

Krzysztof Tomasz Witczak
 Uniwersytet Łódzki
 ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8895-974X>
 e-mail: krzysztof.witczak@uni.lodz.pl

Considerations of the origin of the Armenian term *gom* ‘stable, stall, pigsty’*

Rozważania nad genezą ormiańskiego terminu *gom* ‘obora, stajnia, chlew’

Abstrakt

Autor dowodzi, że silne argumenty fonologiczne i semantyczne nie pozwalają zestawić ormiańskiego wyrazu *gom* ‘obora, stajnia, chlew’ ze staronordyckim leksemem *gammi* ‘lapońska chata, ziemianka’. Pierwszy z powyższych terminów reprezentuje bowiem prastare zapożyczenie ze źródła anatolijskiego, por. het. *hūmmaš* c. ‘obora, stajnia, chlew’, luv. *hūmmaš* c. ‘chlew’ (< anat. **haumaš* < pie. **h₂óymos*), drugi natomiast jest oczywistą kopią lapońskiego apelatywu *gammi* ‘ziemianka zbudowana z torfu’, który sprowadza się ostatecznie do fińskopermskiej praformy **kθm3* ‘spichlerz, spiżarnia’. W językach kaukaskich spotykamy dwie wiązki leksykalne wykazujące odmienne, możliwe do oddzielenia znaczenia ‘obora, stajnia, owczarnia, chlew’ vs. ‘spichlerz, spiżarnia’. Pierwsza wiązka, zapożyczona z leksyki anatolijskiej (za pośrednictwem ormiańskim), została udokumentowana przez gruz. *gomi* ‘chlew’ i orm. *gom* ‘obora, stajnia, chlew’. Niektórzy lingwiści błędnie kojarzyli z nią inną grupę wyrazów, poświadczoną m.in. w języku swańskim, kabardyńskim, adygejskim, inguskim i czeczeńskim (por. sw. *gwem* ‘spiżarnia’; kabard. *gwän* ‘skrzynia na ziarno, skład zboża’, adyg. *kon* ‘rozszerzający się ku górze pleciony spichlerz, oblepiony z zewnątrz gliną i pokryty słomą’; ing. *ke*, obl. *keno* ‘spichlerz’; czecz. *čõ*, obl. *čõna* ‘skład ziarna, spichlerz’). Moim zdaniem, powyższe wyrazy kaukaskie są ugrofińskimi zapożyczeniami, dokonanymi za pośrednictwem osetyńskiego *gom*, *gon*, *gondan* ‘skrzynia na zboże, spichlerz, spichrz’, por. ostiackie *kóm* ‘spichlerz, spiżarnia’ < fińskoperm. **kθm3* ‘ts.’).

Słowa kluczowe: etymologia, języki indoeuropejskie, języki kaukaskie, języki uralskie, kontakty językowe, słownictwo pasterskie, zapożyczenia

* The present article is part of the research project entitled *Prehistoric contacts between Indo-European and Uralic*, financed by the scholarly development fund of the Faculty of Philology, University of Lodz. I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Elwira Kaczyńska and Dr. Marek Majer (University of Lodz) as well as two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on this paper. Errors of fact and opinion are my responsibility alone. Additionally, I would like to thank Prof. Anna Cichosz (University of Lodz) for correcting and improving the English version of my text.

Abstract

The author pursues an argument that the Armenian word *gom* ('stable, stall, pigsty') cannot be related to Old Norse *gammi* ('Saami hut, dug-out') for both phonological and semantic reasons. Rather, the former noun represents an ancient borrowing from an Anatolian source (cf. Hittite *ḫūmmaš* c. 'stable, stall, sty', Luwian *ḫūmmaš* c. 'pigsty' < PIE. **h₂rómos*), whereas the latter one seems to be a Finno-Ugric loanword (via the Northern Sáami appellative *gammi*, which derives from the Finno-Permic archetype **kθm3* 'granary, pantry'). Furthermore, the modern Caucasian languages attest lexical data with two different (and easily separable) meanings: 'stable, stall, sty' vs. 'granary, pantry'. The former group, documented e.g. by Georgian *gomi* 'pigsty', is evidently of Anatolian origin (via Armenian *gom*). On the other hand, the Caucasian terms for 'granary, pantry' (e.g. Svan *gwem* 'cupboard, pantry, larder', Kabardian *gwän* 'chest for corn, grain-store', Ad. *kon* 'upward widening woven granary, covered on the outside with clay and covered with straw', Ingush *ke*, obl. *keno* 'granary', Chechen *čō*, obl. *čōna-* 'store for grain, granary' etc.), wrongly linked to the aforementioned words for 'stable, stall, pigsty' by some linguists, should be treated as borrowings of Finno-Ugric origin (via Ossetic *gom*, *gon*, *gondan* 'box for grain, granary' ← Ostyak *kóm* 'granary, pantry' vel sim. < Finno-Permic **kθm3* 'id.').

Key words: borrowings, Caucasian languages, etymology, Indo-European languages, language contacts, pastoral vocabulary, Uralic languages.

1. Introduction

In our paper published in "Prace Językoznawcze" we established the Anatolian origin of the Modern Greek word *κουμάσι* n. 'small room for animals; henhouse, dovecote, doghouse, pigsty' and a related Balkan lexical bundle (Kaczyńska, Witczak 2017: 53–69). An alternative research hypothesis, considering Mod.Gk. *κουμάσι* to be a borrowing from Turk. *kümes* 'henhouse; cot, little cottage, cabin', was definitely rejected on the basis of chronological, onomastic, lexical and morphological reasons. Unfortunately, for lack of space some aspects of this correspondence, which turned my attention towards Iranian and Caucasian languages, could not be taken into account in the previous paper. In the following sections of this article I am going to discuss the issues beyond the scope of the previous investigation.

