

Elio PROVASI

WANDERERS AND PROPHETS IN THE CAUCASUS

(Studia Iranica et Alanica. Rome. 1998)

*fæzzaruncæ 'j xonx, buduri,
Jiræ ma Digoræ dæ nom.
Gurdžibeti Blaškæ*

To Vasilij Ivanovič Abaev
with deep respect

It is a well-known fact that the languages of the Caucasus possess, in a greater or lesser degree, a fair amount of lexical elements of Iranian origin, due to longstanding contacts with speakers of Iranian languages, in particular Scytho-Alano-Sarmatian languages/dialects and Western Middle and New Iranian languages. Among the latter, those which have exerted the greatest lexical influence on Caucasian languages have been first of all Parthian and Middle Persian, followed by New Persian and lesser languages like Tātī.

In many of his publications, and especially in his etymological dictionary of Ossetic, Prof. Abaev has considered innumerable examples of lexical exchanges which involve both Iranian and Caucasian languages. It suffices to peruse the Index to his etymological dictionary of Ossetic¹ to realise the wealth of information on Caucasian languages included therewith.

Of all the lexical material of Iranian origin occurring in Caucasian languages, the Iranian borrowings in Georgian, which belong to different chronological strata and which entered Georgian either directly or sometimes through Armenian, have received the greatest attention. Beside the monograph by Mzia Androniķašvili (*Narķvevebi*), published in 1966, there is now the recent and very thorough investigation on about 50 of the most ancient Iranian loanwords in Georgian (and Armenian) by Jost Gippert (GIPPERT 1993).

Iranian borrowings in Caucasian have been studied among others by H. W. Bailey in various articles (e.g. BAILEY 1975, BAILEY 1992) and under

many lemmata in his Khotanese dictionary (*Dict.Kh.Saka*). Lexical elements of Scytho-Alanian origin in North-Central and North-Eastern Caucasian have been examined by R. Bielmeier (BIELMEIER 1989)² and K. Š. Mikailov (MIKAILOV 1970).

I shall consider hereafter a series of interconnected words, spread all over the Caucasus and beyond, and whose Iranian origin has been usually ascribed to, or in some way connected with some form of Persian *āvār(a)*, trying to trace the routes through which they spread in the languages of the area.

In New Persian there exists a word *āvāra* “lost, annihilated; ruined, scattered; destitute of name or character; an exile, outcast, vagabond, vagrant; [...] oppression, injustice; bane, ruin, desolation” [STEINGASS 117], with a quasi-synonym *āvār* “injustice, iniquity; oppression; [...] ruined, depopulated; a vagrant, outcast, exile” [STEINGASS 117]. Thus, the primary meaning of *āvāra* seems to be an adjectival one (“lost, annihilated; ruined, scattered; destitute of name or character” or, as a substantive referring to persons, “an exile, outcast, vagabond, vagrant”), and the secondary one an abstract noun (“oppression, injustice; bane, ruin, desolation”), while for *āvār* the contrary seems to be true.

The same word (in the form with final *-a* and with the general meaning “vagabond”) occurs in other New Iranian languages, where it is almost certainly a loan from Persian, e.g. Kurdish *awaræ* “vagabond” [KURDOEV-JUSUPOVA 42], Tališ *aværa*, *oværa* “vagabond” [PIREJKO 19], Gilaki *āvārā* “vagabond” [KMR 37], Pashto *āvārā* “vagabond; wayfarer” [ASLANOV 83], Waxī *oworā*, *aworā* “wayfarer, exile, vagabond” [*Vax.jaz.* 408], and maybe (in the form without *-a*) also Brahui *awār* and Balōčī *əwar* [ROSSI 61]. Also from Persian the word entered Urdu and other North Indian languages, cf. Urdu *avarā* “wandering; homeless; abandoned; idle; profligate; dishonest; vagabond; idler; libertine; cheater” [ANSARI 88], Panjabi *əvarə* “vagabond” [BAILEY, *Panj.* 130; Iršād 61], Sindhi *avarō* “vagabond” [MEWARAM 426], as well as, near the other end of the Persian-speaking world, in modern East Syriac *āvārā* /*awāra*/ “vagabond” [MACLEAN 6; MACUCH 4] (from Persian or Kurdish).

In Caucasian languages, the same borrowing from Persian occurs as an abstract noun (cf. the meanings “oppression” and “ruin” of Pers. *āvāra* above) in Avar *awāra* “obstacle, impediment, hindrance” [SAIDOV 25] and Lak *awara* “rebellion, confusion, riot, disorder” (with the adjectival derivative *awaras:a* “restless, worried, upset, fretful” [XAJDAKOV 1962: 26]), both probably through Kumyk (cf. below) while it is used as an adjective and/or noun referring to persons in Lezgi *awara* “idle; vagabond” [TALIBOV-GADŽIEV 29], Budux *awara* “vagabond” [MEJLANOVA 16], Udi *awara* “vagabond, idle” [GUKASJAN 33], Georgian *awara* “vagabond” [TSCHENKÉLI 6].

In the Turkic languages spoken in or near the Caucasus we have, as an abstract noun, Kumyk *awara* “worry, care” [BAMMATOV 24] and Nogay *awara* “business, cares; disorder” [BASKAKOV 20] and, as an adjective, Azeri *awara* “idler; vagabond” [AZIZBEKOV 15], Ottoman Turkish *avara* “loose, free-running; useless, fruitless”, *āvāre* “idle, out of work; exiled, vacant, wandering” [REDHOUSE 96], and, with a divergent meaning, Anatolian Turkish *avara* “poor, infertile soil; bad, weak; inactive, idle” [TIETZE 1967: 135]; in other Turkic languages this word usually functions as an adjective, cf. Turkmen *āvāra* “vagabond; wayfarer, pilgrim” [BKX 17], Uzbek *āvāra* “busy” [ABDURAXMANOV 221], Uygur *awarā* “restless, worried; busy” [NADŽIP 54].

On Caucasian soil, we can compare with the Persian form without final *-a* also Armenian *awar* “prey, booty” [HÜBSCHMANN 112] and Georgian *iavari, avari* “booty” [*Narḳvevebi* 206, 331-332].

NPers *āvāra* “scattered” was traced back by Horn to **ā-* + *bar-* [HORN 13, who cites also the Mandaean loanword $\mathcal{A}w\mathcal{R}$], a view accepted by Andronikašvili [*Narḳvevebi* 331-332]³.

