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It is a well established fact that for the reconstruction of the Middle Iranian lexicon, the *Nebenüberlieferung* provided by Old Armenian is extremely valuable if not indispensable. In comparison with it, the *Nebenüberlieferung* of Old Georgian has for long been underestimated, mostly because it was regarded as a mere offshoot of the Armenian tradition. It can be proven on both linguistic (phonetic) and textual grounds, however, that the Old Georgian share of Middle Iranian lexical items is mostly independent of Armenian as a mediator and that it must be taken serious as a witness in its own right, thus indicating a more widespread influence of Iranian languages extending into the Caucasian area.\(^1\)

To the two ancient Caucasian *Nebenüberlieferungen*, a third one can now be added after the first manuscript remains of the so-called "Albanian" people have been detected in St. Katherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai. As is well known, this people established an independent state with an autocephalous church in the Middle Ages; situated in what is now the Northwestern part of Azerbaijan, it was adjacent to both Armenia and Georgia, and it must have witnessed as strong an impact of the Iranian world as its neighbours, given that it had been ruled by Arsakid and Sasanian emperors for centuries before.\(^2\) Without anticipating the *editio princeps* of the manuscript remains (Biblical texts mostly from the New Testament),\(^3\) we can take it for granted even now that the Albanian language as represented in them was a predecessor of present-day Udi, a Lezgian language spoken in North-West Azerbaijan and Georgia,\(^4\) and that it was influenced by

\(^1\) Cf. ANDRONIKAŠVILI 1968 and GIPPERT 1993 for detailed studies on this question.

\(^2\) The most extensive source on the Caucasian “Albanians” available is the “History of the Alban people” (*Patmowt`iwn alowanic*) by the 10th century writer Movsēs Kalankatowac`i (also known as Dasxowranc`i); cf. the English translation by DOWSETT 1961. Arm. *alvan-k* corresponds to Greek Ἀλβανοί (→ “Albanians”), the traditional name of the people.

\(^3\) The edition is at present being prepared by Z. Aleksiaš`e (Tbilisi), J. Gippert (Frankfurt) and W. Schulze (Munich) in cooperation with J.-P. Mahé (Paris) and will be published in the series “Palaeographia mediaevalis” (Brepols, Turnhout) in 2007. The project has been supported by the Volkswagen Foundation since 2000; cf. http://armazi.uni-frankfurt.de/armaz04.htm. For preliminary reports cf. ALEKSIAŠ`E 1997, 2001 and 2003 and ALEKSIAŠ`E/MAHÉ 2001.

\(^4\) Until recently, Udi was spoken in the towns of Nij and Vartašen in Azerbaijan, the settlement in Okdomberi (formerly Zinobiani) in East Georgia (Kakheti) being an offshoot of the latter town (from the 1920’s on). After the Azeri-Armenian clashes of the early
Middle Iranian languages to a similar extent and in a similar fashion as Old Georgian was. This implies that we have to face the same problem here as with the latter language, viz. to determine whether a given lexical item may have been borrowed independently or via armeniaca. Given that there are good reasons to believe that the “Albanian” texts were translated from Armenian models, the latter assumption might suggest itself; in the following pages, however, a few examples will be discussed which suffice to show, in my opinion, that not all Iranian elements to be detected in the “Albanian” texts can be traced back to former Armenian usage.

In the rendering of Greek μακάριος “blessed” (in the sense of German “selig”, not in the sense of a priestly blessing, German “gesegnet”), Armenian uses the word erani which can clearly be shown to be an Iranian loanword. Its basis must be a stem like the one present in Avestan rānīōs.kərəitīm (Y. 44,6; 47,3; 50,2), an epithet of the cow meaning “joy-providing”;\(^5\) according to the communis opinio, the stem *rānjah- this compound contains is a comparative formation\(^6\) “more joyful” pertaining to the IIr. root we have in Skt. \(\sqrt{rān}/n\)\(^7\). Note that the prothesis of a vowel to the word-initial \(r\) is a normal feature of Old Armenian, also occurring in the quasi-homonym eran-k “loins, hip, thigh” which must reflect a Middle Iranian correspondent of Ya\(v\). \(\overset{\wedge}{rān\text{-}}\) “thigh”\(^8\).

