

Iranian Lexical Material in the Caucasus

Part II. Armenian *gerezman* and Albanian *garazman*

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 20 December 2023 | Accepted 10 January 2024 |

Published online 22 March 2024

Abstract

The paper examines a new etymology that has recently been proposed for Arm. *gerezman* and Caucasian “Albanian” *garazman*, both meaning ‘grave, tomb’, and the relationship of the latter to modern Udi *gärämzä* ‘id.’. It shows that the peculiar shape of the Udi word can only be explained on the basis of a morphological restructuring that involved the genitive suffix *-in-*. Concerning the proposed etymology of *gerezman* and *garazman*, which builds upon an Iranian (“Median”) phrase **gr̥ḍa- zmani-* ‘house of clay’, it refutes the hypothesis of a “mirroring effect” influencing vowels in the neighbourhood of *r* in Albanian and points out further problems in the assumed developments.

Keywords

Middle Iranian – Caucasian Albanian – Udi – Armenian – loanwords – Bible translation

In his recent attempt to justify a new Iranian etymology for the word for ‘grave’ or ‘tomb’ as appearing in Armenian *gerezman* and Caucasian Albanian (CA) *garazman*, Martin Schwartz (2023: 184, 190; hereafter: Sch.) quotes Th. Wier for the assumption of two metanalyses concerning relevant terms in the latter language, in deducing *afre-pesown* ‘praise’ from Middle Iranian *āfrīn* ‘prayer, blessing, praise’ and in trying to account for the ‘Udi derivative of *garazman*,

i.e. *gärämzä*. In the first part of the present paper (Gippert 2023a), I have proposed a different explanation for *afre-pesown*, based on the identifiability of *-in* with one of the endings of the CA ergative(-instrumental), *-in*. Interestingly enough, a similar metanalysis was envisaged in Sch.'s article for the development of Udi *gärämzä* from *garazman*: according to Th. Wier's proposal quoted by Sch. (2023: 190), the latter's "final *-n* was lost due to the noun termination being reanalyzed as an Udi morphological suffix, *-n* being found both in the ergative *-(a)n* and genitive *-(V)n* case".

This assumption, however, is not as easy as it may seem. First of all, the *-an* in CA *garazman* cannot have been metanalysed as an ergative marker in CA because ergatives in *-an* are extremely restricted in that language: they only occur in the plural forms *cexar-an* 'all', *išeb-an* 'brothers' and, probably, *āñ* 'they' (masc.) if this form, which always appears abbreviated in the palimpsests, stands for **āan* or, rather, **āaran* (cf. Gippert et al. 2008: vol. 1, 11–38).¹ Even words with a stem in *-a* do not show *-an* in the ergative singular but, with the most frequent ergative ending, *-a-en*; this is true, e.g., of the proper names *marta* 'Martha' (→ *marta-en*), *yowda* 'Judas' (→ *yowda-en*), and *ešaya* 'Isaiah' (→ *ešaya-en*), but also for the common nouns *manana* 'manna' (→ *manana-en*) and, probably, *bāgala* 'depth' (→ **bāgala-en*).² In Udi, however, it is just words with a stem in *-a* that exhibit an ergative in *-a-n*; so we find *marfa-n* (VB)³ and *marṭa-n* (NB)⁴ for Martha, *iuda-n* for Judas and Jude (NB and VB), and *isaya-n* for Isaiah,⁵ but also frequent common nouns such as *baba* 'father' (→ *baba-n*) and *nana* 'mother' (→ *nana-n*). Likewise, we find ergatives in *-ā-n* of the name *zākāriyā* 'Zachariah' (→ *zākāriyā-n*)⁶ and the word *fārištā* 'angel' (→ *fārištā-n*),⁷ thus, indeed, suggesting a similar relation between Udi *gärämzä* and CA *garazman*.

1 The plural pronouns *žan* 'we' and *van* 'you' may contain the same ending but they stand for both the absolutive and the ergative.

2 Jo. 11.21 and 24 (A65va, 9 and A60ra, 17); Jo. 12.39 (B55ra, 21); Jo. 13.2 (A66va, 1); Heb. 9.4 (A75va, 18–19); Rom. 8.39 (B33va, 13 where only *-laen* has been preserved). As in the edition (Gippert et al. 2008), 'A' stands for the palimpsest manuscript Sin. georg. NF 13 and 'B', for Sin. georg. NF 55.

