



BRILL

IRAN AND THE CAUCASUS 27 (2023) 435–448



brill.com/ic

Iranian Lexical Material in the Caucasus

Part 1. Albanian *afre*-pesown

Jost Gippert | ORCID: 0000-0002-2954-340X

Centre for the Study of Manuscript Cultures, University of Hamburg,
Hamburg, Germany

jost.gippert@uni-hamburg.de

Received 21 August 2023 | Accepted 4 September 2023 |

Published online 29 November 2023

Abstract

The present article examines the peculiar shape that the Middle Iranian word for ‘praise’, *āfrīn*, has achieved as a loanword in the language of the Caucasian “Albanians” where it appears as *afre*- in the complex verb *afre-pesown* ‘praise, bless’. Based on a thorough investigation of the morphology of formations with the light verb *-pesown* in Caucasian Albanian, it is proven that a recent proposal, which assumes the influence of an agreement marker, is untenable; instead, it is shown how *afre*- can have emerged from a metanalysis of *afri*n as a case form.

Keywords

Middle Iranian – Caucasian Albanian – Udi – Armenian – Bible translation – complex verbs – light verbs – clitics

Since Heinrich Hübschmann's pioneering work of the late 19th century, the language and the textual tradition of the Armenians have been acknowledged as a highly important *nebenüberlieferung* of Old and Middle Iranian lexical material. This is witnessed to by the huge amount of scholarly investigations that aimed at clarifying the interrelations between Armenian and the Iranian languages;¹ a field to which our jubilarian has contributed immensely (cf., among others, the collection of 91 articles in Russell 2004). In contrast to Armenian, the two neighbouring languages that shared the beginning of their literacy with it in the course of the Christianisation of the Caucasus, namely, Georgian and the language of the so-called Caucasian "Albanians", have attracted much less attention so far, even though it has been proven that both underwent similar influences by Iranian languages, and not necessarily *viā armeniacā* as had been suspected for long (cf. esp. Andronikashvili 1966 and Gippert 1993 for the proof of independent Iranianisms in Georgian). It is true that the case of Caucasian Albanian (hereafter: CA), which has only become accessible to the scholarly world in 2008 via the *editio princeps* of the two palimpsested manuscripts in that language that were detected in St Catherine's Monastery on Mt Sinai in the 1990s (Gippert et al. 2008, hereafter styled "the edition"), is different from both the Armenian and the Georgian ones, simply because the amount of linguistic material that has been preserved in the palimpsests (and a few inscriptions) is much smaller than that of its neighbours. It is all the more welcome then that the Iranianisms of CA have recently been the object of a fellow-Iranianist's study, which aimed at providing new insights; unfortunately, however, the author's assumptions are not always convincing and in some points even erroneous so that I see the necessity to reply to them. In the present article, I will confine myself to one of the lexical items that Martin Schwartz (hereafter: Sch.) discussed in his study of 2023, namely, CA *afre-pesown* 'praise, bless';² a term that is well suited to honour James Russell.

In the edition of 2008 and, depending on it, the summary of the linguistic strata of CA published in 2011 (Gippert et al. 2008: 11-79, 1V-7; Gippert 2011: 3, 7),³ the complex verb *afre-pesown*⁴ with the meaning 'praise' was proposed to

- 1 For the present purpose, it may suffice to name the surveys of Bolognesi 1960, Schmitt 1986 and Bailey 1986, which added considerably to the set of 686 "persische Wörter" proposed by Hübschmann (1897) for Armenian.
- 2 A discussion of other terms treated by Sch. will follow in due time.
- 3 Sch. cites only the summary, which is misleading as it does not take the attestations of the word and its morphological forms into account.
- 4 As in the edition, the digraph rendering the vowel /u/ in the CA script (as in Armenian and Georgian) is transliterated as <ow>.

represent, in its initial part, Middle Iranian (MIran.) *ā-friř-*, i.e. the root with pre-verb that is contained in Middle Persian (MP) *āfrīn* ‘prayer, blessing, praise’ and the homonymous (MP. and Parthian = Pth.) verbal stem (Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 26, 27, s.vv. *ʾfryn*, *ʾpryn* and *ʾfryn-*), thus matching the Armenian verb *awhrnem*, later *awrhnem* / *ōrhnem* ‘praise’, even though with two remarkable differences: CA has preserved the Iranian *-f-*, which is represented by *-wh-* in Armenian,⁵ and the CA verb shows no trace of the stem-final *-n*, which lastly resides upon the Old Iranian (OIran.) present stem infix that is attested in Avestan (Av.) *āfrīnāmi*. To overcome this latter discrepancy and thus to bring the CA verb closer to “a stratum of words, which are here called ‘Parthian’, of a vintage par with Manichean Parthian” and “suggesting the existence of a ‘Christian Parthian’” (Schwartz 2023: 184), Sch. (2023: 192) cites a proposal by Th. Wier according to which “one possible explanation for the loss of the **-in-* in *qfr-* is that it was reinterpreted as part of the Udi/CA person agreement system with *n(e)* ‘3sg.’”. Quoting the phrase *evax-te afre-n-exa* ‘when you pray (lit. one prays)’ from Mt. 6.5 in the 1902 translation of the Gospels into Udi,⁶ the alleged daughter language of CA, Wier (*apud* Schwartz 2023: 193) concludes: “Because the person agreement can be cliticized between the root *afre* and the light verb *-ex-* ‘say’, it is in a perfect position for morphological reanalysis: the vowel becomes reassigned to the root: **afri-ne- > *afri-ne- > afre-ne-*”. It is true that this type of development may be regarded as “conforming to a common Udi reanalysis” (Wier *apud* Schwartz 2023: 193); however, it is not applicable to CA and therefore fails to account for the CA formation. As a matter of fact, there are two striking differences between CA and Udi in the given constellation. First, the 3rd person agreement marker *-n(e)-* never combines with a present stem of a non-static verb in CA (cf. Gippert et al. 2008: 1, 11–53); Mt. 6.5 is not attested in the CA palimpsests but we may quote Lk. 1.64 with the form *afre-ka-oen-hē* ‘he was praising’, which clearly shows, beside the CA variant of the (suppletive) present stem of the light verb, *-ka-*,⁷ that there is no *-ne-*

