Armenian is nowadays the official language of the southernmost republic of the Commonwealth of Independent States and is spoken by around four million people living in an area of approximately 29,900 square kilometres. A so-called 'Western' variety of the language is known and used not only by small communities still present in the territory of the Republic of Turkey, but also by an unknown number of emigrants or their descendants in various countries of the world. These speakers, although inevitably bilingual, preserve links with the language and culture of their origin. The area where Eastern Armenian is spoken nowadays – the Armenian republic and a small linguistic enclave in north-western Iran – is smaller than the area which was the historical homeland of the Armenian people from the sixth century BC onwards. It is then that we have the first mention of the Armenians, in an inscription of Darius I at Behistūn. Since that time the Armenians have been present in a broad area of Transcaucasia bounded by Mount Ararat, Lake Van and the sources of the Tigris and the Euphrates. This same area had previously been the seat of the Urartian kingdom, which was definitely destroyed by the Medes and incorporated into their kingdom at the end of the seventh century BC.

The proto-history of the Armenian language extends up to relatively recent times, in that classical Armenian or the grabar (written language), which is the linguistic phase with which we shall be concerned in this chapter, is documented only from the fifth century AD onwards, after the creation by a priest called Mašt’oc’ (also known as Mesrop) of an original alphabet with signs for the vowels, much closer to the Greek model than to the writing systems of Asia Minor. The traditional date of this historical event varies between AD 406 and AD 407, but similar attempts had probably been made previously, at least since the Armenian kingdom had been evangelized and Christianity had become the state religion in AD 301. Tradition also tells of a previous alphabet, created by the Syriac bishop Daniel, which was abandoned because it was not suited to the phonological inventory of the language.

The reasons why Sahak, the Patriarch of Armenia, and the Armenian king Vramşapuh entrusted to Mašt’oc’ the task of elaborating an alphabet were essentially of two kinds: on the one hand, a widening gap was forming between the people and their faith, because the liturgy was conducted in
Greek or Syriac, according to the area; on the other hand there was a need for effective measures to counter the Mazdaic propaganda from the East which was intensifying and becoming increasingly insistent in the kingdom of Armenia.

The grabar appears to be a language without any dialectal differentiation. Even in recent times there has been much debate about this apparent uniformity: Ovsepjan (1976) maintains that administrative, religious and commercial needs in a state with extensive urban development like Armenia had led to the formation, as early as the Hellenistic period, of an inter-dialectal spoken language which had been the model for a literary language prior to the emergence of the written form, that epic poems and legends had been handed down in it and that it had been used for all cultural expression. However, within this uniform language traces have been found of a very few variant phonological elements which may be interpreted as the emergence of dialectal differences; here it will suffice to cite the Armenian dual development \( c/t \) of IE \(*\hat{g}\) which may be reconstructed in cases such as \( \text{bucanem} \) 'I forage' as opposed to \( \text{but} \) 'forage, fodder' < IE \(*b\hat{w}g\).\(^1\)

From the point of view of the structure of the language we can speak of a substantially uniform classical language prior to the emergence of Middle Armenian (twelfth to seventeenth centuries AD) because the authors of literary works sought to model their language on that of the authors of the so-called 'Golden Age' literature (i.e. those authors who wrote in the period between AD 407 and 460-70); however, a close analysis of texts written later than the fifth century shows that within the literary output of this period it is possible, on the basis of linguistic features, to distinguish two subperiods, which we term 'post-classical' (sixth to seventh centuries) and 'pre-Middle Armenian' (eighth to twelfth centuries). From the seventeenth century to modern times, although the grabar was still the courtly model to imitate, there emerged a language which was closer to the spoken form. Within this there was a notable split into two broad varieties, Eastern and Western Armenian.

The first documents written in Armenian (in addition to the translation of the Bible) were a large number of other translations of Syriac and Greek texts. The originals of some of these have been lost and they are thus known to us only thanks to the Armenian version. On the whole they are ecclesiastical texts, but they also include secular material such as a large part of the works of Aristotle and the Neoplatonist philosophers such as Porphyry, Probus and Diodorus, and the grammatical treatise by Dionysius Thrax. In addition, a great deal of original literary works suddenly appeared after the invention of the alphabet: among the first of these were historical works such as the 'History of the Conversion of Armenia by Gregory the Illuminator' written by Aga't'angелos, the biography of Maš't'oc' outlined by Korinw, and religious treatises such as 'Against the Sects' by Ez'ник of Kołb, which is a valuable source of information about various religious beliefs that threatened Christianity in the early centuries.
Despite the fact that historical Armenia is held by some scholars to be the original homeland of the IE peoples, it seems unlikely that the Armenians have always lived in the Transcaucasian area. If, then, they settled in their historical territory having come from the west in successive waves on the decline of the Urartian power, we know hardly anything about the extremely long formative period of the Armenian language, since we lack attestations of any kind. The language documented in the fifth century AD looks very unusual as a member of the IE family: its phonological structure is very different from those of the other IE languages and much more closely resembles those of the Caucasian languages; almost 40 per cent of its vocabulary consists of borrowings, a large number of which are words of obscure origin; its morphology is much more Indo-European than the two above-mentioned areas might lead us to expect, but in the area of morphology, too, there have been a large number of far-reaching innovations.

Scholars who have wondered about the position of Armenian within Indo-European have always come to conclusions of a rather generic nature. On the basis of a ‘pluralist’ classification – one which makes use of all available criteria and not just a few arbitrarily chosen ones – it seems possible to claim that the languages with which Armenian shares the most notable and most numerous isoglosses are Greek, Indo-Iranian and Phrygian (what we know of it). Ancient evidence stresses the Phrygian origin of the Armenians, but the sparse attestations of the Phrygian language cannot be of help from the point of view of placing the Armenians historically. However, archaeological data would seem to reduce the importance of the Phrygian element in the origin of the Armenian people, since in eastern Anatolia there are none of the characteristic tumuli typical of the Phrygian kingdom, in particular of Gordium. According to the archaeological theory, the Phrygians were part of a small group of invaders who imposed themselves on a body of people ethnically related to the Hurrians and the Hattians (and thus, indirectly, to the Urartians). After the destruction of Gordium and Midas City, these ‘Phrygianized’ peoples, who had adopted the language of the Phrygian rulers but had not adopted some of their customs (such as burying their kings and military leaders in tumuli) sought out new lands to the east of the upper Euphrates and gradually came to settle in Urartian territory, driving the original peoples – traditionally the Alarodi – towards the less fertile mountain regions. In this regard we must mention the theory put forward recently by Soviet scholars (Diakonoff and Starostin 1986), according to which there exist obvious correspondences, as regards both the basic lexicon and some morphological characteristics, between the proto-forms which may be reconstructed for around thirty languages spoken in the north-eastern part of the Caucasus by small – sometimes tiny – communities, and the Hurrian and Urartian languages, which are genetically related to each other. However, a current line of research investigating the relationship between Armenian and the Hurro-Urartian languages, although promising, has not yet provided any
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definite contribution. The great bulk of the vocabulary of obscure origin has not been explained other than minimally: in recent times there has been more detailed work on terms of Mesopotamian and Kartvelian origin (cf. Cardona 1983), but the broad outlines of the linguistic proto-history of Armenian still remain very largely conjectural.

Better known are the lexical borrowings from Greek, Syriac and above all Iranian, which has had a marked influence on Armenian for many centuries. Within the great mass of Iranian borrowings, different layers can be perceived: the oldest, apart from a few doubtful examples attributed to the period of Median domination (end of the seventh to middle of the sixth centuries BC) goes back to the time of the Achaemenids (550–330 BC), when Armenia was under Iranian domination but not completely Iranianized: cf. Arik 'Aryan' < OPers. Ariya-; tšami 'enemy' < OPers. *duš-manyu-; gušak 'informer' < OPers. *gaušaka-. The majority of Iranian borrowings, however, belong to the period during which a branch of the Parthian dynasty of the Arsacids (AD 53–428) was dominant in Armenia; this is demonstrated by the north-eastern dialect characteristics of these words, of which it will suffice here to cite the following:

- presence of /s/ instead of /h/: Arm. vnas 'wrong, damage, harm', cf. MPers. wināh
- presence of /z/ instead of /d/: Arm. yazem 'I adore', cf. OPers. yad-
- presence of /r/ (< Parth. /dr/) instead of /l/: Arm. xoyr 'diadem', cf. Man. MPers. xöy
- presence of /(r)h/ instead of /sl/: Arm. parh/pah 'guard', cf. NewPers. pāš

A more recent and less obvious layer comprises loans from Middle Persian of the Sasanian epoch. In this period there come in mainly technical terms relating to the military, administrative, legal and commercial spheres, cf. Arm. sālar 'chief, general' < MPers. sālar < *sardār.

