



**HAL**  
open science

## On Armenian -agin: additional evidence for a third West Middle Iranian dialect?

Agnes Korn, Birgit Anette Olsen

### ► To cite this version:

Agnes Korn, Birgit Anette Olsen. On Armenian -agin: additional evidence for a third West Middle Iranian dialect?. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 2012, 66 (2), pp.201-220. hal-01340802

**HAL Id: hal-01340802**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01340802v1>**

Submitted on 1 Jul 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

AGNES KORN & BIRGIT ANETTE OLSEN

## On Armenian *-agin*: additional evidence for a third West Middle Iranian dialect?<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

The origin of the Armenian (Arm.) nominal suffix *-agin* is disputed. KLINGENSCHMITT (1982: 95) considers it as inherited and assumes that it is based on opaque possessive compounds in *\*-gini-* < *\*-g<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>-ni-* ‘the going (Gehen)’, GREPPIN (1974: 14) suggests a derivation from an unspecified substrate, while SCHMITT (2001: 85) dismisses a link to the Middle Iranian (Mīr.) suffix MPZ <-k(y)n’>, MPM, Pth. <-gyn> on formal grounds (cf. 3.2) without suggesting an alternative solution. This paper investigates the hypothesis that *-agin* is a borrowing from Iranian (Ir.) in spite of the formal difficulties. This idea has already been advocated by JAHUKYAN (1993: 262f.),<sup>2</sup> who derives *-agin* via “-gēn (and -gīn?)” from *\*-k-aina-*, identifying it with Arm. *-kēn* (likewise borrowed from Iranian), but does not venture to explain how *-agin* came to exist besides expected *-kēn*.

---

<sup>1</sup> We wish to thank Thomas Jügel for his thoughtful comments, Nicholas Sims-Williams and Yutaka Yoshida for several hints and Georg Warning for consultation on botanic matters. Transliterated and transcribed Manichean Middle Persian (MPM) and Parthian (Pth.) is quoted from and in the form given in DMD and the “Reverse Index” at <http://www.bbaw.de/bbaw/Forschung/Forschungsprojekte/turfanforschung/de/iranischeTexte> unless otherwise noted, Zoroastrian MP (MPZ) from MACKENZIE 1986. Old Iranian material with an asterisk refers to the phonological form abstracted from the specificities of Old Persian (OP) and Avestan (Av.). New Persian (NP) material is quoted in the contemporary standard of Iran.

<sup>2</sup> Thus also JAHUKYAN 1987: 569, accepted by OLSEN 1999: 217.

## 1. The Armenian suffixes

1.1. The oldest (and rare) instances<sup>3</sup> of word-final *-kēn*, the form that one would expect from an Iranian input *\*-k-aina-*, are secondary derivatives in *-ēn* (← Ir. *\*-aina-*) from nouns in *-ik* with regular Armenian syncope of *-i-*: *čančkēn* (F)<sup>4</sup> ‘spotted, moucheté’ (*čančik* ‘small fly, moucheron’), *kočkēn* ‘of ankle length’ (2 Sam. 13:18-19 < *\*kočik*, cf. *koč* ‘ankle’).<sup>5</sup>

1.2. The above-mentioned phonetically regular instances of *-kēn*, whose Iranian origin is uncontroversial (JAHUKIAN 1993: 263), are semantically quite diverse, while the situation is remarkably different for the more common suffix *-(a)gin*.<sup>6</sup> Here, the adjectives found in the oldest texts mostly denote the being affected with a certain feeling:<sup>7</sup> the very well attested *ahagin* (B, Ez, A, L, F, E, LV, M, YD) ‘terrible’ (from the Ir. LW *ah* (*i*-stem) ‘fear, terror’) besides the rare *ekiwłagin* (L) (*erkiwl* (*i*-stem) ‘fear’) and the later (quasi)-synonyms *sarsragin* (*sarsowr* (*o*-stem) ‘shudder’) and *zarhowragin* (*zarhowrank* ‘fear’); *vštagin* (B, L) ‘sad, distressed’ (Ir. LW *višt* (*a*-stem) ‘grief, sorrow’) besides *c<sup>o</sup>awagin* (B, YD) ‘painful,

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the reverse dictionary by JUNGSMANN / WEITENBERG 1993.

<sup>4</sup> Arm. texts are abbreviated as in JUNGSMANN / WEITENBERG 1993, i.e. B = Bible, Ez = Eznik, K = Koriwn, A = Agathangelos, L = Łazar P<sup>c</sup>arpec<sup>i</sup>, F = P<sup>c</sup>awstos Bowzandac<sup>i</sup> (all 5<sup>th</sup> c.), E = Elišē, Ir = Irenaeus (6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> c.), LV = Łevond Vardapet (8<sup>th</sup> c.), M = Movsēs Xorenac<sup>i</sup> (9<sup>th</sup> c.), YD = Yovhannēs Kat<sup>c</sup>olikos (Draxanakertec<sup>i</sup>) (10<sup>th</sup> c.).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. also the dialectal forms *kočik* ‘wrist’, *gojig* ‘ankle’. The later meaning “buttoned” quoted by JAHUKIAN 1993: 263 is surely derived from *kočak* ‘button’ (with Middle Armenian loss of unstressed *-a-*). Not a derivative in *\*-k-aina-*, but a complete Iranian loanword (LW), is *parkēn* ‘moat’ (MPM *pārgēn* ‘moat’, NP *pārgīn* ‘sewer’ < *\*pari-kanya-* from the root *\*kan* ‘dig’, HENNING 1934: 228).

<sup>6</sup> The inflection of the derivatives in *-agin* is not clear: the only attestation showing the stem class is Gen.Dat.Abl.Pl. *ahagnic* (*i*-stem) in Movsēs Xorenac<sup>i</sup>, but since this text does not belong to the strictly Classical period, the later productivity of the *i*-stems, which include adjectives of this type, could already be at work here.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. MEILLET 1913: 34: *-agin* is found “in einigen Adjektiven, die ein Gefühl bezeichnen”.

distressed’ (*c̣aw* (*o*-stem) ‘pain’); *trtmagin* (B, L, E) ‘distressed, sorrowful’ (*trtowm* ‘id.’) and the antonym *zowarfagin* (B, L, E, Ir, YD) ‘happy, glad’ (*zowarf* ‘id.’); *diwagin* (B) ‘furious, possessed’ (Ir. LW *dew* (*a*-stem) ‘demon’) besides *molegin* (B, A) ‘angry, wild’ (*moli* ‘passionate, wild’; *-e-gin* < \**-i-agin*) and *zayragin* (B, E, LV) ‘angry, upset’ (verb *zayranam*); *ereragin* (L) ‘excited’ (*erer* (*i*-stem) ‘excitement’); *srtagin* (B) ‘cordial’ (*sirt* (*i*-stem) ‘heart’); *hiwandagin* (B) ‘sick, ill’ (Ir. LW *hiwand* ‘ill’); *tōfagin* (B) ‘hot, burning’ (Ir. LW *tōf* (*o*-stem) ‘heat’) and *c̣ōlagin* (B, A) ‘dewy’ (*c̣ōl* (*o*-stem) ‘dew’)<sup>8</sup>; and finally the very common *owžgin* (B, K, A, L, F, LV, M, YD) ‘powerful, strong’ (Ir. LW *oyž* (*o*-stem) ‘power, strength’), the only lexeme without the connecting vowel *-a*.<sup>9</sup>

