

**Achtung!**

Dies ist eine Internet-Sonderausgabe des Aufsatzes  
„The linguistic background of Caucasian Albanian literacy“  
von Jost Gippert (2010).

Sie sollte nicht zitiert werden. Zitate sind der Originalausgabe in  
*Languages and Cultures in the Caucasus. Papers from the International Conference "Current Advances in  
Caucasian Studies" Macerata, January 21-23, 2010,*  
ed. by Vittorio Springfield Tomelleri, Manana Topadze, Anna Lukianowicz with the collaboration of Oleg  
Rumjancev  
München / Berlin: Otto Sagner 2011, 3-21  
zu entnehmen.

**Attention!**

This is a special internet edition of the article  
“The linguistic background of Caucasian Albanian literacy”  
by Jost Gippert (2010).

It should not be quoted as such. For quotations, please refer to the original edition in  
*Languages and Cultures in the Caucasus. Papers from the International Conference "Current Advances in  
Caucasian Studies" Macerata, January 21-23, 2010,*  
ed. by Vittorio Springfield Tomelleri, Manana Topadze, Anna Lukianowicz with the collaboration of Oleg  
Rumjancev  
München / Berlin: Otto Sagner 2011, 3-21.

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

Jost Gippert / Bernard Outtier, Frankfurt 2012

# THE LINGUISTIC BACKGROUND OF CAUCASIAN ALBANIAN LITERACY

Jost Gippert

The discovery of Albanian palimpsest manuscripts in St. Catherine's monastery on Mt. Sinai has laid a completely new foundation for the study of the Medieval Caucasus, its languages and its religions. The edition of the palimpsests, which has only recently appeared in print,<sup>1</sup> has clearly proven that the language of the Caucasian Albanians was closely related to modern Udi, but also that the Christian texts contained in the palimpsests (Gospels and other NT texts as well as a few OT fragments, distributed among an Evangeluary and a Lectionary manuscript)<sup>2</sup> pertained to a textual tradition that is otherwise best preserved in the Armenian Bible. In the present paper, I intend to illustrate the complex problems that are involved in determining the background of the Caucasian Albanian literacy on the basis of the Sinai manuscripts.

The Caucasian Albanian (hereafter: CA) lexicon as preserved in the palimpsest texts is characterised by a noteworthy number of words which have counterparts in non-related languages such as Armenian, Georgian, Greek, Syriac, Hebrew, or (Middle) Iranian and which are likely to have been borrowed from one of these languages, either in the course of Christianisation and text translation or in every day usage. The exact source and the route of borrowing is not always easy to determine though, especially when the same etymon is present in more than one of the languages concerned. The following list groups a set of relevant terms with their presumed equivalents:<sup>3</sup>

CA	Translation	Armenian	Georgian	Greek	Syriac	Iranian <sup>4</sup>
<i>aba</i>	Abba, Father	<i>abba</i>	<i>abba</i>	Αββα	<i>abbā</i>	
<i>abazaḳ</i>	robber	<i>awazak</i>	<i>avazaḳ-i</i>			MIr. * <i>ā-wāzak</i> (?) <sup>5</sup>
<i>afre(-pesown)</i>	to praise	<i>awhrnem</i> <sup>6</sup>				MIr. <i>ā-fri-</i>

<sup>1</sup> Gippert et alii 2009 (hereafter "the edition"). The edition project, which was jointly undertaken by Zaza Aleksidze, Jost Gippert, Jean-Pierre Mahé, Wolfgang Schulze, and Manana Tandaschwili, was kindly supported by the Volkswagen Foundation from 2003 to 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the edition, vol. I, pp. I-25–37 and vol. II as to the contents of the palimpsests.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the edition, vol. I, pp. II-79–84 as to a thorough account of foreign elements in the Albanian palimpsest texts.

<sup>4</sup> Abbreviations used in this column: MIr. = Middle Iranian, MP. = Middle Persian, MPT. = Middle Persian of Turfan texts, Pth. = Parthian, NP. = New Persian, OP. = Old Persian, Sogd. = Sogdian.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Andronikašvili (1966: 217 - \**āvāzak*).

CA	Translation	Armenian	Georgian	Greek	Syriac	Iranian
<i>angelos</i>	angel		<i>angeloz-i</i>	ἄγγελος		
<i>aḫçiba(y) / aḫsiba(y)</i>	Easter		<i>ağvseba-y</i>			
<i>ašarkeṭ</i>	disciple	<i>ašakert</i>				MIr. <i>*ašākərt</i>
<i>avazan</i>	basin	<i>awazan</i>	<i>avazan-i</i>		<i>āwzānā</i>	MIr. <i>*ā-wāzan- (?)</i> <sup>7</sup>
<i>avel</i>	much, many	<i>aṛ-awel (?)</i>				
<i>bamgen</i>	blessed					MIr. <i>*bāmgēn</i> <sup>8</sup>
<i>bazmacown</i>	dinner guests	<i>bazmakan</i>				MP.Pth. <i>bazm</i> ‘meal’
<i>belzebowl</i>	Beelzebub	<i>beelzebowl</i>	<i>berzebul-i</i>	Βεελζεβοὺλ	<i>b<sup>c</sup>ēl-zəbūb</i>	
<i>bod’var</i>	censer	<i>bowrvar</i>	<i>bervar-i</i>			MIr. <i>*bōdiβār</i> <sup>9</sup>
<i>borz-</i>	work, labour					MP.Pth. <i>warz</i>
<i>čat̃ar</i>	temple, shrine	<i>tačar</i>	<i>tažar-i</i>			OP. <i>tačara-</i>
<i>dag(i)n</i>	dinar, penny	<i>dang</i>	<i>dang-i</i>		<i>dānqā</i>	MP. <i>dāng</i>
<i>daxtaḳ</i>	tablet	<i>taxtak</i> <sup>10</sup>				MP. <i>taxtag</i>
<i>dev / dew</i>	devil, demon	<i>dew</i>	<i>dev-i</i>			MIr. <i>dēw</i>
<i>d’ip̃</i>	scripture, book	<i>(dpir</i> ‘writer’)				OP. <i>dipi-</i> , MI. <i>*dip-</i>
<i>dowrowd</i>	beam, wood					(Pth. <i>dārūβdag</i> ‘crucified’)
<i>eḳlesi</i>	church	<i>ekelec’i</i>	<i>eḳlesia-</i>	ἐκκλησία	<i>(aqlisā)</i>	
<i>garazman</i>	grave, sepulchre	<i>gerezman</i>				
<i>hačex</i>	right (hand)	<i>aǰ</i>				

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Meillet (1936: 32); the reservations uttered by Hübschmann (1897: 511) are not justified.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Andronikašvili (1966: 218 - *\*ā-vāz-āna*).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Gippert (2007a: 100-102).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Gippert (2007a: 102-106).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Gippert (2007a: 106-107). – In Georgian, *taxt-* ‘throne’ is attested too late (in late Middle Georgian texts) to be considered here.

<i>hambaw</i>	fame, rumour	<i>hambaw</i>	<i>hambav-i</i>		MIr. * <i>ham-</i> <i>bāw</i> (?) <sup>11</sup>
<i>hariḱ</i>	tribute, tax	<i>hark</i>	<i>xarḱ-i</i> <sup>12</sup>		MP. <i>harg</i> , MPT <i>harāg</i>
<i>hetanos</i>	heathen, Gentile	<i>het<sup>c</sup>anos</i>		ἔθνος	
<i>iṣḱapos</i>	bishop	<i>episkopos</i>	<i>epiṣkopos-i</i>	ἐπίσκοπος	<i>epiṣqūpā</i>
<i>kahana</i>	priest	<i>k<sup>c</sup>ahanay</i>			<i>kāhnā</i>
<i>ḱala</i>	lame	<i>kaḷ</i>			
<i>kalak</i>	town, city	<i>k<sup>c</sup>aḷak<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>kalak-i</i>		<i>karḱā</i> (?) <sup>13</sup>
<i>ḱatoliḱeow(n)</i>	Catholic	<i>kat<sup>c</sup>oliḱē</i>	<i>ḱatoliḱe-</i>	καθολικός	<i>qaṭōlīqā</i>
<i>ḱilṭ</i>	key		<i>ḱliṭe-</i>	κλεῖς	((a)qlīdā)
<i>ḱor-</i>	back(wards)	<i>kor</i>			
<i>kroba</i>	cherubim	<i>k<sup>c</sup>rovbēk<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>kerobi-ni</i>	Χερουβίμ	<i>krōḅā</i>
<i>laḱēn</i>	basin, bowl				(NP. <i>lagan</i> ) <sup>14</sup>
<i>madil' / midil'</i>	grace, gift, favour		<i>madl-i</i>		
<i>manana</i>	manna	<i>mananay</i>	<i>manana-</i>	μάννα	<i>mannā</i>
<i>margāven</i>	prophet	<i>margarē</i>			MIr. * <i>marya-</i> <i>wēn</i> / - <i>ḡē</i> <sup>15</sup>
<i>marmin/n'</i>	body	<i>marmin</i>			
<i>mog</i>	mage	<i>mog</i>	<i>mogu-</i>	μάγος	MP. <i>mog</i>
<i>mu<sup>f</sup>ak</i>	worker	<i>mšak</i>	<i>mušaḱ-i</i>		
<i>n<sup>f</sup>a-</i>	boat, ship	<i>nav</i>	<i>nav-i</i>	ναύς	MIr. <i>nāw-</i>
<i>paḱar</i>	reason	<i>patčar</i>			MIr. * <i>pat-čār-</i>
<i>pasek</i>	Passover	<i>pasek<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>pasek-i</i>	φασέκ	<i>paseḱ</i>
<i>piling</i>	bronze, cop- per	<i>plinj</i>	<i>(s)pilenj-i</i>		MP. <i>brinǰ</i>
<i>powsaḱ</i>	crown	<i>psak</i>			Sogd. <i>pusak</i> , MP.Pth. <i>pusag</i> <sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Androniḱašvili (1966: 222: \**hambav*).