As well as these dialect areas of Iranian borrowings, another, called Parnian, has been distinguished. This links Armenian with the Eastern Iranian dialects and consists of loans which correspond to terms attested only in Sogdian. These would appear to be elements belonging to the language spoken by those peoples who, moving from the east, conquered Parthia and abandoned their Sogdian-related language in favour of Parthian, which, however, ended up permeated with eastern elements: cf. margarē 'prophet', Sogd. mārkarē 'magician'; kari 'much', Sogd. k’dy; baw 'enough', Sogd. βāw 'satiety'.
Phonology

Vowels

Armenian is characterized with respect to the IE vowel system by the loss of the quantitative opposition, with the following development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE</th>
<th>/a:/</th>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>/o:/</th>
<th>/o/</th>
<th>/e:/</th>
<th>/e:/</th>
<th>/i:/</th>
<th>/i:/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arm.</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>(a/)</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>/et/</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the loss of the quantitative opposition, the Armenian vowels underwent further changes consisting of the raising of /e/ to /i/ and /o/ to /u/ before nasals.

Another important change which took place before the written phase was the change of /i/ and /u/ to /a/ (on the whole not written) in unaccented syllables: this change was caused by the strong stress accent which had become fixed in Proto-Armenian on the original penultimate syllable, perhaps under the influence of Urartian; as well as causing the weakening of /i/ and /a/, this led to the loss of the vowel in the final syllable, regardless of what that vowel was.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IE</th>
<th>*a/</th>
<th>Arm. atam ‘grind’, Gk aléō</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>/a:/</td>
<td>Arm. bam ‘speak’, Dor. Gk phāmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>Arm. es ‘I’, Gk egō; Arm. cin ‘birth’, Gk génos, Ved. jānah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>/e:/</td>
<td>Arm. mit ‘mind’, Gk méodos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>Arm. ost ‘branch’, Gk ózōs, Goth. asts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>/o:/</td>
<td>Arm. ul ‘kid’, Gk pōlos, Goth. fula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>*i/</td>
<td>Arm. egit ‘he found’, Gk eīde &lt; évide, Ved. avidat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>*i:/</td>
<td>Arm. siwn ‘column’, Gk kāōn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>*u/</td>
<td>Arm. nu ‘daughter-in-law’, Gk nyós, Lat. nurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>Arm. mukn ‘mouse’, Gk mīs, Lat. mās</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the Armenian reflexes of the IE vowels, several cases are still unclear; these are:

1. Arm. /a/ instead of expected /e/; cf. Arm. vašun ‘sixty’ beside Arm. vec’ ‘six’; Arm. tasn ‘ten’ beside Gk déka, Lat. decem; Arm. catr ‘laugh’ beside Gk gelōs;
2. Arm. /a/ instead of expected /o/; cf. Arm. akm ‘eye’ beside Gk ósse; Arm. ateam ‘hate’ beside Lat. odium.
As regards the phonetic realization in Armenian of */H/ between stops, where a very short vowel is produced before or after the laryngeal, the Armenian reflex is in every case /a/, irrespective of the series to which the above-mentioned laryngeal belonged: cf. *ph₂ter > Arm. hayr ‘father’.

On the other hand, according to Kortlandt (1987), different reflexes of the sequences */h₁-o-/ and */h₃-e-/ may be traceable in Armenian, not as regards the vowel quality (which would be /o/ in both cases because */h₁/, unlike */h₁/, alters the quality of the neighbouring vowel towards backness), but from the presence or absence of Arm. /h-/: *h₁orbʰo- > Arm. orb orphan’, while *h₃edos > Arm. hot ‘smell’.

**Diphthongs**

As with the development of vowels from the IE phase to Armenian, in the case of the diphthongs it is also possible to establish phases of relative chronology. Assuming that Indo-European had the diphthongs */aj/, */ej/, */oj/, */ew/, */ow/, */aw/ (see Chapter 2, p. 50), in the first phase of the development from Indo-European to Armenian original */ej/ and */oj/ would have merged in */ej/, while original */ew/ and */ow/ would have undergone a mirror-image development and merged in */ow/.

Subsequently, after */ow/ had given Arm. /oy/ and new diphthongs had arisen with labial second elements derived from the weakening of stops, as in Arm. ewfn ‘seven’ < *septm, or from -m- between sonants, as in Arm. anun ‘name’ < *anown < *nomn, a new system of the following type was created:

/aj/ */ej/ /oj/ /aw/ /ew/ /iw/ */ow/

which was finally modified by the closure of */ej/ to /e/ and of */ow/ to /u/; this latter vowel merged with original /u/ before the spread of the alternation /u/ ~ /α/ which was linked with the stress accent. This accent-determined alternation also affected /e/ and /oy/ and the so-called diphthong /ea/ (< */i/ + /a/), which in atonic syllables became /i/, /u/ and /e/ respectively:

IE */aj/ Arm. ayc ‘goat’, Gk aix
IE */ej/ Arm. edēz ‘he accumulated’, Ved. déhmi ‘smear’
IE */oj/ Arm. déz ‘heap, pile’, Gk toikhos
IE */aw/ Arm. awró ‘place to spend the night’, Gk aulis
IE */ew/ Arm. loys ‘light’, Gk leukós
IE */ow/ Arm. boyc ‘nourishment’, Ved. bhogah ‘pleasure, delight’

**Syllabic Consonants**

As is well known, in IE, /m/ /n/ /l/ /l/ between or before stops, before /s/ or /H/, and in absolute final position after most consonants, were realized as allophones with the feature [+syllabic]. Their development into Armenian systematically introduced a supporting vowel /a/; consequently the reflexes
were /am/, /an/, /al/ (/*al/), /ar/: Arm. am ‘year’ < *sma-; Arm. negative prefix an- < *η-; Arm. barjr ‘high’ < *bʰr̥ɨhʊs; Arm. katin ‘acorn’ < *gw̱-eno-.

Consonants

The traditional interpretation posits three series of stops for the common IE phase (a fourth series, consisting of voiceless aspirates, not being attributable to common IE) characterized as (I) voiced, (II) voiced aspirate and (III) voiceless. According to this interpretation, Armenian has innovated greatly. However, the stop series listed above have recently undergone a reinterpretation, due above all to Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (see in particular (1980) and see Chapter 2, Obstruents, p. 33), on the basis of typological considerations: from this point of view, the traditional series seem implausible and unrealistic because they go against typologically established phonological universals. Consequently, three series with characteristics very different from the traditional ones have been postulated: (I) glottalic (corresponding to the voiced stops); (II) voiced stops, possibly realized phonetically with aspiration (corresponding to the voiced aspirates); (III) voiceless stops, possibly with aspirated allophones (corresponding to the voiceless stops). If we accept that the IE stops were distinguished from each other in this way (and various factors support the theory, including the fact that series I is still attested in Sindhi, a modern Indo-Iranian dialect), then Armenian, far from having innovated radically, is remarkably archaic in its stop system. Table 8.1 shows the correspondences between the traditional interpretation of phonological characteristics (to which we adhere for convenience in citing examples in the present work) and the more recent interpretation; the reflexes in Classical Armenian are given in the customary transliteration (see the note on transliteration at the end of this chapter).

Examples

Series I

1. very few, uncertain examples: Arm. stipem ‘I constrain’, cf. Gk steibō
2. Arm. tur ‘gift’, cf. Gk dōron
   Arm. art ‘field’, Lat. ager
4. Arm. křunk ‘crane’, cf. Gk géranos, Lat. grūs

Series II

1. Arm. berem ‘I bear’, cf. Gk pherō, Ved. bhārāmi; Arm. instr. ending -w/-v, e.g. in azga-w (nom. azg ‘people’), but geto-v (nom. get ‘river’)
Table 8.1 Reflexes of the consonant system in Armenian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Recent</th>
<th>Armenian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series I</strong>&lt;br&gt;voiced stops</td>
<td>glottalics</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;((/p'/))&lt;br&gt;((/p/))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (/bl/)</td>
<td>(/p'/)</td>
<td>(/p/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 /d/</td>
<td>/ç'/</td>
<td>/s/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 /g/</td>
<td>/k'/ &gt; */ç'/</td>
<td>/ç/ (/ç/)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 /g/</td>
<td>/k'/</td>
<td>/ç/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 /g'/</td>
<td>/k'/</td>
<td>/ç/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Series II</strong>&lt;br&gt;voiced aspirates</td>
<td>voiced (aspirated)</td>
<td>&lt;br&gt;/bh/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 /bh/</td>
<td>/bh/</td>
<td>/bh/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 /dh/</td>
<td>/dh/</td>
<td>/dh/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 /gh/</td>
<td>/g/; /gh/; &gt; */ç(h)/; &gt;</td>
<td>/ç/; /ç-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 /gh/</td>
<td>/g/; /gh/;</td>
<td>/ç/; /ç-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 /gwh/</td>
<td>/gwh/</td>
<td>/gwh/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Series III**<br>voiceless | voiceless (aspirated) |<br>/p/ | /p/; /p'/ |<br>/h- or 0; /-w-; /-v-| |
| 1 /p/ | /p/; /p'/ | /h- or 0; /-w-; /-v-| |
| 2 /l/ | /l/; /l'/ | /l- (also after */aw, ow/);<br>/-d (after nasal/liquid)<br>*-/y-/ (>/0); /-w- (before /l/);<br>/l'/; /ç-| |
| 3 /k/ | /k'/; */ç(h)/; > */ç'/; | /ç'/; /ç-|; /ç-| |
| 4 /k/ | /k'/; */ç(h)/; | /ç'/; /ç-|; /ç-| |
| 5 /kw/ | /kw'/; /kwh'/ | /kw'/; /kwh'/ |<br>/kw'/; /kwh'/ |<br>/k'/; /-g (after nasal/liquid); /ç'/ (before /-e, -i/);<br>/ç-| |