2. On the alleged Iranian origin of the Turkish appellative *kümes*

First of all, I would like to refer to the hypothesis put forward by Kostas Karapotosoglou (2005: 101), according to which the Greeks borrowed the word *κουμάσι* from a Turkish source, and the Ottoman Turks took over

kümes ‘henhouse; cot, cottage’ from the Persian language. Greek researchers refer in this context to the New Persian appellative *koma* ‘guard’s hut standing on a crop field / καλύβα φύλακα σε αγρούς’ (Karapotosoglou 2005: 101; Orfanos 2014: 197).

I am not able to identify the New Persian appellative in available Persian dictionaries, nor to trace its origin, but I have identified terms that are phonologically and semantically similar to the Modern Greek and Turkish term in other Iranian languages, e.g. Kurd. *gōm*, *gōv* (f.) ‘sheepfold, pigsty’ (Tsabolov 2001: 393), Yaghn. *kōy* ‘pigsty’ (Novsák 2010: 87), Osset. *gom*, *gon*, *gondan* ‘grain box, granary’ (Abaev 1959: 524). Authors of etymological dictionaries of the Kurdish and Ossetic languages unanimously indicate that the cited Iranian names cannot be a native element for phonological reasons and they are obvious foreign language borrowings (Abaev 1959: 524; Tsabolov 2001: 393). Vasiliy Abaev (1959: 524) finds semantic equivalents of the Ossetic word primarily in Caucasian languages, which is not surprising since all Ossetic words with the onset *g-* are relatively late borrowings. It is worth mentioning here the Iranian phoneme **g-* is regularly continued in the Iron dialect as *q-* [q] and in the Digoron dialect as *ǰ-* [ɟ], e.g.

2.1. Osset. (Ir.) *qarm*, (Dig.) *ǰar(m)* adj. ‘warm, hot’ < Iran. **garma-* adj. ‘id.’, cf. Av. *garəma-*, OPers. *garma-*, NPers. *garm*, Kurd. *garm*, Yaghn. *ɣarm* ‘id.’ (Abaev 1973: 266–267; Rastorgueva, Edelman 2007: 161–162).

2.2. Osset. (Ir.) *qīs*, (Dig.) *ǰesæ* ‘coarse hair; bristles, horsehair; string’ < Iran. **gaisa-* m. ‘lock, curl’, cf. Av. *gaesa-* ‘locks, curls, frizzy hair’, NPers. *gēsū* ‘woman’s hair, braid’, Kurd. *gēsū* ‘woman’s braid’ (Abaev 1973: 304–305; Tsabolov 2001: 380; Rastorgueva, Edelman 2007: 115–117).

Since the Iranian phoneme **g* [g] was transformed into Iron *q* [q] and Digoron *ǰ* [ɟ], respectively, all Ossetic words with the onset *g-* [g] must represent newer borrowings from a foreign source.

Discussing the etymology of Kurd. *gōm*, *gōv* (f.) ‘sheepfold, pigsty’, the Iranist Ruslan Tsabolov (2001: 393) clearly states: “Поствокальный *-m* указывает на заимствование”. Moreover, the Russian researcher quotes the Armenian word *gom* ‘cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty’, clearly concluding definitely that the Kurdish language borrowed the word *gom*, *gov* from the Armenian source.

A similar interpretation seems valid also with regard to the origin of other Iranian appellatives. According to the unanimous opinion of experts, the above-mentioned Iranian terms, confirmed, among others in Ossetic, Kurdish, Yaghnobi and probably in New Persian, should be regarded as foreign language borrowings.

3. Arm. *gom* in the context of the Caucasian lexis

Iranists usually point to closer equivalents of the abovementioned Iranian words, which are attested in Caucasian languages:

3.1. OArm. *gom* ‘cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty’ (Martirosyan 2008: 204–205; 2009: 224–225), EArm. *qnu gom* ‘cowshed, stable, pigsty’ (Pisowicz, Sedojan, Ter-Grigorian 2006: 87), WArm. *kum* ‘cowshed’ (Ačarjan 1971: 574–575); Geo. *gomi* ‘pigsty’, *gomuri* ‘country house; pigsty’, Sv. *gwem* ‘pantry’; Kab. *gwän* ‘grain box, grain storage’, Ad. *kon* ‘upward widening woven granary, pasted on the outside with clay and covered with straw’ (Shagirov 1977: 112); Ing. *ke* (obl. *keno*) ‘granary’, Che. *čō* (obl. *čōna-*) ‘grain storage, granary’.

Abaev (1959: 524) explains the semantic variability of the combined words on the basis of the former material culture of the Caucasian highlanders, whose huts-dugouts were used not only for residential but also for farming purposes (they contained, e.g. grain and storage, and rooms for breeding animals). This outstanding Ossetic linguist recalls the testimony of a Greek writer and historian, Xenophon (*Anab.* IV 5, 25–26), who described the houses of Caucasian highlanders seen during the famous march of ten thousand Greek soldiers from Mesopotamia to Trebizond (401–400 BC):

αἱ δ' οἰκίαι ἦσαν κατάγειοι, τὸ μὲν στόμα ὡσπερ φρέατος, κάτω δ' εὐρεῖαι· αἱ δὲ εἴσοδοι τοῖς μὲν ὑποζυγίοις ὀρυκταί, οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι κατέβαινον ἐπὶ κλίμακος, ἐν δὲ ταῖς οἰκίαις ἦσαν αἴγες, οἶες, βόες, ὄρνιθες, καὶ τὰ ἔκγονα τούτων· τὰ δὲ κτήνη πάντα χιλῶ ἔνδον ἐτρέφοντο. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ πυροὶ καὶ κριθαὶ καὶ ὄσπρια καὶ οἴνος κριθίνος ἐν κρατήρσιν. (Hug 1889: 120)

