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(1) Introduction

(2) As an Indo-European language, Armenian has been the subject of research for about two hundred years.

- The high number of Iranian loans led scholars in the mid-19th century to conclude that Armenian belonged to the Iranian group of Indo-European languages.
- This opinion prevailed until 1875, when Heinrich Hübschmann proved that Armenian is an independent branch of the Indo-European language family.
- The later decades are marked by two fundamental studies, namely Hübschmann 1897 and Meillet 1936, as well as works by a number of other scholars such as Pedersen and Lidén.

(3-5) The next phase of comparative-historical Armenian linguistics starting in the 1930s is notable for several fundamental works of the most outstanding figure in Armenological disciplines, Hrač’ya Ačaṙyan, who successfully maintained the high standards of his great teachers, Hübschmann and Meillet. Of his works we should mention especially:

- “History of the Armenian language” (AčaṙHLPatm 1940-1951),
• Liakatar K’erakanut’yun (“Complete grammar”, AčarLiak 1952-2005),
• and especially his magnificent “Armenian Etymological Dictionary” (HAB), originally published between 1926 and 1935.

(6) Ačaryan’s traditions have been continued by his pupils, such as Ėduard Alayan and Gevorg Jahukyan. Especially valuable are “History of the Armenian language” (Jahukyan 1987) and the posthumously published “Armenian Etymological Dictionary” (Jahukyan 2010).

(7) Some handbooks & studies on comparative Armenian linguistics:

(8) Ačaryan’s corpora roughly reflect the state of research in the 1940s. Since then:
• a large number of critical texts, concordances and dialect descriptions;
• voluminous corpora of inscriptions and colophons of Armenian manuscripts;
• a large amount of lexicological and etymological examinations: corrections and supplements to HAB, newly found words, revision of the philological status of words, many new etymologies.

(9) One of the main tasks of comparative-historical Armenian linguistics is to newly re-evaluate Ačaryan’s achievements, and to combine them with the huge amount of new materials in order to create new corpora, such as:
• “History of Armenian Language and Culture”;
• “Linguo-Cultural and Etymological Thesaurus of the Armenian Language and Culture (organized by semantic fields: sky, world, flora, fauna, kinship, body parts, craft, arts, poetry, religion, etc.)”.

This work will benefit greatly from the possibilities presented by modern data storage and processing techniques.

(10) Main shortcomings that can be observed in etymological studies is that scholars often:
• neglect internal etymology;
• take poorly explained, or unexplained, choices between conflicting etymologies.

(11) Examples from Mkrtč’yan 2005 (Нерсес Мкртчян, Семитские языки и армянский):
Derives the dialectal word p’etat ‘hoe, mattock’ from Akkadian petut ‘implement’.
• In fact, its derivation from Classical Armenian p’aytahat / p’aytat ‘woodcutter; axe, hatchet, mattock’ is impeccable.
Removes native (Indo-European) etymologies of a number of words, such as arawr ‘plough’ and erekoy ‘evening’ with no solid argumentation, replacing them with Semitic explanations.
• In fact, the IE etymologies of these words are impeccable:

2
PIE *h2rhstrom, cf. Gr. ἀράτρον, Lat. arātrum, MIR. arathar, Welsh aradr, OIC. arðr, etc.;
PIE *h₁regʷos-, cf. Gr. ἔρηβος n. ‘the dark of the underworld’, Goth. riqis n. ‘darkness, twilight’, etc.

(12) In the last few decades an increasing usage of linguistic data in the study of Armenian historical and cultural issues can be observed:

• ideas that violate the most elementary principles of philological and etymological research;
• Armenian as cognate with or identical to a non-Indo-European isolated language, such as Sumerian, Basque or Etruscan.
• Armenian as the Indo-European mother tongue or the mother of all languages in the world.

► It is essential to:

• carry out some work towards popularizing some of the elements of comparative-historical Armenian linguistics;
• write reviews on at least the most influential pseudo-scientific publications and present them in academic journals, as well as in more popular media.

1. Indo-European origins of Armenian

1.1 General

(13) Armenian is genetically related to Indo-European languages such as Hittite, Sanskrit, Avestan, Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Slavic. Lexical correspondences belonging to basic vocabulary:

anun, dial. anum ‘name’: Gr. ὄνομα, Lat. nōmen, Skt. nāman-, Goth. namo
astī, asteī ‘star’: Gr. ἄστις, Av. star-, Goth. starrno, Lat. stella, Hitt. ḫasterza
duṙn ‘door’: Skt. dvār-, Gr. ἱδρα, Lat. foris, Welsh dor, Eng. door, OCS ьрь

dustr ‘daughter’: Skt. duhitār-, Gr. ἡγάτηρ, Lith. dukte

kin, kanay- ‘woman, wife’: OAv. 낀- ‘woman’, Gr. γυνή, γυναι-, Goth. qino
dvur ‘heart’: OCS srъцce, Lith. širdis ‘heart’, Goth. hairto ‘heart’

(14) Systematical and consequent phonological agreements:

An initial *s- drops: Arm. alt ‘salt’ vs. Engl. salt ‘salt’; Arm. ewt’n ‘seven’ vs. Skt. saptā and Lat. septem, etc.
The PIE initial *p- yields Arm. h-, and the intervocalic *-t- drops:

hayr ‘father’: Skt. pītā, Gr. πατήρ, Lat. pater, OHG fater, Toch. B pächer

heru ‘last year’: Gr. πέρυσι, Dor. πέρυτι, Skt. parut ‘last year’

čor-k ‘four’: Skt. plur. cāstras, Pers. čahār, Lat. quattuor, OCS četyre

(15-17) Even more significant are grammatical agreements. Here are two examples:
1.2 The PIE homeland and the dispersal

(18) Speakers of the Indo-European cognate languages once spoke the same language, which we conventionally call Proto-Indo-European. Furthermore, they once lived in a defined geographical area, the PIE homeland (Urheimat), the location of which has not yet been established. The dispersal of PIE is dated to about 4000–3000 BC by most scholars and a few millennia earlier by the followers of the Anatolian model.