(4) Arm. meg ‘cloud’, cf. Ved. mégah


**Series III**


(2) Arm. fařamim ‘I wither’, cf. Gk térsomai, Lat. torrêô; Arm. ard ‘order’, Gk artýs, Ved. ῥτûh; Arm. bay ‘word’, Gk phâthis; Arm. berē ‘he bears’<br>Proto-Arm. *berey, Ved. bharati, Arm. beraw ‘was borne’<br>*bherato

(3) Arm. aseṁ ‘needle’, cf. Gk akís ‘spur’; Arm. c’ax ‘branch’, Ved. sâkhã, Goth. höha ‘plough’

As the outline shows, if the starting point is the traditional one, the Armenian consonants appear extremely innovative when compared to Indo-European, but if we accept the interpretation proposed by Gamkrelidze, Armenian seems to have modified only slightly the IE stop system, essentially losing the glottalic feature and undergoing a few other changes of secondary importance. Of particular interest is the development, common to all the satem languages, of the series of palatalized tectals into compact affricates. In Armenian these subsequently develop into diffuse affricates; this phase is maintained in the historic period for the series I and II (but in intervocalic position the reflex of */3(h)/ is sibilant), while */ç(h)/ reaches the sibilant stage in all positions, except in a limited number of words where the affricate phase of the voiceless (aspirated) palatalized tectals persists. Those cases hitherto identified, in addition to the above-mentioned Arm. cax ‘branch’ < IE *kákā (cf. Ved. sákha, Goth. hōha, Slav. soxa, NewPers. šax), are Arm. cacnul ‘fall’ < *kad-snu-, cf. Lat. cadere and OInd. cad- ‘id.’; Arm. čankl/cang ‘wall, enclosure’, čangel ‘to enclose’, čangel ‘to enclose’ < *kŋ-, cf. Gk kákala.

Vocalic Prothesis
One phenomenon particularly characteristic of Armenian is the notable development of prothetic vowels: the presence of these vowels in Armenian can be explained partially by allowing the presence in the reconstructed IE form of a laryngeal which in the context --[syll] developed into --V[--syll], as for example in Arm. arew ‘sun’ < IE *h2-rewo (cf. the Hittite verb har-wa-na-iz-ci ‘it is light’), or in Arm. ayr ‘man’ < *h2-nër, a nominative form corresponding to Gk anēr, which would have gone through the hypothetical stages *ayyir < *aynir < *anir < *anēr. The existence of an initial laryngeal in this word allows us to take account both of the correspondence with Greek as regards the development of the initial vowel and of the lengthening of the final vowel in the first element of Vedic compounds of the type sünara-, viśvānara-, etc. which have nara- as their second element.

Fairly convincing are some reconstructions, such as the two examples mentioned above, in which the initial vowel a- of Armenian is taken back to an IE /h2-/, while the hypothesis of divergent developments within Armenian itself according to the type of laryngeal postulated for the IE form leads to greater complexity. Kortlandt’s attempt to pinpoint regular derivations appears problematic (on the basis of these, */h1/ + [--syll] became Arm. e-, Gk e-; */h2/ + [--syll] became Arm. o-, Gk o-, but became Arm. a- in open syllables, as might be deduced form the following correspondences: Arm. eluzanem ‘I extract’, eleúsomai; Arm. erek ‘evening’, Gk érebos; Arm.
anicanem 'I curse', Gk óneidos; Arm. օթ ‘weeping’ Gk olophýromai).

If we accept a regular derivation of this type, the deviant cases have to be explained ad hoc: thus the correspondence between Gk ereúgomai and Arm. orcam ‘I belch’ may be taken back to IE /h₁+/ /C/- only if we accept that the Armenian form derives from *eruc- with assimilation of /e-/ to the rounded vowel of the following syllable, even if assimilation of this type is not found in a similar case such as eluzanem.

We note, nevertheless, that the Laryngeal Theory takes account of correspondences in words which in Armenian and Greek (see Chapter 9, p. 233) begin with a vowel, while in other languages they can begin with a consonant, irrespective of the type of consonant which followed the initial laryngeal in the reconstructed IE form: not only liquids and nasals, then, but also other consonants.

However, vocalic prothesis in Armenian is a further-reaching phenomenon, on the basis of which a word cannot begin with certain consonants or certain consonantal clusters and has to have a vocalic onset.

The consonant which is systematically avoided in initial position is /r/-, but sporadically the vocalic onset is also used to avoid initial /l/-, /m/- and /n/-.

The antiquity of the phenomenon is notable, since even loan-terms from other languages are subject to this restraint, such as those which come from Iranian: cf. Arm. erang ‘colour’ < MPers. rang ‘id.’. Arm. aroyr ‘brass’ < MPers. röy ‘copper’ (< *röö).

In addition, the loans from Iranian also exhibit a phenomenon of vowel prothesis sporadically in the case of initial sp-, and systematically in the case of the typically Iranian consonant cluster šs- which gives Arm. šx-. cf. ašxarh ‘world’ < MPers. Parth. šahr (< xšaētra); Arm. aspahan, Gk Aspaddna, Parth. Man. 'sp’h’n, NewPers. Ispāhān, a toponym derived from spāda-‘army’, original meaning ‘(military) field’.

The two initial consonant clusters mentioned above could, however, already have developed the prothetic vowel in their original Iranian dialect, if we accept the hypothesis of Perikhanian (1966; 1971) who, on the basis of attestations in inscriptions from the first half of the second century BC, attributes the prothetic vowel a- before šx- and sp- to the middle phase of the language of the Medes.

The other consonant clusters which determined the Armenian phenomenon of vowel prothesis, with the exception of the cluster *sr- which developed into Arm. Vr-, contained an original voiced or voiced aspirated stop in initial position and almost all had the liquid /r/, originally in second position. This /r/ underwent metathesis in Armenian according to the following pattern: *Cr- > Arm. VrC-, cf. *gwrāwōn > Arm. erkan ‘millstone’, cf. grāvan-, OIr. brau, OCS žrunuvi.

The process of metathesis which changed the cluster *VCr- > VrC- took place systematically even in medial position, cf. *kub'rōs > Arm. surb ‘holy’, cf. Ved. すべき ‘brilliant’. 
Both of these phonetic phenomena, together with others, traditionally controversial, have recently been explained in a particularly brilliant way by Vennemann (1986) on the basis of a theory of syllabic structure which, thanks to few universal rules and one single Armenian-specific syllabification rule, brings apparently disparate phonetic phenomena together within a single explanatory framework. In order to explain the metathesis all we need to say is that, given the Armenian-specific syllabification rule, which states that inter-nuclear consonantal clusters are heterosyllabic (i.e. \( *VCr \rightarrow VC#r \)), a syllabic contact \( A#B \) is the more preferred, the lesser the consonantal strength of \( A \) and the greater that of \( B \); vice versa, if the relations of consonantal strength are reversed, the greater the tendency to change the syllabic structure until the optimal structure is attained.

Since consonantal strength increases according to the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vowels</th>
<th>central liquids</th>
<th>lateral liquids</th>
<th>fricatives</th>
<th>stops and affricates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

it is clear that the central liquids have less consonantal strength than the occlusives, and consequently the syllable contact \( *D/T#r \) is less preferred than the more 'general' heterosyllabic sequence \( *r#D/T \), and it is towards this that Armenian structure tends.

The vowel prothesis fits into this theoretical framework in a fairly convincing manner: before \( *r- \) it is interpreted as one of the methods used to eliminate the weaker syllable margins (these are \( */f/-, */w/-, */l/- \) of word-initial syllable onsets. For \( */w/- \) the method adopted consists in the strengthening of the margin, so that the result is \( /lg/ \) in all positions (except in word-final postvocalic position, where the result is \( /lw/ \) (\( /lw/- \)), cf. Arm. \( \textit{gayl} \) 'wolf', OIr. \( \textit{fail} \) 'id.' < \( *\textit{wajlo} \), while Arm. \( \textit{tiw} \) 'day' < \( *\textit{diwo} \), cf. Skt \( \textit{diva} \) 'sky', Lat. \( \textit{tri- duum} \). On the Armenian reflexes of initial \( */j/- \) there are various theories (\( /j/ \) or \( 0 \) word-initially, \( 0 \) medially, \( /j/ \) after a sonant, but if the sonant is preceded by the vowel \( /a/ \) there is metathesis of \( /j/- \): cf. Arm. \( \textit{jur} \) 'water', Lith. \( \textit{jüra} \), pl. \( \textit{jüres} \) 'sea'; denominatives in \( -\textit{em} \) < IE \( *\textit{-eje} \), Ved. \( -\textit{aya}- \), Gk \( -\textit{êo} \); Arm. \( \textit{anurj} \) 'dream' < \( *\textit{onörjom} \), an ablaut form of \( *\textit{onerm} \) which gives rise to Gk \( \textit{óneiron} \); Arm. \( ayl \) 'other' < \( *\textit{aljo} \), Lat. \( \textit{alius} \), Gk \( \textit{állos} \). As regards \( */l/- \), the elimination of the weak margin would occur with its transformation into \( *Vr- \), perhaps under the influence of a model with vocalic onset due to the development of the laryngeals into vowels.

