



ՍՏՈՒԳԱԲԱՆԱԿԱՆ ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐ
ЭТИМОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ
ETYMOLOGICAL STUDIES

ՀՀ Գիտությունների ազգային ակադեմիա
Հ.Աճառյանի անվան լեզվի հնստիտուտ

Վազգեն Համբարձումյան

ՀԱՅԵՐԵՆԸ ԵՎ ՀՆԴԵՎՐՈՊԵՐԵՆԸ

Ակնարկներ հայերենի համեմատական
բառագիտության
(*Համեմատական-տիպարանական տարրերակայնություն*)

Երևան 2014



Национальная Академия наук РА
Институт языка имени Р.Ачаряна

Вазген Амбарцумян

АРМЯНСКИЙ И ИНДОЕВРОПЕЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК

Очерки по сравнительной лексикологии
армянского языка
(*Сравнительно-типологическая вариативность*)

Ереван 2014

National Academy of Sciences of RA
H. Adjarian Institute of Linguistics

Vazguen Hambardzumyan

ARMENIAN AND INDO–EUROPEAN

Essays on Comparative Lexicology
of the Armenian Language
(*Comparative-typological Variativity*)

Yerevan 2014

Printed by the decision of Scientific Council of the
Institute of Language after H. Adjaryan of NAS RA

UDC 809.198.1

Editor-in-chief

Ph. D. Doc. N. M. Simonyan

Reviewer

Ph. D. M. A. Aghabekyan

Ph. D. Doc. H. V. Sukiasyan

V. G. Hambardzumyan

Armenian and Indo-European. Essays on Comparative Lexicology of the Armenian Language (*Etymological-typological and Variative Studies*) / (Editor-in-chief N. M. Simonyan).- Yerevan.: NAS RA Publ., 2014, 184 p.:

The present work is dedicated to different questions on the History of Armenian Language and Comparative Linguistics.

The statistics of affricate consonants in Armenian is presented, Indo-European variability, as well as the study of the vernacular and loan-words variability is suggested, new etymologies are made and those done in the past are being reviewed.

The book is suggested for philologists, historians, and general public who are interested in the ancient period of the Armenian language.

ISBN 978-5-8080-1103-8

© Hambardzumyan V. G., 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	8
Abbreviations	11
Part I. Armenian Etymology and Variative Reconstruction	
0. Preliminary	15
1. Current Issues of the Study of the History of the Armenian Language	17
2. The Non-Complete Shift of IE Explosives in Armenian	28
3. The Variativity of the IE Languages and Some Questions on Variative Studies of Armenian	37
4. The Variative Reconstruction of the Armenian Roots of IE Origin	55
Part II. The Etymology of the Armenian Words of IE Origin	
0. Preliminary	62
1. Arm. <i>aljik</i> < IE *al-	66
2. Arm. <i>altamult</i> < IE *alghi-	72
3. Arm. <i>ašan</i> < IE *(e)s-en	77
4. Arm. <i>artaxoyr</i> < IE *ar-(t ^[h] o-)	80
5. Arm. <i>astuac</i> < IE *Has-t ⁱ ieŋ-os	84
6. Arm. <i>galgal</i> < IE *k ^{[h]o} el-	90
7. Arm. <i>əmpem</i> < IE *p ^(h) oH(i)-	92
8. Arm. <i>kamn</i> < IE *ak ^[h] men	103
9. Arm. <i>sayl</i> < IE *k ^{[h]o} el-	106
10. Arm. <i>s̄mel</i> < IE *k ^o er-	112
11. Arm. <i>tic^c</i> (< <i>tik'</i>) < IE *di-t	115
12. Arm. <i>ʃanjr</i> < IE *t ⁱ ŋs-u-	117
13. Arm. <i>xawarci</i> < <i>xaw-</i> + IE *treg'-	121
14. Arm. <i>xawart</i> < <i>xaw-</i> + IE *treg'-	124
Part III. Some IE parallels between Armenian and Anatolian Languages	
0. Preliminary.....	129
1. Arm. <i>cawi</i> ~ Luv. <i>taui-</i>	131
2. Arm. <i>kayf^c</i> ~ Hier.Luv. <i>kati-</i>	136
Bibliography.....	144
Index of Words.....	162
Index of Scholars mentioned in the Text.....	181

Introduction

The object of the research is to discuss separately a number of essential issues of the history of the Armenian language which has not only linguistic value but also poses a great importance from the point of view of both historical grammar and comparative linguistics.

The immense data on the Armenian language enables to develop and study more thoroughly: it also outlines the probable ways of how the research on the history of the Armenian language should develop under new circumstances on the basis of the previously gained material.

This study summarizes the research of some essential issues of the Armenian language in its ancient historical aspect, which also briefly outlines the results of the studies by different scholars. A part of the research was published earlier as scientific articles, another part was introduced as reports at various conferences. And the other part of the research will be published here for the first time.

The first chapter discusses some fundamental issues of the history of the Armenian language. The solution of problems supposes a more detailed and extensive study of various facts and evidence of the Armenian language broadly implementing the latest linguistic data about the history of different stages of the Armenian language.

The second chapter refers to a very important phenomenon, that is the history of IE plosives and their occurrence in the Armenian language. The latter shows that this phenomenon is not clearly and completely applied in Armenian. The above mentioned will give the etymology of a number of Armenian words that haven't ever been studied before or have had ambiguous explanation. These words

have become the subject of this study. The latter will allow to illustrate several phenomena which haven't been revealed before.

The third chapter touches upon the etymology of a number of Armenian words of IE origin. Those words either haven't been studied etymologically before or only to a certain extent. The latest data introduced in the comparative studies of the IE languages is used parallelly to the data about the traditional etymology. The etymology of the Armenian words of IE origin enlarges the vocabulary of the native semantic groups connected with different fields of life.

During the last three or four decades the study of the IE languages has entered a new development stage and acquired great interest. New studies have appeared, scholars have begun investigating completely new issues. Some models with incomplete explanation have been targeted again, taken a new modification or interpretation.

In the field of comparative linguistics more realistic principles and approaches are worked out, which are nothing but further development of a number of methods and rules in comparativeness. Thus appear new criteria about the relationship of the languages and the history of linguistic phenomena which are substantiated from the point of view of different etymological studies [cf. *Jakobson* 1957; *Якобсон* 1963: 95-105; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984, etc.].

In the latest studies of the prehistoric (pre-literary) period of the Armenian language some researchers have focused on issues which have become the center of attention especially with mentioned criteria. Because of its features of archaism the data on Armenian acquires comparably great interest among scholars.

The expression and description of both invariant (common) and variative (partial) units acquire greater significance not only for the reconstruction of the IE parent language but also for the discussion of modern trends on split, individual development and contacts of the coherent languages. In some cases theoretical generalization is considered to be ideal and in other cases separation and variative studies seem perfect [*Джаукян* 1982: 59-67; *Djahukyan* 1987].

Many problems of the Armenian comparative lexicology can be revised through comparative and typological studies and also by means of so called variative studies.

This work touches upon the variability of some IE word roots and several noteworthy problems on the variative study of Armenian which will enable linguists to begin broader research of the subject in the future. The initiation of these studies supposes a new detailed and broad study of different Armenian roots. Thus, several matters on root and form of lexis may become a subject of interest from different aspects which will create a real basis for new etymologies or edition and revision of the old ones. Because of the importance of such issues we are going to investigate problems of the variative reconstruction and typological analysis, the solution of which will make it possible to describe newly the root structure of both Armenian and cognate languages.

We give the etymology of some words taking into account especially the principle of the variative studies.

The author expresses his acknowledgement to N. M. Simonyan for her comments and valuable observations on this study.

Abbreviations

1. Languages and Dialects

Afgh. - Afghan	Let. - Lettish
Agn. - Agnean (dial. Toch. A)	Lezg. - Lezgian
Agh. - Aghul (lang.)	Lith. - Lithuanian
Akkad. - Akkadian	Luv. - Luvian
Alb. - Albanian	Megr. - Megrelian
Anat.(Anatol.) - Anatolian (lang.)	Mit. - Mitanian (language)
Arab. - Arabic	MLGerm. - Middle Low German
Aram. - Aramaic	Myc. - Mycenaean Greek
Arm. - Armenian	OAgh. - Old Aghul
Arm. (Gyp.) - Armenian (Gypsy) (dial.)	OArm. - Old Armenian
Avar. -Avarian	OChin. - Old Chinese
Av. (Avest.) - Avestan	OCim – Old Cimric
Beng.- Bengali (Hind.-Hindi)	OCS - Old Church Slavonic
Corn. - Cornish	OEngl. - Old English
Cim. - Cimric	OGk. - Old Greek
Cun.Luv. - Cuneiform Luvian	OHedr. - Old Hebrew
Darg. - Darginian	OHG - Old High German
Engl. – English	Oic. - Old Icelandic
Gaul. – Gaulish	OInd. - Old Indian
Georg. - Georgian	OIr. - Old Irish
Germ. - German	OLat. - Old Latin
Gk. - Greek	OPers. - Old Persian
Gk. (Eol.) - Greek (Eolic)	OPruss. - Old Prussian
Gk. (Hom.) - Greek (Homeric)	ORuss. - Old Russian
Goth. - Gothic	Osc. - Oscan
GZ - Georgian-Zan	OScand. - Old Scandinavian (lang.)
Hier. Luv. - Hieroglyphic Luvian	Oss. - Ossetic
Hind. - Hindi	Pahl. - Pahlavi
Hitt. - Hittite	Pal. - Palaic
Hurr. - Hurrian	Parth. - Parthian
Ind.- Indian	Pel. ('Pelasg.') - Pelasgian
Iran. - Iranian (Avestan)	Pers. - Persian
Kart. - Kartvelian (languages)	Phryg. - Phrygian [Pre-Gk. (Hom.)]
Khot. - Sak. (Scyth.) - Khotanese (Middle Sakian)	Pruss. - Prussian
Khutch. - Khutchanian (dial. Toch. B)	Russ. - Russian
Kurin. - Kurinian (dial. Lesgin)	Scyth. - Scythian
Lak. - Lak (language)	Sem. - Semitic
Lat. - Latin	Slav. - Slav(on)ic
	Sogd. (Manich.) - Sogdian (Manichaean)
	Sumer. - Sumerian
	Tabas. -Tabasaran (lang.)

Tchan. -Langue de Tchanes
Toch. - Tocharian

Ugar. – Ugarit (lang.)
Urart. – Urartian

2. Other abbreviations

abl. - ablativ
accus. – accusative
anat. – anatomic(al)
art. – articulate(d)
bot. - botanical
cas. - case
cf. - confer (confirm)
DAL - “Dictionary of the Armenian
Language”
dat. - dativ
dial. - dialect(al)
e. g. -exempli gratia
etc. - et cetera
gen. - genitive
ib. (ibid) - ibidem
id. -idem
IE - Indo-European
i. e. - id est

instr. - instrumental
lang. – language(s)
loc. – locative
medic. – medic(in)al
metaph. - metaphoric(al/ly)
miner. - mineral(ogical)
MSL - “Memoire de la Société de
linguistique de Paris”
mus. - music(al)
NAD - “The New Armenian
Dictionary”
nom. - nominative
pl. –plural
relig. - religious
sing. - singular
verb. - verbatim
zool. - zoological

Part I.

**Armenian Etymology
and Variative Reconstruction**

0. Preliminary

Regardless of the attempts made in comparative and typological research devoted to the prehistory of languages in different periods of development of Linguistics to sketch the approximate picture of the kindred languages in order to restore the proto-language (prototype language) from which languages as dialectal groups or dialects have deviated, the problem of common prototype language remains hypothetical.

The problem of common prototype language gives a rise to divergence of opinions in modern science as well. In order to solve the problem different methods and approaches of comparative as well as typological research have been proposed, various complementary and contradictory principles have been applied. Yet it has been impossible to outline the complete and real picture of genetically related languages though discussions going deep into the past have been expanded in that sphere. “However deep we may probe into the past of the IE languages, we cannot find a complete identity in vocabulary and grammatical structure. For this reason the common language which can be reconstructed represents a unity of very closely related but not completely identical tribal dialects”[*Georgiev* 1981: 320].

Thus, not only invariative but also variative reconstruction of real introduction of the original picture, e. g. of the system of plosive consonants of Indo-European languages have been proposed [*Szemerényi* 1970; *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов*, 1972: 15-18; *Djahukyan* 1982: 59-67].

According to this the appliance of the principle of variative reconstruction of the original state of languages is of primary importance. The variative studies of the original state of genetically related languages operates within the boundaries of probability like

any other comparative-typological examination of languages in general.

Thus, in a brief summary we represent some contemporary problems of the history of the Armenian language. Besides we examine the partial reflection of the traditional shift of the Indo-European plosive consonants, revert to Indo-European variativeness and accordingly to variative manifestations in Armeninan, namely to the question of variative restoration of the Armenian word root.

Data collected from Old Literary Armenian language and dialects have been used to a great extent especially new analysis and convincing motivations on them to make theoretical acknowledgments.

1. Current Issues of the Study of the History of the Armenian Language

1. The history of the Armenian language has developed considerably and has yielded great achievements. Yet, there are a number of unsolved problems the solution of which becomes vital in the modern stage of the development of the Armenian studies. Thus, it is essential to carry out research in that direction [cf. *Hambardzumyan* 1995: 92-99]. As a cognitive language to other IE groups, the Armenian language becomes rather significant as a language source and typologically prominent among ancient languages of the Asia Anterior and others as well. It includes several linguistic phenomena such as phonetics, vocabulary and syntax which are attributed as following:

a) Archaic which are illustrated only in etymological researches;

b) Phenomena which testify about the interaction between neighbouring and related languages, not yet completely studied;

c) Provide more comparable facts and typological evidence than has been exposed before.

Thus, the interest in this kind of elements is increasing and it becomes a matter of significant concern.

2. The history of the Armenian language is a comparably vast field of research because of its phonetic and syntactic structures, rather ancient layers of vocabulary, the written and spoken variations, the older strata of the vocabulary, the relation between the dialects and the literary variants at different stages of language development, as well as the differences in discourse of pre-written and written periods. The latter is associated with the attributes of time period, area and practical characteristics.

3. The history of the Armenian language is divided into two large phases; pre-literary (the beginning of the 3rd millennium B.C. till the end of the fourth century A.D.) and literary (or written) phase (from the fifth century till nowadays) [*Hübschmann* 1883, and 1895-1897; *Adjaryan* 1940-1951; *Djahukyan* 1987]. The recent studies denote that Armenian and some cognitive languages (Greek-Armenian-Indian-Iranian dialects) separated from other IE dialects at the same period of time as the Anatolian languages (4th millennium B.C. and even earlier) [*Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1980, and 1981, 1984; *Нерознак* 1981: 24]. In the history of the Armenian language the two-stage separation is explained by the following reasons:

a) Regardless of the lack of written manuscripts, the time of split dates back to the unknown period, that is when the related IE dialects and dialect groups were gradually becoming distinct, however, not completely separated yet.

b) In the 4th millennium B.C. the first separations began when Armenian got isolated from the related languages (Anatolian, Indo-Iranian, Greek) and formed a dialect which gradually developed into a separate language (the 3rd millennium B.C. when the first separation of the IE languages started).

c) A comparably new phase started for the new written Armenian in the fifth century A.D. connected with the adoption of the Armenian alphabet. Especially after putting ‘Mesropyan letters’ into practice Armenian started to develop, change in different development stages, namely, Ancient, Middle and Modern periods with numerous dialects and practical varianties.

This period differentiation is widely accepted in Armenian Studies and there is no need for further changes in it [*Djahukyan* 1987: 20-26]. It is obvious that the expressions of different development periods of the language are connected with the adoption of the Armenian alphabet in the fifth century (405 A. D.) and the new literature which thrived as a result of that fundamental event. The latter is rather arbitrary as it is connected with cultural changes and doesn’t express the merits and measures in the development of the written language.

3.1. The pre-written history of the Armenian language is a more difficult aspect to study. There are various, often controversial sources of information and written evidence about the peoples who had cultural or social contacts with the Armenians.

The information is sometimes ambiguous. There are also difficulties in analyzing and interpreting the cuneiforms or other existing writing forms (*vimagir* ‘lapidary letter’). The history of writing period was monotonous and simple because the rules and the writing traditions were kept faithfully and precisely. The word-lists preserved in various manuscripts testified about the stated practice.

Non-homogeneity of the linguistic elements and the typology itself is specific to the pre-written period while the history of the written period demonstrates structural and typological cohesion. It is mainly linked with the written traditions of Ancient Armenian which became a foundation for the further development of various dialects. Thus, in pre-written period the phenomenon called “income components, mixture and interaction” as, in contrast to “basic layers” [*Djahukyan* 1987: 257-293, 382-417] is called borrowings in written period and they are mainly taken from other languages into Armenian and not vice versa.

3.2. The history of Pre-Literary Armenian is chronologically a rather long period. Its origin hasn’t received a thorough illustration yet, and its typology is still incomplete. Several features of Armenian, in comparison with other languages, and typological description of IE languages are revealed in the study. As a result, a number of theories about those features, the degree of coherence to other languages, typological description and other views are exposed as well. In that sense the research of *Djahukyan* becomes radical [*Джаукян* 1960, and 1963, 1964, 1967, 1982 etc.; *Djahukyan* 1970; 1972, and 1987 etc.]. Presently, due to the achievements in the study of the history of the Armenian language there is still an immense work to do in order to enlarge and broaden this field.

The studies about the history of that period are confined mainly as research of some phonetic and typological forms or the

examination of some word stems and morphemes (morphology). Little research is done about the comparative syntax, the Armenian sentences and morphologic phenomena in comparison with Indo-European languages [cf. *Meillet* 1962; *Benveniste* 1969].

In the recent years great efforts have been made in the field of comparative semantics of IE languages where the material on Armenian is also implemented. That topic has a vital value in scheming and giving the complete picture of different areas of the IE life [*Benveniste* 1969; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984]. Furthermore, during this kind of investigations it is important to use the data of Armenian not having found any attention yet. For example, Gk. *ἥλιον κύκλος* ‘sun-ring; sun-wheel’ and the Arm. *արիւղ-ւղի* [areg-akn] ‘sun’, (*verb.*) ‘sun-ring; sun-wheel’ [cf. *Нерознак* 1981: 30].

The history of pre-literary period has different phases of development and various new research methods of implementation are necessary to be applied in order to distinguish these periods. All these current attempts can be classified into two types; they refer to the chronology of various linguistic data and, occasionally, linguistic facts are used to differentiate the period [cf. *Hübshmann* 1898: 128-172; *Fourquet* 1948; *Zabrocki* 1951; *Aghayan* 1961: 67-90; *Джаукян* 1967: 313-332, and 1987: 20-33 etc.]. In our opinion nowadays it is relevant to make a distinct and comprehensive division of the pre-literary period at present. Without a complete division based on detailed linguistic data it will be very difficult to depict the relation of the Armenian language within the IE language family tree or with other related languages, to show the development of Armenian and its interaction with other languages. By distinguishing the different development periods we realize the close unity of the IE, Armenian- Iranian dialect correlations, the intensive interaction between North-Caucasian (Khur-Urartian) and Iranian languages [cf. *Иванов* 1984: 61-62].

In the recent years the view that Armenian had features of Ancient IE consonants was a matter of serious discussions. First of all it refers to the system of plosive consonants [*Гамкрелидзе* 1984: 31-34, and *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 44-49; *Haudricourt*

1975]. It is stated that the Armenian consonant system is closer to IE language prototype system which gives us the reason to modify the traditional approach about the “consonant shift” [Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 44-46]. There arise the hypothesis about the glottal consonants which brings to the necessity of new description of the Armenian consonants. This is especially due to the data gathered on the dialects where the voiced aspirates occur beside the “pure” voiced consonants as variations of the same phoneme [cf. Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984; Широков 1972; Нерознак 1981: 39-40]. Other common type of consonant shifts and expressions (like palatalization, shift, the allocation of the fricatives and sonorous consonants etc.) brought to compliances functioning with certain sound rules as well as to numerous exceptions (deviation from the common rules) which caused various parallels [Джаукян 1984: 146-160]. It is known that the Arm. words շնի [šun] ‘dog’, սկմնի [skund] ‘little-dog’ originated from the IE *k’*uon*, *k’*uon*-to. It is also known that in some words the IE phoneme group exposed the Arm. շ [š] and in the other case սկ [sk] [cf. *Adjaryan* 1977: 534-535, and 1979: 230-231; *Szemerényi* 1964; *Джаукян* 1967: 189, 228; *Djahukyan* 1987:134 etc.]. Then, we have the Arm. երկսնի(ք) [erkan(k^c)] ‘mill, mill-stone’ that originated from IE root *k’*o*rā^u- ‘grinder’ [cf. *Adjaryan* 1973: 61; *Джаукян* 1967: 226; *Гамкрелидзе/ Иванов* 1984: 693].

We assume that the Arm. (dial.) սննի [sɪnel] ‘to grind into big pieces; to break the corn into two’ also originated from the same word-stem with the shift of the main two phonemes forming the word root [see *Hambardzumyan* 1996: 191-192]. In both cases we deal with the phenomena of phonetic shift that was put into practice in different periods. This and the other parallel cases from the same source of words in Armenian confirm that the language developed and was affected to changes in different periods. We can confirm the existence of various development stages, as each period brought its specific rules, and, as a result, nowadays there are lots of Armenian words that were subjected to various consonant modifications left from each stage. The genealogical and

chronological studies of these words denote that some of them are expressions and the result of the existing modification of a certain period, the rest are exceptions and deviations of the rules. The problem is whether the rules occurred in the same period of the Armenian language development and are the result of completely different changes, or they are the result of consecutive periodical changes.

The above mentioned can refer to various cases of simple and palatalized consonant words that are semantically grouped by some scholars [cf. *Джсаукян* 1967: 300-313; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 42-43].

Thus, we assume that the division of different historical periods of Ancient Armenian must completely be based on a greater number of linguistic data, whereas facts and conditions should not be considered essential. Furthermore, the linguistic data should be observed thoroughly, that is it should be a matter of inner reconstruction, external comparison, typological coincidences, corresponding analyses and, if necessary, we should work out new methods that will serve a thorough and broad study, together with the existing ones. And this kind of approach, will certainly promote the classification of more realistic system of Armenian at its earlier stages as well as the complete description of the language history.

The thorough study of the language history is scholarly essential and it will exclude all types of hypotheses and “theories”, various views and images which are not based on real evidence.

3.3. The written period of Armenian history is consistently divided into several stages. At present three stages of the language development are accepted undisputedly. They are Old, Middle and Modern Armenian with both literary and non-literary forms or sub-periods [*Djahukyan* 1956, and 1964]. The division is arranged according to both external conditions and linguistic issues.

Yet, there is biased approach to the separation of the stages. For instance, Middle literary Armenian which included two sub-periods was described as Cilician Armenian variant. It is not clear if the separation was carried out only for the literary language of the Cilician Armenian or for Armenian as a whole with its all

areas, variations, etc. Accordingly, we assume that the issue needs a meticulous revision, especially, when the preserved written materials enable us to do so.

Since the beginning of the written period till the 20s of the twentieth century Classical Armenian (“Grabar”) was used as the only dominant language or in some cases parallel with other languages. In this sense a special attention should be paid to Old Literary Armenian and to the language used much later as Common Grabar, as well as the interaction and influence of Grabar, Middle and Modern Armenian should be observed [cf. *Hambardzumyan* 1990]. The solution to issues should be based on new linguistic confirmations and written manuscripts. Thus, Modern Literary Armenian has a rich vocabulary and a variety of terms but it goes on enhancing due to the relation with the Grabar (especially in the 18th and 19th centuries). Both Middle Literary Armenian and Modern Armenian with its two variations have constantly prospered, becoming more complete due to their correlation with Classical Armenian (Grabar) and, still, keep improving their structure with the application of Grabar [*Hambardzumyan* 1990: 62-127, 128-261].

Finally, it is essential to clarify the sub-periods of Modern Armenian in connection with the recent data on the topic. The new study of the linguistic data enables us to make the precise stage-division free of external impact or other negative pressure.

4. Another current issue in the history of the Armenian language is the study of its dimensional variations. After collecting the data, the formation of the dialect map is greatly beneficial for detailed and comprehensive study of the history of the Armenian language.

4.1. In this regard it is hard to solve instantly the problem where Armenian was split from the related IE proto-language and what other languages were associated with it during its detached development. The above-mentioned issues have always been the matter of scholars’ interest. In different periods there were completely different approaches to the solution. Recently especially at the IE language study there is a new approach

according to which the birthplace of the IE proto-language must be found in Asia Anterior [*Нерознак* 1981: 25; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 859-957, 890]. It is known that the separation of the IE languages took place in the fourth millennium B.C., as it was mentioned above, which became the source of separate languages (dialectal clusters) and Armenian started its development being used on its own and associated with other languages. Hence, it is necessary either to deny this new approach if it has no scientific proof or a completely new approach should be developed to study the pre-literary period problems concerning the internal (linguistic) features, the language environment and the contacts with the neighboring nations. It is also essential to base our study on complete and complex language associations instead of separate or random cases [cf. *Djahukyan* 1985: 151-160, and 1990: 1-16, 1997: 45-66 etc.].

4. 2. In its written period Armenian was not applied persistent by manners because of the loss of independent government, prosecutions by the neighboring nations, the migration and other unfavorable reasons which often occurred in the history. This kind of events are inevitable, and their impact on the language development is obvious

In the period of Classical (“Mesropean”) Armenian we observe the Old Armenian language in its initial form. However, it hasn’t preserved the features specific to certain areas. Theoretically, the existence of those local features is not excluded, since the Old Armenian had its literary principles and traditions of oral interpretations maintained by the Armenian and foreign translators. It was too difficult to find the specific features of the spoken language of that time, though some of them were found by the Armenian scholars [*Айтәнеан* 1866; *Adjaryan* 1951; *Djahukyan* 1972 etc.]. In the Armenian version of the “Bible” and in other 5th and 6th century translations the traits and peculiarities of “the native dialect” of the translators are somehow evident. The comprehensive study of the vocabulary of “The New Armenian Dictionary” (vol.1-2, Venice, 1836-1837) gives the opportunity to confirm that the Old (literary) Armenian had

some dialectal basis and besides the literary language local variations (dialects) were used with the interactions of which a lingual idiom (*koine* < Gk. *κοινή* ‘common; jointly, conjointly’) was created. It began serving as basis for the Old (literary) Armenian as a means of written communication. Later, those forms caused the development of a new language, that is the system of Middle Armenian. In this sense the history of the literary period of Armenian turned out to be significant especially connected with the study of the variations of the literary language and the dialects of Middle Armenian.

4.3. Later the local variations of the language grew further apart as:

a) the written sources contain lots of local (dialectal) forms and deviations from the literary language standards,

b) the study of the latter is conducted thoroughly which is connected with the elucidation of the background of Middle Armenian, as well as, its dialects. Afterwards, in the new period, due to migration, foundation of national colonies, new schools and universities which were far from the motherland, the number of Armenian dialects grew to such an extent, that dialects and separate speech-forms expressed more variety of local features than those in previous centuries. There is a great number of theoretical and individual studies on dialect and speech. The creation of the typology of the various dialects of that period and demonstrating them in the dialect atlas has become an important undertaking. Boundless scientific efforts and motivation is necessary for the accomplishment in that task.

The formation of the catalogue, the typology and cartography of the new literary language and certain modern dialects will enable us to picture the past and the current state of the Armenian people. The scientific study of the Armenian dialects will provide a basis for further standardization of modern Armenian language which is very vital nowadays.

5. In all stages of development the Armenian language has had some prominent traits which have undergone changes from time to time, but, as a unity, they characterize an ancient nation with

cultural, scientific and linguistic traditions, as well as, its sociopolitical relations.

5.1. Ancient Armenian with its vocabulary, phonetics and grammar emerged through the interaction which has been the subject matter of the above mentioned linguistic phenomena. Thus, the vocabulary that preserved after the process of separation from IE languages was categorized into semiotic (thematic) groups, i.e. with clear differentiation according to their practical use [cf. *Adjaryan* 1940: 108-113; *Джаукян* 1967, and *Djahukyan* 1987; *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984, etc.].

Respectively, the following issues have been focused on:

- a) a great number of Armenian words that have not been etymologically explained,
- b) dialectal words that have not been included in the Armenian word-stock or dictionaries of standard language,
- c) further semantic analysis and categorizing according to the semantic (thematic) meaning of the words which will enable us to find their complete semantics.

Thus, as we have mentioned above, the Arm. *երկուի(ք)* [erkan(k^с)] ‘mill, mill-stone’ and *ունիւի* [sɪnel] ‘to grind into big pieces; to break the corn into two’ are included in a subgroup of the semantic (thematic) group “natural farmstead”. The second is a dialectal word which becomes a matter of semantic analysis only because of its phonetic correspondence and semantic closeness to the first word.

5.2. Both the written and pre-written periods of the Armenian language have some differences in their practical aspect. They are well-observed in the vocabulary, as the latter changes more quickly than other linguistic phenomena. In Old literary Armenian there were more works of religious character and more translations of the same nature than in Middle Armenian. Fiction was specific to later Armenian. Historicographical works were equally common in Old, Middle and Modern Armenian, mainly written in Old Armenian (Grabar). Middle Armenian is copious with works on natural science, e.g. medicine, human anatomy, horse breeding, as well as law, trade, management and works concerning other fields

of life. Modern Armenian is characterized by its broad practical implementation. Press and publishing was a feature of this era.

The main object of the history of Armenian is to study Old and Middle Armenian with reference to existing database, to classify them scientifically according to their linguistic criteria. The language of mass media, in the new period, which is significant from the point of view of customizing and accomplishing the language, hasn't been completely investigated, moreover, it has never been a matter of study from the viewpoint of linguistic description.

6. The long history the Armenian language has been a matter of separate sphere of investigation and has always been analyzed and revised as a vivid expression of the Armenian mentality and identity.

It has always been investigated as a subject of grammar, lexicography, syntax and linguistics. However, Armenian is a state language today, and it must become a subject of thorough and comprehensive study more than ever. We have been granted with enormous literature which has become the matter of scientific assessment. The fundamental concern of Modern Armenian Studies is not only to maintain that tradition but also to develop and expand it to a new scientific level.

2. The Non-Complete Shift of IE Explosives in Armenian

1. Armenian and other IE languages indicate common origins through their phonemic systems, not only for vowels and diphthongs, but also for consonants. The IE system of explosives is reflected in Armenian differently than in other languages. According to G. Djahukyan, this is the result of four types of processes:

- 1) plosive shift;
- 2) plosive palatalization;
- 3) affricate and sonorant change;
- 4) consonant cluster change [Джаукян 1967: 73-81].

There is no unified approach for the reconstruction of the system of plosives, a fact which causes certain problems. Until the 1960s, the traditional consonant system was accepted [Brugmann 1904; Szemerényi 1967: 96-97; Джаукян 1967; Djahukyan 1990: 2-3]. Djahukyan indicates that “Classical Indo-European linguistics had assumed a paradigm of about twenty plosives, characterized by a series of voiced and voiceless consonant, aspirates and non-aspirates, labials, front-lingual (apical) and back-lingual consonants, with back-lingual consonants including a number of palatalized, regular, and labialized consonants” [Djahukyan 1987: 37] Correspondingly, a “protostate” of plosives could be reconstructed for Armenian, with sixteen possible consonants rather than twenty. Instead of having three series of back-lingual consonants, just two series could be isolated: palatalized and common fricatives which also include archaic (labialized) sounds. Thus, the possibility that the IE “three series of back-lingual (labialized) and the archaic (palatalized), *b, *kʰ and *kʷh voiceless aspirates are reflected in Armenian, is brought into

question” [Djahukyan 1987: 37-38]. This means that the Armenian data does not completely reflect the system in reconstruction, i.e. there are some missing data (“empty cages”).

It should be noted that there are also some other missing points in the case of the IE back-lingual labialized (archaic) voiced aspirate *gʰ and the voiced *gʷ, the common voiceless aspirate *kh, the front-lingual voiceless aspirate *th, and voiced labial *b¹. In Djahukyan’s work all Armenian words and roots of IE origin are compiled (established before the 1960’s and featuring signs of plosive consonant shifts). There are no sufficient data pertaining to the above-mentioned consonants [Джаукян 1967: 82-154, and 1982: 45-54].

In the recent past, attempts have been made to revise that system, particularly with respect to the shift of plosives. The attempts are based not only on the evidence that in the IE system glottalized consonants are a distinct category [cf. Hopper 1973: 141-166, and 1977: 41-53; Haudricourt 1975, and Hagège/Haudricourt 1978: 123-125; Bomchard 1981: 333-335], but also the existence of such consonants is possible in Armenian [Solta 1963; Kortlandt 1978: 9-16; Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 41-45]. This possibility is closely associated with the shift of Armenian plosives - hence the assumption that Armenian glottalized consonants are the indirect reflection of equivalent IE plosives. Cf. IE *t’om > Arm. *umli* [tun] ‘house; home’, rather than IE *dom > Arm. *umli* [tun] ‘house; home’, IE *t’ō- > Arm. *umw* [tam] ‘to give’, rather than IE *dō- > Arm. *umw* [tam] ‘to give’, etc. [Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 41].

To these attempts, and in favor of the Armenian traditional system of explosives, serious objections have been made [Джаукян 1982: 59-67, and 1990: 1-16]. The matter can be solved by correcting the regularities and obvious deviations of the shift, as well as explaining the origin of some words that haven’t been etymologically studied yet. From that point there is much work to

¹ In this part of the book the orthography of the IE phonemes and words are given according to traditional transliteration [see Джаукян 1967]:

do which should be preceded by the detailed analyses that the statistic data provides [see *Hambarzumyan* 1996: 30-31].

2. The shift of the Armenian plosives demonstrates both regularities and exceptions. If we were to judge by the data of etymologized words before the 1960s, it would become obvious that those regularities constitute one third of the number of exceptions [*Джаукян* 1967: 86-154]. According to our calculations, there are 100 cases of regular shifts and 347 cases of exceptions. The so-called unshifted reflection of IE plosives in Armenian can be explained as a result of two processes:

- 1) normal deviations,
- 2) extraordinary cases.

Onomatopoeia, the reduplication of the lexical root, and other secondary processes (i.e. the influence of neighbouring sounds) can be considered normal deviations; there are 20 cases of this type.

There are 327 cases of extraordinary cases of deviation, 159 of which do not fall into the category of a consonant shift [*Джаукян* 1967: 100-127], 161 cases reflect the IE consonant system without shift [*Джаукян* 1967: 128-153], and 7 cases are the result of the second shift [*Джаукян* 1967: 153-154].

3. It is known that in words and word roots, plosives are shifted in four positions: in initial position before a vowel, between vowels, after consonants, and before consonants. Correspondingly, the examined 100 cases could be divided into four groups:

a) 39 cases in initial position of words before vowels: cf. IE **bhā-* > Arm. *բա-նամ* [ba-nam] ‘to open’, IE **dāiγer* > Arm. *տայր* [taygr] ‘brother-in-law’, IE **pedo-m* > Arm. *հետ-ոյ* [het-oy] ‘trace; track’, IE **phōlo* > Arm. *փուլ* [p^hul] ‘phase, stage’ etc.

b) 25 cases between vowels: cf. IE **au-dh-o* > Arm. *աւ-դ-ոյ* [awd (awd-oy)] ‘shoes’, IE **steib(h)o* > Arm. *ստիպեմ* [stipem] ‘to insist’, IE **māter* > Arm. *մայր* [mayr] ‘mother’, IE **meu-thi* > Arm. *մոյթ* [moyt^c] ‘pillar, pilaster; support’ etc.

c) 18 cases after consonants: cf. IE **ambho-* > Arm. *ամբ(ոյ)* [amb(oj)] ‘entire, whole; complete’, IE **k'erdī* > Arm. *սիրտ* [sirt] ‘heart’, IE **penk^he-* > Arm. *հինգ* [hing] ‘five’ etc.

d) 18 cases before consonants: cf. IE **bhrǵter* > Arm. *եղբայր* [elbayr] ‘brother’, IE **septm̥* > Arm. *եւթ* (*եւաթ*) [ewt^cn (eawt^cn)] ‘seven’, IE **treṣes* > Arm. *երեք* [erek^c] ‘three’, IE **dhǵʰ-nā* > Arm. *դառնալ* [darn-am] ‘to turn, return’ etc. [cf. Джаукян 1967: 86-97].

If we set apart the forth position before the consonant where we have no single example of being submitted to any plosive consonant in conformity with regularity, then in the rest three cases, i.e. in initial part of the word before the vowel, between the vowels and after the consonants, the plosives reveal “non-complete” reflection.

In this respect, the following should be noted:

3. 1. In initial position of words before vowels, there are three cases of “non-complete” reflection:

a) The IE back-lingual (labialized) **gʰh* is not presented in any word or word root in Armenian, unlike the IE **bh*, **dh* and **gh*, which are reflected in Armenian as *p* [b], *ṛ* [d], *q* [g]. Cf. IE **bhā-n* > Arm. *բանալ* [banam] ‘to open’, IE **bhā-nis* > Arm. *բան* [ban] ‘speech, word; mind’, IE **dhǵʰ-* > Arm. *դալար* [dal-ar] ‘fresh; green’, and IE **ghṣi* > Arm. *գարշ* [garš] from which *գարշելի* [garšeli] ‘abominable’ [Джаукян 1967: 86-87, and 1982: 46].

b) Armenian has no word or root in which the IE apical voiceless aspirate **th* is reflected. However, the IE **ph* and **kh* consonants correspond to the Armenian *ṭh* [p^c] and *ṭx* [x]. Cf. IE **phōlo* > Arm. *փուլ* [p^cul] ‘phase, stage’, IE **phelg-* > Arm. *փեղկ* [p^celk] ‘shutter, window-shutter’, IE **khād-s-* > Arm. *խած-սնունդ* [xac-anem] ‘to bite; to nibble’ [Джаукян 1967: 89, and 1982: 48].

c) Armenian has no word or root which reflects the IE back-lingual (labialized) voiceless aspirate **kʰh*. However, the IE consonants **ph* and **kh* correspond to the Armenian *ṭh* [p^c] and *ṭ* [k^c] (compare the above-mentioned case b).

3. 2. In the position between vowels, there is only one case of “non-complete” reflection, namely the IE back-lingual (labialized) **kʰh*, for which Armenian has no correspondence; the IE **ph*, **th* and **kh* consonants are rendered in Armenian by *ṭh* [p^c], *ṭ* [t^c], and

ju [x]. Cf. IE **eph-* > Arm. *tuhtu* [ep^cem] ‘to cook; to boil’, IE **doph-* > Arm. *unnhtu* // *nnhtu* [top^cem, dop^cem] ‘to stamp, to stample’, IE **meu-thi* > Arm. *uñj* [moyt^c] ‘pillar, pilaster; support’, IE **mukho* > Arm. *-uñju* [mux] from which *đtññiawñju* (*ihññi*) [jernamux (linel)] ‘to undertake’ [Джаукян 1967: 93, and 1982: 49].

4. There are five cases of “non-complete” reflection in the position after consonants.

a) For the IE labialized (archaic) voiced aspirate **g^h* we have no correspondence in any word or root in Armenian. However, the IE consonants **bh*, **dh*, and **gh* are present in Armenian as *p* [b], *q* [d], and *g* [g]. Cf. IE **ambh-* > Arm. *uup-*(*ñq*) [amb-(oñ)] ‘entire’, ‘whole’, ‘complete’, IE **s₂bh-* > Arm. *urp-tu* [arb-em] ‘to drink, to get drunk’, IE **uendhā* > Arm. *qhñq* [gind] ‘earring’, IE **srung^{h-}* > Arm. *nniñqñ* [rungn] ‘nostril’ [Джаукян 1967: 93-94, and 1982: 50],

b) For the IE voiced aspirate **b* there is no reflection in any word or root in Armenian, unlike the IE consonants **d* and **g* which are presented in Armenian as *w* [t] and *l* [k]. Cf. IE **k’erdi* > Arm. *uñru* [sirt] ‘heart’, IE **ang-//*ank-* > Arm. *uñqññ* // *uñlññ* [angiwn, ankiwn] ‘corner’ [Джаукян 1967: 94, and 1982: 50]²,

c) For the IE back-lingual voiced aspirate **g^u* there is no reflection in any word or word root in Armenian, unlike the IE consonants **d* and **g* (see the above-mentioned case under *b*),

d) Armenian has no word or word root in which the IE common voiceless aspirate **kh* is presented. However, the IE consonants **ph* and **th* are rendered in Armenian as *ç* [p^c] and *þ* [t^c]. Cf. IE **phamph-* > Arm. *çawuç-* (*çawuç-ni₂u* < **çawuç-pni₂u*) [p^camp^c- (p^camp^c-ušt < *p^camp^c-bušt)] ‘bladder; bullet’, IE **por^h-thu-* > Arm. (*bot.*) *ññþ* (*ññþawnniññ*) [ort^c (ort^catunk) ‘vine; vine-stock, grape vine’ // (*zool.*) *hññþ* [hort^c] ‘calf’ [Джаукян 1967: 94, and 1982: 50].

² See Pedersen 1951; Нанр 1954: 40; Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 6-7 (cf. Джаукян 1982: 59-67; Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 1317-1318).

e) Armenian does not have any word or word root in which IE voiceless aspirate **kʰ* is presented. This is, however, not the case with the IE **ph* and **th* (see the previous case d).

Thus, we have nine cases of incomplete reflection, or a “rule” according to which the shift of plosives is an exception within regularities. A closer look at these regularities shows that a substantial part of the back-lingual (labialized) consonants, and one of each set of a front-lingual consonants are “incompletely” reflected or rather not reflected in the shift of plosives. What is the reason? What kind of results can be expected from future investigations? These questions still need to be answered by comparative linguistics.

5. In other positions, the shift of the Armenian plosives present the following quantitative regularities.

5.1. In initial position the words before vowels:

a) the IE voiced aspirates **bh*, **dh*, **gh* are rendered in Armenian as *p* [b], *q* [d], *g* [g] in ten words and word roots. Cf. IE **bherō* > Arm. *բերեմ* [berem] ‘to bring’, IE **dhē-no* > Arm. *դնեմ* < **q(h)-dēm* [dnem < *d(i)-nem] ‘to put’, IE **ghomo-* > Arm. *գոմ* [gom] ‘cattle shed, cow shed; stable’ etc.,

b) the IE voiced **b*, **d*, **g* (**gʷ*) as *ph* [p^c], *q* [t^c], *g* [k] in seven words and word roots. Cf. IE **belō* > Arm. *պեղեմ* [pelem] ‘to excavate, to unearth’, IE **dā-je-mi* > Arm. *տամ* [tam] (< *tu-m*) ‘to give’, IE **gur-no-s* > Arm. (*anat.*) *կուռն* (> *կուռն-ակ*) [kuɾn (> kɾn-ak)] ‘back; shoulder’, cf. (*dial.*) (*anat.*) *ճուռն* (> *ճուռն-իկ*) [čurn (> čɾn-ik)] ‘thigh, hip’, ‘throw off, overthrow’, IE **gʷou-* > Arm. *կով* [kov] ‘cow’ etc.,

c) the IE voiceless **p*, **t*, **k* (**kʷ*) as *h* [h] or *j* [y], *∅* [(zero)], *p* [t^c], *q* [k^c] in 12 words or word roots. Cf. IE **pel-nu-mi* > Arm. *հեղեմ* [heɬum] ‘to fill (in); to pour’, IE **pol-* > Arm. *յոլ-ով* [jol-ov] ‘full, a lot of; many, much’, IE **pod-* > Arm. *ոտ-ն* [ot-n] ‘foot’, IE **tā-n* > Arm. *թանամ* [t^can-am] ‘to wet; to drench’, IE **kʷ-* > Arm. *քամել* [k^cam-el] ‘to press out’, IE **kʷa-m* > Arm. *քանի* [k^ca-ni] ‘how; how much’ etc.,

d) the IE voiceless aspirates **ph* and **kh* as *ph* [p^c] and *ch* [x] in ten words or word roots. Cf. IE **phelg-* > Arm. *փեղկ* [p^celk]

‘shutte; window-shutter’, IE **khai-t-* > Arm. *խայ-թ-տւ* [xay-t^c-em] ‘to sting, to bite’ etc.

5.2. Between vowels:

a) the IE voiced aspirates **bh*, **dh*, **gh* (**g^h*) correspond to the Arm. *ւ* [v (w)], *ղ* [d], *գ* [g] in seven words and word roots. Cf. IE **bhsə-bh-* > Arm. *ււււգ* [avaz] ‘sand’, IE **au-dh-o-* > Arm. *օղ* (<**uղ*) [od (<**awd*)] ‘air’, IE **meighā* > Arm. *ւժգ* [mēg] ‘haze, mist’, IE **g^hhag^h* > Arm. *ճւգ* [jag] ‘young, youngling’ etc.,

b) the IE voiced **b*, **d*, **g* and **g^h* to *ւ* [p], *ւ* [t], *կ* [k] in five words and word roots. Cf. IE **steibo-* > Arm. *ււնիւտ* [stipem] ‘to insist’, IE **uedo-* > Arm. *գտւ* [get] ‘river’, IE **bheg-* > Arm. *քիկ-ւնիւ* [bek-anem] ‘to break’, IE **reg^hos-* > Arm. *երեկ-ոյ* [e-rek-oy] ‘evening’ etc.,

c) the IE voiceless **p*, **t*, **k* and **k^h* to *ւ* [v (w)], *թ* [t^c] (*or յ* [y]), *ք* [k^c] in eight words or word roots. Cf. IE **prep-* > Arm. *երեւիւ* [erevim] ‘to appear’, IE **auti-* > Arm. *ււթ* (>*օթ*) [awt^c (>ot^c)] (cf. *օքոււ* [ot^cevan] ‘shelter, lodging; dwelling’, IE **mā́ter* > Arm. *մայր* [mayr] ‘mother’, IE **tek-* > Arm. *քեկ-տւ* [t^cek^c-em] ‘to incline, to tilt; to bend’, IE **lik^h-* > Arm. *քաւնիւ* (<**լ(հ)ք-ւնիւ*) [lk^canem (<**l(i)k^c-anem*)] ‘to abandon’ etc.,

d) the IE voiceless aspirates **ph*, **th* and **kh* are reflected in the Armenian *փ* [p^c], *թ* [t^c] and *ք* [k^c] in five words or word roots. Cf. IE **eph-* > Arm. *եփտւ* [ep^c-em] ‘to cook; to boil’, IE **meu-thi* > Arm. *մոյթ* [moyt^c] ‘pillar, pilaster; support’, IE **mukho* > Arm. *մոխ* [mux] ‘smoke’ etc.