<sup>12</sup> A variant *harḱ* is attested two times in the Vienna palimpsest, fol. 90va, 5 and fol. 98va, 11 (Gippert 2007b: 6-20 and 6-28).

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Bielmeier (1985: 38-41).

<sup>14</sup> Very uncertain example.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Gippert (2005a: 163-165).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Gippert (2007a: 106).

<i>rabbi</i>	my master!	<i>ṛabbi</i>	<i>rabi</i>	Ῥαββί	<i>rabbī</i>	
<i>rabbowni</i>	our master!	<i>rabbowni</i>	( <i>h</i> ) <i>rabbuni</i>	Ῥαββουνι	<i>rabbūlī</i>	
<i>-šad-</i>	loosened	<i>-šat</i>				MP.Pth. <i>šād</i> < <i>*šāt</i> 'happy' <sup>17</sup>
<i>salmos</i>	psalm	<i>sałmos</i>	<i>psalmun-i</i>	ψαλμός		
<i>šam/nbaṭ</i>	Sabbath	<i>šabat<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>šabat-i</i>	σάββατον	<i>šabtā</i>	Pth. <i>šambat</i>
<i>sa<sup>l</sup>owrzel</i>	throne, see		<i>savrzel-i</i>			
<i>saṭanay</i>	Satan	<i>satanay</i>	<i>saṭana-y</i>	Σατανᾶς	<i>sāṭānā</i>	
<i>saxē</i>	image, vision		<i>saxe-y</i>			
<i>ṭalavar</i>	tabernacle	<i>taławar</i>	<i>ṭalavar-i</i>			Pth. <i>talawār</i>
<i>targowmanown</i>	translation	<i>t<sup>c</sup>argmanowt<sup>c</sup>iwn</i>	<i>targmaneba</i>		<i>*targumānu</i>	
<i>va<sup>l</sup>amaḵ</i>	cerecloth, napkin	<i>varšamak</i>	<i>varšamag-i</i>			Sogd. <i>w<sup>2</sup>š<sup>2</sup>my</i> , NP. <i>bāšāma</i>
<i>varṭapeṭ</i>	teacher	<i>vartapet</i>				MIr. <i>*wardapet</i> (?) <sup>18</sup>
<i>xarṭaḵ-</i>	(into) pieces	<i>xortakem</i>				MP. <i>xurda</i> < <i>*x<sup>w</sup>ərtak-</i> <sup>19</sup>
<i>xexer-</i>	saw		<i>xerx-i</i>			
<i>xo<sup>l</sup>aḵ</i>	heat	<i>xoršak</i>	<i>xoršaḵ-i</i>			MPT. <i>hōšāg</i> 'hot wind'? <sup>19</sup>
<i>xoran</i>	tent	<i>xoran</i>				MIr. <i>*xwadān</i> (?) <sup>19</sup>
<i>*ž(olovowr)d</i>	crowd, people	<i>žolovowrd</i>				

At first glance, these terms provide a highly diversified picture. However, some observations can be made off-hand.

First, it is obvious that the amount of lexemes Caucasian Albanian shared with Armenian is the largest. Of the terms in question, it is but very few, however, that do not have an Iranian basis (*avel* 'many, much', *haḵeḵ* 'right (hand)', *ḵala* 'lame', *kor* 'bent, crooked', *garazman* 'grave', *marmin* 'body', and *\*žolovowrd* 'crowd, people'). The picture we see thus strongly reminds us of the situation of Old Georgian where we do find a large number of Iranianisms

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Hübschmann (1897: 211-212).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Benveniste (1929: 10).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Gippert (2009: 127-136).

shared with Armenian but hardly any Armenian loans proper (Gippert 2005b). Since for Old Georgian, the wide-spread hypothesis that all Iranianisms entered the language *via armeniaca* can no longer be maintained (Gippert 1993: 345-350), we may assume for Albanian, too, that many (if not all) of its Iranianisms may have entered the language directly. This assumption is corroborated by the fact that Albanian possesses Iranianisms not shared by Armenian (and/or Georgian) such as *bamgen* ‘blessed’, which presupposes a Middle Iran. *\*bāmgēn*, lit. ‘ray-like, shining’; *margaven* ‘prophet’, which opposes itself to Arm. *margarē* ‘id.’ as containing the present stem, not the past stem of the Middle Iran. verb ‘to see’ as its second compound member (*\*marya-wēn-* vs. *\*marya-δē-* ‘augur’, lit. ‘bird-seer’); or *dowrowd* (= Udi *duruṭ*) ‘beam, wood (used for the cross)’, which clearly corresponds to Parth. *dārūβdag* ‘crucified’ (Boyce 1977: 34),<sup>20</sup> a derivate of Old Iran. *dāru-* ‘wood’. The term *d’ip* ‘scripture, book’ may also be mentioned here since its presumable etymon, Old Pers. *dipī-* ‘inscription’, is not continued as such in Armenian but only in the derivate *dpir* ‘writer’ (< *\*dipī-βar-*?).<sup>21</sup> The assumption that Iranianisms are direct loans in CA is also corroborated by phonetic differences where CA does not share an internal Armenian development; cp., e.g., *powsaḵ* ‘crown’, which opposes itself to Arm. *psak* ‘id.’ by the preservation of the first syllable vowel (< Early NW-Middle Iran. *\*pusak-*, cf. Middle Pers. Parth. *pusag*, Sogd. *pusak*; Gippert 2007a: 106-108); *afre-pesown* vs. Arm. *awhrnem* / *awrhnem* ‘to praise’, where CA has preserved the Iranian consonant cluster *fr* (< *\*ā-frī-*) which developed into *whr* > *wrh* in Armenian;<sup>22</sup> or *bod’var* ‘censer’ (< Middle Iran. *\*bōdiβār-*), where CA does not share the substitution of Middle Iran. *-δ-* > *-r-* visible in both Arm. *bowrvaṛ* and Georg. *bervar-i* (Gippert 2007a: 103-106). Conversely, Albanian may exhibit peculiar developments as in the three terms *vaḷamaḵ* ‘cerecloth, napkin’ (vs. Arm. *varšamak*, Georg. *varšama(n)g-i*, Sogd. *wʾšʾmy*, New Pers. *bāšāma*), *xoḷaḵ* ‘heat’ (vs. Arm. *xoršak*, Georg. *xoršak-i*, Middle Pers. Turfan *hōšāg* ‘hot wind’), and *mowḷaḵ* ‘worker’ (vs. Arm. *mšak*, Georg. *mušaḵ-i*, with no clear Iranian equivalent). Here we have the crucial representation of a *š* sound (or *rš* cluster) by the CA pharyngeal<sup>ʕ</sup>.<sup>23</sup> The question of the route of borrowing notwithstanding, the elements of Iranian stock represent the largest layer of loanwords by far in Albanian, even if a few cases remain doubtful (*borz* ‘labour, work’ ~ New Pers. *barz*, vs. Middle Pers. Parth. *warz* ‘id.’, or *laqēn* ‘basin, bowl’ vs. New Pers. *lagan* ‘id.’).

<sup>20</sup> The word is written <d’rwbdg> in the texts (also in the derivation *dārūβdagiftīg* <d’rwbdgyftg> ‘concerning the crucifixation’, ib.).

<sup>21</sup> Cp. also Old Georgian *\*dabir-* (only attested in the hapax legomenon *šahr-dabir-* ‘town-writer’), which must have been borrowed from Middle Persian (Gippert 1993: 225-228).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. n. 6 above for the Armenian development.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Gippert 2009 for a full discussion of the terms *vaḷamaḵ*, *xoḷaḵ*, and *mowḷaḵ*.

