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Chapter 1

Introduction

Of all the subgroups of the Indo-European family, Armenian is unique in being completely devoid of grammatical gender, not only in its nominal inflection, but throughout its deictic and anaphoric markers as well. Rather than grammatical gender, a distinction of physical or metaphorical distance pervades its deictic system, from adverbs of time and place, to emphatic pronouns and the definite article. The three-fold distinction built into the Armenian deictic system is that of proximal, medial, and distal or neutral, all of which can metaphorically be extended to first, second, or third person reference, respectively.

All proximal deictic markers are built to a stem in -s-, derived from Proto-Indo-European *´k. The medial or second person deictic markers in -d- are derived from Proto-Indo-European *t, and function similarly to iste forms of Latin, ὦτος of Greek, and maybe tū of Old Church Slavic [7, 35]. The distal or third person deictic markers are built to a stem in -n- from Proto-Indo-European *n. In addition to pure physical distance and the distinction of first, second, and third person reference, these forms may also implicate the emotional attitude of the speaker about the object being referenced: -s- (first person) deixis may suggest emotional solidarity, -d- (second person) deixis pejoration, and -n- (third person) deixis emotional distancing or neutrality.

In this study, I have chosen to focus on the text of the Gospel of Matthew in Modern Eastern Armenian, with reference to the Grabar and Koinė versions. I have used the Etchmiadzin translation[1], which is based upon the Classical Armenian version, rather than a retranslation of the Koinė. The decision to use the Gospels as a basis for this inquiry was partially based on availability of translations in both Classical and Modern Armenian, and
partially based upon the earlier study by Klein on this matter in the Classical language. The
Gospels, clearly, are not native Armenian literature. However, that these texts represent
translations of another language should not be a matter of concern:

...the fact that the three-way Classical Armenian and two-way Hellenistic Greek
systems of deixis do not match up is helpful in allowing us to perceive independent features of Armenian usage. These can be stated with the greatest degree of confidence in the case of the Armenian d-forms, which are without precise systematic counterparts in Greek,\(^1\) but sufficient deviations exist in the case of s- and n-forms and their Greek counterparts to provide insight into the workings of the Classical Armenian system. [6, 2-3]

The same justification can be made in favor of the Modern Armenian translations: not only in comparison with Greek sources, but also with those of the classical language. Enough change has occurred throughout the system that usage in the modern texts is completely independent of that found in the classical texts.

The focus of this inquiry will not be on translational techniques from Greek to Armenian, or even from Classical to Modern Armenian, but on the independent forms and systems of usage in each period of Armenian. I will be examining the changes that have affected the phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic aspects of the deictic system.

1.1 Deixis in the earliest attested Armenian

The earliest attested work in Armenian is the text of the Classical Armenian Bible. In Classical Armenian, one of the most common occurrences of s-, d-, or n- markers is as a definite article which assumes the form of a suffix -s, -d, or -n, generally attached to the end of the noun being definitized or the last noun in a definite noun phrase. I will be using a

\(^1\) Although d-deixis is etymologically related to Greek \(ο\ddot{ε}τος\), they cannot be construed as functioning similarly within their respective systems, due to the fact that d-deixis has a connection to the second person, whereas \(ο\ddot{ε}τος\) is simply a proximal deictic in the Greek system with no connection to the second person at all.

As will be shown to be the case in Modern Eastern Armenian as well, determiners in Classical Armenian could be either syntactically or semantically conditioned. Determiners were syntactically required when the nominal syntagm in question was already within the scope of demonstratives and genitives, a usage which is retained in Modern Eastern Armenian. The majority of Kleins book, however, focuses not on syntactic issues, which are relatively transparent, but on semantic issues.

1.1.1  *N*-Deixis

The determiner -n was used primarily for textual or generic anaphora. Textual anaphora, as Klein shows, could be quite overt, as in:

Mt. 1.20 - 24: hreštak *TN* i teslean erewec’aw nma... 24. Ew zart’owc’edal Yovsēp’

... arar orp’ēs hramayeac’ nma hreštak-n *TN*.

An angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream... 24. and awakening Joseph... did as the angel of the Lord had commanded him. [6, 12]

In verse 20, the angel (hreštak) appears for the first time in the narrative. In verse 24 the angel is marked with a determiner to show textual anaphora: Joseph is obeying *that very angel* who appeared in his dream, not just any angel.

Textual anaphora need not be so overtly stated. Rather, synonyms or different morphological categories of the same root could be employed, or the anaphora could be implied through the situation in the text, as in:

Mk 2.1-2 lour ellew et’e *i tan* ē. 2. ew žołovec’an bazownk’. Minč’ew teši ews oč’

linel ew oč’ ař *dran-n*.

Word got out that he was in a (particular) house. 2. And many gathered, to the point that there was no longer space, not even by the door. [6, 13].
Klein explains the appearance of the -n deictic marker on the door as situational anaphora: “...Jesus is in a house, which may be assumed to have a door. Hence, the form dran-n with the article attached” [6, 14].

Beyond textual anaphora, Klein defines seven subtypes of generic anaphora, or anaphora to “things generally known”: aspects of nature, geographical names, groups of people, aspects of Jewish culture or history, generally-known or common things, features of the emergent Christian culture, and terms used with mystic or oracular language which are definitized as types or as symbols rather than as specific instances of things [6, 10-11]. Examples of all seven types are provided from the Classical Armenian corpus. Because -n is also associated with emotional or physical distance or neutrality, it is often used rather than d- or s-forms to mark both textual and generic anaphora. In this way, -n functions as the unmarked determiner in narration or in cases where no extra implied meaning overlays the original Greek:

Lk 22.66: Ew ibrew ayg ełew zołovec‘aw cerakoym zołovrdean-n, k‘ahanayapetk‘-n ew dpirk‘... And when morning began, a council of the people, the high priests, and scribes gathered...

In this excerpt, as well as throughout the majority of the text, forms of the definite article in -n, are used in a completely neutral, narrative context.

The most marked usage of the -n definite article in the Classical Armenian Gospels is with proper names. According to Thomson’s Introduction to Classical Armenian, proper names do not usually take the demonstrative suffix (cf. Aršak ark‘ay - ‘Arshak the king’). In Luke, however, throughout the trial of Jesus one name is often definitized: that of Barabbas.

Lk 23.18 Ew nok‘a ałałakein amenayn bazmouł‘emmb-n ew aseín barj zda ew arjakea mez z-Barabba(y).
And they were screaming all with a great multitude and saying, ‘Carry that guy away and release to us Barabbas.’
Lk. 23.25 *Arjakeac’ noc’a z-Barabbay-n.*

He released to them that particular Barabbas.

After the first appearance of Barabbas in Lk. 23.18, he is continually definitized. While it is true that in 23.25 Barabbas is definitized in the Greek *Vorlage*, the marked usage in the Armenian cannot be explained so simply, since Barabbas is also definitized in 23.18 in the Greek, but not in the Armenian. Further, Greek regularly definitizes names, whereas in Armenian such usage of the definite article is highly marked. The -n form suffixed to his name shows usage of the definite article for purposes of textual anaphora: He is *that very* Barabbas, the one previously mentioned, and not just any Barabbas. This usage, strictly anaphoric in nature, does not function to add any new connotations to the text. The same marked usage can be seen in other passages exhibiting the only other name typically definitized in the Biblical text, those in reference to the other Mary, *miws Mariam-n* rather than the expected *miws-n Mariam* [11, 29-30].

The other context in which Klein presents names marked with *n*-deixis is within the genealogy of Christ in Luke. Here the determiner is employed within a relative clause to mark that clause as definite. In Classical Armenian, relative clauses were often marked as definite by marking the first accented word following the relative pronoun within the clause with a determiner. In the genealogy in Luke, however, the noun *son*, is ellipsed. Therefore, the determiner moves to the next most appropriate word: the name of the son in question. In this list, all but two of the names are marked with determiners: those of Abraham and God. Klein determines that “both God and Abraham were considered so distinctive that they could dispense with the article even under ellipsis”[6, 19].

When a definite relative clause was headless, especially when the relative itself was the subject, Klein found that the relative pronoun was determined:

Mt. 1.22 *Ayl ays amenayn e'lew zi lc’c’i or asac’aw-n i TĖ i jeın Ėsayay margsařeni.*
But all this happened so that what (≈ that which) was spoken by the Lord through Isaiah the prophet should be fulfilled [6, 18].

Klein explains this phenomenon, in which a substantivized relative pronoun was definitized, thus: “In these cases [when the relative clause was headless and the relative functions as the subject] we are dealing with a rule which bestows upon noun-like structures nominal syntax: the susceptibility to be definitized”[6, 18].

1.1.2 D-DEIXIS

In Classical Armenian, the d-form of the determiner is used in primarily second-person contexts, either with connotations of possession by the second person (that of yours) or to mark something as distally in the sphere of the second person (that over there by you).

Mk 14.70 ṭausk’-d isk k’o nman en.

That speech of yours truly is similar.

Here, not only is the head noun followed by a second person possessive pronoun (k’o), but also a suffixed determiner of the second-person. As is pointed out by Klein, “This employment foreshadows, already at the earliest written stage of Armenian, a development that continues on into the modern language”[6, 91].

In translating the Greek vocative case, an obvious second-person context, the Classical Armenian version often employs d-deixis:

Mt 23.13 Vay jez dpac’-d (= οὐάι ἵμιν γραμματεῖκ). Woe unto you, (the/ye) scribes.

In the above example, the Classical Armenian dative, which is marked with d-deixis, translates a Greek vocative. This usage is found in only the M manuscript of the Gospels, one which Klein repeatedly finds to be slightly more progressive in its utilization of s- and d-forms relative to strict Classical Armenian standards. This manuscript, incidentally, also
shows many more progressive spellings, such as ō for aw and psilosis of hōgi ‘spirit’ to ogi. In many ways, these progressive tendencies of the M manuscript reflect what will be shown true of Modern Eastern Armenian usage as well.

The second-person contexts governing d-deixis may also be much less overt than the above examples:

Mt. 6.22 et'e akn k'o aṅat ē. Amenayn marmin-d lowsawor etic'i.
If thine eye is simple (i.e. clear), all thy body will be radiant.

Mt. 16.18 dow es vēm (= Πέτρος) ew i veray aydr vimī šinec'ic' zekelec'ī im.
Thou art a rock (Peter); and upon this rock (≈ thee) I shall build my church.

In both of the above cases, d-forms themselves may be translated into English as second-person pronouns or possessive adjectives with second person reference. As Klein asserts, this development of a convergent usage of deictic forms with personal pronouns will come to full bloom in the later language [6, 91].

