

Achtung!

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Aufsatzes

„Albano-Iranica“

von Jost Gippert (2005).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in

Macuch, Maria / Maggi, Mauro / Sundermann, Werner (Hrsg.),

Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan.

Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume

(Iranica, 13),

Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2007, 99–108

zu entnehmen.

Attention!

This is a special internet edition of the article

“Albano-Iranica”

by Jost Gippert (2005).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the original edition in

Macuch, Maria / Maggi, Mauro / Sundermann, Werner (eds.),

Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan.

Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume

(Iranica, 13),

Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 2007, 99–108.

Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved:

Jost Gippert, Frankfurt 2016

Albano-Iranica

JOST GIPPERT, Frankfurt a. M.

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'wn alowanik'*) by the 10th century writer Movsēs Kałankatowaci (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. Aleksizė (Tbilisi), J. Gippert (Frankfurt) and W. Schulze (Munich) in cooperation with J.-P. Mahé (Paris) and will be published in the series "Palaeographia mediævalis" (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. ALEKSIŽE 1997, 2001 and 2003 and ALEKSIŽE/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 *rāniiōs.kərəitīm* (Y. 44,6; 47,3; 50,2), an epithet of the cow meaning “joy-providing”;⁵ according to the communis opinio, the stem **rāñjah-* this compound contains is a comparative formation⁶ “more joyful” pertaining to the Ilr. root we have in Skt. $\sqrt{\text{ran/ñ}}$.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 YAv. *rāna-* “thigh”.⁸

The Old Georgian equivalent of Arm. *erani* “blessed” is *neṭar-i*; 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 development¹⁰ and the semantics¹¹ involved would remain unparalleled. Instead,

1990’s, many Udi speakers were expelled from Vartašen and live now scattered about the states of the former Soviet Union.

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.

⁷ Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904, p. 1523 f.; KELLEN/PIRART 1990, p. 310; MAYRHOFFER 1986–, II, p. 428 s.v. *RAÑ*; WERBA 1997, p. 369 s.v. *ran*⁴⁴⁷ reconstructs “urar. **(H)Ran(H)*”.

⁸ Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904, p. 1523; HÜBSCHMANN 1897, p. 147, no. 216.

⁹ ANDRONIKAŠVILI 1968, p. 358.

¹⁰ ANDRONIKAŠVILI (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 a(nother) voiceless stop (1895, p. 188). For NPers., too, only *nē/īktar* (with the consonant cluster retained) is attested.

¹¹ ANDRONIKAŠVILI (1968, p. 358) refers to MPers. *wahišt*, lit. “best (place)” (Georg. *sauketeso*) 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-i 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-i abar nēktarān az hutaštāgān 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.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 *erani* 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.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-* (< **-aṭna-*) element. Alb. *bamgen* would thus represent an Old Iranian formation **bām(a)kaṭna-*, 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 mnaṭriden dedani* “Blessed I am, for I am used to being blessed by the women” (Μακαρία ἐγώ, ὅτι μακαρίζουσίν με αἱ γυναῖκες). ANDRONIKAŠVILI (1968, p. 355) obviously regards the Georgian verb to be secondarily derived from *neṭar-*; the phonetic process implied (“*neṭar* > *ṇtar* > *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 GAMQRELIŠE/MAČAVARIANI (1967, p. 159; cf. also FÄHNRIČH/SARJVELADZE 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” **na/eṭ(r)* emerged by derivation itself, the underlying forms being verbal adjectives (participles) of a root **-ṭ(r)-* built with the prefixes *na-* and *ne-* (cf. FÄHNRIČH/SARJVELADZE 2000, pp. 350 and 355 for an etymological account of these morphemes). **-ṭ(r)-* might further be identified with the root **ṭuar-/ṭur-* worked out by G.A. KLIMOV (1998, p. 187; cf. also FÄHNRIČH/SARJVELADZE 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 *sanaṭrel-*, lit. “to be blessed”) appear in the so-called Khanmeti 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*¹⁴ as in MPers. Parth. *nāmgēn* “famous” (from *nām* “name”; MirMan. III, 867), Parth. *zēngēn* “armed” (from *zēn* “weapon”; MirMan. III, 851 a.o.), MPers. *bīmgēn* “fearful” (from *bīm* “fear, terror”; Wiz.Zadspr. 31,3), *sahmgēn* “terrible” (from *sahm* “threat”; PT: Ay.Wuz.Mihr 154 f.), *šarmgēn* “ashamed” (from *šarm* “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*).¹⁵ With both these changes, the loan might best be attributed to a later Middle Iranian period; as **bāmgēn* 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 **bāmgēn* to be represented different from *bamgen* here.

