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1. Armenian and Anatolian: general remarks
   Two circumstances unite the Armenian and Anatolian languages: (1) a common Indo-European origin, and (2) geographical proximity of their historical homelands, namely the central and western parts of the modern-day Turkey for Anatolian, and the Armenian Highlands (the Armenian plateau) for Armenian. The former circumstance raises the question of linguistic relationship between these two branches within the Indo-European language family, whereas the latter is concerned with the issue of loanwords which would have been transferred mainly in the 2nd millennium BCE and possibly also in the early 1st millennium BCE.

1.1 Common heritage
   On the basis of the (alleged) identification of hay ‘Armenian’ / Hay-k‘ (-o-c’) ‘Armenia’ with Ḫatti\(^2\) and a number of linguistic features\(^3\) it has been assumed that Armenian and the Anatolian languages were intimately related. Scholars have addressed several phonological and morphological correspondences between Armenian and the Anatolian languages, such as the preservation of the Indo-European laryngeals (cf. Arm. han ‘grandmother’ and Hitt. Ḫanna- ‘grandmother’ vs. Gr. ὀὔβίς ‘mother-in-law’, etc.; Arm. haw ‘grandfather’ and Hitt. Ḫuḫḫaš ‘grandfather’ vs. Lat. avus ‘id.’, Lith. avýnas ‘maternal uncle’, etc.; Arm. hovi- ‘sheep’ in hoviw ‘shepherd’ and CLuw. Ḫāu(i)- ‘sheep’ vs. Lat. ovis ‘sheep’, etc.), the Armenian subjunctive in -ɪc’ė and the Hittite iterative in -eške-, as well as a considerable number of lexical correspondences. However, some of these correspondences (such as Arm. getin ‘earth, ground’ and Hitt. utnē ‘land’, Arm. barju gen. ‘high’ and Hitt. parku- ‘high’) are likely to be archaisms rather than shared innovations, others proved wrong, and a few of the lexical comparisons may

---

\(^1\) I am greatly indebted to Kate Bellamy for proof-reading my paper. I am also indebted to Ilya Yakubovich for valuable suggestions.

\(^2\) P. Jensen 1898, 1904, 1911; cf. Kretschmer 1933; N. Martirosyan 1972: 164-166 < 1921-22; for more references, see Martirosyan 2010: 383.

\(^3\) Austin 1942.
be explained as loanwords. We can therefore assume that there is no particular relationship between Armenian and Anatolian within the Indo-European family.4

1.2 Loanwords: historico-geographical background

The problem of Anatolian borrowings in Armenian has attracted the attention of various scholars since the early 20th century.5 There is a certain scepticism concerning the existence of Hittite loanwords in Armenian, whereas the Luwian ones are largely accepted. The scepticism is mainly conditioned by chronological and geographical problems (cf. e.g. Greppin 1978b, 1988: 189; Simon 2013: 128-129). As Greppin (1980b: 357) points out, if we can show clear-cut evidence for Hittite in Armenian, we will know that the proto-Armenians were in their historical homeland in the 2nd millennium BCE. The opinion that speakers of Armenian migrated into the Armenian Highlands after the fall of the Urartian Empire in the 6th century BCE should be abandoned. That the Armenian language was present in the historical Armenia in (or prior to) the Urartian period is confirmed particularly by Armenian loanwords in Urartian, such as Urart. *arsibi- from Arm. arcu ‘eagle’ and Urart. *Tuurasini huši vs. Arm. *Tuuracatap’ (district in the province of Turuberan). Armenisms in the Urartian language are not limited purely to lexical correspondences. Urartian me(i) probably reflects the Armenian prohibitive particle mi,6 which derives from the PIE prohibitive particle *meh₁. Diakonoff (1984: 112) claims that “we should apparently seek the Proto-Armenians either in the Muški or in the Urumeans who penetrated into the valleys of the Upper Euphrates and the Arsalias around 1165 BC”. Vaux (2006: 475a) and Gercenberg (2010: 200) accept the view on the Armenian settlement in the (second half of the) 2nd millennium, and Watkins (2011: xii) notes that Armenians had “probably already settled in eastern Turkey by the mid-second millennium BC”.

In order to be more confident of the existence of specifically Hittite loanwords in Armenian, we need to have linguistic evidence that would confirm the earliest presence of speakers of Armenian in historical Armenia prior to the 12th century BCE, for which Jahukyan (1988, 1990) presents a large number of arguments. Not all of them are convincing, however.7 Earlier (Jahukyan 1970: 146-147) he had assumed that, should the theory on the coming of the speakers of Armenian in the 12th century BCE prove correct, we will be dealing with contacts between them and the residual populations of the destroyed Hittite Kingdom. On the other hand,
it has been suggested that the handful of Anatolian loanwords in Armenian “were probably picked up during the migration eastward through Anatolia” (Fortson 2010: 382).

