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With the decipherment of the “Albanian” palimpsests from St. Catherine’s Monastery on Mt. Sinai, Iranianists have gained one more Nebenüberlieferung that witnesses to the spread and use of Middle Iranian lexical material in the Southern Caucasus in the early Middle Ages. As in the case of Old Georgian, many of the items concerned pose the question whether they were borrowed into the Caucasian “Albanian” language directly from a Middle Iranian vernacular or via armeniaca, i.e. with an Armenian loan as an intermediary. The latter assumption seems all the more probable since there is good reason to believe that the Biblical texts contained in the palimpsests were translated from Armenian models. Nevertheless there are clear indications that the Caucasian “Albanians”, ancestors of the present day Udi people, did have direct contacts with Middle Iranian languages, too, given that some of the Iranian words they used differed considerably from their Armenian equivalents (such as margaven- “prophet” vs. Arm. margare) or had no matching counterpart in Armenian at all (such as bamgen- “blessed” vs. Arm. erani).

One of the less clear cases is the equivalent of the Armenian verb xortakem ‘to break, crack, grind’, which has for long been regarded as a denominal formation built upon an unattested adjective *xortak, in its turn related with MPers. xwurda ‘something small, particle’, NPers. xurda ‘small, fine, minute’. Arm. xortakem does have a counterpart in the “Albanian” palimpsests, in the formation xarṭaḳ-biyesun, which occurs three times in Jo. 19,31–33 rendering Arm.

---

1 Cf. Gippert 2007 and Gippert/Schulze 2007 for details as to the palimpsests and their contents. The editio princeps is at present being prepared by Z. Aleksie (Tbilisi), J. Gippert (Frankfurt) and W. Schulze (Munich) in cooperation with J.-P. Mahé (Paris) and will be published in the series “Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi” (Brepols, Turnhout) in 2008. The edition project has been supported by the Volkswagen Foundation since 2000; cf. http://armazi.uni-frankfurt.de/armaz04.htm. For preliminary reports cf. Aleksie 1997, 2001 and 2003, and Aleksie/Mahé 2001.

2 Cf. Gippert 2005 and below for details as to this word.

3 Cf. Gippert 2007 for details as to this word.

4 Cf. Hübschmann 1895, p. 57, no. 507 (contra Horn 1893, p. 112) and 1897, p. 161, no. 286, for details; for the MPers. lemma cf. MacKenzie 1971, p. 96, for the NPers. lemma, Steingass 1977, pp. 454a (s.v. khurda) and 484a (s.v. khwurda).
xortakem (Greek κατάγνυμι ‘to break, smash’)\(^5\) and once in Mt. 2,16 in the position of Arm. kotorem ‘to slay’ (Greek ἀναιρέω ‘to remove’). As a compound verb, “Alb.” xartak–biyesun contains, besides the otherwise unattested nominal base xartak–, the usual transitive auxiliary biyesun ‘to do, make’, thus matching the formation of NPers. xurda kardan.\(^6\) The present-day meaning “to change money” of this latter compound must have derived from a less specific “to make small”, cp. German kleinemachen used in the same sense to denote the changing of banknotes into coins. The same meaning is also conveyed by Georgian (ga)dan-xurda-v-eb–, a denominal verb built upon the noun xurda– which is prima-rily used in the sense of “small change, cash money” today.\(^7\)

There can be no doubt that the Georgian noun directly reflects NPers. xurda. This is clearly suggested by its late attestation, none of its occurrences preceding the 15\(^{th}\) century, even though the original meaning of Georgian xurda– is hard to ascertain from the few instances we find in the literary works of the Middle Georgian period.\(^8\) The least problematic case is met with in the so-called Saamni, which is a 15\(^{th}\)–16\(^{th}\) century prose derivate of the Persian epic tradition on Sām son of Narīmān and part of the Georgian Šāhnāme adaptation.\(^9\) Here the word is obviously still used as an adjective denoting something “small” or “minute”; cf.

Saam. 11 (p. 308, ll. 5–6):

> „He, Pridon (Pers. Firēdūn) went to that castle, took up his 900 litre cudgel (gurz-i, Pers. gurz) with his hands and stroke such a blow at the gate of that castle that he turned it into a rocket plant (?)\(^{10}\), minute like a poppy (xašxaš-i, Pers. xašxaš).”