5.3. After the consonants (sonorant or plosive):

a) the IE voiced aspirates **bh*, **dh* and **gh* are reflected in Armenian as *բ* [b], *ղ* [d] and *գ* [g] in four words or word roots. Cf. IE **s₂bh-* > Arm. *ւրբ-տւ* [arb-em] ‘to drink, to get drunk’, IE **ϑendhā* > Arm. *գիւղ* [gind] ‘earring’, IE **srung^h-* > Arm. *նուկ* [rungn] ‘nostril’ etc.,

b) the IE voiced **d* and **g* as the Armenian *ւ* [t] and *կ* [k] in two words or word roots. Cf. IE **k^herdi* > Arm. *սիրտ* [sirt] ‘heart’, IE **ang-//^hank-* > Arm. *անկ-իւ//ւնկ-իւ* [ang-iwn, ank-iwn] ‘corner’ etc.,

c) the IE voiceless **p*, **t*, **k* and **kʷ* as the Armenian *p* [b], *η* [d] and *q* [g] in five words or word roots (sonorisation of the voiceless). Cf. IE **kppi-* > Arm. *քալք* [k^carb] ‘asp(ic); viper’, IE **ar-t-* > Arm. *արդ* [ard] ‘now’, IE **snerk-* > Arm. *սերգել* [nergew] ‘down, underneath’, IE **penkʷe* > Arm. *հինգ* [hing] ‘five’ etc.,

d) the IE voiceless aspirate **ph* and **th* are reflected in Armenian as *ϕ* [p^c] and *թ* [t^c] in two words or word roots. Cf. IE **phamph-* > Arm. (*anat.*) *փամփուռ* [p^camp^cušt] ‘bladder; bullet’, IE **por-thu* > Arm. (*bot.*) *որթ* (*որթաւունկ*) [ort^c (ort^catunk)] ‘vine; vine-stock, grape vine’, ‘calf’ etc.

e) the IE **t* in the clusters **bt*, **kt*, **pt* result in the Armenian *p* [t^c] in five words or word roots. Cf. IE **gǵb-ti-* > Arm. *կարթ* [kart^c] ‘angle, fish-hook’, (*dial.*) ‘marc (of hen)’, IE **galakt* > Arm. *կաթ* [kat^cn], (*dial.*) *կաղ* [kałc^c] ‘milk’, IE **pter-i-ski-* > Arm. *քռ-չ-իւ* (<**p(h)n-չ-իւ*) [t^cř-č^c-im (< **t^c(i)ř-č^c-im)] ‘to fly, to flee away’ etc. [see Джаякян 1967: 86- 95].*

6. Etymological essays written later on, especially in the 1960s, introduce some additional observations and corrections into this quantitative picture. Here are some of them [Hambarzumyan 1996: 95, and 1998: 25-26]:

a) Based on Hübschmann’s data, Adjaryan connects Arm. *դալ* [dayl] (also (*dial.*) *դալ* [dal]) ‘milk resin’ with the Arm. *դիմ* [diem] ‘to breast-feed’ deriving it from the IE form **dhāl-* (also **dhēi-*, **dhē-*, **dhāi-*, **dhī-*) [cf. Hübschmann 1983: 437; Adjaryan 1971: 611-612, 668], although in J. Pokorny’s dictionary the Arm. *դալ* [dayl] is derived from the IE **dāli* [Pokorny 1959: 829-831]. Djahukyan indicates the IE root **dhē(i)-* from which he derives the IE **dhēje-*; from this he originates the Arm. *դիմ* [diem] ‘to breast-feed’, and from the IE root **dhāi-li-* the Arm. *դալ* (*դալ*) [dayl (dal)] ‘milk resin’ [Джаякян 1967:247, and 1987: 119, 211]. According to this, Arm. *η* [d] corresponds to the IE **dh* and not **d*, if we ignore the more probable IE form **dhāl-*, from which the Arm. *դալ-ար* [dal-ar] ‘fresh; green’ originates.

b) According to Adjaryan, Arm. *գիհ* (also *գիլի*, and *գի*) [gihi (giyi, gi)] ‘a sort of tree’ originates from the IE **wītā* [Adjaryan 1979: 627]. He also considers the Georgian *γვია* ‘a sort of tree’ and

Tush (Georgian dial.) $\gamma wi\bar{e}$ ‘a sort of tree’ to be borrowings from the Arm. $qhh\bar{h}$ [gihi] ‘a sort of tree’. As a proof he compares the Arm. $qh\bar{u}h$ [gini] ‘wine’ ~ Georg. $\gamma wini$, $\gamma wino$ ‘wine’ and the transition Arm. q [g] ~ Georg. γw (instead of Arm. $*q/^{*}qni$ [$*gw$ / $*gu$] ~ Georg. γw) [*Adjaryan* 1971: 554, 558]. Djahukyan does not give the etymology of Arm. $qhh\bar{h}$ [gihi] ‘a sort of tree’ although he mentions for the transition of Arm. $qh\bar{u}h$ [gini] ‘wine’ ~ Georg. $\gamma wino$ ‘wine’ the IE $*g^{u}hin\bar{u}$ - with a question mark [*Джаукян* 1967: 53; *Aghabekyan* 1998: 49-144].

Another example for the transition of the IE $*g^{u}h >$ Arm. labialized q' (< or $*q' // q^{m}$) [g' ($*g^{w} // *g^{u}$)] to Georg. γw is the Arm. $\psi hr\bar{u}w$ [virap] ‘pit; cellar, prison’ ~ Georg. $\gamma wirabi$ ‘opening, aperture; hole’ which derived from the IE $*g^{u}hirap$ - (?) [cf. *Джаукян* 1967: 53].

The Georgian must have borrowed these words before they became the Arm. $qh\bar{u}h$ (< $*q^{m}h\bar{u}h$ < $*qni\bar{h}\bar{u}h$) [gini (< $*g^{u}ini$ < $*guini$)] and $\psi hr\bar{u}w$ (< $*q^{m}hr\bar{u}w$ < $*qni\bar{h}r\bar{u}w$) [virap (< $*g^{u}irap$ < $*guirap$)]. The proto-Armenian forms $*q^{m}h\bar{u}h$ (< $*qni\bar{h}\bar{u}h$ [$*g^{u}ini$ or $*gowini$]) and $*q^{m}hr\bar{u}w$ (< $*qni\bar{h}r\bar{u}w$ [$*g^{u}irap$ or $*gowirap$]) are hypothetical [see *Hambardzumyan* 1996: 31].

3. The Variativity of the IE languages and Some Questions on Variative Studies of Armenian

1. The principal (formula) completeness of linguistic studies includes certain structural regularities and typological similarities along with different specific features and non-typological qualities.

a) As a subject of the study of the development constancy (diverse periods) the linguistic phenomena appear free, and as a subject of a certain period (contemporary period) they appear in relation to objective distribution. These phenomena are in invariant (common) and variative (specific) relation at different stages in the history of the related languages or languages in different genealogical closeness.

b) So far the problems of the correlations of the invariant (common) linguistic phenomena have got the foremost significance in the studies of the IE languages. On that account a number of theories were practiced, some schools were opened, different methods and principles were worked out, various phonetic and other rules were applied, different approaches were used which most of the time completed each other, but sometimes also excluded each other.

c) The history of the IE languages is much older than it is accepted and its clarification based on the linguistic studies can't be considered sufficient. During the prehistoric and historic stages those languages had the function of communication regardless of their similarities and closeness. While initiating the study of the living and "dead" (old) languages known to us only through written sources and literary manuscripts we must pay attention to the fact that first of all they were all natural and living means of communication.

Therefore while sketching the prehistory or the main history of those languages we must be led not only by the invariant but also

by the variative forms and formulas. In order to reconstruct any prehistoric status of these languages it is necessary to solve the phenomena which occurred as a result of convergation and divergation. Thus, the IE languages also could be changed, and they were distinguished because of the internal and external factors of development.

d) Being a consequence of the social, periodic and local development and a result of the expression of the structural factors, as signs of the language, the invariant and variative forms describe a certain language in its progress and shifts, its correlation and interaction with other languages [see more details in *Hambarzumyan* 1977: 5-9; 1978: 50-54; 1981: 182-192 etc.].

e) At the early stage of the study of the IE languages the main attention was concentrated on the external side (form of expression) of the linguistic phenomena. Recently the problems concerning the semantic side (form of content) of these phenomena have parallel to the form become the matter of great importance [cf. *Buck* 1949; *Dumézil* 1968; *Benveniste* 1969; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984 etc.].

f) At different stages of linguistic studies the investigation of various linguistic patterns was carried out from the view of either their form or content. That's why most of the time both these approaches were severely criticized and considered formalisms, logicisms etc. In these cases it was not necessary to avoid the extremism. More than that the practical side of these factors was ignored.

The study of the phenomenon can be considered sufficient only if it is based on the structural side (form of expression), semantic side (form of content) and practical side (functional form) of the linguistic unit because the subject of the study is characterized based not only on its structural-semantic attributes but also on its practical features.

The smallest element of each level of the language becomes a matter of interest only with the unity of these three forms which enables us to give a comprehensive account of the corresponding units (phonemes, root words, morphemes or any syntactic segment) [cf. *Макаев* 1967: 26-33].

2. The language, as a subject of a separate study, is examined by different linguistic scientific circles. So it is natural that they are separated and classified in accordance with basic linguistic-semantic criteria.

a) Like many of his predecessors Djahukyan gives a comparably determined classification of linguistic scientific status considering that the universality (the dimensions of the concept) of the subject, its historic quality (the study of target subject in its diverse and contemporary periods) and variability (invariant as an ideal condition and variative as a subject presenting the real condition) are the most significant qualities.

Separate studies are being written based on this comprehensive theoretical approach. They have not only linguistic-awareness feature but they also concern certain languages including IE languages, the clarification of some problems in the comparative investigation of the Armenian language and the solution of some disputable problems [see *Джаукян* 1976: 45-55, and 1978: 35-43, 1984: 59-67, 1999: 76-217 etc.].

First, we want to mention that from the viewpoint of our interest this type of classification with its main features corresponds to the outlook we had earlier [cf. *Hambardzumyan* 1978: 50-51]. Besides, this kind of classification allows us to realize not only the Armenian comparative-typological observation but also the variative-typological study based on the already known data and the data or the theories recently worked out. It's worthwhile mentioning that Djahukyan remarks "in its broad interpretation the basic meaning of the concept of variability including dimensional-local, contemporary-chronological, social-practical, systematic-structural variations" [*Джаукян* 1978: 42].

b) Such an approach, if not completely, is mainly based on the predecessors' viewpoints and attitudes (compare the separation of the IE dialects, the disconnection of IE "lingual period", localization of the languages etc.) [*Meillet* 1908, and 1931; *Bonfante* 1931: 69-185; *Porzig* 1954 (Russ. vers. 1964); *Георгиев* 1958: 276-283; *Georgiev* 1981 etc.].

This reality is obvious especially when the problem of the IE dialects becomes the subject of study [cf. *Djahukyan* 1987, 58-64, *Широков* 1988, 45 etc.]. We also mention that according to such separation, inequality and the general linguistic variability, the studies which appeared later and those which were devoted to the description and differentiation of the shift of the IE plosive consonants acquire special significance, cf. the classification of languages according to the attribute of *centum//satəm*, and *decem//taihun* etc. [see, e. g. *Иванов* 1958: 12-23; *Hopper* 1981: 133-142 (Russ. vers. 1988: 173-182), *Mayrhofer* 1983 (Russ. vers. 1988: 520) etc.].

c) Unlike some earlier or other modern researchers, *Djahukyan* considers the variability as a separate branch of linguistic and comparative study, in which linguistic phenomena have certain development perspectives. According to it we can assume that it is possible to make corrections or give new solutions to many unsolved or incomplete issues of the Armenian pre-writing or writing periods e.g. a more accurate description of the plosive consonants preserved in Old Armenian literary works, the expression of the IE vowels in Armenian especially with their attributes of length and shortness, the nature of the Armenian root word construction, and the separation of specific root word, the genealogical clarification of the words, morphemes and root words which do not have received their etymology or have only partial and incomplete etymology etc.

3. Comparably later *Djahukyan* also developed the idea of the language variability, when in the mid 60s of the 20th century he tried to investigate the problem of the consonant system of the Armenian and other IE languages, practically paying special attention to etymological doublets and their reconstruction [see *Джаукян* 1967: 300-313].

a) The variability of the linguistic examples have awareness-psychological base, it is conditioned by the physical and physiological attributes of the mother tongue [cf. *Блумфилд* 1968: 35-86]. Linguistically variability is a separated study of the plan of expression of different communication (linguistic) units containing

certain plan of content. According to it we can say that the dichotomy of language and speech mentioned by F. de Saussure is connected with style or stylistic uniqueness since style is the difference between the communication means [see *Hambardzumyan* 1981: 184]. Such an approach has linguistic, awareness and much more significance.

We should pay attention to the following consequences as well: in the 60s of the same century H. Martinet devoted a whole study to the variants of the language structure stating that language variants can be investigated not only according to their attributes of time and dimension but also according to their structure and the *shifts* that have occurred in the language system [see *Martinet* 1962 (Russ. vers. 1965: 450-464)]. With this study on the one hand we focus our attention on language structure, different expressions (variations) of phonetic, semantic transitions of the language, on the other hand we practically raise issues relating to diachronic assessment (in this case chronological and local) [*Мартине* 1965: 450-455].

At the same time in Russian linguistics the concept of variative study appeared which was connected with the analysis of word variants and so called ortology as an independent branch of synchronic study with potential separation [cf. *Ахманова* 1957: 192-230; *Филин* 1963: 128-133; *Ахманова /Бельчиков / Веселитский* 1960: 35-42; *Семенюк* 1965: 48-55 etc.]. In this case the subject of the interest was the problems of the synchronic study of modern Russian such as the choice of different parallel forms of phonetic or other units of different linguistic level forms, the preference of the accurate and accepted forms from different linguistic and stylistic variants etc. There was the urgency of forming a special discipline to study these issues. However, they were unjustly and severely criticized as if they were already a matter of interest of the language norm, stylistics and other disciplines [see *Скребнев* 1961: 140-142].

In addition, the question of the synchronic study of the word, syntactic and different variants of Russian, German and other languages becomes research matter [cf. *Горбачевич* 1978].

Comparably later separate linguistic works were devoted to the problems of the variative reconstruction of the ancient status of the IE languages (phonetic, root word, morphemes and syntactic structure etc), as well as to the similar expressions in related languages [cf. *Гигинейшвили* 1972: 48-52; *Клычков* 1975: 100-110 etc.].

b) Later Djahukyan paid special attention to the Armenian double and parallel forms including the possible dialectal examples into the existing facts [*Джаукян* 1983: 23-34, and 1985: 151-160, 1983: 5-116, 1984: 146-160; *Djahukyan* 1976, 1987: 252-265, 363-382; *Simonyan* 1979; *Sukiasyan* 1986 etc.].

c) From the point of view of our target issue, the disconnection of Armenian as a separate IE language, the research of the possible variants of the dialects existing in the transition period from the ancient Armenian to the Old Armenian, becomes more important. No doubt there were dialectal variations at different stages of pre-writing Armenian, which somehow have become the basis for general Armenian [cf. *Патканов* 1869, and 1875 (twice), 1882, and 1884 etc.; *Мсерианц* 1897, and 1901; *Mseriants* 1898, and 1899 etc.). At the present stage of the Armenian studies the importance of that question is quite a different matter.

In the paper we are going to discuss the dialectal variants connected with the consonant shifts, their first palatalization and other phenomena in syntactic and morphologic (root forming) parallels along with the differences between the standard language and dialect, the structural regularities and some peculiar cases.

From the point of view of the Armenian variative-typological studies the solution of these types of questions anticipates new problems.

4. The history of the languages, the assessment of the phenomena referring to their interaction can become a separate object of examination. According to the attribute of variability Djahukyan classifies the following disciplines;

a) disciplines which study the phenomena of invariants (as ideal) which first of all are expressed as a standard language (e.g. literary language), or gradually transform into such one (e.g.

universal language, reconstructing proto-language, automatic translation of the language) etc.;

b) disciplines which demonstrate the variability (inconstancy) of the phenomena, i. e. different variants of a certain language or generally all the languages (e.g. invariant linguistics, variative linguistics) etc. [Джасукян 1978: 42].

a. In this thesis Djahukyan means the variability (inconstancy) in a broad sense and includes the dimensional-local, contemporary-chronological, social- practical, systemic-structural variations of the language that can be expressed united, parallel or separately according to the certain approach connected with the subject (object) of study [Джасукян 1978: 42-43; *Hambardzumyan* 2001: 203-218]. Furthermore, genealogical and typological variants occur during the separate or related study of the IE and other languages regardless of the degree of the relation of those languages.

During the study of the languages of such relations we have to consider the occurring expressions of the synchronism and diachronism of the phenomena along with the circumstance in which the languages exist in the course of their development or stopped being a living means of communication. Their existing changes (variations) are a result of the extra-lingual (external) factors and intralingual (internal) cause (in broad sense-language factors), and a certain short period [*Hambardzumyan* 1978: 50-54].

b. We are apt to think that these variants are primarily characterized as self-directed linguistic phenomena in their steady development, in the settings of some interaction with corresponding phenomena of other languages. Those interactions can exist among both related and non-related languages, both in close or distant circumstances, in nostratic frequency or possible generalization.

Thus, at different phases Armenian was linked with related and non-related (as they can be considered) languages and as a result Armenian provided or borrowed words, root words, suffixes and other forms, which were utilized along with the Armenian equivalents as variants. At the time they have been used either as

parallel forms and variants or in the new settings one of them expresses superiority over the other and excludes it.

c. According to it the current problem of the history of the Armenian language is to study these types of variants in order to discover the correlations, the estimation of the phenomena inherited from the IE period along with those acquired at the period of independent development. Linguistic variability has the opportunity of new investigation perspectives connected with the study of Indo-European languages, with its distant relatedness, as well as with the comparative and etymological study of nostratic languages.

5. As an IE language, Armenian includes such linguistic variants, which were used both in pre-writing and writing periods. So far there has been no special research devoted to the separate and complete study of those variants. Armenian can provide copious data with its special features because it has a long history and it contains lots of archaic traits of the IE Armenian and is comparably abundant in linguistic variants [cf. *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 41].

For the current comparative study of the Armenian language we need to use intensively the existing methods and work out new ones for the investigation of the linguistic variants. We also need to generate new approaches to the accumulated data and the principles of their analysis, as well as to suggest new theoretical principles, new methods for application, etc. [*Hambardzumyan* 1998: 11-13, and 2001: 201-218, 2001: 21-22, 2003: 125-127].

a. The doublets and parallel forms separated by Djahukyan create a base for broad research on the variability using new approaches and principles. These doublets and parallel forms are practiced as variants attributed to specific period of time in different regions. The genetic interpretation and comparative analysis of these or similar forms in a definite period of time, local forms and practices denote that some of them are the result of certain rules that worked at a certain period of time in a certain dialectal area and had a certain practical value. The rest of the forms were exceptions from the rule and didn't cover any linguistic area.

A broader and updated study of the corresponding facts of the Armenian language with new principles and implementation of existing literary monuments, dictionaries and co-dictionaries of the dialects reveal new data, allow further, more detailed and complete analysis.

We mean that the latest studies on the IE languages having been written since the 70s, and having explained the data on Armenian with a new approach contribute greatly to the study of the Armenian variative forms connected not only with the new type of reconstruction of the IE root words but also connected with the more organized utilization of those root words.

b. The newest comparative and typological studies of the Indoeuropean languages confirm the necessity of the reconstruction of the phonetic, syntactic and lexical variants which will enable us to comprehend the pre-IE stage. Furthermore, it is hard to show if all the related languages were separated from the IE in the same way or if it is possible to reconstruct the IE protolanguage, if it is also likely first to receive a general IE language then separate the related languages and the dialectal subgroups in each group. Thus, the comparative and typological database on IE languages allows us to reconstruct the variative forms, which could have been the reason of the corresponding forms of the related languages. During the process of their independent development those forms appear in either invariant or variative types according to the existing conditions. So the data on Armenian enables us to compare a great number of variative forms (root words, suffixes and other linguistic elements) to reconstruct the IE protolanguage, as well as to confirm the accuracy of such reconstruction and to denote more distinct borders [cf. *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 200, 221-223, 263 etc.].

c. The existence of the Armenian double or parallel forms is the result of different consonant shifts. In Djahukyan's list the number of those examples surpass more than several hundreds [*Джаукян* 1967: 300-313] and most of the variants are characterized with regional attributes. These become a special matter of interest in another work of Djahukyan [*Djahukyan* 1985: 151-160]. It is

worthwhile mentioning that literary and dialectal variants are copious in Armenian and they have been analysed in different studies. That's why in our further studies it is essential to complete the existing lists formed by other scholars as well as to examine the whole linguistic material in a comparably new and broad theoretical environment.

The source of the Armenian phonetic, syntactic and lexical variants is the language derived within the period of IE generalization. It has got its manifestation in dialects and expresses variability specific to the semiotics, synonyms, homonyms and other similar attributes of the IE period at the same time preserving the features peculiar to IE languages.

Djahukyan considers the pre-writing period variants of different Armenian phases as archaic dialectal phenomena and mentions that their comprehensive study and chronological distribution, especially for pre-writing period, is a matter of future research. At the present stage of scientific development it is only possible to make general observations [Джаукян 1984: 252].

For instance, as the general and initial meaning of 'to fill, pour, flow', 'filled, full' along with further acquisition 'to spread, to stretch, to broaden', 'area, spread' and for other meanings we have the Armenian following examples:

- 1) *hḡn-* [heł-] *hn-* [hol-], *hu-* [hal-];
- 2) *ḡn-* [yeł-], *yn-* [yol-], *h(p)n-* [y(ə)ł-];
- 3) *ḡh* (*-ḡh) [li (-hi)], *(q)ḡn-* [(z)eł-], *nn-* [oł-];
- 4) *hu-* [hał-], *hn-* [hoł-];
- 5) *u-* [al-], *un-* [ał-], *h(p)l-* [h(ə)l-];

and other roots which form a number of words and morphemes used in the Armenian literary and dialectal variants and probably had their initial expressions at the pre-writing period.

Thus we can suppose that from the point of view of the Armenian lexical and semiotic variability (even with the separation of homonyms) those stem-words are lexical variants of the Armenian pre-writing and writing periods and express the variability with different semiotic correspondence which remained

from the period of IE unity and have various principles of the phonetic and morphologic explanation.

We should also mention that previous scholars etymologized most of the root words, which go back to any IE variant. The problem is that the systematic study of the facts confirms the accuracy of these etymologies and furthermore becomes a realistic and trustful source for the etymology of new words. A number of words and roots that didn't have their etymology obtain their genealogical analyses and comprehension which we are going to discuss further.

If we use the above mentioned approach to solve the occurrence of variative root words it becomes clear that they are expressions of the IE root variants like $*p^{(h)}el-H-$, $*p^{(h)}l-eH-$ and $*p^{(h)}l-H-$ which are derived forms. These are different derivations of the same root word, i.e. they are different degrees of IE root words of mobil vowel alternation (*Schwebeablaut*) used with guttural (laryngeal) suffix [cf. Anttila 1969: 145-147, apud Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 232-242].

We should note that the Armenian expression of the IE first degree vocalic alternation root word $*p^{(h)}el-H-$ proves the existence of such root word in other languages along with Indo-Iranian ones. It is attributive and specific to Armenian and the mentioned phenomenon denies Anttila's statement according to which that type of root word can hardly be common for the Indo-European period [cf. Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 234-235].

Thus, the number of the Armenian expressions with such lexical variants increase on account of the possible etymology of the words and root words which haven't had their etymology or have an unknown origin. New phonetic rules are being established which supply the number of already known rules (confirmed by Hubschmann and his followers) and become a realistic foundation for the chronological, local and practical study of the Armenian variative root words and the broad study of expressions justified with their own status (we'll consider those expressions separately).

d. The comparative-variative study of the Armenian language gives us the chance to have a complete idea not only about the

individual development of the linguistic phenomena inherited from IE but also about the preservation of the inherited features. As a result of the phonetic, semiotic and other types of grouping of the root words and words, new root words and morphemes appear during the development of the Armenian language and obtain independent application and when we reconstruct those glosses we can speak about their genetic similarities i.e. they are derived from the same root word.

As a consequence in order to comprehend the understanding ‘animation’ (‘fauna and flora’) the IE variative word-root **k^oi-*, and **k^oei-* have recently been reconstructed, at the period of IE unity it was probably expressed with both primary and secondary (derivative, syntactic etc.) structural forms [cf. *Курпилович* 1971: 122-126]. We are inclined to think that lots of widely used Armenian literary and colloquial (dialectal) forms concerning to the fields of “animal world-fauna” and “plant world-flora” are originated from the above mentioned variants and their derivations. According to it we can distinguish two types of root words and root forms:

1. a) *կե(ւ)–//կեւ–* [ke(a)-, kea-];
- b) *կեւաց- (կեց-)* [keac^c- (kec^c-)];
- c) *կեւան- (կեան-)* [kean- (ken-)];
- d) *կեանս- (կեսնս-)* [keans- (kens-)];
- e) *կեանց- (կեանց-)* keanc^c- (kenc^c-),
- f) *կենդ- (կենդանու-)* [kend- (kendan-)] etc. [see *Adjaryan* 1973: 564-565; *Djahukyan* 1987: 129-209 etc.].
2. a). *ծիւ- //ծւոյ-* (<*ծի-, *ծւ-) [cil-, cał- (<*ci-, *ca-)];
- b) *ծեղ-, ծիղ-, ծիւղ-* (cf. *ըն-ճիւղ*) [ceł-, cił, ciwł (cf. ən-jiwł)];
- c) *ճեղ-, ճիղ-, ճիւղ-, ճող-* [čeł-, čil-, čiwł-, čoł-];
- d) *շիղ-, շիւղ-* [šil-, šiwl-];
- e) *ճող-, ճեղ-* (cf. *ճեղ-մն*) [joł-, jeł- (cf. jeł-un)];
- f) *ցող-* (i. e. *ցող-մն//ցւոյն-մն* or *ցող-մն*) [c^coł- (c^coł-un, c^cawł-un)] ‘stem, stalk’ etc. [see *Adjaryan* 1973: 435, 438-439, 463, and 1977: 203-204, 517-518, 1979: 460, 466 etc.; *Bediryan* 1975: 451-459, and 2012: 18-20, 27-28 etc.; *Djahukyan* 1987: 124-125 etc.].

First, the mentioned root words and root forms (morphemes) have either simple or derived structure and they are effected by different vowel and consonant changes. Besides they have their variative and similar expressions either only in literary language or only in dialects, though they have some specific stylistic differences in the literary manuscripts (e.g. *gn̄m̄l̄* [c°oʎun], *ḡw̄n̄m̄l̄*/*gōn̄m̄l̄* [c°awʎun, c°oʎun] ‘stem, stalk’ etc). We should pay attention to the fact that some of the mentioned root words haven’t got their precise etymology yet.

We get the chance to establish more precise phonetic correspondences during the variative-genealogical examination of the forms presenting certain semiotic regions. We are also able to confirm the nature of the root words and words with comparably true etymology or of those that need of further etymology.

The variative forms of the above mentioned semantic groups are first of all attributed to the contradiction of the plosive /affricate consonants before the initial vowel: cf. Arm. *կիւն*//*ծիւն* [kin,cin] ‘woman, wife; born, birth’ < IE *k’en- [see *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 41-42]. In their turn the variations of plosive-spirant consonants express the variability of the contradiction in the quality of voiceless/non-voiceless and voiced/non-voiced consonants. The forms with the latter type of contradiction are more common in both literary and dialectal Armenian variants [see *Джаукян* 1967: 167 etc.].

It’s worthwhile mentioning that the singular instrumental case and generally the plural of the Arm. *կիւն* [kin] ‘woman, wife’ derives with the help of *ւ* [a]: cf. *կանամբ* //*կուամ* [kanamb, know] (*instr.*), *կանայք* [kanayk^c] (*pl.*) < IE *k^oen-, *k^o(e)naH₂-s, and *ն* [o] deriving particles in singular forms *կինոյ* [knoʝ] (*gen.*), *կինոյէ* [knoʝē] (*abl.*), so they cause phonetic-syntactic variability in the system of old literary Armenian. That variability is more connected with the expression of the Old Armenian general noun concept than with the expression of grammatical concept of plural forms [cf. *Джахукян* 1959; *Туманян* 1978: 306; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984:185,758].

Afterwards, the semantic (thematic) group of the fauna

(“animal world”) encloses variability of the contradiction of the plosive //affricate connected with the parts of body, precisely, with the upper and lower limbs: cf. *կրննի//ճրննի* [kurn, čurn] ‘back; shoulder’, ‘throw off, overthrow’ < IE *gēu-, and *keu- [see *Джаукян* 1967: 68, 167, 199 etc.; *Aghayan* 1974: 88-91, 102-108; *Hannegyan* 1979: 154, 158].

These and similar root-words become the base for the forms like *կրնույ* [krnak] (*anat.*) ‘back; shoulder’, *կրնուս* [krnat] (*anat.*) ‘armless, one-armed’, *ճրնիկ* [črnik] (*dial.*) ‘throw off, overthrow’ (Mush, Alashkert etc.) and others not only in literary manuscripts but also in dialects.

However, literary and spoken (dialectal) variants of the Armenian language along with chronological, dimensional variants comprise a number of words and root words with such contradictions. These root words haven’t received their genealogical study especially from the viewpoint of comparative-typological study [cf. *Simonyan* 1979: 188-248]. One of the best modern works of this type detects such variability as an expression of phonetic and lexical archaism as compared with the Old Armenian literary canonic system and the variability of the phonetic level becomes a matter of special attention [see *Simonyan* 1979: 210-248].

Such consonant and vowel shifts occur at the pre-writing period of the IE unity and the period of the Armenian independent development. They caused the formation of the variability of the same words and root words which present distant semantics and syntax.

e. From the viewpoint of the origins of the Armenian words or root words and the tribal correlations (cultural, also mythological), the variative research creates real status for the new comparative-etymological approach. This new approach makes the latest explanation of the basic questions on the history of pre-literary period as well as the accurate etymology of previously incomplete etymologies or the etymology of other words and root words accidentally.

Obviously, this type of task is necessary for the complete and convincing solution of the major problems of the Armenian pre-writing period. It has prior consequence because the modern studies of the IE languages suggest a more important role to Armenian because of its old archaic features [cf. *Гамкрелидзе / Иванов* 1984: 16-17, 41- 43 etc.].

It refers not only to the real value of the Armenian phonetic system [see *Mayrhofer* 1988: 530, gloss.73], the etymological reconstruction of morphological and derived forms, the clarification of the correction and distributive relations but also to the interpretation of legends, the specific features of poetic works and the structural principles of old Armenian original works (texts), which originated from the IE family.

Thus, the people who used the IE dialects had completely different perception like *խմել* [xmel] ‘to drink (water)’ and *ըմպել* [əmpel] ‘to drink (a refreshing liquid)’ which has the IE variants *ek^{(h)o}- and *p^(h)oH(i)- [see *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 702-703].

We have different Armenian forms to express the meaning of ‘to use liquid’ which probably originated from IE language itself. This approach makes the new analyses of some Armenian words and morphemes rather realistic. They are found both in the Armenian literary and spoken (dialectal) forms as well as the forms in children’s vocabulary.

We consider that the following root words and morphemes containing the Armenian plosive and fricative consonants originate from the IE *ek^{(h)o}-:

1. *խմ* [xum] ‘to drink’, *խոխում* [xoxum] ‘gorge, ravine’, *խոխումել* [xoxomel] ‘to water, to irrigate’, *խոխումն* [xoxumn] ‘irrigation’, *խոխոյ* [xoxoj] ‘voice of water’ (also *խոխոյոջ* // *խոխոյն* [xołxoј, xołxonj]) (*id.*), *խոխոտիլ* [xoxotil] ‘to dare; to attack, to assault’, *խոխում* (*dial.*) [xxum] ‘to swallow; to gulp down, to absorb’, *խոխումել* (*dial.*) [xxmel] (*id.*) etc. [cf. *Adjaryan* 1973: 386-387: *Джаукян* 1967: 119: *Djahukyan* 1987: 314, 591 etc.];

2. *կմ* [kum] ‘drink, mouthful’, *կմկմալ* [kmmal] ‘to stammer, to falter’, *կմնիլ* (*dial.*) [kmuk] ‘the upper part of the

throat to the palat' etc. [cf. *Adjaryan* 1973: 658; *Джаукян* 1967: 148; *Djahukyan* 1987: 591 etc.].

First, none of the above mentioned words have had their etymology. The rest are considered either onomatopoeic words or borrowings from other languages. We can suggest that they originated from another language presumably from IE **ek^(h)*-. The data listing about the Armenian literary and colloquial (dialectal) variants make it possible to study the above mentioned questions or the like. The study becomes completely realistic especially when we use the latest data about the related languages and rely on the possibilities and corresponding principles of comparative-typological variability.

Then, Arm. *ըմպեմ* (< *ըմ-պե-մ*) [əmpem (< əm-pe-m)] 'to drink' originated from the IE **p^(h)oH(i)-*. It is in variative relation with the words *համբոյր* (< *h-am-bo-yr*) [hamboyr (< h-am-bo-yr)] 'kiss', *բերան* (< *be-r-an*) [beran (< be-r-an)] 'mouth' if we acknowledge the initial root word variants *pn-//ykt-* [bo-//pe-], and *pt-* [be-] of the pre-writing period [see *Hambardzumyan* 2003: 41].

Adjaryan connects *ըմպեմ* [əmpem] 'to drink' to *նմպ* (< **nmyp*) [ump (< *oump)] 'sip', *խմել* [xmel] 'to drink', *խում* [xum] (*id.*) and considers it unetymologized word [cf. *Adjaryan* 1977: 599-600]. *Djahukyan* like *Zolta* [see *Solta* 1960: 90-91] separates the morphemes *ըմ-* [əm-] and *-պեմ* [-pem] and consequently connects them with IE **anti* 'opposite, in front' or **pdhos* 'bellow, under' and IE **pō(i)-//*pi-* 'to drink' [see *Djahukyan* 1987: 52, 144 etc.]. He also believes that the proto-form *ըմպեմ* [əmpem] 'to drink' produces some difficulties which makes us to confirm a hypothesis because "*նմպ* [ump] 'sip' has Armenian features with the reconstruction of the analogy *m* [u]" [*Djahukyan* 1987: 187]. It is necessary to add that later the researchers considered the Arm. *ըմպեմ* [əmpem] 'to drink' to be originated from the IE **p^(h)oH(i)-* with the separation of the guttural element from the vowel of the main simple word stem and that phenomenon forms a long vowel in the pre-writing Armenian which is not specific to the writing period [cf. *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 426, 702-703; *Майрхоффер* 1988: 127].

6. During the last two decades the comparative-etymological study gives a special significance to the Armenian language among the other related Indo-European languages as well as in the unity of other related languages. Regardless of its amount and the accuracy, the data about Armenian is widely considered along with other languages while investigating the diverse approaches and principles for different theories and scientific analyses.

The Armenian language became noteworthy in the traditional and modern comparative study because of its ancient (archaic) features, long-lasting history, independent preservation during the separation and diffusion of the IE languages and for many other reasons. Both foreign and Armenian linguists have their immense contribution to that area. Most of the Armenian linguists have been faithful to the traditional theories, developed and tried to make them as much perfect as possible, the rest have expressed their individual approaches and expanded rather unique ideas.

We assume that at the current stage of the IE comparative-typological study, it is necessary to implement the Armenian glossary which has been included in historical, etymological and other dictionaries, in various studies of researchers, in the Armenian dialects, widely etc. The core problem of the modern Armenian studies is to reveal it and include as much new information as possible. For the realization of this problem it is necessary to follow the principles of the comparative-typological linguistics and if possible to apply new approaches and new principles.

The implementation of the variational approach in the study of the history of the Armenian pre-writing and writing period makes it possible to solve a number of problems concerning the relations of Armenian and Indo-European along with other related languages.

The new etymologies of the words (roots) representing correction of relative timeline (approaching the true time), consonants, vowels and other varieties have more importance in the history of language, as well as etymological revisions, the confirmation or definition of new regularities by means of inner

reconstruction, etc. Later we need to clarify whether this or that variability has been formed within the Armenian language or within the IE language in general or in later periods.

Adjaryan has gathered together all varieties existent in Armenian handwritten (manuscripts) and pen written (books) that anyhow reflect the pronunciation of the time as oral penetration [*Adjaryan 1957*]. Djahukyan completes them basing on Armenian dialectological data [*Djahukyan 1972*]. However, there still are pen written and oral words and word-forms that can separately be studied from the point of view of the analysis of the Armenian variative etymology.

4. The Variative Reconstruction of the Armenian Roots of IE Origin

1. The comparative-typological study of the IE languages has interested many scholars for three and a half decades. Several works have been published in Russian and other languages which claim that though chronologically Armenian was recorded comparably later, still it possesses such features and traits which are very valuable for the re-estimation and correction of the nature and proximity degree of the related languages.

Armenian contains a lot of evidence on the phonetic system, morphological and grammatical structure which might have a decisive role in outlines of general status of IE, split up of the related languages. It might help also for inner language (dialect) perception of core problems of the typological parallel forms [see *Simonyan 1979; Aghabekyan 1979*].

2. In this case we are more interested in the principle problems of the IE root word reconstruction which concerns the variability of the root words. According to the data of both pre-written and written periods, Armenian contains a great number of variative root words which are a result of manuscript variants (forms set forth from the script writers) and dimensional, chronological and other type variability [cf. *Adjaryan 1971: 773-842; Джаукян 1967: 300-349 etc.*].

The results of the latest research denote that it is impossible to reconstruct any root words, morphemes or other linguistic examples of common Indo-European without taking into consideration the variability of the concept, as well as mythological, cultural and other factors. This feature has long been neglected, i.e. the examples have been studied only according to the principles of phonetic-grammatical correspondence [see

Adjaryan 1971-1979; *Aghayan* 1974; *Джаукян* 1967; 1982 etc.]. Thus the problem of the variative reconstruction and typological analysis of the Armenian root words of IE origin stands out as one of the branches of the modern Armenian studies.

3. We have already mentioned that in recent years the issue of the variative study of the Armenian root words of IE origin has drawn attention of several scholars [see *Hambardzumyan* 1997: 149-152; 1998; 2002: 43-59; 2002: 242-260; 2003: 39-43 etc.].

Here we should state, that the research of the Armenian root words of the IE origin could solve a number of problems connected with not only the explanation of the words and root words of “unknown origin” but also with the words which have incomplete etymology and need comparative-typological corrections.

The Armenian Root Theory supposes to apply the latest data accumulated in the study of the phonetic system and grammar structure of related languages and if possible, compare them with the database of Armenian with necessary corrections.

4. Thus, some foreign and Soviet linguists, not irrespective of previous achievements [see *Pedersen* 1951; *Martinet* 1962: 67-78 etc.] set forth the idea of reconsidering the traditionally reconstructed system of IE plosive consonants because the aspirates might have had glottal or ejective articulation [*Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1972:15-18; *Gamkrelidze/Ivanov* 1973: 150-156; *Hopper* 1973, 141-166; 1977: 41-53 (Russ. vers. *Хоннер* 1988: 160-172) etc.]. According to Hopper, the plosives in Eastern Armenian are aspirates and a bit glottalized [*Hopper* 1981: 133-142, and 1988: 173-182].

But T. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov think that the system of Armenian plosives inherited the Indo-European inventory with the oldest features, and according to them it is obvious not only in some modern dialects but also in old Armenian literary variants [see *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 17, 41 etc.].

5. The latest studies have caused different problems pertaining to the exclusion of voiceless aspirates from the system of plosive consonants, the triple row classification of back lingual plosives, the new elucidation of the attributive structure of Indo-European

guttural and aspirate phonemes etc. As a result, the necessity of the use of the corresponding Armenian data increases.

Consequently, until the recent time the Armenian variative root words *hūn(p)* [het(k^c)] ‘track; footprint, footstep’, *nu(ū)* [ot(n)] ‘foot’ and *jūn* [yet] ‘back, backwards’ were considered to be reconstructed from IE **pedo* [see *Adjaryan* 1977: 82-84; *Djahukyan* 1987: 14, 185, 214 etc.]. The latest studies concern the IE variative root words **p^(h)et’-//*p^(h)ot’-* in which the particle **t’* probably had the glottal articulation and it is best expressed in Armenian (a number of root words are expressed with *Mesropyan* voiceless *u* [t] either separately or in their variations which reflect that phenomenon. Cf. *unuū* [tam] ‘to give’, *mutū* [utem] ‘to eat’, *unū* [tun] ‘house’, *uḥi* [tiw] ‘day, time, a part of the day’ etc.

According to the regular expression of this phonetic rule in Armenian and the expression of IE **p* in Armenian *h* [h], *ι* [w] or *ø* [zero], and *u* [p], we can assume that the Armenian word *uḥunuḥ* [aptak] ‘slap in the face’ originated from the IE suchlike root word variants.

In this case we can suppose that first, the Armenian word ‘aptak’ hasn’t had its accurate etymology, besides, the data of the related and non-related languages prove that IE root words **p^(h)et’-//*p^(h)ot’-* have the meaning of *nu(p)* (pl.) [ot(k^c)] ‘foot’ which denotes both ‘front’ and ‘back feet’. Consequently, we can assume that the component of the Arm. *uḥunuḥ* (*u-ḥun-uḥ*) [aptak (a-pt-ak)] ‘slap in the face’ is *-ḥun-* [-pt-] and it originated from the above mentioned root word (cf. OInd. *upa-bdā-* ‘stomp’, Av. *fra-bda* ‘front foot’, *a-bda* ‘a place not to step’, Gk. *ἐπι-ἰ-βδᾶ* ‘the day after a holiday’, ‘on one foot’ (with the precise meaning) [*Гамкрелидзе / Иванов* 1984: 154-155; *Майрхоффер* 1988: 126, 136-148].

In Old literary Armenian the word *uḥunuḥ* [aptak] ‘slap in the face’ acquires narrower meaning ‘hit with a hand’ to distinguish from the word *uḥuḡh* [ak^cac^ci], (*dial.*) *puḡh* [k^cac^ci]) ‘kick; hit with a foot’. We should mention that the root word of the latter is *uḥ-* [ak^c-], which initially had the meaning of ‘foot’; cf. *uḥuḡuḡtḥ* (*uḥuḡ-ḥuḡ-tḥ*) [sayt^cak^cel] ‘to stumble’, *uḥuḡtḥuḡ* (*uḥ-ḥuḡ-tḥuḡ*)

(*relig.*) [arak^ceal] ‘apostle; missanger’, *սուսրհնի* (*սա-սը-ինի*) [arak^cini] ‘virtuous; honest’, *բարձրաբեաց* (*բարձր-աբ-եաց*) [barjrak^ceac^c] ‘a person of a long shank’ etc.

The Arm. word *համբոյր* [hamboyr] ‘a kiss’ initially was considered a word of unknown origin. Djahukyan considered it derived from the Iranian form *ham-bōd* [*Adjaryan* 1977: 25; *Djahukyan* 1987: 530]. As mentioned above, Adjaryan connected the Armenian verb *ըմպեմ* [əmpem] ‘drink’ with the supposed root word *մմպ* [ump] ‘sip’ while Djahukyan believed “it to be originated from the present tense of the thematic double form”, stating that “it is hard to reconstruct its protoform” and the “word *մմպ* [ump] ‘sip’ has an Armenian origin” [see *Adjaryan* 1973: 124, and 1977: 599-600; *Djahukyan* 1987: 187]. However, we are apt to think that the particles of *բո-//պե-* [bo-, pe-] and *բե-* [be-] ‘drink’ in the Arm. *համբոյր* (*h-am-bo-yr*) [hamboyr (h-am-bo-yr)] ‘kiss’, *ըմպեմ* (*ըմ-պե-մ*) [əmpem (əmpem)] ‘to drink’ and *բերան* (*բե-ր-ան*) [beran (be-r-an)] ‘mouth’ are variative root words which are in close relation with their phonetic expression and semantic frequency. The variability is supposed to occur long before the Old literary Armenian. They are the expression of the IE **p*^(h)*oH-*, its double form **p*^(h)*ip*^(h)*oH-*, and according to Mayrhofer, **peh*₃- form etc. [*Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 220, 402; *Майрхофер* 1988: 127]; see the comparative forms of the related languages at the same place. The Armenian particles *ան-* [an-] ‘un-, upon’, *ամ-* [am-] ‘on, upon’, *համ-* [ham-] ‘on; to’ can be compared with the Arm. *անձեռնոցիկ* [anjeroc^cik] ‘serviette’, *ըմբնեմ* [əmbnem] ‘to understand’, *համբոյր* [hamboyr] ‘kiss’ and other compounds.

6. Until recent years the study of the Armenian root-word structure especially the phonetic rules and the degree of relatedness was mainly realized according to the principles of relationship of Hübschmann’s school the phonetic rules and the degree of relatedness. The latest comparative-typological studies of the IE languages touch upon the problem of reconsidering those principles [see e.g. *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 31-34, *Kortlandt* 1983: 54-70, *Mayrhofer* 1983; *Майрхофер* 1988: 507-530 etc.].

