Classical Armenian Relative Clause Syntax

A comparative study of relative clauses in the Armenian and Greek NT

and other 5th-c. Armenian texts

Robin Meyer

Faculty of Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics

University of Oxford

May 2013

Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations & Glosses

1	First Person (I/we)	Med	Middle
2	Second Person (you)	NBHL	= Awetikʿean et al. (1979-80)
3	Third person (he/she/it/they)	NE	Modern English
Abl	Ablative	Neg	Negative
Acc	Accusative	NHG	Modern High German
Act	Active	Nom	Nominative
AdjP	Adjective phrase	NP	Noun phrase
Aor	Aorist	Ntr	Neuter
Arm.	Armenian	Obj	*nota accusativi*
Coll	Collective	ODB	= Kazhdan et al. (1991)
Comp	Complementizer	Pass	Passive
Correl	Correlative pronoun	Perf	Perfect
CP	Complementizer phrase	Pers	Personal pronoun
Dat	Dative	Pl	Plural
Dem	Demonstrative pronoun	Poss	Possessive pronoun
Det	Determiner	PrepP	Preposition phrase
DP	Determiner phrase	Prs	Present
Fem	Feminine	Pst	Past/Imperfect
Fperf	Future Perfect	Ptcp	Participle
Fr.	French	Pth.	Parthian
GELS	= Lust et al. (1992)	RC	relative clause
Gen	Genitive	r-case	relative clause case
Gk.	Classical Greek	REArm	Revue des Études Arméniennes
Goth.	Gothic	Rel	Relative pronoun (gloss)
Indef	Indefinitive pronoun	RelNP	cf. p. 22
Inf	Infinitive	Res	Resumptive pronoun
Instr	Instrumental	RPro	Relative pronoun
Int	Intensifier	Sg	Singular
Interrog	Interrogative pronoun	Slav.	Slavic
Impv	Imperative	Span.	Spanish
JSAS	Journal of the Soc. of Arm. Studies	Skt.	Sanskrit
Lat.	Latin	Subj	Subjunctive
Loc	Locative	VP	Verb phrase
LSJ	= Liddell et al. (1968)	WC	Wackernagel clitic
Masc	Masculine	XP	any phrase
m-case	matrix clause case		

Transliteration follows the system of Hübschmann, Meillet and Benveniste, with the exception that the digraph *ow* /u/ is rendered as such and not as *u*.

Acknowledgements

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1   The Problem

This study, initially conceptualised as an investigation solely of case attraction phenomena in Armenian, aims to contribute a few pieces to the puzzling question of how to define 'Classical' Armenian. Traditionally taken as the literary language into which the Armenian Bible was translated in the beginning of the 5th century CE, this view has been cautiously questioned by WEITENBERG (1993) and more rigorously challenged by COWE (1994-5) in the recent past. As the former points out (1993:24-5), it is only by considering the development of syntactic features that changes and differences between the various stages of the Armenian language can be observed; in a small frame, this is what shall be accomplished in this study.

Its focus will lie on case attraction in relative clauses and the influence exerted by Greek, but due to the paucity of secondary literature on the topic, it will also function as a general introduction to and discussion of Armenian relative clauses and their features in general; particular attention will be paid to word order and the occurrence of Wackernagel clitics, both of which are exponents of Greek intrusions, and elabora-

tions concerning the different classes of relative clauses. Further, a summary of and small contribution to the question of the etymology of the Armenian relative pronoun will be presented on the basis of the data collected.

1.2 Goals

In the course of discussion, this study endeavours to provide arguments in support of the following hypotheses:

1. (a) Jensen's claims concerning the grammaticality of case attraction in Armenian relative clauses need to be revised (1959:210);

   (b) Biblical Armenian, as opposed to non-translated Armenian, is not subject to case matching constraints;

   (c) In Biblical Armenian, relative pronouns are regularly used as direct translations of Greek definite articles in specific circumstances;

   (d) Although the employment of clitics in relative clauses is subject to clear statistical tendencies, no categorical conditioning factors can be determined.

2. (a) Biblical Armenian syntax is heavily influenced by its Greek *Vorlage*;

   (b) The Armenian Bible translation has a *modus operandi* very similar to that of later translations, particularly those of the (pre-)Hellenising School;

   (c) The stratification of the stages in the development of the Armenian language needs to be re-evaluated.

3. The Armenian relative pronoun *or* and its interrogative and generalising cognates are likely to derive from PIE *k^wi-/k^wo-.

1.3   Structure

Chapter 2 provides a brief overview over the extant literature dealing with the Hellenising School of translators and the translation of the Armenian Bible, and points out a number of similarities between the two, elaborating on *modus operandi* as well as other issues surrounding the subject. It concludes with a theory-neutral introduction to relative clauses, in which different structures and terminology are presented and explained in order to facilitate the ensuing discussion.

Chapter 3 is dedicated to the survey of relative clauses in Armenian in general, and to their manifestation in the New Testament in particular. After a presentation of general facts and discussion of peculiar aspects, the Greek structures rendered as Armenian relative clauses and the differences in those renditions will be discussed, with specific emphasis on case attraction in free relative clauses. On the basis of comparative and statistical evidence, this phenomenon is shown to be the result of Greek influence and likely not to be native to Armenian.

Chapter 4 continues the proof that case attraction is not an intrinsic feature of Armenian by considering relative clauses from non-translated texts. The claim is confirmed on all grounds with only minimal reservations. The frequency of clitics within the relative clause is taken as a further statistically significant indication that original and translated Armenian differ in certain respects. Finally, the overview of relative clauses in Armenian is used to corroborate Kölligan's argument for a derivation of Armenian *o(v), or* from PIE *k^wi-/k^wo- on the basis of syntactic and typological data.

Chapter 5 summarises the results of the study and evaluates the significance of the data and insights gained for the question of 'Classical' Armenian.

Chapter 2

Background

2.1   The Hellenising School

The cultural ties linking Armenia to the Greek world, specifically the Byzantine Empire, were considerable in the centuries following the invention of the Armenian alphabet by the monk Mesrop Maštocʻ in the first decade of the 5th century.[1] One of the manifestations of this relationship consists of translations into Armenian of Greek philosophical, theological and scientific literature, both classical and contemporary, and commentaries thereon. The style, or rather *modus operandi*, of these translations is peculiar in so far as it 'ne servait pas à transmettre le sens, mais à transmettre la lettre' (Nichanian 1989:135). Adontz in his edition of the Armenian version of the τέχνη γραμματική attributed to Dionysius Thrax rightly goes so far as to say that due to the strict adherence to Greek lexicon, syntax and the calquing of morphological structures, works of the School are immediately recognizable and even allow for reconstructions of the Greek original (1970:CLXX).

---

[1]According to Koriwn's *Life of Maštocʻ* §§31-52, a previous script suggested by a syrian Bishop (Winkler 1994:235) was ill-suited for the purpose of rendering Armenian, wherefore Maštocʻ sought leave to develop an appropriate script. Precise dating of the invention is impossible, but the year 407 is likely to be the *terminus post quem non* (Winkler 1994:245).

A great number of texts are part of this so-called Hellenising School (Arm. *Yown-aban Dproc'*, Fr. *École hellénisante* or *École hellénophile*), including Dionyisos Thrax's treatise, considered one of the earliest translations; selected works of Philo, Plato and Aristotle; the *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon*; and many others.[2] Literary scholars and language historians have long been attempting a stratification, localisation[3] and proper dating of the various Hellenising pieces, but in the process have encountered a plethora of issues. As MANANDYAN puts it in his ground-breaking, if hardly self-consistent monograph *The Hellenising School and its Period of Development*:

> 'Č'ownenalov drakan ow čšgrit tełekowt'iwnner sranc' meknowt'iwn-
> neri hay t'argmanič'neri masin, hay banasirowt'iwnn ankaroł ē gtnowel
> orošelow óč' miayn ayd erkeri t'argmanman čišd taret'iwə, ayl angam
> darašrǰanə'(MANANDYAN 1928:87).[4]

Traditionally, the School is said to have been active in three or four distinct stages,[5] commencing with the translation of either the aforementioned τέχνη γραμματική, potentially from the late 5th century, or the *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon* in the 6th century, and ending with the work of Step'anos Siwnec'i in the beginning of the 8th century.[6] These stages originate with MANANDYAN, whose reasons for cate-

---

[2]For lists of these translations and their categorisation, cf. CALZOLARI (1989:117-9), TERIAN (1982:175-6); for a summary discussion of the features of the various texts, cp. MURADYAN (2012:1-15).

[3]The evidence for any one place is scarce: CALZOLARI (1989:114-6) sensibly argues that the Tarōn area (Muş province of modern-day Turkey) may have been one of the places of activity due to a large number of examples in the translations of Dionysios Thrax (e.g. ADONTZ 1970:16-7). For reasons of manuscript access, however, and due to other textual evidence, Edessa and Constantinople are likely to have been the main centres of activity (TERIAN 1982:177-8, 180-1).

[4]'With neither positive nor accurate information concerning the Armenian translators of these commentaries, it is impossible for Armenian philology to determine not only the true date of the translation of these works, but even an era.'