“The houses here were underground, with a mouth like that of a well, but spacious below; and while entrances were tunnelled down for the beasts of burden, the human inhabitants descended by a ladder. In the houses were goats, sheep, cattle, fowls, and their young; and all the animals were reared and took their fodder there in the houses. Here were also wheat, barley, and beans, and barley-wine in large bowls”. (Brownson 1961: 53–55)

The above-mentioned Caucasian terms (3.1) are based, undoubtedly, on mutual influence, as individual Caucasian languages have different origins:

3.2. Armenian and Ossetic belong to the Indo-European language family;

3.3. Georgian and Svan make up a relatively modest Kartvelian (South Caucasian) family (together with Mingrelian and Laz);

3.4. Kabardian and Adyghe form a subgroup of the Circassian (Adyghe) subgroup, which is a part of the Abkhaz-Adyghe family, i.e. the (North) West Caucasian family;

3.5. Chechen and Ingush together with the Bats language form a subgroup of the Nakh-Daghestanian (Northeast Caucasian) family.

These four linguistic families are probably not closely related to each other (see Klimov 1994; Hewitt 2004). Although it is assumed that the Indo-European and Kartvelian families belong to the Nostratic macrofamily (Illich-Svitych 1971: 52–58; Duda 2000: 155–163; Stachowski 2011: 241–274), possible relations between Indo-European and Kartvelian are very distant in time and space¹. Moreover, a distant relationship between Abkhaz-Adyghe and Nakh-Daghestanian languages, which supposedly form an ancient North Caucasian language community, has been postulated (Nikolayev, Starostin 1994), but this hypothesis has never gained significant support. In this context, the aforementioned Caucasian words can only be regarded as a testimony to secondary relationships and influences in the Caucasus area.

Nowadays, it is practically impossible to trace the exact paths along which words penetrated from one Caucasian linguistic family to another, and it is not easy to determine the time and character of these borrowings since most Caucasian languages have relatively late attestations. The issue is extremely complex and incredibly difficult to resolve.

However, it is worth emphasizing that linguists consider Armenian a *lingua franca* in the areas situated near the Caucasus and at the same time the main distributor of Caucasian, Iranian and Greek words not only in ancient times, when the Kingdom of Great Armenia existed (from 4thc. BC to 3rd c. AD), but also in the Middle Ages, i.e. during period of the Kingdom of Cilicia (9–14th c.). Indeed, Old Armenian served as an intermediary between the Greek Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantine) and the Iranian Kingdom of the Sasanians, and Armenian did not lose this function even after the Ottoman conquests. One can, therefore, agree with the opinion that the Kurdish, Persian or Yaghnobi words mentioned above were borrowed through Armenian transmission.

Now I will try to answer the following three extremely important questions below:

- Is the Armenian term *gom* a native word?
- Is this term a Caucasian borrowing?
- Is the Armenian appellative of Anatolian origin?

I will analyse each of these three interesting issues separately.

¹The oldest Indo-European borrowings in Kartvelian languages are discussed by Klimov (1991: 325–341; 1994) and Gamkrelidze, Ivanov (1995: 774–777).

4. Arm. *gom* as the Indo-European heritage. Hübschmann's hypothesis

The research hypothesis concerning the native origin of Arm. *gom* ('Stall') was introduced to the literature of the subject by an outstanding German Iranist and Armenologist, Heinrich Hübschmann (1897: 436), who assumed that the Armenian word is motivated by the verb *goy* 'be, exist' (< IE. **uoséiō*), representing an iterative form developed from the Indo-European root **ues-* 'stay, live, stay overnight / verweilen, wohnen, übernachten'; Pokorny 1959: 1170–1171; Rix, Kümmel 2001: 293). The Armenian noun would be therefore a native derivative brought down to the Indo-European archetype **uós-mo-* 'place of stay and sleep (for farm animals)'. This etymology refers to numerous related words, e.g. OInd. *vásati* 'stays, lives, sleeps' (caus. *vásáyeti* 'stays overnight', initially 'makes somebody stay overnight'), Av. *vaṇhati* 'stays, lives'. This verb is currently reconstructed with the initial laryngeal sonant **h₂-* (Rix, Kümmel 2001: 293–294), the presence of which is shown both in Anatolian languages (*h-*), and the Greek language (as *α-*), cf. Hitt. *huiš-* 'žyc', Gk. Hom. *ἄεσα* (1 os. sg. aor. act.) 'I spent the night, I stayed overnight' (< PIE. **h₂ues-*). Such a reconstruction undermines the connection between the verb *goy* and an Armenian noun *gom* with the postulated Proto-Indo-European root **h₂ues-*, since in Armenian, like in Greek, the onset sonant **h₂* in the position before a consonant should behave as *α-* [a], as it happens in the case of the Armenian verb *aganim* 'to spend night' or the Armenian noun *awt* 'a place for spending night' < PIE. **h₂eu-* (Pokorny 1959: 72; Greppin 1983: 260, 319–320). Hübschmann's argument has not been widely accepted, and in the literature of the subject it appears much less frequently than the alternative hypothesis presented by Lidén.