Unfortunately, the Persian model of the given passage has not yet been determined\(^{11}\) so that the source for the wording remains uncertain.

\(^{5}\) The other NT verses containing xortakem (Mk. 5,4; Lk. 9,39; 20,18; Rom. 16,20) are not contained in the “Albanian” palimpsests, nor is any one of the 147 OT attestations.

\(^{6}\) Cf., e.g., Steingass 1977, p. 484 a.s.v. khwurda kardan.

\(^{7}\) Cf. Tschenkeli 1974, p. 2410; Rayfield 2006, p. 1709.

\(^{8}\) The Middle Georgian period extends from about the 12\(^{th}\) to the 18\(^{th}\) century AD.


\(^{10}\) The meaning of xaršir-i is uncertain. For the proposal to regard it as a synonym of Georg. gongola– ‘(London) rocket’ (Rayfield 2006, p. 433) cf. Ḑobiże 1974, p. 649; the Persian word xakšīr mentioned there as a source of Georg. xaršir-i has not been verifiable so far.

\(^{11}\) There is no matching passage in the corresponding chapters of the Persian Šāhnāme (on the struggles between Zuhḥāk and Firēdūn, chs. 5–6 according to the numeration system used in Wolff 1935). According to Ḑobiże 1974, p. 55ff., the Georgian text is relatively close to the prose version of the Persian Sām-nāme.
In a verse of the poem on “the customs of Georgia” (Sakartvelos zneobani) by the 17th century king Arčil, part of the so-called Arčiliani, xurda- is used with a totally different meaning, in a context which obviously refers to polo or another game with horses but is quite obscured by several hapax legomena. Here, Georg. xurda- might reflect NPers. xurda in another meaning still persistent today, viz. denoting “small stones” or “gravels”, cf.

Arčil. Sak. Zn. 27 (vol. I, p. 6, ll. 5–8):

“Perforating the stick, wattling it, forming a smooth ball, dashing out happily on the playground, in the time of the ball-game, leaping up on the horse without using hands, at the same time cutting swiftly across, and acting as a horseshoer(?), taking (it) out for drying(?), cutting out the gravel(?).”

The least comprehensible attestation of xurda- in the Middle Georgian period is found in the poem on the “Seven Planets”, also called the Baramguriani, i.e., the 17th century adaptation of the Persian story on Bahrām Gōr and the Seven Princesses by Nodar Cicišvili. Here xurda occurs in an idiomatical combination with hila, another hapax legomenon obviously representing (Pers. hila ←) Arab. hilat ‘trick, stratagem, ruse’, cf.

Sv.Mt. XIX, 1192 (p. 147, ll. 9–12):

The hapax legomenon mopaitroba- is not accounted for in Georgian lexicography (the lexicon provided in Baramiże/Berʒenišvili 1936–1937, p. 183, lists the word but gives no explanation); the proposal to interpret it as “acting as a horseshoer” is built upon Arm. paytar ‘horseshoer’ (→ mo-paiṭr-oba-).

Georg. saxmob-i usually denotes a place or area where something is dried (sa-xmob-i); a second meaning “ethmoid hæmatoma” is given in Rayfield 2006, p. 1177. The ethmoid bone (of horses) itself is usually named cxa[v]-is zval-i, i.e. “sieve bone” in Georgian (cp. German Siebbein), so that this cannot be meant here.

It is hardly probable that Georg. xurda might match NPers. xurda meaning “that part of a horse’s leg round which the fetter passes” here (cf. Steingass 1977, pp. 454a and 484a).

Cf. the edition Kekelishe 1930.

Cf. the edition Kekelishe 1930.
Jost Gippert

The knight said: ‘If I had known you earlier, why should I have wished to be with you? If I had had the same nourishment as you, I should not be envious of you. We ate and drank mine together, it was exhausted, now I am hungry; and I was truly close friends with you, I could not imagine your being so tricky (?).’