3 Lk. 10.40; Jo. 11.21, 24, 39. Here and in the following, VB stands for the Bible translation into the Vartashen dialect by the Bežanov brothers (1902; online in a Latin transliteration on <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/cauc/udi/udint/udint.htm>) and NB, for the new Bible translation into the dialect of Nij (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>).

4 Jo. 11.21, 24, 27, 28, 39, 12.2.

5 Jo. 11.21 etc.; Jo. 18.3 etc.; Jo. 12.39 etc. Besides *isayan*, the forms *isaien* (Jo. 12.41) and *isaen* (Jo. 12.39 etc.) also occur in VB.

6 Lk. 1.18 etc. in NB; VB has *Zakari-n-en* instead.

7 Mt. 28.5 in VB; NB has *angel-en* instead. Elsewhere in VB we find *fārišt-in-en* (e.g., Lk. 1.19).

Nevertheless, the ergative(-instrumental) is anything but likely to have ‘triggered’ the re-shaping of the given nominal stem, considering that a ‘grave’ is neither prototypically perceived as an agent nor as an instrument; and as a matter of fact, the actual ergative of the word is attested neither in CA (where we would expect **garazman-en*) nor in written Udi (where we would expect **gärämzä-n* or **gärämz-in-en*, cf. below). What we do see in the CA palimpsests is only locative cases⁸ such as the datives (I) *garazman-a*⁹ and (III) *garazman-a-s*,¹⁰ the ablatives (II) *garazman-a-ḡ-oc*¹¹ and, probably, (I) *garazman-oc*,¹² and the dative (I) plural *garazman-owḡ-o*.¹³ The picture is similar in the Vartashen Udi Gospels of the Bežanov brothers: besides six instances of the absolutive *gärämzä* in passages that are not attested in CA,¹⁴ we usually come across locative cases or the genitive with a local postposition like *toḡol* ‘to’, *boš* ‘in’, or *tüş* ‘against’.¹⁵ Here, now, we find the clue to what happened to the word in diachrony: the genitive, upon which the locative cases are built, is *gärämz-in*, with the usual elision of the stem-final *-ä*; we thus have the dat. *gärämz-in-a* and the abl. *gärämz-in-a-xo*, matched by dat. *gärämz-in-ä* and abl. *gärämz-in-a-xun* in Nij.¹⁶

Having this evidence at hand, several scenarios can be envisaged for the restructuring of *garazman* to Udi *gärämzä*, all building upon the genitive, not the ergative: either, we might assume that a former (CA) genitive **garazman-own* was replaced by **garazman-in* before the resulting form was reduced to

The Udi word is a borrowing from New Persian *فرشته*, probably via Azeri (*firištə*); CA used the Greek word *ἄγγελος* (probably via Georgian *angelos*-).

8 For the system of locative cases and their relation to the three datives of CA cf. Gippert et al. 2008: 1, 11–24–29 and Gippert/Schulze 2023: 181–184.

9 Jo. 11.17 (A60vb, 18), 20.4 (B7vb, 20–21), 20.6 (B14va, 6–7), 20.8 (B7ra, 15–16), possibly also in Jo. 20.11 (B14vb, 5–6) and Act. 13.29 (B27vb, 4).

10 Jo. 20.3 (B7vb, 14), probably also in 20.1 (B14rb, 1–2).

11 Jo. 12.17 (B11va, 4), probably also in 20.1 (B14rb, 4) and 20.11 (B14vb, 1) where we have to reconstruct *garazmanaḡoc* with the postposition *ḡohoc* ‘out(side) of’; the genitive *garazmani* assumed in the edition (Gippert et al. 2008: 1, 14–13) must be given up as the *-a-* of the ablative ending has now become visible on the newly detected scrap B78v (cf. Gippert 2023b: 193–209 for the 19 additional fragments that were found in the course of the Sinai Palimpsests Project between 2012 and 2017 and their identification).

12 Jo. 20.2 (B14rb, 10) where the reading is not certain in all points.

13 Sic Jo. 5.28 (A97ra, 14), not a dative (II) in *-owḡ-oḡ* as assumed in the edition.

14 Mt. 23.29; Lk. 11.44, 47, 48; Jo. 19.41, 42. The latter two must have been present in the CA palimpsests on the burnt-off half of the bifolio consisting of B14r and B7v of which only a few characters have remained.