5. Arm. *gom* as the Indo-European heritage. Lidén's hypothesis

The Swedish linguist Evald Lidén was also in favour of the native origin of the Armenian term *gom* ('sheepfold / Schafstall') (Lidén 1906: 13–16), but the etymology of the term he provided was different than that of Hübschmann. He juxtaposed the Armenian appellative *gom* with the following Germanic words: ON. *gammi* m. 'Saami hut, dugout / Lappenhütte, Erdhütte', Icel. *gammi* 'id.', Norw. *gamme* 'dugout / Erdhütte', ODan. *gamme* 'sheepfold, fence, fencing / Schafstall, Hürde', Swed. dial.

gamme ‘(cow) manger / Krippe, Kuhkrippe’, Sw.G. *gämmeli* ‘small barn or hut on the pastures, cowshed / kleine Scheune oder Hütte auf den Weiden, Viehhütte’ (de Vries 1977: 155). Based on this alleged correspondence, Lidén proposed the Indo-European archetype **g^hom-*. Numerous diachronists accepted both the Armenian-Germanic set (e.g. Ačarjan 1971: 574–575; de Vries 1977: 155), and the alleged Indo-European reconstruction **g^hom-* ‘stable, cowshed, pigsty / Stall’ (Walde, Pokorny 1930: 637; Pokorny 1959: 452; Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995: 38).

Unfortunately, the Armenian-Germanic set contains at least a few weaknesses. Firstly, the set is isolated and has never been supported by lexical material attested in a third Indo-European group (the so-called *tertium comparationis* is missing). Contemporary Indo-Europeanists believe that an Indo-European reconstruction is possible only when cognates from at least three language groups can be identified. Without the third comparandum, the set does not have the necessary evidentiary power and the reconstruction is not certain. Secondly, the Armenian word *gom* has rich counterparts in Caucasian languages (e.g. Georgian, Svan, Kabardian, Adyghe, Chechen, Ingush and Ossetic), which strongly supports the hypothesis of its local (Caucasian or sub-Caucasian) origin. Thirdly, the Armenian form of *gom* retains the vowel [ɔ] in the position before a nasal, which is completely inconsistent with the development of the Armenian language. The expected form should be **gum* (Olsen 1999: 198; Martirosyan 2009: 225). Fourthly, Germanic words can be borrowings from some pre-Indo-European, Scandinavian, substrate, cf. a Northern Saami term *gammi* ‘Saami hut, dugout, hut made of peat’ (de Vries 1977: 155). Fifthly, the Germanic words contain an insufficiently explained “expressive” geminate *-mm-*. Sixthly, the meaning convergent with the Armenian term (e.g. ‘sheepfold, cowshed’) is demonstrated by Germanic forms of relatively late origin. It seems that the initial semantics (in the sense of ‘dugout’) is better motivated in the preserved Germanic lexical material. Seventhly, based on the Saami form and numerous Nordic words (attested e.g. in Old Norse, Icelandic, Norwegian), the original meaning of ‘dugout’ can theoretically be postulated, which allows for an alternative reference of the Germanic appellatives to Proto-Indo-European word for ‘earth’ (PIE. **d^hǵ^hom-* f. ‘earth, soil’), as previously suggested by outstanding Norwegian Germanists, Hjalmar S. Falk and Alf Torp (1910: 298). Eighthly, the suggested Indo-European archetype **g^hom-* (‘stable, cowshed, pigsty / Stall’) neither has an obvious lexical motivation, nor is it a component of complex words, which makes it completely isolated (at least from the perspective of Indo-European word formation).

All these difficulties make the Armenian-Germanic correspondence a hypothesis that is insufficiently justified and relatively poorly supported on the grounds of phonology, semantics and word formation (Kowalski, Rychło, Witczak 2020: 75–77).

6. Olsen's hypothesis. Arguments for the rejection of the Indo-European origin of the alleged Armenian Germanic set

Birgit Olsen (1999: 198) tries to explain the lack of vowel lengthening *o* [ɔ] in the position in front of the nasal consonant *m* [m] observed in the Arm. appellative *gom* 'cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty' by putting forward an interesting hypothesis on the disappearance of the Indo-European sibilant **s* [s] in the position before [m], which is a fully regular process in the Armenian language. As a result, the Danish linguist reduces the Armenian word to two related archetypes of **g^hos-mo-* (m.) and **g^hos-meh₂-* (f.), referring to the Proto-Indo-European root **g^hos-* 'to eat' (cf. OInd. *ghas-* 'to eat') and finally explaining Arm. *gom* as a *nomen loci* denoting 'eating place'. Development from such a proto-form could explain the Proto-Germanic geminate **-mm-* as a result of a regressive assimilation in the consonant group *-zm-* (< PIE. **-sm-*). In other words, PG. **gamman-* (from previous **gazman-*) would represent an alleged *n*-stem archetype **g^hos-món-* (Kroonen 2013: 166). The main obstacle in recognising the nativity of Germanic words is the fact that the Nordic name *gammi* does not describe the native North Germanic reality, but a typical Saami hut in the form of a dugout ('Lappenhütte, Erdhütte'), which speaks strongly in favour of a borrowing from a Finno-Ugric source. Indeed, the Northern Saami appellative *gammi* 'dugout, provisional hut built of peat' can be successfully reduced to the Finno-Ugric archetype **køm3* 'granary, pantry / Speicher, Vorratskammer' (Rédei 1988: 680). Although the Saami form *gammi* does not appear in Rédei's Uralic etymological dictionary, its omission seems to stem from a misconception of researchers believing it to be an Old Norse borrowing. However, it is enough to mention other Saami forms of Finno-Ugric (or Uralic) origin, to find out that the Saami word perfectly matches the core of **køm3* in both semantic and phonological aspects:

6.1. SaaN. *gammi* 'a dugout built of peat / Erdhütte, Torfhütte' (de Vries 1977: XXXVIII, 155) = Fi. *kumo* 'grain barn', dial. *kommio* 'tent, forest hut'; Md. (Erz.) *kav* 'granary', (Mksh.) *kav* 'hay box'; Zr. *kum*

‘hunter’s pantry in the forest, clothing box’; Ost. *kõm* ‘granary, pantry’; Vty. *kūm* ‘attic’ < FU. **kõm3* ‘granary, pantry / Speicher, Vorratskammer’ (Rédei 1988: 680).