5 The process leading from **awhrinem* to *awrhnem* was first described correctly by Meillet (1903: 13). Another candidate for the development of **āfr-* > *awrh-* is Arm. *awrhas* / *ōrhas* ‘fate, destiny’, which Russell (1998) proposed to represent an unattested MIran. **aw-fras*, in its turn derived from OIran. **abi-frāsa-*; it may as well represent the attested Pth. *āfrās* ‘teaching, instruction’ (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 26 s.v. *ʾfr’s*); cf. IIMacc. 5.7 (5.13) where *ōrhasi žamanakn* translates Gk. προσημανηείσα ὥρα.

6 The translation (hereafter: VB) was provided by two brothers, Bežanov and Bežanov, in the Vartashen dialect of Udi (V); an electronic version in an adapted Roman transcription, which is also used in the present article, is available on <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/udi/udint/udint.htm>.

7 Different from CA *-ka-*, Udi uses a stem *-ex(a)-* for the present stem of *-p(e)sun*, for which

involved.⁸ Second, and this is even more crucial for the diachronical relationship of CA and Udi, the agreement marker in CA never enters into the position between a lexical base and the light verb *-pesown* in a complex verb like *afre-pesown*: the system of “endoclititics”, for which Udi is notorious (cf. Harris 2002 for details), is by far less developed in CA than in the later language, and this is one of the major differences between the two. As this very fact has not yet been elaborated in detail (cf. Schulze/Gippert 2023: 255 for a first outline), it may be worthwhile giving a short summary of the relevant data here; this is all the more necessary as a lot of new and better readings of the CA palimpsests have been secured meanwhile.⁹

Together with *-biyesown* ‘make, do’ and *-ihesown* ‘be(come)’, *-pesown* is the most frequent light verb in CA; it has a suppletive paradigm with *-pes-* being the infinitive stem, *-pe-* the past stem, *-pa-* the imperative stem, and *-ka-* the present stem (cf. Gippert/Schulze 2023: 191–203 for the morphology of CA verbs in general and 195 for suppletive stem formation). It combines with nouns such as *çi* ‘name’ yielding the transitive verb *çi-pesown* ‘name, call’, *cam* ‘script(ure), writ(ing)’ yielding *cam-pesown* ‘write’, and *il’ow* ‘word’ yielding *il’ow-pesown* ‘speak’;¹⁰ interjections like *voe* ‘woe’ yielding *voe-pesown* ‘weep’; and preverbs like *ta-* ‘thither’ in *ta-pesown* ‘approach, offer, close (door)’, *aci-* ‘down, under’ in *aci-pesown* ‘pour’ or *hay-* ‘up’ in *hay-pesown* ‘exalt’. In a great many cases, the lexical element is not attested as such, thus remaining obscure; this is true, e.g., of *hi-pesown* ‘shout’, *ya-pesown* ‘yell’, *n’in’i-pesown* ‘mourn’, *marmir-pesown* ‘grumble’, *ɣela-pesown* ‘worry’,¹¹ *fow-pesown* ‘blow’, *cow-pesown*

cf. n. 15 below; the new translation of the Gospels (NB) into the dialect of Nij (N), which is available online on <https://www.udibibliya.com/en/> and, in an adapted orthography which is also used in the present article, on <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/udi/udntn/udntn.htm>, has the converb form *afəra-ka-tan-* ‘after praising’ with *-ka-* in Mt. 6.5.

8 In Lk. 1.64, VB has the nominal form *afre-pesax*, lit. ‘in praying’; NB uses a different verb (*alxəš-psa*, with *alxəš* < Azeri *alxış* ‘applause’).

9 The revised readings have become possible by the application of new technology in the framework of the Sinai Palimpsests project (<http://sinaipalimpsests.org/>); for a summary of the present state of decipherment cf. Gippert 2023, a new edition is at present being worked on.

10 The form *il’ow-al-owka-hanayt’a=gaen=ke-žan* ‘because of which we also speak’ in II Cor. 4.13 clearly shows that the incorporated noun is not *il’* but *il’ow*; the examples adduced for simple *il’* in the edition (I, IV–19s.v. *il’(ow)*) must be corrected to *il’a* (dative I) in Jo. 2.2, *il’aɣ* (dative II) in Jo. 5.24, and *il’ow* (absolutive) in I Cor. 15.54.

11 The reading is uncertain but *ɣela-* is more probable than *mela-* as proposed in the edition (Mt. 10.19). The relation with Udi *qela* / *xela* ‘laden, pregnant’ remains unclear as this seems to be represented by CA *ɣalay*, not *ɣelay* in Lk. 2.5.

'spit', *qowt-pesown* 'swallow', *zar-pesown* 'make noise', *zarzar-pesown* 'clang', *cowcow-pesown* 'itch', or *tartar-pesown* 'twinkle', all of which are likely to be onomatopoeic or ideophonic, but also of *aṣay-pesown* 'open', *kak-pesown* 'pray, worship', *niz-pesown* 'desire', *q̄ṣa-pesown* 'reproach', *kač-pesown* 'cut, circumcise' (in the latter sense also with the preverb *hala-* 'up, on top'), *sak-pesown* 'throw' (also with preverbs: *aci-sak-pesown* 'throw down', *hala-sak-pesown* 'throw upon', *če-sak-pesown* 'throw out'), *par-pesown* '(let) free', *ṣax-pesown* 'quarrel', *ṣak-pesown* 'run', *kap-pesown* 'hurry', *ḡṣam-pesown* 'catch up', *ṣap-pesown* 'dine',¹² *towp-pesown* 'leap', *ṣom-pesown* 'tear', and *ṣowt-pesown* 'beat'. The verb *q̄ač-pesown* 'adjust'¹³ might contain an adjective *q̄ač* 'narrow', attested as such in Udi and probably also underlying CA *q̄ač-akesown* 'be oppressed, troubled' (lit. 'see narrow(ness)') and *hiwke-q̄ač* 'sadness, sorrow' (lit. 'narrow(ness) in heart').