## 2. The Iranian suffixes

2.1. From a semantic point of view, Arm. *-agin* has a matching counterpart in the Western Middle Iranian (WMIr.) — i.e. Middle Persian (MP) and Parthian (Pth.) — suffix <-gyn> *-(a)gēn*.<sup>10</sup> This suffix forms adjectives “die das Behaftetsein mit dem Begriff des Substantivs, von dem sie stammen, ausdrücken” (HNS 178), e.g. Pth. <zyngyn> *zēngēn* ‘armoured’ (*zēn* ‘weapon’), MP <’wzm’hgyn> *awezmāhgēn* ‘lewd’ (*awezmāh* ‘lust’), MP/Pth. <n’mgyn> *nāmgēn* ‘famous’ (*nām* ‘name’), <’bgyng> *ābgēn-ag* ‘crystal, glass’ (*āb* ‘water’, *ābgēn* lit. ‘water-like’).<sup>11</sup> The derivatives in *-gēn* are not particularly numerous: the examples just mentioned are the only clear ones in the published WMIr. Manichean material while

<sup>8</sup> *C̣ōlagin* may be due to the influence of *tōfagin*, cf. Is. 18:4: *ibrew zloys tōfagin ... ew ibrew zamp c̣ōlagin* “like a hot/burning light ... and like a cloud of dew”.

<sup>9</sup> For more discussion of *owžgin*, see 3.4. Compounds with the noun *gin* ‘price’ (cf. *gnem* ‘buy’), e.g. *mecagin* ‘precious’, *noragin* ‘newly bought’, are immaterial to the present study.

<sup>10</sup> See SALEMANN 1901: 280, SKALMOWSKI 1967: 83, HNS 178, RMMP 71, RMPth 196, DMGr 4.1.3.19. After *š*, *-kēn* is found (cf. GIPPERT 2007: 102 n. 15). For the *-a-*, see 3.3.

<sup>11</sup> For the comparison of the brilliance of jewels with water, see SUNDERMANN 1997: 119f.; cf. also note 30.

MACKENZIE (1986) and MAJIDI (1995: 604f.) quote seven examples each plus *ābgēnag* / *ābgīne* ‘(crystal) glass’ (cf. note 30) for MPZ and NP, respectively.

**2.2.** WMIr. *-gēn* has been derived from Old Iranian (OIr.) *\*-k-aina-*, i.e. the suffix *\*-aina-* forming adjectives of material (e.g. Avestan *zaran-aēna-* ‘golden’, Old Persian *aθang-aina-* ‘from stone’) added to stems in *-k-* (i.e. chiefly the common suffix *\*-aka-*, but in principle also *\*-uka-*, etc.).<sup>12</sup> As for the vowel quality, the WMIr. orthography is ambiguous,<sup>13</sup> but the Ir. LW *bamgen* ‘blessed’ (cf. WMIr. *bām* ‘splendour’, MP *bāmīg*, *bāmēw*, Pth. *bāmēn* ‘radiant’) recently found in ‘Caucasian Albanian’ confirms the expected *-ē-*.<sup>14</sup>

The suffix thus owes its emergence to a metanalysis of *\*-ak-* and *-ēn*.<sup>15</sup> This process is not very surprising as both MIr. *-ag* and *-ēn* are extremely productive<sup>16</sup> and may be combined with each other,<sup>17</sup> cf. the Manichean examples: MP/Pth. <pd(y)ngyn> *pidēnag-ēn* ‘soiled’ (MP <pdyng> *pidēn-ag* ‘meat meal’, Pth. <pdngynyft> *pidēn-ag-īft* ‘defilement’, MP/Pth. <pdyn> *pid-ēn* ‘of meat’, SUNDERMANN 1997: 124), MP <srgyn> *sarag-ēn* ‘silken’ (*\*sarag*, NP *sare* ‘silk’), <prm’ngyn> *parmānag-ēn* (*parmān-ag* ‘thinking’, a Manichean element of the soul), <prg’mgyn> *fragāmag-ēn* ‘arousing desire’ (*fragām-ag*, *fragām-išn* ‘desire’), Pth. <prwngyn> *parrōn-ag-ēn* ‘yonder (adj.)’ (*parrōn* ‘yonder’).

**2.3.** The suffix *-gēn* is qualified as “speciell neupersisch” by HNS 178. However, the existence of a parallel suffix *-kyn* in Sogdian (e.g. C *z’wrqyn*, M *z’wrk’yn* ‘strong’ from *z’wr* ‘strength’, C *ny’zqyn*, B *ny’(’)zkyn* ‘poor’ from (M) *ny’z* ‘want’, GMS § 1060-62) and Ossetic

<sup>12</sup> Thus all sources named in note 10 with the exception of RMMP 71 (which has *\*-ka-ina-*).

<sup>13</sup> <y> can stand for *ē*, *ī*, *ai* and also for *e* und *i*.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. GIPPERT 2007: 101f.

<sup>15</sup> DARMESTETER 1883/I: 272, HNS 178, BAILEY 1971: 129ff., GIPPERT 2007: 101.

<sup>16</sup> For examples, see RMMP 68f., 71, RMPth 194-196.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. RMMP 71.

(*-gin*, Iron *-ġin*)<sup>18</sup> appears to point to an early emergence of the suffix. On the other hand, the only OIr. example of *\*-Vġaina-* is Old Persian *kāsakaina-* (<k<sup>a</sup>-a-s<sup>a</sup>-k<sup>a</sup>-i-n<sup>a</sup>>) ‘of semi-precious stone’ (from *kāsaka-*, KENT 1953: 51, 180), no example of this combination being found in Avestan.<sup>19</sup>

In this context, the evidence of some additional Iranian languages is enlightening.<sup>20</sup> In Bactrian and Khotanese, a suffix deriving from *\*-ak-aina-* is not attested. Bactrian shows the simple adjective suffix *-ηνο / -ινο* < *\*-aina-* only in names (ραβτηνο, σορηνο); and *σιμινο* ‘silver (adj.)’ (*\*σιμο* ‘silver’, cf. MP *asēm*; NP *sīm* ← Greek ἄσημος, SIMS-WILLIAMS 2001: 190f.) is the only example with *-ινο* (unless the place name *σαγγινο* also contains the suffix). Instead, we find *-ηγγο*, *-ιγγο* ([-ē/īŋ(g)]). The clear cases<sup>21</sup> are: *ζαριγγο* ‘golden’ (*ζαρο* ‘gold’ “+ suffix *-ηγγο* or directly < *\*zar(a)naina-ka-*”, BD II: 211b), *σιμιγγο* ‘silver’, *οιφογγο / οιβ(ο)ιγγο* ‘of cotton or linen’ (*\*οιφο* ‘cotton, linen’), *σαριγγο* ‘glazed, with lacquer’,<sup>22</sup> *λαρσιγγο* ‘ill’ (*λαρσο* ‘illness’), showing that, besides the formation of adjectives of material, the suffix is also found in formations with the meaning ‘affected with’, parallel to WMIr. *-gēn* and Sogdian *-kyn*. The suffix *-ηγγο* obviously derives from *\*-aina-ka-*, i.e. the same elements that compose WMIr. *-gēn*, but in the reverse order.<sup>23</sup>

In Khotanese, *\*-aina-* is apparently found only in the combination *\*-aina-ka-* > Khot. *-īnaa-*, a rather common suffix; there are a number of adjectives of material and other quality, but also various derivatives where

<sup>18</sup> On this see 4.2.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 1909 and the TITUS text data base.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. the glossary for the Bactrian corpus in BD II, and DEGENER 1989: xxix, xxxiii, 133-152 for the Khotanese suffix.