For comparison, I would like to mention other Finno-Ugric sets exhibiting a similar structure **kVm* in Finno-Ugric:

6.2. SaaN. *gāmâ* ‘Saami leather shoe’ = Fi. *ken-kä* ‘shoe’; Md. (Erz.) *keme*, (Mksh.) *kämä* ‘shoe’; Cher. *kem* ‘id.’; Zr. *kem* ‘shoe made of bast or birch bark’ < FU. **kämä* ‘shoe, leather footwear’ (Rédei 1988: 650);

6.3. SaaN. *goabmâ* ‘protruding, arched edge (of the rock, earth, snow)’ = Fi. *komi*, *komo* ‘hollow’, adj. ‘empty, hollow’; Ost. *kõm*, dial. *χõm* ‘hollow’; Hu. *homorú* ‘concave, hollow’ < FU. **kõm3* ‘hollow; concave’ (Rédei 1988: 203–204);

6.4. SaaN. *goabmer* ‘two bent open hands folded together to receive something’ = Fi. *kamahlo*, *kahmalo* ‘double handful’; Md. (Erz.) *komoro*, (Mksh.) *komor* ‘handful’; Zr. *kamjr* ‘handful’ < FU. **kom3r3* ‘id.’ < Ur. **kom3r3* ‘empty hand’, cf. also Yen. *hammara* ‘hand’, Km. *kāmæru?* ‘arms’ (Collinder 1977: 42; Rédei 1988: 175);

6.5. SaaN. *gõw’dâg* ‘wide’ = Cher. *kumða*, *kumda* ‘id.’, Ost. *komæt* ‘id.’ < FU. **kumte* adj. ‘wide’ (Collinder 1977: 96; Rédei 1988: 203–204);

6.6. SaaN. *goaw/de* ‘opening; a protruding roof; roof on stilts, without walls’ = Fi. *kansi* ‘lid, cover’, Est. *kaas* ‘id.’, Liv. *kõntš* ‘id.’; Md. *kunda* ‘lid’; Cher. *komδâš* ‘id.’; Zr. *kud* ‘eyelid; lid’ < FU. **komta* ‘lid, cover’ (Collinder 1977: 158; Rédei 1988: 671);

An overview of the etymological sets shown above leaves no doubt that the Saami word *gammi* is perfectly well anchored in the Finno-Ugric lexicon while the Germanic words are isolated in the Indo-European context (Kowalski, Rychło, Witeczak 2020: 75–77). Let us emphasize once again that the Old Norse appellative *gammi* refers to a Saami hut, a dugout built of peat (“Lappehütte, Erdhütte, Torfhütte”), which definitely speaks in favour of a borrowing from Saami. The opposite direction of borrowings is not justified by the available lexical material.

7. Arm. *gom* against the background of the Caucasian lexical material

The hypothesis about a former Caucasian borrowing in the Armenian language is noteworthy, since both the Ossetic term *gom*, *gon*, *gondan* ‘grain box, granary’, and the Armenian *gom* ‘cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty’ look like words taken from a foreign source, and not like native

words, inherited from the Proto-Indo-European language. The problem is that the previously identified Caucasian lexical material is attested in eight different languages belonging to four different, unrelated linguistic families (see 3.2–3.5): Indo-European, Kartvelian, Abkhazo-Adyghean and Nakh-Daghestanian.

After rejecting the native character of the Ossetic-Armenian words we have at our disposal three pairs of words that remain in a probable etymological relationship with each other:

7.1. a Georgian-Svan, cf. Geo. *gomi* ‘pigsty’, Sv. *gwem* ‘pantry’²;

7.2. a Circassian pair, cf. Kab. *gwän* ‘grain box, grain storage’, Ad. *kon* ‘woven grain storehouse, pasted with clay on the outside and covered with straw’, dial. (Shapsug) ‘storehouse, granary’ (Shagirov 1977: 112);

7.3. a Nakh pair, cf. Ing. *ke* (obl. *keno*) ‘granary’, Che. *čō* (obl. *čōna-*) ‘grain storage house, granary’.

The semantic convergence leads us to believe that at least two of the above-mentioned pairs appeared secondarily as a result of borrowing. Therefore, which pair of words would represent the original forms? Linguists are unable to give a plausible answer to this question³. Solving this complex issue requires comprehensive knowledge of Caucasian languages. However, even thorough linguistic knowledge may not be enough because it may finally turn out that the Caucasian lexical material under discussion is the result of ancient external influences. Following this line of thinking, I have decided to put forward a research hypothesis that two independent influences from the north and from the south crossed at the Caucasus and the areas near the Caucasus.

² It should be noted that the lexical pair, confirmed in Georgian and Svan, does not appear in the etymological dictionary of Kartvelian languages (Klimov 1998), which only explains native words inherited from the Kartvelian proto-language and omits later borrowings. Therefore, specialists in the Kartvelian language reject the native character of the Kartvelian words. On the other hand, researchers do not list these appellatives in the group of Kartvelian Indo-Europeanisms borrowed in former times (Klimov 1994; Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1995: 774–777), which, however, does not exclude the possibility of a lexical influence of the Armenian language.

³ It is hard to find a clear position on this issue in the literature on the subject. Abaev (1959: 523–524) limits himself to juxtaposing Caucasian (including Kartvelian) words with a similar meaning to Osset. *gom*, *gon* ‘grain box, granary’, but does not discuss the issue of their origin nor the direction or source of the borrowing. Shagirov (1977: 112) juxtaposes Circassian appellatives with Caucasian words, attested in Ossetic, Svan and Georgian (omitting in this set Arm. *gom*), and then adds a commentary that the original source of the borrowing is unknown (“Первоисточник неизвестен”). Shagirov additionally indicates the possible Abkhaz equivalent of the Circassian words, cf. Abkh. *а-кIуна* ‘basket, trug’, especially ‘fishing basket’.

