

Be, become or remain

The grammaticalisation of the copulative perfect in Classical Armenian

Robin Meyer

Université de Lausanne,
Section des sciences du langage et de l'information

robin.meyer@unil.ch

The Lexicon-Grammar Interface in the Synchrony and Diachrony of Armenian
Würzburg, 04 April 2022

Reminder: the copulative perfect in Classical Armenian

- ▶ Classical Armenian exhibits three synthetic tenses (PRS, PST, AOR) and two analytical ones (PF, PLPF) – setting aside modal forms
- ▶ the analytical tenses are traditionally explained as consisting of the past participle in *-eal* and a form of the copula *em* ‘to be’
- ▶ the synthetic tenses follow NOM-ACC alignment, the analytical ones are tripartite (S: NOM – A: GEN – O: ACC; cf. Meyer fthc.)
- ▶ by the 8th c., the analytical tenses have stabilised as NOM-ACC, too

Caveats

- ▶ the origin of this alignment pattern is still under discussion (see e.g. Kölligan 2013; Meyer 2017)
- ▶ the use of the copula is not common in the earliest 5th-c. texts, and not yet obligatory in the later ones
- ▶ yet, when it occurs, the copula with transitive verbs (almost) always takes the 3SG form
- ▶ the past participle can be used independently as a passive-intransitive ADJ and perfective CVB – the latter being its principal use

Questions

1. How is the diachronic development of the perfect in Classical Armenian best described?
2. Does the construction described above exhibit any variation? If so, of what kind and to what effect?
3. What—if anything—do these developments tell us about the origin of the analytical tenses?

Structure of this talk

Reminders & Questions

Preliminary notes

Diachrony: CVB → PF

Synchrony: AUX *em*

Synchrony: AUX *linim*

Synchrony: AUX *kam*

Diachrony: the role of WMIr.

Conclusions

Preliminary notes

- ▶ the data analysed are taken from 5th (and early 6th) c. historiographical texts (Koriwn, Agat'angelos, P'awstos Buzand, Łazar P'arpec'i, Elišē)
- ▶ translated texts are eschewed to avoid potential influence from Greek (cf. Coulie 1994; Meyer 2018)
- ▶ the focus lies on the presence or absence of AUX in the perfect and its semantics
- ▶ setting aside morphosyntactic considerations
- ▶ Grammaticalisation: here broadly all interacting semantic, syntactic, ... processes in diachrony and synchrony leading to novel encodings of meaning or function

Preliminary notes

- ▶ the data analysed are taken from 5th (and early 6th) c. historiographical texts (Koriwn, Agat'angelos, P'awstos Buzand, Łazar P'arpec'i, Elišē)
- ▶ translated texts are eschewed to avoid potential influence from Greek (cf. Coulie 1994; Meyer 2018)
- ▶ the focus lies on the presence or absence of AUX in the perfect and its semantics
- ▶ setting aside morphosyntactic considerations
- ▶ Grammaticalisation: here broadly all interacting semantic, syntactic, ... processes in diachrony and synchrony leading to novel encodings of meaning or function

The *-eal* participle as CVB

- ▶ the predominant function of the PTCP in *-eal* is converbial
- ▶ compare *participia coniuncta* in Latin or Greek
- ▶ they express an action subordinate or secondary to the action expressed by the matrix verb
 - ▶ CVB: e.g. ‘nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination’ (Haspelmath 1995:3)
 - ▶ type: free/varying-subject converb (may but need not share matrix verb subject; Nedjalkov cf. 1995:110–11)
 - ▶ semantics: contextual (Nedjalkov 1995:108–9, König 1995:59–64)
- ▶ statistical distribution in the corpus:
 - ▶ earliest: Koriwn 56.7% of all PTCPs
 - ▶ maximum: Lazar P'arpec'i: 67.9% of all PTCPs
 - ▶ minimum: P'awstos Buzand: 47.3% of all PTCPs
- ▶ cp. use as ADJ: 12.3–17.6%

