

**Achtung!**

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Aufsatzes  
„Old Armenian and Caucasian Calendar Systems [I]“  
von Jost Gippert (1986).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in  
*Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 8, 1987, 63-72  
zu entnehmen.

**Attention!**

This is a special internet edition of the article  
„Old Armenian and Caucasian Calendar Systems [I]“  
by Jost Gippert (1986).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the  
original edition in  
*Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 8, 1987, 63-72.

**Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:**

Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 2001–2011

## **Old Armenian and Caucasian Calendar Systems**

JOST GIPPERT

Free University of Berlin

The discussion of the Old Armenian month names has been reopened by a recent article in this journal.<sup>1</sup> The author dealt mainly with the Iranian elements in the list, confronting it with a synoptical table of Middle Iranian calendar systems. In a paper read in Oslo, July 1986, I tried to show that such a confrontation hardly yields new insights with regard to the Old Armenian calendar.<sup>2</sup> It does not explain, e.g., why most of the “Iranian” month names etymologically are names not of months but of festivals, and how they were combined with perhaps autochthonous designations to give a twelve-month calendar. Instead I claimed that a different comparison should be more effective, i.e., with the calendar systems of the neighboring nonIranian peoples. This holds for two such systems which had in fact been confronted with the Armenian calendar for the first time as early as 1832,<sup>3</sup> but had been left out of the discussion again in more recent times.<sup>4</sup>

The results of my Oslo paper, in which I could deal with the Old Georgian calendar only, can be summarized as follows:

The Old Georgian month names, which were used until in the seventh or eighth century Latin designations were taken over, have come down to us in three branches of tradition. First, we have the list compiled by the Georgian lexicographer Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani (early eighteenth century) in his “*Leksik’oni kartuli*”, used by M. Brosset, through the Georgian prince Teimuraz, in his article in 1832. Second, a comparable list was preserved in Armenian tradition in the calendar

treatises of the authors Anania Širakac'i (seventh century) and Hovhannes Imastaser (twelfth century). The third and most important branch of tradition is the Old Georgian textual material itself, which reveals some 50 attestations within Bible translation and hagiography. These attestations, while largely agreeing with the lists for relative sequence, do not reestablish the chronological shape of the Old Georgian year compared with, e.g., the Julian year because there are contradictions with other parallel traditions. A tentative conclusion leads to the following equational table:

Latin month	≈ Georgian month
January	<i>surc'q'nisay</i>
February	<i>mhrak'nisay</i>
March	<i>igrik'isay</i>
April	<i>vardobisay</i>
May	<i>marialisay</i>
June	<i>tibisay</i>
July	<i>kueltobisay</i>
August	<i>axalc'lisay</i>
September	<i>stulisay</i>
October	? <i>t'irisk'nisay</i>
November	? <i>t'irisdinisay</i>
December	<i>ap'nisay</i> .

It can easily be shown that the basic structure of the Old Georgian and the Old Armenian month lists was the same. In word formation every month is in a genitive form (*navasard-i*, *ara-c'* etc.), the Georgian forms being built on genitive *-isa-*; the structure is an attributive scheme "month of (the) x." The etymological basis also agrees. If we start with the month *axalc'lisay*, and confront the Georgian list with the Armenian starting with *nawasardi*, we can state agreements in at least five positions:

Georgian month	Armenian month
1. <i>axalc'l-isay</i>	<i>nawasard-i</i>
2. <i>stul-isay</i>	<i>hoṙ-i</i>
3. <i>t'irisk'n-isay</i> ?	<i>sahm-i</i>
4. <i>t'irisdin-isay</i> ?	<i>trē</i>
5. <i>ap'n-isay</i>	<i>k'alo-c'</i>
6. <i>surc'q'n-isay</i>	<i>ara-c'</i>

7. <i>mihrak'n-isay</i>	<i>mehekan-i</i>
8. <i>igrik'isay</i>	<i>areg</i>
9. <i>vardob-isay</i>	<i>ahekan-i</i>
10. <i>marial-isay</i>	<i>marer-i</i>
11. <i>tib-isay</i>	<i>marga-c'</i>
12. <i>kueltoḅ-isay</i>	<i>hroti-c'</i>