As no exact model of the given passage has been found in Niẓāmī’s *Haft Paikar* or any other Persian adaptation of the Bahrām Gōr story, it must remain uncertain whether *xurda* is at all related to NPers. *xurda* (in the sense of “mean”?) in this idiom.

These problems notwithstanding, we may safely maintain the assumption that Georgian *xurda*- is a relatively recent borrowing from NPers. *xurda* denoting “something small” such as “pebbles” or, later, “coins”. In contrast to this, Arm. *xortak*- and “Alb.” *xartak*- must represent an older stratum, and it is by no means certain that they represent the same formation as the NPers. (and Georgian) word and its alleged MPers. ancestor, *xwurdag*. The problem consists in the vowel of the first syllable. It was Paul Horn who first drew attention to the fact that the NPers. word contains a *u* vowel as its rhyming behaviour shows; he therefore read its MPers. cognate as *χurtak*, too, and proposed to separate the word from the root *χv*ar ‘to eat, drink’ with its full grade *a*. In spite of the different vowel, both Horn and Hübschmann seem to have regarded Arm. *xortak* as a direct representative of MPers. *χurtak*. While the vocalism of the Persian word is now confirmed, at least for New Persian, by the evidence of the Georgian loan, “Alb.” *xartak*- can hardly be assumed to represent a MPers. *χurtak*, and even its derivation via Arm. *xortak*- is anything but probable, given that the language did possess an *o* vowel which regularly occurs in loan words; cp., e.g., *angelos*- ‘angel’ ← Greek ἄγγελος or *hetanos* ‘gentile, heathen’ ← Arm. *hetʿanos* (⇦ Greek ἔϑνος). This is also true for Armenian words for which an Iranian origin can be assumed.

19 The passage is located within the story told by the sixth princess, ch. 37 in the edition by Ritter/ Rypka 1934 of the *Haft Paikar*; in general the Georgian text shows a “remarkable agreement” with Niẓāmī’s in this chapter (cf. Rudenko 1975, p. 37: “разительное сходство”).

20 A comparable quasi-compound *hila-xurda* seems not to be attested for Persian. Arab. *ḥurda* ‘iron part, pellet’ and *ḥurdaq* ‘pellet’ (Wehr 1958, p. 210: “Eisenteilchen; Schrot”) are likely to be derived from NPers. *xurda* themselves.

21 Horn 1893, p. 112, no. 507.


23 Additionally it even seems to have had a second *a* vowel different from plain *a* as in *xartak*- , with a more back articulation.
One example is Arm. xoran ‘tabernacle, hut, tent’ which is rendered by the totally identical stem xoran- in the “Alb.” palimpsests in Heb. 9,3,6, and 13,10 (Gk. σκήνη); additionally, “Alb.” xoran- occurs in Ps. 83,2 (84,1) as the equivalent of Arm. yark ‘tabernacle’ (Gk. σκήνωμα). It is true that for Arm. xoran, an Iranian origin seems not to have been proposed so far, different from its two quasi-synonyms, vran and tālavar which have for long been derived from Parthian sources: tālavar, which is also mirrored by “Alb.” ṭalavar occurring once in Mt. 17,4, reflects Parth. ṭalawār <tlwʾr> ‘hall, tabernacle’, and vran, Parth. wiδān <wdʾn> ‘tent’. Considering the similarity of xoran with the latter, both containing the element -ran, there is good reason to assume an Iranian etymon for xoran, too. Starting from vran ← wiδān-, xoran might well reflect a compound with the same second member, *δān, which can be deduced from an OIr. *dāna- meaning “construction, building” or the like (IIr. ӳdhā); the same element is also present in Avest. uz-dāna- ‘rack, stand’, lit. ‘superstructure’ (Vd. 6,50 and 8,74) and OPers. apa-dāna- (→ Arm. aparan) ‘palace’. In xoran, then, *δāna- might have been composed with *xya- ‘self’,29 thus denoting the “separate” or “detached” construction of tents or huts. With its xo-, Arm. xo-ran would show the regular outcome of MIr. *xwāt- as in xortik-kʿ ‘food’ ← *xwartī (MPers. xwardīg), Avest. xvarəiti-, or xost- ‘confess’ ← *xwāst- (Parth. wuxāstwānifi, MPers. xwastūg); “Alb.” xoran would share this development.