[5]MANANDYAN (1928:111-7) initially suggested three different stages, differing in the extent to which Greek compounds are rendered uniformly throughout the text; later scholars have added a fourth and final stage (TERIAN 1982:175-6; MURADYAN 2012:9). Whether this subcategorisation in stages is warranted on the basis of the present data and arbitrarily chosen criteria is doubtful.

[6]The Hellenising School has yielded a large amount of lexical material still used in Modern Armenian (CALZOLARI 1989:124); its methodology has similarly been adopted in later centuries by writers invested in an erudite, and thus Hellenising style (e.g. Grigor Magistros, ca. 990-1059; cf. TERIAN 1982:183; 1985-6:85, 91-3). Similar calquing patterns continue to produce morpheme-by-morpheme calques in the modern language, e.g., under Soviet influence, on the basis of Russian as noted by COWE (1992*a*:335).

gorising texts are largely restricted to their way of rendering Greek compounds and consistency in doing so.[7] Since then, however, the evaluation of Hellenising texts has been augmented to take into account other aspects of language, such as word order and other syntactic matters, too.[8] A further point is of particular interest: mediaeval Armenian commentators were often puzzled at the incomprehensibility of these translations, since many compounds and syntagmata were meaningless to the reader due to calquing of morphological and syntactic structures (Terian 1980:201).

Therefore, it has been argued that those texts, which 'maintain not only the word order of the Greek, but also the form of Greek compounds and other grammatical structures' (Terian 1980:197), were not meant as translations as much as *aides memoires* or cribs for Armenian students of the liberal arts at higher schools and universities;[9] they were not meant to be used by themselves but in combination with the Greek original. This further explains why only selected pieces and no complete œuvres were translated (Terian 1980:198; 1982:183).

The views concerning stratification outlined above are, however, not uncontested: Terian (1982:176) and before him Akinian (1932*b*) have argued that the first three traditionally recognised groups of texts may have been produced by the same collective of authors, potentially in one generation. Further inconsistencies arise when considering the trends of lexico-morphological fidelity on the one hand, and adherence to Greek syntax on the other: the former, so it would seem, increases over time,

---

[7]Traditionally, earlier texts produced by the School tend to contain a mixture of calqued terminology and native terms representing the same word in the Greek original, whilst later translations have a more rigid system of correspondence with less variation. The τέχνη γραμματική (Adontz 1970), for example, renders cυλλαβή variably as *vang, pʻaɫaṙowtʻiwn* (9.16-18) and *šaɫašar* (11.8), where no semantic distinction in the Greek or Armenian can be made; cf. Clackson (1995:122-30), Terian (1980:198; 1981:10-13).

[8]In the most recent study on the subject, Muradyan notes the lack of systematic studies concerning the syntax of these translations (2012:16), and thus sets out to provide a comprehensive overview herself; approximately half of her work is dedicated to various syntactic peculiarities (2012:125-90).

[9]Throughout the Middle Ages, the terms *trivium* and *quadrivium* are commonly used to signify such courses; although comprising, in principle, grammar, logic and rhetoric in the *trivium* and arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy in the *quadrivium*, there was no generally agreed curriculum; cf. ODB (564, 1765); Terian (1982:183-4); Calzolari (1989:110, 128).

as described above, whereas the renditions become freer in terms of syntax (Terian 1982:176). Adontz (1970:CLXXII) makes a further important point: the particular style of the translation depends not on any particular timeframe or translator, but rather on the type of text translated; complex philosophical or scientific texts are usually rendered more literally than their theological or otherwise religious counter-parts.[10] Coulie sums up the status of research in this particular field quite succinctly:

> 'Aujourd'hui, plusieurs des résultats obtenus révèlent des contradic-tions que les critères traditionnels ne permettent pas de résoudre: des grécismes lexicaux et syntaxiques sont presents déjà dans les versions de l'époque classique, des formations jugées caractéristiques des traductions pré-hellénophiles se trouvent encore dans les productions purement hel-lénophiles' (1994-5:43).

In addition to the uncertainty regarding relative and internal chronology, it is ex-tremely difficult to determine the absolute chronology of the School's existence, too. As Coulie hints, a significant amount of Hellenising features occurs already in very early texts not commonly associated with the School; cf. also pp. 69, 81, 91. Further-more, certain intertextual relations suggest that at least some translations must have been produced in the 5th century already: a number of direct quotations from the translations of the works of Philo occur already in Ełišē's *Vasn Vardanay ew Hayocʻ paterazmi*, commonly dated to the last quarter of the 5th century (Terian 1982:177); it has also been argued that the translation of Dionysios Thrax' grammar may stem from the 5th century (Jahowkyan 1954:50-3; Mowradyan 1971:104-11). Both of these early datings, however, have been contested: Akinian (1932*b*) argues for a later date of Ełišē's work, largely in order to date the Philonic translations to a later point. This

---

[10]Yet this is, to a certain extent, at odds with the tradition of Biblical translations, both Armenian and otherwise, and certainly the maxim of St. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate: 'Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor, me in interpretatione Graecorum, *absque Scripturis sanctis*, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu' (Epistula LVII. *Ad Pammachium De Optimo Genere Interpretandi*, Migne 1857-66:571; italics added).

is convincingly refuted by Thomson (1993:14-5), who calls the former's argument 'arbitrary'. As for the dating of the translation of the τέχνη γραμματική, which Adontz considers impossible (1970:CXII), Mercier (1978-9:59-61) and Inglisian (1963:163) prefer a later date, but produce no convincing argument in favour of this preference.[11]

Muradyan, whose introduction to her study of Grecisms in Classical Armenian comprises the most up-to-date and comprehensive discussion of the extant literature and opinions available, agrees with the 5th-century hypothesis (2012:3), without, however, giving any specific reason. She furthermore agrees with Coulie's assertion that next to the Hellenising School, which is signified mainly by its lexical and morphological imitation of the Greek originals, a pre-Hellenising School must have existed, in which word-calquing was less widespread, but syntactical correspondences more numerous (Muradyan 2012:20; Lafontaine and Coulie 1983:129-30).

The distinct differences these translations exhibit are best demonstrated by means of two examples. The first is a brief extract with parallel Greek and Armenian text from the τέχνη γραμματική, traditionally taken as belonging to the first stage of Hellenising translations; the second excerpt stems from Basil of Caesarea's *Book of Questions*, and forms part of the pre-Hellenising School.

(2.1) Dionysios Thrax, τέχνη γραμματική §13 (Adontz 1970:30)

ew anowan	*hast(at)adrowtʿiwnkʿ*	*en*	*erkow,*	*nergorcowtʿiwn*
and noun.Gen.Sg	disposition.Nom.Pl	be.3.Pl.Prs	two	agency.Nom.Sg
Τοῦ δὲ ὁμόματος	διαθέσεις	εἰcὶ	δύο,	ἐνέργεια

ew	*kir.*	*ew nergorcowtʿiwn*	*ē*	*ibr tʿe*
and	Patience.Nom.Sg	and Agency.Nom.Sg	be.3.Sg.Prs	like
καὶ	πάθος,	ἐνέργεια μὲν		ὡς

datawor,	*əntrawł.*	*ew kir*	*ibr tʿe*
judge.Nom.Sg	judge.Prs.Ptcp.Nom.Sg	and Patience.Nom.Sg	like
κριτής	ὁ κρίνων,	πάθος δὲ	ὡς

---

[11]Mercier bases his judgement on relative chronology, having established that the *Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon* should have been translated before the Second Council of Duin in 555; the argument does not go beyond that, and remains weak.

  dateal,   *datecʿeal*
  judge.Perf.Ptcp.Nom.Sg   judge.Perf.Ptcp.Nom.Sg
  κριτόϲ   ὁ κρινόμενοϲ.
  'The dispositions of the noun are two, Agency and Patience. Agency, such as "judge", (viz.) who is judging. Patience, such as "judgeable" (lit. "judged"), (viz.) who is judged.'

(2.2) Basil of Caesarea, *Book of Questions* §542 (Uluhogian 1993:I.189; II.XVI-XVII); PG 31, 1189 B

  Tear̈n   *erbemn*   *aselov*   *...,*   *erbemn*   *z=ardar*
  Lord.Gen.Sg   since   say.Inf.Prs.Instr.Sg   since   Obj=just
  Τοῦ Κυρίου   ποτὲ μὲν   λέγοντοϲ   ...,   ποτὲ δὲ   τὴν δικαίαν
  datastan   *datel*   *hramayeal,*   *očʿ*   *z=datel=n*
  judgement   judge.Inf.Prs   command.Perf.Ptcp   Neg   Obj=judge.Inf.Prs=Det
  κρίϲιν   κρίνειν   προϲτάϲϲοντοϲ·   οὐχὶ   τὸ κρίνειν
  amenewimb   *argelowl,*   *ayl*   *zanazan*
  all-kind.Instr.Sg   prevent.Inf.Prs   but   different
  καθόλου   κωλυόμεθα,   ἀλλὰ   διαφορὰν
  z=datastans=n   *xratimkʿ:*
  Obj=judgment.Acc.Pl=Det   admonish.1.Pl.Prs.Pass
  κρίϲεωϲ   παιδευόμεθα.
  'Since the Lord said ..., since he commanded to judge a just judgement, we are admonished not to interfere with the judging in general, but with different judgements.'
  (Gk. '...we are prevented from judging in general, but are taught differentiation of judgement.')

