Suren Zolyan

Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University, Kaliningrad, Russia /
Russian-Armenian University, Yerevan, Armenia. surenzolyan@gmail.com

ON THE SO-CALLED "DEFINITE ARTICLE" IN EASTERN ARMENIAN:GRAMMATICAL CONSTRAINTS AND PRAGMA-SEMANTIC FUNCTIONS[1]

In our paper, we reconsider the accepted viewpoint that the definite postpositive article in Eastern Armenian should be classified as belonging to the grammatical category of nouns. We demonstrate that an interplay between various grammatical (morphological and syntactical) and pragmatic (demonstrative, referential, and anaphoric) factors could be key to understanding its functions. In modern Eastern-Armenian, the so-called definite article may perform different functions, and the expression of definiteness is only one of them. Bearing in mind that the diachronic origin of the definite article is the demonstrative/possessive pronoun Նա (na) and the enclitic -ն (-n) in classical Armenian, it seems that it would be more adequate to categorize it as a demonstrative determinant. Upon some grammatical constraints, it has also taken on various pragma-semantic manifestations and functions; some of them have been grammaticalized, and most of them depend on prototypical contextual features and speakers' communicative intentions. The most important of these newer functions is that it is used as a marker of any of part of speech in subject/object positions. Complete grammaticalization occurs only in the accusative.

Keywords: Eastern Armenian language, definite article, grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, noun phrase, substantives, deixis.

Сурен Золян

Балтийский федеральный университет им. Иммануила Канта, Калининград, Россия /
Российско-Армянский университет, Ереван, Армения
surenzolyan@gmail.com

О так называемом "определенном артикле" в восточно-армянском языке: грамматические ограничения и прагма-семантические функции

Предлагается пересмотреть принятую точку зрения на постпозитивный артикль в восточноармянском языке как на грамматическую категории существительных. Показано, что ключ к пониманию его

функций лежит в рассмотрении взаимодействия между различными грамматическими (морфологическими и синтаксическими) и прагматическими (демонстративными, референциальными и анафорическими) факторами. В современном восточноармянском определенный артикль может выполнять разные функции, и выражение определенности — лишь одна из них. Принимая во внимание, что диахронически определенный артикль происходит из указательного/притяжательного местоимения Նա (na) и энклитики -ն (-n) древнеармянского, представляется более адекватным отнести его к категории указательного детерминанта. В современном армянском он характеризуется рядом грамматических ограничений, он также приобрел новые прагма-семантические функции; некоторые из них были грамматикализированы, и большинство из них зависит от прототипических контекстуальных особенностей и коммуникативных намерений говорящих. Самая важная из этих новых функций — не указание на определенность, а роль маркера не столько существительных, сколько словосочетаний в позициях субъекта/объекта, поэтому так называемый определенный артикль может употребляться с любой частью речи. Полная грамматикализация происходит только в винительном падеже.

Ключевые слова: восточноармянский язык, определенный артикль, грамматикализация, прагматизация, именная группа, существительные, дейксис.

1. Introduction

Multifactorial and flexible approaches to possible interrelations between grammatical and pragma-semantic phenomena[2] can be of help when attempting to reconsider well-known cases that have traditionally been treated as "pure" grammatical phenomena despite numerous controversies and deviations that are lacking in any consistent explanations for their existence. We intend to dispute the generally accepted view on how the definite article (DA) is used in Eastern Armenian. For us, an interplay between various grammatical (morphological and syntactical) and pragmatic (discursive, contextual, referential and anaphoric) factors can be considered as key to both its identification and to understanding its functions.

The category of the article and its description in various Indo-European languages is of considerable interest. This category was absent in the Indo-European proto-language, so its primordial prototype does not exist. The relatively late appearance of articles in many Indo-European languages predetermined that the category of definiteness-indefiniteness has a specific trajectory of origin and

---

[2] On the coinage of the term *pragma-semantics* and the possible scope of its operation, see: (Zolyan 2021: 247).

development in each of them. Even in the two versions of the modern standard Armenian language, its Eastern and Western branches, the category of the article differs significantly both in semantics and means of expression. At the same time, in linguistics, there were attempts to universalize it following a certain etalon language: in the Middle Ages — with Greek, in modern times — with European languages that had developed a grammaticalized article system.

The article in the contemporary Eastern Armenian language and descriptions of it in linguistics demonstrate a similar situation when linguistic facts are considered based on schemes that are elaborated concerning other languages. In Armenian linguistics, this category is addressed as the morphological category of a noun; in general, the existing views with some slight differences can be summed up in the following way:

«Modern Eastern Armenian distinguishes definite and indefinite nouns. Definiteness is marked by suffixing the definite article *-ն -ě/-ն -n* to the noun. Indefiniteness appears unmarked by using the bare noun and as marked by using the preposed indefinite article *մի mi.* The unmarked, i.e., bare or zero forms of a noun, denotes its general meaning without determining it more closely. It is used if the speaker refers for the first time to a person/object, i.e., it is completely unknown and unspecific to both speaker and hearer» (Dum-Tragut 2009: 102).

However, this definition is complemented by a long list of various deviations and exceptions. We intend to demonstrate that it would be more suitable to adopt an approach opposite in nature — one in which so-called deviated or exceptional cases are classed as proper instances of various pragma-semantic functions being performed; the distinction between definite and indefinite usages of a noun being only one of them. The concept of the incomplete grammaticalization of pragmatic markers[3] allows the so-called DA in Eastern Armenian to be viewed as an interface between morphology and communicative semantic syntax. The DA can be identified not as a morphological, but as a context-dependent syntactic marker. It is not so much characteristic nouns as of noun phrases. Just the fact that the DA can be used with all parts of speech, including prepositions and interjections, calls into question its classification as a morphological subcategory of a noun a noun.

---

[3] Cf.: Traugott & Konig. 1991; Diewald 2011a, b; Hopper & Traugott 2003; Heine 2018; Mendoza 2021.

In the first part, we shall consider the category of the article in Classical (old) Armenian and its status in the early medieval Armenian grammars, then we shall discuss the existing points of view on the article in modern Eastern Armenian and demonstrate inconsistencies within theories relating to its use. In conclusion, we put forward the concept of heterogeneity of the so-called DA in Eastern Armenian

2. **The category of the article in Classical Armenian**

In this part, we do not intend to review the linguistic data and shall confine ourselves to presenting existing points of view. It is generally accepted that the DA in Old (or classical) Armenian (Grabar) appeared due to the desemantization of personal demonstrative and possessive pronouns. The independently used lexical units, *sa, da, na* became post-positive particles *-s , -d, -n,* attached to the noun and indicating domains of a speaker, hearer, and third person, respectively. Accordingly, these articles added a demonstrative meaning to the noun. This demonstrative meaning was associated with a first, second, and third person, and then these particles were re-interpreted as possessive markers. Additionally, they also related to the expression of definiteness and appeared in anaphoric references (Tumanyan 1971; Acharyan 1957; Abeghyan 1974).

As outlined by Kagyrova (Kagyrova 2014), in general terms this process is consistent with the scheme suggested by J. Greenberg (Greenberg 1990). According to this hypothesis, the DA derived from the demonstrative evolves along the following three stages of grammaticalization: Demonstrative > Definite Article > Specific Article > Noun Marker. This scheme was significantly supplemented and expanded to 8-stages. For instance, Berndt Heine describes the following stages:

«The transition from demonstrative attribute to the definite article appears typically to lead from exophoric to endophoric demonstrative and finally to definite marker, and it is both proximal and distal demonstrative attributes that can be recruited. In this process, semanticization has the effect that the demonstrative loses its deictic (locative) content, such as the ability to express relative distance (e.g., proximal vs. distal). Via decategorialization, the demonstrative loses its independent status, becoming an appendage of its head noun, it changes from free word to clitic, and eventually, it may turn into an affix» (Heine & Kuteva 2007: 88).

This slightly different but simultaneously somewhat similar situation is outlined in (De Mulder, Carlier 2011):

«How does the demonstrative evolve into a definite article? The demonstrative signals that the identity of the referent should be established by making reference to the speech situation or the immediate context of utterance. It conveys typically a deictic meaning component, indicating the location of the referent in terms of distance with respect to the speaker or in terms of association with the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person. It is commonly assumed that the exophoric or situational use of the demonstrative, referring to entities in the extra-linguistic situation, is the basic use, giving rise to endophoric or intralinguistic uses, among which the anaphoric use (Diessel 1999: 109–11). Definite articles would be derived from adnominal anaphoric demonstratives» (De Mulder, Carlier 2011: 526).