(19) PIE homeland (Urheimat): Various locations have been proposed (see the map, Mallory 1989: 144):

(20) The archaeological material and the linguistic relationship between the Indo-Iranian and the Finno-Ugric languages seem to favour the view according to which, after the dispersal, the ancestors of the Indo-Iranian languages were once in contact with those of the Finno-Ugric languages somewhere in the southern Urals. However, this would make it hard to explain the close relationship between the Indo-Iranians and Proto-Armenians, if the latter would have been in the Near East around the 3rd millennium BC. Besides, even more impressive lexical correspondences between Armenian and Greek, both shared innovations and substrate words especially in the domains of agriculture and technical activities, imply a long and multistage stay of Proto-Armenians in the regions not very far from the Black Sea.

(21) Therefore, even if one accepts the Near-Eastern origin of the Indo-Europeans, it is hard to claim that the PIE dispersal took place in the Near East, and that the Proto-Armenians stayed there all the time. Efforts have been made to reconcile the two theories within a chronological framework implying two phases: an earlier stage (in the Near East) and a later stage (north of the Caucasus mountains and the Black Sea).

1.3 The place of Armenian in the Indo-European language family

(22) The linguistic evidence allows to draw the following preliminary conclusions on the place of Armenian in the Indo-European language family. Armenian, Greek, (Phrygian) and Indo-Iranian were dialectally close to each other or even formed a dialectal group at the time of the Indo-European dispersal. Within this hypothetical dialect group, Proto-Armenian was situated between Proto-Greek (to the west) and Proto-Indo-Iranian (to the east).
(23) There are a large number of connections between Armenian, Greek and Indo-Iranian on the one hand (set A), and between Armenian and Greek on the other (set B). The latter set of lexical agreements also involves European branches of the Indo-European language family, a large portion of which should be explained in terms of substrate rather than Indo-European heritage.

(24) **Method**
Archaic features and independent developments are not significant for determining a close genetic relationship between two languages or dialects. Instead, one should rely on shared innovations from the outset. The drawback with this method: there is often (if not always) the possibility of independent innovations yielding similar results. Nevertheless, the cumulative evidence decreases the likelihood of chance in such cases.

(25) When an etymon is only found in two or three non-contiguous dialects, it may theoretically represent an archaic PIE lexeme that has been lost elsewhere and is thus not significant for our purpose.

But when an etymon appears in a few dialects that can be regarded as contiguous at a certain stage, we should take it seriously even if the etymon has no PIE origin and cannot be thus treated as a shared innovation in the genetic sense.

Two Indo-European dialects that were spoken in the same geographical area at a period shortly before and/or after the Indo-European dispersal could both develop shared innovations as a result of their interaction with neighbouring non-Indo-European languages.

1.4 **Substrate**

(26) After the Indo-European dispersal Proto-Armenian would have continued to come into contact with genetically related Indo-European dialects.

- Simultaneously, it would certainly also have been in contact with neighbouring non-Indo-European languages.
- A word can be of a substrate origin if it is characterized by:
  1. limited geographical distribution;
  2. unusual phonology and word formation;
  3. characteristic semantics (mostly: plant names, animal names, cultural words).

(27) The consonantal correspondences between substrate words in Armenian and other languages are of two kinds:

(28) 1. **archaic**, matching the correspondences of the native Indo-European heritage:

- *-rj-* > Arm. -rj- and *g/gʷ* > Arm. k, e.g. Arm. anurǰ ‘dream’ vs. Gr. ὄνε/οιρος; Arm. kamurǰ ‘bridge’ vs. Gr. γέφῡρα;
- *أسلحة > Arm. սներ 'chick pea' vs. Lat. cicer 'chick pea', Arm. սառ 'column, pillar' vs. Gr. κίον;
- *ձ > Arm. երբու 'breast of animals' vs. Gr. φάρυγξ, gen. -υγος, -υγγος 'throat, dewlap';
- *պ- > Arm. հ- or zero, e.g. Arm. ալան 'pigeon, dove' vs. Lat. palumbēs 'wood-pigeon, ring-dove' (*pʰlʌm-ᵓn, gen. *-bʰ-n-os); Arm. հէկ', gen. հէկ'-i 'fellow', if from *pelk-s, cf. OHG felga, OEEngl. felg(e) 'fellow', etc.; Arm. օրտ', o-stem 'vine' vs. Gr. π(τ)όρθος 'sprout'.

(29) 2. relatively young:
- *կ > Arm. կ, e.g. Arm. կալամաք(i) 'white poplar, aspen' vs. Hesychian καλαμίνδαρ 'plane'; կարիչ 'scorpion', dial. 'crayfish' vs. Gr. κάρις 'crayfish';
- *պ- > Arm. պ, e.g. Arm. պալ 'rock' vs. OIr. ալ 'cliff' < *pal-i-, Mlr. ալ < *պլո-, Gr. πέλλα 'rock';
- *ս > Arm. ս (unless these words have been borrowed from lost satem-forms in *է), e.g. Arm. սայլ, i-stem and o-stem 'wagon; Ursa Major and Minor, Arcturus' vs. Gr. σατίνη f. ‘chariot’ and Hesychian σάτιλλα· πλειὰς τὸ ἄστρον, the constellation being regarded as a car (considered to be of Phrygian or Thracian origin); Arm. սրին 'pipe, fife' vs. Gr. σῦριγξ, -ιγγος f. ‘shepherd’s pipe, panpipe’, which is considered to be of Phrygian or Mediterranean origin.

1.5 Lexical material

(30) I present the material in summarizing tables divided into semantic fields. Wherever a lexical agreement is likely to be an innovation rather than an isolated etymon, I mark it by shading.

(31) Table set A: Lexical isoglosses: Armenian, Greek and Indo-Iranian

(32) Table set B: Lexical isoglosses: Armenian, Greek, etc.

(33) Collation of the two sets
- Both sets have a roughly equal number of lexical agreements in the semantic fields of, e.g., physical world, fauna, animal husbandry and human body.
- As far as the domains of flora and agriculture are concerned, however, in A we find zero and five lexemes respectively, whereas B has 13 lexemes for each domain.
- Especially remarkable are sets of correspondences within a narrow semantic group, e.g. the three designations of plants of the legume family, all of Mediterranean origin: օլուն 'pea, bean', օսպն 'lentil', and սներ 'chick pea'. Interestingly, all three Armenian words display an additional -n and belong to the an-declension class.
Another remarkable difference is that, in the domain of technical activities, set A has lexemes with more general meanings, such as ‘bond’, ‘grave’ and ‘threshold’, whereas B displays a number of specific technical terms such as ‘bridge’, ‘drying implement’, ‘hinge’, ‘pillar’, ‘potter’s wheel’ and ‘rein’.