Identity can be postulated for *mihrak'n-isay* and *mehekan-i* (7.), for *marial-isay* and *marer-i* (10.), from the Iranian preforms \**mihrakāna-* and \**maḍyār-* > \**marear*.<sup>5</sup> We can connect *t'irisdinisay* and *trē* through the Iranian name of the god *Tīr*.<sup>6</sup> The Georgian *axalc'l-isay*, obviously built on *axal-c'el-* 'New Year', represents a loan translation of the Iranian preserved in the Armenian *nawasardi*.<sup>7</sup> As a semantic concordance, the Georgian *tib-isay* has long been interpreted as 'month of mowing or haycrop',<sup>8</sup> which fits quite well with the Armenian *marga-c'* 'month of the meadows'.

Although many of the Old Georgian (and some Old Armenian) month names remain unclear, the mass of concordances above can hardly be accidental. It suggests that both lists had a common skeleton in the Iranian calendar of festivals, filled in with names reflecting seasonal terms. Some further observations: The two remaining Armenian month names from Iranian festivals, *ahekani* and *hrotic'*,<sup>9</sup> match the Georgian *vardobisay* and *kueltoḅisay*, both from a noun in *-oba-*, a suffix forming names of festivals (*vard-oba-* 'rose feast', from *vard-i* 'rose'); *vardoba-* and *kueltoḅa-* seem to stand for the Iranian models of *ahekani* and *hrotic'*, although *kueltoḅa-* is not yet clear.<sup>10</sup>

I now want to examine some problems of the Old Armenian month names for which Old Georgian gives evidential support. The present part is devoted to the names that have an Iranian origin. In a second part, I shall deal with the etymology of the Armenian *hoṛi* and *sahmi*. A discussion of the "Albanian" month names and of the chronological facts involved in the comparison of the Armenian and Caucasian calendars will finish the article.

An Iranian etymology has been claimed for six Armenian month names, only three of which fully agree with the rules for borrowings from Arsacid Middle Iranian (Parthian), viz. *nawasardi* (1.), *mareri* (10.) and *hrotic'* (12.). The first must be the genitive singular of an *-a--* stem \**nawasard*, from a Parthian \**naua-sard-* 'New Year'. *Mareri* is the genitive of \**marear*, traceable to Avestan *maiḍiiāiriia-*, the 'fifth seasonal feast', assuming a Parthian \**maḍiār-*.<sup>11</sup> The form *hrotic'*, genitive plural of an *-i-* stem \**hro(r)t-*, exactly reflects the Iranian "immortal souls" and "protecting spirits" which through Avestan

*frauuaši-* must be an *-i*-stem *frauar-ti-*<sup>12</sup> for Western Iranian. Thus, *hrotic*<sup>1</sup> is not identical with the Middle Persian festival name *fravardīgān*, but rather with the first month, *fravardīn*, in its turn derived from the festival, too.<sup>13</sup> A special treatment, however, is required for the three remaining “Iranian” names, *trē* (4.), *mehekani* (7.), and *ahekani* (9.).

The *-e*- vowels in *mehekani* and *ahekani* cannot be motivated on the basis of the proposed Iranian preforms, *\*mihrakān-* ‘festival of the god Mithra’ and *\*āhrakān-* ‘fire festival’.<sup>14</sup> These forms if from Arsacid times, should have given *m(r)hakan-* (with syncope of the pretonic *-i-*) and *a(r)hakan-* as regular outcomes. In fact, both of these are attested in Armenian tradition: *mrhakan-*, an adjective ‘related to Mithra’, occurs in Agathangelos’s history,<sup>15</sup> while *ahakani* is a *varia lectio* of *ahekani*.<sup>16</sup> Since just the oldest manuscript preserves the “abnormal” form,<sup>17</sup> we must assume that the canonical *ahekani* reflects a later development. The same assumption can be made for *mehekani*, too, but here it is the Georgian evidence which is decisive.