15 Mt. 27.61, 66; Mk. 16.2; Lk. 24.1; Jo. 11.38, 20.1, 3, 5, 6, 11.

16 NB provides much less examples than VB because here, the word *maḡara* is used more often; cf. below.

**garazm-in* by haplology; or we might suggest a replacement of the CA dative *garazman-a* by the more usual genitive-based formation **garazman-in-a* with a similar haplology following; or we might presuppose a substitution of the stem-final element *-an-* by the more frequent suffix *-in-* leading from the same dative, *garazman-a*, to **garazm-in-a* directly, without haplology.

The peculiar role that the genitive in *-in-* played in the prehistory of the nominal inflection of modern Udi, where it developed to what is usually called a “stem augmentation” (cf. Gippert et al. 2008: 1, 11–23; Gippert/Schulze 2023: 184),¹⁷ is clearly visible in the name Martha for which, besides the absolutive *Marfa*,¹⁸ the ergative *Marfa-n* (see above) and the dative *Marfa-x* (Jo. 11.5), VB provides a genitive *Marf-in* (Jo. 11.19) and, built on it, an ergative *Marf-in-en* (Jo. 12.2, with the particle *-al* ‘also’ added).¹⁹ Telling is also the word *mağara* ‘cave’, which is generally used to denote the grave of Jesus Christ in NB. As a borrowing of Arab. *mağāra*^t via Azeri *mağara*, it exhibits a similar inflection, with a dative *mağar-in-a*²⁰ and an abl. *mağar-in-a-xun*,²¹ both built upon a genitive *mağar-in*;²² as a matter of fact, this can be regarded as the regular formation of oblique cases for a stem in *-a* (and *-ä*) in Udi (cf. Schulze 1982: 102).²³ A peculiar form is the dative *mağaran-in-a-* which occurs once (with the person clitic *-ne* attached) in Mt. 27.60 (alongside the gen. *mağar-in*) and which might remind us of the form **garazman-in-a* we supposed above as underlying later **garazm-in-a*; given the evidence for the many other forms, however, it should rather be regarded as dittographical. In any way, only the genitive with its ending *-in* can have been the ‘triggering’ case for the emergence of Udi *gärämzä* and its inflection, not an ergative; and this is all the more true as only the *-in* ending can account for the ‘umlauting’ effect that *gärämzä* reveals.²⁴

17 Schulze (1982: 101–102) uses the term “Stammerweiterung”.

18 Lk. 10.38, 41; Jo. 11.1, 20, 30.

19 In NB, we only find the genitive *Marfa-y* (Lk. 10.37, 40), with the alternative ending *-y*.

20 Mt. 27.56 (header), 65; Mk. 16.5; Lk. 23.53, 55, 24.12, 22, 24; Jo. 19.37 (header), 20.4, 8; in addition, with the 3rd person clitic *-ne* attached, in Mk. 15.46 and Jo. 20.1 and with the plural clitic *-tun*, in Mk. 6.29 and Jo. 20.3. VB has the dative *gärämzina* in Mk. 6.29, 15.46, 16.5, Lk. 23.53, 55, 24.24, Jo. 20.4, 8, the superessives *gärämzinal* (singular) in Lk. 24.12 and *gärämzıgöl* (plural) in Lk. 24.22, and the genitive with postposition *gärämzin toğöl* in Jo. 20.1 and 3. Mt. 28.8; Jo. 20.2; VB has *gärämzinaxo* in both cases.

22 Mt. 27.60, 61, 66 (2×), 28.2; Mk. 15.46, 16.2, 3; Lk. 24.1, 2; Jo. 20.1, 6, 11 (2×); VB has *gärämzin* (sometimes spelt *gäramzin*) in all these instances except for Lk. 24.2 with the abl. *gärämzinaxo*.

23 The only stems in *-a* and *-ä* that do not take the stem augmentation in *-in-* but in simple *-n-* are stems in *-ya/ä* such the Arabic borrowing *düni/ya* ‘world’ with the ablatives *dünian-i-xo* (VB) and *dünyä-n-e-xun* (NB; Jo. 8.23).

24 For a similar umlaut caused by an *-i* vowel cf. the Nij form of the biblical name *Zäkärıyü* (contrasting with *Zaxari* in VB, e.g., in Mt. 23.35).