I am convinced that all the Caucasian words with the meaning of ‘granary, pantry’ can be successfully associated with the Finno-Ugric prototype **kθmз* ‘granary, pantry’ (see 6.1). I also believe that the people who transferred the above Finno-Ugric borrowing to the Caucasus were Iranian Ossetians, descendants of Sarmatians and Alans, who did not settle in the Caucasus until the historic era, and in the epoch before that (i.e. before 5th c. BC⁴) often encountered the Finno-Ugrians, which is evidenced by numerous Iranian borrowings in Finno-Ugric languages⁵.

However, the origin of the lexical bundle with the meaning ‘stable, cowshed, pigsty’ is different, and – in our opinion – finally comes down to the Anatolian appellative **haumaš*, already documented in the second millennium BC, cf. Hitt. *ḫūmmaš* c. ‘stable, cowshed, pigsty’, Luw. *ḫūmmaš* c. ‘pigsty’ (Kaczyńska, Witczak 2017: 62). In this case, the role of an intermediary was played by Armenians, who settled in the areas near the Caucasus, probably at the end of the second millennium BC.

8. Arm. *gom* as an Anatolian borrowing

The hypothesis about the relationship between the Hittite appellative *ḫūmmaš* c. ‘stable, cowshed, pigsty’ and the Armenian lexeme *gom* ‘cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty’ was once put forward by an Armenian linguist Grigoriy A. Kapantsian (1931: 45, 1956: 338–339), which was thoroughly reported by Jaan Puhvel (1991: 373). Based on phonetic equivalence, the Hittite-Armenian words cannot be considered proto-related lexical units, and this state of affairs raises the question of what other kind of relationship is documented by the alleged Hittite-Armenian pair. The answer is obvious: we deal here with a typical lexical borrowing. The direction of this borrowing is relatively easy to indicate. The extinct Hittite language was used in the third and second millennium BC in Asia Minor, while the oldest records of the ancient Armenian language date back to the fifth century BC. The time span between these languages reaches even two thousand years. Chronological reasons allow us to conclude that

⁴ Herodotus of Halicarnassus, a Greek historian from the 5th century BC, considers the Sarmatians, referred to by him as Sauromats, to be the eastern neighbours of the Scythians (Hdt. IV 20), locating their settlements behind the Tanais River (i.e. beyond the Don) and the Maeotis (i.e. Sea of Azov). In other words, still in the middle of the first millennium before Christ, the ancestors of the Ossetians lived in the immediate vicinity of the Finno-Ugric peoples.

⁵ Numerous Finno-Ugric borrowings in the Ossetic language were discussed by Joki (1962: 147–170). See also Menges (1964: 183–184) and Joki (1974: 191–196).

in the observed situation we can only talk about the lexical influence of the Anatolian languages on the Armenian language. An intermediary medium could be the extinct Urartian language, used in ancient times in the area of today's Armenia.

We should also add that the Hittite word *hūmmaš* c. 'stable, cowshed, pigsty', with clear Indo-European etymology (< PIE. **h₂óymos*) has close equivalents in other Anatolian languages (Luw. *hūmmaš* c. 'pigsty', *hūmmati*- 'stable', HLuw. *humati*- 'base, basis, pedestal') and a good motivation in insular Celtic languages, cf. OIr. *úam* f. (*ā*-stem), also *úama* f. (*d*-stem) 'cave, burrow, lair of wild boar'.

9. Once again about the origin of Gk. κούμος / κουμάσιον

The Anatolian origin of two Modern Greek appellatives κούμος m. and κουμάσι n. 'small room for animals; henhouse, dovecote, doghouse, pigsty' and related words confirmed in the Balkan context, e.g. in the language of Ottoman Turks as *küm* / *kümes* 'henhouse, cot, cottage, hut' has been proposed in a separate paper (Kaczyńska, Witczak 2017). It is worth returning to this issue once again to consider the following question: Could the Greeks (and later the Ottoman Turks) borrow an Anatolian word via the Armenians?

This possibility cannot be rejected *a priori* because the Greek-Armenian contacts, already existing in ancient times, were rapidly intensified after the Armenian adoption of Christianity in 4th c. AD. Greek lexical influences can be easily observed in Armenian religious and scientific vocabulary. However, the influence of the Armenian language on Middle Greek is less visible, although in the Byzantine era we can see some traces of it, in particular in the vernacular. Let us also recall that the lexicon of Hesychius of Alexandria, recording for the first time the Ancient Greek lexeme κουμάσιον ('henhouse'), was created only at the end of the 5th c. AD. The Armenian intermediary in the transmission of this lexical bundle is therefore not ruled out, especially that the Western Armenians, as a result of the so-called Cilician consonant shift, replaced the Old Armenian form *gom* 'cowshed, stable, sheepfold, pigsty' with its Western Armenian variant of *kum* 'cowshed' (Ačařjan 1971: 574–575; Martirosyan 2009: 225). Mod. Gk. κούμος [ˈkumos] and κουμάσι [kuˈmasi] in its pronunciation resembles the Western Armenian form, quite distinct from the Old Armenian and East Armenian *gom* [gɔm] both in its voiceless character of the onset dorsal consonant, and the difference in the root vocalisation (Gk. κ [k] against

Arm. Գ [g]; Gk. ου [u] against Arm. օ [o]). Unfortunately, the assumed dating of the Cilician consonant shift to the Middle Ages (9th–10th c.) seems to rule out Armenian transmission with regard to the Modern Greek appellatives *κουμάσι* (< AGk. *κουμάσιον*) and *κούμος*.