Prothesis before consonant clusters would be explained by means of a general rule concerning syllable onsets: in this position all consonant clusters are less preferred than syllable onsets with a single consonant. Unlike previous explanations, which saw the metathesis \( *Cr- \rightarrow rC- \) as preceding the development of prothesis, Vennemann sees the prothesis rather as an event preceding the metathesis. We should thus have: \( *CrV- \rightarrow *VC#rV- \rightarrow Vr#CV- \). Vowel prothesis before \( *Cr- \) would, then, be only one of the means used to
avoid word-initial consonant clusters, while other possible expedients would consist of eliminating a consonantal element or fusing two consonants into a single phoneme: the only clusters tolerated would be sequences of sibilant plus occlusive, where the sibilant could be extra-syllabic.

Prothesis before initial consonant clusters affects not only those clusters containing /l/, but also other sequences, such as IE *dw-, which would become *tw- and according to the syllabic hypothesis would subsequently give *tg because of the strengthening of the semi-vowel, then *tk by assimilation. At this point, in order to avoid the initial cluster, we should have the development of the prothetic vowel: *Vtk, split into two syllables as *Vt#kV and subject to change in the coda of the first syllable to avoid a non-preferred syllable contact. In this case the expedient would consist in the replacement of the stop by the weakest consonantal member of the dental series, which is indeed /r/, with the result that we have the sequence that is in fact attested, *tgV: e.g. IE *dwäros > Arm. erkar 'long', cf. Gk dērōs, metrically *dvārōs, Ved. dūrāh.

Still unclear in the syllable-based interpretation of the vowel prothesis are the rare cases where the vowel is prefixed to words beginning in /l-/ and /n-/ for which it is not always possible to hypothesize an initial laryngeal, as in the case of Arm. amis ‘month’, cf. Gk mēn, OIr. mi, Lat. mensis, which allow us to posit a derivation from IE *mēnso-. However, despite the criticisms which have been put forward, particularly by Kortlandt (1989), the syllabic hypothesis makes it possible to interpret many apparently unrelated phenomena on the basis of a small number of general rules. The theory can perhaps be extended to the interpretation of other cases: thus, on the basis of the principle of the simplification of the initial consonantal cluster we can explain why clusters comprising a voiceless stop + /r-/ or /l-/ produce er- and l- respectively: Arm. erēk ‘three’ < *trejēs, cf. Skt trāyāḥ, Lat. trēs; Arm. lu ‘hearing’ < *kluto- cf. Skt śrūta- ‘heard’, Gk klytōs. The same motivation lies behind the development from *pt- to Armenian f: fēii ‘elm’, cf. Gk ptelea. Certain clusters made up of an IE word-initial voiceless stop followed by */j/, */w/ have monophonemic reflexes with an aspirate, such as:

*ktj- > Arm. kēj/ (Arm. ǰogay ‘I went’ < *kJow-â-)
*tw- > Arm. kēj/ (Arm. kēw ‘with you (sg.)’ < *twe-bhī

but the reflex is Arm. /k/ medially after /sl/, cf. Arm. oskēr ‘bone’ < *ostwer).

The explanation provided by Vennemann of the second case could also be extended to the first; according to this model, the hypothetical developments would be:

(a) a consonantal shift by which *ltl > Arm. lēl/*tw- > *fw-

(b) strengthening of the semi-vowels: */-w-/ > */-g-/ (*/fw- > */fg-)

(c) assimilation of voicelessness: *fg- > *fk-
(d) aspiration of the velar, on the basis of which */k/ > */kʰ/ syllable-initially when a preceding aspirate is lost (/s-/ is also considered to be an aspirate: e.g. Arm. k'oyr 'sister' < *swesör; the aspirate nature of the sibilant should be clear from the development */s/ > */h/ > 0 in voiced environments, with sporadic retention of the phase /h-/ before vowels: cf. Arm. al 'salt', Lat. sal, beside Arm. hin 'old', Lat. senex).

Probably point (d) can be postulated not only in the case of the velars but also for other voiceless stops (this would be the justification for the dual reflexes of *sp-, *st-, giving Arm. sp-/p' and st-f; cf. Arm. spařnam < *sper-; Arm. sterj 'sterile' < *ster-; but also Arm. p'und 'pot' < *spond; Arm. frr 'a dripping' < *ster-) and also in the case of an affricate */-ʃ/-, the result of the strengthening of the semi-vowel */fj-/

Consequently, in the case of the first phenomenon we can also postulate similar developments, as follows: */kj- > */kj> */k'- > */k'- > /k'-l, since the reflexes of */tj, */dj, */kj postulated by Godel (1975), which might contradict the above correlation, are uncertain, as well as occurring in a different position (e.g. Arm. mucanem 'I lead in' < *mowd-je-; Arm. lucanem 'I set light to' < *lowk-je-). The reflex of */-dʰj-, of which there is only one certain example, is in medial position: mēj 'middle' < IE *medʰjo-; this has an unexpected vowel with /ē/ < Proto-Arm. */ey/. normally explained as epenthesis of */y/. However, this case could also be incorporated into the framework of the syllabic hypothesis which would also provide a different explanation of the vowel.

If we accept that the syllabic contact *d#j deriving from the IE cluster */dʰj/ is not optimal and requires a weakening of the coda of the first syllable, we can suppose that */yl/, assumed because of the vowel -ē-, was not due to epenthesis under the influence of the original */j/, but is the most obvious result of the weakening of */d/ in the series of the weakest syllable margins.

A consonantal weakening analogous to that suggested above is encountered in many of those consonant clusters with an original voiceless stop which we have already examined, when they come to be internal; here the principle of unfavourable syllable contact leads to changes, for example:

*pn- > Arm. wn-: Arm. tawn 'feast' < *dapni-, cf. OInd. tafn 'victim' (< *dāpno-)
*pt- > Arm. wfr-: Arm. ewfn 'seven', Skt saptá, etc.
*tr- > Arm. wr-: Arm. arowr 'plough', Gk árotron, Lat. arātrum, perhaps also *kr- > Arm. wr-, if Arm. mawruk 'beard' can be made to derive from *smokru-, attested in Lith. smākras 'chin'
*kt- > Arm. wfr-: Arm. alawfr- k 'prayer' (pl. tantum) < *-ak-ti-

The only clusters which did not alter consonantal strength relations were...
*st, *sd, which became Arm. st in all positions: Arm. astē ‘star’, Gk astér, Skt star-; Arm. z-gest ‘clothes’ < *westu-, cf. Lat. vestis; other clusters were simplified into single-phoneme reflexes even medially: *(-)sk/kl- > c: Arm. hacī ‘ash-tree’ < *askiā; *(-)klks- > c: Arm. vec ‘six’ < *useks; *-kj- > c-: Arm. gočem ‘shout, cry’ < *wok-je, Skt vāc- ‘voice’.

**Liquids**

Indo-European */t/ became Armenian /t/ in all positions without exception, apart from sporadic cases of dissimilation: unlike the stops, /t/ in Armenian is retained also in originally final syllable. Armenian also includes /c:/ (transliterated here as 槁) in its phonological inventory; this was both the reflex of IE *sr (in part also of *rs) and a contextual variant of /t/ before nasals which was extended beyond its original context by analogy: cf. Arm. aru ‘stream’ < IE *sruti-; Arm. arnem ‘I do’ beside aor. arari ‘I did’, but arnum ‘I take’ with aor. arī ‘I took’.

IE */l/ has two reflexes in Armenian, one alveolar and one velar. Greppin (1986) claimed to have established the rules governing this dual development: according to this view, these rules would be disturbed only through deviations which were mainly due to analogical extensions within the flection:

1. IE */l-/ > Arm./l-/ in all cases
2. Proto-Arm. word-final */-l/ > Arm. /-l/: Arm. dal ‘yellowish’, Gk thállos
3. IE post-consonantal non-final */-l/ > Arm. /-l-/: Arm. glem ‘I turn’, Lat. volvo
4. IE post-consonantal final */-l/ > Arm. /-l/: Arm. astē ‘star’, Lat. stella
5. IE preconsonantal /-l- > Arm. /-l-/: Arm. olt ‘lament’, Gk olophýromai
6. IE intervocalic */-l/ > Arm. /-l/: Arm. elegen ‘reed’, Gk élegos
7. Arm. */-l-l/ > Arm. /-l-/: Arm. katał ‘den, lair’, Lith. guōlis

**Nasals**

The IE initial and medial nasals had the reflexes /(-)m/-, /(-)n/- in Armenian, except when they were followed by -s: *Ns > Arm. -s, while the inverse sequence *sN > Arm. -N: Arm. us ‘shoulder’ < IE *omsos, Ved. ámsah, Gk ὀμος; Arm. eris ‘three (acc.)’ < IE *trins; Arm. mi ‘one’ < IE *smijos; z-genum ‘I get dressed’ < IE *wesnumi. Note also that */-N-/ between sonants > Arm. /-w-/: cf. Arm. awr ‘day’, Dor. Gk ἀμαρ.