Excerpt (2.1) not only strictly adheres to Greek word order, but also demonstrates three different types of rendering of the Greek lexical material:

 (i) strict calquing – *nergorcowtʿiwn*, like ἐνέργεια, consists of three morphemes, *ner-* ≈ ἐν- 'in, inside', cp. Arm. *nerkʿo* 'under, in'; *gorc* ≈ ἔργον 'work, action'; and *-owtʿiwn* ≈ -ια as an abstract suffix. *hast(at)adrowtʿiwn* also belongs to this category.

 (ii) approximate calquing – this type is more variable, and may contain very close renderings, such as *datawor* ≈ κριτήϲ 'judge', in which both words contain a lexical root and a suffix, the latter of which differs in function in both languages.[12]

---

[12]Gk. -τήϲ functions solely as an agentive suffix (Kühner-Gerth 1869:694), whereas Arm. *-wor* < PIE *-bhorā (Ajello 1971:61) originally and synchronically still means 'imbued with, possessing', cp. *tʿagawor* 'king; lit. who bears the crown', *meławor* 'sinner; lit. who is imbued with sins'.

Where no parallels can be found in the morphological inventory of Armenian, approximations are attempted along semantic lines, as for example in *dateal* ≈ κριτός – while Armenian does have a verbal adjective in *-i* '-able', it does not support the secondary meaning of -τός denoting an accomplished action; therefore, it is substituted with the Perf.Ptcp. built on the present stem.[13]

(iii) redefinition – an existing lexeme is used in order to render the Greek, often by extending its original meaning, so for example in *anown* ≈ ὄνομα 'noun', *kir* ≈ πάθος 'suffering; patience'; the latter Armenian word only occurs in Hellenising texts in this meaning (NBHL I.1099).

Passage (2.2), on the other hand, is marked not by its morphological imitation of the Greek – προστάσσοντος, for instance, is not rendered as a compound, nor are καθόλου or διαφοράν – but rather by its imitation of the model sentence syntax.[14] Whilst the grammatical forms used are not identical (*aselov* vs λέγοντος), they are functional equivalents in the writings of the pre-Hellenising School, to such an extent in fact that the Instr.Sg. of the infinitive has lost its original semantics (ULUHOGIAN 1993:II.XVI). Yet, at this stage, the translations cannot be described as 'slavish' yet, as often done when referring to the Hellenising School,[15] since a certain amount of freedom in rendering the original is preserved: instead of co-ordinating two main clauses as in the Greek, the Armenian translator chose to render the first as a dependent infinitive instead; in the same vein, the formal parallel between the co-ordinated participles λέγοντος and προστάσσοντος is not upheld. Finally, no attempt is made

---

[13]The contrast κριτός, κρινόμενος cannot be rendered properly in Armenian, since participles are unable to reflect aspect; there is further no semantic difference between *dateal* and *datec'eal* – the latter is built on the aorist rather than the present stem, both of which variations are common (JENSEN 1959:105) – but assuming this variation to be an attempt at rendering aspects seems plausible.

[14]Also cf. ULUHOGIAN (1989) for a view on the rendition of the Greek genitive absolute in Armenian.

[15]cf. INGLISIAN (1963:163), ADONTZ (1970:CLXXII). It is of note, however, that a similar statement concerning the closeness of Greek and Armenian syntax has been made with regard to the Bible; cf. MEILLET (1913:3) and p. 69.

at giving a form to the discourse particles μέν … δέ.

These translations, which adhere strictly to Greek texts and still form a rather heterogeneous continuum, are the result of the strong cultural, political and religious influence of the Greek-speaking world on the Armenians; they have had considerable impact on literature and language, as has been mentioned above and will become clearer presently. The Hellenising style is often taken to stand in strong contrast with that of literature originally composed in Armenian, as well as that of the Armenian Bible translation, constituting the first text to be translated. This view, however, has been challenged in the recent past, as will be shown in the following section.

2.2   The Armenian Bible Translation

From literary and text-internal evidence it is known that two versions of the Armenian Bible need to be distinguished: the first translation was made from a Syriac original text,[16] the second and permanent one from an Alexandrian text, i.e. the Greek version according to the canon established by Origen (cf. JOHNSON 1984:359; ZEITOUNIAN 1993:236). The first translation was relatively rough, often very exegetical in itself, and polemical due to its usage in the missionary field (COWE 1984:50; 1990-1*b*:100).[17] These two translations, designated as Arm I and Arm II respectively, are not fully independent from one another, however; as LELOIR points out 'le passage d'arm. 1 à arm. 2 s'est sans doute opéré graduellement; ceci explique la subsistance, dans arm. 2, d'assez nombreux vestiges d'arm. 1' (1972:305).

There exists, therefore, a Syriac layer in the Greek version Arm II. These Syriac

---

[16]ALEXANIAN (1984:382) points out that the translation is likely to be based not on the Peshitta or the Diatessaron, but rather on a four-gospel text in Sinaitic Syriac.

[17]All assertions concerning the Armenian translation of the Syriac original are by necessity speculative, since no full copy of said text is available; it only subsists in quotations in classical authors and as a layer in the later, Greek-based version; COWE (1984:49-52) argues that no complete translation from Syriac was ever made.

vestiges can often be adduced to effectively explain certain discrepancies between the perceived Greek original and the Armenian texts, in that problematic passages are in concord not with the Greek, but with the Syriac text. Passages (2.3, 2.4, 2.5) will demonstrate both these differences, and certain idiosyncrasies of the Armenian translation.

(2.3) Mt. 25:34

ekaykʿ,	*ōrhnealkʿ*	*hōr*	*imoy,*
come.2.Pl.Aor.Impv	bless.Perf.Ptcp.Nom.Pl	father.Gen.Sg	1.Sg.Poss.Gen.Sg
Δεῦτε	οἱ εὐλογημένοι	τοῦ πατρός	μου

ew	*mtēkʿ*	*žaṙangecʿēkʿ*
and	enter.2.Pl.Aor.Impv	inherit.2.Pl.Aor.Impv
		κληρονομήσατε

'Come, blessed of my father, and enter, inherit!'
(Gk. 'Come, blessed of my father, inherit!')

(2.4) Jm. 1:15-18

cʿankowtʿiwn	*yłacʿeal*	*z=mełs cnani.*	
lust.Nom.Sg	conceive.Perf.Ptcp	Obj=sin.Acc.Pl bring-forth.3.Sg.Prs	
ἡ ἐπιθυμία	συλλαβοῦσα	τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν,	
ew mełkʿ=n	*katareal*	*z=mah cnanin*	...
and sin.Nom.Pl	finish.Perf.Ptcp	Obj=death.Acc.Sg bring-forth.3.Pl.Prs	
ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία	ἀποτελεσθεῖσα	ἀποκύει θάνατον	...
kamecʿeal	*canaw*	*z=mez*	
wish.Perf.Ptcp	bring-forth.3.Sg.Aor	Obj=1.Pers.Acc.Pl	
βουληθεὶς	ἀπεκύησεν	ἡμᾶς	

'Lust, having conceived, brings forth sins (Gk. sin). And the sins (Gk. sin), when accomplished, bring forth death. ... [He, God,] by his wish brought forth us.'

(2.5) Deut. 29:18

ertʿal	*paštel*	*z=dis*	*azgacʿ=n*
go.Inf.Prs	worship.Inf.Prs	Obj=false-god.Acc.Pl	nation.Gen.Pl=Det
πορεύεσθαι	λατρεύειν	τοῖς θεοῖς	τῶν ἐθνῶν

'to go and worship the (false) gods of the (gentile) nations'

In excerpt (2.3), the two asyndetically juxtaposed imperatives in the Armenian version do not render the original Greek, in which only one imperative occurs. Instead,

the passage reflects an Old Syriac text, which contains a similar collocation. Leloir (1972:303) further points to a number of plurals which are retained in the Armenian version due to Old Syriac influence. Similarly, example (2.4) demonstrates Syriac affinities in that one verb alone, *cnanim* 'to bring forth, give birth' < PIE *$\hat{g}enh_1$-, is used to translate this passage, whereas the Greek version uses both τίκτω 'to give birth' and ἀποκυέω 'id.'. Passage (2.5), on the other hand, demonstrates the above-mentioned polemical or missionary tendencies of Arm I; here, the Greek θεός 'God' is rendered as *dik'* 'false god, foreign divinity' as opposed to *astowac* '(Abrahamic) God'. This differentiation is found in classical authors as well, so for example in Eznik's *Vasn Astowcoy*.

Apart from a few remnants of the earlier Syriac tradition, Arm II is substantially Greek. This is reflected in its close adherence to the Septuagint and New Testament in matters of word order and syntax more generally, whereas lexical or morphological similarities are less common. This, as mentioned above, is also true for pre-Hellenising texts, and for some of the exemplars belonging to the early School itself. Yet, whilst the latter two are commonly considered of inferior quality as far as their literary value and linguistic status are concerned, the language of the Armenian Bible has long been considered the pinnacle of Armenian literary tradition.