Thus, the preservation of the archaic forms in the Armenian phonetic structure which was not wholly and completely expressed in the *Mesropyan* writing becomes a significant base for the study of the Armenian pre-written period as well as for the comprehensive and detailed study of various phenomena common in IE [*Maïṛxoxep* 1988: 530, footnote 73; see *Hambadzumyan* 2002: 15 etc.].

As a result, there rise essential questions one of which refers to the variative reconstruction and typological analysis of the Armenian root words of Indo-European origin. In order to solve this problem there is need to generate new principles and approaches and use them in certain researches. The new principles and approaches must preserve the traits of the traditional principles including broader use of linguistic phenomena. We believe one of those principles is the detailed and careful variative-typological study of the Armenian root word structure, its phonetic and morphologic (as well as syntactic/poetic speech, etc.) structure.

7. Naturally, the variative reconstruction of IE root words was the target for previous scholars, and there is a conventional tradition on this matter. The development and accomplishment of these new principles and approaches may become a new branch of study which will contribute to more detailed assessment of the Armenian core phenomena (of IE origin and comparative-typological) as well as clarification and solution of many unsolved problems. All those phenomena have been studied from the linguistic point of view which ignores the semantic side, particularly the concepts inherited from IE and somehow expressed in the Armenian mythology, legends and other cultural inheritance.

8. The language variants emerge not only due to the internal, namely, under the circumstances deriving from chronological, regional or functional features, but also owing to the persistence and transfer of the most general etymological or genetic traits of more than one language regardless of any peculiarities obtained in the course of their development.

As a matter of fact, since the 1970s of previous century a considerable amount of work has been done in the sphere of

etymological and typological research of languages in comparison, with certain extent of attention attributed to the facts investigated in the Armenian language. The facts explored so far could be of much wider use within the context of much deeper insights into the facts detected in all the possible language variants.

Consequently, the issues of utmost attention are those which have been reflected and, at best, have found proper solutions not only through traditional comparative and typological methods developed so far, but also based on the latest data obtained in the realm of the studies of Armenian, as well as, other genetically correlated languages.

The contemporary and most recent studies evidence that within the general Indo-European linguistic situation it is almost impossible to restore or recover, for instance, any word root (stem) without taking into consideration not the historical, social and cultural, but also mythological and other varieties of conceptions underlying the concept. Thus, the discussions on the reconstruction of variants of words (or stems (roots)) of Indo-European origin and typological verification gradually grow into one of the key issues of contemporary science.

Part II.

**The Etymology of the Armenian
Words of IE Origin**

0. Preliminary

1. The questions concerning to the history of the Armenian language remain in the center of the scholars' attention. There are certain achievements in this field that have become a matter of further studies. However we distinguish some problems which have not found their complete explanation yet. The latter mainly refers to the phonetics, syntax and lexicology. There is a large group of words of Indo-European origin that need thorough etymological study.

The etymological study of most of these words and the occurrences of phonetic shifts could seem essential concerning several unsolved issues in accordance with the study and evaluation of the Armenian language.

2. Regardless of the previous etymological studies there are a great number of Armenian words that are considered to have Indo-European origin. They are based on etymological data and also are confirmed by the correspondence between the Armenian and other related languages.

The etymology of the Armenian words which have Indo-European origin is not based on random classes (e.g. according to the alphabetical order) but on the semantic groups they are included in according to their position in 23 semantic (thematic) groups stated by G. Djahukyan [see *Djahukyan* 1987: 46-58, 204-222; cf. *Buck* 1949; *Benveniste* 1969 etc.].

Therefore, the following Armenian words of IE origin are included in five semantic groups directly. Some corrections are made as a result of semantic changes due to the development of the Armenian language.

For instance, the word *ւոյշիկ* [aʃik] 'girl' according to the data of manuscripts has the concept of the semantic group of 'humanity,

gender, age, family relation’ [Djahukyan 1987: 207-208]. The new data shows that the word formerly meant ‘a woman grounding flour’, in other words ‘a person of feminine gender working in natural farmstead’. That meaning is older than the one mentioned in the manuscripts. Thus, the word *աղջիկ* [aʃjik] ‘girl’ is included in another semantic group indicating “food and drink, food preparation and cutlery”. The latter is related to the group denoting “physical actions or arts and handicraft performed with different tools, material and product” [Djahukyan 1987: 213-214]. The above mentioned group also includes the Arm. (dial.) *սնել* [snel] ‘to grind into big pieces; to break the corn into two’.

The Arm. (dial.) *գ’ալգ’ալի* [g’alg’ali] ‘two-wheeled cart’ has IE origin and is included in the semantic group of farming. Later the Arm. *սայլ*, (dial.) *սել* [sayl (sel)] ‘cart’ acquired a name of another concept. The other glosses of this group are the Arm. *կամն* [kamn] ‘thresher’ and Arm. *աշան* [ašan] ‘thresh, thrash of ear’; ‘threshing, thrashing of ears’.

The Arm. *արտախոյր* [artaxoyr] ‘tiara, mitre, diadem’, *խաւարտ* (bot.) [xavart] ‘greens, vegetables, legumes’, *տիգ* (gen. pl.) [tik^c] (< *տիք* [tik^c]) ‘age’ that were metaphoric units in Pre-Christian ideology belong to different semiotic groups according to their different meanings. While observed in their broad meanings these words belong to the semantic groups of “feelings, character, moral and esthetic understandings” and refer to words connected with culture.

The Arm. *թանճ* [tanjr] ‘thick; dense’ of the IE origin is analysed for its need of phonetic structure correction in the root stem and it belongs to the semantic group of “dimensional relations of place and shape” [Djahukyan 1987: 215-216].

3. The new etymology and the etymological corrections of these words are based on the data of the comparative study of the Indo-European languages. Thus, we tried to preserve the existing traditional approach as well as to update the study according to the current data. The ancient layers of the Armenian vocabulary may become a matter of semantics and word-investigation as a result of our achievements and thorough analysis.

4. A part of the Armenian vocabulary has been considered “uncertain” or “not etymologized”. At different periods the etymological traditional means and methods (rules) had their role in the clarification of the Armenian wordstock. Great work is done by the followers of Hübschmann and other scholars.

At recent times the etymology of the Armenian vocabulary has been studied more by foreign linguists than by Armenian scholars themselves.

5. Like other cases Root Theory (especially etymology) also supposes to carry out the research considering the existing achievements and data as well as to produce and set forward new principles, means and methods of analysis which will promote the accomplishment of further studies.

6. The part of the Armenian vocabulary of unknown origin or with incomplete etymology can become matter of interest if we state new phonetic rules regarding the phenomena of certain phonemes, phoneme clusters, syllable structure or stress. The new rules must be the logical result of the data in both literary language and dialects including the variability of time, area and language practice.

As we have already mentioned the variative study of this phenomenon was ignored by the followers of “Hübschmann’s school”. The only exceptions are Djahukyan’s works and some other books that somehow demonstrate etymological doublets and parallel forms [see *Hambardzumyan* 2002: 22].

7. We keep on reflecting the etymology of some words via the comparative-typological methods. They refer to certain semantic groups and complete the set of the words and root words of IE origin.

Consequently, by means of the etymology of the Arm. *uuunnuð* [astuac] ‘god’ we may speak about the supreme God of the Armenian mythology as well as to complete the semantic group of religion, superstition and prejudice [cf. *Djahukyan* 1987: 50, 273-274 etc.]. Affected by the Iranian pantheon, instead of it we have the name *Uuunnuð* [astuac] ‘God’ of native IE origin as the top of the Armenian pantheon.

With the etymology of the Armenian words *ծաւ(ի)* [caw(i)] ‘azure; sky-blue’ and *կայք* [kaytʰ] ‘basket’ we enlarge the number of the Armenian original words and study them in relation with Hittite-Luvian (Anatolian) languages. The study is performed with the principle of utilizing and comparing the data of Old Armenian (Grabar) and dialects with other languages.

Below we present the study of some Armenian words in their semantic groups. The study is comparative research of Old Armenian and dialect data viewing them as options and as such comparing them with other languages: not only by the usage of known phonetic rules, but also by newer explanations and possible confirmations of new ones.

1. Arm. *atjik* < IE *al-

1. The Armenian word *աղջիկ* [aʎjik] ‘girl, virgin’ has IE origin and belongs to the semantic group denoting ‘mankind: gender, age, family relations’ [Djahukyan 1987: 145, 207 etc.]. The subject of our interest is the IE semantic root-stem from which the word was originated [cf. Hambarzumyan 1997: 149-152].

2. The word *աղջիկ* [aʎjik] ‘girl, virgin’ was used in the Armenian manuscripts in the fifth century. It consists of the root-stem *աղջ* [aʎj] and *-իկ* [ik] softening-familiarizing suffix. The word *աղջ* [aʎj] was also used in ancient times. The word had several meanings; a) ‘maid, maiden, virgin’; b) ‘young woman’, c) ‘maid, servant’. Much later it got the meaning of ‘a daughter, not a male child’ [Adjaryan 1971: 129]. The initial form of the word *աղջիկ* [aʎjik] was *աղիճ* [alič]. So the fricative voiced *ջ* [j] was replaced by voiceless *ճ* [č] probably under the influence of *ղ* [ʎ] [see *ibid*].

It is supposed that some Armenian words with *-իկ* [-ik] suffix, as well as the word *աղջիկ* [aʎjik] in Pre-Armenian had the root-particle *-իկն* [-ikn] (< IE **i-kon*), because later in Grabar (Old Armenian) such words had internal declension; e.g. *ծաղիկ* [caʎik] (<**ծաղիկն* [caʎikn]) ‘flower’, (*gen.-dat.*) *ծաղիկան* [caʎikan] ‘of the flower’, *մանուկ* [manuk] (<**մանուկն* [manukn]) ‘baby, infant; child’, (*gen.-dat.*) *մանուկան* [manukan] ‘the child’s’, *աղջիկ* [aʎjik] (<**աղջիկն* [aʎjikn]), ‘girl, virgin’, (*gen.-dat.*) *աղջիկան* [aʎjikan] ‘girl’s’ etc. It means that the sonorant *ն* [n] was dropped [Meillet 1936: 80; Djahukyan 1987: 238, 356, 368].

In Old Armenian (Grabar) the word *աղջ* [aʎj] is used with its common meaning as “girl, virgin, maiden” [see *Timotheos Kuz* 1908: 238; “*Knik^ε hawatoy*” 1914: 168 etc.]. In the future the word acquired other meanings like “immoral, depraved” [see *Eusebeos*

Kesaratsi 1818: 204 etc.] and as we can see below all these meanings were the result of further development.

3. H. Adjaryan considered the word *աղիջ* [aɬij] (<*աղիճ* [aɬiç] ‘girl, young, lady’ (also ‘prostitute, strumpet, women of easy virtue’) as “non-etymologized word” (i. e. “anstoyg bar”) and “as a borrowing from Khaldi (Urartian) language” [*Adjaryan* 1979: 129, 1940, 186] in another work. In his early studies Djahukyan gives the etymology of the word *աղիջ* [aɬij] (< *աղիճ* [aɬiç]) [*Джаукян* 1967: 121; 1982, 122]. In his first study he mentions its connection with the words *աղխ* [aɬx] ‘family’ and *աղախին* [aɬaxin] ‘servant, maid-servant’. “Meillet connects the words *աղախին* [aɬaɬjin] ‘servant’ and *աղիկ* [aɬjik] ‘girl’ with the IE **al-* ‘to grind, to mince, to crush” [*Джаукян* 1967: 121]. Later this important observation was ignored.

Afterwards Djahukyan states the new etymology of the word *աղիջ* [aɬij] from the IE **pə-li* form [*Djahukyan* 1987: 145]. Being concordant with Adjaryan he considers the word *աղիկ* [aɬjik] ‘girl’ as a borrowing from “Urartian” as one of the words denoting family relationship [*Джаукян* 1987: 436].

4. Lately there is an opinion that the word woman in some IE dialects has the meaning of ‘grind, mince the corn’ (< IE **mel-* ‘crush, mince, grind’ has been said connectedly (< IE **m̥-//*mul-* ‘mill, mincer’); cf. Lat. *mulier* ‘woman’ etc. The Arm. *աղիկ* [aɬjik] ‘(young) woman’ is considered to be related to the Arm. *աղալ* [aɬal] ‘to grind’ and *աղալի* [aɬawri] ‘mill, grind’ [*Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 692-693].

The authors of this new view also state that grinding and mincing are phenomena connected with natural farmstead which were mainly conducted by the female, the woman. In this sense, it is a remarkable fact that hieroglyph Hitt. SAL^{NA4}ARA means ‘miller’ or literally ‘grinding-woman’ [see *idem*].

The authors observe that the occurrence of the “mill, grinder” dates back to the fifth millennium B.C. (the north part of Iran, which also finds its expression in Egyptian culture) and it was brought to Europe through Middle East [*idem*, 693-694]. There is the view that in the Indo-European dialects the word stem **mel-*

(‘mince, crush, grind’) later got the new expression of **al-* which is connected with the Arm. *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘grind’, *աղալարի* [aʎawri] ‘mill, grind’. Cf. Gk. *ἀλέω* ‘mince’, Av. *aša-*, and **arta-* ‘ground’, Pers. *ārd* ‘flour’, Hind. and Beng. *āṭā* ‘flour’ etc. [*idem*, 693].

5. Obviously, the Arm. *աղջիկ* [aʎjik] (< **աղիջ-իկ* [aʎij-ik]) ‘girl’ and *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘to grind’, *աղալարի* [aʎawri] ‘mill, grind’ are originally close and connected to a certain fact of IE natural farmstead. But the existing ancient pre-writing root stem *աղ-* [aʎ-] (**ալ-* [al-]) is not connected with the IE **mel-* and it is completely different. Gamkrelidze and Ivanov do not distinguish this kind of root stem.

It does not mean that the origin of the Arm. *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘to grind’, *աղալարի* [aʎawri] ‘mill, grind’ is unknown. On the contrary, it is known that the words originated from the IE root stem **al-* [*Adjaryan* 1971: 118]. Djahukyan thinks that the word *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘to grind’ comes from the IE root stem **alā-*, and the word *աղալարի(ք)* [aʎawri(k^c)] ‘mill, grind’ from the IE **alatrijo-*. They both have the common root stem as the IE origin **al-*. Those are just the statements that Hübschmann and Adjaryan stated [*Hübschmann* 1895-1897: 414; *Adjaryan* 1971: 118].

6. Meillet pays special attention to the Armenian word *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘to grind’ and its derivatives and finds a certain connection between the Arm. *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘grind’ and the Gk. *ἀλέω* ‘mince’ [*Meillet* 1924: 4-6; 1978: 227-228]. The connection was found out even earlier, at the beginning of the last century. In one of his articles G. Aivazovsky denotes the similarity between the Arm. *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘to grind’ and Gk. *ἀλέω* ‘mince’ [*Aivazovsky* 1852: 15]. Later other authors describe the same coincidence [*Adjaryan* 1971:118]. Meillet describes this concept in its complete expression with the implementation frequency of this IE phenomenon (in IE dialects Baltic, Slav, Celtic, Italian, Albanian used the various dialects). He mentions that the northeastern group word-stem **mel-* expressed the meaning of *աղալ* [aʎal] ‘to grind’, ‘to mill’ while eastern group (Indian, Iranian, Greek, Armenian) used the word-stem **al-*. According to this the existence of the word-stems **mel-* and **al-* become an important and unavoidable attribute to distinguish the dialects in IE languages.

Recently there has been an attempt to consider the IE **h₂elhl-* as the source of the Arm. *սղսս* [*alam*] ‘I grind’ and the Gk. *ἀλέω* ‘mince’ as well as to show the IE origin of the Arm. *սսլտս* [*malem*] ‘to geld, to castrate’ from IE **m(y)elh₂-* [cf. Barton 1996: 21-27].

7. The same distinction by Meillet referred to the IE **al-*, while some Armenian words of the Indo-European origin refer to the IE **mel-*. For instance, the Arm. *սսլ-* [*mal-*] ‘to mince, to crush’ originates from the IE **mel-* which has various expressions in the Arm. *սսլել* [*malel*] ‘to geld, to castrate’, *սսւնրել* [*manrel*] ‘to grind, to crush’ (i.e. ‘reduce into small pieces’), *սսւշել* [*mašel*] ‘to wear out, to rags’, *ջսրրել* [*ǰardel*] ‘to mince, to crush, to wear out’ as well as *կրտել* [*kritel*] ‘to castrate, to emasculate’, *սսնրծատել* [*amorjatel*] ‘to castrate’, the word-stem *սսլ-* [*mul-*] with its derivatives *սլսղսղ* [*młáč*^c] ‘a mill’, *սլսլել* [*mlmlel*] ‘to rub, to scratch’, *սսսնլ* [*mamul*] ‘(printing) press’, the word-stem *սել-* [*meł-*] and its derivatives *սել-ք* [*meł-k^c*] ‘sin’ and *սել-մ* [*meł- m*] ‘mild, soft’ etc. [*Adjaryan* 1977: 255]. Furthermore there are a number of words in the Armenian dialects that originated from that special word-stem. According to this peculiarity Armenian belongs to the IE northeastern group marked out by Meillet.

8. Summarizing the historic, cultural and linguistic facts we can say that the Armenian word *սղջիկ* [*ałjik*] ‘girl; virgin’ has been originated from the form *սղիջ* [*alıj*] (< **սղիճ* [*alıč*]) and refers to the IE **al-*. Thus the word-stem *սղ-* [*ał-*] (< **սլ-* [*al-*]) of the Arm. *սղջիկ* [*ałjik*] ‘girl; virgin’ had the meaning of "to grind with grinding stones, a working homemaker". Later the meaning was narrowed from "a feminine working at the natural farmstead" to "a woman, non male child", then to "virgin, maiden", and much later to "a wicked, immoral woman". The semantic changes are the result of perpetual linguistic development. Since the 5th century the Arm. *սղջիկ* [*ałjik*] (<*սղիջ* [*alıj*] - < **սղիճ* [*alıč*]) has been used with its new meaning. The later was testified by the Armenian written traditions and acquired the exact modern meaning.

9. The new interpretation of the Arm. *սղջիկ* [*ałjik*] (<*սղիջ* [*alıj*] < **սղիճ* [*alıč*]) can be considered complete if we illustrate the *-իջ* [*iǰ*] (**-իճ* [*ič*]) particle (component) of the word.

We have several words in Armenian with the particle *-հճ* [ič], e. g. *աղաւնիճ* [aławnič] (*bot.*) ‘vervain; holy herb’, *արտիճ* [artič] (*bot.*) ‘vetch’, *լուիճ* [luič] ‘worm’, *կապիճ* [kapič] 1) ‘a measure of trade’; 2) ‘a helmet (or peel) for legs’, *կաւիճ* [kawič] ‘chalk’, *կոպիճ* [kopič] ‘gravel, pieces of stone’, *պատիճ* [patič] (*bot.*) 1) ‘peel, skin’; 2) ‘spur’; 3) ‘trunck’), *հատիճ* [hatič] (*bot.*) ‘corn’, *պատաւիճ* [patalič] (*bot.*) ‘ivy’, *ուտիճ* [utič] ‘moth’ etc.

The Armenian words with particle *-հճ* [ič] are historically and linguistically divided into several groups:

a) words which have not been etymologized yet, e. g. *աղաւնիճ* [aławnič], *արտիճ* [artič], *կաւիճ* [kawič], *կոպիճ* [kopič], *հատիճ* [hatič], *պատաւիճ* [pałatič], *պատիճ* [patič] etc.;

b) words of the IE origin, e. g. *լուիճ* [luič] (< IE **plusos*), *ուտիճ* [utič] (< IE **ōd-*) etc.;

c) borrowings from Iranian, e.g. *կապիճ* [kapič] (~ Pahl. *kapič*) etc. [cf. *Djahukyan* 1993: 257-269].

The following words of the IE origin have the particle *-հճ* [ič], the Iranian borrowing *կապիճ* [kapič] also has that special particle. We may assume that the particle *-հճ* [ič] is a later expression and the Armenian language has borrowed it from the Iranian language. The simple word-stems *կաւ* [kav] (*miner.*) ‘clay’, *հատ-* [hat-], *պատ-* [pat-] etc. in the words *կաւ-իճ* [kawič], *հատիճ* [hatič], *պատիճ* [patič] etc. support this hypothesis.

10. If in these words, with the exception of the word *կապիճ* [kapič] ‘peel’, the particle *-հճ* [ič] is not the result of Iranian influence (according to the law of analogy, which is quite difficult during affixation) we can draw a hypothesis according to which a particle similar to the Iranian ending *-հճ* [ič] was used in the pre-writing and ancient stages of the Armenian language. That particle was used in the word *աղիջ* [alič] (< *աղիճ* [alič]), as well as in *կոպիճ* [kopič] (< *կոպ-իճ* [kop-ič]) (cf. *կոպար* [copar] ‘confines, boundaries’, i. e. ‘divided, shared’) as a component and not as a derivation.

11. Thus we can assume that the Armenian word *աղջիկ* [aljik] (< **աղիջ* [alič] < **աղիճ* [alič]) has an IE origin and comes from the IE **al-* with the meaning of ‘a person working in the natural

farmstead, a homemaker'. Not previously etymologized and later derived from IE **pə-li-* form the Arm. *աղիջ* [alij] has probably originated from the IE **al-* from the historical, cultural and etymological points of view.

In this way we make corrections in the semantic (thematic) group of the Armenian vocabulary.

2. Arm. *altamult* < IE *alghi-

This word exists in the explanation of the head word *աղջամուղջ* [aġjamuġ] 'twilight, dusk', i. e. *աղտամուղտ* [aġtamuġ] 'darkness, obscurity', and *խաւար* [xawar] 'gloom; gloomy' (also 'darkness, obscurity') [see *Eremia Meghretsi* 1975: 12]. There is also a version with *ւ* [t] determinative in declined form *աղտից* [aġtic^{cl}] 'dark' (*աղ* [aġ] 'salt'), which is explained as *աղտաղտուկ* [aġtaġtuk] 'saliferous ground, salt-mine', but the main meaning bears the word *աղտ* 'dark' as salty places are very humid.

According to "The New Armenian Dictionary" the word *աղտամուղտ* [aġtamuġ] (see *աղջամուղջ* [aġjamuġ]) is explained as a place where the dark falls. Consider an example from Oskeberan: "Իբրև օրն տարածամեցաւ, և աղտամուղտ եղևն, զաղտուկ մութին զնա աշակերտքն ի քաղաքն" [ibrew awrn tarazamec^caw, ew altamuġ elen, gaġtuk mucin zna ašakertk^cn i k^calak^cn] "When the day turned into evening, and it got dark, the disciples brought him to the city in secret" [NAD, 1836: 44]. Also "*աղջաղջ*, is the same as *աղջամուղջ* [as *աղջումաղջ* or *աղտումաղտ*) and *աղտամուղտ* etc." [see *ibid*, 1836: 43]:

Adjaryan uses the root *աղջ* [aġj] 'dark' to form *արջն* [arjɛn] 'black', and at the same time he mentions that it has two more forms *աղջ աղջ* [aġj aġj] 'darkness' and *աղտ* [aġt] 'gloom, dark', which are not used separately and *աղջութիւն* [aġjut^ciwn] 'gloom; blackness', *աղջաղջ* [aġjaġj] 'fog', *աղջամուղջ* [aġjamuġ] 'twilight, dusk'; 'darkness', *աղջամղջիւն* [aġjamġjin] 'on twilight', *աղջամղջեալ* [aġjamġjeal] 'to get dark', *աղտամուղտ* [aġtamuġ] 'darkness; blackness' (see also the root *մուղտ* [muġt] which derives from it [cf. *Adjaryan* 1971: 135, 335].

It is considered as a loan word borrowed from north Caucasian languages, which in Djahukyan's opinion is not right [Джаукян

1967: 171; *Djahukyan* 2010: 39]. Djahukyan doubts about the origin of this word: "if *աղտամուղտ* [altamult] is not a compound word or a reduplication, it means there is a model of surplus sonorous, which became very common in the Armenian language later" [*Djahukyan* 1987: 252; 2010: 39].

But the word is not a reduplication for the particle *ւ* [m], but for *աւ* [am]. And this is not only true for the word *աղջաղջ* [aʃjaʃ] 'fog', but also *աղջամուղջ* [aʃjamuʃ] 'twilight, dusk', 'darkness', *աղջամղջին* [aʃjamʃjin] 'at twilight', *աղջամղջեալ* [aʃjamʃjeal] 'to turn dusk' words. Moreover the word *աղջամուղջ* [aʃjamuʃ] 'twilight, dusk', 'darkness' does not mean simply 'dark; gloom', but 'thick (bushy) dark'.

In "Dictionary of Armenian Roots" the root *մուղտ* [mult] 'ash-grey' is considered as not current and it isn't etymologized. The words *մղտանալ* [mʃtanal] 'to cover with gloom', *մղտփարսաւ* [mʃtp^carat] 'dispelling darkness', *մղտագոյն* [mʃtagoyn] 'sombre, obscure', *մղտութիւն* [mʃtut^ciwn] 'darkness, gloom', *աղտամուղտ* [altamult] 'darkness' are derived from it. It is also mentioned that: "Pokorny 2: 274 and 275 Scheftelowitz's description is denied because of the sound *ղ* [ʃ]. According to him that *մուղջ* [muʃ] 'ash-grey' originated from IE **mel-* 'black' is suspicious. It takes the independent root *մուղջ-*, which is only in *աղջամուղջ* [aʃjamuʃ] 'twiligh, dusk', which according to Adjaryan is the reduplicated nform of the word *աղջ* with surplus *ւ* [m] (Meillet also has the same meaning; see MSL 18, 253)" [*Adjaryan* 1977: 357]. This incorrect explanation has recently been considered as right [see *Martirosyan* 2010: 37-39].

There is a contradiction from the point of view of explaining *աղջամուղջ* [aʃjamuʃ] 'twilight, dusk' as a reduplicated word and a word with surplus *ւ* [m].

According to Djahukyan Arm. root *աղջ-//աղտ-* [aʃ-, alt-] 'gloom, dark' (from which *աղջաղջ* [aʃjaʃ] 'fog', *աղջամուղջ* [aʃjamuʃ] 'twilight, dusk; darkness', *աղջութիւն* [aʃtut^ciwn] 'darkness; obscure', *աղջամղջին* [aʃjamʃjin] 'on twilight', *աղջամղջիկ* [aʃjamʃjik] 'twilight', *աղտամուղտ* [altamult] 'darkness' etc.) originated from IE **alghi-* (before **alghjo-*)

[**aghl(u)-*] form. Cf. Gk. *ἀχλύς* ‘obscure; gloom, dark, darkness’, OPruss. *aglo* ‘rain’ [see *Джаукян* 1967: 171, 303 etc., *Djahukyan* 1987: 111, 207; 2010: 39], but on the other hand Armenian (*աղբա-մուղ* (?)) [(a]lja-)mułj] < IE **mōl-* [before **mulghio-* < **mughlio-* < *(*s*)*meugh-*/*(*s*)*mughlio* ‘smoke; fill with smoke’] [see *Джаукян* 1967: 171, 319 etc.; *Djahukyan* 1987: 138]. The same is (*աղբա-մուղ* (?)) [(a]lta-)muł] ‘darkness’ < IE **mōl-* [**mel-*] [*ibid*]. The etymology of these two is ambiguous, which means that the identification is impossible. The latter becomes possible for the previous etymology.

According to “The New Armenian Dictionary” Arm. *աղբամուղ* [ałtamuł] is composed of the components *աղբ* [ałt] and *մուղ* [muł], besides the etymology of the word *աղբամուղ* [ałtamuł] is not right. Like this word many other words in the Armenian language, whose components are different roots, have different structures, which means that they have undergone vowel changes or are particles (cf. *աղ-ջ-* // *նղ-ջ-* [ał-j, uł-j], *աղ-տ-* // *նղ-տ-* [ał-t, uł-t] etc.

For example:

1) Some words in the Armenian language have a reduplicated structure, moreover they can contain a simple vowel or particle *-ամ-* [-am-], or *ա* // *ա* [a, u], *ա* // *ա* [a, o] vowel alternation, or without vowel alternation. So all these words *աղբ-աղբ* [ałj-ałj] ‘fog’ and *աղբ-ամ-նղ* [ałj-am-ułj] ‘twilight, dusk’, *աղբ-աղբ(նղ)* [ałt-ałt(uk)] ‘saliferous (ground), salt-mine’, *աղբ-ամ-նղ* [ałt-am-ułt] ‘darkness, obscurity’ and *արհ-ամ-արհ(եմ)* [arh-am-arh(em)] ‘to despise; to disdain’, *այլ-այլ(եմ)* [ayl-ayl(em)] ‘to agitate; to trouble’ and *աղ-ամ-նղ(եմ)* [ał-am-oł(em)] ‘to change; to pervert’, (*բազմ*)*աղխ-աղխ* [(b)azm]ałx-ałx] ‘multichanged’ and *աղխ-ամ-աղխ* [ałx-am-ałx] ‘changed’ are of the same type.

According to Adjaryan Arm. *արհ-ամ-արհ-* [arh-am-arh] ‘shameful, vile» (from which we have *արհ-ամ-արհ-անք* [arh-am-arh-ank^c] ‘contempt, scorn’, *արհ-ամ-արհ-եմ* [arh-am-arh-em] ‘to despise, to hold in contempt’ etc.)” is reduplicated from *արհ-* [arh], which is an unknown root, as compared with *աղխ-ա-մաղխ* [ałx-a-małx], *խառն-ա-մառն* [xaɾn-a-maɾn]” [*Adjaryan* 1971: 323].

2) Dulaurier was right, when he separated the particle *-ամ-* [am] in the word *արհ-ամ-արհել* [arh-am-arhel] ‘despise, hold in contempt’, also *արխ-ամ-արխ* [arx-am-arx] ‘changed’, *հեղձ-ամ-ըղձ(ուկ)* [helj-am-əlj(uk)] ‘close, stuffy; suffocating’ [Dulaurier 1870: 125-129; see Adjaryan 1971: 323].

3) There are many words originated by the same model, in which there exists the particle *աւ-* [-aw-] instead of the particle *-ամ-* [-am-], also *այլ-այլ(եւ)* [ajl-ajl(em)] ‘to agitate, to trouble’, *աղ-աւ-աղ(եւ)* [aʎ-aw-aʎ(em)] ‘to distort, to pervert’, etc.

According to Adjaryan the Arm. word *աղաւաղ* [aʎawaʎ] ‘distorted, perverted; spoiled, weak (body)’ is reduplicated from the form *աղ* [aʎ] of the word *այլ* [ajl], which is not used separately, so the old form of this word is *աղեւաղ*, the same is true for the word *այլայլել* [ajlaylel] ‘to agitate, to trouble’ (= *այլեւայլել* [ajlewaylel]) ‘id.’, which originated from IE **alio-*: cf. Gk. *ἄλλος* ‘other; another’, Lat. *alius* ‘other; another’, Goth. *aljīs* ‘other; some other’ etc. [Adjaryan 1971: 122, 168- 169; Djahukyan 1990: 10, and 2010: 48].

4) For the Arm. word *արխ // ախ* [arx, ax] ‘lock; ring; property’ Adjaryan mentioned *արխսամարխ* disregarding Dulaurier’s opinion. As to Adjaryan this root is not etymologized (“*անստոյգ*” [anstoyg]) [Adjaryan 1971: 131-132].

5) The compound word *հեղձամղձուկ* [heljamʎuk] ‘stifling; suffocating’ is derived from the word-root *հեղձ* [helj] ‘throttle, stifle’ and is formed by the components *հեղձ-ամ-(ը)ղձ(ուկ)* [helj-am-(ə)ʎj(uk)]. According to Adjaryan’s dictionary the Arm. word-root *խեղդ* [xeld] ‘strangle’ with *խանդ // խանձ* [xand, xanj] ‘jealousy’, also *նախանձ* [naxanj] ‘envy; envious’, *փոխանդ // փոխանձ* [pʰoxind, pʰoxinj] ‘the flour of fried and ground wheat’, *խանդ* [xind] ‘joy, gaiety’ // *խանդ(ո)* [xanj(oʎ)] ‘give a coarse laugh’, (*metaph.*) ‘seductress; dissolute, licentious’) etc. are not etymologized.

6) According to Adjaryan the Arm. root *աղամող* [aʎamoʎ] ‘perverted’ has an “ambiguous meaning, and that is ‘go astray; move a side; bend, warp; stray’. The meaning is seen from

աղաճնդի verb" [Adjaryan 1971: 119]. The right meaning of this word is driven by the authors of "The New Armenian Dictionary" describing it as *այլ-ու-այլ* [ayl-um-ayl] 'diverse, various; different', *այլ-ել-այլ* [ayl-ew-ayl] 'id.', where the verb group *լ* [l] // *ղ* [ɣ], particle *-ու-* [-um-] and conjunction-particle *-ել-* [ew-] are separated [see NAD, 1836: 89].

There also exists the word *այլ(ք)* [al(k^c)] 'depth, deep (place)' which give rise to the word *այլուց* [aluc^c] 'interior, deeper'. In his "Dictionary of Armenian Roots" Adjaryan mentions that this word is found not only in Eznik's work "Disproof of Sects", but also in Petros Duryan's poem 'Lamentation', which remained erroneous in further publications [Hambardzumyan 1990: 4, and 1991: 2]. This word can also be found in S. Roshka's dictionary. Adjaryan does not give any etymology, but presumably it originated from IE **alio-*.

7) Arm. *անդ-ունդ* [and-und] 'abyss, gulf' has a simple structure, but it is accepted as a word with negative particle *ան-* [an-] and unexact root **դունդ* [dund] 'ringing; sound' (in Adjaryan's dictionary it is mentioned with asterisk) which is wrongly said to have originated from IE **dhundhos*. Cf. Gk. *ἀβυσσος*, Oslav. *bez-dŭna*, Russ. *бездна*, Germ. *ab-grund*, Gaul. *an-wfn* etc., that by no means is not right [see Adjaryan 1971:190].

We have the Arm. word *մնջ* [unj] 'under; depth; floor' which is a version of Arm. root *անդ* [and] 'piece of ground; place' with distinction *ա* // *մ* [a, u] and *դ* // *ջ* [d, j]. It is used in old Armenian, for example: "Յորժամ յաջ ոտնս յենուի, զաջ լեառն ընդ գետին տանէի, յորժամ ի ձախ ոտնն յենուի, զձախ լեառն ընդ գետին տանէի: Ապա հարցանէր քազարոն Պարսից Շապուհ եւ ասէ. աղէ՛ տոր ինձ գիտել. ո՞վ եմ լերիմքն այնքիկ՝ զորս դու ընդ *մնջ* տանէիր" [Yoržam yaǰ otns yenui, zaǰ leaŋn ənd getin tanēi, yoržam i jax ottn yenui, zjax leaŋn ənd getin tanēi. Apa harc^canēr t'agaworn Parsic^c Šapuh ew asē: ałē, tur inj gitel: ov en lerink^cn ajnok^cik, zors du ənd unǰ tanēir?] "When I used to stand on my right foot, the right mountain was splashed under the ground, when I turned on the left foot, the left mountain was splashed. Then King Shapuh of Persia asks: Let me know, which were the mountains you splashed?" [Phawstos Buzand 1987: 260].

3. Arm. *ašan* < IE *(e)s-en

1. There are lots of phenomena in the Ancient Armenian vocabulary that have been preserved and nowadays they are either of rare and specific use in literary or in dialects as names of narrow application. They comprise some words belonging to the thematic subgroup of agriculture (farming) and naming certain phenomena connected with harvest. They have old origins and mainly come from IE: *uʒ* [aš] (*bot.*) ‘granule, grain (wheat corn)’ [see *Qadjuni* 1892: 17], *uʒuʒ* [ašan] ‘thresh, threshing’, *uʒuʒuʒ* [ašaraj] (*uʒuʒuʒuʒ* [ašoraj]) (*bot.*) ‘rye’, *qupḥ* [gari] (*bot.*) ‘barley’ (< IE **gh̥r̥i̯o* or **g^(h)ri-*) [*Djahukyan* 1987: 128; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 656], *qilqil* [glgil] (*dial.*) (<**qhl-qhl* [gil-gil]) and *qinl* [glul] (<**qhl-qnl* [gil-gul]) (*dial.*) (*bot.*) ‘great millet’, *ḡuʒ* [dan] (*dial.*) (*bot.*) ‘grain to grind’, *ḡuʒ* [kal] (*ḡuʒ-u-tl* [kal-s-el]) ‘to beat the grain’, *ḡnḡtuʒ* [koreak] (> *ḡnḡtl* [korek]) (*bot.*) ‘a kind of grain; millet’, *ḡuḡuʒ* [hačar] (*bot.*) ‘spelt, german wheat’, *ḡuʒ* [hask] ‘ear, ear of grain (corn)’, *ḡuʒḡtl* [hatik] (> *ḡuʒ-ḡtl* [*hat-ik*]) (*bot.*) ‘grain’, *ḡnḡtuʒ* [c°orean] (> *ḡnḡtl* [c°oren]) (*unḡnḡtl* [*sor-un*]) (*bot.*) ‘a kind of wheat’, *ḡḡuʒ* [k°ist] (*bot.*) ‘awn, deard’ etc.

These and some other similar words are still considered as “non-etymologized words” (Adjaryan). The etymology of another group of words from different sources has in some way been clarified.

2. The Arm. *uʒuʒ* [ašan] ‘thresh, threshing’ is an agricultural and farming lexeme, connected with harvest and presume corresponding work may be still preserved in a number of dialects (Araratyan, Mush, Alashkert, Kharabał, Goris etc.). There is a derivative word *uʒuʒḡtl* [ašanel] ‘to harvest, to thresh’ which exists in subdialects too (the same dictionary) [cf. *Hambardzumyan* 1997: 38].

3. In the dialectal dictionaries the following definitions are given for the word *ւշււնի* [ašanel] ‘to harvest, to thresh’: a) wheat to hay, b) to fill the cereal crop into the thresh ground to thresh [see *Amatuni* 1912: 384; *Adjaryan* 1912]. The word hasn’t been a matter of etymological study before.

Recently Djahukyan has conducted etymological study on the word *ւշւն* [ašan] explaining the word with the same way as Adjarian did [*Djahukyan* 1993; 22-23; 1994, 75-76]. But A. Margaryan objects to both explanations stating that the word has the meaning of “threshing the hay in the turf” and its derivation *ւշւնի* [ašanel] bears the meaning of “to thresh the hay in the turf” [see *Margaryan* 1994: 72-74].

It is necessary to mention that the definitions for these words are rather precise and they derive from their application in dialects. That’s why they don’t completely express the meaning of the root word form of their origin which is connected with the word *ւշմն* [ašun] ‘autumn’. Djahukyan’s observation is acceptable that this word was used in ancient (pre-literary) period and it could have been connected with the word *ւշմն* [ašun] ‘autumn’ reasoning that it is in autumn (*ւշմն* [ašun]) that people start the harvest ‘*ւշւն*’ [ašan] [*ibid*, 22].

The word *ւշւն* [ašan] denotes both “the cereal crop and anything to thresh” as well as “the action of threshing, to turn the hay from time to time and then make a pile”. According to it the words *ւշւն* [ašan] ‘to thresh, threshing’ and *ւշւնի* [ašanel] ‘to thresh, to harvest’ denote important work connected with the harvest and that work precedes beating off the grain kernels and cleaning the grain (give to the air by a pitchfork’; cf. Arm. (*dial.*) *էրնի* [ērnē] ‘beat off the grain’. Now it is hard to say what time period or part of the year this phenomenon was specific to; at the end of summer or the beginning of autumn or at quarter of the year unfamiliar to us when the harvest took place (with its old meaning “in autumn”).

4. As we mentioned before the word *ւշւն* [ašan] is not included in Adjarian’s etymological dictionary and the first etymology of the word belongs to Djahukyan. According to it the

word a) is probably connected with the word *աշուն* [ašun] ‘autumn’, b) it is noted the latter is usually compared with its Russ., Pruss. and Goth. forms, c) he denies the IE. prototypes **es-en/r-*, **os-en-r-* which are based on Slav., Balt., Germ. At the same time Djahukyan reminds about his previous suggestion, i.e. the IE prototype **oskhon* “which is the most probable but not pure” [Djahukyan 1993: 22-23]. Djahukyan restructures the IE form **oskhg* for the word *աշուն* [ašun]. This issue is very significant and worthwhile for further investigations.

5. We may assume that the Arm. (dial.) *աշուն* [ašun] originated from the IE **(e)s-en* ‘time of reaping’; ‘summer’ [cf. *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 691, 868]. The authors who have improved the restructure of IE **(e)s-en* bring the following parallels from the related languages: Gk. (Hom.) *ὄπ-ὥρη* ‘the end of summer’; ‘autumn’; ‘reaping period’, Goth. *asans* ‘crop’; ‘summer’, OHGerm. *aran* ‘harvest’ (Germ. *Ernte*), Pruss. *assanis* ‘autumn’, Oİc. *qnn* ‘harvest’, ORuss. *осень* (Abl. Sing. *осени* ‘in autumn’), Hitt. *zena-* ‘autumn’ (Dat.-Abl. *zeni* ‘in autumn’) [*ibid*: 691]. The Arm. (dial.) *աշուն* [ašun], also *աշունի* [ašanel] and the root-word *աշուն* [ašun] in other words must have originated from the IE **(e)s-en*.

4. Arm. *artaxoyr* (< *art* ‘out’+**xōδ*) < IE **ar-(t^{hl}o)-*

1. There are a number of Armenian words that have apparently been a matter of attention but they haven't received their complete etymology yet. One of them is the word *արտախոյր* [*artaxoyr*] ‘shawl; covering’ mentioned in the extract from the Ancient Armenian epic work “The Desire of Lady Sathenik” written by Movses Khorenatsi. In the original text the word is used in the following form:

“Տենչայ Սաթինիկ տիկին տենչանս՝/
Չարտախոյր խաւարս եւ զտից խաւարծի”
[Tenč^{ay} Sat^{inik} tikiⁿ tenč^{ans}/
Zartaxoyr xawart ew ztic^{awarci}]
‘Queen Sat^{inik} had great desire for the
vegetable *artakhur* and the shoot tits’
[*Khorenatsi* 1913: 84]³.

This fragment as we have mentioned is a piece of metaphor, and the simile is achieved according to the pagan mentality [*Hambardzumyan* 1995: 227-236]. It is necessary to remember that it is a good example of *բամբարակ երգեր* [*bambarak erger*] ‘dissolute (amoral) songs’ in the Armenian epic work [see *Ter-Mkrtchyan* 1979: 131; *Дюмезиль* 2001: 58-65].

2. There is a lot of philological, linguistic and source-study estimation literature on the elucidation of this fragment. Adjaryan studied this problem not only as a separate unit but also connected it with its bibliographical value [*Adjaryan* 1908: 124; 1971: 340-

³ See *Moses Khorenats'i*, History of the Armenians, translation and commentary on the Literary Sources by R.W.Thomson, London, 1978, p. 122.

342] though there were several views which remained out of Adjaryan's notice.

3. Some of linguist-philologists considered the word *արսուխոյր* [artaxoyr] 'shawl; diadem' as a borrowing which was influenced by some word-structure changes. We agree with K. Patkanyan's opinion that "all the translators accepted the initial *q* [z] as a particle of Accusative (Objective) case. Only P. de Lagarde [see *de Lagarde* 1877: 53] states *զարսուխոյր* [zartaxoyr] 'shawl; diadem' and compares it with Pers. *zardachwar* 'covering'" [*Patkanyan* 1882: 240; cf. *Musheghyan* 2000, 41-44, 81-82].

P. de Lagarde states that the particle *q* [z] is undividable from the word stem and it was derived from the Persian word *zardxau* ('name of a flower') and it is nothing but the distorted (as Adjaryan used to express: "perverted") form of the word *zardxwar* [*de Lagarde* 1877: 53]. Hübschmann as we know denies de Lagarde's etymology stating that "the etymology and the application of that word is still obscure" [*Hübschmann* 1895-1897: 150]. Later, comparative-linguists such as Adjaryan and Djahukyan avoid to give the etymology of the word considering it a word impossible to elucidate thus giving no opinion on the existing view (e.g. de Lagarde, Hübschmann etc.) [*Adjaryan* 1971: 340-342; *Djahukyan* 1987: 367].

4. We think that the word *արսուխոյր* [artaxoyr] 'shawl; diadem' is not a derivative word but it is a compound one and it consists of *արսու(w)-* [art(a)-] 'out' used in Proto-Armenian [cf. *Adjaryan* 1971: 340, column 2, up. 6] and *խոյր* [xoyr] 'diadem; tiara' (cf. *սարսուխոյր* [apaxurel] 'to uncover the head'. The word *արսուխոյր* [artaxoyr] 'shawl; diadem' came from the dictionary by Eremia Meghretsi not in that exact form but as *արսուխոյրակ* [artaxurak] 'external wreath, or condition' [*Eremia Meghretsi* 1975: 41]. In the "Dictionary of the Armenian Language" by Mkhithar Sebastatsi *արսուխոյր* [artaxoyr] 'shawl; diadem' is given as *արսուխոյրակ* [artaxurak] 'external wreath, or condition' which is explained in the following way: "This word comes from the word *խոյր* [xoyr] which means 'headpiece, i.e. hood or crown' etc. And hence *արսուխոյրակ* [artaxurak], i.e. visible headpiece

which is called (dial.) *մէնտիլ* [mēntil] ‘headpiece’ (was worn by noblemen on their heads)” [*Sebastatsi* 1749: 112].