*Mihrak’nisay*, the normal Georgian form, must be the nominative (in *-y*) of an hypostatical paradigm built on an underlying genitive (*-isa*).<sup>18</sup> Because Georgian syncope strikes the vowels *a* and *e* in certain syllables it is not clear by itself whether the basic stem here is *mihrak’n-*, *mihrak’en-* or *mihrak’an-*. From the Parthian *\*mihrakān-* it is the stem *mihrak’an-* which becomes at once preferable.

Theoretically, a genitive like *mihrak’nisa* could belong to a vocalic stem in *-a-* or *-e-*; however, no Parthian words were borrowed into Georgian as stems in *-a-* or *-e-*, so that we can ignore this possibility. The nominative *mihrak’ni*<sup>19</sup> offers no counterevidence because it can be due to abbreviation or to false restitution from the genitive *mihrak’nisa-*. The reconstruction is in turn supported by forms like *mirk’anisa-*, e.g., in Bible translation.<sup>20</sup> These forms can be analogical levellings of different syncopations: Originally genitive *mihrak’nisa* and nominative *\*mihrk’ani* both reflected underlying *\*mihrak’an-*.

There is at least one more Old Georgian month name to be traced to an Iranian festival name, viz. *marialisay*.<sup>21</sup> The basic stem here is certainly *\*marial-*; and a nominative *marial-i* is attested, too.<sup>22</sup> If we assume that *marial-* is due to regular Georgian dissimilation of two *r*-sounds, we reach *\*mariar-* which exactly represents the state between Armenian *mareri* < *\*marear-* and Parthian *maδjār-*. Returning to *mehekani*, this form must surely share a common predecessor with Georgian *mihrak’nisay*, viz. *\*mihrakan-* < Parthian *\*mihrakān-*. We are forced to assume that *mehekan-* did develop within Armenian, from *m(r)hakan-* < *\*mihrakan-* just as *ahakan-* became *ahekan-*.

To explain the development of *-a-* to *-e-* in the middle syllables of *mehekani* and *ahekani*, we must consider the third Iranian name that left traces in both the Armenian and the Georgian calendar: *trē*.

The name *trē* was treated by R. Schmitt in his article mentioned above. He considers it to be the genitive of a noun *\*Tri* < Proto-Armen. *\*Tiri*, exactly matching a Parthian *\*tīrī*. *Trē* would be from a preform *\*Treay* = /tareay/, with a sound change as in *tēr* ‘master, lord’ < *\*ti-ayr*.<sup>23</sup> Schmitt’s argument, however, offers several problems with respect to relative chronology. The equation of *ē* in *trē* and in *tēr* is crucial, because the element *\*ti-* in the preform of the latter word has to be traced back to pretonic *tē-* itself, as the maintenance of the first *i* in *ti-kin* ‘lady’ shows; in view of words like *asteay*, genitive *astēi* ‘spear’, one wonders which period of Armenian sound history to assign the change *\*-eay* to *-e* to. Second, a Proto-Armenian *\*Tiri* would lead to *\*Tir*, not *\*Tri*, because apocopy of final syllables is prior to syncopy. The central problem is one of stem class chronology when positing a nominative *\*tiri*.<sup>24</sup>

A connection between Georgian *t’irisdinisay* and Armenian *trē* became probable as soon as the latter was traced back to the name of the Iranian god *Tīr*.<sup>25</sup> This, however, leaves the second element of the Georgian *t’irisdinisay* unexplained, as it does the name of the third Georgian month, *t’irisk’nisay*. It is just this element, *t’iri-*, which bears the clue of the problem.