Another reason that parallels are often drawn between -d- and iste of Latin has to do with pejorative connotations. Cf., for example, Cicero’s usage of iste in his speech against Cataline:

Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? quam diu etiam furor iste
tuus nos eludet?
How long will you keep trying our patience, Catiline? How much longer will that fury of yours mock us? [3, 13]

The pejorative connotations of this context – a speech in which Cicero is railing against Cataline – barely demand pointing out. Similarly, Armenian second-person deixis may carry with it pejorative connotations:

Mt 25.28 Ard aṙēk' i dmanē z-k'ank'ar-d...
which Klein translates into colloquial English as “Take the damned/lousy talent from this ass/schmo,” preserving the pejorative connotations of the Armenian version which are not possible in the Greek Vorlage[6, 110].

1.1.3 S-DEIXIS

The most infrequently occurring determiner in the Classical Armenian Gospels is the $s$-form, which is associated with first person possession, reference, or proximity, and functions mutatis mutandis like the determiner in -d. Of Mark 14.66-72, Matthew 5.13-19, and Luke 22.63-23.49, forms of the definite article in -$s$ appear only in Luke:

Lk 23.2 \text{gtak‘ z-sa zi t’iwrēr z-azg-s mer.}

We have found this one corrupting our people.

In this sentence, the definite noun $z$-azg-s ‘our people’ is in a first person context: These are not just any people, they are our people. When a definite noun precedes a possessive pronoun or adjective, very frequently the definitizer suffixed to the noun will agree in person with the possessive. In all cases where the person of the determiner does not match the person of the possessive, there is always a reason.

As a function of its relationship to spatial notions, $s$-formants may also be employed to clarify reference when more than one pronoun is required:

Jh 3.1-2 \text{ēr ayr mi i p’arisac’woc‘ anti. Nikodēmos anown nora. išxan hrēic‘ (2)}
\text{sa ekn aɪ na...gišeri ew asē c’na...}

There was a man of the Pharisees, Nicodemus his name, prince of the Jews. (2)
This one (under discussion) came to him at night and said to him...

In the second verse of this passage, one participant is in the foreground, namely Nicodemus, and is therefore closer, at least metaphorically, to the speaker. Nicodemus is thus marked
with an s-form of the personal pronoun, while the second participant is marked with n-forms to signal pure textual anaphora and stand in opposition to the s-form associated with Nicodemus [6, 70].

A first person definitizer may also be used to signify something emotionally significant to the speaker or narrator:

Lk 23.4 չուտանում մինչ տնտես իթար-ս իթամիկ.

I do not find any guilt in this man here.

Although it can be argued that the -s-form appears here because of proximal deixis — this man standing right here before me — what is more important for a complete understanding of the usage of the first person definite article is Pilate’s empathy for Jesus during the majority of the trial, as written into the text by the Armenian translator. Not only is Jesus ‘this very man standing before me,’ but also ‘this very innocent man standing before me with whom I am showing emotional solidarity.’

Once a context of s-deixis has been established, Classical Armenian tends to maintain that same deictic marker throughout the discourse, a property Klein calls The Principle of Deictic Consistency. “Once [an s-form] is brought into play for whatever reason, subsequent anaphoric references must agree with it in deixis, so long as they are part of the same discourse without change of perspective ”[6, 57]. After the initial marking of s-deixis, all other occurrences may be purely anaphoric.

1.2 Deixis in Modern Eastern Armenian

The most obvious difference between Classical and Modern Eastern Armenian is the allomorphy exhibited by the third-person deictic. When -n appears after a consonant it becomes reduced to -o:

Mt. 2.19 Երբ Հերուդաս-ո վածանուկ, ահա Տիրոյի հրեշտա-ո ըրաzi մէիզ ըրեւաց’

Եուսեպ’ի-ն Էզիպտոսում էվ ասաց’…
And when (that) Herod was dead, lo, an angel of the lord appeared in a dream to (that) Joseph in Egypt and said . . .

This rule \(^2\) holds in all cases in Modern Eastern Armenian, except when the following word is “an auxiliary verb that is enclitical and marks the focused word (the most important piece of information in the sentence) or a word beginning with a vowel and bearing the phrasal stress” \([8, 8]\). The determiner -\(\varnothing\) represents no more than a predictable allomorph of -\(n\), and thus it will not be necessary to differentiate between the two forms. Because -\(\varnothing\) has no differences in deictic usage from -\(n\), they will be treated together as one morpheme throughout discussions of the modern language.

1.2.1 Syntactically Necessary Deixis

The system of deixis in Modern Eastern Armenian, much like that of Classical Armenian, employs determiners in -\(s\), -\(d\), and -\(n\) for both syntactic and semantic reasons. Syntactically necessary determiners, usually in -\(n\), although in one instance in -\(d\), occur in nominal syntagms of varying levels of complexity which are within the scope of a demonstrative, a genitive marker, or a quantifier. Of these three types of nominal syntagms, only the third is an innovation since the Grabar version. In Chapter 2 I will discuss in detail such syntagms, including their syntactic structures and limitations.

\(^2\)In order to grasp the true implications of this rule, it is important to understand the basics of Armenian orthographic conventions in relation to its rules of phonotaxis and syllable structure. Modern Eastern Armenian inherited orthographic conventions from earlier stages of the language which obscure the true nature of its syllabification rules: “[The letter \(a\)] is rarely written save in initial position for monosyllables and compounds derived therefrom... It was, however, the most common vowel in spoken Armenian, which has many open syllables” \([11, 14]\). Thomson elucidates the many rules of schwa insertion in his book, including that: “the demonstrative suffixes \(s\), \(d\), and \(n\) coalesce with a preceding vowel but not with a preceding consonant or diphthong” \([11, 120]\). Because of these schwa insertion rules, it would be more proper to speak of \(n\)-deletion than of reduction to schwa.
1.2.2 Semantically Necessary Deixis

Semantically necessary determiners occur for many of the same reasons in Modern Eastern Armenian as in the classical language, the most common being to mark textual and generic anaphora.

In nominal syntagms in which the head nominal is anything but a noun (or represents an ellipsed noun), the head nominal must be marked with a determiner, generally -n. The head nominal could belong to any other class of word: adjective, quantifier, participle, or genitive noun with an ellipsed head.

Another usage which is peculiar from a diachronic perspective is that of determining definite direct objects when the distinction between nominative and accusative is structurally ambiguous. This usage was not found in the Grabar, because the distinction between the subject and definite direct object was easily marked via the Nota Accusativi, a prefix z- which was affixed to the definite direct object. This morpheme has since fallen out of use, causing a limited amount of structural ambiguity as the nominative and the accusative forms of all non-determined nouns show homophony.

Further, deictic markers may be employed to mark pronouns or adpositions as emphatic, or to mark emphatic comparatives.
In Modern Eastern Armenian, determiners are obligatory in nominal syntagms modified by a genitive noun, possessive pronoun, demonstrative adjective, or quantifier. In the few instances in which a syntagm containing one of these is undetermined, however, it is (with
one exception) within the domain of an adposition which governs the genitive. These highly marked syntagms will be taken up at the end of this section.

In nominal syntagms with a possessive pronoun or a noun in the genitive case, the syntagm always begins with the genitive noun or possessive pronoun and ends with the head nominal, which must always be marked with a determiner in -\( n \):

Mt. 4.22. \( Nrank'\ iskoytn t'o\text{\textdegree} nelov nawak-\( o \ ew \ irenc'\ hör-\( o \ gnac'in nra jetewic'. \)

Immediately having left the ship and their father they went after him.

Mt. 27.16 \( Ayn \ žamanak own\text{\textdegree}in mi nšanawor bantarkeal, ori anoun-\( o \ Yesow Barabba ěr. \)

At that time they had a noted prisoner, whose name was Jesus Barabbas.

Mt. 10.7 \( Ew erb gnak' k'arozeeč'k'\ ew asac'čk', “Erknk’i ark’ayowt’iwn-\( o \ mōtec’el ě.” \)

And when you go back, proclaim and say, “The kingdom of heaven is near.”

In all of the above passages, the head noun is directly preceded by the possessive pronoun or genitive noun modifying it. In all such cases, which number 572 in Matthew alone, the head noun is marked with -\( n \) deixis, regardless of the person of the possessive.

In the classical language it was often possible to omit the determiner entirely from such syntagms, or to match the person of the determiner to the person of the possessive pronoun: -s with first person possessives and -d with second person possessives.

Mt. 5.2 (Classical) \( Ew bac'eal z-beran-\( o \ iwr owsovč'anēr z-nosa, ew asēr… \)

And having opened his mouth, he taught them and said…

Mt. 16.16 (Classical) \( Patasxani et nma simovn petros ew asē, “dow es K’ristos ordi Astowcoy kendanwoy-\( o .” \)

Simon Peter gave an answer to him and said, “You are Christ, son of the living God.”
Lk 23.1 (Classical) *gtak’t z-sa zi t’iwrêr z-azg-s mer*.

We have found this one corrupting our people.

In both Mt 5.2 and Mt. 16.16, the head noun precedes the possessive pronoun or the genitive noun that is modifying it and remains undetermined. In Lk 23.1, the head noun precedes its possessive pronoun, and the determiner on the head noun matches the person of the possessive pronoun. In the classical language, first person possessive pronouns were often paired with first person determiners and second person possessive pronouns with second person determiners, following the Principle of Deictic Consistency.¹

First and second person possessive pronouns are never matched with -s or -d determiners in Modern Eastern Armenian:

Mt. 2.6 ... or *piti hovou im žołowrdi-n Israyêli-n*.
... who shall feed my people Israel.

Mt. 4.6 ... *orpêszi erbek’ k’o otk’-a k’ari-n ċxp’es*.
... so that you shall never bash your foot on a rock.

Mt. 8.17 *Na mer hiandowt’iwnner-a ir vray verc’rec’ ew mer c’awer-a krec’*.
He took our sicknesses on himself and bore our pains.

Mt. 5.16 *T’oł aydpês p’ayli jer loys-a mardkanc’ araj, orpêszi tesnen jer bari gorcer-n ow p’araworen jer Hor-a, or erknk’owm ē.*
In that way let your light shine before mankind, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father, who is in heaven.