Old Armenian and Old Georgian differ considerably in the rendering of Greek πυρεῖον, θυμιατήριον and other terms denoting “censers”. In Armenian, the regular equivalent of this word in the Bible is *bowrvaṛ*, occurring e.g. in Heb. 9,4, while Old Georgian uses *sa-cecx-ur-i*, lit. “place (or vessel) for fire (*cecxl-i*)” or *sa-saḱumevl-e-*, lit. “place (or vessel) for incense (*saḱumevel-i*)”.¹⁶ Georgian did possess a closer equivalent of the Arm. word, however, viz. *bervar-i* (with a later variant *berval-i*) which appears in the same sense elsewhere.¹⁷

¹⁴ The MPers. and Parth. derivatives of *bām* might suggest a formation **bāmīgēn-* rather than **bāmagēn*, presupposing an OIr. *i*-stem **bāmi-*. The only cognates of this word in Avestan are the YAv. compound *vīspō.bāma-* “all-glittering” (Yt. 10.136) and its extension *vīspō.bāmiia-* (Yt. 15.15); both are no more decisive for this question than MPers.Parth. *b’md’ d (bāmdād)* “dawn”.

¹⁵ In MPers.M *rēškēn* “hurtful, harmful” from *rēš* “wound, harm” (written <ryškyn> in Salemann, Man. III, 5) the voicing of the *-k-* did not occur because of the adjoining *š*. Formations such as MPers.B *zamīgēn* “earthen” (Šnš MT 2, 117) or *pambagēn* “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 *srūwēn* “horny”, from *srū* “horn”, occurring in the same contexts).

¹⁶ Arm. *bowrvaṛ* (var. *bowrowaṛ*) 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. [= OI] of the 10-11th centuries and the Mxeta Bible [S] of the 17th century has *sacecxur-*); Lev. 10,1 (Georg. OIS *sacecxur-*); 16,12; Num. 4,14; 16,17.18 (M *sacecxur-*); 16,46 (= 17,11 LXX; Georg. M *sasaḱumevl-*; passages missing in O); 4.Kön. (= 2.Kön.) 25,15; 2.Chr. 4,22 (M *sacecxur-*); the Arm. equivalent of πυρεῖον is missing in Ex. 27,3. Gr. θυμιατήριον is rendered by Arm. *bowrvaṛ* in 2.Chr. 26,19 (M and the Vienna palimpsest have *sasaḱumevl-*), Ez. 8,11 (OIS and the Gelati Bible [G] have *sasaḱumevl-*), and Hebr. 9,4 (all Georg. redactions have *sasaḱumevl-*). In St. John's apocalypse (5,8), Arm. *bowrvaṛ oski li xnkov*, “a golden censer full of incense”, renders Gr. φιάλας χρυσᾶς γεμούσας θυμιαμάτων (the Georg. version has *lanḱnani okroysani savseni saḱumevelita* corresponding to the Greek text).

Arm. *bowr̥vaṛ* has been successfully traced back to a Middle Iranian preform **bōd̥yar* 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*, **ō* 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., **bōd̥i-yar-* < Old Iranian **baud̥i-bara-*. That the first compound member must once have been an *-i*-stem is at least suggested by its Avestan counterpart, *baoidi-*.²⁰ Deducing Old Georgian *bervar-* directly from an early Middle Iranian trisyllabic preform **bōd̥i-yar-* 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 T̥pilisi (8th century). Here, we have clear allusion to Biblical (OT) traditions: *da kwalad adgili igi samsxuerploysa šenisay emsgavsā berversa Ahronissa da Zakariayssa m̥gdeltaysa, rametu naķercxalsa mas zeda cecxlisasa aḡvidoda, vitarca sulnelebay saķumeveltay* “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 ABULAṢE 1963). In the Arm. version of the Georgian Chronicle, the *Patmowtiwn vrac*, *bowrvaṛ* is the equivalent of *sasakumevle-* 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 *-r̥* of the word does not disprove the derivation of *-vaṛ* from **-bar-* “bearing” as it might have been affected by a dissimilation (against the first *-r-*); besides, the Iranian origin of *-vaṛ* has been corroborated by Sogd. *βwδβr-* occurring, among others, in the Vessāntara Jātaka (P1, 3 and 5). In any case, Arm. *vaṛel* “to kindle”, regarded as the real source of *-vaṛ* by HÜBSCHMANN, may have exerted a secondary influence by popular etymology.

