh 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. 221-6) more than one bridges are mentioned at the gate of the city of Artašat (*i xels kamrāc‘n a‘r druns Artašat k‘alak‘i), although Thomson (1976: 49) took it as a singular.


**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” (*te‘lī 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. Xačatrjan 1980: 111. Note that only the meaning ‘herdsman’ is present in the dialects (see Aca‘ean 1913: 1019b). For ‘pasturer’ > ‘pasturing’, see also s.v. hawran. Note dial. tavar-a-tap‘ ‘gathering place of cattle’ (see Mkrtumjan 1974: 73b).

Aca‘yan (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 Yuzbaşyan. The passage reads as follows: <...>, xalev ijanē i Tuaracoy Tap‘, *ew anti ijanē yendarjak dasin Basenoy a‘ran 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 Авиньк” [Yuzbaşyan 1963: 89-20, 158b; 1968: 101, 166a].


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, *Tuaraşini ḫubi must have had a considerable quantity of cattle and flock [Arutjunjan 1965: 196-197].

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’ē**oy (see A. Abrahamyan 1941: 109^3^, 200^3^, 232^1^).

For the site (Yaštišat, 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; Lusaranean 1912: 142 (spelled as K’arkê); 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 Aštisat, see also s.v. place-name *Hac’eak-k’*.

**ETYM** The identification with the Urartian mountain-/land-name ŠADŪ/KUR Gurgu (for references and a discussion, see N. Arutjunjan 2001: 506-507; further see J̌ahukyan 1988: 153-154) is formally uncertain.


The etymon *kar-kum* ‘stony rise (where cultic rites were practised)’ is probably related with Welsh *carrug* ‘stony river’ < *karrākā*, OIr. *carrac* ‘cliff’, *carrn* ‘stone grave’, etc.; also forms reflecting *kar-ant-* (see Pokorny 1959: 531-532; Markey 1972: 370; cf. Krahe 1955: 118; Vennemann 1994: 226, Tabelle 1). 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 *ubh*ro- > *ampro-p* ‘thunder’, *pter- > t’er-t’ vs. t’er ‘leaf’ (see s.v.v.); alternatively, we may posit substratum *k’ar-k-*. It has been suggested that OEngl. *hearg* as a heathen temple is identified with hell (Markey 1972: 367). This is reminiscent of the Armenian *duṙn dżoxoc* ‘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 Ačaryan, 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 AčarHLPatm and AčarLiak, and especially in his crowning work, the Etymological Dictionary of Armenian (HAB).

Unfortunately, most of the works of Ačaryan (as well as those of Jahukyan and others) are written in Armenian and are therefore inaccessible to many students of Indo-European linguistics.

Besides Ačaryan’s and Jahukyan’s works, the following general dialectological research and handbooks should be mentioned: Patkanov 1869; Yovnanean 1897; Msereanc’ 1899; Łaribyan 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’ar’šamim : t’ar’amim ‘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. astelno (vs. ClArm. astl ‘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 AćaṙHL.Patm 2, 1951: 114-141, 324-439; Winter 1966; Jāhukyan 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 anum ‘name’ from PIE *h₂ne₁-h₂mn ‘name’ and Agulis yns 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. *(glk-t- [lac, lactis] n. ‘milk’, although the absence of -l- in Armenian makes the connection not evident. But the dialects of Agulis and Melri reflect a form, which preserved the liquid: *kak’ < 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 Aćaṙyan’s Law and consonant shift (see 2.3.1).

As is shown by Weitenberg’s treatment of Aćaṙyan’s Law, one can posit an old contrast between (a) Western dialects (Muš, Alaškert, Karin/Erzrum, etc.) and (b) Eastern-Southeastern dialects (Agulis, Larabal, 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, Larabal and other adjacent dialects, whereas the Van subgroup follows the remaining dialect areas and the classical language.
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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, Öşakan), Me tri, Jula. 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. Laz'ar P’arpec’i (5th cent.) was a native of the village of P’arpi (very close to the above-mentioned Öşakan); Step’anos Orbelean (13th cent.) was from Siwnik; “Baṙgirk’ 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 Aɫuank’; (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), Ačar’yan records numerous dialectal formations, labelling them as nor baṙer (“new words”). Sometimes, however, one doubts whether this definition is justifiable. Let us take a look at some examples.

According to Ačar’yan (HAB 2: 621a), dial. *aṙikoɫ and *aṙkoɫ are new words. The forms are: Muš, Van *aṙkoɫ ‘stony place; precipice’ [Amatuni 1912: 57b; Ačar’ean 1913: 133a]; Xotorjür *aṙikol ‘sloping, precipitous’ [YušamXotor 1964: 430a; HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 99b]; Hamšen aṙcob[t [Ačar’ean 1913: 135; 1947: 221]. Next to z-aṙ-i-kol(-eal) ‘precipitous’ (“Book of Chries” etc.), one also finds aṙ-i-kol-eal ‘precipitous, sloped’ in Movs’es Xorenac’i 1.16 (1913= 1991: 51L13; transl. Thomson 1978: 99). Thus, the dialectal forms are not recent.

*gišer(n)uk: Among several dialectal derivatives from gišer ‘night’, which denote ‘bat’, Ačar’yan (Ačar’ean 1913: 230b) also mentions Maškert (Arabkir/ Xarberd) gišeruk and Lazax gišernuk.

Compare Lat. vesper-ūgō ‘bat’. Since Arm. gišer 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 Maškert and Lazax are located in the opposite peripheries of the Armenian-speaking territory, Arm. *gišer(n)uk is a potentially old formation, although the independent creation of these forms cannot be excluded.

Darman-a-goɫ ‘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, Lori and Larabal, and may indeed be a recent replacement of the older *Yard(a)goɫ. However, this is hard to verify since, in Larabal, next to ‘Milky Way’, Darmanagol 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 Xotorjūr, which is, both geographically and dialectally, quite far from Larabal. For more details, see 3.1.3.

*erat’at’: Ačāryan (HAB 2: 55a) cites Larabal, Lori horat’at’ < *er-a-t’at’, composed of eri ‘shoulder’ (q.v.) and t’at’ ‘arm, paw’, as a new word. Probably, Xotorjūr *reil’t’at’ ‘shoulder-blade’ [YušamXotorj 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’ [Ačāryan 1913: 811b], obviously net ‘arrow’ + ōj ‘snake’. Ačāryan (HAB 3: 442b) cites it as a new dialectal word derived from net ‘arrow’. One finds Dersim (K’i) nedig ‘a poisonous snake’, featured by Bahramyan (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?

Ačāryan (HAB 4: 413a) places t’aljik ‘a young girl/woman’ in his list of new dialectal words. The compound is present in the dialects Davrež/Tabrez [Ačāryan 1913: 1032b], and Melri (tšľaxč’č’k’, see Alayan 1954: 332). Certainly composed of tlay ‘child’ and ajik ‘girl’. Given the literary attestation of tlay ajik ‘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 t’aljik is relatively old.

k’aloc’ ‘mowing time’ (in Karin, see Ačāryan 1913: 1092b), a derivative of ClArm. k’elem ‘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’al-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:

-mol-čz: ‘lizard’ (Bible+); widespread in the dialects, also in the form *molož-. In the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance (see H. Simonyan 1989: 431L3): molčz’ mek’ orpēs višapk ‘lizards as big as dragons’; the final edition has here: molozk’ k’an zvišaps mec ēin (306L4f). The classical form molčz, thus, has been replaced by dialectal *molož-, present in Van, Moks, Salmast, etc.

The word maškat’ew ‘(having) a wing of skin’, an epithet of the bat (č’ičkan) in “Hexaemeron”, in the independent meaning ‘bat’ appears first in the earliest edition of the Alexander Romance (see H. Simonyan 1989: 423L3). In the final edition, we find čoljikan instead (op. cit. 290L3). Since maškat’ew ‘bat’ is attested poorly and
late and is preserved only in some peripheral dialects, namely Hamšen and Xotor (see s.v.), whereas č’iľjan (Bible+; dialects of Sebastia, Axalc’xa, Alaskert [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’iľjan.

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: 306L3, 431L5), 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: 432L16, in the earliest edition). The word kunt(n) or kund(n) ‘wheel’ is attested from the “Book of Chries” onwards and judged by Aćaṙayan (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. kondner) 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 xēçać’ip’ar’ as words for ‘crayfish’, see H. Simonyan 1989: 261 (three times xec’get, and once xec’ip’ar), 290 (pl/coll. xec’getnay), 413 (sec’get, or ē xić’ip’ar), 423 (xēći’ip’ar), 478 (three times xac’ap’ar). In a 16th-century kafa, Zak’aria Gnuuće’i (of Gnuu) introduces sarat’anay as synonymous with xec’ip’ar (see H. Simonyan 1989: 261). The form astonishingly resembles the word for ‘crayfish’ in the dialect of Moks, namely säläträna (Orbeli 2002: 320, rendered by Russ. krab ‘crab’), cf. also Van salatrana ‘Satan’.

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. bat‘ ‘word’ : dial. Van p’ar, with an initial aspirated p‘ which is explained by assuming a loan from the literary language of Polis (see Aćaṙayan 1952: 53, with a few other examples of the same type).

Arm. *brinč‘ etc. ‘snowball-tree’: Agulis b/pruşna, with allophonic b- and p- (the shift b > p being irregular for this dialect), is considered to be a loan from Larabal

156 Aćaṙayan (1952: 72, 104, 290; HAB 4: 164a) placed these forms s.v. salamandr ‘salamander’.
prěšno [Ačaryan 1935: 93]. The latter probably reflects *bhrō- or *bhrṓ-, cf. Lazax p’ēš, Laradal bhrṓni (see 1.12.1).

In the Hamšen region, the initial g- yields g’- in Mala, k- in Čanik, and g- in Trapizion. In view of this, Ačaryan (1947: 42) treats ClArm. gerandi ‘scythe’ > Hamšen gerandi (also k’rendi), galtikur ‘a plant’ > galgur, etc. as borrowed from other dialects, such as Trapizion. Further on gerandi, see 1.10.

lur ‘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 lrčanal ‘to turn blue’ (referring to a beaten and bitten body); Akn. lrjuc ‘in one’s waking hours; as well as in Syria: Svedia lrč ‘blue’, K’esab lrj ‘light blue’, Aramo laurč ‘blue’. As we can see, the “pure” adjectival colour designation lur ‘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/Dilijan xemk* ‘the wooden frame of a sieve’ (see Mežunc‘ 1989: 205b), for which cf. Van, Moks xim, xemk’, Jála xemk’, etc. from himn ‘basis’ (see HAB 3: 93-94); cf. especially Xnus-Bulanx xemk* ‘the wooden frame of a sieve’ (Melik’ean 1964: 499b). The initial x- is irregular for Šamšadin, Lazax and adjacent areas. One therefore might assume that the initial x- in Šamšadin/Dilijan 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 Lazax the hero of which is from Van (HZhek’ 6, 1973: 318-329).

In the same fairy-tale (326) one finds anel ‘wool-card’. In the dialects of Van, Moks, Lo, Muš, Širak, etc., *anel ‘bow’ (from ClArm. alehn ‘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 Lo, Lazax, 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-Tabalcjian 1976.

1.6 Ašxarhac’oyc’ (Armenian Geography): agreement between historical and dialectal distributions


The tree-name hačar- ‘beech’ (Agat’angeš; see HAB s.v.; Greppin 1983a) has been preserved only in Hamšen, Lo, Lazax, Larabal [HAB 3: 16a]. The tree Fagus
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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'oṙlak’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, Loṙi, Łazax, Łarabaɫ) and the testimony of Ašxarhac’oyc’ (Gugark’).

The term tawsax ‘box-tree’ (Bible+), another product of Gugark’, refers to Buxus sempervirens which, except for Europe and NW Africa, is present in Transcaucasia, N. Iran, and in Turkey it is confined mainly to the Pontic coastal areas and in Cilicia [FlorTurk 7, 1982: 631, 886M74]. On Hamšen see T'oṙlak’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 (dɔsxi, dɔsxəni, GŞg dɔsxu, dɔsxɛc’, see Ačaryan 1947: 12, 92-93, 255), perhaps also in Svedia (Musa-leṙ, if t’usug ‘box-tree’ (recorded in Gyozalyan 2001: 88 without a note on its origin) is related. The word tawsax is probably composed of *taws- (from *takhs-? cf. Hurr. tas̄kar- ‘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 -o- or -i- or -o-, cf. cacuk > jajög, t’mbuk > t’mbüg, čnčuk > čnčılug (see Ačaryan 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’usuģ 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), Axale’xa [HAB 1: 499b]. Since the district of Karin neighbours with Turuberan, and Axale’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 Ašxarhac’oyc’ by Anania Širakac’i (from Širak) and in “History of Tarōn” by Zenob. In the former, gazpe/ēn is mentioned as a product of Turuberan (the province where the district of Tarōn is located), alongside with mēr ‘honey’ [MovsXorenMaten 1865: 608L2; A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 394-395]. In the long recension (Soukry 1881: 31L-4), gazpe/ēn is missing. Instead one reads: mēr anovō 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’alan’tar 1895: 30-31; Petoyan 1965: 101-104. According to Amir dovlat’ Amasian’ci (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
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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 Xotorjur *euroš ‘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 zaṙik as a product of the province of Korčēk’ = Korčayk’ [Soukry 1881: 32L-13; MovsXorenMaten 1865: 608L14; A. G. Abrahanyan 1944: 349L34].

The word zaṙik refers to arsenic and has been borrowed from MIran. *zarnīx (→ Arm. *zarrīk > zaṙik), 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 zaṙik, within the context of Ašxarhac’oyc’, needs additional evidence. See also Hewsen 1992: 176L-177 (brief note). On the map of Ašxarhac’oyc’ apud Eremyan 1963, zaṙik 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. zaṙīn/x, zīnex (MijjlayBar 1, 1987: 209a-221a; also Hübschmann 1897: 149; ModArm. zīnex). Present in the dialects of Moks, Van, Akn, T’ıflis, etc. [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 422b].

That zaṙik and zaṙīn/x refer to arsenic is clearly shown by Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’ī (15th cent.), who treats these forms as equivalent to Pers. zīnex and Arm. mkn-de, literally ‘mouse-poison’, and describes the varieties and the medical use of the arsenic (see S. Vardanjjan 1990: 119 § 525, comments 606-525). He also notes that arsenic is used to get rid of armpit hair (ibid.). Compare Moks zaṙīn/x described as follows: “yellow earth used for removing one’s body-hair” [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 422b; Orbeli 2002: 222].

One can even specify the precise location of the mines of zaṙik mentioned in Ašxarhac’oyc’. According to Srvanjtyane’ (1, 1978 [< 1884]: 402), there are mines of zaṙīn/x in the vilayet of Van, districts of Norduz and Jūłamerg, and one finds select coal in the vicinity of the village of Šamanis. Since Norduz and Jūłamerg 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 Srvanjtyane’ (1884 AD) identifying mines of arsenic in the district of Čahuk.

According to Strabo (16.1.24), Korduk’ (in Korčayk’) produced γαγγῆτις λίθος ‘lignite’, i.e. ‘a variety of brown coal’, which keeps serpents away (see Aćărya 1940a: 90, ModArm. transl. 91). This is obviously identical with the evidence presented by G. Srvanjtyane’ on coal in this area.
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1.8 Anania Širakac’i

Parallel to Karič, the standard term for the constellation Scorpio, Anania Širakac’i (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 329I-10, 330I-12) sometimes uses the vernacular form Kor (see s.v.v.). 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 Larabul, and from Axalc’xa and T’iflis to Moks and Ožim. 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.], Amir dovlat’ Amasiac’i [15th cent., Amasia]) and has been preserved in some W and SW dialects (Cilicia, Xarberd, Akn, Arabkir [ko-class]), as well as in two Southeasternmost villages of Mara 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 Arkaw is attested only in Anania Širakac’i (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 331I). 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 Altnawor (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’ic’k’s anēk kotor-kotor,
Xayt’ē zmardoyn ač’k’n zed kor.

There comes from the North [an] equestrian,
Rides as a sword, as if having wings,
Breakes 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.), pat(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 barxar/yc’a ‘a Northern cold wind’ [HAB 4: 63a].

P’ičči ‘pine-tree’ (John Chrysostom, Fables of Mxit’ar Goš, Geoponica, etc.); present in Xotorjur [YušamXotor 1964: 518b], Hačen, 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.), Amir dovlat’ 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 ka-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’aycān ‘spleen’ > Cappadocian Greek πτήαγα ‘id.’ > Xotorjur sīpex ‘id.’ (see s.v.); this helps to eliminate the theory on the extremely archaic nature of this Armenian dialectal form.


Arm. gerandi ‘scythe’ (q.v.): Larabal k’arándi (vs. regular kərəndu) and Kizên k’ərənt’i can be explained as back loans from Azerbaijani. Similarly, Hamšen k’érəndi may have been borrowed from Laz kərəndi, which in turn is considered to be an Armenian loan.

As is demonstrated by Açarjan (HAB 3: 204a), Van, Muş, Alaşkert, Bulanxə *čiwel ‘flock of sheep’ derives from čiwel ‘branch’ and čel- ‘to divide’, and Kurd. čečl (sheep-)flock’ is borrowed from Armenian (see 3.9.1). Sasun *čel ‘flock of sheep’ recorded by Açarjan (1913: 739b) without any etymology or internal connections, may have been borrowed from Kurdish. Thus: Arm. čiwel ‘branch, division; flock’ > Kurd. čečl (sheep-)flock’ > Arm. dial. (Sasun) *čel ‘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. rd > (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 ergerek ‘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 gārmāsi vs. germast ‘snowball-tree, guelder rose’ (Alayan 1954: 265b) can be explained by a Turkish intermediate (see HAB 1: 546 for the forms).

Arm. dial. di/ala ma ‘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
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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, kašin, 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.’.

*bṙińč’ (the fruit), bṙińč’-enji (the tree); dial. *bɾo-oš-, *bɾińč’-j-, etc. ‘Celtis australis or occidentalis’ (see Ališan 1895: 101\textsuperscript{No387}; HAB 1: 490b) or ‘snowball-tree, guelder rose (Viburnum opulus)’. According to Malxaseanc’ (HBB 1: 397b), bɾińč’-i means ‘Viburnum opulus’, whereas the alternating dialectal forms pršni and p’ɾšni are taken as synonymous with ltt-eni and denote ‘Celtis australis’ or, according to Sepetçeın, ‘Celtis caucasica’ (Malxaseanc’ HBB 2: 221c; 4: 129a, 528b). Abelyan (Abeghian 1899: 61) distinguishes between bɾińč’-i ‘Viburnum opulus’ and bɾi ‘Celtis australis’ (the latter form is unknown to me).

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’.

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 mknarınj ‘mouse-coloured (e.g., of a horse or cat)’ [Amatuni 1912: 483a] can be interpreted as mukan ‘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.
βοράτινη
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Attested in Galen (brinč‘, blinč‘, etc., see Ališan 1895: 101\textsuperscript{1}, Greppin 1985: 139) and Jūanšēr [HAB 1: 490b]. NHB (2: 1061b) considers it as a dialectal word.

Preserved in the dialects of Akn, Arabkir, Xarberd, etc. \*brinč‘, \*brinč‘-i. Muš, Balaš, Bulanax have \*b’linč‘ [HAB 1: 490b]. Šatax pališk ‘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 pališk reflects \*blinč‘-\*k is corroborated by Moks pališč‘k, gen. pališč‘kaš, pl. pališč‘kǽtir ‘[kustarńyj] plôd, mëlkjuy, kruγljuy, žel’tuy i š s kôstóčkuy, mýsja máló, šerńkuy, pòsnèveát oséńuy’ (see Orbèli 2002: 313).

Ališan (1895: 631\textsuperscript{10}, 635\textsuperscript{11}) records Sasun, Muš p’линк‘, p’линк‘-i vs. Northern p’rčni, 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 brinč‘. Note Sasun plinč‘, přínč‘, plinjk’ [Petoyan 1954: 153; 1965: 517-518].

Ağulis brásňa, přásňa Larabal přišna (the berry), přišnæ (the tree), Łazax p’růš, Laradal břošní [HAB 1: 490b].

Ačāryan (HAB 1: 490b) notes the resemblance with Assyry. barăšu, Hebr. b’růš, Aram. brätä. 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. barăšu is ‘Juniperus giganteus’, which is identical with the meaning of Aram. \*břoš-ni, \*brás-ňa. He also notes that the Armenian form brinč‘ 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. Aram. brinč‘-i is a powerful ‘Abwehrmittel’ against the Evil Eye [Abeğhian 1899: 61]. Note also the curse formula from Axale’xa: brinč‘i terevé uc ‘may he eat the leaf of the snowball-tree’ (see Ačāryan 1913: 207b). In a number of traditional stories, the juniper protects Jesus Christ, or is related to certain saints (Lanalanyan 1969: 115f).

The tree-names under question come from Mediterranean and Near-Eastern areas: Gr. ἄναθο n. ‘šavin, Juniperus sabina; Juniperus foetidissima’ (also ἄναθον n., ἄναθον), Lat. bratus (Pliny) ‘an Anatolian cypress’; Aram. b’rát, Hebr. b’růš, Assyry. barăšu ‘cypress’ < Proto-Semitic \*brādu (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 Laradal point to \*brós or \*břoš, which is derivable from Semitic, cf. Assyry. barăšu and Hebr. b’růš. Considering forms in the closely related Łazax and Laradal, Larabal přišna, too, seems to reflect \*brós. Given the allophones with initial b- and p-, Ağulis b/prášna is considered to be a loan from Larabal [Ačāryan 1935: 93]. Since the accented penultimate -a- yields -a- in Ağulis (see Ačāryan 1935: 66-67), one may reconstruct \*brós- for Ağulis.

Some comments on Larabal vocalism are in order. In view of such examples, as boxi ‘hornbeam’ > pixi, the derivation \*brós- > Larabal přišna seems regular. A closer look, however, shows that Larabal -e- 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 *bró-; or (2) Larabal přěšna reflects a form different from the one seen in Lazax, Laradal and Agulis and, therefore, requires another solution. Since accented i yields Larabal e (see Açaányan 1899: 68; Davt’yan 1966: 35), one may derive Larabal přěšna from *brinč’-n-, cf. 2.1.11. The same solution is given by Alayan (1954: 39, 84) for Mehti barčnšna.

How to reconcile *bróš- with the other forms, namely *brinč’- and *brinč’/? 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: *bró(ă)učš-ni > *brinč‘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. βόπατον, Arm. brütă, etc., so the Armenian may reflect a substratum form with an affri cate. One can also offer alternatives for -inč’/i: (1) *-in-ıeh > Arm. -ınj, cf. Gr. βópat-ɪnъ vs. βópatov; (2) compare other Armenian plant-names (Persian/Arabic loans), such as т’уринъ, нариң ‘orange’ (see HAB s.vv.).

Arm. *bró-oš vs. бри (Abelyan) and *brilinč’- have been synchronically interpreted as containing a “plant-suffix” -oš, as seen in t’el-awš vs. t’el-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 ‘гонач’ [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, Açaányan (1913: 212b) does not specify the form or location of the dialectal word. Such a form is found, for example, in Šatax: pərt-un ‘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 pərti ‘мять, смазывать, мешать’ = ‘to batter, plunge, anoint, mix’ (see Orbeli 2002: 314). Note especially Moks pərtun xol ‘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-к‘, 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 Açaányan (HAB 2: 642-643), although the dialectal descendants of the forms k(o)tor and ktrem are
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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/e'ir.

Among the forms mentioned by A'charyan s.v. kotor (HAB 2: 643a), Marafa kutir presents a special interest; see also Dav'tyan 1966: 400.

In the dialects of Van, Sasun and Šatax, there is a similar form, namely k'atir, meaning ‘flock of sheep’ (see A'charyan 1913: 619a; M. Muradyan 1962: 212b). According to A. Xa'ch'yan (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. ba'žin-k' ‘dowry’ from ba'žin ‘share, cut’ (see 3.8.2).

1.12.4 xučič ‘scarecrow’ is attested in Evagrius of Pontus. In “Ba'qr'girk' hayoc’” (Amalyan 1975: 113n55, cf. 145n224), 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. A'charyan (HAB 2: 418a) rejects the relation of these words with xuč-ap ‘panic fear’ (Philo etc.): xuč-ap-k’ ‘bogy, ghost’ (Bible) on the strength of the dialectal forms: Sebastia xx/čj ‘bogy’, Erznka etc. *xox ‘etc.’. He (A'charyan 1913: 481a) compares the latter with Pers. kux.

A more careful internal examination shows that A'charyan’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 xx/čj 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 Erznka also has xuj-ur-ik ‘scarecrow used in a drought-ritual by children’ (see Kostandyan 1979: 152b, in the glossary of dialectal words). Further: Vaharšapat/Ējmiačin xuč-‘ak ‘scarecrow’ (Amatuni 1912: 292a), P'arpi xon-ol-oz ‘an evil spirit’ (P'iliposyan 2005, 2: 84), Nor Bayazet xuč-‘kurur-ik ‘doll of the drought-ritual’ (A'charyan 1913: 489-490).

The element -ap is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, compare tagnap, which is synonymous with xučap (see L'ap'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 *xv/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: 270q2), Partizak *xuxu-l-ič, etc. Typologically, compare *bo-: *bo-bol : *bolo-č ‘insect, bogy, etc.’ (q.v.).

1.12.5 ğkoyt', a-stem, ğkoyt'n, an-stem (John Chrysostom etc.); ğkoyt', o-stem (Bible+); cîk (Arak'el Dawrižec'i, 17th cent.) ‘the little finger’.

Widespread in the dialects. All the kn-class dialects, including those located in extreme peripheries, such as Transylvania, T'iflis, Cilicia, as well as Van and Salmast, have the form ğkoyt'. 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: Larab développements, Kévyn, Jula čik (next to rural čkit’, for which I posit čkoyt’ = čkuit’ > *čkwit’, through metathesis), Šamaxi čkla mat, Agulis čavgh buıt’, Ganjak čcink’, etc.; cf. also Aza, Marala čltik [HAB 3: 205a]. In K’esab, one finds an intermediate form, namely čkek (see C’olak’e’an 1986: 206a).

Ara’el Davr’ee lived very close to Nor Jula and witnessed the well-known migration of Jula. The form čkit, used only by him, can be seen, in fact, as a first-hand record of the dialectal form from Jula in the 17th century.

Ačar’yan (HAB 3: 204-205) reconstructs a proto-form *c(u)lkoyt’ and treats it as borrowed from Kartvelian languages; cf. Laz čulu k’lt’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 ka-dialects, but not in SE and E dialects. Ačar’yan’s etymology can be correct only if one assumes that čkoyt’ has been reduced to *čk- 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, o-stem: GDSg unj-o-y in Gregory of Nyssa ‘bottom, depth (of a sea etc.); root; the underground, Underworld’ (P’awstos Buzand, Hexameron, Philo, etc.);

unj, prob. ‘treasure, treasury, granary, barn’ (P’awstos Buzand 5.6); cf. Georg. unji ‘treasure’;

unj, ‘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, cart; case’ [Steingass 1998a], Miran. ganj ‘treasury’; also Iranian loans: Skt. gaṅja- ‘treasury, jewel room; a mine; a cowhouse or station of cowherds; a cart, place where grain etc. is stored for sale; tavern’ [Monier-Williams 1899/1999: 342c], Gr. γάζα f. ‘(royal) treasury’, Aram. gna’z’, etc., see Hübschmann 1897: 126; HAB 1: 516-517; Nyberg 1972: 81a; Olsen 1999: 872. In view of the final -j instead of -j, Arm. ganj (cf. also Georgian ganji ‘buried treasury’ is considered to be a Median loan (see Jahukyan 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, etc.), ‘wallet, case’ (Yovhannès Vanakan Vardapet Tawušec’i, 12-13th cent.). Ačar’yan (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 Kolb, 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- : *unj- points to ablaut *wan- : zero-grade *un-. In view of the parallel i- and u-stems of Arm. *ganj, as well as the fact that the ablaut alternants differ also with respect to the following affricate (*ganj vs. *unj), one can tentatively reconstruct the following old paradigm: nom. *wanj-ōi > Arm. *ganj-u(i), with 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 *giwɫ ‘village’ (q.v.), arew ‘sun’, etc. (see also 2.2.2.4). For the sound development *ji̯ > 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- ‘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-.