The *-eal* participle as CVB

- ▶ the predominant function of the PTCB in *-eal* is converbial
- ▶ compare *participia coniuncta* in Latin or Greek
- ▶ they express an action subordinate or secondary to the action expressed by the matrix verb
 - ▶ CVB: e.g. ‘nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination’ (Haspelmath 1995:3)
 - ▶ type: free/varying-subject converb (may but need not share matrix verb subject; Nedjalkov cf. 1995:110–11)
 - ▶ semantics: contextual (Nedjalkov 1995:108–9, König 1995:59–64)
- ▶ statistical distribution in the corpus:
 - ▶ earliest: Koriwn 56.7% of all PTCPS
 - ▶ maximum: Łazar P’arpec’i: 67.9% of all PTCPS
 - ▶ minimum: P’awstos Buzand: 47.3% of all PTCPS
- ▶ cp. use as ADJ: 12.3–17.6%

Examples of CVB use: ITR

Shared subject

(1) *isk na hawaneal valvalaki barbareal asēr*

PTC 3SG.NOM believe.CVb suddenly speak.CVb say.3SG.PST

‘And being convinced, he suddenly spoke and said ...’ (Ag. §794)

Different subject

(2) *ew ankeal zawrawork'=n i sur t'snameac'=n meraw k'aj=n*

and fall.CVb soldier.NOM.PL=DET into sword enemy.GEN.PL=DET die.3SG.AOR valiant=DET

Mamikonean Vasak

PN

PN

‘And as the soldiers engaged the enemies in battle (lit. fell on the swords of the enemies), the valiant Vasak Mamikonean died.’ (ŁP' §69)

Examples of CVB use: ITR

Shared subject

(1) *isk na hawaneal valvalaki barbareal asēr*

PTC 3SG.NOM believe.CVb suddenly speak.CVb say.3SG.PST

‘And being convinced, he suddenly spoke and said ...’ (Ag. §794)

Different subject

(2) *ew ankeal zawraworkʻ=n i sur tʻšnameacʻ=n meraw kʻaǰ=n*

and fall.CVb soldier.NOM.PL=DET into sword enemy.GEN.PL=DET die.3SG.AOR valiant=DET

Mamikonean Vasak

PN

PN

‘And as the soldiers engaged the enemies in battle (lit. fell on the swords of the enemies), the valiant Vasak Mamikonean died.’ (ŁPʻ §69)

Examples of CVB use: TR

Shared subject

- (3) *ew amenayn əst* *asac'eloy* *patuirani=n* *arareal* *handerjeal*
and **all** according-to say.PTCP.GEN.SG command.GEN.SG=DET **make.CVB** **prepare.CVB**
kazmeal *patrastec'in*
decorate.CVB prepare.3PL.AOR

'And they made, prepared, decorated, and arranged everything according to the command given.' (Ag. §760)

Different subject

- (4) *z=ors* [...] *iwrov* *isk anjamb=n* *awrinak* *c'uc'eal*, *areal*
OBJ=REL.ACC.PL [...] 3POSS.INS.SG PTC self.INS.SG=DET example.ACC.SG **show.CVB** **take.CVB**
z=omans *y=ašakertac'n* [...] *z=ařawreak=n* [...] *včarēin*
OBJ=INDF.ACC.PL from=student.GEN.PL=DET OBJ=daily=DET [...] settle.3PL.PST

'These things he demonstrated [...], with himself as an example, taking some of his students ... [they] settled [with their daily, vegetarian diet].' (Kor. XXII.1)

Examples of CVB use: TR

Shared subject

- (3) *ew amenayn əst* *asac'eloy* *patuirani=n* *arareal* *handerjeal*
and **all** according-to say.PTCP.GEN.SG command.GEN.SG=DET **make.CVB** **prepare.CVB**
kazmeal *patrastec'in*
decorate.CVB prepare.3PL.AOR

'And they made, prepared, decorated, and arranged everything according to the command given.' (Ag. §760)