<sup>21</sup> All quoted from the glossary in BD II (whence also the derivations).

<sup>22</sup> Thus the latest interpretation of the word (SIMS-WILLIAMS 2012: 194f.).

<sup>23</sup> Since Ir. *\*-ka-* is extremely productive, the suffix combination *\*-aina-ka-* is of course also found in other Iranian languages (e.g. NP *-īne*, HNS 181, Sogdian *-’yn’k*, s. GMS § 1052-1054), but, in contrast to Bactrian, it usually stands besides simple *-ēn* (and sometimes also combined *-gēn*). Similarly, simple *-ēn* can occur besides *-gēn*, e.g. MPM *sahmēn*, MPZ *sahmgēn* both ‘terrible’.

*-īnaa-* seems to merely mean “related to” (cf. the examples listed by DEGENER 1989: 138-152).

The data suggest that *\*-akaina-* is not an Old Iranian suffix, but that the suffixes *-ag* and *-ēn* could be combined in Middle Iranian to express ‘consisting of; affected or afflicted with’. The actual combining, however, occurred independently in the individual languages.<sup>24</sup>

### 3. The derivation of Arm. *-agin*

3.1. Among the explanations of the Arm. suffix, the suggestion by GREPPIN (1974: 14) that we are dealing with substrate formations is a *Notlösung* without actual points speaking in its favour, and substrate influence would at any rate not be particularly likely for the field of adjectives expressing emotions. Otherwise, almost all Armenian suffixes can be shown to be either inherited or borrowed from Iranian.<sup>25</sup>

KLINGENSCHMITT’s hypothesis (1982: 95) of an inherited compound member *\*-g<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>ni-* ‘the going (Gehen)’ is phonologically and morphologically possible, and indeed we find a syntagm *molegin gnac<sup>c</sup>k<sup>e</sup>* (2 Macc. 13:23) ‘going with a mad gait’ as noted by Klingenschmitt. However, for most formations with *-agin* such an interpretation does not suggest itself, and it does not seem quite likely that examples such as *tōf<sup>f</sup>agin* ‘hot, burning’, *srtagin* ‘cordial’ or *owžgin* ‘strong, powerful’<sup>26</sup> would have an underlying meaning *\*‘with heat gait’*, *\*‘with heart gait’*, *\*‘with power gait’*, or that *molegin*, if we follow Klingenschmitt’s hypothesis, would be the model of the entire type.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>24</sup> The same applies to several similarly structured Mlr. suffixes, e.g. MP *-gān* (Sogdian *-k<sup>n</sup>*), for which cf. SKALMOWSKI 1967: 82, RMMP 70, RMPth 195, HNS 178.

<sup>25</sup> There are also some cases of an Armenian suffix arising from a merger between an indigenous and an Iranian element, thus presumably *-i* and *-owk* (cf. OLSEN 1999: 432-452 and 584-590).

<sup>26</sup> Also as an adverb, e.g. Rev. 5:4: *es layi owžgin* “I wept a lot” (Greek *ἐκλαίον πολύ*).

<sup>27</sup> It is conceivable that the denominative verb *molegnim* ‘be mad, go mad’ may have triggered a secondary association with *gnam* ‘go’ (aorist *gnac<sup>c</sup>i* and verbal

3.2. If we disregard the formal difficulties for a moment, a derivation from Iranian appears highly likely: the most common lexemes, viz. *owžgin* ‘powerful, strong’ and *ahagin* ‘terrible’, are based on Iranian loanwords. It also seems plausible that *erkiwłagin* was formed secondarily as an Armenian equivalent of *ahagin*, and the same would apply to *vštagin* (with Ir. base) ‘painful, sad’ vs. *čawagin*, and to *trtmagin* and *diwagin* ‘furious’ vs. *molegin* and *zayragin*.

Additionally, there is a series of exact semantic correspondences with the suffix <-gyn> in WMIr., and this despite the fact that the suffix is not particularly common in these languages (cf. 2.1): MP *bīmgēn*, *sahmgēn* ‘terrible’, Pth. *andāgēn*, MPM *ōhāngēn*, MP *andāg(g)ēn*, *andōhgēn*, *pīmgēn*, all ‘grieving, sad’ corresponding to Arm. *vštagin*, etc.<sup>28</sup> And at least for Arm. *hiwandagin* and *tōfagin*, the required adjective bases with suffix *\*-Vka-* are actually attested (MPM *xīndag* ‘ill’, MP *taftīg* ‘burning’, Pth. *taft(ag)* ‘burning hot’).<sup>29</sup>

However, the derivation of *-agin* from WMIr. *-gēn* is difficult in several respects. SCHMITT (2001: 85) notes: “*-agin* kann wegen der Schreibung von mpers. *-k(y)n'* nicht hiermit (und mit manich.-parth. *-gyn*, npers. *-gīn*) zusammengehören”, i.e. in view of the other WMIr. elements in Armenian, one would expect *-k-* rather than *-g-* and *-ē-* rather than *-i-*, i.e. †*-akēn*. These problems will be the subject of the following discussion.

3.3. One way out would be to assume that Arm. *-agin* was borrowed at a rather late point, when OIr. postvocalic *\*-k* had yielded WMIr. *-g*, and when OIr. *\*ai* had developed into WMIr. (*ē* >) *ī*. However, in addition to problems on the Armenian side (see 3.4), this scenario would be chronologically incoherent. At a time point when OIr. postvocalic *-k* had yielded *-g*, a Mir. syncope should also have occurred (thence *-gēn*, not *-agēn*).

Unfortunately, the precise contexts in which syncope phenomena operated in MP and Parthian are not clear since the orthographies are

---

noun *gnac<sup>c</sup>k<sup>c</sup>* ‘gait’).

<sup>28</sup> On MP *sōzāgēn* ‘burning’, see 3.3.