The underlying meaning of *-pesown* is likely to have been 'push forward' and hence, more concretely, 'say, speak, utter'; in the latter sense, it appears as an independent verb with a prothetic *ow-*, possibly a fossilised preverb 'away',¹⁴ in the infinitive, present, and imperative stems (*owpesown*, (*ow*)*ka-*, *owpa-*), while the past stem is simply *pe-* as in the light verb function.¹⁵ In contrast to this, some complex verbs that denote speech acts, emotions or the like show an *e* vowel in the position before *-pesown*, which led to the assumption of another fossilised preverb *e-* in the edition (Gippert et al. 2008: I, IV-15–16 s.v. *epesown*). This seems to be corroborated by the existence of *hekalepesown* 'call hither', which is likely to contain the (irregular) imperative *he-kal* 'come hither' (> 'say "come hither"'), and *nowtepesown* 'deny', which obviously comprises the negation *nowt* (> 'say "no"'); however, if we consider that *nowt* itself is likely to be shortened from the combination of the two negators *now* and *te* and that the full form *nowte* has been detected meanwhile (in Jo. 1.3; cf. Gippert 2020: 297), an analysis as *nowte-pesown* remains probable. The same is true for the verb meaning 'console', which is rather *q̄iwmane-pesown* than *q̄iwman-epesown*, given that *q̄iw-ma-ne* can easily be understood as 'may (there) be no fear', lit. 'may fear not be'; in this case, *-ne* would indeed be the 3rd person marker, but as part of the embedded phrase ('say "may fear not be!"', cf. Georgian *nu-*

12 Uncertain; instead of *ṣap-*, we might also read *baṣ-*.

13 Uncertain; instead of *q̄ač-* (2× in II Cor. 9.6) we might also read *q̄aš-*, *q̄at-* or *q̄al-*.

14 This is suggested by the irregular imperative *ow-kal-* 'go!' vs. *he-kal-* 'come!'.

15 In Udi the imperative stem has been preserved as *upa-* in both V and N; the infinitive stem appears only in N with *u-*. In both dialects, *uḡa-* has become the subjunctive stem, while the present stem has been replaced by *ex(a)-*, possibly a successor of CA *ṣexa-* 'fix, fasten'. This is suggested by the form *çi-ṣelexa-ā-n-ooow-hē* 'they were about to name him' in Lk. 1.59 (with a present stem infix that is no longer existent in Udi).

gešinis-cema, lit. 'give "don't be afraid!")',¹⁶ and this analysis is supported by the 'passive' counterpart of the CA verb, 'be consoled', which is now ascertained as *qūwmane-heqesown*, lit. 'take "may fear not be!")'.¹⁷ Less clear is the analysis of *müwxe-pesown* 'rejoice', which is probably derived from an underlying noun **müwḫ* 'joy' of which only the derivative *müwḫen* 'feast, Passover' is attested,¹⁸ a typical formation based on an ergative-instrumental case (*müwḫ-en* lit. 'with joy', cf. *tšeg-en* 'true, truth', lit. 'with sign', from *tšeg* 'sign'); *müwxe-* might then represent a dative(-locative) case ('speak in/to joy') (cf. Gippert/Schulze 2023: 180–184 for the case system of CA), conforming to the dative *hiwḫe* of *hiwḫ* 'heart' that we have in *hiwḫe-qač* 'sadness' (see above) and *hiwḫe-qa* 'wish, desire' (lit. 'wanted to the heart'). The verb *bal'e-pesown*, newly attested with the meaning 'cherish',¹⁹ may similarly be derived from *bal* 'ill, sick' ('speak to someone ill?'), with unclear relation to the frequent verb *bal'-bi/aqesown* 'serve' (with *bi/aqesown* meaning 'seize'). For *zan'e-pesown* 'call', *axae-pesown* 'urge' and *owhe-pesown* 'confess', no such analysis imposes itself.²⁰ The verbs *iwgexale-pesown* 'praise, boast' and *ageçale-pesown* 'rejoice'²¹ are peculiar, as they seem to contain forms of the present(-future) participle in *-al* (cf. Gippert/Schulze 2023: 197, 199–200); in both cases, no finite forms of the underlying verbs are attested and the root structure remains strange. However, the form *iwgexalin* occurring two times with the meaning 'praising' or 'boasting'²² again points to a case formation; we will return to this below.

- 16 Arm. *m-xit'ar-em* is also built upon an embedded phrase 'don't be afraid' (**mi xit'ar*) but contains no light verb.
- 17 Mt. 2.18 with the infinitive *qūwmane-heqesa*; the reading *qūwman-epet'esa* proposed in the edition (Gippert et al. 2008: I, IV–31s.v. *qūwman-epet'esown*) must be given up.
- 18 The relation to *hiwḫmowḫ* 'happy', which seems to represent a compound 'heart-joy' (with *hiwḫ* 'heart', cf. below), remains unclear; the spelling (not **müwḫ*) is ascertained in Jo. 3.29, 8.56, 11.15, 16.20, and Jm. 1.2. Possibly there is a dissimilation involved.
- 19 Present *bal'e-ka-oen* in Eph. 5.29 in the newly found fragment B67va, 4 (as in the edition, 'A' stands for Sin. georg. NF 13 and 'B' for Sin. georg. NF 55).
- 20 In *owhe-pesown* one might see a combination of the frequent preverb *he-* 'thither' with the fossilised preverb *ow-* (see above); such a combination is not attested elsewhere, however, and *owq-owpesown* 'murmur, groan' with the preverb *owq(a)-* 'under, down' seems to indicate that *ow-* should rather follow another preverb than precede it. The relation to *owhow* in *owhow-ošom* 'likewise' remains as well unclear; the assumption of an independent pronoun *owhow* in 11 Cor. 9.4 (A56ra, 4) must be given up.
- 21 In Jo. 5.35, we now have the infinitive *ageçale-pesa*; the combination of an independent *ageçale* with *hiwḫ-ihesa* (quasi 'rejoice joyfully') as proposed in the edition (I, IV–4s.v.) must be given up.
- 22 Apart from Lk. 4.15, where *iwgexalin* is followed by *hē*, the past form of *ihesown* 'be(come)'; it is probably attested a second time in 11 Cor. 9.4; the noun *iwgexown* proposed in the edition (I, IV–40) must be given up.