The Old Georgian equivalent of Arm. erani “blessed” is neṭar-ı; for this word, too, an Iranian etymology has been proposed, tracing it back to MPers. nēktar, the comparative formation of nēk "good".\(^9\) In contrast to that of Arm. erani, this derivation cannot be taken for granted, however, because both the phonetic development\(^10\) and the semantics\(^11\) involved would remain unparalleled. Instead,

---

5. Thus HUMBACH 1991, p. 151.
6. H. W. BAILEY’s proposal to derive erani from “Av. rānya-” (1982, 460) is misleading as no such stem is attested in Avestan.
8. Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904, p. 1523; HÜBSCHMANN 1897, p. 147, no. 216.
10. ANDRONIAŠVILI (1968, p. 358) presupposes a MPers. preform “nēttar < nēktar” which is not attested as such, however. The reference to HÜBSCHMANN, P.St. (ib. Fn. 1) is void, too, as this author only discusses the preservation of the OIr. -t- in the given context, i.e., following another voiceless stop (1895, p. 188). For NPers., too, only nētktar (with the consonant cluster retained) is attested.
11. ANDRONIAŠVILI (1968, p. 358) refers to MPers. wahišt, lit. “best (place)” (Georg. sauketes) having adopted the meaning of “paradise” (Georg. samotxe) which prevails in NPers. bihišt. A similar semantic shift into the religious sphere cannot be proved for MPers. nēktar or its NPers. descendant, however; cf., e.g., Dēnk. IV,85 (642,13 M) where nēk-ı az nēktarān, lit. “good over the better” is attached as an attribute to a bowl (tašt) which is apt for being used by a ruler, clearly referring to its outer appearance and not to anything mental (stān tašt-i nēk-ı abar nēktarān az hutaštagān i kard “take the bowl which is the better than the best of [all] the well-formed [bowls] that have been made”).
the inner-Kartvelian etymology connecting it with Old Georgian naṭr- “to wish, desire, felicitate, congratulate” has a good deal in its favour.\(^\text{12}\)

Yet another word meaning “blessed” in the given sense has now been attested for “Albanian”. In two passages from the New Testament texts (Mt. 16,17 and Tit. 2,13) and in the initial lines of Ps. 31,1 quoted in a marginal gloss, we read, as the equivalent of Armenian erni and Greek μακάριος, a word bamgen, which cannot be explained on the basis of Udi (or other Lezgian) word material. A possible source for it can be found in Iranian, however, in the word family surrounding Parth. and MPers. bām “splendour, ray” which is clearly associated (or associable) with the religious sphere.\(^\text{13}\) It is true that of the words pertaining to this family, none has been detected so far in Middle Iranian that would match Alb. bamgen exactly in its formation and phonetic shape, but it is well conceivable that we have the common adjectival suffix -gēn here which must have originated in an extension of a primary *-k- suffix with a secondary *-ēn- (< *-ajna-) element. Alb. bamgen would thus represent an Old Iranian formation *bām(a)kajna-, presupposing both the Middle Iranian voicing of the

---

\(^{12}\) The coherence of neṭar- with naṭr- is clearly indicated by Gen. 30,13 where both words occur side by side, reflecting Greek μακάριος and its derivative μακαρίζω: neṭar var me rametu mnafriden dedani “Blessed I am, for I am used to being blessed by the women” (Μακαρία ἐγώ, δότι μακαρίζουσιν με αἱ γυναῖκες). ANDRONIKAŠVILI (1968, p. 355) obviously regards the Georgian verb to be secondarily derived from neṭar-; the phonetic process implied (“neṭar > nṭar > naṭr”) remains ad hoc and unparalleled, though. Given that the word has equivalents in the sister-languages of Georgian, Megrelian and Svan, it seems more probable that we have a Kartvelian root here as proposed by GAMOŔELIŠE/MAÇA\[\text{VARIANI} (1967, p. 159; cf. also FAHNRICH/ŠARV\[\text{ELADEZ} 2000, p. 353 f.), even though it remains unclear what the r-element present in both neṭar- and naṭr- might have originated in if the root was *naṭ-. To account for the coexistence of na- and ne- in Georgian, one might presuppose that the “root” *nalet(r) emerged by derivation itself, the underlying forms being verbal adjectives (participles) of a root *-t(r)- built with the prefixes na- and ne- (cf. FAHNRICH/ŠARV\[\text{ELADEZ 2000, pp. 350 and 355 for an etymological account of these morphemes}. *-t(r)- might further be identified with the root *muar/-yr- worked out by G.A. KLIMOV (1998, p. 187; cf. also FAHNRICH/ŠARV\[\text{ELADEZ 2000, p. 433) on the basis of Megrelian and Svan material; with the meaning “to brighten, enlighten” this root seems close enough to naṭr- (“enlightened” > “blessed, felicitated”), and the phonetic structure of this root might be responsible for the r-less variants of the latter. Note that both neṭar- and -naṭr- (the latter also in the adjectival derivative sanatrel-, lit. “to be blessed”) appear in the so-called Khemeti texts which represent the oldest stratum of the Georgian language attested (ca. 5th-8th centuries); cf. my forthcoming edition of the Vienna palimpsest Codex Vind. georg. 2 (to appear in the series “Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi” 2007).