Different subject

- (4) *z=ors* [...] *iwrov* *isk anjamb=n* *awrinak* *c'uc'eal*, *areal*
OBJ=REL.ACC.PL [...] 3POSS.INS.SG PTC self.INS.SG=DET example.ACC.SG **show.CVB** **take.CVB**
z=omans *y=ašakertac'=n* [...] *z=ařawreak=n* [...] *včarēin*
OBJ=INDF.ACC.PL from=student.GEN.PL=DET OBJ=daily=DET [...] settle.3PL.PST

'These things he demonstrated [...], with himself as an example, taking some of his students ... [they] settled [with their daily, vegetarian diet].' (Kor. XXII.1)

Non-converbial use

- ▶ in exx. (1–4) co-occurred next to an inflected matrix verb
- ▶ this is not the case in all instances: PTCPS without AUX can serve as matrix verbs

(5) *ew andēn valvalaki dahičk' =n hraman areal y =eric'*
 and then suddenly executioner.NOM.PL=DET command receive.PTCP from=three.ABL
naxararac' =n srov hatanel z =paranoc' eranelwoy =n
 noble.ABL.PL=DET sword.INS.SG cut-off.INF OBJ=neck.ACC.SG blessed.GEN.SG=DET

“And then, the executioners immediately received a command from the three nobles to cut off the head of the Blessed.” (Eł. p. 169)

(6) *omanc' cneal, ew oč' snuc'eal, i č'ap' hasuceal, ew*
 INDF.GEN.PL give-birth.PTCP and NEG rear.PTCP in manhood cause-to-arrive.PTCP and
anargeal t'šnamanōk'.
 dishonour.PTCP insult.INS.PL

“Some are born but were not nurtured, reached maturity, and were dishonoured by insults.” (P'B IV.5)

Non-converbial use

- ▶ in exx. (1–4) co-occurred next to an inflected matrix verb
- ▶ this is not the case in all instances: PTCPS without AUX can serve as matrix verbs

- (5) *ew andēn vaṭvaṭaki dahičk' =n hraman areal y=eric'*
 and then suddenly executioner.NOM.PL=DET command receive.PTCP from=three.ABL
naxararac' =n srov hatanel z=paranoc' eranelwoy =n
 noble.ABL.PL=DET sword.INS.SG cut-off.INF OBJ=neck.ACC.SG blessed.GEN.SG=DET

“And then, the executioners immediately received a command from the three nobles to cut off the head of the Blessed.” (Eł. p. 169)

- (6) *omanc' cneal, ew oč' snuc'eal, i č'ap' hasuceal, ew*
 INDF.GEN.PL give-birth.PTCP and NEG rear.PTCP in manhood cause-to-arrive.PTCP and
anargeal t'šnamanōk'.
 dishonour.PTCP insult.INS.PL

“Some are born but were not nurtured, reached maturity, and were dishonoured by insults.” (P'B IV.5)

CVB → PF

- ▶ the CVB use accounts for more than 40% of PTCPS across the corpus
- ▶ the rest is distributed among adjectival use (<18%) and matrix verbs
- ▶ of these matrix verbs, an AUX occurs:
 - ▶ minimum & earliest: Koriwn 11.8%
 - ▶ maximum & latest: Elišē 77.7%
- ▶ this suggests that:
 - ▶ the AUX perfect is a secondary (= non-inherited) development
 - ▶ it develops over the course of the 5th century
- ▶ potential corollary: variability of the construction (grammaticalisation-in-progress)

CVB → PF

- ▶ the CVB use accounts for more than 40% of PTCPS across the corpus
- ▶ the rest is distributed among adjectival use (<18%) and matrix verbs
- ▶ of these matrix verbs, an AUX occurs:
 - ▶ minimum & earliest: Koriwn 11.8%
 - ▶ maximum & latest: Elišē 77.7%
- ▶ this suggests that:
 - ▶ the AUX perfect is a secondary (= non-inherited) development
 - ▶ it develops over the course of the 5th century
- ▶ potential corollary: variability of the construction (grammaticalisation-in-progress)