The chronological and geographical framework of early contacts between Armenian and the Anatolian languages may be placed within the context of the kingdom or tribal confederation of Ḥajaša-, which is attested only in Hittite texts from the 14th to 13th centuries BCE. This place is located in the northwest peripheries and perhaps in central regions of historical Armenia. The name of Ḥajaša- is reminiscent of the ethnonym hay, gen. hayoc’ ‘Armenian’ (cf. Hay-k’ ‘Armenia’), although the origin of the latter has not been established with certainty. Recently (Kitazumi 2013; Simon 2013: 127) the connection has been criticized particularly on the basis of the Armenian h- instead of the expected x-. One might think, however, that Ḥajaša- may merely be a cuneiform reflection of the local name with /h/, for which the cuneiform script has no distinct sign. The comparison, albeit not impeccable, should not be abandoned altogether.

Jahukyan (1988, 1: 70, 2: 85, 1990: 27-28) treats a number of Hittite words as loanwords from Armenian, such as Hitt. luzzi- n. ‘forced service, public duty, corvée’ from Arm. luc ‘yoke; burden of forced service and taxes, subjection; bondage’; Hitt. arziiya- n. ‘cultivated land, agricultural resource, granary (figurative)’ from PArm. *arc- > art ‘cornfield, tilled field’ (from PIE *h2eɡro-). In my paper, however, we will be concerned by loanwords of the opposite direction, that is from Anatolian to Armenian.

1.3 Historicocultural context: “Dragon stones”

Concerning the general historicocultural context one might address, for instance, the problem of “Dragon stones” (Arm. višap’ar, composed of višap ‘dragon’ and k’ar ‘stone’), stone stelae found in high-altitude summer pastures in the northern and northeastern regions of the Armenian highland (i.e. the historical provinces of Tayk’, Gugark’, Ayrarat and Syunik’). They are interpreted as monuments related to mortuary rituals and belong to the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2200-1600 BCE). Some are shaped in the form of a fish, on others the head and hide of a sacrificed bovid are depicted, while a third class represents a combination of both previous types.

As burial monuments, these Dragon, or Vashap, stones have a broad semantic framework and display a syncretic set of functional, ritual and mythical features. There is a special focus on the sacrificial meal which might be organized not only at funerals but also for rain invocation rituals and festivals, such as Vardavār. The genealogical framework of the Vashap stones and their semantics is also complex and multilayered: Indo-European elements (compare the so-called “Head and Hooves” ritual burial in Sredny Stog, Yamna, Catacomb, Srubna and other

---

8 Compare the possible use of Hittite h for an h-hiatus before u (Yakubovich 2011, Kümmel 2014).


10 For other etymologies of the Hittite word, see Puhvel HED 5, 2001: 130-131; Kloekhorst 2008: 536; Beekes 2010, 1: 881-882. For the comparison between the Armenian and Hittite words, see Mkr’t’yan 1970: 59-61.


12 See Gilibert / Bobokhyan / Hnila 2012 and especially a forthcoming collection of papers on these stelae.
cultures) have been combined with cultural features that are observable in other Caucasian and Near Eastern (especially Hittite) traditions.\(^{13}\)

1.4 Scope of this paper

Recently, Simon (2013) offered a very valuable paper attempting to analyse critically all the Anatolian loanwords in Armenian (in total, 78) suggested until now. He concludes that instead of the assumed extended Hittite-Luwian loanword layer, only isolated and only Luwian loanwords can be found in Armenian. I agree with Simon in eliminating the majority of etymologies involved in the discussion. In some cases, however, his judgments seem hypercritical to me. Besides, the material included in his paper is not exhaustive. I therefore assume that we are not yet ready for its final evaluation and clear-cut conclusions.

Rather than give final decisions on the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of the Anatolian borrowings in Armenian, this paper merely aims to rework and supplement some of the relevant etymological material. In the section 2 I shall present some remarks on etymologies that are (in my opinion, too easily) rejected by Simon. Section 3 will address etymologies suggested by other scholars but remained out of the scope of Simon. Finally, in section 4 I propose some of my own etymologies.

2. Revision of some rejected etymologies

In this section I present some remarks on etymologies that are rejected by Simon.

2.1 šelj (spelled also as šilj), i-stem, o-stem (gen.-dat.pl šelj-i-c' and šelj-o-c' in 2 Paralipomenon 31.7/9; note loc.sg i šelj in Agat'angelos § 239) ‘heap, mass, pile, accumulation (mainly of corn, fruits and the like)’ (Bible, Agat’angelos, P’awstos Buzand, etc.).