\(^{13}\) Cf., e.g., the attestations of MPers.Parth. b’m (bām) “splendour, brilliance” as well as MPers. b‘myg (bāmīg), Parth. b‘myn (bāmēn) and MPers.Parth. b‘myw (bāmēw), all meaning “radiant, brilliant, splendid” or the like, in the Manichaean hymns compiled by RECK 2004, p. 184. MPers.B bāmīg is often attributed to the word wahišt in the sense of “paradise” (e.g., Šnš. ST 22,18; PT Ay.Zar. 2; etc.). None of these words seems to have been used as an attribute of people, however.
intervocalic k and the syncope of the word-internal Fugenvokal\textsuperscript{14} as in MPers. Parth. nām\textsuperscript{gēn} “famous” (from nām “name”; MirMan. III, 867). Parth. zēng\textsuperscript{gēn} “armed” (from zēn “weapon”; MirMan. III, 851 a.o.), MPers. bām\textsuperscript{gēn} “fearful” (from bām “fear, terror”; Wiz.Zadspr. 31,3), sahm\textsuperscript{gēn} “terrible” (from sahm “threat”; PT: Ay.Wuz.Mihr 154 f.), šārm\textsuperscript{gēn} “ashamed” (from šārm “shame”; PT: Hand.Adurb.Marasp. 50), or ābgēn-ag “crystal” (from āb “water”, lit. “water-like”; Šnš. MT 2, 5b side by side with āb).\textsuperscript{15} With both these changes, the loan might best be attributed to a later Middle Iranian period; as *bām\textsuperscript{gēn} has not been attested as such in (either Zoroastrian or Manichaean) Middle Persian, the source may well have been a Northwestern stratum. Note that Albanian resembles both Armenian and Georgian in that it can by no means distinguish long and short a vowels, and as in the alphabets of the two neighbouring languages, a letter representing a “long ē” is present but with its usage restricted to instances of the rather diphthongal sequence of e+i; so we cannot expect Middle Iranian *bām\textsuperscript{gēn} to be represented different from b\textsuperscript{am}g\textsuperscript{en} here.

Old Armenian and Old Georgian differ considerably in the rendering of Greek πυρεῖον, θηματήριον and other terms denoting “censers”. In Armenian, the regular equivalent of this word in the Bible is bowr\textsuperscript{vār}, occurring e.g. in Heb. 9,4, while Old Georgian uses sa-ccex-ur-i, lit. “place (or vessel) for fire (cecxl-i)” or sa-sakum\textsuperscript{e}v\textsuperscript{e}l-e-, lit. “place (or vessel) for incense (sakum\textsuperscript{e}v\textsuperscript{e}l-i)”.\textsuperscript{16} Georgian did possess a closer equivalent of the Arm. word, however, viz. berv\textsuperscript{a}r-i (with a later variant berv\textsuperscript{a}l-i) which appears in the same sense elsewhere.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{14} The MPers. and Parth. derivatives of bām might suggest a formation *bām\textsuperscript{gēn}- rather than *bām\textsuperscript{a}g\textsuperscript{e}n, presupposing an OIr. i-stem *bām-i-. The only cognates of this word in Avestan are the YAv. compound vispā.bāma- "all-glittering" (Yt. 10,136) and its extension vispā.bāmīia- (Yt. 15,15); both are no more decisive for this question than MPers.Parth. b\textsuperscript{m}d\textsuperscript{d} (bām\textsuperscript{dā}) “dawn”.