Like Latin, Armenian literature and language were stratified along the same lines into a Gold, Silver and Bronze era, a tradition that originates with Mxit'ar of Sebastia (1676-1749), founder of the Benedictine order of monks who must be credited with the first scholarly endeavours in the field of Armenian studies (Akinian 1932*a*). His initial stratification was rather generous, and defined as the Golden period of the Armenian language everything written between the inception of the alphabet in the beginning of the 5th century up to the fall of the Bagratid dynasty in the 11th century

(Cowe 1994-5:128). His disciples, having seceded from the original order and settled in Vienna in 1812, stratified the language more narrowly, defining Golden Armenian as anything written in the first half of the 5th century, and as Silver Armenian works of the second half of the same century. The standard by which the language was measured for a long time was thus the translation of the Bible.

Yet, early in the 20th century already, scholars came to doubt whether this definition was sensible and meaningful. Meillet (1913:3) adumbrates what later has been proven more thoroughly: 'Die Übersetzung der heiligen Schrift ist ja ganz sklavisch … die Struktur der Sätze kann immer von den fremden Sprachen beeinflusst worden sein'. Bolognesi goes so far as to be surprised at certain irregularities in the Armenian translations, where only occasionally phrases are simplified or translated *ad sensum*, since 'la traduzione armena del Vangelo mostra chiaramente una singolare aderenza lessicale al testo greco' (2000*b*:281). The fact that the translations are variable, inconsistently rendering the Greek very literally, then more freely, then retaining some Syriac elements, is of little import and generally not surprising; similar idiosyncrasies have been observed in other ancient translations, as Barr (1979:5) points out.

Cowe, in a study of the Arm I and Arm II version of the book of Chronicles, notes, like Bolognesi above, that there are only minor discrepancies between the Greek and Armenian renderings, and that additions to the text are usually the result of either necessities of Armenian grammar, the explanation or glossing of unclear passages, or retention of Semitic material (1990-1*b*:57). He ascribes the more literal translation technique of the translators from Greek to their better education, specifically in terms of grammar and linguistic systematicity (1990-1*b*:84, 91), and concludes:

> 'Techniques which are extremely literal in terms of morphology and syntax such as that of Aquila must thereby sacrifice fidelity to the plain meaning of the original as well as ready intelligibility in the target language. It is therefore Arm2's lack of thoroughgoing systematisation, particularly in consistency of equivalents, which saves it from falling into this category' (1990-1*b*:61).

In spite of displaying several characteristics of the (pre-)Hellenising School, the Bible translation is used freely both as the basis of linguistic studies (e.g. OUZOUNIAN 1992; OLSEN 1999; SCALA 2011) and for language teaching as witnessed by its prominent occurrence in chrestomathies (MEILLET 1913; JENSEN 1964; THOMSON 1975); given the prominence of translation literature and the general influence the Bible has had on the development of the language, this is not categorically problematic, but nonetheless engenders faulty assumptions concerning the linguistic nature of Armenian.

Given the data and judgements above, postulating different schools of translators with different methods and goals is unnecessary; at the same time, not all translations can be tarred with the same brush, since the degree to which the above-named features apply varies. Instead, it seems most sensible to speak of a continuum of translations, all of which adhere to the Greek original quite closely with respect to either their lexicon and morphology, their syntax or both. The beginnings of this methodical as well as temporal continuum, spanning almost four centuries, exhibit features less distinct than their successors, and the continuum evolves, in a variety of directions. This model of translation techniques squares readily with the issues that scholars have had in dating various texts based on the mainly lexico-morphological criteria used so far, whilst being inclusive at the same time. Given the data produced by COWE (1990-1*b*; 1992*b*; 1994-5) and MURADYAN (2005), it is surprising that the various streams of translations, which are so clearly related, have not been linked more closely in the past.

It is therefore one of the aims of this study to demonstrate further syntactic parallels both between the Armenian and Greek versions of the Bible, specifically the New Testament, and to show that the Greek language has influenced that translation on more than only the surface level; at the same time, it aims to show that some of the traits of the Armenian New Testament are very similar to those of the supposedly later Hellenising School. Finally, having established the existence of a translation continuum, adhering to the Greek original in varying degrees of strictness and with respect to different linguistic categories, the study will demonstrate that the features symptomatic of Hellenising translations do not occur in 5th-century non-translated texts, which will be used to test the hypotheses in more detail.

As opposed to e.g. Cowe's study of the Book of Chronicles (1990-1*b*), the focus shall here lie not on single excerpts, which are taken as exempla and analysed on the basis of various criteria; instead, the enquiry will consider two complete corpora, viz. the Armenian New Testament and the works of three selected classical authors, as to their usage of relative clauses. Primacy will be given to translation patterns, i.e. the correspondences in syntactic structures between the source language, Greek, and the target language, Armenian. Particular attention will further be paid to the occurrence of case attraction phenomena in both languages, and to whether and how they were translated and adopted; for this reason, the next section will briefly discuss the literature available on this phenomenon, with a focus on Greek, where it is attested best and has been researched most thoroughly.

2.3   Relative Clauses and Case Attraction

In order to facilitate the discussion of attraction phenomena, and to establish certain terminological conventions, a brief definition and exposition of different types

of relative clauses (henceforth RC) must be given here.[18] On the basis of an English

example (2.6) some general terms may be clarified.

(2.6)   (a) John finds the key. He had lost the key.

         (b) John finds the key which he had lost [RelNP].

Sentence (2.6b) is clearly bipartite, consisting of the matrix clause *John finds the key*

and the sentence to be subordinated by relativisation *He had lost the key* found in

(2.6a). Both sentences are linked by means of the relative pronoun (henceforth RPro)

which, denoting the element that is semantically shared by both sentences, in this

instance *the key*. This element, on which the RC depends, shall be called its pivot.[19]

The position marked above as RelNP is that of the relativised NP (here *the key*), had

the sentence not undergone relativisation (Keenan 1985:146).

   Although RCs are realised differently in different languages, certain typological

generalisations and a common ground definition can be achieved. Thus, following

Keenan and Comrie, a RC may be defined along semantic lines in that it

> '...specifies a set of objects (perhaps a one-member set) in two steps:
> a larger set is specified, called the *domain* of relativisation, and then re-
> stricted to some subset of which a certain sentence, the *restricting* sen-
> tence, is true' (1977:63).

Such a definition is by nature very inclusive, counting as RCs also syntactic construc-

tions which may not canonically be taken as such.[20] Furthermore, in defining RCs in

this way, an implicit requirement for a pivot as the domain of relativisation is intro-

---

[18]For a more general overview on this topic, cf. Keenan (1985).

[19]For this usage, cp. de Vries (2002:1, 77-8), who rightly defines the pivot as the element which
is semantically part of both the matrix and the RC. The more traditional term 'antecedent' is avoided
here for its specific meaning in the context of anaphora, and since it falsely suggests that the pivot
always precedes the RC.

[20]Keenan and Comrie (1977:64) and Keenan (1985:144) state, for example, that the present partici-
ple in German, by virtue of being able to govern direct objects, etc., must be analysed as a RC when
part of the subject NP.

duced; given the variety of RCs, however, KEENAN AND COMRIE's approach needs to be supplemented by considering the syntactic structures underlying RCs. For the present purpose, this is best done on the basis of Greek and Armenian examples.

In addition to the headed RC, (2.7) below, in which the RC relates to the pivot and restricts or defines it more closely, there are three further main types of RCs. Examples (2.8a, 2.8b) show free RCs which do not relativise on a pivot contained in the matrix clause; (2.9) is an instance of light-headed RCs, in which the pivot is a pronoun, and which therefore may be considered as halfway between headed and free RCs (CITKO 1999); and (2.10), which demonstrates the typologically rare type of relative-correlative clauses, which, however, in Indo-European languages are not uncommon.

(2.7)   Headed relative clause

asteł=n	*z=or*	*tesin*	*ařjnordeacʿ*	*nocʿa.*
star.Nom.Sg=Det	Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg	see.3.Pl.Aor	guide.3.Sg.Aor	Dem.Dat.Pl
ὁ ἀστὴρ	ὃν	εἶδον	προῆγεν	αὐτοὺc

'The star that they saw guided them'

(2.8)   (a) Free (=headless) relative clause

z=or	*asem*	*jez*	*i*	*xawari*
Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg	say.1.Sg.Prs	2.Pers.Dat.Pl	in	darkness
ὃ	λέγω	ὑμῖν	ἐν	τῇ cκοτίᾳ

asacʿēkʿ	*i*	*loys*
say.2.Pl.Aor.Impv	in	light.Loc.Sg
εἴπατε	ἐν	τῷ φωτί

'What(ever) I tell you in darkness, speak in light.'

(b) Free relative clause with pseudo-pivot

hápa,	*orov*	*ōrinakaw*	*z-inčʿ*	*kamis*
then	Rel.Instr.Sg	manner.Instr.Sg	Obj=Indef.Acc.Sg	wish.2.Sg.Prs

ařnel,	*katarea.*
do.Prs.Inf	accomplish.2.Sg.Prs.Impv

'Then, in which(ever) manner you wish to do something, accomplish (it).

(2.9) Light-Headed relative clause

> *ov?* *ayn* *orowm* *ordwoyn* *hramayeacʻ*
> Interrog.Nom.Sg Dem.Nom.Sg Rel.Dat.Sg son.Dat.Sg command.3.Sg.Aor
> *... yašt* *aṙnel*
>   sacrifice make.Prs.Inf
> 'Who is that one to whom he commanded his son to make sacrifice?'