<sup>29</sup> With Ir. *-af-* rendered as Arm. *-ō-*, i.e. [aw] as in *nōf* ‘naphta, pitch’, MP *naft* ‘damp; naphta’ (as opposed to the Old Iranian *u*-diphthong *-au-*, which shows a regular development to Arm. *-oy-*).



systematically defective exactly in this point. Nevertheless, evidence such as Caucasian Albanian *bamgen* (see 2.1) and the absence from NP of examples with *-agīn* or *-egīn* suggests that the stage that shows *-g-* for OIr. postvocalic *-k-* had undergone syncope. There may have been items where the context prevented syncope;<sup>30</sup> to these might be added words suffixed with *-ag* plus *-ēn*, which may have escaped syncope (thence had *-agēn*) for morphological reasons because they were newly coined and/or transparent formations (cf. 2.2). However, it appears questionable whether these instances would have provided enough input for an Arm. suffix *-agin*.

Still, we may consider the possibility that other suffixes could have played a role in the creation of a WMIr. input for Arm. *-agin*. Indeed, the suffix *-āg*, which forms present participles (e.g. MP/Pth. <br'z'g> *brāzāg* 'radiant', Pth. <'mwc'g>, MP <hmwc'g> 'teacher (lit. teaching)'),<sup>31</sup> is occasionally found combined with *-ēn*, thence MPM <swc'gyn> *sōzāg-ēn* 'burning' (*sōz-* 'burn') and <hws'gyn> *hōšāg-ēn*, adjective from *hōšāg*

<sup>30</sup> KLINGENSCHMITT 2000: 210f. discusses syncope in the OIr. penultimate (e.g. OIr. \**páθana-* > MP, NP *pahn* 'broad') and suggests that this syncope takes place in contexts other than between unidentical stops. If the syncope relevant here operated similarly, it would produce e.g. *nāmgēn*, *zēngēn* and (against the dictionaries) *ābagēn-ag* 'crystal, glass'; and most NP examples would likewise fit, thus *andūh-gīn* 'distressed' (synonym with *gam-gīn*) and the five of the seven NP lexemes with *-gīn* noted by MAJIDI 1995 which have first members with final nasal. The remaining case is again *āb-gīn*. If MP did have *ābagēn*, the absence of a middle vowel in NP *ābgīn* could be explained as an analogy *āb* vs. *ābgīn* on the model of e.g. *nām* vs. *nāmgīn*. This word (cf. the Sogdian parallel ''*pkyn* 'crystal') is derived by HÜBSCHMANN 1897: 103 from \**āpak-ēn-ak*, "wenn es nicht aus *āb* 'Wasser' und dem fertigen Suffix *gīn*, *gīna* (vgl. DARMESTETER, Étud. iran. I, 272) gebildet ist". For \**āpak*, one could compare Arm. *apaki* 'glass, crystal' and Osset. *avg* / *avgæ* 'glass' (ABAEV I:34), for which Hungarian *üveg* suggests a derivation from Ir. \**āpak-*, BAILEY 1971: 130, GIPPERT 1993/I: 15 n. 9).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. SKALMOWSKI 1967: 80. The suffix is derived from \**-āka-* by HNS 146 and RMPth 197 (RMMP 73 notes "unclear etymology"), which in view of Eastern Iranian cognates is to be preferred (cf. DEGENER 1989: 42) to SALEMANN'S 1901: 278 assumption \**-āyaka-*.

‘hot wind’ (lit. ‘drying’).<sup>32</sup> Semantically, MP *sōzāgēn* is an exact equivalent of Arm. *tōfagin* (cf. 1.2). Indeed, *-āgīn* is functionally a variant of *-gīn* in New Persian, and has lost its deverbal function. MAJIDI (1995: 604) notes ‘*anbarāgīn* ‘containing amber; fragrant’ (*anbar* ‘amber’), *dardāgīn* ‘painful’ (*dard* ‘pain’) and *zahrāgīn* (*zahr* ‘poison’).

That the participle suffix *-āg* could influence sequences containing *-ag-* is also shown by the quasi-suffix *-gar* (< \**-kara-*), where some instances of *-āgar* (i.e. <-’gr>) are found besides usual <-gr>, e.g. Pth. <rwšn’gr> ‘illuminating’ (vs. MPM <rwšn(y)gr>), <bwj’gr> ‘saviour’ (vs. MPM <bwzygr>), <’bjyn’gr> ‘tailor’ (vs. MPM <’bzyngr>).<sup>33</sup>

3.4. However, the scenario just presented would imply a lenition of *-k-* > *-g-*; and it is rather unlikely or even chronologically impossible for an Iranian loan suffix in Armenian to be borrowed at such a late time, especially since *-agin* is already found in the oldest Armenian sources. There are, to our knowledge, no parallels with *-g-* for OIr. *-k-* in Iranian loanwords in Classical Armenian, and similarly structured Iranian loan suffixes such as Arm. *-akan* and *-akert* all have *-k-*, indicating that OIr. \**-aka-* had not been subject to lenition by the relevant period.

Moreover, while the change of MP *ē* to *ī* (and of *ō* to *ū*) preceding a nasal took place rather early,<sup>34</sup> WMIr. loanwords in Arm. otherwise show

<sup>32</sup> Cf. KORN / DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2009: 9f. Pth. <’brwlj’gyn> ‘radiant’ could be an additional case if it were clearly attested (cf. KORN 2010: 421).

<sup>33</sup> This does not seem to occur in Persian: the unclear hapax <hl’gr> seems to be the only MP candidate, and the only NP examples in MAJIDI 1995 contain a first member in *-ā*.

<sup>34</sup> PAUL 2009: 106 notes that the material suffix “preserved its MP. pronunciation *-ēn* (...) up until the 14<sup>th</sup> or 15<sup>th</sup> century”, referring to PISOWICZ 1985: 77ff. However, this misses the mark as Pisowicz only discusses preserved *ē* / *ō* in general and does not mention the context preceding nasals. In fact, the change *ē* > *ī* / *\_N* has already taken place in Pazand and in the *Šāhnāma* (10<sup>th</sup> c.) (HORN 1899: 156, HNS 26, 33, HÜBSCHMANN 1895: 141; for Early Judeo NP *-gīn* (vocalised as *-ī-*), see GINDIN: Morphology 2.3). This change has to be distinguished from the considerably later general merger of *ē* und *ī* (and of *ō* and *ū*)

$\bar{e}$  also in this position (HÜBSCHMANN 1895: 141, SALEMANN 1901: 270, HNS 26, 33), as seen in the case of *-kēn*.<sup>35</sup>

Despite these discrepancies, *-agin* has the clear appearance of an early borrowing, presumably belonging to the predominant layer of Parthian loan words and loan suffixes. A clear indication to this effect is the Parthian (not MP) first member of *owžgin* with the significant development of OIr. \* $\check{y}$  to \* $\check{z}$  as opposed to MP *z*. *Owžgin* is the only case where a syncope of the vowel preceding *-gin* took place, which allows the conclusion that the base is not an Iranian form with *-a-*, but rather with *-i-*, perhaps a Caland variant. As a protoform we may assume \**auji-* (\**au-* → Arm. \**oy-* > *u-*) or, perhaps better, the morphologically regular zero-grade form \**uji-*<sup>36</sup> (besides the *ro*-stem of Av. *ugra-* and the *s*-stem \**aujāh-*), which in Armenian was subject to regular syncope of the unaccented \**-i-* at a rather early stage.<sup>37</sup>

that characterises Standard NP (in contrast to Dari); according to PISOWICZ 1985: 74-89 this development should be dated after the 13<sup>th</sup> c. While the material suffix is preserved only in special and metaphoric meanings in Early NP, *-ī* (< MP *-īg*) is generalised (cf. PAUL 2009). For Southern Kurdish, FATTAH 2000: 833f. notes occasional cases of merger of the general adjective suffix *-ī* and the suffix *-īn* denoting adjectives of material, but this may be a late phenomenon.