Without Greek:
On the other hand, there are a number of lexical agreements between Armenian, Balto-Slavic and Germanic or Celtic especially in the domain of physical world. This might indicate that at a certain stage Armenian shared the same geographical environments with European dialects.

1.6 Preliminary conclusions

Armenian, Greek, (Phrygian) and Indo-Iranian were dialectally close to each other or even formed a dialectal group at the time of the Indo-European dispersal.

Within this hypothetical dialect group, Proto-Armenian was situated between Proto-Greek (to the west) and Proto-Indo-Iranian (to the east). On the northern side it might have neighboured, notably, Proto-Germanic and Proto-Balto-Slavic. After the Indo-European dispersal, Armenian developed isoglosses with Indo-Iranian on the one hand and Greek on the other.

The Indo-Iranians then moved eastwards, while the Proto-Armenians and Proto-Greeks remained in a common geographical region for a long period and developed numerous shared innovations. At a later stage, together or independently, they borrowed a large number of words from the Mediterranean / Pontic substrate language(s), mostly cultural and agricultural words, as well as animal and plant designations.

1.7 Chronological background: inherited and borrowed

The Armenian lexicon comprises three major layers:

1. Indo-European heritage: 5th-4th millennia BC;
2. late Indo-European and Mediterranean/European substrate: 3rd-2nd millennia BC;
3. loanwords from neighbouring languages, such as Caucasian, Anatolian, Hurrian, Urartian, Semitic and especially Iranian: 2nd-1st millennia BC to the present.

The first two layers belong to prehistoric times, whereas the third belongs to the most recent period and is partially elucidated by historical records.

1.8 The first millennium BC: Armenian and Urartian

For a long time it was the common opinion of scholars that speakers of Armenian migrated into the Armenian Highlands after the fall of the Urartian Empire in the 6th century BC. However, the presence of the Armenian language in
the Armenian Highlands prior to the Urartian Empire is confirmed particularly by Armenian loanwords in Urartian, such as:

(39)  
- Urart. arštibi- from Arm. arcui ‘eagle’ < *h₂rji-pi-, cf. Skt. ṭṛipyā- ‘epithet of an eagle’, m. ‘eagle’, etc.;  
- Urart. abili-d(u) ‘to join, increase’ from Arm. awel- ‘to increase’ < *h₁r ĝi-pi-, cf. Gr. ὁφέλλω ‘to increase, enlarge, augment, advance’;  
- Urart. siw (cō(w)a) ‘(inland) sea’ from Arm. cov ‘sea’ possibly from *ĝobʰ-, compare Ir. gō ‘sea’ (cf. Ir. bō vs. Arm. kov ‘cow’), perhaps also OIr. kaf ‘sea’, etc.;  
- Urart. qaburzani ‘bridge’ vs. Arm. kamurǰ, a-stem ‘bridge’ from *gʷ(e)m/hur₂ ‘bridge’, cf. Gr. γέφῡρα f. ‘bridge’.

(40) Armenisms in the Urartian language are not limited purely to lexical correspondences.  
► Morphology:  
- Urartian me(i) reflects the Armenian prohibitive particle mi, which derives from PIE *meh₁, cf. Skt. mā, Av. mā, Gr. μή, Alb. mo, Toch. AB mā.  
- Urartian conjunction e-'a ‘and, also, or’, (not known in Hurrian) may be read e-wi and identified with Arm. ew ‘and, also’ < PIE *h₁e/opi ‘by, at, on, to’, cf. Gr. ἐπι, ἐπί ‘on it, at it, by, at the same time’, etc.  
► Toponymy:  
- Urart. Ńuarašini ḫubi and Armenian Tuarac-a-tap‘  
  ► KUR Etiuni/Etiuḫi, a country attested in Urartian sources of the 9th to 7th centuries BC, which basically corresponds with the Ayrarat province of Greater Armenia  

(41) Armenian giwl ‘village’ and Urartian ueli ‘crowd, army’  
Urartian ueli ‘crowd, army’ from PArm. *wel-i- > *gel-i-: giwl ‘village’, gen. gel-f < *wel-i-ōh, etc.; cf. Gr. ἀλίη, Dor. ἀλία ‘assembly of people’, (ϝ)άλις adv. ‘in crowds, in plenty’ < *ul-₁-s  

(42) Urartian hieroglyphic script: Karagyozyan  
A hieroglyphic inscription on a bronze vessel is read as Ur-sa-a (Rusa): interprets the first sign as an ideogram meaning “horse”, Arm. ors. However:  
- Arm. ors always means ‘hunt, catch’ or ‘hunted animal, game’, never ‘horse’.  
- Xorenac‘i 2.61: Et‘ė du yors hecc‘is “If you mount for (or go) hunting” (i + acc. purpose; cf. Xorenac‘i 2.9: hecanel yors ew i paterazmuns “to ride out to hunt or to war”).  
- Not related with English horse (from *k/k(e)rs-, cf. Lat. currō ‘to run’, OIr. carr ‘vehicle’, MHG hurren ‘hasten’).
(43) West Armenian *horsak* ‘midday’: Karagyozyan claims that the (alleged) meaning ‘horse’ of Armenian *ors* developed to ‘sun’, which in turn yielded ‘midday’

This is a violation of the principles of internal etymology. In fact, WArm. *horsak* ‘midday’ is inseparable from: Polis *harsag*, Adabazar *varsag*, Nor-Naxijewan *arssag*, Ṙodost’o *orarsag*, etc., all meaning ‘midday’ and clearly reflecting Classical Armenian *ōr-hasarak*, an actually attested compound of *ōr* ‘day’ and *hasarak* ‘half’.

1.9 The third and second millennia BC

(44) We have seen that the presence of the Armenian language in the Armenian Highlands in the beginning of the 1st millennium is undeniable. It is also possible that it was also present in the 2nd millennium BC, albeit much harder to prove. Even more difficult is the situation with the 3rd millennium BC. In the following sections, I will briefly present a number of comments on this topic.

- *Hajaša*—(attested in Hittite texts from the 14-13th centuries BC) vs. the ethnonym *hay* ‘Armenian’.

  ► Etymologies of *hay*:

  - 1) *Hajaša*—(from PIE *h2eios- ‘copper, iron’; cf. Gr. χάλυψ ‘hardened iron, steel’, the appellative of the Chalybes);
  - 2) Ḥatti;
  - 3) IE *poti- ‘master’.