In my Oslo paper I concluded that the material available does not suffice to decide which is the true order of the two months in the table above (and in Saba Orbeliani’s lexicon). Both cases fail to reveal the exact names of the months.<sup>26</sup> With due caution, I proposed that *t’irisk’nisay* and *t’irisdinisay* could be two different names of the one (fourth) month matching Armenian *trē*. This was suggested by the fact that for Armenian *trē*, too, there existed a parallel form which can be etymologically cognate: *trekani*, which occurs at least once in the Girk’ *t’it’oc’*.<sup>27</sup> Given the identification of *mehe-kani* and *mihra-k’nisay* with the Iranian “Mithra-festival” *\*mihrakān-*, *tre-kani* should be equated with *t’iris-k’nisay* and an Iranian festival name, too. The festival can only be that of the god *Tīr*, the 13th day of the month of *Tīr*, and called *tīragān* in Middle Persian.<sup>28</sup>

Neither *trekan-i* nor *t’irisk’n-isay* can however match exactly *tīragān*, which points to a Parthian *\*tīrakān-*. The Armenian *-e-* of the central syllable, again, fails to agree with the Parthian *-a-*. But in this case, we may assume that the name should be reconstructed as *\*tīr(i)akān-* > *\*tīreakan-*, regularly yielding *trekan-* in Armenian. The Georgian *t’irisk’nisay*, of course, seems to disagree, since we

would expect *\*t'iriak'nisay*. We seek, then, some evidence for the *-s-* of *t'irisk'n-* being a secondary linguistic or graphical phenomenon. In the 1956 edition of the Armenian author Hovhannes Imastaser a list of Georgian month names as part of a calendar treatise is reproduced after four different Erevan manuscripts.<sup>29</sup> In three of them the third and fourth month names occur in nearly identical forms, viz. *tirisdi/tirisdini*, *tiritdi/tirissdini* and *tirisdi/tirisdini*; further agreeing with the forms *tirist'i/tirisdeni* and *tirisdin/tirisdini* attested in the treatise of Anania Širakac'i.<sup>30</sup> The fourth manuscript, however, offers a very divergent reading which must be taken seriously: *trisdidos* and *treakan* (in this order!).<sup>31</sup> Although there might be an Armenian influence, the latter form seems to conceal just the postulated *\*t'iriak'an-*.

The *-s-* of *t'irisk'n-* can be motivated as an analogical levelling from the neighbouring name, *t'irisdinisay*. Equating *t'irisk'nisay* with Armenian *trekani* and assuming that *t'irisdinisay* originally meant the same month, the latter form should converge semantically with Armenian *trē* as the synonym of *trekani*. We should thus postulate the meaning "month of (the god) *Tīr*" for *t'irisdinisay*, too. This form cannot be a genitive of the god's name alone: it can, however, come from a borrowing from Armenian, indeed attested in the genitive form *Tri dic'*.<sup>32</sup> The plurale tantum *di-k'* 'deity' contained in this figure, taken over into Georgian, yields *\*di-ni*, which might have been reinterpreted as a singular *\*din-i* in the appositive construction with the single deity *Tīr*. *T'irisdinisay* is seen to be built upon the Georgian rendering of the apposition *Tri dic'*, *\*t'iris dinisa*,<sup>33</sup> "the (month) of *Tīr*, (of) the deity"; the *-s-* of *t'iris-* spread into the synonymous *t'irisk'nisay* after both names lost their transparency,<sup>34</sup> doubtlessly, more easily if the original form of *t'irisk'nisay* was *\*t'iriak'nisay*, not *\*t'irak'nisay*.<sup>35</sup>

Georgian thus supports Armenian *trekani* as *\*tiriakan-* < Iranian *\*tīr(i)yakān-* as opposed to, e.g., Middle Persian *tiragān*; and throws new light on the origin of *trē*, which should reflect a stem in *-ya-*, namely *\*tīr(i)ya-*.<sup>36</sup> As *\*tiriya*, this would have led to an Armenian nominative *Tri* (by apocope, and syncopy of the first syllable *-i-*),<sup>37</sup> which persists in *Tri dic'* if we assume that only the final member of the group was inflected.<sup>38</sup> *Trē* would be an archaic genitive of *Tri* < *\*tiriya-*, retained instead of a regular *\*trwoy* (from the stems in *\*-iyo-*), because it was no longer analyzed.