As mentioned in (Konig 2018:172), in the first stages of their development into articles, demonstratives lose their exophoric (gestural) use and their contrastive meaning, instead, they obtain new functions and meanings. Ekehard Konig has suggested an elaborated pattern of the pragma-semantic changes — see table 1.

Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4	Stage 5
exophoric contrastive	anaphoric cataphoric (sufficient description) *employ mémoriel* (loss of contrastive and exophoric use)	abstract context universe of discourse extension of context from co-text to abstract universe of discourse	generic, abstract non-referential non-episodic contexts	specific contrastive loss of uniqueness

Tab. 1: Semantic changes in the development of definite articles (Konig 2018:172)

Neither data relating to classical nor modern Armenian were taken into consideration during the creation of these typological schemes. An application of this scheme to the Armenian language may require significant elaboration and additions. Therefore, we shall not consider the degree of applicability of this scheme to the history of the Armenian language. However, the origin of the DA in Classical Armenian seems to be consistent with the general regularity: "the main diachronic source of the indefinite article is the numeral 'one', while the main diachronic source of the definite article is the demonstrative pronouns of the sphere of distant deixis (that is, expressing the lack of proximity to the speaker and/or to the addressee". (Plungian 1993: 166). At the same time, we would like

to mention that at least some of the DA's primary meanings, including the exophoric and contrastive ones, may be pointed out in modern Eastern Armenian.

The article as a grammatical category of classical Armenian was detected early on and outlined in the first Armenian grammar (V–VI century) — see (Adonts 1915, Jahukian 1978: 271–275). Distinction of the article was based on Greek grammars. The Armenian term "*հոդ*" or *հատդ (hod)* is a calque borrowed from Greek. It appeared in the Armenian translation of *The* Grammar of Dionysios Thrax (170–90 BC), The Armenian translator and commentators extrapolated his taxonomy on Classical Armenian In particular, they translated the part "On the Article (№20)[4]. Due to the difference between the so-called "articles" in Greek and Armenian (for more details, see: (Müth 2011), this extrapolation led to significant disturbances. The translator supplemented the text with his examples; he translated Greek articles using demonstrative pronouns and not articles. These were three different demonstrative pronouns that relate the subject of speech to the sphere of the first, second and third person: proximal *այս,* medial *այդ,* and distant *այն: (ajs, ajd. ajn)* — (Adonts 1915: CLXVII)[5].

At the same time, the intuition of the first commentator[6] allowed him to get much closer to characterizing the article in the commentaries than he was able to do within the translation text. Besides abovementioned demonstratives *այս (ajs); այդ (ajd), այն*

---

[4] Cf.: "20. On the Article. An Article is a declinable part of speech prefixed or subjoined to the various cases of nouns. It has three accidents: Gender, Number, and Case. The Genders are three. The Numbers are three: Singular, Dual, and Plural" (Dionysios Thrax 1874: 13).

[5] Recently this issue was considered in (Meyer 2019). Cf.: "Armenian does not have a prepositive, independent article like Greek does, but instead uses the deictically marked enclitics -u, -ŋ, and -ù; this is not mentioned in the translation. Instead, interrogative pronounce (n), relative pronouns (որ), and demonstrative pronouns (այս, այդ, այն) are given as equivalents. Only the latter has a similar function to the Greek article. Further issues lie in the inflectional categories mentioned with reference to the Greek article. Armenian has no grammatical gender, one fewer number, and two more cases than Greek. The question of gender is simply ignored in the translation. In its translation of the gendered articles in the different numbers, the Armenian version uses the three deictic variants of the demonstrative, proximal այս, medial այդ, and distal այն" (Meyer 2019: 6).

[6] Presumably: David the Philosopher or David the Invincible, VI century, see: Adonts 1915: 115; Muradyan 1980.

(ajn), the commentator mentioned the particles, which denote the actual reference. In the translation, demonstrative pronouns were given as examples of the articles. But in the commentary, the proper articles were represented: they were the particles *-s, -d, -n* directly associated with a person. These articles -s, -d, -n also derived from the other demonstrative pronouns: սա; դա; նա, (sa-, da-. na-) and this was described correctly in the commentary. The third of them, Նա (na) gave birth to a personal pronoun in the third person in modern Armenian, and its reduced form Ն *n* is used as the DA.

Pointing to the difference between articles in Greek and Armenian, the commentator went further and gave examples of the proper articles *-ս, -դ, — ն (-s, -d, -n):* — ձ ի ս, ձ ի դ, ձ ի ն ։ (dzi + s, dzi + d, dzi + n; *this horse of mine, this horse of yours, that horse).* (Adonts 1915: 115). The commentator noted: the article itself does not perform a signifying function. However, while adding to a noun, it endowed a name with a capacity to signify. Thus, using the noun Ձի *(dzi, horse)* without combining it with the article Ձի եկն *(Dzin yekn, a horse came),* the speaker does not mean anything *(ոչինչ նշանակեցէ).* In contrast to it, in the forms with the article Ձին եկն *(Dzin yekn, the horse came),* the DA stands for "a signifier of known things" *(նշանակիչ հայտնիի իրաց)* (Adonts, 1915: 115). In a slightly modernized manner, it can thus be interpreted as "a communicative relevance". Besides this capacity, the use of the article is also associated with the anaphoric repetition of the previously mentioned object (Adonts 1915: 115).

A remarkable feature of Classical Armenian was that the deictic and possessive meanings of the articles might not coincide, as can clearly be seen in the example given in (Tumanian 1976:276):

1. Եթե մեղիցես որդւոյդ [N accus,sing+ Article_{2pers}] *իմում, սպանից և ես զորդիդ քո*

*Et'e mexices orduj**d** [N accus,sing+ Article 2pers] imum, spanic ev es zordujd k'o:*

If you damage my son [who is now at your disposal], I shall kill your son [who is now at your disposal].

The possessive pronoun *Իմում,* (*imum, My*) indicates affiliation, but since the son of the speaker is held captive by the addressee of the message, the lexeme *որդւոյդ (orduj**d**)* is marked by the second person article *- Դ, (- D).*

3. The definite article in modern East Armenian: the general trends

The codification of the modern literary Armenian language and the separation of its two branches, Eastern Armenian and Western Armenian, took place in the XIX–XX centuries. Some grammarians of that time mentioned the grammaticalization of the DA, but at the same time, they mentioned the inconsistency of that process. In the XIX century, the DA was regularly used in the nominative and accusative cases, marking the subject and the direct object, and rather rarely in the indirect cases (see: Abrahamyan1960; 74–75).

In the twentieth century, the usage of the DA (*Ն, n* before vowels; and *ը, ĕ* — before consonants) is already limited to only two cases: the subject (nominative) and the direct object and addressee (dative-accusative, nominative-accusative). The process of complete grammaticalization was interrupted. In general, in comparison with Classical Armenian, the use of the DA has become, on the one hand, more formalized; on the other, more positional restrictions have appeared (Jahukyan 1974: 212). The use of the article turns out to be associated only with a specific syntactic position and does not correlate to the semantic characteristics of definiteness or indefiniteness. The parallelism between the use of possessive and deictic articles, on the one hand, and the so-called DA, on the other, have ceased to exist. As summarized in (Lyons 1999: 55):

«The Modern Armenian forms descended from the article of the classical language have been partly reinterpreted as possessive suffixes: *-s* 'my', *-t* 'your'. The third form, modern -n/-, descended from classical -n, serves both as the third-person possessive and as the definite article. So Modern Armenian, while maintaining a three-way person-based deictic contrast in demonstratives, has lost it in the definite article».

The first- and second-person's possessive articles are manifested differently — they can be attached to a noun in any case and are not obligatory. They lost the previously dominant deictic demonstrative meaning; now they always express the meaning of belonging, affiliation, or possession. Possessive articles in almost all contexts

can be replaced by the corresponding possessive pronouns *իմ im (my)* and *քո k'o (your)*[7]. Cf.:

    2. *Քո գլուխը vs գլուխդ —*

    K'o glukhě (Poss. Pronoun + Noun + DA) glukhed (Noun + possessive article).

    Your head Your head

When a possessive pronoun is attached to a noun, the possessive article is necessarily replaced by the DA, but only in the nominative and accusative/dative, because it cannot be used in other cases. As for the demonstrative — Ն, (-N), associated with a third person and/or a distant deixis, it has lost its connection with a person, but has acquired new semantic-syntactic and pragmatic functions.