<sup>35</sup> To be distinguished from phenomena relevant here is the regular Armenian change of  $\bar{e}$  > *i* in unaccented (i.e. non-final) syllables. For further discussion of the *-i-* of the Arm. suffix, cf. 4.3.

<sup>36</sup> Initial *ow-* is not subject to syncope before single consonants, cf. e.g. *ows* ‘shoulder’, Gen. *owsōy*.

<sup>37</sup> In Parthian the stem is attested in the compound *paryōž* ‘victory’ (\**pari-aujāh-*, BARTHOLOMAE 1904: 862) with derivatives. MPZ <’wc> ‘strength’ could stand for *ōž* (thus the transcription in NYBERG 1974: 147), which would point to a Pth. LW, but also for (MP) *ōz* (thus MACKENZIE 1986), since MPZ <c> may also be used for *z* that derives from OIr. \* $\check{y}$  (MACKENZIE 1967: 21, KORN 2010: 426 n. 59, cf. e.g. <pyrwc> *pērōz*, <bwc-> *bōz-* ‘save’). Pazend *aōž* is likewise inconclusive as Pazend uses <-ž> to correspond to MPZ <-c> (MACKENZIE 1967: 21). <j> in Pazend *aojmānd* (*Škand-Gumānīg-Vizār*) could be a transcription of the Avestan form or also represent MP *z* (cf. MACKENZIE *ibid.*). The item MP “*ōj*” quoted by HORN 1893: 286 and HÜBSCHMANN 1897: 215 is their rendering of MPZ <’wc>.

#### 4. The dialect hypothesis

4.1. In 3.2 and 3.4 we discussed the obstacles to a derivation of Arm. *-agin* from the Iranian sources that Iranian elements in Armenian mostly come from. Since inner-Armenian processes cannot account for *-agin* either, we will in the following investigate the hypothesis that the Mİr. source had a suffix of fitting form, i.e. *-agīn*, whether by sound changes regular for that dialect, by some analogical process, or by a combination of both. At any rate, the obvious implication is that *-agīn* comes from a dialect sufficiently similar to Persian and Parthian, since these languages show a semantically matching suffix and also some of the lemmata found in Armenian. More specifically, the *-ž-* of *owžgin* would speak for a dialect more similar to Parthian than to MP.

The postulated dialect does not appear to coincide with one of the known modern Wİr. languages. For instance, Kurdish and Zazaki do not show a suffix *-(a)gē/in*, and isolated examples are likely to have been borrowed from NP.<sup>38</sup>

The existence of a third WMİr. dialect providing Armenian lexemes has been postulated before, and is also rather plausible *a priori* in view of

---

<sup>38</sup> Among these, *ğamgīn* (cf. note 30) is the most widespread one. FATAH 2000: 841 notes *xammgīn* (with variants) for some speakers of Southern Kurdish while others use *-īn* and *-dār* on *ğam* (vel sim.). In Balochi, instances of *-agēn* involve the attributive adjective suffix *-ēn* added to word-final *-ag*, e.g. *zindagēn*. The (to our knowledge) only example possibly involving the suffix in question is *rōdgin*, which is interesting because on the one hand, *rōd* ‘copper, brass’ cannot be a Persian borrowing (cf. NP *rūy*); on the other, one would expect *ē* or at least *ī*, not *i* (cf. e.g. *ādēn(k)* ‘mirror’; for some cases of *ē* > *ī* see KORN 2005: 199f.), and if the word was inherited, it should also have *-k-*. *rōdgin* is found in a tale deriving from the oral tradition about the Gorgej tribe printed in BARKER / MENGAL 1969/II: 288-292. BARKER / MENGAL 1969/II: 299 translate *rōdgin u rangēn tīr* (p. 290, line 49) as “river-hued bullets”, evidently relating *rōdgin* to *rōd* ‘river’. In the context of “blueish-grey, (...) gold-hilted Indian swords”, “bejewelled saddle” and “crimson battlefield” (line 46-53) “missiles from copper/ brass, [and] coloured” is certainly preferable. In the glossary, BARKER / MENGAL 1969/II: 548 render *rōdgin* (only occurring in the quoted passage) as “river-like, mid-coloured, reddish”, the latter meaning possibly reflecting the correct sense.

the fact that MP and NP themselves reflect dialectal differences. Evidence in favour of dialectal diversity within the NWIr. sources that Armenian borrowed from includes the pair Arm. *šava*<sup>o</sup> ‘black’ (in *Šavaspa*, *Šavarš*, HÜBSCHMANN 1897: 61, 489) vs. *seaw* (Pth. *syāw(ag)*, cf. KORN 2005: 129f.); <sup>o</sup>*marg* ‘bird’ (in *siramarg* ‘peacock’ and *loramarg* ‘quail mother’) vs. MP *murw* and Pth. *mury*,<sup>39</sup> the opposition *rj*, *nj* [r/ndz] vs. “Standard Parthian” *rž*, *nž* in e.g. *varj* ‘reward, wages’, *ganj* ‘treasure’, *plinj* ‘copper, bronze’;<sup>40</sup> the peculiar *u*-stem inflection of a number of original *a*- and *s*-stems, occasionally exhibiting other phonetic peculiarities (*ganj*, *u*-st., vs. (Iran. →) Skt. *gañja-* is an example for both), and the not inconsiderable amount of lexical correspondences with East Iranian (Sogdian), e.g. *kari* ‘very’ (Sogdian *k’δy*) or *čakat* (*u*-stem!) ‘forehead’ (Sogdian *ck’t*).<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> On Ir. *marg*, see also GERSHEVITCH 1989: 117f. and GIPPERT 2005: 163, on *siramarg* GIPPERT 1993/I: 194f.