(2.10) Relative-Correlative clause

> *z=or* *ōrēns* *tēr=s* *jer*
> Obj=Rel.Nom.Sg law.Acc.Sg Lord.Nom.Sg=Det 2.Poss.Nom.Pl
> *owni,* *z=noyn* *ew* *dowkʻ* *kalarowkʻ*
> keep.3.Sg.Prs Obj=Correl.Acc.Sg also 2.Pers.Nom.Pl take.2.Pl.Aor.Impv
> 'The laws which (=which laws) my lord keeps, the same you, too, keep!'

As is evident from all examples, in both Greek and Armenian the main relativisation strategy relies on RPros coded for case and number, in Greek also for gender; case is determined in most instances by the requirements of the RC (r-case), whereas number and gender depend on the pivot (cp. Keenan 1985:149-50). Thus, in (2.7) *z=or* is marked as accusative since it is the object of *tesin* 'they saw', and singular since it represents the singular *asteł* 'star'.

Free RCs, as in (2.8a), have no explicit pivot to which to relate; due to this lack of a syntactically relatable constituent, in some languages they are restricted to occurring in constellations where the RPro occurs in the same case in the subordinate clause as a hypothetical pivot would in the matrix clause.[21] This restriction is usually referred to as case matching (cp. van Riemsdijk 2006:353-60). As far as semantics are concerned, this type often generalises over instances of an action.[22]

---

[21]Hirschbühler (1977:193-4; 1979:161) states that structural matching effects do not apply in Classical Greek, wherefore free relatives are far less restricted in their usage and often 'attracted' into the case required by the matrix clause; this statement needs to be qualified, however, in that Homeric and other pre-Classical Greek does not feature such instances, unless the surface form of the pronoun is identical for both cases (Chantraine 1953:237); further cf. van Riemsdijk (2006:356-7).

[22]An indication of this tendency may found, for example, in the occurrence of '-ever' in English, as in (2.8), signifying the general applicability of the statement.

Similarly, free RCs with pseudo-pivot like (2.8b) do not relativise on a constituent of the matrix clause; the perceived 'pivot' forms a constituent with the RPro but syntactically is part only of the RC.[23]

Light-headed RCs, as in (2.9), take as their pivot a pronoun which in itself bears little semantic information; although these pronouns are the pivot of both clauses concerned, their function seems most akin to case matching (or the lack thereof) in free RCs, viz. the recoverability of the RCs syntactic function in the matrix clause.[24]

Finally, relative-correlative clauses such as (2.10) are constellations in which the relativised NP, whether it be expressed as in headed RCs or not as in the free type, is taken up again by means of a demonstrative 'correlative' pronoun.

While different types of RCs are subject to different syntactic constraints and, to a certain extent, may reflect different sentence structures,[25] it is still clear that they belong to the same spectrum of semantic and syntactic operations, each type fitting specific requirements that others cannot fulfill.[26] In all instances, however, the relativisation strategy is the same. Yet, there are instances which do not fit into any of the above patterns: certain RCs contain a resumptive pronoun in the position of RelNP in addition to a RPro;[27] the case coding of the RPro may not reflect relative clause (r-case), but rather matrix clause (m-case) syntax. The latter phenomenon, occurring

---

[23]RCs with pseudo-pivot occur widely in Indo-European languages, e.g. Hittite (Garrett 1994:41-3; Probert 2006*b*:39-40), Greek (Smyth 1984:570; Hirschbühler 1977:200) and Latin (Kühner 1912:II.ii.309-14).

[24]Citko (1999) demonstrates that in Polish, choice of relative pronoun and certain aspects of word order differ in light-headed and headless RCs on the one hand, and headed ones on the other; as will be discussed below, p. 48, Armenian, too, may exhibit certain particularities in light-headed RCs.

[25]Both relative attraction and free RCs pose certain difficulties for syntactic analysis, as shown e.g. in Bianchi (2000:58-9). In the analysis of the latter, the two competing analyses interpret the relative pronoun as either in Comp position, or as the head of the RC; Hirschbühler (1977:188-9, 212) argues that, at least for French and Classical Greek, the Comp hypothesis is to be preferred, as matching phenomena do not apply, and RCs with pseudo-pivot are found. The head hypothesis, as posited by Grimshaw (1977), cannot account for certain free RCs in e.g. Dutch and German, as demonstrated by Groos and van Riemsdijk (1981:173-94). The Comp hypothesis has since been refined by Hirschbühler and Rivero (1981; 1983), Grosu (1994) and others.

[26]Languages in which matching effects obtain usually require a method to express what in Classical Greek can be achieved by free RCs, for instance light-headed RCs.

[27]This common relativisation strategy (cp. Keenan 1985:146-55) occurs in Armenian, too; its potential provenance and function will be discussed below, p. 90.

in both headed and free RCs, is often referred to as relative attraction, or *attractio relativi.*

In Classical Greek, case attraction occurs both in headed and free RCs under slightly different constraints, respectively. The phenomenon has been the topic of research since at least the middle of the 19th century, during which a number of doctoral dissertations relating to its occurrence in various authors were submitted (e.g. Förster 1868; May 1878). In more recent history, Hirschbühler (1977; 1979) has occupied himself with this phenomenon and come to interesting conclusions. He notes that in headed RCs, accusative RPros are optionally, but regularly attracted into the case of their pivot (m-case), if the latter is in the genitive or dative. In free RCs, however, these constraints are less strict and allow for attraction into the genitive or dative, as required by matrix clause syntax, if the RPro is expected to show neuter nominative, accusative or dative morphology.[28] Hirschbühler (1977:194-5) rejects Quicoli's idea (1972:205) that attraction in headless RCs is transformationally related to that in headed RCs,[29] since the former show a different pattern. Grosu (1994:108) has extrapolated the following case hierarchy, in which any case lower in the hierarchy may be attracted into a higher one:[30]

(2.11) Nom < Acc < Dat < Gen < ... < P[ronominal]-Case

The paradigms noted by Hirschbühler fit this scheme neatly, if posing the question why the headed setting is more restrictive than its headless counterpart. This question has not been answered in any definite way yet, nor indeed has the question why exactly this should be the case hierarchy applying to attraction phenomena.

---

[28]Grimm (2007:141) provides a table showing the different combinations of pivot and relative pronoun in which case attraction occurs; further cf. Hirschbühler (1977:203).

[29]Quicoli suggests that these clauses have a pronominal head which is deleted after the attraction process.

[30]The non-neuter nominative, at least in Greek, is an exception and not attracted; this restriction does not apply to Armenian, cf. section 3.3 and appendix A.

On the latter topic, Grimm suggests that attraction occurs in instances where the attracted pronoun is inherently less agentive than its pivot, and that a case hierarchy is only the surface manifestation of a more intricate lattice, motivated by various semantic factors such as *instigation, motion, sentience and volition*, all of which form part of the agentivity concept (2007:142, 145-7). Grimm's results happen to align with the data, but hardly provide a cogent explanation for the case hierarchy.

Firstly, it ought to be noted that the intrinsic relationship between agentivity and relativisation is not immediately obvious; secondly, his assignment of the various properties named above to the morphological cases in question seems, if not arbitrary, at least unwarranted in certain instances.[31] It further seems unusual that such a distinction should be made in relation to RCs, but in no other grammatical category. Finally, Grimm's model neither predicts nor accounts for the different distribution of case attraction in headed and free RCs.

A different explanation may be sought in comparing (2.11) with the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy as argued for by Keenan and Comrie (1977), who on the basis of data from 50 languages postulate that in any given language, if a position in a sentence can be relativised, all those higher in the hierarchy can be relativised as well.

(2.12) Subject < Direct Object < Indirect Object < Oblique < Genitive < Object of
       Comparison (1977:66; pattern adjusted)[32]

Thus, for instance, the fact that the genitive or possessor can be relativised entails that subject, direct object, etc., can be relativised too; objects of comparison, however, do not fall within this remit, and indeed grammaticality judgments in, e.g., English vary

---

[31]Grimm (2007:146-7) elucidates the mapping of Greek cases on his agentivity lattice; apart from the generally questionable relation of the lattice features and RC structure, his explanation of the genitive as the most agentive case due to its features of *sentience, instigation and total persistence* are unconvincing, esp. since the nominative itself is never mentioned or given a place in the lattice.

[32]This, however, remains an abstraction; attraction is still constrained by morphological case rather than by syntactic rôle.

concerning their status in relativisation contexts. Comparing the two hierarchies of GROSU (2.11) and KEENAN AND COMRIE (2.12), it is noticeable that one can be mapped on the other in that subject function is fulfilled in Greek by the nominative, the direct object function by the accusative, etc. Thence follows that attraction phenomena may be described as the 'attraction' of the more accessible case into the less accessible case, e.g., accusative into the genitive. Although the conditioning of attraction phenomena is still understood imperfectly and thus appears optional, it is still extremely common, wherefore it may be sensible to speak of the pronoun as tending towards the maximally inaccessible case.

It may, in turn, however be worthwhile to give the hierarchy a secondary function as concerns discourse accessibility. This is best explained at the hand of examples; expected cases are noted in square brackets.