    The heterogeneous nature of the DA in Eastern Armenian leads to noticeable discrepancies in its characterization. At the end of the XIX century, new scientific grammars on the Armenian language appeared, and the classification of the DA had received different interpretations. The medieval point of view on the article as a part of speech, stemming from Dionysius Thracus's work, was rejected. Articles were 'lowered' in rank: from parts of speech, they were identified as particles. In general, the discussion can be characterized as whether articles are particles of speech, discourse, or part of a word. The characteristics of the European languages with articles were extrapolated onto Armenian. Finally, a student and collaborator of Antoine Meillet. Hrachya Acharyan, accepted his point of view (Meillet 1936) and directly mentioned the similarity of the article in Armenian with that in other European languages (Acharyan 1957: 934). By analogy with several European languages, the DA was addressed as an indicator of definiteness. From parts of speech, as was the case with medieval Armenian grammarians, the article was transposed into the category of variable morphological characteristics (subcategories) of a noun. Such a description becomes riddled with numerous clarifications, reservations, exceptions, etc., since the obligatory correlation between the use of the article and the expression of definiteness is characteristic only for a few particular cases.

---

[7] The exceptions are some instances of the generalized use of *YOU*, when it can be replaced by *everybody*, or *one։ Գլուխդ բարձր պահիր — Glukhed bardzr pahir — Keep your head up.*

One can point to two main tendencies that exist when the DA is used: one came from the previous state of a language system, and the second may be considered a relatively new development. The first is based on the original function of the DA associated with deictic indication. If a noun or a substantive (infinitive, adjective, etc.) item in a nominative case has a dependent deictic or anaphoric determinant (demonstrative, possessive or personal pronoun, or an anaforic/cataforic component), the use of the article is mandatory (except vocatives and appositions): — *այդ ձի**ն**, իմ ընկեր**ը**, նրա տուն**ը**, վաղվա առավոտ**ը**, ayd dzi**n**, im ynker**ē**, nra tun**ē**, vaghva arravot**ē**, that horse, my friend, his house, tomorrow morning*, etc.

It happens even in those positions (for example, in the predicate position) where the DA is usually not used*: Սա քաղաք է vs Սա իմ քաղաք**ն** է, Սա այն քաղաք**ն** է, < որի մասին ես պատմել էի>: Sa k'aghak' ē vs Sa im k'aghak'**n** ē Sa ayn k'aghak'**n** e, < vori masin yes pa**ι**mel ēi>. This is a city vs. This is my city. This is the city <that I was talking about>.*

Along with it, there is another tendency, which can be associated with modern grammaticalization, in which the use of articles is dependent upon morphological and syntactic characteristics. Therefore, even in the presence of demonstratives or possessives, the DA can only be used in two morphological cases and can only perform two syntactic functions, the subject NP_1 and object NP_2 (the position of the noun predicate, where the deictic function can be "revived," should be considered separately).

4. The DA and noun declension

As noted above, in the 19th century, the definite article could not could be used not only in the nominative and accusative but, albeit extremely rarely, in all other cases. In modern Eastern Armenian, the DA can only occur in two positions, in the nominative/accusative and dative/accusative cases. (a specific use in the genitive case is possible, and will be discussed separately)[8].

---

[8] The peculiarity of modern East Armenian is that the same noun in the accusative can be used both in an animate and inanimate function, depending on whether this use is referential or not. In the first case, the accusative form coincides with the dative form, in the second — with the

Existing descriptions are based on the fact that the definite article expresses the relationship of definiteness /indefiniteness. However, the list of exceptions turns out to be much larger than cases of 'proper' designation (Abeghyan 1974: 428–431, Acharyan 1957; 984–993; Petrosyan 1960, Tumanyan 1963; Khachatryan 1975; Jahukyan 1974; Kagirova 2013). Meanwhile, the situation may become more apparent if one associates usage or non-usage of the DA not with semantics, but with its syntactic and pragmatic (discursive) functions within a sentence. Then the regular and obligatory correlation between the use of the DA and the expression of definiteness may be considered not so much to be a semantic characteristic but a positional one — the position of the direct object. Accordingly, the accusative case is a proper manifestation of it.

As for conditions of an occurrence or absence of the DA in the nominative case, it does not depend on the semantic status of the nominative phrase, on its definiteness or indefiniteness. The nominative performs various syntactic functions: in addition to the primary function of the subject, the nominative can be used as a vocative, as a head in nominative sentences, as an apposition and as a nominal predicate. In these various functions and positions, the use of the definite article varies greatly, and these instances should be considered separately.

4.1. The use of the DA and the accusative

The complete grammaticalization of the DA occurs only in the accusative. For its use, countability of uncountability, concreteness, or abstractness is not relevant, and the main factor is whether the given object is one that the listener is meant to know or not. At the same time, the use of the DA is closely connected to the animateness — inanimateness of a noun. Animateness in Armenian is a changeable characteristic; it is not a morphological category but a mode of using a noun — it can be the so-called mode of a person or a thing (*անձի — իրի առումով*). This distinction is formalized in the accusative — whether the inflection of the noun coincides with the dative or nominative.

---

nominative. Thus, *to call the doctor* can be translated as *կանչել բժիշկին,* with the DA in the dative, *to call a doctor* as բժիշկ կանչել, the form coinciding with the nominative without an article, usually with by inversion of a verb and noun, (*a doctor to call).*

The opposition between definiteness-indefiniteness is obligatory for both forms and applied to animate and inanimate nouns. However, there is an asymmetric difference between them. Semantically animate nouns (proper names, names of individuals, professions, animals), may also be used in the mode of things; in these cases, their accusative forms coincide with the nominative zero form and it cannot have a definite marker

3a. Կանչեցի տղային $N_{Acc/Dat,Animate \ + \ DA}$ *Kanch'eci tghayi**n***
$Acc/Dat,Animate + DA$
VS

3b. տղա կանչեցի $N_{Acc/nom \ Non- \ Animate}$. tgha ($N_{Acc/nom \ Non- \ Animate}$) kanch'eci *I called a boy*

It should be noted that in such cases, indefiniteness is usually given special emphasis: instead of the zero article, an optional prepositive article "MI" (one, some) appears. Its use presupposes the existence of a single referent unknown to the speaker (the zero article does not imply this). Compare:

*4a. Նա արջի**ն*** *($N_{Acc/Dat,Animate \ + \ DA}$) սպանեց —*
*Na arji**n** spanec He killed the bear*

4b. Նա արջ ($N_{Acc/nom \ In,Animate}$) սպանեց
Na arj ($N_{Acc/nom \ In,Animate}$) spanec — He killed a bear

*4c. — Նա **մի** արջ ($N_{Acc/nom}$) սպանեց —*
Na mi arj spanec — He killed (some) bear

In the third case (4a), the indefinite particle *մի* (*MI*, literally: *one* is used to refer to some existing bear who is not individualized and, probably, unknown for interlocutors. In the second case (4b) with the zero article, that is an "abstract" bear, a representative of the class of bears is mentioned; implying the agent's ability to kill a bear rather than referring to a specific event.

As for semantically inanimate nouns, they can only be used in the mode of a thing, except rather exotic cases of impersonation in poetry, fairy tales, etc. While being used with the DA, these nouns have a metaphorical meaning. For instance:

*5a. տեսա իմ կյանքի**ն*** *($N_{Acc/Dat,Animate \ + \ DA}$)*
- tesa i'm k'ank**'in** *($N_{Acc/Dat,Animate \ + \ DA}$)*; literally: *I saw my life (soul),* where the noun *կյանք (life)* is used in the mode of a person,

in the dative/accusative form. It means: *I saw the person who is my life*, in contrast to the literal one,

5b. տեսա իմ կյանքը (N_{Acc/nom}) tesa im kyank'ē *(N_{Acc/nom})* — *saw my life,* the noun is used in the accusative/nominative form.

Thus, the use of the DA is connected more to syntactic function than case. The same flective form dative/accusative marks both a direct animate object and an animate addressee. In both cases, this usually performs the obligatory valence of a transitive verb, and the semantic difference between these functions is sometimes not noticeable.