CVB → PF

- ▶ the CVB use accounts for more than 40% of PTCPS across the corpus
- ▶ the rest is distributed among adjectival use (<18%) and matrix verbs

- ▶ of these matrix verbs, an AUX occurs:
 - ▶ minimum & earliest: Koriwn 11.8%
 - ▶ maximum & latest: Elišē 77.7%

- ▶ this suggests that:
 - ▶ the AUX perfect is a secondary (= non-inherited) development
 - ▶ it develops over the course of the 5th century

- ▶ potential corollary: variability of the construction (grammaticalisation-in-progress)

CVB → PF

- ▶ the CVB use accounts for more than 40% of PTCPS across the corpus
- ▶ the rest is distributed among adjectival use (<18%) and matrix verbs

- ▶ of these matrix verbs, an AUX occurs:
 - ▶ minimum & earliest: Koriwn 11.8%
 - ▶ maximum & latest: Elišē 77.7%

- ▶ this suggests that:
 - ▶ the AUX perfect is a secondary (= non-inherited) development
 - ▶ it develops over the course of the 5th century

- ▶ potential corollary: variability of the construction (grammaticalisation-in-progress)

Synchrony: AUX *em*

Intransitive verbs (S=NOM)

- (7) *ew orpēs etun zroyc'ork' and nma ekeal ēin*
 and as give.3PL.AOR news REL.NOM.PL with 3SG.DAT come.PTCP be.3PL.PST
 'And as those, who came with him, reported ...' (P'B IV.5)

- (8) *ayl duk' or ayžm y=erec'unc' ašxarhac' ekeal=d ēk'*
 but 2PL.NOM REL.NOM now from=three.ABL country.ABL.PL come.PTCP=DET be.2PL.PRS
tanuteark' ew sepuhk'
 magnate.NOM.PL and noble.NOM.PL
 'But you magnates and nobles, who have now come from three countries, ...' (ŁP' (2)§27)

Synchrony: AUX *em*

Transitive verbs (A=GEN, O=ACC)

- (9) *ew gitem t'ē lueal ē z=xorhurds mer Parskac'*
 and know.1SG.PRS COMP hear.PTCP be.3SG.PRS OBJ=plan.ACC.PL 1PL.POSS Persian.GEN.PL
kapen z=na ew vštac'uc'anen
 bind.3PL.PRS OBJ=3SG.ACC and torment.3PL.PRS

'I know that [if] the Persians have heard our plans, they [will] imprison and torment him.'
 (ŁP' (3)§66)

- (10) *ew lueal ews ē im [t'ē i Parsiks xōsi]*
 and hear.PTCP further be.3SG.PRS 1SG.GEN [COMP to Persian.ACC.PL say.3SG]

'And I have also heard that he is talking to the Persians.' (P'B V.4)

Synchrony: AUX *em*

- ▶ in the corpus, the AUX *em* ‘to be’ is the most common
- ▶ the perfect in later Classical and Middle Armenian retains this AUX as the standard (cf. Karst 1901:354–5)
- ▶ the aspectual semantics of the perfect are not the same as those of the PTCP qua CVB
 - ▶ the converbial use is restricted to perfective actions in the past (backgrounded information)
 - ▶ the *em*-perfect (& the PTCP used as matrix verb) largely function as present perfects / resultative perfects (cf. Lyonnet 1933; Ouzounian 2001)

Synchrony: AUX *em*

- ▶ in the corpus, the AUX *em* ‘to be’ is the most common
- ▶ the perfect in later Classical and Middle Armenian retains this AUX as the standard (cf. Karst 1901:354–5)
- ▶ the aspectual semantics of the perfect are not the same as those of the PTCP qua CVB
 - ▶ the converbial use is restricted to perfective actions in the past (backgrounded information)
 - ▶ the *em*-perfect (& the PTCP used as matrix verb) largely function as present perfects / resultative perfects (cf. Lyonnet 1933; Ouzounian 2001)