In absolute final position the development of the nasals is linked with the morphological problem of the development of the old inflectional endings; according to the convincing suggestion put forward by Kortlandt (1985), we have the following cases, in chronological order:

1. non-syllabic final nasals > 0 in polysyllables by the following stages: *-VN > *-V after the fixing of the accent on the penultimate syllable;
subsequently *-\(\hat{V}\) > -\(\hat{V}\) > -0. As a result of this change the nominative and accusative singular of -\(\tilde{a}\) stems merged, while -\(o\)-, -\(i\)- and -\(u\)- stems seem to have eliminated the nominative singular sigmatic ending (which ought to give -\(k\)', like the nominative plural ending) in favour of the generalization of the accusative singular as the nominative case (which appears as 0 in so far as it derives from *-\(\hat{V}\) < *-\(V_N\)). For this reason words such as jiwn 'snow' and siwn 'column' are to be compared with the Gk accusative singular forms khiona and kiona and not with the nominative forms; equally the suffix -\(fiwn\) corresponds not to Lat. -\(ti\)ō but to -\(ti\)ōnem.

2 non-syllabic final nasals gave Armenian /-n/ in monosyllables: Arm. k\(\'\)an Lat. quam.

3 final syllabic nasals gave Arm. /-n/: Arm. e\(\'\)wn 'seven'; Arm. sermn 'seed'; this development happened after the change *-\(\hat{V}N\)- > -\(\hat{V}\)-. When *
\(\hat{y}\) became Arm. -\(\hat{a}n\), the nasalization of -\(\hat{V}N\) was exhausted; for this reason medial */-N/- developed into Arm. -\(\hat{a}n\)- (cf. e\(\'\)\(\'\)anasun 'seventy') while finally the vowel in the final syllable was lost, so that *-\(\hat{a}n\) > Arm. /-n/.

**Sibilants**

As with the nasals, the development of */s/ (whose initial and medial developments have already been discussed) in absolute final position is linked to the morphological problem of the development of the IE flectional endings. In the nominal flection, -\(\hat{k}\)' appears as a plural marker in both the nominative and instrumental of all nouns, pronouns and adjectives: in the verbal flection the same marker appears in the first- and second-person plural. Since almost all the corresponding IE forms ended in *-s* (nom. pl.: *-ös* for *-o* stems; *-äs* for *-\(\tilde{a}\) stems; *-es* for the other stems; instr. *-b\(\hat{h}\)is; 1 pl. *-mes*), we can postulate a special development of *-s* in these cases, along the lines of *-Vh > -(V)k*. The most contentious point of this theory is the need to accept divergent developments of */-s/, namely to /kV in the cases mentioned above and to 0 elsewhere, as for example in the nominative singular (*mrt\(\tilde{o}\)s > Arm. mard). Among the alternative theories which have been suggested, we note that the most coherent one interprets the ending -\(\hat{k}\)' as a derivational morpheme with collective value, maintaining not the flectional but the derivational nature of the plural marker, which is clear in the syntactic peculiarity whereby the attributive adjective has zero ending in the nominative plural. However, this problem can be overcome by postulating that the adjective had pronominal endings as in the strong adjective declension in Germanic (cf. Goth. blindai ‘blind (nom. pl.)’ beside dag\(s\)s ‘days’): if this were so, the flectional nature of the marker -\(\hat{k}\)' would not be called into question. A further confirmation of the development of */-s/ > Arm. /-k/ would also come from the interpretation of the large number of pluralia tantum in Armenian as regular phonetic developments of sigmatic nominative singulars which increasingly came to be perceived as nominative
plural; in certain cases, for example in the locative, these nouns accompany demonstratives and possessives in the sing., cf. *keansn kûm ‘in your life’ (lit. ‘in lives (pl.) your (sg.)’).

Morphology
In general terms it can be stated that in certain respects Armenian retains archaic IE characteristics and in others it innovates greatly; however, even when it innovates, it uses morphological material inherited from Indo-European, except in nominal derivation, where many derivative morphemes have been borrowed131(183,587),(784,861)...cut, mainly from Iranian. These morphemes are:

1 Iranian lexemes which form the second element of compounds in the source language: in Armenian, however, they do not function independently but are taken over, in grammaticalized form, as suffixes, for example *-a*stan: Arm. asp-a*stan* ‘stable’ (lit. ‘place of the horse’) < Iran. *-stāna-, Parth. MPers. -stān; -(a)ran: Arm. ganj-a*ran* ‘room of treasure’ < Iran. *-dāna- ‘container’, Parth. -dān

2 elements which are also suffixes in Iranian: these are very productive in both languages: -ak, diminutive suffix: Arm. naw-ak ‘boat’ < nāw ‘ship’ (+ < Iran. *-aka-); -ik, a diminutive suffix: Arm. hayr-ik ‘little father’ < hayr ‘father’ (+ < Iran. *-ika-); -akan, an adjective suffix indicating ‘belonging to’: Arm. mayr-akan ‘maternal’ < mayr ‘mother’ (+ < Iran. *-akāna-); -ean, an adjective suffix indicating ‘belonging to’: Arm. arewel-ean ‘Eastern’ < arewelk ‘East’ (+ < Iran. *iyāna-)

3 prefixal morphemes, not very productive in Armenian: apa- < Iran. *apalu-; aw- < Iran. *abi-; dž-/liš- < Iran. *duš-; ham- < Iran. hama-; pat- < Iran. *pati-.

In its derivation, too, Armenian at times preserves traces of IE morphology, e.g. in the derivatives in *-ti- and *-tu- (cf. Arm. bard ‘heap’ < *bhṛti-; Arm. arđ ‘form’ < *ṛtu-) and in *-mon/-my (cf. Arm. erdumn ‘oath’ < erdnum ‘I swear’; Arm. jermn ‘heat’ < jeṟnum ‘heat’); at other times Armenian innovates in that on the whole these same suffixes occur in expanded forms unparalleled in other IE languages (e.g. Arm. -oyf, an abstract suffix from *ow-ti-; Arm. -st < *s-ti-; Arm. -awn < *a-mn; Arm. -umn < *u-mn; Arm. -iwn < *i-mn. In other cases, in words of IE derivation, Armenian exhibits suffixes not attested in other IE languages; e.g. Arm. -s- < *-k-, as in lsem ‘I hear’ (< *lusem < *klu+k); Arm. -or in nor ‘new’ (<*new-or).

Nouns
Among the principal innovations in Armenian, we may mention the loss of the distinction of grammatical gender even in the pronouns (with subsequent loss of any formal distinction between nouns and adjectives) and the loss of the dual, while as an example of the retention of archaic features we can cite the
morphological process of ablaut, clearly preserved above all in the \(-n\)- stem declension and to a lesser extent in that of the \(-r\)- stems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Nom. Acc.</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to(\text{\textcopyright}n) ('\text{grandson}')</td>
<td>to(\text{\textcopyright}un)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Dat. Loc.</td>
<td>to(\text{\textcopyright}in)</td>
<td>Acc. Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>to(\text{\textcopyright}n)(\text{\textcopyright})</td>
<td>Gen. Dat. Abl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>to(\text{\textcopyright}mb)</td>
<td>Instr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example, the stem variation between \(-\text{\textcopyright}n\), \(-\text{\textcopyright}un\) and \(-\text{\textcopyright}an\) \((am)\) reflects the IE alternation \(*-\text{\textcopyright}nl*-\text{\textcopyright}onl*-\text{\textcopyright}n\).