A Middle Iranian form which can be compared with Persian *āwār* is Inscriptional Parthian $\mathcal{A}w\mathcal{R}$ “booty” (cf. Gignoux 48), attested in the phrase *pty* $\mathcal{A}w\mathcal{R}$ “as booty” (lit. “in pillage”), which corresponds to MPers Inscr. *PWN* $\mathcal{A}d\mathcal{A}ly$ and to Greek $\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\text{-}\pi\alpha\gamma\eta\tilde{\eta}$ in Šāpūr’s inscription at the Ka^Cba-yi Zardušt (*W mrthwmk MH MN prwmy n hštr MN* $\mathcal{A}ny\mathcal{A}ry\mathcal{A}n$ (16) *pty* $\mathcal{A}w\mathcal{R}$ *HYTYt* [ŠKZ pa. 15-16] = [$\mathcal{A}P$]*n* $\mathcal{A}N\mathcal{S}WT\mathcal{A}$ *MH MN hrvm* $\mathcal{A}dyk$ *štry* ... [$\mathcal{A}nyr$] $\mathcal{A}n$ *PWN* $\mathcal{A}d\mathcal{A}ly$ (21) *HYTYW* [ŠKZ mp. 20-21] = KAI ANΘΡΩΠΟΥΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΑΠΟ ΑΝΑΡΙΑΝΩΝ ΕΝ ΑΡΙΑΓΗ ΗΓΑΓΑΜΕΝ [ŠKZ gr. 34], cf. BACK 324-325). As Gignoux, who refers to Zoroastrian Middle Persian $\mathcal{A}dw\mathcal{A}l^4$, suggests, MPers. $\mathcal{A}d\mathcal{A}ly$ is possibly an error for $\mathcal{A}d<w>\mathcal{A}ly^5$ (GIGNOUX 15), hence possibly connected with two uncertain forms cited by Sundermann, viz. Manichaean Middle Persian ($\mathcal{C}y$)*w* $\mathcal{A}ry$ (*h*) (in *M* 1009 I.II.8, cf. *Parabeltexte* 25 and 119 “Raub, Plünderung”) and Manichaean Parthian [\mathcal{A}]*yw* $\mathcal{A}r$ (in *M* 183 I.R.5, cf. *Parabeltexte* 62 and 118 “Raub”); on the other hand, Back suggests tentatively *PWN* $\mathcal{A}p\mathcal{A}ry$ or *PWN* $\mathcal{A}p\mathcal{A}ry$ (BACK 177).

For Inscriptional Parthian $\mathcal{A}w\mathcal{R}$ (phonologically /awwār/?), which cannot be separated from Armenian *awar*, Back reconstructs an Old Iranian form **ava-bāra-* (Back 177), with preverb **ava-*, rather than **ā-*, as suggested by Horn. This agrees better with the meaning “to take away” (rather than “here”). Hence, the ancestor of Persian *āwār(a)*⁶ can with a certain confidence be reconstructed, via Mir. **awwār(ag)*, as OIr **ava-bāra(-ka)-*.

A different, but evidently in some way related, form, which is spread almost all over the Caucasian area, shows a final velar obstruent (*-k/-g*).

In North-West Caucasian we have Kabardian *ābrag'* “a runaway who has committed some crime; abrek” [KARDANOV 13; ŠAGIROV I: 56], Abxaz *abrag'* [Sagirov I: 56], Abaza *abrag'* “abrek” [Tugov 29], and probably also the Ubyx proper name *Abrag'* [Vogt 235]. In Southern Caucasian there is Georgian *abragi* “partisan who lives in the mountains and fights against the king’s dominion; robber, bandit” (*Narkvevebi* 76)⁷, “abrek; bandit” [TSCHENKÉLI 2], with a derivative *abragoba* “highway robbery” [TSCHENKÉLI 2], with a by-form *abraki* [IĚSOJa I: 25-26], Mingrelian *abragi* and Svan *ambregi* [*Narkvevebi* 76]. To these we can compare the forms occurring in Turkic languages of the Caucasus: Karačay *abrek* [PRÖHLE 1909: 84, SCHMIDT 1933: 466-67]⁸, Balkar *abrek* [ŠAUMJAN 1935: 70] “bandit, robber’ and Kumyk *abrek* “abrék; temerarious” [BAMMATOV 24].

This form has been borrowed by Russian (*abrék* “mountaineer, bandit” [VASMER I: 57]) from some Caucasian language (according to Vasmer from Circassian).

Besides these forms of type *abrag* ~ *abreg*, there are others where the labial consonant and *r* are separated by a vowel. We can consider first of all Ossetian (Iron) *ab̄æræg*, (Digor) *ab̄æræg*, *ab̄æræg* “robber, bandit” [IĚSOJa 1:25-26], which Abaev plausibly considers a borrowing from some adjacent Caucasian language. Then there is the Georgian (Xevsurian) proper name *Ap̄areka* which Andronikašvili derives from Ossetian *abyræg* | *ab̄æræg*; this is however contradicted by the two ejective stops *p̄* and *k̄* in the Georgian form, as against the voiced *b* and *g* in Ossetian.

For the meaning “abrek” there is in Avar the form *ab̄urik* “abrék, man who parts from the community and lives exclusively by war and robbery”, with the derivative *ab̄urikli* “the quality of being an abrek” [USLAR 1889: 35], which is particularly interesting for its vocalism, if one compares it with Georgian *Ap̄areka*. Besides *ab̄urik*, there is in Avar another word *ap̄arag* “vagabond” [USLAR 1889: 40], which seems to be employed in the modern literary language only with the meaning “newcomer, foreigner” [SAIDOV 34]; cf. also the saying: *ap̄aragas:ul r̄uq: róso raeálda* “the newcomer's house is on the edge of the village” [Saidov *ibid.*].

In the Kaxib dialect of Avar there is moreover the feminine proper name *Awarage*⁹ [MIKAILOV, *Dial.* 413], which seems to be in some way connected; the latter is from **awarag-a-y*¹⁰, with feminine class index *-y*, and shows a formation similar to Hidatl proper names in *-o* (m.), *-e* (f.), formally substantivized adjectives, which are in origin patronymics [MIKAILOV, *Dial.* 377-378].

In Turkic Čuvaš there is a word *ap̄ārša* “unfortunate, unhappy, homeless person whose behaviour is bad; gossip” [SCHERNER 118]. Schemer refuses (wrongly, it seems to me) Ašmarin's etymology, from Persian *āvāra*, and

proposes instead Russian *obóryš*. The Čuvaš form could on the contrary be connected with some Middle Iranian form, and the final /š/ of Čuvaš could be a trace of the Middle Iranian final velar obstruent¹¹.

All these words can be connected with Middle Iranian forms where intervocalic *p*, being geminated, has not undergone lenition; cf. Zoroastrian Middle Persian 𐭯𐭯 /appar/ “robbery, theft, plundering, pillage”, 𐭯𐭯𐭯 /appār/ “taken away, removed”, 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯 /appārih/ “removal, loss, deprivation”, 𐭯𐭯𐭯 /apparag/ “robber”, *YHNCLWN* /appurdan/, pres. stem 𐭯𐭯- /appar-/ “steal”, 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯 /apparišn/ “stealing, theft” (*Pahl.Dict.* 10; NYBERG, *Gloss.* 28). Nyberg derives these forms from **apa-par-*, with the transitive root **par-*¹² “to carry”; together with the Armenian loanword *apur* “booty” from **apa-p̄na-* [NYBERG, *Gloss.* 28].