It should also be noted that in ancient times, the Greeks from Asia Minor (mainly Aeolians, Ionians and Pamphylans) for many centuries had contacts with the local population of Anatolian origin, including Carians, Lydians, Lycians and many other nations. It is easier to assume a direct lexical influence of Anatolian languages on Greek (Mod.Gk. *κούμος* ← HLuw. *hūmmaš*; Mod.Gk. *κουμάσι* < AGk. *κουμάσιον* ← Luw. *hūmmati* ‘stable’) than a mediation of the Armenian language, quite distant from the original Hellenic settlements.

In my opinion, it is not possible to derive two Turkish lexemes *küm* / *kümes* ‘henhouse; cot, cottage, hut’ from the West Armenian source. It should be noted that the semantics of both Turkish nouns is convergent with the meaning of the Modern Greek words, as well as with the Old Greek appellative *κουμάσιον* n. ‘henhouse’ (confirmed already in the 5th c. AD in the dictionary by Hesychius of Alexandria), and different from the sense of ‘cowshed’, documented in the West Armenian term *kum*, see also EArm. *gom* ‘sheepfold, cowshed, stable, pigsty’.

10. Conclusions

A thorough analysis of the linguistic facts has led to the following conclusions:

10.1. The Arm. *gom* ‘sheepfold, stable, cowshed, pigsty’ is not a native word, but an ancient Anatolian borrowing.

10.2. The correspondence of the Armenian word with ON. *gammi* ‘Saami hut, dugout’ seems to be excluded both from the semantic and phonological point of view.

10.3. The Northern Germanic (or Nordic) words are probably borrowings from a Saami source.

10.4. Contemporary Caucasian (and Iranian) languages are characterized by a heterogeneous (two-layer) lexical material, in which two following meanings alternate: (1) ‘pantry, granary’ and (2) ‘room for farm animals’. The suggestion of Abaev that the two above meanings are a natural result of the former material culture of the inhabitants of the Caucasus was rejected.

10.5. A research hypothesis was put forward that the first lexical bundle is of Finno-Ugric origin, and its transfer to the Caucasian languages took place via Iranian Ossetians. In other words, the following relationship was assumed: FU. **kðm3* ‘granary, pantry’ > Ost. *kõm* ‘granary, pantry’ (vel sim.) → Osset. *gom, gon, gondan* ‘grain box, granary’ → Sv. *gwem* ‘pantry’; Kab. *gwän* ‘grain box, grain storehouse’, Ad. *kon* ‘upward widening woven granary, covered on the outside with clay and covered with straw’; Che. *čõ*, obl. *čõna-* ‘grain storage, pantry’; Ing. *ke*, obl. *keno* ‘pantry’ etc.

10.6. The second lexical bundle of Anatolian origin reached the Caucasus and nearby Iranian languages via Armenian. Therefore, the following direction of borrowing is assumed: PIE. **h₂óymos* ‘animal den’ > Anat. **haumaš* c. ‘stable, cowshed, pigsty’ → Arm. *gom* ‘sheepfold, stable, cowshed, pigsty’ → Kurd. *gõm, gõv* f. ‘sheepfold, cowshed, pigsty’, Geo. *gomi* ‘pigsty’, *gomuri* ‘country house; pigsty’, etc.

Language abbreviations

Abkh.	– Abkhaz	Km.	– Kamassian
Ad.	– Adyghe	Kurd.	– Kurdish
AGk.	– Ancient Greek	Liv.	– Livonian
Anat.	– Anatolian	Luw.	– Luwian
Arm.	– Armenian	Md.	– Mordvin
Av.	– Avestan	Mksh.	– Moksha (dialect of Mordvin)
Che.	– Chechen	Mod.Gk.	– Modern Greek
Cher.	– Cheremis	Norw.	– Norwegian
Dig.	– Digoron (dialect of Ossetic)	NPers.	– New Persian
EArm.	– Eastern Armenian	OArm.	– Old Armenian
Erz.	– Erza (dialect of Mordvin)	ODan.	– Old Danish
Est.	– Estonian	OInd.	– Old Indic
Fi.	– Finnish	OLr.	– Old Irish
FU.	– Finno-Ugric	ON.	– Old Norse
G.	– German	OPers.	– Old Persian
Geo.	– Georgian	Osset.	– Ossetic
Gk.	– Greek	Ost.	– Ostyak
Hitt.	– Hittite	PG.	– Proto-Germanic
HLuw.	– Hieroglyphic Luwian	PIE.	– Proto-Indo-European
Hom.	– Homeric	SaaN.	– Saami (northern dialect)
Hu.	– Hungarian	Sv.	– Svan
Icel.	– Icelandic	Sw.G.	– Swiss dialect of the German language
IE.	– Indo-European	Swed.	– Swedish
Ing.	– Ingush	Turk.	– Turkish
Ir.	– Iron (dialect of Ossetic)	Ur.	– Uralic
Iran.	– Iranian	Vty.	– Votyak
Kab.	– Kabardian	WArm.	– West Armenian
		Yaghn.	– Yaghnobi
		Yen.	– Yenisey Samoyed
		Zr.	– Ziryene