Of the \(-r\)- stems, only some have a more archaic aspect since they show the zero grade of the final root vowel in the oblique cases of the singular:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Nom. Acc.</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may(\text{\textcopyright}r) ('\text{mother}')</td>
<td>mark(\text{\textcopyright}c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Dat. Loc.</td>
<td>maw(\text{\textcopyright}r)</td>
<td>Acc. Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>maw(\text{\textcopyright}r)(\text{\textcopyright})</td>
<td>Gen. Dat. Abl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>mar(\text{\textcopyright}b)</td>
<td>Instr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards the other thematic classes, the Armenian vowel stems reflect the IE schema of stems in \(*-o\)-, \(*-\text{\textcopyright}i\)-, \(*i\) and \(*-u\)-, but within this schema there is in Armenian a redistribution of nouns and adjectives across the various vocalic declensions: the loss of the gender contrast, which in Indo-European was expressed in many adjectives in the contrast between \(*-\text{\textcopyright}o\)- stems for the masculine and neuter, and \(*-\text{\textcopyright}i\)- stems for the feminine, leads in Armenian to a merger, as a result of which the old adjectives in \(*-\text{\textcopyright}o\)/\(-a\)- follow the declension in \(-o\)-, while the adjectives in \(*ijolij\(\text{\textcopyright}a\)- exhibit alternation between endings in \(-o/-a\)- (probably due to a phenomenon whereby the \(-a\)- stems underwent expansion). Furthermore, as well as the stems in \(-a\)-, there is an expansion in Armenian of the \(-i\)- stems, and a moderate expansion of those in \(-r\)- and \(-n\)-, while stems in \(-u\)- decline markedly. The redistribution of nouns and adjectives across the various declensions also affects a large number of Iranian loan words, e.g. Arm. dat 'justice' \((-i\)- stem) < Iran. \(\text{\textcopyright}d\(\text{\textcopyright}a\)-; Arm. spahl spay 'army' \((-i\)- stem) < Iran. *\(\text{\textcopyright}p\(\text{\textcopyright}d\(\text{\textcopyright}a\)-; Arm. z\(\text{\textcopyright}n\) 'weapon' \((-u\)- stem) < Iran. *\(\text{\textcopyright}z\(\text{\textcopyright}n\)\(\text{\textcopyright}a\); Arm. \(\text{\textcopyright}p\(\text{\textcopyright}u\)t 'putrid' \((-o\)- stem) < Iran. \(\text{\textcopyright}p\(\text{\textcopyright}u\)-; Arm. pet 'chief' \((-a\)- stem) < Iran. \(\text{\textcopyright}p\(\text{\textcopyright}t\)-; Armenian has lost the stems in stops and in \(s\)-: former members of these classes have gone over into the other classes, e.g. jer 'heat' \((-o\)- stem) < IE \(*\(\text{\textcopyright}g\(\text{\textcopyright}w\)h\(\text{\textcopyright}e\)\(\text{\textcopyright}r\)\(\text{\textcopyright}o\)- stem).}

As regards the case endings, Table 8.2 shows some examples of vowel-stem paradigms. The eight cases of Indo-European are reduced to four through a process of syncretism which is different in the singular and the plural. As was mentioned previously, in the singular the nominative and accusative merge formally by means of a complex process which has been reconstructed by Kortlandt (1985):
Table 8.2 Examples of vowel-stem paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I (-o-)</th>
<th>II (-a-)</th>
<th>III (-i-)</th>
<th>IV (-u-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.Acc.</td>
<td>erg 'poem'</td>
<td>azg 'people'</td>
<td>bay 'word'</td>
<td>gah 'throne'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Dat</td>
<td>erg-oy</td>
<td>azg-i</td>
<td>bay-i</td>
<td>gah-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>erg-oy</td>
<td>azg-ê</td>
<td>bay-ê</td>
<td>gah-ê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst.</td>
<td>erg-ov</td>
<td>azg-aw</td>
<td>bay-ia</td>
<td>gah-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc.</td>
<td>erg</td>
<td>azg-iw</td>
<td>bay-iw</td>
<td>gah-u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>erg-k'</td>
<td>azg-k'</td>
<td>bay-k'</td>
<td>gah-k'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Dat.Abl.</td>
<td>erg-oc'</td>
<td>azg-ae'</td>
<td>bay-ic'</td>
<td>gah-uc'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.Loc.</td>
<td>erg-s</td>
<td>azg-s</td>
<td>bay-s</td>
<td>gah-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>erg-ovk'</td>
<td>azg-awk'</td>
<td>bay-ik'</td>
<td>gah-uk'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In the *-ä- stems the two cases would have fallen together by regular phonetic development because the non-syllabic nasal of the accusative singular of polysyllables is lost as a result of the changes -VN > V > 0, reducing the form to the root, exactly as happened in the nominative after the loss of the stem vowel caused by the stress accent.

2. The form of the nominative was generalized as the nominative case in the -r- and -n- stems denoting persons (cf. hayr 'father'; mayr 'mother', etc.).

3. The accusative was generalized in the -o-, -i- and -u- stems, which in some cases show the reflex -k from old sigmatic nominative singulars, which is however felt to be a nominative plural ending (e.g. elk' 'exit'; xawsk' 'speech').

The possibility of interpreting the final -n of consonantal stems such as jeĩn 'hand', otn 'foot', jiwn 'snow' as deriving from < *-m makes it possible to postulate that in these stems too the form of the accusative singular was generalized as the nominative case.

More immediate is the derivation of the instrumental ending which appears in vocalic stems as -w/-v (with variation in spelling, while in the -u- stems there is loss of earlier -w) and as -b in nasal and liquid stems. All these forms can be taken back to IE *bhi, whose final vowel is still present in the instrumental iwi-k' of the indefinite pronoun *i-k'. The IE morpheme *bhi probably applied to both singular and plural: the Armenian instrumental plural form where -k' is added to the singular morpheme is probably to be interpreted as an Armenian innovation formed on the model of the nominative plural.

Another ending which may easily be taken back to Indo-European is the genitive singular -oy of the -o- stems, which reflects *osa, while the ending -i of the genitive singular of -a- stems has been borrowed from the -i- stems. For the ablative singular ending -ê (< earlier *ey) we assume a derivation with
an intervocalic voiceless dental; consequently, this ending has been compared with the Luw. -ati, Lyc. -edi, -adi ablative and instrumental forms, but more probably the origin of the Armenian form lies not in an inflectional ending but in a postposed particle *eti, cf. Gk éti, Skt ati.

As regards the plural endings, the accusative form -s can easily be taken back to an earlier *-ns, still attested in Goth. daga-ns ‘days’, gasti-ns ‘guests’, etc. On the other hand, the -s of the locative is to be interpreted in terms of an extension of function of the accusative. Generally accepted is the derivation of -c, the genitive/dative/ablative ending, from an adjectival suffix *-sko-, which occurs in many other IE languages. The derived form was initially used with genitive value and subsequently also underwent an extension of function to the other cases. We have discussed in Sibilants, pp. 212–13 the possible derivation of the plural marker -k from IE *-s which is found in the nominative.

Pronouns

The pronouns exhibit stems and endings whose etymologies are often difficult. As regards the demonstrative stems, they form a coherent deictic system which makes it possible to distinguish first, second and third persons at the level both of pronouns and of adverbs: the pronominal stems used, which are recognizable as Indo-European only if we presuppose irregular phonetic developments, do not form a system comparable with that of Armenian in any other IE language: so-*this* < *ko-, cf. *ki- in Gk sēmeron ‘today’, Lat. ci-s; do-*that* (close to the interlocutor) < *to-, cf. Gk to-; no-*yon* < *no-, cf. Hitt. eni-, uni-*yon*, OCS onū. In combination with various particles these stems form other pronouns. Prefixed with *ay-, they form ays, ayd, ayn with a demonstrative meaning; suffixed with -in they give rise to soyn, doyn, noyn ‘the same’; suffixed with -a they create the anaphoric pronoun sa, da, na. The consonantal element of the stem on its own, suffixed to a word (not necessarily a noun), is roughly equivalent to the definite article which occurs in some IE languages: cf. fag-s ‘this crown’, fag-d ‘that crown’, fag-n ‘yon crown’.

The inflection of the demonstrative stem can be clearly seen for example in the declension of the anaphoric pronoun in Table 8.3. From the demonstrative, the following adverbs of place are derived:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ast ‘here, in this place’</th>
<th>aydr ‘there, in that place’</th>
<th>and ‘yonder, in yon place’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aysr ‘hither, to this place’</td>
<td>aydr ‘thither, to that place’</td>
<td>andr ‘to yon place’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>asti ‘hence, from this place’</td>
<td>ayti ‘thence, from that place’</td>
<td>anti ‘from yon place’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the interrogative pronoun there are traces of a stem distinction between persons and things:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ov/o ‘who?’</td>
<td>oyr</td>
<td>ēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z-i (z-inč’) ‘what?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.3 The anaphoric pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.Acc.</td>
<td>s-a</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>sor-a</td>
<td>oroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.Loc.</td>
<td>sm-a</td>
<td>orum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>sm-anē</td>
<td>um</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>sov-a-w</td>
<td>(orov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>sok'-'a</td>
<td>nom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.Loc.</td>
<td>sos-a</td>
<td>ors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.Dat.Abl.</td>
<td>soč'-'a</td>
<td>oroce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>sok'-'awk'</td>
<td>orov'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interrogative adjective is *or*, which also takes on the function of a relative pronoun and is inflected like a pronominal stem in *o-ː*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.Acc.</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>Nom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>oroy</td>
<td>Acc.Loc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>umē</td>
<td>oroc'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>(orov)</td>
<td>Instr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronominal stem is probably IE *kʷ-o-/kʷ-i-*, as in the Slavic languages, and for the interrogative adjective a derivation from *kʷ-o(ie)ro-* has been assumed. In both cases it is necessary to postulate a special phonetic development by which *kʷ-* > k' > h- > 0.