In the Iranian texts from Turfan we have Manichaean Middle Persian 𐭯𐭯𐭯- /ap(p)ur-/ “wegtragen”, 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯 /ap(p)urd/ “geraubt”, 𐭯𐭯𐭯 /ap(p)ar/ “Raub; räuberisch”, with the comparative 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯 and the abstract noun 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯 and a *ka-* derivative 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯 /ap(p)arayē/ [ʔ]¹³, plural 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯 “robbers” (HENNING 1947: 46) (e.g. in *(q)dg wysp𐭯𐭯 xyšmyn 𐭯𐭯𐭯𐭯* “all the wrathful ‘robbers’ of the house” *M 781* ii V.5 (= I 45 in HENNING 1947: 40) and also in *M100* V.II.1.17 (= 764 in *Parabeltexte* 40)) and Manichaean Parthian 𐭯𐭯𐭯 /appar/ “predatory, thievish” (cf. *Word-List* 13), e.g. in 𐭯𐭯𐭯 *w𐭯𐭯ynd kw dyw 𐭯𐭯 b(zk)[r]* (𐭯)wt𐭯𐭯𐭯 (4) *bwd* “they tell that there was an evil and predatory demon” *M 6470* R.3-4 (= 1830-31 in *Parabeltexte* 94).

To the same form **apa-bar-* can be connected Khotanese *pūda-*, *pūda-* “removed, freed from” [*Dict.Kh.Saka* 243].

Thus, also Zoroastrian Middle Persian 𐭯𐭯𐭯 is probably /appurt/ < **apa-p̄na-*, while 𐭯𐭯𐭯 goes back to **apa-bara-* (cf. BACK 177).

The Avar form *abúrik*, discussed above, could then go back to a Middle Iranian prototype **appurrīg* (< **apa-p̄n-ia-ka-*), with adjectival *-īg*. The voicing of *p* could be an Avar phenomenon; according to Mikailov, voicing of /p/ in initial position is a characteristic of Southern Avar dialects (MIKAILOV, *Fon.* 46-47), e.g. North Avar *piq*:, South Avar *biχ* “fruit”, or N. Av. *purúc*:, S. Av. *burus* “wooden plough”. In northern dialects (in particular Xunzax, the basis of the literary language), there is on the contrary a tendency to reduce /p/ to a laryngeal spirant¹⁴, e.g. Xunzax *holoh*, literary Avar *polóp* “foam”, Xunzax *her*, lit. *per* “onion” (MIKAILOV, *Dial.* 484; cf. also MIKAILOV, *Fon.* 44-45). This spirantization occurs also in loanwords, e.g. Xunz. *t𐭯𐭯han*, lit. Av. *ṭupán* “flood” (GUDAVA 36).

To this purpose we can cite two other forms from North-Central Caucasian (Nax), which have not hitherto received the attention they deserve: Čečen *obarg* [MACIEV 320] and Inguš *ebarg* “abrek” [OZDOEV 19].

Let us examine in some detail the different vowel patterns of these two words.

A historical rule operates in Čečen and Inguš, according to which an /a/ in the first, stressed syllable of the word¹⁵, becomes respectively rounded or fronted according to whether the vowel of the second syllable was /u/ or /i/ (which then usually merge into /a/ [ə]). This regressive vowel assimilation occurs regularly in autochthonous words.

Before a syllable containing (historical) /i/, Proto-Nax short *a becomes /e/, both in Čečen and Inguš, e.g. *karlin “new” > Čeč. *kerla* [MACIEV 215], Ing. *kerda* [OZDOEV 389], Čeč. (Čeberlo dialect) *karlī* [IMNAIŠVILI 72]; *pālig “finger” > Čeč. *pelg* [MACIEV 354], Ing. *pelg* [OZDOEV 460], Čeč. (Čeberlo dialect) *pālig*, Čeč. (Šaro and Wedana) *pelig* [IMNAIŠVILI 73]; in the same environment long *ā becomes Čečen ē (ā), Inguš ā, e.g. *ēāržin “black” > Čeč. *ēārža* [MACIEV 555], Ing. *ēārža* [OZDOEV 789], Čeč. (Xildikaro and Wedana) *ēērži*, Čeč. (Čeberlo) *ārži* [IMNAIŠVILI 76]; *lāci “hawk” > Čeč. *lēča* [MACIEV 279], Ing. *lāča* [OZDOEV 681], Čeč. (Plains and Wedana) *lēči*, Čeč. (Čeberlo) *lāci* [IMNAIŠVILI 75]; *šāqi “ink” > Čeč. *šēqa* [MACIEV 513], Ing. *šāqa(š)* [OZDOEV 788], Čeč. (Plains and Wedana) *šēqi*, Čeč. (Čeberlo) *šāqi* [IMNAIŠVILI 75]¹⁶.

Before a syllable containing (historical) /u/, Proto-Nax short *a becomes /o/, e.g. *laḡun “low” > Čeč. *loxa* [MACIEV 282], Ing. *loxa* [OZDOEV 386], Čeč. (Čeberlo) *loḡū* [IMNAIŠVILI 81], Bats *loḡū* [IMNAIŠVILI 118]; *dayu “rain” > Čeč. *doya* [MACIEV 152], Ing. *doya* [OZDOEV 160], Čeč. (Čeberlo) *dayu* [IMNAIŠVILI 81]; in the same environment long *ā becomes Čečen ō, Inguš oa, e.g. *dācun “short” > Čeč. *dōca* [MACIEV 157], Ing. *loaca* [OZDOEV 277], Bats *dacū* [IMNAIŠVILI 118]; *wārtu “neck” > Čeč. *worta* [MACIEV 94], Ing. *foart* [OZDOEV 800], Čeč. (Čeberlo) *wārtu*, Čeč. (Plains) *wōartu* [IMNAIŠVILI 84]; *kārgun “deep” > Čeč. *koarga* [MACIEV 265], Ing. *koarga* [OZDOEV 125], Bats *keokrū* [IMNAIŠVILI 118], Čeč. (Čeberlo) *kārgō*, Čeč. (Wedana) *kōrgū* [IMNAIŠVILI 69].