(45) Ancient Armenisms in the Kartvelian languages


- Georgian *p'oni*, Mingr. *p'oni*, etc. ‘riverbed’ from PArm. *pont*—(cf. Arm. *hun* ‘ford, shallow, riverbed’ < PIE *pontH-*) at an early stage before the sound changes *-oN- > -uN- and *p- > *f- > h-.

- More examples of possible Kartvelisms can be found in Žahukyan 1988, 2: 68-70.

(46) Ancient Armenisms in the Anatolian languages?

Žahukyan (1988, 2: 85, see also 1: 70) treats a number of Hittite words as loanwords from Armenian, such as:

- Hitt. *luzzi*—n. ‘forced service, public duty, corvée’ from Arm. *luc* ‘yoke; burden of forced service and taxes, subjection; bondage’ (from PIE ‘yoke’, cf. Skt. *yugā-,* Gr. *γυόν/, Lat. *iugum*, etc.; the initial *l-* has been explained by influence of *luc-anem* ‘to unbind, loosen’).

1.10 Cultural excursus:
(47) “Dragon stones” (Arm. višap’ar, composed of višap ‘dragon’ and k’ar ‘stone’)

“Višap stones”
1. Map, designed by Anush Martirosyan and Tsovinar Martirosyan
2. Some “višaps”, drawn from Barselyan 1967 by Rafayel Martirosyan

(48) Stone stelae found in high-altitude summer pastures in the northern and northeastern regions of the Armenian highland (i.e. the historical provinces of Tayk’, Gugark’, Ayrarat and Syunik’). They are interpreted as monuments related to mortuary rituals and belong to the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2200-1600 BCE). Some are shaped in the form of a fish, on others the head and hide of a sacrificed bovid are depicted, while a third class represents a combination of both previous types.

(49) The genealogical framework of the Vishap stones and their semantics is complex and multilayered: Indo-European elements (compare the so-called “Head and Hooves” ritual burial in Sredny Stog, Yamna, Catacomb, Srubna and other cultures) have been combined with cultural features that are observable in other Caucasian and Near Eastern traditions.

2. The development of the Proto-Indo-European phonemic system in Armenian

(50-53) The Armenian alphabet and the phonemic system
(54) Accent; vowel mutations

An inherited Indo-European musical accent changed into an intensity accent which was fixed on the prehistoric penultimate syllable. This was followed by apocope of the posttonic vocalic elements (leaving the accent in final position) and by syncope in pretonic position, e.g. gen.sg. *sirtiyo > *sirti > s(ə)rți ‘of the heart’.

Certain vowels change according to their position on a stressed or a non-stressed syllable.

1. The vowels i and u disappear (become an unwritten Ε ə):
   • sirt ‘heart’, gen. srt-i
   • sûrb ‘pure, clean; holy’, gen. srbóy, srbém ‘I clean’

2. The vowel ē, etymologically *ei, a diphthong) becomes i:
   • sēr ‘love’, gen. siróy, sirém ‘I love’

3. The diphthongs oy [pronounced as /uy/] and ea [pronounced as /ya/]) become u and e, respectively:
   • lóys /lǔys/ ‘light’, gen. lusóy
   • leárd /leyárð/ ‘liver’, abl. i lerðê

(55) PIE laryngeals: PIE *HV- (H = any laryngeal, V = any vowel)
(56) PIE *h₁e-

*h₁es-mi, *h₁es-si, *h₁es-ti ‘to be’: Arm. em, es, ē, Hitt. ēšmi ēšši ēšzi, Skt. āsvi āsvi āsti, OAv. ahmī, Gr. εἴμι, εἶ (Dor. ἔσσι), στί, Lat. sum es est, OCS jesmь, OLith. esmi, etc.

(57) PIE *h₂e-


*h₂ēr/er/-er/n-: Arm. harawunk- ‘sowing, seeds; sowing-field; arable land’, Gr. ἀποστάς f. ‘tilled or arable land; pl. corn-lands, fields’; Skt. urvārā- f. ‘arable land, field yielding crop’, Av. uruvarā- f. pl. ‘food plant, plant, ground covered with plants, flora’; Mlr. arbor, nom.pl. arbanana, OIr. gen. arbe ‘grain, corn’, etc.

*h₂ēμi- (genitive *h₂ē-ί-s) ‘bird’: Arm. haw₁, u-stem ‘bird; rooster; hen’, Lat. avis, -is f. ‘bird’, cf. Gr. ὄς/εἶχος < *aw-itos m. ‘eagle’, Skt. vāy-, nom. vēh/vih, acc. vīm, gen. vēḥ, nom.pl. vāyah, ins.pl. vibhiḥ m. ‘bird’, YAv. vaśi- m. ‘bird’, etc.


(58) PIE *h₃e-


*h₃esdos-: Arm. hot, o-stem ‘smell, odour’, Gr. ὄσμα ‘smell’, Lat. odor, odōris m. ‘smell, scent, odour; perfume’, etc.

(59) PIE *HÇ- (H = any laryngeal, C = any consonant)

The so-called “prothetic vowel”, viz. Gr. ἀ- (and ὁ-) and Arm. a-, Gr. ὅ- and Arm. e- vs. zero in other languages, is now interpreted as a vocalized reflex of PIE initial laryngeal followed by a consonant.

(60) PIE *h₁Ç-

*h₁regʷ- /-es-, s-stem neuter: Arm. erek, old gen. erekoy (note erek-oy, i-stem ‘evening’, and a few derivatives based on *erek-o-r-), ereik-un ‘evening’, Skt. rājas- n. ‘space, air; space between heaven and earth’, synonym of antārika- (cf. also rājas- n. ‘dust, mist, vapour, gloom, dirt’, rajasā- ‘unclean, dark’, OAv. rajiš- n.
‘darkness’), Gr. ἐρήμος n. ‘the dark of the underworld’, Goth. riquis/z n. ‘darkness, twilight’, Olc. rōkkr n. ‘darkness’ < PGerm. *rekwiz-.

(61) PIE *h₂C-

*h₂le/o(u)pek-: Arm. ḥuēs, gen. ahes-u ‘fox’, Gr. ἄλωπης, -εκός ‘fox’, Skt. lopāsā-probably ‘fox’, etc.