---

158 The connection of Arm. *ganjak with Skt. vakṣāṇā ‘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. vakṣāṇā from substr. *y(a)n̥g̥-s- and connect it to PArm. *unaj-ōi, obl. *unj-, which has developed into Arm. *unj-øi, 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. ἑκατόν, and tasn ‘ten’ vs. Gr. δέκα, IE *e yielded a “unter unbekannten Umständen”. But the Iranian origin of vasn cannot be doubted (see HAB 4: 309-310). 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, 206). 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 Urart. euri ‘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 večernji, etc.; Arm. iž, i-stem ‘viper’ vs. Gr. ἐφίς, 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 *medh- > Arm. mēḏ, 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. lór ‘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. karíč ‘scorpion’ < *karid-ja, cf. Gr. κᾱρίς, -ίδος ‘Crustacea’ vs. κορίς, κωρίς ‘id.’. Note the element *-id- seen in both sets of words (λαρίς, -ίδος and κᾱρίς, -ίδος).
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. Ačaryan (AčarLiak 6, 1971: 519-520) argues against this rule, mentioning holani ‘uncovered’ and hol ‘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. aytum ‘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, ayč'. 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 *h2óid-os, GSg. *h2id-és-s > PArm. *oi̯t-, *ai̯t- (with analogical -i̯- 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 *j- > Arm. zero

Since a sound change *k- > Arm. zero is untenable (if not impossible), and the development *j- > Arm. j- or j- (for references and discussion and/on the theory of *Hj- see Pisani 1950: 180-182; Minshall 1955; Winter 1965: 113-114; Polomé 1980: 20; Beekes 1981-82: 113; Ravenæs 1991: 64-68; Alabekyan 1998: 71-79) is not convincing either, one should posit PIE *j- > Arm. zero; Arm. ur ‘where, where to’ (interrog.), ‘wherever’, o-, interrogative indefinite pronoun; also o-r ‘which’, o-v ‘who’ (see s.v.) should be derived from PIE *j- rather than *k- forms; PIE *jo-, cf. Skt. या- ‘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-ij-< QIE *leuwi-(e)h2- or *leuwi-ir-; ors, o-stem ‘hunt; animal for hunting’ < QIE (substratum) *firk-oi- ‘deer, roe’; see s.vv.

Further, see s.vv. du, obl. je- ‘you’, ju ‘egg’.
2.1.7 PIE *i > Arm. l-
Examples: leard ‘liver’ vs. Skt. ṣāṅkṛ etc.; luc ‘yoke’ vs. Skt. yugā-, Lat. iugum, etc.

Different explanations have been offered for these words (see s.vv.). Hamp (1982: 191) assumes \( l < [\lambda] < *[j] < *[\iota] \), “an unspectacular phonetic sequence known from current attestation in dialects of a number of languages”.

The alternation *i* - : *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, hōwsem ‘to weave’ (q.v.) > Łarabal lūsil, yesan ‘whetstone’ > Alaštērt, Muš, Sasun lksan. In some cases, contamination is possible. For Łarabal lūsil, Ačāryan (HAB 3: 101b) assumes contamination with PIE *plek- ‘to weave’. Muš listag may be due to the influence of lōys ‘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 [Ačārēan 1913: 423a] and Moks [HayLezBrbBār 1, 2001: 225b]. NPl liz-n-ir is attested in a Moks version of the famous folk-song “Camt’el” (see Šahpazean 1913: 262-6 and footnote 3). The plural ending -ner (Van and Šatax) : -nir (Moks) presupposes an older N_sg form with -n (see Ačāryan 1952: 108; M. Muradyan 1962: 85; M. Muradyan 1982: 139); cf. Van/Šatax yezner, Moks iznīr, the plural of yez (Moks iz) < Cl Arm. ezn ‘bullock’. This implies that the older nominative form of the word under discussion would have been *lezn. One wonders, then, if *lezn ‘buffalo’ is identical with the synonymous by-form *ye/z < Cl Arm. 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 Bagdasaryan-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 *y

According to Pedersen (1905: 196 = 1982: 58), the intervocalic *w-* “erscheint als arm. vow es auslautend geworden ist, sonst aber als g”. Note that govern 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’, hōviw ‘shepherd’, etc.
2. ASPECTS OF HISTORICAL GRAMMAR

2.1.9 Nasals

In two cases, we find Arm. *m-: Arm. merk ‘naked’ : Skt. nagná- ‘naked’, Lith. niogas ‘naked’, etc.; Arm. magil ‘claw’ : Gr. ὄνυξ, -υχος 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-*no- > *n*eg*no- > *mekn- > merk (influence of lerk ‘hairless; smooth’?). Note especially YAv. maɣنا- ‘naked’. The etymological details concerning these words are uncertain, however.

Moks *mžɫawil, next to *nžwaɫil, is probably due to contamination of *muž ‘fog’ and nuaɫ ‘to become dim; to faint, swoon, grow weak’ (Bible+; in dialects also *nɫawil); see s.v. *muž ‘fog’.

2.1.10 PIE *s > Arm. h

This sound change (see Greppin 1975a; Jahukyan 1982: 39-40; Beekes 2003: 169) has taken place in Armenian, Greek, Iranian, Phrygian, Lycian (and also in Brythonic Celtic) [Szemerényi 1985; Clackson 1994: 53-54].

For the loss of internal *-s-, see Viredaz 2000, as well as the discussion of arīwn ‘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 : *h me-; mis ‘meat’ vs. OCS meṣo ‘flesh, meat’, Goth. mimz ‘meat’, etc.; us ‘shoulder’ vs. Gr. ὅμος, Lat. umerus, Skt. āmsa-, etc.

All the forms of Armenian (ClArm., 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 yɔns seems to be particularly important (see s.v. us ‘shoulder’).

For a later period, one finds evidence for -nt’ > -š.

Dav’t’yan (1966: 62, cf. 425) posits a sound change rt’ > Larabal š, giving only one example: matnašurt’n ‘a suppurative swelling on one’s finger-tip’ > mnnásš. This sound development is improbable. Next to matnašurt’n (lit. ‘finger-lip/edge’; attested in “Bžškaran” apud NHB 2: 215a, preserved in Van matšurt’), there is a dialectal (Muš, Karin, T’iflis, etc.) equivalent *matnašuč, lit. ‘finger-breath’ (see Amatuni 1912: 465a). Ačayan (1913: 759a) derives Larabal mnnásš from this compound. Alternatively, Larabal mnnásš may be linked with Agulis mtnášrž etc., with šurj ‘around’ as the second member (on this, see HAB 3: 539b): *matnašurj > *mtnašo(r)ž > Larabal mnnásš. Another example of the sound change -nč > -š is Astuacašunč ‘Bible’ > Aslanbek asvajašš [HAB 3: 535b].

The sound change is more transparent when -nč- is followed by another consonant; cf. examples from Měri [Ałąyan 1954: 84], among which břešna from *brinč- ‘snowball-tree’, cf. also Larabal přešna (unless one prefers to link it with Lazax, Laradal, Agulis *břoš-, see 1.5 and especially 1.12.1).
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2.1.12 The ruki-rule

On veštasan ‘sixteen’ vs. vec ‘six’, and arj ‘bear’, Meillet (1898: 280-281) 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. rksas, 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 Ačaš Liak 6, 1971: 560-561) rejects this explanation and derives arj from *rksi-o-, 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 *-rsi-o-, cf. Skt. tṛṣas, ḍṛṣṭi, Gr. ἄρκτος; the chuintant pronunciation was eliminated only later than the change of sound to vowel after r.

Meillet (1898: 280-281) 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. rksas, 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 Ačaš Liak 6, 1971: 560-561) rejects this explanation and derives arj from *rksi-o-, 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 *-rsi-o-, cf. Skt. tṛṣas, ḍṛṣṭi, Gr. ἄρκτος; the chuintant pronunciation was eliminated only later than the change of sound to vowel after r.

The explanation of -rš-in t’arš- and garš from *-rsi-o- 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’ < *suek-s-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’áran (adj.) : *t’aršam-émi (verb) ‘to wither’; for a philological discussion, see s.v.; jaṙ 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’.

golorši, -ea-c’ vapour, steam’, if from QIE *uol-HuVrs-ieh2 ‘warm vapour’ (cf. Hitt. urša- ‘fog, mist’, Gr. ἐέρση ‘dew’, etc.) > PArm. *wol-ą(w)orši-yá; see s.v. gol ‘warmish, lukewarm; warmth’.

giser ‘night’ vs. Gr. ἐξαπατάω, Lat. vesper, Lith. vâkaras, OCS večern, etc. on the one hand, and Welsh ucher < *ekwser-; Bulg. dial. (Vinga) učer, on the other; perhaps contaminated with the other synonymous word: YAv. *sšapar-, Skt. ksáp-, Hitt. ispant- ‘night’, etc.), thus: *neksepero- > PArm. *we(k)jše(ro>- *geliser-o- > giser.

moš(–) ‘blackberry’, moš-i ‘bramble, blackberry-bush’ vs. mor, mor-eni ‘id.’, Gr. μόρον n. ‘black mulberry; blackberry’, μορέα, -έη f. ‘mulberry-tree, Morus nigra’, Lat. morum, ī, n. ‘fruit of the black mulberry’, morus, ī, f. ‘black mulberry-tree’, cf. Gr. μόρον ‘black mulberry; blackberry’, μορέα, -έη ‘mulberry-tree, Morus nigra’, Lat. morum ‘fruit of the black mulberry’, morus ‘black mulberry-tree’, etc.; the form mo(r)š is mostly found in derivatives (moš-a-vayri in Jeremiah 17.6, moš-i, etc.) and probably points to the tree/plant-name *morš-i- derived from PArm. *mor-s-ieh2- (see also s.v.v.).
č'ir 'dried fruit' (only in a medieval glossary), č'or 'dry' (Bible+) vs. Gr. ξηρός 'dry; withered, lean; fasting' (see s.v.);

uši, *ho/uši probably 'storax-tree' and 'holm-oak', if from QIE *h3ek-s-ieh2- (cf. Gr. ὄξυα, η 'beech; spear', Erzamordvin uks(o) 'elm, ash', etc.) or *HoHks- from *HoHs- (cf. Lith. úosis 'ash-tree' etc.) > PArm. *ho(k)sija- > *hoši, and *ut(k)sija- > uši (see s.v.).

The rule did not operate in Arm. *-rs- < PIE *-rk̂-, cf. hars-n 'bride' from *prk̂-; 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 -ṙ- 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 Hačan hašnik’ (also haš[n]uk ‘little bride’) [Gaspyan 1966: 50], Sebastia hašnik’ and other derivatives, such as hašn-uk etc. [Gabikean 1952: 329], Č’aharmahal hašnik’ [Eremean 1923: 79a] and rural Jula 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 has 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 CIArm., 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 – Hačan, Sebastia : SE – Č’aharmahal, rural Jula (migrated from the Ayrarat 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- > š/šV in Nor Naxijewan, Sivri-Hisar, and Hačan (see s.v. erek’ ‘three’).

Note also hangoyc’ ‘knot’ : *hangu(r)st > Sebastia hankašt (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 ἀστρον (see s.v.), as was pointed out by Jahukyan (1987: 346).
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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’i), etc. [Kortlandt 1975 = 2003: 10-12; Beekes 2003: 176-179].

An interesting case is gelj-k’ ‘glands’ from PIE *g(w)hel-gh-, 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 in the root (see Meillet 1905-06: 243-245; HAB 1: 535; Ačāryan 1952: 79; Jahukyan 1967: 196; 1982: 216; Kortlandt 1975: 43-44 = 2003: 10-11).159

If related with Skt. kaśīk- ‘Ichneumonweibchen’ or ‘weasel’ and kāśa- ‘weasel’, ak’is ‘weasel’ derives from *Hkek-ih2- and shows a similar depalatilazion: *k - k’ - s instead of ē - s.

The absence of palatalization may be due to the onomatopoetic nature of certain words. A probable example is *gel-, get-gel- ‘to sing’ (P’awstos Buzand, Hexaemeron, etc.) from QIE *gwet-i̯, cf. Lat. betula ‘birch’, Welsh bedwen ‘id.’, etc. (from PIE *g’etu- ‘resin’, cf. Skt. jat∪u- n. ‘lac, gum’ etc.).

The absence of palatalization may be due to the onomatopoetic nature of certain words. A probable example is *gel-, get-gel- ‘to sing’ (P’awstos Buzand, Hexaemeron, etc.) from QIE *gwet-i̯, cf. Lat. betula ‘birch’, Welsh bedwen ‘id.’, etc. Compare Arm. dial. onomatopoetic *gl-gl-, referring to water or laughing (see Amatuni 1912: 135a; Ačāryan 1913: 232b).

Arm. mak’i ‘ewe’ is perhaps of onomatopoetic 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’erdi-, cf. Skt. grhā- m. ‘house, residence’ (RV+), YAv. garsā- m. ‘house of da’ēvíc 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.v.v. alawsunk ‘Pleiades’, acul ‘coal’, arows

---

159 Ačāryan (1906-08; AčārLiak 6, 1971: 542; 1952: 79-80) adduced some dialectal parallels to this dissimilatory development: jfrjatalac-k’ ‘water-mill’ > Aslanbek k’atlaš; č’orek sáb’ti ‘Wednesday’ > Van k’orok’as p’at and č’orok’as p’at; He assumes that the palatals j and č’ have turned into their velar correspondent k’ through dissimilatory influence of š. However, an assimilatory influence of k’- seems more likely and simpler (an alternative mentioned but rejected by Ačāryan himself).

2.1.16 Initial *H-

2.1.16.1 PIE *H(V) (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.), *h₂̌e- 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 Larabal 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: 132, 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. hayč’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. geta’-), 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. *aļǰ- ‘darkness, twilight’, ayg ‘morning’, ayc’ ‘visit, inspection’, 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. *adĵ- ‘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.

2.1.1.6.2 PArm. *(h)o- > dial. fo-

In a few CIRArm. words with initial o- or ho- one finds dialectal forms with *fo-:

(h)o- > dial. fo-


Ačāryan (2003: 106-107) notes that this development occurs in monosyllables and is conditioned by the vowel o. He (AčaHLPatm 2, 1951: 411) correctly derives the form *fort ‘calf’ (see s.v. CIRArm. 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, Larabal and others, which did participate in the consonant shift. It is remarkable that ort ‘calf’ yielded Kakavard ho’surt’ in three villages and va’art’ 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 *j̄o- (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 *j̄o-?) 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 unspirated -t’, see s.v. ort’. See also s.v. hot ‘earth’.

Among other cases, note hog ‘pain, grief; care’ (Bible) > *fog, ogi and hog-i ‘spirit, soul’ (both Bible+) > *fogi [H. Muradyan 1982: 268f] vs. the etymologically related hov ‘cold’, with no 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 Ačāryan 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 *h₁e- > 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 auslaut\(^{160}\): Arm. srah ‘hall’ (Bible+) > Zeyt’un sryf, srf, vs. srah in Łaraball, Ararat, etc., and srx in Muš, Moks, Salmast, etc. [HAB 4: 281-282], of which Ačaryan (2003: 108, 338) offers no explanation. Since the only dialect showing the development is Zeyt’un, where, unlike in the other dialects, the vowel -a- regularly yielded -ɔ-, one can reconstruct the following development: srah > Zeyt’un *sroh > sɔy/ɔf. Here again, the sound change h > f may be conditioned by the neighbouring labial vowel Ϛ, which, in this case, precedes the -h. Note, however, many counter-examples in Ačaryan 2003: 108.

2.1.17 Prothetic vowel

2.1.17.1 Preliminaries

The so-called “prothetic vowel”, viz. Gr. ἀ- (and ὀ-) : Arm. a-, and Gr. ἐ- : 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 reflex\(^{161}\).

For the material and discussion I refer to Audouin 1892; Meillet 1927; Bonfante 1937: 19; Hovdhaugen 1968; Beekees 1975b: 428; 1991: 237; Condins 1978-79; Muller 1984; Olsen 1984; 1985; Peters 1986: 377-378; Beekees 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 Alayan 1958: 67-72.

2.1.17.2 PIE *h₁le/a- > Arm. IV- (V = any vowel)

\(\text{lanj}f, a\)-stem ‘breast’ (< ‘lungs’) < QIE *h₁lngw̃-i(h₁)-eh₂-, cf. Gr. ἰλαχύς ‘small, short, mean, little’, ἐλαφρός ‘light (in weight)’, Olc. linga ‘lung’, etc.;

\(\text{lerk} f\) ‘hairless’, dial. ‘smooth’: o-\(\text{ork} f\) ‘smooth, polished’ vs. cf. Mlr. lerg f. ‘sloping expanse, plain, surface’ < *lergā, less-lergg ‘pasture’, Nlr. learg ‘a plain; field’, etc. (q.v.).

If the etymology of \(\text{lanj}f\) 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-\(\text{ork} f\) 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 lóys ‘light’, lusin ‘moon’, etc. This implies that lerk : o-\(\text{ork} f\) points to *Hle/org(w)-. It is theoretically possible that *h₁le-, with a front vowel in the root, yields Arm. *(o)lV-, 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’ < *orcam vs. Gr. ἐρέγομαι, from *h₁reug-. For this assimilation, see below.

2.1.17.3 PIE *h₁NV- > PArm. *oNV- > *(a)m-V-
As is well known, PIE initial *h₁NV- yields Arm. *anV- (through *o > a in an open syllable), cf. anēc-k’ ‘curse’ vs. Gr. ὠνεἴδος 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 *h₁NV- > PArm. *oNV- > *(u)m-V-.

As is well known, PIE initial *h₁nV- yields Arm. *anV- (through *o > a in an open syllable), cf. anēc-k’ ‘curse’ vs. Gr. ὠνεἴδος n. ‘reprimand, abuse’, Lith. niedėti ‘to despise’, etc.

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 erēk ‘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 *gʷr(e)h₂-n-: Lith. girna ‘millstone’, OCS žrny, cf. Skt. grāvāna- ‘pressing-stone’, etc.; eɫbayr ‘brother’ < PIE *h₁r’eh₂thēr ‘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.).
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On the other hand, the prothetic vowel is a- if the word contains a labial vowel or diphthong:

\[\text{aṙu 'brook, etc.' from PIE *sru- (cf. Greppin 1980a: 97, who assumes *e-ru- > a-ru, with "erratic *e > a") and aṙog- 'to water, wet, sprinkle, irrigate' from PIE *srou- 'to strem, flow'; see s.v. Better attested is the variant oṙog(an)em, which, as well as oroč- 'to chew, ruminate' (cf. Skt. ṛādati 'to gnaw, bite, scratch', Lat. rōdere 'to gnaw') and orcam 'to vomit' (vs. Gr. ἑρεύγομαι) 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. *röd, cf. MPers., NPers. rōv 'copper, brass', Skt. lohā- m. 'reddish metal', etc.; cf. also Georg. rvali 'copper, brass', which, according to Ačāryan (HAB 1: 331b), is borrowed from Armenian.162

Further: arows, arowš 'bustard', if from Iran. *röš.163

2.1.18 PIE *p/t/k + *H

2.1.18.1 PIE *kH > Arm. x vs. *k > Arm. k'; *kH > c' vs. *k > s

Arm. xaxank' 'loud laughter' (Ephrem+) next to Skt. kākhati 'to laugh', Gr. kακάζω, OCS xoxotati 'to laugh loudly', and c'ax 'branch' (Geoponica, etc.; widespread in dialects) next to Skt. śā̱-f. (RV+) 'branch, twig', are considered to represent PIE *k̂ [Meillet 1894b: 294; 1936: 35; 1950: 78-83]. For a discussion on voiceless aspirates see Hierche 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 onomatopoetic rather than from PIE *kH- or *kH-.

Another onomatopoetic formation with -x- is baxem 'to beat (said of breast, wave, etc.); to strike (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 onomatopoetic origin (see s.v.).

As to c'ax, which in some dialects (Larabal, 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. s 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 Jula dialect on the vowel of the third syllable, as is formulated by Ačāryan (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’aw(h)un ‘stem, stalk’, *c’i’fi ‘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’, *yalat ‘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 *dghuH-m and *muHs-m respectively (with loss of *-s- in mukn), assuming that “the laryngeal was oralized before the syllabic nasal” and is reflected as glottalic -k-. 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), *k’unh ‘crane’ if it reflects a metathesized AccSg *gruHnm (cf. OHG *kroni/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 *k’unk, 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 (1998: 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)llHju-; 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.

Olsen (1999: 778, 808) assumes *-lh₁C- > Arm. -oloC- when a labial *p or labiovelar *kw precedes the sonant. Her examples, however, are not convincing. The derivations of holov ‘rolling’ from *kwlh₁-ti- (cf. Skt. cūrti- ‘moving’) and yolov from the zero-grade *-plh₁bhi (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 *kw- > Arm. h- and *-h₁ti- > Arm. -Vw- are uncertain.

More probably, yolov reflects *polh₁u-s (cf. Gr. πολύς ‘much’). The IE etymology of olorn ‘pea, been; globule’ (old heteroclitic *kwlh₁-r-n- from *kwelh₁- ‘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 *plh₁no- ‘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-)


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. ėš, o-stem and u-stem ‘ass’ may reflect an original PIE u-stem: *h₁ek-u. This is, however, highly hypothetical164.

2.1.22 Clusters

2.1.22.1 PIE *-Ti- (T = any dental stop)

According to Pedersen (1906: 396-397 = 1982: 174-175): *-tj- > -č’, *-dj- > -č’, *-d’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. šk vs. *ku > š, the -š of *hašk, unless due to influence of Pers. xāša ‘ear of corn’, may be explained as follows: PIE nom. *h₂ek-̂(ē)ōja : gen. *h₁ek-u-ōs (and/or *h₂ek-̂u-ih₂-) > PArm. *hašu vs. *(h)ask- > > hask and *hašk. Of course, this is highly hypothetical, too.
gēj 'moist' < *gʷe/o/id̪-jo- vs. cf. Russ. židkij, Scr. židak, etc. 'liquid, watery'; koč ‘to call, invite’ < *gʷot-je- vs. Goth. glihan etc.; mēj ‘middle’ < *med-jo- vs. Lat. medius etc.; see s.v.v., as well as s.v. oročam ‘to chew, ruminate’. 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. *-cj- > -č-, *-jj > -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. *wānj-ōi- > Arm. *ganj-uči) < 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 *skH- > Arm. c-; PIE *skH- > Arm. š-

Next to PIE *kH > Arm. x (2.1.8.1) 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.v.v. xayt ‘sting, bite’, šant ‘lightning, thunderbolt, spark’, sel ‘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 Larabal 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, Larabal pspt-in tal ‘to shine’ (see Aćärean 1913: 929-930, without etymology). The root seems to be *pol ‘fiery coal’ (Lrabal; see Aćärean 1913: 919b), cf., perhaps, pal- ‘shine’ [HAB 4: 13a, 14-15], p’alp’atim, p’olp’otem ‘to shine’ [HAB 4: 476], and, perhaps, dial. *pl-pl-al ‘to shine’ (see Aćärean 1913: 914a). The first part of the compound, namely *ps-, may be identical with Ararat, Larabal, T’iflis etc. *pec ‘spark’, cf. Van pe-*i- ‘spark’) [Aćärean 1913: 908]; cf. also paco-ar ‘shiny, clear, splended’ (Bible+; dial.) [HAB 4: 17-18]. We arrive at *p(e/a)c-pol-.

Compounds of this semantic sphere containing (almost) synonymous roots are common; cf. *kaye-x-pol-un (Larabal kкопs̥lun [Aćärean 1913: 545a], Goris kкопs̥lun [Margaryan 1975: 414a]) ‘fiery’, comprising kaye ‘spark’ and the very

---

165 In view of Skt. aśva- ‘horse’ > aśvatārā- ‘mule’, ‘a horse, the one of the two’, one could derive Arm. fora ‘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. ērk ‘four’ etc.) + the suffix -i which is frequent in animal-names such as ayei ‘goat’, mari ‘female bird’, mak'i ‘ewe’, etc. Thus: *jiyori > fora.
same *poł ‘fiery coal’; Ganjak pcećin-krakin anel (pceć ‘spark’ and krak ‘fire’) [Ačarean 1913: 908a]; etc. If this etymology is correct, Xian, Č’arsančag psal ‘to shine’ (especially of eyes; cf. also ps(ps)-ik ‘eye’) [Ačarean 1913: 929b] should be treated as a back-formation based on *ps-pV₁ < *pc-pV₁. Van ps-pel ‘eye-light’ (see Ačarean 1913: 929b) can be seen, then, as an intermediary between the semantics of psal ‘to shine’ (of eyes) and the formation of ps-pl-al ‘to shine’.

Arabkir, Polis, Karin etc. kas-karmir ‘entirely red’ (see Ačarean 1913: 553b; HayLezBrbBr 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 Naxiewan mos-mɔr ‘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, Jahukyan 1967: 214-215, and HAB s.vv. san, sandul, sareak, sunkn. See also my treatments s.vv. sunkn ‘mushroom’ (cf. Gr. σπόγγος ‘sponge, tonsil’), sandul-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 *ky-: SWIran. s- vs. Iran. sp- (see Brandenstein/Mayrhofer 1964: 12-13, 39; OsnIranJaz-Sr 1981: 29a, 174; Schmitt 1983: 80-81; Abaev 1985: 12; Jahukyan 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. Spandarmac ‘earth goddess’ [HAB 4: 172-173; Russell 1987: 324-329].

Next to spah and spay ‘army’ (borrowed from Iranian, cf. Pahl. späh, NPers. sipäh ‘army’, etc.), attested since the Bible, there is sah ‘army’ (John Chrysostom), also in the compound sah-a-pet ‘army leader’ (Canon Law). Jahukyan (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. PIlran. *späda- > Oss. efsad ‘army’; *spätα- > Oss. æfsadun ‘to saturate’; *spana- > Oss. æfsæn ‘ploughshare’ (see s.v. arjaspn ‘vitril’); *aspä- > Oss. jæfs/æfsæ ‘mare’; *kasjapa- > Oss. æfsæ/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. (Muş 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 Alaşkert (Haykuni 1902: 158, lines 2-5; reprinted: HŽHeK’ 9, 1968: 77); in other fairy-tales from the Alaşkert and Xnus regions: stak’an (HŽHeK’ 9, 1968: 159-14), ʻstok'an (305L15,20, 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 Muş-region) and recorded by Senek’erim Šal’čyan 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 [AčaṙAnjun 4, 1948: 600]. The form Sep’an is found three times in a fairy-tale recorded by Orbeli (2002: 656;35) in 1911-12 in Moks. In the Russian translation made by Orbeli himself (op. cit. 139) it is rendered as Cmenau. Further: in Nor Bayazet: Sub-Sep’anos < Surb ‘holy’ Step’annos [P’ilojeaneč’ 1888: 25-26]; in a fairy-tale recorded in T’iflis (< Muş, village of Salskan) in 1916 (HŽHeK’ 13, 1985: 14-15); in the autobiography of V. Ananyan (1980: 368-369), on refugees of the Genocide from the Van/Arçak 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: 1.13, with references). It has been assumed that the regular reflex is k. The initial er- of erku ‘two’ (< duo-h, or *dau-i) is interpreted as taken from erek ‘three’, and the original *ku- is seen in kel-a-karc ‘doubtful’, kul (allegedly) ‘fold, double’, kic ‘conjoined’, kês ‘half’, koys ‘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’ (< *dukh₂-ro-; cf. Gr. ὅπρος, Dor. ὅρος ‘lasting long’, etc.) is another possible case representing the sound law under discussion.