(2.13) πρὸ οὖν τῶν κακῶν ὧν οἶδα … [… ἃ οἶδα …]
        Instead of the evils that I know … (Plato Apology 29b)

(2.14) δεῖταί σου τήμερον τοῦτον ἐκπιεῖν σὺν οἷς μάλιστα φιλεῖς [… σὺν τούτοις οὕς …]
        He asks that today you drink with (those) whom you like best. (Xenophon Anabasis I.9.25)

(2.15) καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως ἄξια γὰρ ὧν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν … [… τούτων ἃ …]
        And we justly receive (a reward) worthy of what we have done … (Lk. 23:41)

(2.13) is a typical example of attraction in headed RCs; instead of the accusative direct object required by the RC verb οἶδα 'I know', the pronoun adopts m-case. While there does not seem to be an immediately obvious reason for such attraction in (2.13), the free RC in (2.14) requires its pronoun to be in a different case than required internally due to being governed by a preposition in the matrix clause.[33] This further conforms

---

[33]Prepositions in Greek are not found preceding a relative pronoun in an attracted, viz. 'wrong', case; the reason for this may lie in the fact that a number of prepositions have different meanings dependent on the case they govern.

with the hierarchy laid out above, in that the dative is less accessible than the accusative. Similarly in (2.15), the expected accusative as required by the RC predicate is rendered as genitive dependent on the matrix clause constituent ἄξια; again, the direct object case is attracted into the less accessible genitive.

The last two examples show clearly that failing to attract in free RCs is likely to render the sentence incomprehensible (unless supplemented with a pronominal head); attraction, at least in free RCs, serves the purpose of expressing less readily deducible grammatical relations, viz. those lower in the accessibility hierarchy. If, for instance, the RPro in (2.15) were in the accusative rather than the genitive, the sentence would have a different meaning:

(2.16) † καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως ἄξια γὰρ ἃ ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν…
    And we justly receive the worthy things which we have done.

For this reason, ascribing a secondary, discourse rôle to Keenan and Comrie's accessibility hierarchy seems warranted in this context, and more immediately connected to the issue than Grimm's agentivity approach.

The following two chapters strive to elucidate, in addition to the matters partly laid out above, how far the same rules and constraints that apply to relative attraction in Greek are valid in Armenian too, and whether they may thus lend more substance to the suggestion of a discourse accessibility hierarchy. On a more general note, the relativisation strategies of both languages will be compared, and close attention will be paid to outlining similarities and differences in RC syntax.

Chapter 4 will further include a discussion of two other topics related to the syntax of RCs in Armenian, viz. the occurrence of determiner clitics in Wackernagel position and their distribution in the two corpora, which in turn will prove to be indicative of

the differences between New Testament and original Armenian; and the relevance of syntax and typology for the etymology of the Armenian RPro.

Chapter 3

Relative Clauses in the Armenian New Testament

3.1 Preliminary Remarks

The Armenian RCs found in the New Testament are of various origins. While the majority of them, ca. 75%, is directly parallel to Greek RCs, a significant number derives from different constructions: phrases consisting of article and participle are regularly rendered as RCs (12.5%), as are predicative and attributive participles (3.2%) and nominalised adverbial phrases (1.6%). It is of note that in those instances, where relative attraction occurs in the Greek version, Armenian does not commonly follow suit; nevertheless, there are a few examples of attraction phenomena in Armenian, which to some extent may be said to originate in the Greek model. They most commonly manifest in free RCs in which the RPRO exhibits m-case for the purpose of improved discourse accessibility.

This chapter will discuss these translation mechanisms in detail. It will demonstrate that certain phrase structures in the original Greek were regularly and quasi-

mechanically transposed into Armenian syntax, at times rendering the result unidiomatic or plainly grammatically faulty. Furthermore, the issues of translating Greek into Armenian will be analysed with the aid of examples, showing why certain passages may contravene preset rules. During this analysis, these translations will be compared to the trends prevalent in the (pre-)Hellenising School, whereby it will become evident that the Armenian New Testament partly shares the School's *modus operandi*.

After a brief introduction to the corpus used in this survey, and a few notes on the etymology of the Armenian RPRo, the syntax of RCs will be presented in general, and thereafter with a view to the Greek original. Following a discussion of the aspects in which Armenian RCs are similar and dissimilar to their Greek counterparts, a passage erroneously containing a RPRo will be discussed. Thereafter, the rendering of Greek DPs and adjectivally used participles as Armenian RCs will be analysed, followed by a statistical evaluation of the corpus.

3.1.1 Corpus

The examples cited in the following were drawn from ZOHRABIAN (1805) for the Armenian, and from NESTLE AND ALAND (2001) for the Greek.[1] In those instances where either text showed ostentatious grammatical irregularities, *variae lectiones* were consulted both in ZOHRABIAN's critical apparatus, and in KÜNZLE (1984); if variant readings are of any relevance, they will be discussed in the commentary of the passage in question.

The corpus used for analysis was constructed with the help of the TITUS Project of the Universität Frankfurt am Main (TITUS 1991); its integrated search engine al-

---

[1]Although both the Greek and the Armenian version of the Bible have undergone various and different changes over the centuries, sensible linguistic comparisons can still be made with the help of manuscript stemmata and critical apparatus; cf. COWE (1992*b*:59-77), COX (2006).

lows for lemma based enquiry, the results of which were transferred to and formatted in a spreadsheet for further analysis. The query included all paradigmatic forms of the RPRO as well as combinations thereof with the common prepositional prefixes *z-* and *i/y-*. The criteria underlying the analysis are as follows: source of Armenian RC (from Greek relative; from Greek DP; from PTCPS; other), occurrence of attraction (none; proper attraction; attraction in free RCs), occurrence of determiner clitic in Wackernagel position, retention of Greek case. Where appropriate, these different features will be discussed for the individual examples as part of the commentary provided, and will be summarised and evaluated at the end of the chapter. It is the goal of this analysis to demonstrate that in the vast majority of instances, the translation of the passages in question is extremely regular, quasi-mechanistic, and exhibits features usually attributed to the (pre-)Hellenising School.

Case	Singular	Plural
Nom.	*or*	*orkʿ*
Acc.	*or*	*ors*
Gen.	*oroy*	*orocʿ*
Dat.	*orowm*	*orocʿ*
Loc.	*orowm*	*ors*
Abl.	*-ormē*	*-orocʿ*
Instr.	*orov*	*orovkʿ*

Table 3.1 – Paradigm of the Armenian Relative Pronoun

Tables (3.1) and (3.2) list all forms of the RPRO, and indicate the number of occurrences within the corpus. At the same time, table (3.1) reflects two problems which arise in attempting to compare Greek and Armenian RCs: firstly, the case systems of the two languages do not align neatly, since Armenian has retained the original number of Indo-European cases which in the history of Greek was reduced by syncretism,[2]

---

[2]Functionally, the Indo-European ablative has been subsumed in the Greek genitive, while the dative has taken over the functions of the original locative and instrumental; the development of the morphological features differs according to nominal classes and pronouns, and is of no further import

resulting in non-linear correspondences.[3] Secondly, Armenian nominal and prono-

minal morphology presents with regular homonymy in certain cases of the paradigm,

resulting in, e.g., the formal identity of the Nom./Acc.Sg., or the Gen./Dat./Abl.Pl.; in

practice, this causes comparatively little confusion, but is relevant when considering

relative attraction.

Case	Singular	Plural
Nom.	or (2184)	orkʻ (167)
Acc.	y=or (48), z=or (517)	ors (1), y=ors (3), z=ors (36)
Gen.	oroy (151), y=oroy (7), z=oroy (7)	orocʻ (94), y=orocʻ (12)
Dat.	orowm (87)	= Gen.Pl.
Loc.	y=orowm (63)	ors (2), y=ors (17)
Abl.	y=ormē (18), z=ormē (13)	= Gen.Pl.; z=orocʻ (8)
Instr.	orov (82)	orovkʻ (16)

Table 3.2 – Numerical Distribution of the Armenian Relative Pronoun

Table (3.2) further demonstrates that a number of pronouns is also found with pre-

fixed prepositions or the *nota accusativi*.[4] All of these occurrences are grammatical,

yet forms such as *y=oroy*, i.e. the combination of a preposition *i/y=*, governing the

accusative, ablative or locative, with the Gen.Sg. of the RPro, are peculiar. They do,

however, reflect common Armenian phrase structure.

With the exception of the forms *z=or* and *or*, all instances of each case form were

taken into consideration; for the two forms named, this was impracticable[5] due to

their sheer number, and lacked purpose for multiple reasons: in passages such as Lk.

---

here; cf. Brugmann (1897:II.476ff.). The non-linear correspondences resulting from the difference in the Armenian and Greek case system can be neatly categorised, however, since Greek specifies function by means of prepositions; cf. p. 44 below.

[3]Accordingly, not all Greek datives can be mapped on Armenian datives; the mapping has to include the locative and instrumental, too. The situation is further complicated in that even those cases which were retained in both languages without change fail to align in all instances - the Greek nominative as subject case, for instances, will frequently be reflected by an Armenian genitive; cf. p. 38.