Returning to *mehekani* and *ahekani*, we can now propose that the vowel *-e-* is due to influence of *trekani*, where the *-e-* was justified, a development that must have taken place within Armenian.<sup>39</sup>

One problem remains with regard to *mehekani*: the vowel *-e-* of the first syllable, which cannot continue Iranian *\*-i-*, cp. the adjective

*mrhakan*.<sup>40</sup> A secondary assimilation of the reduced vowel resulting from syncope to the *-e-* of the following syllable, which was secondary itself, would match, e.g., the result in *mehean* ‘shrine’ if this really is connected with the name of Mithra, too,<sup>41</sup> the preform being something like *\*mih(r)iyan*; cp. the genitive *mehe(n)i*. There are, however, other forms (the personal names *Mehružan/Merhužan/Mehužan* or the family name *Mehran*<sup>42</sup>) for which such an assimilation cannot be presumed. Together with some other similar cases, such as the name *Meherdates* met with in Tacitus,<sup>43</sup> they point to a different suggestion: There might have existed an Arsacid pronunciation with the *-i-* lowered to *-e-* by which the Armenian forms were influenced.<sup>44</sup> As we have no authentic testimony of the pronunciation of short vowels in Western Iranian of that time, we must leave this problem open.<sup>45</sup>

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. Schmitt, “Zu den alten armenischen Monatsnamen”, *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 6, 1985, pp. 91-100.

<sup>2</sup> An extended version of my Oslo paper “Die altgeorgischen Monatsnamen” (“Monatsnamen”) will be published in the “Proceedings” of the “3rd Caucasian Colloquium” (to appear Oslo, 1987).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the two articles of M. Brosset J<sup>e</sup>, “Calcul chronologique des Géorgiens, § 2: Des mois” and “Extrait du manuscrit arménien no. 114 de la Bibliothèque royale, relatif au calendrier géorgien”, in: (Nouveau) Journal Asiatique, Sér. 2, 10 = 21, 1832, pp. 171-175 and 526-532. For a later treatment cf. K.P. Patkanov, *Neskol’ko slov o nazvanijax drevnix armjanskix mesjacev*, Sanktpeterburg 1871, pp. 35-43.

<sup>4</sup> This holds not only for the article of R. Schmitt, but also for V. Bănăţeanu, “Le calendrier arménien et les anciens noms des mois”, in: *Studia et Acta Orientalia* 10, 1980, pp. 33-46, who made use of parts of the material published by Brosset and Patkanov only. Two extensive treatises have been completely ignored by Armenology apparently because they appeared in Georgian journals and in the Georgian language: P’. Ingoroq’va, “Jvel-kartuli c’armartuli k’alendari” (“The Old Georgian pagan calendar”), in: *Sakartvelos muzeumis moambe* (“Messenger of the Museum of Georgia”), 6, 1929-30, pp. 373-446 and 7, 1931-32, pp. 260-336, and K’. K’ek’eliġe, “Jveli kartuli c’elic’adi” (“The Old Georgian year”), in: *St’alini saxelobis Tbilisi Saxelmc’ipo Universit’et’is ŗromebi* (“Working papers of the Tbilisi State University by the name of Stalin”) 18, 1941, reprinted in the author’s “*Et’iudebi jveli kartuli lit’erat’uris ist’oriidan*” (“Studies in the history of Old Georgian literature”) 1, 1956, pp. 99-124.

<sup>5</sup> The first etymology was proposed by P. de Lagarde as early as 1866 (cf. his “Gesammelte Abhandlungen”, Leipzig, p. 9), the second by J. Marquart in 1907 (cf. his “Untersuchungen zur Geschichte von Eran” 2, Leipzig, p. 205). Cp. Schmitt, op. cit., p. 94 sq.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. de Lagarde, l.cit. and now Schmitt, l.cit.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. e.g., K’ek’elije, op.cit., p. 101.

<sup>8</sup> The equation was proposed for the first time by the Georgian prince Teimuraz who prepared the material used by Brosset in his article in 1832; cf. *Journal asiatique* ... p. 171.