There is one more difference between the CA and the Udi word that must be taken into account, namely, the metathesis of *-zm-* to *-mz-* that *gärämzä* presupposes; Sch. (2023: 190) mentions it but does not elaborate on it. As a matter of fact, a sequence *-zm-* is not attested within the stem of any Udi word in the text materials available, all instances containing a morpheme break between the two sounds as in *üz-muġ-o* / *ayiz-moġ-o*, gen.pl. of *üz* / *ayiz* ‘village’ with the plural suffix *-mu/oġ-*,²⁵ or being borrowings from Azeri like the verbs *üzmiš-b(e)sun* ‘swim’²⁶ (Az. *üzmək*) and *pozmiš-b(e)sun* ‘break’²⁷ (Az. *pozmaq*), which in their turn contain a morpheme boundary, too (before the suffix *-miš* < Az. *-mi/iş*). On the other hand, *-mz-* is not met with in any other Udi word either if there is no morpheme boundary implied as in *cam-zu-pe* ‘I have written’²⁸ or *zom-zu-be* ‘I have taught’.²⁹ For a comparable metathesis as in *gärämzä*, we can only refer to the Nij word for ‘man(kind)’, *amdar*, which has obviously replaced Vartashen *adamar* as the older formation (cf. Azeri *adam*, Georgian *adamian-i*, etc.), possibly after a syncope (**admar*); this, however, is a single case, too, and the word is not attested in CA so that the chronology remains obscure.

CA *garazman* is assumed by Sch. (2023: 190) to be a borrowing of Arm. *gerezman*. To account for the divergence in the vocalism, he points to three other CA words which, in his view, “demonstrate a tendency whereby after *r* the vowel of a following syllable assimilates the vowel of the first syllable in a mirroring effect”, the three words being *margaven* ‘prophet’, *xarṭaḱ-* ‘[make] (into) pieces’, and the biblical place name *Serebta*. Unfortunately, this assumption is untenable.

First of all, there are numerous CA words which show that the two vowels “around” an *r* did not interact in any way. We may quote, e.g., the present stem formations *karexa-* ‘living’ (Jo. 5.34), *bareta-* ‘leaving, redeeming’ (Jo. 20.23), *hareza-* ‘rising’ (Mt. 10.21), *areca-* ‘sitting (down)’ (Mt. 19.28), and *ġare* and *ġaren*, the dative and ergative singular of *ġar* ‘son, child’ (1 Cor. 13.1 / Jo. 5.19), all

25 E.g. in Mt. 9.35 and Mk. 1.38 in both NB and VB; in Lk. 8.1, VB has the form *üzurġon* instead, with the suffix *-ur-*.

26 Only in VB; e.g., in the infinitive *üzmiš-besa* in Mk. 6.48.

27 Only in NB; e.g., in the present form *pozmiš-bsa* in 1Jo. 3.4.

28 Cf. Gippert 2023a: 442 for this and other forms of *cam-p(e)sun* ‘write’. The form *cam-pe-sa* in Jo. 19.22 should better be regarded as containing the Nij conditional clitic *-sa* (used in the sense of ‘whatever I have written’) than the present stem (‘I am writing’); my thanks are due to T. Maisak who proposed this to me (personal communication of 5 December 2023). Cf. Maisak 2019 for the conditional clitic, which is likely to be a borrowing from Azeri.

29 Lk. 1.4 and Jo. 18.20 in VB; NB here has the forms *zombakiṭoġoy* ‘of those which were taught’ and *zombe* ‘I have taught’ (without personal marker) instead.