References

- Abaev, V. I. / Абаев, В. И. (1959): *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка*. Vol. I. Москва–Ленинград.
- Abaev, V. I. / Абаев, В. И. (1973): *Историко-этимологический словарь осетинского языка*. Vol. II. Ленинград.
- Ačařjan, H. H. (1971): *Hayeřēn armatakan bařaran* [Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Language]. Vol. I. Yerevan.
- Bader, F. (1974): *Suffixes grecs en -m-: Recherches comparatives sur l'hétéroclisie nominale*. Genève–Paris.
- Brownson, C. L. (1961): Xenophon, *Anabasis*, Books IV–VII, with an English translation by C. L. Brownson, and *Symposium and Apology*, with an English translation by G. J. Todd. London–Cambridge. (MA)
- Collinder, B. (1977): *Fenno-Ugric Vocabulary. An Etymological Dictionary of the Uralic Language*. Hamburg.
- Duda, H. (2000): *Bardzo krótkie wprowadzenie do językoznawstwa nostratycznego*. [In:] *Język polski. Współczesność. Historia*. Vol. I. W. Książek-Bryłowa, H. Duda (eds.). Lublin 2000, pp. 155–163.
- Falk, H. S., Torp, A. (1910): *Norwegisch-dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. I. Heidelberg.
- Gamkrelidze, T. V., Ivanov, V. V. (1995): *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans. A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*. Vol. II. Berlin–New York.
- Greppin, J. A. C. (1983): *An Etymological Dictionary of the Indo-European Components of Armenian*. “Bazmavep” CXXI, pp. 235–323.
- Hewitt, G. (2004): *Introduction to the Study of the Languages of the Caucasus*. München.
- Hübschmann, H. (1897): *Armenische Grammatik*. Theil I: *Armenische Etymologie*. Leipzig.
- Hug, A. (1889): *Xenophontis Expeditio Cyri*. Lipsiae.
- Illich-Svitych, V., M. / Иллич-Свитыч, В. М. (1971): *Опыт сравнения ностратических языков*. Vol. I. Москва.
- Joki, A. J. (1962): *Finnisch-ugrisches im Ossetischen?* [In:] *Commentationes Finno-Ugricae in honorem Paolo Ravila* (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne CXXV). Helsinki, pp. 147–170.
- Joki, A. J. (1974): *Ossetisch und die Finnougristik (Eine Übersicht)*. “Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae” XXIV (1/4), pp. 191–196.
- Kaczyńska, E., Witzak, K. T. (2017): *Wyjątkowy bałkanizm anatolijskiego pochodzenia*. “Prace Językoznawcze” XIX (3), pp. 53–69.
- Karantsian, G. A. / Капанцян, Г. А. (1931): *Chetto-Armeniaca*. Ереван.
- Karantsian, G. A. / Капанцян, Г. А. (1956): *Историко-лингвистические работы к начальной истории армян: Древняя Малая Азия*. Ереван.
- Karapotosoglou, K. / Καραποτόσογλου, Κ. (2005): *Ετυμολογικά της δυτικής κρητικής διαλέκτου*. “Λεξικογραφικόν Δελτίον” XXV, pp. 69–117.
- Klimov, G. A. (1991): *Some Thoughts on Indo-European-Kartvelian Relations*. “The Journal of Indo-European Studies” XIX (3–4), pp. 325–341.
- Klimov, G. A. (1994a): *Einführung in die kaukasische Sprachwissenschaft*. Hamburg.
- Klimov, G. A. / Климов, Г. А. (1994b): *Древнейшие индоевропейизмы картвельских языков*. Москва.
- Klimov, G. A. (1998): *Etymological Dictionary of the Kartvelian Languages*. Berlin–New York.
- Kowalski, A. P., Rychło, M., Witzak, K. T. (2020): *Is Old Norse gammi an inherited or a borrowed word?*. “Скандинавская филология / Scandinavian Philology” XVIII (1), pp. 72–84.
- Kroonen, G. (2013): *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden–Boston.

- Lidén, E. (1906): *Armenische Studien*. Göteborg.
- Lubotsky, A. M. (1988): *The System of Nominal Accentuation in Sanskrit and Proto-Indo-European*. Leiden–New York–København–Köln.
- Martirosyan, H. (2008): *Studies in Armenian Etymology with Special Emphasis on Dialects and Culture: Indo-European Heritage*. Leiden.
- Martirosyan, H. K. (2009): *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden–Boston.
- Matasović, R. (2009): *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Leiden–Boston.
- Menges, K. H. (1964): *Zur Frage der Beziehungen zwischen den Finnougriern und Osseten*. "Ural-Altaiischer Jahrbücher" XXXVI, pp. 183–184.
- Nikolayev, S. L., Starostin, S. A. (1994): *A North Caucasian Etymological Dictionary*. Moscow.
- Novák, L. (2010): *Jaghnóbsko-český slovník*. Praha.
- Olsen, B. (1999): *The Noun in Biblical Armenian: Origin and Word-Formation with Special Emphasis on the Indo-European Heritage*. Berlin–New York.
- Orfanos, V. / Ορφανός Β. (2014): *Λέξεις τουρκικής προέλευσης στο κρητικό ιδίωμα (Συναγωγή από λεξικά)*. Ηράκλειο.
- Pisowicz, A., Sedoian, S., Ter-Grigorian, N. (2006): *Mały słownik ormiańsko-polski, polsko-ormiański*. Kraków.
- Pokorny, J. (1959): *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern–München.
- Puhvel, J. (1991): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. III. Berlin–New York.
- Rastorgueva, V. S., Edelman, D. I. / Расторгуева, В. С., Эдельман, Д. И. (2007): *Этимологический словарь иранских языков*. Vol. III. Москва.
- Rédei, K. (1988): *Uralisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. I. Budapest.
- Stachowski, M. (2011): *Teoria nostratyczna i szkoła moskiewska*. „LingVaria” VI (1), pp. 241–274.
- Shagirov, A. K. / Шаги́ров, А. К. (1977): *Этимологический словарь адыгских (черкесских) языков*. Vol. I. Москва.
- Tsabolov, R. L. / Цаболов, Р. Л. (2001): *Этимологический словарь курдского языка*. Vol. I. Москва.
- Vries, J. de (1977): *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2nd edition. Leiden.
- Walde, A., Pokorny, J. (1930): *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. I. Berlin–Leipzig.