<sup>9</sup> For the presumed Iranian etymologies cf. de Lagarde, op.cit., p. 9 and 163, resp. and Schmitt, op.cit., p. 95.

<sup>10</sup> The proposal of K’ek’elije (op.cit., p. 102), *kue-* ‘downward, below’ > \**kueltoba-* ‘those being below, in the underworld’, has much in its favour. This could be a calque on the Iranian *fravardigān*, rendered *ῥεχυνία* in Greek by the Byzantine author Menander (cf. de Lagarde, op.cit., p. 161). – For details see “Monatsnamen”.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Schmitt, op.cit., p. 94 sq. In answer to Schmitt’s question on *nawasardi*, “wie es bei den Armeniern zu dieser Namengebung gekommen sein mag”, we must consider that it is not the Iranian month names but the festival calendar which is the main basis of the Armenian month name list.

<sup>12</sup> für Helmut Humbach, München 1986, p. 172.

<sup>13</sup> That *fravardin* is the first month while Armenian *hrotic* ‘is the twelfth is explained by the fact that the festival was located between the old and new year; cf. also Schmitt, op.cit., p. 95 sq.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Schmitt. l.c., who notes the anomaly but does not offer any solution.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. § 790 of Thomson’s edition (Albany 1976, p. 328): *Gayr hasanēr i Mrhakan meheann anowaneal ordwoyn Aramazday* ... ‘He came to the temple of Mihr, called the son of Aramazd’.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. the critical edition by P. Inglisian of “Kiwrlī Erusałēmac’woc’ t’ult’ aṛ Kostandios Kaysr. Usumnasirut’iun ew bnagir (sarunakut’iun)”, *Handes Amsorya* 79, 1965, pp. 1-16, § 4; *Zi yawowrsn sowrb yaynosik sowrb Pentēkostēni, i glowx Ahakani* ... ‘For in those holy days of the holy Pentecost, in the beginning of (the month) Ahakani ...’ (*i glowx Ahakani* translates *Νόνημας Μαΐας*, cf. *Patrologia Graeca*, t. 33, Parisiis 1892, 1169).

<sup>17</sup> A Vienna manuscript of the X.-XI. century (noted as A), cf. Inglisian, op.cit., p. 2.

<sup>18</sup> This type of word formation is a well known feature of Old Georgian.

<sup>19</sup> In the martyrology of St. Philectimon.

<sup>20</sup> E.g., 2 Mos. 40, 2 in the freshly edited “Mcxeta” bible. - The loss of word internal *-h-* is well known in Old Georgian.

<sup>21</sup> Loan translations are not at issue here.

<sup>22</sup> Again the martyrology of St. Philectimon.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Schmitt, op.cit., p. 94.

<sup>24</sup> Schmitt refers to *ti-kin* himself (l.cit.). As for the relative chronology of apocopy and syncopy, cf., e.g., the same author’s “Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen”, Innsbruck 1981, p. 37sq. (§ II.2.7./8.).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Patkanov, op.cit., p. 39.

<sup>26</sup> *t’irisk’nisa-* occurs in two martyrologies, one of which has the variant reading *t’iris k’ninisa-* (the martyrology of St. Thalele contained in the Georgian ms. of the Bodleian library, f. 118v, cf. P. Peeters, *Analecta Bollandiana* 31, 1912, p. 308). For *\*t’irisdinisay* we have only one attestation in Old Georgian reading *t’irisdidi* and one attestation in an XVIII. century manuscript colophon reading *t’irisdeni*. The lexicon of Sulxan-Saba Orbeliani presents the forms *t’irisk’nisa* and *t’irisdeni*. For the Armenian tradition cf. below.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. the edition Tiflis 1901, p. 273.

<sup>28</sup> For this festival cf., e.g., M. Boyce, “On the calendar of Zoroastrian feasts”, *BSOAS* 33, 1970, p. 534 sqq.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. A.G. Abrahamyan, *Hovhannes Imastaseri matenagrut’yunə*, Erevan 1956, p. 74.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. A.G. Abrahamyan, *Anania Širakac’u matenagrut’yunə*, Erevan 1944, p. 119.