See also s.vv. erkn ‘labour pains’, erknc’im ‘to be frightened’, and erkinv ‘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: *dʊo ‘two’ > *tʊo > *tq’o > *tk’o > erku. This is met with sceptis (cf. e.g. Szemerényi 1985: 791-794). If, nevertheless,
one accepts this development, it would be tempting to treat Kartv. *tgub-* ‘twins’ (on
which see Klimov 1998: 194) as reflecting (or somehow related with) the theoretical
PArm. *t'k'u-* ‘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 Júla *ye'tkar or *yetkar ‘far away’
from *erkar (q.v.).

In non-initial position: PIE *melду-i(h2)- (cf. Skt. mr̥dvī f. ‘delicate, weak, soft,
mild’, Lat. mollis ‘weak, soft’ from *meldu-i-) > Arm. melk ‘soft’ (q.v.). Also oskr
‘bone’, if from *ost-wer-

2.1.22.7 PIE *-kr- > Arm. -wr-

An example: mawru-k’ ‘beard’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects, also *miruk’,
*muruk’) < PIE *smokru-, cf. Lith. smäkras, smakrą ‘chin’ vs. Skt. smāśru- n.
‘beard’, etc.

A possible example with *l may be Arm. giw ‘village’, if from QIE *
lu(e)/ok(s)-l-ih2- (see s.v.)

See also s.vv. artawsr ‘tear’ and ėrın ‘heifer, young cow’ (if from *kř-).

There are no cases with *g and *gʰ. A special development is found in art
‘cornfield’ from *h₂(e)gро-, which is hard to explain (see s.v.). Kortlandt (1980: 101
= 2003: 28) notes that the palatal articulation of *gʰ- before *-r- was preserved in
merj ‘near’ (cf. Gr. μῆκος ‘near’), but later assumes *me¬gʰsr-i (see s.v. merj ‘near’).

2.1.22.8 PIE *-ln- > Arm. -l-

For examples and references, see Lidén 1933: 42; Meillet 1936: 48; Bonfante 1937:
19. See also s.vv. ałam ‘to grind’, ārastal ‘ceiling’, āṣt ‘star’, etc.

Note also Atłwn, a district of the province of Barj Hayk’ ‘Upper/Higher
Armenia’, if from *Alnib/wn, cf. Analibna (Ptolemy) etc.

2.1.22.9 PIE *-k’ > Arm. -c’

According to Aćāryan (HAB 4: 105), MidArm. and dial. (Nor Naxijewan, Polis,
Ararat, Larabał) *puc’ ‘vulva’ (see Aćārēan 1913: 926b) derives from QIE *bul-sk-,
cf. Skt. bul- f. ‘buttocks; vulva’, Lith. bulis (-išis), bū́lė, 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, OEEngl. felg(ē) ‘felloe’) > *heli ‘hoc’
(i-stem) ‘felloe’ (q.v.). See especially s.v. kat’n ‘milk’ on the loss of *-l-, which has
been preserved in Agulis and Melri *kale’.

Compare also aşamudji ‘darkness, twilight’ > Larabał žmažen’k (see s.v. *alaʃ-).

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
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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-iyô- (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 amayi 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 (GDPl anp'ay-i-c') : anp'ay-i ‘uninhabited, desert, inaccessible, untrodden’, said of ravines (Anania Širakac'i, 7th cent.), and river-banks (Paterica), apparently composed of priv. an- and p'ay ‘foot’ < Iranian (cf. Pers. pay ‘foot; footstep, track’, pāyīdan ‘to stand firm; to be constant, fixed, established; to trample upon’, etc.).

Deriving amol ‘couple’ (Agat'anges etc.; dialects of Karin, Muš, Van, Moks, Salmast, etc.) from *səm-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 mrjwun : pl. mrjmunk ‘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. *anun > 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 matćim, 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,
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2) -c : -wt

arac- ‘to browse, graze’ (Bible+) : arawt, i-stem ‘pastureland’ (Bible+); see s.v. aracem.

*boyce- in bucanem ‘to feed’ (Bible+) : but ‘food’ (Bible+; dial.), on which the denominative btem ‘to feed’ (Ephrem+) is based; see s.v. *boyce-.

*moye- in mukanem ‘to introduce, give entrance’ (Bible+) : mut (i-stem) ‘entrance; income; sunset, West’ (Bible+), mtanem ‘to enter’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects).

3) -č- : -wt

canač’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. acuɫ ‘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’ < *drák̵ur : aratasu-k’ (pl.) < *drakü-a, assuming that arawt is composed of the PIE prefix *p_printf(i) and Arm. *hawt (cf. hawt, i-stem ‘flock of sheep 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 *-ō in the nominative (as in gewl, q.v.): NSg *pah2dō(i) > *hātu > *hātu, ISg *pazdi-b2i- > *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 -ṙ- : 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’ (Korwn, P’awstos, Lazar P’arpec’i, Elišė) with Skt. ā-vitti- f. ‘not-finding’ (AV); see s.v. git-.

The third subtype may be explained as follows: *gni̱h₂-sk-ie- > *canač’em > čanač’em : *gni̱h₂-sk-ti- > canawt’ (see Clackson 1994: 40), and the first subtype involves a development of *-g-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 erti’am, mat’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 -e- : -wt-, arawt, i-stem, must be taken as a deverbal noun in *-ti- based on verbal arac-. If the latter derives from *treHğ-, arawt (i-stem) would point to *trHğ-ti- (cf. Gr. τρῦξ-ις). Similarly, but ‘food’ (vs. boyc- ‘to feed’ < *bheug-) is best explained by *buwt from *bʰug-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’ < *khj2 eid-ti/o-, cf. Lat. caedō, etc. The forms xit’ and šit’ represent the zero-grade of the same word and go back to PIE *khj2 (d)-t- and *skh2 (d)-t-, respectively. This seems to contradict giwt, etc. However, in xit’ and šit’ we might be dealing with an 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’, erti’am ‘to go’, kat’n ‘milk’, mat’em ‘to pray’, šant’ ‘lightning’, p’oyt’ ‘zeal’.

2.1.23 Assimilation: *-a-,  \( V'_r > V_m. V'_r \) (*s also from PIE *-H-;  \( V = \) any vowel)

In 2.1.20 I assumed that the internal laryngeal was vocalized before a resonant, cf. *hj2(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 *polh₂-u-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 *dhugh₂-tēr > Arm. dusťr ‘daughter’ (q.v.). This is not conclusive, however, since dusťr is the only example. Unlike dusťr, where we are dealing with the sequence *-g(H)tt- 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 usṭr ‘son’ (q.v.) from *su(H)k-ter- is accepted, dusṭr could be explained by the analogical influence of usṭr.
apparently derives from the same PIE word (cf. YAv. *parjījanī-, NPers. parvīn, Greek ἱλιοκτήτης), underwent the same assimilation, starting with the -a- from the zero-grade form (cf. Ilr. *prHu- ‘abundant’).

For arīwn ‘blood’ and garūn ‘spring’ Szemerényi (1960: 21) assumes assimilation and contraction: *ehar > *ahar > *ar-, *gehar > *gahar > *gar-. Similarly, he (ibid.) explains ĉ’or-k’ ‘four’ and k’or-k’ NPl of k’oyr ‘sister’ from *č’ewor-k’ < *k’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 to ok 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 *bhendh-, cf. Skt. bandh- ‘to bind, fasten’, etc. (see Jahunyak 1969: 66; 1978: 176). See also s.v. papanjim ‘to grow dumb, speechless’. Counter-examples: barjr ‘high’, geļ-k’ ‘glands’, dēz ‘pile’, etc.

For a further discussion see Rasmussen 1989: 170-171.

2.1.24.2 r...r > l...r. Apart from the well-known cases of Indo-European origin, namely albewr ‘spring, well’ and elhbw ‘brother’ (q.v.), this dissimilation is also seen in olorm ‘compassion; supplication’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects), if this word derives from reduplicated *or-orm- (see HAB 3: 556-557). See, however, s.v. olorm ‘compassion; supplication’. Note also an Iranian loan: satawart ‘helmet; mitre’ (Bible+; dial.) < MPers. *sāravart(i)-, literally ‘Kopf-bedeckung’ [Hübßchmann 1897: 235-236; HAB 4: 165, 652b]. See Ača-liak 6, 1971: 699-700.

Examples in the dialects:


parart ‘fat’: Dersim barard and (Čarsančag) balard [Balramyan 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’iršālīg ‘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, po/ak, etc. (see HAB
s.vv.). One might therefore explain hokik > *hobik through a twofold process: assimilation (b...k > 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 anapok-uk ‘waterless, oilless, pure’ > Sebastia *ampakuk > *ampapuk > ambshuq and mentions only the assimilatory process. For an explicit description of a simultaneous process of assimilation and dissimilation, see Alayan 1987: 269-270, 280.

The form hobik in turn underwent a further development: *hobik > Larabal *topik > téwg’ (Alayan 1987: 280v2). This development probably started from the compound with otn ‘foot’, cf. Goris vondapipik, vonnapipik (see Margaryan 1975: 474a). *otnapopik > *otnatopik is to be understood then as t...p...p > t...p...p (ABB > AAB).


Further examples:

zok’an ‘wife’s mother’ > Larabal zānk’uč’, zămk’uč’, zēmk’uč’, zěmk’uč’ [Davit’yan 1966: 351]: zok’an’č’ > *zak’onč’ > zā/enk’uč’ > zā/cměk’uč’, as well as nzov- ‘to curse’ > Larabal nzov-.


xadol ‘grape’ > *xavol (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. + Vlab + vel. / > (vel. + V + lab. + Vlab + 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 *havol < the same xadol ‘grape’. This is, thus, a combination of two dissimilatory developments: (1) x-l-l > h-l-l, (2) x-l-l > x-v-l.

*net-u-adel(n) > Zeyt’un lmb adel’ : *nedv- > *nibd- > *nimb- > *limeb-; see s.v. adeln ‘bow’.

tatr(ak)-ik > *tattrik > Aslanbek dadordig : t-t-t-k > t-t-t-k (see s.v. tattrak ‘turtle-dove’).

tzruk ‘leech’ is reflected in Juła 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 > *pztruk > pzdruk. The first two steps are not convincing, however. An alternative explanation is: (1) tzruk > *tizdruk, with epenthetic stop before r, cf. t’mril > Juła d’mbrel, manr > Juła mandr, etc. (see Ačarean 1940: 159-160); (2) *tizdruk > pzdruk, with dissimilatory simplification of the initial cluster comprising four dental phonemes.

Amatuni (1912: 442a) records Muš, Alaškert čšmar ‘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
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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’) > Xotor: köpcuc ‘green lizard’ [YušamXotorj 1964: 472a]; see s.v. kov-a-diac’, cf. also dagat-k ‘coffin’ > Malat’ia, Sebastia *gagalk’.

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. oloṙn ‘pea, bean; globule’ (Bible+; dialects), there are other variants: oleṙn (Paterica; several dialects), and *oṙel (dialects of Xotorjor, Nor Naxijewan). Both philological (oloṙn is the basic form and is attested from the Bible onwards) and etymological (cf. Akkad. ḫallūrē, ḫiullūrē, etc.; probably also Gr. ὀλυραι) considerations suggest that oloṙn must have served as a starting point. The fact that the same metathesis is present also in Semitic forms (cf. Aram. ḫarul, Arab. ḫarl, Hebr. ḫarl) makes it difficult to determine whether the dialectal form *oṙel 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 *oṙel is present only in two Armenian dialects located far from the Semitic languages.

Also internal factors should be taken into account. The vocalism of *oloṙn (and *oṙel) seems to have resulted analogically after siseṙn, GŚg sis(e)ran ‘pea’ (Agat’anglos+; widespread in the dialects). Further, note gaylagṙaw, lit. ‘wolf-raven’ > Łarabal karáklav, Hadrut’ karəklav [Davt’yan 1966: 332], perhaps due to influence of onomatopoeic kṙ- ‘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, julhak ‘weaver’ (also julahak in Grigor Tat’ewac’i, see HAB-Add. 1982: 16), dial. also ‘spider; spider-web’, is borrowed from Pers. julāhak ‘weaver’; cf. jūlah(a), jūlāh(a) ‘spider; weaver’. Some forms have an “epenthetic” -w- or -f-: Č’mškacag ē’uvlāg, Karin jafłak next to jufa(k), Axale’xa j’uflak [HAB 4: 133a], Berri (Dersim) jivlāg ‘spider-web’ [Balrmyan 1960: 164a], Tigranakert ē’uvlāg, ē’ulāg [A. Haneyan 1978: 196a], Malat’ia juvalag ‘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 *jəw(V)lak should be interpreted as coming from *jəhalak, which in turn represents a metathesized form of jəlahak. The postulation of such a metathesized form, namely *jəhalak, is directly corroborated by Zeyt’un čhalag, j’halag ‘weaver; spider’ [HAB 4: 133a; AČaryan 2003: 337], Ararat jəhlak [Nawasardeane’ 1903: ...]
102a] or juhlag, T’iflis jühlak, Jula juxlak (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 Hačan forms have the unmetathesized sequence -hl- (see Aćayan 2003: 337, 586). As to the development -uha- > -uwa-, see 2.1.32, on zohal.

Next to Moks tɛrɔ̈xri ‘priest’s wife’ one finds txorxi ‘id.’ in the dialect of Šatax, which is both dialectally and geographically closest to Moks. M. Muradyan (1962: 216b; 1972: 209) interprets Šatax txorxi ‘priest’s wife’ as a compound of tɛr ‘lord’ and huri ‘(heavenly) beautiful woman, fairy’ not mentioning the Moks form. This etymology is not convincing. It is better to treat Moks tɛrɔ̈xri as the original form deriving from *tɛr-hōr-i ‘(the one that belongs) to the priest’.

In what follows I will present several sets of (mainly dialectal) examples of metathesis.

2.2.6.2. Stops

PIE *-Dr- and *-Dhr- are subject to metathesis in Classical Armenian (see s.vv. albewr ‘spring, well’, artawsr ‘tear’, darbin ‘blacksmith’, elbeyr ‘brother’, surb ‘pure, holy’, etc.), but *-tr- is not. It yields Arm. -wr-.

One might expect metathesis also in a form with an aspirated *-Th-, in words of substratum origin, for instance. A possible example would be k’aɫirt’, a-stem ‘stomach of animals’, if from *k’aɫíth-ra- (q.v.).

Examples from the dialects:

**Labial : dental**

*put ‘poppy’ > Larabal tɔp ‘id.’, put ‘drop’ > Larabal tɔp ‘id.’ (q.v.), see especially Margaryan 1977: 161-164;*  
*p’etur ‘feather’ > dial. (Zeyt’un, Xarberd, Hamšen, Karin, Alaškert, Larabal, Agulis, Jula, etc.) *tep’ur ‘id.’.*  
*Arm. p’aycañ ‘spleen’ > Cappadocian Greek πεϊσάχι ‘id.’ > Xotorjür sipex ‘id.’, s.v. p’aycañ.*

This material can be used to create new etymologies. For instance, t’epk ‘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**

*dagal ‘coffin’ > dial. *gadal, targal ‘spoon’ > *gdal, jgem ‘to throw’ > dial. *gjem (see HAB s.vv.).*  
*Next to kadin ‘acorn’ (q.v.), the dialect of Larabal has tkšlen and metathesized ktšlen ‘hazel-nut’.*  
*čakat ‘forehead’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects) > Řodost’o jadag, gen. jadgi [HAB 3: 176a].*
Next to ClArm. čkoyt’ and čkoyt’ ‘the little finger’, Larakal has čkêyna, kćêyna, etc. (cf. also Jula čk-ič, Şamaxi čkla mat, etc.). The form čkêyna, found also in Goris (see Margaryan 1975: 346a), reflects a metathesis čk- > ke-.

Velar : dental

kayc-oṙ-ik ‘glow-worm, firefly’ > Larakal cikûri [HAB 2: 506-507];
kant’ ‘handle’ > Ararat, Larakal, Goris, Melri etc. tank/g ‘id.’ [Margaryan 1977: 160-162];
kot’ ‘handle’ > Svedia dük’ [Açaryan 2003: 430].

2.1.26.3 Nasals, resonants, spirants

r...N > N...r

Arm. erani ‘blissful’ > Larakal (h)ənérak, nérak.

For the dialect of Hamšen, Açaryan (1947: 73; see also 235) mentions only one case for r...n > n...r: cirani gôti ‘purple girdle’ > jinari kxdî ‘rainbow’. The other dialects have no metathesis here: Polis jirani-gôti [Açaryan 1941: 220], Erznka cirani gôdi [Kostandyan 1979: 157b], Svedia cirâno kudk’ [Andreasyan 1967: 366b], K’esab cirînô kûä [Ç’olak’ean 1986: 206a], Xotor jirani-gôti [YušamXotor 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. aṙn, 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 ārânud [Andreasyan 1967: 353b]; t’onir ‘ground-hearth’ > Larakal t’ɔran, etc.

l...n > n...l

This metathesis is found e.g. in MFr. alumette > Fr. omelette ‘omelet’.

For the dialect of Hamšen, Açaryan (1947: 73) mentions only one case: šlni- ‘neck’ (q.v.) > šnlık’ ‘face’. xnlık’ from xlink’ ‘snivel’, mentioned by Açaryan (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 šnlık’ and *xnlık’ have developed into šnlîk’ and xnlîk’, with an epenthetic -n-, exactly as in banali ‘key’ > Hamšen pɔnlink’ alongside with pɔnlik’/k’. The form xnl- is corroborated by
other NW dialects such as Řodost’o, Ewdokia and Karin. Here, Ačaṙyan (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; Ačaṙyan 1913: 222b; Gabikean 1952: 135; HayLezBrbBar 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 Türkitätürkische 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 Ačaṙyan’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’ [Ačaṙyan 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: onli and onlink/k’, onlink/k’ (see Ačaṙyan 1947: 56, 220, 222). A dissimilation from n..n results in n..l in ananux ‘mint’ > Hamšen onluxk’, cf. also annman ‘not resembling’ > onlomon (see Ačaṙyan 1947: 56, 220, 221).

The contact group ln (resulting from -lin- ir -lun-) mostly develops into Hamšen -ll-, cf. inum ‘to fill’ > lluš, linim ‘to be, become’ > əlluš, *hjulunem ‘to button up’ > hilluš, etc. [Ačaṙyan 1947: 56]. One may assume that the metathesis l..n > n..l is relatively old and predates the syncope of -a-. Thus, (1) *gdalanoc’ > gdanloc’ (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, inum ‘to fill’ (< *linum) > lluš, is easy to explain. The nasal belongs to the present and is naturally absent from aorist (lc’-i, le’-ir, e-lic’ etc.) and imperative (lc’, le’-ek’), see Ačaṙyan 1947: 133, 232, thus a metathesized

167 An interesting though highly hypothetical case may be Aɫiwn (“Ašxarha‘oyc’”) vs. Analib(n/l)a (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’ > *ɛlʊš* : *ɛla, ɣel*, 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. *šlın* > *šnık*, etc.); (3) *n...n* > *l...n* (cf. *ananux* > *ənluık*, 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 *ɛvežoč* ‘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 *ɛvežoč* ‘fawn’ above). Arm. *analut* ‘deer’ < QIE *h₁(o)l-Hn-th₂o-* demonstrates that this metathesis is rather old.

**l...r** > **r...l**

*olo* ‘pea, been; globule’ (Bible+; several dialects) : *ořel* (dialects of Xotorǰur, Nor Nakıjewan). The same metathesis is present also in Semitic forms (see s.v. *olo*). Probably we are dealing with independent developments of a similar nature.

**h...v** > **v...h**

*hawak’em* ‘to gather’ > Larabal *hovák’el* and *vahák’el* [Davt’yanyan 1966: 411]. A textual illustration can be found in a fairy-tale from Larabal recorded by Grigor Bahat’yany in 1860 (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 67-100): *vohak’al am* ‘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.) > Marala and Salmast *level* [HAB 4: 300a; Ačařean 1926: 76, 424].

 *awele’uk* ‘remnant’ > Svedia *lovcäk* [Hananyan 1995: 54].

**m...n** > **n...m**

*mananay* ‘manna’ > Šamaxi *namana* [Balramyan 1964: 67, 213].

### 2.1.26.4 Vowel metathesis

Examples: *zok’anč* ‘wife’s mother’ > Larabal *zänk’uč*, *zâmk’uč*, *zénk’uč*, *źêmk’uč*’ [Davt’yanyan 1966: 351]: *zok’anč* > *zak’onč* > *źânk’uč*. 
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lezu 'tongue' > Larabāl lūzi [Davt'yan 1966: 366].
Martiros > Gor. Martüris (see Lisic'yan 1969: 273).
See also s.v. uela, o-stem 'brain'.

2.1.26.5 Metathesis involving a cluster
Arm. dial. *pong'i 'panther' seems to be related with Pers. palang 'leopard, panther', cf. Skt. pṛḍūkā-, Sogd. pwrōŋk-, Gr. πάρδαλις 'leopard', etc. (see Lubotsky 2004: 4). Metathesis of a cluster (l...ng > ng...) or contamination with another oriental word *panTVr/-, cf. Gr. πάνϑηρ, -ηρος m. 'panther', Skt. (Lex.) puṇḍarikam. 'tiger'.

This is reminiscent of the following example: next to Akn, Polis kṙt'n-il 'to lean, recline, incline the body against an object for support' (see s.v. kṙt'unk' 'back'), Ararat attests knt'ṙnil, with metathesis, as is pointed out by Ačāryan (HAB 2: 669b).

One of the possible scenarios is: (1) *-t'n- > -nt'n- (anticipated or epenthetic -n-);
(2) *knt'ṉ- > *knt'ṙn-.

In both cases, thus: C1RNC2 > C1NC2R, in other words, metathesis of R and the cluster NC2.

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 čmlil, next to it we find dial. (widespread) *čm-r-em > Aslanbek, Sebastia, Akn *črmel. Other metathesized forms of this verb are čm-k-ot- vs. čm-l-k-(o)jt-. The evaluation of forms like čmt'el, čmt'el, čm-t'-el vs. kcm't'el, kmč't'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 HZHek' 9, 1968: 552-554.
šiša 'demon' (q.v.) : NPl šiš-ay-k'.

2.27 Anticipation

2.27.1 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 *medh- -io- > PArm. *meiʃ > mēj '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 mēj may be kamurj 'bridge' (q.v.) > Kak'avaberd kārmij in the village of Varhavar (vs. kārmunj in other villages, as well as in other Armenian dialects). Perhaps we may assume *karmuj > *karmuj > kārmij.

Ačāryan (1935: 35) cites three examples of the irregular sound change CIArm. a > Agulis ay : ašeln 'needle' > āysāl(na), calel 'to fold' > cāylil, halel 'to melt' > háylil. One may explain these forms through anticipation of the front vowel e/i in the following syllable. On āysāl(na) see also s.v. ašeln.
For anticipation or metathesis of -u/w- see s.vv. acul ‘coal’, aweanem ‘to anoint’, awji-k’ ‘collar’, awli ‘a strong drink’, awr ‘day’.


2.1.27.2 Anticipation of a nasal

Anticipation of a nasal is found in the following cases:

\*ayg-ho ɫ k’ ‘ceremony on the next morning after a funeral’, Eastern \*ayg-n-a-ho > J̣̣u nagaxol and Šamaxi ink’nahol. See s.v. ayg ‘morning’. See further in the next sections.

gtanem ‘to find’ > Van etc. kəndələ, Šatax lə̣štrak, etc. (see Ačar Lian 1952: 101; M. Muradyan 1962: 64).

Probable case of perseveration: PIE *ŋ̥bhro- > PArm. *amb/pro- > ampro-p ‘thunder’ (q.v.). Note also kə̣̣ṇ̣k’ ‘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];
alač’unk ‘supplication’ > Kržen lanč’ank’ [Balramyan 1961: 173b];
zok’anč ‘wife’s mother’ > dial. (mostly western) *zɔnk’anče’ [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 Kržen: alač’el ‘to beg, supplicate’ > alanč’el, amač’el ‘to be shy’ > homanč’el, barač’el ‘to bellow’ > baranč’el, kanač’ ‘green’ > kananč’el, čanač’el ‘to know’ > čonanč’el. In Kržen 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. Kržen anգjoj and zünk’č’č’ (see Balramyan 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
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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, Jula *dandum, whereas the majority of the dialects has no epenthetic -n-. Since Hamšen is located in extreme NW, while Agulis and Jula are in SE, we are hardly dealing with a shared innovation. One may assume an archaism or an independent development, perhaps a (quasi-)reduplication *dandum.
- xuc’‘small chamber’ (5th cent.+; several dialects) > dial. (Moks, Ozim, Sipan, Hamšen) xunc’[HAB 2: 422-423].
- *ccruk ‘leech’ (cf. Aparan, Bulanx ccruk from tzruk, due to contamination with ccel ‘to suck’) > Nor Bayazet inrűk (with an epenthetic -n-).
- karmunj ‘bridge’ > *karmunj (late attestations), which is the only form found in dialects.

Before a labial stop

- žpit ‘smile’, žptim ‘to smile’ (Bible+) : žmtim (Philo etc.), žmt(i)tim (Knik’ hawatoy= “Seal of faith”, 7th cent.). Dial.: Arrarat žapštél : Moks, Salmast, T’iflis, Alaškert *žmtal, Kärin žmnîl [HAB 2: 234b]. No acceptable etymology in HAB 2: 234b. The comparison with OIc. gaman ‘Freude, Spaß, Wollust’, MHG gamben, gumpen ‘to spring’ etc. (< PIE *gwhem-b-; see Jahukyan 1967: 200) implies that the nasal in the Armenian form is original. However, the etymology is highly uncertain, and žpit is the oldest and principal form. In my view, žp(i)t- has developed to *žmt(i)- (cf. “Knik’ hawatoy”) with nasal epenthesis, then *žmt(i)- was simplified to *žm-. *xabarik-a-tu, lit. ‘who gives information or news’ > Hadrut xambəxərkatu ‘spider’ (see Polosyan 1965: 2861-7, without etymology); cf. xəbər-bezan ‘spider’ (Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan, FW 2003, Larabat).
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**736**

xipilik ‘demon, nightmare’ > dial. xmblik ‘house spirit or goblin, brownie’ (T’öxBaŋ apud Amatuni 1912: 696a).

haablus ‘bilberry, Vaccinium Myrtillus L.’ (Geoponica) from Arab. ħabb-al-ās : Svedia ĥmbālus [HAB 3: 44-45; Ācāryan 2003: 575; Andreasyan 1967: 176, 370b; Gyozalyan 2001: 17]. See also s.v. aleh ‘bow’.

hpart ‘proud’ > Šamšadin *hmbart, in compound tārākhmbart ‘empty-proud’; see textual illustrations in Xemč’yan 2000: 172aL17, 221aL22.


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’ɔ (*šan-k’ar) is due to re-interpretation as šan ‘k’ar “dog’s stone”.

An older example may be seen in Arm. kŋum vs. k’ak’um and Pahl. kākum ‘white weasel’, see s.v. ak’is and *č’asum.

Compositional epenthesis

*aŋg-hoɫ-k’ ‘ceremony on the morning after a funeral’ > Łarabal ik’nāvoł, Ararat ek’nāfšek’, Űľa nagnxol, Šamāxi ik’nahɔl, etc.; also Łarabal ik’nārɔt (with arawt ‘pasturing’); see s.v. aŋg ‘morning’.