\textsuperscript{15} In MPers.M rēškēn "hurtful, harmful" from rēš "wound, harm" (written <ry̱škyn> in Salemann, Man. III, 5) the voicing of the -k- did not occur because of the adjoining š. Formations such as MPers.B zamīg\textsuperscript{n} "earthen" (Šnš. MT 2, 117) or pambag\textsuperscript{e}n "made from cotton" (ib. 4, 4) stand apart here as they still rely upon existing stems in -g (< *-k-), cf. zamīg "earth" and pambag "cotton"; synchronically, they must be described as formations in -ēn (as the adjectives pašmēn "woolen", from pašm "wool", or srīwēn "horney", from srī "horn", occurring in the same contexts).

\textsuperscript{16} Arm. bowr\textsuperscript{vār} (var. bowr\textsuperscript{v}ow) stands for Gr. πυρεῖον in Ex. 38,1,3,4 (= Ex. 38,22,23,24 LXX; the Georg. text of the Oški and Jerusalem OT mss. [= OL] of the 10-11th centuries and the Mxeta Bible [S] of the 17th century has sacecx\textsuperscript{u}r\textsuperscript{e}-); Lev. 10,1 (Georg. OIS sacecx\textsuperscript{u}r\textsuperscript{e}-); 16,12; Num. 4,14; 16,17,18 (M sacecx\textsuperscript{u}r\textsuperscript{e}-); 16,46 (= 17,11 LXX; Georg. M sasakum\textsuperscript{e}v\textsuperscript{e}l\textsuperscript{-}; passages missing in O); 4.Kŏn. (= 2.Kŏn.) 25,15; 2.Chr. 4,22 (M sacecx\textsuperscript{u}r\textsuperscript{e}-); the Arm. equivalent of πυρεῖον is missing in Ex. 27,3. Gr. θηματήριον is rendered by Arm. bowr\textsuperscript{v}a\textsuperscript{r} in 2.Chr. 26,19 (M and the Vienna palimpsest have sasakum\textsuperscript{e}v\textsuperscript{e}l\textsuperscript{-}), Ez. 8,11 (OIS and the Gelati Bible [G] have sasakum\textsuperscript{e}v\textsuperscript{e}l\textsuperscript{-}), and Hebr. 9,4 (all Georg. redactions have sasakum\textsuperscript{e}v\textsuperscript{e}l\textsuperscript{-}). In St. John's apocryp. (5,8), Arm. bowr\textsuperscript{v}ar os\textsuperscript{̱}ki li xnkōv, “a golden censer full of incense”, renders Gr. φίλας χρυσᾶς γεμοῦσας θηματήριον (the Georg. version has lākhnāni okrōysanī savsoni sakumeveli\textsuperscript{a}ta corresponding to the Greek text).
Arm. bowr̄var̄ has been successfully traced back to a Middle Iranian preform *bōδ̣yaɾ which, with a literal meaning of “perfume-bearing”, may well have developed into a word denoting “censers”; the sound changes involved would be typical for the early, “Arsacid” stratum of Iranian loans in Armenian (*ō in pretonic syllables reduced to u, *ő replaced by r).18 If Georgian berval-i is to be identified with this, its e vowel must be explained both if a via armeniaca is assumed and if not, as this is not the usual outcome of either Middle Iranian *ō or Armenian u. Assuming the word to have been taken over from Armenian, we might easily see an influence of popular etymology here which connected the word with the verbal root ber- meaning “to blow” and, esp., its masdar (“infinitive”) ber-va.19 On the other hand, the e might also be regarded as a reflex of an umlaut process if it were traced back directly to an Iranian source still containing an i vowel at the morpheme boundary in the given compound, i.e., *bōδ̣i-yaɾ- < Old Iranian *baydi-bar-. That the first compound member must once have been an -i-stem is at least suggested by its Avestan counterpart, baoiδ-.20 Deducing Old Georgian bervar- directly from an early Middle Iranian trisyllabic preform *bōδ̣i-yaɾ- would imply two assumptions, however, that remain problematic: First, the “umlaut” leading from *ō to *ē (> Georgian e) seems not to be attested elsewhere so far,21 and second, there are no certain