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

²⁰ Cf. HÜBSCHMANN 1897, p. 122, no. 116, who suggests “zd. **baoidibara-*”.

²¹ ANDRONIKAŠVILI 1968, p. 292f., following MARR 1902, p. 106, identifies Georg. *ber-i* “old (person), monk” with MPers. *pīr* “old man” which she regards as an equivalent of OPers. *paruviya-* (in a compound *paruviya-yāra* “passed year” ≈ NPers. *pīrār*, which is not attested though). On the basis of today’s knowledge, this would presuppose that

examples proving that the substitution of δ 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 δs , but they can all have entered the language *via armeniaca*.²² 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 syncope.²³

New light is thrown on this bundle of questions by the “Albanian” manuscript remains. In Heb. 9,4, we here read a word *bod'var* as the equivalent of Armenian *bowr'var* and Greek $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$, 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 vowel²⁴ 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.²⁵ As a matter of fact, it is rather rare in the documents, appearing only in a few loanwords; besides *bod'var*, we find it in *d'ip*- 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 *ayzid'ip* corresponding to Arm. *ašxarhagir* “land writing”, with *ayz*- \approx Arm. *ašxarh* “land”, in Lk. 2,1 and *d'ipyabaal(ix)*- in Mt. 5,20 and 23,34 corresponding to Arm. *dpir* “writer”. It is clear that Alb. *d'ip* must represent the famous “Wanderwort” which we find, among others, in Old Persian *lipi*

MPers. *pīr* reflects OIr. **parūija-* as the correspondent of Skt. *pūrviya-* < IIr. **prHuijo-*, the \bar{i} vowel having resulted from an umlaut process comparable with the epenthesis present side by side with an *ao* diphthong in Avestan *paoiriia-*. Such a development might well have gone via a stage with $-\bar{e}-$ (**pēr*), but the assumption remains problematical as the (“mağhūl”) \bar{e} 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. δ 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) δ .

²³ A possible candidate for this case is the Old Georgian quasi-compound *zlis-pirni* denoting a certain type of religious hymns. If this contains the (syncopated) genitive of *zil-i* “sleep” as proposed by K. KEKELIZE (1912, 341), the word means something like “(hymns to be recited at) the beginning (*pīr-*, 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'uṣ* 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* < **dipī*- (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 (cp., 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. *bowr̥var*, 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. *madil'* “mercy”; obviously, this is a loan from Old Georgian (*madl-i* “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. *ḳod'* “house”. Unlike the loans dealt with here, this word does have a successor in

²⁶ Cf. HÜBSCHMANN 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 Mlr. *Fugenvokal -a-*. Georgian *boṣṭan-i* 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 *bod’var* from **bōdiyar-* (< **baydi-bara-*) seems well founded, Albanian thus confirming the Mlr. etymon proposed for Armenian *bowrvař*.²⁹

Old Armenian and Old Georgian diverge again, in rendering Greek στέφανος “crown”: While the Georgian equivalent, *gwrɡwn-i* (to be read *gũrgũni*), 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 Mlr. 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’akoyk* “plate, vessel”, with an aspirated initial, and Georgian *taķuk-i* “id.” with a glottalized one, both presupposing a Mlr. **takōk*.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. *taxtak* “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” *bod’var* but must go back to either Armenian *bowrvař* or Georgian *bervar-* (as a secondary loan).

³⁰ Cf. FÄHNRIKH/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 *tařang-* “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. *vardapet* “teacher” which is represented by both *vardapet-* and *varřapet-* 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. *taḡuḡ-i* must be regarded as an Armenian loan because of its *u* vowel (which cannot be motivated otherwise as an outcome of Mlr. *ō*) 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.