*aŋi-kol ‘precipitous, sloped’ (cf. aŋi-kol-eal in Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.16 vs. z-aŋi-kol-eal ‘precipitous’ in “Book of Chries” etc.) > Hamšen arŋeol (cf. Xotorur *arŋok, Muš, Van*arŋok); see 1.3.

maškat’ew ‘(having) a wing of skin’ (an epithet of the bat in Hexaemeron 8), ‘bat’ (Alexander Romance etc.) > Hamšen maškɔnt’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. Ācāryan (HAB 1: 601) assumes that Van, Salmast, Nor Bayazet kɾunj is the original form and for the sound change nj > z compares koriz ‘stone or hard seed of fruits’ which appears in Łarabal (kɾunj) and the Van-group (*kolinj) with -nj (see also HAB 2: 648b; Dāvt’yan 1966: 77). However, the nasalless form koriz is attested in literature (Hexaemeron, Paterica, Grigor Magistros, etc.) and is present in most of the dialects, such as Hamšen, T’ıflis, Ararat, Šamāxi, etc.; cf. also Ūľa k’ız and Agulis kław. It is more probable, then, that koriz is the original form, and Łarabal/Van *kon/konj has a non-etymological epenthetic -n- or should be explained as follows: *köliz > *köliz-n (additional -n, on which see 2.2.1.3) > *kolinj. Similarly, gruz ‘curly’ > *gruz-ž-n (cf. Łarabal kɔrɔz-n-ut) > Van etc.
For both words no acceptable etymologues are recorded in HAB. Is ṣrūz ‘curly’ related with Pers. ḡurs ‘curled hair; a ringlet’ (see Steingass 1082a)?

Sometimes we have an alternation ṼnC : 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 təlkunk 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-eli ‘razor’ (Bible+; several dialects) : Muš, Alaškert, Nor Bayazet, Ozim, Ararat, Marala *arceli [HAB 1: 102b].

acu ‘garden-bed’ < PIE *h₂(e)g-us-ih₂- (cf. Gr. ἀγυια, pl. ἀγυιαί f. ‘street, road’ (q.v.) > Nor Jula arcu (see HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 100a; cf. NHB 1: 21b); see s.v. acu. Given the etymology of the word, the -r- should be seen as epenthetic.

bažanem ‘to divide’ (Bible+; ubiquitous in 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 Ačaṙyan (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, Bulanx, Ararat, Łazak) have *horsesli. For the description of the object, see HayLezBrbBar 3: 2004: 308a. According to Ačaṙyan (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. astl ‘star’ (q.v.) is reflected as ust/ḍl, but its diminutive suffixed as well as plural forms have an inserted -r- or -r̃-: Svedia ahr̃sdlag, arasšig, K’abusie arasš̃k, pl. aras(asht)nnir or -nnɔyr, Aramo aришtәir. In this case the epenthesis may have been prompted by contamination with arištal ‘ceiling’, taken metaphorically as ‘starry sky’; see 3.7.1.

Another peculiarity is that the epenthesis often occurs before sibilants and affricates.

Further examples:

xc ‘small chamber’ (5th cent.+; several dialects) > Akn xurc’ [HAB 2: 422-423].

tač, dial. kač : MPers. kač, NPers. kaž ‘raw or floss silk’ > Arab. qaz > NPers. qaz, see Maciuszak 1996: 30.

koč ‘stem, beam; ankle’ > Xotorjur koyj (< *korč) ‘balkony’ [Ačaṙean 1913: 590a; HAB 2: 626a; YuşamXotorj 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 *sterc (or stēc), According to N. Simonyan (1979: 245-246), Moks *sterc has preserved the original form, with -r-.

Other: Xotor ėk’ar, Sebastia *kālart’ vs. Hamšen, Trapizon kālai ‘a big basket’ from Gr. κάλαϑος, see Ačarēan 1913: 541b.

According to N. Simonyan (1979: 245-246), Moks *sterc has preserved the original form, with -r-.

Other: Xotor ėk’ar, Sebastia *kālart’ vs. Hamšen, Trapizon kālai ‘a big basket’ from Gr. κάλαϑος, see Ačarēan 1913: 541b.

According to N. Simonyan (1979: 245-246), Moks *sterc has preserved the original form, with -r-.

Other: Xotor ėk’ar, Sebastia *kālart’ vs. Hamšen, Trapizon kālai ‘a big basket’ from Gr. κάλαϑος, see Ačarēan 1913: 541b.

According to N. Simonyan (1979: 245-246), Moks *sterc has preserved the original form, with -r-.

Other: Xotor ėk’ar, Sebastia *kālart’ vs. Hamšen, Trapizon kālai ‘a big basket’ from Gr. κάλαϑος, see Ačarēan 1913: 541b.

According to N. Simonyan (1979: 245-246), Moks *sterc has preserved the original form, with -r-.
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poz ‘horn’ : Julia pozd, Agulis push [HAB 4: 93b].

hangowe ‘knot’ > dial. *hangust [HAB 3: 37b].

patroys ‘incubation, grafting’ > Hamšen badrast, Muš padrast, Svedia badrest, Julia patrast [HAB 4: 54a].

For more examples in Hamšen see Ačarjan 1947: 74. For a discussion of one of them see s.v. asem ‘to say’. In Hamšen Istus Kristos < from Yissus Kristos (see Ačarjan 1947: 74), Istus is clearly influenced by Kristos.

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, rús ‘Russian’ > rúst (for these and some more examples, see Ačarjan 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 Ačarjan 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’ > Larabal ark’avot’un [HAB 1: 347a], Moks ärk’ávot’in, ark’avor’in [Orbeli 2002: 99121, 124N203], etc. Compare the development V”H > V”wV in e.g. jul(a)hak ‘weaver’, dial. also ‘spider; spider-web’ (from Pers. julāhak ‘weaver’) > *juhalak (with metathesis, cf. Zey’t’un ŭalak, j’halog, T’iflis, Ararat *juhal, Julia jukla > *juvalak, cf. Malat’ia juvalag, Tigranakert č’üvälg, 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’ < *newiws (cf. Gr. vespág ‘young’), sor ‘hole’ < PIE *kowor- (cf. Lat. caverna ‘cavern, grotto, cave, hole’), erkan ‘millstone’ < *erkanw-, and the genitives of the type aler ‘well’ and aler ‘flour’ from *alēwar(os), *alewar(os), with the instrumental -erb from *-ēwarbi. Alabekyan (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 PIE *wul-HuVrs-ieh2- ‘warm vapour’ (cf. Hitt. parša- ‘fog, mist’, Gr. ἔσπη ‘dew’, etc.) > PArm. *wul-woršiya-; see s.v. gol ‘warmish, lukewarm; warmth’.

168 Note also zohal, zōhal ‘the planet Saturn’ > Zval Astl, the princess of India (Hindkastan) in a folk-tale from Balé (see HZHek’ 9, 1968: 361-375). However, Zval is the modernized orthographic variant of Zual Astl ‘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 > Zuval.
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 alber and aler: NSg albwr, 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 alber from *brewr-os, the reshaped gen. of albiwr. On the latter see also Eichner 1978: 153-154.

It has been assumed, however, that alber has developed from *albewer by regular loss of intervocalic *-w-. For references and more details see s.vv. albewr and alewr. As for sor ‘hole, den, cave’ (cf. Gr. κύαρ n. ‘hole’, Lat. caverna ‘cave, hole’, etc.), I prefer to derive it directly from *kowHro- (> 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. 103) 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)wr̥t- > *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: *snëwr-, which lost its w just like alber.

The secondary w (that is, -w- not from PIE *-u-) is not lost before r, cf. PIE GSg *phHròs > Arm. GSg hawr ‘of father’; *smokru-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 Łarabal and adjacent dialects which have penultimate accent. This mainly concerns derivatives.

a(r)celi ‘razor’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects) > Łarabal, Goris, Şamaxi cêli (> Udi cêli), Agulis cêli [HAB 1: 102b; Margaryan 1971: 211]; akanat ‘trap’ > Łarabal kánat ‘net for catching birds’ [HAB 1: 109ab].

*ayg-ho-ɫ-k’ ‘ceremony on the morning after a funeral’and hol ‘earth’, Eastern *ayg-n-a-ho-ɫ-k’ > Şamaxi ink’nahɔɫ and k’nahɔɫ. The latter variant may be due to reinterpretation as composed of k’un ‘sleep’ and hol ‘earth’. See s.v. ayg ‘morning’.

asaranoc’ ‘oil-mill’ > Łarabal sranoc’ [S. A. Avagyan 1978: 28-32].

kalamar ‘inkpot’ from Gr. καλαμάριον (Paterica, Grigor Magistros, etc.) > Ūla lambar (Acařean 1940: 111, 159, 368a; T. Abgarean 1966: 94); cf. kalampar in Karin and Axal’ca, with an epenthetic p [HAB 2: 492-493], also in the Turkish-Armenian dictionary (c. 1720 AD) by Elia Muşelyan Karneč’i [C’ugaszyan 1986: 42¹, 123].
hac’ahan ‘an implement for taking out the baked bread’ (Zak'aria K'anak'erći, 17th cent.) > Şamaxi cahan vs. Larabal and Goris cahan [HAB 3: 65a; Margaryan 1975: 112, 406b].

*č’-erekoy > Larabal č’ürügü ‘until evening’ [Açar 1913: 879b], probably from *(min)č’-erekoy.

On the basis of this evidence, I propose the following etymologies.

Açar (1913: 390a; HAB 2: 223b) interprets Larabal *žamažank’ ‘twilight’ as *žam-a-žam, lit. ‘time of the church service’. Next to *žamažank’, however, there are many forms with final -nk’: Larabal, Ganjak *žmažank’ [Amatuni 1912: 229a; HayLezBbBar 2, 2002: 154a], adv. *žamažank’-in [K’maleancia 1893: 35L-5, 45L-2, 65L-5] and *žmank’-in, the latter being rendered as alfjamuljin [Lalayan 2, 1988: 443], Melri *žmāžunk’ [Alyan 1954: 299], Hadrut’ *žmāženk’ [Polosyan 1965: 15], etc. The -nk’ forms are more frequent in folklore texts. One may derive this word from CLArm. alfjamulj ‘darkness’, positing a formation with -ayn-k’, found with other terms for time (cf. hram-ēn-k’, valord-ayn, see HAB s.vv.): *(a)č’-a-žam-k’ > *žamužaynk’ > *žam-a-žam-k’. The more widespread by-form *žmáženk’ 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 alf-a-m-alj (see Kast 1930: 109), with internal -a-, really exists, it may strengthen the postulation of Larabal *žamaž-ayn-k’.

Goris čəṙavand ‘thick beams as part of the ceiling’ [Margaryan 1975: 434a], Larabal *čəṙavand ‘id.’ [Açar 1913: 734b]. I suggest a composition of a(w)č’ar ‘ceiling’ (cf. Larabal, Lori, Moks etc. *o/oč’or-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)č’-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’ersayi > p’esay, *tersaném(i) > tesanem : *hárs-n > harsn. The -r- is lost, then, in unaccented syllables, before a syllable. 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 *tork-o- ‘deer, roe’ (cf. Gr. δόρκος, ζόρξ, ἰορκός, etc.; Corn. yorch, ‘roe’, Welsh iwrch); see s.v.

Further: -parišt vs. paštem ‘to adore’, from Iranian * pari-stā- (see Meillet 1922k: 217; HAB 4: 23-24).

On Moks šarālk’ ‘retention of the urine’ < *šr-a(r)gil-k see 2.1.39.2 (Açar’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 Tuarašini ḫubi, provides us with a unique clue for the absolute chronology of this haplological sound change. In a fairy-tale from Berd (Šamšadin) one finds veexcarac ‘shepherd’ [Xemč’yan 2000: 35a–13], with the same kind of haplology: oč’xar ‘sheep’ + arac.

A dialectal example is xatol ‘grapes’ > Hamšen xhavöl and xatol-eni > Hamšen xafomi, with haplological loss of -(o)- [Ačåryan 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 Naxiţewan حرف, حرف (older ṝar’iţari); see s.v. ayri ‘widow’. Thus, -p‘(e)-va- > -fa-, or, as far as حرف 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 ṛ in حرف might be due to dissimilatory loss.

2.1.35 Allegro

Allegro forms occur frequently in compounded kinship terms. Typical examples are the derivations of ḫar ‘father’: ḫōr-eɫbayr ‘paternal uncle’: Suč’ava ḫob’ar, Hamšen ḫor’b’er, Larabal ḫarp’er [HAB 3: 32b], Karčewan hērbār [H. Muradyan 1960: 82–83, 199b], etc.; ḫōr-a-k’oyr ‘paternal aunt’ > Larabal, Hadrut’ hák’u, hák’ur [HAB 3: 32b; DAVT’yan 1966: 415], etc.

For ḫōr-a-k’oyr ‘paternal aunt’ and mōr-a-k’oyr ‘maternal aunt’ > Kak’avaberd hák’ur and mák’ur, H. Muradyan (1967: 101) suggests the following scenario: the component ḫōr has been dropped first, and then the initial ḫ- is added to the remaining part *ak’ur, which is found in other dialects as ak’ur. This is unnecessarily complicated. Moreover, *ak‘ir (Larabal а-к’ɛr) is best explained as a vocative form of k’oyr ‘sister’ (see HAB 4: 587a). Thus, ḫōr-a-k’oyr > hák’ur is merely an allegro or, perhaps better, a haplologized form: *horak’ur > hák’ur.

Other examples: *orb-ew-ayri ‘widow’ > Nor Naxiţewan حرف, حرف (older ṝar’iţari); see 2.1.34 (on haplology).


Urmiya, Salmast šma? (next to inč’hma?) ‘why?’, literally ‘for what?’ [Gwê UrmSalm 1, 1897: 544].

Melri *k’san- ‘early morning’, probably from *gišer-hana-, unless very old (see s.v. gišer ‘night’).
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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.\textsuperscript{169}

Arm. \textit{arǰ} cannot be derived from PIE *\textit{h₂rtk̂o} ‘bear’ (cf. Gr. \textit{ἀρκτός}, Skt. \textit{ṛkṣa-}, Hitt. \textit{hartagga-}, etc.) through regular sound developments. The irregularity may be explained by tabu [HAB 1: 334b; Ačaṙyan 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. \textit{arǰ} perhaps a contamination with \textit{arǰn} ‘black’ too played a role. This is conceivable in view of the variety of designations for ‘bear’ in different languages (for some examples see Uspsenskij 1978: 125; Ičiro 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 \textit{leran caltakox} ‘flower-trampler of the mountain’, \textit{tanj-a-ker} ‘pear-eater’ (cf. Russ. \textit{medved} ‘honey-eater’), \textit{k’eṙi} ‘uncle’, etc. [HAB 1: 334b]. According to Gabikean (1952: 224; see also HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 221a), Sebastia \textit{leran caltakox} refers to ‘wolf’. Note also dial. \textit{arǰ-a-blo} ‘ghost, monster’, composed of \textit{arǰ} ‘bear’ and *\textit{bolo} ‘bogy, ghost, monster’. For other examples see A. S. Petrosyan 1995: 163.

This phenomenon, however, has been misused frequently. For instance, Ačaṙyan (Ačaṙyan 1971: 722) explains the phonological irregularity of \textit{kmurǰ} ‘bridge’ vs. Gr. \textit{γέφῡρα} (Boeot. \textit{βέφυρα}, Cret. \textit{δέφυρα}, Lac. /Hesychius/ \textit{δίφουρα}) 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: 287b). For comparable data from Russian ethnography see e.g. Uspsenskij 1978: 120 with lit.

In the dialect of Meṙi, beside the regular form \textit{arǰ} ‘bear’, one finds \textit{新京} with irregular vocalism which was used 1) by hunters; 2) by people when supposing a danger. Alayan (1954: 85, cf. 263b) explains this irregularity through tabu and notes also \textit{gül} from \textit{gayl} ‘wolf’ (q.v.). One may wonder: why \textit{新京}? Perhaps the form has been taken from the neighbouring dialect of Agulis, where \textit{新京} regularly stands for ClArm. \textit{arǰ} (see AČaṙean 1935: 21; M. Zak'aryan 2008: 335). Note, however, that in Melri and adjacent dialects the same irregularity is found also in a few other words, such as \textit{gam} ‘to come’, \textit{garīn} ‘lamb’, \textit{gari} ‘barley’, \textit{mayri} ‘forest’, etc. Further see s.v. \textit{gayl} ‘wolf’.

Also the snake often became subject for tabu (see above). Alayan (1987: 397) records a folk-belief in the villages of Melri according to which the snake will appear if you mention its name, so people used words meaning ‘rope’ (\textit{t'ok}, \textit{č'at'u}, \textit{paran}) instead; cf. also \textit{lar} ‘a kind of snake’ from ‘cord, rope’. In view of this, the

\textsuperscript{169} On tabu in Armenian see Jahukyan 1992: 21.
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explanation of the peculiar form of the word awj ‘snake’ through tabu (see Ačar’yan 1971: 722) seems plausible. However, even here one has to be cautious since there is a phonological explanation: PIE *h₂ngʷh-i- > PArm. *an’gi > *awgʰi (with *gʰ > *g) regularly before *w/w > *awj-i-.

See also s.vv. mor(m) ‘tarantula’, mrǰiwn ‘ant’.

Some words have been replaced by semantically related forms. For instance, ṣuṭanik’ ‘family’ substitutes the word for ‘wife’ (see Ačar’yan 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 jān ‘to be born, produce’, its basic meaning might have been something like ‘race, tribe, family’ (cf. jāṭ ‘born; birth, origin, race’, jā-mf ‘child, family, descendance’, etc.). In this case we might be dealing with ‘tribe, family’ > ‘wife’ comparable to the development of Arm. ṣuṭanik’.

As is convincingly demonstrated by Ačar’yan (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. kōt ‘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 Ačar’yan’s inquiry (ibid.).

2.1.37 Folk-etymology; blend or contamination

For examples and discussion of sound changes based on folk-etymological reinterpretation see Ačar’yan 6, 1971: 728-733, 840; Alayan 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-hoɫ-k’ ‘ceremony at the next morning after the funeral’ is composed of ayg ‘morning’ and hoɫ ‘earth’. In Šāmāxi this word is continued in two forms that are difficult to explain through regular phonetic developments: ink’nahọɫ and k’nahọɫ. These forms can be due to folk-etymological reinterpretation as ink’(n) ‘himself’ + -a- + hoɫ ‘earth’ (cf. Alayan 1984: 88) and k’un ‘sleep’ + -a- + hoɫ ‘earth’, respectively; see s.v. ayg ‘morning’.

Arm. andund ‘abyss’ is represented by Larabał əndəxtə, which might be explained by a folk-etymological reinterpretation as *ənd ox(t)n *at the seventh layer of the Underworld); see s.v. andund-k’ ‘abyss’.

The compound *aŷr-knik ‘widowed woman’ (cf. Zeyt’un ərğọ̀n) has become eɾığ-gnig < *aŷr-knik ‘widow’, lit. ‘husband-wife’ or ‘man(ly)-wife’ in Tigranakert; see s.v. aŷr ‘widow’.

Arm. šałgəm ‘turnip’ is attested in the 12th century onwards, and is widespread in dialects. The by-form šoľgəm is found in “Geoponica” (13th cent.), and in the dialects of Akn, Xarberd, Tigranakert (*šoļgəm), Zeyt’un (*šoɬgəm), Sebastia (ɛnəxbank’) [HAB 3: 489-490]. One may wonder if the by-form šoļgəm is due to folk-etymological association with šoɬ ‘ray, shine’; cf. the following riddle from Bileš, the village of Xult’ik (see Tarıňeăn 1961: 113, 164):
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Gluxn i xoł,
Murrusn i șoł

“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’, mehr ‘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: hög[i] ‘person’, with the regular vocalic reflex, and hɔk[i] ‘soul’, a literary loan, with no vocalic shift [Ačaţean 1935: 67, 69, 370; HAB 3: 108b]. More illustrative is Jula 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) hɔg[i] ‘soul’, a literary loan from the by-form hɔgi [Ačaţean 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 hɔñdrel ‘to select’ vs. əntrel ‘to make one’s choice, vote’ [Madat’yan 1985: 189]; ClArm. azg > Alaškert ask ‘relative, kinsman, kindred’ vs azg ‘people, nation, nationality’ [Madat’yan 1985: 180]; in both cases the latter by-forms must be recent literary loans. A similar picture is seen in Agulis, g’urc ‘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:


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 tev ‘devil, Satan’: dev’ ‘monster’ [HAB 1: 658b; Ačaţyan 1952: 256, cf. 57]; Marala tev ‘devil, Satan’: dev’ ‘mythical dragon’ [Ačaţean 1926: 89, 391; HAB 1: 658b].

Of these by-forms, tev is undoubtedly the older one since it reflects the shift d > t regular for these dialects. The meaning of the older form tev is religious and suits the classical literary context. For an illustration compare a proverb from Moks (Orbeli 2002: 119N(a)): Ine’ tev (var. sālānā) yač’ic’ kąp’axaţ : “(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 Ačaṙean 1926: 89) *dev in given dialects comes to mean ‘monster, dragon’, whereas the older meaning ‘devil, Satan’ remained attached to the genuine dialectal form *tev.

Also Lārābal has doublets *tev/*dev, 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. dārmān ‘medicine, remedy’ [MacKenzie 1971: 24; Nyberg 1974: 58b], probably related to Skt. dhārman- n. ‘support, firm hold, fixed order, law’ (RV+) from PPr. *ṛar- ‘to hold, keep, preserve, support’ [HübSchmann 1897: 138; HAB 1: 640a; Mayrhofer EAIA 1, 1992: 778-779, 780; ÉtimSlovIranJaz 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 tārman ‘straw’ vs. dārman ‘remedy’ [Ačaṙean 1947: 22, 43, 226]; Moks tārman ‘straw’ vs. dārman ‘remedy’ [Ačaṙean 1952: 255, cf. 57]; Urmia/Xoy tārmān ‘straw’ vs. dārman ‘remedy’ [M. Asatryan 1962: 194b], etc. The former is the genuine dialectal reflex of ClArm. (< MIrAn.) dārman whereas the latter is a recent (re-)borrowing from Persian or (as in Ačaṙean 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 ÉtimSlovIranJaz 2, 2003: 338; also Steingass 514a; Cabolov 1, 2001: 277-278). The classical meanings ‘care’, ‘provision, victuals’ ‘subsistence, nourishment, maintenance’ etc., as well as the dialectal meaning ‘straw’ (from ‘fodder’ < ‘nourishment, victuals’) should be treated as reflecting an Iranian older, unattested meaning (cf. Skt. dhārman ‘support etc.’) rather than a semantic development from ‘medicine, remedy’.

More evidence can be obtained from folklore texts, e.g. in Lāziyan 1983 on Lārābal: darman : xelkʿu darman, with synonymous xelkʿu čar ‘remedy for intelligence’ (134-135); dardis dārman ‘remedy for my grief’ (157a, lines 11, 17); tārman : in a narrative where a boy tārman či tam “does not give straw/fodder” to the buffalo (82b11); in a proverb (164a17): K’yohna tārman a k’amun tam : “(He) winnows old straw”.

On *dārmān-a-gol ‘Milky Way’, ‘cloud’, see 3.1.3 and 1.3.

Morphological alternants, too, seem to display semantic differentiation. For possible examples see s.vv. asēn ‘needle’, pətul ‘fruit’, utel ‘brain’.
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2.1.39 Ačányan’s Law

2.1.39.1 Ačányan’s Law with -o- Larabal


The regular reflex of -o- following an initial voiced stop is -ő- in Larabal. Next to this, one also finds -o- > Larabal -i- (the examples are taken from the glossary in Davt’yan 1966: 299: 503):

- boxi ‘hornbeam’ > póxi/e, póxi,
- bokik ‘barefoot’ > pəpjig’, pępjg’,
- bokl ‘radiish’ > pısok/pııxt and pııxt,
- boř ‘bumble-bee, drone’ > Hadrut’ and Šalax pėř, next to Larabal póńo, pówn [Davt’yan 1966: 329, 363];
- also word-internally: borbos- ‘to mould’ > parp’ėšav/ěl : *borbos- > *börbös-(Ačányan’s Law) > *bôrp’ōs- (-rb- > -rp’-) > *p’örp’ōs- (assimilation).

There are no examples with go- and do-, apart from gortn-uk ‘little frog’ > k’ôr(t)’nik, k’ôr(t)’nik, k’êr’nik. Neither are there examples with initial unvoiced stops, including the labial ones: t’a-, to-, p’o-, po-, k’a-, ko-. One may therefore preliminarily formulate the following rule: as a result of Ačányan’s Law (and the subsequent consonant shift), ClArm. bo- yields Larabal pe- (next to pô-). This can be due to labial dissimilation.

A similar case is found with initial o- which regularly yields Larabal vač- or vé-(also word-internally, cf. sovoren ‘to learn’ > savočel). 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 Larabal mō-, but one does find one instance with mo- > mae-: mocak ‘mosquito’ > mačak.

As to gortn-uk ‘little frog’ > k’ôr(t)’nik/k’êr’t’nik, we may be dealing with dissimilative loss of the first of two labial vowels.

For Larabal pėśna, probably from *bros- (cf. Łazax p’rš, Łaradal brošni) or brńč ‘snowball-tree’, see 1.12.1.

This material corroborates the assumption of A. Xač’atryan 1984: 321-322 that Larabal pörp’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 Larabal kénel and Melri génil ‘to hide, conceal oneself’ of an archaic *gel-; A. Xač’atryan 1984: 321 convincingly argues that these forms rather continue gatel ‘to hide’ through Ačányan’s Law.

2.1.39.2 Ačányan’s Law in inlaut

Ačányan’s Law also operated in inlaut, cf. arjasp ‘vitriol’ : Šatax arčāsp, Moks arčāsp or arčēsp/s’arčēsp vs. Alaškert arčasp, Muš arčesp, 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 Ӧәрәк'лыкʰ “задержание мочи” (= ‘retention of the urine’); e.g. Ӧәрәк'лыкʰ ʃ Jakarta is widespread in the dialects [HAB 3: 510a].

There are MidArm. and dial. derivatives referring to the retention of urine: š(e)ɾ̥-kap and š-r̥-at [HAB, ibid.; Amatuni 1912: 147a; Aćarayan 1913: 246b; Termančyan 1970: 150; Aćar 1992: 214a], with kap- ‘to tie, bind’ and *(h)arat- ‘to cut’ respectively. It is conceivable that our Ӧәрәк'лыкʰ 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 kʰ, presupposing an older *-ge- or *-gi- (Aćarayan’s Law). This brings us to ClArm. argent- ‘to forbid, obstacle, hinder, etc.’, cf. Özim arg'iil etc. (see s.v.). Thus, Moks Ӧәрәк'лыкʰ ‘retention of urine’ goes back to *ʃ-r̥-a(r)gil-kʰ; with loss of -r̥- (on which, see 2.1.33.3).

2.2 MORPHOLOGY

2.2.1 Case system

2.2.1.1 Vocative

According to Aćarayan (AćarLiak 6, 1971: 283, 336), in both Classical and Modern Armenian, the vocative is sometimes accented on the first syllable, cf. háyrik ‘father’, máyrik ‘mother’, Káravet, Lázár(e), Pétr-ó/Pétrós, etc. Traces of initial accentuation of vocative forms have been preserved in Armenian manuscripts [Torbjörnsson 1945; Weitenberg 2001: 65]. 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 tía ‘you boy!’ etc. (see Marr 1903: 57; AćarLiak 6, 1971: 283). A few examples are found in the Armenian rendering of the grammar of Dionysius Thrax: ő Hámuńi, ő Mán, ő Nuni [Adonc’ 1915=2008: 246].

Armenian dialects provide rich evidence for vocative forms accented on the first syllable. Note e.g. Hamşen voc. háyri ‘father’, máyri ‘mother’, cf. yéba, yíma [Aćarayan 1947: 175]. Also in the dialect of T’iflis 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’, viért ‘son’, á şun ‘dog’, etc. (Tomson 1890: 190).