In 2 Paralipomenon 31.6-9 (Zōhrapean 1805a: 285a; Xalat’eanc’ 1899: 104) we find plural forms: nom. šeljk’, acc. zšeljs and šeljs šeljs, gen.-dat. šeljo/ic’. Both editions have šeljoc’ in 31.9, and the edition of Xalat’eanc’ has šeljic’ in 31.7. The Armenian word renders Gr. σωρ ός m. ‘heap (of corn)’. In Job 5.26: kam ibrew zšelj kaloy “or as a heap on threshing floor” ἢ ὀσπερ θημωνιὰ ἄλωνος (Cox 2006: 76). In Sirach 20.30 (NHB 2: 475a): Or gorce zerkir, barjrac’ uc’ anē zšelj ivr “He that tills the land shall increase his heap”. In Agat’angelos § 239: yanhnarin i xor virapi and yaynnik, yorum t’aleln kayi es i mēj ōjic’n ibrew i šelj “in that terribly deep pit in which I was buried amidst piles of snakes” (Thomson 1976: 238/239).

The word has been preserved in a few dialects, both western and eastern. In the Ararat dialect we find sexč, with š...č > s...č dissimilation; cf. selj in Zak’aria Sarkawag, a 17th-century author from the K’anak’er village belonging to the same dialect area (HAB 3: 509a).


Tischler (HEG I/2, Lief. 14 S/2, 2006: 987) considers this etymology of šelj “unverbindlich” without adding any further comment. Simon (2013: 112-113, 122, 128) rejects the comparison because of the problems of the initial š- and the vowel -e- (instead of the expected s- and -i-, respectively) and considers Arm. šelj a word of unknown origin. His objections are not cogent, however. An Armenian hissing consonant easily becomes hushing in

\(^{13}\) See Martirosyan forthc. 1.
the presence of a hushing consonant in the word. For this we have secure cases from both native (cf. *vanač’em > čanač’em, aor. caneay, imper. canir ‘to know, recognize’) and borrowed (Iran. *patsač > Arm. patšač ‘suitable, proper, decent’) terms, as well as internal examples (astičan > ašičan ‘stair’, *z-o’yž > zo’yž ‘endurance, hardihood’, soči / šoči ‘pine tree’, etc.). As far as the vocalic problem is concerned, we would indeed expect a development *e̯ > i in early borrowings. However, we have reasons to think that the l had a lowering effect on a preceding i-vowel, cf. Syriac abîla > Arm. abelay ‘monk’; ašln ‘needle’ the oblique stem of which (gen asklan, etc.) presupposes *asil[a]-n-.16 Gr. Βασίλειος > Arm. Barsel (also Barsil); Hitt. Muršiliš > Arm. Mušel (see below). Note that both ašln and šelj are sometimes spelled with -i- rather than -e-.

The Armenian -ʃ reflects the regular development *Ṛi > Rj, compare IE *h3nōrjo- > Arm. anurj ‘prophetic dream, vision’, cf. Gr. ṥāvâp n. ‘dream’, ṣēvō prosecutions m. ‘god of dreams, dream’, Aeol. ṣēvōr; *u-él-j-ôh > gel-j (gen. of giwāl ‘village’); *gʷ[e]n-je/o- ‘to slay’ > Arm. jnem (%jǐn-) ‘to efface, wipe clean, annihilate, destroy’, cf. Gr. ṣēvō ‘to kill’, Lith. geniū ‘to prune, them’. In order to account for the form *šelj- we might assume generalization of the Hittite case forms in *šelj- (GSg. šelijaš, DStg šelija, NPl šeliš, API šeliš; Tischler HEG I/2, Lief. 14 S/2, 2006: 985-986; Kloekhorst 2008: 743-744) and later thematization in Armenian. Since Arm. šelj has both i- and o-stems, the following scenario can be envisaged: Hitt. nom.-acc. šeli- and oblique še/ēli̯- yielded PArm. nom. *seli- and gen. *seljo-, respectively. The latter would become *seljo- > *šelj(o) (with the aforementioned hushing assimilation), and the nominative would be levelled analogically after the oblique stem: *seli- >> *šelj-. The word was thematized and thus received the o-stem, but next to this we observe a parallel i-stem as a residual reflection of the old nominative *sel(i)j-.

Regardless of minor details concerning the suggested scenario, we can safely conclude that Arm. šelj, i-stem, o-stem ‘heap, mass, pile (of corn, etc.)’ is a loan from Hittite šěli- c. (gen. šeliš) ‘grain pile, grain storage’.