*h₂rej-i-: Arm. arew, u-stem, old gen. areg ‘sun; sunlight; life’: Areg kʻatalk ‘the city of the Sun’ (Gr. Ἡλίου πόλις, e.g. Genesis 41.45, 50), areg, gen. aregi ‘the 8th month’, areg ‘eastern’, areg-akn ‘sun’, etc.; Skt. ravi- m. ‘sun, sun-god’ (Upaniṣad+), ravi-putra- m. ‘son of the Sun’ (Kāthaka-Brāhmaṇa); cf. also Hitt. ḫaru(ya)nae-2t ‘to become bright, get light, dawn’.

*h₂Ster- ‘star’: Arm. astl, gen. astel ‘star’, Hitt. ḥaster(a)-, nom. ḥasterza c., Gr. ἀστήρ, -ερος, pl. ἀστέρες m. (also old coll. ἀστρος), Skt. nom.pl. tārali (the absence of the s- is unexplained), instr. stf-bhiḥ, Av. star- m., Lat. stella f. ‘star’, Goth. stairno, etc.

(62) PIE *h₂C-

*h₂neid-: Arm. anicem, 3sg.aor. anēc ‘to curse’ < PIE sigm. aor. *h₂neid-s-, anēc-k- ‘to revile; to blame; to mock’, Skt. ned-: pres. nindati, aor. ānindisur, desid. nīṇīts ‘to curse’ (prob. from *nāid-s-m), Gr. ὀνείδος n. ‘reprimand, abuse’, Lith. niedėti ‘to despise’, etc.

*h₂nēh₃-mn PD n-stem ‘name’ > PArm. *anwn > anun, gen. anuan ‘name’ (dial. also anum, anum), obl. *h₂nh₃-mēn- (> *anumān > dial. *anum)-: Hitt. lāman n., HLuw. alaman- n., Lyc. alaman-, Skt. nāman- n., MPers. NPers. nām, Gr. ὄνομα, -ατος n., Lat. nōmen, -inis n., Goth. namo, OCS imę, etc.

3. Archaisms and innovations of the Armenian nominal system

(63) Accusative pl. -s

Classical Armenian accusative plural ending -s < PIE *ns, with a regular loss of the nasal; e.g. eris < PIE *trins: Goth. prins, cf. nom. ere-k ‘three’ from PIE *trejes ‘three’: Skt. trāyas, Gr. τρεῖς, etc.

Note also ar-s from PIE acc.pl. *anrans vs. nom. ayr ‘man’ < PIE *h₂nēr: Gr. ἀνήρ, etc.

(64) Archaic genitives

aṁ from *arnos < *anos < PIE *h₂nr-ōs: Gr. ἀνήρ, -ός; cf. nom. ayr ‘man; husband’ < PIE *h₂nēr: Gr. ἀνήρ, etc.

hawr from PIE *ph₂str-ōs: Gr. πατρός, Lat. patris; cf. nom. hayr ‘father’ < PIE *ph₂tēr: Gr. πατέρ, Lat. pater
k’er from PIE *suesr-ós, cf. nom. k’oyr < PIE *suesör ‘sister’
Note also PIE gen.sg. *-osyo-: Skt. -asya, Gr. -oio, Arm. -øy, etc.

(65) Instrumental
Arm. instrumental ending -w / -(m)b derives from PIE *-bʰi, cf. instr.pl.: Skt. -bhis, Av. -bīš, OPers. -biš; dat.abl.pl.: Skt. -bhyas, Av. -byō; Homeric Greek attests -φι- as a marker of the ablative, instrumental and locative in both singular and plural markers; cf. also Lat. dat.abl.pl. -bus, OIr. dat.pl. -b, etc.

er-i-w- < *tri-bʰi: Skt. dat.abl.pl. tribhás; cf. nom. ere-k’ ‘three’ from PIE *trej(es): Skt. tráyas, Gr. τρεῖς, etc.

har-b from *ph2tr-bʰi-: Skt. dative plural pitj-bhyas; cf. nom. hayr ‘father’ < PIE *ph2tēr: Gr. πατήρ, Lat. pater;
jer-b continues *je(h)ar-b < *ĝh-es-bʰi vs. nom. jeṙ-n ‘hand’ from *gʰes-r-; note the analogical instr. jeṙ-am-b

k’er-b derives from *suesr-bʰi, cf. PIE nom. *suesör ‘sister’ > Arm. k’oyr (*-ehō- > *-e(h)u- > -oy-).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>o-stem</th>
<th>i-stem</th>
<th>u-stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>gorc</td>
<td>sirt</td>
<td>cov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(z)gorc</td>
<td>(z)sirt</td>
<td>(z)cov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>gorcoy</td>
<td>srti</td>
<td>covu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>i gorcoy</td>
<td>i srti</td>
<td>i covi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl</td>
<td>gorcov</td>
<td>srtiw</td>
<td>covu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>o-stem</th>
<th>i-stem</th>
<th>u-stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>gorck’</td>
<td>sirtk’</td>
<td>covk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(z)gorcs</td>
<td>(z)sirts</td>
<td>(z)covs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>gorcoc’</td>
<td>srtic’</td>
<td>covuc’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>i gorcoc’</td>
<td>i srtic’</td>
<td>i covuc’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl</td>
<td>gorcovk’</td>
<td>srtiwk’</td>
<td>covuk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(67) Armenian o-stems

k’un, o-stem ‘sleep’ < *ṣuop-no-: Skt. svāpna- m. ‘sleep, dream’, Av. x’afna- m. ‘sleep, dream’, Gr. ὕπνος ‘sleep’, Lat. somnus ‘sleep’, Lith. sūnas ‘dream’, OCS sūn ‘sleep’, etc.

gin, o-stem ‘price, purchase price’ < *yres-no-: Skt. vasnā- n. ‘purchase price’, Lat. vēnum n. in the formula vēnum dare ‘to put up for sale’, cf. Gr. ὑπόκτωσ ‘purchase price’ and the verbal form in Hittite, yāš- ‘to buy’.

gorc, o-stem ‘work, labour’ (cf. gorcem ‘to work, labour; to make, produce’) < *גרjured: Gr. πέργον n. ‘work, labour, work of art’, OHG werc ‘work’, Av. vəɾəz- ‘to do, work’, etc. The vocalism of Arm. gorc is taken from the verb gorcem, an old iterative (cf. Goth. waœk and waurkjan vs. OEngl. werk, OHG werc, Gr. πέργον, etc.).
erg, o-stem ‘song; poem; playing (music); scoffing song’ (cf. ergem ‘to sing; to play a musical instrument’) < *h₂er³kʷ-o-: Skt. thematic noun arká- m. ‘ray, light, shine; song, magic song’; cf. PIE *h₂er³kʷ-/*h₁rkʷ-: Hitt. ārku₂-₁, arku- ‘to chant, intone’; Skt. root noun ār- f. ‘song of praise, poem, stanza, verse’, ārcati ‘to sing; to praise; to shine’, Toch. A yārk, B yarke ‘worship, reverence’, probably also OIr. erek ‘sky’.