<sup>40</sup> For further discussion, see OLSEN 2005, and for the context after *n* also GIPPERT 1993/I: 122 (one type of cases has Georgian and Armenian [ndz], the other one has Georg. [ndz] vs. Arm. *nj*) and KORN 2010: 420 n. 31. Note that instead of *varj*, one would expect a form NWIr. *varz* (PIE *\*-g*, cf. Persian *vard* found in Armenian *vardapet*, BENVENISTE 1946: 69). The word seems to reflect a process parallel to the hypercorrect application of the correspondence “MP *z* equals Pth. *ž* (as e.g. in *zīw-* vs. *žīw-* ‘live’, *bōz-* vs. *bōž-* ‘rescue’)” which appears to be responsible for MP *āmēz-* ‘mix’ (NWIr., cf. OIr. (non-Persian) *maiz-*, PIE *\*meig*) triggering Pth. *āmēž-* (cf. KORN 2010: 422). Some loanwords exhibiting non-standard affricates may even have been introduced before the (final stages of the) Armenian sound shift of mediae to tenuis, apparently exhibiting a development [d<sup>2</sup>] > [t<sup>s</sup>], thus e.g. *arcat* ‘silver’ (cf. Av. *ərəzata-*), and *ciran* ‘apricot’ (cf. Av. *zaraniia-* ‘gold’).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. HENNING 1958: 93, postulating a “Parnian” element in Parthian as the background of Arm. words “whose matches are otherwise only known from Eastern Ir. dialects”. *margarē* ‘prophet’ has been assumed to be another word of this type (cf. Sogdian *m’rk’ry*), but Caucasian Albanian *margaven* ‘prophet’ points to an Ir. form with *\*g* (not *\*k*) and thus speaks against a connection of Arm. *margarē* to the Sogdian word (GIPPERT 2005).

4.2. As far as the consonantism is concerned, the question is how to explain *-g-* for expected *-k-*. Here one may consider whether *-k-* could have given *-g-* in the relevant dialect already before the general change of OIr. *-k-* > WMIr. *-g-*, or if we might — perhaps additionally — be faced with an analogical influence in the source language from the semantically close *-gōn* ‘of ... colour / manner’<sup>42</sup> (OIr. \**gauna-* ‘colour’, NP *-gūn* ‘manner, kind’), cf. the Manichean examples Pth./MP <hwzrgwn> *huzaryōn* ‘green’, Pth. <zrgwng> *zaryōnag* ‘golden, green’, <fry(h)gwn> *fri(h)γōn* ‘friendly, lovingly’, <hwgwn> *huyōn* ‘of a good kind’, *čawāγōn* ‘of such a manner’, Pth./MP <hngwn>, <h’mgwn(g)> *hangōn*, *hāmγōn(ag)*, MP <hmgwng> *hamγōnag* ‘in the same way’ (Arm. *hangoyñ*), MP <’z’dgwn> *āzādγōn* ‘noble’.<sup>43</sup> *-gōn* has also been borrowed into Arm. as *-agoyn*, i.e. with a vocalism that identifies it as belonging to the ‘Arsacid’ layer and from Armenian further *vardagoyn* ‘rose-coloured’ (Sogdian *wrdγwn* ‘rosy’), *karmragoyñ* ‘reddish’ (Sogdian *krm’yr γwn’k* ‘of red colour’), etc.

Several Iranian languages exhibit a convergence of *-(a)gēn* and *-(a)gōn* and phonological adaptations of one to the other, showing that the suffixes were felt semantically rather close. Also, OIr. \**gauna-* following a vowel should give NP *-yūn*, but this is only found in *zaryūn* ‘golden’, *āzaryūn* ‘fire-coloured’,<sup>44</sup> *homāyūn* ‘kingly, happy’ and *čūn* (< \**čiyōn*) ‘as,

<sup>42</sup> HNS 179, 186, SKALMOWSKI 1967: 85, cf. also SALEMANN 1901: 280.

<sup>43</sup> For the Parthian formations, DMD assumes *-γōn*, for those found (also) in MP *-gōn*. This is confirmed by two occurrences of <cw’γwn> (besides dozens of <cw’gwn>), but all other derivatives of this type have <g>. (The opposition *g* vs. *γ* is in most cases not marked in the Manichean script.) However, it seems possible that in Parthian (like in MP) the free form *gōn* hindered the lenition expected in word-internal position and that *čawāγōn* is the only case of the regular development.

<sup>44</sup> According to DEHXODĀ, *āzary/gūn* is also used for various yellow and red flowers (camomile, marigold, sunflower, poppy, red mallow, etc.), but he quotes examples only for *āzargūn* (which are inconclusive insofar as the flower species is concerned).

like'.<sup>45</sup> All other instances have *-gūn*, certainly owing to the morpheme break, and also besides *-yūn*, e.g. *zargūn*, *āzargūn*, *ābgūn* 'azur blue; ice, glass',<sup>46</sup> *sīmgūn* 'silver, star', *bāzgūne* 'reverse' (about two dozens of examples in MAJIDI 1995: 619).

In Ossetic, one would expect *\*gauna-* > †*-gīn* vs. *\*akaina-* > *-jīn* in Iron corresponding to Digor *-gun* vs. *-gin*,<sup>47</sup> but the acutal form is only *-jīn*.<sup>48</sup> Also, a number of the Digor lexemes with *-gun* are semantically compatible with WMr. *-(a)gēn* and Arm. *-agin*, e.g. Digor *smæstgun* 'angry', *niwgun* 'happy', *suǰzærīngun* 'mixed with silver', *cæxkun* 'salty'.<sup>49</sup>

A contamination of *-gōn* with *\*-agīn* would be particularly likely if the development *-k-* > *-g* had already started in the postulated dialect.

**4.3.** So far as the vocalism (*-i-* for expected *-e-*) is concerned, a contamination of *-ēn* and the outcome of OIr. *\*-ina-*, which forms adjectives of appurtenance, does not seem unlikely. In Avestan, the use of *-ina-* is practically restricted to a group of derivatives based on designations of seasons and times of the day (see DE VAAN 2003: 209f.), e.g. *rapiθβina-* 'of mid-day', *hāmīna-* 'summerly' (no doubt starting from hypostatic constructions based on the locative) besides two derivatives of *s-*stems, *raočah-ina-* 'shining' and *vačah-ina-* 'oral' (which may have a similar background). It seems that the marginal status of *-ina-* in Iranian led to *-aina-* being generalised in some Iranian languages.<sup>50</sup> Similarly, *-ēn* was generalised for attributive adjectives in Balochi to an extent that even OIr. *\*hāmīna-* is reflected by *hāmēn* 'summer'.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. HÜBSCHMANN 1895: 248.

<sup>46</sup> Note the parallel semantics to *ābgīn* (see note 30).

<sup>47</sup> Cf. CHEUNG 2002: 17 on the Ossetic changes and ABAEV 1964: 92 on the suffix ("indicates the content or possession of something"). HÜBSCHMANN 1887: 336 compares it to Arm. *-agin* and HNS 179 to NP *-gīn*, THORDARSON 2009: 57, 60 to the Persian form and to Sogdian *-kyn*.

<sup>48</sup> OIr. *ai* and *au* yield Iron *ī* when followed by *n* (vs. Digor *i*, *u*).

<sup>49</sup> Examples from HÜBSCHMANN 1887: 336 (with adapted orthography).

<sup>50</sup> Note that the examples of OP *-ina-* noted in KENT 1953: 51 are derivatives in *-aina-*.