2.2 Mušel m., a personal name abundantly attested since the earliest stages of Armenian. According to the widely accepted etymology of Ačaryan,17 this name is a loan from Hitt. Muršiliš.18 Simon (2013: 99 fn 3) rejects this connection claiming that it is “lautlich ad hoc”, and the expected form would be tMuršil. However, the problem of -il > -el is not insurmountable (see § 2.1 on šelj ‘heap of corn’). As far as the loss of the r is concerned,19 we are dealing with a special development of it before the sibilant s: in internal position rs yields rš (ruki-rule), but in

---

14 Unless the š is due to the ruki-rule after *-i- of *pati- (Yakubovich, pers. com.).
15 However, the case of Iranian as adduced by Simon is not relevant, since Armenian spitak ‘white’ (cf. MPers. spēdag ‘white’, YAv. spaeča- ‘white’) derives from earlier *spētak [speitak] with an inner-Armenian regular development e̯ [e] > i in pretonic position.
16 See Martirosyan 2010: 115-117.
18 Note that the name of Muršiliš is also borrowed into Greek (Dale 2011).
19 Simon refers to Schmitt 2007: 68-69, but here one does not find any example of rs.
many cases the $r$ disappears, although the chronological distribution of the forms with and without the $r$ varies. Here is a list of relevant examples:

$gološi$ (Sirach 22.30, Gregory of Nyssa, Book of Chries, Aristotle, Paterica, Yovhan Öjneć’i, etc.) vs. $golorši$ (Eznik Koławbac’i, Elišè, Aristotle, Philo, Grigor Magistros, etc.) ‘vapour, steam’; according to my tentative etymology, $golo(r)ši$ is a compound of Arm. $gol$ ‘warm, lukewarm, warmth’ and PArm. unattested $*ə(w)orsiya$– ‘fog, mist’ from Hitt. $yarša$– ‘fog, mist’, Gr. $έρση$, $δέρση$, $έρη$ f. ‘dew’, etc.;

t’ošom- (Mandakuni) vs. t’orom- (MidArm. and dial.), t’aršamim and t’aṙamim (both Bible+) ‘to wither’;

t’uš, a-stem ‘cheek’ (13th century onwards), possibly from $*tuHr-s-$ or the like, cf. Czech tvář, Pol. twarz, Slk. tvár ‘face, cheek’, etc.;

$xəšem$ (T’ovma Arcruni, Grigor Magistros, etc.; dialectally widespread) vs. xaršem (Bible+) ‘to burn, boil, stew’, cf. xarem ‘to burn, brand, cauterize’ (Bible+), see HAB 2: 338-339, 346-347;

$kaž$ (widespread in the dialects) vs. karž (MidArm.) ‘skein, hank, a length of yarn or thread wound on a reel’ (see § 4.3);

kaši ‘skin, hide, leather’ (referring to the hide of a bull in Leviticus 8.17 and 9.11) probably from Hitt. kuršå-, kuršå- c. ‘skin, hide, fleece; skinbag, sheepskin as a divinized fetish or talisman’ (see § 4.2);

$mašem$ (Bible+) vs. maršem (Paterica) ‘to use up, consume, wear out, waste, corrode, spoil, destroy’. Ačaṙyan (HAB 3: 258b) derives it from $*mrś-$, cf. Skt. maśśākaroti ‘to grind to powder’ (AV, etc.) vs. mṛśmrśā-, 22 OHG morsari ‘mortar’, etc. Bailey (1979: 321b) departs from the same etymon but treats the Armenian word as a loan from Iranian $*mar$-$š-$ ‘to be worn out’, cf. Khot. maṃgāra- ‘old, long continued’, Av. marśo.kāra- (Yašt 14.28),

$moš(-i)$ ‘tamarisk; blackberry, bramble’ (< $*mor-s-iya-$) vs. mor ‘blackberry’ (both Bible+; cf. also dial. moř, cf. Gr. μόριον n. ‘black mulberry, blackberry’, μορια, -ή f. ‘mulberry-tree, Morus nigra’; Lat. mōrum, ī, n. ‘fruit of the black mulberry’, mōrus, ā, f. ‘black mulberry-tree’; 24

$p’oši$, gen.sg. p’ošwoy, gen.pl. p’ošac’ ‘dust’ has been interpreted as an i-derivative of IE $*po(ρ)ro$-: OCS praxь m. ‘dust’ < *porso-, prstb ‘dust, earth’, Russ. póróx ‘gun-powder, powder’, Pol. proch ‘dust, powder’, Czech pršetí ‘to sprinkle’, Latv. pārsla f. ‘flake, particle (snow, hoarfrost, ashes)’; these words are usually connected to Hitt. papaɾš- ‘to sprinkle’, Skt. pṛṣant- ‘spotted, piebald’, etc. Thus, *porsio- > Arm. p’oši, gen. p’ošwoy. The problem with this etymology is that an initial $*po-$ would have yielded o- in Armenian. One might solve this

---

20 Wherever no references are given, see Martirosyan 2010 s.vv.; for the ruki-rule in Armenian, see Martirosyan 2010: 709-710.