5. The word *արտ* [art] ‘out (of house); pasture; threshing’ was used in Literary Armenian much later or exactly during the Post-classical Armeninan, when *արտ(u)-* [art(a)-] ‘out’ was turned into a prefix. In Hellenistic (Greecized) Armenian (after 460 AD) it was used as a prefix (equivalent to Gk. *ἐξ-*, *ἐξ-*; cf. with *ἐχπνέω* ‘to exhale’, *ἐχφέρω* ‘to articulate’ etc. which was much later used in Latinized Armenian (the equivalent of Lat. *ex-*; cf. *ex-portō* ‘I win, take, carry’, *exemplum* ‘example, exponent’, *experientum* ‘experience, habit’ etc). Those words are used in Modern literary Armenian.

However, we come to the conclusion that Arm. root *արտ-* is a native word that first of all has to have the meaning of ‘to put, to carry, be close, to unite’ the issue form IE **ar-(t^ho)-* that in its general meaning meant ‘to suit; to unite’. In ritual and legal meaning it meant ‘be proper, decorous; be correspondent to’ (cf. M. Khorenatsi’s expression “*որպէս օրէն է թագաւորաց*” [orpēs orēn ē t‘agaworac‘) ‘as a rule for kings’ [*Khorenatsi* 1913]. Cf . Hitt. *ara* ‘by a rule’, ^{UL}*ara* ‘it not lawful, its unjust’, ^D*Ara* ‘Result’, ‘Right’ [cf. Arm. *Արտ Գեղեցիկ* [Ara Gelec‘ik] (mythological name)]⁴, OInd. *ṛá-* ‘holy law’, ‘right, order’, Avest. *arəta-* ‘law’, OPers. *arta-* ‘law’, ‘right’, ‘holy right’, Gk. *ἄριστον. δίκαιον* ‘just, justful’, ‘righteous’, etc. [see *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 810].

6. According to Hübschmann the word *խոյր* [xoyr] ‘oriental crown, wreath, headpiece, hood’ is a borrowing from Iranian < Pahl. **xōδ*; cf. Av. *xaōda-* ‘helmet’, OPers. *xauda-* ‘hood, Parth. *xwd* and *xūd*, Pers. *xōi* ‘helmet’, Afg.. *xol*, Os. *xodā*, *xūd* ‘hood’ etc. [*Hübschmann* 1895-1897: 160; *Adjaryan* 1971: 392; *Djahukyan* 1987: 527; *Периханян* 1993: 9-11 etc.]. The Iranian forms were joined to make Lat. *cūdo* ‘canvas’, ‘helmet’ and they became the IE **squeu-* ‘cover’.

7. According to that the first part of the word *արտախոյր* [artaxoyr] ‘shawl; diadem’ is a native word, the second one is an

⁴ In this context the king’s name *Արտ Գեղեցիկ* [Ara Gelec‘ik] may have totally a different comment which we will discuss later.

Iranian borrowing of IE origin. Thus we can assume that it was not a complete borrowing but only the second part was borrowed, i.e. the word has an Armenian structure joint with *-u-* [-a-].

8. In the extract of our interest the word *արքայոյր* [artaxoyr] ‘shawl; diadem’ is used with the meaning ‘something outer, round, spheral’, which in the context metaphorically means “testicle or testicles”. It is worthwhile mentioning that in his “Dictionary of Armenian Roots ” [Adjaryan 1971:339-342; 1973: 392] Adjaryan emphasizes the word *արքայոյր* [artaxoyr] only using the meaning of the word from the original work by Khorenatsi which is explained in a different way. It is the same as the word *արքայոյր* [artaxoyr] in Agathangeghos’s work [Agathangeghos 1909: 7]. Those words are mentioned as different functions in Adjaryan’s "Dictionary of Armenian Roots” and it seems that we deal with two different words of *արքայոյր* [artaxoyr]. We don’t agree with the statement. In reality Agatangeghos used the word *արքայոյր* [artaxoyr] with its initial meaning while Khorenatsi used it as a metaphor, not the exact meaning of the word. Thus it is not so accurate to mention this single word as an expression of different words in Adjaryan’s dictionary. Both Agathangeghos’s and Khorenatsi’s works testify the applications of this word in its direct (and unfortunately no evidence is preserved) and metaphoric meanings.

5. Arm. *astuac* < IE *Has-t'ieḡ-os

1. The Arm. *uuunniwð* [astuac] ‘god’ hasn’t had a complete and accurate etymology. Along with this word the Arm. *utʰr* [tēr] ‘master, ower; lord’, *gʰrʰtʰl* [c^oerek] ‘day; daytime’, *qʰhʰtʰr* [gišer] ‘night’, *uʰrʰtʰuuquw* [arewagal] ‘sunrise; dawn’, *uʰuʰrʰuʰmʰu* [mayramut] ‘sunset, sundown’ and others have ancient (very old) origin. The Armenian apostolic church gave new meanings to these names at the same time preserving the antique meanings of those and other similar words.

The word *uuunniwð* [astuac] ‘god’ belongs to the original layer of our language and corresponds to a number of parallel forms of related languages. We follow the variative linguistic principle while reconstructing the root words and words linking to it [*Hambardzumyan* 1998; also 1999; *Амбарцумян* 2001: 21-22].

a) The detailed study of the analyses of the existing observations, philological, etymological and source study interpretations denote that the works about the Armenian word *uuunniwð* [astuac] ‘god’ cannot be considered complete and precise [cf. DAL,749; NAD,1836-1837; *Adjaryan* 1971, 280-281; *Hilmarsson* 1983: 5-15; *Djahukyan* 1986: 51-52; *Hamp* 1984: 87-89 etc.].

b) The interpretations of the ancient authors are merely the slight descriptions of the word *uuunniwð* [astuac] ‘god’ (*uuunniwð* < *uuun* and *wð* or *ʰwð* [ēac], *wqʰm* and *wð* [azdu ac], *wqʰniwð* [azduac], and *hʰuuʰnhʰ* [hastič^o] or *uuun* [ast] ‘creator, maker’, *juʰuʰnhʰu wðnhʰ* [yastis acol] ‘id’, *uu-* [as-] ‘to say; word and giving breathe’ and *unniwð* [tuac] ‘giver’, etc.) [cf. *Adjaryan* 1971: 281].

According to the opinion of succeeding authors the Arm. *uuunniwð* [astuac] has Iranian, Thracian or Phrygian, Urartian and

other origin [cf. *Hilmarsson* 1983: 5-15; *Djahukyan* 1987, 274]. More accurate views are considered by the authors who tried to see the particle of **unni* [*tu- (or **unniwə* [*tuac]) (cf. *unhu* [tiw] ‘day, daytime’) as a separate component and connected it with the data of the other languages. We mean the approach of the old scholar Karapet Shahnazaryan, and new author V. Pisani [cf. *Adjaryan* 1971: 280-282; *Pisani* 1969: 257-269 and "Handēs amsoreay" ("Monthly magazine") 1961: 549-562].

c) V. Pisani reconstructs the form **ag'i-diy-ag'* for the Arm. word *wuunniwə* [astuac], Djahukyan considers only the IE particle **diy-* and accepts the interpretation of (*h*)*wuunniwə* [(h)astuac] ‘confirmer, establisher’ [see *Pisani* 1969; *Djahukyan* 1986: 52]. The previous researchers see connection between the Armenian words *wuunniwə* [astuac] and (*h*)*wuunniwə* [(h)astuac] but it is a possible hypothesis not a final or an accurate view. Those who accept this view don’t state any protoform. H. Pedersen following Kluge’s ideas mentions some forms from related languages [cf. NAD 1836: 320; *Pedersen* 1906: 239, 243, and 1982: 107, 111; *Adjaryan* 1971, 281 etc.].

d) G. Melikishvili tries to connect the Arm. *wuunniwə* [astuac] ‘god’ with the Urart. *Aštiuzi* ‘god; picture of god’ which occurs in one of the cuneiforms of Argishti. We can believe the reverse too, i.e. the source of the Urart. *Aštiuzi* ‘god; picture of god’ is the form Arm. *wuunniwə* [astuac] [cf. *Melikishvili* 1980: 35-36; *Djahukyan* 2000: 128]. In this case Urartian form *Aštiuzi* expresses the phonetic state of the Armenian word (compare *u* [s] > *ʔ* [š], *m* [u] > *hni* [iu], *ə* [c] > *q* [z] contradiction) which can also have the factor of the specifics of cuneiform writing.

2. The variative forms of the Armenian writing and pre-literary stages can certainly become a matter of origins and typological studies of languages due to their forms (phonetic) and meanings (the name of the subject/object). Consequently, the Arm. *wuunniwə* [astuac] ‘god’ can get its etymology based on both form (morphologic) and semantic (a name of a concept specific to the ancient world) with the help of the Armenian inner resources and thus establish new data among the related languages.

3. The Arm. *սուսուած* [astuac] ‘god’ is not a simple but a complex compound. As for the phonetic and semantic comparison with the Indo-European languages it becomes real in a sense of their original meaning and also typology of that single word. In the most ancient Armenian vocabulary it had first and foremost significance because of the social structure and spiritual understanding of the world of myths and legends. The data of the myths and legends of the related people is extremely essential for the new variative interpretation of the word under examination. They have got their parallels and associations in the traditions preserved in the Armenian written and oral monuments.

a) We distinguish the particle **unniած* [*tuac] in the Arm. *սուսուած* [astuac]. Cf. Hitt. *šiyaz* ‘daytime divinity’, Pal. *tiaz* ‘idem’, Luv. *Tiyat*-‘the god of the heaven’, OInd. *Dyáuḥ* ‘heaven’, Gk. *Ζεύς* (Gen. *Διός* ‘god’), Lat. *deus* (OLat. *Diouis*) ‘god’ etc. [Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 36, 46, 223, 226-227, 242, 897₂].

This form is also comparable because originally it refers to such forms of the related languages that express the concepts of ‘god’ carrying the meanings of ‘to light’, ‘to shine’, ‘to radiate’, ‘to seem’, ‘to appear’ [see Watkins 1974: 101-110; Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 791].

Therefore, the Armenian names **unniած* [*tuac] and (*uu*)-*unniած* [(as)- tuac] must have initially denoted ‘light’ and ‘to light’.

b) We can also separate the root-word **unni* [tu] (articulated **unni* [tou]) which is parallel to the Hitt. *šiuš* (acc. *šiuṇ*, gen. *šiuṇaš*); comp. Arm. *Սուսու-ար* [Sanas-ar] ‘mythological name; god’(?), perhaps and *Սիւն-իք* [Siwn-ik^c] ‘toponymic name’(?), Luv. ^D*Tiyaz* ‘god’, OInd. *Dyáuṣ* ‘god’(also *dyāñh* ‘sky’; comp. Urart. *Diauḫi*, which is a borrowing from Mitanian or through the latter from Armenian), Gk. *Ζεύς* ‘the god of the sky’ (gen. *Διός*, Mik. Gk. *di-we*), OLat. *Diouis* (gen. *Jouis* ‘Jupiter’, Osc. *Diúvei* ‘to Jupiter’ etc. [Гамкрелидзе/Иванов 1984: 227, 791; Weitenberg 1984: 172-179].

c) As we see most of the above mentioned meanings of ‘the god of the sky and the sun’ in related languages are proper names. As a

common name they have the IE *t₁yeu- ‘god’; cf. OInd. *devá-* ‘god’, Av. *daēva-* ‘demon’, Lat. *deus* ‘god’, *di-vus* ‘divine’, OIr. *dia* (gen. *dé*) ‘god’, Olc. *tívar* ‘gods’, Pruss. *deiws* ‘god’, Lith. *diēwas* ‘god’ etc. [see *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 791]. Most probably this word is the source of the Arm. *դի-ք* [di-k^c] (<**uñ-ti* [ti-ew], articulate **uñ-tim* [ti-eu]) ‘gods’ [cf. *Djahukyan* 1986: 49].

d) These forms along with the root word variations **t'eiu-* and **t'iu-* are separated from the IE unity. IE **t'iu-* ‘god’ expresses the concept of ‘day’ [*Pisani* 1969: 257-269; *Djahukyan* 1986: 52] and it best was expressed in Anatolian languages as well as in Armenian. Cf. Anat. **Tiu-* (Hitt. *Šiu-*, Luv. **Tiça-*, and *Tiçat-* ‘the god of the sun’, Pal. *Tiça* etc.) as well as (according to me) Arm. *uñu* [tiu] ‘daytime’, ‘a part of the day’ and Urart. *Šivini* ‘god’ (mythological name), Hurr. *Šimigi* etc. [see *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 792; *Djahukyan* 1986: 45, 48-49; *Амаякян* 1982: 141-143; *Нмакякян* 1990: 44-45; *Нмакякян/Грекякян* 2010: 3-19]. In other languages this root-word has the following expressions: OInd. *diva-*, *divya-* ‘divine’ (e. g. Arm. *uñnřǫtawli* [tuəñjean] ‘daytime’, articulated **uñnřǫtawli* [touəñjean]), Gk. *δῖος*, Lat. *dius* (**diuos*) ‘devine’ etc. [see *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 242].

e) Hence, Armenian and other languages have ancient expressions for the three variative states of the reconstruction of the Indo-European proto-language with different stages of the root word formation. They can be analyzed by means of utilizing the applied variability in root word structure.

4. Above we separated root-word **uñi* [tu] in the form **uñiuð* [tuac] (articulated **uñni* [tou]) as basic particle, so the particle *-uð* [-ac] occurs as a separate element. We don’t have any accurate explanation of its word forming (base forming) value in the earliest or antique Armenian. The same can be said about the origin of that particle [cf. *Djahukyan* 1998: 5-45 etc.].

a) We suppose the Armenian particle *-uð* [-ac] has IE origin and it can be confirmed with the latest data about the comparative linguistics and the method of variative assessment of the data. The Armenian particle *-uð* [-ac] originates from the IE morpheme **-os*

which along with the particle **-s-* as nominative ending has syntactic and semantic value in the IE languages. So T. Gamkrelidze and V. Ivanov not independent from K. Shilds, find that the IE endings **-os-* and **-s-* are attributes for the classified group of living-beings while the group for not living-being gets the IE ending **-om*. Then, for the first case we have an active class and for the second case we have a passive (object) one. They are simply the attributes (endings) for the nominative and objective cases [see *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 272*].

b) Accordingly the Arm. **unniwð* [tuac] leads to the IE **t'eḡos* (and **t'ieḡ-s*) 'god'; cf. OInd. *deváh*, Av. *daēva* 'demon' (initial meaning), Lat. *dīvus* 'god', OIc. *Týr* 'the god of war', Lith. *diēvas* 'god' etc. [cf. *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 46, 271-272, 799* etc.].

c) The Arm. **unniwð* [tuac] was not used separately in Old Armenian (Grabar) manuscripts, but the form *uuunniwð* [astuac] 'god' supposedly comes from Pre-Grabar (ancient or prehistoric) period. In Old literary Armenian such structure was considered as a separate word though it must have had lexical (syntactic unit) value before. The word *uuunniwð* [astuac] is comparable with the complex word *unniwot* (*unniwot*) [arawot (arawawt)] 'morning' not only for its semantic but also for its syntactic-practical function.

5. The particle *uu-* [as-] in the word *uuunniwð* [astuac] (<*uu-unniwð* [as-tuac]) as a separate root word probably originates from IE **Has-* 'shrine; source of fire, fire (the main idea 'sun')'. In traditional comparative etymology that root word is presented without guttural feature, i.e. 'fire', 'to burn' and 'to dry', 'to turn into ash', 'ash' in which the semantic variant is the Indo-European root word **as-* [*Pokorny 1959-1969: 3-4*]. We have a number of Armenian root- words that bear the variants of the IE **Has-* or **as-* (cf. *uquqtł* [azazel] 'dry, get dry', *uðhł* [ačiwñ] 'ashes, cinder', *nuñhł* [ostin] 'arid, dry' etc.) [see more details in *Hambardzumyan 2002: 30-31*].

6. The Arm. *uuunniwð* [astuac] (*Uunniwð* [Astuac] 'God' at the Christian period) has IE origin for which we reconstruct the form **Has-t'ieḡ-os*. It is a derived form and its components have

their correspondence in the other IE languages, especially in Anatolian languages.

a) Consequently the form **Smiuð* [Tuac] which was shaped during the Armenian earliest or antique period can be considered as a correspondence to Anatolian, Indo-Iranian, Greek and other forms; cf. Hitt. *Šiyaz* (< **Šiy-az*), Pal. *Tiyaz* (< **Tiy-az*), Luv. *Tiyat* (< *Tiy-at*), OInd. *Dyáuh* (< **Dyá-uḥ*), Gk. *Ζεύς* (< *Ze-ús*, Gen. *Διός* < **Δι-ός*), Lat. *deus* (OLat. **Diou-is*), Mik. Gk. *di-we* etc.

b) Keeping impartial to the discussions of the application of such forms and their phonetic correspondences we have to mention that the form **unniuð* [tuac] (as a mythologic name **Smiuð* [Tuac] derives from the Armenian form **unni-* [tu-] and it is probably the name of the Indo-Eueopean origin ‘the supreme power’ (initially ‘light’, later ‘God’) that in Pre-Grabar (ancient or prehistoric) period has got its semantic and variative forms ‘sunlight’, ‘daylight’, ‘source of light’, ‘abode’ and ‘lighter’.

c) The etymological-typological analyses of the Arm. **unniuð* (> **Smiuð*) [tuac (Tuac)] as a mythological name (the name of supreme divinity, i.e. theonym) can be a matter of a special study when it will be discussed comparative-variatively with such names as are *ψιτνβλ* [p^cɛɾɛk] ‘crack’, *ψιτηλ* [p^cɛɾk] ‘curtain, wall of a tent’, etc. The structure of the Arm. *uuunniuð* [astuac] as a word unit was considered an independent phenomenon with its certain connotation and application at a later period but not later than the 5th century A.D. That’s why many authors in different countries try to find any explanation to that word and find out its primary meaning.

6. Arm. *galgal* < IE *k^{(h)l}el-

The Arm. *qunqun* [galgal] ‘wheel, gathering, appearance’ evidently has a double formation [*Eremia Meghretsi* 1975: 61]. We cannot find it separately in Adjaryan’s “Dictionary of Armenian Roots”, perhaps, for being reduplicated word. [*Adjaryan* 1971]: Djahukyan’s “Armeinian Etymological Dictionary” lacks *qunqun* [galgal], but it has the form *qun(q)unql* [gal(g)alql] ‘enlarge; make large’ referring to *qunquql* [galgazil] (misprint, in case of *qunquql* [galgatil]). No other evidences of this word’s origin and formation exists (see also *qunql* [galql] ‘cover; conceal; keep’) [*Djahukyan* 1987: 155, 199 etc., and 2010: 146-147]:

It is a doubled complexity with the root *qun-* [gal-] the main meaning of which is ‘whirl’ whereas in the original it is explained as ‘wheel’.

If for the root *qun-* [gal-] we understand ‘rotation’ as a universal meaning, then it may also include not only ‘wheel’, but also other two meanings of ‘gathering’ and ‘discovery’.

The same meanings are for *uujl* [sayl] ‘an old wheeled transportation’, (main meaning is ‘pulled by an ox a rough carriage’, (*metaph.*) ‘Great and Little Bears’ constellation’, as well as ‘North or North Pole’, ‘axis, shaft’, ‘a kind of musical sound’ etc.) and *qujqulh* [galgali] (*dial.* *q’ulq’ulh* [g’alg’ali]) ‘two-wheeled one shaft transportation’ that come from the IE *k^{(h)l}el- ‘turn around, move’, ‘wheel, wagon’: cf. OIr. *cul* ‘cart’, OIc. *hvel* ‘wheel’, Pruss. *kelan* ‘idem’, Latv. *du-celis* ‘two-wheeled’, OSlav. *kolo*, (*gen.*) *kolese* ‘wheel’, Lat. *colus* ‘winch’, ‘spinned thread, yarn’ etc.

From the IE *k^{(h)l}el- we also have the *k^{(h)l}(e/o)k^{(h)l}o double root form having genealogical reflection not only upon Armenian but also other languages of Indo-European family: cf. Toch. A

kukäl ‘cart’, Toch. B *kukale* ‘idem’, OInd. *cakrá* ‘idem’ (in R̥gveda-) ‘sun wheel - wheel’, Gk. *κόκλος* ‘circle’, ‘wheel’, Phryg. *κίκλην* (Hesich.) ‘a cluster of constellations’, and ‘cart’ etc. [Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984:718-719; *Hambardzumyan* 1998: 34-38].

It should also be mentioned that it is common with the pronunciation of Arm. *q//u* [g, s], also *η //l* [ł, l]: cf. *qայթ-ել* // *սայթ-(ւթ)-ել* [gayt^c-el, sayt^c-(ak^c)-el] ‘stumble’, *ջիլ* // *ջիլ* (*dial. ճիլ*) [jil, jil] ([čil]) ‘nerv; tendon, sinew’, as well as post lingual and palatal sounds.

The word *գաղգալ* [gałgał] in the sense of ‘gathering’, ‘appearance’ is closer in form to the words *գաղգալայ* [gałgałay] ‘clear appearance’, *գեղգեղ* [gełgeł] ‘turning’, ‘turn’, as well as *գաղաղել* (<**գաղ-գաղ-ել*) [gałałel(< gał-gał-el)] ‘abhor’. These words are subject to a different discussion [see *Eremia Meghretsi* 1975: 61- 64]:

Derivationally the abovementioned words are identical to the Arm. *սայլ* [sayl] ‘cart’ [*ibid*].

7. Arm. *əmpem* < IE *p^(h)oH(i)-

The Arm. verb *ըմպել* [əmpel] ‘to drink (a refreshing liquid)’ in Adjaryan’s “Dictionary of Armenian Roots”, is similar to the root *մմպ* [ump] ‘mouthful; sip, gulp, drink’. In Old Armenian (Grabar) manuscripts it appears also as *ըմբել*, *ըմպել*, *ըմբել*, as *ըմբաւն*/*ըմպաւն* ‘the upper part of the mouth; the pharynx’ and as *թերումպ*/*թերումբ*, etc. It generally exists in the words having the *p//պ* [b, p] and *ւ//ւ* [n, m] phonetic changes [see *Adjaryan* 1977: 599-601].

In the part of the root history Adjaryan presents the attempts of the past. The most notable of them are the opinions of Petermann, P. de Lagarde, Hübschmann and Charpentier. However, their explanations are incomplete. Thus, according to Adjaryan, the origin of the word is unknown.

He also mentions that Petermann separates the particle *ըւ-* of the root and the other part generates from OInd. *pa-* ‘drink’. After that de Lagarde compares it with the OInd. *pa-* ‘drink’, and the Gk. *πίνω* ‘I drink’.

According to Adjaryan, these are forms generated from IE **po-* // **pi-*. Cf. OInd. *pa-*, also *pibami* ‘I drink’ (Indic. Pres. 1 pers.), Arm. (Gyp.) *բիել* // *պիել* [biel, piel] ‘drink’, Gk. *πίνω*, (Eol.) *πώνώ*, *πεπώκα* (Indic. Perf.) ‘to drink’, *ποσις*, *πώμα* ‘drunkenness’, Lat. *bibo* (< **pibo*) ‘drink’, *pōtus* ‘drink; beverage, liquor’, OIr. *ibim* ‘I drink’, OCim. *iben* ‘a drink’, Corn. *evaf* ‘to drink’, OPruss. *pouit* ‘to drink’, OSlav. *piti*, Russ. *numь* ‘to drink’, Alb. *pī* ‘to drink’ etc. Then, the following is mentioned: “In this rich linguistic family, only Armenian has no coresponding word to it. The form *ըմպել* is mentioned with its *p* sound (i.e. sound value - V. H.) which resembles the IE *pō-*//*pōi-*//*pī-*, however, it does not go into details” [*ibid.*: 599].

It is noteworthy that these "details" are the subject of later discussions.

Then, comes Hübschmann's comparison with IE **pō-// *pī-*. However, as Hübschmann and Adjaryan claim, this comparison remains abstained [see *Hübschmann* 1883 (Arm. vers. 2004: 197); *Hübschmann* 1897-1898 (Arm. vers. 2003: 447)].

Later on, S. Tervishyan made a partly correct description in the etymology of *múy* [ump]. He mentions that it comes from the IE **pō-// *pī-* by means of inversion, with the determinative *ú* [*n*] (**ym* [pu] > **my* [up] > *múy* [ump] 'mouthful; sip, gulp, drink'). Adjaryan does not admit Meillet's version, as he mentions, "a smart explanation", especially as H. Hübschmann rejects it. Charpentier connects *múy* [ump] 'mouthful; sip, gulp drink' with IE **pō-// *pī-*, too. But he mentions that first there has taken place repetition of the root IE **pop-* and addition of the particle **popmo* and then inversion **pompo*. This is the origin of the word *múy* [ump] which is incredible [see *Adjaryan* 1977: 600].

Adjaryan focuses his attention on the dialectal and childish forms of this root. Thus, in some dialects we find *múp* (Kharberd, Nor Nakhitschevan), *ṛúṛḥq* [əmbig] (< *ṛúyḥq* [əmpik]) (Arabkir) 'a small drop', in child language *ṛni* [bu], *ṛniw* [bua], *ṛḥu* [biva], *ym* [pu], *ṛúym* [əmpu] 'water', *ṛḥq* [əməg] (the latter is found in the Svedia dialect child language). Moreover, there is an opinion, that the existing dialectal form *múṛm* [umbu] 'water' in other languages is a loan word from Armenian.

Perhaps, not independently Zolta tries to find another solution to the etymological problem of the word *ṛúyḥú* [əmpem] 'to drink', that's why, first he separates the word into *ṛú* and *yḥú* components correspondingly bringing them to IE **anti* 'before; in front of' or **ndhos* 'under' and IE **pō(i)-// *pī-* 'drink' forms [see *Djahukyan* 1987: 52, 144, 187, 244-245 etc.; *Solta* 1960: 90-91]. Zolta may have suggested such an approach basing on Petermann's and Adjaryan's data.

Meantime he finds that reconstruction of earlier forms of *ṛúyḥú* is rather difficult. We suggest thematic reduplicated present tense like in the forms OInd. *pibati*, OIr. *ibid* 'drinks', Lat. *bibō*

(**pi-bō*) ‘I drink’ passing on **pibeti* > **hipeti* and later adding *ընդ* (**ընդ-հիպետ*) > *ընդտ* [ənd-hipe > əmpɛ]. The word *նմույ* [ump] was formed on the Armenian type by the help of the analogical reconstruction of *ni* [u]: cf. *նւնդ* ~ *ընդաւրնյու* [und - əndaboys] ‘innate’, *նւնչ* ~ *ընչաւք* [unč^c - ənč^cac^ck^c] ‘moustache’ on the basis of the pair types [*Djahukyan* 1987: 187].

But for the forms IE **anti* ‘in front of; before’, **ndhos* ‘under’ the following is mentioned: “Pre-Arm. **andi-* (**əndi-*?) (IE **anti-* ‘in front of; before’ and **ndhos* ‘under’: the last is used in the declined form) > OArm. *ընդ* [ənd], it is rarely used in confusion with *դ* and *ւ* for *ընւ* (before the vowels), *ըւ-* [əm] (before the labial consonants) and *ըւ-* [ən] (before the other consonants); as a preposition it expresses the senses of IE **anti-* (‘in front of, in stead of’, ‘with, together’) and **ndhos* (‘under’), the last one is mostly used in the instrumental case” [*ibid*: 244].

The etymological study was carried out in the same way in traditional comparative linguistics [cf. *Martirosyan* 2010:277-279].

However, a lot of work has been done in the field of comparative, etymologic-typological study where there are some references towards Armenian facts, which can be used more widely than before if we take into consideration facts in all language forms. The etymology of the word *ընդտ* [əmpɛm] is a similar step based on the modern investigation data that enlarges the possibility of wide usage of Armenian facts.

So the later researchers suggest that for the meanings of ‘to drink’ and ‘to swallow (the liquid)’ in general indoeuropean language there are two different bases, IE **ek^{[h]o-}* and **p^{[h]oH(i)-}*.

In the first case cf. Hitt. *ekuzzi* ‘(he/she/it) drinks’ (3th pers. pl. *akuyanzi* ‘(they) drink’, Luv. *aku-*, Hier. Luv. *aku-*, Pal. *ahu* ‘drink’, Toch. AB *yok-* ‘to drink’, and for meaning of ‘water’ Lat. *aqua* ‘water’, Goth. *aha* ‘river’, OIc. *áger* ‘sea god’.

In the second case cf. Hitt. *paš* ‘swallow’, Gk. *πίνω* ‘I drink’, *πώθι* ‘drink (imper. form)’, as well as Gk. *πώμα* ‘drank, drinking’, OInd. *Pibati* ‘drinks’, Lat. *bibō* (< *bibēre*) ‘I drink’, OIr. *ibid* ‘drinks’, Pruss. *poieiti* ‘drinks’, OSlav. *pijo* ‘I drink’,

Alb. *pi* ‘to drink’, Arm. *ըմպեմ* [əmpɛm] ‘drink’ [cf. *Mayrhofer* 1963: 286-287; *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 702-703].

It is supposed also that initially the IE **ek^{[h]o}* means ‘drink (water)’, and the IE **p^[h]oH(i)-* ‘drink (juice, honey, wine, sweet, etc.)’ [see *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 703]. Note that this option is better expressed in Armenian, e.g. cf. *խմել* (ջուր) [xmel (jur)] ‘drink (water)’ and *ըմպել* (ոգելից խմիչք) [əmpel (ogelic^c xmič^ck^c)] ‘drink spirituous liquid’.

There is a quite delicate difference of meaning in these two Armenian roots. In Armenian water, as a beverage is saturating, meanwhile honey, vinegar, wine, alcohol, etc. as a beverage in a wider sense are spirituous juices: comp. on one hand Arm. *ջուր խմել* [jur xmel] ‘drink water’ and *գինի ըմպել* [gini əmpel] ‘drink wine’, on the other hand - Arm. *բաժակ* [bažak] ‘glass’ and *ըմպանակ* [əmpanak] ‘goblet; tumbler’ (also *գալափ* [gawat^c] ‘cup; wine glass’, *կթղայ* [kt^clay] ‘wine glass’) etc. Moreover, water is a common liquid, while others are used in different cases, like in rituals, parties, etc. This is evident in all stages of Armenian.

Thus, more real bases are created to etymologically and typologically analyze a great number of Armenian word-roots that have or have not been explained. These word-roots are word forms that refer to the spheres of general Armenian literary language, dialects, child language and natural sounds.

Basing on this we suggest that this IE **ek^{[h]o}*- generates the following roots and root forms expressed by Armenian explosive and fricative deaf consonants *q* // *χ* [k, x]. Cf.:

a) *խում*- [xum] ‘to drink; drink’, *խոխոմ* [xoxom] ‘gorge, ravine’, *խոխոմել* [xoxomel] ‘to water; to irrigate’, *խոխոմն* [xoxumn] ‘murmuring, gurgling’, *խոխոյ*- [xoxoj] (also *խոխոյ/խոխոյն* [xoxoj, xoxonj]) ‘(voice of water) grumbling; murmuring, gurgling etc.’, *խոխոտիլ* [xoxotil] ‘to dare; to attack, to assault’, *խոխում* [xxum] (*dial.*), and *խոխմել* [xxmel] (*dial.*) ‘to swallow; to gulp down, to absorb’ etc. [cf. *Adjaryan* 1973: 386-387; *Djahukyan* 1967: 119]. Here the first component (root) is the *խո-//խո-* [xo-, xu-], while *մ-* [m-] is another type of component.

b) *Կում*- [kum-] ‘(one) drink; mouthful», *կմկմալ* [kmkmal] ‘stammer, falter; stutter’, as well as *մկկալ* [mkkal] (*մրկ-մրկ-ալ [mæk-mæk-al, with metathesis) ‘sound of goat (kid)’, *կմուկ* [kmuk] (*dial.*) (*anat.*) ‘upper part of the throat up to the alveolar ridge; palate’ [cf. *Adjaryan* 1973: 658; *Джаукян* 1967: 148, and *Djahukyan* 1987: 591 etc.]. The first component here is the root *կմ*- [ku-], while *մ*- [m-] is the same component.

Coming up to this we stress the following:

1) Many of the words presented up to now have no certain or any etymology, the other part has been considered either as a natural sound word (root) of less significance than other types of words (roots) or as a loan word from other languages.

2) The comparative analysis helps us to speak in favor of loan words and words of similar sound formation being local.

3) Thus we can conclude that the units in comparison derive from IE **ek^{[h]o}*- root, the reconstruction of which is more evident based on family languages and especially Armenian. This has been practiced lately, especially using the principles of differential-typological analyses.

IE **p^[h]oH(i)*- ‘drink (juice: honey, wine, syrup etc.) gives birth to Armenian word *քսւտւ* ‘I drink’, where we can separate the components *քմ*- (<**քմ*) [əm- (<*ən)] and *տւ*-(*ւ*) [pe-(m)]. They have a great many versions not only in literary Armenian, but also in the dialects. *Adjaryan* also brings examples from Armenian dialects and child language: *մւք* [umb] (Kharberd, Nor Nakhitshevan), *քմքիգ* (< *քմսիկ*) [əmbig (< əmpik)] (Arabkir) ‘a small drop’, *քմ* [bu], *քմա* [bua], *քի-վա* [bi-va], *քմ* [pu], *քմքմ* [əmbu] ‘water; drink’, also *քմքմգ* [ənbuɡ] ‘drink; beverage; liquor’ (Svedia). In the language of Armenian Gypsies once again according to *Adjaryan* we have the words *քիել* [biel], *քիել* [piel] ‘to drink’ [cf. *Adjaryan* 1977: 599-600].

First of all Armenian component *աւ*- [an-] in the meaning of ‘to, on (towards)’, is also known in forms of *ամ*- [am-], *քմ*- [əm-], *քն*- [ən-] that have local conventionality due to the pronouncing quality of the primary component of the next syllable. Cf.:

a) Arm. *ձեռն* [jeɾn] ‘hand (human part of body)’, literally *անձեռնոցիկ* [anjeroc^ɕik] ‘(table) napkin, serviette’ used for hand cleaning, a handkerchief, paper, etc.’ but *կող-* [kol-] resulting from main root **կողի* (< *կողն*) [kolin (< koln)] with generative stem *անկողի* (also *անգողի*, *ընկեղի*, *ընգողի*) [ankolɪn (angoɪn, ənkelin, əngoɪn)] ‘place to lie down’. Cf. also Arm. (*dial.*) *գողի-ք* [golin-k^ɕ] (Karin, Alashkert), *գողի-ք* [g^ɔolin-k^ɕ] (Akhaltskha), *գողեք* [golēnk^ɕ] (Tbilisi) etc.

b) Arm. *բարձրաց* [barnam] ‘rise; lift, raise, pick up; stand up; uplift’ from the word (*h*)*ամբարձրաց* [(h)ambarnam] ‘(whole) rise up, ascend; mount’, while *բերեմ* [berem] ‘bring, fetch’ derives from the word (*h*)*ամբերեմ* [(h)amberem] ‘be patient, have patience; sustain, stand, endure’, *համբերություն* [hamberut^ɕyun] ‘patience, endurance’ etc.

This particle *ամ-* [am-], by the way, is generally viewed as a variety of the component *համ-* [ham-] «a widely used prepositional particle» without the particle *h* [h] [*Adjaryan* 1977: 17-18] being considered as a Persian loan word (Av. *hama-*, OPers. *hama-* ‘same, like whole’, etc), illustrated by the examples *ամբարձրաց* [ambarnal] ‘rise, go up’, *ամբարձում* [ambarjumn] ‘rise, go up’ and other similar words. The same can be viewed in the case of *համ-* [ham-] (expletive) [*ibid.*: 18], examples are *համբարձրաց* [hambarnal] ‘rise, go up’, *համբերեմ* [hamberel] ‘be patient, have patience’, etc.

In this case it may seem that we study the sound changed form of the native particle (< IE **an-* ‘on, to, together’) which is a general heritage in Persian and Armenian introduced as a separate reflection.

c) Arm. *ծիլ* [ciwɫ] (cf. *ծիլ//ծեղ*, *ծիլ* [cil, ceɫ, ciɫ] etc.) ‘firewood, brushwood; shrub’ from the word *ըն-ծիլ* (<*ըն-ծիլ*) [ən-jiwɫ (< ən-ciwɫ)] ‘sprout, shoot; bud, leaf-bud’, of which perhaps, the stems *ձու-* [ju-] (cf. *ձու* [ju] ‘egg’, *ձագ* [jag] ‘(bird or mammal youngling) young one’ etc., from the form *n // u* [o, a] and *l // q* [w, g] the change) ‘result, follower’ we have *ըն-ձու-իմ* (< *ըն-*

ծու-իւ) [ən-ju-im] (< ən-cu-im] ‘sprout, shoot; arise, spring up’, and from this particle and the root *կալ-* [kal-] ‘catch’ (<IE *g^u-əl-) we have *ըն-կալուլ* [ən-kalul] ‘perceive; take in’, *ըն-կալուլ* [ən-kaluč^c] ‘receiving; receiver’; (*metaph.*) ‘fiance, bridegroom’ etc.

The traditional opinion on this case states that this particle derives from *ընդ* [ənd], when it is expressed mainly by an explosive consonant, either with a root or word that begins with a vowel. Cf. *ընկեր* < *ըն(դ) - կեր* [ənkɛr < ən(d)-kɛr] ‘friend’, *ընկղմել* < *ըն(դ) - կղմել* [ənkɪmɛl < ən(d)-kɪmɛl] ‘dip (in, into)’, *ընթեր* < *ըն(դ) - թեր* [ənt^cɛr < ən(d)-t^cɛr] ‘near; by’ (cf. *առընթեր* [arənt^cɛr] ‘attached to, under; by, near’, *ընթերսկայ* [ənt^cɛrakaj] ‘assistent’) etc. This viewpoint is not complete and overall in his statement.

However in this case we confront three types of changes:

1) Reflection of IE derivative root or a part of the stem *ընդ* [ənd]. Cf.: *ընթանալ* ~ *ընթ - աճալ* [ənt^canal] ‘run; go’ (< IE *sent- ‘go’);

ընծայ (also *ընձայ*) [əncay (ənjay)] ~ *ընծ(//ձ) - ալ* [ənc(/j)-aj] ‘present, gift; dedication’ (< IE *eng’həti);

ընդեր (cf. *ընդերք*, also *ընտերք*) [ənder (ənderk^c, ənterk^c)] ‘entrails; bowels’ ~ *ընդ(//տ)-եր* [ənd(/t)-ɛr] (< IE *entero- ‘entrails; guts, bowels’);

ընկենուլ [ənkɛnul] ‘throw, throw about; pull, overthrow’ ~ *ընկ - ենուլ* [ənk-ɛnul] (< IE *sengt- (*senk-);

ընթեռնուլ [ənt^cɛrnul] ~ *ըն-թեռնուլ* [ən-t^cɛrnul] ‘read (aloud)’ (< IE *ter- ‘call; voice, give tongue’) etc.

2) Formation mainly refers not to the last particle of the final element *դ* [d], but to the version *ըն* [ən] for (*ը* [ə] instead of *ա* [a]) of the particle *աճ* [an], a complexion is formed from the unity of endemic or loan word root. Cf.:

ընկղմել (<*ըն-*, no *ընդ*)- *կղ* (<*կուղ* <**կուլ*)-(ւ)ել [ənkɪmɛl (<ən, no ənd)- kɪ (<kuɪ <*kul)-(m)ɛl] ‘submerge, sink; plunge into water’ (< IE *g’ul- ‘deepen, become deeper; go deep into’);

ընթեր (< *ըն*, no *ընդ*)-*թեր* [ənt^cɛr (< ən, no ənd)-t^cɛr ‘near; by’ (< IE *pter- (*pet-) ‘leaf, sheet; blade?’) [see *Djahukyan* 1987: 144, 212] etc.

3) The connection of this endemic or loan-word root particle. Cf.:
ընդգրկել (<*ընդ* - *գրկել*) [əndgrkel (<ənd-grkel)] ‘embrace, envelope; include, cover’;

ընդարձակ (<*ընդ*-*արձակ*) [əndarjak (<ənd-arjak)] ‘spacious, roomy, expanded; wide, vast’;

ընդհանուր (<*ընդ*-*հանուր*) [əndhanur (<ənd-hanur)] ‘general; universal, common’;

ընդունակ (<*ընդ*-*ունակ*) [əndunak (<ənd-unak)] ‘able, capable (of)’ etc.

d) From Arm. *բռնել* [brnem] ‘take or hold in the hand’ we have *ըմբռնել* (<*ըմ*-*բռնել* < **ըմ*-*բռնել*) [əmbbrnem (< əm-brnem <*ən-brnem)] ‘take, understand’, (*metaph.*) ‘good, thoroughly’, *ըմբռնում* (<*ըմ*-*բռնում* < **ըմ*- *բռնում*) [əmbbrnum (< ən-brnum <*ən-brnum)] ‘understanding; take up (by mind)’ etc.

e) Also, we think, that the variant *ում*- [um-] which is the component (**ում*-*պե*-*մ*) [um-pe-m] is found in the word *ումպ* [ump] being a parallel to the particle *ըմ*- [əm-] (*ըմ*- *պե*-*մ* [əm-pe-m]).

According to Djahukyan this distinction comes from the IE prefix **an-* ‘on, upon (of slope)’ and it is doubtful that “there is the same prefix in (*h*)*ամբառնամ* [(h)ambarnam], *համբերել* [hamberem], *հանուր* [hanur] words which are mixed with Persian prefix (*h*)*ամ*- [(h)am-], (*h*)*ան*- [(h)an]. It’s not difficult to see the variants of the same particle (**nō*/**nə*) in *նախանջ* [naxanj] (cf. *խանդ* [xand], *խանջ* [xanj]), if it has Persian origin” [Djahukyan 1987: 245].

It is remarkable that in the case of *ան*- [an-], *նա*- [na-], and *-իճ* [-ič], *-ուճ* [uč], *-աճ* [-ač] (cf. *աղիճ* [aħič] ‘seductress’, *կալիճ* [kawič] ‘chalk’, *բրդուճ* [brduč] ‘a slice of bread’, *պարկուճ* [parkuč] ‘cartridge-case’, and *պատիճ* [patič], *արճիճ* [arčič] etc.) affixes coincide in Armenian and Persian, because they are cognate languages, affixes are not borrowings.

We think that the roots which have labial explosive *p* [b] consonants are descended from IE **p^(h)oH(i)-* ‘drink (jouce’ honey, whine, etc)’.

a) Arm. *hhuṣpnjp* < (*h*)-*uuṣ-pn-jp* [hamboyr < (*h*)-am-bo-yr] ‘touching of lips (to someone or something)’ for a long time the word has been considered as one with unknown origin, but according to Djahukyan it is descended from Persian ham-bōδ (cf. Sogd. (Manich.) *’nβyδ* (**ham-baudaya-*) ‘to kiss’ form and it is a borrowed word in Armenian [Adjaryan 1977: 25; Djahukyan 1987: 530; Hambardzumyan 2003: 41].

We can think that the root of this word is *pn-* [bo-] having a prefix and suffix.

1) There is *h* [h] intensive augmentum with the suffix. Cf.:

lm- [lu-] (*lm-p* [lu-r] ‘news, piese of news’, *lubl* [lsl] ‘hear, listen (to)’) > *h-lm* [h-lu] ‘obeying’;

qop- [zor-] (*qop-p* [zor-k^c] ‘army; forces’, *qop-ulūw* [zor-anal] ‘grow strong; become stronger’) > *hqop* [hzor] ‘strenth, courage’;

uyurun- // *uyurδ-* [part-, parc-] (*uyurδ-ulūp* [parc-ank^c] ‘pride’, *uyurδ-tūw* [parcenal] ‘to be proud of’) > *huuyurun* [hpart] ‘boast’;

ūmun- [mut-] (*ūmun-p* [mut-k^c] ‘entrance’, *ūn-ulūtl* [mt-anel] ‘enter’) > *h-ūmun* [h-mut] ‘keen’;

ulwuj [skaj] < *h-ulwuj* [h-skay] ‘strong, great, courageous (person)’;

ultl [skel] < *h-ultl* [h-skel] ‘work, stay guard awake, be attentive’ etc.

2) On the other hand *-(j)p* [-(y)r] with the last stressed syllable, which is probably descended from IE particle **-tero* < *-t(o)-+ero-* (?). Cf. *hhuunnjp* [hastoyr] (< *hhuun*) [hast] ‘very strong’, *ūpnjp* [nk^coyr] ‘sieve; boulder’ (< IE **neik* ‘sieve; sift’), or IE **-er/or* particle: cf. *unwjqn* [taygr] ‘brother-in-law’, *pnjp* [k^coyr] ‘related in kinship (of brother)’ etc. [Djahukyan 1987: 236-237, 239]:

b) According to Hübschmann and Adjaryan Arm. *pṭruwī* (**uṭr-p-wī*) ‘mouth’ word is descended from IE **bher-* ‘make a hole; cut’, which has similarities in Lith. *burna* ‘mouth’, Gk. *φάρυγξ* and Lat. *frumen* ‘throat’ forms, which means ‘hole; opening’. As

Adjaryan mentions Hübschmann wasn't sure and he compared it with Arm. *puh* [bah] 'spade; oar', *p̄hp* [bir] 'pointed wood; pick' [see *Hübschmann* 1897: 427, 429-430; *Adjaryan* 1971: 392-393, 441-442, 452].

This word is often used not only in Old Armenian, but also in Middle and New Armenian, moreover sometimes with component *ըն-* [ən-] in *ըմբերանել* [əmberanel] 'reduce to silence' word. For example: “Քանզի բազումք են անհնազանդք, զրախաւսք եւ մտախաբք, մանաւանդ որ ի թլփատութենէ անտի են, զորս պարտ է *ըմբերանել*, որք զամենայն տունս կործանեն, եւ ուսուցանեն՝ զոր չէ արժան, վասն զաւշարարութեան” [K^canzi bazumk^c en anhnazandk^c, zraxawsk^c ew mtaxabk^c, manawand or i t^clpatut^cenē anti en, zors part ē *əmberanel*, ork^c zamenayn tuns korcanen, ew usuc^canen, zor č^cē aržan, vasn zawšak^całut^cean] ‘There are also many rebellious people, idle talkers and deceivers, especially those of the circumcision; they must be silenced, since they are upsetting whole families by teaching for sordid gain what it is not right to teach’ [*Bible* 1895: 1192]:

If we take into consideration the fact that sound **uht-* [*pe-] > *pt-* [be-] interchange belongs to prewritten period we can suggest that Arm. *բերան* [beran] means ‘opening of the lips’ and not exactly as ‘hole, opening’. In this case the etymology of the word coincides with Hübschmann’s followers opinion (Walde, Boisacq, Trautmann, Adjaryan etc.).