4.4. As for the WMIr. dialect reflected in Arm. *-agin*, one would hardly expect that the suffix *\*-ina-*, already recessive in Old Iranian, had ousted *\*-aina-* in the complex *\*-ak-aina-*. More likely, *\*-aina-* and *\*-ina-* may have converged in *\*-īna-*, and hence also *\*-ak-aina-* and *\*-ak-ina-*.<sup>51</sup> The simplest scenario is to assume that the dialect in question showed a change of *-ēn* > *-īn* at least in word-final position, and already at an early Mlr. stage, i.e. in Arsacid times. This change would agree with *ē* changing to *ī* in front of nasals in a number of Ir. languages while (or at least at a time when) *ē* in other contexts does not.<sup>52</sup> For instance, Bactrian appears to regularly show *η* besides *ι* preceding *n* and *η* (*γγ*), e.g. *οην-* / *οιν-* ‘see’, *αβδδιο* ‘custom’ (< *\*abi-dayana-*) and the suffixes *-ηνο* / *-ινο* and *-ηγγο* / *-ιγγο* discussed in 2.3.<sup>53</sup>

A change of the suffix of adjectives of material *-ēn* to *-īn* would at the same time provide a solution for a number of Armenian lexemes with suffix *-in* that are otherwise not well accounted for. Some Arm. adjectives in *-in* certainly reflect PIE *\*-ino-* (cf. OLSEN 1999: 463ff.), but this suffix (cf. Av. *-ina-*) is only productive in adjectives of space and not a likely candidate for a number of other adjectives. Among those that we would prefer to derive from a suffix going back to OIr. *\*-aina-* there are e.g. *marmin* ‘body, flesh’ < *\*marmaina-* (cf. Skt. *mārman-* ‘vulnerable part of the body’, cf. OLSEN 1999: 472), *bagin* ‘altar’ (*\*bagaina-*), *xawarin* ‘dark’, *anhnarin* ‘impossible’ (Ir. *hunara-*), *džowarin* ‘difficult’ (Ir. *duž-bara-*). As noted by SCHMITT (2001: 85), these derivatives pose the same dilemma as does *-agin* (“Wie hier [bei *-agin*, s. 3.2] die Rückführung auf ‘*\*(V)kainV-*’ scheitert auch die von *-in* (...) auf *\*-ajna-*: vgl. dagegen *-ēn*”), so our explanation of *-agin* besides *-kēn* would be corroborated by

<sup>51</sup> Note that WMlr. *-ēn* and *-gēn* may also occur side by side (see note 23).

<sup>52</sup> Kurdish likewise preserves Mlr. *ē*, but has *î* preceding a nasal (see CABOLOV 1976: 14-18), cf. the material suffix *-īn* (BEDIR KHAN / LESCOT 1970: 287, BLAU 1980, Southern Kurd. also *-ēn*, see FATTAH 2000: 834), but it is not clear how old this change might be. For Persian, cf. note 34.

<sup>53</sup> *οην-* vs. *οιν-* seems to be distributed somewhat chronologically, but the data are rather meagre for farther conclusions.



the simple *-in* besides *-ēn*.<sup>54</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

The Armenian suffixes discussed in this paper are doubled in several aspects. A suffix cluster *\*-V<sub>k</sub>-aina-* appears to have been borrowed twice: the Early WMIr. form of *\*-ik-aina-* is found in Arm. *-kēn*, and a form *\*-agīn* deriving from *\*-ak-aina-* would be the source for Arm. *-agin* while a form *\*(a)užigīn* is reflected by Arm. *owžgin*. In a parallel way, the WMIr. suffix *-ēn* seems to have been borrowed first as Arm. *-en* and secondly as *-in*. If this is so, Armenian would in both cases have borrowed not only the early MIr. forms *-kēn* and *-ēn*, conforming to the usual pattern of Parthian loan words and suffixes, but also *-(a)gīn* and *-īn*, which would belong to a separate dialect where 1) internal *-k-* was lenited to *-g-*, and 2) *-ēn* had merged with *-in* at an early stage. The dialect in question must have been archaic in several respects, such as in the preservation of internal *-a-*. Judging from the lexeme *owžgin*, we can assume either a close relation to Parthian or a borrowing via that language. Whether these features should be attributed to the dialectal source responsible for the peculiarities mentioned in 4.1 will be an object for future investigations.

## Bibliography

- ABAEV = Vasilij I. ABAEV 1958-1989: *Istoriko-etimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*. Moscow / Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk, 4 vol.
- ABAEV, Vasilij I. 1964: *A Grammatical Sketch of Ossetic*. The Hague: Mouton.
- BAILEY, Harold W. 1971: *Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books*. London etc.: Oxford University Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
- BARKER, Muhammad A., and Aqil Khan MENGAL 1969: *A Course in Baluchi*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 2 vol.
- BARTHOLOMAE, Christian 1904: *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*. Strassburg: Trübner.

<sup>54</sup> There are several examples of the incorporation of the same Iranian lexeme from different dialectal sources (cf. 4.1), cf. e.g. Arm. *varž* 'study' (Pth.) besides *varj* 'reward, wages' and *vard-apet* 'master' (SWIr.), or *barapan* 'doorkeeper' (Pth.) vs. *darapan* 'id.' (SWIr.).

- BD I = Nicholas SIMS-WILLIAMS 2000: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press (repr. 2012).
- BD II = id. 2007: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan II: Letters and Buddhist Texts*. London: Nour Foundation.
- BEDIR KHAN, Emir Djeladet, and Roger LESCOT 1970: *Grammaire kurde*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- BENVENISTE, Émile 1946: “Études iraniennes.” *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1945, pp. 39–78.
- BLAU, Joyce 1980: *Manuel de kurde. Dialecte Sorani*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- BOYCE, Mary 1977: *A Word-list of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Leiden etc.: Brill.
- CABOLOV, Ruslan L. 1976: *Očerk istoričeskoj fonetiki kurdsogo jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka.
- CHEUNG, Johnny 2002: *Studies in the Historical Development of the Ossetic Vocalism*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- DARMESTER, James 1883: *Études iraniennes relatives à l’histoire des langues et des croyances de la Perse ancienne et moderne (...)*. Paris: Vieweg (repr. Amsterdam: Philo Press 1971), 2 vols.
- DEGENER, Almuth 1989: *Khotanische Suffixe*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- DEHXODĀ = ‘Alī Akbar DEHXODĀ 1959–1971: *Loġat-nāme-ye Dehxodā*. Tehran: Dāneškade-ye adabiyāt, 50 vols.
- DMD = Desmond DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2004: *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- DMGr = id. (no year): *Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Parthisch und Mittelpersisch) auf Grund manichäischer Texte, des Inschriftenmaterials und auszugsweise der Pahlavī-Literatur* (Münster, unpublished manuscript).
- FATTAH, Ismaīl Kamandār 2000: *Les dialectes kurdes méridionaux*. Leuven: Peeters.
- GERSHEVITCH, Ilya 1989: “Margarites the Pearl.” In: Charles-Henri DE FOUCHÉCOUR, Philippe GIGNOUX (eds.): *Études irano-aryennes offertes à Gilbert Lazard*. Paris: Association pour l’avancement des études iraniennes, pp. 113–136.
- GINDIN = Tamar GINDIN (in print): *The Early Judaeo-Persian Tafsīrs of Ezekiel III: Commentary*. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- GIPPERT, Jost 1993: *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen*. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2 vols.
- 2005: “Armeno-Albanica.” In: Günter SCHWEIGER (ed.): *Indogermanica: Festschrift Gert Klingenschmitt. Indische, iranische und indogermanische Studien dem verehrten Jubilar dargebracht zu seinem fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag*. Taimering: VWT-Verlag, pp. 155–165.