In loanwords, regressive vowel assimilation does not always occur in both languages; sometimes only Čečen or only Inguš shows ablaut; this is due to the fact that loanwords do not go back to a Proto-Nax etymon, but have often followed different transmission routes. Cf., e.g., Čeč. *ball* [MACIEV 53], Ing. *boal* [OZDOEV 74] “sour cherry” ← New Persian *bālū* (cf. PROVASI 1995, nr. 7)¹⁷, Čeč. *omra* [MACIEV 323], Ing. *amar* [OZDOEV 495 s.v. *povelet*] “order, command” ← Arabic *amr(u)*, Čeč. *gōmaš* [MACIEV 104], Ing. *gamaš* [OZDOEV 56], Čeč. (Čeberlo) *gāmuš* [IMNAIŠVILI 83] “buffalo cow”, from a New Persian prototype with *u* in the second syllable, cf. NPers. *gāvmēš*, *gāmēš*, *gāmūs* (< MPers. *gāwmēš* [PahlDict. 36]), Ar.-Pers. *jāmūs* “buffalo” and Tališ

gãmüš [PIREJKO 57] (but Gilaki *gãvmiš* [KMR 99], Kurdish *gameš* [KURDOEV-JUSUPOVA 544] (with *u*-vocalism of the second syllable we have also Caucasian Hunzib, Arči *gamuš*, Axvax *gamuš:i*, Caxur *žamuš*, Xinalug *gomuš* [XAJDAKOV 1973: 21], Avar (literary) *gámus*: [SAIDOV 145], (Xunzax dialect) *gãwš*: [GUDAVA 38], Andi *gãwš*: [CERCVAŽE 14], Karata *gamuš*: [MAGOMEDBEKOVA 238], Lak *gamuš* [XAJDAKOV 1962: 81], Tabasaran *gamúš* [USLAR 1979: 639], Budux *gomúš* [MEJLANOVA 36], and with *i*-vocalism Caucasian Kryz *gomiš*, Rutul *žamiš* [XAJDAKOV 1973: 21], Lezgi *gamiš* [TALIBOV-GADŽIEV 82] and Turkic Karačay *γammeš* [PRÖHLE 1909: 103], Balkar *gãmeš* [ŠAUMJAN 1935: 84], Kumyk *gamiš* [BAMMATOV 93]), Čeč. *elp* [MACIEV 5221, Ing *alap* [OZDOEV 56] “letter (of the alphabet)” ← Ar. *alif*, Čeč. *q̇ēda* [MACIEV 251] “islamic judge, cađi” ← Ar. *qāđin*, Čeč. *k̇ēyat* [MACIEV 216], Ing. *k̇axat* [OZDOEV 56] “paper” from a variant of New Persian *kāyaz* with /i/ in the second syllable, cf. Ottoman Turkish *kāğiz*, *kāğit* [REDHOUSE 580], Čeč. *čētar* [MACIEV 491], Ing. *čātar* [OZDOEV 460, 797] “tent; umbrella” from a variant of NPers. *čatr* with epenthetic vowel /i/, cf. Blk. *catir* [ŠAUMJAN 1935: 82], Kum. *čatir* [BAMMATOV 356], AnT. *četir* [TIETZE 1967: 139] (and also Oss. (Ir.) *catər* [IĚSOJa I: 292] (cf. PROVASI nr. 18), Čeč. *q̇ēpal* [MACIEV 252] “caravan” ← Ar. *qāfila*, Čeč. *ṗēqar* [MACIEV 339] “poor” ← Ar. *faqir*, Čeč. *pelḣō* [MACIEV 339], Ing. *pelha* [OZDOEV 23] “acrobat”, from a variant of New Persian *pahlavān* with /i/ in the second syllable, cf. Kumyk *pehliwan* [BAMMATOV 259], Ottoman Turkic *pehliwan* [REDHOUSE 923], Lezgi *pahliwan* [TALIBOV-GADŽIEV 257], Budux *pehliwan* [MEJLANOVA 118], Ossetic (Digor) *pehliwan*, *pelwan* [IĚSOJa II: 240] (cf. PROVASI nr. 50).

Thus, both Čečen *obarg* and Inguš *ebarg* can be shown to go back to the same prototype of Avar *abúriq*, viz. **appurrīg* > **aburig*, which then split into **aburg* (with loss of *i*) > **oburg* > Čeč. [obərg] and **abrig* (with loss of *u*) > **abirg* > **ebirg* > Ing. [ebərg].

In his work on Avar, Uslar compared to Turkish and Persian *āvāra* the Avar form *awárag* “prophet” [USLAR 1889: 36; cf. SAIDOV 25]; according to him, it probably derives from Turkic *أواره* “homeless; hermit ('otšel'nik')”¹⁸. A similar word meaning “prophet” occurs in a certain number of East Caucasian languages; cf. Andi, Cez *awarag* [ABDULLAEV 1972: 340] (which is probably a borrowing from Avar), Dargva (Akuš and Urax dialects) *idbag*, (Kubači dialect) *idabag*, *ibadag*, (Cudaxar and Xaydak dialects) *iwarak*, Arči *idbag-t.u*, Caxur *idāg*, Lak *idaws* [ABDULLAEV 1972: 340; cf. also XAJDAKOV 1962:124 and MURKELINSKIJ 146].

Žirkov¹⁹ connects Avar *awárag* “prophet” with *apárag* “newcomer”, considering them as etymological doublets; Abdullaev [*ibid.*] observes that the meaning of the two words remains well distinct, and that moreover one cannot

explain a passage $p > w$ from the Avar point of view. Abdullaev (1972: 341-342) traces the Dargwa, Arči e Caxur forms back to a protoform **idawag* [ABDULLAEV 1972: 345] ($> idabag > idbag$), with a metathesized variant **iwadag* (from which both Kubači *ibadag* on the one hand (with $*w > b$) and Cudaxar *iwarak* and Avar *awárag* on the other hand (with $*d > r$) derive); the apparently anomalous Lak form *idaws* is brought back by Abdullaev (1972: 343-344) to *idawag*, through the stages **idawš < *idawž < *idawg*.

As shown by Abdullaev (1972: 345), this is an old borrowing of Scytho-Alano-Sarmatian origin, from a term which survives in Ossetic (Iron) *dawæg*, (Digor) *idawæg* “godhead, heavenly force, saint”²⁰.

The Ossetic word is often used in the plural (Iron *dawžytæ*, Digor *idawgutæ*) to indicate a class of spirits similar to, but different from those called (*i*)*zæd* ($< *yazata-$), pl. (*i*)*zædtæ*.

Ossetic *zæd* and *dawæg* are sometimes apparently interchangeable (Digor *idawgutæ* is explained by “*izædtæ*” [cf. GERSHEVITCH 1955: 483 fn. 2]).

Besides the class of supernatural beings called collectively *dawžytæ* there exists an individual genius by the name of *Dawæg* [GERSHEVITCH 1955: 483 fn. 2]; here the semantic passage seems to have gone from the generic to the particular, in the opposite direction to *Wacilla* → *wacillatæ* and *Wastyržy* → *wastyržytæ*.

The semantic difference between *zæd* and *dawæg*, however subtle (notwithstanding Dumézil’s objection, according to which “ces deux mots sont fréquemment associés sans nuance appréciable” [DUMÉZIL 1956: 355]), is rather clear; according to G. G. Bekoev (*Pamjatniki* III: 136 n. 22 and 138 n. 72, cited in GERSHEVITCH 1955: 483) *zæd* is an “angel”, while *dawæg* is an “intercessor (*predstatel’*) (and also “a man who becomes a dweller of heaven (*nebožitel’*)). G. A. Dzagurov, in *Pamjatniki* I: 71 n. 4-5, as quoted in Dumézil 1956: 356, translates (*i*)*zæd* as “angel” and (*i*)*dawæg* as “heavenly judge”²¹; the meaning of the latter, then, agrees rather well with the above-mentioned Daghestanian terms for “prophet”.