Of the few terms that may be loans from Armenian proper, only one is beyond any doubt, viz. *marmin* ‘body’ which has for long been equated with Old Ind. *mārman-* ‘link, hinge, vulnerable spot’<sup>24</sup> (Hübschmann 1897: 473 no. 278). In a similar way, CA *avel* ‘many, much’ may pertain to the Armenian root *\*awel* present in *aweli* and *aṛ-awel* ‘more’ and the derivative verbs *y-awel-owm* ‘to add’ and *aṛ-awel-owm* ‘to increase’, most probably a cognate of Gk. ὀφείλλω ‘to foster, further, increase, add’, < Proto-Indo-Eur. *\*h<sub>3</sub>b<sup>h</sup>el-* (Pedersen 1906: 336, Klingenschmitt 1982: 236 and 238); however, we should note that Arm. *aweli* and *aṛawel* are usually translated by *ixoy* in the palimpsests, not *avel*.<sup>25</sup> For the equivalent of Arm. *žoḷoword* ‘crowd, people, synagogue’, the CA texts show the abbreviation *ž̃d* throughout so that the identification with the Armenian term remains uncertain. The identity of CA *garazman* ‘grave, sepulchre’ with Arm. *gerezman* ‘id.’ seems undisputable, but there is no generally adopted etymology available for the latter and the different vowels require an explanation.<sup>26</sup> In the case of *haç-* ‘right (hand)’, only attested in the presumptive dative (III) form *haçeḡ-* underlying the compound verb *haçeḡ-biyesown* ‘to make successful, let succeed’ (cp. Arm. *y-aḡ-oḡ-em* ‘id.’) and the genitive *haçeḡown* ‘by the right (hand)’, the comparison with Arm. *aḡ* must take even two differences into account, viz. the word-initial *h-* and the stem-final affricate. While the former might be regarded as a residue of an older *\*h-* reflecting PIE *\*s-* (root *\*seHd<sup>h</sup>-*, cf. Old Ind. *sādhati* ‘lets succeed’) (Ačāryan 1971: 246, Rix et alii 1998: 468), the latter remains hard to comply with, all the more since there is some uncertainty about the Udi equivalent of the word. The identification of the CA preverb *ḡor-* ‘back’, attested in *ḡor-biyesown* / *ḡor-ihesown* ‘to return’ (tr./intr.) as well as *il’ow-ḡor-biyesown* ‘to answer, reply’, lit. ‘to return word(s)’, and *kowl-ḡor-biyesown* ‘to recompense’, lit. ‘to return hand(s)’, with Arm. *kor* ‘bent, crooked’<sup>27</sup> is supported by Udi *ḡori* which shares the semantics of the Arm. word; however, the special notion of the preverb is not matched by Udi evidence (cf. *ḡori-baksun* / *ḡori-besun* ‘to bend’, lit. ‘to become/make crooked’). Lastly, CA = Udi *ḡala* ‘lame’ may well be related to Arm. *kaḡ* ‘id.’,<sup>28</sup> an *a*-stem

<sup>24</sup> The alternation of the stem final consonant (*-n* vs *-n’*) in CA is clearly secondary.

<sup>25</sup> The only exception seems to be Gal. 1, 14 where *avel* translates first *bazowm* ‘many’, then *aṛawel* ‘more’.

<sup>26</sup> The proposal by Henning 1945/1977 to identify Arm. *gerezman* with New Pers. *marzayan* / *mary(a)zan*, *maryūzan* ‘sepulchre’ (and Mongol. *suburyan* ‘id.’ < Sogd.) via an underlying (Avest.) *\*zəmarkana-* ‘dug in the ground’ presupposes several metatheses that are not easy to account for (*\*garzman* < *\*zmargan*?) and leaves the Armenian *e*-vowels unexplained, too. The older etymology relating *gerezman* to Avest. *garō dāmān-* / *nmān-* ‘paradise’, lit. ‘house of chant’, was already rejected by Hübschmann (1897: 172).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Hübschmann (1897: 520) as to possible cognates of the Arm. word.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. already Ačāryan (1973: 419) for the Udi term and Schulze 2002 as to Udi *ḡori* and *ḡala*.

preserved also in the derivative verb *kałam* ‘to limp’ (Klingenschmitt 1982: 90); however, the etymon of the Arm. word is anything but certain<sup>29</sup> and Old Georgian *kel-* (occurring in the present stem *kel-ob-* ‘to limp’, participle *m-~~kel~~-ob-el-i* ‘lame, limping’)<sup>30</sup> must also be taken into account here (Ačařyan 1973: 491).

Considering the seven Armenian terms discussed above, we may state that only two of them, *marmin* and *žořovowrd*, have a notable religious connotation, which suggests that they may have been adopted from Armenian in the course of Christianisation; the others rather pertain to every day usage. In contrast to this, the few CA terms that are likely to be of Georgian provenance yield a different picture. With the only exception of *xexer-* ‘saw’,<sup>31</sup> which may reflect Georg. *xerx-i* ‘id.’ if it is not purely onomatopoeic, all of them are strongly associated with religious thought. This is especially true for the CA designation of Easter, *aḫḫiba(y)/aḫsiba(y)*, which clearly reflects Old Georgian *aḡvseba-y* (nom. sg.) ‘id.’, lit. ‘fulfilment’, and which has been preserved down to the present day in Udi *aḫḫima* (Vartašen)/*axsibay* (Niž); as a central term of Christian practice, this word must have prevailed over synonyms such as Arm. *zatic* (together with Georg. *zatic-i*, < Middle Pers. *\*zatic* < *\*jatic*-, lit. ‘slaughter’; Gippert 1989: 15-16), Hebr. *pēsaḥ* with its descendants (e.g. Gk. *πάσχα*, but also Syr. *paseḳ*, reflected in Arm. *pasek<sup>c</sup>*, Georg. *pasek-i*, and CA *pasek*, in its turn attested in two marginal glosses in the palimpsests), or CA *müwḫen*, most probably an instrumental-based derivative of *\*müwḫ* ‘joy(ful), happiness’ (> Udi *mu<sup>c</sup>q* ‘id.’): ‘feast, festival’ < ‘(day) with joy’.<sup>32</sup> A term of similar importance within Christian tradition is CA *madil* ‘grace, mercy’, which is as obviously based upon Georgian *madl-i* ‘id.’<sup>33</sup> as *saxē* ‘image, vision’ and *sa<sup>l</sup>owrzel* ‘throne, see’ reflect their Georgian counterparts, *saxē* and *savrzel-i*. It is true that in the latter case, the identity does not manifest itself textually, given that in the verse in question (Mt. 19,28), the Georgian NT redactions have not *savrzel-i* but *saḡdar-i*; however, with attestations as early as the Khanmeti period,<sup>34</sup> the Georgian term can be proven to be old enough to have been borrowed by Caucasian Albanian in a Christian context.

<sup>29</sup> Of the possible cognates listed by Hübschmann (1897: 457 no. 195), Goth. *halts*; Gk. *κυλλός*, Skt. *kunī-*, NPers. *kul*), none matches the Arm. word-initial *k-* (< *\*g-*).

<sup>30</sup> Attested e.g. in Mt. 15, 30 since Khanmeti times.

<sup>31</sup> Only attested in the compound verb *xexeren-biyesown* ‘to saw’, lit. ‘to make with saw’.

<sup>32</sup> Note, however, that a cognate of Udi *mu<sup>c</sup>q* may also be present in the compound *hüwḫmowḫ* ‘joy’ if this represents a compound ‘heart-joy’.

<sup>33</sup> The variant *midil*-, once attested in the erg.pl. as *midil’owgon* in Eph. 2, 5, is rather due to a misspelling (anticipation?) than *sprachwirklich*.

<sup>34</sup> E.g. within the Protevangelium Jacobi in the Vienna palimpsest, f. 67vb, 19 (Gippert 2007b: 5-7).