[4]The proclitic *z=* is applied to those direct objects which are considered definite; it is often applied to the head of the object phrase, but may variably occur prefacing the whole object DP, all or some of its constituents, and even further phrasal adjuncts; cp. Scala (2011).

[5]The TITUS Project search engine generally yields a list of 100 results with contextual passages; if more instances occur, they are reproduced as a (sometimes unreliable) hyperlinked reference list. The engine is unable to process more than 1000 items.

3:23-38, 78 occurrences of the pronoun in the Nom.Sg. are found in a paragraph only 169 words long. All of these instances are reflexes of the same Greek construction and make no statistically sensible contribution to an understanding of the Armenian RC due to the nature and length of the passage.[6] Furthermore, both case forms are the result of conventional and predictable translations in the vast majority of tested cases, wherefore it is more economical to investigate those instances which demonstrate deviation from the perceived standard.[7]

3.1.2 Etymology of the Armenian Relative Pronoun *or*

Etymological considerations regarding the provenance of Arm. *or* go back to MEILLET (1925:183-4; 1927:1-3; 1936:89-90), who relates it to Skt. *kataráḥ*, Slav. *kotorŭ, koterŭ*, Goth. *hvarjis*. He further postulates that the form was originally suffixed with an incomplete suffix *-(e)ro < *-tero,[8] found as such also in Gk. ἔνεροι 'underneath', Arm. *ner-kʿin* 'id.'. This etymology is uncertain however, since a regular development of *#kʷ- > Arm. *o*- is counterindicated by, e.g., *kʿan* 'as' < *kʷehₐn̥t and *kʿaṙasown* 'forty' < *kʷt(u)r̥-hₐ-ḱomt-hₐ.[9] KÖLLIGAN (2006:119) suggests that Arm. *o(v)*, the interrogative pronoun related to the relative *or*, 'may be derived from a preform *kʷos-yos that arose in focal interrogative clauses of the type "who is it who"'; in terms of explaining the development of the initial labiovelar, he only states that 'the evidence for a development of IE *#kʷ > #Ø in Armenian is weak, but it seems hard to dismiss the equations between the Armenian forms of the interrogative pronouns and its appar-

---

[6]A genealogy of Joseph. The Armenian renders Greek DPs (Gen.Sg. determiner + uninflected Semitic name) as RCs (Nom.Sg RPRO + Gen.Sg. name).

[7]The Nom.Sg. form is used ubiquitously and either renders a Greek RC or a participial phrase according to the set of rules laid out below; this form will not be taken into account in the statistical analysis of the corpus for that reason. Similarly, not all instances of the object-marked Acc.Sg. will be taken into account; the scope will here be limited to the four Gospels.

[8]The derivation envisaged by MEILLET may be viewed more simply as a coexistence of the forms *-tero and *-ero, both of which are attested individually on separate grounds (SIHLER 1995:363-4).

[9]For these etymologies, cf. MATZINGER (2005:92) and WINTER (1992:351), respectively.

ent cognates in other languages' (2006:112). Martirosyan (2010:523) is somewhat laconic in regard to this topic and offers only this statement: 'More probably, however, it reflects PIE *i̯o-'. The development PIE *y- > Arm. Ø has been shown to be similarly hard to prove as the one mentioned above (Kölligan 2012:142-5).

Given the generally scanty evidence for certain developments in Armenian phonology, it is unlikely that the provenance of the pronouns will ever be clearly identified; yet, further evidence for their likely derivation from *kʷi-/kʷo- – stems may be sought in syntactic parallels, as argued in more detail in section 4.3 below.

3.2 The Armenian Relative Clause

3.2.1 Regular Relative Clause Syntax

Little in the general usage of RPros and RCs in Armenian differs from other Indo-European languages. In both instances, the case of the RPro is usually determined by its syntactic function within the dependent clause (r-case), whereas its number is generally, but by no means always,[10] governed by its pivot, if present;[11] Armenian does not distinguish gender. As regards mood, the indicative is by far the most common one, but the subjunctive stands where uncertainty or necessity is expressed (cf. Jensen 1959:198-9, 205). (3.1) below is an example of a standard headed RC, in which the pivot *mi geł* 'a village' is restricted by the clause introduced by *orowm* 'to which'.

---

[10]The Nom.Sg. *or* is at times also used to refer to a plural pivot (Jensen 1959:86; Schmitt 1981:123); for other aspects of nominative-accusative case syncretism in Armenian, cf. Kortlandt (1985). Similar agreement failures also occur in Homeric Greek (Chantraine 1953:21) and may be an archaic feature of both languages.

[11]Jensen (1959:198) states that 'Ein Pron. dem. [demonstrative pronoun] kann, braucht aber nicht dem Relativpronomen vorauszugehen'; as in many other Indo-European languages, a relative without explicit pivot may be a headless, free relative (cf. p. 23), or may relativise on a whole clause.

(3.1) Mt. 26:36

> *yaynžam gay   Yisows ənd nosa   i   geł*
> then   go.3.Sg.Prs Jesus   with Dem.Acc.Pl into village.Acc.Sg
> *mi   orowm   anown ēr   getʿsamani*
> Indef.Acc.Sg Rel.Dat.Sg   name   be.3.Sg.Pst Gethsemane
> 'Then Jesus went with them to a village whose (to which) name was
> Gethsemane'

As may be gleaned from (3.2, 3.3) below, prepositions, particularly *i/y=* 'in; into; from',

z= 'about', and the *nota accusativi* are applied to the RPro as to any other nominal

constituent. In most instances, the RPro is governed by the preceding preposition,

but there are examples where the preposition governs the head of the phrase itself,

whereas the pronoun, usually in the genitive, is a possessive adjunct.

(3.2) Mk. 16:9

> *Yarowcʿeal   Yisows aṙawōtow=n   aṙaǰin miašabatʿow=n*
> rise.Perf.Ptcp Jesus   morning.Loc.Sg=Det first   week.Gen.Sg=Det
> *erewecʿaw   Mariamow   Magdałenacʿwoy, y=ormē*
> appear.3.Sg.Aor Mary.Dat.Sg   Magdalene,   from=Rel.Abl.Sg
> *haneal   ēr   z=ewtʿ=n   dew=n*
> expel.Perf.Ptcp be.3.Sg.Pst Obj=seven   demon=Det
> 'As he rose, in the morning of the first day of the week Jesus appeared to Mary
> Magdalene, from whom he had expelled seven demons.'

(3.3) 1Jn. 1:1

> *Or ēin   i   skzbanē.   z=ormē*
> Rel be.3.Pl.Pst from beginning.Abl.Sg about=Rel.Abl.Sg.
> *lowakʿ=n,   orowm   akanates=n   isk ełakʿ.   ənd*
> hear.1.Pl.Aor=Det Rel.Dat.Sg eyewitness=Det Int become.1.Pl.Aor at
> *or   hayecʿakʿ=n...*
> Rel.Acc.Sg look.1.Pl.Aor=Det
> 'The things which were in the beginning, about which we heard, to which we
> bore witness and upon which we looked ...'

Passage (3.2) demonstrates the application of *i/y=* as a preposition governing the ab-

lative; it is noteworthy that, as noted in table (3.1) above, the ablative of the RPro

does only occur in collocation with this preposition in the present corpus. Further, the passage is ambiguous in that the agent of an impersonal or passive construction may be expressed by means of the ablative, as well (JENSEN 1959:131).

A different issue is evident in example (3.3); the above-mentioned homonymy of Nom.Sg. and Acc.Sg. can at times lead to confusion, esp. when occurring with prepositions. The passage is perfectly grammatical, but is wholly dependent on the force and recognition of the preposition, as distinct morphological marking is lacking.

Further, it is worth noting that the genitive of the RPRO may under certain circumstances act as the subject of the clause, if a participle or an impersonal expression with the participle form the VP of that clause; this shift is the result of an agency-pivot in perfect tense constructions.

(3.4) Mt. 25:24

Matowcʻeal   *ew*   *oroy*   *z=erkows* *kʻahkʻars=n*
approach.Perf.Ptcp and Rel.Gen.Sg Obj=two   talent.Acc.Pl=Det
aṙeal   *ēr,*   *ew* *asē.*
receive.Perf.Ptcp be.3.Sg.Pst and say.3.Sg.Prs
'The one who had received the two talents approached and said.' (lit. 'Having approached, (he by) whom the two talents were received, said.')[12]

No wholly convincing suggestion has been made concerning the genesis of the unconventional marking pattern as presented in (3.4), wherein the agent occurs in the genitive and the object in the accusative; it must be noted, also, that further agent-patient-constellations are possible. Both STEMPEL (1983) and WEITENBERG (1986) attempt explanations based on the historically nominal nature of the *-eal* participle; STEMPEL assumes that this construction resulted from the development 'eines

---

[12]The word order of this passage is unusual and distinctly unidiomatic. It results from strict adherence to the Greek original, in which both RCs are rendered as participles.

vorhistorischen Passivs zum Aktiv' (1983:83), transitioning through various syntactic phases, some of which are preserved in other argument structures.[13] Irrespective of its precise provenance, this constellation is worth noting as it has no parallel in Greek, and therefore adds to the complications underlying the translation processes between the two languages.