As stated above, the 3rd person marker *n(e)* does not enter into the position between *-pesown* and the lexical element of the verbal complex in CA, in contrast to what we see in Udi. So we find for *afre-pesown*, besides the masdar form itself and *afre-pēown*, the verbal noun derived from the past tense,²³ only the finite forms *afre-pē-ne* 'he (Isaac) blessed' and, with the 3rd person sg. masc. pronoun *oen* added, *afre-pē-n-oen* 'he (Jacob) blessed';²⁴ similarly we have the 2nd person pl. imperative form *afre-pa-nan* 'praise!' with the marker *nan* following the verbal form.²⁵ While this latter form is matched perfectly by Udi *afre-pa-nan* / *afārā-pa-nan*,²⁶ the equivalent of CA *afre-pē-ne* always shows the 3rd person marker in the infixed position, with 19 occurrences of *afre-ne-pi* in VB and 8 of *afārā-ne-pi* in NB.²⁷ Similarly, we find *afre-z-pe* / *afārā-s-pi* 'I have praised' with the 1st person marker in the infixed position in Lk. 22.32.²⁸

Of course, the few attestations of CA *afre-pesown* that are available are not sufficient to prove that the insertion of *-ne-* between the light verb and the lexical element was not yet possible in CA. However, the rule clearly stands out if we compare the other verbs that contain *-pesown*. We may, e.g., contrast the forms of *cam-pesown* 'write' with those of the corresponding verb in Udi, *cam-p(e)sun*. In the CA palimpsests, we find three occurrences of *cam-pē-ne* meaning 'he (Pilate) wrote' or 'it is written' and one of *cam-pē-n-oen* 'he (Zechariah) wrote' with the pronoun added, as well as one of *cam-pē-zow* 'I have written' and one of the corresponding present form, *cam-ka-z-vʹaxow* 'I am writing to you'; in addition, we may note the prohibitive (negated imperative) *ma-cam-pa-n(ow)n* 'do (sg.) not write' (Jo. 19.19; 6.45, 8.17; Lk. 1.63; Jo. 19.21; 1 Tim. 3.14; Jo. 19.21). Other clitics, too, follow after the light verb; so we have *cam-pē-anaḳe* 'because

23 Gen. *afre-pesownown* ~ Arm. *ōrhnowt'ean* in Heb. 13.15; abs. *afre-pēown* ~ Arm. *ōrhnow-t'iwn(n)* 2× in 11 Cor. 9.5; the underlying past form *afre-pē* is probably used as a participle ~ Arm. *ōrhneal* in 11 Cor. 11.31.

24 Heb. 11.20–21, both ~ Arm. *ōrhneac*; note that in the first case, the agent (*isaḳen* 'Isaac', erg.) follows immediately after the verbal form, while in the second case, *yaḳoben* 'Jacob' precedes it considerably, a constellation which triggered the use of the 'resumptive' pronoun.

25 Ps. 112.1 [113.1] in the gloss introducing Mt. 2.16–18 in A34rb, 9 ~ Arm. *ōrhneac'ēk*, with the vocative *ḡarmo* 'children' ~ Arm. *mankownk* following.

26 Mt. 5.44; 24.20; Mk. 13.18; Lk. 22.40 in both VB and NB; also in Ps. 105.1 in NB. In Ps. 112.1 [113.1], NB has a totally different wording: *qonzuḡo halal-qa-n baki upa-nan, ay Šotay ḳulurxo* 'Say, "may it be acceptable to the Lord!", (you), o, His servants!'.
 27 Mt. 26.44, Lk. 22.41 etc.; as the Pauline epistles have not yet been translated into Udi, there is no direct exact parallel available for CA *afre-pē-ne* and *afre-pē-n-oen*. Cf. notes 6 and 7 above for the Udi Bible versions VB and NB.

28 For the equivalence of CA *-pē-* (past) and Udi *-pi-* (aorist) vs. *-pe-* (perfect), cf. Schulze/Gip-pert 2023: 255 with n. 87.