¹In his book, Klein used deictic consistency in a slightly different sense, as was described above in section 1.1.2: “Once [an s-form] is brought into play for whatever reason, subsequent anaphoric references must agree with it in deixis, so long as they are part of the same discourse without change of perspective “[6, 57]. Here we see a logical extension of this principle: not only are subsequent references to the same referent using s-forms, but multiple deictic markers to the same referent all use the same type of deixis.
In all of the above passages, the nominal syntagm is modified by either a first or second person possessive pronoun. Unlike in Luke 23.1 quoted above from the classical text, Modern Armenian does not permit deictic consistency between the possessive pronouns and determiners. Rather, determiners in such syntagms are always in -n.

In Modern Eastern Armenian, nominal syntagms modified by genitives or possessive pronouns may contain any number of additional modifiers, all of which will be placed between the possessive pronoun or genitive noun and the head nominal. The constituent boundaries are clearly marked with the genitive noun or possessive pronoun as the foremost member, and the determined head nominal as the last. Everything between the genitive and the determiner must be a part of the constituent:

Mt. 18.14 Ayspēs im erknowor Hōr kamk'-o č'e, or ays p'ok'rīkneric' mēk-o korē'i.

In this way, my heavenly Father’s desire is not that one of these little ones should perish.

Mt. 20.21 Asa, or srank' im ays erkow ordiner-o, nsten k'o ark'ayowt'ean mēj.

Say that they, these, my two sons (literally ‘my these two sons’), may sit in your kingdom.

Mt. 13.11 Na patasxanec' ew asac' nranc', “K'ani or jez ē trowac imanal erknk'i ark'ayowt'ean xorhowrdner-o, isk nranc' trowac č'e.”

He answered and said to them, “Because to you was given to know the secrets of the kingdom of heaven; but it was not given to them.”

In all of the above examples, complex nominal syntagms with multiple modifiers are marked with a single -n on the head noun. In Matthew 13.11, erknk'i ark'ayowt'ean ‘the kingdom of heaven’ could easily stand on its own as a noun with a genitive complement, as it did in Matthew 10.7. Unlike in 10.7, however, in 13.11 ark'ayowt'ean is not determined because it is contained within the larger syntagm erknk'i ark'ayowt'ean xorhournerver-o ‘the secrets
of the kingdom of heaven’. Only the final nominal in these syntagms may be determined, regardless of how many smaller syntagms modify the head noun.

In the few cases in which the head nominal in a syntagm modified by a genitive is not a noun, that nominal will be substantivized and will exhibit the same syntax as the noun it represents:

Mt. 1.18 *Nra maŋr-ŋ* Mariam-ŋ, or Yovsēp’i nšanac-n ēr, naŋk’an nranč’ irar mōtenal-ŋ. *Sowrb Hogowc’ yliac’ac gtnowec.*

His mother, that Mary, who was betrothed to Joseph, before their coming together to each other (literally ‘their to each other coming together’), was found to have conceived by the Holy Spirit.

Mt. 8.21 *Ew ir ašakertneric’ mēk-n asac’.*

And one of his disciples (literally ‘his from-the-disciples one’

Mt. 13.46 *Ew gtnelov mi t’ankaržëk’ margarit gnac’ vačařec’ ir amboľ ownc’ac-ŋ ew ayd margarit-ŋ gnec’.*

And having found a precious pearl, he went away and sold all his possessions (literally his all possessions) and bought that pearl.

Mt. 2.15 *Orpēzsi kataowi margarēi beranov Tiroj koľmic’ asowac-ŋ.*

So that the thing of the prophet which was said by God through the mouth (literally of the prophet through the mouth by god the said thing) could be fulfilled.

In each of the above cases, a nominal syntagm modified by a noun in the genitive case or a possessive pronoun is headed by something other than a noun, namely a quantifier or a participle. As was true of syntagms with a head noun, the substantivized nominal head

---

2These partitive constructions (*ašakertneric’ mēk-n ‘one from the disciples’*) will be treated in section 3.3.2.
must be the last word of the syntagm, no matter how many modifiers intervene between the genitive and the head. These substantivized heads function exactly the same as nouns would, and, having been given nominal syntax, are determined just as if they were nouns.

The most marked nominal syntagm in which the head nominal is modified by a noun in the genitive case occurs in Matthew 13.22. Here, the genitive noun marked by s-deixis is followed by a head noun with n-deixis, the only such case in Matthew:

Mt. 13.22 baycʻ ašzarhi-s hogser-ə (=ŋ méρημα νοῦ αἰώνος νοῦν³) ew harstowtʻean patrankʻner-옴 ew sa linowm ō anptowł.

but the cares of this world and the deceit of riches choke the word, and it becomes unfruitful.

The n-determiner, as has been the case in each like syntagm, is required by the syntax of the phrase. The s-marker on the genitive noun, however, is highly marked. This is the only occurrence of a genitive with a deictic marker in such a syntagm in the entirety of Matthew. The above very marked construction is employed because it is the only way to convey the desired meaning. The most unmarked construction, ays ašzarh ‘this world,’ is impossible in this context because, in conjunction with the head noun as ays ašzarhi-s hogser-ə, the meaning would become ‘these cares of the world’ rather than ‘the cares of this world.’ Without recourse to the demonstrative ays ‘this,’ Modern Eastern Armenian may rely on the highly marked usage of s-deixis to show a connection with proximal reference.

There are many syntagms involving a nominal with a genitive complement which do not fit the above stated pattern:

Mt. 5.24 nax haštowir k‘o eľbör het ew, apa ek k‘o ŏncan matowc‘ir.

First reconcile with your brother, then go offer your gift.

³The editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford of the Greek New Testament omit νοῦν, reading instead only Ń méρημα νοῦ αἰώνος ‘the cares of the world’ [2, 35]. It can be assumed from the presence of the s-morpheme that the Koinē version this was ultimately translated from must have included νοῦν, otherwise we would have to postulate that the -s constitutes further interpretation of the text by the Armenian translators, a conclusion that is not on the whole unwarranted, albeit less likely in this case.
Mt. 17.16 *Nran k’o ašakhtneri mêt taray, ew č’karolac’an bžškel.*
I brought him near your disciples, and they could not heal him.

Mt. 25.21 *mtir k’o tiroj owrazout’ean mĕj.*
Enter into the pleasure of your lord.

All of the above passages show nominal syntagms with genitive complements; however, none show determiners on the head nominal. Unlike all of the other examined passages above, these syntagms all end with adpositions. At its earliest attestation Armenian had only six true adpositions: *ař, ənd, əst, z-, c’, i.* To make up for this dearth, Classical Armenian grammaticalized many nouns as adpositions governing the genitive case, or occasionally the instrumental as well. Mt. 5.24, 17.16, and 25.21 all show syntagms in which the head noun is within the scope of one of these grammaticalized nouns. Throughout Matthew, whenever nouns are in the genitive case because of one of these adpositions, they do not take determiners. Likewise, any other nouns within the same constituent are also undetermined. Notice in 25.21, *tiroj* ‘Lord’ ought to be determined, as it is modified by *k’o* ‘our’; however, it is within the scope of the adposition *mĕj* ‘into’ modifying the larger constituent *k’o tiroj owrazout’ean mĕj* ‘into the pleasure of your lord’.

Of the remaining seven cases in which the head nominal is not determined, six are in either the ablative, locative, or instrumental case:

Mt. 5.36 *Ew k’o glxov ĕl č’erdowes.*
And do not swear by your head...

Mt. 7.4 *Kam inč’pės k’o elbŏr-n asowm “es t’oř or hanem ayd šiwł-ə k’o ač’k’ic’,”
ev aha k’o ač’k’oum geran kay?
Or how do you say to your brother, “let me remove that speck from your eye,” and lo, in your eye there is a stick.

Mt. 7.22 *Ayn őr-ə šater-n inj piti asen, “Têr, Têr, č’ėor k’o anownik margarēac’ank’ ew k’o anownik dewer hanec’ink’ ew k’o anownik bazowm zōravor*
gorcer arec‘ink‘?"

On that day many will say to me, “Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by your name,
cast out demons by your name, and do many works by your name?”

It is possible that in all of these instances an adverbial case such as the locative or the instrumental, similar in meaning to an adposition like mēj ‘into’, is enough to block the otherwise-obligatory determiner on the head nominal.

The final case in which the head nominal is left undetermined does not fit the above explanation:

Mt. 7.21 Oč‘ amēn mard, or inj, “Tēr, Tēr” ē asown, erknk‘i ark‘ayowt‘iwn-∅ ko mtni, ayl na, ov katarown ē kamk‘-∅ im Hōr, or erknk‘owm ē.

Not every man, who to me says “Lord, Lord” will enter the kingdom of heaven,
but he who accomplishes the will of my father, who is in heaven.

This passage, which parallels Mt. 10.7 and 18.14 quoted above, is completely devoid of deictic markers throughout, except on kamk-∅ ‘the will’. The expected erknk‘i ark‘ayowt‘iwn-∅ ‘the kingdom of heaven’ and im Hōr kamk‘-∅ ‘the will of my father’ (with the head nominal occurring as the last word in the syntagm), which have occurred elsewhere in the narrative (cf. Matthew 3.2 erknk‘i ark‘ayowt‘iwn-∅ ‘the kingdom of heaven’ and 18.14 im erknawor Hōr kamk‘-∅ ‘my heavenly Father’s will’), do not occur here. The reasons for this conspicuous absence of the determiner on erknk‘i ark‘ayowt‘iwn ‘kingdom of heaven’ and the marked syntax of kamk‘-∅ im Hōr ‘the will of my father’ remain unclear.

2.2 SYNTAGMS INVOLVING A DEMONSTRATIVE

Syntagms involving demonstratives function similarly to the syntagms involving genitive constructions treated in 2.1. These begin with the demonstrative and end with the head nominal which must be marked by a determiner. In all cases, regardless of the person of the demonstrative employed, the determiner is always -n.
Table 2.2: Syntagms with Demonstratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntagm</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative + noun-n</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative + quantifier + noun-n</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative + demonstrative + noun-n</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative + genitive noun + noun-n</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative + adjective-n</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative + quantifier-n</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Syntagms</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mt. 24.33 *Noynpēs ew dowk‘ erb ays bolor-ա tesnēk‘, imac‘ēk‘, t‘ē mōt ē na, dīneri aṟaj.*

In the same way, also when you see all this (literally ‘this all’), understand that it is near, by the doors.

Mt. 19.11 *Bolor-n ondownak č‘en ayd bani-n, ayl nrank‘, oronc‘ trowac ē.*

Not all receive that word, but those to whom it is given.