<sup>31</sup> This is f. 56 of the *Matenadaran* ms. no. 1999, which shows some further peculiarities, too. E.g., it is the only ms. to give the correct first letter of both the names *surc’q’nisay* and *tibisay*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. § 778 of Agathangelos’s history in Thomson’s edition. According to Thomson (p. 483), the form *Tiur* found in other editions “has no manuscript authority”; for the god’s actual name in Armenian cf. below.

<sup>33</sup> The reinterpretation of *\*dini* as a singular form is clear because the plural genitive would have been *\*di-ta*, not *\*dinisa*.

<sup>34</sup> The variant readings quoted above show how both names influenced each other: *t’irisdidi* contains *did* ‘great’; and *t’irisk’ninisa-*, *k’nini* ‘small’. Note that in 1932 P. Ingoroq’va still maintained the proposal of Brosset a hundred years before, that *t’irisdeni* (sic) means “the running of water” and is to be connected with *t’irili*

‘weeping’ (op cit., 2, p. 331 sq.).

<sup>35</sup> The reconstruction of *-ria-* seems to be supported by the Jewish Talmud, too, where a “Median” feast is mentioned under the name of *Turyaskai* or *Triaski*; cf. S.H. Taqizadeh, “The Iranian Festivals Adopted by the Christians and Condemned by the Jews”, BSOAS 10, 1939-42, p. 637. The *-s-*, however, might rather be due to a mutilation; cp. the form of the *mhrakan* feast given as *Muharneki* or *Moharneki* (ib.).

<sup>36</sup> This assumption would well fit with the Middle Iranian attestations of the god’s name as a first member of compounds with the regular spelling <try->; cf. the examples offered by W.B. Henning in A.D.H. Bivar, “A Rosette phiale Inscribed in Aramaic”, BSOAS 24, 1961, p. 191. The original name of the god was supposed as “*Tīrī* oder etwa *Tīria*” by Th. Nöldeke, “Persische Studien 1“, Wien (SBAW, 116) 1888. p. 420.

<sup>37</sup> For the borrowing of Iranian *-iya-* stems into Armenian words in *-i* cf. E. Benveniste, “Les nominatifs arméniens en *-i*“, REA 10. 1930, p. 82 sq. with examples such as *ari-k*’ from *\*ariya-*.

<sup>38</sup> This would be the normal construction of Old Armenian; cf. H. Jensen, Altarmenische Grammatik, Heidelberg 1959, § 427. Note the difference in Georgian “*t’iris dinisa*”; perhaps the form *tri* was reinterpreted as a genitive (*-i*!) at the time of the borrowing into Georgian. The same reinterpretation might have led to the restitution of a form *Tiur* as a nominative in the older editions of Agathangelos’s history; cf. note 32 above.

<sup>39</sup> The analogical influence might have struck *mehekani* more thoroughly than *ahekani* as the later forms *meheki* and *ahki* show, the latter of which seems to represent the Middle Armenian development of *\*ahaka-ni*, not *ahekani*.

<sup>40</sup> I do not see why Hübschmann (AG. p. 194) regards *mrhakan* as a “spätere Neubildung” as well as *mhrakan*. The metathesis of *\*-hr-* to *-rh-* points to a borrowing in Arsacid times, cp. Hübschmann’s own doublet *asxarh/sahr* (op.cit., p. 13).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Hübschmann, op.cit., p. 194.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. the collection in Hübschmann. op.cit., p.52 sq.

<sup>43</sup> Annales, 12, 10.

<sup>44</sup> Cp. the variant reading *mhrak’nisa-* appearing in Georgian as, e.g., 1 Esra 6, 15 in the so called Ošk’i-Bible (dated AD 978). These readings are not decisive, however, because there may be an influence of an Armenian model containing *mehekani* itself.

<sup>45</sup> My thanks are due to G. Klingenschmitt for a thorough discussion of the problems dealt with above.