A slightly more problematic case is Arm. xoršak ‘heat’. Different from xoran, this word has an exact counterpart in Georgian, viz. xoršaḵ-, which is attested several times in NT and OT texts, e.g. in Lk. 12,55, Is. 49,10, and Deut. 28,22. In the “Alb.” palimpsests we meet a word xoˁaḵ in Jac. 1,11 in the position of Arm. xoršak and Gk. καύσων, which obviously represents the same etymon and is identical with its Arm. counterpart except for the medial consonant.

24 Ačaṇyan 1973-1979, B, p. 406b, mentions an Udi word xoran ‘sanctuary’ (“Owt. xoran «ekteleʾ xorans»”) which he regards as a borrowing of Arm. xoran ‘shade’. This word may well continue its “Alb.” predecessor.

25 In the “Alb.” lectionary, Psalms are numbered according to the Septuagint model, the present Psalm being introduced by no. “83”.

26 xoran has no counterpart in Georgian, its regular equivalent being karav-i. – The place name xoranta mentioned in the Old Georgian chronicle Kartlis Cxovreba (I, 5, 11 ed. Qau.Absavili 1955) may well reflect the “Alb.” word, given that the town in question lies in hereti, i.e. “Albania”.

27 Cf., e.g., Schmitt 1985, 452a; the Parthian word is attested five times in the Parthian Manichaean texts contained in Boyce 1975, viz. at (2), ax (3), bc (1), bh (3), and bp (3).

28 Cf., e.g., Schmitt 1987, p. 452a, and Bailey 1987, pp. 463a and 465a, who further refer to MPers. wiyān, NPers. gāyān, and Judeo-Pers. byʾn. The Parthian word is attested in ac (1) of Boyce 1975, the Middle Persian word, in the Ayādgār-i Zarērān (32ff.; cf. JamaspAsana/Orian 1992, p. 204f.). Cf. also Sogd. wyʾn (“LW from MP”, cf. Sims-Williams 1985, p. 58) and Bal. gidān (Korn 2005, p. 98, after Morgenstierne 1932, p. 44).

29 Cf. already Gippert 2005, p. 163, for this proposal.
As a matter of fact, a similar constellation—Armenian and Georgian -<r>š- vs. “Albanian” -<r>- occurs in two other words that are shared by the three languages.30 One of them is “Alb.” wa’amak ‘cerecloth’ occurring in Jo. 20,7 as the equivalent of Arm. varšamak and Georg. varšamag-i. While this triad can be established with no doubt, the second one is less certain as far as the “Albanian” partner is concerned. The word in question appears two times in Mt. 20,1 and 2, and in both cases it has not been preserved entirely due to damages of the manuscript. What we can read is <mo-> in the latter and <-<š>ak->, in the former verse. Taken together, these scraps permit to reconstruct a word <mow<š>ak->, i.e. mu<š>ak-,31 as the equivalent of Arm. mšak and Georg. mušak-i ‘worker, labourer’.

Nevertheless the correspondence of “Alb.” <-<š> and Armenian and Georgian (r)š remains hard to account for. It is true that the “Alb.” letter here transcribed <-<š> (the 14<sup>th</sup> letter of the “Alb.” alphabet, with a numerical value of 50) bears the name šá in the alphabet list contained in the Armenian ms. Echm. 7117, a name which suggests a š-like articulation offhand. In the three words discussed above this would well match the corresponding Armenian and Georgian forms. In the (few) words that have clear equivalents in modern Udi, there is no such correspondence though. Instead we find pharyngealised vowels where “Albanian” words have a sequence of šá plus a vowel letter; cp., e.g., “Alb.” v’an ≈ Udi van ‘you (pl.)’ or b’eg ≈ Udi beg ‘sun’. The only exception seems to be “Alb.” i’a ‘near’ which is obviously reflected in Udi iša, i.e. a constellation with both a pharyngealised vowel and a sibilant.33 The letter <-<š> is therefore likely to have represented a sound with a pharyngeal articulation or, at least, co-articulation.