it is written', *cam-pē-hačinke* 'as it is written', *cam-pē-h(anayo)ke* 'which is written' and, with person markers added, *cam-pē-h(anayo)ke-zow* 'which I have written', *cam-pē-hanayoenke-al-eb(o)wr* 'who also wrote these (things)', *cam-pē-hamayke-hē* 'where it was written', and *cam-pē-en'e-ebowr* 'if they (ntr.) were written' (Jo. 2.17; 6.31 and Rom. 8.36; I Cor. 15.54; Jo. 19.22; 21.24; Lk. 4.17; Jo. 21.25). In vB, however, we find three occurrences of *cam-ne-pi* and four of *cam-ne-pe*, as well as two of the imperfect *cam-n-exa-i* 'he was writing' and two of *cam-zu-pe* 'I have written' (Jo. 19.19, 21.24, Lk. 1.63; Mk. 12.19, Lk. 20.28, Jo. 5.46 (where CA possibly reads *cam-pē-anaķe-oen* 'because he wrote'); Jo. 8.6 and 8.8 (passages not available in CA); Jo. 19.22 (2×)); only the subjunctive *cam-ka-z* 'I shall write' (Lk. 1.3 (passage not available in CA)) here shows the person marker after the light verb. The Nij Bible texts have two times the form *cam-e-pi* (with the reduced form of the 3rd person marker *-(n)e-*) and once the 1st person *cam-ez-pi*, but also *cam-ko-z* 'I shall write', *cam-pe-zu* 'I have written', and *cam-pe-z-sa* 'I am writing' (Lk. 1.63, Ex. 24.4; III Jo. 1.9; Ex. 34.1; Jo. 19.22), the latter with the person marker inserted into the present stem, which represents the former infinitive, *-p(e)sa*.²⁹ A similar picture is provided by CA *il'ow-pesown* 'speak' with two instances of *il'ow-pē-ne* 'he spoke', two of *il'ow-pē-zow* 'I spoke' and one of *il'ow-pē-anaķe* 'that He (God) spoke' (Jo. 2.10, 11.13; 18.20 (2×); 9.29 (uncertain)); for the corresponding verb in Udi, which uses a different lexical element (*a/äit* / *äyit* 'word'), we may quote *äit-te-pi* 'he spoke' (with assimilated 3rd person marker inserted) and *ait-zu-pe* 'I have spoken' from vB, and *äyit-e-pi* 'he spoke' (with reduced marker) vs. *äyit-pe-ne-y* 'he had spoken' from NB (Mt. 14.27, Mk. 6.50; Jo. 16.25 (passages not available in CA); Lk. 23.20; Mk. 14.44 (passages not available in CA)). Of the many further complex verbs containing *-pesown* in CA, we may cite the forms *nowte-pē-ne* and *nowte-pē-n-oen* 'he denied', *zan'e-pē-n-oen* 'he called', *kak-pē-n-oen-oowx* 'he worshipped him', *niz-pē-ne* 'he desired', *řak-pē-n-oen* 'he ran' (along with the imperfect *řak-ka-ā~n-hē* 'they were running'), *ćow-pē-n-oen* 'he spat', *qowt'-pē-ne* 'it is swallowed', *řom-pē-n-oen* 'he hauled', and *řowt'-pē-n-oen* 'he struck' (Jo. 18.27, Heb. 11.24; Jo. 18.33; 9.38; 8.56; 20.4; 9.6; I Cor. 15.54; Jo. 21.11; Acts 12.7); with preverbs, *aci-pē-n-oen* 'he poured', *ta-pē-ne* 'they approached', *ta-pē-n-oowxow* 'they approached him', *ta-pē-n-ā~n* 'they offered', *hay-pē-ne* 'he raised', *hala-pē-n-oowx* 'they clad him', and *eša-pē-n-oen* 'he girded (himself)' (Jo. 13.5; 12.21; Mt. 22.23; Jo. 19.29; 19.2; 13.4). In all the material that is available today, there is not a single instance where *-ne-* would fill the gap between the lexical base and the light verb, and the same is true for

29 The infinitive function is still visible in Jo. 8.6 in *Isusen ... campsa-ne burqi* 'Jesus began to write', with the 3rd person marker attached to it as a 'floating clitic' pertaining to the finite verb.

the pronominal person markers, with but one exception: in Jo. 15.15, we meet the expression *vša zan'e-zow-pē* 'I have called you' (corresponding to Arm. *zjez koč'ec'ī*), in a verse which also provides one of the two only examples of the light verb preceding the lexical base, in the negated present form *now-ka-z-vša-himi-zan'e* 'I do not call you furthermore' (Arm. *oč'ews koč'em zjez*). Considering that we have a highly focussed discourse structure here, which also manifests itself in the pronoun *vša* 'you' preceding *zan'e-zow-pē* and thus exhibiting itself as emphasised, we may grasp the idea how the much more flexible Udi system with its 'floating' clitics emerged. The same is true for the second example of "inversion": in the question *han-k-own-voe*³⁰ 'why do you weep?' (Arm. *zi las*) in Jo. 20.15, the interrogative pronoun is likely to have carried a similar emphasis. It is important to note that in the given examples, it is not the 3rd person marker *-ne-* that is involved but only the "pronominal" markers of the 1st and 2nd persons; a form like **afrin-ne-pē*, as postulated by Th. Wier, was obviously not possible in CA.

To be sure, there is one more type of possible "insertions" between a lexical base and the light verb *-pesown* that must be taken into account here. In several cases, we can observe that the optative marker *-qa-*, one of the "heavy" clitics of CA (cf. Gippert/Schulze 2023: 178 for the system of clitics in CA), takes the position after the lexical base, together with a person marker following it. A good example is *müwxe-qa-n-pē* 'it (the world) will rejoice' (with the 3rd person marker reduced to *-n-*) in Jo. 16.20, which also provides the 2nd person pl. forms *voe-qa-nan-pē* 'you will weep' and *n'in'i-qa-nan-pē* 'you will mourn' (Arm. *xndasc ē, lasjik', otbasjik'*). Similarly, we have *agečale-qa-n-pē* 'may (the earth) rejoice' (Arm. *c'ncasc ē*), *üwgexale-qa-n-pē* 'may he boast' (Arm. *parcesc'ē*), and *towp-qa-n-pē* 'he shall leap' (Arm. *vazesc'ē*), as well as, with other person markers, *či-qa-tow-pē* 'it (highway) shall be named' and *či-qa-va-pē* 'you will be named' (Ps. 96.1 [97.1] in the gloss introducing Mt. 24.29–35 (A15ra, 6); Jac. 1.9; Is. 35.6; 35.8; Lk. 1.76). The strong preference of *-qa-* for a "Wackernagel" position manifests itself also in cases like *ma-qa-nan-xela-pē* 'you should not worry' with the clitic following after the negator, *ma-* (Arm. *mī hogayc'ēk'*), and *isaḡaxoc-qa-va-zan'e-pē rowǵ* 'by Isaac shall your seed be named' (Arm. *sahakaw koč'esc'ī k'ez zawak*) with the chain introduced by a focussed (fronted) noun (Mt. 10.19; Heb. 11.18);³¹ similarly we have *mal-qa-n-oow-či-pē* 'he will be named "small"' and

30 Note that the 2nd person marker here appears as *-own-* (with the present stem *-ka-* reduced to *-k-* before it), not as *-nown-*; cf. Gippert/Schulze 2023: 194 as to the distribution.