21 For references and a discussion, see Martirosyan 2010: 296-297.

22 On this Indic etymon, see Mayrhofer KEWA 2, 1963: 604.


problem by assuming that this is a “European substrate” word in Armenian and Balto-Slavic to be added to a list of etyma within the domain of physical words;26

\(k\text{’a}šem\) (Ephrem, etc.; dialectally widespread) vs. \(k\text{’aršem}\) (Bible +) ‘to draw, drag, pull’; an Iranian loanword, cf. MPers. \(kešid\)an and NPers. \(kašdan\) (also with a loss of \(r\)), ManMPers. \(k\text{rš}−\) ‘to pull, draw’, Skt. \(k\text{âr}sat\) ‘to draw, drag, plough’.27

I conclude that Ačaṛyan’s interpretation of the Armenian personal name \(Mušèł\) as a loan from Hittite \(Muršili\)š is unproblematic.

3. Overlooked etymologies

In this section I address etymologies suggested by other scholars but remained out of the scope of Simon.

3.1 \(akaws\), \(i\)-stem ‘furrow’ is considered a word of unknown origin.28 The comparison with Gr. \(όγμος\) m. ‘furrow, swath, line of scythed grass or grain’29 is phonologically problematic. Gr. \(όγμος\) is etymologically identical with Skt. \(ájma -\) m. ‘passage, way’ deriving from IE \(*h2e\text{g-}\) ‘to drive, lead’.30 The Armenian word has been compared with Hittite \(akkuš(š)a-\) n. ‘(catch-)hole, (trapping-)pit’, nom.acc.pl \(akkuš(š)a\), gloss -wedged hapax legomenon in the Hittite \(Gilgameš\), as well as \(akkala-\) c. or n. ‘furrow’, and the latter is sometimes linked to the aforementioned Gr. \(όγμος\) m. ‘furrow’.31 In my opinion, Arm. \(akaws\) may be in a way related with Hitt. \(akkuš(š)a-\), although the rest is uncertain.

---

26 \(*_{h1H-ni-}\): Arm. \(eleamm\), gen.sg. \(eleman\) ‘hoarfrost’ (*\(ini-áman\) > *(i)\(liamm\)); BSL. \(*ı\text{v}io\) ‘hoarfrost, rime’: Russ. \(ınej\), Scr. \(ıne\), Bulg. \(ınej\), Lith. \(ınis\) (dialectal), etc.

\(*_{groHd-}\): Arm. \(karkut\) ‘hail’; OCS \(grad\) ‘hail’, Scr. \(gräd\) ‘id.’, Lith. \(grūdas\) ‘frozen dirt or earth’; Lat. \(grandō\), \(-inis\) f. ‘hail, hail-storm’. For the reduplication, compare \(mamur\) ‘moss’.


\(*_{mus-r-}\): Arm. \(*_{mur-}\), the base of the reduplicated form \(mamur\) ‘moss’; Slav. \(*_{mox-r-}\) ‘thin moss on trees and stones’. For this type of reduplication, compare Arm. \(ka-rkut\) ‘hail’ vs. OCS \(grad\) ‘hail’.

\(*_{(H)e/oug-}\): Arm. \(oyc\) ‘cold’, \(ucanam\) ‘to cool down, be estranged’; Lith. \(áušti\) ‘to become cold’, Latv. \(aũksts\) ‘cold’; Celt. \(*owx-tu->\) OIr. \(ócht\), \(úacht\) (subst.) ‘cold’, \(*owg-ro->\) OIr. \(úar\) (adj.) ‘cold’.

\(*_{fůr-}\): Arm. \(fůr\) ‘water’; Lith. \(jůra\) ‘sea’, Latv. \(jūra\) ‘sea’.26

\(*_{(e)rs-n-}\): Arm. \(sárn\), gen.sg. \(sárin\) ‘ice, frost; cold’ < \(*_{k̂\text{r̥s-en-}}\); Ols. \(hjarn\) ‘frozen snow’; Lith. \(šer̃kšnas\) ‘hoarfrost’, Russ. \(serēn\) ‘crust over snow’, Ukr. \(serēn\) ‘frozen hard snow’;

\(*_{ke/ol-n-}\): Arm. dial. \(*_{ś-}\) ‘ice, frost’ vs. Ols. \(hěča\) ‘frost’, Lith. \(šalnă\) ‘hoarfrost’, Scr., Bulg. \(slăna\) ‘hoarfrost’, etc.