Here are some more examples from folklore texts: in P’iloyeanc’ 1888 (Nor Bayazet): hárse (21L1, 22L-6, 23L9); Hórichtim (25L4, 26L7); Máyran (31L5); Márçar (34L2), Bálásasar, t’ágavur (Moks, see SasCr 1, 1936: 315, 526), etc. The same is observable even when we are dealing with lexicalized expressions or formulae, such as tnakolner “you whose house may be destroyed!” (P’iloyeanc’ 1888: 23L1), or word combinations, türban harse “you, dear sister-in-law (to whom may I be sacrificed)” (P’iloyeanc’ 1888: 21L1).

When used with a vocative particle, the noun loses the accent. In some dialects this can also be seen in the vocalic difference, cf. Larabał vocative á-k’ir vs. nominative k’ur from ClArm. k’oir ‘sister’ (see HAB 4: 587a). Note also the auslaut reduction in e.g. á may < mayr ‘mother’ (see HŽHeke’ 6, 1973: 409, 522).
dias which have penultimate accentuation, the last vowel of a disyllabic word may drop, cf. Tavuş vocative á vàri' vs. vàri' from ClArm. ordi 'sun or daughter, offspring', see Xemč'yan 2000: 59b, 62a, 130a (here note a vocative vàri in a few lines above, 130a, 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 J̌ahukyan 1959: 151-152; Alabekyan 1998: 123-124). In Vedic Sanskrit, the vocative, when accented, has the acute on the first syllable, e.g. pitār vs. NSg pitā 'brother'; ṭiṣṇa vs. NSg ṭiṣṇo 'master (of the house), lord'; páṣar vs. κατηρ '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, -ɛ, -ɔ, -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 tägor) is a compound with ayr 'man': Svedia dak'rär, K'esab tägrër [Ačaryan 2003: 589; Andreaasyan 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 < *κονιδ-ς. Further note *kalc' vs. κατ '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-), see s.v.) and derives from PArm. NSg *urd-s.

I wonder if this *-s is responsible for cases like nom. ahuēs ‘fox’ vs. oblique ahues-. Compare also Bēl vs. GDSg Belay: in Movsēs Xorenac' 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. al ‘salt’, hać ‘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 Melri *kalc'. Also s.v. us 'shoulder'.

Arm. arjasp (attested since the 7th cent.) and arjaspn ‘vitiol’; 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, -on, Arm. -oy, etc. see Meillet 1900a: 17; Lehmann 1981; Beekes 1990-92; Eska/Wallace 2001. For -oj 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 Łarabal.

Locative in -i in Łarabal

händ-i ‘in pasture-land’: Vart’i <...> ešem a, taesnum min händi min č’oban vexčar a .textColor(178)abč’onom. “Vart’i <...> looks, sees (that), on a pasture-land, a shepherd pastures sheep” [HZhek’ 5, 1966: 538L17]. In a riddle (see Barxutareanc’ 1898: 51): Mi kov unem - händ 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 Ač’yan’s Law).

əra/äz-i ‘in a dream’ [HZhek’ 5, 1966: 540L-9; HZhek’ 6, 1973: 140L-9, 183L-5]. In a fairy-tale recorded by M. Grigoryan in Mardakert in 1950 [HZhek’ 5, 1966: 401-409], əra/äz-i ‘in a dream’ is found frequently (402L-6, 403L-1, 14, 404L-14, 405L-18, 408L-15). Next to it, one also finds the more recent, normal form ərazum (402L-8, 405L-18, 407L-1, 4, 408L-10). Note that eraz has a u-stem in Łarabal, at least in the same fairy-tale (cf. GDSg. ərazu: 402L-14, 406L-8), and an o-stem in ClArm. Therefore, the option that Łarabal LocSg *(y)eraz-i is identical with ClArm. LocSg. y-eraz-i ‘in a dream’ (frequent in the Bible) should be taken seriously.


These three examples show that the classical locative in -i has been preserved in Łarabal. Later it produced more recent, analogical adverbs, such as səri ‘today’, urkyüni ‘in the evening’, etc. An illustration for süt-i ‘quickly’ is found in [HZhek’ 5, 1966: 573].
Discussion

The Larabal and adjacent dialects normally have a penultimate accent. Nevertheless, they display locative forms with both ultimate and penultimate accentuation, cf. yŏrkë and hărînë vs. yĕrgi and héru and Agulis hărvi (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-i ‘foot’: Skt. pad-ī, Gr. dat. zòb-i, 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, *hīreg*-i-jo- > *ereki-yo > *ereki, cf. avg ‘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’: akyăn, aksańi, aksni, 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. *adf- ‘darkness, twilight’, avg ‘morning’, erev/-ik(-) ‘evening’ and erēk ‘yesterday’. Note also EArm. dial. *heru-i vs. heru < PIE *perui ‘last year’ (q.v.).

2.2.1.6 Instrumental

Arm. instrumental ending -w / -(m)b derives from PIE *-b/i, cf. IPI (Skt. -bhiṣ, Av. -biṣ, Opers. -biś), DAbPI (Skt. -bhyas, Av. -byā), Homeric Greek attests -pi- as a marker of the ablative, instrumental and locative in both singular and plural markers; cf. also Lat. DAbPI -bus, OIr. DPl -b, etc. (for the forms and discussion see Meillet 1950: 120-123; K. Schmidt 1982: 50-52; Shields 1982: 50-52; Beekes 1995: 115-116, 117-118). According to Shields (1982: 51), *-b/i(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 *ph-th-b/i- (see s.v. hayr ‘father’).

-av : -ok' in Larabal

Ačáryan (1899: 97, 147) derives the Larabal 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 -ok'/-uk’. For instance: ClArm. us ‘shoulder’ : Larabal IPI x̑s-uk’ : min xurjīn osuk’ k’e’ac [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 398[2]; xurjīna <...> ošük’ k’e’- (ibid. 109l14, 111l3). The same expression is found in the singular: xurjīna <...> ošaša k’e’- [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 647l13]. It seems that Larabal *usok’ reflects *us-av-k’ = ISg *us-av + pl. marker -k’. The development -av-k’ > -ok‘ (seemingly identical with ClArm. -aw-k’ > -ok’) is unexpected for such a recent stage, however. One expects *usavok’. More likely, *us-ok’ is analogical after the type of ClArm. jer-k’, IPI jer-a-w-k’ ‘jēr-ā-k’ ‘hand’ : Larabal IPI ēvarok’ (see e.g. HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 466l12).

Unlike the numerous petrified adjectives of the type xelok’ ‘clever, intelligent’, arók’-p’arok’ ‘with honour, glory’, etc., the above-mentioned examples demonstrate the function of the case marker. Note also: pēt a <...> srtok’ ali “must be brave”
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[HŽHek' 6, 1973: 452L-4, 401L-5]. Of these adjectives, xel’k’ and p’ar’k’ reflect the ClArm. IPl forms in -aw-k’ = -ök’ 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-ɔk’ ‘with stones’, maz-ɔk’ ‘with hair(s)’ (see Tēr-Atek’sandrean 1885: 189-6 and 190-1, respectively).

2.2.1.7 Accusative pl. -s

The Classical Armenian accusative plural ending -s has been lexicalized in many dialects. For instance, k’riw-s, API of k’riw ‘fight’, appears in Ararat, Łarabał, Lazax etc. k’ris tal ‘to struggle’, literally ‘to give fights’ (see Ačaṙean 1913: 613a).

Textual illustrations are found e.g. in a fairy-tale from Sisian, in Zangezur (HŽHek’ 6, 1973: 236L-11), and, in Ł. Ałayan 1979: 615L12. For a discussion, see s.vv. 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. nabhās- n. ‘cloud, mass of clouds’, Gr. vópoc n. ‘cloud’, OCS nebo ‘sky’, etc. The Armenian old nominative *nēb- (< *nēb’os) was replaced by amp after the genitive *am-p- from *nōb’ē-s-s. The possible influence of amprop ‘thunder’ (< *nb’h-ro- : Skt. abhrā- n. ‘thunder-cloud’, etc.) must also be taken into account. See s.vv. amp and amprop.

ayt ‘cheek’ : Gr. οἶδος etc. (see s.v.). The Armenian old nominative *ajt- (> *ēt) from *h2ōid-os was replaced by the oblique stem *ai̯t- (from NSg GSg. *h2id-ēs-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 *bhārg(w)-os. It became bark analogically after the oblique *bhārg(w)-ē-s > *bark-.

sut, o-stem ‘false; falsehood, lie’ (Bible+; dial.) : Gr. ψεῦδος n. ‘lie’, also ψόδος. NSg *psēudos, GSg *psud-ēs-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. anum ‘name’.

For a possible example of a HD n-stem consider Arm. del ‘herb’ and δαλλός 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
zəlva, etc.), the following paradigm may be reconstructed: NSg *ĝl̥H-oH > *talH-
ə > *talw, oblique *ĝl̥H-i- > *tal(i-). See s.v. tal.

For a discussion and other examples see s.vv. arew ‘sun’ and especially giw ‘village’.
Further, see s.vv. gol ‘warmish, lukewarm’ vs. gafj ‘id.’; k’arb ‘a snake’.

2.2.2.5 *l-stems

See s.vv. aseh ‘needle’, jol ‘log, bar’, ptul ‘fruit’, p’ul ‘fall, ruins’, and especially
acul ‘coal’.

2.2.2.6 Laryngeal stems

The hysterodynamic (HD) paradigm of PIE words in laryngeal stems is
reconstructed as follows: NSg *C(R)C-eH-s, GSg *C(R)C-H-ős (see Beekes 1995:
181-183). A well-known example is the PIE word for ‘path, road, ford’: NSg
*pont-eh1-s, GSg *pnt-h1-ós, cf. Av. panta vs. ISg patH. The nominative
analogically became *pontH- in Skr. pānth and, probably, Arm. hun (q.v.). For
the o-grade nominative within this paradigm cf. also PIE *Hros-eh2-: Lith. rasā
‘dew’, OCS rosa ‘dew’, Skt. rasā́- f. ‘name of a mythical stream at the end of the
world, a tributary of the Indus’ (RV) (cf. also rása- ‘juice (of plants), liquid,
essence’), YAv. raṇhā- f. ‘name of a mythical stream’.

Next to Arm. ordi (wo-stem) ‘generation, son/daughter’ (< PIE *por-ti-o-, cf. Gr.
zōρις, -oς f. ‘calf, young heifer; young maiden’, Lat. partus, -iús m. ‘bringing forth,
birth; foetus, embryo; offspring, progeny’, etc.), there also exists Arm. ort‘ (dialect.
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 *pört-eh2-s, GSg *prt-h2-ós > PArm. *ord-a-
(cf. awri-ord, a-stem ‘virgin’), obl. *hurtb. Subsequently, NSg *ord- became ort‘
analogically after the oblique *hurt. 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’ux ‘branch’ (Geoponica etc.; widespread in the dialects) vs. Skt. śākhā- f.
(RV+) ‘branch, twig’ etc. In some Armenian dialects (Larabal, Agulis, Lori, etc.) we
also find a form with -k’ instead of -x. Here we are dealing with the development
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*-* > Arm. x, Skt. kh, Slavic x. The alternants c’ak’ and c’ax probably reflect nom. *-k-eh2- and gen. *-k-h2-ös, 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. mr̥dvī f. ‘delicate, weak, soft, mild’, Lat. mollis ‘weak, soft’ from *moldu-i- (q.v.).

yalt’ ‘wide, broad spacious (land, space, territory); mighty’ (5th cent.), yalt’-k-u ‘victorious, mighty’ (Philo+), also spelled yalt’-u (e.g., in Grigor Maškuori, 12th cent.). While y-alt’ (q.v.) can be derived from PIE *plth2-u- (cf. Skt. pr̥thu- etc.), y-alt’-u must have had one syllable more and can theoretically go back to PIE fem. *plth2-u-ih2- (Skt. pr̥thvī, Av. pr̥thihi-). However, the -u in yalt’-u can be accounted for by the synchronic pattern of adjectives in -u, cf. has-u, bs-u, etc. (see Jähukyan 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 Ača Liak 1, 1952: 131-453. For individual treatments of the Armenian numerals see s.v. mi, erku, erék’, č’ork, hing, vec’, eawtn, u’, inn, tasn, k’san, k’arásun, 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. ún-decim < *ũn-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. ún-decim < *ũn-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

In Van, vat'sun ‘60’ is followed by Turkish loans, yet.miš ‘70’, sâhysân ‘80’ and ákus 90’ [Açarəyan 1952: 26, 147]. For an illustration of the juxtaposition of native vat'sun ‘60’ and the loan et.miš ‘70’ in Alaşkert folklore see HzHek 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 [Laribyan 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, Laraba'l (in some villages) *erek 'k'san ‘sixty’ < erek ‘three’ + k'san ‘twenty’; cf. er'ek k'san mi tasa ‘seventy’ < “three twenty (and) one ten”. This is considered as taken from the Caucasian system [Açarəyan 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, erkek'ean ‘both’ (Bible+) has been preserved in Laraba'l arık'kan, č'arık'k'an, Melri arık'k'en (see s.v. erku ‘two’). ClArm. erkek’in, erkek’ean ‘all three’ (Bible+) has been preserved in Laraba'l arık’kan, irık’kan and Karčewan irık”en, but in other parts of Melri region one finds forms with -k’k- or -k’k-. Melri irık’k’in, Kak'avaberd irük’kan (see s.v. eręk ‘three’). The other forms are: č'orek’in or č'orek’ean ‘all four’ > Larabał č'aruk’ek’an vs. č'ursek’kan and č'rerek’kan, hŋgɛk’ɛn or hŋgɛk’ɛn ‘all five’ > hŋgɛk’kan (emphatic hŋgɛk’k’an), vec’ɛk’in or vec’ek’ean ‘all the six’ > vec’ɛk’an, etc. [Dav'tyan 1966: 126]; Melri č'oruk’ɛk”ɛn, hŋgɛk”ɛn or hŋgɛk”ɛn, vec’ɛk”ɛn, etc. [Alayian 1954: 179-180]; Kak’avaberd č'orůk’kan, hŋgɛk’k’an, vèc’ɛk’kan, etc. [H. Muradyan 1967: 127-128]. See also Açaflıak 1, 1952: 325-326.

One might treat the gemination in Melri irık’k’in and Karčewan irük’kan (forerek’ean) as emphatic. More probably, however, they go back to analogical *erek’-k’ean (that is, eręk > iręk ‘three’ + -k’ean) after arık’kan which is analysed as arık- (cf. erku ‘two’) + -k’ean. The analogical process is clearly seen in forms like Larabał č’uruk’ek’an (next to č’uruk’kan directly from ClArm. č’orek’ean) and Melri č’oruk’ɛk”ɛn and Kak’avaberd č’ok’k’kan.

The analogy has functioned differently in Karčewan. Here we find yark’en, irık’in, č’ok’ɛn, hŋgɛn, etc. [H. Muradyan 1960: 110]. These forms can hardly reflect different formations: (1) there is no alternative way to satisfactorily explain Karčewan yark’en; (2) Karčewan is dialectically and geographically very close, actually almost identical with Kak’avaberd and Melri, so that one hardly expects a significant variety with respect such archaic grammatical features; (3) Karčewan irık’ɛn exactly corresponds to ClArm. eręk’ean (or -in); (4) the paradigm of yark’en, namely gen. yarkunc’u etc. (see H. Muradyan 1960: 110) clearly continues that of Classical Armenian: erkok’in, erkoc’ün, etc.

One must therefore start from Karčewan irık’ɛn < ClArm. eręk’ean. Apparently, this form has been analysed as eręk ‘three’ (> Karčewan irık’ ‘id.’) + -eăn or -in.
Then, *erkok’ean* has been replaced by analogical *yarkén*, as if composed of *erku* ‘two’ (> Karčewan *yarku* ‘two’) and -ean or -in. The same holds for the other numerals.

In Larabal, the Classical Armenian paradigm *erkok’in*, gen. *erkoc’un* etc., has been replaced by *ərkuk’an-* etc. (see Davt’yan 1966: 127), with analogical -c’- > -k’- after the nominative, whereas in the Melri-region the -c’- has been preserved (see Ačalqian 1952: 325-326). Note further Karčewan gen. *yorkunc’ù*, etc. [H. Muradyan 1960: 110]. For Melri, Alayan (1954: 180) records by-forms with -k’- and -c’-: *arkc’un* and *arkk’èn*. Kak’averd has analogical *ərk’-c’-un* etc. [H. Muradyan 1967: 128].


**2.2.5 Pronouns**


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 Ačalqian 4a, 1959; 4b, 1961; Laragyulyan 1961; Godel 1965; Ant’soyan 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; Jähukyan 1982: 171; cf. e.g. *fjʊnje* ‘to efface, annihilate, destroy’ < *eŋ-*h-*je-a/-: Gr. *βαίνω* ‘to kill’, etc. (q.v.). See further s.vv. *goće’em* ‘to call’, *koće’em* ‘to call’, as well as *yorj-oy-em* ‘to call’, all are synonymous verbs with o-grade and *je*-present. *koškoće’em* < *ko-h-koć-em* ‘to beat, break’ (q.v.) < *koc-koc-i*<sub>-mi</sub>, from *koc-‘to beat; to lament by beating one’s breast’, a reduplicated present in o-grade with the present suffix *-je*-; For *-je-* see 2.1.22.2.

*čanaće’em* (see s.v. *can* ‘to know, be acquainted’) derives from QIE *qnh-h-sk-je-*, with zero grade in the root, cf. Gr. *βαίνω* ‘to go’ and Lat. *venīo* ‘to come; to go’ from *gra-*<sub>-je-</sub>- (see Beekes 1995: 228).

Another possible, though highly hypothetic example is Arm. conjectural *huyem* ‘to fear’ < *pu-je-mi* (see s.v. *hoy* ‘fright, fear’).
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2.2.6.2 Presents with a nasal element

For nasal presents, see e.g. s.vv. *aṙem* ‘to make’, *dnem* ‘to put’. Further see s.vv. *əpem* ‘to drink’, *lsem* ‘to hear’, *ylp’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. *har’č’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. *aṙnum* ‘to gain, obtain, win, plunder, take, grasp’, *zgenum* ‘to put on clothes’, *li*: *lnum* ‘to fill’, *ǰeṙnum* ‘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 Ačańyan 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’, *méranim* ‘to die’, *térém* ‘to flay’, *č’ncam* ‘to rejoice’, etc. (see s.vv.). For a discussion, see Pedersen 1906: 423ff = 1982: 201ff; Frisk 1944: 30 = 1966: 278; Godel 1965; J̄ahukyan 1982: 74, especially 180; Olsen 1984: 114; Kortlandt 1987a; 1995 = 2003: 79-82, 107-109; Ravenæs 1991: 169.

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. ὠδώσωμαι and Skt. vasantáti, from *uesno- ‘price’: Skt. vasmá-, Lat. vēnum, Arm. gin ‘price’, cf. also *uog’eie-* from *uog’o- ‘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. ἐξηλιάζω 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; J̄ahukyan 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 'lucalli 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-ili-k- 'a pair of cerebral veins' (Osip'orik); see s.vv. luc 'yoke' and lucatli 'Orion'. For sayl, another asterism with *-lih2-, see next.

sayl, i-stem (Bible+), o-stem (Movses Xorenac'i, "Čaṙəntir") 'wagon' (Bible+), 'Ursa Major and Minor, Arcturus' (Job 9.9, Philo, Anania Širakac'i), 'North Pole' (Aristotle), etc.: Hesychian σάτιλλα · πλειὰς τὸ ἄστρον (perhaps of Thracian origin), next to Gr. σατίνη f. 'chariot'. Probably from Mediterranean/Pontic substratum *k̂̚ati-lih2-.

tam-al(i) 'building; roof' from QIE *dmh1-li(h2)- (see s.v.).

targ-al 'spoon' from QIE *tru̯-l-i-, cf. Hitt. GIŠ taru̯-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 -āli-n. seen in Hitt. GIŠ ṣulāli- n. 'distaff' and the above-mentioned GIŠ tary-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). Alayan (1980: 142) analyzes ayceamn 'gazelle,roe' as aycei- + -amn and compares it with eleamn = *elh-āmn 'hoar-frost' (q.v.), pašt-avn, -aman 'service', etc. He further (op. cit. 139-140, 142, 146) 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; J̌ahukyan 1998: 9, noting that the origin of the suffix is unclear.); see also s.v. lusan: dial. *lus(an)amn).

Compare the type -un, gen. -uan, presupposing older nom. *-iwn or *-iumn. Thus, anun, GDSg anuan 'name', jehun, GDSg jehuan 'ceiling', sran-k', GDPl sruan-c (vs. sru/i-c' etc.) 'shin, shank', etc. (see s.vv.) are derived from *anuwn, *jehuwn, *sruwn, etc., respectively (see Alayan, ibid.; Zekiyan 1980: 156-157). Here again we are thus dealing with -mn/-wn. See s.vv. anun. As regards jehun, note ISg jehmamb (Anania Sanahnec'i, 11th cent.).

ardivn-k 'deed, work; earth products' (Bible+) > Ararat ardum 'earth goods, harvest' < *ard(i)umn (see s.v.).

-arm

Arm. t'el-arm 'holm-oak; pine' (Bible+; dial.) vs. t'el-i 'elm' (late attest.; several dialects), cf. Gr. πτελέ-α, Ion. -η 'elm', Lat. tilia 'linden'; note also Georg. ʾelamuši 'elm' (see s.vv.).

Greppin (1975: 64-65) posits -awš/-oš as a botanical suffix seen in t'el-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
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plant-names which, however, seem to be irrelevant (cf. e.g. *marzangoš* < Pers. *marzan* ‘mouse’ + *gōš* ‘ear’; see HAB 3: 282b).

Jahukyan (1987: 380) mentions *t’el-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. *dandal* ‘slow’), as well as in *tk-ı-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:

*bṙinê* ‘snowball, Viburnum opulus’ (poorly attested; dial.) : Lazax and Laradāl *bṛoš* or *bṛōš* 170

*koki-oš* vs. *koko* ‘water-lily; currant’ (late; dial. of Larak’ilisa) [HAB 2: 618b];

*kokan* ‘blackthorn’, only in *kokan-eni*, attested in “Bžškaran”; present in some dialects [HAB 2: 617b]; Ararat, Loři *brū-ɔš* ‘a kind of black round plum, *hapalasi* [*bilberry, Vaccinium Myrtillus* L.], found in the Northern parts of Armenia’ (see HayLezBrbBar 3, 2004: 355a) probably belongs here;

*p’ološ* ‘muraena, moray eel’ (Step’anos Lehac’i), if from *p’ol* ‘pipe’ (see s.v. *ąŋtłayk*).


Bailey (1985: 29) derived the Iranian form from *vana- ‘blue’, comparing also Arm. van- ‘crystal’. I propose a comparison with Gr. *lov* [<< *pion*], DPl *lian* [tû] n. ‘violet’, *via (= *via*’ ãvthy (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*, Mr. *vagr* (cf. Arm. *vagr*, Georg. *vgrî*) vs. Skt. vyågrá- ‘tiger’. We might be dealing with a Mediterranean-Iranian/Near-Eastern flower-name, as in the case of Gr. *pódoν* << *pódov, AeoL. *pódoν* n. ‘rose’ : Olran. *yrd−* ‘rose’ (cf. Arm. *vard*, NPers. *gul* ‘id.’, etc.); see Meillet 1908-09b: 162 (cf. HAB 4: 317-318). At any rate, Ir. *-aʃ* can be regarded as a suffix of stratum origin comparable with Arm. -awš in *t’el-awš* etc.

---

170 Açaşyan (HAB 1: 490b) notes the resemblance with Assyr. *burāsu*, Hebr. *b’rōš*, 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’el-awš : t’el- vs. Gr. πτελέ-α 'elm' and Lat. tilia 'linden'.

-awt

Next to kar-awt, Jahukyan (1990: 74) mentions aṙ-awt-awt ‘morning’ and čl-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’ [Lazar P’arpec’i, Movsēs Xorenac’i 1.15 (1913=1991: 5015), etc.] and karčarōt-i-w-k’ [Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.49 (1913=1991: 17615), John Chrysostom, etc.]. Transparently contains karē ‘short, brief’ (HAB), perhaps also the verbal root aṙ- ‘to take’, as suggested in NHB 1: 1074a (karē aṙēal ew yōdeal).

The same aṙawt occurs in another synonym: hamaṙawt ‘brief’ (Bible+), also an i-stem; cf. hamaṙōt-i-w-k’ in Eusebius of Caesarea, etc.

According to Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 21a), hamaṙōt contains the Iranian prefix ham-. He also states that karčarōt and hamaṙōt have the same root *aṙōt or *rōt, which is of unknown origin. Olsen (1999: 887, 889) suggests a derivation from the participle of Ihr. *-rābh-, cf. Skt. rābh- ‘to grasp’.

In my view, we are dealing with the suffix -awt, which may be identified with that of aṙaṙawt ‘morning’, as well as in in some hour-names (see s.v. aṙaṙawt), 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: GDP narōt-u-c’ in Ezekiel 27.16, 24; a-stem: GDPI narōt-awt-awt twice in P’awstos Buzand 6.2 (1883=1984: 223); o-stem: GDPI narawt-o-c’ in Hexaemeron 4 (K. Muradyan 1984: 12013) ‘coloured thread or plait/braid’ (Bible+). In Nersēs Snorhalı (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.

Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 431b) mentions Ozim narinj ‘dyed thread’ s.v. narinj ‘orange’ and questions whether it belongs there (i.e. to narinj ‘orange’; cf. Moks narinjš ‘оранжевый (цвет)’, Orbeli 2002: 297). In fact, the word seems to belong to the first component of nar-awt, see below.

This etymology partly coincides with that of Dervišyan, who interprets the word as *n-arak-t, comparing the second component with Skt. rakṣa- (see HAB 3: 432b).

Another such compound can be seen in Ozim narɛnǰ ‘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. *rzanj ‘colour’, see 1.11.

-t’ (and/or -it’) < PIE *-t- + *-H-. See s.v. yalt ‘broad’; other examples; see 2.1.18.


-(V)x *bo/u (x)-i ‘hornbeam’ (dial. Ararat, Łarabal, see Aćaṙean 1913: 200a), if related to the PIE word for ‘beech-tree’, cf. OHG buohha, etc., see Jahukyan 1972: 317, with reservation because of the vocalism and the -k’- in rural Łarabal pük’i. The formal problems would be partly solved if we assume *bo/uk- + tree-suffix -x- + -i, thus *bo/u(k)xí.

Saradževa (1981a: 229) compares the -ax of kalam-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 Ašxarhac’oyc’, a species of the Northern Armenian province of Gugark’; preserved in the dialect of Hamšen: dɔsxi, dɔsxəni (see 1.6).171

mel-ex, o-stem, i-stem ‘the handle of an axe’ (Deuteronomy 19.5, Ephrem, “Naxadrut’iwnk’” 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: mel-ex vs. kalam-ax and taws-ax. *bo/u(k)xí may be explained through *buk-(u)x-i > *buk(k)xí. Note that the tree-suffix -i is accented even in dialects with penultimate accent, such as Łarabal. See also s.v. t’lk’i ‘maple’.

Since kalam-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: kalamas-ax, tawsax-ax.

171 Somehow related with Hurr. taškar- ‘box-tree’: *tak’sar- + -(a)x?
-k – diminutive > plant-suffix

From the examples for the determinative -k in H. Suk’iasyan 1986: 90, the following are reliable: bol-k ‘radish’ (q.v.) and jalk ‘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: 330f.), Larabal, 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-āg (the berry) and snj-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 mœrun-ik ‘blackberry’, Muš,阿拉ker *moren-uk, Atap’azar mœm-ik, 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-iḳ: Gr. ὑμρίκ-η ‘tamarisk’.

-kn

For examples see Jahukyan 1987: 238. For a discussion see s.vv. armukn ‘elbow’ and unkn ‘ear’.


