Here’s Looking at “You”:
The Second Person Pronouns in Old Armenian

This paper aims to elucidate the perplexing development of the Old Armenian 2nd pers. pronominal stems, of which there are synchronically three: k’- in the singular oblique forms, je- in those of the plural, and dow- in the nominative forms for both sg. and pl. After re-examining the classical reference works for Armenian, and consulting more recent scholarly literature, the paper offers an updated and comprehensive account for these pronominal forms in the context of the OArm. pers. pron. subsystem as such, focusing on the following disputed points:

1. The stem je- has often been left with an uncertain explanation (Džaukjan 1982:147), or without any (Godel 1975:110, Schmitt 1981:117). Unfortunatelly, the in-depth account of Arm. pronouns in Katz (1998:173-194) is untenable at least in one point: the assimilation in *(s)gʰeɡ'i from *(u)s-we- + *ɡʰi could not have occured, nor could it have been the source of the initial j-, for the rather early change PIE *ɡʰ > *dʰj (which eventually led to j; Ravnæs 1991:173-4) significantly preceded the regular development of *sw > (*xw >) *kw > (Ravnæs 1991:177) *k (> k’ as a part of the famous sound shift). Whether or not we took into consideration the proposed ad hoc aphaeresis (Katz 1998:193), and whether we wished to follow via the regular development *sw- >> k’- or the later *u- > g-, this route would be misleading. Here, we argue for the reconstruction *yɛ-ɡʰi- > *jeji suggested already by Meillet (1920:205), supported by the evidence of *y > j in different phonological contexts incl. Anlaut (Džaukjan 1982:38, Ivanova 2018:42-55, Kölligan 2012), eg. jan ‘effort’ < *yahz-wn- and followed by the assimilation into *jeji in the same direction as eg. žoyž ‘endurance’ < *zoyž.

2. The dat. (later also acc. and loc.) ending -z in je-z, as well as k’e-z and 1pl. me-z, is usually traced back to the particle *ɡʰi. Indeed, (PIE *ɡʰ >) j gave z intervocalically (Ravnæs 1991:153-4), as in lezow ‘tongue’, together with VjV > VžV; this change, however, occurred only after the loss of final syllables, and therefore cannot serve for the explanation of the form jez (contrary to Kölligan 2012:140). The only phonetically plausible path for the final -z seems to be in the dissimilation *je > jez, and analogical spread to k’ez, mez (unlike the other Arm. dat. pron. ending originating in *ɡʰi, 1. pers. in-j, which at that stage of Arm. naturally did not satisfy the conditions to undergo the same levelling); thus, mez < *mej vs. mêj < *mejfo < *medʰ- + yo- ‘middle’ can be explained.
3. A comparatively solid etymology is that of Arm. 2sg. atonic \( k'e- < *ke- < *kwe- < *twe- \). In regard to the initial consonant of the gen. \( k'o \) though, we will briefly discuss the possibility of analogy.

4. Out of the various accounts for why the initial voiceless stop in \( *tu \) did not give the expected voiceless aspirated outcome in Arm. \( dow 'you (sg.)' \), we opt for \( *tu > *[\text{du}] > du \) (Kim 2016:158, Pedersen 1905:232-3). Its plural counterpart \( dow-k' \) is undoubtedly from \( *yů- > *ju- \); the remodelling of \( *fuk^h \) after \( du \) to \( duk^h \) is however a process that lacks obvious motivation. There must have been a certain period of time when all the 2pl. forms were homophonically beginning with \( *j- \): \( *jůs \) and \( *je-z \) etc. Independently, stem suppletion was eliminated in OArm. 1pl. forms, which all then displayed the stem \( me- \); such syncretism in pl. pers. pron. forms thus led to the parallelism such as nom. \( *mek^h \) vs. \( *fuk^h \), gen. \( *mer \) vs. \( *jer \) etc. Hence, there seems to be no structural reason for remodelling towards lesser similarity between the pronouns, and furthermore no reason why the nom. of the 2pl. should have been altered. We will argue that the change in the oblique stem \( *jeji > *jejii \) must have occurred early enough to allow the remodelling in question, and place it within the relative chronology of OArm. phonological changes.
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