Synchrony: AUX *linim*

- ▶ of the c. 7'000 PTCPS in the corpus, c. 100 co-occur with *linim* 'to become'
- ▶ in all but a handful of instances, it is clear that the PTCP and the form of *linim* form a periphrastic perfect
- ▶ (11) is an example of these exceptions, where the participle could be interpreted as a 'pure' adjective

(11) *ew amenayn antanik' t'agaworin, carayk' ew spasawork' ar*
 CONJ all household.NOM.PL king.GEN.SG slave.NOM.PL and servant.NOM.PL in
hasarak, haruacovk' harealk' linēin
 common, torment.INS.PL afflicted.NOM.PL become.3PL.PST

"All the king's household, slaves and servants alike, were afflicted with torments. (Ag. §213)"

- ▶ "were afflicted" / "became afflicted" / "had become afflicted"?
- ▶ logically, either PST or PLPF

 additional question: participle agreement

Synchrony: AUX *linim*

- ▶ of the c. 7'000 PTCPS in the corpus, c. 100 co-occur with *linim* 'to become'
- ▶ in all but a handful of instances, it is clear that the PTCP and the form of *linim* form a periphrastic perfect
- ▶ (11) is an example of these exceptions, where the participle could be interpreted as a 'pure' adjective

- (11) *ew amenayn antanik' t'agaworin, carayk' ew spasawork' ar*
 CONJ all household.NOM.PL king.GEN.SG slave.NOM.PL and servant.NOM.PL in
hasarak, haruacovk' harealk' linēin
 common, torment.INS.PL afflicted.NOM.PL become.3PL.PST

“All the king's household, slaves and servants alike, were afflicted with torments. (Ag. §213)”

- ▶ “were afflicted” / “became afflicted” / “had become afflicted”?
- ▶ logically, either PST or PLPF

 additional question: participle agreement


Synchrony: AUX *linim*

- ▶ of the c. 7'000 PTCPS in the corpus, c. 100 co-occur with *linim* 'to become'
- ▶ in all but a handful of instances, it is clear that the PTCP and the form of *linim* form a periphrastic perfect
- ▶ (11) is an example of these exceptions, where the participle could be interpreted as a 'pure' adjective

(11) *ew amenayn antanik'* *t'agaworin, carayk'* *ew spasawork' ar*
 CONJ all household.NOM.PL king.GEN.SG slave.NOM.PL and servant.NOM.PL in
hasarak, haruacovk' harealk' linēin
 common, torment.INS.PL afflicted.NOM.PL become.3PL.PST

“All the king’s household, slaves and servants alike, were afflicted with torments. (Ag. §213)”

- ▶ “were afflicted” / “became afflicted” / “had become afflicted”?
- ▶ logically, either PST or PLPF

 ▶ additional question: participle agreement

Synchrony: AUX *linim*

A clearer idea of the semantics

- (12) *ew darjeal ōr ast ōrē matakaraṛēr atk'atac'=n ew aynm*
 CONJ again day after day.ABL.SG adminster.3SG.PST beggar.DAT.PL=DET and DEM.DAT.SG
stēp stēp lc'eal linēr
 continually fill.PTCP become.3SG.PST

“And so day after day he distributed [the content of jars] to the poor and they were incessantly refilled.” (P‘B II.12)

- (13) *bayc' vasn k'o zi mec vastakk' en ar is z=or*
 CONJ because 2SG.GEN COMP great service.NOM.PL be.3PL.PRS to 1SG.ACC OBJ=REL.ACC.SG
inč' xndrec'er=n ert' tual lic'i k'ez
 INDF.INAN desire.2SG.AOR=DET go.2SG.PRS.IMV give.PTCP become.3SG.AOR.SBJV 2SG.DAT

“But because your services to me have been great [let] what you have requested be given to you!” (P‘B III.7)

Synchrony: AUX *linim*

- ▶ the data suggest that—as compared to instances with *em*—the perfects with *linim* indicate a change of state that is seen as completed (‘unafflicted’ → ‘afflicted’; ‘empty’ → ‘filled’; ‘not yet given’ → ‘given’)
- ▶ the co-occurrence of PRS, PST & SBJV forms suggest that this periphrasis is primarily aspectual

(14) *zi mi erbēk' amač'esc'en oyk' yusac'eal linin i*
 COMP NEG.MOD ever be-ashamed.3PL.AOR.SBJV REL.NOM.PL hope.PTCP become.3PL.PRS in
k'ez
 2SG.AOR

“So that those who [have come to] hope in Thee may never suffer shame.” (PB V.4)

Synchrony: AUX *linim*

- ▶ these forms account for 7.9% of perfects on average:
 - ▶ 60% in Koriwn
 - ▶ 20.6% in Agat'angelos
 - ▶ 8.0% in P'awstos Buzand
 - ▶ 5.0% in Łazar P'arpec'i
 - ▶ 1.9% in Elišē

[not accounting for the occasional form of *etanim*]
- ▶ the diachronic trend suggests that this construction fell out of use
- ▶ early on, the use of *linim* may have contributed to the rise of *em* in the perfect (which in Koriwn still occurs largely without copula)
- ▶ forms of *linim* were required to provide the change-of-state connotation – forms of *em* were, over time, added by analogical extension

Synchrony: AUX *kam*

- ▶ the verb *kam* ‘to stay, remain’ can on rare occasions also function as AUX, it appears
- ▶ in the 5th-c. corpus, there are however only c. 20 instances, some of which are unclear
- ▶ (15) illustrates a common conundrum: *kam* as a AUX + PTCP or matrix verb + CVB?

(15) *ew dadarec'in novaw handerj minč'ew i pahs errorđ ew aynpēs*
 CONJ remain.3PL.AOR 3SG.INS together until to watch.ACC.PL third and thus
xalaleal kac'in i k'un amenek'ean
 be-calm.PTCP stay.3PL.AOR in sleep each.NOM.SG

“... they remained with him until the third watch and thus calmed they all slept ...” (Eł. p. 150)

Synchrony: AUX *kam*

- ▶ the verb *kam* ‘to stay, remain’ can on rare occasions also function as AUX, it appears
- ▶ in the 5th-c. corpus, there are however only c. 20 instances, some of which are unclear
- ▶ (15) illustrates a common conundrum: *kam* as a AUX + PTCP or matrix verb + CVB?

(15) *ew dadarec'in novaw handerj minč'ew i pahs errorđ ew aynpēs*
 CONJ remain.3PL.AOR 3SG.INS together until to watch.ACC.PL third and thus
xalaleal kac'in i k'un amenek'ean
 be-calm.PTCP stay.3PL.AOR in sleep each.NOM.SG

“... they remained with him until the third watch and thus calmed they all slept ...” (Eł. p. 150)

Synchrony: AUX *kam*

Less ambiguous examples

- (16) *isk ibrew etes et'ē arhamarheal kayr hayr i mardkanē,*
 CONJ when see.3SG.AOR COMP **scorn.PTCP** **stay.3SG.PST** **father.NOM.SG** by mankind.ABL.SG
xalac' ekn ēj y=aǰmē at'oroy anti
 move.3SG.AOR come.3SG.AOR descend.3SG.AOR from=right.abl.sg throne.GEN.SG from
 “But when he saw the Father scorned by mankind, he arose and come down from the right hand of the throne.” (P'B IV.5)
- (17) *ayr du zi kas zarmac'eal ew oč' i mit*
 man.NOM/VOC.SG **2SG.NOM/VOC** why **stay.2SG.PRS** **amazed.PTCP** and NEG in mind.ACC.SG
ařnus z=mecamecs Astucoy
 take.2SG.PRS OBJ=miracle.ACC.PL God.GEN.SG
 “O man, why do you stand in amazement without pondering the miracles of God?” (Ag. §741)

Synchrony: AUX *kam*

- ▶ this construction does not lend itself to closer numerical analysis
- ▶ it is, however, possible that a marginal pattern AUX *kam* + PTCP existed
- ▶ where *linim* + PTCP emphasised a *change* of state, *kam* + PTCP seems to denote the (*resultative*) *state* (and perhaps its endurance)
- ▶ once more, this is a primarily aspectual construction, since PST and PRS forms of *kam* occur

Diachrony: the role of WMIr.

- ▶ a periphrastic past tense composed of PTCP + AUX exists in West Middle Iranian (Middle Persian, Parthian) as well – on its potential relevance for Armenian, cf. Meyer (2017)
- ▶ similarly, verbs with the same semantics as in Armenian can be used to serve as AUX
 - ▶ *h-* ‘to be’
 - ▶ *bw* /*baw-*/ ‘to become’
 - ▶ ‘(y)št- Pth. /*išt-*/, MP /*ēst-*/ ‘to stay’
- ▶ the ‘stay’-perfect denotes a state here, too (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014:384 Asatrjan 1989; Ghilain 1939; Skjærvø 2004)
- ▶ the semantics of *bw-* in this context are less clear; both an anterior past and a change-of-state reading occur (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014:376)
- ▶ these issues arise likely owing to the suppletive relationship of the *h-* and *bw-* paradigms and the absence of a synthetic past tense in (non-archaic) WMIr.

Diachrony: the role of WMIr.

- ▶ a periphrastic past tense composed of PTCP + AUX exists in West Middle Iranian (Middle Persian, Parthian) as well – on its potential relevance for Armenian, cf. Meyer (2017)
- ▶ similarly, verbs with the same semantics as in Armenian can be used to serve as AUX
 - ▶ *h-* ‘to be’
 - ▶ *bw* /*baw-*/ ‘to become’
 - ▶ ‘(y)št- Pth. /*išt-*/, MP /*ēst-*/ ‘to stay’
- ▶ the ‘stay’-perfect denotes a state here, too (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014:384 Asatryan 1989; Ghilain 1939; Skjærvø 2004)
- ▶ the semantics of *bw-* in this context are less clear; both an anterior past and a change-of-state reading occur (Durkin-Meisterernst 2014:376)
- ▶ these issues arise likely owing to the suppletive relationship of the *h-* and *bw-* paradigms and the absence of a synthetic past tense in (non-archaic) WMIr.

Diachrony: the role of WMr.

- (18) *u=m was xwēš nām gyāgīhā abar ... mādayān nibišť estēd*
 CONJ=1SG much own name in-various-places upon book write.PTCP stay.3SG.PRS
 “I have written my name many times all over [...] books (= and it remains there).”
 (MP, KNRb, 24–5)
- (19) *u=šān bār ud mēw az draxtān xward ud mahy ... būd hēnd*
 CONJ=3PL fruit and fruit from tree.PL eat.PTCP and bug become.PTCP be.3PL.PRS
 “And they ate various fruits from the trees and were / (as a result) became big.”
 (MP, M7981/I/V/i/2–6)

Diachrony: the role of WMIr.

- ▶ the existence of these constructions in WMIr. suggests that they may have contributed to (or even have been instrumental in) the development of similar constructions in Armenian
- ▶ the differences in semantics (WMIr. simple past vs. Arm. perfect) may be explained by the retention of the Armenian imperfect
- ▶ owing to the suppletive relationship between *h-* and *bw-*, its potential role in this model-copy paradigm is as yet unclear

Conclusions

- ▶ the different perfects (*em*, *linim*, *kam*) are not described in the standard grammatical literature (Jensen 1959; Meillet 1936) nor in research on the perfect (Lyonnet 1933; Ouzounian 2001)
- ▶ the stative-resultative nature of the *em*-perfect may explain why the *linim*-perfect (change of state) had greater currency than the *kam*-perfect – the latter is too semantically similar to the former
- ▶ the existence of parallel constructions with very similar meanings in WMlr. seems to corroborate the model–copy relationship between these constructions in both languages

Conclusion

pre-attestation

- ▶ creation of perfect (PTCP + Ø / PTCP + *linim*) on / influenced by WMlr. model

early 5th c.