With both Armenian and Georgian, Albanian shares a few terms for which a Greek origin is evident. Different from both its neighbours, however, Albanian does not possess any Greek loans that would be exclusive, and there are clear indications that all Greek elements entered the language via either Armenian or Georgian. This is obvious, e.g., for *salmos* ‘psalm’ and *hetanos* ‘heathen, Gentile’, which exhibit the peculiar phonetic adaptations of Arm. *salmos* and *het<sup>c</sup>anos*, vs. Gk. ψαλμός (and Georgian *psalmun-i*, which is likely to reflect the Gk. accusative ψαλμόν) and ἔθνος (not reflected at all in Georgian, which uses the autochthonous formation *çarmart-i*, lit. ‘averted’, instead). On the other hand, *eḱlesi* ‘church, congregation’, *angelos* ‘angel’, and *ḱilt-* ‘key’ clearly match the Georgian representatives of Gk. ἐκκλησία, ἄγγελος, and κλείς (gen. κλειδός), *eḱlesia-*, *angelos-i*,<sup>35</sup> and *ḱliṭe-*, at the same time opposing themselves to Arm. *ekelec<sup>c</sup>i* (with its peculiar phonetic structure) and, all the more so, the unrelated terms *hreštak* (< Middle Iran. \**frēštak* ‘angel’, lit. ‘sent one’) and *p<sup>c</sup>akank<sup>c</sup>*, lit. ‘bolts’.<sup>36</sup> In the case of CA *ḱatoliḱe-own* ‘Catholic’, both Arm. *kat<sup>c</sup>olikē* and Georg. *ḱatoliḱe-* may be regarded as the intermediary source procuring Gk. καθολικός or, rather, its feminine form καθολική (scil. ἐκκλησία). Only CA *iṣḱapōs* ‘bishop’<sup>37</sup> exhibits a special shape vs. Gk. ἐπίσκοπος, Arm. *episkopos* and Georg. *epiṣḱopos-i*, which may indicate a deeper integration into the spoken language, probably in connection with an early date of borrowing.

A layer *sui generis* within the CA lexicon is constituted by the elements for which we may claim Semitic provenance. Again, there is practically no item that has no counterpart in Armenian and Georgian. However, we must distinguish at least two different types here, viz. a) terms that are part of the Biblical tradition, and b) words that have spread about the Near East without any peculiar textual affiliation. The latter type is clearly represented by CA *targowman-own* ‘translation’, which opposes itself to both its Arm. and Georg. counterparts by having preserved the mid-syllable vowel *-u-* of Akkadian (> Aramaic) *targumānu* ‘id.’,<sup>38</sup> and CA *kalak* ‘town, city’, which agrees with Arm. *k<sup>c</sup>alak<sup>c</sup>*, Georg. *kalak-i*, and several other related terms (the etymological basis of this *Wanderwort* has not yet been established with certainty; Bielmeyer 1985: 38-41).

<sup>35</sup> Thus e.g. in the Khanmeti version of Lk. 2, 21 in the Tbilisi palimpsest A-844 (cf. Kažaia 1984: 86) vs. more regularly attested *angeloz-i*.

<sup>36</sup> Arm. *p<sup>c</sup>ak* ‘bolt’ has no reliable etymology.

<sup>37</sup> Attested only in a gloss introducing 2.Tim. 4,1 in the palimpsests, and in the Mingechaur inscription; cf. the edition, vol. II, pp. VII-2/VII-37 and vol. I, p. II-86, and Gippert (2004: 116-117).

<sup>38</sup> Cf., e.g., Brockelmann (1928: 834a) s. v. *targem*.

To the same group we may further add the CA designation of the Sabbath, *šambaṭ*, which, together with its variant *šanbaṭ*, comes closer to Parth. *šambat* than to Arm. *šabat*<sup>c</sup>, Georg. *šabat-i* or *šapat-i*, Gk. σάββατον, or any other descendant of Hebr. *šabbāt*. Within the group of Biblical terms, we find elements such as *belzebowl* ‘Beelzebub’, *saṭanay* ‘Satan’, *manana* ‘manna’, *pasek* ‘Passover’, or the appellation forms *aba* ‘Abba, Father!’, *rabbi* ‘My master!’, and *rab-bowni* ‘Our master!’. In many cases, it is just terms of this type that are decisive in determining the transmission of the Biblical texts into Caucasian Albanian. Thus we may observe that CA *saṭanay* ‘Satan’ perfectly matches Arm. *satanay* ‘id.’ but also the rare Georg. nom.sg. *saṭana-y*, while Gk. Σατανᾶς or Syr. *sāṭānā* do not yield a sufficient basis for the CA stem ending in *-ay* (cf. the dat. III *saṭanay-ax* in Heb. 2, 14). In a similar way, CA *manana* ‘manna’ is more similar to both Arm. *mananay* and Georg. *manana-* than to Gk. μάννα (or Syr. *mannā*) ‘id.’ even though the word-final *-y* of the Arm. term is not preserved here (cf. the abs.sg. *manana* in Jo. 6, 31 and the erg.-instr.sg. *manana-en* in Heb. 9, 4). A peculiar case in this context is the CA name of the cherubim, *kroba*, which seems to reflect Syr. *krōbā* rather than Arm. *k<sup>c</sup>rovbēk<sup>c</sup>* or Gk. Χερουβίν (and its Georg. descendant *kerobin-i*). Unfortunately, the one attestation of the term (*kroba-ax*, abs.pl., in Heb. 9, 5) is not certain enough to permit further conclusions.

A similar picture is observable with the proper names attested in the palimpsests, all of which pertain to the Biblical sphere. The following tables list a selection of CA forms of personal names, geographical terms, ethnonyms, and derivatives thereof,<sup>39</sup> in contrast to their Armenian, Georgian, Greek, Syriac, and (where applicable) Hebrew equivalents.<sup>40</sup>

### Personal names

CA	trl.	Armenian	Georgian	Greek	Syriac	Hebrew
<i>Abel</i>	Abel	<i>Abel</i>	<i>Abel</i>	Ἀβελ	<i>Hāḇel</i>	( <i>Hāḇēl</i> )
<i>Abraham</i>	Abraham	<i>Abraham</i>	<i>Abra(h)am</i>	Ἀβραάμ	<i>Abrāhām</i>	( <i>Abrāhām</i> )
<i>Aharon</i>	Aaron	<i>Aharon</i>	<i>Ahron</i>	Ἀαρών	<i>Ahrōn</i>	( <i>Ahārōn</i> )

<sup>39</sup> For a complete survey cf. the edition, vol. I, pp. II-82–84.

<sup>40</sup> Hebrew equivalents of NT name forms are given according to OT attestations (in parentheses). The rendering of Syriac and Hebrew vocalisation marks remains tentative; spirantised variants of stops in these languages are marked by a horizontal stroke added above or below. Word initial *aleph* characters are not transcribed. Names that are only attested in liturgical headings, glosses and the like are listed in square brackets. Parentheses and slashes within words indicate graphical variants; restorations of abbreviations are put in angle brackets. For the attestations of the name forms cf. the respective indexes in the edition, vol. I, pp. IV-2 ff.

CA	trl.	Armenian	Georgian	Greek	Syriac	Hebrew
<i>Eliša</i>	Eliseus	<i>Elise</i>	<i>Elise</i>	Ἐλισαῖος	<i>Eliša</i> <sup>c</sup>	( <i>Ēlišā</i> <sup>c</sup> )
<i>Elisabet</i>	Elisabeth	<i>Elisabet</i> <sup>c</sup>	<i>Elisabet</i>	Ἐλισάβετ	<i>Elišba</i> <sup>c</sup>	( <i>Ēlišəḇa</i> <sup>c</sup> )
<i>Ešaya</i>	Isaiah	<i>Ēsaya</i>	<i>Esaia, Esaya</i>	Ἡσαίας	<i>Eša</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>yā</i>	( <i>Yəša</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>yāhū</i> )
<i>Herode, -es, -ēs</i>	Herod	<i>Herovdēs</i>	<i>Herode</i>	Ἡρῴδης	<i>Herōḏes</i>	
<i>Herodiow</i>	Herodias	<i>Hērovdias</i>	<i>Herodia</i>	Ἡρῳδιάς	<i>Herōḏiyā</i>	
<i>Isa</i>	Isaiah	<i>Ēsaya</i>	<i>Esaia, Esaya</i>	Ἡσαίας	<i>Eša</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>yā</i>	( <i>Yəša</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>yāhū</i> )
<i>Isaḳ</i>	Isaac	<i>Isahak</i>	<i>Isa(ha)ḳ</i>	Ἰσαάκ	<i>Īṣḥāq</i>	( <i>Yiṣḥāq</i> )
<i>Ḳirines</i>	Cyrenius	<i>Kiwrenios</i>	<i>Ḳwrinēs</i>	Κυρήνιος	<i>Qūrīnōs</i>	
<i>Laazar</i>	Lazarus	<i>Łazaros</i>	<i>Lazare</i>	Λάζαρος	<i>Lə</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>āzar</i>	
<i>[Lowḳas</i>	Luke	<i>Łowkas</i>	<i>Luḳa</i>	Λουκᾶς	<i>Lūqōs]</i>	
<i>Maryam</i>	Mary	<i>Mariam</i>	<i>Mariam</i>	Μαριάμ	<i>Maryam</i>	
<i>Mowse, Mowsēs</i>	Moses	<i>Movsēs</i>	<i>Mose</i>	Μωϋσῆς	<i>Mūše</i>	( <i>Mošeh</i> )
<i>Peṭros</i>	Peter	<i>Petros</i>	<i>Peṭre</i>	Πέτρος	<i>Peṭrōs</i>	
<i>Pilaṭos</i>	Pilate	<i>Pīlatos</i>	<i>Pilaṭe</i>	Πιλάτος	<i>Pilatōs</i>	
<i>Rakel</i>	Rachel	<i>Hṛak</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>ēl</i>	( <i>H</i> ) <i>rakel</i>	Ῥαχήλ	<i>Raḥēl</i>	( <i>Rāḥēl</i> )
<i>Yeš</i>	Jesse	<i>Yesse</i>	<i>Iese</i>	Ἰεσσαί	<i>Yišay</i>	( <i>Yišay</i> )
<i>Yaḳob, -os</i>	Jacob, James	<i>Yakovb</i>	<i>Iaḳob</i>	Ἰακώβ	<i>Ya</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>qūḇ</i>	( <i>Ya</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>āqoḇ</i> )
<i>[Yešo</i>	Joshuah	<i>Yesow</i>	<i>Iso</i>	Ἰησοῦς	<i>Yešu</i>	( <i>Yēšūa</i> <sup>c</sup> )]
<i>Yesoa</i>	Esau	<i>Isaw</i>	<i>Esav</i>	Ἡσαῦ	<i>Īsū</i>	( <sup>c</sup> <i>Ēsāw</i> )
<i>Yo(v)h(an)an, Yo(v)-han(n)ēs</i>	John	<i>Yovhannēs</i>	<i>Iohane, Io-vane</i>	Ἰωάννης	<i>Yūḥanān</i>	( <i>Yōḥānān</i> )
<i>Yosep, Yosēp</i>	Joseph	<i>Yovsēp</i> <sup>c</sup>	<i>Iosep, Ioseb</i>	Ἰωσήφ	<i>Yawsep</i> <sup>̄</sup>	( <i>Yōsēp</i> <sup>̄</sup> )
<i>Zakari(y)a</i>	Zacharias	<i>Zak</i> <sup>c</sup> <i>aria</i>	<i>Zakaria</i>	Ζαχαρίας	<i>Zəḳaryā</i>	( <i>Zəḳariyāh</i> )