Wherever no references are given, see Martirosyan s.v.


28 HAB 1: 112a; Olsen 1999: 953.


30 Mayrhofer EWAia 1, 1992: 50-51; Beekes 2010, 2: 1045.


3.2 astuac, o-stem ‘god’ is widely represented in Classical Armenian and in dialects (HAB 1: 279-282). A considerable number of etymologies have been proposed for it. In my opinion, the best etymology has been suggested by Xačaturova, according to which Arm. astuac ‘god’ may be regarded as a loanword from a directly unattested Anatolian form going back to *Aššu-Tižaz ‘good deity/lord, good Sun-god, good dawn/day’ or the like, compare Luw. Tižaz ‘Sun God’, Hitt. aššu-šiatt- ‘good day’ (cf. Ved. su-dyut- ‘having magnificent lustre’).

For the typology of ‘Good Deity’ or ‘Good Sun-god’, note Hatt. izzie-ištan ‘Good Sun-god’ > Hitt. ḫizzistanu (if this interpretation is correct), Lat. Bona Dea, Fr. le Bon Dieu, as well as Ofr. dagdaes < Celt. *dago-dēuos, literally ‘le Bon Dieu’, etc. It is remarkable that, e.g. in an Armenian Morning Prayer from Balu, the God is referred to as Bari K‘ristos Asvac “Good Christ God” and is associated with the Sun God (surb arew “holy sun”). A Morning Prayer from Nerk’in Basen starts with Ov Bari lusi astvac, Hisus K‘ristos tɛr “O God of Good light, Jesus Christ Lord”; the verb is put in plural as if two divinities are addressed. In a folk belief recorded by Sargis Haykuni, Bari lusu astuc “God of Good light” is mentioned in contrast with evil spirits of the night; note Arm. dial. bari-li/us ‘dawn’, literally ‘good light’.34

3.3 Armawir (the first capital of Armenia; the sun and moon divinities are attested there) has been interpreted as being composed of Hitt. arma- ‘moon, moon god’ and Hitt. pir/parn-, pir-, per- n., para(n)tc. c. ‘house, building; habitat, quarters, household; estate, holdings’.36 In view of the use of Hittite pir also in allusion to a god’s house, the basic meaning of Armawir may have been ‘house/temple of moon god’.

4. My etymological suggestions

In this section I propose some of my own etymologies; some of them have been published earlier but are not included in Simon’s treatment, while others are published for the first time.

4.1 leli, gen. lel(w)oy ‘gall, bile’ (Bible+). In Job 20.14: leli iži i p‘ori iwrum “the venom of an asp is in his belly”: χολὴ ἀσπίδος ἐν γαστρὶ αὐτοῦ (Cox 2006: 148); Arm. leli renders Greek χολή ‘gall, gallbladder; metaph. bitter anger, wrath; venom’. In Elišē, Chapter 2 (Ter-Minasyan 1989: 94.137); transl. Thomson 1982: 98-99): Yaynţam da ḫrnan k‘an zleli t‘agaworn, p’luzanēr andēn i p‘orin zcov kamawor małjoyn iwroy; ew ǝnd k‘it‘sn ew ǝnd berann ǝr hasarak golorši ǰermaxara ǝlannel, ibrew i sastik ɥnoc‘ecux t’anjrac‘eal “Then the king became more bitter than gall. He spewed forth the sea of the willful bile in his stomach; from his nose and mouth issued hot vapor like thick smoke from a heated furnace”. The word is widespread in the dialects in both substantival (‘gall, gallbladder’) and adjectival (‘bitter’) meanings (HAB 2: 275).

Arm. leli is considered a word of unknown origin. Olsen (1999: 440) derives it from *gêlheziom < IE *gêlhe3 ‘yellow; gall’ pointing out that the expected form *jelei “might have

---

33 Xačaturova 1979: 373-374; for a comparison with the second member of the Anatolian compound, cf. Lap’anc’y an 1956: 279 fn 1; Simon 2013: 101.
34 For references and a thorough discussion, see Martirosyan 2010a and forthc. 2.
37 Note šunuš pir ‘god’s house, temple’, see Puhvel HED 9, 2013 : 82-91.
38 HAB 2: 275; Jahukyan 2010: 294b.
been subject to (tabuistic?) distant assimilation or influenced by the semantically related leard ‘liver’’. This etymology, albeit attractive, is not totally convincing. Besides, the initial l- of leard (from PIE *Hiekʷr-t, cf. Skt. vākrt, etc.) itself requires an explanation and may be due to influence of *liparo- ‘fat’ (cf. Gr. ἱππαρός ‘oily, fatty, greasy’, λιπαρία f. ‘fatness’, OIC. līf ‘liver’, etc.) or even Armenian leli ‘gall, bile’). On the other hand, the problem may be in a way related with Hitt. lišši- n. ‘liver’.39 I therefore propose an alternative etymology for Armenian leli ‘gall, bile’.