- ▶ gradual analogical extension of finite AUX to *em*
- ▶ aided by system pressure from synthetic tenses / cross-system harmony (cf. Haig 2008:193)

late 5th/early 6th c.

- ▶ dominance of PTCP + *em* perfect
- ▶ gradual loss of marginal / semantically more specific perfects (*linim*, *kam*)

Conclusion

pre-attestation

- ▶ creation of perfect (PTCP + \emptyset / PTCP + *linim*) on / influenced by WMlr. model

early 5th c.

- ▶ gradual analogical extension of finite AUX to *em*
- ▶ aided by system pressure from synthetic tenses / cross-system harmony (cf. Haig 2008:193)

late 5th/early 6th c.

- ▶ dominance of PTCP + *em* perfect
- ▶ gradual loss of marginal / semantically more specific perfects (*linim*, *kam*)

Conclusion

pre-attestation

- ▶ creation of perfect (PTCP + \emptyset / PTCP + *linim*) on / influenced by WMlr. model

early 5th c.

- ▶ gradual analogical extension of finite AUX to *em*
- ▶ aided by system pressure from synthetic tenses / cross-system harmony (cf. Haig 2008:193)

late 5th/early 6th c.

- ▶ dominance of PTCP + *em* perfect
- ▶ gradual loss of marginal / semantically more specific perfects (*linim*, *kam*)

Thank you for your attention!



References I

Asatrjan, G. S. 1989. *Ot'glagol'nye imena v srednepersidskom i parffjanskom (na materiale turfanskikh tekstov)*. Ph. D. thesis, Erevan.

Coulie, B. 1994. Style et traduction: réflexions sur les versions arméniennes de textes grecs. *REArm* 25, 43–62.

Durkin-Meisterernst, D. 2014. *Grammatik des Westmitteliranischen (Parthisch und Mittelpersisch)*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Ghilain, A. 1939. *Essai sur la langue Parthe, son système verbal d'après les textes manichéens du Tukestan Oriental*. Louvain: Bibliothèque du Muséon.

Haig, G. L. J. 2008. *Alignment Change in Iranian Languages – A Construction Grammar Approach*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, M. 1995. The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category. In M. Haspelmath and E. König (Eds.), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms*, pp. 1–55. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jensen, H. 1959. *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Karst, J. 1901. *Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen*. Strassburg: Trübner.

References II

- Kölligan, D. 2013. Non-canonical subject marking. genitive subjects in classical armenian. In I. A. Seržant and L. I. Kulikov (Eds.), *The Diachronic Typology of Non-Canonical Subjects*, pp. 73–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- König, E. 1995. The meaning of converb constructions. In M. Haspelmath and E. König (Eds.), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms*, pp. 57–95. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lyonnet, S. 1933. *Le parfait en arménien classique, principalement dans la traduction des évangiles et chez Eznik*. Paris: Edouard Champion.
- Meillet, A. 1936. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique* (second entirely revised ed.). Vienna: Imprimerie des PP. Mékhitaristes.
- Meyer, R. 2017. *Iranian-Armenian language contact in and before the 5th century CE. An investigation into pattern replication and societal multilingualism*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Oxford, Oxford.
- Meyer, R. 2018. Syntactical peculiarities of relative clauses in the Armenian New Testament. *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 38, 35–83.

References III

- Meyer, R. fthc. Armenian morphosyntactic alignment in diachrony. In E. Dahl (Ed.), *Alignment and Alignment Change in the Indo-European family*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nedjalkov, V. 1995. Some typological parameters of converbs. In M. Haspelmath and E. König (Eds.), *Converbs in Cross-Linguistic Perspective. Structure and Meaning of Adverbial Verb Forms*, pp. 97–136. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ouzounian, A. 2001. Le parfait en arménien classique. *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 28, 13–27.
- Skjærvø, P. O. 2004. A triplet of manichean middle iranian studies. *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 18, 147–166.