Mt. 10.12 *Ew erb ayn town-ա mtnēk‘, oljoyn towēk‘ nran ow asac‘ēk‘…*

And when you enter that house, give it a greeting and say…

In all of the above examples, as is true throughout the text, demonstratives in the first, second, and third person are followed by the determiner in -n. This usage contrasts with the tendency of the classical language to match the person of the demonstrative with the person of the determiner on the head nominal. That is to say, in Classical Armenian it is possible to match *ays* with -s and *ayd* with -d in keeping with the Principle of Deictic Consistency. As was the case with the above genitive constructions, however, Modern Eastern Armenian does not observe this principle, rather marking all head nominals in these constructions with -n.
Just as was observed with genitive nominal syntagms, syntagms with demonstratives may be quite complex. In all cases, the syntagm begins with the demonstrative and ends with the determined head nominal; everything between the demonstrative and the determiner must be a part of the constituent, and no other nominals within the syntagm may be determined:

Mt. 2.20 Ver kac’, verc’ow ayd mankan-n ow ir mór ew verararcir Israyēli erkir-ə, orovhetew meṙan nrank’, or ayd mankan mah-n ēin owzown.

Having risen, take that child (by you) and his mother and go into the land of Israel, because they who wanted the death of that child (by you) are dead.

Mt. 8.13 Ew ayd noyn żami-n nra cara-n arofjac’aw.

And at that very moment his servant was healed.

Mt. 26.1 Erb Yisows ays bolor xōsk’er-ə verjac’rec’, ir ašakertneri-n asac’…

When Jesus had finished all these words, he said to his disciples…

Matthew 2.20, ayd mankan mah-n ‘the death of that child’ contains within the syntagm a smaller constituent ayd mankan ‘that child.’ Construed alone with only ayd, mankan would certainly require an n-determiner as it did in the previous sentence. However, within the larger syntagm, the head nominal is mah ‘death’, not mankan ‘child’, and therefore mankan cannot be determined. In Matthew 8.13, we see another instance in which Modern Eastern Armenian does not observe the principle of deictic consistency: in the classical language we would expect ayd to be followed by the emphatic demonstrative doyn ‘that very one (by you)’; however, in Modern Eastern Armenian when multiple deictics are employed only one (generally the one which occurs first in a syntagm) will be made from the s- or d-stem. All others must be made from the n-deictic stem.

As was also the case with genitive constructions, demonstratives can modify syntagms headed by nominals which are not nouns:

Mt. 5.18 Čsmarit em asowm jez, minčew or erkink’ ow erkir anc’nen, mi yovt isk, – or mi nšanaxec’ ē, – Ōrēnk’ic’ ew margarēneric’ ēi anc’ni, minčew or
**ays bolor-** katarowi.

Truly I say to you, until earth and heaven may end, not even one iota - which is one sign - from the Law and the prophets will pass, until all of this (literally ‘this all’) is ended.

Mt. 20.14 Ays veršinneri-n kamenown em tal ork’an ew k’ez.

To this last I want to give also as to you.

In Matthew 5.18, the head nominal of the syntagm modified by the demonstrative *ays* is the quantifier *bolor* ‘all.’ Matthew 20.14 shows the only instance in Matthew in which the head nominal in such a syntagm is an adjective: *veršinneri-n* ‘last’. Just as was the case with the genitive syntagms above, adjectives and quantifiers functioning as substantivized nominals attain nominal syntax, i.e. they must be determined in all cases in which a noun would bear a determiner. As the head nominal to a syntagm modified by a demonstrative, the quantifier in Matthew 5.18 and the adjective in Matthew 20.14 are required by the nature of their syntagms to bear *n*-deixis.

### 2.3 Syntagms Involving a Quantifier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntagm</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier + noun-n</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier + noun-d</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Syntagms</strong></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syntagms involving a nominal modified by a quantifier work *mutatis mutandis* like syntagms with genitives or demonstratives. The syntagm begins with the quantifier modifying the nominal, and always ends with the head nominal which bears a determiner. In all but two cases (both from the same verse), the determiner (as should be expected) is in -*n*:
Mt. 25.22 *Ov erkow k’ank’ar-n ūr ariel, na ēl móte‘aw ow asac’.*

Who had received two talents, that one approached and said...

Mt. 20.19 ... *sakayn na errord ūr-ō yarowt’iwn piti ārni.*

...yet on the third day he will achieve resurrection.

Mt. 12.23 *Amboł żołovowrd-ō zarmac’aw ew asowm ūr.*

The whole crowd was amazed and said...

The most obvious type of quantifier, a cardinal number, is given in Matthew 25.22, in which *k’ank’ar ‘talents’* is modified by the number *erkow ‘two’,* causing *k’ank’ar* to become determined. Ordinal numbers also cause the nominals they modify to bear determiners, as in *errord ūr-ō ‘the third day.’* Commonly, however, the quantifier is not a number, but an adjective of quantity such as *ambołj ‘all.’*

The most marked usage of this type occurs in Matthew 11.28:

Mt. 11.28 *Ekēk’ inj mōt, bolor yognac-ōr ow beńaworowacner-d, ew es jez kō hangstac’hem*

Come to me, all (you) laborers and (you) bearers of burdens, and I will give you rest.

In this verse, the head nominals modified by the quantifier *bolor ‘all’* are vocatives, which are generally marked with *d-deixis.* This *-d* is used in place of the expected *-n* to show that the laborers and the bearers of burdens are, in fact, the objects of address rather than third-person entities removed from the discourse, as would be implied by *n-deixis.*
Chapter 3

Semantically Necessary Deixis

3.1 N-Markers as Anaphorics

Table 3.1: Types of Anaphora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anaphora</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Syntagms</strong></td>
<td><strong>703</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Modern Eastern Armenian, the most frequent usage of the determiner for non-syntactic reasons is to signify either textual or generic anaphora. As has been noted in both Classical and Modern Eastern Armenian -\( n \) is the unmarked anaphoric deictic marker, whereas -\( d \) and -\( s \) both imply extra meaning related to person or distance from the discourse, usages which are generally not employed in purely narrative contexts.

3.1.1 Textual Anaphora

Table 3.2: Textual Anaphora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntagm</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun-( n )</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name-( n )</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nominals with -( n )</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Syntagms</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most common reason for employment of a determiner is to signify pure textual anaphora. The first time a nominal is introduced, it may or may not be determined, depending on many factors. Each appearance of a given nominal after the first, however, should be determined to signify that this is the same object or person mentioned above, and not a separate instance of the same type of object or a different person by the same name. In this way, Armenian avoids ambiguity in the text:

Mt. 2.1 Erb Yisows conowec’ Hrēastani Bet’lehēm k’ałak’owm, Herovdēs ark’ayi őrov, aha arewelk’ic’ moger ekan Erousatēm ew asac’in…
When Jesus was born in the Judean city of Bethlehem in the days of Herod the King, lo, magi came to Jerusalem from the east and said…

Mt. 2.7 Ayn ˇ zamanak Herovdēs-ô gałtni kanć’ec’ mogeri-n…
At that time Herod privately called the magi…

In Matthew 2.1, the magi appear for the first time in the narrative; thus, they are left undetermined. In Matthew 2.7, the magi appear once again. To emphasize the fact that Herod is calling those same magi, and not just other magi who happen to be in Jerusalem at the time, moger appears with a determiner -n.

Throughout Matthew, textual anaphora takes the form of a single nominal with a determiner (usually -n). This nominal, as seen above, is generally a common noun which has already been introduced into the discourse. It may also be a proper name, a relative pronoun, a quantifier, or a participle.

As was stated in section 1.1.1. above, Classical Armenian very infrequently employed the definite article with proper names. Apart from Barabbas and ‘the other Mary’, -n deixis with proper names is largely unseen in Classical Armenian. In the modern language, however, this constraint has loosened. In Matthew 2.1 (quoted above), King Herod appears for the first time in the narrative, and is referred to as Herovdēs ark’ayi, with no determiner at the end of the syntagm. Herod next appears in Mt. 2.3:
And when Herod, the King, heard this... 

Because Herod has already appeared in the narrative at this point, as was seen in the classical language, it is important that the syntagm referring to him be determined: Herovdēs ark’a-n ‘that king Herod’. Again, determiners must be suffixed to the last word in a syntagm, not necessarily on the head nominal; thus, in this syntagm the determiner is suffixed to ark’a-n ‘the king’, which stands in apposition after the head nominal Herovdēs ‘Herod’. In Mt. 2.7, however, modern usage departs from the constraint discussed in Classical Armenian against determining proper names:

At that time (that very) Herod privately called the magi... 

In this passage, Herod’s name appears for the first time without the appellation ark’ay ‘king’, and therefore, since the determiner must be placed on the last word at the end of a syntagm, -ə (of course representing -n) is suffixed to Herod’s name. This usage of a determiner with a proper name, amounting to 83 occurrences in the text of Matthew, is far from rare.

The one name that seems to be mostly exempt from bearing determiners, surprisingly enough, is that of Jesus. Of the 159 occurrences of his name, only 24 are determined. In each case, Jesus is either the direct or indirect object:

Mt. 8.34 Ew aha ambolj k‘ałak‘-ə Yisowski-n ονδαίαį elaw... 
And, lo, the whole city came to meet (that) Jesus...

Mt. 17.4 Petros-ə patasxan towec’ ew asac’ Yisowski-n... 
(That) Peter gave answer and addressed (that) Jesus...

Mt. 17.9 Ew minč’ leric’ išnowm ēin, Yisowski-ə nranc’ patouic’ ow asac’... 
And as they came down form the mountain, Jesus commanded them and said...
Mt. 26.4 *ew xorhowrd arec‘in, orpēszi nengowt‘eamb brnen Yisowsi-n ow spanen*

and they took counsel, that by fraud they might take *(that)* Jesus and kill *(him)*.

The name *Yisows* ‘Jesus’ is marked with a determiner in three of the four above cases. Matthew 17.9 demonstrates that simple textual anaphora cannot explain these determiners, because there has been no change in discourse since 17.4. There is an extra layer of meaning beyond just textual anaphora implied by only determining the name of Jesus in the accusative and dative cases. Until the trial scene, the name of Jesus is most often determined in contexts such as 8.34 or 17.4, when other people in the narrative are approaching or addressing him. Perhaps unsurprisingly, half of all occurrences of the name Jesus with a determiner occur within the last three chapters, when Jesus is taken and put on trial. Throughout the trial scene, when decisions are made about his fate by others and he is taken from one place to another or subjected to various tortures, his name is determined.