Various etymologies of Ossetic *dawæg* | *idawæg* have been proposed.

According to Benveniste (*Ét.oss.* 132) it derives from **vi-dāva-ka-*, from the Avestan root *dav* “to go away” (in this case “to drive away”).

Gershevitch proposed as the etymon of Ossetic (*i*)*dawæg*, which he defines as “a blessed dead in Heaven”, a Middle Ossetic form **ærdawæg*, from an extension in *-(a)k(a)-* of the Old Iranian term which appears in Old Persian as *artāvan-* and in Avestan as *ašāvan-* (cf. also Zoroastrian Middle Persian *ahlaw*, Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian *ardāw* [BOYCE 14]) “characterized by *arta-/aša-*” (GERSHEVITCH 1955: 132-133).

Dumézil criticizes Gershevitch's etymology, chiefly on the basis of the fact that the proposed **ærdawæg* does not explain the initial *i-* in the Digor form, and moreover that in the other example quoted by Gershevitch of initial *i-*-accretion in a Digor word, *iwændæg* (Iron *wændag*) "brave, daring, agile, fast" (GERSHEVITCH 1955: 133), the *i-* is in fact etymological (from Old Iranian **yavant-aka-* [or **yuvant-aka-?*, cf. DUMÉZIL 1956: 366 n. 57]); Dumézil draws the conclusion that also the initial *i-* in (*i*)*dawæg*, like the one in (*i*)*zæd*, has an etymological value (DUMÉZIL 1956: 359).

Dumézil (1956: 359-360) proposes a derivation as enlargement from Old Ir. **yātu-* "sorcery", hence (*i*)*dawæg* as "a being endowed with *yātu-*", or, alternatively, a derivation from Indo-Iranian **vi-dhā-* "to distribute" (DUMÉZIL 1956: 362).

The most plausible etymology is the one proposed by Abaev, according to whom *dawæg* | *idawæg* derives from **vi-tāva-ka-* [IĖSOJa I: 348-49]; it should be noted that Gershevitch too had thought of a connection of (*i*)*dawæg* with Sogdian *wytʷw-* "to endure, persevere", but subsequently abandoned this hypothesis [GERSHEVITCH 1955: 484 fn. 1].

We can now review a few Middle Iranian connections of the Indo-Iranian root **tav-* (< Indo-European **teuH-*) "potentem esse" (cf. *Air. Wb.* 638).

The root **tav-* is attested with the preverb **vi-* in Buddhist Sogdian *wytʷwnʷk* /witāwnē/ "patient" (rather than "obstiné" [TSP 53, 277] (in *rty wytʷwnʷk mynʷt* (1131) *ʷPZY ʷntʷwysʷk prw šyrʷkrtyh* "and he remains patient and striving for good actions" P2.1130-1131 (TSP 53)) and in Manichaean Sogdian *wytʷwpʷznyʷh* /witāw-pāz(a)nyā/ "patient-mindedness" (*Sogdica* 3, from *M 133*)²² (= *wytʷw pʷznyʷh* "Duldensinn" *M 133* V ii 5 (= *ak* 89 in *Licht-Nous* 130) and (in Sūtra-script) *wytʷwpʷz-nyʷkh* /witāw-pāz(a)nyā/ "patient-mindedness" *T ii T(oyoq)* Fr. I (b) 15 (*Sogdica* 2), *wy-tʷwpʷz-ʷnkyʷh* "patience" (fragm. 18170 = (T.M. 371) = u.9 = 41b in *Licht-Nous* 60, 68; cf. also the photograph of the fragment on plate XVI).

With the preverb **pati-* it is attested in Sogdian *ptʷw-/pattāw-/* "to endure": Christian Sogdian *ʷdy qt ptʷwt wytwr qt (ʷ)[y](m)* "but he who endures till the end [comes]" *TIIB 71* I.V.5 (STI p. 6, as corrected in SUNDERMANN 1974: 251); *qy cn xypθ [b]nty ptyθyʷ ʷt nmyʷq* (8) *ptʷwsʷq* "he who has endured contempt and abuse from his own servant" *TIIB 66* R.7-8 (*ST II* 6.7-8, p. 535)²³; *ʷt dwyd bywny ptʷwʷz ʷt myθ wʷbʷz* "and the prophet David endured it and spoke thus" *TIIB 66* R.10 (*ST II* 6.10, p. 536)²⁴; *ʷt yʷntt zprtt* (24) *ptʷwyntqn* "these saints endured (it)" *T II B 66* R.23-24 (*ST II* 6.23-24, p. 536). In Buddhist Sogdian *[ʷ]βzʷy ptʷwt* "he endures the torment" L85.11 (RAGOZA 59); *rty nwkr ZNH* (836) *δʷmyh myδβtʷ δʷwn nʷβcykt prʷyw* (837) *wyspw Lʷ ptʷwʷnt wnʷnt* "then the ministers of the nation with the people

could not endure it all” P.2.835-837 (*TSP* 40). In Manichaean Sogdian *pt*²*w*- (*GMS* 572 from *M* 372).

With the same preverb **pati-* we have the Buddh. Sogd. adjective *pt*²*w*(*y*)*n*²*k* /pattāw(ē)nē/ “patient”²⁵, in the phrase *pt*²*w**n*²*k* *wkry* /pattāw(ē)nē w(i)kar/ “patience” (*2PZY* *γwnx* (68) *ZKZY* *ywn*²*k* *δwky* *kršn*²*w* *rty* *ZK* *c*²*w**n* *pt*²*w**n*²*k* *wkry* *s*²*r* (69) *2γt*²*k* *βwt* “thus he who in this world is handsome comes from patience”²⁶ *SCE*. 67-69 (MACKENZIE 1970: 4); *2PZY* *ZKw* *škš*²*pt* *2t* (172) *pt*²*w**yn*²*k* *z*²*r*²*y* *m*²*n* *wn*²*nt* “and they practice the precepts and a patient, compassionate mind” *Vim.* 171-172 (*BSTBL* 28); *rty* *nwykr* *kδ* *prw* *L*² *2z*²*yt* (194) *pδkh* *ZKw* *pt*²*w**yn*²*k* *wkry* *βyr*² “then if in the ‘non-birth’ rule one has acquired patience”²⁷ *Vim.* 193-194 (*BSTBL* 30)) and the Sogdian compounds Chr. *pt*²*w**p*²*z**ny*² /pattāw-pāz(a)nyā/ “endurance (Duldersinn)” (*c*²*nw* *pt**w**šym* *cymyd* *xw*²*n* (33) *pt*²*w**p*²*z**ny*² “when we hear about this endurance of sins” *TIIB* 66 V.8-9 (*ST II* 6.32-33, p. 537)) and Buddh. *pt*²*w**p*²*z**ny* /pattāw-pāz(a)nē/ “having a patient mind” (?) (*pt*²*w**p*²*z**ny* *myn* *mz*²*γγ* *γwt*²*w* “think of the patient mind, great lord” L49.II [RAGOZA 39]).