with an *a* uninfluenced by a following *e*. We may further quote the past stems *ari-* ‘having come’ (Jo. 5.43), *acari* ‘having sat (down)’ (Jo. 19.13), *bozari-* ‘having got tired’ (Jo. 4.38), *hayzari-* ‘having risen’ (1 Thess. 4.14), and the adjectives *qari-* ‘dry’ (Jo. 21.11) and *igari-* ‘hot’ (Jo. 18.25) with an *a* before an *i*; the numeral *powran* ‘second’ (heading of 11 Cor. 4.7) and the present stem *bowra-* ‘standing’ (Rom. 8.26) with an *u* unaltered before *a*; cf. also the corresponding infinitive stem *bowres-* ‘stand’ (Jo. 4.40) with *u* before *e* as well as the past stem *bowri-* ‘having stood’ (Heb. 12.4) and the frequent form *powri-* ‘died, dead’ with *u* before *i*. The sequence *e* before *a* is rare but we have it in the present stem (with light verb) *ser-aha-* ‘being justified’ (Acts 13.39). Within loanwords, we find *-ari-* in *hark-* ‘tribute’ (11 Cor. 9.7), where the *i* is epenthetic (cf. Arm. *hark*, Georg. *hark-* / *xark-* ‘id.’, < Mİran.),³⁰ and in *parisaowx-* ‘Pharisees’ (Mt. 5.20) with an original *i*; similarly, we have *-are/ē-* in the name of Nazareth, *Nazare/ēt-* (Jo. 1.45; Lk. 4.14) and in the recently detected Iranian loanword *asparez-* ‘stadium’ (Jo. 11.18; cf. Arm. *asparēz/s*, Georg. *asparez-* ‘id.’, < Mİran. **asparēs*).³¹ Across consonant clusters with *r*, we may note, e.g., *serbaown* ‘first’ with *e* before *a* (Lk. 2.2), the infinitive stems *bartes-* ‘leaving, redeeming’ (Heb. 2.17), *karxes-* ‘life, salvation’ (Jo. 12.47) and *harzes-* ‘rising, resurrection’ (11 Cor. 4.14) with *a* before *e*, the loanword *targowman* ‘translation’ (Jo. 9.7) as well as the inherited plural forms *garmowx* (abs.) and *garmo* (dat.1) of *gar* ‘son, child’ (Rom. 8.15 / 1 Thess. 2.12) with *a* before *u* and *o*, the Armenian borrowing *marmin* ‘body, flesh’ (< Arm. *marmin*; *passim*) with *a* before *i*, the Georgian loanword *sabowrzel* ‘seat, throne’ (< Georg. *savrzel-*; Mt. 19.28) with *u* before *e*; and *a* before *e* has also been preserved in *ašarkeṭ* ‘disciple’ (Mt. 10.24), which represents the same Iranian loanword as Arm. *ašakert* does but with a metathesis.

Of the three words that Sch. instanced to support his hypothesis of a vowel assimilation tendency, the place name *serebta* can be ruled out off-hand, given that it is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament (Greek Σάρεπτα / Σάρεφθα, Arm. *sarep’t’a*; Lk. 4.26 referring to 111 Kings 17.10) which can easily have been distorted because as a foreign toponym, it was unknown to the scribe; cf. the Greek tradition itself where a spelling Σεραφθα is attested at least once.³² In CA,

30 Cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 364 s.v. *xrg*, *hrg*, *hr:g* for ManMPers. *xarg* / *harg* ‘tribute’ and 182 s.v. *hrg* for ManMPers. *hargān* ‘taxes, duties’, and MacKenzie 1971: 43 for MPers. *harg* ‘duty, tribute; work, effect’. For further details concerning the MPers. word cf. Henning 1958: 41 with n. 4.

31 From Oİran. **aspa-uraisa-*, denoting the turning point in horse races; cf. Gippert 1993: [1], 20.

32 Manuscript Mt Athos, Megistē Laura, A’ 104 (Greg. 1071; diktyon 27032), fol. 96vb, ll. 21–22; see <https://www.loc.gov/resource/amedmonastery.00271051098-ma/?sp=101>. Note that from the same context of Lk. 4.26, the name of the region of Sidon (Greek Σιδωνία) was

the shape of the name may well have been influenced by the frequent word *ser* ‘just, true, righteous’ (> Udi *ser* ‘friendship’), which also appears in the light verb combinations *ser-biyəsown* ‘justify’ (> Udi *ser-besun* ‘make, build’), *ser-ihəsown* ‘be justified’; and *ser-ʒexəsown* ‘settle down, dwell’ (cf. Gippert et al. 2008: I, IV–38; for the Udi words, Gukasyan 1974: 200 and Mobili 2010: 246), with a clear affinity to inhabited places.