17 The word seems not to be attested in translations from the Bible but in one of the oldest autochthonous hagiographical texts, viz. the legend of St. Habo of Tpiilisi (8th century). Here, we have clear allusion to Biblical (OT) traditions: da ḵualad adgilī igi samsxueploysa šenisay emsgavsa bervarsa Ahronisssa da Zakariayssa mḏdelsaysa, rametu nakwercxalsa mas zeda cecxlisasa āḡiidoda, vitareca sulnelebay sākumeveltay “and again, the place of your sacrifice was similar to the censer of Aaron and Zachariah the priests, for from the embers of the fire, it ascended like the scent of incense ...” (80, 8ff. in the edition ABULAΞE 1963). In the Arm. version of the Georgian Chronicle, the Patmowtwa vrac, bowr̄var̄ is the equivalent of sasakumevelt- again (PV 79,15 ≈ KC 84,12 / MKA MKB 115,13). — Neither bervar- nor berval- is documented in the Old Georgian dictionaries; the variant with -l-, if it exists, shows the usual result of a dissimilation of two r sounds in Georgian.

18 Cf. HÜBSCHMANN 1897, p. 122, no. 116, and p. 123, no. 119. As against HÜBSCHMANN’s view, the final –r of the word does not disprove the derivation of -var̄ from *-bar- “bearing” as it might have been affected by a dissimilation (against the first -r-); besides, the Iranian origin of -var̄ has been corroborated by Sogd. bō̥hr- occurring, among others, in the Vessāntara Jātaka (P1, 3 and 5). In any case, Arm. var̄el “to kindle”, regarded as the real source of -var̄ by HÜBSCHMANN, may have exerted a secondary influence by popular etymology.

19 This solution was first suggested by ANDRONIKAȘVILI 1968, p. 173; it manifests itself in SCHULTZE’s translation of St. Habo’s legend which has “dem Wehen [= Wohlgeruch]” (1905, p. 41).


21 ANDRONIKAȘVILI 1968, p. 292f., following MARR 1902, p. 106, identifies Georg. ber-i “old (person), monk” with MPers. pîr “old man” which she regards as an equivalent of OPers. paruviya- (in a compound paruviya- γāra “passed year” ≈ NPers. pîrār, which is not attested though). On the basis of today’s knowledge, this would presuppose that
examples proving that the substitution of $\delta$ by $r$ occurred in direct loans from Middle Iranian (as in Armenian): There are quite a lot of Iranian loans in Old Georgian which do show $rs$ instead of Middle Iranian $\partial$s, but they can all have entered the language via armeniaca. As to the syncope of the middle syllable, this might have occurred both within Middle Iranian (i.e., before the borrowing but necessarily after the umlauting process) or within the prehistory of Old Georgian (i.e., after the borrowing but before the emergence of literacy); note, however, that within Georgian, $i$ is especially resistant against syncopation.

New light is thrown on this bundle of questions by the “Albanian” manuscript remains. In Heb. 9,4, we here read a word bodîvăr as the equivalent of Armenian bowr̄var and Greek θοματήρ, and it is clear right from the beginning that this represents the same Iranian etymon, albeit in a form closer to what its Middle Iranian sounding might have been in that both the $o$ colour of the first syllable vowel and a dental stop instead of the Armenian $r$ seem to have been preserved in it. It must be admitted, though, that the exact pronunciation of the third character, here transcribed as $d'$, has not yet been established. As a matter of fact, it is rather rare in the documents, appearing only in a few loanwords; besides bodîvăr, we find it in dîp- which means “letters” or the like, most often used in the formulae introducing lectures from St. Paul’s epistles but also in Lk. 4,17, 20, and 21 and Mt. 22,29, always translating Arm. gir “writing”), and in the compounds ayzidîp corresponding to Arm. ašxarhagir “land writing”, with ayz- $\approx$ Arm. ašxar “land”, in Lk. 2,1 and dîpyabaal(ix) in Mt. 5,20 and 23,34 corresponding to Arm. dpir “writer”. It is clear that Alb. dîp must represent the famous “Wanderwort” which we find, among others, in Old Persian lipi

MPers. pîr reflects OIr. *paru̯iia- as the correspondent of Skt. pūrviya- $\prec$ Ilr. *prHuįio-, the $i$ vowel having resulted from an umlaut process comparable with the epenthesis present side by side with an ao diphthong in Avestan paorīia-. Such a development might well have gone via a stage with -ē- (*pēr), but the assumption remains problematical as the (“maĝhūl”) ē vowel which we would have to expect in this case seems not to be attested in any variety of New Persian. The identification with Georgian ber-$i$ is further problematical because of the substitution of $p$- by $b$- which is at least unusual in prevocalic position.