Compounds with the root **tav-* occur in addition, with the same preverb **pati-*, in Zoroastrian Middle Persian *pt*²*d**stn*¹ /pattāyistan/, *ptwtn*¹ /pattūdan/, pres. stem *pt*²*d*- /pattāy-/ “stay, remain, last, endure”, with the adjective *ptwk*¹ /pattūg/ “enduring, patient, persevering” and its derivative *ptwkyh* /pattūgīh/ “endurance, patience, perseverance” [*Pahl.Dict.* 66] and *pt*²*n*¹ /pattān/ “continually, uninterruptedly” (NYBERG, *Gloss.* 159, from **pati-tāvana-*; he compares also Armenian *atak* “capable”, according to him from **ati-tavaka-*). In Manichaean Middle Persian *pt*²*γ*- /pattāy-/ “endure, last, remain” (*Verbum* 209; according to Henning from **pati-tāvaya-*; he compares also MPZor. *pattūg* (according to Nyberg “capable of”²⁸ from **pati-tuvaka-* [Nyberg, *Gloss.* 159]); *Word-List* 75) (cf. Zoroastrian Middle Persian *pt*²*γ* /pattāy/ “lasting, durable” (NYBERG, *Gloss.* 159), in the compound *dglpt*²*γ* /dagr-pattāy/ “long-lasting, everlasting” [NYBERG, *Gloss.* 56]). In Manichaean Parthian we have, from the past stem, the adjective *ptwd* /pattūd/ “having endured, suffered” (*Mir.Man.* III 854-855²⁹, 905; *Word-List* 75), and, from the present stem, *hwpt*²*w* /hupattāw/ “forbearing, patient” (*Mir.Man.* III 855 [e.g. *2ydr*²*d* (16) *cy* *hwpt*²*w* *dyn*²*br* *kyc* (17) *cyš* *myhg*²*r* *kyrd* *ny* *šhyd* “because of this, nobody can do any harm to the forbearing dēnāwar” b (= *TIID* 134, cf. above) 15-17], 901; *Word-List* 49).

Finally, the same root apparently occurs with the preverb **ā-* in Manichaean Middle Persian *2d*(*w*)*g* /ādug/ “capable” (*Verbum* 250; according to Henning from **ā-tuvaka-*); cf. also Man. Parthian *2dg* /ādug/ “capable” (*Word-List* 3).

NOTES

1. *Ukazatel'*, where the list of words quoted from Caucasian languages goes from p. 334 to p. 393.

2. In particular, the name of the Alanians themselves (or its prototype **ārya-*), which entered the Nax languages with the meaning “prince, lord” (Čečen *ēla*, Inguš *āla*, Bats *alē*); on the name of the Alanians cf. also GNOLI 1996.

3. But on page 206 she compares Geo *avari* “booty” with MPers *āβār* (< *ā-pār*) [sic].

4. This is attested only twice (cf. BACK 177, with references to Bailey and Messina, who reads it *āwār*).

5. Which, according to Back, could represent /aywār/ > /ēwār/ (BACK 177), cf. the spelling *ᶚdwyn* for /ēwēn/ < **abi-dainā-* (BACK 130).

6. The initial *ā-* of the Persian form, however, could point to a confusion, in this particular case, between **ā-* and **ava-*.

7. In the section on loanwords of Scytho-Alano-Ossetic origin.

8. Schmidt considers the Karačay form as a borrowing from Kabardian, and all other Caucasian forms (the Ossetian ones included) as borrowings from Georgian.

9. In Kaxib, as in Hidatl, the groups /ay/, /aw/ undergo monophthongization, e.g. *bercine* < *bércina-y* “beautiful (f.)” (cf. MIKAILOV, *Dial.* 377-378).

10. It is formed as *nucál-a-y* “princess” (also a proper name) (cf. SAIDOV 362, 727) from *nucál* “prince”.

11. Usually Čuvaš /š/ corresponds in borrowings to Iranian /š/ [SCHERNER 69-71], while Persian /k/ and /g/ become Čuv. /k/ [SCHERNER 82-84]; in loanwords, moreover, /b/ of the source-language becomes /p/ (phonetically [b]) between vowels [SCHERNER 17].

12. Cf. Benveniste 1955: 36-41.

13. According to Henning from **apa-bar-* [*Verbum* 175], as also New Persian *burdan* “to take away” (thus also *AirWb* 942 n. 35).

14. The literary language has not accepted this peculiar Xunzax phonological trait, except in a few cases, like *haťán* “sunday” < **pał'an*, cf. GUDAVA 36.

15. In Čečen and Inguš stress falls on the first syllable of the word, as against Bats, where the stress is relatively free and may fall either on the radical syllable or on the ending, e.g. *čúyxi* ‘lamb’, pl. *čuxuí*, *žágn* ‘book’, gen. sg. *žágnō*, gen. pl. *žagnō* (cf. IMNAIŠVILI 17-20). Bats probably represents the original situation; hence one can suppose that stress, which was still free in proto-Nax, has become secondarily fixed on the first syllable in Čečen-Inguš; this fixing of the stress position has had three consequences: 1) the reduction and centralization of vowels in post-stress syllables; 2) the umlaut of /a/ (and other vowels) in the first syllable; 3) the lengthening of first syllable vowels, if this syllable was open (this generally happens only in loanwords).

16. This is probably a borrowing from Avar, cf. Av. *šaḳ:i* [SAIDOV 591]; in other languages of Daghestan there is Lak *š:iḳi* [XAJDAKOV 1962: 326]; in Turkic languages, Kumyk

šaḡi [BAMMATOV 367], Balkar *šaḡi* [ŠAUMJAN 1935: 78]; moreover, among North-West Caucasian languages, the word appears in Kabardian *šāḡa* [KARDANOV 429]; the origin of this word is according to Z. G. Abdullaev [apud ŠAGIROV II: 136] ultimately from Dargi (Darg *šinḡa*).

17. The Inguš form seems to go back to a prototype **bālu*, while Čeč. *ball*, which presents no trace of *u*-umlaut, probably derives from a form without final *u*, cf. Oss. (Iron) *bal* [IĚSOJa I: 233] and Arm *bal* [HÜBSCHMANN 263].

18. He assigns the same origin to Avar *abúriḡ* [USLAR 1889: 35]; cf. also IĚSOJa I: 25-26.

19. ŽIRKOV 14, 16 (non vidi; quoted by ABDULLAEV 1972: 340).

20. On *dawæg* | *idawæg* in Caucasian languages cf. also BIELMEIER 1989. Murkelinskij considers the Avar form *awarag* as an Arabo-Persian loan like *payyambar* and *šayx* [MURKELINSKIJ 146]; in other Caucasian languages the word for “prophet” is usually a borrowing from New Persian *payyāmbār* (cf. PROVASI 1995, n. 53).

21. Besides, the *dawžytæ* are defined as “protector spirits of the animals, forests, waters, winds ...” in KULOV 495 and 496; cf. DUMÉZIL 1956: 357.

