"Guests and '-selves': notes on Armenian reflexive pronouns"

Daniel Kölligan, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, Germany

keywords: Classical Armenian, clitics, reflexive pronouns, grammaticalization

Cliticization is a recurrent process in pre-literary and literary Armenian, attested from the 5th c. CE onward, as can be seen e.g. in the clitic articles =s/d/n (with 1st/2nd/3rd person deixis respectively) attached to a preceding noun such as *manowk* 'a boy' : *manowk=n* 'the boy', in the combination of the pronominal stems **so/to/k̑o-* with the particle *ay* showing an early loss of *-y* (**say > sa* 'this one', but DAT SG *smay-n* 'to him', cf. with the inverse order *ay-s* 'this one') and in the proclitic prepositions *c‘=* 'toward' (e.g. *c‘na* 'to her/him'), *y=* /_V (*i/_C*) 'in(to)' (e.g. *y=erkins* 'in heaven'), and *z=* 'around, concerning, towards' also used for differential object marking (e.g. *tesanem manowk* 'I see a boy.' vs *tesanem z=manowk=n* 'I see the boy.').[1] In historical times, *kay*, the 3rd SG PRS of *kam* 'stand, be', + *ow* 'and' coalesces with the following predicate into a complex phrase, e.g. *kow tay* 'gives/will give', and further grammaticalizes into a present tense marker in Modern Western Armenian and a future tense marker in Modern Eastern Armenian, e.g. *k-grem* [kəgərém] 'I will write' (Dum-Tragut 2009: 253).[2] A similar development is seen in the future marker *t-* in the Western Armenian dialect of Shatax which goes back to Classical Armenian *piti* 'necessity' (Vaux 1995).[3]

The paper will argue that cliticization is a process also relevant for the prehistory of one of the reflexive pronouns of Classical Armenian and a phonologically corresponding verbal ending. For the 3rd person a pronoun *iwr* is used (*iwr* GEN/DAT/LOC, *iwrew* INSTR, *iwrmē* ABL, PL *iwreank‘* NOM, ACC/LOC *iwreans*, GEN/DAT/ABL *iwreanc‘*, INSTR *iwreambk‘*), whose NOM and ACC SG is supplied either by *ink‘n* (GEN *ink‘ean* etc., PL *ink‘eank‘*) or by the noun *anjn* 'self, person' which together with the corresponding possessive pronoun may also be used for reference to speaker and addressee, e.g. *z-anjn im* [ACC-self 1SG.GEN] 'myself'. Beside this, for the 1st and 2nd person the simple pronouns are used, e.g. from the New Testament John 5.31 *es vkayem vasn im* [1SG.NOM give_testimony.1SG.PRS about 1SG.GEN] 'I give testimony about myself.' (cf. Jensen 1959: 77–79):

	personal pronoun	*iwr/ink‘n*	*anjn* + possessive pronoun/*iwr*
1st	+	-	+
2nd	+	-	+
3rd	-	+	+

The paper will discuss the various etymological proposals made for these forms. For *ink‘n* it will be argued that it is likely to continue a reduplicated form of the PIE reflexive pronoun **s(u̯)e* as found in Lat. *sese*, for *anjn* a connection with PIE **h₂emǵh-e/on-* (Goth. *hals-agga* 'throat') will be suggested. The grammaticalization into a reflexive is argued to be due to Iranian influence, cf. Middle Persian *grīw* meaning both 'throat, neck' (Skt. *grīvā-*) and 'person, self'. While both *ink‘n* and *anjn* are synchronically orthotone words, the status of *iwr* is debatable. Following recent discussions about the probable common origin of *iwr* and the noun *hiwr* 'guest' (de Lamberterie 2014), it will be argued that a derivative of PIE **s(u̯)e-*, i.e. **setros* (cf. Gk. ἕταιρος 'fellow'), resulted both in the noun 'guest' and the reflexive pronoun whose cliticization caused the loss of word-initial /h/ (cf. *erkeriwr* '200' from *erkow/-i°* '2' + *hariwr* '100'). Finally, the 3SG imperfect mediopassive ending *-iwr* as found e.g. in Łazar P‘arpec‘i (5th c.) *hetewiwr* '(s)he followed' will be argued to derive from a verb phrase with the cliticized variant of the same etymon.

---

1 On possible enclitics becoming proclitis in pre-literary Armenian cf. Hill et al. (2019).

2 Some modern dialects (Hamshen, Gyumri, Akhalkalaki) both pre- and suffix *kow* (or its respective phonological outcomes /gu, gə, g/) according to phonological and/or syntactic factors, in the dialect of Akhalkalaki /gə/ may also attach to any other focussed element (Bezrukov and Dolatian 2020). This may be a remnant of a stage after the univerbation of *kay* with *ow*, since the syntax of the original phrase was fixed.

3 For an analysis of the clitic behaviour of the copula in Modern Eastern Armenian cf. Kahnemuyipour & Megerdoomian (2011). In the classical language the copula is not a clitic, but may host clitics itself, e.g. the proclitic negative particle *č‘=*, Mt 25.4 *č‘=ē aržan* [NEG 3SG.PRS right] 'it is not right'.

References

Bezrukov, Nikita, and Hossep Dolatian. 2020. 'Mobile Affixes Across Western Armenian: Conflicts Across Modules'. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 26.1: Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Penn Linguistics Conference: 12.

Dum-Tragut, Jasmine. 2009. *Armenian: Modern Eastern Armenian*. London Oriental and African Language Library. Amsterdam: Benjamins

Hill, Eugen, Daniel Kölligan, Corinna Scheungraber, & Michael Frotscher. 2019. "The development of prefixation in time and space - Ditropic clitics and prosodic realignment in dialects of Indo-European". *TPhS* 117 (2): 157–98.

Jensen, Hans. 1959. *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kahnemuyipour, Arsalan, and Karine Megerdoomian. 2011. 'Second-Position Clics in the vP Phase: The Case of the Armenian Auxiliary'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42 (1): 152–62.

de Lamberterie, Charles. 2014. 'Arménien իւր *iwr* et hիւր *hiwr*, Grec ἕταιρος: le "soi" et le "sien", l''hôte' et le "compagnon"'. In *Mélanges Jean-Pierre Mahé*, edited by Aram Mardirossian, Agnès Ouzounian, and Constantin Zuckerman. Paris: Association des Amis du Centre d´Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance, 429–38.

Vaux, Bert. 1995. 'A Problem in Diachronic Armenian Verbal Morphology'. In *New Approaches to Medieval Armenian Language and Literature*, edited by Jos. J. S. Weitenberg. Leiden: Brill.