-j/z in animal and plant names

Apart from well-known plant-names such as deḷi ‘peach’ from deḷ-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 *-k- or *-g-, cf. ahūs ‘fox’; ak’is ‘weasel’ : axaz ‘marten’; lusan- ‘lynx’; inj ‘panther’ (see s.vv.); kuz ‘cat; marten’ (< Iran. – Sem.); etc. Cf. also Latv. luõss ‘weasel’, Russ. làska ‘weasel’, NPers. râsû ‘weasel’, If from *loH-k- ‘weasel’ (see Mallory/Adams 1997: 638b).

This suffixal element is reminiscent of the Indo-Iranian animal suffix *-āć-á- (see de Vaan 2000) and probably related *-āj-ā- found in Ifr. *yarař-ā- ‘wild boar’ (> Finno-Volgian *orāśe (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-ā- comparable Arm.-IAr. *sing’o- : Skt. singhā- ‘lion’, inj ‘panther’. Note also *h₁el-k- : Gr. ἀξοκ ‘elk’, Skt. ṛṣa- m. ‘male antelope’ (AV), etc.

Other possible examples:

xl-ēz ‘lizard’ (MidArm.), dial. also ‘snail’; cf. xhunin ‘snail’, Aftial xxañč ‘crayfish’ (see Ačaryan 1953: 269), Svedia: xranč, xranč ‘chameleon’, etc. related to Syriac xl’zonā ‘snail’ etc. (see 3.5.2.5). Separating the element -ēz, I propose a connection with Kartvel. *muxul- ‘lizard’, see below.
**mol-ēz**: ‘lizard’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects): in Leviticus 11:30, kovadiac’ and molōēz 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: 3061ff), in the form molōz (see 1.4).


Given the remarkable formal and semantic resemblance, I propose to combine Arm. *xul- ‘lizard; snail’ with *mo/uɫ- ‘lizard’ deriving them from *m)xul- and *m)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 molōz-r-ik ‘lizard’, and especially Trapizon and Hamšen *mol- or-ik ‘a small poisonless snake’ (see HAB 3: 342b; Ačaryan 1947: 263), with a suffixal -r-, are reminiscent of the Kartvelian forms like Laz *m(t)xolar-. Note also the MidArm. hapax marlis ‘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: *mol/al-ur-is > *maɫris > marls (with metathesis).

It is also interesting that Arm. xlēz has forms with initial m-: mglēz, mglōdrez, mrxī. One might assume contamination with synonymous molēz 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 *det-ez ‘bumble-bee’, if from det- ‘yellow’.

It has often been stated that PIE initial *p- and *s- sometimes irregularly yield y- instead of h- (see AčarLiak 6, 1971: 519; Alayan 1964: 162-164; Winter 1966: 203ff; H. Muradyan 1982: 277-278; Greppin 1983b: Jāhukyan 1987: 244, 372-373). The usually listed examples are: *penkwe > hing ‘five’ : *penkékonth₂ > yisun ‘fifty’; *ph₂ṭ-eč > hayr ‘father’ : yawray ‘stepfather’; etc. Greppin (1983b) discusses this conflicting evidence within the context of a reverse development, namely ClArm. y₁V- > ModArm. and dial. hV-, and explains the forms with y- as hypercorrections. He also (ibid.) adduces yatı̄em ‘to overcome, subdue’ (q.v.).

Admitting the alternative development *p- and *s- > y- (alongside the regular h-), Jāhukyan (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-cidō ‘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 *penkʷēkoth2 ‘fifty’: Gr. πεντή-κοντα, Lat.
quinquagintā, Skt. pañcā-sāt- ē, etc.) is usually explained as *hingisun {Meillet
1936: 40, 101; cf. Szemerényi 1977: 19, 19α} > *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: 234-232. 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
*hingsun : *hij(n)sun > *(h)i-isun > *(i)-isun (where the y- is perhaps a glide) > yisun. This explanation basically coincides with that of Beekes (2003:
163). See also s.v. yorfjorgem ‘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-uṙ-t’i.

In the dialects

Bearing in mind that the Classical y- yields voiced h- (h’) in Šatax whereas it
disappears in Van (see Ačaryan 1952: 76; M. Muradyan 1962: 24, 53), one should
trace the anlaut of e.g. Šatax hākī ‘tail’ (vs. ClArm. agi, q.v.) back to y- rather than
h-, since the latter would have given x-. On this and related problems see also
AčarHLptm 2, 1951: 427-428; H. Muradyan 1982: 225ff, 276ff; H. Muradyan
1982a; Haneyan 1985: 36ff.

Weitenberg (1986: 92-97; 1993: 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 hʻa-, Van ŏ- and Muš hʻa-. He (1986: 96)
lists 20 such forms. Then he adds: “It seems to me that the words reconstructed in
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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)tatak covn ‘to the bottomless sea’ (Ōdabaşıyan 1976: 121; Harut’yunyan 2000: 12); in the dialect of Muş (Bulanax): <...> i cov, /Covn h’anatak [Movsisyan 1972: 130a]; etc. For the relationship i y -: Muş h’-, see Weitenberg 1997. Note also the context with the ablative: hanem i yandndoc’ (ǰur, aɫbiwr, šogilk’) ‘to take ((spring-)water, steam) from the Abyss’ (see Mnac’akanyan 1956: 383L29, 391LL28,44). 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-dund-k’ is parallel to Armenian yatak ‘bottom (of sea, underworld, hell)’, dial. also ‘hell; abyss’: y- + Iran. privative a- + tak (*a-ták ‘bottomless’), exactly like *y-an-dund-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’, aᵳu ‘brook’.

-t’i, -ti, -di : PIE *-ti-

This suffix is found in words of PIE origin (e.g. bay ‘word’ from PIE *bh₂t₁i, It remained productive at later stages too. Compare an-fr-di ‘arid, not-watered’ (with privative an- and jur ‘water’), y-uᵳ-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-t’i > sard, obl. sard-i(-). See s.v.

In spand, i-stem ‘slaughter’ (cf. span-anem ‘to kill’; see s.v.), Viredaz (2005: 91-92, 97(a) sees an Armenian creation with the suffix *-di- < PIE *-tis, which, being “phonetically regular after *r and *l, seems to have been analogically extended after n”. He points out that -nd is not regular here, in view of hun ‘ford’ < *pontis. However, hun may be from *pontH-.

Svedia *anapurt ‘uninhabited’ [HayLezBrbBar 1, 2001: 55a], anaburd dil ‘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. anjr(i) (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[N180]) one finds špit, glossed by lkt ‘licentious’. In “Baṙgirk’ hayoc” (Amalyan 1975: 252 Nr186) one finds špti, glossed by lkt ‘licentious’. This form is hardly a corruption for htpit (as has been assumed by Aćaryan, HAB 3: 129a, who also cites špit in Philo). It may rather be regarded as a ti-derivation of šp’-anam ‘to boast’ (John Chrysostom), dial. ‘to become spoiled, mischievous’ (on which, see HAB 3: 546a).

dial. (Xian) an-lr-ti ‘garrulous, chattering, talkative’; Aćaryan (1913: 100a) writes: ‘it seems composed of the privative an- and the verb lrel ‘to be silent’’. He does not specify -ti, which is clearly a deverbal suffix here. Thus, an-lr-ti basically means ‘who does not become silent’.

Urma, Salmast anlrti ‘insatiable (for eating and drinking)’ [GwrUrmSalm 1, 1897: 545] is probably composed of privative an-, l(i)r- ‘full’ and the suffix -ti.

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, bogy’.

Connected with Skt. ácchā (adv.) ‘to, towards’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 499 with lit.; Matzinger 2005: 132; Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 50 with lit.). Aćaryan (HAB 4: 446a; see also Jáhukyan 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 *poti-, which is untenable. One expects *oč’- from *poti-

The best solution is to directly connect Arm. c’- with Skt. ácchā (adv.) ‘to, towards’ < PIlran. *a-sćā, probably from PIE *h₁eskʷeh₁, 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. ast ‘after’ < *post, and ‘to’ < *anti, etc.”.

2.3.2 Reduplication

On reduplication patterns of Proto-Armenian I refer to the survey in Jáhukyan 1987: 250-252. On reduplicated presents, see 2.2.6.1, and s.vv. koškočem ‘to beat, break’, yokldodem ‘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 Hitito-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. Ὠξόδη Ἐ ‘smell’ and perf. Ὠξόδηα; 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. hefel ‘flood’; further, note e.g. kokov- ‘to boast’ vs. Skt. intensive jónive ‘to call, announce’ from garv- ‘to call, invoke, praise’ (see s.v.); (3) words like xaxank’, mirmiram, tatrak etc. (also those not included in Greppin’s list, such as alalak etc.; see above) which all have reduplicated parallels in cognate languages cannot be removed only because of their
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onomatopoeic nature; (4) Greppin himself accepts *kokord ‘throat’ and *siseṙn ‘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. *xoçosłem ‘to slaughter’, *jasjarem ‘to crush, destroy’, etc.; on *getgel-, see s.v.), whereas the examples above, as well as the examples of the types *Ci-CaR (see s.v. cical ‘laughter’, cf. also s.v. šisai ‘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):

\[
\text{xač'(uc')}eal\ ew\ zayl\ gerut'iwns\ gawaṙ\ ac'\ gawaṙ\ ac',\ koɫ\ manc',\ p'ori\ p'ori,\ zašxarhi\ ašxarhi,\ acin\ žolovec'in\ i\ k'ala'k'\ Naxcawan,\ zi\ and\ ēr\ žūražolov\ ivreanc'\ zōrac'n:
\]

["[the Persians] also took away captives from every district, region, valley, and realm, and collected them in the city of Naxcawan, for that was the gathering place for their army"]. Malxasyanc’ (1987: 267) translates not “from every” but “from various (zanazan)"}.

\[
\text{šr-\ ‘to turn’ : šr-šr-, attested in Agat'angełos § 112 (1909=1980: 66)};\ \text{transl.}\ \text{Thomson 1976: 125): ew k'aršec'in\ ew\ t'ač'in\ zna\ i\ tataskin;\ ew\ šr-šrējin\ zna\ andēn:\ "they dragged and buried and rolled him in the ‘thistles’". For the whole passage, see s.v. tatask ‘thistle’.
\]

For a list of such examples, see Leroy 1986: 64-65, and, with the conjunction -a-, 70-71.

**With the copula ew**

In Agat'angełos § 33 (1909=1980: 22):

\[
\text{Zi getn Eraxx 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: ... e'el\ gayr\ dariw\ ew\ dariw. Here the Greek text reads as follows: οὐ δὲ Ιορδάνης ἐπλήρου καθ’ ὅλην τὴν κρηπῖδα αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὑπέτοσα πυρῶν. As is clear from the collation of the passage, the Armenian phrase is not a Greek calque. Aąāryan (HAB 1: 631b) does not mention this passage, but compares Agat'angełos’ 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\ aṙ hasarak\ cayriw\ iwrov .}

**Reduplication a/o, a/u, etc.**

For this type, Leroy (1986: 67, 67) presents only one example: *hay-hoy-em ‘to scold, utter abuse or slander’ (Bible; dial. Ararat, Sebastia etc.), cf. Pers. hāy ā hōy ‘tumulte, plainte’, etc; onomatopoetic [HAB 3: 30b]. In the dialect of Larabal it has been replaced by *hovvel (HAB), a reduplication of *hov or *huv, unless one assumes remodelling with the copula u ‘and’: *hayuhoy > *hātywhoy > (assimil.) *hov-hov; cf. also Pers. hāy ā hōy. See also Jahukyan 1987: 250-252, 364.

For a remarkable type a/u-reduplication see s.vv. aţamud ‘darkness, twilight’, karkut ‘hail’, mamal ‘press’, mamur ‘moss’. Note also kerakur ‘food’ (see s.v. ker- ‘to eat’). All these words are of IE origin.
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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 mats ‘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)?” [Acafean 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 (10aN70) and Axalc’xa (11bN79), in the latter referring to the Milky Way.172 A Partizak riddle on astler ‘stars’ reads [Tër-Yakobean 1960: 389f]: Mer tan vray maɫəhawkit’: “A sieve of eggs above our house”. In a riddle from Moks (Karčkana Nanəkanc’) told by Arman Martirosyan [Haykuni 1906: 350 L10], astler ‘stars’ is represented as a sieve of čort’an (a milk product).

The folk astronomy in all the countries of the Northern hemisphere distinguishes first of all (the ladle of) Ursa Major, Orion or its belt, and Ursa Minor [Karpenko 1981: 45]. Of the Armenian designations of these astral terms, the following are of considerable importance:

Sayl (rendering Gr. Ἀρκτοῦρος ‘the star Arcturus, Bearward’ in Job 9.9) vs. Gr. σατίνη f. ‘chariot’, σάτιλλα πλειὰς τὸ ἄστρον (Hesychius), the constellation being regarded as a car [considered to be of Phrygian (Lidén 1905; 1933: 45; 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. Xɛk’ (on which, see below, on Pleiades); cf. also Van xek’er ‘starry sky’ [HayLezBrbBarf 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’-bazuk’ ‘Orion/Hayk and Pleiades’ are mentioned s.v. alaw(s)unk’ ‘Pleiades’ within the context of the close association of these two astromy. On xek’, xek’er, see HAB 3: 373; Lanalanyan 1969: 10

In fact, in the traditional story cited by Lanalanyan, 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 Xɛyk’ is also attested in a late medieval folk-song (Šêrenc’, VanSaz 1, 1885: 52; see also Abelyan 1940: 14). In a footnote, Šêrenc’ (ibid.) describes Xɛyk’ 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 Mlrn. form cognate with OAv. bazuaitē ‘dense’, Khot. bahysga- ‘wide, large’ < bazulakā-, Skt. bahū- ‘many, much, frequent, abounding in’ (see Hübschmann 1897: 426-427; HAB 1: 378; Bailey 1979: 270; Jâhukyan 1987: 518; Mayrhofer EWAlia 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; MjHayBar 1, 1987: 108b; Amatuni 1912: 80b]. Cf. also Moks pāzünk’y [Ačačyan 1952: 249], Šatax pāzunk’ [M. Muradyan 1962: 193a], Svedia pāzānk’ (u > ā 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 Ačačyan 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 pāzūk (next to pāzünk’ < bazum-k’) [Ačačyan 1952: 43, 99, 105, 249], Melri bézuk [Alayan 1954: 25, 264], Łarabal pāzuk, pēzuk [Davit’yan 1966: 323], Šamšadin/
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Dilijan pțzǐk [Mežunci 1989: 185a], Borće’alu (Loći) bazûk [Amatuni 1912: 80b], as well as in Hamšen *bazûk (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 Strf’zk, interpreted by Bogoljubov (1987: 9-10) as reflecting *Str-Bâzuka-, the second component of which, namely bâzu- ‘hand’, corresponds to the Indian equivalent asterism: Bâhu- (cf. Monier-Williams 1889: 730b: ‘the constellation Ædrâ’, 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. bahulā- ‘thick; many’, f. pl. ‘Pleiades’, and bâhula- ‘manifold; the month Kârttika, when the moon is near the Pleiades’ (see Monier-Williams 1889: 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. bahulā- 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’ < *bʰeuH-l-i-, cf. Skt. bhûri- ‘much; abundant; numerous’, OAv. bûri- ‘abundant’), Malat’ia has p’ɔrk’ < *boyr-k’, probably borrowed from MIran. *bûr- (cf. OAv. bûri- ‘abundant’), unless directly comparable with Lith. bû̀r̥s ‘multitude; crowd’, Latv. bûris ‘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’ (< *polhı̂ us, cf. Gr. πολύς ‘many’), namely *plh₁u- (cf. Skt. purî-, 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: 148). There is also some fluctuation or confusion between ‘Orion’, ‘Ursa Major’ and ‘Libra’; see 3.1.4.

3.1.3 Milky Way

Yard(a)go: In ‘Yaɫags am poc’ ew nšanac’’ by Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 307-311f) : Asteɫk’ en oroc ’xarnakeal čanaparkh ’linin gnac’ic’, or anuanec ko’t[n] yardgo : “There are piles of stars that stretch as a road and is called yardgo” (cf. EArm transl. Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 319f-321). The published text is based on the oldest Armenian manuscript of paper (Matenadaran Nr 2679) which is copied by the scribe Lukas in 971 AD (op. cit. 142). If the reading is reliable, the syncope of -a- antedates the 10th century (see s.v. alawn ‘dove’ for the syncope). See also below, on the dialect of Xotorjir.

In “Yalags kendanatesakac’” by the same author (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 326f144f), in APl: yardagof - zhet astuacoc’n : “the trace of gods”.
In another passage, Anania Širakac'i (A. G. Abrahanyan 1944: 321L7f) mentions yardagol '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 Lalanyany 1969: 768a) mentions also Arm. Yardgo heter ‘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. Abrahanyan/Petrosyan 1979: 95-96; for the passage with English translation see Russell 1987: 170).

For other attestations of Yardago see Ališan 1910: 126-130.

Xotor *erdgo i 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. Abrahanyan/Petrosyan 1979: 95-96; for the passage with English translation see Russell 1987: 170).

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 Xotor both dialectally and geographically, one may regard *Yard(-a)-go as a potential case of an areal restriction recorded in the 7th century. Both Anania Širakac'i and the dialect of Xotor have the name in plural, as well as the syncopated form yardgo (manuscript from 971 AD). The area may have been somewhat larger since one also finds the word in other ko-dialects such as Tigranakert hərt’k’u (see Haneyan 1978: 51). Note also Alaškert Sanam ox 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, Loṙ [Amatuni 1912: 162a; Ačaṙean 1913: 270a] and Ľarabal [Lisic’yan 1981: 66b], *Yard(-a)-goł has been replaced by Darman-a-goł ‘Milky Way’, with darman ‘straw’. The actual designation of the Milky Way in Ľarabal is Termankiši čənapar “the road/way of the Straw-Thief” or Termani haši “the road/way of straw” [Lisic’yan 1981: 66b]; according to Džejranov (1898: 91), tarmanu-ki čənapar in Čajkend-Getašen.

Ľarabal Termankiši : *Darman goš occurs e.g. in an Ascension folk-song (“jangyulum”) from Ľarabal (probably Šuši) [Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 219, Nr 1348]:

Kyeto k’şom a Termankišin,
Ast’serin şoxka a calkin c’ošin,
The river drives the Darmango,
The reflection of stars is on the dew of flower.  
And the Moon has put his eye
On the golden coin of my forehead.

Obviously, Darmango refers here to Milky Way; the river drives down the reflection of the Milky Way.

In Varanda (a region of Larabal), Darmangol 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 Xotorjür.

On corresponding beliefs particularly in connection with the testimony from Eznik Kolbaci (5th cent.) see Garamanlean 1931: 515a; Abelyan 1941: 18, 23-25, 30-31; B. Arak'elyan 1951: 80. For the comparison with Pers. kāh kāstān 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 Larabal relates the Milky Way with milk from the breast of a female werewolf [Lalayan 2, 1988: 175; Lanalanyan 1969: 8Ne6; Licič'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'ar'anc' 1901: 181L-13f; Nždehean 1902: 271; Ališan 1910: 129-130; Lalayan 2, 1988: 175; Amatuni 1912: 162a; Karst 1948: 67-68, 76-79; Petoyan 1965: 341; Lanalanyan 1969: 7-9; S. Movsisyan 1972: 27b; Licič'yan 1981: 66b; Martirosyan-Gharagyozyan, FW 2003) are mostly connected with the idea of stealing, cf., apart from the above mentioned Yard(a)go and Darmangol ‘Straw-Thief’, also Derman hli ‘Straw-way’, as well as a number of designations comprising sanamər ‘the mother of a baptized child for the godfather and godmother’: Sanamər čamba (‘way’), Sanamər yerd (‘straw’), Sanamər k'as (‘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'šeyan 1971: 111bL-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: 199.\footnote{Compare also perhaps Hittite kapirt ‘mouse’, if from PIE *bʰer- ‘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.}

However, the motif of ‘milk’ in this connection is not only resulted from learned tampering. A traditional story recorded in Larabal relates the Milky Way with milk from the breast of a female werewolf [Lalayan 2, 1988: 175; Lanalanyan 1969: 8Ne6; Licič'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'ar'anc' 1901: 181L-13f; Nždehean 1902: 271; Ališan 1910: 129-130; Lalayan 2, 1988: 175; Amatuni 1912: 162a; Karst 1948: 67-68, 76-79; Petoyan 1965: 341; Lanalanyan 1969: 7-9; S. Movsisyan 1972: 27b; Licič'yan 1981: 66b; Martirosyan-Gharagyozyan, FW 2003) are mostly connected with the idea of stealing, cf., apart from the above mentioned Yard(a)go and Darmangol ‘Straw-Thief’, also Derman hli ‘Straw-way’, as well as a number of designations comprising sanamər ‘the mother of a baptized child for the godfather and godmother’: Sanamər čamba (‘way’), Sanamər yerd (‘straw’), Sanamər k'as (‘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'šeyan 1971: 111bL-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: 199.\footnote{Compare also perhaps Hittite kapirt ‘mouse’, if from PIE *bʰer- ‘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.} One may therefore assume that ‘Vahagn
the Straw-Thief" was a chthonic deity somehow associated with the mouse, like Apollo Σμινθεύς (from σμίνϑος 'mouse') and Mars Sminthanus (for which see Toporov 1977a: 55; Toporov 1977b: 48-49; Gindin 1977: 107-108, 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. мишиня тропка (myšína trópka) ‘Milky Way’, literally: “the Way of the Mouse”, dial. Мышьин Тропки (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-Keç‘ut, recorded by S. Harut’yunyan (1965: 8b), reads:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ɔɾə gnac’</th>
<th>mukə mnač’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The day passed,</td>
<td>the mouse stayed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The answer of the riddle is: ASTLER ‘stars’. S. Harut’yunyan (op. cit. 220) 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-Thunder-cloud 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 Muş 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>🅰mpə gəɾəc’</th>
<th>Mukə čɾəɾəc’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayram xat’un</td>
<td>T‘axtə nstaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cloud cried,</td>
<td>the mouse squeaked,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariam—Lady</td>
<td>sat on the wooden bed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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); Mus/Bulanx 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[li] ‘Orion’; cf. Lat. iugula below. Note that Lat. iugula ‘the girdle of Orion’, as well as Gr. ζυγός 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).

kšiř ‘weigh, balance, scales’ (Bible +) : ‘the zodiacal constellation Libra’ in Hexaemeron, Anania Širakac’i (see A. G. Abrahanyan 1944: 323, 327, 329-330, 332); dial. Zeyt’un *kširk ‘the constellation Hayk/Orion’, Maraša *kər-kširk ‘id.’ [Açarean 1913: 582b, 1104a]. According to S. Movsisyan (1972: 55b), Bulanx Kširk’ refers to a part of Orion with three stars forming one line and “called Šamp’ur Haykay in astrology”. This is in perfect agreement with the evidence from Anania Širakac’i’s “Yaɫags kendanatesakac’” (“On zodiacal constellations”), which states that the constellation Kšir consists of three stars (see A. G. Abrahanyan 1944: 332L8) and is thus, in fact, identical with the girdle of Orion. In another chapter (323L12f), Arm. Kšir is presented as equivalent to Gr. ζυγώς/ζυγός (cf. ζυγός ‘yoke; beam of the balance; the constellation Libra’) and Pers. tfafrazuk, on which, see below. On *šamp’ur-kširk’ also see below.

tf[afrazuk 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 kšiř) ‘a constellation comprising three stars on one line’ (see Cánikean 1895: 331). The same dialect also has the appellative t’erazu ‘balance’ found in a folk-song (see op. cit. 439L-2, footnote 4).

šamp’ur ‘rod of wood or metal’ (Bible +), in the book Ėfimērtē and in the dialect of Zeyt’un: ‘the constellation Hayk/Orion’; cf. Ararat *šamp’ur-kširk ‘id.’ [Açarean 1913: 820b; HAB 3: 492b]. For the association between Hayk [= Orion], Kšir, and Šamp’ur, see also “Bağırq hayoc’”: Amalyan 1975: 1782, 2702; Ališan 1910: 133-137.

**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 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 (aɫeňawor) Hayk, the ancestor of the Armenians, kills Bēl (identified with Nebrovt’ in 1.5, p. 2015) 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=Nebrovt’ above) and burnt it down; the fire turned into water and deepened downwards into the mountain (see Lanalanyan 1969: 751945), 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. 891933).174

As we have seen, the ancestor of the Armenians, Hayk, the skillful archer (aɫeňawor), 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. Abrahayman 1944: 33115). 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 Gharagyozyan 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 *Tīr*, which, next to the meanings ‘the angel who is guardian of the cattle’, ‘name of the fourth month and the 13th day of every month’, ‘the planet Mercury’, ‘arrow’ etc., denotes also ‘a scale-beam’ (see Steingass 341a), may have referred to the divine archer of the type Orion/Hayk and/or to ‘Orion’s belt’ as well; cf. also *tīr-andāz ‘archer’. Note the Indo-Iranian term for the Orion’s girdle seen in the designation of Sirius *tištriia*- < *tri-str-ii- ‘belonging to the Three Stars’: YAv. *tištriiaēniō, -aēniitas-catīštriia- ‘Sirius-Stars’ [Hoffmann/Forsman 1996: 127], Tištriia- m. name of Sirius, worshipped as a god, Pahl. Tištar ‘Sirius’, considered as confused with *Tīr ‘the planet Mercury’, cf. also Pers. tīr ‘arrow’ [MacKenzie 1971: 83; Nyberg 1974: 193b], Skt. tiṣya- (tiṣya-) m. name of a fixed star or asterism (RV+), etc. (Lelekov apud MifNarMir 2: 515; Mayrhofer EWAia 1: 649; cf. Bogoljubov 1987: 9; for another etymology of *Tištriia- involving tig-ri- ‘arrow’ etc., see Scherer 1953: 113 with ref.). I putatively conclude that Pers. tīr-andāz ‘archer’ too referred to ‘Orion’ or ‘Orion’s belt, Three-Star’. This may be corroborated by the following considerations.

The typical Armenian fasting period called *Aṙaǰawor-a-c’ (aṙaǰ-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 Geɫec’ik) and his dog, which always preceded the saint and was therefore called *aṙaǰ-awor ‘forerunner’, played an essential role in the traditional background of this fasting, the latter having been determined to honour the dog *aṙaǰawor which was killed by wolves [HAB 1: 252-253; Čanikean 1895: 471; Matikean 1930: 153-170; Lap’anc’yan 1945: 61-68; A. Petrosyan 2001: 158].

Diachronically, the fasting *Aṙaǰawor-a-c’ of the movable calendar seems to be somehow related with the fixed feast *teaṙn-and-aṙaj (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 *Təṙandž* [Amatuni 1912: 625a; Davt’yan 1966 (Č’aylu)] or *Tərnətəs [Ačařean 1913: 1025-1026] (found in numerous dialects); Ararat, Muš drndz [Amatuni 1912: 172]; Łarabal Dəṙdəɾi(n)č’ [Davt’yan 1966: 482] or Dəṙdəɾi(n)č’ [Lisic’yan 1981: 70b], Goris Dəṙdəɾi(n)č’ [Lisic’yan 1969: 262-263], etc. [Bdoyan 1972: 445a̲o]. For an extensive description for Sebastia see Gabikean 1952: 528. NH2 (2: 862b) presents Tərnətəs as a dialectal equivalent to *Teaṙn-and-aṙaj and Tə-r-and-aṙ, the latter being a re-interpretation as “Lord with this” (see also HAB 4: 402b). Note Hačən Deyndez ‘New Year’ vs. Zeyt’un deyṁdâs ‘Candlemas’ [HAB 4: 402b; Ačařyan 2003: 95, 340].
In the same dialect of Hačon, the term for ‘Candlemas’ is substituted by šved, which goes back to šuot ‘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 Teaṙnandaraj (February 13/14)’ [Ačarean 1913: 604a; Hoy 1898]. Ačaryan (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 Teaṙnandaraj/Tērantas ‘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. šuot ‘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, Tištria- 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 Teaṙnandaraj ‘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 Araǰawor-a-c’ (aǰawor ‘going in front, forerunner’).