Concerning *xartak-* ‘[make] into pieces’, for which Sch. assumes his “mirroring effect” in identifying it with Arm. *xortak-* ‘id.’, it may suffice here to refer to the detailed discussion of the two words I have published earlier (see Gippert 2009: 136–138):³³ both must be derived from a MIran. form **xwartak* which contrasted with MPers. *xwurdag* as a dialectal (NWIran.) variant where **-ʔ-* was represented by *-ar-*, not **-əʔ-* > *-ur-*, and with the usual rendering of **xwa-* by *xo-* in Armenian. In CA, which does not know word-initial consonant clusters, *xwa-* was simplified to *xa-*, a development that is also attested in Armenian, e.g. in *xah* ‘food’ as a variant of *xoh* ‘id.’ (< **xwarθra-*, cf. Avest. *xʷarəθra-*) (cf. Hübschmann 1897: 160), in *kaxard* ‘sorcerer’ < **kaxward-* (cf. Avest. *kaxʷarəda-*) (cf. Gippert 2009: 137, n. 54 with further literature), or in *patasxan* ‘answer’ < **patsaxwan* (cf. MPers. *passaxw*) (cf. Bolognesi 1960: 61). In contrast to this, CA *xoran* ‘tent’ may be a borrowing from Arm. *xoran* ‘id.’; no matter whether this is to be regarded as an Iranian loanword with former **xwa-* or not;³⁴ and of course, this word does not reveal any “mirroring effect” in its vocalism.

For his third key witness, CA *marğaven* ‘prophet’, Sch. (2023: 190) recurs to the vowel assimilation hypothesis because he deems it necessary to “operate with an underlying **muryaven*”, thus approaching the word to Manichaean Parthian “where ‘bird’ is /mury/, a development probably contrasting with Arsacid Parthian **/mṛg/* reflected by Armenian *marg*” as contained in *margarē* ‘id.’³⁵ It is true, of course, that the two words for the ‘prophet’ represent different formations even though they can both be derived from MIran. compounds

erroneously taken to be the name of a widow (Sidonia) in a philippic against Jews, pagans and heretics attributed to John Chrysostom (CPG 4506; PG 48, 1077, cf. Gippert 2006: 121).

33 Schwartz (2023: 190) quotes only the summarising list of borrowings from Gippert 2011: 3–6.

34 Cf. Gippert 2009: 131 for the proposal to derive this word from a MIran. compound **xwa-dāna-*, with **dāna-* ‘construction, building’ as in OPers. *apa-dāna-* ‘palace’ (> Arm. *aparan*) and Parth. *wiḍān* ‘tent’ < **wi-dāna-* (> Arm. *vran*) and **xwa-* ‘self’, here “denoting the ‘separate’ or ‘detached’ construction of tents or huts”.

35 Schwartz does not mention the many other Iranian loanwords in Armenian that show the same **-ar-*; cf., e.g., Gershevitch 1989 and Korn 2013.

denoting a ‘bird-seer’: while CA *marġaven* must include the present stem of the verb for ‘seeing’, **wēn-* (cf. Avest. *vaēnaiti* 3rd person sg.), Arm. *margarē* must contain a verbal noun of the suppletive root of the same verb, **dē* (cf. Gippert 2005 for the etymology and a detailed discussion);³⁶ and it is also true that the two words are distinguished by the velar that appears in their middle. This, however, forces us in no way to posit a different vocalism in the word for the ‘bird’ they contain, as there is no reason why a former sequence *-urCa-* should have been changed to *-arCa-* in CA. Instead, the easiest solution is to assume the representation of former **-r-* by *-ar-* in CA *marġaven* as well as Arm. *margarē*. And even the difference in the velars is not decisive: Arm. *g* can by all means stand for a velar fricative as we see it in CA *marġaven*, given that the language did not possess such a fricative in the period in question and *g* was its usual substitute;³⁷ and the fact that *margarē* presupposes the dental fricative in the underlying MIran. formation (with **-δ-* > *-r-*) clearly suggests that this formation must also have had a fricative *-ɣ-*, not a stop *-g-*. In any way, CA *marġaven* cannot be taken to prove a “mirroring tendency”.