One can assume that the use of the DA is connected more to the semantic-syntactic function of a noun in a sentence than to its definiteness. This may explain why nouns in the accusative case, expressing the meaning of a place or a final point of movement, are used completely differently. In this position, only inanimate nouns can be used (in the case of animate ones, this position is formalized as a combination of a genitive with a polysemic preposition *մոտ*, mot). Unlike the function of a direct object, in this case, as a rule, only forms without a DA can be used. Compare:

6. հասնեմ Անի ու նոր մեռնեմ, .. տեսնեմ Անին ու նոր մեռնեմ (Hovhannes Shiraz)

hasnem Ani (Nacc.) u nor merrnem, .. tesnem Anin (Nacc+DA) u nor merrnem

I shall reach Ani and then will die ... I shall see Ani and then will die.

The name of the city (Ani) is used with the DA while being the object complement of the verb "*to see*". However, it is used without it when the same city Ani is mentioned as the endpoint of movement. Thus, the use of a noun with or without a DA also presupposes a distinction between the semantic-syntactic functions of a direct object and an endpoint of movement, on the one hand, and a direct object and animate addressee, on the other. The exceptions indicate that other factors may cause the use of the DA, and they are not determined by the morphological features of the accusative, but reproduce the primordial characteristics of the DA, when it functioned as a deictic or possessive particle. Thus, for nouns designating the final point of movement, the definite article

appears, if only the definiteness is strengthened by demonstrative or possessive pronouns —

5a. *նա մտավ տուն* ($N_{acc/nom}$) *na mtav tun he entered a/the home*

5b. *ա մտավ իր տունը* ($N_{acc/nom\,+DA}$) *na mtav ir tune he entered his home*

5c. *նա մտավ այդ տունը* ($N_{acc/nom\,+DA}$) *na mtav ayd tunē he entered that home.*

In some exceptional cases, the DA may appear with proper names. As an emphatic means, its appearance is not connected to definiteness, but serves instead as a topicalization, a form of individualization, or in a contrastive function. The semi-deviant phrase

6. *եկավ Մոսկվան* ($N_{acc/nom+DA}$)*; yekav Moskvan*($N_{acc/nom+DA}$)*; came to Moscow*

is acceptable only if it presupposes a negation of the opposite statement (*he came to Moscow, not to some other place*). Perhaps, in addition to contrastive, distinguishing, or deictic meanings, in this use, one can see that this highlights the more basic function of the DA than referring to definite objects; this is the prototypical function of emphasizing the focus of an utterance. Interestingly, the opposite effect is observed when a proper name designates not an endpoint but a direct object. As mentioned above, the direct object's function is usually associated with the DA. However, without the DA a proper name may change its semantic status. This semi-deviant expressions without the DA changes the semantics of the noun.

7. *սիրեց Մոսկվա* ($N_{acc/nom}$) *(sirec 'Moskva, loved Moskva)*

It loses its individualization function and, instead of designating a place, becomes an object about which one has certain feelings. The absence of the DA in such positions endows a proper name with connotative meanings of a common noun; it can even be used in the plural:

8. *հասցնելով մոսկվաներ,*($N_{pl.,Acc.}$) *"Հայֆիլմի" այն ժամանակվա տնօրենը "վերևներում" համոզել է, որ դրանք այն են, ինչ պետք է.* (*Առավոտ, Aravot newspaper, 2003.07.03*). *hasts'nelov moskvaner*($N_{pl.,Acc.}$)*, "Hayfilmi" ayn zhamanakva tnorenē "verevnerum" hamozel ē, vor drank' ayn yen, inch' petk' ē:*

Delivering to Moscows, the director of "Hayfilm" convinced the "uppers" that they were what they needed.

– in this context, *Moscow* in the plural without a DA means something like *Soviet bosses*.

4.2. The definite article and the nominative case

In the nominative one can observe an even greater degree of correlation between the semantic-syntactic function of the use, or not, of the DA than in the previous case. It is generally accepted that in the nominative and accusative, there is a regular and obligatory marking of the noun phrase based on its referential definiteness or indefiniteness. However, upon closer examination, it becomes apparent that such an opposition occurs only in one rather specific case: that is in syntactically non-binding uses, for example, when used as a title (heading). Therefore, it is necessary to consider all possible syntactic positions separately.

a) Obviously, the most characteristic function of nouns in nominative is the position of the subject of the sentence. Regardless of its semantic characteristics, a noun with rare exceptions (see below) is marked by the DA.. Maybe, it would be better to view the DA in this position as a marker of the function of the subject. All grammars indicate cases in which the DA is used with words that have a generalized meaning — for example, *Մարդը մահկանացու է, դատավորներ` արդար, ալկոհոլը` վնասական* (Mardē mahkanacu ē, datavornerē ` ardar, alkoholē ` vnasakar; man is mortal, judges are just, alcohol is harmful). Nouns in a subject position can be used without the DA, but this might only happen under special conditions. Indefinite zero articles are marked, and in this case, as a rule, the optional prepositive article մի MI. (literally one) is used: *Մարդ է եկել,* Mard ē yekel, *Մի մարդ է եկել, Mi mard ē yekel — someone came literally: one man came, Ուղեվոր է մահացել Ughevor ē mahac'el A Passenger died (it does not matter who he/she was).* It is noteworthy that instead of its regular position as an enclithic to the verb: *Մարդը (N_{nom + DA}) եկել է , Mardē (N_{nom + DA}) ekel ē The man came)* in these cases, the auxiliary verb է, *ē* changes its position and occurs after a noun, thus becoming a proclithic to it: *Մարդ է եկել, Mard ē yekel* (N_{nom +} V _{aux}

+ V); *A man came.* When loosing an article, a noun generally attaches to an auxiliary verb.

b) Vocative — the DA is not used.

c) Apposition. — in this case, nouns function as non-declining adjectives (in Armenian, adjectives are not declined) and are used without an article. — *Մայրաքաղաք (N_{nom}) Մոսկվան գեղեցիկ է; Mayrak'aghak'(N_{nom}) Moskvan geghecik ē; The capital Moscow is beautiful.*

d) The semantic distinction between definiteness/indefiniteness is manifested when a noun is in a syntactically unconnected position, for example, in a title function or in sentences in the nominative. Although there is no exact estimate, the intuitive impression is that the headings are more often used in the non-article form (cf.: Atcharyan 1957: 991). Note that within a sentence, both in the subject and object positions, the title of a text is always used with the article. So, the title of the novel "*խաղաղ Դոն*"; "*khaghagh Don*"; "*Quiet Don*" within the sentence takes on the article:

9. "*Խաղաղ Դոնը*" (Nom+DA) *արժանացել է Նոբելյան մրցանակլի: (Armenian Wikipedia). "Khaghagh Donē" (Nom+DA) arzhanacel ē Nobelyan mrts'anaki. The "Quiet Don" won the Nobel Prize.*

Perhaps this happens due to anaphoric quotation: the author quotes the novel's title.

e) One-member nominative sentences present an interesting case. Their semantics and pragmatics are heterogeneous, affecting how articles are used. It is generally accepted that usually there is no opposition between the subject and the predicate in one-member sentences. However, in Armenian, a noun phrase may be used both with and without a copula, therefore nominative sentences can be divided into subject-nominative, or proper nominative sentences, in which there is no auxiliary verb, and nominative-predicative sentences, in which the noun behaves as a predicate and can be changed in moods and tenses. For example, two variants are possible: *Ամառ (N_{nom})* and *Ամառ է($N_{nom} + V_{Aux}$). Amar(N_{nom}).* and *Amar ē Summer* — and *Summer ($N_{nom} + V_{Aux}$).* The semantic difference between these cases is minimal; it can be roughly defined as the difference between indicative and existential meanings. In the second predicative case, in which an auxiliary verb appears, the

noun phrase is used without an article unless there are special conditions (which will be discussed below). Similarly, the DA is not used in exclamations, or with imperatives *Կրակ* (Krak, Fire!), and expressives — *Ապուշ*,(Apush, Idiot!), *Հրաշք* (Hrashk', Beauty!).

When a noun phrase is used without an auxiliary verb, both article and non-article nominative forms may be used. In nominative sentences, as is the case in the titles, the choice between them is associated with the speaker's intention. Thus, in Vahan Teryan's poem "Carousel" the poet recalls circumstances of the meeting with his beloved:

10. *Եվ այն վալսը (N_{nom+DA})՛ "Անդարձ ժամանակ", Ծառուղին(N_{nom+DA})՛ ՛ամայի պուրակում, Եվ գիշեր (N_{nom}), և՛ համբույր(N_{nom}), և՛ լուսնյակ(N_{nom}), Տաղտկալի՛, ձանձրալի՛ պատմություն(N_{nom}):*

(ev ayn valse(N_{nom+DA})՛ ՛"Andardz zhamanak", Tsarrughin(N_{nom+DA})՛ amayi purakum, Ye v gisher(N_{nom}, yev՛ hambuyr(N_{nom}), yev՛ lusnyak(N_{nom}). Taghtkali՛, dzandzrali՛ patmut'yun (N_{nom})

And that waltz "Unreturnable time", the alley is in an empty square, and a night, and a kiss, and the moon, a boring- boring story.