2) The central figures of this cycle are St. Sargis, the Christian descendant of the resurrecting god Aray Geｌec’ik, and his dog which was always preceding the saint and was therefore called *aǰawor ‘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 Gelec’ik, Artawazd, Zangi-Zrangi, etc.). Compare also St. Karapet, lit. ‘forerunner’, i.e. Yovhannēs Mkrtič = John the Baptist, the forerunner of Jesus Christ. It is remarkable that the festival of nawaseard ‘New Year’ has been established for the commemoration of John the Baptist/St. Karapet (Agat’angelos §
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3) The month February with Teaṙnandaraj ‘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 Hačen, remarkably, Deyendez < *Teront/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 šuot ‘February, the month of freedom from devils; the demon of February’.

For the contrast with wolves see above under point 2. In Muš/Bulanx, 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, *Teaṙnandaraj ‘Candlemas’ can be interpreted as ‘(the feast of) the Archer Hayk/Orion = Ilran. *Tišтрия-’ in association with Pleiades, marking the vernal equinox and, subsequently, the New Year, and Sirius, Orion’s dog. Iranian Tišтрия- conquered the demon of drought and released the waters. Similarly, the skillful archer Hayk, the ancestor and eponym of the Armenians, kills Bēl/Nebrovot and (indirectly) gives rise to the underground sources of the river Meḥraget, lit. ‘honey-river’ (see S. Harut’yunyan 2000: 226, 230, espec. 232; A. Petrosyan 2003: 203-204). The names of both Tišтрия- and Hayk are related with the asterism ‘Orion’s belt’ : *Three-Star’. Note also Arm. Śn-ast ‘Sirius’, lit. ‘dog-star’, the first in Širakac’i’s list of the asterisms which indicate “abundance of rains”.

5) Arm. dial. *Teront/das/z ‘Candlemas’ can hardly be explained as a corrupted or re-interpreted form of Teaṙnandaraj. The connection with the theonym Tir proposed by Durean (1933: 46; accepted by P. Xač’atryan 1990: 81-82) is more plausible. One may treat *Teront/das/z as reflecting (or influenced by) Pers. tīr-andāz ‘archer’ and testifying by this the unattested theonymical/astral aspect of the latter, comparable to the divine/astral archer Hayk/Orion/Tišтрия- (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. ἑσπερός m. ‘evening; evening-star, Venus’, Lat. vesper ‘evening; evening-star’.

In a homily by Zak’aria Kat’olikos (9th cent.) we find Efjeru ‘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; Alayan 1986: 79-80; A. Petrosyan 2002: 61-221); further, see G. Muradyan 2006: 1-2.
In a tale written by H. T'umanyan (5, 1994: 89L1f, var. 611L–1) entitled ‘Eljerun = The stag’, Eljeru-Lusast ‘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 žveris ‘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. Eljeru 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 Astl-ik < ‘little star’; further see e.g. Lisic’yan 1969: 143. For the cult of the deer and see Mnac’akanyan 1977; Deweyyan 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-ast ‘Evening Star’, see s.v. *hawt.a- ‘shepherd’.


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’aǰuni [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 *p̞bʰ-ro- (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 Ar’ak’el Siwneč’i (14–15th cent.) who describes Saturn, Zawhal ast, as amp-a-(y)holov (see A. G. Abrahamyan 1979: 47–15), composed of amp ‘cloud’ and holov- ‘to roll, move rolling, turn’.

In the dictionary of Zak’ařia (15th century) a similar compound is used to render amprop ‘thunder’, namely: ampayoyz < amp ‘cloud’ + -a- + yoyz (see Amalyan 1966: 97). Compare yuzum (or pl. yuzmun-k’/s) amplc’, frequent in ‘Yaphants amplc’ ew nšanac” by Anania Širakac’i, 7th cent. (A. G. Abrahamyan 1944: 305–309). Note also holm-a-yoyz-k’, with holm ‘wind’ as the first member (Hexaemeron); anjreya-yoyz, with anjrew ‘rain’ as the first member, in Hexaemeron (see K. Muradyan 1984: 195L20) and Movsēs Xorenac’i 3.68 (1913=1991: 365L1; transl. Thomson 1978: 354): amarın 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
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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):

\[Zcov\ \text{asen xelagareal p’ilsap’ayk’n het’anosac’, t’ê pat areaal zerkrav, ew i miği cvu è erkir orpêš kzi mi : “The mad heathen philosophers say about the sea that it encircles the earth, and the earth is in the middle of the sea like an island” (cf. also ModArm. transl. Abrahamyan / Petrosyan 1979: 75). It has been assumed that Anania Širakac’i may have taken this information from Cosmas Indicopleustes [Abrahamyan/Petrosyan 1979: 341],.\]

\[cirani cv “Purple Sea”, in the famous epic fragment on the birth of Vahagn recorded by Movsês Xorenac’i (1.31); see Abełean 1, 1955: 34; Saradžева 1976: 192. See the passage s.v. erkâ “labour pains, pang (of childbirth); fear, grief, sorrow”.\]

In a folk morning-prayer from Gelark’unik’ (R. Grigoryan 1983: 235a): Erkink’ cvov a cirani “The heaven is a purple sea”.

In a folk-song consisting of a series of questions and answers of the pattern: “Whom may my little child resemble? – May (or may not) he resemble ...” (R. Grigoryan 1970: 175), among negative answers, Ciran cov “Purple Sea”, as well as arew “sun” and lusin “moon” are mentioned.


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’: Sirak aryuncov, Basen arni cov, Borč’alu (Loři) 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: arn-cov, arun cov [S. Harut’yunyan 1965: 61a Nob33a/251a, 204a Nob280/321b].

In a folk-song from Moks (Yovs’eanc’ 1892: 22):

\[Caṙ am ker meč’ arənkın covirun,\]
\[Xawk’ am ker meanč’ en covun.\]

There was a tree in blood-seas, there was a bird in that sea.

In a folk-song (R. Grigoryan 1970: 352), Lusunka k’eri “Uncle Lusunka” says he is coming Abrahamu cvu veren “from over the sea of Abraham”. Compare arün 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 Xač’ikyan 1963: 150) we read:

\[El hovin Cirani, aracėr yovitn Cirani “The purple shepherd arose; (he) was pasturing in the Purple valley”. In another incantation, entitled gir cxac’awi
“writing against breast-pain” (ibid.), mayr (‘mother’) Cirani, dusdr (‘daughter’) Cirani, and dētor (?) Cirani are mentioned (Xač’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 groɫin 175 anto ‘cornfield/pastureland of the Otherworld’ preserved in proverbs and in a curse formula, see Gabikean 1952: 60, 157, who explicitly refers to and ‘cornfield, pastureland’ and assumes mythological origin.176

A curse formula in Xotorjur [YušamXotor] 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 [YušamXotor] 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 perse, GŠg peyi, etc. [Ačaṙyan 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. haruğanaı́- ‘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 Grol is the divine scribe.
176 Hardly related to Sebastia anten ‘the afterlife’, which is from ClArm. adverbial and, and-ēn ‘there’ (op. cit. 68-69).
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‘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, andén ‘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];

zam ‘time; hour’ : ‘church ceremony’ : ‘church’ [HAB 2: 221-224];
vayr ‘place’: ‘field, commons’ : ‘a while’, vayrkean ‘minute’ [HAB 4: 300b];
dial. telo ‘while’ (< tel ‘place’); cf. in a fairy-tale from Lori: manelis telo ‘while spinning’; xac’a gnalis telo ‘while going to the Cross’ (see HŽHek’ 8, 1977: 73 and 7512, respectively); in Šamšadin (Tavuš): orek’naka mer mtnilis teło “when the sun was setting” [Xemč’yan 2000: 28a7].

Next to these examples, Ačarıyan (HAB 1: 286-287) also mentions Pers. gāh. One may add more:

Parth. tcr [*tažar] ‘palace, dwelling’; as an astronomical term, ‘double hour, period of two hours’ [Boyce 1977: 86];
Lat. saeculum, -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. *aśxart mtnēl ‘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, 853-854 = 1995: 750-75120.

The new terms for ‘summer’ often derive from words for ‘year’, cf. Arm. amaṙn ‘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: vasantā- ‘spring’ and hemantā- ‘winter’ (see Èrlix 1989: 246).

The Armenian seasonal terms are usually stable. Some exceptional replacements have taken place in a few dialects. In Nor Naxiţian, ašun ‘autumn’ has been replaced by *kiz/kuyz : giz, rural guyz (see P’ork’šeyan 1971: 220b): kuyz kuka “the autumn comes” (52b18). Note that in the same song the winter is represented by the native, basic Armenian term jmeṙ (52a10): Cmēr’ anc’av, puk’ halec’av “The winter passed, the snow melted”. Other illustrations: ušgeg kizin ‘in the late autumn’ (57b14): kuyz əgav “the autumn came” (79a17).

In a remarkable passage (80b L14f), all the seasons are mentioned: kizin, cmēr’ ew paherin cin xist aleg ev, ama erb amaṙī egav, cin p’eratc’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 cmēr and amaṙ, whereas kiz appears instead of ašun ‘autumn’, and pah-er ‘fests’ functions for the spring, of which the native term is garun. The words cmēr and amaṙ are also mentioned in 80b196. For the origin of *kiz/kuyz note Pers. gūz ‘autumn’ (see Steingass 1102b).

Next to amaṙ from ClArm. amaṙn ‘summer’ (q.v.), of native/IE origin (see HAB 1: 146; Ačāryan 2003: 296), the dialect of Zeyt’un has also t’amuz (gen. t’amzən) ‘summer’, borrowed from Arab. tammūz ‘July’ (Ačāryan 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

In Armenian, this semantic shift is reflected in sar ‘mountain’ > Hamšen sar ‘forest’ [Ačaryan 1947: 253]. See also antā ‘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]; c’mak ‘dark place’: dial. ‘forest’; according to Gabikean (1952: 475), Muš c’mak 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, OEEngl. ēa ‘water; river’, etc.); cf. also OEEngl. ēaland, ēalond ‘island’ = ēa ‘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. strauja, Latv. strauja ‘stream’, Skt. sra- ‘to stream, flow’, etc. (see s.vv. ari, arog); Skt. dvīpā- ‘island, island in a river, sandbank’ (RV+) < *dui-h2p-ō-, lit. ‘having water on two sides’, cf. Skt. āp- ‘water’, Toch. AB āp f. ‘water, river, stream’, etc. For more examples, see Jordan-Cólera 1997.

The semantic development can also be seen in Armenian; see s.v. geta(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)


‘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]; čakondi bazuk in “Bžškaran joy” (13th cent.), see Čugasyan 1980: 110-21.

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. čakndeɫ ’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’oṙlak’yan 1986: 205 L-17):

“Karmir kov əktrec’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’oṙlak’yan, ibid., the next riddle). Compare also karmir eiz ’red bullock’ equated with keṙ ‘cherry etc.’ in Trapizon [Haykuni 1906: 351 L-5f]; sew kov ’black cow’ = boɫk ’radish’ in Moks (Karčkana Nanak’c) [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, Bulanax, Širak, Aparan čavik ‘leaf of beet’ (Amatuni 1912: 80a; see also HayLezBrbBaṙ 3, 2004: 374a) in a broader context of internal comparison. Karčewan and Kak’avaberd čɛv ’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. čiv ’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, Lazax, Larabal haw-čiv ’poultry’ [Ačaréan 1913: 652a]), but a connection with *čav ‘leaf of beet’ seems semantically more attractive, especially in view of Melri gał-a-čev ’the child of a thief’ (see Alayan 1954: 294) = goł ’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 > e after unvoiced consonants in monosyllables is not very common in Kak’avaber, but we do have some examples here, cf. čanč ’fly’ > čenj or čanj, čas ’dinner’ > čes, č’ap ’measure’ > č’ep’ (Varhavar), etc. (see H. Muradyan 1967: 21). In Karčewan there are more examples (see H. Muradyan 1967: 19).

As to the literary language, it is tempting to consider čavak ‘child’ (also in čavket ’daughter’), attested only by grammarians. De Lagarde (see HAB 2: 85a) and Jahukyan (1967: 210, 308) link čavak with zawak a-stem ‘child, offspring, tribe, generation’ (Bible+; widespread in the dialects). Jahukyan (1967: 210) proposed to connect čavak with Avest tuoxman etc. (see HAB 4, s.v. tohm ‘tribe’), which is formally improbable. As to zawak, Iranian origin is considered possible (see Jahukyan 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. zagha > *zahwak > zawak (Marr, see HAB 2: 85). Olsen (1999: 151-285, 244-245, 769a, 784, 858) derives it from Ir. *zandha-(ka-) < *γenh Italians , cf. Av. zха ’birth etc.’, MPers. z’hk ‘child, offspring’ vs. z’dk ‘child’, with the
development $\theta < w$ in intervocalic position. She admits (245:76), 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)thwa-ka-, cf. OAv. huguzañtu- ‘of good lineage, noble’, haozqīfła- n. ‘good relationship’, jantu- m. ‘creature, being, tribe, race’, from */gi(e)n(h)-tu- (cf. Marr’s etymology), or Iran. *zavaka-〈ghniiu-.

For the alternation č – z Jahakyan (1967: 308) only mentions čawak : zawak, but there are more of such examples, e.g. xoř 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’

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 mämęk ‘spider’ < *mam-uk [Andreasyan 1967: 374a], Polis, Nor Našijewan mamuk ‘id.’, see Ačarėan 1913: 748a and HAB 4: 186b, with parallels from other languages: Kurd. pirìk ‘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’avaberdt tat ‘scorpion’, literally, ‘grandmother’ (see s.v. tat ‘grandmother).

mor, morm ‘tarantula’ (MidArm. and dial.): Gr. Μορμώ, -ός -οῦς, Μορμών, -όνος f. ‘she-monster, bogy’ (also used by nurses to frighten children), generally ‘bugbear’, Lat. formidō, inis f. ‘fear, terror; a thing which frightens, bogy’; note also Gr. μύρμηξ ‘ant; fabulous animal in India’, Lat. īdōnis f. ‘fear, terror; a thing which frightens, bogy’; and especially Arm. dial. (Lori) mormef (see s.v. mor, morm ‘tarantula’).

Similar formations can also be found for the snail, cf. Larabał ana-xat’um [Ačarėan 1913: 93b], ala-xat’um (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 12a; also Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan FW 2003, Goris). In both forms the second component is xat’um ‘Lady’. According to Ačarėan (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 mamaxat’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."

Melri, Karčewan, Kak’avaberdt 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 Gharagyozyan at the 10th General Conference of the AIEA, Vitoria-Gasteiz, 7-10 September 2005 (see Martirosyan/Laragyozyan 2005), and at the Workshop Cultural, linguistic and ethnological interrelations in and around Armenia in Michaelbeuern, July 4-7, 2007.
In a poem by Arak’el Siwnc’i /14-15th cent./ [Poturean 1914: 52, stanza 30] the Virgin Mary is equated with a spider:

Sard es luselên yankean,
Aranc’ niw’ hines zostayn;
Ansermn ychac’ar xzBan.

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. zatik ‘sacrifice; Passover; Resurrection feast, Easter; feast’; dial. also ‘ladybug’):


‘cow of God’: Arm. dial. Łaraba *astucoy kov/eznak, Russ. bož’ja korovka, Lith. dięvo karvytė, Roman. vaca domnului, 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^\text{150}), a young woman is metamorphosed to a kyoṙt’unk ‘frog’. A similar story from Alaškert narrates about a pregnant woman turning into a frog too (op. cit. 130^\text{155}). 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’ (Kar`in/Erzrum region) see Łanalanyan 1969: 104^\text{128}. 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. HZHek’ 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 HZHek’ 9: 195 and 343-346, Kırıkan Sanamer and Xörơxơ xanum seem to implicitly represent an aquatic female deity personified as a frog and associated with weaving. For Xörơxơ 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. Mkrt’c’yan (PmSivHisHay 1965: 455; N. Mkrt’c’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. Mkrt’c’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. varde.

Further examples:
‘butterfly’: Arm. xipilik (mostly dial.) ‘nightmare, spirit; an illness; beautiful girl; doll; trefoil; etc.’ [HAB 2: 369]; Russ. babočka ‘butterfly’ from baba ‘woman, wife’, etc.
‘damsel-fly, dragonfly, mosquito’: Engl. damsel-fly “the slender dragon-fly 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. jōreak ‘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 jori ‘mule’ (Bible+, widespread in dialects) and the diminutive suffix -ak [NHB 2: 676a].

Ačaryan (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. jōreak ‘hyena’.

In Amirdovlat’ Amasiac’i (see S. Vardanjan 1990: 94-95, § 397, comment 596w; MİHayBar 1, 1987: 138a; cf. NHB 1: 508b) one finds gayl-jori (gen. gayl-jorı), gayl-jorek ‘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-agrıaw ‘a kind of raven’, with agrıaw ‘raven’), gayl-jorek, literally ‘wolf-hyena’, may be interpreted as ‘a kind of hyena’. The compound is corroborated by dial. (Büťania/Nikomedia) *gayl-jorı ‘a kind of predator’ < gayl ‘wolf’ + jori (see Ačaryan 1913: 219a), where an unsuffixed jori is used instead of joreak. Note that both Amasia and Nikomedia are located in the NW margins of the Armenian-speaking territories.

The existence of jōreak ‘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: 298w], the animal called jōreak is represented as follows:

Azniv uni ink’n žanik’,
Işxanayk’ mi ir handipik’;
Gerezmanac’ uni balıık’,
Uti zmerealn 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 ǰoreak ‘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 ǰoreak, 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), fore(a)k (abl. i forek-ē) occurs in a list of beasts between gayl ‘wolf’ and aṙewc ‘lion’. S. Harut’yunyan (op. cit. 473a) hesitantly identifies the word with the insect-name ǰoreak. Here again we are rather dealing with ǰoreak ‘hyena’. In his list of animal-names in Svedia, Andreasyan (1967: 162) mentions čirəg ‘hyena’ glossing it by Arm. boreni and Arab. /dabaa/. Taking the word as “formally identical with ǰori ‘mule’” (> Svedia čira, op. cit. 381b; in Acaryan 2003: 586, j’ira), he does not give any further comment. I think it simply reflects ǰoreak ‘hyena’. Note that Nersēs Šnorhali is from Cilicia, and the dialects of Cilicia and Svedia form an appropriate locus for MidArm. items (cf. Acaryan 2003: 12-13, 350). On Svedia *jore-patik ‘hyena’ see 1.2.

In a famous dance-song from Svedia / Musa Leṙwe read (see YuşMusLer 1970: 222 with ModArm. translation where ǰirɛk is correctly interpreted as ‘hyena’):

Itew tuno mirek i,
Mire kinol jirek i
Behind the house there is brushwood,
In the brushwood stays the hyena.

Č’olak’ean (1986: 216a, 277) records K’esab jurik or jürık ‘hyena’ and derives it from ǰoreak.

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: 2933, 335N⁵⁹), 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. κιλλός ‘grey’ : κίλλος m. ‘ass’ and Cyprian ‘cicada’ (glossed as τέττιξ πρωϊνός in Hesychius); French grison ‘donkey’ vs. gris ‘grey’; Arm. *bor- ‘brown (animal)’ : bor-ēn ‘hyena’, perhaps also vorak ‘locust’ (lex.).

‘Hyena’, ‘wolf’, ‘witch’


A compound *jori-a-parik ‘mule-demon/witch’ goes parallel with yušk-a-parik (Bible+), vsk-a-pari-k’ (John Chrysostom) ‘a mythical being’, ‘ass-demon/fairy’, which renders Gr. ὄνοκληταρχος in Isaiah 13.22, 34.11, 34.14, and is composed of

Elsewhere (Ačaryan 2003: 527), the first component is considered to be fur ‘water’. Compare in this respect *jër-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 jërparik ‘old woman’, perhaps ‘witch’, which, according to S. Erēc’ (1898: 380a), reflects *jër-parik with the sound change a > ɔ. In all his examples, however, as well as in those of Gabriēlean 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 *jër-parik ‘old woman, witch, sorceress’ indeed comprises jūr ‘water’ and parik, its original meaning would have been ‘female water spirit, nymph’. Svedia jirbäligi hardly contains jūr ‘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 čṙ-paɫu ‘frog; (pejorative) a new-born child of a woman’ (see Gabikean 1952: 379). Further, note Marzvan *gayl-paṙav ‘a female evil spirit which, like the ali-paṙaw, strangles new-born children’ [Ačaryan 1913: 219a], obviously composed of gayl ‘wolf’ and paṙaw ‘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: GDPl 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. bör ‘reddish-brown, bay, chestnut (horse)’, Kurd. bör ‘grey; brown’, etc.

The word for ‘leprosy’ is also associated with the notions of (moral) dirt, heresy’, cf. bor-ot ‘leprosy’ > Georg. boroti ‘evil, bad, unjust, dangerous’, Arm. dialect of Malat’ia borot ‘heretic’ (see HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 212a); Arm. pisak ‘spotted; leprous’, dial. of Van and Larabal pis ‘dirty’ vs. Pers. pis ‘leprous; dirty’ (see HAB 4: 84b; Ačarean 1902: 352); Arm. dial. Van kř-ot ‘leprous; bad, useless’. The latter is identical with Arrarat, Muš, Nor Bayazet gř-ot ‘id.’ (see Amatuni 1912: 154b; Ačarean 1913: 257b; HayLezBrbBař 1, 2001: 286b).

Arm. dial. k’awt’ær-k’os(i) ‘hyena; old witch’ is present in T’iflis, Larabal [Ačarean 1913: 1107a; HAB 4: 567a], Lazax [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
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(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 ḷ ‘hyena; old witch’, which is poorly attested but is widespread in the dialects [HAB 4: 567a]. In the late medieval dictionary Bārgirk’ ḷ hayoc’ (Amalyan 1975: 58°6°7, 33°8°2°1°), 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, kaftarkūç (Kars), kaftarkūski (Arvīd) ‘hyena’, Azerbaijani kaftar ‘hyena; (pejorative) ‘alter, häßlicher Kerl, alter Knacker’, kaftarkūş ‘id.’, kaftarkūskus ‘alter Stinker’, mentioning also Arm. k’awt’ar ḷ and k’awt’ar-k’ōṣ(i). He points out that the element -k’ūs/š is unclear.

I suggest to treat Arm. k’awt’ar-k’ōṣ(i) as containing k’ōṣ ‘a kind of leprosy, scab’ (Bible+; widespread in dialects), cf. k’ōṣ-ot ‘scabbed’, in dialects also ‘dirty, useless’ [Ačārean 1913: 1121b; HAB 4: 588a]178. If this is accepted, Azerbaijani kaftarkus, Turkish dialectal kaftarkūç etc. should be regarded as Armenian loans. Note that the geographical distribution of Turkish dialectal (Kars, Arvīd) and Azerbaijani forms is roughly compatible to that of the Armenian term (T’iflis, Larabal).

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. šiunaš šiutar ‘wild animals’, lit. ‘animals of God’, Latv. dieva žwosis ‘wild geese’, lit. ‘geese of God’, etc.179


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 El’jeru ‘Deer, Stag’ as the name of a planet, presumably the Venus. One may link Arm. El’jeru with Early German tierstern ‘Evening Star’ from tier ‘wild animal’, Lith. žvėrinė ‘Evening Star’ from žveris ‘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’ōṣ-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 *astucov leṙnerə ‘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; HayLezBrbBar 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: 24712 = 1, 1983: 247; Arevov anjrew galis, asum en, enikner ko 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 wargas 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 ew “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: 19611]: ew xortakēr zk’āc’r luc hawatoyn or i K’ristos, ew orośiwr i hötēn Tērn ew zgenoyr zkerparan gayloy, ew partawor Arnēr zink’n tiezerakan atēnin : “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 *zgenoyr 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 [Mnač’akanyan 1980: 28912] by Nersēs Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), where the wolf is described as a thief who did not worship Christ: č’ēr K’ristosi erkrpagol.

One may assume that the phrase “to become a wolf” or “to assume the image of a wolf” at least in Hittite and Armenian legal traditions reflects an Indo-European legal expression. It seems to actually mean “to become an outlaw, offcast, a person declared to be outside the society”.

---

3.5.2.4 ‘hind, deer’ : ‘dragon, snake’ : ‘wolf’ : ‘devil’

‘hind’ : ‘dragon, snake’

In a medieval riddle [Mnac’akanyan 1980: 287Nr164] written by Nersē Šnorhali (12th cent., Cilicia), the hind (eň) is described as follows:

Ę annman ahuor tikin,
Ink’n cnani zmayrn ďjin

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 Įavaxk’ (Axlalk’alak’), the dragon (ušap) = tornado originates from a new-born deer that has been taken to the sky by dragons [Lalayean 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/251a, 204a/321b], the thunder has been replaced by the stag (efjeru) and the dragon (višap).

In a fairy tale from Łarabał [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 492-494], a deer (jeyran) appears in the role of the resurrecting figure (which is commonly represented by a demon in fairy-tales), and transforms to a snake.


‘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; HayLezBrbBrb 1, 2001: 235a] and other languages often refer to the wolf [Abeghian 1899: 108; A. Petrosyan 1987: 581], and in Įavaxk’ one finds the hind instead [Lalayean 1897: 247 = 1, 1983: 247]: Arewov anjrew galis, asum en, eňikner ka enin “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 Įavaxk’, 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 Cuhrut’ close to Axale’xa), see P. Hakobyan 1979: 6. It says that dragons are born from hinds in mountains at the time of banjarbusuk. The latter refers to a kind of soft snow or hail in early spring [Amatuni 1912: 89b; Açañean 1913: 174b]. Remarkably, it is synonymous with siklik or szklik, which seems to refer to one of the daughters of Satan etymologically (see below). Thus, the sun-shower and banjarbusuk 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. Diljan/Pološk’ilisa բարտ պարթ արտ է (see Ananyan 1980: 370) vs. Atap’azar սատանյի դրագ and Polis սատանյի անար (see Aćarean 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 բանջարբասուկ, 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 սիկլիկ or սեկլիկ, which, according to Amatuni (1912: 589a), has been preserved in Trapizon. The word is synonymous with բանջարբասուկ. No etymological explanation of սի/սեկլիկ is known to me. I think this word may be identified with one of the two daughters of Satan: Սելիկ and Բելիկ, in Ewdokia [Gazančean 1899: 22, 54] and in Sebastia [Gabikean 1952: 499]; cf. the light-minded (գեղ) spouses Տելիկ and Բալիկ in a fairy-tale [HŽHek’ 3, 1962: 388-390].

Dial. (Muš, Van) եզալ-=ջ ‘a kind of snake’, with ջ (= ոչ) ‘snake’ as the second component (see Aćarean 1913: 445a), or simply եզալ [HayLezBrbBăr 2, 2002: 260b], can be identical with dial. (Muš, Van, Sasun, Moks) եզալ/եզալ ‘hind, deer’ (on which, see Petoyan 1954: 127; 1965: 479; HayLezBrbBăr 2, 2002: 260b).

The mountain-name Գայլակազ-ուտ is explicitly understood as ‘abounding in գայլակազ’. The latter (lit. = ‘wolf’s stone’) refers to ‘flint’ and resembles or is confused with dial. սատանի էնջ ‘obsidian’, lit. ‘Satan’s nail. Earlier the mountain was called Պաքրայ, possibly identical with պաքրայ ‘cattle; hind, deer, stag’. Aristakēs Lastiverteč’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 Mnak’akanyan 1977 (especially 17-21); Dewelyan 1982; cf. also the famous song by Grigor Narekač’i entitled “Տաք Յարութ’եան”, the horns of the oxen are described as եզակիս-անման ‘cross-like’ [K’yōskeryan 1981: 621-2b; Mnak’akanyan 1977: 20-21]. In what follows I shall discuss the word եզակիսէկ within the same cultural framework.