Lastly, it remains enigmatic how Sch.’s “tendency” could have yielded CA *garazman* from Arm. *gerezman*, given that the vowel after the *r* in the latter word is not an *a* but an *e*. Should the “mirroring” in this case have been triggered by the vowel of the last syllable? Sch. does not elaborate on this³⁸ even though it is crucial for the new derivation he proposes. In fact, Sch.’s (2023: 188) etymology, which builds upon a “Median **gr̥ḏa-zmani-* (with **-δ-* < **-d-*) ‘house made of clay’ with nom. **gr̥ḏah zmaniš*”, is only designed to match Arm. *gerezman*: it presupposes that “Iranian **r* after velar” is represented by Arm. *-er-* as in “*ašakert* ‘disciple’ and the many forms with *-(a)kert* ‘made’” and that “the internal *-ah-* became *-e-*, just as in *sepouh* ‘prince’, from a secondary compound representing the OIr. phrase *wisah puθra-* ‘son of the (royal) clan’”. In addition, Sch. assumes that “**δ* was assimilated to the nearby **z*”. Here, it remains unclear where the “assimilated” *z* is found as a form †*gerzezman* does not exist, and the example of Arm. *gerdastan* ‘household, menial staff’, adduced by Sch. himself, rather suggests that after *r*, Iran. **d* did not develop to **δ* at all (which would

36 Schwartz (2023: 190) again quotes only the list from Gippert 2011.

37 Cf., e.g., Arm. *marg* ‘meadow’ ~ Parth. *mary* (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 230 s.v. *mrg*) or Arm. *mog* ‘magus, Zoroastrian priest’, *mogpet* ‘Zoroastrian chief priest’ (cf. Man.Parth. *maybed*; Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 228 s.v. *mgbyd*) vs. *movpet* ‘id.’ ~ MPers. *mowbed* (cf. Bolognesi 1960: 53). The modern Armenian pronunciation of Դ (d) as [ɣ] emerged in any case too late to be envisaged here.

38 Schwartz (2023: 190) states laconically: “Thus, *gerezman* > **garazman*” (sic, with an asterisk).

have led to **r* in Armenian) but remained a stop into Middle Iranian times,³⁹ which was certainly much less prone to an influence of a neighbouring *z* in whatever way.

For CA *garazman*, Sch.'s etymology raises the same problem, plus that of the diverging vocalism.⁴⁰ If one intends to maintain it anyway, it would be necessary to take refuge to a different (Middle) Iranian dialect where the same loss of the dental occurred but **-r-* developed to *-ar-* (as in *marġaven* and *margarē*, see above) and the **-e* (rather **-ē*) of the former genitive ending was substituted by *-a-*, possibly induced by the many compounds with *-a-* in the morpheme boundary. In this context, we might also consider the influence of a Middle Iranian term that has even been proposed to be connected to the word for the 'grave', namely, the word for 'heaven' or 'paradise' appearing as *gardmān* in Parthian, *yarōman* in Sogdian, and *garāsmān* in Middle Persian (cf. Henning 1945: 157), in their turn reflecting Avestan *garō dman-*, later *garō nman-* 'house of song'.⁴¹ Of these, it is the Middle Persian one, appearing as *garasmān* in Book Pahlavi (cf. MacKenzie 1971: 35)⁴² and as *garāsmān* in Manichaean texts (cf. Durkin-Meisterernst 2004: 163 s.v. *gr'sm'n*), that is the most appealing: obviously transformed after *asmān* 'sky, heaven' itself, it might well have influenced the CA word for 'grave' in its form if this was shaped like Arm. *gerezman* before. The actual etymology of the two sister terms must remain open, however.⁴³

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)

39 Exempting, of course, Middle Persian with its development of *-l-* < *-rd-* (for which cf. Bolognesi 1960: 49–52). Deriving Arm. *gerdastan* from "OIr. **grdastāna-*" (Schwartz 2023: 188) only obfuscates the problem.

40 True Armenian loanwords in CA show the vocalism unaltered; besides *marmin* 'body' (cf. above), we may quote *hetanos* 'heathen, Gentile' < Arm. *het'anos* 'id.', which includes the anaptyctic *a* in the second syllable (< Greek ἑθνος).

41 The connection of Arm. *gerezman* with Av. *garō-dman-* was first suggested by Marr (1891: 319–320, n. 3) but decidedly refused already by Hübschmann (1897: 127).

42 I have not yet come across an attestation.

43 There is no need here to further discuss the proposal by Henning (1945: 157–162) who suggested an "Av. **zəmarkana-* 'dug in the ground'" as the underlying term because, as he himself stated, this cannot account for the word-initial *g-*.

under Germany's Excellence Strategy—EXC 2176 'Understanding Written Artefacts: Material, Interaction and Transmission in Manuscript Cultures' (Project No. 390893796). My thanks are due to Agnes Korn who read a draft of this paper and provided valuable hints.