The references to *waltz* (it is specifically named: "*Unreturnable time"*) and the *alley* (it is pointed out: *in an empty square*) are marked by the DA, while the rest of the nouns are used without it. The usage or non-usage of the DA may vary as it depends on an interpretation of the described situation. Thus, the great Russian poet Alexander Blok's poem *Ночь. Улица. Фонарь. Аптека. Бессмыс-ленный и тусклый свет* 'Night, street, street-light, drugstore. A dull and meaningless light.') is rendered in three versions in Armenian translations. Two of them are free of articles:

11.1 . *Գիշերային փողոց, լամպ, դեղատուն, Անիմաաստ ու աղոտ լույս; (Gisherayin poghoc, lamp, deghatun, Animaast u aghot luys);*

11.2 . *Գիշեր ու փողոց, լապտեր, դեղատուն; Աղոտամշար և անիմաստ լույս. (Gisher u p'oghoc', lapter, deghatun; Aghotamshar yev animast luys)*

In the third translation, all three possible options are presented:

11.3. *Գիշեր է (N_{nom} + V_{Aux}), փողոց(N_{nom}) , լապտեր (N_{nom}),
դեղատուն (N_{nom}), Անբովանդակ ու աղոտ լույսը (N_{nom+DA})*:
Gisher ē, p'oghoc', lapter, deghatun, Anbovandak u aghot luyse

The word *Գիշեր* (*night*) received the auxiliary verb է (ē),
referring to the present tense, and the noun *luyse (light)* used with
the DA in contrast to the nouns — *pharmacy* and *lantern*.

4.3. The definite article and the genitive case.

Although the DA is not used in the genitive, nevertheless, there
is one case in which the article *-ն (-n)* acts as a possessive. (cf:
Jahukian 1974:213). A possessive construction like *Իվանի (N_{gen})
գիրքը (Ivani(Ngen) girk'e (N_{nom +DA})* "*The Book of Ivan*) can later
be used in the elliptical form — "*Իվանի-ն-ը(N_{nom +DA + DA})* "
(*Ivanine, Ivan's*):

12. *Իվանը (N_{nom +DA}) գիրք է գրել: Իվանի-ն-ը (N_{nom +DA + DA})
ավելի հետաքրքիր է: (Ivane girk' ē grel: Ivani-**n**-e (N_{nom +DA + DA})
aveli hetak'rk'ir ē: Ivan wrote a book. Ivan's <book> is more
interesting).*

It is noteworthy that in this case, the DA *-ն (-n)* becomes
inseparable from a nominal form and when declining a noun is used
with it: — *Իվանի-ն-ից, Ivani-**n**-ic (N_{instr})*

A noun can acquire a second article (let us remember that the
order of inflections in Armenian is agglutinative, and the DA occurs
after inflections relating to case and number). In this case, a new
word form with a built-in article is produced, and flexions of case
and number are attached to it. The second article is necessary in the
nominative and accusative; the first has a possessive function and
the second anaphoric. Obviously, such cases should be considered as
a kind of possessive form of the noun or pronoun, indicating that the
object belongs to the previously-indicated third person. In the first or
second person, similar constructions are replaced by the possessive
pronouns, *mine* or *yours*. *Իմս (my+ 1-st person possessive article)
քոնից լավն է: Ims k'onic lavn ē VS Իմը (my + DA) քոնից լավն
է — Imē k'onic lavn ē Mine is better than yours[9].*

---

[9] Christopher Lyons suggested another point of view: "Another example is
Modern Armenian, in which possessive affixes doubling free-form
possessives(at least in the first- and second-persons singular): im kirk'-s

4.4.The use of the DA with prepositions

The use of the DA with prepositions is similar to the use outlined for the previous case. The DA can be used with semantically full prepositions (*under, on, with,* etc.) when they substitute the previously used noun phrase: *Գիրքը սեղանի վրա է, տետրը դիր վրան (Prep. + DA) (Girk'ě seghani vra ē — tetrě dir vran)* — it can refer both to the book or to the table: *The book is on the table. Put the notebook on it (on the book or on the table*) or in the situation of the ostensive reference: *նրա հետ գնա vs հետը (Prep. + DA) գնա* (*nra het gna vs hetě gna; Go with him/her*). These anaphoric/ostensive relationships usually can only be properly specified through context.

5. The DA as a marker of nominalization

Our analysis demonstrates that in the declension system, referential definiteness-indefiniteness is not the main factor taken into consideration when the DA is used. The various uses of the DA are semantically heterogeneous and cannot be reduced to a common denominator. Other meanings can be added — for example, pfossessive and anaphoric ones. Summarizing the characteristics of grammaticalized use in the nominative and accusative, we can conclude that it acts as a marker in noun phrases, namely, in a subject or object position . It has already been noted that

«…the identification of determination with opposition in terms of definiteness/indefiniteness, is not completely accurate and occurs under the implicit influence of the Western European model. From a universal typological point of view, both definiteness and

---

(me+GEN book-1SG) 'my book".   Unfortunately, he did not mention the source for his example, but the phonetic transcription indicates that his informants likely were speakers of Western Armenian.

The normative grammars of East Armenian do not list these forms, though they may occur in some mixed non-standard variety s of Armenian, esp. with regard to Turkish speakers of West Armenian. We found out the similar case Իմ գիրքս **(Im girk's My +Book-1sg)** in the book published in Istambul

(see: https://www.arasyayincilik.com/urun/%D5%AB%D5%B4-
%D5%A3%D5%AB%D6%80%D6%84%D5%BD-
%D5%B8%D5%9B%D5%B9-%D5%A9%D5%A7-
%D6%84%D5%B8%D6%82/ — accessed 28/08/2022).

indefiniteness are a special case of referentiality, and the hierarchically dominant opposition in terms of reference / non-reference is much more critical» (Plungian 1993: 173).

However, our analysis of the use of the DA in Eastern Armenian shows that the DA may not imply referentiality and is obligatory even with regard to the generic use of nouns as subjects or objects in the nominative and accusative: *Մարդը մահկանացու է. Marde mahkanats'u ē Man is mortal). Հիվանդությունը տանջում է մարդուն:; Hivandut'une tancum ē mardun Disease tortures ē man).* Therefore, it would be more accurate to associate the use of the DA with nominalization (substantivation) and, accordingly, with the syntactic functions of the subject and object. To clarify the nature of these functions, one can refer to cases in which the DA is used with words of other than nouns parts of speech and therefore cannot be considered a noun category and thus connected to referentiality and definiteness. In Armenian, they can acquire the syntactic and morphological characteristics of a noun; they are altered in number and cases and may be complemented by possessive articles and the DA. In these cases, substantive forms do not differ from nouns, except that they cannot be used in the so called *mode of person, (see above footnote 7 and chapter 4.1) .* But concerning the DA, a significant difference exists — in the subject and the direct object function, these substantives can only be used with the DA.

5.1. The DA with numerals

The function of pointing out a noun phrase is very clearly manifested in the case of numerals. When numerals are used in their primary function, denoting numbers, the DA is not attached

12a. *Հինգ անգամ հինգ քսանհինգ; հինգ գումարած հինգ տաս է*

Hing angam hing k'sanhing; hing gumarats hing tas ē:
Five times five twenty-five; five plus five is ten.