Other nominals may also be determined when used anaphorically:

Mt 20.1 *Erknk‘i ark‘ayowt‘iwn-° nman ê mi tanowtêri, or arawôtean elaw ir ayyow hamar mšakner varcelow.*

The Kingdom of Heaven is like a houselord, who went in the morning to hire *laborers* for his vineyard

Mt. 20.9 *Erb ekan žam-° hingi¹ môt varcowacner-°, iwrak‘ančiwr-° mēk dahekan stac‘aw*

And when the fifth hour came, the ones hired each received their own drachm.

In 20.9, the participle *varcowacner-°* ‘the ones hired’ is determined because it refers back to the first appearance of these individuals in 20.1 *mšakner* ‘laborers.’ Again, as we saw in the

¹Expressions of time always show the inverse of the expected word order. That is to say, *hingi žam-°* should be expected, as numbers generally precede their head nominals; however, in Modern Eastern Armenian time expressions always take the form *žam-° + ordinal*, c.f. [12, 72]: *žam-° tasnhibic‘ tasninn-°* ‘from the 15th to the 19th hour (i.e. 3 - 7 o’clock)’. The newspaper from which Zorc takes this excerpt uses a determiner on both *žam-°* ‘the hour’ and *tasninn-°*; however, the text of Matthew is consistent throughout in only determining *žam* and never the ordinal following it.
classical language in Mark 2.1-2, synonyms may be used in textual anaphora. Rather than restating mšakner, these employees are renamed as varcowacner-∅. As was seen repeatedly, when the head nominal is anything other than a noun, it is given nominal syntax and acts the same way a noun would, including being determined in any instance when a noun ought to be determined. This example is slightly more complicated than what was seen in Chapter 2, however, because when participles, numbers, pronouns, and verbals are used substantively they are always determined, regardless of whether they have been brought into the discourse already or not. In 20.9, varcowacner-∅ is determined both because it is used substantively (rather than as a participle with an explicit head noun, for example varcowacner mard-n ‘the hired men’), a phenomenon which will be discussed in section 3.3.2, and also because it is functioning as an anaphor for mšakner. It is not uncommon at all for nominals to take deictic markers for multiple reasons: syntactic, anaphoric, and otherwise. Here, though, the important function of varcowacner-∅ is its anaphoric nature.

Another complicated example in which there are multiple reasons for deictic markers to be employed is the following:

Mt. 10.1 *Ew na ir môt kanč’elov ir tasnerkow ašakertneri-n* . . .

And he called to him his twelve disciples . . .

Mt. 10.5 *Nranc’ Tasnerkowsi-n Yisows owłarkec’, patowirec’ nranc’ow asac’* . . .

Jesus sent forth the twelve of them, commanded them and said . . .

Here we see the first mention of the twelve apostles. In 10.1, ašakertneri-n ‘disciples’ must be determined because it is preceded by the possessive pronoun ir ‘his’ (as well as a number, although the number is within the domain of the genitive). In 10.5, Tasnerkowsi-n ‘the twelve’ is determined, both because it is a number being used substantively (i.e. instead of ‘the twelve apostles’), but more importantly it refers back anaphorically to 10.1.
3.1.2 Generic Anaphora

I have used the subgroupings of generic anaphora provided by Klein: aspects of nature, geographical names, groups of people, aspects of Jewish culture or history, generally known or common things, features of the emergent Christian culture, and terms used with mystic or oracular language which are definitized as types or as symbols rather than as specific instances of things [6, 10-11] One additional aspect that I will treat in this section is the related phenomenon of quotative deixis.

The most common type of generic anaphora employed in Matthew is the last defined by Klein, terms used with mystic or oracular language which are definitized as types or as symbols rather than as specific instances of things:

Mt. 1.23 *Aha koys-ō piti jḥianay ew mi ordi piti cni...*

Lo, the virgin\(^2\) will conceive and will bear a son...

\[^2\]In this example, *koys-ō* ‘the virgin’ is not determined because of pure textual anaphora, as the referent here is not truly Mary herself. These are the words spoken by the prophet, and cannot
Mt. 3.3 *Anapatown kanč’oři caym-n ě, patrastec’ek’ Tiroj čanaparh-ő ew hart’ec’ek’ nra šawíñer-ő.*

In the wilderness the voice cries out, ‘Prepare the way of the Lord and make straight his paths.’

Mt. 24.28 *Owr or diakn ě, aynteľ ko hawak’owen arcwmer-ő.*

For wherever a corpse is, in that place will the eagles gather together.

In each of these cases, teachings are spoken through parables or prophecies. Matthew 1.23 and 3.3 give prophecies from the Old Testament. In Matthew 1.23, the birth of Jesus is foretold. By *koys-ő ‘the virgin*, the prophet did not signify a specific virgin, or (obviously) that there would be only one virgin in Israel. Likewise in 3.3, the prophet did not signify a specific voice, but rather that there would be a specific instance of a voice crying out. Matthew 24.28 gives the words of Jesus describing the end of the world. He does not have in mind specific eagles which will be in charge of eating corpses; any eagles will do. Also, none of these instances could be textual anaphora because they are the first instances of that given noun within the narrative. Throughout the text of Matthew, whenever Jesus speaks in parables or prophets are quoted, there are examples of this type of symbolic anaphora.

In all of the following passages, the determined noun represents an aspect of Jewish or Christian culture which ought to be familiar to the original audience of the text:

Mt. 7.12 . . . orovhetew ayd isk en Örěnk-ń ow margarěner-ő.

. . . because that truly is the law and the prophets.


At that time Herod the Tetrarch heard the fame of Jesus and said to his servants . . . point anaphorically to something that had not been introduced into the narrative at the time of the utterance.
Mt. 4.3 *Ew p’orjinč-ə satana-n, mōtenalov nran asac...*

And the tempter (that) Satan having come to him said...

References to the text of the Old Testament, such as those in 7.12, are determined throughout the text of Matthew. By Ōrēnk-‘n ‘the Law’ and margarēner-ə ‘the prophets’, the author of the text is referring to the laws set down by Hebrew scripture, and the prophets contained therein, an assumption which should be obvious to readers familiar with the culture which produced the text of Matthew. Likewise, a first century audience living under Roman rule would have no doubts as to what a tetrarch is. Finally, terms which have become canonically associated with Christianity such as erkir-ə ‘(the) Heaven’, Tēr-n ‘the Lord’, K’ristos-ə ‘the Christ’, xač-ə ‘the cross’, and hreštakner-ə ‘the angels’ are continually determined throughout the text.

A practice that separates modern usage from classical is that of determining names to tie the text of Matthew into the Hebrew tradition. This practice is best demonstrated by the genealogy of Christ:

Mt. 1.2 *Abraham-ə cnec’ Isahaki-n, Isahak-ə Yakobi-n, Yakob-n cnec’ Yowdayi-n ew nra eṭbayrneri-n.*

(That) Abraham begat (that) Isaac. (That) Isaak (that) Jacob. (That) Jacob begat (that) Judas and his brothers.

In the first eighteen verses of the first chapter of Matthew, there are 76 instances of names with determiners which are intended to link Jesus to important figures of the Old Testament. Throughout Matthew, when names of popular figures from religious or secular life are used they are often determined in order to show that Jesus is related to *that particular Abraham, about whom you have already heard (but not necessarily within this narrative)* rather than just any Abraham, or that he is referring to *that particular Caesar*, and not just any guy by that title.

The other four types of generic anaphora outlined by Klein are also present in the text of Matthew:
Mt. 8.6 Tēr, cara-s tan-ə andamaloyc enkac ə ew č‘arač‘ar tanjwowm ə.
Lord, my servant is at the house fallen palsic and very badly tormented.

Mt. 22.17 Ard, asa mez, inč‘pēs ə k‘ez t‘iwum? Pētk‘ ə hark tal kaysri-n, t‘ē oč‘?
Tell us, truly, how does it seem to you? Is it lawful to give tax to (that) Caesar or not?

Mt. 9.11 Erb p‘arisec‘ner-ə ayd tesan, asac‘in nra ašakertnri-n...  
When the pharisees saw that, they said to his disciples...

Mt. 13.6 erb arew-ə cagec‘, xanjowec‘.
when the sun rose, it was scorched.

Mt. 13.1 Ayd ēr-ə Yisows tnic‘ dowrs galov nstec‘ covezerk‘i-n.
That day, Jesus, having gone out from the house, sat on the seashore.

Mt. 15.29 Ew Yisows meknelov aydtetliec‘ ekaw Galiliayi covezerk‘i-ə ew, leř-ə bar-
And Jesus departing from that place went to the Sea of Galilee and, ascending the mountain, sat down in that place.

In all of the above cases, words entering the narrative for the first time are determined. In Matthew 8.6 the centurion addressed Jesus for the first time, so there is no reason to suspect that tan-ə ‘the house’ is determined due to textual anaphora. However, it is clear that a centurion would live in a house. Likewise, in a community in which centurions live, the title Caesar would be well known. As is the case for all of the above quotations, the determined word represents a generally known person or common thing, features of nature or geography, and generally known people or groups of people (such as houses, the sun, the seashore, the mountain) which would be ubiquitous in the setting of the narrative.

One deictic phenomenon that is related to generic anaphora is the quotative usage of the determiner in both Classical and Modern Eastern Armenian:
Mt. 5.37 Ayl jer xős‘-o lini ayo-n ayo, ew oč‘-n oč‘.

But let your word be “yes yes”, and “no no”...

Mt. 19.18 Mi spanir-ə, mi šnanar-ə, mi gołanar-ə, sowt mi vkyar-ə

(The) don’t kill, (the) don’t commit adultery, (the) don’t steal, (the) do not bear false witness

Mt. 19.19 k‘o hör-n ow mör-ə mecarir-ə ew k‘o ankerøj-ə k‘o anji pēs piti sires-ə.

(the) honor your father and your mother, and (the) love your neighbor in the same way in which you love yourself.

In each of these examples, Jesus is quoting previous speech. This usage of the determiner is a metaphorical extension of anaphora: he is referring back to an earlier discourse. Klein notes this phenomenon in Classical Armenian in both his book [6, 36] and an unpublished article on Classical Armenian syntax [5, 4]. In Matthew 5.37, Jesus quotes simply the words ayo ‘yes’ and oč‘ ‘no’, whereas in Matthew 19.18-19 he refers back to the Ten Commandments of Exodus and Deuteronomy, laws with which the audience is expected to be fairly familiar. Both could, by extension, fit easily into the domain of generic anaphora.