Bibliography

- Bolognesi, G. (1960), *Le fonti dialettali degli imprestiti iranici in armeno*, Milano.
- CPG: Maurits Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, 11: Ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum, Turnhout, 1974.
- Durkin-Meisterernst, D. (2004), *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Turnhout.
- Gershevitch, I. (1989), "Margarites the Pearl", Ch.-H. de Fouchécour/Ph. Gignoux (eds.), *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*, Paris: 113–136.
- Gippert, J. (1993), *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen*, 2 vols., Vienna.
- Gippert, J. (2005), "Armeno-Albanica", G. Schweiger (ed.), *Indogermanica. Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt*, Taimering: 155–165.
- Gippert, J. (2006), "Çm. Ninos legenda: gansxvavebul çqarota k'vali", *Enatmecnierebis saḳitxebi* 1–2: 104–122 (English version: <https://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/personal/jg/pdf/jg1997je.pdf>).
- Gippert, J. (2009), "An Etymological Trifle", W. Sundermann/A. Hintze/F. de Blois (eds.), *Exegisti monumenta. Festschrift in Honour of Nicholas Sims-Williams*, Wiesbaden: 127–140.
- 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 (available online at: <https://download.e-bookshelf.de/download/0000/3540/65/L-G-0000354065-0002317146.pdf>).
- Gippert, J. (2023a), "Iranian Lexical Material in the Caucasus. Part 1. Albanian *afre-pesown*", *Iran and the Caucasus* 27.4–5: 435–448 (available online at: https://brill.com/downloadpdf/view/journals/ic/27/4-5/article-p435_12.pdf).
- Gippert, J. (2023b), "New Light on the Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of St. Catherine's Monastery", C. Rapp et al. (eds.), *New Light on Old Manuscripts: Recent Advances in Palimpsest Studies*, Vienna: 187–215 (available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1553/978OEAW91575s187>).
- Gippert, J./Dum-Tragut, J. (eds.) (2023), *Caucasian Albania. An International Handbook*, Berlin-Boston (available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110794687>).
- Gippert, J./Schulze, W. (2023), "The Language of the Caucasian Albanians", *J. Gippert/*

- J. Dum-Tragut* 2023: 167–229 (available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110794687-004>).
- Gippert, J./Schulze, W./Aleksidze, Z./Mahé, J.-P. (2008), *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai*, 2 vols., Turnhout.
- Gukasyan, V. (1974), *Удинчо-азербайджанчо-русчо лүгәт (Udinsko-azerbajdžansko-russkij slovar')*, Baku.
- Henning, W.B. (1945): "Two Central Asian Words", *Transactions of the Philological Society*: 150–162 (reprinted in *Selected Papers* 11, Leiden 1977: 259–271).
- Henning, W.B. (1958), "Mitteliranisch", *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, 1. Abteilung, 4. Band: *Iranistik*, 1. Abschnitt: *Linguistik*, Leiden: 20–130.
- Korn, A. (2013), "Final troubles: Armenian stem classes and the word-end in Late Old Persian", P. Lur'e/V. Tokhtasev (eds.), *Commentationes Iranicae*. Vladimiro f. Aaron Livschits nonagenario donum natalicium, St. Petersburg: 74–91 (available online at: <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01340794>).
- MacKenzie, D.N. (1971), *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*, London.
- Maisak, T. (2019), "Borrowing from an unrelated language in support of intragenetic tendencies. The case of the conditional clitic =sa in Udi", *Diachronica* 36.3: 337–383.
- Marr, N. Ya. (1891), [Review of] "Istoričeskaya grammatika sovremennago armjanskago yazyka goroda Tiflisa. Izslėdovanie A. Tomsona, S.-Peterburg' 1890", *Zapiski vostočnago otdėleniya russkago arxeologičeskago obščestva* 5.2: 307–321.
- Mobili, R. (2010), *Udi-azerbaycanin-urusin əyitluğ/Udicə-azərbaycanca-rusca lüğət/Udinsko-azerbajdžansko-russkij slovar'*, Baku.
- PG: Jean-Paul Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Graeca*, 1–CLXI, Paris: Firmin Didot, 1857–1866.
- Schulze, W. (1982), *Die Sprache der Uden in Nord-Azerbajdžan. Studien zur Synchronie und Diachronie einer süd-ostkaukasischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden.