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Pronouns as Verbs, Verbs as Pronouns:  
Demonstratives and the Copula in Iranian

Agnes Korn

The conversion of pronominals to copula forms is rather common cross-linguistically, and has also received a certain amount of attention in the literature, starting with Li & Thompson's article "A mechanism for the development of copula morphemes" (1977). The use of pronouns as copula forms has also been described for Eastern Iranian, but these data have not yet been compared to parallel patterns of other languages in the typological or general linguistic literature.

So the first part of the article intends to link Iranian data investigated several decades ago with the research carried out more recently in linguistics on a great variety of languages other than Iranian. A presentation of the Eastern Ir. data will be followed by a comparison with parallel structures in other languages with view to the questions how such constructions emerge, and why languages recruit a new copula at all. The second part argues that some Western Ir. pronominal clitics might derive from copula forms or verbal endings. Here as well, the motivation of this process will be discussed.

1. Pronouns as copula

For the purposes of this paper, the term "copula" refers to a functional element that links a noun phrase with subject properties to another noun or adjective phrase (i.e. to "predicate nominals" and "predicate adjectives" in the categories of Payne 1997:111-128), but otherwise lacks lexical content. Sentences that contain such an element (e.g. this is a question; her uncle is our teacher; the sky is blue) will be called "copula sentences". This definition excludes sentences expressing location (such as the dog is in the house; there is a book on the table) or belonging (a book is with me / there is a book to me, i.e. I have a book), i.e., Payne's "predicate locatives", "existentials" and "possessive clauses". The latter group of patterns will collectively be termed "existential sentences" here, and an overt verb used in them "existential verb". While many languages use the same verb as copula and existential verb, the distinction is relevant for several languages discussed below.

---

1 I am grateful to Lucia Raspe for information on Modern Hebrew, to Yutaka Yoshida for advice on Sogdian, to Wolfgang Behr for counsel concerning Chinese and to Andreas Waibel for instruction about Turkic. Special thanks are due to Geoffrey Haig for helpful comments and to Thomas Jügel for his dedicated reading of previous versions and interesting discussion. – In this article, some examples have been somewhat adapted for their use here, glosses are mostly mine.

2 For instance, Haig (2011:370-375) notes that the so-called "tense ezâfe" in Bahdini Kurdish "appears to be unique in Iranian" in crossing "from the D and N domain to the T domain" (p. 370). - The "tense ezâfe" shows similarities to pronominal copulas in that "it must have arisen through constructions where the initial NP was a left-dislocated topic, and the Tense Ezâfe was an anaphoric/demonstrative referring back to that topic" (p. 373). However (as also noted by Haig), the structure differs from the Ir. constructions discussed here insofar as it only occurs in addition to a finite verb (copula or full verb) in the sentence. So it is, as Haig notes, rather similar to "stance particles" common in East Asian languages.
Copula sentences are common in Iranian languages, cf. the underlined elements in (1-2).

(1) azəm əhmī zarədəṣṭra haomō (...)
Avestan I.NOM be.PRES1SG PN.VOC.SG PN.NOM.SG
"I am Haoma, o Zarathustra" (Y 9. 2)

(2) tyw ZY ʾk y ʾš
Sogdian you.SG.NOM and who be.PRES2SG
"and who are you" (cf. BENVENISTE 1946, l. 929)

(3) aʃəm vohū vahišτam astī
Avestan truth.NOM/ACC good.NOM/ACC good.NOM/ACC be.PRES3SG
"Aṣa (Truth) is the best good" (Y 27. 14)

An alternative strategy is the use of a structure without a copula, juxtaposing two nominal phrases. This pattern, which will be called "nominal sentence" here, is also common in Old and most Middle Ir. languages (and in ancient Indo-European languages in general) specifically for the 3rd person indicative, but to some extent also elsewhere.4

(4) adam dārayavauš
Old I.NOM PN.NOM.SG
Persian "I [am] Dareios" (DB 1.1, cf. KENT 1953:79)

(5) rty cβ ʾβ ʾβ sn ZKβ zJβ
Sogdian and how much mile ART.f country
"how many miles [is] this country [from here]" (cf. HESTON 1976:219)

While these examples might suggest that the copula is optional, BENVENISTE 1950 argues that a nominal sentence in ancient IE languages did not "omit the copula", but originally had a different function: a nominal sentence marks the situation as being outside any time frame, "it always serves for statements of a general, even didactic character" ("elle sert toujours à des assertions de caractère général, voire sentencieux", BENVENISTE 1950:30), such as "X is a virtue; a monkey is fun for children", etc., while copula sentences appear in narratives and descriptions. So omnis homo mortalis ("every human [is] mortal") corresponds to omnis homo moritur ("every human dies [=is mortal]") while omnis homo mortalis est ("every human is mortal") is different, rather parallel to ... mortalis videtur / dicitur, etc. ("... seems / is reported to be mortal", BENVENISTE 1950:26-28).

In addition to nominal sentences and to the use of a verb as copula, some Ir. languages show another pattern, viz. the use of a pronoun in copular function. These fall into two groups: pronouns which are used as copula forms and continue to be used as pronouns, and

2. See REICHELT (1909:350f.) for Avestan, EMERICK (2009:401) for Khotanese, HESTON (1976:215-223) for several Middle Iranian languages, and FORTSON § 8.15, BRUGMANN (1902:626f.) and MEILLET 1906 for Indo-European (see also Section 1.5 below).
3. I follow WENDTLAND 1998 in spelling Sogdian (in Sogdian script) word-final <h> with a capital to indicate that it does not stand for /h/ (in this sense <h> is a heterogram); it is a graphic device to encode a word-final vowel, or to indicate feminine gender (as e.g. in zʾyH). However, as some cases of <h> do imply information about the pronunciation (differing from the "usual" Arameograms), I use a superscript H.
forms that have abandoned their pronominal function entirely.

1.1 Pronominals that also function as copula

In Sogdian, the demonstrative pronoun (ʾ)xw may be used as a 3rd person copula, as in the two underlined instances in (6). This construction is found in copula sentences while a verb is used in existential sentences (WEBER (1970:21-24)).

(6) rty ʾmyn wʾḥʾy ZK ptkʾʾkʾʾxw
Sogdian living.OBL ART appearance same empty mark DEM

"(lit. ca.:) and this being's appearance is in fact the sign of emptiness, and the sign of emptiness is in fact the being's sign" (cf. WEBER 1970:21)

As formulated by WEBER (1970:24), the pronoun in such instances "occupy the place of the verb in the sentence" ("nehmen (...) die Stellung des Verbums im Satz ein"). This applies in a double sense: in the copular function of the pronoun and in the position of the verb, as verbs are often sentence-final in Sogdian (while other positions are also common).

A similar phenomenon occurs with the pronominal clitics: in Wakhi, nominal sentences occur with and without such clitics as in (7). BASHIR (2009:841) comments on this phenomenon: "the pronominal clitics sometimes perform the copular function".

(7a) sāiš kāi
Wakhi you.PL who

"who [are] you (pl.)?"

(7b) tu =f kāi
you.SG PRO.2SG who

"who are you (sg.)?" (both MORGENSTIERNE 1938:497)

Just like Sogdian (ʾ)xw, the Wakhi pronominal clitics are also used in pronominal function.

---

6 See BEVENISTE (1959-75, noting that this use of (ʾ)xw is also found in the 3pl., see Section 1.4). - Sogdian has a three-way deictical system; (ʾ)xw is the distal pronoun (see SIMS-WILLIAMS 1994:41, 48-50). WEBER (1970:21-24) also notes other Sogdian pronouns and pronominal derivatives in copula function, but these forms are not quite clear (Antje Wendtland, personal communication).


8 The "sign of emptiness" appears to mean "vain imagining, false discrimination between real and unreal" (MACKENZIE 1976/II: 42).

9 Note that the clitics are largely identical to the forms of the copula except for the 3sg., which has =i(clitic). The pronominal clitics in Wakhi prefer the position on the first constituent of the clause, but are also found elsewhere (BASHIR 2009:835; see ibid. p. 842 for further examples and Section 1.2 below for further details on Wakhi). Variations in the rendering of Wakhi are due to the differing orthography in the sources, and to some extent also to dialectal variation. - Another language with pronominal clitics in copula function is Kilba, a language of Nigeria (see SCHUH 1983).
1.2 Copula forms that derive from pronouns

Eastern Ir. languages also show copula forms which do not function as pronouns synchronically, but are likely to derive from pronouns. The most important ones for our purposes are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Forms of the copula and existential verb deriving from a pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wakhi and other Pamir languages:</td>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>tey, Past tu</td>
<td>&lt; OIr. DEM *aita-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashto: 3rd person</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>day, f. da, pl. di</td>
<td>&lt; OIr. DEM *aita-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cf. DEM day, da, day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaghnobi: 3sg.</td>
<td>3sg. =x (DEM ax)</td>
<td>&lt; OIr. DEM *hau-/awa-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossetic: 3sg.</td>
<td>Iron u (DEM u-),</td>
<td>&lt; OIr. DEM *awa-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Door æi</td>
<td>&lt; OIr. DEM *ayam/i-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Door ie (DEM ie)</td>
<td>&lt; OIr. DEM *ayam/i-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron i, Door iæ</td>
<td>&lt; OIr. DEM *aïša-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ossetic 1sg., 2sg.</td>
<td>1sg. den</td>
<td>Cf. subjunctive -on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2sg. deve</td>
<td>se &lt; OIr. *ahi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One language with historically pronominal forms for "to be" is again Wakhi: tey (present) / tu (past, including a perfect stem formed from the latter) are used as copula and existential verb. MORGENSTIERNE (1938:544) considers tey/ tu as members of a group of Eastern Ir. 3rd person copular forms which are probably demonstrative pronouns integrated into the copula paradigm. tey and tu co-occur with pronominal clitics functioning as agreement markers, cf. (8). Since the pronominal clitics are used as subject markers for both transitive and intransitive verbs in past and perfect tenses (BASHIR 2009: 835), tu may be said to have adopted verbal morphology, and tey would have been adjusted to that pattern.

---

10 For the etymologies given here, see BENVENISTE (1959:74-76) and WEBER (1983:86-87) in general, SIMS-WILLIAMS (1994:49) for Wakhi and Yaghnobi. Yaghnobi ax, obl. aw-i is the distal demonstrative while the proximal deixis is expressed by iš, obl. it, < *aita- / aita- as in Sogdian. For Pashto, see BENVENISTE (1959:75) and MORGENSTIERNE (2003:22, 100, 1927:100); the forms of the demonstrative are adapted from LORENZ (1979: 33). The Pashto 1sg. and 2sg. are from the OIr. copula 1sg. *ahmi, 2sg. *ahi. For Ossetic, see WEBER (1983:87, 90ff.) and THORDARSON (2009:5f.; Iron u- might also be from *hau-), somewhat differently BENVENISTE (1959:75f.). Copular u and æi are used in identification function and i, iæ, iæs as existential verb while it is not clear whether æi is indeed used as copula (David Erschler, p.c.). The derivation of 1sg. /æmi from *ahmi (BENVENISTE 1959:75) is rejected by WEBER (1983:89) on the grounds that a regular change of word-final -m > -n happens only in Digor. However, this does not seem a strong counterargument, as the -m could have been adjusted to the ending of the subjunctive. The Digo plural forms may go back to the OIr. copula (WEBER 1983:84f.) while the Iron pl. forms are based on a stem st- (probably from the verb "to stand", BEILMEIR 1977:162f.); the latter explanation appears more likely than the derivation of the 3pl. from (3sg.) *asti advocated by WEBER (1983:85-87). The Ossetic proximal pronouns are based on the stem æ- (THORDARSON 1989:472). Potentially also relevant is Yidgda/Munji čĕš "is not", which might be compared to OIr. čit "anything" (SKJÆRVØ 1989:373).

11 For further discussion, see Section 1.4.

12 The clitic is optional in the 3sg. (BASHIR 2009:835, 841f.). However, BASHIR's (2009:836) Table 19.9 has 3sg. tey (=it) with optional use of the copula rather than the pronominal clitic -i(cf. note 9).
The Yaghnobi 3sg. $=x$ and the 3rd person copula in Pashto are nearly identical to demonstratives in these languages. Ossetic has several forms for the 3sg. copula, and they are even different for the two dialect groups Iron and Digor. However, $u$- and $ie$ are indeed also the forms of the distal demonstrative in the respective dialects.

The Ossetic 3sg. is not the only form with a pronominal history: the 1st and 2nd sg. are prefixed with an element $d$- which is likely to derive from a demonstrative, probably from the same OIr. pronoun *aita- that the Pashto 3rd person copula and the Wakhi existential verb derive from. This would imply that an originally pronominal element was reanalysed as verbal stem.

1.3 Conversion of pronouns as an isogloss?

Considering that all copula forms of pronominal origin mentioned so far are from Eastern Ir. varieties, one wonders whether this feature might be an isogloss of the Eastern Ir. languages as a group. However, the languages employ different pronominal stems. Indeed, all three sets of pronominal stems found in Old Iranian, plus the pronominal clitics, are employed as copula forms in some Eastern Ir. language (Table 2).

Table 2: OIr. pronominals used as copula or existential verb sorted by their protoforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OIr. &quot;arya&quot; (/ ima-) &quot;hic&quot;</th>
<th>Ossetic $i$, $ei$, $ye$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OIr. &quot;aiša- / aita-&quot;iste&quot;</td>
<td>Ossetic $is$, $yes$ Ossetic $d$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pashto $dai$, $dâ$, $dí$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wakhi $tey$, $tu$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIr. &quot;hau (/ awa-)&quot;ille&quot;</td>
<td>Ossetic $u$ Sogdian (')xw Yaghnobi $=x$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIr. pronominal clitics</td>
<td>Wakhi $PRO$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Particularly interesting are the elements deriving from the OIr. pronoun *aita-. They include the 3rd person in Pashto with its masculine, feminine and plural forms, the Ossetic element $d$- and the existential verb in Wakhi. On the other hand, the oldest attested item in the group is Sogd. (')xw, echoed by the closely related modern Yaghnobi and by Ossetic. In Wakhi, the development of pronouns to copula forms even seems to have happened twice: the existential verb $tey$ / $tu$ comes from a demonstrative via copula, and the copular use of the pronominal clitics could be a more recent means to express copula function.
BENVENISTE (1959:75) notes: "So here is a group of three dialects [= Ir. languages]: Ossetic, Sogdian, Pashto, where the demonstrative pronoun functions as copula, without the innovation being a common one; every dialect uses a different pronoun. The coincidence is in fact all the more significant." ("Voilà donc un groupe de trois dialectes, ossète, sogdien, paštò, où le pronom démonstratif fonctionne comme copule, sans que l'innovation soit commune ; chaque dialecte se sert d'un pronom différent. La rencontre n'en est que plus significative.")

So the phenomenon appears to be a case of parallel development of a certain structure by means of etymologically unrelated elements; it might be seen in the context of the observation that Eastern Iranian cannot be established as a genetic group (in the sense of being descended from a protolanguage intermediary between Proto-Iranian and the attested varieties), but seems to have evolved as a Sprachbund, in this case a group of related languages (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996:651). So far as the development of parallel structures without shared origin of the phenomenon is concerned, the conversion of demonstratives to pronouns in Eastern Iranian is similar to the development of a periphrastic perfect with "have / be" in various IE languages or the grammaticalisation of different adpositions as markers of the definite direct object in numerous Iranian languages.13

1.4 Typological framework

While the presence of Iranian pronominals in the paradigm of the copula has been noted since long ago, it has not been linked to observations on other languages so far.14 The languages which are best known for pronominal copulas include Chinese and varieties of Arabic and Modern Hebrew, among many others.15 For Cairo Arabic, EID (1983:197) notes that one "may use pronouns to perform copula functions" in the present tense, as in (9b).16 Alternatively, one can also use a nominal sentence without any addition as in (9a). Essentially the same patterns are also seen in modern Hebrew.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cairo Arabic</th>
<th>Modern Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9a) il=mudarris sīlaṭīf ART=teache</td>
<td>ha=klavim ne'e'emanim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART=teacher DEM=SG nice.m.SG</td>
<td>ART=dog.PL faithful.m.PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the teacher is nice&quot;</td>
<td>(adapted from EID 1983:198, 204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9b) il=mudarris hōwwa sīlaṭīf ART=teacher</td>
<td>ha=klavim hēm ne'e'emanim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART=teacher DEM=SG nice.m.SG</td>
<td>ART=dog.PL DEM=PL faithful.m.PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;the dogs are faithful&quot;</td>
<td>(cf. DORON 1986:315)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Cf. the articles by WENDTLAND and SIMS-WILLIAMS, respectively, in this volume.
14 BENVENISTE (1959:75) announced that he planned to do so, but apparently he did not.
15 See HEINE / KUTEVA (2002:108f.) for examples from other languages and references.
16 In what follows, statements about Arabic all refer to Cairo Arabic as presented by EID 1983, but other varieties of Arabic have similar constructions. The pronoun agrees with the subject in gender, number and person, see (11). For tenses other than the simple present (including a "habitual present"), Arabic has verbal copula forms. For the negations used for the various tenses, see note 18.
17 The optionality of the Hebrew pronoun depends on the types of nominal complements involved and on various factors of style, definiteness, etc.; there is no agreement in person, i.e. hi is used for f.sg. of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person (cf. KATZ 1996:85-96). Hebrew also has another pronoun in copula function (m. ze, f. zot; pl. eile), for which see e.g. DISSSEL (1999:35).
There are several features demonstrating the verbal character of the demonstrative in such constructions. One of these is negation: in Cairo Arabic, the demonstrative is negated with the circumfix \textit{ma=š} (10b, 11b), which is otherwise used with verbs while the negation \textit{miš} is mostly used for nominals (10a, 11a).\footnote{With verbs in the present tense, both negations may be used, while \textit{ma=š} is used with verbs in the past tense (e.g. \textit{ʿalī ma=katab=š gawāb} "Ali did not write a letter") and \textit{miš} with verbs in the future (e.g. \textit{ʿalī miš ḥayiktib gawāb} "Ali will not write a letter", EID 1983:199-200). \textit{ma=š} is also used in existential sentences like "there isn't a book in the drawer", "there isn't a book with me (i.e. I don't have a book)" (cf. EID 1983:198f.).}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
(10a) & \textit{il=mudarris} & \textit{miš} & \textit{latīf} \\
Arabic & ART=teacher & NEG\textit{nominal} & nice.m.SG \\
(10b) & \textit{il=mudarris} & \textit{ma=huwa}=š & \textit{latīf} \\
Arabic & ART=teacher & NEG\textit{verb}=DEM.m.SG=NEG\textit{verb} & nice.m.SG \\
(10c) & \textit{il=mudarris} & \textit{ma=latīf}=š \\
Arabic & ART=teacher & NEG\textit{verb}=nice.m.SG=NEG\textit{verb} & "the teacher is not nice" (cf. EID 1983:200f.)
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
(11a) & \textit{inta} & \textit{miš} & \textit{mudarris} \\
Arabic & you.SG & NEG\textit{nominal} & teacher \\
(11b) & \textit{inta} & \textit{ma=nta}=š & \textit{mudarris} \\
Arabic & (you.SG) & NEG\textit{verb}=you.SG=NEG\textit{verb} & teacher \\
 & "you are not a teacher" (EID 1983:201)
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

The conversion of pronouns to copula forms has been seen as a reanalysis of a topic-comment construction: "the subject pronoun which is coreferential with the topic (... of a topic-comment construction is reanalyzed as a copula morpheme in a subject-predicate construction" (LI / THOMPSON 1977:420). Adapting their schema (ibid.), the Arabic example (9) above would be a pattern like (12):\footnote{DIESSEL 1999 argues in favour of different ways of grammaticalisation depending on the category of the pronoun, and maintains that it is (only) the 3rd person pronouns which are reanalysed in the way described by Li / Thompson. In Iranian there is no difference between 3rd person pronouns and demonstratives, but in most cases the pronoun used as copula is the one (also) used as 3rd person pronoun. See also HEINE / KUTEVA (2002:108f., 235.)}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{llll}
(12) & \textit{teacher} & \textit{he} & nice \\
TOPIC & COMMENT & SUBJECT & PREDICATE \\
& \textit{NP} & "that one" & \textit{NP} & \textit{COP} & \textit{NP} & \Rightarrow & \textit{he} & \textit{COP} \\
& "that one" & \textit{NP} & & & & & & &
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

While LI / THOMPSON 1977 outline the historical process by which Chinese \textit{šì} changed from a demonstrative to a copula, descriptions of pronominal copulas mostly focus on deciding whether or not a given element is to be considered as copula. For instance, DORON 1986 dismisses the copular interpretation of the Hebrew pronoun mentioned above on the grounds that it does not show specifically verbal features (such as verbal negation). If the conversion DEM > COP is seen as a historical process of language change, the issue at stake is not a decision about "yes" or "no", but rather one of determining the stage reached by a given pronominal. Under this approach, the Hebrew pronoun could be described as having proceeded less far on the way to a fully categorialised copula than the Chinese or Arabic elements. NICHOLAS 1996 suggests to distinguish the three stages shown in Table 3.
Table 3: Types of pronominal copula (from Nicholas 1996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>category</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑1 morphological</td>
<td>with verbal morphological features (e.g. marking of tense/mood/aspect or inflection for gender)</td>
<td>Arabic DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑2 non-morphological</td>
<td>with verbal syntactic / semantic features (e.g. negation that follows a verbal pattern)</td>
<td>Creole da (&lt; that), sa (&lt; cela)20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑3 incipient copula</td>
<td>&quot;decategorialised&quot; pronoun</td>
<td>Bahasa Indonesia itu (determiner &amp; topic marker)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most advanced type is shown by languages like Cairo Arabic. Chinese *shì* is the classic case of a copula that shows verbal features, but (necessarily) not on the level of morphology (thence "non-morphological copula"); and a topic marker which is losing its original function in favour of becoming a copular element, or broadening its use to include copula-like functions, might be called "incipient copula".

Relating this typology to the Iranian data, it is remarkable that most of the pronominal copula forms are only used in the 3rd person, and in the present tense (Table 4). This corresponds to the frequent use of nominal sentences in the 3rd person in Indo-European, although nominal sentences are found for all persons.

Table 4: Pronominal forms used as copula or existential verb in Eastern Iranian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>used for</th>
<th>synchronically also pronoun</th>
<th>verbal features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ossetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES 3sg. <em>u, ie</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>position; person marking; obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES 3sg. <em>is, yes, aei</em></td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES 1sg., 2sg.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakhi <em>tey</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES *tey, PAST tu + PRO: all persons (existential verb)</td>
<td>(modified to <em>ya</em>)</td>
<td>tense and person marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaghnobi =<em>x</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES 3sg.</td>
<td>(yes: <em>ax</em>)</td>
<td>position; obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pashto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES 3sg. m.f., 3pl.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>position; no nominal inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogdian (*'nw)</td>
<td>PRES 3sg., 3pl.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wakhi clitics</td>
<td>PRES and PAST: all persons</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the Wakhi pronominal clitics as copula (see Section 1.1) would probably qualify as "incipient copula", implying that the pronoun in question has not yet been "reanalysed as a full copula", does not have specifically verbal features, and is synchronically also used as pronoun. Sogd. (*\'nw) might be seen as being on the verge to a "non-morphological copula"

---

20 For examples from Tok Pisin (3sg. predicate marker *i* < *he*, past form *i bin*), see Haig (2011:374).
for reasons of its position in the sentence and for having lost its nominal features insofar as
the same form also refers to the f.sg. and to the plural (see GERSHEVITCH 1954:208,
YOSHIDA 2009:300). Among the other Eastern Ir. pronouns (see Section 1.2), the 3sg.
copula forms of Yaghnobi and Ossetic are instances of demonstratives that have changed
into an obligatory copula. Ossetic has gone comparatively far as its entire sg. copula is
made from demonstratives, with endings added to the 1st and 2nd sg. Wakhi têy / tê has
adopted verbal morphology as well. So the Wakhi existential verb and the Ossetic forms
could qualify as having reached the stage of "morphological copula".

1.5 Motivations for the use of pronouns as copula

The process just discussed shows how copula forms may develop from pronominals, but it
does not say why this process occurs at all. Indeed, as noted by Li / THOMPSON
(1977:436f.), it is quite common for languages not to use a copula at all, and even more
common to dispense with a copula at least in the present tense.

EID (1983:203) assumes that the presence of a pronoun in nominal sentences serves "to
prevent potential ambiguity of a phrase vs. a sentence interpretation of a structure" in Cairo
Arabic. However, this ambiguity is only hypothetic: an example like (9) il=mudaris laṭif
only allows a sentence interpretation since an attributive adjective agrees with its head noun
in gender, number and definiteness (il=mudaris il=laṭif"the nice teacher", EID ibid.). 21

While it seems questionable whether avoidance of ambiguity is really the motivation, it is
worth noting that the situation postulated by Eid exists in Iranian (and other IE languages):
there is (only) agreement in gender and number, and it has the same form for noun phrases
and nominal sentences. 22 So structures like (13) permit two interpretations when viewed
without context, and (14) could be interpreted as "the best-remembering-of-assaults Ahura
Mazda (i.e. Ahura Mazda, who remembers assaults best)" (thus HUMBACH et al. 1991:1/121).
As the following relative clause appears to depend on saxɔrɔ, the sentential interpretation
by Reichelt and others 23 seems preferable to me, but the interpretations suggested illustrate
the ambiguity. If (as argued by Benveniste, see Section 1.0) a nominal sentence conveys a
sense different from that of a copula sentence, the use of the inherited copula would not be
viable to resolve the ambiguity. So a newly recruited copula would identify a predicative
construction as a sentence.

(13) nmānɔm srɪɔm
Avestan house.NOM/ACC.SG.n beautiful.NOM/ACC.SG.n
"(a / the) beautiful house" (Yt 17.60), potentially also "the house is beautiful"

---

21 The same applies to Hebrew (ha=klavim naˈeˈmanim "the dogs are faithful" vs. ha=klavim ha-naˈeˈmanim "the faithful dogs"). Eid does not discuss the indefinite pattern, which is indeed ambiguous at least in Hebrew: klavim naˈeˈmanim means "faithful dogs" and "dogs are faithful". So the use of the pronoun (klavim ha-ˈnemanim) is rather common to get the latter reading (Lucia Raspe, p.c.).
Another possible motivation for the emergence of a new copula may be found in the languages spoken in the same area. For instance, it has been suggested that the Modern Hebrew copula could be due to the fact that many immigrants to Israel have been speakers of European languages, most of which have a copula (cf. Li / THOMPSON 1977:438). So one might consider the possibility that similar factors could have triggered Sogdian copular (ʾ)xw (see Section 1.1).

Indeed, a comparison with Turkic has been suggested (Henning apud GERSHEVITCH 1954:208). For instance, ʾsy xw in (15) corresponds exactly to Turkic af-yu of "are to be taken" (Sims-Williams / Hamilton 1990:24, 26).24

24 For Turkic af-yu of (take-PRTC DEM), cf. ERDAL (2004:526). Another good example of copular (ʾ)xw is in text H 1 ("this is XY [name"]), Sims-Williams / Hamilton 1990:77).

(15) cnʾnkʾyy tmyʾwyzy nbʾntʾ chʾʾr kmryr 2I ṣpyny ṛzy
Sogdian PN.OBL PN.OBL at four red 21 white (cloth)
ʾsy ṛw
take.PRTC.FUT DEM
"in Čanglay [place name] 4 red and 21 white pieces of ṛzi cloth are to be taken from Tāmir-ōz" (cf. Sims-Williams / Hamilton 1990, text A line 2-3)

However, the texts with a Sogdian-Turkic bilingual background are from ca. 900 AD (Sims-Williams / Hamilton 1990:9), and it seems questionable whether all examples of Sogdian copular (ʾ)xw can be explained in this way. Turkic influence appears particularly unlikely for the Buddhist texts (which are a rather conservative type of text in Sogdian), where copular (ʾ)xw is chiefly found (cf. example 6). Since nearly all these texts are translations from Chinese (Sims-Williams 1989:175), and Chinese is the classic case of a pronominal copula (see Section 1.4), it would be tempting to see a connection.25


26 Note also that the use of both (ʾ)xw and shi is limited to copula sentences (to the exclusion of existential sentences, cf. note 6).

27 Thus Peyraube / Wiebusch 1994, also presenting even earlier examples that could show copular shi. The issue of the Chinese copula is much more complex than indicated here; other relevant topics include copulas other than ʾshi (see Peyraube / Wiebusch 1994), and the relation between shi and other demonstratives.
Sogdian, MEISTERERNST / DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2009 quote sentences which happen to contain two instances of shì as demonstrative (是人 "this man", p. 317, 是念 "these thoughts", p. 319). While the issue surely needs more investigation, it seems at least possible for the Sogd. use of ʾ)xw to be influenced by the double function of shì in Chinese.28

2. Copula as pronoun

2.1 Candidates

We now turn to the integration of verbal forms into the pronominal paradigm. The New Persian sg. pronominal clitics are generally considered to go back to the OIr. genitive/dative clitics (-am, -at, -as < Old Persian -maiy, -taiy, -šaiy, cf. e.g. RASTORGEVA / MOLČANOVA 1981:82) while the pl. is based on the sg. (with addition of the pl. suffix -ān). This pattern applies to the majority of Middle and New Iranian languages.

However, there are also several other patterns. Some forms go back to other case forms of the OIr. clitics (e.g. from the accusative).29 There is also a group of clitics in Western Ir. languages which might derive from copula forms or verbal endings (Table 5, next page). These varieties include languages from the North-West of Iran, from the Semnan region, from Luristan and Balochistan.

Example (16) illustrates some uses of the pronominal clitics. The 1sg. =un ([=on] in the Bal. dialects of Iran) is used as agent of an ergative construction in the first clause and in possessive function in the second one.

(16) dars=on=a want dabīrestān ā-wahd=f
Balochi lesson=PRO.1SG=V.EL high school that-time-REL
(15) ke pānzdah sīl=on=at
SUB fifteen year=PRO.1SG=COP.PT3SG
"I was studying at high school when I was 15 years of age (lit. my year was 15)"
(BARANZEHI 2003:92)

For the 1sg. pronominal clitic of Balochi, Bartholomae suggests that its -n could be due to analogy with the stressed pronoun man "I" ("dessen n offenbar aus dem hochtonigen man bezogen ist", BARTHOLOMAE 1906:60). However, such an analogy appears rather unlikely, because a 1sg. clitic =m would correspond quite well to man, specifically since the 2sg. has a clitic -t vs. full pronoun tau, which would surely favour a retention of a 1sg. =m rather than its being abandoned in favour of =n.30

28 Sogdian contacts with China go back at least to the 2nd century BC "and continued to the end of the Tang and beyond" (SIMS-WILLIAMS 1996a:45), and the "śūtra" script variety used for the Buddhist texts may have emerged ca. 500 AD (HENNING 1958:55). The so-called "Ancient Letters" (early 4th c. AD, found near Dunhuang and bearing evidence of major Sogdian colonies in China) are the oldest major Sogdian texts (YOSHIDA 2009:280).

29 For more discussion, see KORN 2009.

30 Alternatively, one could assume that the 1sg. has been generalised from the 1pl., which is also =Vn in Balochi, Koroshi, South Baskhardi and Sorani dialects (these 1pl. clitics are likely to derive from OIr. *=nah, cf. KORN 2009:165-167). However, the vowel is not always identical (1pl. West Bal. =ēn, =in), and Semnani and Biyabuneki have 1pl. =man.
Table 5: Western Ir. pronominal clitics potentially derived from copula / verbal ending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronominal clitic</th>
<th>copula/verb ending</th>
<th>notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg. West &amp; Ir. Bal. South &amp; East Bal. Semnan region</td>
<td>(=u), (=ā̃), (=ō̃), (=ū̃), (=(a/e/i)n)</td>
<td>also PRO1SG (=um)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg. South &amp; East Bal., Vafsi, North Talyshi</td>
<td>(=ē), (=i)</td>
<td>also Tactic PRO2SG (=it); (&lt;) OIr. (*=ta?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg. Semnani</td>
<td>(=ā), (=i)</td>
<td>also PRO3SG (=e); cf. (=V) in Sorani, Fars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl. Laki (Luristan)</td>
<td>(=ino(n))</td>
<td>cf. PRO1PL (=ino(n))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So the idea cautiously suggested by LEQOQ (1989:257): "emprunté aux désinences?" ("[perhaps] borrowed from the [verbal] endings?") deserves consideration. Indeed, all Western Ir. varieties with a 1sg. clitic in -\(n\) also have a 1sg. verbal ending in -\(n\). In Baluchi, the vowel of the 1sg. clitic is identical to the one seen in the verbal ending and/or copula. In Semnani, \(=in\) is common to both clitic and verbal ending, and the variants \(=an\) and \(=en\) may have taken their vowels from the 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) sg. clitic, respectively. \(^{34}\)

If Lecoq’s suggestion is valid for the 1sg. clitic of Baluchi, and by extension also for varieties of the Semnan region, it is worthwhile to consider the same logic also for other clitics.

For instance, some Tatic varieties have a 2sg. clitic which consists in a palatal vowel (\(=i\) in Vafsi and Northern Talyshi dialects), while other Tatic varieties have zero, among these the Talyshi of Lenkoran (LECOQ 1989a:299). For Talyshi, SCHULZE (2000:43, following PIREJKO 1991:103) suggests a derivation of the palatal vowel clitic from the OIr. 2sg. clitic.
The input was a disyllabic clitic *=Vai (> *=Vai > *=tai?)
36 Another possibility would be to explain =ā as a cliticised demonstrative (Thomas Jügel, p.c.). Such a process has been assumed for some 3rd person clitics in other Ir. varieties (see KORN 2009:164). In this case, it seems somewhat less certain as the Semnani demonstratives are en, an, an (LECOQ 1989a:307), although the loss of a nasal in a clitic appears not unlikely.
The subject is indexed by the verbal ending of an intransitive verb and of a transitive verb in the present system. In the past system, it is indexed by a pronominal clitic in sentences that do not have a nominal subject (and sometimes even if there is one), i.e. the =ī in (18b) harkat=ī kurt indexes the 3sg. So the verbal ending (which is identical to the copula) is used to index the subject in three of these four patterns, which may be a motivation to generalise the majority pattern.

Technically speaking, an analogy as in (19) may have operated. In Section 2.1, it was argued that the 1sg. pronominal clitic in Balochi is one candidate for the hypothesis that some clitics may have been taken from the verbal paradigm. It could previously have had the form =um as it does in Middle Persian and Parthian, and might have been replaced by =ān in ergative constructions consisting of the verb alone, so that the clitic is attached to the verb. Such patterns are obviously common enough to trigger a generalisation of the clitics as verbal endings for the past domain in several Ir. varieties, e.g. in Semnani (cf. LECQ 1989a:308). In this way the verbal ending could have been generalised to transitive verbs in the past and reanalysed as pronominal clitic.

(19)  intr. verb tr. verb
  present kap-ān "I fall" war-ān "I eat"
        fall,PR-1SG eat,PR-1SG
  past  kapt-ān "I fell"
        fall,PT-1SG
        =wārt=um "I ate" ⇒ wārt-ān "I ate" ⇒ =ān
        eat,PT=PRO1SG PRO1SG

In this context, it may be significant that the clitics with verbal origin discussed above involve the 1st and 2nd person, while the instances of verbal derivation for those of the 3rd person are more uncertain. This could be seen in the context of the 3rd person (specifically the 3sg.) being unmarked (e.g. 3sg. kapt-∅ "s/he fell"), which would prevent an analogy as in (19) from operating.

The process just postulated is to a certain extent parallel to the situation in Sorani, where the verbal ending has assumed pronominal functions in the past domain (see JÜGEL 2009:153f.), including reference to the direct object, the indirect object, the complement of adpositions, and the possessor. However, the verbal endings remain attached to the verb in Sorani, and their pronominal function is limited to the past domain of transitive verbs.

A move of copula forms into pronominal paradigms has also been claimed by Katz for Biblical Hebrew hu (20): the Proto-Semitic verb "to be" develops into a pronoun (which is the one that is used as copula in Modern Hebrew).40

---

37 The Bal. 1sg. is in fact =um in some dialects, but it is possible that this form has been borrowed from Persian.
38 I owe the gist of this thought to Thomas Jügel.
39 See also HAIG (2008:290-301) for further discussion.
40 KATZ (1996:118ff.) also posits such a development for the Turkish pronoun o (which she derives from a 3sg. ol"is" via DEM ol. However, this is mistaken as it confuses the Turkish verb ol, which comes from bel (thus still in other Turcic languages, see RASANEN 1949:169f., 1969:79, 360), with the Turkic demonstrative ol (which yields o in modern Turkish, cf. RASANEN 1957:27, 1969:1:356, 360). Conversely, the DEM ol is commonly used in copular function (cf. note 23).
(20) Proto-Semitic > Biblical Hebrew: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>haya/hawa</th>
<th>howo</th>
<th>→</th>
<th>hu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"to be"  
(e.g. "his being" → "he"  

(KATZ 1996:189)

If the interpretations suggested above are correct, Iranian would present evidence for both the change of pronouns to copula and of copula / verbal ending to pronominal clitic.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ART</th>
<th>article</th>
<th>Oir.</th>
<th>Old Iranian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bal.</td>
<td>Balochi</td>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>Proto-Indo-European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>inscription of Dareios at Bisotun</td>
<td>pl., PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative pronoun</td>
<td>PN</td>
<td>name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>present stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>PRO</td>
<td>pronominal clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ir.</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>PRIC</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>past stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>sg., SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation</td>
<td>tr.</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
<td>VOC</td>
<td>vocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
<td>Y, Yt</td>
<td>Yasna, Yasht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obl., OBL</td>
<td>oblique case</td>
<td>(Avestan text collections)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Erratum

In ex. (15) tmy ʾwyzy should read tmyr ʾwyzy and nβʾntʾ should read nβʾnt.
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