In Old Armenian there is a word *ըմբերանել* [əmberanel] ‘prove, demonstrate; convince, persuade (to); force, oblige’, which according to Adjaryan has **ընդ-բերանել* [*ənd-beranel] structure, yet we do not accept it as possible [*Adjaryan* 1971: 442].

According to H. Pedersen there are only few words in IE starting with consonant **p*. Many linguists agreed with him, others not, but during the last decade it was offered to review the plosive consonant system of Indo-European languages giving way to glottals [see *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 703; *Джаукян* 1982: 59-67 etc.]. For that reason Armenian consonant system is considered

to be essential and preserving archaic features [see *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 16-17]. Djahukyan brings additional facts (words and word roots) in IE **p* that are seemingly reflected. This fact must surely be admitted to solve this problem [*Джаукян* 1982: 61-62].

The etymology of Arm. *ըմպեմ* [əmpem] <IE **p^[h]oH(i)*- ‘drink’ is completed with IE **p-*, which has general comparative value not only for the Armenian language, but also for the study of Indo-European languages.

8. Arm. *kamn* < IE *ak^[h]men

1. There is a number of Armenian words from the semantic group ‘agriculture, vegetation’ that have IE origin, e.g. *անի* [and] ‘field, meadow’, *արոր* (< *արար*) [aror (<arawr)] ‘plow’, *արտ* [art] ‘cultivating area’), *գարի* [gari] ‘barley’, *եղան* [elan] ‘a farming tool’, *կորի* [kori] ‘stream in the field’, *հերկ* [herk] ‘ploughed land’, *գաբ(ան)* [c^oak^o(an)] ‘a farming tool’ etc.

The names of the crops, the toponyms, means of their cultivation were very significant for IE languages. Thus, the vocabulary about that area was rather substantial. There are a great number of such kind of words in Armenian [see *Adjaryan* 1940; *Djahukyan* 1987: 212-213]. For a lot of Armenian words the IE origin has not been confirmed yet or are of unknown origin.

The Arm. *կամն* [kamn] ‘thresher, beate’ also has an IE origin.

2. Given in Old Armenian sources, the word *կամն* [kamn] occurs twice with forms, e.g. *կամնև* [kamun] (*acc. pl.*), *կամնացն* [kamacⁿ] (*gen.-dat., abl. pl.*) [see *Oskeberan* 1826: 745; *Buzand* 1987: 220 *etc.*].

Philologist A. Vardanyan considers the abovementioned form of *Buzand* *կամնացն* [kamacⁿ] as a mistake and makes *կամնացն* [kamanc^o] a correction in the original text regarding it as *կամն* [kamn] in nominative case, *կամնևք* [kamunk^o] in plural nominative, *կամնաց* [kamanc^o] in plural genitive case which must be accepted as an accurate view [*Vardanyan* 1921: 410-411]. This word is used with its derivations such as *կամնասայլ* (<*կամնասայլ*) [kamasaylk^o (<kamasayl)] ‘threshing-cart’, *կամնասայլից* [kamasaylic^o] (*gen. pl.*) ‘threshing-cart’, *կամնավար* [kamnavar] ‘drive of threshing(?)’ etc. [*The Bible, Yesay*, 15: 10-11; *Zaqaria Sarkavag* 1870: 83].

3. Adjaryan considers the word *կամն* [kamn] as a “non-etymologized” word though he tries to connect it with similar forms of related languages such as OSlav. *зоумьно* ‘threching floor’, Russ. *зѹмнѠ* ‘threching floor’ and others because, as he mentioned, “according to Pogodin [see *Berneker* 1: 362]” those words are derived **gumīno-* in which **g^u-* < IE **g^hōus* ‘cow, ox’, *mīnō, mēti* = Lith. *minù, miñti* ‘to tread’ [*Adjaryan* 1973: 502; cf. *Фасмер* 1986: 474]. In his time A. Meillet denied this kind of genetic connection [see *Adjaryan* 1973: 502].

Applying this existing etymological attempt, Djahukyan states that *կամն* [kamn] originated from IE **gem-* ‘to catch, to press, to smash’ and *կամ* [kam] from IE **g^hm-* [*Джаукян* 1965: 256].

The same root stem precedes to Arm. *ծվել* (<**ǵ(h)ǵ-l-tl*) [čmlɛl (< č(i)m-l-el) ‘smash’, and OScand. *kumla* ‘to smash, to break, to press’, Russ. *жать*, (sing. 1) *жму* ‘press; squeeze’ etc. Later the part of *կամ* [kam] in the Arm. *կամախարել* [kamaharel] ‘express’ associates with the root stem *կամն* [kamn] or *կամ* [kam] [*Adjaryan* 1973: 500].

In this case we should mention that:

a) A. Vardanyan’s philological correction of regarding it a misspelling of the word *կամսցն* (< *կամ*) [kamacⁿ (<kam)] is ignored;

b) Associating the form *կամն* [kamn] to IE **gem-* and non-correct form *կամ* [kam] to IE **g^hm-* is theoretically correct but practically not acceptable;

c) The root words *կամն* [kamn] and *ծվ-(լ)-(ել)* [čm-(l)-em] are not correlated, similar to the look of correlation between ‘to beat’, ‘to thresh’ and ‘to press’, ‘to smash’. Otherwise we have to prove the original associations of the phonemes *կ* [k] and *ճ* [č] as variations of the same root word.

Later Djahukyan considered the etymology of the word *կամն* [kamn] not accurate, consequently he questioned them as “a doubtful form” and the sign (+) denoted more credible [*Djahukyan* 1987: 125]. Those phenomena are expressed in the dictionary of J. Pokorny and Adjaryan [*Pokorny* 1959-1969; *Adjaryan* 1973: 502]. Later in one of his works Djahukyan mentions “Without knowing the origin of *կամն*

[kamn] ‘thresher’ it is impossible to assert if *u* [m] belongs to the root word or the suffix” [Джаукян 1982: 116-117, 222].

4. In our opinion the Arm. *ղամլի* [kamn] originated from the IE **ak^[h]men* ‘stone’ as a noun with *-li* [-n] base: cf. OInd. *man-* ‘stone’, Lith. *акмиõ, акмиõs* ‘stone’, OSlav. *kamy* ‘stone’ [see Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 112, 184, 297].

It is necessary to mention the following:

a) As a rule IE **k^[h]* turns into Arm. *g* [c^c], *u* [s], *ʒ* [š] and in rare cases into *ղ* [k].

IE **k^[h]ak^[h]*- > Arm. *guʒu* [c^cax]; cf. OInd. *śākha* ‘branch’, Lith. *šakā* ‘branch’, Slav. *socha* ‘spike’, ‘plow’, *posochŭ* ‘cane’, Goth. *hōha* ‘plow’;

IE **k^[h]er-* > Arm. *uʒun* [sirt] ‘heart’; cf. Hitt. *ki-ir* ‘heart’ (gen.) *kar-di-a* ‘of the heart’, Gk. *καρδία* ‘heart’ and OInd. *śrad* (< *śrad-dhā*) ‘to believe’;

IE **k^[h]u(e/o)n-* > Arm. *ʒmli* [šun], (gen. sing.) *ʒulī* [šan] ‘dog’; cf. Cun. Luv. *šu-wa-nā-i* ‘dogs’, and OInd. *ś(u)nā*, (gen. pl.) *śūnas*, Lith. *Šuõ*, (gen.) *šuiõs*, Gk. *κύων*, (gen.) *κυνός* ‘dog or dog’s’ etc., as well as the Arm. *ւղմւղ* [skund] ‘dog, doggie’; cf. Lat. *canis* ‘dog’, OIr. *cú*, (gen.) *con* ‘dog’;

IE **suek^[h]ru-* / **suek^[h]uro-* > Arm. *uʒtunŷ* [skesur] ‘mother-in-law’; cf. OSlav. *svekry* ‘mother-in-law’, Lith. *šėšuras*, OInd. *śvāśura*, Gk. *ἐκνρός* ‘mother-in-law’, Goth. *swaihrō* ‘mother-in-law’ etc. [Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 94, 97, 100, 112; Джаукян 1967; Szemerényi 1964: 291; Илич-Свитыч 1961].

b) It is known that the same association with its regularities and exceptions is connected with the IE dialect group *centum* and *satəm*. In this case the IE back lingual palatal **k^[h]* corresponds the Armenian plosive *ղ* [k] and fricative *ւղ* [sk] as well as spirant *ʒ* [š] consonants [cf. Абаев 1956: 286-307, 293].

There is a completely different approach that attempts to connect Arm. *ւղմւղ* [skund] (< IE **k’ouon-to*) with Khot.-Sak. (Scyth.) or Scyth.-Slav. languages [Абаев 1965: 21-22].

9. Arm. *sayl* < IE *k^hel-

1. The Arm. *սայլ* [*sayl*] ‘ancient wheeled vehicle’ is used in two different ways in the manuscripts; with its basic and metaphoric meanings;

a) ‘a rough cart driven by oxen’:

“Եւ դու զայս հրաման տացես. առնուլ յերկրէս Եգիպտացոց *սայլս* մանկանց եւ կանանց ձերոց, եւ առեալ զհայրն ձեր ածիցէք” [Ew du zays hraman tac^{es}: aṛnul yerkrēs Egiptac^{woc} *sayls* mankan^c ew kanan^c jero^c, ew areal zhayrn jer acic^{ēk}] ‘You are further charged to say, “Do this: take wagons from the land of Egypt for your little ones and for your wives, and bring your father, and come’ [*Bible, Gen. 45: 19*];

“Եւ արարին այնպէս որդիքն Իսրայելի. եւ ետ նոցա Յովսէփ *սայլս* ըստ բանիցն Փարաւոնի արքայի” [Ew ararin aynpēs ordikⁿ Israyeli: ew et noc^a Yovsēp^c *sayls* əst banicⁿ P^arawoni ark^{ayi}] ‘The sons of Israel did so and Joseph gave them wagons according to the instruction of Pharaoh, and he gave them provisions for the journey’ (*Bible, Gen. 45: 21*) etc.;

b) ‘Big and Small Dippers’:

“Որ արար զԲազմաստեղսն եւ զԳիշերավարն եւ *զՍայլն* եւ զշտեմարանս հարաւոյ” [Or arar zBazmastelsn ew zGišeravarn ew z*Sayln* ew zštemarans haraway] ‘Who made the Bear and Orion, the Pleiades and the chambers of the south’ (*Bible, Job. 9: 9*);

“Բազմաստեղք եւ գիշերավար եւ *սայլք* յիշին փոխանակ ամենայն աստեղաց” [Bazmastelk^c ew gišeravar ew *sayld* yišin p^ooxanak amenayn astelacⁱ] ‘Recalls the Constellation and Venus instead of (all) other stars’ (see *NAD, 1837: 692*);

“Հիւսիսային աստեղքն, որ յոմանց արքտորոս կոչին, իսկ յոմանց հեփտաս ազրոն, իսկ յերկրագործաց *սայլ*, եւ ի նաւավարաց բազմոյք” [Hiwsisayin astelkⁿ, or yomanc^c

arketoros koč^cin, isk yomanc^c hep^ctas agron, isk yerkragorcac^c *sayl*, ew i nawavarac^c bazmoyt^c] ‘The brightest star in the northern celestial hemisphere, called by some people Arcturus and by other – Heptas Agron, and by cultivators carriage or cart, by sailors it was termed as multitude (constellation)’ (*Ibid.*).

c) ‘north or northern pole’:

“Եղջիւրքն (սեղանոյ) առ չորս կողմանս աշխարհիս խոնարհեալ յառին. յարեւելս եւ յարեւմուտս, ի միջօրեայ եւ ի սայլն” [Ełjıwrk^cn (sełanoy) ar č^cors kolmans ašxarhis xonarheal yařin. yarewels ew yarewmuts, i miřoreay ew i *sayln*] ‘The edges of it (table) – namely, the “horns” directed towards the cardinal: towards the East, towards the West, towards the Meridian, and towards the Cart’ (*Ibid.*),

d) ‘axis’:

“Իբրու առ հաստատունն իմն սայլն զարագաշրջանակին խաղացմունս շուրջանակի վարելով” [Ibru ar hastatun imn *sayln* zaragařjanakin xałac^cmuns řurjanaki varelov] ‘As some cart that rotates speedily around itself’ (*Ibid.*) etc. [cf. *Adjaryan* 1979: 169; *Malxaseants* 1945: 180].

2. The thorough etymological attempt of the word *սայլ* [*sayl*] belongs to E. Liden (see “*Handēs amsoreay*” 1905: 192). According to him the word was a borrowing from Phyr. **satilja*. His idea was accepted by his followers [*Boisacq* 1923: 854; *Pokorny* 1959: 339; *Adjaryan* 1979: 169].

Other forms are considered to have been derived from this word like the Gk. *σάτιλλα* ‘constellation, Big dipper’ (Hesich.), *σάτιννη*, (*gen. pl.*) *σατινέω* ‘chariot, cart’ (HH= Hymni Homericı, Eur. =Euripides, Anacr.=Anacreon). So the Greek word has Minor Asian origin. Furthermore, according to Djahukyan, the word *սայլ* [*sayl*] has either an Arm.-Phryg. origin from the IE **k’at-* ‘to fight, to struggle’ or it is a borrowing from the neighboring nations.

In the first case, the word is studied with the relation of the Phryg. *kat-* ‘struggle’ < IE **k’at-* ‘struggle’ and the Arm. *սայլ* [*sayl*], mentioning the following notice.

1) “It is not likely that the Armenian word originated from this word-stem: the hypothesis is based on the comparison of the Arm.

and Phryg. *σάτιλλα* ‘constellation’, and *σάτινῆ* ‘chariot’: a) the etymology of these words is not certain; b) It is not convincing that the initial meaning of this word is ‘chariot’; c) this Armenian word is probably a borrowing from a Minor Asian language and these words belong to that language” [Djahukyan 1970: 21].

2) There are two different opinions about the Arm. *սայլ* [sayl] i.e. it has the meaning of the constellation of “Big and Small Dipper”. The linguists who are in favor of the close relations between Armenian and Phrygian tribes consider the words *σάτιλλα* (“the Constellation of Big Dipper”) and *σάτινῆ* ‘chariot’ to stem from the IE **k'at-* ‘struggle, fight’ as the meaning of *σάτιλλα* ‘chariot’ and the Phryg. origin word **satil̥a*. Other linguists consider this word as a simple borrowing [Adjaryan 1940: 141, and 1979: 169].

It is hereby definite to characterize the word as a Phrygian one.

It is also not proven that the original meaning of the word ‘chariot’ comes from an IE **k'at-*. If the Arm. *սայլ* [sayl] is a borrowing from a Minor Asian language we can assume that the consonant **-t* was changed into *j* [y] and the loss of the following vowel occurred in the period of Ancient Armenian (after the XII cent. B. C.) [Djahukyan 1970: 18].

The second case considered the fact that “R. Schmidt (see “*Glotta*” 44, 1967: 148-151) made an attempt to prove the Thracian origin of the word *σάτιλλα* ‘(one) constellation (*‘chariot’; ‘cart’)” [Djahukyan 1987: 311]. The solution to the problem adds even more complexity to further researches.

3. The etymological attempts are becoming unconvincing as we study the new data about the concept of ‘wheel, vehicle’ in the IE languages and other facts from the Armenian literary monuments and the Armenian dialects.

In this case we deal with the native word and not with a borrowing. We assume the Arm. *սայլ* [sayl] is native stem from the IE **k^hel-* ‘wheel, vehicle’. There are similar words in related languages, e.g. OIr. *cul* ‘cart’, OIc. *hvél* ‘wheel’, Pruss. *kelan* ‘wheel’, Let. *du-celis* ‘two wheeled’, OSlav. *kolo* (Gen. *kolese*)

‘wheel’, (pl. nom.-acc.) *kola* ‘cart’, Lat. *colus* ‘weaver, weaving, thread’ [see *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 258, 718-719].

Later the IE form was formed from the vowels $*k^{[h]o}el-$ ‘to spin’ which has the associations in related languages, e.g. OInd. *cārati* ‘to turn’; ‘to wander’; ‘to go’, Av. *čaraiti* ‘to turn’, Gk. (Hom.) *πέλω*, (*medic.*) *πέλωμαι* ‘move, budge; advance’, Alb. *siëll* ‘to turn, to spin, to bring’ etc. [*idem*, 718].

That vehicle was first used in the territory stretched between Transcaucasia and Upper Mesopotamia in the fourth millennium B. C. and later it was spread to other areas [cf. *idem*, 869-870].

4. We should consider we have duplicated form $*k^{[h]o}(e/o)k^{[h]o}lo-$ from the IE $*k^{[h]o}el-$ which occurred in related languages such as Toch. A *kukäl* ‘cart’, Toch. B *kokale* ‘cart’, OInd. *cakrá* ‘wheel’ (also ‘sun wheel’, and ‘period of year’ in R̥gveda-, cf. with Arm. *արեգակն* [aregakn] ‘sun wheel’; ‘period of year’, Av. *čaxra-* ‘wheel’ (cf. Arm. *ջահրայ* [jahray] ‘weaving machine’, *ջարխ* [č‘arx] ‘wheel of fortune’, *ճախր* [čaxr] ‘to spin, to turn’, *ճախարակ* [čaxarak] ‘wheel’, ‘wheeled instrument’) [cf. *Hübschmann* 1895-1897: 186; *Adjaryan* 1977: 172-174], Gk. (Hom.) *κύκλος* ‘circle, wheel’, *κύκλα* (pl.), Phryg. *κίκλην* ‘(constellation of) Big Dipper’, ORuss. *кола* ‘(constellation of) Big Dipper’, OIc. *hjól*, *hvél* ‘wheel’, OEng. *hweogol*, *hwēol* ‘wheel’, Eng. *whell* ‘id.’, MLGerm. *wēl* ‘wheel’ etc. [*Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 718, 737-738, 869-870, and *Шураков* 1991: 57-64].

According to typology the double root-word occurs not only in the IE languages; OHebr. *gigāl*, *galgal* ‘wheel’, Aram. *galgal* ‘wheel’ (cf. Georg. *gorgal* ‘wheel’; ‘circle’), Sum. *gigir* ‘chariot, cart’ etc. (*Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 718₁).

5. According to the structure and semiotic correlation of the IE $*k^{[h]o}el-$ or the reduplicated word stem $*k^{[h]o}(e/o)k^{[h]o}lo-$ as well as typological similarities of these words in non-IE languages, we can state that the origin of the Arm. *սայլ* [sayl] ‘cart’ and *զայլզայլ* [g‘alg‘ali] ‘two-wheeled cart’ preserved in several dialects is much older than the existing opinion about it. It would be more accurate to say that those are native words rather than borrowings. We can also state that the dialect word *զայլզայլ* [g‘alg‘ali] (Mush,

Alashkert etc.) is older than the word *uuʃʃ* [sayl] if we take into account that in the mentioned form the palatalized (not glottalized) *q'* [g'] types must have preceded *u* [s] (*q'uwʃ-* [g'al-] and its double form *q'uwʃ-q'uwʃh* [g'al-g'al-i]).

On the other hand we can assume that:

a) it is a hereditary feature from the period of IE unity, e.g. IE **k^{[h]o}(e/o)k^{[h]o}lo-* > Arm. (*dial.*) *q'uwʃ-q'uwʃh* [g'al-g'al-i];

b) According to the abovementioned there must be (typological) associations with Sum. *GIGIR* 'chariot', OHebr. *gilgāl*, *galgal* 'wheel', Aram. *galgal* 'wheel' as IE **k^{[h]o}ek^{[h]o}lo-*, Sum. *GIGIR*, Sem. **galgal*, Georg. (Kartv.) *gɔgar-* (and **bɔbar*) and OChin. (< IE) **gr* 'holy horse' have the same typological equivalence and the same semiotics ('cart' > 'pulling force' > 'horse') i.e. semantic development [Greppin 1998: 85-86].

6. As a cultural (especially as ritual) phenomenon the Arm. *uuʃʃ* [sayl] and *q'uwʃq'uwʃh* [g'alg'ali] have certain 'heritage' with mythical changes of the meanings of IE **k^{[h]o}el-*

Arm. *uuʃʃ* [sayl] ('two or four-wheeled vehicle'), and *q'uwʃq'uwʃh* [g'alg'ali] ('two-wheeled vehicle') must have had a very significant role not only in the cultural life of Armenia but of Asia Anterior as well.

The two-wheeled and four-wheeled vehicles found during the excavations conducted in Lchashen and in other places in Armenia date back to be remaining from the 2nd millennium B.C. [cf. *Пуотровский* 1959: 153; *Martirosyan* 1969: 39-40] though there were attempts to consider them from much earlier period. The figures of carts illustrated on some dozens of cliffs in Syunik in 4th-3th millennium B.C. are parallel to the figures of one-wheel (i. e. *q'uwʃq'uwʃh* [g'alg'ali] - V.H.), two-wheel (i.e. *uuʃʃ* [sayl] - V.H.) round-wheeled, wooden carts with bars found at Sevan area in Nerkin Getashen (New Adiaman) by E. Lalayan and in Lchashen by H. Mnatsakanyan, this goes back to the end of the 2nd millennium [Mnatsakanyan 1960: 139]. Meanwhile, in the recent years especially in 1970s the linguistic and archeological researches date back to period even further to the 4th millennium [cf. *Littauer-Crouwel* 1974: 20-37, and 1977, 1-7; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 718, 869-870 etc.].

7. Arm. *uuɟɟ* [sayl] (< IE **k^{[h]o}el-*) is a newer form, the phonetic transition is the following:

a) IE **k^{[h]o}* > Arm. *u* [s], and b) IE **e* > Arm. *t̄* [e] (> *uɟ* [ay]: cf. Arm. (*dial.*) *ut̄ɟ* [sēl] ‘cart’ in which the form *t̄* [ē] is considered a new dialect phenomenon initiated from the Old Armenian (Grabar) *uɟ* [ay] diphthong through the rules of diphthong simplification.

Yet, Arm. *q'uɟɟq'uɟɟ* [g'alg'ali] must be older because:

a) IE **k^{[h]o}* > Arm. *q* [g] (palatal or glottal *g'*) transition is an old phenomenon (cf. IE **p^{[h]o}enk^{[h]o}e* > Arm. *h̄h̄l̄q* [hing] ‘five’);

b) we have IE **e/o* ablaut of some degree Arm. *u* [a] (not *uɟ* [ay] or (*dial.*) *t̄* [e] or *t̄* [ē] as in the word *ut̄ɟ* [sēl] ‘cart’), i.e. the diphthong *uɟ* [ay] in *uuɟɟ* [sayl] parallel with *u* [a] which is common in Armenian (comp. *ηuɟɟ* > *ηuɟ* [dayl > dal] ‘beestings’, *ṽuɟɟ* > *ṽuɟɟt̄ɟ* [mayr > mar-el] ‘sunset’ (cf. *ṽuɟɟuṽm̄uṽ* [mayramut] ‘sun-set’) [*Djahukyan* 1986: 29-33].

Thus, we can assume that the Ancient Armenian words *uuɟɟ* [sayl] and **q'uɟɟ* [g'al] (> *q'uɟɟq'uɟɟ* [g'alg'ali]) have an IE origin, i.e. they are not borrowed from any other related or not related languages during their interaction. According to this the word *uuɟɟ* [sayl] and its dialect correspondences *q'uɟɟ-q'uɟɟ-h* (< *q'uɟɟ*) [g'al-g'al-i] (<g'al]) belong to the Armenian semantic group of Indo-European origin ‘agriculture, vegetation’ and at the same time to the group of ‘religion, prejudice’ related to the belief of the ‘*Բոյլք* [Boylk^c] or Big Dipper constellation’ and to the former imagination of ritual practices of some phenomenon or phenomena existent in the Armenian imagination.

10. Arm. *s̄mel* < IE *k^ʰer-

1. In the Armenian written sources we have never come across the word *unl̄it̄l* (*un ū-t̄l*) [s̄nel (s̄r n-el)] ‘to grind’ but it is used in several Armenian dialects (Mush, Alashkert, Bulanukh, Aparan etc.) and denotes ‘to grind the corn into big pieces’. We find this word in Adjarian’s and S. Amatuny’s dialect dictionaries as well as in E. Lalayan’s ethnographical journal [*Adjaryan* 1911: 984; *Amatuni* 1912: 599; *Lalayan* 1916: 77].

Nowadays the word is included in the mentioned dialects.

2. The word *unl̄it̄l* [s̄nel] ‘to grind’ is not included in Adjarian’s “Armenian Root Dictionary”, as well as in other scientific works about the Armenian etymology [cf. *Adjaryan* 1979; *Джаукян* 1967, and 1982; *Djahukyanyan* 1987 etc.].

Thus, we can say that the word *unl̄it̄l* [s̄nel] has never been a matter of etymological study. It is explained with the specific application of the word i.e. with its dialect feature. Arm. *unl̄it̄l* [s̄nel] is a native word and it has been preserved to modern times with its dialect or non-literary application. It names a perception originated from IE and denoting a theme connected with natural farmstead [see *Hambardzumyan* 1996: 191-192].

3. We must seek the meaning of the verb *unl̄it̄l* [s̄nel] in the word *huun̄hly* [hatik] ‘corn, grain’, because the initial meaning of the word ‘to grind’ was ‘to break the grain into two pieces’. Adjarian finds the application of the word only in Mush dialect and gives the definition as “to grind in big pieces so that the grain is broken into two or three pieces” [*Adjaryan* 1911:984].

4. It is known that IE *g^ʰernos means ‘grain’, it is connected with the concept to sow the seed and is specific to IE Western

languages [*Adjaryan* 1940: 16]. As usual for the concept (meaning) of ‘to mince, to grind’ the IE **k^orāy-* ‘mill’ is used for the meaning of ‘grind, mince’ [*Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984: 693]. According to it the Arm. *տրկաւի* (**t-լր-աւի*) [*erkan* (**e-kr-an*)] ‘grindstones; mill’ originated from the IE **k^orāy-* ‘mill’ (cf. **g^orāwanā-*, **g^hrāy-ānā*, **g^hrānā*) [*Hübschmann* 1897: 444-445; *Adjaryan* 1973, 61; *Джаукян* 1967, 226; 1987: 129, 450].

5. In our opinion the Arm. (*dial.*) *առկ(ել)* [*srn(el)*] ‘to grind’ derives from IE **k^oern* ‘mill’ and variations of this root word are IE **k^oer-* or **k^oər-* (comp. Goth. *-qairmus* ‘mill’ , OIc. *kvern* ‘grindstones’, OInd. *gurú-* ‘heavy’, Gk. *βαρύς* ‘heavy’, Lat. *grauis* ‘heavy’, Let. *dziņus* ‘grindstones’, Lith. *girnós (pl.)* ‘grindstones’, OSlav. *žrūnovŭ* ‘mill’ [*Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984:175].

According to it at the earliest stages of Armenian, i.e. at the period when Armenian became a separate language, the root-word **րկ-աւի* (< **լր-աւի*) [*rk-an* (<**kr-an*)] in the word *տրկ-աւի* (<**t-լր-աւի*) [*e-rk-an* (**e-kr-an*)] and the root-word *առկ-* (<*առ-կ-*) [*srn-* (<*sr-n-*)] in the verb *առ-կ-ել* [*sr-n-el*] are variations of the same root word with different vowels and *լ/у* [k/s] variation. This kind of distinction comes from the period of unity with IE because in IE we see the variation of **k^oern-* and **k^orāy-* [*op. cit.*, 693, 868, 873].

It is worthwhile mentioning that the authors consider the first and dated to the third millennium B.C. to be the period when these tools (‘mill’ and ‘grindstones’) were brought to Europe from Asia Anterior (see *op. cit.*, 694, 869).

It is known that IE **k^oern* ‘grindstones’ is a borrowing from Semitic languages; cf. Sem. **gurn-* ‘cornfield, current’ > Ugar. *grn* ‘current’, Akkad. *mak/grattu* ‘current, pressing place’, OHebr. *gōren* ‘current’, Arab. *ḡarana* ‘to mince, to grind’], *ḡurn-* ‘gurrnt’ [*op. cit.*, 873-874].

Thus, the origin of both words *տրկաւի* [*erkan*] ‘grindstones’ and the Arm. (*dial.*) *առկ(ել)* [*srn(el)*] ‘to mince in big pieces’ have

lasting history and they are old borrowings from Semitic languages [cf. *Djahukyan* 1987, 450].

According to it the Arm. (dial.) *unútł* [sɪnel] belongs to the thematic subgroup of tools, material, product in the group denoting “Miscellaneous physical acts and those pertaining to certain special arts and crafts, with some implements materials, and products, other miscellaneous notions” [cf. *op. cit.*, 213-214 etc.].

11. Arm. *tic*^ε (< *tik*^ε) < IE *di-t

1. Those are not the only words in the section by Khorenatsi “The Desire of Lady Sathenik” that haven’t been completely studied, even more there is another word *unhg* (<*unhp*) [*tic*^ε (<*tik*^ε) ‘age’ that needs etymological study. There were various controversial views, different accounts including the correction and edition of the original text, attempts to explain the word *unhg* [*tic*^ε].

2. In the original text the word is used in its declined form:

“Տենչայ Սաթինիկ տիկին տենչանս՝/
Չարտախոյր խաւարս եւ *qunhg* խաւարծի”
[Tenč^εay Sat^εinik tikin tenč^εans/
Zartaxoyr xawart ew ztic^ε xawarci]
‘Queen Sat^εinik had great desire for the
vegetable *artakhur* and the shoot *tits*’
[*Khorenatsi* 1913: 84].

We think it represents the declined form of the Arm. *unhp* [*tik*^ε] i.e. it is not used as a non-singular word but a plural form in genitive-dative case. The latter is an initial form and must be very common in Ancient Armenian. The singular form of the word **unh* [*ti*] ‘day’ has not been found in written sources but it must have the meaning ‘day, epoch, period, era’ [cf. *Djahukyan* 1987: 117, 217, 269, 401]. *Djahukyan* gives that word the common meaning ‘age’ too. The definition of this word fixed in the dictionary is ‘time-denoting’. In this context the word *unh-p* [*ti-k*^ε] ‘age’ has metaphoric meaning and comes from its original, direct meaning.

3. It is known that the Arm. *unh-p* [*ti-k*^ε] ‘age’ originated from the IE **di-t*, (cf. Engl. *tid* ‘time, hour’). At the same time it is necessary to mention that *Djahukyan* considers the form *unt* [*tē*],

unh [ti] (< IE **dei*) to be general for the root stems *unh-p* [ti-k^c] ‘lady’ and *unh* [ti] ‘day’.

It makes us think that the form *unhg* [tic^c] ‘age’ (Pl.) in the word combination *qunhg huuuiwpðh* [ztic^c xawarci] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ is the plural genitive-dative form of the Arm. *unh* [ti] and its plural form is *unh-p* [ti-k^c]. The possible parallel preserved among the related languages is the Engl. *tid* (‘time, hour’) but the likelihood of other forms is also potential if we illuminate the parallels in the Armenian dialects and related languages.

4. In the fragment of “The Desire of Lady Sathenik” the particle *q* [z] is a prefix and not an indivisible part of the root word as some researchers have stated. Thus the singular nominative case form of the word is *unh* [ti] and the plural nominative case form is *unh-p* [ti-k^c] ‘age’ which later was turned into non-singular noun. The word *ti* is declined as a common word i.e. as a non-single word. There is an obvious grammar change of a common word into non-singular form; cf. *nh* (> *nh-p*) [di (> di-k^c)], (*gen.-dat. pl.*) *nhg* [dic^c] ‘gods’ etc.

12. Arm. *tʰanjr* < IE *tʰns-u-

1. Regardless of the importance of the data for the etymology of the words and for the study of the Armenian pre-writing period history the data cannot become a basis for the further investigations if it is not recruited with new etymology or if the words don't get their new accurate etymology and typology. From this point of view it is necessary to mention a number of words the etymology of which has still been considered incomplete or unpersuasive. A good example of that is the Arm. *բուձր* [tʰanjr] 'thick, immense, bulky' which has been studied by several scholars but according to new data we can consider it as originated from IE and possessing different phonemic structure.

2. As we said the origin of the Arm. *բուձր* [tʰanjr] has not been completely studied yet. At different times it has been connected with different IE forms because of the different types of consonants in the root word.

2.1. The etymology of the Arm. *բուձր* [tʰanjr] has a long history which can symbolically be divided into two stages: pre-Adjaryan and post-Adjaryan.

a) For the first stage Hübschmann's etymology is very important according to which the Arm. *բուձր* [tʰanjr] originated from IE *tenk- [Hübschmann 1895: 448]. Adjaryan accepts that concept and separates the prototype *tng'hu- [Adjaryan 1973: 152-153]. Djahukyan regards G. Zolta's etymology the most remarkable. He believes that as a vowel bearing IE form the Gen. sing. form *բուձմ* [tʰanju] of the word *բուձր* [tʰanjr] is the closest to Lith. *tankus* 'thick, frequent' [Solta 1960: 223; Djahukyan 1987: 197].

b) In this case Djahukyan has a completely different opinion. He thinks the IE *tenk- and *thengh- are the same *ten- 'to draw,

to pull' with growths **-k-* and **-gh-* [Djahukyan, op.cit.; cf. Sukiasyan 1986: 91,16] and he also gives IE **thengh-* as a root form, **tng'hu-* or **tng'hiu-* as the source of the word *pułúđp* [t^canjr]. But Djahukyan has a question mark on this i.e. he considers them doubtful prototypes [Djahukyan 1987: 152, 109].

2. 2. All these facts prove the origin of the Armenian word *pułúđp* [t^canjr] and the etymology of the word seems complete and final. Later this etymology is regarded questionable, especially by Djahukyan.

That's why we emphasize Hübschmann's etymology about the IE possible prototype for *pułúđp* [t^canjr]. Adjaryan accepts that etymology and comes to the conclusion that "the parallels in related languages must have instigated the Arm. *pułúđp* [t^canjr] from the IE **tḱkú-*". Then he adds that "our word *pułúđp* [t^canjr] originated from IE **tḱg'hu-*" [Adjaryan 1973: 153].

In his later works Djahukyan reflects on the etymology of this word [Джаукян 1967, and 1982; Djahukyan 1987] and mentions another form (**tḱg'hiu-*) parallel to the form (**tḱg'hu-*), together with the sonant of the root forming vowel, but both of them seem questionable.

New data of cognate languages greatly contribute to the solution of the problem. But before referring to them let's remember that Hübschmann himself had mentioned about these parallel forms, however they haven't been paid careful attention to at that time. Likewise also Adjaryan writes about it in his "Dictionary of Armenian Roots". Finally, J. Pokorny mentions the following data in his dictionary: Avest. *ang-* (*anjasántē*) 'pull, seek; draw', Lat. *temō*, (*gen. sing.*) *temonis* 'harness, gear', Oic. *pungr* 'thick, bushy; dense' etc. [Pokorny 1959: 1067-1068]. G. Zolta adds another parallel from the related language i.e. Lith. *tankus* which initiates a new study on the word *pułúđp* [t^canjr] and thus illustrates a number of cognates to other languages.

2.3. It is notable that Adjaryan considers those parallels comparable with another Armenian form **pułúđp* [t^cangr] with the same meaning in the pre-writing period. Later at the writing period we have the traditional form *pułúđp* [t^canjr]. The question is if it is

possible to prove that at the stage of separate development especially at the pre-writing period there occurred the internal shift of the word **pułiqn* [t^cangr] > *pułiđn* [t^canjr], because of the **q* [g] > *q* [z] shift i.e. plosives obtained fricative attributes.

So we can conclude the following.

a) This assumption is based on the possible existence of the correspondence IE **g* > Arm. *đ* [j]: cf. IE **b*^(h)*g*^(h)-*u* > Arm. *puwđ-p* [barj-r], (*gen. sing.*) *puwđ-ni* [barj-u]) ‘high’, IE **g*^(h)*alg*^(h)- > Arm. *đawղղ* [jałk] ‘walking stick’, IE **g*^(h)*ǵem-s* > Arm. *đułbnú* (< *đ(h)u-łbnú*) [jmeɾn (< j(i)m-erɾn)] ‘winter’ etc.

b) Otherwise it is possible to compare the Arm. *pułiq* [t^cang] with the Arm. *pułiqniqbł* [t^canguzel] ‘to avoid because of fear or shame, to run away’ (according to M. Djakhdjakhean’s Dictionary); cf. “Կաս թէ *pułiqniqhgł*՞ք. զի դոք անննքրեան դասուարք եղերոք” [Kam t^ce t^canguzic^cēk^c: zi duk^c amenek^cean datawork^c ɛleruk^c] ‘Will you show partiality towards him, will you plead the case for God?’ [*The Bible, Job. 13: 8*]; Gk. *ή ύποστελετδε* ‘to escape because of fear and awe’, also with the words *pułiqniqbł* [t^canguzi] ‘indolent, idle, lazy’ separating the common meaning of “to dense, to thicken”. The word *pułiq* [t^cang] is considered a borrowing from Pers. *tang* [*Adjaryan 1973: 151-152*].

3. The Arm. *pułiđn* [t^canjr] originated from a completely different source i.e. from the IE **t*^c*psu-* ‘thick, dense, solid, intense’ which is parallel to Hitt. *dassu* ‘strong’, for which the forms Hitt. **da(n)su-* < **dpsu-*, and Gk. *δασύς* ‘dense, thick’, Lat. *dēnsus* ‘thick’ are reconstructed [see *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 200*]. We’ll mention the Hitt. form *dankuli* < *dankui* ‘thick, dense’ [*Иванов 1977: 26*].

3.1. For the IE **t*^c > Arm. *ř* [t^c], and IE **ǵ* > Arm. *uł* [an] association we’ll bring the following parallels:

a) IE **t*^c*el-* > Arm. *řtղ* [teł] ‘long, pile’, *řtղ-łu* [teł-em] ‘to pile in length’: cf. OSlav. *di-liti* ‘to grow long’, Russ. *длить* ‘to get long’, OIc. *talma* ‘to stop, to prevent’ [see *Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 230; Djahukyan 1987, 158*];

b) IE **b*^h*ndh-s-* > Arm. (*u**u*)*u**u**łu**łu**đ-* [(pa)panj-] ‘to get dumb’ and *u**u**u**u**łu**łu**đł* [papanjil] ‘grow dumb’ etc.

3.2 The IE *s > Arm. ǰ [j] association is a matter of a separate study connected with the expressions of the IE plosive consonants and the problems around it.

3.3 Finally, there is the particle *u in the IE form *t'us-u- that appears in the Armenian inclined forms, Gen. sing. *pułǰ-m* [tanj-u] 'of thick', nominative plural *pułǰ-m-łp* [tanj-u-nk^c] 'thicks' and the nominative singular is not preserved for unknown reasons.

Thus we can assume that the etymology of the Armenian *pułǰn* [tanjr] is connected with the form IE *t'us-u- and not with *t^ghu-.

13. Arm. *xawarci* < Arm. *xaw-* + IE **træg'*-

1. The questionable word in the fragment of "The Desire of Lady Sathenik" by Khorenatsi is *խաւարժ* [*xawarci*] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’:

“Տենչայ Սաթինիկ տիկին տենչանս՝
Ջարտախոյր խաւարտ եւ զտից *խաւարժ*”
[Tenč^cay Sat^cinik tikin tenč^cans/
Zartaxoyr xawart ew ztic^c *xawarci*]
‘Queen Sat^cinik had great desire for the
vegetable artakhur and the shoot tits’
[*Khorenatsi* 1913: 84].

The etymology of this word is still undecided.

2. The word *խաւարժ* [*xawarci*] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’, in our opinion has the same origin as the word *խաւարտ* [*xawart*] ‘greens, vegetables; legums’. Still they are being studied separately because of their special importance in Khorenatsi’s fragment as well as the obvious significance of those words in the Armenian lexicon.

As a difference to the word *խաւարտ* [*xawart*] ‘greens, vegetables; legums’ the word *խաւարժ* [*xawarc*] has changed into noun due to the word-structure particle *ժ* [-i]: cf. *գեր-ժ* [*ger-i*] ‘captive’, *գին-ժ* [*gin-i*] ‘wine’, *յղ-ժ* [*yl-i*] ‘pregnant’, *մայր-ժ* [*mayr-i*] ‘type of tree’, *տեղ-ժ* [*teg-i*] ‘place’ etc. [*Djahukyan* 1987:231].

They differ from each other with *տ* [t] ~ *ժ* [c] sound correlation: cf. *արած-ել* [*arac-el*] ‘graze, pasture’ ~ *արօտ* (< *արատ*) [*arawt*] ‘pasture, common pasture’, *խայտ* [*xayt*] ‘bait, lure’ ~ *խայժ* [*xayc*] ‘bait, lure’, *սլիղժ* [*pllc*] ‘unclean’ ~ *սղտ-ղտ* [*plt-or*] ‘turbid, muddy’ etc.

Djahukyan doubtfully connects the word *խաւարժի* [xawarci] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ with *խաւ* [xaw] ‘nap; pile, fluff’ because of its later application *խաւարժի* [xawarcil] ‘medical herb’ [Djahukyan 1987: 598].

This kind of associations are very common in G.Ter-Mkrtchyan’s view [Ter-Mkrtchyan 1979: 133].

But Djahukyan believes that in this case the word can be considered as an example of association between Armenian and South Caucasian (Kartvelian) languages. He also adds that the similarities between *խաւարժի* [xawarci] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ and some other words "must be regarded as non-typical [contaminant?] case". According to Djahukyan only the following words are comparable; *խաւարժ* [xawarc] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ (later *խաւարժի* [xawarcil] ‘medical herb’(?), from Arm. *խաւ* [xaw-] ‘nap; pile, fluff’ ~ Georg. *γwarjli* ‘weed, unkindness’, Megr. *γurjul* ‘plague, misfortune’, Laz (Chan.) *γurjul* ‘poison, misfortune, Georg.-Zan. **γwarjɫ* ‘Folium temulentum; seed’ [Djahukyan 1987: 598].

3. In both words *խաւարտ* [xawart] ‘(vegetable) garnich’ and *խաւարժի* [xawarci] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ the second root stem *արժ-* [arc-] originated from IE **træg-* ‘to graze, pasture’. For the first case we have IE **g’* > Arm. *ւ* [t], and the second case - IE **g’* > Arm. *ժ* [c] correspondence which is different root stem coherence common in Ancient Armenian if we exclude the possibility of period difference.

4. In this piece of the epic the word *խաւարժի* [xawarci] means ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ but metaphorically it has completely different meaning as in the case of *խաւարտ* [xawart] ‘(vegetable) garnich’. In difference to *արտախոյր*, which meant ‘covered with goat fur, (something) round and outcasted’; here with ‘shameless’ (i. e. ‘impolite; not suitable’) style the word *խաւարժի* ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ is mentioned.

In the end we should mention that these four questionable words of etymological study are used in two word combinations i.e. *զարտախոյր խաւարտ* [zartaxoyr xawart] ‘shawl; covering garnich’ and *զուհի խաւարժի* [zitic xawarci] ‘dainty food’ (also

‘age , years; time of life’). The first is a postpositional attributive word combination and the second is a preposition possessive word combination. In one case the prefix *q* [z] is used in its precise place and in the other case it is used with the object. For the second case we would have a canonic form if the combination *qʃuuiwprðh wʃg* [zxawarci tic^c] ‘dainty food’ was used instead. We must take into consideration that this phenomenon is obvious in Ancient Armenian stage.

Thus, the words *wpruwʃunjp* [artaxoyr] ‘shawl; covering’, *ʃuuiwprw* [xawart] ‘(vegetable) garnich’, *wʃg* [tic^c] ‘age’ and *ʃuuiwprðh* [xawarci] ‘shoot, tendril of plants’ used by Khorenatsi, if we take into consideration their usage in the Armenian epics and in the figurative speech we can observe them as “cultural” words, i. e. ‘emotion (with some physical expressions of emotion); temperamental, moral, and aesthetical notions’, words belonging to thematic subgroup [cf. *Djahukyan* 1987: 218].

14. Arm. *xawart* < Arm. *xaw-* +IE *træg'-

1. This word is also used in the ancient Armenian epics "The Desire of Lady Satenik":

“Տենչայ Սաթինիկ տիկին տենչանս՝
Չարտախոյր խաւարտ եւ զտից խաւարծի”
[Tenč'ay Sat'linik tikin tenč'ans/
Zartaxoyr *xawart* ew ztic' xawarci]
‘Queen Sat'linik had great desire for the
vegetable *artakhur* and the shoot tits’
[*Khorenatsi* 1913: 84].

And it occurs in the word combination like (*q*)արտախոյր խաւարտ [(z)artaxoyr *xawart*] ‘shawl; covering garnich’ as a back-position attribute expressing metaphoric quality. We don’t find this word in Eremia Meghretsi’s dictionary and Mkhithar Sebastatsi gives the following definition to the word: "It is a simple (cf. ‘common’ V.H.) vegetation or greenery edible by people with or without boiling.... like salads, dill and suchlike etc." [*Sebastatsi* 1749: 375, col. 2]. Later the majority of the researchers follow the opinion of Sebastatsi, so do the authors of “The New Armenian Dictionary” and consider this word խաւարտ [*xawart*] ‘(vegetable) garnich’ as a plant name.

We approve Adjaryan’s approach to the etymology of this word and mention that he considers the word խաւարտ [*xawart*] ‘(vegetable) garnich’ to be the adjectival object for the back-position attribute արտախոյր [artaxoyr] ‘tiara, mitre, diadem’ and they make the word combination արտախոյր խաւարտ [(z)artaxoyr *xawart*] ‘shawl; covering garnich’ [*Adjaryan* 1973: 351-352].

2. The word *խաւարտ* [xawart] consists of the parts *խաւ* [xaw] and *արտ* [art]. The first part *խաւ* [xaw] ‘fuzz, hair cover, thick layer’ is not an etymologized word but *արտ* [art] ‘field’ is rather old. The latter has absolutely no connection, at least at the period of early Armenian, with the word *արտ* [art] ‘out, outside’ as a part of the word *արտախոյր* [artaxojr] ‘shawl; covering’ which was broadly used in ancient Armenian. In our opinion *արտ* [art] in the word *խաւարտ* [xawart] is etymologically connected with other words i. e. on the one hand it has similar sources with *արատ* [arat] ‘to graze’, *արատ* [araut] ‘grass, pasture’ and on the other hand with the words *արած(ել)* [arac(el)] ‘graze, pasture’, *(տն)արած* [(tu)arac] [***(*տնար*)*արած*] [***(*tuar*)arac] ‘herdsman, cowboy’ (i.e. *տնար* < IE **dīp̄aro* + Arm. *արած* [arac] ‘graze, pasture’), and with the dial. word *արձ(այ)* [arj(al)] ‘graze, pasture’; for the sounds *ar* [t] ~ *ar* [c] cf. *խայտ* [xayt] ‘bait, lure’ ~ *խայծ* [xayc] ‘cheerful’, *բուտ* [but] ‘bred’, *բու-ել* [bt-el] ‘fatten, feed (up)’ ~ *բոյժ* [boyc] ‘to breed’, *բուծ-անեմ* [buc-anem] ‘breed’, *պիղծ* [pilc] ‘foul, unclean.’ ~ *պղտ-որ* [pl̄t-or] ‘dirty’, *հպարտ* [h-part] ‘proud’ ~ *պարծ-եման* [parc-enam] ‘brag, be proud (of)’, *տատանեմ* [tatanem] ‘shake; whiver’ ~ *ծածանեմ* [cacanem] ‘to wave’, *խելի* [xeld] ~ *հելի* [helj] ‘chock’ etc.

3. The root-word *արատ* [arat] and *արատ* [arawt] ‘pasture’ (vocalic alternation *u//au* [a//au]) originated from IE **tr̄agʰ*. Cf. Gk. *τρώγω* ‘to graze, to eat’, Toch. AB *tr̄ask* ‘to chew’ [see *Djahukyan* 1987: 153, 253; *Джаукян* 1982: 57].

Then, *արտ* [art] ‘field’ is derived from the same word stem; cf. Arm. (*dial.*) *արձայ* [arj-al] ‘graze’ forming vocalic alternation low zero degree [see *Adjaryan* 1957, 37]. That’s why in Armenian we have to distinguish three homonyms of *արտ* [art] ‘cornfield, field’ (< IE **agʰ-ro* ‘field’), *արտ(ա)-* [art(a)-] ‘out, outside’, also as a prefix mentioned ‘out-’ and *արտ-* [art-] (< IE **tr̄agʰ* ‘to graze, pasture’). We must assume that etymologically the word *արտ*-[art] ‘pasture, to graze’ is connected with the words *արատ* [arat] ‘to graze’, *արատ* [araut] ‘pasture’ as words from the same source. *Djahukyan* conducted the etymology of the words *արատ* [arat] and *արատ* [araut] and considered them to originate from IE

**træg*ʹ, which can be considered completely acceptable in this case [see also *Abrahamyan* 1958: 62-63].

Though his approach is completely convincing and acceptable but it is still incomplete as he covers only the etymology of the words *արատ* [arat], *արատ* [araut] and *արած(ել)* [arac(ɛl)] excluding the word *արտ* [art] which has ancient application and is closely related to the above mentioned two words. Thus this group is complete with the word *արտ*- [art-] ‘pasture, to graze’ and is connected with the semantic group of "agriculture, vegetation".

4. The component *արտ* [art] in the compound word *խաւարտ* [xawart] is native and has IE **træg*ʹ ‘to graze, pasture’. Later that word was linked with *խաւ* [xaw], as a second component of a compound word, which was used metaphorically in Khorenatsi’s work, which means that the usage of the main direct meaning refers to an earlier stage. Thus we can assume that the word *խաւարտ* [xawart] in the section of our interest has the metaphorically meaning of ‘covered with short hair, fussy’ or ‘appearing from under the short fuzz, naked’.

Part III.

**Some IE parallels between Armenian
and Ancient Anatolian Languages**

0. Preliminary

1. The researches of the recent two or three decades have set forward completely new problems about the IE languages and there has risen the necessity to reconsider the traditional approaches. They somehow refer to different associations of Armenian and Ancient Anatolian (Hittite-Luvian) languages.

Regardless of the classification accepted in the 1970s the Hitt.-Luvian languages are presently divided into two subgroups; Hitt.-Lidian (Hittite, Lidian and Carian) and Luv.-Likian (cuneiform Luvian, Hieroglyphic Luvian, Likian A, Likian B and Palayian). Chronologically they are divided into three periods, i.e. Early (18th-12th centuries B.C.), Middle (15/13th-8th centuries B.C.) and Late (8th-3rd cent. B.C.) [cf. *Нерознак* 1981: 11-12].

The attributes of such classification are the internal tribal contact of these languages and their dialectal variability [cf. *Иванов* 1982, 48-50].

2. The associations of the Armenian and Hittite-Luvian languages have been a major subject for both Armenian and foreign orientalists, linguists, professionals on epigraphy and other researchers. The interest has grown greatly since the second half of the twentieth century when the orientalists finally deciphered most of the signs of the cuneiform system and could observe the relatedness of Hittite and other IE languages [see *Spenean* 1920: 48-123; *Kronasser* 1956; *Иванов* 1963; *Королев* 1976 etc.].

a) G. Ghapantsyan and G. Djahukyan have their great contribution to this problem. Their works especially with etymological attempts were apparent achievements in etymological-lexical analyses. Ghapantsyan judges from linguistic, historical, cultural and mythological points of view [see *Ghapantsyan* 1931, and 1947, 1956-1975, 1961: 146-219 etc.].

Djahukyan mainly makes evaluations about the glosses (items) of vocabulary, the original equivalents of the words, makes some corrections and additions and states certain phonetic rules [see *Djahukyan* 1970: 123-167, and 1987: 311-321]. He also considers that both languages have plosive shifts in the consonant system and describes these features while other researchers describe the attributes of the shift in Hittite-Luvian languages [*Djahukyan* 1970:130-132, 134].

b) Later such works were written but the authors study special cases especially in etymology [see *Greppin* 1980; 1982, 65-71; *Kossian* 1994: 63-65 etc.]. The detailed study of the vocabulary of Luvian, Lydian and other languages shows that a great number of Armenian phenomena are associated with the corresponding units of these languages with their phonetic peculiarities and semantic-cognitive relations.

In the recent years the comparative-typological studies on the IE languages have set forward such theories according which along with Hittite-Luvian languages Armenian also has ancient (archaic) features concerning to Indo-European condition and though the Hittite-Luvian records date back to earlier periods yet the Armenian records still preserve features of the same importance [*Гамкрелидзе /Иванов* 1984; *Майрхоффер* 1988: 530 etc.].

Nowadays Armenian acquires more significance in the study of the Indo-European languages than it had before. At present new approaches are applied to solve the existing problems and as the latest authors mention in their works published during the latest two or three decades, the data on Armenian, once almost ignored, is accurate and valuable containing ancient and typological features which are extremely useful for the reconstruction and description of the IE condition.

According to such views we are going to consider a phenomenon referring to Armenian-Luvian word equivalents. It's worthwhile mentioning that according to the latest data those types of equivalents are numerable and they are not the result of regular borrowings but tribal frequency expressed in different languages.

1. Arm. *cawi* ~ Luv. *taui-*

In this case our subject of interest is the Arm. *ծաւի* [*cawi*] ‘blue eyed’ and its Luvian equivalent *taui-* ‘eye’.

1. The Arm. word *ծաւի* [*cawi*] ‘blue eyed’ is used in the literary works of the fifth century:

“Եւ ածէր կսցուցանէր աղջիկ մի կոյս նմին համեմատ, զեղով եւ հասակաւ, աչս *ծաւի*, յօնս միակիցս, բիրս խարստեալ” [Ew acēr kac^cuc^canēr aljik mi koys nmin hamemat, gelov ew hasakaw, ač^cs *cawi*, yawns miakic^cs, bibs xarteaš] ‘And brought about a virgin similar to the previous one with the stature beautiful and slim with sea-blue eyes shading into brown, ached eye-brows’ [*Oskeberan* 1862: 660; cf. NAD];

“Այս անուն, ասեմ, զանգրահեր եւ *ծաւի* եւ փարփաւն է ի ծնէ” [Ays anun, asen, gangraher ew *cawi* ew p^carp^car i cnē] ‘This name, they say, with wavy hair and *blue eyes* and is smiley-face by birth’ [*Barsegh Kessaratsi* 1830: 119; cf. NAD] etc.

“The New Armenian Dictionary” [NAD 1836: 1013] explains the words «ծովագոյն աչօք, անոյշ կսպուտակ տեսանելեօք, խայտակն» [covagoyn ač^cok^c, anoyš kaputak tesaneleok^c, xaytaknⁿ] ‘sea-blue-color eyes, pleasant blue view, blue-eyed’ and gives the New Armenian translation *սլուռ, անուշաշուի* [pluz, anušač^cui] ‘blue-eyed’. In this explanation the word *անոյշ* [anoyš] ‘sweet’ must be interpreted as ‘pleasant, funny, dear, lovely’ [*ibid*, 217]

Adjaryan gives the definition of the word *ծաւի* [*cawi*] ‘pleasantly blue-eyed’ which is the exact explanation of “The New Armenian Dictionary” [see *Adjaryan* 1973: 450]. Both dictionaries include the two variants of the forms *ծաւիր* [*cawir*] ‘sea blue’, and *ծաւիկ* [*cawik*] ‘bluish green’ which can be a special matter of

discussion (we'll not reflect on them now leaving for another time).

2. It is commonly known that H. Adjaryan and G. Djahukyan revealed the etymology and morphology of the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] 'blue eyed'. However, the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] 'blue eyed' hasn't got its vigorous etymology or any equivalents in other languages yet.

a) Adjaryan believes the attempts of the previous etymology of the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] are inaccurate even the ones made by the authors of "The New Armenian Dictionary" and S. Tervishyan. It is necessary to mention that S. Tervishyan considers *ծււ* [caw] 'blue eyed' as the initial form of the word *ծնլ* [cov] 'sea'. Adjaryan supposes the possible associations with Caucasian languages: cf. Avar. *zob*, Darg. *dzubri*, Kurin. *ccaw*, Tabas. *dzav*, Agh. *zaw*, Lak. *ssau*. Like Trubetskoy Adjaryan also mentions that all these words have the meaning 'sky' and are related to each other [Adjaryan 1973: 450]. Adjaryan states that the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] can be understood as 'sky blue' [*ibid*].

In another work Adjaryan assumes the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] 'blue-eyed' has Urartean ("Chaldean") origin i.e. it is a borrowing [see Adjaryan 1940: 151].

As we see the solution to the issue has remained indistinct.

b) Djahukyan focuses on this word in his later work. He follows the opinion of Adjarian and considers the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] as an Urartean borrowing [Djahukyan 1987: 436, 609-610]. Later on, in another chapter of the same work speaking about the possible links between the Armenian and East-Caucasian (Nachian-Daghestanian) languages he includes the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] in the list of the word equivalents [Djahukyan 1987: 604-615]. In fact it is mentioned that at first "H. Adjaryan considers 11 words as loan-words from Eastern Caucasian languages", however he rejects some of them and adds others, including the word *ծււիհ* [cawi] [see Djahukyan 1987: 609].

According to it the Arm. *ծււիհ* [cawi] 'blue-eyed' (< 'sky blue') is observed as one of the 16 borrowings from the East-Caucasian (Nakhian-Daghestanian) languages: comp. Lezg. *ууав* 'sky', OAg. *у(у)ва* 'sky' (*ibid*, 609). It's worthwhile mentioning that the

equivalent is included in Adjaryan's "Dictionary" along with other words [Adjaryan 1973: 450].

In two of his previous works Djahukyan speaks about the possible associations among the Armenian, Hittite-Luvian and Caucasian languages, connected with general concepts of 'eye' and 'sky-blue'. For example, in many works on Indo-European, Khuro-Urartian and Caucasian languages Djahukyan compares the IE **dei-* 'to shine, to radiate, to sparkle' and their forms with the words Kartv. *te-* 'light', *ten-* 'to make visible, to enlighten', *ca-* 'sky' [Джәкүкян 1967: 66, 182]. On the other hand the Kartv. form *ca-* 'sky' is compared with Lak. *ccab*, Lezg. *ццав*, Tabas. *дзав* etc. [ibid, 182]. It is worthwhile adding that in the same work the author compares the IE **ok^h-* 'to see' and **ok^h-*, **ok^hē-* 'eye' and their parallel forms with the Georg. *uцә* 'to see', also with some resemblance to Kartv. *twal-* 'eye', Georg. *twal-* and other forms [ibid, 98].

In his last works Djahukyan mentions the following: "There are words, which are common in Hittite-Luvian, Armenian and a number of Caucasian (especially Kartvelian) languages, and their source is still doubtful" [Djahukyan 1970: 157]. As an example, some parallels like Luv. *taṽi-* 'eye'; present' ~ Kartv. *twal-* 'eye' are drawn in the footer.

c) Summerizing Adjaryan's and Djahukyan's lexicological (root-words) and etymological analyses we may observe, that in some cases there are certain parallels between Arm. *дуйл* [cawi] 'blue eyed' and (Eastern) Caucasian, between Armenian and Kartvelian (see Kartv. *twal-* 'eye'), as well as between Urartian languages.

3. In written works the Luv. *taṽi-* 'eye' is used both as an incoherent word or as a part of lexico-morphological structures like the forms *tawi-* or *dawi-* and *da-a-u-i-iš* (nom. sing.), *da-a-u-wa* (pl., nom.-acc.), *tauswašši-* or *dauswašši-* 'visual' [see Laroche 1959: 96]. Luv. *taṽi-* is compared with the first two parts of the word *Ta-ya-ú-i-ma-an* which occurs on the Capadocian tablets (3rd-2nd and the beginning of the 2nd millennium) found in the Old Assyrian trade colonies in Minor Asia [cf. Goetze 1954: 351-352; Laroche 1966: 183; Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 860].

a) Some scholars examined the association of the sounds Hitt. *š-* ~ Luv. *t-*: cf. Hitt. *šakuṽa* ‘eye’ ~ Luv. *taṽi-* ‘eye’, Hitt. *ḫiṣṽant-* ‘animal’ ~ Luv. *ḫiṽyali-* ‘animal’ etc. [see Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 861] on the one hand and the association of the sounds Hitt. *t* ~ Arm. *ḍ* [c] on the other: cf. Hitt. *taḫḫu(ṽa)i-* ‘smoke’ ~ Arm. *ḍmḫu* [cux] ‘smoke’, (*gen. singl.*) *ḍḫunj* [cxoy] [see Djahukyan 1970: 157; 1987: 203, 314 etc.]. Consequently, there is great possibility that the Luv. *t* ~ Arm. *ḍ* [c] sounds appear coincident in their phonetic aspect.

In order to show the equivalency of the Hitt. *šakuṽa* ‘eye’ ~ Luv. *taṽi-* ‘eye’ it is sensible to make a quotation “As for the aspirates in the Hitt. language *š-* is regularly used in cases when the corresponding consonant is missing in other languages... In the same way Luv. *d-* corresponds to Hitt. *š-*: cf. Hitt. *šakuṽa*, Lat. *ocu-(lus)*, Luv. *dawi-* ‘eye’ (*kw->w-* obscuration) in the word” [Иванов 1982: 33].

b) It is essential to add that there is the following opinion about the correspondence of Hitt. *š-* ~ Luv. *t-*:

“Different Indo-European sibilants **s-* and **š-* are observed in Hittite and Luvian languages. It is known that there is a similar sound **s* (cuneiform *š*) in Hittite and Luvian which derives from Hitt. *s* ~ Luv. *s* correspondence while the Indo-European **š-* has different correspondences in Hittite and Luvian. Thus we have Hitt. *s* ~ Luv. *t* type of correspondence between those languages; cf. Hitt. *šakuṽai* ‘eye(s)’ ~ Luv. *taṽ-i* ‘eye(s)’” [Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 122]. As for phonetic association we may observe relations between Hitt. *k* and Luv. *ø* (zero).

c) Accordingly we may confirm that the Hitt. *s* (cuneiform *š*), Luv. *t* ~ Arm. *ḍ* [c] are phonetic parallels, however the Arm. *ḍ* [c] perhaps is closer to Luvian interdental pronunciation of IE **š* [see Гамкрелидзе /Иванов 1984: 122).

From this point of view the Armenian phonetic variations *ḍ* [c] ~ *m* [t] or *u* [s], as well as Arm. *g* [c^c] ~ *ʒ* [š] and *ḫ(u)* [t^c(s)] become very remarkable:

Cf. Arm. *արածել* [aracel] ‘to graze’ ~ *արատ* [arawt] ‘pasture’, *ծածկել* [cacanel] ‘to wave’ ~ *տատակել* [tatanel] ‘to

swing' ~ *uuuuuḡtḡ* [sasanel] 'shake, shake loose', *ḡtḡ* [vec^c] 'six' ~ *ḡtḡʔ(unuuuḡ)* [veš(tasan)] 'sixteen', and *ḡuḡp(unḡ)* vat^c(sun) 'sixty', (*dial.*) *ḡuḡmḡ* [vac^cun] 'sixty' and a number of other variations.

Such a parallel is rather strong especially on the basis of the articulating similarity of the sounds Hier. Luv. *t*, Hitt. *z* (perhaps *s*) and *t* and the Arm. *ḡ* [c]; in Anatolian languages they have been lateral phonemes somewhat close to semi-fricatives [cf. *Иванов* 1963: 76-77, 97-98].

4. The Arm. *ḡuḡḡ* [cawi] 'blue eyed' and Luv. *taḡi-* parallel forms have Indo-European origin. We must also take into consideration that according to the mythology of Indo-European peoples the light (the sun) comes from the sea. We are not going to discuss how well this legend is preserved in the historical-mythological 'memory' of those people or to make an attempt to connect the Arm. *ḡuḡḡ* [cawi] 'blue' with the word *ḡnḡ* [cov] 'sea' or the other meanings of that word.

2. Arm. *kayt*^c ~ Hier.Luv. *kati-*

The history of the study of Armenian and Ancient Anatolian (Hittite-Luvian) languages starts at the 20s of the twentieth century and covers two periods (the middle of the 20s-70s and 70s to present days). During the first period the subject of interest is the clarification of the tribal relations between the compared languages, the vocabulary and partially the norms of grammar (N. Martirosyan, G. Ghapantsyan, N. Adonts, H. Adjaryan, G. Djahukyan, I. Diakonoff, A.Goetze, E. Forrer etc.). During the second period linguistic, political, cultural record-source, toponymical problems and others become the matter of study (L. Barseghyan, V. Khachatryan, A. Kossian, J. A. Greppin, O. Karuba, V. Haas, M. Salvini, J. Puhvel, J. Tishler etc.).

There are a number of words, root-words, affixes and other morphemes that don't have their etymologies yet. They are significant not only as separate units but also from the view-point of their origin and associations with other languages.

Below we examine a separate issue connected with Armenian and Hittite-Luvian relations.

1. The Armenian *կայթ* [*kayt*^c] 'pot, basket' and Hier. Luv. *kati-* 'cup; goblet' correspondence has never been a matter of comparative-etymological study by any researcher yet.

2. The general denotation of the Arm. *կայթ* [*kayt*^c] is 'a basket', 'a pot' Adjaryan like H. Manandyan has a more precise definition for it, i. e. 'a basket, a container to measure sixty liters'(it is also mentioned that a liter is 1,3 kilograms) [*Adjaryan* 1973: 505].

We have two homonyms for this word; *կայթ* [*kayt*^c] 'a toy for teeth of a baby' and *կայթ* [*kayt*^c] 'to hop, dance of joy'. The first cognate does not have its etymology yet and the second one,

according to Djahukyan, originates from the IE **kai-t-* ‘light’ [Djahukyan 1970: 98].

Using Djahukyan’s examples about the second cognate we can make additional observations. Later on Djahukyan considers the word *կայթ* [kayt^c] as a dialectal variation of the words *խաղ* [xaɫ] ‘game’, *կարգաւննլի* [kak^cawumn] ‘to walk gracefully’, *պար* [par] ‘a dance’, *ցուց* [c^cuc^c] ‘hof’ [see Djahukyan 1987: 399]. In his previous work Djahukyan writes the following about the origin of the word: “Below we make a list of the Armenian words without confirming their Pelasgian or Thracian origin because: a) a number of researchers believe that dissimilated desaspiration observed in some Pelasgian words occurred in Greek as a result of the influence of the specific phonetic rule in Greek (*Grassmann’s law*); b) in some cases we deal with the Iranian source i.e. with the *kh* > Arm. *ju* [x] transition typical to Iranian...” [Djahukyan 1970: 98]. Along with other 18 counterparts he mentions the words *կայթ* [kayt^c] ‘hop, dance of joy’, *կայթել* [kayt^cel] ‘to have fun, to hop, to dance’ - IE **kai-t-* ‘light’ (cf. OHGerm. *heitar*, Germ. *heiter* ‘merry, lively’ [ibid]).

In this case alienating the Iran. *kh* > Arm. *ju* [x] transition specific to Iranian and supporting the Armenian *կ* [k] / *խ* [x] variation we can associate the word *կայթ* [kayt^c] with Arm. *խայտ* [xayt]; cf. Arm. *խաւննիկ* [xatutik] ‘motley; dandelion’ and *խայտ* [xayt] ‘happiness, joy’ (Adjaryan 1973: 326-327). Adjaryan considers these cognates to get their source from the IE **khaid-* and mentions resemblances in a number of related languages like OHGerm. *heitar* ‘bright’, Germ. *heiter* ‘merry, bright’ etc. As we see these are the same examples used by Djahukyan to confirm the connection between Arm. *կայթ* [kayt^c] and IE **kai-t-*.

As a result we can assume that the Arm. *կայթ* [kayt^c] and *խայտ* [xayt] have the same origin; For that reason Adjaryan and Djahukyan separate IE **kai-t-* or **khaid-* with their voiced/voiceless, voiceless/voiceless-aspirated variations.

a) It is a plausible guess that the initial and the oldest form of the word Arm. *կայթ* [kayt^c] ‘basket, pot’ is *կաթ* [kat^c] because of the addition of the sound *յ* [y] refers to later written monuments.

Moreover, the appliance of the diphthong of simple vowels is a comparably late period phenomenon in the Indo-European related languages: cf. Germ. *heiter* ‘merry, bright’, Goth. *heito* ‘warm, fever’, Let. *kaists* ‘shining with joy’ etc. [*Adjaryan* 1973, 326].

b) The initial application of the word is in the “Bible”: “Եւ աճապարեաց Արիգեա, եւ առ երկերիւր նկանակ եւ երկուս աճանս զինոյ եւ հինգ ոչխար հասուցեալ եւ հինգ արդու փոխնոյ եւ *կայթ մի չամիչ*, եւ պաղաստիսս երկերիւր, եւ եղ ի վերայ իշոյ” [Ew ačapareac^c Abigea , ew ar erkeriwr nkanak ew erkus amans ginwoy ew hing oč^cxar hasuc^ceal ew hing ardu p^coxndoy ew *kayt^c mi č^camič^c*, ew palatits erkeriwr, ew ed i veray išoy] ‘Then Abigail made haste, and took two hundred loaves, and two bottles of wine, and five sheep ready dressed, and five measures of parched corn, and hundred clusters of raisins, and two hundred cakes of figs, and laid them on asses’ [*The Bible, A Kings* 25: 18-35]. This part is a translation from the Greek origin: ‘καὶ ἔσπενσεν Αβιγαία καὶ ἔλαβεν διάκοσιον ἄρτον καὶ δύο ἀγγεῖα οἶνον καὶ πέντε πρόβατα πεποιημένα καὶ πεντε οἶφι ἀλφίτον καὶ γομορ ἔν σταφίδος καὶ διαστιας παλάθας καὶ ἔθετο ἐπὶ τούς ὄνονς’ [*The Bible, Bas., A*, 18-20].

The following comments are rather important.

1) Zohrapian’s text of the “Holy Books” (see “*Holy Bible. Old and New Testaments*”, editor I. Zohrapean, Venice, 1805) contains the Armenian expression *կայթ մի չամիչ* [*kayt^c mi č^camič^c*] ‘a pot of raisins’ and such comments: “Hebrew հարեր ողկոյ չամիչ [*harewr ołkoyz č^camč^coy*] ‘a hundred bunches of raisins’, i. e. the Hebrew text can be translated in different ways”;

2) according to the Hebrew text the later translations contain dissimilar phrases: *հարյուր ողկոյ չամիչ* [*haryur ołkuyz č^camič^c*] ‘a hundred bunches of raisins’ or *մեկ զամբյուղ չամիչ* [*mek zambyuł č^camič^c*] ‘a basket of raisins’ [see *The Bible*, 1896 (printed copy): 361, and 1981: 377, 1994: 377, 1994, 1999: 351 etc.].

3) Only Etchmiadzin version applies the new meaning of the word *կայթ* [*kayt^c*] as ‘a basket’ which is rather close to the concept of *զամբյուղ* [*zambyuł*] ‘a basket, a pot’.

Afterwards, Old Armenian translation suggests Greek correspondences *ἀγγεία, οἶφι, γομορ*, and *παλάθας* for Arm. *ամամի* [aman] ‘receptacle; pitcher, crockery’, *արիւն* [ardu] ‘(measures) unit of weight’, *կայթ* [kayt^c] ‘pot, basket’ and *ւաղաւաղ* [pałatit] ‘bunch; cluster’, however only the latter is a loan word, the rest are translations.

Consequently, the Greek phrase *γομορ ἐν σταφίδος* is translated into Old Armenian (Grabar) as *կայթ մի շամիչ* [kayt^c mi č^camič^c] ‘a basket of raisins’ and in New Armenian (Ashkharabar) the same expression is translated as *հարյուր նղկույզ շամիչ* [haryur ołkuyz č^camič^c] ‘a hundred bunches of raisins’ or *մեկ զամբրյուղ շամիչ* [mek zambyuł č^camič^c] ‘a basket of raisins’. It is obvious that the word *կայթ* [kayt^c] ‘pot, basket’ has not found its implementation in New Armenian because of its semantic obscurity. Thus, the application of that word is limited only within the Armenian semiotics and its source must be found in Ancient Armenian.

c) Adjaryan refuses the existing etymology and interpretation attempts about the word *կայթ* [kayt^c]. The explanation of the author of “The New Armenian Dictionary” is rather noteworthy. It runs as follows: “as root word for harvesting, i.e. *կթոց* [kt^coč^c], *թթոց* [k^ct^coč^c], *կեղթ* [kelt^c] ‘basket of grapes, raisins or grape bunch’” [NAD, 1837: 1044]. The explanation *նղկույզ ճնղիւ* [ołkoyz noč^cin] ‘bunch of raisins, grapes’ (i.e. for grapes and raisin- V.H.) considers the translation of the “Holy Bible”, while the other cases consider the definition of ‘pot, basket’. The authors of NAD also add that the literary word *կեղթ* [kelt^c] ‘basket’ has the anticipatoral phoneme *ղ* (ł) which is present in the dialectal form *կաղց* (kałc^c) ‘milk’. Moreover, literal forms of *կթոց* [kt^coč^c] and dialectal *թթոց* [k^ct^coč^c] are also mentioned which suggests being derived from *կայթ* (<*կայթ*) [kayt^c, kałc^c] root.

The authors of NAD point out the native names which are loans with substantial measure units *գրիւ* [griu] ‘measure (of bread, wine etc.)’, *քոռ* [k^coɾ] ‘sort of measure’, *արիւն* [ardu] ‘a kind of measure’ *գոմոր* [gomor] ‘sort of measure’ which have their semantic and lexical application in the Holy Bible and its translations. It is reasonable to assume that Adjaryan could have

admitted this prestigious explanation as a base for the etymology of the word *կայթ* [kaytʰ].

Both the words *արηմ* [ardu] ‘a kind of measure’ used in the Holy Bible and *կայթ* [kaytʰ] (< **կայթ* [katʰ]) are featured with phonetic mutations which are vital for the comprehension of the Armenian historical phonetics. According to the Greek scholars the Arm. *արηմ* [ardu] is a loan word from OGk. *ἀρτάβη* ‘name of Persian measure’, i. e. “the Greek authors have passed on to us and from which the Arab. *irdabb* or *ardabb* forms have been loaned” [see *Adjaryan* 1971: 310].

d) The word *կայթ* [kaytʰ] has not had any comparative-etymological explanation yet. It was used during the later centuries as a common name of a container of grain (barley, wheat, corn etc.) [*Adjaryan* 1973: 505]. Later on etymological studies do not comprise the assessment of the word *կայթ* [kaytʰ] ‘basket, pot’ [see *Djahukyan* 1970; 1987: 311-321; *Greppin* 1980; 1982 etc.].

3. We are apt to think that the Arm. *կայթ* [kaytʰ] ‘basket, pot’ has Indo-European origin and its counterpart is the Hier.-Luv. *kati-* which is associated with Greek (even Pre-Greek or Pelasgian) forms.

a) Before we reflect the phonetic association between Hitt.-Luv. (Anatolian) and Armenian languages or the etymology of the word *կայթ* [kaytʰ] ‘basket, pot’, we should mention that it is considered a loan word from Hittite-Luvian languages to Greek at a very early period. Apparently, the word was borrowed through Pre-Greek (Pelasgian). Theoretically the Pre-Greek *κηθίς* ‘basket, pot’ and *κάθιδοι* ‘pans, basket’ are also loan words with the similar B and A types i.e. with the Pre-Greek and Kretominoian form *ka-ti* [see *Chadwick/Baumbach* 1963: 209].

The Pre-Greek *κηθίς* and *κάθιδοι* are loans from the earlier period of Anatolian languages especially from the hieroglyph. Luv. *kati-* (see *Гиндун* 1967: 168). Furthermore, we can confirm that those Pre-Greek cognates are loan forms, with the help of the evidence of the existing “voiceless aspirates in (pre)Greek is a contradiction to Hittite-Luvian simple voiceless consonants and this fact supposes the subsistence of a mediator language” [cf. *Гиндун* 1967: 168].

b) We should notice that later on Djahukyan, perhaps not independent from Gindin's view, finds the Pelasgian "consonant system like Armenian had consonant shift: IE **bh, *dh, *gh* > Pel. *b, d, g*, IE **b, *d, *g* > Pel. *p, t, k*, IE **p, *t, *k* > Pel. *ph, th, kh* (the aspirate shift is not observed only in rare cases which is explained with the difference of times they are borrowed)" [Djahukyan 1970: 83-84]. This phenomenon is proved by V. Georgiev [see *Георгиев* 1958, and *Georgiev* 1981; see also Gindin's thesis in: "*Вопросы языкознания*" 1959: 106].

c) In this case the mediator language could be only Pelasgian: cf. Pre-Greek-Anatolian **gati-* > Pre-Greek (Pelasgian) **kathi-* or **khathi-* > Gk *κηθίς* though the invariant form for Pre-Greek (Pelasgian) is **k(h)athi-* [see *Гиндин* 1959: 106, 185].

As a result we can claim that there exists the correspondence among Anatolian (Hitt.-Luvian) *g* > Pelasgian *k* and Anatolian (Hitt.-Luvian) *t* > Pelasgian *th* etc. (*Гиндин*, op.cit.). Notably, this theory was based on the thesis that in Luvian the *gati-*, and not the *kati-* form could be reconstructed.

4. If we discuss the Arm. *լւյթ* 'basket', the Hier.Luv. *kati-* and Pre-Greek **k(h)athi-* (variants: **kathi-* and **khathi-*), Kretomin. *ka-ti*, Gk . *κηθίς* and *κάθιδοι* with their initial meanings, i.e. the concept which is common for all of them ('to separate, to acquire, to achieve, to store, etc. '), it can be concluded that they all are related with Gk. *κτάομαι* 'I achieve', *κτῆμα* 'achievement; share', Mik.Gk. *ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na* ~ *κτιμένα κτοίνα* 'to give land, share of land', and Ind. *kṣatrám* and *kṣatriya* '(initial meaning) a share, a piece of land' [see *Иванов* 1965: 39, 289; *Гамкрелидзе/Иванов* 1984: 148, 788 etc.].

a) Hier.Luv., Pre-Greek (Pelasgian) and Modern Greek and other languages root-words contain simple vowel in contrast to Armenian diphthong *ւյ* [ay]. Yet, this phenomenon is not limited to the above-mentioned languages. Adjaryan considers the initial variant of that word to be with the vowel *u* [a]. This type of root words refer to the old period of Armenian which appeared only in literary works. The registers of the Armenian dialects testify that they are a manifestation of much earlier facts.

It is a common rule from the comparative-etymological viewpoint: cf.

գայթ [gayt^c] ‘to slip, to fail, to make a mistake’, and *զտղ* [gēd] ‘mistake’, *զհթ* [git^c] or *զուրթ* [gut^c] (*dial.*) *զթել* [gt^cel] ‘to mislead, to destroy’:

դայլ // *դալ* [dayl, dal] ‘beestings’, and *դիել* [diel] ‘to breastfeed’;

վայթել [vayt^cel] ‘to empty, to fill out’, and *վաթել* // *վոթել* [vat^cel, vot^cel] ‘id.’, *վիթեալ* [vit^ceal] ‘to pour to the end’;

ցայթ // *ցայտ* [c^cayt^c, c^cayt] ‘to spring, the hop, spring (something)’ and (*dial.*) *ցաթել* [c^cat^cēl] ‘to pee’;

ծաթիլ // *ձաթիլ* [cat^cil, jat^cil] ‘to spring’;

ցալ // *ցալակ* [c^cayl, c^calak] ‘pubis’ (according to Adjaryan an unknown word though is has IE origin);

փայլ//*փաղ*//*փող* [p^cayl,p^coł] ‘brilliance; wave, flutter’, *փայլել* [p^caylel] ‘shine, glitter’, *փաղփաղիլ* [p^calp^calel] ‘gleam; sparkle’, *փողել* [p^cołel] (*idem*), *փողփողել* [p^cołp^cołel] (*idem*) etc. [see *Adjaryan* 1971: 510-511, 611, 619, and 1979: 300, 449, 476-477; *Hambardzumyan* 1998: 25-26; *Simonyan* 2008: 3-6 etc.].

b) Fostering Adjaryan’s correction of the word *կայթ* [kayt^c] into *կաթ* [kat^c] in one of the original works we conclude that those words are plausible variants (in written sources) which had lexical-communicative value. Conversely, as the common denotation of the word *կայթ* [kayt^c] is ‘to gather, to separate’ we can state that the words *կիթ* [kit^c] ‘the product from the cattle’ and *կուրթ* [kut^c] (*cp.* *այգեկուրթ* [aygekut^c]) ‘the blossom and harvest of the orchard’ are variants (see "The Bible" the meaning of ‘basket, pot’ for the word *կայթ* [kayt^c]) along with the Arm. (*dial.*) *քթել* [k^ct^cel]// *քթել* [k^ct^cēl] ‘to milk; to harvest the orchard’, *կթոց* [kt^coc^c] ‘the container for the harvest; basket, pot’, (*dial.*) *քթոց* [k^ct^cot^c] [*id.*].

According to Adjaryan the last three words are word stems or root word alternates and haven’t got their etymology yet [*Adjaryan* 1973: 585]. The list can be furthered with the Arm. (*dial.*) *քթվել* // *քթվիլ* [k^ct^cvel, k^ct^cvil] ‘to clean the hair from nits, to clean the hair’ (e.g. *Mush*, *Alashkert* etc.).

5. Consequently, we can assume that *կայթ* [kayt^c] (< *կաթ* [kat^c]), *կիթ* [kit^c], *կութ* [kut^c] and others are Armenian alterations and have IE origin. The comparison of the data of the related languages enables us to reconstruct a counterpart, which was the source for the above mentioned forms IE **gat-i-* with the particle *-i- as the basic vowel [according to Adjaryan the word *կայթ* [kayt^c] belonged to the *h* [i] declination in Old Armenian.

Finally, we should mention that *կաթ* [kat^c] ‘to pick, to store, to obtain, to separate, etc.’, is a completely different root-word as compared with word *կաթն* [kat^cn] ‘milk, product’.

Bibliography

1. Dictionaries

Adjaryan H.

1911. Հայերէն գաւառական բառարան («Էմինեան ազգագրական ժողովածու») [Hayerēn gawarakan bařaran] (“Vocabulary of Armenian Dialects”) (*“Eminean azgagrakan žolowacu”*), vol. 6, Moscow.

1971-1979. Հայերէն արմատական բառարան [Hayerēn armatakan bařaran] (“Dictionary of Armenian Roots”), vol. 1-4, Yerevan.

Amatuni S.

1912. Հայոց բառ ու բան [Hayoc^o bař u ban] (“Armenian Word and Speech”), Vařarřapat.

Awetikhean G., Siwrmēlean X., Awgerean M.

1836-1837. Նոր բառգիրք հայկազեան լեզուի [Nor bařgirk^o haykazean lezui] (“The New Armenian Dictionary”), vol. 1-2, Venice:

Djahukyan G.B.

2010. Հայերէն ստուգաբանական բառարան [Hayeren stugabanakan bařaran], Yerevan.

Eremia Meghretsi

1698. Բառգիրք հայոց [Bařgirk^o hayoc^o] (“Dictionary Armenian”), Halikornay.

1975. Բառգիրք հայոց [Bařgirk^o hayoc^o] (“Dictionary Armenian”), Yerevan.

Hovhannisyen L.

2010. Գրաբարի բառարան. Նոր հայկազյան բառարանում չվկայված բառեր [Grabari bařaran. Nor hajkazyen bařaranum č^ovkajvac bařer], Yerevan.

Laroche E.

1959. Dictionnaire de la langue louvite, Paris.

1966. Les noms des hittites, Paris.

Malxaseants St.

1944-1945. Հայերէն բացատրական բառարան [Hayerēn bac^oatrakan bařaran] (“Armenian explanatory Dictionary”), vol. 1-4, Yerevan.

Martirosyan H.

2010. Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon, Leiden-Boston.

Mchithar Sebastatsi (and disciples).

1947-1769. Բառգիրք հայկազեան լեզուի [Bařgirk^o haykazean lezui] (“Dictionary of the Armenian Language”, vol. 1-2, Venice..

Qadjuni M.

1892. Բառգիրք արուեստից եւ գիտութեանց եւ գեղեցիկ դարութեանց
[Bargirk^c aruestic^c ew gitut^c eanc^c ew gefec^c ik dprut^c eanc^c] (“Dictionary
of Art and Sciences and Pretty Literature”), vol. 1-3, Venice.

Фасмер М.

1986-1987. Этимологический словарь русского языка, тт. 1-4, Москва.

Berneker E.

1908-1913. Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Heidelberg.

Boisacq E.

1923. Dictionnaire étymologique de la lange grecque, Paris.

Buck C.D.

1949. A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European
Languages, Chicago.

Pokorny J.

1959-1969. Indogermanisches Etymologisches Worterbuch, Bd. 1-2, Bern-
München.

Puhvel J.

1984. Hittite Etymological Dictionary (Trends in linguistics. Documentation
1. Editor W. Werner), vol. 1 (Words beginning with A), vol. 2 (Words
beginning with E and I), Mouton Publishers. Berlin-New York-
Amsterdam.

Tischler J.

1990-1993. Hethitisches etymologisches Glossar, mit Beiträgen von
G. Neumann und E. Neu, Lieferungen 5 und 6 (L-M), Teil II-III,
Lieferungen 7 und 8 (N und T, D/1), teil III, Lieferung 9 (T, D/2),
Innsbruck.

Watkins C.

1985. The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots, Boston.

2. Texts

Agathangehos

1909. Պատմութիւն Հայոց [Patmut^c iwn Hayoc^c] (“History of Armenia”),
Tbilisi.

Barsegh Kessaratsi

1830. Ճառք վասն վեցօրեայ արարչութեան [Čark^c vasn ve^c awreay
ararč^c ut^c ean]. Venice.

Biblia.

1894. Die Heilige Schrift der alten und neuen Testamente, Freiburg und
Leipzig:

The Bible [Holy Bible or Biblia]

1895. Սուրբ գիրք. Աստուածաշունչ մատեան Հին եւ Նոր Կտակարանաց [Surb Girk^c: Astuacašunč^c matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranac^c] (“Holy Bible: Old and New Testament”), Konstantinopol.
1805. Սուրբ գիրք. Աստուածաշունչ մատեան Հին եւ Նոր Կտակարանաց (յաշխատասիրութենէ տեան Յովհաննու Չոհրապետան) [Surb Girk^c: Astuacašunč^c matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranac^c (“Holy Bible: Old and New Testament”, ed. by Iohan Zohrapean)], Venice.
1981. Սուրբ գիրք. Աստուածաշունչ մատեան Հին եւ Նոր Կտակարանների [Surb Girk^c: Astuacašunč^c matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranneri] (“Holy Bible: Old and New Testament”), Beirut-Lebanon.
1984. Սուրբ գիրք. Աստուածաշունչ մատեան Հին եւ Նոր Կտակարանների [Surb Girk^c: Astuacašunč^c matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranneri] (“Holy Bible: Old and New Testament”) Moscow.
1989. Սուրբ գիրք. Աստուածաշունչ մատեան Հին եւ Նոր Կտակարանների [Surb Girk^c: Astuacašunč^c matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranneri] (“Holy Bible: Old and New Testament”) Preprinted of 1896 ed.), Stuttgart.
- 1994 (second ed. 1999). Սուրբ գիրք. Աստուածաշունչ մատեան Հին եւ Նոր Կտակարանների [Surb Girk^c: Astuacašunč^c Matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranneri (New Arm. trans.)] (“Holy Bible: Old and New Testament”), St.Edjmiacin.
- Eusebeos Kesaratsi*
1818. Ժամանակակապ [Žamanakakank^c], Venice.
“*Knik^c hawatoy*”
1914. Կնիք հաւատոյ [Knik^c hawatoy] (Collection), St.Edjmiacin.
- Lalayan Eruand*
1916. Ազգագրական հանդէս (պատկերազարդ) [Azgagrakan handēs (patkerazard)] [Ethnographic magazine (illustrated)], vol. 5, Tbilisi.
- Movsēs Khorenatsi*
1913. Պատմութիւն Հայոց [Patmut^ciwn Hajoc^c] (“History of Armenia”), Tbilisi.
- Phawstos Buzand*
1987. Պատմութիւն Հայոց [Patmut^ciwn Hayoc^c] (“History of Armenia”), Yerevan.
- Timotheos Kuz*
1908. Հակաճարտութիւն [Hakačarut^ciwn]. St.Edjmiacin.
- Yovhan Oskeberan*
1826. Յաւետարանագիրն Սատթէնս [Yawetaranagirn Matt^ceos], Venice.

1862. Մեկնութիւն թղթոցն Պօղոսի [Meknut'iw n t'ht'oc' n Połosi],
Venice.
Zakharia Sarkawag
1870. Պատմութիւն [Patmut'iw n], Vagharshapat.

3. Works

Abrahamyan A. A.

1958. Բառաքնական դիտողություններ [Barak'nnakan ditohut'yunner]
(*Hajkakan SSR gituf'yunneri akademiaji «Tel'ekagir»*, № 4: 61-64).

Aghabekyan M.A.

1979. Հայ-իտալյան բառային զուգարանությունները [Hay-italyan barayin
zugabanut'yunnerə ("Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erakanut'yan
harc'er", Yerevan: 23-127)].

1998. Հայերենի համեմատական հնչյունաբանության հարցեր [Hayereni
hamematakan hnc'yunabanut'yan harc'er] ("Hayoc' lezvi
hamematakan k'erakanut'yan harc'er", 2, Yerevan: 49-144).

Aghayan E.B.

1974. Բառաքնական և ստուգաբանական հետազոտություններ
[Barak'nnakan ew stugabanakan hetazotut'yunner], Yerevan.

1961. Հայերենի հնչյոյթային համակարգի պատմությունից [Hayereni
hnc'uyt'ayin hamakargi patmut'yunic'] ("Patma-banasirakan handes",
№ 2: 67-90).

Adjaryan H.

1908. Հայերէն ստուգաբանութիւններ [Hayerēn stugabanut'iw nner]
("Handēs amsoreay", № 22: 120-124).

- 1940-1951. Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն [Hayoc' lezvi patmut'yun], vol. 1-2,
Yerevan.

1957. Լիակատար քերականություն հայոց լեզվի [Liakatar k'erakanut'yun
hayoc' lezvi], vol. 3, Yerevan.

Aywazovski G.

1852. Յաղագս հնչման լ [l] տառին [Yalags hnc'man l tarin], Teodosia.

Aytənean A.

1866. Քննական քերականութիւն աշխարհաբար կամ արդի հայերէն լեզուի
[K'nnakan k'erakanut'iw n ašxarhabar kam ardi hayerēn lezui], Vien.

Bediryan P.

2012. Հայերենագիտական հոդվածներ ու նոթեր [Hayerenagitakan
hodvacner u not'er], Yerevan.

Djahukyan G.B.

1956. Հայոց լեզվի պերիոդիզացիայի հարցերը [Hayoc^o lezvi periodizacⁱayi harc^oerə] (“*Erevani petakan hamalsarani gitakan ašxatut^ounner*”, № 57: 49-100).
1959. Հին հայերենի հոլովման սխառնը և նրա ծագումը [Hin hayereni holovman sistemə ew nra cagumə], Yerevan.
1964. Հայոց լեզվի զարգացման փուլերը [Hayoc^o lezvi zargac^oman p^oulerə], Yerevan.
- 1964a. Ստուգաբանություններ [Stugabanut^oyunner] (“*Patma-banasirakan handes*”, № 4 : 85-98).
1967. Հայերենի և խեթալուվական լեզուների բառային կազմի ծագումնային զուգադիպումները [Hayereni ew xet^oaluvakan lezneri barayin kazmi cagumnayin zugadipunnerə] (“*Patma-banasirakan handes*”, № 4: 57-74).
- 1967a. Հայերենի բառապաշարի խեթալուվական տարրերը [Hayereni barapašari xet^oaluvakan tarrerə] (“*Banber Erevani hamalsarani*”, № 2 : 111-124).
1970. Հայերենը և հնդեվրոպական հին լեզուները [Hayerenə ew hndewropakan hin lezunerə], Yerevan.
1972. Հայ բարբառագիտության ներածություն [Hay barbaragitut^oyan neracut^oyun], Yerevan.
1976. Հնդեվրոպական բաղաձայնախմբերի արտացոլումը հայերենում [Hndewropakan bałajaynaxmberi artac^oolumə hayerenum] (“*Handēs amsoreay*”, col.: 258-272).
1986. Հայկական շերտը ուրարտական դիցարանում [Haykakan šertə urartakan dic^oaranum] (“*Patma-banasirakan handes*”, № 1: 43-58).
1987. Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն: Նախագրային ժամանակաշրջան [Hayoc^o lezvi patmut^oyun. Naxagrayin žamanakašrjan], Yerevan.
1988. Ուրարտերենը և հայերենը [Urarterenə ew hayerenə] (*B.N.Arakelyan, G.B.Djahukyan, G.X.Sargsyan*, Ուրարտու և Հայաստան [Urartu ew Hayastan], Yerevan: 127-168).
1993. Ստուգաբանություններ [Stugabanut^oyunner] (“*Banber Erevani hamalsarani*”, № 2: 22-30).
1994. Դիտողություն մի դիտողության առթիվ [Ditołut^oyun mi ditołut^oyan art^oiv] (“*Banber Erevani hamalsarani*”, № 3: 75-76).
2000. Ուրարտական արձանագրությունների ներածական բանաձևերի հնարավոր հայկական բնույթի մասին [Urtakan arjanagrut^oyunneri neracakan banajeweri hnarawor haykakan bnuyt^oi masin] (“*Patma-banasirakan handes*”, № 1: 124-129).

2003. Արդյո՞ք հայերը ապրել են Առաջավոր Ասիայում մ.թ.ա. 12-րդ դարից առաջ [Ardyok^c hayerə aprel en Arajavor Asiyum m.t.^c.a. 12-rd daric^c araj] ("*Lezu ew lezvanut^cyun*", 1: 5-12).

Ghapantsyan G.A.

1961. Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն: Հին շրջան [Hayoc^c lezvi patmut^cyun. Hin šrjan], Yerevan.

Hambardzumyan V.G.

1977. Լեզվական միավորների նշանային բնութագիրը [Lezvakan miavorneri nšanayin bnut^cagirə] ("*Семантика, лингвистика и проблемы коммуникации. Тезисы докладов*", Երևան: 5-7).

1978. Լեզվի զարգացման արտաքին և ներքին գործոնների մասին [Lezvi zargac^c man artak^c in ew nerk^c in gorconneri masin] ("*Hajoc^c lezuv ew grakanut^cyun dproc^cum*", № 4: 50-54).

1981. Լեզու, ոճ, խոսք [Lezu, oč, xosk^c] ("*Banber Erevani hamalsarani*", № 3: 182 -191).

1990. Գրաբարի գործառնությունը որպես գրական լեզու ԺԸ-ԺԹ դդ. [Grabari gorcarut^cyunə orpes grakan lezu XVIII-XIX dd.], Yerevan.

1990a. Վերականգնենք «Տրտունջ»-ի ճիշտ բառը [Verakangnenk^c «Trtunj^c»-i čišť barə] («Avangard» (newspaper), № 113, p. 4): Idem in: «Grakan t^cert^c» (journal), 1991, 6 April, p. 2 [preprint from «Avangard» (newspaper)].

1995. Մովսես Խորենացու Պատմության «Տենչայ Սաթենիկ տիկին» հատվածը [Movses Xorenac^c u Patmut^cyan "Tenc^cay Sat^cenik tikin" hatvacə] ("*Patma-banasirakan handes*", № 2: 227-236).

1995a. Հայոց լեզվի պատմության ուսումնասիրության արդի խնդիրները [Hayoc^c lezvi patmut^cyan usumnasirut^cyan ardi xndirnerə] ("*Festschrift Prof. Dr. Dora Sakayan zum 65 Geburtstag*", part 1, Montreal, Quebec Canada: 92-99):

1996. Հայերեն ստուգաբանություններ [Hayeren stugabanut^cyunner] ("*Patma-banasirakan handes*", № 1-2: 189-192).

1996a. Հ. -ե. պայթական բաղաձայնների տեղաշարժի «ոչ լիարժեք» արտացոլումը հայերենում [H.-e. payt^cakan bałajaynneri telašarzi 'oč^c-liaržek^c artac^columə hayerenum] ("*Nšanagitut^cyun ew lezuni dasavandum. T^cezisner*", Yerevan: 30-31).

1996b. Հայերեն *աղջիկ* բառի ստուգաբանությունը [Hayeren ałjik 'girl' bari stugabanut^cyunə] ("*Mižazgayin gitažolov, nvirvac A.Meyei cnndyan 180-amyakin. Zekuc^cumneri t^cezisner*", Yerevan: pp. 17-18).

1997. Հայերեն *աղջիկ* բառի ստուգաբանությունը [Hayeren ałjik 'girl' bari stugabanut^cyunə] ("*Patma-banasirakan handes*", № 2: 149 -158).

1997a. Հայերեն *աշան* բառի ստուգաբանությունը [Hayeren ašan 'threshing' bari stugabanut^cyunə] ("*Gitažolov, nvirvac G. Djahukyani cnndyan 77- amyakin. Zekuc^cumneri t^cezisner*", Yerevan: p. 38).

- 1998-2007. Ակնարկներ հայոց լեզվի համեմատական բառագիտության [Aknarkner hayoc^c lezvi hamematakan baragitut^cyan], 1-2, Yerevan.
2001. Հայոց լեզվի կետադրական տերմինների ծագումը և կառուցվածքը [Hayoc^c lezvi ketadrakan termineri cagumə ew karuc^cvack^cə] ("*Patma-banasirakan handes*", № 1: 202-218).
2002. Հայերեն աստուած բառի ծագումը [Hayeren *astuac* ‘God’ bari cagumə] ("*Ejmiacin*", 5: 43-59).
- 2002a. Հնդեվրոպական արմատի տարբերակայնությունը և հայերեն աստուած բառի ծագումը և տիպաբանությունը [Hndewropakan armati tarberakaynut^cyunə ew hayeren *astuac* ‘God’ bari cagumə ew tipabanut^cyunə] ("*Patma-banasirakan handes*", № 3:242 -260).
- 2002b. Հայերեն աստված բառի ծագումն ու տիպաբանությունը [Hayeren *astua* ‘God’ bari cagumn u tipabanut^cyunə], Yerevan.
2003. Հնդեվրոպական ծագման հայերեն արմատի տարբերակային վերականգնման և տիպաբանական վերլուծության խնդիրները [Hndewropakan cagman hayeren armati tarberakayin verakangnman ew tipabanakan verlucut^cyan xndirnerə] ("*Lezu ew lezvabanut^cyun*", № 1: 39-43).
- 2003a. Հնդեվրոպական տարբերակայնությունը և հայոց լեզվի տարբերակային ուսումնասիրության խնդիրները [Hndewropakan tarberakaynut^cyunə ew hayoc^c lezvi tarberakayin usumnasirut^cyan xndirnerə] ("*Hayagitut^cyan ardi vičakə ew nra zargac^cman hejankarnerə. Zekuc^cumneri druyf^cner*. September 15-20, 2003", Yerevan: 125-127).
2005. Հայերեն *ծախ* ~ լուվ. *taui*- [Hayeren *cawi* ~ Luv.*taui*-] ("*Hanrapetakan gitažolovi nyuf^ceri žolovacu*", Yerevan-Vanajor: 61-66).
- Hanneyan M.*
1979. Մարմնի մասերի հնդեվրոպական անվանումների տարածքային նկարագիրը հայերենում [Marmni maseri hndewropakan anvanumneri tarack^cayin nkaragirə hayerenum]. ("*Hayoc^c lezvi hamematakan k^cerekanut^cyan harc^cer*", Yerevan: 128-187).
- Hmayakyan S.*
1990. Վանի թագավորության պետական կրոնը [Vani t^cagavorut^cyan petakan kronə], Yerevan.
- Hmayakyan S., Grekyan E.*
2010. Վանը հնադարում (*Տյրուշյա, Տուշյա, Տոսյ*) [Vanə hndarum (Turšpa, Tušpa, Tosp)] ("*Patma-banasirakan handes*", № 3: 3-19).
- Hübschmann H.*
2003. Հայերենի քերականություն: Առաջին մաս. Հայերեն ստուգաբանություններ [Hayereni k^cerakanut^cyun: Arajin mas. Hayeren stugabanut^cyunner], Yerevan.

2004. Հայագիտական ուսումնասիրություններ [Hayagitakan usumansirut'yunner], Yerevan.
- Kortlandt F.*
1983. Պատմասիանմատական հնչյունաբանության հարցեր [Patmahamematakan hnc'yunabanut'yan harc'er] ("Hayoc' lezu ew grakanut'yun: Gitakan asxatut'yunneri miḡbuhakan žolovacu", Yerevan: 54-70).
- Margaryan A.*
1994. «Աշան» բառի այլ ստուգաբանության փորձ ["Ašan" bari ayl stugabanut'yan p'orj] ("Banber Yerevani hamalsarani", № 2: 72-74).
- Martirosyan H.A.*
1969. Ուշ բրոնզեդարյան բնակավայրեր և դամբարանադաշտեր [Uš bronzedaryan bnakavayrer ew dambaranadašter], Yerevan.
- Meillet A.*
1974. Հայագիտական ուսումնասիրություններ [Hayagitakan usumansirut'yunner], Yerevan.
- Msereants L.*
1898. Հայերեն բարբառախօսութիւն [Hayerēn barbaraxosut'awn] ["Handēs amsoreay" (magazine), pp. 306-313].
1899. Հայերեն բարբառախօսութիւն [Hayerēn barbaraxosut'awn], Vien.
- Simonyan N. M.*
1979. Հայ բարբառների հնդեվրոպական հնաբանությունները [Hay barbarneri hndewropakan hnabanut'yunnerə] ("Hayoc' lezvi hamematakan k'erekanut'yan harc'er", Yerevan: 188-248).
2008. Ստուգաբանական դիտողություններ [Stugabanakan ditolut'yunner] ("Lezu ew lezvabanut'yun", № 2: 3-6).
- Spenean K.*
1920. Ուսումն դասական հայերեն լեզուի [Usumn dasakan hayeren lezui: haykabanut'awn], Vien.
- Sukiasyan H.V.*
1986. Աճականը հայերենում [Ačakanə hayerenum], Yerevan.
- Ter-Mkrтчyan G.*
1979. Հայագիտական ուսումնասիրություններ [Hayagitakan usumnasirut'yunner], vol. 1, Yerevan.
- Tervishean S.*
1887. Հնդեվրոպական նախալեզու [Hndewropakan naxalezu], K.Polis.
- Tshanashian M.*
1956. Ստեփանոս Ռոշքայի բառարանը (քննական տեսութիւն մը) [Step'anos Roškayi ba'aranə (k'nnakan tesut'awn mə)] ("Baxmavēp" (magazine), pp. 254-255), Vien.

Vardanyan A.

1921. Բարակնական նոր դիտողություններ [Barak^cnnakan nor ditohut^ciwnner] [*"Handēs amsoreay"* (magazine), № 7-8].

Абаев В.И.

1956. О принципах этимологического исследования ("Вопросы методики сравнительно-исторического изучения индоевропейских языков", Москва).

1965. Скифско-европейские изоглоссы. На стыке Востока и Запада, Москва.

Амаякян С.Г.

1982. Культ солнца у земледельческо-скотоводческих общин Закавказья и Урартское божество Шивини ("Культурный прогресс в эпоху бронзы и раннего железа", Ереван: 141-143).

Амбарцумян В.Г.

2001. Вариативность индоевропейского корня и происхождение и типология армянского слова *astuac* "бог" ("*Мацгоцские чтения*" , 3, Ошакан: 21-22).

Ахманова О.С.

1957. Очерки по общей и русской лексикологии, Москва.

Ахманова О.С., Бельчиков Ю. А., Веселитский В. В.

1960. К вопросу о "правильности" речи ("*Вопросы языкознания*", № 2: 35-42).

Блумфилд Л.

1968. Язык. Москва.

Бомхард А.Р.

1989. Очерк сравнительной фонологии так называемых "ностратических" языков ("*Вопросы языкознания*", № 3: 33-50).

Гамкрелидзе Т.В.

1984. Индоевропейская "глоттальная теория" и система древнеармянского консонантизма ("Международный симпозиум по армянскому языкознанию", Ереван: 31-34).

Гамкрелидзе Т.В., Иванов Вяч. Вс.

1972. Лингвистическая типология и реконструкция системы индоевропейских смычных. "Конференция по сравнительно-исторической грамматике индоевропейских языков" (12-14 декабря). Предварительные материалы, Москва: 15-18).

1980. Древняя Передняя Азия и индоевропейская проблема ("*Вестник древней истории*", № 3).

1980а. Реконструкция системы смычных общеиндоевропейского языка. Глоттализированные смычные в индоевропейском ("*Вопросы языкознания*", № 4: 21-35).

1981. Миграции племен носителей индоевропейских диалектов (“Вестник древней истории”, № 2).
1984. Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы: Реконструкция и историко-типологический анализ праязыка и протокультуры, тт. 1-2, Тбилиси.
- Георгиев В.И.*
1958. Исследование по сравнительно-историческому языкознанию (Родственные отношения индоевропейских языков), Москва.
- Гигинейшвили Б.К.*
1972. Сравнительная реконструкция и вопрос о вариативности в языкооснове (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 4: 48-52).
- Гиндин Л.А.*
1959. Обзор литературы по “пелазгскому” (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 5: 105-114).
1967. Язык древнейшего населения юга Балканского полуострова. Фрагмент индоевропейской ономастики, Москва.
- Горбачевич К.С.*
1978. Вариативность слова и языковая норма, Москва.
- Десницкая А.В.*
1990. О понятии второго генетического родства и о его значении для исследования проблем балканистики (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 1: 38-44).
- Джаукян Г.Б.*
1960. К вопросу о происхождении консонантизма армянских диалектов (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 6: 39-49).
1963. Урартский и индоевропейские языки, Ереван.
1964. Хайасский язык и его отношение к индоевропейским языкам, Ереван.
1967. Очерки по истории дописьменного периода армянского языка, Ереван.
- 1967а. Взаимоотношение индоевропейских, хурритско-урартских и кавказских языков, Ереван.
1978. Общее и армянское языкознание, Ереван.
1982. Индоевропейская фонема *b и вопросы реконструкции индоевропейского консонантизма (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 5: 59-67).
- 1982а. Сравнительная грамматика армянского языка, Ереван.
1983. Опыт семантической классификации и ареального распределения индоевропейской лексики армянского языка (Г. Б. Джаукян, Л. А. Сараджева, Ц.Р. Арутюнян, Очерки по сравнительной лексикологии армянского языка, Ереван: 5-116).

1984. Об этимологических дублетах и параллелях в армянском языке (*“Международный симпозиум по армянскому языкознанию”*: 149-160).
1999. Универсальная теория языка. Прологомены к субстанциональной лингвистике, Москва.
- Дюмезиль Ж.*
1986. Верховные боги индоевропейцев, Москва.
2001. Осетинский эпос и мифология, 2-ое изд., Владикавказ.
- Иванов Вяч. Вс.*
1958. Проблемы языков centum и satem (*“Вопросы языкознания”*, 4: 12-23).
- 1958а. Типология и сравнительно-историческое языкознание (*“Вопросы языкознания”*, № 5: 34-42).
1963. Хеттский язык, Москва.
1965. Общеиндоевропейская, праславянская и анатолийская языковые системы, Москва.
1977. К истории древних названий металлов в южнобалканском, малоазийском и средиземноморском ареалах (*“Славянское и балканское языкознание: Античная балканистика и сравнительная грамматика”*, Москва).
1982. Хетто-лувийские (анатолийские) языки (*“Сравнительно-историческое изучение языков разных семей: Задачи и перспективы”*, Москва: 31-48).
1984. Первоначальная глубинная структура текста гимна Вахагну и проблемы древнеармянской этимологии (*“Международный симпозиум по армянскому языкознанию”*: Ереван: 61-86).
- Иллич-Свитыч В. М.*
1961. Один из источников начального X в праславянском, (*“Вопросы языкознания”*, № 4: 93-98).
- Капанцян Г.А.*
1931. Chetto-armeniaca. Сравнительно-лингвистическое исследование выявляющее до 200 общих слов и форм, Ереван.
1947. Хайаса – колыбель армян. Этногенез армян и их начальная история, Ереван.
- 1956-1975. Историко-лингвистические работы, тт.1-2, Ереван.
- Кейпер Ф. Б. Я.*
1986. Труды по ведийской мифологии, Москва.
- Клычков Г.С.*
1975. Вариативность индоевропейских языков дописьменного периода (*“Вопросы языкознания”*, № 2: 100-110).

- Королев А.А.*
1976. Хетто-лувийские языки (“Языки Азии и Африки”, 1, Москва: 13-93).
- Курилович Е.*
1970. [Рец. на кн.]: Э.А.Макаев, Структура слова в индоевропейских и германских языках, Москва, 1970 (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 3: 122-123).
- Майрхофер М.*
1988. Индоевропейская грамматика, т. 2, Фонетика (“Новое в зарубежной лингвистике”, XXI, Москва: 126-148).
1988. Санскрит и языки Древней Европы: Два открытия и диспутов (“Новое в зарубежной лингвистике”, XXI, Москва: 507-530).
- Макаев Э.А.*
1965. Структура и стратиграфия общегерманской лексики (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 5: 3-12).
1967. Реконструкция индоевропейского этимона (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 4: 26-33).
- Мартине А.*
1965. Структурные вариации в языке (“Новое в лингвистике”, IV: 450-465).
- Мельничук А. С.*
1979. О генезисе индоевропейского вокализма (“Вопросы языкознания”, № 5: 3-16).
- Мнацаканян А.О.*
1960. Древние повозки (“Советская археология” № 2).
- Мсерианц Л.М.*
1897. Этюды по армянской диалектологии, часть 1. Сравнительная фонетика Мушского диалекта в связи с фонетикой грабара, Москва.
1901. Этюды по армянской диалектологии, часть 2. Сравнительная морфология Мушского диалекта в связи с морфологией грабара и среднеармянского, Москва.
- Нерозн В.П.*
1978. Палеобалканские языки, Москва.
1981. Индоевропейские языки (“Сравнительно-историческое изучение языков разных систем: Современное состояние и проблемы”, Москва: 8- 62).
- Патканов К. П.*
1875. Материалы для изучения армянских диалектов. Вып. 1: Говор Нахичеванский, Санкт-Петербург.
1875а. Материалы для изучения армянских наречий. Вып. 2: Мушский диалект, Санкт-Петербург., 1875.

- 1882-1884. Материалы для изучения армянского словаря, Вып. 1-2, Санкт-Петербург.
- Периханян А.Г.*
1993. Материалы к этимологическому словарю древнеармянского языка, Ереван.
- Пиотровский Б.Б.*
1959. Ванское царство (Урарту), Москва.
- Порциг В.*
1964. Членение индоевропейской языковой области, Москва.
- Семенюк Н.Н.*
1965. Некоторые вопросы изучения вариативности (*“Вопросы языкознания”*, № 1: 48-55).
- Скребнев Ю.М.*
1961. К вопросу об “ортологии” (*“Вопросы языкознания”*, № 1: 140-142).
- Туманян Э.Г.*
1978. Структура индоевропейских имен армянского языка, Москва.
- Филин Ф. Н.*
1963. О слове и вариантах слова (*“Морфологическая структура слова в языках различных типов”*, Москва-Ленинград: 128-133).
- Хоппер П. Дж.*
1988. Типология праиндоевропейского набора сегментов. (*“Новое в зарубежной лингвистике”*, XXI, Москва: 160-172).
- 1988а. Языки “desem” и “taihun”: Индоевропейская изоглосса (*“Новое в зарубежной лингвистике”*, XXI, Москва: 173-182).
- Широков О.С.*
1972. Кавказско-индоевропейские фонологические схождения (*“Конференция по сравнительно-исторической грамматике индоевропейских языков”* (12-14 декабря). Предварительные материалы, Москва: 92-93).
1988. Реконструкция праязыковых изоглосс общеиндоевропейского диалектного континуума (*“Сравнительно-историческое изучение языков разных семей: Теория лексической реконструкции”*, Москва: 26-67).
1991. Палеобалканские этнические связи по данным фригийской лексики (*“Сравнительно- историческое изучение языков разных семей: Лексическая реконструкция. Реконструкция исчезнувших языков”*, Москва: 57-64).
- Якобсон Р.*
1963. Типологические исследования и их вклад в сравнительно-историческое языкознание (*“Новое в лингвистике”*, III, Москва: 95-105).

- Anttila R.*
1969. Proto-Indo-European Schwebeablaut, Berkley-Los-Angeles.
- Barton R.*
1996. Armenian *malem, maem, alam* and the PIE verb **m(y)elh₂* ‘grind’ (*“Festschrift Prof. Dr. Dora Sakayan zum 65 Geburtstag”*, part 1, Montreal, Quebec Canada: 1, 21-27).
- Bediryan P.S.*
1975. Systeme des alternances vocaliques en pre-arménien (Istituto Lombardo-Academia di Scienze e Lettere, vol. 109: 451-459).
- Benveniste E.*
1962. Hittite et indoeuropéen, Paris, 1962.
1969. Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes: 1. *Economie, parenté, société*, 2. *Pouvoir, droit, religion*, Paris.
- Bolognesi G.*
1977. Sul sistema consonantico indoeuropeo e I suoi riflessi in epoca storica. Atti del Convegno della S.I.L. (*“L’indoeuropeo: prospettive e retrospettive”*, Milano, IULM, 16-18, ottobre: 147-176).
- Bomhard A.R.*
1981. A new look at Indo-European (*“The Journal of Indo-European Studies”*, vol.1, № 2).
- Bonfante G.*
1931. I dialetti indoeuropei (*“Anali del Roale Istituto Orientale di Napoli”*, vol. IV, fasc. IX: 69-85).
- Brugmann K.*
1904. Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, Strassburg, 1904.
- Chadwick J., Baumbach L.*
1963. The Mycenaean Greek vocabulary (*“Glota”*, vol. 41: 3-4).
- Djahukyan G.B.*
1983. On etymological doubles and paralleles of Armenian (*“Annual of Armenian Linguistics”*, vol. 4: 23-37).
1985. Die archaischen Schichten armenischer Dialektwörter (*“Studia linguistica Diachronica et Synchronica”*, Berlin-New-York-Amsterdam: 151-160).
1986-1987. L’etymologie des mots *haraw* ‘sud’, *hiwsis(i)* ‘nord’ et le systeme d’orientation des anciens arméniens (*“Revue des etudes arménienne”*, t. XX, Paris:29-33).
1990. Variational Model of the Indoeuropean Consonant System (*“Historische Sprachforschung (Historical Linguistics)”*. Band 103, Heft 1:1-16).

- 1990a. Combinatory Vowel Changes in Armenian (*“Annual of Armenian Linguistics”*, vol. 11: 1-16).
- 1990b. Did Armenian Live in Asia Anterior Before the Twelfth century B.C?. (*“When Worlds Collide: Indo-Europeans and Pre-Indo- Europeans”*, Karoma Publishers, Inc.: 25-33).
1993. The Armenian suffixes of Iranian origin (*“Comparative- Historical Linguistics: Indo-European und Finno-Ugric”*, Amsterdam-Philadelphia).
1997. Variative Modelle des Urindoeuropäischen und der Begriff der partiellen Parallelen (Isoglossen) (*“Studia indogermanica Lodziensia”*, vol. 1, Lodz: 45-66).
- Dumézil G.*
1968. Mythe et Epopee: L’ideologie dans les epopees des peuples indoeuropeens, Paris.
- Fourquet G.*
1948. Les mutations consonantiques du germanique. Essai de position des problèmes (*“Publications de la faculté des lettres de l’université de Strassburg”*, III, Paris).
- Gamkrelidze T.V., Ivanov V.V.*
1973. Rekonstruktion der indogermanischen Verschlüsse: Vorläufiger Bericht (*“Phonetica”*, vol. 27: 150-156).
- Georgiev V.I.*
1981. Introduction to History of the Indo-European Languages, Sofia. Bericht (*“Phonetica”*, vol. 27: 150-156).
- Gharibyan A.S.*
1968. A propos de la premiere mutation des consonnes des peuples indoeuropéens, Paris, 1968.
- Goetze A.*
1954. Some groups of ancient Anatolian proper names (*“Language”*, vol. 30, №3 : 349-359).
- Greppin J.A.C.*
1980. “Hittite” loan words in Armenian (*“Lautgeschichte und Etymologie”*, Wisbaden).
1982. The Anatolian Substrata in Armenian: An Interin Report, (*“Annual of Armenian Linguistics”*, vol. 3: 65-72).
1998. [Book Notes]: *V.G.Hambardzumyan*, Essays on Comparative Lexicology of the Armenian Language, Yerevan, 1998 (*“Annual of Armenian linguistics”*, vol. 19: 85-86).
- Hagège C., Haudricourt A.G.*
1978. La phonologie panchronique: Comment les sons changent dans les langues. Paris.

Hambardzumyan V.G.

1999. Linguistic Variations and the investigations of the Phonematic Variants of Old Armenuan Literary Language (“*Sixieme Colloque Internationale de Linguistique Armenienne. Abstracts*”, Paris: 25).
2001. The “Non-Complete” Shift of Indo-European Explosives in Armenian (“*Semiotics and Language Teaching: Theoretical Principles and Practicla Applications. Selected Papers Presented at the II Conference on Semiotics and Language Teaching Held at Yerevan State University, 20-22 May 1996*”, edited by Dora Sakayan, McGill University, Caravan Books, Ann Arbor: 5-32).
- 2001-2002. Variabilite linguistique et problemes d’etudes des variants morphologiques de l’arménien classique (“*Actes du Sixieme Colloque International de Linguistique Armenienne*”, Paris: 131-134).
2005. L’étymologie du mot arménien *ałjik* ‘fille’ (“*Language and Linguistics*”, 1: 5-8).
2006. Arm. *kayf* und Hier.-Luv. *gati*- (“*Language and Linguistics*”, 1: 46-47).

Hamp E. P.

1954. Gothic IUP ‘ǰvω’ (“*Modern Language Notes*”, № 1: 39-41).
1984. Remarks on *astuac* (“*Annual of Armenian Linguistics*”, vol. 5: 87-89).

Haudricourt A.G.

1975. Les mutations consonantiques (occlusives) en indo-européen, (“*Melanges Linguistiques offert à Emile Benveniste*”, Société de Linguistique de Paris, LXX, Louven: 267-272).

Hilmarsson J.

1983. Armenian *astuac* ‘God’ (“*Annual of Armenian Linguistics*”, vol. 4: 5-15).

Hopper P.J.

1973. Glottalized and murmured occlusives in Indo-European (“*Glossa*”, vol. 7, n. 2: 141-166).
1977. The typology of Proto-Indo-European segmental inventory (“*The Journal of Indo-European Studies*”, vol. 5, № 1: 41- 53).
1981. “Decem” and “taihun”: An Indo-European isogloss (“*Bono Homini Donum. Essays in Historical Linguistics*”, part 1, Amsterdam: 133-142).

Hübschmann H.

1883. Armenische Studien, Leipzig.
- 1895-1897. Armenische Grammatik, Bd. 1-2, Leipzig.
1898. Zur Chronologie der armenischen Vokalgesetze (“*Spracwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen*”, 1: 129-172).

- Jakobson R.*
1957. Typological studies and their contribution to historical comparative linguistics (“*Reports for the VIIIth International Congress of Linguists*”, Oslo: 17-25).
- Kortlandt F.*
1978. Notes on Armenian historical phonology II. The second consonant shift (“*Studia Caucasica*”, 4: 9-16).
- Kossian A.V.*
1994. An Anatolian-Armenian Parallel (“*Annual of Armenian Linguistics*”, vol. 15: 63-65).
- Kronasser H.*
1956. Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen, Heidelberg.
- Lagarde P. de*
1877. Armenische Studien, Gottingen, 1877.
- Littauer M.A., Crouwel J.H.*
1974. Terracotta models as evidence for vehicles with tilts in the Ancient Near East (“*Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*”, vol. XL: 20-37).
1977. Chariots with Y-poles in the Ancient Near East (“*Deutsches Archeologisches Institut*“, H. 1, 1-2, Berlin).
- Martinet A.*
1953. Remarques sur le consonantisme sémantique (“*Bulletin de la Societe de Linguistique de Paris*”, t. 49, fasc. 1: 67-78).
1962. Structural Variation in Language (“*Preprints of Papers for the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics*”, Cambridge, Massachusetts: 501-508).
- Mayrhofer M.*
1983. Sanskrit und Sprachen Alt-europas: Zwei Jahrhunderte des Wiederspiels von Entdeckungen und Irrtumern, Gottingen.
- Meillet A.*
1908. Les dialects indo-européens, Paris.
1931. Essai de chronologie des langues indo-européennes. La théorie du féminin (“*Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*”, t. 32, fasc. 1:1-28).
1924. Remarques étymologiques (“*Revue des études arméniennes*”, № 4).
1936. Esquisse d’une grammaire comparée de l’arménien classique, Vienne.
1962-1977. Etudes de linguistique et de philologie arméniennes, vol. 1, Lisbonne, 1962, vol. 2, Louvain, 1977.
- Melikishvili G.*
1980. Urartu und des sudliche Transkaukasien (“*Georgica*”, Jena- Tbilisi).
- Musheghyan A.*
2000. Essays on History of the Armenian Language, vol. 1 (Historical-Etymological Studies), Yerevan.

- Neumann G.*
 1961. Untersuchung zum Weiterleben hethitischen und Luwischen Sprachgutes in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit, Wiesbaden.
- Pedersen H.*
 1906. Zur Akzentlehre (*"Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung"*, 39).
 1951. Die gemeinindoeuropäischen und die vorindoeuropäischen Verschlusslaute (*"Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab"*, Hist.-filol. Meddeleiser. XXXII, 5, København).
 1982. Kleine Schriften zum Armenischen, Hildesheim-New-York.
- Petermann H.*
 1837. Grammatica linguae armeniacae, Berolini.
- Pisani V.*
 1961. Der Gott als "Verteiler" und armenisch *Astuaç* [*"Lingue e Culture"*] (see *"Handás amsoreay"*, № 75).
- Porzig W.*
 1954. Die Gliederung des indogermanischen Sprachgebiets, Heidelberg:.
- Schmidt K.H.*
 1990. The Indo-European Basis of Proto-Armenian: Principles of Reconstruction (*"Annual of Armenian Linguistics"*, vol. 11: 33- 47).
- Schmitt R.*
 1967. Die Hesyngglosse (*"Glotta"*, 44):
- Solta G.R.*
 1960. Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen, Wien.
 1963. Die Armenische Sprache (*"Handbuch der Orientalistik"*, Bd. VII: Armenische und Kaukasische Sprachen, Leiden-Köln).
- Szemerényi O.*
 1964. Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the nature of Indo-European ablaut (*"Istituto Universitario Orientale"*, Napoli).
 1967. The new look of Indo-European reconstruction and typology (*"Phonetica"*, 17: 65-99).
- Watkins K.*
 1974. "God" (*"Antiquitates Indogermanica"*, Innsbruck: 101-110).
- Weitenberg J.J.S.*
 1984. Die Hethitischen U-Stämme. Amsterdam.
- Zabrocki L.*
 1951. Usilinienie I lemiejä w językach indoeuropejskich w ugrofinskim, Poznań.

Index of Words

Armenian

- ազազել* [azazel] ‘dry; get dry’ 88
ազրու ած/ազրուած [azdu ac, azduac] 84, 87
ալ- (**ալ-*) [al-] ‘dark’ 46, 68, 69
ալք, (gen.) *ալուց* [alk^c, (aluc^c)] ‘dept’ 76
աղ- [al-] 46, 68, 69, 72, 75
աղալ [alal] ‘grind, mill’ 67- 69
աղախին [alaxin] ‘servant, maid-servant’ 67
աղամող(իւ) [alamol(im)] ‘agitate; trouble’ 74, 75
աղասաղ(եւ) / աղեւաղ [alawalem, alewal] ‘perverted’, ‘agitate, trouble’ 75
աղանիճ [alawnič] ‘mill’ 70
աղարի(ք) [alawri(k^c)] ‘mill’ 67, 68
աղիչ (*աղիճ*) [aɬj, aɬič] 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 99
աղխ / ախ [ax, ax] ‘family’ 67, 75
աղխասաղխ [alxamaɬx] ‘stupid; foolish’ 74, 75
աղջ/ուղջ [aɬj, uɬj] 72-74
աղջաղջ [aɬjaɬj] 72-74
աղջամուղջ [aɬjamuɬj] ‘twilight’ 72-74
աղջամղջեալ [aɬjamɬjeal] 72, 73
աղջամղջիկ [aɬjamɬjik] 73
աղջամղջին [aɬjamɬjin] 67, 72, 73
աղջիկ(ւ) (**աղիչ-իկ*) [aɬjik(n) (*aɬij-ik)] ‘girl’ 62, 63, 66-70
աղջութիւն [aɬjut^ciwn] 72, 73
աղջունաղջ [aɬjumalɬj] 72
աղա / ուղա [alt, ult] ‘dirt, filth’ 72-74
աղտաղտ(ուկ) [altaht(uk)] 72, 74
աղտամուղտ [altamuɬt] 72-74
-աճ/-ուճ [ač, uč] (*suffix*) 99
աճիւն [ačiwɛn] ‘cinders’ 88
ամ-/-ամ- (*-ու-*) [am (um)] (*prefix/inflix*) 73, 75, 76, 96, 97, 99
աման [aman] ‘receptacle’ 139
ամբառնալ [ambainal] 97
ամբարձուսն [ambarjumɛn] ‘ise, go up’ 97
ամբողջ [amboɬj] ‘all’ 30 32
ամորձատել [amorjatel] ‘castrate’ 69
այգեկուրթ [ajgekutc] ‘grape harvest’ 142
այլ [ayl] ‘other’ 75
այլայլ(եւ)/այլեւայլ(եւ) [aylayl(em)/ayleuayl(em)] ‘different’; ‘agitate, trouble’ 74, 76
այդումայդ [ayɬumayɬ] ‘agitation; distortion’ 76
ան- / նա- [an, na] (*prefix*) 58, 76, 96, 98, 99
անգիւն (անկիւն) [angiwn (ankiwn)] ‘corner, turnig’) ‘corner, turning’ 32, 34
անգողին (անկողին)/ընգողին (ընկեղին) [angoɬin (ankoɬin), əngolin (ənkelin)] (*dial.*) ‘bed’ 97

wánŋ [and] ‘there, over there’ 76, 103
wánŋh [andi] ‘before’ 94
wánŋuánŋ [andund] ‘abyss, gulf’ 76
wánđtznghly [anjeroc^cik] 58, 97 ‘serviette’
wʒ [aš] ‘granule, grain (wheat corn)’ 77
wʒwán [ašan] ‘threshing’ 63, 77-79,
wʒwánbly [ašanel] ‘thresh’ 77-79,
wʒwaryj / wʒaryj [ašaray, ašoray] ‘rye’ 77
wʒmún [ašun] ‘autumn’ 78, 79
wywfumrly [apaxurel] ‘to incover the head’ 81
wywtwly (w-uyur-wly) [aptak (apt-ak)] ‘slap in the face’ 57
wmwuow (wmuwuw) [arawot (arawawt)] ‘morning’ 88
wmwptwly [arak^ceal] ‘messenger’ 57
wmwphlyh [arak^cini] ‘virtuous’ 58
wnrńpłp [arənt^cer] 98
wu- [as] 84, 88
wuun / huuunhy [ast hastič] 84
wuun wð / wuun tawð [ast ac, ast ěac] 84
wuunniwð [astuac] ‘god’ 64, 84-86, 88
wuunniwð (Wuunniwð) [astuac (Astuac)] ‘God’ 64, 88
(wu)-uunwð [(as)-tuac] 86
wrwð(ty) [arac(ɛl)] ‘graze, pasture’ 121, 125, 126, 134
wrwun [arat] ‘vice’ 125, 126
wrwuun / wrowun [arawt, arot\] ‘pasture’ 121, 125, 126, 134

wrawr / wrowr [arawr, aror] ‘plow’ 103
wrpbw [arbem] ‘drink’ 32, 34
wrrŋ [ard] ‘now, at present’ 35
wrrŋu [ardu] ‘(measures) unit of weight’ 139, 140
wrtqwyly [aregakn] ‘sun’ 20, 109
wrtwawly [arewagal] ‘sunrise; dawn’ 84
wrh- [arh] 74
wrhwáwrph(-wlyp) [arhamarh(-ank^c)] ‘contempt’ 74
wrhwáwrph(-tw) [arhamarh(-em)] ‘despise’ 74, 75
wrdwly [arjal] (*dial.*) ‘graze, pasture’ 125
wrŋly [arjn] 22
wrwun [art] ‘field’ 80, 82, 103, 126
wrwun(w)- [art(a)] (*prefix*) ‘outside’ 81, 82, 125
wrwunwrrŋr [artaxoyr] ‘tiara, mitre, dianem’ 63, 80-83, 122, 124, 125
wrwunwrrwly [artaxurak] ‘external wreath or condition’ 81
wrwunwrrly [artaxurel] ‘to uncover the heag’ 81
wrwrhđ [artič] ‘vetch’ 70
-wr- [-aw-] (*infix*) 75
wruwq [awaz] ‘sand’ 34
wrw [awd] ‘shoe’ 30
wrw [awd] ‘air’ 34
wrw [awt^c] ‘shelter; dwelling’ 34
wrw- [ak^c-] ‘foot’ 57
wrwgh [akac^ci] (pwgh [kac^ci]) (*dial.*) ‘kick’ 57
(rwaw) *wrh/-wrhu* [(bawz)awx-awx] ‘multichanged’ 74

pačwly [bažak] ‘glass’ 95
paḥ [bah] ‘spade’ 101
paḥ [ban] ‘speech’, ‘affer’ 31
paḥiḥ [banam] ‘open’ 30
paḥiḥ [baḥnam] ‘rise, lift; raise, pick up; stand up; uplift’ 97
paḥiḥ [barjr] ‘high’ 119
paḥiḥpaḥiḥ [barjak^ceac^c] ‘a person of a long shank’ 58
paḥ- [be] 58, 101
paḥiḥ [beganem] ‘annul, reserve’ 34
paḥiḥ (**paḥiḥ-paḥiḥ*) [beran (pe-r-an)] ‘mouth’ 52, 58, 100, 101
paḥiḥ [berem] ‘bring’ 33, 97
paḥiḥ (*paḥiḥ*) [biel (piel)] ‘drink’ 92, 96
paḥiḥ [biwa] ‘water; drink’ 93, 96
paḥiḥ [bir] ‘pointed wood; pick’ 101
paḥiḥ (*paḥiḥ-*) [bo-, pe- (be-)] ‘drink’ 52, 58, 100, 101
paḥiḥ [boylk^c ‘Big Dipper constellation’ 111
paḥiḥ (*paḥiḥ*) [boyc (bucanem)] ‘breed, rear; breeding’ 125
paḥiḥ/*paḥiḥ* (**paḥiḥ*) [bu, bua (pu)] ‘water; drink’ 93, 96
paḥiḥ/*paḥiḥ* [but, btel] ‘breed, rear’ 125
paḥiḥ [brnem] ‘held; keep’ 99
paḥiḥ [brduč] ‘a slice of bead’ 99
paḥiḥ/*paḥiḥ* / *paḥiḥ*/*paḥiḥ*

[galgal(i), g'aḥg'aḥ (i)] (*dial.*) ‘cart’ 63, 90, 109-111
paḥiḥ (*paḥiḥ*) / *paḥiḥ* (*paḥiḥ*) [gaḥ(em)//gaḥgaḥ(em)] ‘whirl; enlarg’ 90, 91
paḥiḥ (*paḥiḥ*) [gaḥgazim] ‘whirl’ 90
paḥiḥ (*paḥiḥ*) [gayt^c(el)] ‘stumbling; stumble’ 91, 142
paḥiḥ [gari] ‘barley’ 77, 103
paḥiḥ (*paḥiḥ*) [garš(eli)] ‘disgusting’ 31
paḥiḥ [gawat^c] ‘cup’ 95
paḥiḥ [get] ‘river’ 34
paḥiḥ [geri] ‘prisoner’ 121
paḥiḥ [gēd] ‘mistake’ (*dial.*) 142
paḥiḥ [gt^cel] (*dial.*) ‘to mislead, to destroy’ 142
paḥiḥ / *paḥiḥ* / *paḥiḥ* [gi, gihi, giyi] ‘sort of tree’ 35, 36
paḥiḥ / *paḥiḥ* [git^c/gut^c] ‘mislead, destroy’ 142
paḥiḥ / *paḥiḥ* / *paḥiḥ* [gilgil, gilgul] (*dial.*) ‘great millet’ 77
paḥiḥ [gind] ‘ear-ring’ 32, 34
paḥiḥ [gini] ‘wine’ 36, 121
paḥiḥ [gišer] ‘night’ 84
paḥiḥ [glul] (*dial.*) ‘great millet’ 77
paḥiḥ / *paḥiḥ* / *paḥiḥ* [golink^c, g'olink^c, gofēnk^c] (*dial.*) ‘bed’ 97
paḥiḥ [gom] ‘cattle shed; cowshed’ 33
paḥiḥ [gomor] ‘sort of measure’ 139
paḥiḥ [griv] ‘measure (of bread, vine etc.) 139

qⁿhúh [g^u:ini] ‘vine’ 36
qⁿhraway [g^u:irap] ‘pit’ 36
ηαι / ηαιη [dal, dayl] (*dial.*)
 ‘colostrum; beestings’ 35,
 111, 142
ηαι/ηαιη [dal, dayl] ‘colostrum;
 beestings’ 35, 111, 142
ηαιηαι [dalar] ‘green’ 31
ηαι [dan] (*dial.*) ‘grain’ 77
ηαιηαιη [dařnam] ‘become’ 31
ηh [di] ‘dead body’ 116
ηhη [diel] ‘breastfeed’ 35, 116,
 142
η(h)úη [d(i)nem] ‘to put’ 33
ηhəp/ηhg [dik^c, dic^c] ‘God(s)’
 87, 116
ηηηηη / *ηηηηηη* [dop^cem,
 top^cem] ‘to stamp, to
 stampl’ 32
 **ηηηηη* [*dund] ‘ringings; sound’
 76
ηηαι [eřan] ‘pitchfork’ 103
ηηηηηη [eřbayr] ‘brother’ 31
ηη [et] ‘afterwaeds; back’
ηηηηηη [erekoy] ‘evening’ 34
ηηηηη [erewim] ‘be seen’ 34
ηηη [erek^c] ‘three’ 31
ηηηηηη(p) (**η-ηηη-ηηη*)
 [erkan(k^c), ekran] ‘mill, mill-
 stone’ 20, 21, 113
-ηη- [ew] (*infix*) 76
ηηη(η)/ηηηηη(η) [ewt^cn, eawt^cn]
 ‘seven’ 31
ηηηη [ep^cem] ‘boil’ 32, 34
ηηηηηηηη [zambiwł] ‘a basket, a
 pot’ 138
(q)ηη-/ηη- [(z)eř-, oř] ‘full,
 plenty’ 46

qor(p) [zork^c] ‘army; forces’
 100
qorawúη [zoranal] ‘become
 stronger’ 100
ηηηηηη [ěrnal] (*dial.*) ‘deat off
 the grain’ 78
ηηη-/ηηη- [əm, ən] (*prefix*) 52, 58,
 93, 94, 96, 98, 101
ηηηηηη/ηηηηηη [əmbel, ənbel]
 (*dial.*) ‘drink’ 92
ηηηηηηηηηη [əmberanel]
 ‘convince, persuade (to);
 force, oblige’ 101
ηηηηη [əmbig] ‘a small drop’
 93, 96
ηηηηηηηηη (*-ηηηη*)/**ηηηηηηηηη*
 (*-ηηηη*) [əmbřnem, -um,
 ənbřnem, -um] ‘understand’
 58, 98, 99
ηηηηηη / ηηηηηηηη [əmbu, əmpu]
 (*dial.*) 93, 96
ηηηηη [əməg] (*dial.*) ‘drink’ 93
ηηηηηηηηηη [əmpanak]
 ‘drinking-glass’ 95
ηηηηη-/ηηηηη(-ηηη, -ηη) [əmp-,
 ənpel-, -em] ‘drink’ 51, 52,
 58, 92-96, 99, 102
ηηηηη [əmpel] ‘drink’ 94
ηηηηηηηη [əmpik] ‘a small dop’ 93,
 96
ηηηηηηηη / ηηηηηηηηηη [ənbān, ənpān]
 ‘the upper part of the
 mouth; the pharynx’ 92
ηηηηηηηη [ənbuq] (*dial.*) ‘drink;
 beverage; liquor’ 96