In most cases, it is clear off-hand that the CA name forms reflect the Greek tradition, at the same time matching either the Armenian or the Georgian counterparts or both. A few characteristics may be mentioned, however: first, it is noteworthy that different from Georgian (but in accordance with Armenian), CA does not continue any Gk. vocative forms, contrasting, e.g., *Peṭros* = Gk. Πέτρος (~ Arm. *Petros*) with Georg. *Peṭre* = Gk. voc. Πέτρε, *Pilaṭos* = Gk. Πιλάτος (~ Arm. *Pīlatos*) with Georg. *Pilaṭe* = Gk. voc. Πιλάτε, or *Lowḳas* = Gk. Λουκᾶς (~ Arm. *Łowkas*) with Georg. *Luḳa* = Gk. voc. Λουκᾶ. There are

but very few examples where CA forms seem to be closer to Georgian than to Armenian, as in the case of *Ḳirines* ~ Georg. *Ḳwrinēs* vs. Arm. *Kwrenios* ~ Gk. Κυρήνιος.<sup>41</sup> A peculiar case is the name of the prophet Isaiah for which the palimpsests provide two extremely different forms, viz. *Isa* (in Lk. 4, 14 and 17 but also in the heading of the lecture from the prophet's book, Is. 35, 3-8), and *Ešaya* (in Jo. 12, 38), none of them matching the Greek, Armenian or Georgian name forms (Ἰσαΐας/Ēsaya/Esaia, Esaya) exactly. Instead, the latter CA variant shows a remarkable resemblance with its Syriac counterpart, *Eša<sup>c</sup>yā*, while *Isa* seems to reflect a later (itacistic) Greek pronunciation of Ἰσαΐας also underlying the form *Isaia* of the Latin Vulgate. A similar divergence is met with in the variants of the name of John, appearing in the stem forms *Yo(v)han(n)ēs*, *Yovhan*, and *Yo(v)hanan*. Here again, a Syriac layer is likely to manifest itself, at least in the last named variant;<sup>42</sup> this, however, seems to have undergone an adaptation that is otherwise typical for Armenian, viz. the (graphical) representation of a long rounded vowel by a sequence <ov>. A Syriac layer may further be recognised in the name of Lazarus, *Laazar*, which equals Syr. *Lə<sup>c</sup>āzar* while Arm. *Łazaros* and Georg. *Lazare* are clearly based upon Gk. Λάζαρος and its voc. Λάζαρε, resp. A peculiar development must be assumed for the CA name of Herodias, the sister-in-law of Herod, which is attested in the genitive form *Herodiowy* in Mt. 14,6, contrasting with Arm. *Hērovdias*, Georg. *Herodia*, and Gk. Ἡρώδιάς; this might represent an unattested Armenian name formation \**Herodiowhi* containing the female “motion” suffix *-owhi*.<sup>43</sup>

### Place names

CA	trl.	Armenian	Georgian	Greek	Syriac	Hebrew
<i>Arabiya</i>	Arabia	<i>Arabia</i>	<i>Arabia</i>	Ἀραβία	<i>Arabīya</i>	( <sup>c</sup> <i>Ārāb</i> )
<i>Betlahem</i>	Bethlehem	<i>Bet<sup>c</sup>leem</i>	<i>Betlem</i>	Βηθλέεμ	<i>Bēt-lhem</i>	( <i>Bēt-lehem</i> )
<i>Damaskos</i>	Damascus	<i>Damaskos</i>	<i>Damaske</i>	Δαμασκός	<i>Dar-msūq</i>	( <i>Dammāseq</i> )
<i>Erowsalem</i>	Jerusalem	<i>E(rowsalē)m</i>	<i>I(erusa)l(ē)m</i>	Ἱεροσόλυμα, Ἱερουσαλήμ	<i>Ūrišlem</i>	<i>Yērūšālaim</i>
<i>Galil/l'ea</i>	Galilee	<i>Galilea</i>	<i>Galilea</i>	Γαλιλαία	<i>Galilā</i>	( <i>Gālīl</i> )
<i>Hrama</i>	Rama	<i>Hrama</i>	<i>Hrama</i>	Ῥαμά	<i>Rāmṭā</i>	( <i>Rāmāh</i> )
<i>Ihowda</i>	Judaea	<i>Hrēastan</i>	<i>Huriastan-i</i>	Ἰουδαία	<i>Yəhūdā</i>	
<i>Ḳaparna(h)om</i>	Capernaum	<i>Kap<sup>c</sup>aṛnaowm</i>	<i>Ḳaparnao/um</i>	Καφαρναούμ	<i>Kəṣṣarnaḥūm</i>	

<sup>41</sup> The rendering of Gk. *ypsilon* by CA *i* (vs. Arm. *iw*, Georg. *w*) is noteworthy.

<sup>42</sup> For the shorted variant *Yovhan* cp. the variant reading *c<sup>c</sup>-Yovhán* appearing in Mt. 11,13 in the Ejmiacin Gospel ms. (cf. the facsimile edition by Macler 1928, fol. 28r).

<sup>43</sup> As to the suffix cf. Šaniže (1968: 7 ff.).

CA	trl.	Armenian	Georgian	Greek	Syriac	Hebrew
<i>Nazaret, -ēt</i>	Nazareth	<i>Nazaret<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Nazaret</i>	Ναζαρά, -έθ	<i>Nāṣraṭ</i>	
<i>Serebta</i>	Sarepta	<i>Sarep<sup>c</sup>t<sup>a</sup></i>	<i>Sarepta</i>	Σάρεπτα	<i>Sarpaṭ</i>	( <i>Šārəpāṭāh</i> )
<i>Šiloham/n</i>	Siloam	<i>Silovam</i>	<i>Siloam</i>	Σιλωάμ	<i>Šilūhā</i>	( <i>Šelaḥ</i> )
<i>Yordanan</i>	Jordan	<i>Yordanan</i>	<i>Iordane</i>	Ἰορδάνης	<i>Yūrdnan</i>	( <i>Yardēn</i> )

The picture provided by toponyms is quite the same as that observed with personal names. Here, too, we find at least one term that is marked by a *š* consonant matching the Syriac tradition and opposing itself to the Greek NT, viz. the name of the lake Siloam, which appears as *Šiloham/Šilohan* in Jo. 9, 7-11 in the CA palimpsests, in contrast to Arm. *Silovam* and Georg. *Siloam* agreeing with Gk. Σιλωάμ (vs. Syr. *Šilūhā*). In the case of the name of the river Jordan, both the CA form *Yordanan* and its Arm. counterpart are closer to the Syr. equivalent (*Yūrdnan*) than to the Gk. name form (Ἰορδάνης, reflected in Georg. *Iordane*). Another remarkable case is the name of Judaea, which is attested as *Ihowda* in Lk. 2,4, matching Syr. *Yəhūdā* rather than Gk. Ἰουδαία and strongly differing from both Arm. *Hreastan* and Georg. *Huriasṭan-i* which exhibit the typical “Armenian” representation of a spirant *\*d* by *r* (*\*yhūdīyā* > *\*huria*-).<sup>44</sup> In the rendering of Greek word initial <ῥ> by <hr> in the name of Rama, CA *Hrama* agrees with both Armenian *Hrama* and Georgian *Hrama*; this feature cannot be used for argumentation, however, as the same verse (Mt. 2, 18) provides the name of Rachel (Gk. Ῥαχήλ) spelt without <h>, in the form *Rakel* (vs. Arm. *Hrak<sup>c</sup>ēl*, Georg. (*H*)*rakel*).