22. Cf. also *Catalogue* 11.

23. Cf. also *GMS* 644.

24. Cf. also *GMS* 814.

25. A present participle, cf. *GMS* 893.

26. Rather than “from a patient kind”, cf. *BSTBL* 25 [note to *Vim.171*].

27. Cf. fn. 26 above.

28. This seems in fact to be the meaning of *ptwk*¹ e.g. in *ZK YKR*² *wcyn*¹ *ptwk*¹ *hlt*¹ /ān ī harw wizēn pattūg xrad/ “the intellect, capable of every choice” (NYBERG, *Texts* 55.2 [from DĚNKART VII, M 623]).

29. Three examples in successive lines: b [= *T II D II 134* (now = *M5815*, cf. *Catalogue* 115) R I] 11, 12, 13.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABAEV, V. I., *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka*, I, Moskva-Leningrad 1958; II, Leningrad 1973; III, Leningrad 1979; IV, Leningrad 1989 (= IĚSOJa).
- ABAEV, V. I., *Istoriko-étimologičeskij slovar' osetinskogo jazyka. Ukazatel'* (sost. E. N. Ščensnovič, A. V. Lušnikova, L. R. Dodyxudoeva), Moskva 1995 (= *Ukazatel'*).
- ABDULLAEV, I. X., “K istorii nazvanii proroka v dagestanskix jazykax”, *Étimologija* 1970, Moskva 1972, 339-348.
- ABDURAXMANOV, R. (ed.), *Russko-uzbekskij slovar'*, Moskva 1954.
- ANDREAS, F. C., HENNING, W., *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan*, III, SPAW 1934, 846-912 (= *Mir.Man.* III).

- Andronikašvili, M., *Narkvevebi iranul-kartuli enobrivi urtiertobidan*, Tbilisi 1966 (= *Narkvevebi*).
- ANSARI, Z. (ed.), *Urdu-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1964.
- ASLANOV, M. G., *Puštu-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1985.
- AZIZBEKOV, X. A., *Azerbajdžansko-russkij slovar'*, Baku 1965.
- BACK, M., *Die sassanidischen Staatsinschriften* (Acta Iranica, 18), Téhéran-Liège 1978.
- BAILEY, H. W., "Excursus iranocaucasicus", in *Monumentum H. S. Nyberg*, I (Acta Iranica, 4), Téhéran-Liège 1975, 31-35.
- BAILEY, H. W., *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge 1979 (= *Dict.Kh.Saka*).
- BAILEY, H. W., "Iranica in Veinakh languages", in C. Paris (ed.), *Caucasologie et mythologie comparée. Actes du Colloque international du CNRS. IV^e Colloque de Caucasologie* (Sèvres, 27-29 juin 1988) (SELAF n. 332), Paris 1992, 323-324.
- BAILEY, T. G., *An English-Panjabi Dictionary*, Delhi 1976 (repr. of 1919) (=Bailey, *Panj.*).
- BAMMATOV Z. Z., *Kumyksko-russkij slovar' / Qumuqča-rusča sözlük*, Moskva 1969.
- BARTHOLOMAE, Ch., *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg 1904 (= *AirWb*).
- BASKAKOV, N. A. (ed.), *Nogajsko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1963.
- BASKAKOV, N. A., KARRYEV, B. A., XAMZAEV, M. Ja., *Turkmensko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1968 (= BKX).
- BENVENISTE, E., *Textes sogdiens*, Paris 1940 (Mission Pelliot, III) (= *TSP*).
- BENVENISTE, E., "Homophonies radicales en Indo-européen", *BSL* 51 (1955), 14-41.
- BENVENISTE, E., *Études sur la langue ossète* (Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, LX), Paris 1959 (= *Ét.oss.*).
- BIELMEIER, R., "Sarmatisch, Alanisch, Jassisch", in R. Schmitt (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, Wiesbaden 1989, 236-245.
- BOYCE, M., *A Catalogue of the Iranian Manuscripts in Manichaean Script in the German Turfan Collection*, Berlin 1960 (= *Catalogue*).
- BOYCE, M., *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Acta Iranica, 9a), Téhéran-Liège 1977 (= *Word-List*).
- BOUDA, K., "Beiträge zur etymologischen Erforschung des Georgischen", *Lingua* II (1949-50), 291-307.
- CERCVAŽE, I., *Andiuri ena (gramatičkuli analizi tekštebit)*, Tbilisi 1965.
- DUMÉZIL, G., "Noms mythiques indo-iraniens dans le folklore des osses", *JA* CCXLVI (1956), 349-367.
- GERSHEVITCH, I., *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian* (Publications of the Philological Society XVI), Oxford 1954 (= *GMS*).
- GERSHEVITCH, I., "Word and Spirit in Ossetic", *BSOAS* XVII, 1955, 478-489.
- GIGNOUX, Ph., *Glossaire des inscriptions Pehlevies et Parthes* (Corpus Inscriptionum Iranicarum, Supplementary Series, I), London 1972.
- GIPPERT, J., *Iranica Armeno-Iberica. Studien zu den iranischen Lehnwörtern im Armenischen und Georgischen [I-II]* (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Iranistik 26), Wien 1993.

- GNOLI, G., "Il nome degli Alani nelle iscrizioni sassanidi: Considerazioni linguistiche e storiche sul tema dell'opposizione tra Iran esterno e Iran interno", in *Il Caucaso: cerniera fra culture dal Mediterraneo alla Persia (secoli IV-XI)* (Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, XLIII), Spoleto 1996, 831-861.
- GRJUNBERG, A. L., STEBLIN-KAMENSKIJ, I. M., *Vaxanskij jazyk. Teksty, slovar', grammatičeskij očerk*, Moskva 1976 (= *Vaxjaz.*).
- GUDAVA, T. E., *Konsonantizm andijskix jazykov. Istoriko-sravnitel'nyj analiz*, Tbilisi 1964.
- GUKASJAN, V., *Udinsko-azerbajdžansko-russkij slovar' / Udinjä-azärbayjanja-rusja liryät*, Baku 1974.
- HENNING, W. B., "Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente", *ZII* 9 (1933), 158-253 (= *Verbum*).
- HENNING, W. B., *Sogdica*, London 1940 (= *Sogdica*).
- HENNING, W. B., "Two Manichaean Magical Texts, with an Excursus on the Parthian ending -ēndēh", *BSOAS*, 1947, 39-66.
- HORN, P., *Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie*, Strassburg 1893.
- HÜBSCHMANN, H., *Armenische Grammatik, 1. Armenische Etymologie*, Leipzig 1892 (Hildesheim 1962²).
- IMNAIŠVILI, D. S., *Istoriko-sravnitel'nyj analiz fonetiki naxskix jazykov*, Tbilisi 1977.
- IRŠAD, A., *Urdü-panjābī luyat*, Lāhaur 1974.
- KARDANOV, B. M. et al., *Kabardinsko-russkij slovar' / Qabarday-wāräs slovar'*, Moskva 1957.
- KERIMOVA, A. A., MAMEDZADE, A. K., RASTORGUEVA, V. S., *Giljansko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1980 (= KMR).
- KULOV, K. D. (ed.), *Osetinskie nartskie skazanija*, Dzæudžyqæu 1948.
- KURDOEV, K. K., JUSUPOVA, Z. A., *Kurdsko-russkij slovar' (sorani) / Færhængi kürdi-rusi (sorani)*, Moskva 1983.
- MACIEV, A. G., *Čečensko-russkij slovar' / Noğčīn-örsīn slovar'*, Moskva 1961.
- MACKENZIE, D. N., *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*, London 1971 (*PahLDict.*).
- MACKENZIE, D. N., *The 'Sūtra of the Causes and Effects of Actions' in Sogdian* (London Oriental series, 22), London 1970.
- MACKENZIE, D. N., *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library* (Acta Iranica, 10), Téhéran-Liège 1976 (= *BSTBL*).
- MACLEAN, A. J., *Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac*, Oxford 1901.
- MACUCH, R., PANOSSI, E., *Neusyrische Chrestomathie*, Wiesbaden 1974.
- MAGOMEDBEKOVA, Z. M., *Karatinskij jazyk. Grammatičeskij analiz, teksty, slovar'*, Tbilisi 1971.
- MEJLANOVA, U. A., *Buduxsko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1984.
- MEWARAM, P., *A New English-Sindhi Dictionary*, Hyderabad 1933 (New Delhi 1971²).
- MIKAILOV, Š. I., *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja fonetika avarskix dialektov*, Maxačkala 1958 (= Mikailov, *Fon.*).