ընդ/ընտ [ənd, ənt] ‘with;
 together; under’ 94, 98
ընդաբոյս [əndaboys] ‘innate’
 94
ընդարձակ [əndarjak] ‘spacious, roomy; wide’ 99
**ընդ-բերանել* [*ənd-beranel] ‘prove; convince; oblige’ 101
ընդգրկել [əndgrkel] ‘embrace, envelope; include, cover’ 99
ընդեր(ք)/ընտեր(ք) [ənder(k^c), ənter(k^c)] ‘entrails; bowels’ 94, 98
ըն(դ)թեր [ən(d)t^cer] ‘near; by’ 98
ըն(դ)կեր [ən(d)ker] ‘friend’ 98
ըն(դ)կղմել [ən(d)k^clmel] ‘submerge, sink; pluge into water’ 98
ընդհանուր [əndhanur] ‘general; universal(of)’ 99
**ընդհիպել* [*əndhipe] ‘drink’ 94
ընդունակ [əndunak] ‘able. capable (of)’ 99
ընթանալ [əntcanal] ‘run; go’ 98
ընթեռնուլ [ənt^cer^{nul}] ‘read (aloud)’ 98
ընթեր [ənt^cer] ‘near; by’ 98
ընթերակայ [ənt^cerakay] ‘assistent’ 98
ընծայ/ընձայ [əncay, ənjay] ‘present, gift; dedication’ 98
ընծիւղ/ընձիւղ [ənciwl, ənjiwl] ‘sprout, shoot; bud, leaf-bud’ 48, 97

ընծուիւ/ընձուիւ [əncuim, ənjuim] ‘sprout, shoot; arise, spring up’ 97, 98
ընկալուլ [ənk^calul] ‘perceiver; take in’ 98
ընկալուչ [ənk^caluč^c] ‘receiving; receiver’ 98
ընկենուլ [ənk^cenul] ‘throw; pull, overthrow’ 98
ընկեր [ənker] ‘friend’ 98
ընկղմել [ənk^clmel] ‘submerge, sink; plunge into’ 98
ընչացք [ənč^cac^ck^c] ‘moustache’ 94
թանամ [t^canam] ‘to wet; to drench’ 33
թանգ [t^cang] ‘dear; precious’ 119
թանգուզել [t^canguzel] ‘to avoid because of fear or shame; to run away’ 119
թանկուզի [t^cankuzi] ‘indolent, idle, lazy’ 119
թանձր (*թանգր) [t^canjr (t^cangr)] ‘thick; dense’ 63, 117-120
թեղ(-եմ) [t^ceł(-em)] ‘to pile in length’ 119
թերուսք/թերուսկ [t^cerumb, t^cerump] ‘half drunk’ 92
թեքեմ [t^cek^cem] ‘incline, to tilt; to bend’ 34
թ(հ)ռչիւ [t^c(i)rč^cim] ‘to fly; to fly away’ 35
-իկ(ւ) [ik(n)] (*suffix*) 66
**-իճ/-իջ* [ič, iǰ] (*suffix*) 69, 70, 99_

li (*-*li*) [li (hi)] 46
li *li* (*li*-, *li*-*li*) [lɛl (lu-, lur)]
 ‘hear, listen (to) 100
li *li* [luič] ‘flea’ 70
li (*li*) *li* *li* [l(i)k^canem]
 ‘abandon’ 34
li *li* *li* *li* [xacanem] ‘to bite, to
 nibble’ 31
li *li* [xał] ‘play’ 137
li *li* *li* *li* [xayt^cem] ‘to sting, to
 bite’ 34
li *li* *li* / *li* *li* *li* [xayc, xayt] ‘bait,
 lure’, ‘cheerful’ 121, 125
li *li* *li* [xayt] ‘dandelion’ 137
li *li* *li* [xayt] ‘happiness, joy’
 137
li *li* *li* / *li* *li* *li* [xand, xanj]
 ‘jealousy’ 75, 99
li *li* *li* *li* *li* *li* [xarnamain]
 ‘mixed’ 74
li *li* *li* *li* *li* *li* [xatutik] ‘motley;
 dandelion’ 137
li *li* [xaw] ‘nap; pie, fluff’ 122,
 124-126
li *li* *li* *li* [xawar] ‘gloom;
 gloomy’ 72
li *li* *li* *li* *li* / *li* *li* *li* *li* *li* [xawarc,
 xawarci] ‘shoot, tendril of
 plants’ 116, 121, 123
li *li* *li* *li* *li* [xawart] ‘greens,
 vegetables; legums’ 63, 121-
 126
li *li* *li* *li* *li* [xawrcil] (*dial.*)
 ‘medical herb’ 122
li *li* *li* *li* [xeld] ‘strangle’ 75, 125
li *li* *li* *li* [xind] ‘joy, gaiety’ 75
li *li* *li* *li* (*li* *li* *li* *li*) [xxum, xxmel]
 (*dial.*) ‘to swallow; to gulp
 down, to absorb’ 51, 95

li *li* *li* (*li* *li* *li* *li*-) [xmel (xum-)]
 ‘drink’ 51, 52, 95
li *li* *li* (*li* *li*) [xnj(oł)] ‘give a coarse
 laugh’ 75
li *li* *li* *li* (*li* *li*) [xoxom(el)] ‘to
 water, to irrigate’ 51, 95
li *li* *li* *li* *li* (*li* *li*) [xoxum(n)]
 ‘murmuring, gurgling’ 51, 95
li *li* *li* *li* *li* / *li* *li* *li* *li* *li* *li* / *li* *li* *li* *li* *li* *li*
 [xoxoj/xołxoj/xołxonj] ‘voice of
 water; murmuring’ 51, 95
li *li* *li* *li* *li* *li* [xoxotil] ‘to dare; to
 attack, to assault’ 51, 95
li *li* *li* *li* [xoyr] ‘diadem; tiara’ 81,
 82
 **li* *li*- / **li* *li*- [ca, ci] (*verb. root*)
 48
li *li* *li* *li* / *li* *li* *li* *li* [cat^cil, jat^cil]
 (*dial.*) ‘to spring’ 142
li *li* *li* *li* *li* (*li* *li*) [cacanel, (-em)]
 ‘wave’ 125, 134
li *li* *li* *li* *li* (*li* *li*) [całik] ‘flower’ 66
li *li* *li* (*li* *li*) [caw(i)] ‘pleasantly blue-
 eyed’ 131-133, 135
li *li* *li* *li* [cawik] ‘bluish green’
 131
li *li* *li* *li* [cawir] ‘sea blue’ 131
li *li* *li*- / *li* *li* *li*- / *li* *li* *li*- [cel-, cił-,
 ciwł] (cf. *li* *li*-*li* *li* [ən-jiwł])
 ‘sprout, shoot’ 48, 97
li *li* *li*- / *li* *li* *li*- (**li* *li*-, **li* *li*-) [cil-,
 cał- (*ci-, *ca-)] (*verb. root*)
 ‘firewood, brushwood; shrub’
 48, 97
li *li* *li* [cov] ‘sea’ 132, 135
li *li* *li* (*li* *li* *li*) [cux (cxoy)]
 ‘smoke’ 134
li *li* *li* - [kał] ‘catch’ 98

կալ (*կալսել*) [kal (kalsel)] ‘to beat the grain’ 77
կաղց [kalc^o] (*dial.*) ‘milk’ 35, 139
կամ(ն) [kam(n)] ‘thresher’ 103-105
կամսահարել [kamaharel] ‘express’ 104
կամսասայլ [kamasayl] ‘‘threshing-cart’ 103
կամնավար [kamnavar] ‘drive of threshing’ 103
կայթ (<*կաթ*) [kajt^e, kat^e] ‘pot, basket’ 65, 136-141
կայթ (<*կաթ*) [kajt^e, kat^e] ‘to gather, to separate’ 142, 143
կայթ [kajt^e] ‘a toy for teeth of a baby’ 136
կայթ [kajt^e] ‘to hop, dance of joy’ 136, 137
կայթել [kajt^eel] ‘to have fun, to hop, to dance’ 137
կաթն [kat^en] ‘milk’ 35
կասպիճ/կոսպիճ [kapič, kopič] ‘size; a measure of trade’ 70
կարթ [kart^e] ‘angle, fiish-hook’ 35
կաւ (-իճ) [kaw (-ič)] ‘clay; chalk’ 70, 99
կաքաւումն [kak^eawumn] ‘to walk gracefully’ 137
կե(ա)/կես- [ke(a)-, kea-] (*verb. root*) ‘life’ 48
կեսն- (*կեն-*) [kean- (ken-)] (*verb. root*) ‘life’ 48
կեսնս- (*կենս-*) [keans- (kens-)] (*verb. root*) ‘life’ 48
կեսնց- (*կենց-*) [keanc^e- (kenc^e-)] (*verb. root*) ‘life’ 48

կեսց- (*կեց-*) [keac^e- (kec^e-)] (*verb. root*) ‘life’ 48
կէղթ [keltc] ‘basket of grapes’ 139
կենդ- (*կենդան-*) [kend- (kendan-)] (*verb. root*) ‘life’ 48
կթղայ [kt^elay] ‘vine glass’ 95
կրոց /քրոց [kt^eoc^e, k^et^eoc^e] (*dial.*) ‘(large) basket, pot’ 139, 142
կիթ [kit^e] ‘grape harvest’ 142, 143
կին (*կանանք, կնս, կանայք, կնոջ, կնոջտ*) [kin, kanamb, knaw, kanyk^e, knoʃ, knoʃe]) ‘women, wife’ 49
կին/ծին [kin., cin] ‘women, wife; born, birth’ 49
կնկնայ (*մկկայ* < * *մկկայ*) [kkmkal (cf. mkkal < *mkmkal)] ‘to stammer, to falter’ 96
կնուկ [kmuk] (*dial.*) ‘the upper part of the throat to the palat’ 51, 96
կող(-ն, -ին) [kol(-n, -in)] ‘side’ 97
կոսար [kopar] ‘confines, boundaries’ 70
կով [kov] ‘cow’ 33
կորեակ (*կորեկ*) [koreak(korek)] ‘millet’ 77
կորի [kori] ‘stream in the field’ 103
կութ [kut^e] ‘grape harvest, vintage’ 142, 143
կում [kum] ‘drink, mouthful’ 51, 96

կունն (*կընսւլ*) / *ճունն* [kuɾn
 (kɾnak), čuɾn] ‘wing; arm’,
 ‘back’ 33, 50
կընսւտ [kɾnat] ‘armless, one-
 armed’ 50
կընտել [kɾtel] ‘to castrate, to
 emasculate’ 69
հաղ-/հող- [haɫ, hoɫ] (*verb.*
root) 46
հաճւոր [hačar] ‘spelt, german
 wheat’ 77
(h)աւ- [ham] (*prefix*) 58, 97, 99
(h)աւբառնաւ [hambarnal]
 ‘rise, go up’ 97, 99
(h)աւբերել [hamberel] ‘be
 patient, have patience’ 97,
 99
(h)աւբերութիւն
 [hamberut^{ci}wn] ‘patience,
 endurance’ 97
հաւրոյր (*h-աւ-րո-յր*)
 [hamboyr] ‘kiss’ 52, 58, 100
(h)ան- [han] (*prefix*) 99
հանուր [hanur] ‘common’ 99
հասկ [hask] ‘ear, ear of grain’
 77
հաստ(ոյր) [hastoyr] ‘very
 strong’ 100
(h)աստուած [hastuac] ‘god’
 85
հատիկ [hatik] ‘grain’ 70, 77,
 112
հատիճ [hatič] ‘corn’ 70
հեղ-/հոլ-/հալ- [heɫ, hoɫ, hal]
 (*verb. root*) 46
հեղձ [heɫj] ‘chock’ 75, 125
հեղձասնդձուկ/հեղձասնդձ(ուկ)

[heɫjamaɫjuk, heɫjaməɫj(uk)]
 ‘stifling; suffocating’ 75
հեղմւ [helum] ‘fill (in); pour
 out’ 33, 46
հետ(-ք, -ոյ) [het-k^c, -oy] ‘trace;
 ‘track’ 30, 57
հերկ [herk] ‘ploughing, tillage’
 103
հինգ [hing] ‘five’ 30, 35, 111
հզօր [hzor] ‘strength, courage’
 100
հլու [hlu] ‘obeying’
հմուտ [hmut] ‘keen’ 100
հորթ [hort^c] ‘calf’ 32
հայարտ [hpart] ‘boast’ 100, 125
հսկայ [hskay] ‘strong, great,
 courageous (person)’ 100
հսկել [hskel] ‘work, stay guard
 awake, by attentive’ 100
ճագ [jag] ‘young one’ 34, 97
ճաղկ [jaɫk] ‘scutching’ 119
ճեղ (ճեղ-ուն) / ճող- [jeɫ, jeɫ-
 umn, joɫ-] ‘roof, house-top’
 48
ձեռն [jeɾn] ‘hand; arm’ 97
ձ(հ)մեռն [jimeɾn] ‘winter’ 119
ձու [ju] ‘egg’ 97
ճախարակ [čaxarak] ‘wheel’;
 wheeled instrument’ 109
ճախր [čaxr] ‘to spin, to turn’
 109
ճեղ-/ճիղ-/ճիւղ-/ճող- [čel-, čil-,
 čiwɫ-, čoɫ] ‘branch’ 48
ճ(հ)նկել [č(i)mleɫ] ‘smach’ 104
ճոնկ [čɾnik] (*dial.*) ‘thigh, hip’,
 ‘throw off, overthrow’ 33, 50
մալ(ել) [mal(ɛɫ)] ‘to geld, to
 castrate’ 69

մամուլ [mamul] ‘(printing)
 press’ 69
մայր [mayr] ‘mother’ 30, 34,
մայր (մարել) [mayr (marel)]
 ‘sunset’ 111
մայրամուտ [mayramut] ‘sunset,
 sundown’ 84, 111
մայրի [mayri] ‘type of tree’ 121
մանրել [manrel] ‘to grind, to
 crush’ 69
մանուկ(ն) [manuk(n)] ‘baby,
 infant’ 66
մաշել [mašel] ‘to wear out, to
 rags’ 69
մեղ(ն)/մեղ(ք) [mełm, mełk^c]
 ‘mild, soft’, ‘sin’ 69
մէգ [mēg] ‘haze, mist’ 34
մէնտիլ [mēntil] (*dial.*)
 ‘headpiece’ 82
մլաղաց [mlałac^c] ‘a mill’ 69
մլմլել [mlmlle] ‘to rub, to
 scratch’ 69
մղտագոյն [młtagoyn] ‘sombre,
 obscure’ 73
մղտանալ [młtanal] ‘to cover
 with gloom’ 73
մղտութիւն [młtut^ciwn]
 ‘darkness, gloom’ 73
մղտփարատ [młtap^carat]
 ‘dispelling darkness’ 73
մոյթ [moyt^c] ‘pillar, pilaster;
 support’ 30, 32, 34
մուլ- [mul] (*verb. root*) ‘a mill’
 69
-մոյս [mux] (*ծեռնա-մոյս*
(լիւն)) [jērnamux (linel)] ‘to
 undertake’ 32
մոխ [mux] (*dial.*) ‘smoke’ 34

մուղթ / մուղտ [mułt, mułj]
 ‘ashgrey’ 72-74
մուտ(-ք)/մտ(-անել) [mutk^c,
 mtanel] ‘entrance’, ‘enter’
 100
յաստիս ածող [yastis acol]
 ‘creator, maker’ 84
յեղ-/յ(թ)լ-/յղ- [yeł-. y(ə)l-, yol-]
 (*verb. root*) ‘change’ 46
յետ [yet] ‘back, backwards’ 57
յղի [yhi] ‘pregnant’ 121
յոլով [yolov] ‘full, a lot of;
 many, much’ 33
նախան [naxanj] ‘envy;
 envious’ 75, 99
ներգել [nergew] ‘down’ 35
նքոյր [nk^coyr] ‘sieve; boulder’
 100
շիղ-/շիղ- [šił-, šiwl-] (*verb.*
root) ‘squint-eyed’ 48
շուճ [šun] ‘dog’ 21, 105
նստիւն [ostin] ‘arid, dry’ 88
նո(-ն, -ք) [ot (-n, -k^c)] ‘foot’
 33, 57
որթ (որթատունկ) [ort^c
 (ort^catunk)] ‘vine; vine-
 stock, grape vine’ 32, 35
շարիս [č^carx] ‘wheel of fortune’
 109
պաղատիտ [pałatit] ‘bunch;
 cluster’ 139
(պա)պանձ (-իլ) [papanjil]
 ‘grow dumb’ 119
պատ(-իճ) [pat(- ič)] ‘pod’ 70, 99
պատաղիճ [patalič] ‘ivy’ 70
պար [par] ‘dance, dancing’ 137
պարծ(-անք, -եմամ) [parc
 (-ank^c, -enam)] ‘brag, be

proud (of) 100, 125
 պարկուճ [parkuč] ‘cartridge-
 case’ 99
 պարտ [part] ‘pride’ 100
 պէ(* պէ-) (*verb. root*) ‘drink’
 58, 101
 պեղեմ [pelem] ‘to excavate, to
 unearth’ 33
 պիել [piel] ‘to drink’ 92, 96
 պիղծ [pilč] ‘unclean’ 121, 125
 պղտոր [płtor] ‘turbid, muddy’
 121, 125
 քահրայ [jähray] ‘weaving
 machine’ 109
 քարդել [jardel] ‘to mince, to
 crush’ 69
 ջիղ/ջիլ/ճիլ [jil, jil, čil] (*dial.*)
 ‘nerv; tendon, sinew’ 91
 նուզն [rungn] ‘nostril’ 32, 34
 սայլ / սել (*սէլ*) [sayl, sel (sēl)]
 (*dial.*) ‘cart’ 63, 90, 91, 106-
 111
 սայթ(աթ)ել [sayt^cak^cel]
 ‘stumble’ 57, 91
 Սանաս-ար [Sanas-ar]
 (*mythological name*) ‘God’(?)
 86
 սասանել [sasanel] ‘shake, shake
 loose’ 135
 սիրտ [sirt] ‘heart’ heart’ 30, 32,
 34, 105
 Սիւ-նիք [Siw-nik^c] (*toponymic
 name*) 86
 սկայ [skay] ‘strong, great,
 courageous (person)’ 100
 սկել [skel] ‘work, stay guard
 awake, be attentive’ 100

սկեսուր [skesur] ‘mother-in-
 law’ 105
 սկունդ [skund] ‘dog doggy’ 21,
 105
 սորուն [sorun] ‘a kind of wheat’
 77
 սոն(ել) [srnel] (*dial.*) ‘to mince
 in big pieces’ 21, 26, 63, 112-
 114
 ստիպեմ [stipem] ‘to insist’ 30,
 34
 վաթել/վորթել/ վայթել (*վիթեալ*)
 [vat^cel, vot^cel, vayt^cel
 (vit^ceal)] ‘to empty’, ‘to fill
 out’, to poue to the end’ 142
 վաթ(սուն)/վազուն [vat^csun,
 vac^cun] (*dial.*) ‘sixty’ 135
 վեշ(սասուն) [veštan] ‘sixteen’ 135
 վեց [vec^c] ‘six’ 135
 վիրապ [virap] ‘pit; cellar,
 prison’ 36
 տալ/տաս [tal, tam] ‘to give’ 29,
 33, 57
 տայր [taygr] ‘brother-in-law’
 30, 100
 տատանեմ [tatanem] ‘to shake;
 shake loose’ 125, 134
 տեղի [tehi] ‘place’
 տ/տի(ք), (*gen.pl.*) տից [tē,
 ti(k^c), tic^c] ‘day’; ‘age’ 63,
 115, 116, 123
 տր [tēr] ‘master, owner, lord’
 84
 *տի-ել (*art. տի-ելն*) [tiew,
 tieu] ‘god’ 87
 տի [tiw] ‘day; daytime’ 57, 85,
 87

unni* /unni-* [(*art.*) *unni*] [tu, tu- (<to-)] (*verb.root*) 85-87, 89

unniwəð* (Sniwəð*) [**tuuac*, **Tuac*] ‘giver’; ‘god’ 84-89

unniwəruəð [tuarac] ‘herdsman, cowboy’ 125

unniɾɿŋətuəs [(*art.*) **unniɾɿŋətuəs*] [tuənʒean, touənʒean] ‘day; daylight’ 87

unni [tun] ‘home’ 29, 57

gawtu [c°ax] ‘firewood, brushwood’

gawjəgawjən (*gawjəktɿ*) [c°ayt°, c°ayt, c°at°ēl] ‘to spring, the hop, spring (something)’ 142

gawj (*gawjəwɿ*) [c°ayl (c°alak)] ‘pubis’ 142

gawjəni (*gawjəni*, *gawjəni*) [c°awʔun, c°oʔ-un] ‘stem, stalk’ 48, 49

gawpəs [c°ak°an] ‘a farming tool’ 103

gawɾɿkɿ [c°erek] ‘day; daytime’ 84

gawɾɿkɿ (*kawɿ*, *kawɿ*-) [c°oren, -ean] wheat 77

gawj [c°uc°] ‘hof’ 137

nɿwɾ (*nɿwɾni*)/*nɿwɿ* [(*art.*) **nɿwɿ*] [umb, ump (oump)] ‘water; drink’ 52, 58, 92-94, 96, 99

nɿwɿ [unʒ] ‘under; depth; floor’ 76

nɿwɿ [utel] ‘to eat’ 57

nɿwɿ [utič] ‘moth’ 70

ɿwəwɿ- (*ɿwəwɿni*) [p°amp°- (p°amp°ušt)] ‘bladder; bullet’ 32, 35anot’

ɿwəwɿ (*ɿwəwɿ*, *ɿwəwɿ*) [p°ayl (p°al, p°oʔ)] ‘brilliance; wsve, glitter’ 142

ɿwəwɿ (*ɿwəwɿ*, *ɿwəwɿ*) [p°aylel, p°olel, p°ap°alil, p°oʔp°olel] ‘shine; glitter; gleam; sparkle’ 142

ɿwəwɿ [p°elk] ‘shut; window-shutter’ 3133, 89

ɿwəwɿ [p°erck] ‘crack’ 89

ɿwəwɿ (*ɿwəwɿ*)/*ɿwəwɿ* [p°oxind, p°oxinj] ‘the flour of fried and ground wheat’ 75

ɿwəwɿ [p°ul] ‘stage, phase’ 30, 31

ɿwəwɿ [k°amel] ‘to press (out)’ 33

ɿwəwɿ [k°ani] ‘how; how much’ 33

ɿwəwɿ [k°arb] ‘asp(ic); viper’ 35

ɿwəwɿ [k°ac°i] ‘kick’ 57

ɿwəwɿ (*ɿwəwɿ*) [k°t°el, k°t°ēl (*dial.*)] ‘to milk; to harvest the orchard’ 142

ɿwəwɿ [k°t°oc°] (*dial.*) ‘basket’ 139, 142

ɿwəwɿ (*ɿwəwɿ*) [k°t°vel, k°t°vil] (*dial.*) ‘to clean the hair (from nits)’ 142

ɿwəwɿ [k°ist] (*dial.*) ‘awn, beard’ 77

ɿwəwɿ [k°oyr] ‘sister’ 100

ɿwəwɿ [k°oɾ] ‘sort of measure’ 139

oɾ [awd] ‘air’ 34

oɾ (cf. *oɾkəwɿ*) [awt° (awt°ewan)] ‘shelter, lodging; dwelling’ 34

Indo-European

- *aghl(u)- 74
- *ag'-ro 125
- *ak^(h)men 103, 105
- *al- 66, 68-70
- *alā- 68
- *alətriŋo- 68
- *alghi- 72, 73
- *alghio- 73
- *alio- 76
- *ambh- 32
- *ambho- 30
- *an- 97, 99
- *anti(-) 52, 93, 94
- *ang-/*ank- 32, 34
- *ar-t- 35
- *ar-(t^[h]o)- 80, 82
- *as- 88
- *au-dh-o- 30, 34
- *auti- 34
- *belō- 33
- *bhā- 30
- *bhā-n 31
- *bhā-nis 31
- *bheg- 34
- *bher- 100
- *bherō 33
- *bṛdh-s- 119
- *bhrāter 31
- *b^(h)ṛg^(h)-u- 119
- *bhsə-bh- 34
- *dāiŋer 30
- *dei(-) 116, 133
- *də-ŋe-mi 33
- *dəili 35
- *dipəro 125
- *di-t 115
- *diŋ- 85
- *dom 29
- *doph- 32
- *dō- 29
- *dhāl- 35
- *dhāl- 31, 35
- *dhē- 31
- *dhē(i)- 35
- *dhēi- 35
- *dhēŋe- 35
- *dhē-no 33
- *dhəi- 35
- *dhəi-il- 3
- *dhī- 35
- *dhr̥g'h-nā 31
- *dhundhos 76
- *ek^{(h)o}- 51, 94-96
- *eng'həti 98
- *entero- 98
- *eph- 32, 34
- *-er 100
- *(e)s-en 77, 79
- *es-en/r- 79
- *galakt 35
- *gat-i- 142
- *gem- 104
- *gēu- 50
- *gṃ- 104
- *gṛb-ti- 35
- *gumīno- 104
- *gur-no-s 33
- *g'ernos 112
- *gh̥riŋo 77
- *ghomo- 33
- *ghr̥si 31
- *g'hag^uh 34
- *g^(h)alg^(h)- 119
- *g^(h)iem-s 119
- *g^(h)ri- 77
- *g^uhinŋo- 36

*g^uhirap- 36
 *g^uou- 33
 *g^uōus 104
 *g^urānā 113
 *g^orāwanā- 113
 *g^urəu-ānā 113
 *Has- 88
 *Has-t'ieu-os 84, 88
 *h₂elhi- 69
 *ɭag'i-diu-ag' 85
 *kai-t- 137
 *keu- 50
 *kṃ- 33
 *kṛp- 35
 *k'at- 107, 108
 *k'en-49
 *k'erdi 30, 32, 34
 *k'ouon-to 105
 *k'yon 21
 *k'yon-to 21, 105
 *khaid- 137
 *khād-s- 31
 *khai-t- 34
 *k̂^(h)āk^(h)- 105
 *k̂^(h)u(e/o)n- 105
 *k̂^(h)er- 105
 *k^{(h)o}(e/o)k^{(h)o}lo- 90, 109, 110
 *k^{(h)o}e k^{(h)o}lo- 110
 *k^{(h)o}el- 90, 106, 108-111
 *k^oei- 48
 *k^oen- 49
 *k^o(e)naH₂-s 49
 *k^oer-/*k^oern 112, 113
 *k^oər- 113
 *k^oi- 48
 *k^orāu- 21, 113
 *k^ua-m 33
 *lik^u- 34

*māter 30, 34
 *mel- 67-69, 73, 74,
 *meighā 34
 *meu-thi 30, 32, 34
 *m̂-/ *mul- 67
 *mōl- 74
 *m(ū)elh₂- 69
 *mulghio-/*mughlio-74
 *mukho 32, 34
 *ṅdhos 52, 93, 94
 *neik 10
 *nō-/*nə- 99
 *ōd- 70
 *ok^u-/*ok^uč̣- 133
 *-om 88
 *-or 100
 *-os 87
 *os-en-r- 79
 *oskhon 79
 *oskhṇ 79
 *pedo 57
 *pedo-m 30
 *peh₃- 58
 *pel-nu-mi 31
 *penk^ue- 30, 35,
 *pə-li- 67, 71
 *phamph- 32, 35
 *phelg- 31, 33
 *phōlo 30, 31
 *p^(h)el-H- 47
 *p^(h)et'/ *p^(h)ot'^o- 57
 *p^(h)l-eH- 47
 p^(h)l-H- 47
 *p^{(h)o}enk^{(h)o}e 111
 *p^(h)ip^(h)oH- 58
 *p^(h)oH(i)- 51,52, 92, 94-96, 100,
 102
 *pi-/*pī- 52, 92, 93
 *po-/*pō- 92, 93

*pō-/*pō(i)- 52, 92
 *pod- 33
 *pol- 33
 *pompo/*popmo 93
 *pop- 93
 *por-thu- 32, 35
 *prep- 34
 *pter- (*pet-) 98
 *pter-i-ski 35
 *reg^uos- 34
 *sengt- *(senk-) 98
 *sent- 98
 *septm̄ 31
 (s)mcugh-/(s)mughlio- 74
 *snerk- 35
 *sneu- 82
 *sṛbh- 32, 34
 *srung- 32, 34
 *steib(h)o 30
 *steibo- 34
 *suck^(h)ru/*suk^(h)uro- 105
 *tā-n 33
 *teju- 87
 *tek-34
 *t'el- 119
 *ten- 117
 *tenk- 117
 *ter- 98
 *-tero(< -t(o)-+ero-) (?) 100
 *thengh- 117, 118
 *t'ejū-os 88
 *t'jeu- 87
 *t'jeu-os/*t'jeu-s 88
 *t'ju- 87
 *tng'hu-/*tng'hiu- 118
 *tnk'u- 118
 *tng'hu-/*tng'hiu- 117, 118, 120
 *t'ns-u- 117, 119, 120
 *t'om 29

*t'ō- 29
 *trejes 31
 *træg^l- 121, 122, 124-126
 *uēdo- 34
 *uēdhā 32, 34
 *wītā 35

Hittite

akuṽanzi 94
 ara /^DAra /^{UL}ara 82
 dankui dankuli 119
 *da(n)su- (<*dṛsu-) 119
 dassu 119
 ekuzz i 94
 huiṽant- 134
 kar-di-a (*gen.*) 105
 ki-ir 105
 paš 94
 šakuṽa /šakuṽai (*gen.*) 134
 Šiu- (Anat. *Tiu-) 87
 šiun (*acc.*) 86
 šiunaš (*gen.*) 86
 šius 86
 šiṽaz 86
 Šiṽaz (<*Šiṽaz) 89
 taḥḥu(ṽa)i- 134
 zena- 79
 zeni (*dat.-abl.*) 79

Luvian

aku- (Hier. Luv.) 94
 da-a-u-i-iš (*nom. sing.*) 133
 da-a-u-wa (*pl. nom.-acc.*) 133
 dauswašši- / tauswašši- 133
 dawī- / tawī- 133, 134
 huitṽali- 134
 kati- (Hier. Luv.) 136, 140, 141
 šu-wa-nà-i (Cun. Luv.) 105
 Ta-ṽa-ú-i-ma-an 133

taṭi- 131, 133, 134, 135
*Tiṭa- / *Tiu- (Anat.) 87
Tiṭat- (*Tiṭ-at) 86, 87, 89
^DTiṭaz 86

Palaic

ahu 94
tiṭaz 86
Tiṭa 87
Tiṭaz (*Tiṭ- az) 89

Tocharian A/B

kokale (Toch..B) 109
kukäl (Toch. A) 90, 109
kukale (Toch..B) 91
trāsk (Toch. A/B)
yok- (Toch. A/B)

Old Indian

cakrá- 91, 109
cáratī 109
devá- 87
diva-/ divya- 87
deváh 88
dyāuh 86
Dyáuh (*Dyá-uh) 87, 89
Dyáuṣ 86
gurú- 113
man- 105
pa- 92
pibami 92
pibati 93, 94
ṛtá- 82
śākha 105
śrad 105
śrad-dhā 105
śúnas (*gen. pl.*) 105
š(u)nà 105
śvášura 105

upa-bdá- 57

Indian

kṣatráṃ 141
kṣatriya 141

Bengali (Hindi)

āṭā 68

Armenian (Gipsy)

pʰtʰl [biel] / *uʰpʰtʰl* [piel] 92

Avestan

a-bda 57
ang- 118
anjasántē 118
arəta- 82
*arta- 68
aša- 68
čaraiti 109
čaxra- 109
daēva- 87
fra-bda 57
hama- 97
xaōda- 82

Old Persian

arta- 82
hama- 97
xauda 82

Pahlavi

kapič 70
*xōd 82

Parthian

xwd / xūd 82

Sogdian (Manichaean)

ʾβyō (*ham-baudaya-) 100

Ossetian

xodā / xūd 82

Afganian

xol 82

Persian

ārd 68

ham-bōd (Iran.) / ham-boδ 58,
100

tang 119

xōi 82

zardachwar 81

Greek

ἀ-βυσσος 76

ἀλέω 68, 69

ἄλλος 75

ἄρσιον. δίκαιον 82

ἀρταβη (OGk.) 140

ἀχλύς 74

βαρύς 113

δασύς 119

ΔιΦός (*gen.*) 86Διός (<*Δι-ός) (*gen.*) 86, 89

διός 87

di-we (Mik.-Gk.) 86, 89

ἔξ- 82

ἐκνρός 105

ἐπ-ί-βδα 57

ἐχ- 82

ἐχπνέω 82

ἐχφέρω 82

*gati- (PrGk.-Anat.) 141

Ζεύς (*Ζε-ύς) 86, 89

ἡλίον κύκλος 20

κάθιδοι (Pr.Gk.) 140,141

καρδία 105

ka-ti (Kret.-Min., Pr.Gk.) 140

*kathi (Pr.Gk.) 141

*k(h)athi- [Pr.Gk.('Pel.')] 141

κηθίς (Pr.Gk.) 140, 141

ki-ti-me-na ko-to-na

(Mik.-Gk.) 141

κοινη 25

κτάομαι 141

κτῆμα 141

κτιμένα κτοίνα (Mk. Gk..) 141

κύκλα (*pl.*) 109

κύκλος (Hom.) 91, 109

κύων 105

κυνός (*gen.*) 105

ὀπ-ώρη (Hom.) 79

πέλομαι 109

πέλω (Hom.) 109

πεπώκα (Eol.) 92

πίνω (Eol.) 92, 94

πῶθί 94

πώμα (Eol.) 92, 94

πῶνώ 92

πῶσις (Eol.) 92

σάτιλλα 107, 108

σαπινέω (*gen.pl.*) 107

σᾶτίνη 107, 108

τρώγω 125

φάρυγξ 100

Phrygian (and Brygian)

kat- 107

κίκλην 91, 109

σάτιλλα (*satilḡa) 108

σᾶτίνη 108

Albanian

pi /pī 95

siëll 109

Latin

alius 75

aqua 94

bibō (*pi-bō) (<bibëre) 92, 94

canis 105

colus 90, 109

dēnsus 119

deus 86, 87, 89

Diouis [*Diou-is (OLat.)] 86, 89

Díúvei (Osc.) 86

dius / di-vus 87

diuus- 88

*diuios 87

ex- 82

exemplum 82

experimentum 82

ex-portō 82

frumen 100

grauis 113

Jouis (OLat.) (*gen.*) 86

mulier 67

ocu-(lus) 134

*pibeti (<*hipeti) 94

*pibō (*pi-bō) 92, 94

pōtus 92

temō [-nis (*gen. sing.*)] 118**Old Irish**cú [con (*gen.*)] 105

cul 90, 108

dia [dé (*gen.*)] 87

ibid 93, 94

ibim 92

Gaulish

an-nwfn 76

Old Cimric

iben 92

Cornish

evaf 92

Gothic

aha 94

aljis 75

asans 79

heito 38

hōha 105

-qairnus 113

swaihrō 105

German

ab-grund 76

aran (OHGerm.) 79

Ernte 79

heitar (OHGern.) 137

heiter 137, 138

vël (MLGerm.) 109

Old Icelandic

hjól 109

hvél 90, 108, 109

kvern 113

talma 119

tívar 87

Týr 88

pungr 118

æger 94

qnn 79

English

hweogol / hwēol (OEng.) 109

kumla (OScand.) 104

tid 115, 116

whell 109

Prussian

aglo (OPruss.) 74
 assanis 79
 deiws 87
 kelan 90, 108
 poieiti 94
 pouit (OPruss.) 92

Lithuanian

akmuõ 105
 akmuñs 105
 burna 100
 diẽwas 87
 gĩrnos (Pl.) 113
 miñti 104
 minù 104
 šakā 105
 šėšuras 105
 šuñs (*gen.*) 105
 šuõ 105
 tankus 118

Lettish

du-celis 90, 108
 dzirñus 113
 kaists 138

Old Slavian

bez-důna 76
 di-liti 119
 goymьno 104
 kamy 105
 kola (*nom-acc. pl.*) 109
 kolo [*kolese (gen.)*] 90, 108
 pijo 94
 piti 92
 posochũ (Slav.) 105
 socha (Slav.) 105
 svekry 105
 žrũnovũ 113

Russian

бездна 76
 гумно́ 104
 длить 119
 жать [жму (*sing.*)] 104
 кола (Old Russ.) 109
 осень [осени (*abl. sing.*)] 79
 пить 92

Sumerian

gigir/ GIGIR 109, 110

Hurrian

Šimigi 87

Uartian

Aštuzi 85
 Diauḫi 86
 Šivini 87

Semitic

*gurn- 113
 *galgal- 110

Akkadian

mak / grattu 113

Ugarit (lang.)

grn 113

Old Hebr.

galgal (Aram.) 110
 gigāl 109
 gilgāl 110
 gōren 113

Arabic

ardabb / irdabb 140
 ġarana 113
 ġurn- 113

Georgian

*br̥-bar- (Kartv.) 110
ca- (Kartv.) 133
gorgal 109
gr̥gar (cf. *br̥-bar-) (Kartv.) 110
ɣw 36
ɣwarjli 122
*ɣwarjli (Georg.-Zan.) 122
ɣwia / ɣwiē [Tuch (Georg. dial.)]
35, 36
ɣwirabi 36
ɣwini / ɣwino 36
te- (Kartv.) 133
ten- (Kartv.) 133
twal- (Kartv.) 133
uça 133

Megrelian

ɣurjul 122

Laz [Chan. (lang.)]

ɣurjul 122

Aghul (lang.)

zaw

u(ɥ)ba (OAgħ.)

Avarian

zob 132

Darginian

dzubri 132

Lak (lang.)

ccab 133

ssau 132

Lezgin

ccaw (Kurin. (dial. Lesgin)
132

ɥɥab 132, 133

Tabasaran (lang.)

дзаб 133

dzav 132

Old Chin

*gr (< IE) 110

**Index
of Scholars Mentioned in the Text**

- Abrahamyan A. A. 126, 147
 Agathangeghos 83, 145
 Aghabekyan M.A. 36, 55, 147
 Aghayan E. B. 20, 50, 56, 147
 Adjaryan H. 18, 21, 24, 26, 35,
 36, 48, 51, 52, 54-58, 66-
 69, 72-78, 80-85, 90, 92,
 93, 95-97, 100, 101, 103,
 104, 107-109, 112, 113,
 117-119, 124, 125, 132,
 133, 136-138, 140, 142,
 144, 147,
 Adonts N. 136
 Amatuni S. 78, 112, 144
 Anttila R. 47, 157
 Awetikhean G., 144
 Awgerean M. 144
 Aywazovski G. 68, 147
 Aytənean A. 24, 147
 Barsegh Kessaratsi 131, 145
 Barseghyan L. 136
 Barton R. 69, 157
 Baumbach L. 140, 157
 Bediryan P.S. 48, 148, 157
 Benveniste E. 20, 38, 62, 157
 Berneker E. 104, 145
 Bolognesi G. 157
 Bomhard A.R. 29, 157
 Bonfante G. 39, 158
 Boisacq F. 101, 107, 145
 Brugmann K. 28, 157
 Buck C.D. 38, 62, 145
 Chadwick J. 140, 158
 Crouwel J. H. 110, 160
 Diakonoff I. M. 136
 Djahukyan G.B. 9, 15, 18, 19,
 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29, 36,
 39, 40, 42-45, 48, 49, 51,
 52, 54, 57, 58, 62-64, 66,
 68, 70, 73-75, 77-79, 81-
 85, 87, 90, 93-96, 98-101,
 103, 105, 108, 111, 112,
 114, 115, 118, 119, 121-
 123, 125, 129-134, 136,
 137, 140, 141, 144, 148,
 157
 Djachdjachean M. 119
 Dulaurier E. 75
 Dumezil G. 38, 158
 Eremia Meghretsi 72, 81, 90,
 91, 124, 144
 Eusebeos Kesaratsi 66-67, 146
 Fourquet G. 20, 158
 Forrer E. 136
 Gamkrelidze T.V. 56, 158
 Georgiev V.I. 15, 141, 158
 Ghapantsyan G.A. 129, 136, 149
 Gharibyan A.S. 158
 Goetze A. 133, 136, 158
 Grekyan E. 87, 150
 Greppin J.A.C. 110, 130, 136,
 140, 158
 Haas V. 136
 Hagège C. 29, 158
 Haudricourt A.G. 20, 29, 158, 159
 Hambardzumyan V.G. 17, 21, 23,
 30, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 43,
 44, 52, 56, 59, 64, 66, 76,
 77, 80, 84, 88, 91, 100,
 112, 142, 147-149, 159
 Hamp E. P. 32, 84, 159

- Hanneyan M. 50, 150
Hilmansson J. 84, 85, 151, 159
Hovhannisyan L. 144
Hopper P.J. 29, 40, 56, 159
Hmayakyan S. 87, 150
Hübschmann H. 18, 20, 35, 68,
81, 82, 89, 92, 93, 101,
109, 113, 117, 118, 150,
159
Ivanov V.V. 56, 158
Jakobson R. 9, 160
Karuba O. 136
Khachatryan V. 136
Kortlandt F. 29, 58, 151, 160
Kossian A.V. 130, 136, 160
Kronasser H. 129, 160
Lagarde P. de 81, 92, 160
Lalayan E. 112, 146
Laroche E. 133, 144
Liden E. 107
Littauer M.A. 110, 160
Malxaseantc S. 144
Manandyan H. 78
Margaryan A. 78, 151
Martinet A. 41, 56, 160
Martirosyan N. 136
Martirosyan H. A. 110, 151
Martirosyan H. K. 73, 144
Mayrhofer M. 40, 51, 58, 95,
130, 160
Meillet A. 20, 39, 66-69, 73, 93,
104, 152, 160
Melikishvili G. 85, 160
Mnatsakanyan H. 110
Moses Khorenatsi 83, 115,
121, 123, 124, 126
Msereants L. 42, 152
Mxithar Sebastatsi 82, 144
Musheghyan A. 81, 160
Neumann G. 161
Pedersen H. 32, 56, 85, 101, 161
Peterman H. 92, 93, 161
Phawstos Buzand 103, 146
Pisani V. 84, 87, 161
Pokorny J. 35, 73, 88, 104,
107, 118, 145
Porzig W. 39, 161
Puhvel J. 136, 145
Qadjuni M. 77, 145
Roshka S. 76
Salvini M. 136
Saussure F. de 41
Schmidt K. H. 108, 161
Schmitt R. 161
Shahnazarean K. 85
Shilds K. 88
Simonyan N. M. 10, 42, 50, 55,
142, 151
Siwrmēlean X. 144
Solta G.R. 29, 52, 93, 117, 118,
161
Spenean K. 129, 151
Sukiasyan H.V. 42, 118, 151
Szemerényi O. 15, 21, 28, 105,
162
Ter-Mkrtičian G. 80, 122, 151
Tervishyan S. 93, 132, 151
Timotheos Kuz 146
Tischler J. 136, 145
Trautmann R. 101
Tshanashian M. 151
Vardanyan A. 103, 152
Walde A. 101
Watkins C. 86, 145, 161
Weitenberg J.J.S. 86, 161
Yovhan Oskeberan 146
Zabrocki L. 20, 161
Zakharia Sarkawag 147
Абаев В.И. 105, 152
Амаякян С.Г. 87, 152

- Амбарцумян В.Г. 84, 152
Ахманова О.С. 41, 152
Бельчиков Ю. А. 41, 152
Блумфилд Л. 40, 68, 152
Бомхард А.Р. 152
Веселитский В. В. 41, 152
Гамкрелидзе Т.В. 9, 15, 18, 20-
22, 24, 26, 29, 32, 39, 44,
45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 56-58,
67, 77, 79, 82, 86-88, 91,
95, 101, 102, 105, 109,
110, 113, 119, 130, 133,
134, 141, 152
Георгиев В.И. 39, 141, 153
Гигинейшвили Б.К. 42, 153
Гиндин Л. А. 140, 141, 153
Горбачевич К.С. 41, 153
Десницкая А.В. 153
Джаукян Г.Б. 9, 19-22, 26, 28-
36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46,
49, 50, 51, 55, 56, 67, 72,
74, 96, 101, 102, 104,
105, 112, 113, 118, 125,
133, 153
Дюмезиль Ж. 80, 154
Иванов Вяч. Вс. 9, 15, 18, 20-
22, 24, 26, 29, 32, 38, 40,
44, 45, 47, 49, 51, 52, 56-
58, 67, 77, 79, 82, 86-
88, 91, 95, 101, 102, 105,
109, 110, 113, 119, 129,
130, 133-135, 141, 154
Иллич-Свитыч В. М. 105, 154
Капанцян Г.А. 154
Кейпер Ф. Б. Я. 154
Клычков Г.С. 42, 154
Королев А.А. 129, 154
Курилович Е. 48, 154
Майрхофер М. 52, 57-59, 155
Макаев Э.А. 38, 155
Мартине А. 41, 155
Мельничук А. С. 155
Мнацаканян А.О. 155
Мсерианц Л. 42, 155
Нерознак В. П. 18, 20, 21, 24,
129, 155
Патканов К. 42, 81, 155
Периханян А.Г. 82, 156
Пиотровский Б.Б. 110, 156
Порциг В. 156
Семенюк Н.Н. 41, 156
Скребнев Ю.М. 41, 156
Туманян Э.Г. 49, 156
Фасмер М. 104, 145
Филин Ф. Н. 41, 156
Хоппер П. Дж. 56, 156
Широков О.С. 21, 40, 109, 156
Якобсон Р. 9, 156

Vazguen G. Hambardzumyan

ARMENIAN AND INDO–EUROPEAN

Essays on Comparative Lexicology of the Armenian Language

(Comparative-typological Variativity)

Printed in the Republic of Armenia

•

Printing House of “Zangak-97” LLC