- 2007: “Albano-Iranica”. In: Maria MACUCH, Mauro MAGGI, Werner SUNDERMANN (eds.): *Iranian Languages and Texts from Iran and Turan. Ronald E. Emmerick Memorial Volume*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 99–108.
- GMS = Ilya GERSHEVITCH 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford: University Press.
- GREPPIN, John A.C. 1974: “Classical Armenian Nominal Suffixes.” *Handēs Amsōryay* 88, pp. 74–86, 199–232, and 352–368.
- GrIph = Wilhelm GEIGER, Ernst KUHN (eds.) 1901: *Grundriß der iranischen Philologie* I. Strassburg: Trübner, 2 vols.
- HENNING, Walter B. 1934: “Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente.” *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 9, pp. 158–253 (= id.: *Selected Papers* I. Leiden etc.: Brill 1977, pp. 65–160).
- 1958: “Mitteliranisch.” In: *Handbuch der Orientalistik, 4. Band, Iranistik*. Leiden, Köln: Brill, pp. 20–130.
- HNS = Paul HORN: “Neupersische Schriftsprache.” In: GrIph 2, pp. 1–200.
- HORN, Paul 1893: *Grundriß der neupersischen Etymologie*. Strassburg: Trübner (repr. Hildesheim etc.: Olms 1988).
- 1899: “Reimende ê î ô û im Šāhnāme.” *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 35, pp. 155–192.
- HÜBSCHMANN, Heinrich 1887: “Ossetische Nominalbildung.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 41, pp. 319–346.
- 1895: *Persische Studien*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- 1897: *Armenische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel (repr. Hildesheim etc.: Olms 1992).
- ĀHOWKYAN, Gevork 1987: *Hayoc<sup>ē</sup> lezvi patmowfiwn*. Yerevan: Hayk. SSH GA Hrat.
- JAHUKIAN 1993 = id.: “The Armenian Suffixes of Iranian Origin.” In: Bela BROGYANYI, Reiner LIPP (eds.): *Comparative-Historical Linguistics: Indo-European and Finno-Ugric*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 257–269.
- JUNGMANN, Paul, and J.J.S. WEITENBERG 1993: *A Reverse Analytical Dictionary of Classical Armenian*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- KENT, Roland 1953: *Old Persian: Grammar, Texts, Lexicon*. New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- KLINGENSCHMITT, Gert 1982: *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 2000: “Mittelpersisch.” In: Bernhard FORSSMAN, Robert PLATH (eds.): *Indo-arisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 191–229.
- KORN, Agnes 2005: *Towards a Historical Grammar of Balochi: Studies in Balochi Historical Phonology and Vocabulary*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- 2009: “Lengthening of *i* and *u* in Persian.” In: Almut HINTZE, François DE BLOIS, Werner SUNDERMANN (eds.): *Exegisti monumenta. Festschrift in Honour*

- of *Nicholas Sims-Williams*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 197–213.
- 2010: “Parthian ž.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 73:3, pp. 415–436.
- KORN, Agnes, and Desmond DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2009: “Parthian Seen from a Balochi Perspective.” *Studia Iranica* 38, pp. 7–23.
- MACKENZIE, D. Neil 1967: “Notes on the Transcription of Pahlavi.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30, pp. 17–29.
- 1986: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London etc.: Oxford University Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
- MAJIDI, Mohammad-Reza 1995: *Rückläufiges persisches Wörterbuch*. Hamburg: Buske.
- MEILLET, Antoine 1913: *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- NYBERG, Henrik S. 1974: *A Manual of Pahlavi II: Glossary*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- OIJ = Vasilij ABAEV et al. (eds.) 1981: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: Sredneiranskije jazyki*. Moscow: Nauka.
- OLSEN, Birgit Anette 1999: *The Noun in Biblical Armenian: Origin and Word-Formation*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 2005: “On Iranian dialectal diversity in Armenian.” In: Gerhard MEISER, Olav HACKSTEIN (eds.): *Sprachkontakt und Sprachwandel: Akten der XI. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, 17.–23. September 2000, Halle an der Saale*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 473–481.
- PAUL, Ludwig 2009: “Remarks on the evolution and distribution of the New Persian adjectival suffixes *-īn* and *-ī*.” In: Christine ALLISON, Anke JOISTEN-PRUSCHKE, Antje WENDILAND (eds.): *From Daēnā to Dîn (...). Festschrift für Philip Kreyenbroek zum 60. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 105–110.
- PISOWICZ, Andrzej 1985: *Origins of the New and Middle Persian Phonological Systems*. Cracow: Uniwersytet Jagielloński.
- RMMP = Vera S. RASTORGUEVA, Elena K. MOLČANOVA: “Srednepersidskij jazyk.” In: OIJ, pp. 6–146.
- RMPth = caed.: “Parfjanskij jazyk.” In: OIJ, pp. 147–232.
- SALEMANN, Carl 1901: “Mittelpersisch.” In: GrIPh 1, pp. 249–332.
- SCHMITT, Rüdiger 2001: (Review of OLSEN 1999). *Kratylos* 46, pp. 80–88.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1996: “The Sogdian Merchants in China and India.” In: Alfredo CADONNA, Lionello LANCIOTTI (eds.): *Cina e Iran da Alessandro Magno alla Dinastia Tang*. Florence: Olschki, pp. 45–67.
- 2001: “The inscriptions on the Miho bowl and some comparable objects.” *Studia Iranica* 30, pp. 187–198.
- 2012: “Some Bactrian Terms for Realia.” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute, N.S.* 21 (2007), pp. 193–196.

- SKALMOWSKI, Wojciech 1967: "Das Nomen im Parthischen." *Biuletyn polskiego towarzystwa językoznawczego* 25, pp. 75–89.
- SUNDERMANN, Werner 1997: *Der Sermon von der Seele. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- TITUS = Text data base <http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm?/texte/texte.htm>  
(<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/iran/airan/avesta/avest.htm>,  
<http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/texte/etcs/iran/airan/apers/apers.htm>).
- DE VAAN, Michiel 2003: *The Avestan Vowels*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Agnes Korn  
Empirische Sprachwissenschaft  
Universität Frankfurt  
PF 11 19 32, Fach 171  
D-60054 Frankfurt  
E-Mail: [a.korn@em.uni-frankfurt.de](mailto:a.korn@em.uni-frankfurt.de)

Birgit Anette Olsen  
Roots of Europe  
Department of Nordic Studies and Linguistics  
University of Copenhagen  
Njalsgade 120, DK – 2300 Copenhagen S  
E-Mail: [ba0@hum.ku.dk](mailto:ba0@hum.ku.dk)