### *Ethnonyms and name derivatives*

In Caucasian Albanian, ethnonyms that are not taken over as such from the Biblical tradition (such as, e.g., *Israyēl*, always occurring in abbreviated form as *I ēl*) are usually derived from underlying names by the addition of the derivational suffix *-own*;<sup>45</sup> cp., e.g., *Samar(i)a-own* sg. ‘Samaritan’, *Ebra-own* ‘Hebrew’, or *Asor-own* ‘Syrian’. The plural of such forms is built with the plural suffix added directly to the basis, omitting the derivational suffix *-own*; cp., e.g., *Samara-owx* ‘Samaritans’, *Ebra-owx* ‘Hebrews’, or *Asor-owx* ‘Syrians’. The resulting plural forms are often used in a collective sense to denote the country or region inhabited by the *ethnos* in question; cp. *Egiptos-owx* ‘Egyptians’ > ‘Egypt’, *Galil(e)a-owx* ‘Galilaeans’ > ‘Galilee’, and *Sidonia-owx* ‘Sidonians’ > ‘Sidon’.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Bielmeier (1985: 36) and Gippert (1993: 347 n. 7).

<sup>45</sup> Cf. the edition, vol. I, p. II-37 as to the suffix and its relation to the homonymous genitive ending.

CA	trl.	Armenian	Georgian	Greek	Syriac	Hebrew
<i>Asor-own</i>	Syrian	<i>Asori</i>	<i>Asur-i</i>	Σύρος	( <i>Armāyā</i> )	
<i>Asor-owx</i>	Syrians, Syria	<i>Asorik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Asur-ni, -et-i</i>	Συρία	<i>Sūriyā</i>	
<i>Ebraown</i>	(in) Hebrew	<i>Ebrayec<sup>c</sup>erēn</i>	<i>Ebraelebr</i>	Ἑβραϊστί	<i>ʿEbrāiṭ</i>	
[ <i>Ebraowx</i>	Hebrews	<i>Ebrayec<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Ebrael-ni</i>	Ἑβραῖοι	<i>ʿEbrāyē</i> ]	
<i>Egiptosowx</i>	Egypt(ians)	<i>Egiptac<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Egwp̄te-</i>	Αἴγυπτος	( <i>Meṣrēn</i> )	( <i>Miṣrāyēmāh</i> )
<i>Ellaown’a</i>	(in) Greek	<i>Yownarēn</i>	<i>Berzl</i>	Ἑλληνιστί	<i>Yawnāiṭ</i>	
[ <i>Epesaowx</i>	Ephesians	<i>Ep<sup>c</sup>esac<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Epesel-ni</i>	Ἐφεσίοι	<i>Eṗsōyē</i> ]	
<i>Galil(e)aowx</i>	Galileans, Galilee	<i>Galiteac<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Galilea-</i>	Γαλιλαία	<i>Galilā</i>	
[ <i>Hromaowx</i>	Romans	<i>Hrovmayec<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>hromel-ni</i>	Ῥωμαῖοι	<i>Rhūmāyē</i> ]	
<i>I&lt;stray&gt;ēl</i>	Israel	<i>I(strayē)ḥ</i>	<i>Israē/el-i</i>	Ἰσραήλ	<i>Yisrā’ēl</i>	( <i>Yiśrā’ēl</i> )
<i>I&lt;stray&gt;ēlown</i>	Israelite	<i>I(strayē)ḥac<sup>c</sup>i</i>	<i>Israēliṭel-i</i>	Ἰσραηλίτης	<i>bar Isrā’el</i>	
[ <i>Ḳorintaowx</i>	Corinthians	<i>Kornt<sup>c</sup>ac<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Ḳorintel-ni</i>	Κορίνθιοι	<i>Qūrintāyē</i> ]	
<i>Nazoraown</i>	of Nazareth	<i>Nazovrec<sup>c</sup>i</i>	<i>Naza/orevel-i</i>	Ναζαρεθός	<i>Naṣrāyā</i>	
<i>Parisaowx</i>	Pharisees	<i>P<sup>c</sup>arisec<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Parisevel-ni</i>	Φαρισαῖοι	<i>Pārīšāyē</i>	
<i>Samar(i)aown</i>	Samaritan	<i>Samarac<sup>c</sup>i</i>	<i>Samariṭel-i</i>	Σαμαριτης / Σαμαριτις	<i>Šamrāyatā</i>	
<i>Samaraowx</i>	Samaritans	<i>Samarac<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Samariṭel-ni</i>	Σαμαριται	<i>Šamrāyē</i>	( <i>Šoməronīm</i> )
<i>Vačar</i>	Jew	<i>Hrey</i>	<i>Huria-</i>	Ἰουδαῖος	<i>Yəhūdāyā</i>	( <i>Yəhūdā-</i> )
<i>Zadoḡaowx</i>	Sadducees	<i>Sadowkec<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup></i>	<i>Saduḡevel-ni</i>	Σαδδουκαῖοι	<i>Zadūqāyē</i>	

There are several remarkable formations in the list. We do not find any term here that would contain a <š> character indicating a Syriacism; however, the name of the Sadducees, *Zadoḡa-owx*, is as clearly based upon its Syriac equivalent *Zadūqāyē* with its <z> as it is distinct from Gk. Σαδδουκαῖοι, Arm. *Sadowkec<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup>*, and Georg. *Saduḡevel-ni*. On the other hand, the term *Egiptosowx* ‘Egyptians, Egypt’ obviously reflects the Greek country name Αἴγυπτος, being closer to this than Arm. *Egiptac<sup>c</sup>ik<sup>c</sup>* or Georg. *Egwp̄te*, and opposes itself diametrically to the Semitic name preserved in Syr. *Meṣrēn* (or Hebr. *Miṣrāyēmāh*). A peculiar match with Greek is met with in the term denoting the Greek language itself, which appears as *Ellaown’a* in Jo. 19,20 in correspondance with Gk. Ἑλληνιστί, contrasting with both Arm. *Yownarēn* (sharing the etymon ‘Ionian’ with Syr. *Yawnāiṭ*) and Georg. *Berzl* (< *berz-en*- ‘Greek’, a term generally believed to be derived from the name of ‘Byzantium’; also reflected in Udi *berdzen-un*). The most noteworthy agreement with Armenian can be seen in *Nazora-own*, the epithet of Jesus ‘of Nazareth’, which contrasts

with the place name *Nazaret* in the same way as Arm. *Nazovrec<sup>i</sup>* is distinct from *Nazaret<sup>c</sup>*. It is true that the basic distinction here may be due to Aramaic itself, as the dichotomy of Syr. *Naṣrāyā* vs. *Nāṣraṭ* or Gk. Ναζαρηνός vs. Ναζαρέθ (besides Ναζαρά) shows; however, the special trait shared by Caucasian Albanian and Armenian consists in the stem internal vowel (*o/ov*), which is not matched by the Greek or Syriac terms.<sup>46</sup> Finally, Caucasian Albanian possesses a unique feature in the well attested designation of the Jews, *Vačar*, which can in no way be equated with Gk. Ἰουδαῖος, Arm. *Hreay*, or Georg. *Huria-*, all derived from Syr. *Yəhūdāyā* or a related Semitic term. Instead, CA *Vačar* might represent the Iranian term for ‘trade’ (> *bazaar*, < \**uāičāra-*), which is also represented in Arm. *vačar* and Georg. *vačar-i* ‘id.’;<sup>47</sup> however, there are both semantical and phonetic<sup>48</sup> differences that are not easy to cope with.

In conclusion, the CA set of Biblical names presents an extremely diversified picture. The most salient feature consists in the existence of terms that exhibit a stronger affiliation to the Semitic (Syriac) tradition. The few relevant examples do not admit of claiming a direct transmission from Syriac to Caucasian Albanian, however; instead there are some indications that they are due to an Armenian intermediary which has not been preserved as such. To verify this assumption it would be necessary to investigate the secondary and tertiary tradition chains (lectionaries, Biblical quotations in patristic texts etc.) of both Armenian and Georgian; at present we may be content with noting that the CA palimpsests might have safeguarded an older Armenian tradition that was superseded in this latter language by a later re-orientation towards the Greek NT texts. To corroborate this, it may be useful to contrast a passage from the CA texts with its Armenian, Georgian, Greek, and Syriac counterparts in detail here.