22 On the other hand, the existence of an $r$ substituting a MIr. $\delta$ cannot be taken to prove the via armeniaca either (as assumed by SCHMITT, 1982, 450b): As neither (Proto-)Armenian nor (Proto-)Georgian (or Kartvelian) are likely to have possessed dental spirants, both languages might have recurred to the same substitution process in the adaptation of MIr. (as well as Syriac) $\delta$.

23 A possible candidate for this case is the Old Georgian quasi-compound ʒlis-pîrni denoting a certain type of religious hymns. If this contains the (syncopated) genitive of ʒil-$i$ “sleep” as proposed by K. KEKELIÎE (1912, 341), the word means something like “(hymns to be recited at) the beginning (pir-, lit. ‘face’) of sleep”. Cf. GIPPERT 1993, p. 277, n. 5, for further considerations.

24 Note that there is no distinction of long and short $o$ vowels either in the Albanian sound system.

25 The following considerations have been established in continuous discussions with Wolfgang Schulze; the first person plural here refers to the two of us.
and which is likely to derive from Akkadian tuppi (note that a variant d'ip also appears in the Albanian palimpsests); within Armenian, the word has not been preserved as a simplex but it is with no doubt contained in dpir < *dip- (with unclear suffix), and Albanian now confirms that the first syllable had a high vowel, which was regularly syncopated in Armenian.

What, then, does d'ip contribute to the question of the pronunciation of the d' character? First, we must state that the Albanian script possesses a second character that must be read as a d, viz. the character appearing, among others, in Biblical names such as davit (abbreviated as d–t); as this character does occur in autochthonous words, too (ep., e.g., de “father”), and as it occupies the fourth position in the Albanian alphabet (in accordance with Greek δ, Arm. d, Georgian d, Latin d etc.), it is likely to represent a “regular” d sound (and we transcribe it as a plain d). For d', then, two interpretations impose themselves: Either this character represents a dental fricative as opposed to the stop denoted by d, d' thus matching the δ in the assumed preform of Arm. bowr̄var, or it stands for a palatal variant of the stop, i.e., d'. On the basis of the text material available today, this question cannot be determined offhand. From the point of view of modern Udi, neither dental fricatives nor palatal variants of stops can be postulated as a part of the sound system of Albanian. There are three intrinsic arguments in favour of the latter solution, however. First, it would be astonishing to find a dental fricative in the beginning of the word d'ip, given that in this position even Armenian preserved the stop in Arsakid loans; and correspondances such as dang ≈ Arm. dang "small coin" < MPers. dān(a)g,26 show that Albanian was not prone to a fricativization of word-initial ds in loans. Second, there are other indications that an opposition of palatals and non-palatals is reflected by the Albanian alphabet (i.e., l vs. l', n vs. n', t vs. t'), and in d'ip, the palatalization of *d- might well be due to the following vowel, i. The same could hold true, then, for bod'var if this represents a preform *bōdīyar-, with an i vowel at the compound boundary. The emergence of the palatal would in this case go back as far as the early Middle Iranian period.27 Note that there seems to be but one Albanian word attested so far which contains a sequence of (non-palatal) d + i, viz. madiľ- “mercy”; obviously, this is a loan from Old Georgian (madl-“id.”),28 and to explain this we would have to assume either that the i which must have been due to a secondary anaptyxis was not able to palatalize the preceding d or that the process of anaptyxis was simply too late to do so. Third, there is at least one inherited word in the Albanian texts which is consistently written with d', viz. kod'- “house”. Unlike the loans dealt with here, this word does have a successor in