եզակիսէկ ‘a kind of male animal’ [HAB 2: 335a]. In NHB 1: 924c: “perhaps եզակիսգ’ուրք ‘a young swine, pig’” (highly improbable). Attested only by grammarians. Grigor Magistros (11th cent.) mentions it in a list of male animals, between եղերւ ‘stag’ and ուր ‘ram’ [Adonc 1915: 240]. No etymology is known to me.

Formally, եզակիսէկ can be interpreted as եզակ ‘cross’ + -էկi- + dimin. -ակ. For the suffix -էկi = -էկi- + i cf. արկ’այ ‘king’ : արկ’այեան, արկ’այեն ‘royal’, etc. (see
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Jahukyan 1998: 23). Bearing in mind that the basic meaning of xač’ and xčč’ ‘cross’ (q.v.) was ‘stick, staff; forked branch, pole’, one may identify xač’eneak with the stag. The fact that eľjeru 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 eľjeru and xač’eneak, mentioned next to each other, might be synonymous. Besides, xač’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’ (< *šaka- lit. ‘forked, having branches’) and Russ. soxátj ‘elk’ which derive from Oss. sagoj/sagojna ‘hay-fork’ (cf. Sogd. (Man.) ᵇʸʰ ‘branch’) and Russ. soxá ‘(wooden) plough’ (cf. Pol. socha ‘two-pronged fork’, Bulg. soxá ‘stick with a fork’, Slav. sōha ‘pole with a cross-beam’ etc.), see Gamkrelidze/Ivanov 1984: 519; Cheung 2002: 222 (see also s.v. c’ax). Thus, the derivation of xač’eneak ‘(prob.) stag’ from xač’ ‘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 ‘demon’ on the one hand, and ‘hyena’ : ‘ass, mule’ : ‘fairy, spirit’ on the other.

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.

*č-xranj/č‘ ‘a poisonous spider or the like’: Xotorjč esxranj ‘a wild, poisonous spider’ (see YuşamXotor 1964: 447b; in HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 26a – esxranč’)

may be connected with Larabal *išaxaranc‘ ‘a kind of black, poisonous insect’ and Ararat išaxaranc ‘‘a kind of insect living under ground’ = Trapizon getnī lakot, lit. ‘earth-puppy’, Fr. courtilière, Russ. medvědka [Ačarean 1913: 225a, 399b], also Muš, Van iša/xaranc‘ and Nor Jula išixarič ‘‘a kind of black insect’ (see Amatuni 1912: 233a; HayLezBrbBar 2, 2002: 177b). According to Davt’yan (1966: 363), Larabal and Hadrut iša/xaranc‘ refers to ‘bumble-bee, dog-bee’ and is synonymousal to pûrm < bor. The latter is described by Ačaryan (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/ranj ‘*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, 367b), *xrinj. Andreasyan (1967: 237) ascribes onomatopoeic origin to the word, trying to connect it to xinč’em ‘to grunt (in Lazax, said of an ass)’. This is not convincing, but a folk-etymological association is obvious, see below. I propose a connection to xufnin ‘snail’ and xžeč ‘lizard’, dial. also ‘snail’; cf. Syriac xlizanā, which is borrowed in the dialect of Zeyt’un in both meanings, ‘snail’ and ‘lizard’ (see HAB 2: 315a, s.v. xalizan). For the –r- of *xr/ranj cf. Arm. xnjayl, xnc’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 -(č)ež.
Ačařyan (1953: 269) mentions Aṙtial xssonč ‘crayfish’. Further, note Urmia, Salmast xrrjala is rendered as xeč ap ar ‘crayfish’ in GwUrMslm 2, 1898: 97. Dial.*salatrana ‘crayfish’ (Moks) : ‘Satan’ (Van), see HAB 4: 164a.


3.5.2.6 Chthonic animals


Slav. *ščur designates terrestrial animals such as the sand martin, rat, mole, grass-snake, salamander, earthworm, grasshopper, cricket or scorpion; the prefixed form *práščur means ‘dead ancestor’; note also ščurit’ ‘to squint’; derived from IE *skewr- ‘to cover, hide’, cf. Lat. obscurus ‘dark, shady, obscure; gloomy’; Slav. *guščer ‘lizard’ perhaps contains *gu- ‘horned cattle’, cf. the traditional belief that the lizards are cowmilkers [Jakobson 1959: 277].

Since Russ. jasčur 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- : *skieur- 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. jasčer ‘inflammation of the tongue of cattle, horses’ above; cf. also HAB 2: 374 on xlrud ‘mole’) and/or demons. For interesting illustrations in Armenian, see s.vv. t’it’ řn ‘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).


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: 51ff. On some examples of the pattern ‘goat biter/sucker’ > ‘a kind of lizard’ in other languages, see Monchi-Zadeh 1990: 45-46.

For the structural typology of -ac’ in kov-a-di-ac’ and folk-believes around this lizard, probably to be identified with the toad, the following seems interesting.

In the dialect of Van, Āčarya (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 ac3-xmc’nāg (< *qī-xmc’nuk, lit. ‘who gives the serpent to drink’) ‘a kind of green lizard’ (see Andreyan 1967: 161, 264). Note also K’esab uja xmc’ınıc’ ‘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’e an 1986: 271]. Bearing in mind this synonymous compound, one may tentatively derive Van *mac’-oc’ from *xm-ac’-cj ‘who gives the serpent to drink’.

A similar folk-belief is recorded by Sargsian (1932: 457) on Balu *kovrec’ ‘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) Ačaryan 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 alanak 'a long kind of worm that lives in mud' [HayLezBrbBa 1, 2001: 36a]. In the word-collection of Arşın vardapet T'oxmaxane collected in the prison of Van (see Amatuni 1912: 684a), alanak is explained as follows: ergol ordn čahičneri, atık ajew serm gorteri “the singing worm of the swamps; the intestine-like semen of frogs”. It must be identical with Van alanak 'a kind of animal which, like a turtle, consists of a large lump of flesh, lives in brooks and sings sweetly at night’ [Ačărean 1913: 73a]. According to Ačăryan (ibid.), the same animal is called kxr in Muş.

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. onglayk'. 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. glis, -īris m. ‘dormouse’ and Skt. girī(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 kaśīkā- ('Ichneumonweibchen or weasel')”. Here the context is clearly erotic. If Arm. ak’is (i-stem) ‘weasel’ (q.v.) is related with Skt. kaśīkā-, one may derive it from a PIE feminine noun in *-ihr-. 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’orlakan 1986: 116\textsuperscript{135}, 233b], literally: ‘spotted, motley or beautiful mother’s sister’. This probably refers to the weasel, cf. cormuk ‘weasel’ (< jar-muk), described by people as balak = xatutik (see Martirosyan/Gharagyozyan FW 2003, September, Hrazdan), or čal, čaltik ‘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’ [Gabikean 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 Astilik transformed the weasel, who had fallen in love with a boy, to a beautiful woman.

In a humorous fairy-tale (1926, Leninakan < Bulanax), a mouse (harsnuk-muk “little bride or daughter-in-law : mouse”) marries a rooster (čet) [HŽHek’ 10, 1967: 376\textsuperscript{140}].

3.6 Plants
‘cut, split’ : ‘grain, corn’
Arm. hat, o-stem ‘grain’ is related to hatanem ‘to cut’ (q.v.)\textsuperscript{181}. It seems likely that hat derives from *h₂-edos- 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’ (Hexaemeron+) 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’ : triticum 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’
aşastal ‘ceiling’ (Bible+) > MidArm. (mainly in medical literature) and dial. ‘palate’; see s.v.

In Partizak, Sebastia, Xotoržur etc., Arm. aşik ‘ceiling’ (q.v.) also means ‘ceiling of the mouth’, that is to say, ‘palate’.

CIArm. jehun ‘ceiling’ (q.v.) is metaphorically associated with the sky (Eznik Kolbac’i etc.).

\textsuperscript{181} Whether Arm. hačar ‘spelt’ (Bible; Larabal etc.) is related, is uncertain.
Dial. *tamal ‘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 cečač ‘tanis ‘surface of the hand’ (see Orbeli 2002: 204, 253); see also s.v. *and-:- dr-and.

For the semantic shift ‘ceiling’ > ‘palate’ Ačařyan 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’ (> Eng. palate), perhaps related to Etruscan falanđum ‘sky’ (OxfEnglDict).

‘sky’ > ‘ceiling’, cf. Lat. caelum ‘heaven, sky’ > MLat. ‘canopy; vault; roof’, It. cielo, F. ciel ‘sky; canopy; ceiling’, Eng. 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].


Šatax asttunk’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 aɾaɾstal ‘palate’ with loss of -ɾ- and/or contamination with asthunk’ ‘stars’; see s.v. aɾaɾstal ‘ceiling; palate’. For the relationship ‘star’ > ‘sky’ cf. E.g. Kassit. da-ka-áš ‘star’ : da-gi-gi ‘sky’, ‘*Star’, Tigrē Ethiopian astrar ‘sky’, etc. (see Eilers 1976: 57, 57 134). For ‘palate’ > ‘uvula etc.’ cf. Eng. 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’


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 ən ‘spine, back’, uln ‘neck’ (dial. also, perhaps, ‘elbow’ or ‘shoulder’) and uluk ‘palm, distance from the thumb to the little finger’ with Gr. ὀλέη ‘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 ən).

Similar semantics is found in the set šel ‘slanting, crooked, oblique’, šil ‘squint-eyed’, etc. : Gr. σκόλος n. ‘leg (from the hip downwards)’, σκελλός;
‘crook-legged’, σκολιός ‘wicked, crooked’, Lat. scelus, GSG sceleris n. ‘misdeed, crime’, etc. (see especially s.v. sel). 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. ohn).

A case of ‘shoulder’: ‘spine, back’: ‘chest, breast’ is found in MPers., NPers. dōš ‘shoulder’, cf. YAv. daos- ‘upper arm’, Skt. dos- 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 HayLezBrbBaṙ 1, 2001: 345-346), perhaps through a Turkish intermediate [Ačaṙean 1902: 336; Margaryan 1975: 511b (on Goris dōš ‘breast; slope’)].

3.7.3 ‘calf of leg’: ‘fish’

Ararat, Lori, Širak, Bulanax, Alašiert juk, jkn-er (pl.) ‘(anat.) calf’ [Amatuni 1912: 372a], which is the basic Armenian word for the fish, namely jukn. Larabal *jukn-mis ‘(anat.) calf’ (see Ačaṙean 1913: 690b) literally means ‘meat of fish’.

We find it, for example, in a fairy-tale: vəennis cüknames ‘the *juknamis of my leg’ [HŽHek’ 5, 1966: 523]. Note also Bulanax 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’. Ačaryan (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 cóuk ‘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. Urart. 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] ‘maidens, maiden, one of the women’ [Boyce 1977: 37], duxšt ‘princess’, OPers. *duxš- 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; Aćaṙean 1913: 164a; HayLezBrbBaṙ 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 jeṙnas [harsn] t’axanj ew ktir is mēj berel? [NHB 1: 1131a]. No acceptable etymology is known to me. Aćaṙyan (HAB 2: 677a) only mentions the improbable connection with antir ‘selected, excellent’ proposed by Hiwnk’earp ēy ēnte’an.

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 Aćaṙyan (HAB 3: 204a), Van, Muş, Alaṙkert, Bulanax cǐw ‘flock of sheep’ derives from cǐw ‘branch’ and ēel- ‘to divide’. In the folk-story “Karos Xač’” one finds cǐw mə oč’xar (Sravanjtyane’ 1, 1978: 608; Karos Xač’ 2000: 63a). According to Aćaṙyan (ibid.), Kurd. ēcol ‘(sheep-)flock’ and perhaps Arab. jul ‘flock of sheep; group’ are borrowed from Armenian. Sasun čol ‘flock of sheep’ (see Aćaṙean 1913: 739b) have been reborrowed from Kurdish; see 1.10 on back-loans.

Also notice Mush čła ‘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 sheep or goats’ (Sasun) [Aćaṙean 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: 135b135b), in the very same passage where cǐw occurred (see above): k’t(y)asun ktir oč’xar ‘forty flocks of sheep’. A. Xač’atryan (1993: 107) connects the word to ktir-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. scǐa ‘shin, leg’; Russ. cěvka ‘bobbin; (esp. hollow) bone; (dial.) shinbone’, OCS cěvònica ‘flute’, SCR. ci jev ‘tube, spool, shinbone’, cjевнica ‘shinbone, flute’; Lith. ševà ‘spool, forearm, shin(-bone)’; Indo-Iranian *Hast-čǐHya- ‘shin, shank’; etc. (from PIE *s(k)Hya- ‘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 čuřa, češre ‘a kind of (small) flute’ [Gabikean 1952: 378], see Martirosyan 2005: 83. See also s.v. srunk ‘shinbone’.

Meɫri č’ak ‘shinbone of cattle; instrument for carding wool’ [Ałayan 1954: 323]; Moks č’ak ‘a stick used for beating and carding wool’ [Orbeli 2002: 306].


Further, see s.v. srunk ‘shin, shinbone’.

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. kṛttika- f. pl. ‘Pleiades’ (AV+) from *kṛt-ti- ‘Geflecht’, kart- (kṛṇāti, 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’ ‘felloe’ (8th cent.) from boyt’, through the semantic development ‘multiplicity, abundance’ > ‘woven together’.

3.9.4 ‘plaited, twisted’ > ‘felloe’

Gr. ἵτυς ‘felloe’ and Lat. vitus ‘fellow’ are *-tu- derivatives from a PIE verb meaning ‘to twist, wind, plait’; Lat. viĕre ‘wind, bend’, OCS viti ‘twist, wind’, Russ. vit’ ‘something that has been plaited’, etc.

The same semantic shift can be seen in *pel-ː- ‘to turn, wind’ (a form of *plek- ‘to plait?’) > OHG felga, OEngl. felg(e) ‘felloe’, probably also Arm. hec ‘felloe’ (if from *hele‘), q.v. See also s.v. boyt’ ‘felloe’.

3.10 Miscellaneous

In the territory of Łarabał, e.g., one finds five synonyms for ‘hungry’: anōr’i, k’al’ac’ac, sovac, tūznə and naštav [Davtyan 1966: 313]. The first two are of IE origin, sov is probably an Iranian loan, and the other two are dialectal.
Davit’yan (1966: 52, 343) derives Łarabal, Hadrut etc. tüznə ‘hungry’ from ClArm. doynə, without any comment. ClArm. doynə means ‘few, a few, small, miserable; insignificant (person)’ (Bible+) and has no acceptable etymology [HAB 1: 678b]. Aćaṙyan (HAB ibid.) does not record any dialectal forms. The derivation of Łarabal etc. tüznə from doynə is formally impeccable. As to the semantics, cf. Pers. nahār ‘diminution; fasting’, nī/ahār ‘detriment, loss; a wasting of the body’, nī/ahārdan ‘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.

Čaṙylo (in the territory of Łarabal; 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’, ewləwl ‘oil’, t’az ‘fig’, spung ‘sponge’, sunk/g(n) ‘mushroom’ [Meillet 1908-09b; 1936: 143; Meillet/Vendryes 1924: 16-17; AćaṙHLPatm 1, 1940: 100-104; Jahukeyan 1987: 307-308]. Aćaṙyan (1937: 3) treats Arm. gini ‘wine’,
ewl/iwl ‘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. ἠμόν, Lat. viānum, Hitt. üjuna-, 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; Otkipščík 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. kalin, o-stem ‘acorn’ and Gr. βάλανος f. ‘acorn’ (vs. Lat. glāns, glandis f. ‘acorn, beach-nut’, Russ. želud’, Scr. želud ‘acorn’, Lith. gilė, dial. gylė ‘acorn’, Latv. žile ‘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’ (*-rĵ : Arm. rĵ); katn ‘milk’, kamurj ‘bridge’ (*g/ĝ : Arm. k̂); ors ‘hunt, game’, siwrn ‘chick-pea’, siwn ‘column, pillar’ (*k̂ : Arm. s); erbuc ‘breast of animals’ (*ĝ : Arm. c);

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’; ewl ‘oil’ (if from ‘olive’); t’elavš ‘holm-oak; cedar, pine’, t’ełi ‘elm’; t’uz ‘fig’; xstor ‘garlic’; kalamax(i) ‘white poplar, aspen’, probably also ‘pine’; kask ‘chestnut’; k’ran ‘cornel; ash’ (see s.v. hoyn ‘cornel’); melex ‘the handle of an axe’ (if from ‘ash-tree’); moš ‘tamarisk; blackberry, bramble’, mor ‘blackberry (the fruit of bramble)’; sise ‘chick-pea’; sunk/g(n) ‘mushroom’; uši/*(h)oši probably ‘storax-tree’ and ‘holm-oak’.

fauna: atawni ‘dove’; erbtc ‘breast of animals’; lor ‘quail’ (prob. from ‘seagull’); karič ‘scorpion’; kor ‘scorpion’; mor(m) ‘tarantula’; ozn ‘hedgehog’; ors ‘hunt, hunted animal, game’ (if from a kind of deer, roe’); salam(b) ‘francolin’; k’ašir ‘stomach of animals’; k’ar ‘basilisk, asp’.

physical world: pal ‘rock’.

products: ewl ‘oil’ (cf. above, on “flora’); kat’n ‘milk’.


religion, spiritual world: anurj ‘prophetic dream, vision’.


3.12 Language of gods vs. language of men


A possible trace of this opposition may be seen in the semantic hierarchy between two words for ‘horse’, Arm. ėš (> ‘donkey’): Skt. dśva- (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. ėš (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 AčaṙAnjn (= Ačaṙyan 1942-1962, 5 vols.), Armenian place-names have not been studied in such a thorough way. The voluminous HayTelBar 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 Jiğanyan 1991: 204). The only systematic treatment is found in Hübschmann 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 Jiğanyan 1991.

For the study of historical geography of Armenia particularly important are the works by L. Alişan, 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. Łap'anc'yan, G. Jähukyan, 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 Jähukyan 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 Barzurian, 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 Jähukyan (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 Movses Xorenac’i, *Duin* reflects an otherwise unknown Iranian word for ‘hill’; see s.v.

Čahuk, a place-name close to Naxčawan, attested in Sebőos 16 (1979: 87128). 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)”. Jīhanyan (1991: 250) reconstructs an unattested river-name *Čahuk* identical with modern *Jabri-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 Sebőos 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 Sebőos (1979: 146130), on which, see Hübschmann 1904: 458. For literature and discussion I refer to Abgaryan 1979: 316-317 522. 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 Ačarėan 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 Mel (q.v.) probably derives from PIE *mel- ‘dark, black, blue’: Gr. μέλας ‘dark, black’, Skt. māle- ‘dirt, impurity, filth’ (RV+), Lith. mėlūs ‘blue’, etc.; cf. numerous river-names in the Balkans and Asia Minor, such as Melas, Mēlos, Mella, etc. Remarkably, the etymological semantics of Arm. *mel are corroborated by the modern Turkish name: Kara-su, lit. ‘black water’. Thus, the more common Armenian name Melr-a-get, 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 Manana, 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 Yuzbašyan 1963: 128131) we read: I hatuac(s) lerinn Paxray or ayžm koč’i Gaylaxazut, <<...>> “In a part of the mountain Paxray which now is called Gaylaxazut, <<...>>”. Yuzbašyan (1968: 124) translates the beginning of the passage slightly differently: “דליי הרים פקרה”. The Divine sign (Astuacayn nšan) was
established here in the village of Bazm-albiwr (lit. “abounding in springs”), and the village has been renamed Xač’ (‘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 orjs iwreanc’ “и 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 genetive 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, Lazax (paxra), and the stag in Larabar (bāxra); see HAB 4: 7; Ačaṙean 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 Ačaṙyan (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 xač’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-kuhlerink’ = modern Lara-dal (see Eremyan 1963: 80b), both meaning ‘black mountains’; see 4.6.

Sim : Sev-sar, see s.v. place-name Sim.

Urart. Ardiunak (in Aiduni/Ajada, South of Lake Van, roughly coinciding with the territory of the province of Moks), possibly derives from Arm. ardium-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 Arayl leṙ [HayTelBar 2, 1988: 247c] with ernj ‘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 Örbelean (13-14th cent.) mentions a place in Siwnik’ named Maxal-a-tap’-k’, the first component of which is identified with maxal ‘Mantelsack, Felleisen, Tasche’ by Hübschmann (1904: 448). However, the semantics are not very probable for a place-name. One should rather think of makal ‘sheep-fold’, dial. makal, with the alternation -l : -l (cf. also Kurd. meyel, HAB 3: 231). This is an old Semitic loan and seems to be found in Urart. lower Maqaltuni (on the place-name, see N. Arutjunjan 1985: 132-133) < makal + 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. Arǰ-ovit with arǰ ‘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 kode ‘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 Arǰ-ovit, see 4.4. The hind or the stag frequently appear in this function: Elanc’berd or Elhut, probably Eljišenik’ (see Hübschmann 1904: 423-424), etc. The mountain-name Paxray, later Gaylaxazut, as noted by Aristakēs Lastivertc’i (see Yuzbašyan 1963: 12813), 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. Arciā.

Interesting is Yel’in aspūr < *Elin alibōr ‘spring of hind’ in Larabal (close to the village of Kusapat; see Lisc’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 leaṙn ‘the Dark mountain’ (= Kangar-k’), in the province of Gugark’; attested in Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.8 (1913=1991: 11316) and Asōk (11th cent.); see Hübschmann 1904: 354, 453.

*Mt’in leaṙn or Mut’n ašxarh = Masis, see Xač’kone’ 1898: 486-487; Hübschmann 1904: 453.

Seaw leaṙn ‘the Black mountain’ (Cilicia), attested in Matt’eos Urhayec’i (12th cent.) etc. [Hübschmann 1904: 466].

Siaḥ-kah lerink’ = Lara-daš (see Eremyan 1963: 80b), both meaning ‘black mountains’.

In view of these data, one may propose similar semantic interpretations for e.g. T’omnis and Sim (see s.vv.).

4.7 Place-name > wind-name

Step’anos Örbelean (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. Ačaṙyan (HAB 4: 238b) records dial. (Nor Bayazet) sot ‘an eastern, bitter wind on Sevan’. According to A.
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/Xotorǰur) and especially from the Eastern (Łarabaɫ/Arca’x 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 Xotorǰur 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’).

Łarabaɫ Kɔhak is a sacred grove of holy čapki ‘cornus sanguinea’ on the top of a hill, in the village of Gyuney-Çartar [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 Kalankatāc’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 Łarabaɫ *Eliň albiwr, see 4.5.

No dialectal forms of ClArm. tamal(i) ‘roof, house-top; prob. also ruins’ are attested in HAB 4: 367a. Its existence in the Goris region can be testified by Tamalek-k‘, a village close to the monastery of Tat’ew. Nowadays, the ruins of the village are called Təmbäläsk, from frozen API *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: Xnjorek’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 [Lanalanayan 1960: 97b; Grigoryan-Spandaryan 1971: 42\[205\]] or xünjürkec’i [Margaryan 1992: 136-137]. The -s, not specified by Margaryan, is certainly the ClArm. APl ending. Compare also Tamalek-k’: Təmbäläsk above. The same metathesis is found in p’uk’s ‘bellows’ > Meɫri p’ɔsk [Aɫayan 1954: 289b], etc.

That the APl -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 Örbelean (1250/60-1303/5). This seems to be the k’alak’ag injunction K’arunjjoy, in Yovhannēs Drasxanakertc’i (9-10th cent.) [1912=1980: 333\[4\]], identified with the present-day village of K’arahunj not far from Goris (see T’osunyan 1996: 379\[23\]). The variant with the conjunctional -a-, namely K’ar-a-hunj, is attested in Abraham kat’oisk 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 Dsel, on the foot of the mountain Čat’in-dal. It is composed of k’ar ‘stone’ and unj ‘bottom, depth’ (q.v.) (see Hübschmann 1904: 387, 479, and, independently, Margaryan 1988: 129). The passage from P’awstos Buzand 4.18 (1883=1984: 109L9f) which Hübschmann cites as a contextual illustration for unj reads as follows: zi ēr hareal zxorann i jor yunj berdin: “for the tent was pitched in the gorge beneath the fortress” (transl. Garsoïan 1989: 149L3f).

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 Örbelean).

Compare also the fortress Brd-a-hunj Lala, see Barxudaryan 1995 (< 1885): 87 (the author cites also Berdaun 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 anker ‘friend’ > hinger, etc.), and this triggered an intrusion of the conjunctional vowel -a-. This process does not seem probable. Besides, the actual dialectal reflexes of unj in Goris etc. are unj orunj, without an initial h- (for the connection of unj, ‘bottom’ with unj, ‘soot < sediment’, see s.v. unj). 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 -inj : ɛrku-h-inj ‘second’, ɛ’ws[ə]-h-inj ‘fourth’,
xts-h-inj’ ‘seventh’, etc. Note the symmetry of the semantic field (and perhaps even the etymological identity) of ganj(ak) and un(?) (see s.v. un(?) and 1.12.6).

4.9 Place-names attested in the literature and containing dialectal words or features

Anernap’or, a spot in Siwnik’, in the district of Sot’k’ (on Eastern and Southeastern sides of Sewan-Lake, neighbouring with Arc’ax/Larabal), attested by Step’anos Órhbelean (1250/60-1303/5). Hübschmann (1904: 398, cf. 389) posits a compound of unknown *amein and p’or ‘valley, ravine, district’. In my view, *amein can be identified with Larabal amxeinu and Goris amxen < ClArm. amain ‘summer’ (q.v.).

Dizap’ayt, a mountain in the South of Larabal, 2496 m; also called Ziara’. [Lisic’yan 1981: 55ab; V. Arak’elyan 1969: 281,137].

Attested in Movsès Kalankatuec’i/Dasxurane’i 2.5 (V. Arak’elyan 1983: 1191,127 [also in the title of the chapter]; transl. Dowsett 1961: 70): Yaraj k’an ztec’ aworeln tearin Ahasay Ahaniec’ axxahis i t’snameac’ hrdehec’ an vkarayark’n: i Dizap’ayt lerinn i Kataroy vans, <...>. Amenek’eak sok’ a i lea’rm Dizap’ayt acaaperael xotabat kenök’, <...>: “Before Tēr Abas was elected spiritual overseer of this land of Albania, the chapels on Dizap’ayt Hill in Kataroy Vank’ were burned down by our enemies. <...>. They fled in haste to the hill of Dizap’ayt and lived on grass, <...>”.

According to V. Arak’elyan (1969: 281,137), this mountain is nowadays called Ziara’, 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 Oxt-drn-xut’ “rock with seven doors”, situated on a rock/k’erc (ibid.). The vernacular pronunciation of the name is Ts’zzap’ad in Hadrut’, and Tszzap’ad in Šalax, Xcaberd, Xrmanj’u etc. [Polosyan 1965].


As a matter of fact, *dzap’ayt is a real word in the local vernacular, i.e. the dialect of Larabal, meaning ‘a long pole used as a support for a heap’ (see Aćarean 1913: 277a; L. Harut’yunyan 1991: 154, 377). The actual Larabal 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-hunj, a megalithic monument in Sisian, reflects the same pattern as in Stone-henge, name of a celebrated stone circle on Salisbury Plain: ‘stone’ + *hunj/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 Larabal 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 Larabal.

If this analysis is accepted, we are dealing with an old record of a dialectal word. This further implies that Larabal *dizap’ayt is not a “new word”, as is assumed by Ačaṙyan (HAB 1: 659b).

Jhahayreank’, a village of the district of Ewaylax (in the province of Siwnik‘) attested by Step’anos Örbelean (1250/60-1303/5). No etymological explanation is known to me. One may reconstruct *jol-a-har-i, identifying it with Melri jolhär ‘a kind of poplar-tree’, Karčewan jolhär ‘a tall tree of which logs/beans (jol) are made’, composed of jol ‘log, pole’ (> Melri juk) and har- ‘to beat, strike, cut’; see s.v. *jolt(a)-har-i.

See also s.v. place-name Geta(u).
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