By means of a suffix -k' or a suffix -mn which were probably enclitic particles, two indefinite pronoun-adjectives are derived from the interrogative pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom.Acc.</td>
<td>o-k' ‘someone’ (in negative or conditi-</td>
<td>(inč') ‘something’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>uruk'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.Loc.</td>
<td>umek'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>umek'ē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>(omamb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Singular
Nom.Acc. omn ‘someone’ (in affirmative clauses) Plural
Nom. omank'
Gen. urumn Acc.Loc. omans
Dat.Loc. umemn Gen.Dat.Abl. omanc'
Abl. umemne Instr. omamb
Instr. omambk'

In almost all these pronouns the genitive singular ending is -r; this has been interpreted as deriving from an original adjectival suffix *-ro-. As regards the dative singular, the above pronouns have the ending -m, which can easily be taken back to *-smē, cf. Skt tasmāi, Goth pamma.

Numerals
The numerals from one to four (mi ‘one’ < *smijos; erku ‘two’ < *dwō;erek‘three’< *trejes; čork ‘four’ < *k̥wetores) are inflected thoroughly in Armenian and agree in number and case with the noun to which they refer, whether they precede or follow it. The numbers from five to ten (hing, vec, ewfn, ut, inn, tasn) are not inflected in the nominative, accusative or locative, but are inflected in the other cases when the noun referred to precedes the numeral. From eleven upwards the numerals are on the whole not inflected, apart from certain instances when the numbered noun precedes the numeral.

The numerals from eleven to sixteen are copulative compounds: metasan, erkotas, erektasan, čorektasan, hnetasan, vëstasan, while those from seventeen to nineteen are juxtapositions of units and tens formed by means of the coordinating conjunction ew ‘and’; ewfn ew tasn; utew tasn; inn ew tasn. The decades from thirty upwards are compounds with the element -sun (< *-kont) in second position.

Personal Pronouns
These pronouns, too, can only be taken back to IE forms by accepting phonetic developments:

The first-person singular pronoun exhibits forms which are difficult to explain phonetically both in the nominative (where es is taken back to *eɡō or *eɡʰom by assuming an irregular development attributable to a Sandhi effect (cf. Chapter 4, p. 107) of the expected consonant, lčl or lžl as the case may be) and in the accusative and locative (where is is made to derive from *ins, derived from the stem *em, which is found in the genitive, dative, ablative and instrumental) and from a particle similar to the Greek -ge in emége. However, even for this derivation it is necessary to assume a special phonetic development. The second-person singular pronoun is clearly derived from Indo-European: the nominative du < *tu presupposes an irregular phonetic development, while the derivation of the rest of the flexion is more regular: ko < *two-; kez, kën, kew < *twe-.
Table 8.4  First- and second-person pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First person</th>
<th>Second person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>du</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>im</td>
<td>k'o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.Loc.</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>k'ez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dat.</td>
<td>inj</td>
<td>k'ez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>iņen</td>
<td>k'en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>iņew</td>
<td>k'ew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom.</td>
<td>mek'</td>
<td>duk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>mer</td>
<td>jer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.Loc.Dat.</td>
<td>mez</td>
<td>jez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl.</td>
<td>mēn]</td>
<td>jēnj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr.</td>
<td>mewk'</td>
<td>jēwk'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of the first-person plural pronoun *mek', too, there are parallels in other IE languages (cf. Lith. *mēs, OCS *my), but for the second-person plural pronoun (except for the nominative, which is derived from the singular with the addition of the plural marker -k') there are no parallels in other languages.

**Verb Flection**

The Armenian verb distinguishes between a present and an aorist stem. These have different aspectual values, the former having an imperfective and the latter a perfective value. The IE perfect has been lost; it remains only in a small number of fossilized forms with present value, such as Armenian *gitem* 'I know' < wojd-; Arm. *goy* 'he is' < *wos-.

From the present stem, which is characterized by one of the stem vowels -e-, -i-, -a-, -u-, sometimes with an infixed nasal or -e-, the following forms are derived:

Present indicative (e.g. for the class with stem vowel in -e-): *gtan-e-m* 'I find'

(-e-s; -ē < *-e-y; -e-md; -ēk < *e-yk; -e-n)

Imperfect: *gtan-ei* (-e-ir; -ēr < *-e-yr; -e-ad; -ēk; -e-n)

Present subjunctive: *gtan-ič-e-m* (-e-s; -ē < *-e-y; -e-md; -ēk < *e-yk, -e-n)

Injunctive: (*mi*) *gtan-e-r*; (*mi*) *gtan-ē-k*

Infinitive: *gtan-el*

From the aorist stem the following are formed:

Aorist indicative: *gt-i* (*gt-ir; e-git; gt-ak; gt-ik; gt-in)/middle-passive: *gt-ay* (*gt-ar; gt-aw; gt-ak; gt-ayk; gt-an)
Imperative: *git* (*gt-êk*)/middle-passive: *gt-ir* (*gt-ayk*)
Aorist subjunctive (which also has future meaning): *gt-iê* (*gt-cêś*; *gt-cê*; *gt-cêuk*; *gt-jik*; *gt-cêen*)/middle-passive: *gt-ayê* (*gt-cis*; *gt-ci*; *gt-cuuk*; *gt-jik*; *gt-cièn*)
Participle: *gt-eal*

The Armenian verbal system is remarkably innovative: as well as the loss of the IE perfect, we also have the loss of the optative, whose functions were taken over by the subjunctive; the injunctive, limited to second-person singular and second-person plural and used in negative commands along with the negative particle *mi*: its flectional endings (singular -r < Proto-Arm. *-*rV; plural k' < Proto-Arm. *-*yek') are identical to the secondary endings of the indicative.

As regards number, the opposition is reduced to singular vs plural, the dual having been lost. Extremely innovative is the opposition between active and middle-passive, which is realized incompletely in the verbal flection and by different morphological means from those used by Indo-European to express voice. In the present indicative and subjunctive and in the injunctive, the replacement of the stem vowel -e- with -i- changes the voice of the verbal form from active to middle-passive. The forms in -i- probably derive from IE *-ê-, which is characteristic of a class of intransitive verbs in the Germanic and Italic languages; these forms would have arisen as present middle indicative morphemes and would have been extended to the present subjunctive and partially to the aorist subjunctive. However, this process does not apply to the other forms derived from the present stem, where the opposition is neutralized in favour of -ê-. In addition, a contrast in stem vowel is not possible for the other two verb classes, which are characterized respectively by the stem vowels -a- and -u-. In the forms derived from the aorist stem, the opposition of voice is expressed in the personal endings (although not in all): the first-person plural aorist indicative ending -ak', first-person plural aorist subjunctive - uk' and second-person plural aorist subjunctive - jik' are common to both active and middle. The characteristic feature of the middle voice in these forms is -a-, which may be compared with the IE *-*â- to be found in Balto-Slavic and Italic (cf. Lat. *legeram*). In Armenian, this morpheme would have been extended from the indicative to the other moods.

Armenian also turns out to be highly innovative as regards tense formation: only a limited number of Armenian verbs have an aorist form deriving from an IE aorist, whether athematic or thematic (cf. Arm. *edi* 'I put, placed', Gk ép-thê-ka; Arm. *arari* 'I did', Gk éron; Arm. *egit* 'he found', Gk *eidon*; Arm. *elik* 'he left', Gk élip). The majority of the Armenian root aorists go back not to IE aorists, but to imperfects, e.g. *berem* 'I bear' aor. *beri*; aor. *acem* 'I lead', aor. *aci*; *lizem* 'I lick', aor. *lizi*.

As well as those root aorists deriving from IE imperfects, Armenian has
aorists with an extension -c deriving from an IE expansion *-skelo- which was suffixed to preterite forms. A close analysis shows that the majority of Armenian aorist forms derive from IE imperfect forms. The most important consequence of this innovation was thus the need to construct a new imperfect form. The origin of the Armenian imperfect is still subject to much debate. One suggestive theory derives the Armenian imperfect from the IE optative, in that Armenian -i-, which characterizes many of the endings, could derive from IE *-jel/i-. Both of the subjunctive forms probably derive from an extension *-iskelo-, which can also be traced in Latin and Greek cf. Gk heurisko, haliskomai, etc. While in the present subjunctive the -i- of the extension forms a diphthong with the stem vowel and undergoes regular phonetic development determined by the position of the accent, in the aorist subjunctive the same accent-governed vowel change leads to the weakening of -i-. As for the participle, which has the form -eal and is inflected according to the -o- declension, the suffix which makes it up seems to derive from *-lo- and can thus be related to the Indo-European primary adjectives found in various languages, such as Gk deilos ‘fearful’, Lat. pendulus ‘hanging’, etc. The infinitive is also taken back to a suffix *-lo- which originally formed nouns of action. As regards the endings of the paradigm, it is not possible here to comment on every point, so it will suffice to mention the fact that Armenian has merged thematic and athematic forms. However, some forms of the personal endings have not yet received satisfactory explanation in terms of their derivation from Indo-European (e.g. -w of the 3 sg. aor. mid.; -ak of the 1 pl. past; -jik of the 2 pl. aor. subj.).