3.2 N-Markers as Deictics

A clear outgrowth of the three-part deictic role of the n, d, s system is its role in expressions of time and place. Deictic particles and adverbs play an important role as discourse markers which signal time or place in the narrative, for example aynteł ‘at that place (there or neutral)’, aydteł ‘at that place (by you)’, and aysteł ‘at this place (here or by me)’. Not surprisingly, n-deixis becomes intimately associated with purely narrative contexts, and especially with expressions of specific time when used as discourse markers:

Mt. 20.3 Ew aʁawोtəcaŋ žam-ə inni mót dowrs elnelov tesaw owriŋneri, or parap kangnel ēin hraparakoum.
And having gone out at the ninth hour of the morning, he saw others, who were standing around in the marketplace without employment.

Mt. 27.45 Ew kēsōri-n ambołj erكري vray xawar ēlaw minč‘ew žam-ọ erek‘-ọ.
And at midday, a darkness arose over the whole world until the third hour.

Mt.27.62 Ew hetewal ŏr-ọ, or ourbat‘i yajord ŏr-n ē, k‘ahanayapetner-ń ow p‘arisc‘iner-ọ hawak‘owec‘in Piḷatosi mōt ow asac‘in...
And on the next day, which was the day after Friday, the high priests and pharisees assembled before Pilate and said...

In all of the above examples, together with seven others which are analogous and countless other adverbs of time and place built from the n-deictic stem, the context is purely narrative. These expressions of time are used to move the narrative along and signal that time has passed since the last event in the story.

3.3 N-Markers in Syntagms with Ellipsed Nouns

In syntagms with ellipsed nouns, the head nominal is always determined. These syntagms come in two types: In the first, the head nominal is substantivized. The second is comprised of syntagms made up of numbers and nouns in the ablative case.

3.3.1 Substantivized Nominals

Table 3.4: Substantivized Nominals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntagm</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjective-n</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantifier-n</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participle-n</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Syntagms</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In all of the following, the head noun has been ellipsed, leaving a substantivized adjective, a participle, or a quantifier as the head nominal:
Mt. 5.5 *Erani hezeri-n, orovhetew nranks‘ erkir-Ø piti žažangen*

Blessed (are) the meek (ones), for they will inherit the earth.

Mt. 13.19 *amën mëkic‘, ov lsowm é ark‘ayouw‘ean xösık-Ø ew č‘i haskanowm, č‘ar-Ø galis é ew yap‘ståkowm nra srtown sermanowac-Ø.*

When someone hears the word of the kingdom and does not understand, the evil (one) comes and snatches the sown (thing) in his heart.

Mt. 20.16 *Ayspëš, verjinner-Ø arajin piti linen, ew arajinner-Ø verjin. orovhetew bazowm en kanč‘owacner-Ø, bacy sakaw en amntralner-Ø.*

In that way, the last (ones) will be first, and the first (ones) last, for many are the called (ones), but few are the chosen (ones).

Mt. 18.16 *Isk et‘ê k‘ez č‘lsi, ař k‘ez het mëki-n ew kam erkowi-n, orpëszi erkow kam erêk‘ vkaneri³ beranov hastatowi amé inč‘.*

Truly, if he will not listen to you, take with you one (person) or two (people), so that two or three witnesses may confirm everything by mouth.

In each case where an adjective is functioning as the head nominal, as in Matthew 5.5, the adjective bears n-deixis in order to show that it has been substantivized rather than functioning as an adjective modifying another head nominal. In Matthew 18.16, the quantifiers mëki-n ‘one’ and erkowi-n ‘two’ bear n-deixis because they are functioning as substantivizes. In the following clause, the same referents erkow ‘two’ (i.e., ‘one plus you’) and erêk‘ ‘three’ (i.e., ‘two plus you’) remain undetermined because they are followed by the head noun vkaneri ‘witnesses’. Throughout the text of Matthew, adjectives, participles, and quantifiers always bear n-deixis when functioning as substantives, and lack n-deixis otherwise.

³In this syntagm, a quantifier is followed by a head nominal: erkow kam erêk‘ vkaneri ‘two or three witnesses’. A determiner would be expected on the head nominal, as was shown in section 2.3. It is likely that the head nominal does not bear the expected determiner because it is considered indefinite (‘two or three witnesses’ is an inherently different phrase than ‘two witnesses’ or ‘three witnesses’, both of which would be definite phrases). This inherent indefiniteness in the phrase seems to block the determiner that would otherwise be obligatory in a syntagm such as this.
3.3.2 Partitive Constructions

In twenty occurrences in the text, a plural noun in the ablative is followed by a number with a determiner. These constructions invariably translate either a syntagm of quantifier and noun or a partitive genitive in the Koiné text.

Mt. 21.1 *ayn zamanak Yisows ir ašakertneric’ erkowsi-n* (= δύο µαθητάς) owłarkec’ ow nranc’ asac’.

At that time, Jesus sent two of his disciples (literally ‘the two from his disciples’) and said to them...

Mt. 25.2 *Nranc’ic’ hing-ọ* (= πέντε...αὐτῶν) yimar ēin, isk hing-ọ imastown.

Five of them (literally ‘the five from them’) were foolish, but the (other) five (were) wise.

Mt. 26.14 *Ayn zamanak Tusnerkowsic’ mēk-ọ* (= εἰς τῶν δώδεκα) Yowda Iskari-ovtac’i koč’owac-ọ, gnac’ k’ahanayapetneri mō ow asac’.

At that time, one of the Twelve (literally ‘the one from Twelve’), who was called Judas Iscariot, went to the chief priests and said...

This usage of partitive ablatives contrasts with simple quantifier and noun constructions, such as those examined in section 2.3 (c.f., *erkow k’anκ’ar-n* ‘two talents’ versus *ašakertneric’ erkowsi-n* ‘two from the disciples’). In simple quantifier and nominal constructions, the quantifier precedes the head nominal, and the head nominal bears the determiner in -n. In these partitive ablative constructions, however, the ablative head nominal precedes its quantifier, and it is the quantifier itself (preserving Armenian’s tendency to always put determiners on the last word of a syntagm) which bears the n-deixis. The difference in deictic placement is most easily observable with syntagms in which the head nominal, due to anaphoric reasons, ought to bear n-deixis already, such as *ašakertneric’ ‘disciples’ (as in Mt. 13.10 *Ew ašakertner-ọ mōtenalov nran asac’in... ‘And the disciples approaching him said...’)*
There is at least one example that appears to be a partitive genitive, rather than ablative:

Mt. 10.5 *Nran’ Tasnerkowsi-n Yisows owlarkec’, patowirec’ nran’ow asac’…*

Jesus sent forth the twelve of them, commanded them and said...

Contrast Matthew 10.5 with 25.2. In 10.5, the pronoun *nran’* ‘of them’ is in the genitive case, whereas in 25.2 *nran’ic’* ‘from them’ is in the ablative. The form in 10.5 cannot be the result of mere contamination from the Greek *Vorlage*, as the Greek does not show a partitive genitive:

Mt. 10.5 *tou’ tou’c doodeka destepelen t’ Ihsoci…*

Jesus sent forth these twelve...

The Greek here presents *tou’ tou’c doodeka* with the whole syntagm in the accusative case.

The variation shown by Matthew 10.5 and 25.2 cannot be explained by the classical version either:

Mt. 10.5 *Z-nosa erkotasanesis a’rak’eac’ Yisows…*

Jesus sent those twelve...

The Classical Armenian version follows strictly along with the syntax of the Koiné above with *Z-nosa erkotasanesis*4 which must be in the accusative case (observe the unambiguous *nota accusativi* on the pronoun *nosa*). Without support in the Classical Armenian or Koiné versions, this variation of partitive ablatives and genitives cannot be explained as a result of translation, and the usage of a partitive construction at all must be an innovation of the modern version. Without further evidence from the text, since Matthew 10.5 is the only instance of this construction that I have found, little more can be said about any differences in its meaning or usage as opposed to the partitive ablative.

4For remarks on the inflection of this peculiar word, see [10, 428]
3.4  \textit{N}-MARKERS FOR EMPHATIC DEIXIS

In the following sections, I will examine \textit{n}-deixis used emphatically on pronouns, adpositions, and in comparative expressions.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Syntagm} & \textbf{Occurrences} \\
\hline
pronoun-\textit{n} & 12 \\
adposition-\textit{n} & 1 \\
adjunctive-\textit{n} & 6 \\
\hline
\textbf{Total} & \textbf{19} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

\subsection{Emphatic Usage of \textit{n}-Markers on Pronouns and Adpositions}

In Modern Eastern Armenian, emphatic pronouns can be built by adding \textit{n}-deixis to the normal pronouns. This suffix does not change the essence of the meaning or function of the pronouns, but increases their deictic force:

\begin{quote}
Mt. 5.3  \textit{Erani hogov aIк\textquotesingle atneri-\textit{n}, orovhetew nranc\textquotesingle-\textit{n} ë erknk\textquotesingle i ark\textquotesingle ayout\textquotesingle iwn-\textit{o}}
Blessed are the poor in spirit, for of those very ones is the Kingdom of Heaven.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Mt. 18.35  \textit{Noyn-\textit{o} piti ani jez ew im Hayr-\textit{o}, or erknk\textquotesingle owm ë, et\textquoteright\textquoteright jezanic\textquotesingle iwrak\textquotesingle an\textquotesingle iwr-\textit{o} srtanc\textquotesingle ë\textquoteright\textquoteright nri erblo\textquotesingle o nra yanc\textquotesingle ank\textquotesingle ner-\textit{o}}.
My father, who is in heaven, will also do that very thing to you if you do not forgive each one’s own brother his trespasses from your hearts.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Mt. 26.35  \textit{Noyn-\textit{n} asac\textquotesingle in bolor a\textquotesingle akertner-\textit{n} el}.
All the disciples said that very thing, too.
\end{quote}

In all of the above instances, the determiner is employed in a stylistic manner that does not change the inherent meaning of the sentence. \textit{Noyn asac\textquotesingle in} ‘said the same’ means basically the same thing as \textit{noyn-\textit{n} asac\textquotesingle in} ‘said that very thing’. The latter merely enhances the
deictic force of the pronoun *noyn*. As is the case with all stylistic elements, there is a great deal of variation in usage of these emphatic pronouns. They occur only twelve times in the text, with no real syntactic or semantic reason for their usage as opposed to regular, undetermined deictics.

The same process can be used to build an emphatic adposition in the modern language:

Mt. 8.18 *Yisows ir šōwrj-ə bazowm żołovowrd tesnelov hramayɛc' miws koł gnal.*

Jesus having seen the multitudes all around him, commanded them to go to the other side

In this example, the only one of its kind in the text of Matthew, *n*-deixis has been added to the adposition šōwrj ‘around’ to enhance the meaning to ‘all around.’ The multitudes are not just around Jesus, but completely surround him. The adposition maintains the essence of its original, undetermined meaning, but, like the pronouns above, becomes more emphatic.