(68) Armenian a-stems

am, a-stem ‘year, age’ < *(s)e(m)-eh₂-: Skt. sámā- ‘year, season’, cf. YAv. ham-, OIr. sam, etc. ‘summer’.

hoviw, a-stem ‘shepherd’ < *h₂eu₁-peh₂- (cf. Skt. go-pā- m. ‘herdsman’ < *cowherd’, avi-pāl- ‘shepherd’) = PIE *h₂eu₁- ‘sheep’ (CLuw. hāui-, Skt. āvi-, Lat. ovis, etc.) + *peh₂(s)- ‘to protect, pasture’ (OCS pasti ‘to pasture’, Lat. pāscō ‘to pasture’, Hitt. paḫš- ‘to protect’, etc.)

(69) Armenian n-stems

anun, gen. anuan ‘name’, dial. *anum < PIE *h₁ne₂₃-mn, obl. *H₃ne₁₃-men-: Hitt. lāman n., HLuw. ēlaman- n., Lyc. alāman-, Skt. nāman- n., Pers. nām, Gr. ὄνομα, -ατος n., Lat. nōmen, -īnis n., Goth. namo, OCS ime, etc.

ain ‘wild ram’ (acc.pl. z-ařin-s) < PIE *h₂d-s-en- ‘male, male animal (bull, stallion, ram)’: Gr. ἄρην, -ες, Att. ἄρην adj. ‘male’, Av. āršan- m. ‘man, male’, OPers. āršan- ‘male, hero, bull’, cf. Skt. ṛṣabhā- m. ‘bull’.


(70) Armenian l- and r-stems

astl, gen. astl, instr. astel-b ‘star’ < PIE *h₂st₁₁₂- ‘star’: Hitt. ḫaster(a)₁₃, nom. ḫasterza c., Gr. ὄστρις, ὀρος, pl. ὄστρες m. (also old coll. ὀσπρα), Skt. nom.pl. iāraḥ₁₃, instr. śyj₁₁₂-bh₁₃, Av. star- m., Lat. stella f. ‘star’, Goth. stahrno, etc.

dustr, gen. dster, gen.pl. dster-c’ or dster-a-c’, instr.pl. dster-aw-k ‘daughter’ < PIE *d₁ug₁₁₂-těr ‘daughter’: Skt. duhitā₁₃, Gr. δυνάτη, Lith. dukę₁₃, etc.

(71) Relics of the PIE neuter in Armenian

- PIE heteroclitic *(u)r/n- declension: nom. *pēḥ₁-xur, gen. *ph₁xe₂₃-n s n. ‘fire’; Hitt. pahhur₁₃, gen. pahhuenás, Gr. πῦρ, πύρος, OHG fūr₁₃, Goth. fūr < *pyōn. The old nominative in *(u)r: Armenian hur ‘fire’, thematicized (gen. hr-o-y, instr. hr-o-v), but also an archaic instrumental hur-b.

- Next to this: PIE oblique stem *ph₂u(e)n- > Armenian *hun- in hn-oc ‘oven, furnace’.

- Further development of the *(u)r/n- paradigm in Armenian: asr, gen. asu ‘wool, fleece’, barjr, gen.sg. barj₁-u, gen.pl. barjan-c ‘‘high’, etc.

- Arm. artasu-k’, a-stem (gen.pl. artasu-a-c’) ‘tear’ from *drāku₁: Gr. δάκρυ n., OHG zahar (beside trahan₁), etc. The Armenian plural stem *artasu-a-may reflect an old neuter plural *draku-h₂.
4. Archaisms and innovations of the Armenian verbal system

(71) Present indicative paradigm of PIE *bʰer- ‘to bring, bear’. Note the loss of intervocalic *-t- in 3sg. *bʰér-e-ti > Arm. *berey(i) > berê.

(72) Present indicative paradigm of PIE *h₁es- ‘to be’.

(73-74) Nasal presents: lk‘anem

*l(e)ikʷ- ‘to leave’: Arm. lk‘anem, 3sg.aor. e-lik’ ‘to leave’, Skt. rec-, pres. rinákti, Gr. ἱέπτω, λιμπάνω, Lat. líquō, líquī. PIE nasal-infixed present *līn-kʷ- was remodeled to *līkʷ- > Arm. pres. lk‘anem.

(75) *bʰeg- ‘to break’, nasal pres. *bʰ-n-eg-: Arm. bekanem, 3sg.aor. e-bek, Skt. bhañ-, bhanákti ‘to break’
*bʰer- ‘to fix, put together’: Arm. aṙnem, 3sg.aor. ar-ar ‘to make’: Gr. ἀραρίσω, aor. ἱπαρον ‘to fit, equip’, etc.
*dʰeḥ₁- ‘to put’: Arm. dnem, 1sg.aor. e-di, impv. di-r, Skt. dhā-, Gr. τίθημι, etc. Arm. dnem = *dʰ-e + pres. suffix *ne- seen in e.g. aṙ-ne-m vs. aor. ar-ar- ‘to make’. The 3sg.aor. e-d derive from *é-dʰeh₁-t: Skt. ādḥāt.

(76) *h₂-nu-: Arm. aṁnum, 1sg.aor. aṛ-ī, 3sg.aor. aṛ ‘to gain, obtain, win, take, grasp’, Gr. ἀρνώμαι, aor. ἀρόμεν ‘to win, gain’, probably also Av. ḫaṇauu- ‘to grant, allot, provide’.

*pleh₁-: Arm. lnum or ḥananim 3sg.aor. e-lic ‘to fill, be filled’ (cf. li ‘full’, li-r, i-stem ‘plentitude’), Gr. πλήπημι, -αμαι ‘to fill’, πλήρης ‘full’, πλέος, Lat. plēre ‘to fill’, Skt. par ‘to fill’, pres. pārātī, *pārātī, etc. For the aorist e-li-c’ < *e-plē-ske, with *-skė- / *-skē- / *-skē/- added to the old root aorist *plē-(-s)-, cf. Ved. āprās, Gr. ἐπέλεξεν.