The presence of the augment, restricted to the monosyllabic forms of the third-person singular of the aorist, should also be mentioned.

Invariable Word Classes
These are conjunctions, adverbs, prepositions and postpositions.

Conjunctions
The main conjunctions are: ew ‘and’ (coordinating); kam ‘or’ (disjunctive); ayl ‘but’ (strongly adversative); bayc ‘but’ (delimitative); isk ‘but’ (counter-positive). There are few subordinating conjunctions and each of these has different meanings according to the verbal mood in the subordinate clause: zi + indicative has causal value, but when used with the subjunctive it has final value. Telefe, as well as indicating that direct speech follows and introducing indirect interrogative sentences, introduces a final clause if a subjunctive follows and constitutes the protasis of a conditional clause if it is followed by the indicative or subjunctive. Temporal subordinate clauses may be introduced by ibr(ew) ‘while, after’ or by minc(ew) ‘when, until’. The latter conjunction also introduces consecutive clauses.
Adverbs
There are a small number of primary adverbs, e.g. միշ ‘always’, արդ ‘now’. On the whole, however, the adverbs are old inflected forms of nouns, which have become fossilized with adverbial function, e.g. յետ ‘after’, formed with the preposition ի (in its variant յ before words beginning with a vowel) and the locative form of the noun հետ ‘track, mark, sign’ (-ո- stem), with the loss of հ-. Adjectives can always be used with adverbial function.

In addition, there exist adverb-specific suffixal formatives which are postposed to nouns, adjectives and adverbs and some of which are of Iranian origin, for example, -(ա)պես, which in Iranian (but not Armenian) exists as an independent word with the meaning ‘manner, method’, and -(ա)գոյն, which exists independently in both Iranian and Armenian with the meaning ‘colour’.

Prepositions
In Armenian almost all the prepositions, with the exception of կ ‘towards’ can also function as preverbs; however, the preverb mechanism is no longer productive in Classical Armenian and receives new impetus in the immediate post-classical period from the extremely numerous literal calques formed on Greek. One feature of the Armenian prepositions is their potential for being repeated before each element of a phrase, e.g. սնդ ավուրսն սնդ այնուշք ‘in those days’ (lit. ‘in days in those’). In addition, the same prepositions can be used together with different nominal cases, each with a different meaning;

աֆ + acc. = ‘towards’
  + loc. = ‘near’
  + gen. = ‘because of’
սնդ + acc. = ‘through’
  + instr. = ‘under’
  + loc./dat. = ‘with’
  + gen. = ‘instead of’
աստ + loc./dat. = ‘according to’
  + abl. = ‘after’
գ + acc. = governs definite direct complement
  + abl. = ‘because of’
  + instr. = ‘with regard to’
  + loc. = ‘towards’
i/յ + acc. = ‘in’
  + loc. = ‘under’
  + abl. = ‘from’
կ + acc. = ‘towards’

As well as these prepositions, Armenian has a very large number of adverbs used prepositionally, linked with nouns which are usually in the genitive. Some of these adverbs are used as postpositions.
Word Formation

Of the two methods of word formation which are also found in the other IE languages, derivation and compounding, we linger here on the second, since we have already looked at the process of derivation in Armenian.

As regards nominal compounds, the following types are distinguished (cf. Chapter 4, pp. 121–2):

1. exocentric compounds (also called possessive compounds or bahuvrihi):
   Arm. barjr-a-berj (lit. ‘which has a height (berj) high (barjr)’)

2. verb-governed compounds: in this type of compound one element – which is normally in second position, but can also be in first position – is a verb form (corresponding in general to the stem of the aorist), which governs the other term: Arm. barerar ‘benefactor’ < *bari-arar, lit. ‘(one) who does (arar, aor. stem of aynem ‘I do’) good (bari)’; Arm. jerb-a-kal ‘prisoner’ (lit. ‘(one) who is taken (kal, aorist stem of unim ‘have, hold’) by the hand (jerb, instr. of jefn ‘hand’)’); Arm. yet-a-mit ‘fickle’ (lit. ‘(one) who changes (yet, aor. stem of yetum ‘change’) (his) mind (mit)’)

3. preposition-governed compound: in this type of compound a preposition in first position governs the second element: Arm. čerek ‘day’ lit. ‘until (c) evening (erek)’; aраčawk ‘vision’ lit. ‘before (ař) the eyes (ačawk)’

4. determinative compounds (also called tatpurusa): in these the second element is determined by the first on the basis of a relation which can be of various types: Arm. get-ezr ‘river bank’ (get ‘river’, ezr ‘bank’); nor-a-ji ‘unbroken horse’ (nor ‘new’, ji ‘horse’); mayr-a-katak ‘capital city’ (mayr ‘mother’, katak ‘city’)

5. copulative compounds (also called ‘dvandva’): in these neither element is subordinate to the other; rather, they stand in conjunction. This is the case with certain numerals and a few other examples: hiwf-a-niwf ‘material’ (adj. + noun) (hiwf ‘matter’, niwf ‘substance’); ayr-ew-ji ‘cavalry’ (ayr ‘man’, ew ‘and’, ji ‘horse’)

We note that in all the types of nominal compounding, except the last example, the two elements of the compound are generally joined by means of the linking vowel -a- if the second element begins with a consonant.

Very productive in Armenian, unlike the other IE languages, is the process of reduplication, that is the repetition of the whole word, whether a noun or a verb. This repetition of the word cannot be viewed in the same way as compounding because it does not follow the rules of vowel weakening in unaccented syllables: Arm. bar-bar ‘speech’, goyn-a-goyn ‘variegated’.

Syntax

Word order in Armenian is essentially extremely free since the syntactic functions are already clearly indicated in the inflectional elements of the
sentence constituents. However, we can establish that the unmarked word order is SVO, while the sequence SOV is marked. The simultaneous presence of direct (O) and indirect (I) objects allows three possible permutations of the elements: SVIO, SVOI and SOVI.

This inflectional indication of the syntactic role played by the individual elements is not provided in a few important instances of phrases which consist of modifier + head noun. The instances listed below share as their common denominator a tendency to view groups formed of modifier + head noun as a whole unit. Functionally relevant is the role of the group within the sentence rather than the indication of the relationship with the sentence established by each element in the group. This syntactic feature, which appears only as a tendency in Classical Armenian, is definitively consolidated in Modern Armenian.

1. Nouns and attributive adjectives agree in case and normally also in number (although the pluralia tantum can go with singular adjectives) when the adjective follows the noun (emphatic position), but when the adjective precedes the noun (neutral position) it is on the whole not inflected, except in the case of monosyllabic adjectives: cf. bazum ‘much’ (not inflected) goric-s ‘works’ (acc. pl.) baris-s ‘good’ (acc. pl.) ‘many good works’.

2. In the case of groups formed of two nouns where the first is the head noun and the second the modifier, there are examples of flectional adjustment, where the modifier takes on the same case as the head noun; cf. Deut. 34:9: icaw hogowov (instr.) imastufemb (instr.), corresponding to Gk eneplésthe pneúmatos synéseös, ‘was full of the spirit of wisdom’.

Groups composed of modifier + head noun are indicated in various other ways.

3. By means of the repetition of prepositions (including z-, a marker of the definite acc.) before every element of the group; cf. Matt. 23:25 srbēk z-artakin z-bāzakin, corresponding to Gk katharizete to éxōthen toû potēriou ‘ye make clean the outside of the cup’.

4. By postposing the deictic element (equivalent to the definite article in other IE languages) to the modifier, whatever its position with respect to the head noun; cf. Tit. 2:10: z- vardapetufiwn Prkē-n, corresponding to Gk tên didaskalían tên toû sōtēros ‘the doctrine of the Saviour’.

5. By using the relative pronoun with the function of izāfat, perhaps influenced by the Iranian model: cf. 1 Cor. 2:11: hogi mardoyn or i nma, corresponding to Gk tô pneûma tôû anthrópou tô en autôi ‘the spirit of man which is in him’.
Note

The transliteration of the Armenian alphabet corresponds to that used in the *Revue des études arméniennes*, according to which the letters չ, ղ and ջ represent, respectively, voiceless, voiceless aspirated and voiced apical affricates, while Ծ and Ծ represent, respectively, voiceless, voiceless aspirated and voiced dorsal affricates. The sign ՞ placed after a consonant indicates aspiration. The phonetic values of the remaining signs are as follows: է, ե indicate alveolar-palatal grooved fricatives, voiceless and voiced respectively; 猖 represents a voiceless velar fricative, թ a velarized alveolar lateral, Ռ a long alveolar trill. As regards the vowels, it should be noted merely that է indicates not a long vowel, but rather a mid-high front vowel, whereas ե indicates a mid-low front vowel. The IE glottalic stops are represented with the conventional symbol ʰ.
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