- MIKAILOV, Š. I., *Očerki avarskoj dialektologii*, Moskva-Leningrad 1959 (= Mikailov, *Fon.*).
- MIKAILOV, K. Š., “Ešče neskol'ko dagestanskix alanizmov”, *Ėtimologija* 1970 (Moskva 1972), 333-338.
- MÜLLER, F. W. K., *Soghdische Texte I* (APAW 1912 Nr. 2) (= *ST I*).
- MÜLLER, F. W. K., LENTZ, W., *Soghdische Texte II*, SPAW, Phil.-hist. kl., Berlin 1934, 504-605 (= *ST II*).
- MURKELINSKIJ, G. B. (ed.), *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja leksika dagestanskix jazykov*, Moskva 1971.
- NADŽIP, Ė. N., *Ujgursko-russkij slovar'*, Moskva 1968.
- NYBERG, H. S., *A Manual of Pahlavi, I: Texts*, Wiesbaden 1964 (= Nyberg, *Texts*).
- NYBERG, H. S., *A Manual of Pahlavi, II: Glossary*, Wiesbaden 1974 (= Nyberg, *Gloss.*).
- OZDOEV, I. A., *Russko-ingušskij slovar' / Ersiy-γalyay slovar'*, Moskva 1980.
- Pamjatniki Narodnogo Tvorčestva Osetin, I*, Vladikavkaz 1925.
- Pamjatniki Narodnogo Tvorčestva Osetin, III*, Vladikavkaz 1928.
- PIREJKO, L. A., *Talyšsko-russkij slovar' / Tolāšæ-urusæ luyæet*, Moskva 1976.
- PRÖHLE, W., “Karatschaisches Wörterverzeichnis”, *KSz* 10 (1909), 83-150.
- PROVASI, E., “Gli elementi lessicali persiani in circasso”, in P. G. Donini, C. Lo Jacono, L. Santa Maria (eds.), *Un ricordo che non si spegne. Scritti di docenti e collaboratori dell'Istituto Universitario Orientale di Napoli in memoria di Alessandro Bausani*, Napoli 1995.
- RAGOZA, A. N., *Sogdijskie fragmenty central'no-aziatskogo sobranija Instituta Vostokovedenija*, Moskva 1980.
- Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-ingilizce sözlük / New Redhouse Turkish-English Dictionary*, Istanbul 1968.
- ROSSI, A. V., *Iranian Lexical Elements in Brāhūī*, Naples 1979.
- SAIDOV, M., *Avarsko-russkij slovar' / Awar-eurus maç:alul slovar'*, Moskva 1967.
- SCHERNER, B., *Arabische und neupersische Lehnwörter im Tschuwaschischen. Versuch einer Chronologie ihrer Lautveränderungen*, Wiesbaden 1977.
- SCHMIDT, G., “Über die kaukasischen Lehnwörter des Karatschajischen”, *MSFOu* 67 (1933), 465-471.
- STEINGASS, F., *A Comprehensive Persian-English Dictionary*, London 1892.
- SUNDERMANN, W., *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Berliner Turfantexte, IV), Berlin 1973 (= *Parabeltexte*).
- SUNDERMANN, W., “Nachlese zu F. W. K. Müllers ‘Soghdischen Texten I’, 1. Teil”, *Alt-orientalische Forschungen* 1, 1974, 217-255.
- SUNDERMANN, W., *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous. Eine Lehrschrift des östlichen Manichäismus. Edition der parthischen und soghdischen Version* (Berliner Turfantexte, XVII), Berlin 1992 (= *Licht-Nous*).
- ŠAGIROV, A. K., *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' adygskix (čerkeskix) jazykov*. [1] *A-N*, [2] *P-Z*, Moskva 1977.

- ŠAUMJAN, R., "Balkarskaja leksika (materialy dlja balkarsko-russkogo slovarja)", *Jazyki severnogo Kavkaza i Dagestana*, 1, Moskva-Leningrad 1935, 67-86.
- TALIBOV, B., GADŽIEV, M., *Lezginско-russkij slovar' / Lezgi čalanni urus čalan slovar'*, Moskva 1966.
- TIETZE, A., "Persian Loanwords in Anatolian Turkish", *Oriens* 20 (1967) [1969], 125-168.
- TSCHENKÉLI, K., *Georgisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, I-III, Zurich 1965-1974.
- TUGOV, V. B. [Тəг° Vladimir], *Abazinsko-russkij slovar' / Abaza-wrəš° až°ar*, Moskva 1967.
- USLAR, P. K., *Ėtnografija Kavkaza. Jazykoznanie*, III: *Avarskij jazyk*, Tiflis 1889.
- USLAR, P. K., *Ėtnografija Kavkaza. Jazykoznanie*, VI: *Tabasaranskij jazyk*, Tbilisi 1979.
- VASMER, Max [Maks Fasmer], *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*, I-IV (tr. O. N. Trubačev, ed. B. A. Larin), Moskva 1986-87.
- VOGT, H., *Dictionnaire de la langue Oubykh* (Institutet for sammenlignende kulturforskning, Série B: Skrifter, LII), Oslo 1963.
- XAJDAKOV, S. M., *Laksko-russkij slovar' / Lak°u mazral wa urus mazral slovar'*, Moskva 1962.
- XAJDAKOV, S. M., *Sravnitel'no-sopostavitel'nyj slovar' dagestanskix jazykov*, Moskva 1973.