*yes-nu-: Arm. z-genum, 3sg.aor. zge-c’-a-w ‘to put on clothes’, Gr. ἔνυμμα ‘to clothe’, cf. Hitt. ḫeš- ‘to be dressed’, Skt. vāste ‘to be clothed, wear’, etc. Note Arm. z-gest, u-stem, i-stem ‘dress, garment, clothes’ from *yēs-ti-: Lat. vestis, is f. ‘garments, clothing; clothes; cloth’, Goth. wasti ‘garment, dress’.

*gʷḥeres- ‘warm’: Arm. ḫeṇnum or ḫerānım, 1sg.aor. ḫe-ra-y ‘to be/become warm, burn’ < *gʷḥer-nu-. cf. *gʷḥer-n(e)-u-: Skt. ḫhṛṇaṭi ‘to glow, light’, etc. Arm. aor. ḫe-ra- from sigm. aor, *gʷḥer-s-.

(77) Aorist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mnam</th>
<th>sīrem</th>
<th>nayim</th>
<th>t'olum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘to stay, wait’</td>
<td>‘to love’</td>
<td>‘to look at’</td>
<td>‘to let, permit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>mnac’i</td>
<td>sīrec’i</td>
<td>nayec’ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mnac’er</td>
<td>sīrec’er</td>
<td>nayec’ar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mnac’</td>
<td>sīreac’</td>
<td>nayec’aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>mnac’ak’</td>
<td>sīrec’ak’</td>
<td>nayec’ak’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mnac’ē/ik’</td>
<td>sīrec’ē/ik’</td>
<td>nayec’ay’, -aruk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mnac’in</td>
<td>sīreac’in</td>
<td>nayec’an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>mořanam</td>
<td>anc’anem</td>
<td>cnanim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to forget’</td>
<td>‘to pass’</td>
<td>‘to beget’</td>
<td>‘to get warm’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mořac’ay</td>
<td>anc’i</td>
<td>cnay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mořac’ar</td>
<td>anc’er</td>
<td>cnar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mořac’aw</td>
<td>(ē)anc’</td>
<td>cnaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>mořac’ak’</td>
<td>anc’ak’</td>
<td>cnak’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mořac’ē/ik’, -aruk’</td>
<td>anc’ē/ik’</td>
<td>cnayk’, -aruk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mořac’an</td>
<td>anc’in</td>
<td>cnan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(78-79) Aspects of historical phonology and morphology

Intriguing cases where phonological, morphological and/or word-formative issues seem to be interwoven. A typical example is the initial y-:
5. Onomastics

(80) Place names
An Indo-European etymology of an Armenian toponym can be considered more or less reliable if it meets at least three or four of the following requirements:

- (1) the toponym is reliably attested in Classical Armenian and/or foreign sources;
- (2) its antiquity is guaranteed by attestations from cuneiform sources of the first half of the first millennium BC;
- (3) it contains an Armenian appellative of Indo-European origin;
- (4) it contains an unattested appellative that can be phonologically derived from an Indo-European etymon;
- (5) the semantics of the appellative is compatible with the concrete type of a given toponym;
- (6) the semantic basis is confirmed by other data, e.g. by other names of the place;
- (7) the IE etymon is found in toponyms in other IE languages.

(81) A few possible examples:
- Gis, gen. Gis-o-y (a village in Uti-k’), from PIE *g(e/o)ik-: Skt. viś- ‘settlement’, MPers. vis ‘manor-house, village’, OCS вобъ. For the semantics, cf. Agarak. Note also Urart. Ӧɾiš and Ӧɾiši(ni).
- Jerm, the Bohtan-su: jerm ‘warm(th)’ derives from PIE *gʷʰermo-, cf. Θερμο- < Thracian *germo-, Dacian Germi-sara (both with thermal springs).
- Sim (a famous mountain in Sasun) < PIE *kveh₃mo-, cf. Skt. śyāmā- ‘black, dark’, Śyāmā name of a river, Av. Sītāmaka- name of a mountain, Lith.
šêmas ‘blue-grey’. Mountains are frequently named ‘dark’ or ‘black’. Note the other name of Sim, namely Sev-sar, lit. “Black-mountain”.

(82) Place names in the 3rd and 1st millennia BC

The toponymical studies concerning these periods are mainly based on superficial similarities and lack thorough etymological treatment.

►V. Xač’atryan 2012

• URU Aparḫu a comp. of Armenian apar/ṙ ‘rock’ and xul ‘deaf’;
• URU Alatarmale vs. Arm. a lk ‘depth, abyss’ and tarm ‘group’;
• URU Mararḫa vs. Arm. mar ‘master’ (only in Čarṅtir, and is an Aramaic or Syriac borrowing) and Hitt. arḫa ‘border’;
• UR Mezzari vs. Arm. mec ‘great’ and ari ‘valiant, brave’

►Karagyozyan 1998:

• KUR Ṣiṭeruḫi > Gugar-k’;
• KUR Aṭezaine > Arkaz;
• URU Ḫundur > ɬawn ur;
• Vač’ur from Bexur, reflecting Indo- Eur. *yes-r ‘spring (season)’

(83) Personal names

The most remarkable achievement in this field is Ačaṙyan’s dictionary of personal names (5 vols, 1942-62).

(84) Armenian anthroponyms with underlying native (Indo-European) appellatives include:

• Arew m. ‘Sun’,
• Dustr f. ‘daughter’ (cf. Duxt/t’ar, Iranian),
• Eznik m. (ezn ‘ox, bullock’),
• Elbayer(ik) m. ‘brother’,
• ɬnjak/k’ m. (inj ‘panther, leopard’),
• Kor iw m. ‘cub, whelp’,
• Hawuk m. (haw ‘bird, rooster’, cf. also haw ‘grandfather’),
• Lusik m., later f. (loys ‘light’),
• Mrǰiwnik m. (mrǰiwn ‘ant’).

(85) Theoretically, these names may originate directly from Indo-European, although this is hard to prove. The probability increases if the Armenian name:

• derives from an Indo-European etymon that underlies anthroponyms also in cognate languages, e.g.:
  Aṛjk m., a hypocoristic form of aṛj ‘bear’, cf. Lat. Ursula ‘little bear’, note also Arm. Aṛšak m., an Iranian loanword;
  Arew m. from arew ‘sun’, cf. Skt. ravi- m. ‘sun’, which is also found as a masculine anthroponym.
• is synchronically opaque, e.g. *Hawroy, probably from IE *ph₂tro- (cf. Arm. hayr ‘father’, gen. havr), compare Greek anthroponyms with πατρο-;
• is attested in ancient sources of the Urartian and earlier periods, e.g. Aram (cf. Skt. Rāma-) vs. Urartian Aramu / Arame/a.