It is by mere accident that for one of the many text passages from St. Paul’s Epistles the CA palimpsests provide, the Armenian version is contained in another layer of the same palimpsests, too.<sup>49</sup> This is Heb. 11, 35–12, 5 the Alba-

<sup>46</sup> In the Georgian tradition, the variant *Nazorevel-* occurs side by side with *Nazarevel-*. It is hardly accidental that the former variant is attested in the Adiši Gospels, which represent an older layer of the Georgian Bible translation.

<sup>47</sup> For the latter cf. Bielmeier (1985: 35).

<sup>48</sup> The rendering of the Middle Iran. affricate *č* by a non-glottalised *č* in Albanian (vs. glottalised *č* in Armenian and Georgian) is unexpected.

<sup>49</sup> In their lower layer, the palimpsest manuscripts catalogued as Sin. Geo. N 13 and N 55 contain a set of 42 fols. that are written in Armenian. Just like the Albanian part, the Armenian set consists of two different original manuscripts that are clearly distinguished both by their layout and their style of writing. One of the two originals, which has been re-used in 10 fols. of N 13 and N 55, contained materials from the New Testament; the other one, of which 32 fols. have survived, must have been an Old Testament manuscript compris-

nian text of which is contained in the “Lectionary” manuscript.<sup>50</sup> In spite of its shortness, the passage clearly confirms the view established above that the Albanian version joins the Armenian and Georgian traditions to a considerable extent where they coincide. Thus we find in Heb. 12, 1 the exact equivalence of Armenian *bazmowt<sup>c</sup>iwn vkayic<sup>c</sup>*,<sup>51</sup> Albanian *avelown powlayganowgoy*, and Georgian *simravlē moçametay*, all denoting a ‘multitude of witnesses’ and opposing themselves to the Greek νέφος μαρτύρων, lit. ‘a cloud of witnesses’, which in its turn is matched by Georgian *grubeli moçametay* in a later redaction<sup>52</sup> and, at least partly, by Syriac *sāhdē d-ʿayk ʿnānā* ‘witnesses who like a cloud...’. In a similar way, in the torturings enumerated in Heb. 11, 37, ‘they were sawn asunder’, is followed by ‘they were tempted’ in Armenian (*slōc<sup>c</sup>ec<sup>c</sup>an* → *p<sup>c</sup>orjec<sup>c</sup>an*), Albanian (*xexeren-biyay-n-ā~r* → *ʿaʿē-n-ā~r*), and Georgian (*ganixerxa/ganixerxes/ganixerxnes* → *ganicadnes*) while most of the Greek sources exhibit the inverted order (ἐπειράσθησαν → ἐπρίσθησαν), only the codex Alexandrinus (A) and a few other codices matching the “Caucasian” tradition.<sup>53</sup>

Further on in Heb. 12, 1, Gk. εὐπερίστατος (ἁμαρτία) ‘easily besetting (sin)’, well reflected by Georgian *mçrapl momavali (codvay)*, lit. ‘fast coming (sin)’, or Syriac (*xṭīṭā*) *dabkūlzḡān mṭayḡā hī lan*, lit. ‘(a sin) that is always ready for us’, is opposed to (*meḷk<sup>c</sup>*) *karework<sup>c</sup>* in the Armenian and (*gorowx*) *būwiebowr* in the Albanian text, both meaning something like ‘heavy (sins)’<sup>54</sup> and thus in some way alluding to Gk. ὄγκος ‘burden’ (~ Georgian *simzimē* ‘weight’, Syriac *yuqrīn* ‘obsessions’) which precedes in the given context, in its turn substituted by Armenian *hpartowt<sup>c</sup>iwn* ‘pride, haughtiness’ and Albanian *ʿaʿiown*, probably

---

ing at least the books of Ecclesiastes, Canticum, and Sapientia Salomonis. The contents of the Armenian layer has just been published as vol. III of the edition (cf. Gippert et al. 2010).

<sup>50</sup> Distributed among two different lectures: Heb. 11, 35–40: N 55, 42rb<sub>19</sub> – N 13, 33ra – N 13, 38va – N 13, 33rb<sub>8</sub>; Heb. 12, 1–5: N 13, 67va<sub>1</sub> – N 13, 67vb<sub>13</sub> (the lower part of the bifoliate which must have contained most of Heb. 12,2 and 5 has been lost). Cf. the edition, vol. II, pp. VII-62–63 and VII-68–69.

<sup>51</sup> The Zohrab Bible adds the nota accusativi, z-, to the first word.

<sup>52</sup> I = the Tbilisi ms. A 677 attributed to the XI–XII<sup>th</sup> c., and K = ms. K 4 of the Oriental Institute of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences (XII<sup>th</sup> c.); cf. the edition by Danelia (1974: 395 and 019–020).

<sup>53</sup> Nestle-Aland 1963 note the “Koine” group (K) as well as the VI<sup>th</sup> c. codex Claromontanus (D, with question mark; p. 568). The Syriac (Peshitta) text has only “sawn” (*ʿtnsar*). Cf. Zuntz (1953: 47–48) as to the emergence of the doublet of terms. – In Heb. 11, 33–38 the Old Georgian versions (redactions AB and CD as well as the lectionaries of Paris and Laṭal) exhibit a peculiar trait in adducing the names of the Biblical persons that were affected by the tortures mentioned in the text (cf. Danelia’s edition [cf. n. 52], pp. 06–08); within the Armenian tradition, a similar feature is only attested in St. Ephrem’s Commentary on the Epistles (van Esbroeck 1972).

<sup>54</sup> The variant εὐπερίσπαστος occurring in the papyrus p46 is not closer (‘easy to pull away’).

‘temptation’.<sup>55</sup> The complex interrelation of the versions can easily be illustrated in an interlinear arrangement (Heb. 12, 1):

Gk.	Τοιγαροῦν	καὶ ἡμεῖς	τοσοῦτον	περιεξέμενον	ἡμῖν		νέφος
	now again	we, too,	such a	lying around	us		cloud
Geo. II	აწ უკუე	ჩუენცა	ესოდენი	ზედამდებარე	ჩუენდა		ღრუბელი
	now again	we, too,	such a	lying over	us		cloud
Geo. I	აწ უკუე	ჩუენცა	ესოდენი	გარემოდგომილი	ჩუენსა		სიმრავლე
	now again	we, too,	such a	standing around	us		multitude
Arm.	Այսուհետեւ	եւ մենք	որ	այսչափ	չուրջ զմեւք	մածեալ	ունիմք
	after that	we, too,	who	to this extent	around us	stuck	we have
Alb.	Eṭowaxay	žan-al		howtown	žas horo-aḡay	boči-efa-	-hanayānke-žan avelown
						biyay	
	after that	we, too,		to this extent	around us	stuck	have who we
Syr.	meṭṭūl hānā	āp ḥnan	d-			-ʾīt	lan hālēn
							kulhūn
	after that	even we	who			exist	for these all
							us
Gk.	μαρτυρῶν		ὄγκον	ἀποθέμενοι	πάντα	καὶ	τὴν εὐπερὶστατον
	of martyrs		burden	casting off	all	and	the easily besetting
Geo. II	მონაშენთა		სიმძიმე	ყოველი	განვიშორვით	და	მწრაფელ მოძავალი
							იგი
	of martyrs		weight	all	we shall discard	and	the fast coming
Geo. I	მონაშენთა		სიმძიმე	ყოველი	განვიშორვით	და	მწრაფელ მოძავალი
							იგი
	of martyrs		weight	all	we shall discard	and	the fast coming
Arm.	վկայից		զհպարտութիւն	զամենայն	ի	բաց եւ	զմեղսն
						ընկեցուք	
	of martyrs		pride	all	we shall throw out	and	the sin(s)
Alb.	powlayganowgoy		lowšow	‘a‘iown	çe-qa-žan-sak-		e gorowx
					pē		
	of martyrs		all	temptation (?)	we shall throw out		the sin(s)
Syr.	sahdē	d-ayk	‘nānā nešdē	kul	yuqrīn	āp	xṭīlā
		xḏīrīn lan	menan				
	martyrs	who like a cloud	throw	all	obsessions		also sin
		surround us	away				
			from us				

<sup>55</sup> In the edition, the hapax legomenon has been translated as ‘burden’ in accordance with the Greek text (cf. vol. I, p. IV-22); if the noun is related to the verb ‘a‘esown ‘to try, attempt’ (cf. ib., p. IV-23), ‘temptation’ might fit better.