Formally, Armenian leli may have been composed of *leał- and the suffix -i found in aygi ‘vineyard’, gini ‘wine’, kogi ‘butter’, hogi ‘soul’, telı ‘place’, etc.,40 with regular sound change ea > a in pretonic position, cf. leard and gen. lerd-i ‘liver’. Note also kaši ‘skin, hide, leather’, possibly from Anatolian *gʷro/i- (cf. Hitt. kurša-, kurši- c. ‘skin, hide, fleece’) and p’oši ‘dust’, if from *porso- (cf. OCS praxъ m. ‘dust’, etc.), see 2.2. This theoretical base *leał- might go back to Hittite liššijala-, which has been interpreted as ‘liver-related, pertaining to the liver’, a derivative of the aforementioned word, lišši- n. ‘liver’.41 Such a borrowing could be possible only at a very early stage, when the loss of old *s was still in operation. The semantic development can be explained by the fact that the bile is secreted by the liver. The ancients must have been aware of that (note, e.g., Horace, Carmina 1.13.4: meum fervens difficult bile tumet iecur “my burning liver swells with hard bile”).

On the other hand, Armenian leli ‘gall, bile’ may be compared to the North Caucasian word for ‘liver’, which is reconstructed as *Hläƛ̣V (the ƛ̣ is a lateral affricate)42 and has been compared to the IE aforementioned word *Hiekw -r/n- ‘liver’.43 The relationship between these two proto-forms is dubious. The connection of Armenian leli ‘gall, bile’ with this North Caucasian word should not be excluded, but the nature of relation is uncertain.

4.2 kaši (gen.sg kaš[w]oy, gen.pl kašeac‘: NHB 1: 1052c) ‘skin, hide, leather’ referring to the hide of a bull in Leviticus 8.17 and 9.11; widespread in the dialects (HAB 2: 518b). The word is usually treated as a Semitic loanword, cf. Akkad. kūšu- ‘skin, hide’,44 etc.45 However, the vocalism is unclear. Olsen (1999: 941) places kaši in her list of words of unknown origin.

I alternatively propose to derive Armenian kaši from an Asiatic culture word, cf. Hitt. kurša-, kurši- c. ‘skin, hide, fleece; skinbag, sheepskin as a divinized fetish or talisman’.46 The group CuRCV may reflect *CuRCV or *KʷRCV.47 Therefore, Hittite kurša/i- (perhaps also Greek

---

40 For an extensive discussion on this suffix, see Olsen 1999: 432-452.
43 Starostin 1988: 117; I am indebted to Vahagn Petrosyan for this reference.
44 For this word, see e.g. ChicAssDict 8, 1971: 602b.
45 HAB 2: 517-518; Jahukyan 1987: 452, also 2010: 383b, with some hesitation. For a different view, see Greppin 2008.
47 See Kloeckhorst 2007.
βύρσα f., βυρσίς ‘skin, hide’)\(^{48}\) may be derived from a (probably non-Indo-European) proto-form *
\(^{49}\) For the latter, compare a synonymous word, mort ‘i vs. mort’, o-stem ‘skin, hide, leather’. For the ruki-rule and the loss of r before s, see § 2.2. on Mušel.

3.3 karž ‘skein, hank, a length of yarn or thread wound on a reel’, karžaṙ ‘reel, winder’ (both are Middle Armenian according to Nor ayr), widespread in dialects. No etymology is offered in HAB 2: 550b. The comparison with Gr. γυργαθ ός m. ‘wicker-basket, creel’\(^{50}\) does not inspire much confidence. It is tempting to compare Arm. karž to Hitt. karza / karzan- n. ‘spool, bobbin (vel. sim.)’. The latter has been derived from *k(e)rt -sr/n- ‘a spin’, cf. Ved. Skt. kart- ‘to spin’, etc.\(^{51}\) The ž of Armenian karž is not clear, however.