For the three triads discussed above, this does not help very much, given that neither the Armenian nor the Georgian equivalents have any pharyngeal features. However, starting from xo<š>ak / xoršak and wa’amak / varšamak, one might consider such a feature to have developed from -r- in the sequence -rš-, a suggestion first made by WOLFGANG SCHULZE.34 As there are no words with a consonant cluster -rš- in the whole “Albanian” corpus and plain -š- seems to have been preserved in loans of the same sphere in “Albanian” – cf., e.g., ašarket- ‘disciple, pupil’ ≈ Arm. ašakert – this would imply that mu<š>ak would have to be

---

30 The following considerations were discussed in detail by J. GIPPERT and W. SCHULZE in the course of the edition of the palimpsests.
31 In the “Albanian” script, the vowel u is always denoted by a digraph <ow> as in the Armenian and Old Georgian scripts.
32 Cf. the facsimile of the ms. provided in ŠANIŢE 1938, tables between pp. 16–17.
33 Udi possesses two series of postalveolar sibilants, usually transcribed <-š/ž> vs. <-ś/ź> (plus the corresponding affricates). The same must have been true for “Albanian” <-š, ž, š, ĺ> which are clearly distinguished by different letters.
34 Personal communication of Dec. 19, 2007. For the “pharyngealisation” effect of -r- one might compare similar effects (retraction of the tongue and contraction of the uvular or pharyngeal region) in German dialects (Swabian, East-Middle-German); this, however, seems to presuppose a uvular articulation of -r-.
derived not from an older *mušak as underlying Arm. mšak and Georg. mušak-but from a preform *muršak- not attested otherwise. Such a preform is – as a local variant of the same word – all the easier to argue for as at least for one of the terms in question, viz. Arm. varšamak, there is good reason to assume that its -rš- is due to a secondary development, given that the word was obviously borrowed from an Iranian model which had plain -š- instead (cf. NPers. bāšām(a)/wāšāma, Khwarezm. všmyk and Sogd. všmy). Even though the inner-Iranian etymology of this set of cognates remains unclear, its distribution among both West and East Iranian languages excludes the alternative hypothesis that -š- was reduced from an older -rš- here.

Unfortunately, neither for *mu(r)šak- nor for *xoršak- there is any reliable etymological perspective. With their common suffix -ak-, both words suggest an Iranian origin offhand, and for Arm. mšak and Georg. mušak-i an Iranian cognate has been suggested indeed; the connection “with Khot. muša- ‘field,’ later mša-, base maiz- ‘to cultivate’” proposed by H. W. Bailey is anything but trustworthy, however, as there is no trace of the internal -i- of that root in the Caucasian words and both the word formation and the semantics would remain doubtful (both Arm. mšak and Georg. mušak- denote a “labourer, worker”, not a “farmer” as Bailey claims). The proposal to join the word with NPers. mušāq ‘servant, domestic’ and Kurd. mišāq ‘house servant, worker’ discussed in H. Ačaryan’s etymological dictionary seems more fruitful then but only if these words can be proven to have been secondarily influenced by the Arab. root šaqq and formations such as mašqaq ‘pains, difficulties, troubles’ or mušāqq ‘schismatic’ pertaining to it, the attestation of the Caucasian terms being much too early to admit the assumption of a direct Arabic loan here (see below). In any way, the origin of *mšāk- remains doubtful even under these conditions.

37 For the same reason we must exclude a connection with Av. mīšda-, MPers. mizd ‘salary, wages’, which would also be hard to argue for because of the consonant cluster involved. – The “very doubtful” Av. adjective mīšak- (Bartholomae 1904, col. 1187: “Sehr zweifelhaftes Wort”), which probably pertains to the root myas- ‘to mix’, must as well be kept separate.
39 Cf., e.g., Wehr 1958, p. 435f., for šaqq and its derivatives. – Note that Pers. musāq is marked with an “a” denoting an uncertain relationship with Arabic in Steingass 1977, p. 1243a.
40 None of the three Caucasian languages distinguishes long and short vowels ā/a and ū/u.
41 There is but a vague chance that the word might be derived from Plr. *muš ‘mouse’ (→ ‘muscle worker?’) or from the secondary “root” *muš- ‘to rub’ as present in Baloci (cf. Korn 2005, p. 92).
For Arm. xoršak and its counterparts, the etymological prospects are not much brighter. H. Ačar̄yan was certainly right in drawing our attention to Hebr. חֲרִישִׁית, i.e. hārīšīt, occurring as a hapax legomenon in Jon. 4,8 together with rūḥ qādīm ‘East wind’ where the Arm. Bible has holm xoršak tapaxaṇ, i.e. “a hot combusting storm”, matching Gk. πνεῦμα κάυσωνος σύγκαίον;²² cf.

Jon. 4,8

“... And it happened (together) with the rising of the sun (that) God gave order to a hot burning wind, and the sun fell upon Jona's head ...”

Ačar̄yan’s proposal to further connect the Hebrew word with the root brš ‘to cut, engrave’ and its Semitic cognates (Syr. hrt, Arab. ḫrt)³⁵ remains more than doubtful, however, all the more since the Syriac OT has only ṭwḥʾ d-šwbʾ, i.e. ‘hot wind’ in the given passage. And of course it would be more than hard to assume that a Hebrew hapax legomenon might have been borrowed into Ar­menian (and other languages of the Caucasus) on the basis of but one OT verse and become the general term for “heat” there. Instead, textual attestations like the one treated above suggest a connection of xoršak with the Iranian word for “sun”, MPers. xwar, and its derivatives such as MPers. Parth. xwarāsān ‘East’ or xwar(x)šēd ‘sun (light)’.⁴⁴ If this is right, the word would be another example for the regular substitution of MIr. *xwa- by Armenian xo-, in this case shared by both the neighbouring Caucasian languages, and the -rš- cluster would have to be assumed to be genuine. An alternative solution as well suggested by the attestations would consist in connecting xoršak with ManMPers. ḥōšāg ‘hot, parch­ing wind’, with -rš- having developed secondarily as in varšamak. Tempting as it is,⁴⁶ this solution is problematical as it would presuppose MIr. *ḥō- (root *huš- ‘to dry’) to be represented by Arm. xo-, which is not what we expect for

---

³³ Sic, not Syr. “xraš” = brš (which pertains to another Hebr. root brš ‘to be mute’ instead) and not Arab. “ḥarḍ” = brṭ as in Ačar̄yan, l.c.
⁴⁴ Cf. Androniḳašvili 1966, p. 412f., who connects Georg. xoršak-i with NPers. <xršʾ> ‘sun’ drawing upon the dictionary Borhān-e Qāte’; according to Steingass 1977, p. 455a, this term (“khurshā”) alternates with <xršʾd> (“khurshād”) “in Zand and Pāzand” so that its derivation from an older *xwaršāk remains doubtful. – Should xwar(x)šēd be disguised directly in Hebr. hārīšīt?
⁴⁵ Proposal by Agnes Korn (personal communication); for the MPers. word cf. Boyce 1977, p. 49 s.v. hruʾīg.
⁴⁶ Note that the MPers. word is attested in the list of terms denoting the four “Dark Elements”, in text y (25) in Boyce 1975, p. 68.
early (Arsacid) loans in Armenian.\textsuperscript{47} It must therefore be stated that the actual formation of the etymon of xoršak remains unclear for the time being.