However, when numerals act as a noun phrase in a sentence, then the same principles apply to them as to nouns:

12b. *Հինգը (Num $_{nom +DA}$) երեքից մեծ է: Hingĕ (Num $_{nom +DA}$) yerek'its' mec' ē: Five is more than three.*

5.2. The DA with infinitives

Since there are no morphological differences between nouns and adjectives in Armenian, they are similarly used while performing the function of an object or subject. The same applies to the participles. However, with regard to infinitives, a certain peculiarity exists. Infinitives are used without the DA in syntactically non-bounded forms: *Մոռանալ, Մոռանալ, Մոռանալ (Terian) — Moranal, moranal, moranal — To forget, to forget, to forget; Խաղալ ուրեմն խաղալ — Xag'al uremn hag'al to play then to play.*

In contrast, in the subject position, the infinitive, as a rule, is used with the DA:

13. *Ծխելը (Inf +DA) վնասակար է Tsxelě (Inf +DA) vnasakar ē.To smoke is harmful,*

The deviating cases in which the infinitive in the subject position can be used without the DA may indicate some form of contrastive relationship implied by the context of the given phrase/sentence. As a rule, an inversion occurs: the predicate precedes the infinitive:

14. *Հեշտ է ասել (Inf) Hesht ē asel (Inf) It is easy to say —*
it is assumed that the matter is more serious than expected. Or :

15. *Քեզ համար պիտի նորից հեծեծել (Inf), Բայց լավագույն է քեզ հետ հող մտնել (Inf):* (*Դավթակ Քերթող —* Davtak Kertog') K'ez hamar piti noric hetsetsel*(Inf),,* Bayts' lavaguyn ē k'ez het hogh mtnel(Inf), For you to have to lament again , But it is better to enter the ground with you"

The regular alternation between use and non-use of the DA with infinitives is possible in the object position. It correlates with the distinction between action and process. Without the DA, the infinitive represents action and may not be complemented by possessive pronouns. The infinitive with the DA represents an action as a process, as a gerund, and may accept possessive and other determinants. There is no point in looking for definiteness or referentiality in these uses as the DA serves exclusively as an indicator of nominalization:

16a. *Ես սիրում եմ ծխել* (Inf) *es sirum em tshel (Inf) I like to smoke*

16.b. *Ես սիրում եմ ծխելը* (Inf +DA)*: Es sirum em tshelě (*Inf +DA) *I like to smoke/smoking.*

5.3. *The DA with interjections and auxiliary parts of speech*

A word of any part of speech can be used as a substantive, and then in the positions of the subject or object the DA should be attached to it. For instance, the interjections *Հայ -հայ, "Hai — Hai, ("Wau!") Վայ -վայ "Wai-Wai" (Alas)* in the following phraseological units are used as subjects, and this is marked by the DA:

14a. *հայ-հայ**ը** գնացել, վայ-վայ**ն** է մնացել hayhay**ě** gnacel vayvay**n** ē mnacel* — literally *The haj — haj has gone, the vaj-vaj remains; i.e.: — good days have gone, bad days remain.*

14.b *Վայ**ը** հասել է, մեզ տարել է; Vay**ě** hasel ē, mez tarel ē* — literally: *vay (alas) has come and taken us, i.e., The misfortune has happened.*

The Armenian translation of the Gospel demonstrates how the words *Yes* and *No* in the position of the predicate and the subject differ by the presence of the DA in the subject position and its absence in the predicate position:

15. *Թող ձեր այո**ն** լինի այո, և ոչ**ը** `ո**չ** (Մատթ. 5:37)*
*T'ogh dzer ayo**n** lini ayo , yev voch**ě** `voch '*
But let your 'Yes' be' Yes, ' and your' No '' No'.(Matt'. 5: 37)

Even some prefixes, (for instance –*հակա, haka* — anti), contra-) may be used autonomously as substantives: "*հակա**ն**" ինք**դ** ես*" (Առավոտ, Aravot newspaper, 2007.04.21) — Hakan ink'ed es "Anti" — it's you. The situation is similar: the DA is used in the subject and object positions and without the DA in the predicate position. Using the DA with infinitives and even with interjections and prefixes indicates that the syntactic position is decisive, and that substantivization is closely related to it. For this reason, this seems to be the most important function of the DA in modern Eastern Armenian.

6. The DA with noun predicates

The previous considerations led to the idea of connecting uses of the DA to the marking of the syntactic position of the noun phrase and not with its morphological affiliation to the class on nouns. This view is supported by the fact that in the predicate position, as a rule, nouns are used without the DA. However, in certain contexts and situations, nouns and adjectives in a predicate position must be used with the DA. This cannot be explained either by the opposition of

definiteness/indefiniteness, or by the markedness of the noun phrase. These cases manifest the more archaic indicative function, usually combined with a contrastive one. Its specific status is also demonstrated by the fact that, generally, an interpretation of such cases depends on the context and requires an explanation of under-lying pragmatic presuppositions and conversational implicatures. For instance, no additional information is needed for the regular usage of a noun predicate without the DA:

16a. *Նա վարչապետ է* (Na varch'apet ē (N_{nom}) ē; He is a prime-minister).

However, when the same noun occurs in the same position with the DA

16b. *Նա վարչապետն է*, Na varch'apet**n** (N_{nom+DA}) ē; He is the prime-minister)

A speaker must explain what it means (for example, is he, as a prime minister, responsible for the crisis, or can he afford expensive watches, etc.). Let us give some examples taken from the Eastern Armenian Language Corpus. Thus, when the word *վարչապետ* is used and prime-minister is in a predicative position with the DA, a special context is required. In this case, the speaker had referred not to a position in the Armenian government, but to an actual person, even indicating the individual's surname:

16c. *Միայն այն, որ Անդրանիկ Մարգարյանը վարչապետն է՛ բավարար էր* (Առավոտ Aravot newspaper, 2006.07.29) Miayn ayn, vor Andranik Margaryan**ě** varch'apet**n** (N_{nom+DA}) ē՛ bavarar ēr Just that Andranik Margaryan is the prime minister is enough.

16 d. *ՊԱԿ-ի հետ համագործակցած Անդրանիկ Մարգարյանը անկախ Հայաստանի վարչապետն(N_{nom+DA}) է, — Հայկական Ժամանակ*, Hajkakan zhamanak newspaper 2005.05.18. *PAK-i het hamagortsakts'ats Andranik Margaryaně ankakh Hayastani varch'apet**n** (N_{nom+DA}) ē. Collaborated with the KGB Andranik Margaryan now is the Prime minister of the independent Armenia*

16e. *Իսկ Մանուկյանի կազմած անկախ Հայաստանի առաջին կառավարությունը, որի վարչապետն էր, արտակարգ լիազորություններով, միշտ կմնա որպես ամոթալի թյուրիմացություն — Հայկական Ժամանակ,*

Hajkakan zhamanak 2006.01.28 *Isk Manukyani kazmats ankakh Hayastani arrajin karravarut'yuně, vori varch'apet**n** (N_{nom+DA}) ēr artakarg liazorut'yunnerov, misht kmna vorpes amot'ali t'yurimats'ut'yun Vazgen Manukyan's Government of Armenia, in which he was the prime minister with extraordinary powers, will remain as an unpleasant misunderstanding.*

Even if a speaker refers to an assumed person, he/she has a definite referent in mind:

16f. *իհարկէ, կասեն, որ ծեծողը վարչապետի արտաքինով էր, ուրեմն վարչապետ**ն** (N_{nom+DA}) էր: — Հայկական Ժամանակ, Hajkakan zhamanak2006.10.12 iharke, kasen, vor tsetsoghě varch'apeti artak'inov ēr, uremn varch'apetn ēr. Of course, they will say that the beater had Prime Minister's visage; therefore he was the Prime Minister.*

In some cases, a semantic difference between the usage and non-usage of the DA becomes more salient because it correlates with differences in lexical meanings. The predicate, instead of designating a feature or property, may also designate a person who, or object which, is endowed with that property, and due to which that person or object may be identified:

17. *Նա մեզանից խելոք (Adj) է vs Նա մեզանից խելոք**ն** (Adj +DA) է (Na mezanits' khelok' (Adj) ē vs Na mezanic khelok'**n** (Adj +DA) ē̄ — He is cleverer than we are vs He is the only clever person among us).*

In such cases, a name or adjective with the DA points to a unique object in some domain of reference which is common or familiar to communicants and cannot be used without such specification. These functions can be combined with topicalization and ostensive reference functions, and this is usually accompanied by an inversion of word order.

A similar semantic shift can be seen in the example cited by Manuk Abeghyan (1974: 431):

18a. *Նա մեզ ծառա է (Na mez ($Pron_{pers1pldat}$) care(N_{nom+DA}) ē̄ He is a servant to us (for us)*

18b. *Նա մեր ծառա**ն** է: (Na mer($Pron_{poss}$) carra**n** (N_{nom+DA}) ē̄ He is our servant.)*

In the example (18a), the status of the servant is referred to; in (18b) — a speaker identifies an individual as their servant. A significant change in syntactic dependence occurs: in the first

example, without the DA, the word *ծառա servant* does not have an attribute. In the second, the possessive attribute *մեր, our* determines the mandatory use of the DA.