---

26 Cf. HUBSCHMANN 1897, p. 134, no. 162.
27 If this assumption is right, *bōdīyar- opposes itself to the ancestor of Arm. bowrastan “garden”, lit. “scent-area”, which points to a Mfr. Fugenvokal -a-, Georgian bōstān- is of no help here as it reflect a later (late MPers. or early NPers.) variant of the word, cf. NPers. bōstān.
28 For the time being, this seems to be the only loan from Old Georgian in the Albanian texts.
modern Udi, viz. kož “house, home”. As the development of palatalized stops to affricates is quite common while a change from dental fricatives to a palato-alveolar affricate would be extremely marked, this can also be taken as an argument in favour of the “palatal” theory. In any case, the derivation of bodvar from *boðiwar- (< *baudi-bara-) seems well founded, Albanian thus confirming the Mir. etymon proposed for Armenian bowrvar. 29

Old Armenian and Old Georgian diverge again, in rendering Greek στέφανος “crown”: While the Georgian equivalent, gwrgwn-ı (to be read guṛguini), seems to be based on inherited Kartvelian material (*-gurgu-, a root meaning “to wind”) 30, Armenian has psak (e.g. in Mt. 27,29), an Iranian loan the exact source of which cannot be established since we find a lemma pusag “garland” both in (Man.) Middle Persian (e.g., Mir.Man. II, 333) and Parthian (e.g., Mir.Man. III, 861). Here again, “Albanian” agrees with Armenian in using a word pusak (spelt powsak) in the same sense (in 2.Tim. 4,8); there are two remarkable differences involved, however. First, the “Albanian” word still shows the first syllable vowel which must have been syncopated, in accordance with the general rule, in pre-literary Armenian, thus clarifying the phonetic structure of the model (theoretically, the Armenian word might as well represent an earlier *pisak). In this respect, “Albanian” matches Old Georgian which is as well more “conservative” in preserving “pretonic” vowels of Mir. loans that were syncopated in Armenian. Second, the Albanian word begins with a “plain”, i.e. aspirated, p, thus opposing itself to the glottalized p of Armenian. It is true that, as a general rule, we would expect “Albanian” to show the glottalized variants of stops in Middle Iranian loans wherever the models had voiceless stops, quite in the same way as both Old Armenian and Old Georgian, and the -k in the given word exhibits just this feature. On the other hand, we do meet counterexamples in the two neighbouring languages as well, and there are even cases where one and the same loan is treated differently in this respect; cp., e.g., Arm. t’akok “plate, vessel”, with an aspirated initial, and Georgian takuk-ı “id.” with a glottalized one, both presupposing a Mir. *takok. 31 In some of these cases, the divergence may have emerged from dissimilation processes removing sequences of too many glottalized stops, and we can note “Albanian” daxtak- “board”, the equivalent of Arm. taktak “id.” in Heb. 9,4, as an example to show that the substitution of voiced stops was another possible way out of this problem. 32 If these

29 In the sense of “incense”, Modern Udi uses pervar (W. Schulze, personal communication) which cannot reflect “Albanian” bodvar but must go back to either Armenian bowrvar or Georgian bervar- (as a secondary loan).
30 Cf. FÄHNRICH/SARJVELADZE 2000, p. 156 f. with references to older literature.
31 For a thorough investigation concerning this doublet, cf. GIPPERT 1993, p. 245 ff.
32 The voiced stop in the word tapang- “chest, ark”, occurring in the same verse as the equivalent of Arm. tapanak “id.”, can be explained differently: It seems that in clusters consisting of nasals or liquids plus stops, the pronunciation of the stops was neutralized, at least to a certain extent; cp. Arm. vardapot “teacher” which is represented by both vardapot- and varapot- in ’Albanian’. Note that Old Armenian manuscripts show a great
assumptions are correct, the divergent realizations of stops cannot be taken as a sufficient indication of independent borrowing, for dissimilations of the given type can occur at any time in everyday usage; and indeed, Georg. ṭakuq-i must be regarded as an Armenian loan because of its u vowel (which cannot be motivated otherwise as an outcome of MIr. ŏ) and inspite of its different initial. In contrast to this, the preservation of high vowels in pretonic syllables is much more decisive in this respect, as it must be regarded in connection with the relative chronology of prehistorical sound changes of Armenian: Given that the “syncopation” process must have come to an end in this language before the beginning of literacy, the assumption of a via armeniaca for such cases implies that their transfer into “Albanian” (and Georgian) cannot have taken place under the conditions of (Christian) literacy. Whether the Armenian language was in a position then to exert such an influence on its neighbours may remain open to doubt. In any case, the examples dealt with here show that a careful investigation into every single candidate is necessary before final conclusions can be drawn.
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