### 3.4.2 Comparative Constructions

In Modern Eastern Armenian, the comparative is indicated by constructions of the adverb *aweli* ‘more’ (with an optional adjective), a construction that grows straight out of the classical language. The sense ‘than’ is conveyed by either the conjunction *k’an* or the ablative case (i.e., both *injnic’* or *k’an inj* would be translated ‘than me’):

Mt. 3.11 *Es jez jrov em mkrtowm apašxarowt’ean hamar, bayc’ ov galis ē injnic’ yetoy, injnic’ aweli hzör ē.*

I indeed baptise you with water, but who comes after me, is _______ than me.

Mt. 9.16 *pat’rowack’-ə aweli vat kə lini.*

the tear is made worse.

These comparative constructions, like the pronouns and adposition discussed above, can form emphatics with the addition of *n*-deixis:
Mt. 6.25 ճես կեզքում կան տաքացման կամ զգեստակություն?

Is not life any more than food, and the body than clothing?

Mt. 10.24 Աշակերտին ճես կան վառդապետակություն, և զարդերը կան իր ինքը.

The student is not any better than the teacher, nor the servant than the lord.

Mt. 11.11 Քրիստոսի ծննդամներում երեխան կան Յովհաննեսի մկրտիչին ճես կան սեփականության մեջ կամ սենյականությունը

 Truly I say to you, there has not risen one born of women any greater than John the Baptist, but the least of all in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he.

Again, as was the case with the other emphatic constructions, this emphatic comparative construction is purely stylistic and does not inherently change the meaning of the phrase. There is also no clear pattern shown in the classical or Koinē version to prove translation contamination in the Modern Armenian version; that is to say neither the determined nor undetermined version corresponds closely to a particular comparative formation in either of the other versions. Without the determiner, Matthew 10.24 աշակերտին ճես կան վառդապետակություն would still be translated ‘The student is not better than the teacher.’ In Matthew 11.11, the adverb ավելի is followed by the adjective մեկ, showing that the emphatic -ը marker can be suffixed to the adjective rather than the adverb. The determiner merely makes the comparative a little stronger, but any of these constructions (undetermined, suffixed determiner to the adverb, or suffixed determiner to the adjective) are grammatical in all cases. Of the 27 constructions involving the adverb ավելի ‘more’, only four are emphatic constructions with ն-deixis on the adverb, and only Matthew 11.11 shows the deictic marker on the adjective.
3.5 N-DEIXIS FOR DISAMBIGUATION

In the classical language, although the accusative and nominative singulars had fallen together in all nominals except pronouns, the nota accusativi, a z- prefixed to all definite direct objects, prevented any structural ambiguity. In the modern language, however, the nota accusativi has fallen out of usage. Occasionally, especially in relative clauses, the distinction between the subject and direct object can be lost. In such cases, the determiner in -n is used to disambiguate:

Mt. 27.3 Ayn zamanak Yowda-n, or Yisousi-n matnel ēr... At that time, that Judas, who was to betray Jesus...

Mt. 27.11 Ew Yisous-ø kangnec’ kowsakali arj... And Jesus stood before the governor...

Throughout the text, the one name which is routinely left without a determiner is Jesus. When Jesus is marked with n-deixis, it cannot signal anaphora, as his name is left unmarked in its next appearance, as is seen from contrasting 27.3 with the next instance of the name in 27.11. Were 27.3 an instance of pure textual anaphora, a determiner would be necessary in 27.11 as well. When it is marked, it is always in the accusative or dative case. The vast majority of cases of n-deixis with his name occur in the final two chapters, during the trial and crucifixion. Not surprisingly, before the trial Jesus is often in the role of agent; during and after the trial, he is often the patient. To mark and emphasize this difference and remove any chance of ambiguity, the Armenian makes a point to determine his name whenever he is in the role of patient.

3.6 D-DEIXIS

Classical Armenian used d-forms rather than the unmarked n-forms in order to show a connection (either literal or figurative) with second person contexts. The same can be said
of the modern language, where \( d \)-forms are used in overt second person contexts, and even, in some instances, in lieu of second person pronouns. Because Modern Eastern Armenian does not observe the Principle of Deictic Consistency, and even has constraints against using a first- or second-person determiner with other demonstratives or pronouns of the same person, syntactically necessary \( d \)- and \( s \)-deixis is impossible in the modern language. Only semantically necessary deixis can be found for both \( d \)- and \( s \)-forms.

Table 3.6: \( D \)-Deixis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Syntagm</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Reference</td>
<td>noun-d</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Reference</td>
<td>number-d</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Person Reference</td>
<td>pronoun-2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>noun-d</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pejorative</td>
<td>adjective-d</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Syntagms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.1 Second Person Proximity or Possession

In the following overt second person contexts, in all of which Jesus is addressing the multitudes or a single speaker, \( d \)-deixis is used instead of second person pronouns:

Mt. 18.15 *etʼe ełbayr-\( d \) kʼo dėm mełančʼi... etʼe kʼez lsi, kʼo ełbör-\( o \) șahec′ir.*

If your brother sins against you... if he listens to you, you have gained your brother.

Mt. 12.13 *An зыmanak mardown asacʼ jeřk'-\( d \) erkarir.*

At that time, he said to the man, “Stretch forth your hand.”

Mt. 5.43 *Piti sires ănkeroj-\( d \) ew piti astes kʼo tʼșnamow-\( n \).*

You should love your neighbor and you should hate your enemy.

As the parallel structures in Matthew 18.15 show, *ełbayr-\( d \)* and *kʼo ełbör* in the modern language can be used relatively interchangeably. This variation is independent of the classical version, which reads *kʼo* for both -\( d \) and \( kʼo \).
A certain amount of ambiguity arises from this usage of the determiner. Matthew 5.43 can either be interpreted as another example of d-deixis showing possession (your neighbor), or perhaps the only example of d-deixis for second person proximity (the neighbor who lives near you). It is impossible to distinguish between the meanings by examining this text alone without recourse to the original Hebrew and the Greek Vorlage, both of which contain a second person possessive pronoun. Both readings are equally valid in the context of the Modern Armenian text.

3.6.2 Vocatives

D-deixis, as a clear outgrowth of its second person reference, has been grammaticalized in Modern Eastern Armenian as a marker of the vocative, a usage that Klein found only in the more innovated M manuscript of the classical language:

Mt. 11.28 Ekêk’ inj mêt, bolor yognacner-d ow bernaworowacner-d . . .
Come to me, all you laborers and you bearers of burdens . . .

Mt. 23.8 ew dowk’ bolor-d eibayner èk’.
And you, y’all, are brothers.

Mt. 23.13 Vay jez keľcaworneri-d örênsgetneri-d ew p’arisec’ineri-d . . .
Woe to you, you hypocrites, you scribes, and you pharisees . . .

In all of the above, the noun marked with d-deixis is the subject of address by Jesus. The vocative is an unmarked case in Armenian, having completely fallen together with the nominative and accusative cases in nouns, so the d-marker has become a de facto marker or pseudo-case-sign. In fact, bolor-d and amênk’-d, both of which occur twice in the text of Matthew, are roughly analogous to dialectal English ‘y’all’.
3.6.3 Pejorative Connotations

Overt pejorative connotations are harder to find in the modern language when one examines only the determiner, rather than the system of deixis as a whole. For example, observe the pejorative context cited by Klein:

Mt. 25.28 (Classical) Ard aṙēk’ i dmanē z-k’ank’ar-d

“Take the damned/lousy talent from this ass/schmo”

Mt. 25.28 (Modern) Ard, dranic’ aṙēk’ ayd k’ank’ar-ə

Truly, take from that one (by you) that talent (by you).

Because Modern Armenian does not observe the Principle of Deictic Consistency, it is impossible to see from this example (when only looking at the determiner) that there is d-deixis involved at all: it is shown in the personal pronoun dranic’ ‘from that one (by you)’ and the demonstrative ayd ‘that one (by you)’. Already modified by one d-form, however, the head noun k’ank’ar-ə ‘the talent’ cannot grammatically be modified by another d-form, but rather must have an n-determiner instead.

In order to understand the pejorative connotations of this verse, it is important to remember the context of the parable:

Mt. 25.14 For it is as if a man, going on a journey, summoned his slaves and entrusted his property to them; 15. to one he gave five talents, to another two, to another one, to each according to his ability. Then he went away... 24. Then the one who had received the one talent also came forward, saying, ‘Master, I knew that you were a harsh man, reaping where you did not sow, and gathering where you did not scatter seed; 25. so I was afraid, and I went and hid your talent in the ground. Here you have what is yours.’ 26. But his master replied, ‘You wicked and lazy slave! You knew, did you, that I reap where I did not sow, and gather where I did not scatter? 27. Then you ought to have invested my money with the
bankers, and on my return I would have received what was my own with interest.

28. So take the talent from him, and give it to the one with the ten talents. 29. For to all those who have, more will be given, and they will have an abundance; but from those who have nothing, even what they have will be taken away. 30. As for this worthless slave, throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.’ [4]

Matthew 25.28, in context, gives a fine example of the pejorative value of *d*-deixis. Both *d*ranic’ ‘from that one (by you)’ and *ayd* *k’*ank’ar-َا ‘that talent (by you)’ are built from the *d* deictic stem, and can be equated with the determiner in -*d* for the purposes of their semantics in this instance. Notice, in context, that the master is talking to someone other than the slave holding the talents: the verb is in the imperative and he refers to the slave in question with *d*ranic’ ‘from him by you’ rather than the second person pronoun *k’eznic’ ‘from you’. There is no grammatical reason to use a *d*-form of the person pronoun rather than the neutral *n*-form *nranic’ ‘from that one’, so its employment must be explained in another way. In addition to the peculiar usage of *d*ranic’, the talent is also modified by a *d*-form: that of the demonstrative pronoun *ayd* ‘that (by you)’. Clearly, if the talent is being held by the slave in question, it is not near the person to whom the master is addressing his command – it is within the scope of the third person, rather than the second, and should be modified by the *n*-form of the demonstrative pronoun *ayn*. These two *d*-forms, *d*ranic’ and *ayd*, cannot be second person references, and must, therefore, be explained by the secondary pejorative connotations that are possible with *d*-forms of the deictic markers. The master is emotionally distancing himself from the slave in question by locating him within the sphere of another person, namely the second person.