31 For a similar constellation with the full verb 'speak', cf. 11 Cor. 11.23 with *owpiown lamen-qa-z-pē* 'shall I speak like a daredevil?' (Arm. *yandgnagoyins asac'ic'*), where the noun phrase with the postposition *lamen* 'like' carries the focus.

bân'i-qa-n-çi-pē 'he will be named "great"' with the focussed element attracting the clitics that pertain to 'naming' (all in Mt. 5.19). In contrast to this, *-qa-* can also follow the light verb as in *ġŝam-pē-qa-n* 'we will be caught up' (Arm. *yapštakesc'owk'*).³² The combination of *-pesown* with a preverb seems not to be splittable by *-qa-* as *ta-pē-qa-žan* 'let us offer' (Arm. *matowsc'owk'*) and *ta-pē-q-own* 'you (sg.) shall offer' show (Heb. 13.15; Mt. 5.24);³³ however, we find *çe-qa-žan-sak-pē* 'let us throw out' alongside *çe-sak-pē-qa-n* 'he will be thrown out' (Heb. 12.1; Jo. 12.31), and cases like *ta-qa-n-dağē* 'he will surrender (lit. give)' (Mt. 10.21) show that there was no general restriction for *-qa-* concerning the position after preverbs. The insertion of other "heavy" clitics before *-pesown* is extremely rare; we only find once the negator *-now-* in *qŝa-now-ka-n-anake-oen* 'because He (God) does not reproach' in Jm. 1.5 and once the relative pronoun (with postposition) in *il'ow-al-hanayt'a=gâen=ke-zow-pē* 'because of which I also spoke', contrasting with *il'ow-al-owka-hanayt'a=gâen=ke-žan* 'because of which we also speak' in II Cor. 4.13 (passage quoting Ps. 115.10 [116.10]), in all these cases with a strong focus on the fronted element, which is clearly indicated by the particle *-al'* 'also' that is attached to the lexical element (*il'ow* 'word') in Paul's Epistle. In no case, however, do we find the 3rd person marker *-n(e)-* standing alone (i.e., with no "heavy" clitic carrying it) in the position before *-pesown* in CA.

In addition, it must be stated that neither the reduction of *-ne-* > *-e-* after consonants nor the assimilation of its *n* to another dental as it is typical for modern Udi is attested in CA. The assumed metanalysis of an older **afrin-e-* > **afrin-ne-*, which presupposes the reduction of an original **afrin-ne-* > **afrin-e-*, is therefore insubstantial. Furthermore, the change of the vocalism that *afr-* implies remains unfounded: as *aci-pesown* 'pour' *çi-pesown* 'name', *hi-pesown* 'shout' and *n'in'i-pesown* 'mourn' show, there is no phonological reason discernible why **afrin-pesown* should have changed to *afrin-pesown*. How, then, can we explain the peculiar shape the Iranian word for 'praise' exhibits in CA? If we start from the Iranian noun *āfrīn*, which was likely the basis for the Armenian verb *awhrnem*, we may indeed suppose a CA borrowing **afrin*, with only the vowel length levelled as the language had no long vowels. For the integration

32 I Thess. 4.17. We would expect *ġŝam-pē-qa-žan* with the 1st person pl. marker here but the context is very much distorted anyway at the given position: the equivalent of Arm. *ampovk'* 'with the clouds' was missing and later added secondarily (by a second hand?) above the line (*al'egowġ(o)wē*).

33 For the combination of *-q(a)-* with the shorter form of the 2nd person sg. pronominal marker, *-own*, in the latter form cf. *ma-q-own-dağē* 'you will not admit (lit. give)' in Acts 13.35 (quotation of Ps. 15.10 [16.10]) and *ma-q-own-bockay* 'you shall not wash' in Jo. 13.8.

of such a noun, CA possessed two strategies. It could either have been treated as a stem in *-in* like the Arm. loanword *marmin* 'body, flesh', of which the following case forms are attested: abs. *marmin* or, with progressive palatal assimilation, *marmin'* (cf. Gippert et al. 2008: I, 11-13);³⁴ gen. *marmin'own* (Jo. 1.12, 8.15; Rom. 8.12, 13; also in the compound *hüwķ-ē-marmin'own* 'of a happy body' in Jm 1.4); erg. *marmin'en*; dat. I *marmin'a*; dat. II *marmin'aṣ*; abl. *marmin'aṣoc* (Jo. 6.63; Mt. 16.17; Rom. 8.12; Gal. 1.16; II Cor. 5.6, 10; Rom. 12.4; II Pet. 1.13; Jo. 3.6); abs. pl. *marmin'owṣ*; dat. II pl. *marmin'owgōṣ* and superess. pl. *marmin'owgōl* (Rom. 12.1; II Cor. 4.10). For **afrin*, this would have led to a gen. **afrin'own*, an erg. **afrin'en*, and a dat. **afrin'a*, but in no way to a form *afre-*. By a second strategy, **afrin* might have been taken to be a genitive or ergative-instrumental case form, not an absolutive or a nominal stem. As a matter of fact, genitives and ergatives in *-in* are not the most frequent ones in CA. Leaving aside the adverb *ešin* 'then', which may pertain together with the postposition *eša* 'after' (dative?) to *eš* 'end', we have ergatives in *-in* only for the irregular nouns *bowl* 'head' (> *biin*), *powl* 'eye' (> *piin*), and *kowl* 'hand' (> *kowin*),³⁵ as well as *ayz* 'world, land, country' (> *ayzin*), *hel* 'spirit, ghost' (> *helin*), *xaš* 'light' (> *xašin*), *bows* 'hunger' and *iğ* 'thirst' (> *bowsin*, *iğin*), *kal* 'voice' (> *kal'in*), *mowš* 'wind' (> *mowšin*), and *hüwķin* 'heart';³⁶ genitives in *-in* are attested for some of the same nouns (*biin*, *ayzin*, *helin*, *xašin*, *hüwķin*)³⁷ but also for *kod* 'house' (> *kod'in*), *pax* 'garden' (> *paxin* 'gardener'), the loanword *eḳlesi* 'church' (> *eḳlesin*), and *balalin* 'of a candle' and *ṭaprin* 'of the staff' with no absolutive form attested.³⁸ Beyond that, we have two forms in *-in* which seem to pertain to participles in *-al*, namely, *žow-lowgālin* in II Tim. 4.5 ('of an evangelist', lit. 'news-giving one') and *üwgexalin* in II Cor. 9.4