References

- ABULAṢE, I. (ed.) 1963: *Žveli kartuli agiograpiuli liṭeraturis zeglebi, ḡigni I*. Tbilisi.
- ALEKSIṢE, Z. 1997: *Albanuri mḡerlobis zegli sinas mtaze da mis mnišvnebloba ḡavḡasiologiisatvis / Obnaruḡena pis'mennost' kavkazskoj Albanii / A Breakthrough in the Script of Caucasian Albany / Preliminary Account on the Identification and Deciphering of the Caucasian Albanian Manuscript Discovered on the Mount Sinai*. Tbilisi.
- 2001: “Albanuri enis gramatiḡkuli da leksiḡuri aḡḡerisatvis (ḡinasḡari šenišvnebi).” *Enatmecnierebis saḡitxebi* 2001/4, pp. 3–24.
- 2003: *Ḳavḡasiis albanetis damḡerloba, ena da mḡerloba. Aḡmoḡena sinas mtis ḡm. eḡaterinis monašerši / Caucasian Albanian Script, Language and Literature. Discovery in St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai*. Tbilisi.
- ALEKSIṢE, Z. / J.-P. MAHE 2001: “Le déchiffrement de l'écriture des albaniens du Caucase.” *Comptes-rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 2001, Juillet-Octobre, pp. 1239–1257.
- ANDRONIKASVILI, M. 1968: *Narḡvevebi iranul-kartuli enobrivi urtiertobidan / Studies in Iranian-Georgian Linguistic Contacts*. Tbilisi.
- BAILEY, H. W. 1982: “Armenia and Iran. iv. Iranian influences in Armenian. 2. Iranian loanwords in Armenian.” In: *Encyclopedia Iranica* II, pp. 459–465.
- BARTHOLOMAE, CHR. 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg.
- DOWSETT, C. J. F. (transl.) 1961: *The History of the Caucasian Albanians* by MOVṢĒS DASXURANḲI. London / New York / Toronto.

deal of fluctuation in clusters of this type, too, so that this may be a feature of Armenian, not “Albanian”.

- FÄHNRIK, H. / Z. SARŽVELAŠE 2000: *Kartvelur enata eṭimologiuri leksiḡoni. Meore, ševsebuli da gadamušavebuli gamocema / Etimological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages. Second revised and supplemented edition.* Tbilisi.
- GAMQRELIŠE, T. / G. MAČAVARIANI 1967: *Sonanṭa siṣtema da ablauṭi kartvelur enebši. Saerto-kartveluri ṣṭrukturis ṭipologia / TH. V. GAMKRELIDZE / G. I. MACHAVARIANI, The System of Sonants and Ablaut in Kartvelian Languages. A Typology of Common Kartvelian Structure.* Tbilisi.
- GIPPERT, J. 1993: *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen.* Wien.
- HUMBACH, H. 1991: *The Gāthās of Zarathustra and the Other Old Avestan Texts.* Part II: *Commentary.* In collaboration with J. ELFENBEIN and P. O. SKJÆRVØ. Heidelberg.
- HÜBSCHMANN, H. 1982: *Persische Studien.* Strassburg.
- 1897: *Armenische Grammatik.* I. Theil: *Armenische Etymologie.* Leipzig.
- KEKELIŠE, K. 1912: *Ierusalimskij kanonar' VII vėka (Gruzinskaja versija).* Tiflis.
- KELLENS, J. / E. PIRART 1990: *Les textes vieil-avestiques.* Vol. II: *Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique.* Wiesbaden.
- KLIMOV, G. A. 1998: *Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages.* Berlin / New York.
- MARR, N. JA. 1902: *Drevnegruzinskie odopiscy* (XII v.). S.-Peterburg (Teksty i razyskanija po armjano-gruzinskoj filologii 4).
- MAYRHOFER, M. 1986–: *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen.* 3 vols. Heidelberg.
- RECK, CHR. 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen. Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen.* Turnhout (Berliner Turfantexte XII).
- SCHMITT, R. 1982: "Armenia and Iran. iv. Iranian Influences in Armenian. 1. General." In: *Encyclopedia Iranica* II, pp. 448–459.
- SCHULTZE, K. 1905: "Das Martyrium des heiligen Abo von Tiflis." In: *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Gesichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 28 [N.F. 13], pp. 1–41.
- WERBA, CHL. H. 1997: *Verba indoarica. Die primären und sekundären Wurzeln der Sanskrit-Sprache.* Pars I: *Radices Primariae.* Wien.