A pejorative reading of *d*-deixis can possibly be observed in the determiner of only one example from the Modern Armenian version of Matthew:

Mt. 7.23 *Es jez erbek’ č’em čanač’el, heñow kac’èk’ injanic’ dowk’ amènk’-d. . .

I did not ever know you, you all go away from me...
It is not hard to read pejorative implications into this quote, where Jesus is speaking about those whom he will not save. However, it is impossible to separate a $d$-determiner used for pejorative reasons from a vocative marker in this context, as the subjects are being directly addressed.

### 3.7 *S*-Deixis

In Modern Eastern Armenian, *s*-deixis is used, *mutatis mutandis*, like *d*-deixis: it portrays overt (literal or metaphorical) first person contexts or emotional solidarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Syntagm</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Person Reference</td>
<td>noun-s</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Solidarity</td>
<td>noun-s</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Syntagms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.7.1 First Person Possession

Just as *d*-deixis and second person possessive pronouns can be used interchangeably, *s*-deixis and first person possession are likewise closely linked:

Mt. 8.6 *Tër, *caɾə*-s *tan-ə* andamaloyc ənkac ē *ew* č'arač'ar tanjwom ē.*

Lord, my servant is at home sick with the palsy and in very great torment.

Mt. 8.8 *ayl xōsk'ov asa, *ew *im caɾə-n kə bžskowi.*

But speak with words, and my servant will be healed.

Mt. 18.21 *Tër, k'ani angam, *et'ē elbayr-s *im dēm mełanē'i...* pētk' ē nerem nran?

Lord, how many times should I forgive him when my brother sins against me?
In all of the above examples, the marker of s-deixis really implies first person possession, a fact which is rendered particularly clear by comparing Matthew 8.6 with 8.8: *cařa*-s and *im* *cařa*-n both refer to the same entity: ‘my servant’. Again, like the *d*-forms covered above, those in -s are rarer in the text and more marked. Nonetheless they still reflect the same meaning and the same translation in English. Also, there is no clear pattern of translation contamination from either the classical or Koiné versions: both 8.6 and 8.8 are translated from personal pronoun constructions in both the classical (*manowk im, manowk-n im*) and Koiné (*ό παύς μου, ο παύς μου*) versions.

3.7.2 Emotional Solidarity

Emotional solidarity, like the pejorative connotations of *d*-deixis, can be difficult to see when only examining the determiner due to the grammatical constraints against the Principle of Deictic Consistency. In the text of Matthew, there is only one clear example of *s*-deixis for emotional solidarity:

Mt. 26.41 *hogi*-s ṣôžar ê, *bayc*’ *marmin*-s tkar.

> τὸ μὲν ἡμεία πρόθεμον ἢ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής.

The spirit (by me) is willing, but the body (by me) is weak.

Again, to truly understand the shades of meaning laden in this usage of *s*-deixis, just like the pejorative meanings of *d*-deixis, it is important to put this quote into the context of its passage:

Mt. 26.36 Then Jesus went with them to a place called Gethsemane; and he said to his disciples, “Sit here while I go over there and pray.” 37. He took with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, and began to be grieved and agitated. 38. Then he said to them, “I am deeply grieved, even to death; remain here, and stay awake with me.” 39. And going a little farther, he threw himself on the ground and prayed, “My father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me, yet not what
I want but what you want.” 40. Then he came to the disciples and found them sleeping; and he said to Peter, “So you could not stay awake with me one hour? 41. Stay awake and pray that you may not come into the time of trial; the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.” [4]

In this example, Jesus is warning the disciples against temptation. He is not talking about his own spirit and flesh, as he is addressing Peter, who had just fallen asleep against orders. He is also not merely speaking of the spirit and flesh nearby (that of the disciples), but of the spirit and flesh of everyone (‘this spirit and flesh of me, you, and all mankind’). By employing s-deixis, Jesus invokes emotional solidarity, implying that all people are victim to temptation and must guard against it, as if to say, “You’re not alone. We all must guard against the weaknesses of the flesh.”

Once again, the interpretation written into the Armenian version goes beyond a strict reading of the original Koinē: τὸ πνεῦμα ‘the spirit’ and ἡ σάρκα ‘the body’ have no proximal deictic markers, nor are there any first person pronouns associated with these forms. Based upon a strict reading of the Koineē text alone, there is no clear explanation for the first person determiners found in the Modern Eastern Armenian text.

It could be claimed that the Modern Armenian version is merely aping the classical version, in which the forms (hogi-s, marmin-s) appear, but, regardless, the contention that the modern version is not an innovation does not lessen the reading of emotional solidarity into this passage when the degree of independence of the version as a whole is considered. In both the Classical and Modern Eastern Armenian versions of this passage, first person deictic markers appear without clear first person reference. These forms can only be explained by understanding the implicated meanings of emotional solidarity associated with s-deixis, which can be contrasted with the pejorative values of d-deixis.
Chapter 4

Conclusion

In this thesis, I have attempted to completely and accurately describe the system of usage of the demonstrative article in Modern Eastern Armenian, using for a sample the Book of Matthew from the Etchmiadzin version of the Bible. In Modern Eastern Armenian all three of the determiners found in Classical Armenian have been preserved, to a greater or lesser degree.

The determiner in -n is present in the largest numbers, occurring 1,798 times throughout the text of Matthew for various syntactic or semantic reasons. When a nominal syntagm is modified by a genitive noun, a demonstrative, or a quantifier, n-deixis has become obligatory in the modern language. Syntactically necessary deixis accounted for approximately 44% of all the occurrences of n-deixis. The rule which has made n-deixis necessary in these given syntagms holds true unless there is an adposition also modifying the head nominal, or the entire syntagm is actually indefinite, as was the case only once in the entire text of Matthew.

N-deixis can also be used to signify either textual or generic anaphora, a usage which accounts for 703 instances, approximately 40% of the total instances of n-deixis. N-markers functioning as deictics, including signaling expressions of specific time, accounted for 10 instances of the 1,798 total occurrences of these markers. More commonly, n-deixis was used to signal that the head noun in a noun phrase had been ellipsed and a nominal had been substantivized in its place. This usage accounts for 157 instances, or approximately 8% of the total. N-markers used to signal stylistic emphasis occurred only 19 times in the text on pronouns, adpositions, and within comparative constructions.
D-deixis, which in the classical language had associations with overt second person reference, occur only 28 in the entirety of the text of Matthew. In the modern language, d-deixis retains its tie to the second person, a tie which has minimized its frequency of use. Because this marker inhabits the same semantic space as second person pronouns and second person adverbials of time and place, d-deixis has become rare in its most basic usage: that of a second person demonstrative article. Rather than using d-deixis to show second person reference, proximity, or possession, it has become typical in Modern Eastern Armenian to use pronouns or adverbials instead. The most frequent usage of the d deictic marker is not to show overt second person reference, but as a marker of the vocative case, a clear syntactic and semantic outgrowth of this marker’s tie to the second person. Finally, d-deixis is, in one instance, linked to emotional distancing by the speaker from an object of contempt. This pejorative usage of d-deixis shows the subtle way in which these deictic markers can be used to add shades of meaning to a noun phrase, beyond just marking a nominal as definite.

The final demonstrative article employed in Modern Eastern Armenian is the s-determiner, which is associated with first person contexts. It occurs only 8 times in the entirety of the text of Matthew, and is most often employed to show overt first person reference, akin to the usage of first person pronouns and adverbials. Like d-deixis, s-deixis can also add shades of meaning to a noun phrase, marking the head nominal as emotionally close to the first person.

The reversal of the principle of deictic consistency which has happened since the classical language has also affected the ratio of n-, d-, and s-deixis. Whereas in Classical Armenian it was necessary to use d-deixis with other deictic words built off the d-deictic stem or second person pronouns, and s-deixis with other markers built off the s-deictic stem or first person pronouns, in the modern language this rule has reversed to make the matching of deictic stems within a nominal syntagm completely ungrammatical (cf. Classical Armenian z-azg-s mer ‘our people’ vs. Modern Eastern Armenian mer azgeri-n). Many of the discrepancies between the number of s- and d-deictic markers in the classical and modern versions of the
text can be explained by looking at syntagms in which a nominal is modified by multiple deictic or pronominal markers. This constraint has left Modern Eastern Armenian little choice in the preservation of these markers; as long as the unmarked genitive construction involves possessive pronouns rather than $d$- or $s$-deictic markers, these markers will continue to be used infrequently.

One troubling aspect of a quantitative approach to analyzing usage in a text like the Gospel of Matthew is the effect of translation from non-native literature. Throughout the text, however, there have been obvious departures from the syntax of the classical version, from which the Etchmiadzin translation was most directly derived, and from the Koinē version underlying the classical. The modern translation has proven itself rather independent in usage time and again, and, therefore, this thesis was not overly concerned with translation techniques either from Classical to Modern Armenian, or with any influence that the Greek may have had on either version.

Another difficulty that ought to be addressed is that of biblical language itself. The Bible, in any of it myriad versions extant in the world’s languages, does not represent very closely the speech of the community for which it was translated. In most every version, the language is at least slightly different than the community it is meant to represent. Translators have a tendency to preserve archaisms in the text, so as not to depart too far from earlier versions with which the speech community would already be familiar. These conservative tendencies may have affected to some degree the ratio of $n$-, $d$-, and $s$-markers found in the text of Matthew.

Biblical syntax is problematic for this sort of endeavor in another way: much of the Bible is written in parallel structures. A given syntagm type may be exhibited in the discourse much more frequently in parallel structures than would be expected from natural speech. One good example of this type of problem comes from $n$-deixis on proper names for generic anaphora, as was seen 76 times in the opening verses of the first chapter of Matthew. This density of $n$-deixis with proper names is not seen again in the text; in fact, 80% of the
occurrences of $n$-deixis to signal this type of generic anaphora with proper names occurs in this section alone. A much larger sample size would be required to buffer out the effects that parallel syntax has on this kind of quantitative analysis.

From the data presented here, it is possible to predict that, should Modern Eastern Armenian continue on its current path with no deviations (an assumption which, in linguistics, is not always safe to make), the $n$-deictic markers are likely to achieve true definite article status akin to what is seen in other Indo-European languages, such as English, where the definite article does not convey any connotations of person or distance, but merely marks a nominal as definite. Should this occur, the $n$-deictic could lose its association with the third person and neutral narrative contexts in relation to the three-part system in which it currently participates with the $d$- and $s$-markers. The $d$- and $s$- markers, with their small realm of applicability and overlap with other more frequent markers, could potentially fall out of usage entirely, or be relegated to a minimal realm of applicability much more marked in usage than that which they enjoy at the current stage of the language.
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