Gk.	ἁμαρτίαν	δὲ ὑπομονῆς	τῶν προκειμένων	τὸν προκειμένον	ἡμῖν	ἀγῶνα
	sin	with patience	we shall run	the lying-before	us	fight
Geo. II	ცოდვად	და მოთმინებით	ვრბილით	წინაგანმზადებულსა	ჩვენდა	ღუაწლსა
	sin	and with patience	we used to run	the prepared-before	to us	fight
Geo. I	ცოდვად	მოთმინებით	ვრბილით	წინაგანმზადებულსა	ჩვენსა	ღუაწლსა
	sin	with patience	we used to run	the prepared-before	for us	fight
Arm.	կարեւորս	Համբերութեամբ	ընթացուք	ի պատերազմ	որ առաջի կայ	մեզ
	heavy	with patience	we shall run	into a fight	which stands us	
					before	
Alb.	büwiebowr	ço-biqesen	‘ak-qa-žan-pē	‘axnaćow	büwa bo[wr]a- ža	
	heavy	with patience	we shall run	into a fight (?)	which stands us	
					before	
Syr.	d-abkūlzḥān	w- ḥa-msaybrānūtā	nerḥṭiwh <sup>y</sup>	la’gūnā hānā	d-sīm	lan
	mṭayḥā hī lan					
	that is always ready for and	with patience	we shall run him	into this fight	which is placed	for us
	us					

It will be clear from this arrangement that the relationship between the Armenian and the Albanian versions is by far the closest, the wording being as parallel as it can be, with but very few systematical exceptions that are due to language-specific syntactical rules (esp. the positioning of the relative pronoun, *-hanay(-)ke-*, as a clitic element after the verbal stem). Together, the two versions stand somewhere in between the Syriac text and the older Georgian version (Geo. I) while the later Georgian version (Geo. II) clearly reflects a stronger influence of the Greek text. It is true that the transmission of St. Paul’s Epistles in the Caucasian languages may show peculiar traits distinguishing it from that of the Gospels (and other NT texts). However, the main assumption that the Caucasian Albanian palimpsests have preserved the Biblical texts in a peculiarly archaic “Caucasian” shape holds throughout.<sup>56</sup>

Concerning common loan words in CA we may safely state that the Iranian layer is the only one that can be proven to have been independent of the transmission of Biblical texts or Christian thought. In this connection, Caucasian Albanian behaves quite like Old Georgian, with the important distinction that it was influenced by Georgian as a superstratum language itself. As there are hardly any textual features within the palimpsest texts that would point to a Georgian source, this layer is likely to have been anterior to the Syro-Armenian layer prevailing in the texts.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. vol. I, p. I–36 of the edition as to a general account of the interrelation of the Caucasian Albanian, Armenian, and other versions.

*References*

- AČAŘYAN, Hrač'ya: Hayeren armatakan bařaran. A hator. Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hratarakčut'yun, 1971<sup>2</sup>.
- : Hayeren armatakan bařaran. B hator. Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hratarakčut'yun, 1973<sup>2</sup>.
- ANDRONIKAŠVILI, Mzia: Narkvevebi iranul-kartuli enobrivi urtiertobidan/Očerki po iran-sko-gruzinskim jazykovym vzaimootnošenijam/Studies in Iranian-Georgian Linguistic Contacts. Tbilisi: Tbilisis universitetis gamomcemloba, 1966.
- BENVENISTE, Émile: Titres iraniens en arménien. In: *Revue des Études Arméniennes*, 9 (1929) 1, 5-10.
- BIELMEIER, Roland: Zu iranischen Lehnwörtern im Georgischen und Armenischen. In: Hermann M. Ölberg/Gernot Schmidt (eds): *Sprachwissenschaftliche Forschungen. Festschrift für Johann Knobloch. Zum 65. Geburtstag am 5.1.1984 dargebracht von Freunden und Kollegen* (= *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft*, Vol. 23). Innsbruck: Verlag des Instituts für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1985, 38-41.
- BOYCE, Mary: *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (= *Acta Iranica*, Vol. 9a). Leiden/Teheran/Liège: Brill, 1977.
- BROCKELMANN, Carl: *Lexicon Syriacum*. Halle/Saale: Niemeyer, 1928<sup>2</sup>.
- DANELIA, Kōrnelia: Pāvles epistoleta kartuli versiebi/Gruzinskie versii poslanij Pavla (= *Žveli kartuli enis katedris šromebi*, Vol. 16). Tbilisi: Tbilisis universitetis gamomcemloba, 1974.
- GIPPERT, Jost: Zur christlichen Terminologie in den südkaukasischen Sprachen. In: *Die slawischen Sprachen*, 17 (1989), 13-35.
- : *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen. Band 1*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1993.
- : Ein iranischer Personenname in kaukasisch-albanischer Nebenüberlieferung. In: Peter Anreiter/Marialuise Haslinger/Heinz Dieter Pohl (eds): *Artes et Scientiae. Festschrift für Ralf-Peter Ritter zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wien: Edition Praesens, 2004, 116-117.
- : *Armeno-Albanica*. In: Günther Schweiger (ed): *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien, dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag* (= *Studien zur Iranistik und Indogermanistik*, Band 3). Tübingen: Schweiger VWT-Verlag, 2005a, 155-165.
- : Das Armenische – eine indogermanische Sprache im kaukasischen Areal. In: Gerhard Meiser/Olag Hackstein (eds): *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel. Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2005b*, 139-160.
- : *Albano-Iranica*. In: Macuch, Maria/Mauro Maggi/Werner Sundermann (eds): *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007a, 99-108.
- (ed): *The Old Georgian Palimpsest Codex Vindobonensis georgicus 2 (Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi, Series Ibero-Caucasica, Vol. 1)*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007b.
- : An etymological trifle. In: Werner Sundermann/Almut Hintze/François de Blois (eds): *Exegisti monumenta. Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams* (= *Iranica*, Vol. 17). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009, 127-140.
- GIPPERT, Jost/Wolfgang SCHULZE/Zaza ALEKSIDZE/Jean-Pierre MAHÉ: *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai. 2 vols.* (= *Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi/Series Ibero-Caucasica*, Vol. 2). Turnhout: Brepols, 2009.
- : *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai. Vol. 3: The Armenian Layer*, edited by Jost Gippert (= *Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi/Series Ibero-Caucasica*, Vol. 2/3). Turnhout: Brepols, 2010.

- HENNING, Walter Bruno: Two Central Asian words. In: Transactions of the Philosophical Society, 44 (1945) 1, 150-162 [Reprint Selected Papers. Vol. 2. Leiden/Téhéran/Liège: Brill, 1977, 259-271].
- HÜBSCHMANN, Heinrich: Armenische Grammatik. 1. Theil: Armenische Etymologie (= Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken, Band 6). Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1897 [Reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1992].
- KAŽAIA, Lamara (ed): Xanmeṭi ṭekṣebi. Naḳveti 1. Tbilisi: Mecniereba, 1984.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert: Das altarmenische Verbum. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1982.
- MACLER, Frédéric: L'évangile arménien. Édition phototypique du manuscrit no. 229 de la Bibliothèque d'Etchmiadzin. Paris: Geuthner, 1920.
- MEILLET, Antoine: Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'Arménien classique. Vienne: Imprimerie des PP. Mekhitharistes, 1936<sup>2</sup>.
- NESTLE, Eberhard/Kurt ALAND (eds): Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963<sup>22</sup>.
- PEDERSEN, Holger: Armenisch und die Nachbarsprachen. In: Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung, 39 (1906), 334-485 [Reprint in: Kleine Schriften zum Armenischen. Herausgegeben von Rüdiger Schmitt (= Collectanea, Vol. 40). Hildesheim/New York: Olms, 1982, 112-263].
- RIX, Helmut et alii: Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1998.
- ŠANIŽE, Aḳaḳi: Avri supiksiani kalis saxelevi zvel kartulši. In: Saiubileo. Miežgvna Tbilisis universiṭeṭis ergaseulis ḱlistavs (1918-1968) (= Zveli kartuli enis ḱatedris šromebi, T. 11). Tbilisi: Tbilisis universiṭeṭis gamomcemloba, 1968, 7-16.
- SCHULZE, Wolfgang: The loan layers of Udi: Armenian. In: Wolfgang Bublitz/Manfred von Roncador/Heinz Vater (eds): Philology, Typology and Language Structure. Festschrift for Winfried Boeder on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday. Frankfurt am Main et alibi: Lang, 2002, 211-223.
- VAN ESBROECK, Michel: Hébreux 11, 33-38 dans l'ancienne version géorgienne. In: Biblica, 53 (1972), 43-64.
- ZUNTZ, Günther: The Text of The Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum. London: British Academy, 1953.