4.4 hazar ‘lettuce’ (Eznik Kolbac‘i, Anania Širakac‘i, Grigor Magistros, etc.); Xarberd dial. hazar-maruli, with synonymous maṙ/rul as the second member of the compound (HAB 3: 6b). No reliable etymology is recorded in HAB 3: 6b or Jähukyan 2010: 437b. I tentatively propose a comparison with Hittite ḥaššušara- (ḫa-šu-uš-ša-ra-a-an in KUB 7.1 i 21, KBo 24.7 iv 19, ḥa-šu-uš-ša-ra-an in KBo 13.248 i 5), a garden vegetable. In KUB 7.1 i 21 it is mentioned in a list of vegetables between ḥazzuwaniš ‘lettuce’ and lakkarwan ‘legume’.\(^{52}\) It is unclear whether this plant name is related to Hittite *ḫaššušara- ‘queen’. In view of the consistent single spelling of the first -š- of the plant name, Kloekhorst (2008: 328) is skeptical about that connection. Since it is listed next to the lettuce, one is tempted to assume that it referred to a kind of lettuce or at least a similar vegetable and was borrowed into Armenian as hazar ‘lettuce’. One might also consider contamination with the aforementioned ḥazzuwaniš ‘lettuce’, as well as a folk-etymological reinterpretation influenced by homonymous hazar ‘thousand’.

Should this etymology be accepted, Arm. hazar will join other Anatolian borrowings in the domain of agriculture, such as laxur ‘apium (celery, parsley)’ and torr ‘vine-shoot’ (see Simon 2013: 107-109, 116-117, 127-129, with a positive conclusion).

4.5 hasteay, only acc.pl (ż-)hasteay-s ‘a kind of pastry’ (Jeremiah 44.19 and Ephrem Asori), perhaps in a way related with Hitt. ḥaz(z)īta- ‘a kind of cake’. Uncertain (Martirosyan 2010: 391, 397-398).

4.6 targal ‘spoon’ (attested in Movsēs Xorenac‘i 2.47 and ubiquitous in the dialects) has been derived from PIE *dṛ-, a zero-grade form of the PIE word for ‘wood’. A perfect semantic match is Skt. dārvi f. / darvī f. ‘spoon’, though this has a full grade in the root, cf. Arm. toṛg ‘wooden framework, loom’ and HLuw. tarw-i(ə)- prob. ‘wooden beam’; further, note Arm. tōrn ‘pestle’ vs. Skt. drōṇa- n. ‘wooden vessel, trough, bucket’.\(^{53}\) Now we have a wonderful match that can also solve the problem of the suffix of Arm. targal ‘spoon’: Hitt. GIŠ tary-āli- n., which

---

\(^{48}\) For more etymological detail on the Hittite and Greek words, see Tischler HEG I, 1983, 655-657; Gamkrelidze / Ivanov 1984, 2: 902, 909; Puhvel HED 4, 1997, 274-275; Beekes 2010, 1: 249.

\(^{49}\) One might assume that the i-suffixation was triggered by a possible by-form *g’rsi-: Hitt. kurši-

and Gr. βορσίς:

\(^{50}\) Jähukyan 2010: 392a; for the Greek word, see Beekes 2010, 1: 293.


\(^{53}\) For a discussion of all these words, see Martirosyan 2010 s.vv.
refers to an implement used for grinding or crushing, probably something like ‘pestle’, cf. CLuw. 
*taruwał*- ‘mortar’.\(^{54}\) For *-al(i)* in designations for implements or the like cf., e.g., Hitt. 
*GIS* *ḥulāli*-n. ‘distaff’. Therefore, Arm. *targal* may be treated as an Anatolian loanword. In view of the semantics and the absence of apocope, it seems slightly easier to derive the Armenian word from Hitt. 
*GIS* *staryāli*- ‘pestle’ rather than CLuw. *taruwał*- ‘mortar’.

4.7 *tup*\(^{4}\), o-stem (gen.pl *tpʿocʿ*) ‘case, box, chest, censer’ (Bible\(^{+}\)). No reliable etymology has been recorded.\(^{55}\) I propose to treat this word as a loan from Hitt. 
*GIS* *tuppi*- ‘ark, container’. In Bo 2326 (= KUB LIII.4) Rs iv 32 it refers to an ark or container into which the statue of Telepinu is put: *I-NA UD.6*\(^{KAM}\) *D* *te-li-pi- nu-un*\(^{GIS}\) *tup-pi an-da ti-an-zi pē-da-aš-ša-aḫ-[ḫa-an-zi] “Am 6. Tage legen sie den Telipinu in die Lade hinein (und) bringen ihn an Ort und Stelle (an seinen Kultplatz)” (Haas / Jakob-Rost 1984: 76 / 78). This is reminiscent of the Biblical ark of the covenant (Weinfeld 1993: 466). The word is also attested in the form 
*GIS* *tuppa*-\(^{56}\) and seems to be identical with *E* / *d/tuppa*- ‘storehouse’.\(^{57}\)
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