Returning to the divergence between Arm. xortakem and “Alb.” xartak-biyesun, we must now take into account the question of different routes of borrowing. For one of the items treated above, Georg. varšamag-i, I have argued elsewhere that it is likely to have been borrowed via armeniaca, not only because of its shape but also because of the distribution of its attestations in the Old Georgian literature which show a clear affinity to Armenian sources.\textsuperscript{48} Applying the same criterion to Georg. xoršak-i, we may at once state that this word behaves quite similar as varšamag-i in that its appearance within the NT is limited to but one attestation (Lk. 12,55) in but one Gospel manuscript, viz. that of the so-called Adishi redaction (C),\textsuperscript{49} whereas both the older Khanmeti redaction (represented in the VI\textsuperscript{th} century palimpsest A-89 of Tbilisi) and the so-called Protovulgate (the X\textsuperscript{th} century Gospel mss. of Ksani, Berta, Žruči, and Țarxalı) use the genuine Georg. word sicxe- ‘heat’ instead;\textsuperscript{50} and it is the Adishi manuscript (of 895 AD) which shows the most notable coincidences with the Armenian Gospels in general. In Jac. 1,11 where the “Alb.” palimpsest has xosk-agreeing with Arm. xoršak, the Georgian version has the genuine sicxe- in all its redactions, none of which shows any striking affinity with the Armenian tradition. Other occurrences of xoršak-i in the Old Georgian Bible are confined to a few verses in the OT that may well have had Armenian models, viz. in the list of plagues in Deut. 28,22 (where the word occurs, as the equivalent of Arm. xoršak and Gk. ἀνεμοφϑορία ‘blasting’, side by side with sicxe- rendering Gk. πυρετός and Arm. ğermn ‘fever’, but also with the rare stem goin- in the position of Gk. ὀχρα ‘mildew’, which clearly reflects Arm. ģoyn ‘jaundice’ and thus speaks in favour of an Armenian source for the given verse), Is. 49,10 (in the version of the so-called Oškı Bible of the XI\textsuperscript{th} century; the text of the XVII\textsuperscript{th} century Mtskheta Bible has sicxe- instead), and in Hiob 15,30 (where the Arm. vulgate text has not xoršak but holm ‘wind’, obviously remodelled after Gk. ἀνεμος). In Jon. 4,8, the Georgian Bible text has not xoršak-i but kar-i cxel-i ‘hot wind’ (in the Oškı Bible; the Mtskheta Bible has sul-i cxel-i ‘hot breath’); xoršak-i does occur

\textsuperscript{47} It is true that New Persian has xo- in xōšīdan ‘to dry up’ etc. (cf. STEINGASS 1977, p. 487b s.v. khoshidan). The change from b- to x- might have emerged earlier, but we would expect the pretonic -ō- to be reduced to -u- in the Arm. loan. The proper name Xosrov is hardly comparable here (← ḫōsrāw-? But cf. NPers. xūsrāw).

\textsuperscript{48} Cf. GIPPERT 1993, p.300ff. – The form varšamang-i with -n- noted in some dictionaries is a secondary variant that emerged within Georgian (cf. ib.).

\textsuperscript{49} The facsimile edition of the ms. in TAKAJŠVILI 1916 (tabl. 132) clearly shows that the verse in question must have been added later (by the same hand?), possibly after erasure of a previous text.

\textsuperscript{50} Cp. the occurrence of varšamag- in Jo. 20,7 C where the Protovulgate text has sudar- (← Gk. σουδάγιον).
in a lectionary variant of that verse, however.\textsuperscript{51} Besides the noun xoršak- itself, its derivative xoršakeul- ‘burnt by heat’ is also preserved in the Old Georgian OT tradition where it coincides with Arm. xoršakahar (Gen. 41,6.7.23.24.27); this is also true for Prov. 10,5 where the equivalent of the noun xoršak is replaced by sicxe- again. All in all, there is thus a clear preponderance for Georg. xoršak- to have been borrowed \textit{via} armeniaca; this assumption is not disproved by the fact that the word is also attested in a few autochthonous texts from the XI\textsuperscript{th} century on.\textsuperscript{52}

The case of Georg. mušak- is very different from this. This word is already attested in the Khanmeti Gospel ms. A 89, in Mt. 20,1 where the fragments of “Alb.” *muʾak are found as well. Here it is the Protovulgate redaction which has mušak- too, while the text of the Adishi ms. uses the genuine formation mokmed- ‘active, working (person)’ corresponding to Gk. ἐργάτης. In Mt. 20,2, it is the Khanmeti text again which has mušak-ta mat ‘to the workers’ (Gk. μετὰ τῶν ἐργατῶν, Arm. mšakač’n) while the two later redactions have only the pronoun (mat ‘them’). In Mt. 10,10, however, the Khanmeti text agrees with the latter redaction in using mokmed- while the Protovulgate alone has mušak-. All in all, the distribution of mušak- in its earliest attestations does not speak in favour of its having been borrowed \textit{via} armeniaca.\textsuperscript{53}

It goes without saying that the philological method of distinguishing lexical layers according to their textual distribution cannot be applied to “Albanian”, given that the text corpus we have is much too small and homogeneous. Nevertheless the phonetic peculiarities of the words discussed above admit of hypothesising a scenario. Taking into account that an Armenian background is likely for Georg. xoršak- and varšamag- but not for mušak-, we may assume the same for “Alb.” xoʾak- and vaʾamak- on the one hand and “Alb.” *muʾak- on the other; in the case of the latter, the assumption agrees with the necessity to reconstruct a preform *muršak- which cannot underlie Arm. mšak (or Georg. mušak-) and which must have developed independently in the vernacular the “Alb.” loan was taken from. For the pair of xortakem vs. xartak-biyesun, all this suggests that these two words were as well borrowed independently. On

\textsuperscript{51} In the so-called Paris lectionary; cf. the edition DANELIA \textit{et al.} 1987, p. 371. This verse is alluded to in an apophthegm of the so-called alphabetic collection (Agathias no. 4: p. 19, l. 23 of the edition DVALI 1974).

\textsuperscript{52} Cf. the Vita of Grigor of Xancta, 20 (p. 268, l. 29 of the ed. ABULAŽE 1963) with sul-i xoršak-isa- ‘breath of heat’ and the Vita of Giorgi the Athonite, XXII (p. 165, l. 20 of the ed. ABULAŽE 1967) with hweqana-xoršak- ‘hot land’. The only occurrence in a Middle Georgian text is found in the so-called Abdulmesiani, an ode to David Soslan (husband of the XII\textsuperscript{th} century queen Tamar) where xoršak- rhymes with mušak- (IX: 62,3a; p. 137 of the ed. LOLAŠVILI 1964).

\textsuperscript{53} The fact that the first syllable vowel was syncopated in Armenian before the beginning of literacy cannot be argued with here as the result of the Armenian syncope was a shewa vowel which may well have been (re-)substituted by Georgian -u- in contact with a labial; cf. GIPPERT 1993, p. 277f., for examples.
the other hand, they may nevertheless have had a common source, viz. a MIr. preform *xwartak-; in Arm. xortak-, the *xwa- would have left its usual trace, i.e. xo-, while in “Alb.” xartak- the initial consonant cluster *xw- was reduced to x- as clusters of this type do not exist in the “Albanian” language.54

It is clear, then, that the MIr. preform reconstructed here cannot be the ancestor of NPers. xurda and (Sasanian) MPers. xwurdag as there is no reason to assume that an older *xwa- should have developed into x(w)u- in this word while it remained stable in, e.g., xwardan ‘to eat, drink’.55 However, MIr. *xwartak may well have been a dialectal (NWIr.) cognate of (SWIr.) *xwurtak, provided that both forms derive from an older stem with a syllabic -r̥-. *xwartak vs. *xwurtak would then show the typical divergence we also find in other doublets such as MPers. murw vs. NWIr. *mary ‘bird’56 ← *myga-, with the latter form being represented in Arm. sinamarg ‘peacock’ (‘sēnamarγ-, vs. MPers. sēnurmurw ‘fabulous bird’), Georg. paršamang-i ‘id.’ (‘frašamarγ, MPers. fraš(a)murw ‘id.’)57 or Arm. margārē and “Alb.” margaven- ‘prophet’, lit. ‘augur, Vogelschauer’.58

On this basis we may lastly give an answer to the question first raised by Paul Horn as to whether NPers. xurda and MPers. xwurdag pertain to the verb xwardan ‘to eat, drink’ or not.59 The difference between the stem of the latter infinitive form (together with derivatives such as *xwarti- ‘food’ → Av. xvarəti-, MPers. xwardīg, ← Arm. xortik-kʿ) and the ancestor of the former (together with the unextended MPers. <hwldy> = xwurd occurring in the Pahl. Psalter in Ps. 123 [124],760) obviously consists of mere ablaut (zero-grade -r̥- vs. full-grade...
-ar-), and *xwrta- may well represent the original past participle “eaten” of the root *xwar-. For the semantics we can then compare the derivation of words denoting “trifles” like Engl. bit, Germ. bisschen from a verb meaning “to bite”.
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