But only the presence of an attribute is not enough; an unambiguous individualization is required, which enables a unique referent to be distinguished. Thus, it is essential that an attribute can individualize a referent of a noun. For instance, for the attribute *վատ*, (vat, bad) as a rule, the noun form without an article must be used:

18c. *Նա վատ ծառա է* (*Na vat carra (N$_{nom}$) ē He is a bad servant*.)

However, with the same adjective but in the superlative?, only the form with the DA can be used:

18d. *Նա ամենավատ ծառան (N$_{nom+DA}$) է* (Na amenavat carran ē He is the worst servant.)

In the above-mentioned cases, the use of the DA is determined by the co-occurrence of determinants or attributes. However, the same opposition may occur if we remove the dependent words. In these cases, the usage of the DA requires contextual clarification:

18e. *Նա ծառա է: Na carra (N$_{nom}$) ē He is a servant vs Նա ծառան է:Na carran (N$_{nom+DA}$) ē: He is the servant.*

Therefore, in these cases (16 — 18), one can observe another manifestation of the DA. The position of the predicate blocks the article's appearance in ordinary contexts. Still, in particular contexts, this blocking does not apply to the expression of pragma-semantic meanings, which are not connected to nominal grammatical features. However, the question arises — is it possible in these cases to refer to predication as the function of some attributive features? It can be assumed that it is not so much a predication as an indication. A noun or adjective in a predicate position singles out a certain person, performing the functions not of predication but of individuation. This becomes especially salient in cases when proper names are used in the predicate position for which an occurrence of the DA with a noun is obligatory:

19a. *Ես Իվանn em Նա Իվանn է* Yes Ivan**n** ēm Na Ivan**n** ē I am Ivan He is Ivan

The use of a proper name in this position without the DA changes its semantics; it acquires some characteristics of a common noun.

19b. *Նա Իվան է Նա Շեքսպիր է, Na Ivan ē Na Shek'spir ē he is Ivan,(he is Ivan = a common Russian), he is a Shakespeare = a great play writer. Նա Զոլյան է — Na Zolyan ē — He is Zolyan = He behaves himself as a member of Zolyan's clan.*

Using the DA with names in a predicate position leads to a previously not considered problem, namely, the connection of articles with the attributive and referential use of definite descriptions. According to K. Donnellan's distinction,

«A speaker who uses a definite description attributively in an assertion states something about whoever or whatever is the so-and-so. A speaker who uses a definite description referentially in an assertion, on the other hand, uses the description to enable his audience to pick out whom or what he is talking about and states something about that person or thing. In the first case the definite description might be said to occur essentially, for the speaker wishes to assert something about whatever or whoever fits that description; but in the referential use the definite description is merely one tool for doing a certain job — calling attention to a person or thing — and in general any other device for doing the same job, another description or a name, would do as well» (Donnellan 1966: 285).

Thus, his example "Smith's murderer is insane" allows a twofold understanding: in one case, we point to a murderer who is insane. This is a referential use. In the second, due to the circumstances of the murder, we may conclude that the unknown murderer is a madman (ibid). If Donnellan had used an Armenian translation of his example, it would have been easier to explain this distinction between the referential and the attributive meaning of the nominal predicates, as it is expressed through the use or non-use of the article:

19a. *Սմիթին սպանողը խելագար է* (Smit'in spanoł**ě** khelagar ē) vs

19b. *Սմիթին սպանողն է* (Smit'in spanoł**ě** khelagar**n ē**), or, more appropriate, with inversion

19c. *խելագարն է Սմիթին սպանողը*; (khelagar**n** ē Smit'i spanoł**ě**)

This allows us to single out one more pragma-semantic function of the article in Eastern Armenian — the distinction between attributive and referential descriptions. It is associated with the expression of definiteness, but is not reducible to it.

7. The definite article in idioms and phraseological units

The use of articles in phraseology generally does not differ from other cases. However, there is one remarkable feature. Anna Abajyan (2017: 10–11) has indicated an impact of the DA on changing the semantics in idioms and phraseological units. Using the data of the most representative phraseological dictionary (Sukiasyan, Galstyan 1975), she gives a list of phraseological units in which the use of the DA changes their meaning. For example, *Հոգի տալ* (*Hogi tal,* literally: to give a soul without the DA means 'to be infinitely loyal', while with the DA *Հոգին տալ* (*Hogin tal)* the same combination means 'to die'; — *բերան գցել beran gcel to throw in the mouth* without the DA means *to get into someone's hands*, *to torment,* while *բերանը գցել* beran**ě** gcel with the DA it means literally to have a small meal , and in a figurative meaning — to give a bribe; *Ճամփա կտրել to cut a path* (without the DA) — *to walk a* track, with the DA *Ճամփան կտրել* champ'a**n** ktrel- it means 'to block somebody's way. In our opinion, the following explanation may be given. The above-mentioned dictionary does not distinguish between proper idioms when meaning is not deduced from components and stable collocations when with some reservations, the meaning of the whole expression may be computed from its constituents. As one can see, in the above examples, nouns with the DA manifest their primary meaning; they may be identified with components of some concrete situations and referents. In idioms, the same noun without the DA functions as a non-actualized lexical unit, which is not relativized to a context since that context is related to the idiom as a whole.

8. Conclusions

The so-called DA in Eastern Armenian performs different functions, and the expression of definiteness is only one of them. Their functional and semantic diversity makes it challenging to identify one of them as the principal function. Maybe, a different term would be more adequate. Bearing the diachronic origin of the DA from the demonstrative/possessive pronoun Նա (na) and enclitic -ն (-n) in classical Armenian in mind, it seems to be possible to treat it as a demonstrative determinant, which barring some grammatical constraints and pragmatic circumstances can perform

various pragma-semantic manifestations and functions; some of them (very few) have been grammaticalized, most of them depend on prototypical contextual features and the communicative intention of speakers. At the same time, the only cases that can be considered grammaticalized to a certain extent are the usages of the DA in the accusative and nominative, where it mostly coincides with the functions of the object NP_2, and the subject NP_1. Apart from the accusative, the use of the article is determined not so much by the morphological sub-categorial characteristics of a noun as by parameters of communicative syntax.

We would like to point out four main types of usages of the DA.

1) The article as a marker of a noun phrase in the subject or object function — in this case, it is used with any part of speech and serves as a syntactic rather than a morphological characteristic; Possible semantic connotations (referentiality, definiteness) are optional and follow from characteristics associated with the syntactic function of the noun phrase.

2) The article as an indicator of the definiteness/indefiniteness of a name — in these cases, the article can be viewed as a grammatical category of the name that characterizes the syntactic object (including the function of an animate addressee). As a special case, this also includes cases of syntactically non-binding use of a name, although grammaticalization does not occur.

3) The article as an indicator of indicative, deictic, possessive, anaphoric and contrastive meanings — these meanings have been inherited? from the previous states of the language system and cannot be defined either as morphological or as syntactic categories; the most appropriate term to designate these syncretic functions seems to be the 'discursive particle. These functions are particularly evident in the predicate position.

4) The inherited traits from the previous stages of discursive functions generate a new one: distinguishing between referential and attributive definite descriptions.

5) Nevertheless, grammaticalized constrain have an impact: the DA can no longer be used with nouns and substantives in indirect cases. Therefore, for all the heterogeneity of the functions performed, a certain hierarchy is possible — the basic is the substantive usage of a word, this transposes it into the category of the grammatical object. Only after substantivization, are the other more archaic pragma-semantic functions possible. Therefore, the term DA concerning is more polysemic than homonymic in Eastern Armenian: some affinities exist between its different functions and

manifestations. It may be understood as an umbrella for them, bearing in mind that the definite–indefinite distinction for some of these functions may collapse:

«Definiteness itself can expand its range of application, taking in generics, specifics etc., and a point can come at which its exponent is reanalysed as grammatically and semantically empty (perhaps leading to its being pressed into service with some other function). At this point, unless a new article emerges with a reduced function to renew the category, the definite–indefinite distinction collapses. Not only can languages acquire the category of definiteness; they can also lose it» (Lyons 1999: 340).

References

Abajyan, Anna. 2017: Some observations on the definite article in the Eastern Armenian. *Jahukyan readings.* Int. Conf. Yerevan, June 15–16, Yerevan, "Gitutjun" Publishing, 2017, 5–14

Աբաջյան Աննա. Մի քանի դիտարկումներ արևելահայերենի որոշիչ հոդի մասին. *Ջահուկյանական ընթերցումներ*. Ինտ. Կոնֆ. Երևան, 15-ից հունիսի 15-ը, 2017 թ. Երևան, "Գիտություն" հրատարակչություն, 2017 թ., 5–14. In Armenian.