34 The latter variant occurs in Jo. 1.13 and 3.6 and in Mt. 10.28; in all other occurrences in the lectionary part of the palimpsests, we read *marmin* (Rom. 12.5; I Cor. 13.3; Eph. 5.28; Heb. 13.11; II Pet. 1.14 and, in the compound *marmin-rara-hēoya* 'of the one having become weak-bodied', in the gloss introducing Is. 35.3 and in Ps. 6.3), including a second attestation in Mt. 10.28.

35 *biin*: Jo. 20.7; Heb. 12.3, 11.21; *piin*: I Cor. 15.52; *kowin*: Jo. 1.17; II Cor. 5.1.

36 *ayzin*: Jo. 15.18, 19; 16.20; *helin*: Lk. 1.67, 4.14, 80; Rom. 8.13, 14; *xašin*: Mt. 5.16 (probably also in *éaxašin* 'with generosity' in Rom. 12.8 if this represents a compound *éa-xaš* 'face-light'); *bowsin*: Rom. 8.35, II Cor. 11.27; *iğin*: II Cor. 11.27; *kal'in*: I Thess. 4.16; II Pet. 1.17; *mowšin*: I Thess. 4.17; *hüwķin*: II Cor. 9.4 and in *hüwķin-baqa-z* 'I understand' (lit. 'take by heart') in I Cor. 13.12.

37 *biin*: Jo. 19.17; Mt. 10.30; *ayzin*: Jo. 4.42, 9.5, 11.10, 12.31, 16.11; Mt. 5.14; Mt. 24.30; Lk. 2.1, 2.3; Rom. 12.2; Tit. 2.12; *xašin*: Jo. 12.36; Mt. 17.5; *helin*: Lk. 4.33; gen. *hüwķin* only in *kolo-hüwķin-āṛ* 'those of a fearful heart' in Is. 35.4.

38 *kod'in*: Ps. 25.8 quoted in A7orb, 14 and in the title introducing I Tim. 3.14, also in *boc'e-kod'in* 'of the treasury' in Jo. 8.20 and Heb. 11.26; *paxin*: Jo. 20.15; *eḳlesin*: Eph. 5.27; *balalin*: Mt. 5.15; *ṭaprin*: Heb. 11.21 (along with erg. *biin*).

(‘of the boasting one’?) and Lk. 4.15 (erg. ‘with being praised’?). Among all these words, there is one subset that is important for our question, namely, those which have a dative(-locative) in *-e*. This is true of *bowl* (> *biy-e-*), *powl* (> *piy-e-*), *ayz* (> *ayz-e-*), and *hüwḵ* (> *hüwḵ-e-*),³⁹ and it is especially the last one that might have been a model for the emergence of *afre-* from **afrin*, given that it appears in compounds such as *hüwḵe-qa-* ‘wish, desire’ and *hüwḵe-qač-* ‘sadness, sorrow’;⁴⁰ if it is true that at least some of the complex verbs with *-pesown* combined with a form in *-e* rely upon datives as suggested above, *afre-pesown* might contain just this type of dative (‘speak in praise’). Another, even more simple solution is provided by the existence of *üwgexale-pesown* ‘praise, boast’ alongside *üwgexalin*: We may argue that the latter form represents a verbal noun ‘boasting’ rather than a participle (or agent noun) in II Cor. 9.4 (*ee beṭalnaḵ üwgexalin* ‘in this very share of boasting’ ~ Arm. *i masind yaydmik parcanac*‘) and Lk. 4.15 (*üwgexalin-hē cexaraḵoc* ‘he was praised, lit. with praise, by all’ ~ Arm. *p’araworeal yamenec’ownc*‘), and the character of a verbal noun comes out even more clearly in the only attestation of independent *üwgexale* in Heb. 3.6, which is aligned with the absolutive *bṣaḵnowtown* ‘audacity’ (lit. ‘lawlessness’) and cannot be taken as a dative here: *sa aṭown e bṣaḵnowtown own üwgexale e heḡiyown bai-biyesal-ṭownḵe ser-ḡexay efa-en’ē-žan* ‘but only if we hold fast the audacity and boasting of the hope⁴¹ until (its) fulfilment’ ~ Arm. *miayn t’ē zhamarjakowt’iwn ew zparcans yowsoyn min’ēw i vaxčan hastatown ownic’imk*‘. The noun *üwgexale*⁴² with its gen. and erg. *üwgexalin* may thus have been the immediate model for *afre-* emerging alongside **afrin*, all the more since both words are nearly synonymous and both combine with *-pesown*.⁴³