(86) Mythological lexicon

Native Armenian theonyms replaced by those of Iranian origin. The Iranian divinities do not always fully match their Armenian namesakes functionally.

• Pre-Christian Armenian state pantheon: mainly theonyms of Iranian origin: Aramażd, Vahagn, Mihr, Tir, Anahit, perhaps also Nanē.
• The only deity of the state pantheon with a native Armenian name is Astl-ik (astl ‘star’ from PIE *h₂ster- ‘star’).

(87) A few examples of native Armenian mythonyms, possibly inherited from PIE:
• Ayg ‘Dawn Goddess’ (Van, Moks etc. eki in wedding ritual songs) from PIE ‘Dawn Goddess’ (Skt. usás-, Gr. ἑως, Lat. aurōra, etc. all deified); *h₂(e)us(s)i > *aw(h)jo- > ayg ‘dawn’.
• Andndayin Ōj, the Abyssal Serpent, cf. Skt. Áhi- Budhnà; the Armenian Abyssal tree (andndayin caṙ) and the Rigvedic Cosmic tree (RV 1.24.7) are located in ‘bottomless space, abyss’, Arm. an-dund and Skt. a-budhná- from *g-budh₃no-.
• Arew, gen. Areg- ‘Sun God’ (Movsēs Xorenac’i 2.8 and folkloric texts); Arm. arew/g- ‘sun’ and Skt. ravi- m. ‘sun, sun-god’ (Upaniṣad+) derive from *h₂reu-i-, an Armeno-Aryan poetical or sacred (marked) designation of ‘sun’ replacing the PIE profane (unmarked) word for ‘sun’, *seh₂ul-.

Supplement

(88) Armenian dialects

The foundations of Armenian dialectology were laid by Hrač’ya Ačaṙyan: Armenian dialectology (1911, cf. 1909), Armenian dialectological dictionary (1913).

(89) Dialectal words: old or new?

► Archaisms: methodology
• Arm. dial. anum vs. ClArm anun ‘name’ from *anunw < PIE *h₃neh₃mn ‘name’ has been treated as a reflection of older *anumn. Methodologically more cogent: -m- from oblique *anVman-, cf. paštawn vs. gen. pašt-aman ‘service’.
► Internal treatment comes first
• Łarabaɫ rɛk’nak (vs. Classical aregakn ‘sun’) has been treated as an archaic reflex of the IE proto-form allegedly with an initial *r-. In fact, rek’nak is a marginal form; note i’rik’nak, i’ríhynak, orék’nak, oriỳnak. Regular reduction of the initial pretonic syllable in polysyllabic words in Łarabal: a(r)celi ‘razor’ > cili, asaranoc ‘oil-mill’ > səranoc’.
(90) Reading

1. Դու կաս և մնաս:
   Du kas ew mnas.
2. Աստուած կայ և մնայ յավիտեան
   Astuac kay ew mnay yawitean
3. Արամ ծնանի զԱրայն Գեղեցիկ:
   Aram cnani zArayn Gełec’ik.
4. Գամ և առնում զձեզ առ իս:
   Gam ew arnum zez ar is.
5. Եւ գնաց Տուբիա կնաւ իւրով:
   Ew gnac’ Tuia knaw iwr  .
6. Հայեցաւ նա ի բարձանց:
   Hayec’aw na i aranc’.
7. Դու արարեր զերկինս և զերկիր:
   Du ararer zerkins ew zerkir.
8. Եւ առ ի պտղոյ նորա և եկեր:
   Ew ar i ptł y n r a ew eker.
9. Նա եբեր նմա գինի:
   Na eber nma gini.
10. Եւ զարծաթն իմ եբեր
    Ew zarcat’n im e er.

Glossary
(for personal pronouns, see the table below)

aṙ prep. ‘at, near, next to, by, before’
aṙnum ‘to receive, take, take away, ravish, rob’
astuac ‘God’
arcat’, o-stem ‘silver; money, wealth’
barjr, gen.sg. barj-u, gen.pl. barjanc ‘high, elevated; height, elevation’
berem ‘to bring’
gam ‘to come’
gełec’ik ‘pretty, handsome’
gini ‘wine’
gnam ‘to go, depart, repair’
e-, augment: 3sg.aorist
erkin, i-stem ‘sky, heaven’
erkir, a-stem ‘earth; land’
ew, conj. ‘and; also’
hayim ‘to look’
iwr ‘his own, etc.’ (refl. pron.)
kam ‘to be, exist; to stand, remain; to stop, stay, wait’
kin, gen. knoj, instr. knaw or kanamb ‘woman; wife’
mnam ‘to saty, wait’
yawitean ‘eternally, perpetually; eternity, perpetuity’
-n definite article ‘the’
ptul, o-stem ‘fruit’
uten, 1sg.aor. keray ‘to eat’
Personal pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sg</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Acc</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Abl</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>es</td>
<td>‘you’</td>
<td>(z)is</td>
<td>im</td>
<td>inj</td>
<td>yinēn</td>
<td>inew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du</td>
<td>‘you’</td>
<td>(z)k’ez</td>
<td>k’o</td>
<td>k’ez</td>
<td>i k’ēn</td>
<td>k’ew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>‘he, she, it’</td>
<td>(z)na</td>
<td>nora</td>
<td>nna</td>
<td>i nmanē</td>
<td>nmanē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>(z)k’ez</td>
<td>k’ez</td>
<td>nora</td>
<td>nna</td>
<td>i nmanē</td>
<td>nmanē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>mek‘</td>
<td>duk‘</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>(z)mez</td>
<td>(z)jez</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
<td>(z)nosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td>mez</td>
<td>jer</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>mez</td>
<td>jez</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
<td>noc’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abl</td>
<td>i mēnǰ</td>
<td>i jēnǰ</td>
<td>i noc’anē</td>
<td>i noc’anē</td>
<td>i noc’anē</td>
<td>i noc’anē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>mewk’, meawk’</td>
<td>jewk’, jeawk’</td>
<td>nok’awk’</td>
<td>nok’awk’</td>
<td>nok’awk’</td>
<td>nok’awk’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I thank you for your attention!
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