Abeghyan, M. 1974: *Works, volume V. Theory of the Armenian language* Yerevan. Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, 1974.

Աբեղյան Մանուկ. *Երկեր, Հ. Ջ. Հայոց լեզվի տեսություն*, Երևան: ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ. In Armenian

Abrahamyan, S. G. 1960: The definite article in modern Armenian; — *Bulletin of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, Social Sciences*. 1. 73–82.

Աբրահամյան Ս. Գ. Ժամանակակից հայերենի որոշիչ հոդը; — *Հայկական ՍՍՌ Գիտությունների Ակադեմիայի տեղեկագիր, Հասարակական գիտություններ*. 1. 1960, 73– 82. In Armenian

Acharyan, Gr. 1957: *Complete grammar of the Armenian language in comparison with 562 languages, vol. 3,* Yerevan, Publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.

Լիակատար քերականություն հայոց լեզվի՝ համեմատությամբ 562 լեզուների, հ. *3*, Երևան, ՀՍՍՀ ԳԱ հրատ; 1957 — In Armenian

Adonts, N. 1915: *Dionysius of Thrace and Armenian Interpreters*. (Series "Collection of ancient Armenian and ancient Georgian texts published by the Imperial Academy. V. IV) Petrograd., CXCIII, 307

Адонц Н. Дионисий Фракийский и армянские толкователи. (Серия "Собрание древне-армянских и древне-грузинских текстов, издаваемых Имп. АН". IV) Пг., 1915. CXCIII, 307 стр. In Armenian.

De Mulder, W., Carlier, A. 2011꞉ The grammaticalization of definite articles. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 522–535.

Diewald, G. 2011a꞉ Grammaticalization and pragmaticalization. In: Heiko Narrog & Bernd Heine (eds.). *The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 450–461.

Diewald, G. 2011b꞉ Pragmaticalization (defined) as grammaticalization of discourse functions. *Linguistics* 49, 2: 365–390.

Diessel, Holger. 1999꞉ *Demonstratives. Form, function and grammaticalization*. John Benjamins Publishing, https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.42

Dionysios, Th. 1874꞉ The *Grammar*, Translated From The Greek By Thomas Davidson. St. Louis

Dryer, M. S. 2005꞉ Definite articles. In: Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.). *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 154–157.

Donnellan, K. S. 1966꞉ Reference and definite descriptions. *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 75, No 3, 281–304.

Dum-Tragut, J. 2009꞉ *Armenian: Modern Eastern Armenian* [London Oriental and African Language Library, 14]. xv, 742 pp. John Benjamins Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1075

Greenberg, J. 1990: How does a language acquire gender markers? In: Keith Denning & Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *On language: Selected writings of Joseph H. Greenberg*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 241–270.

Heine, Bernd. 2018꞉ Are there two different ways of approaching grammaticalization? In: Sylvie Hancil, Tine Breban & José Vicente Lozano (eds), *New Trends on Grammaticalization and Language Change* [Studies in Language Companion Series 202], Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 23–54.

Heine, B., Kuteva, T. 2007꞉ *The Genesis of Grammar: A Reconstruction*. (Studies in the Evolution of Language, 9.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hopper, P. J., Traugott E. C., 2003꞉ *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jahukyan, G. B. 1974꞉ *The Foundations of the theory of the modern Armenian*. The Publisjing of the Academy of Sc of the Armenian SSR., Yerevan, 587 p.
    Ջահուկյան . Գ . Բ . *Ժամանակակից հայերենի տեսության հիմունքները*꞉ Հայկական ՍՍՀ Գիտությունների Ակադեմիայի հրատարակչություն, Երևան, 1974 . 587 . In Armenian

Jahukyan, G. B. 1978꞉ Linguistics in Armenia in the V–XVIII centuries. In: Jahukyan, G. B. *General and Armenian linguistics*. Yerevan, The Publisjing of the Academy of Sc of the Armenian SSR, Yerevan, 258–329.

Джаукян, Г. Б. Языкознание в Армении в V–XVIII вв. In: Джаукян, Г. Б. *Общее и армянское языкознание*. Ереван, Изд-во АН Арм. ССР, Ереван, 1978. 258 –329. (In Russian)

Kagirova, V. A. 2013: *The definite article in the modern Eastern Armenian language: typology and diachrony*: PhD theses, St-Petersburg, Кагирова В. А. *Определенный артикль в современном восточно-армянском языке: типология и диахрония*: автореф. дисс. … к. филол. н. СПб., 2013. (In Russian).

Khachatryan, A. 1975: Some peculiarities of the definite article of the Armenian language. *Lraber,* 100–109. Խաչատրյան Ա. Հայերենի որոշիչ հողի մի շարք առանձնահատկություններ. *Լրաբեր* 1975, 100–109 (In Armenian).

König, Ekkehard. 2018: Definite articles and their uses. *Aspects of Linguistic Variation*, edited by Daniël Olmen, Tanja Mortelmans and Frank Brisard, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 165–184. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110607963-006

Meillet, A. 1936: *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique.* Vienna: PP Mekhitharistes.

Lyons, Ch. 1999: *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mendoza, I., 2021: "Definiteness (Morphological)", in*: Encyclopedia of Slavic Languages and Linguistics Online*, Editor-in-Chief Marc L. Greenberg. Consulted online on 17 January 2022. First published online: 2021

Meyer, Robin. 2019: An Uncomfortable Compromise: Armenian and the τέχνη γραμματική // Wolfson College | University of Oxford. *Armenia & Byzantium: Perspectives on Cultural and Political Relations 23* March https://rbnmyr.eu/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Dionysios_paper_rm_2203192133.pdf — accessed 07/07/2021

Muradian, Parujr. 1980: The Problem of the Translator and Interpreter of the Grammar of Dionysius of Thrace. Patma-banasirakan handes, 3, 68–87.
Մուրադյան, Ա. Ն. (*Դիոնիսիոս Թրակացու քերականության թարգմանչի և մեկնիչի հարցը.* Պատմա-բանասիրական հանդես, 3, 68–87. (In Armenian).

Müth, Angelika. 2011: Categories of definiteness in classical Armenian. In: Eirik Welo (ed.) *Indo-European syntax and pragmatics: contrastive approaches*, Oslo Studies in Language 3(3), 11–25

Petrosyan, H . Z, 1960: *The aspects of the definite, indefinite, person's and object's modes in Armenian*, Yerevan., Arm. SSR Academy of Sciences Publishing, 170 p.
Պետրոսյան Հ.Զ., Որոշյալի և անորոշի, անձի և իրի առումները հայերենում, Ե., ՀՍՍՌ ԳԱ հրատ., 1960, 170 էջ:)
(In Armenian).

Plungyan, V. A. 2011: *Introduction to grammatical semantics: grammatical meanings and grammatical systems of the world's languages*. M.: Russian State University for the Humanities, 672 p.

Плунгян, В. А., Введение в грамматическую семантику: грамматические значения и грамматические системы языков мира. М.: РГГУ, 2011 (In Russian).

Sukiasyan, A. Galstyan, S. 1975: *Phraseological Dictionary of the Armenian Language*, Yerevan State University Publishing House, Yerevan, 614 p.

Սուքիասյան Ա., Գալստյան Ս. Հայոց լեզվի դարձվածաբանական բառարան, Երևանի պետական համալսարանի հրատարակչություն, Երևան, 1975, 614 էջ) (In Armenian).

Traugott, E. C., Ekkehard K. 1991: "The semantics-pragmatics of grammaticalization revisited". In Traugott, E. C., Heine, B. (eds.) *Approaches to Grammaticalization,* Vol. l, 189–218.

Tumanyan, E. G. 1963: *Articles in the modern Armenian language*. M.; Yerevan: Yerevan State University Publishing House, 225 p.
Туманян Э. Г. Артикли в современном армянском языке. М.: Ереван: Изд-во Ереванского государственного университета, 1963. 225 с. (In Russian)

Tumanyan E.G. 1971: *The Old Armenian language.* Moscow: Nauka.
Туманян Э. Г. Древнеармянский язык. М.: Наука, 448 с. (In Russian)

Zolyan, S. 2021: On pragma-semantics of expressives: Between words and actions. *Studies at the Grammar-Discourse Interface: Discourse markers and discourse-related grammatical phenomena*. Eds.: Alexander Haselow and Sylvie Hancil. Studies in Language Companion Series, 245–271
https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.219.09zol