39 Attested are: dat. I *biy-e* in Jo. 19.12, dat. II *biy-e-ḡ* in Jo. 5.26, 5.42, 19.2 and 20.7, dat. III *biy-e-s* in Jo. 5.26 and Rom. 12.16, sup. *biy-e-l* in Heb. 13.13, abl. *biy-e-ḡoc* in Jo. 5.19 and 30, anteabl. *biy-e-ḡ-oṣtay* in Jo. 7.18, 16.13 and the title of Jm. 1.1–11; dat. I *piy-e* in II Pet. 1.16; dat. I *ayz-e* in Jo. 6.33, 7.4, 21.25; dat. II *ayz-e-ḡ* in Jo. 1.10, 4.44, 8.26, 9.5, 11.27, 12.46, 13.1, 16.8, 16.21, 18.37, Lk. 2.1, Tit. 2.12; abl. *ayz-e-ḡoc* in Jo. 8.23 and 24, 11.55, 13.1, 15.19, 18.36, II Pet. 1.15; dat. II *hüwḵ-e-ḡ* in Heb. 13.22 (uncertain), sup. *hüwḵ-e-l* (also in *hüwḵel-biyesown* ‘remember’) in Jo. 16.21, I Thess. 2.9, Heb. 12.13, II Pet. 1.13 and 15.

40 Note that in II Cor. 9.7, the erg. *hüwḵin* ‘with the heart’ occurs alongside *hüwḵe-qa-hačinkē* ‘as he desires’ and *hüwḵe-qač’in* ‘with affliction’. The relation of *hüwḵe-* to *hüwḵi-* in *hüwḵi-ahala* ‘compassionate’ (*hüwḵi-ahala-h(anayo)ḵe* Rom. 12.8; *hüwḵi-ahala-ahal-anḵe-va* Heb. 2.17) remains unclear.

41 *heḡiown* is haplographical for *heḡeḡiown*.

42 As another formation of a verbal noun in *-ale*, we may note *hüwḵel-bale* ‘memory, remembrance’ ~ Arm. *zyišataks* in II Pet. 1.15.

43 As an example of another type of metanalysis in the integration of a loanword, we may refer to *eklesi-* ‘church’ whose stem obviously emerged from *eklesi(y)a* (< Gk. ἐκκλησία via Georg. *eklesia-*, not via Arm. *eketec’i*) being taken as a dative-locative (cf. dat. *eklesiya* ~ Arm. *yeketec’woj* in I Cor. 12.28 vs. abs. *eklesi* ~ Arm. *zekelec’i* in Mt. 16.18).

Acknowledgments

This publication is part of a project that has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Grant agreement No. 101019006) and from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy—EXC 2176 'Understanding Written Artefacts: Material, Interaction and Transmission in Manuscript Cultures' (Project No. 390893796).

Bibliography

- Andronikashvili, M. (1966), *Narkvevebi iranul-kartuli enobrivi urtiertobidan / Studies in Iranian-Georgian Linguistic Contacts I*, Tbilisi.
- Bailey, H.W. (1986), "Armenia and Iran. iv. Iranian Influences in Armenian. ii. Iranian Loanwords in Armenian", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 11.4–5. 459–465.
- Bežanov, S./Bežanov, M. (1902), *Gospoda našego Iisusa Xrista Svjatoe Evangelie ot Matheja, Marka, Luki i Ioanna na ruskom i udinskom jazykax*, Tiflis (= SMOMPK, 30).
- Bolognesi, G. (1960), *Le fonti dialettali degli imprestiti iranici in armeno*, Milano.
- Durkin-Meisterernst, D. (2004), *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Turnhout.
- Gippert, J. (1993), *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen*, 2 vols., Wien.
- Gippert, J. (2011), "The linguistic background of Caucasian Albanian literacy", V.S. Tomelleri et al. (eds), *Languages and Cultures in the Caucasus. Papers from the International Conference "Current Advances in Caucasian Studies" Macerata, January 21–23, 2010*, München-Berlin: 3–21.
- Gippert, J. (2020), "The Thorny Road to Caucasian Albania. In Memory of Wolfgang Schulze (1953–2020): *Oya čohoc nowte hil'al bownehē hē-hanayoke*", *Iran and the Caucasus* 24.3: 287–297.
- Gippert, J. (2023), "The Textual Heritage of Caucasian Albanian", *J. Gippert/J. Dum-Tragut* 2023: 95–166.
- Gippert, J./Dum-Tragut, J. (eds.) (2023), *Caucasian Albania. An International Handbook*, Berlin-Boston.
- Gippert, J./Schulze, W. (2023), "The Language of the Caucasian Albanians", *J. Gippert/J. Dum-Tragut* 2023: 167–229.
- Gippert, J./Schulze, W./Aleksidze, Z./Mahé, J.-P. (2008), *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai*. 2 vols, Turnhout.

- Harris, A.C. (2002), *Endoclititics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax*, Oxford.
- Hübschmann, H. (1897), *Armenische Grammatik*. 1. *Armenische Etymologie*, Leipzig.
- Meillet, A. (1903), *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*, Vienne.
- Russell, J.R. (1998), "Arm. *awrhas*", *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 19: 37–39 (repr. in *Russell 2004*: 889–891).
- Russell, J.R. (2004), *Armenian and Iranian Studies*, Cambridge-Massachusetts.
- Schmitt, R. (1986), "Armenia and Iran. iv. Iranian Influences in Armenian. i. General", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* 11.4–5: 445–459.
- Schulze, W./Gippert, J. (2023), "Caucasian Albanian and Modern Udi", *J. Gippert/J. Dum-Tragut* 2023: 231–260.
- Schwartz, M. (2023), "The 'House of Song', the *'House of Clay', Arm. *gerezman*, and Caucaso-Albanica", *Iran and the Caucasus* 27.2: 184–195.