At the side of proper attraction and attraction in free RCs, which will be dealt with separately, there are a number of features commonly occurring in RCs that find fewer parallels in other languages; these are: determiner clitics in Wackernagel position within the RC; resumptive pronouns in oblique-case RCs, representing RELNP; marking of subject RCs relativising on the direct object with *nota accusativi*. This study does not endeavour to provide answers to the questions raised by these phenomena, but will outline the main issues that arise in attempts at explaining them.

The occurrence of the determiner enclitic *=s, =d, =n* has been the topic of research since MEILLET (1897-8:24-5), who states that 'the [definite] article is placed immediately after the first independent accented word or group of words, whatever they may be, following the relative pronoun'; further studies by AČAṙYAN (1954) and MINASSIAN (1981) have contributed much to the topic by surveying conditions under which the clitics occur. VAUX (1994-5) argues that the clitic attaches to the XP or its head which through topicalisation has been raised to a more prominent position in the clause;[14] as for the reasons of presence or absence of the clitic, however, none of the above provide further suggestions. VAUX's assertion that the clitic 'agrees in

---

[13]STEMPEL suggests that the *-eal* participle, historically adjectival in form and function, was integrated into the aorist paradigm, where originally it was 'intransitiv-passiv ... und [bot] insofern gewissermaßen einen Ersatz für das *-to-Part. beispielsweise des Lateinischen' (1983:67). From a leveling process with other passive expressions arose the agent marking with *i* + Abl.; the original genitive marking was then re-analysed as active, whereby the object of the verb gained its accusative marking. WEITENBERG (1986:9, 18-21) disagrees in a number of fundamental points, but fails to suggest any more plausible reconstructions. His view that the genitive is the result of an original denominal adjective overcomplicates the matter unnecessarily.

[14]As will be argued in section 4.2 below, VAUX's topicalisation analysis cannot be backed by the statistical data gleaned in this survey.

deixis with its antecedent [=pivot] in the main clause' (1994-5:28) implies, but does not expressly state that without a pivot, and thus specific deixis, the clitic does not usually occur; the data here suggests otherwise.

It is worth noting that the clitic does not occur in object RCs showing resumptive pronouns (Minassian 1981:135; Hewitt 1978:119); the question then arises whether and under which circumstances the concept of definiteness may play a rôle. Passage (3.5) gives an example of the application of the clitic, whilst (3.6) demonstrates that the pivot need not be definite (*mi* is an indefinite pronoun), but must at least be marked.

(3.5) Jn. 3:29

    ays   *owraxutʻiwn,*   *or*   *im=s*   *ē*
    Dem.Nom.Sg happiness.Nom.Sg Rel.Nom.Sg 1.Poss.Nom.Sg=Det be.3.Sg
    'This happiness, which is mine(-here).'

(3.6) Mt. 12:10

    ew   *and*   *ēr*   *ayr*   *mi*   *oroy*
    and   there be.3.Sg.Pst man.Nom.Sg Indef.Nom.Sg Rel.Gen.Sg
    jeṙn   *iwr*   *gōsacʻeal*   *ēr.*
    hand.Nom.Sg 3.Poss.Nom.Sg wither.Perf.Ptcp be.3.Sg.Pst
    'And there was a man whose (his) hand was withered.'

Both (3.5) and (3.6) show deictic marking within the RC, but are not definite to the same extent: in (3.5), the pivot is specified by a demonstrative pronoun, while in (3.6) an indefinite pronoun accompanies it. It is thus worth asking whether the 'specificity' of the pivot, viz. the fact that it is specified by a pronoun or other marking, may be a condition of the RC containing resumptive pronouns or Wackernagel clitics (cp. Scala 2011). A study of the Gospel of Luke by de Lamberterie (1997) has concluded that such a differentiation does indeed occur:

> 'L'article a en phrase relative le même emploi qu'avec un nom ou un syntagme nominal, à savoir une valeur anaphorique ou déictique … La

> relative prend donc l'article, quand elle fait référence à une personne ou
> à une chose déterminée, connue' (1997:318).

As his analysis shows, however, not all instances follow this pattern straightfor-wardly, and the manuscript tradition has, to a certain extent, obscured the application of the rule; as will be discussed further below (4.11), there may well be passages that throw up additional issues concerning the position of the clitic.

3.2.2 Relative Clauses in the New Testament

Since Armenian RCs arise from a variety of syntactic constructions in Greek, they are best sub-divided into three large categories: those which reflect Greek RCs; those rendering Greek DPs with embedded participial or adverbial phrases; and those which reflect attributively or predicatively used participles. The first group is demonstrably the largest due to the high frequency of RCs in New Testament Greek.

3.2.2.1 Armenian Relative Clause ≈ Greek Relative Clause

As pointed out in (3.4) above, one of its traits is the preservation of Greek word order and syntax. This, to an extent, is equally true for the translation of the New Testament, particularly in instances of RC mapping.

In the simplest and most common instances,[15] a Greek RC will find a one-to-one correspondence regarding case, number and word order in its Armenian translation, as for example in (3.7).

---

[15]While ca. 48% of all surveyed examples display direct correspondence between Greek and Armenian usage of cases, this number ought to be augmented by further taking into account regular agreement between the Greek prepositional dative, e.g., ἐν ᾧ, and the Armenian prepositional locative, y=orowm, and other such agreements; the correspondence rate then rises into the range of ca.75%.

(3.7) Rom 4:7

Erani	*oroc'*	*t'ołan*	*anorēnowt'iwnk',*	*ew*
blessed	Rel.Gen.Pl	forgive.3.Pl.Aor.Pass	misdeed.Nom.Pl	and
Μακάριοι	ὧν	ἀφέθησαν	αἱ ἀνομίαι	καὶ

oroc'	*cackec'an*	*mełk'*	*iwreanc'.*
Rel.Gen.Pl	cover.3.Pl.Aor.Pass	sin.Nom.Pl	Res.Gen.Pl
ὧν	ἐπεκαλύφθησαν	αἱ ἁμαρτίαι	

'Blessed are they whose iniquities were forgiven, and whose sins were covered.'

A comparison of the Greek and Armenian version yields complete correspondence in usage of case, tense and word order; the added *iwreanc'* is the result of a secondary relativisation strategy in which next to the fully case-marked RPro, a resumptive pronoun occurs in the position of RelNP. This does not commonly occur in Greek, and must thus reflect a direct decision of the Armenian translators, or a Syriac vestige.

Yet, correspondence of case and word order are not always maintained in these translations. Divergence in case results from the fact that both languages use different case systems and prepositions. The following passages exemplify instances where such differences surface for reasons of different case usage (3.8, 3.9) and because of prepositions (3.10).

(3.8) Lk. 2:25

ew	*aha,*	*ēr*	*ayr*	*mi*	*y=Erowsałēm,*
and	behold	be.3.Sg.Pst	man.Nom.Sg	Indef.Nom.Sg	in=Jerusalem
Καὶ	ἰδού,	ἦν	ἄνθρωπος	ἐν	Ἰερουσαλὴμ

oroy	*anown*	*ēr*	*Simēovn.*
Rel.Gen.Sg	name.Nom.Sg	be.3.Sg.Pst	Simeon
ᾧ	ὄνομα		Συμεών

'And behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon.'

(3.9) Mk. 14:71

Oč'	*gitem*	*z=ayr=n*	*z=ormē*
Neg	know.1.Sg.Prs	Obj=man.Acc.Sg=Det	about=Rel.Abl.Sg
Οὐκ	οἶδα	τὸν ἄνθρωπον τοῦτον	ὃν

dowk'=d	*asēk'.*
2.Pers.Nom.Pl=Det	speak.2.Pl.Prs
	λέγετε

'I don't know the man you are talking about.'

(3.10) Lk. 9:9

> *ov?*   *icʿē*   *z=ormē*   *z=ayspisi*
> Interrog.Nom.Sg   be.3.Sg.Aor.Subj   about=Rel.Abl.Sg   Obj=such.Acc.Sg
> *irs*   *lsem*
> thing.Acc.Pl   hear.1.Sg.Prs
> τίς δὲ ἐστιν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἐγὼ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα;
> 'Who is it, about whom I hear such things?'

(3.11) Lk. 1:26

> *Ew*   *y=amsean=n*   *vecʿerordi*   *aṙakʿecʿaw*
> and   in=month.Loc.Sg=Det   sixth.Loc.Sg   send.3.Sg.Aor.Pass
> Ἐν δὲ τῷ μηνὶ   τῷ ἕκτῳ   ἀπεστάλη
> *Gabriēl hreštak*   *y=Astoucoy*   *i*   *kʿałakʿ*   *mi*
> Gabriel angel.Nom.Sg   by=God.Abl.Sg   into   city.Acc.Sg   Indef.Acc.Sg
> ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ   ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ   εἰς   πόλιν
> *Galileacʿwocʿ,*   *orowm*   *anown*   *ēr*   *Nazaretʿ...*
> Galilean.Gen.Pl   Rel.Dat.Sg   name.Nom.Sg   be.3.Sg.Pst   Nazareth
> τῆς Γαλιλαίας   ᾗ   ὄνομα   Ναζαρὲτ
> 'And in the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent by God to a city of the
> Galileans, whose name was Nazareth...'

Example (3.8) demonstrates the difference in the expression of possessive relations; whilst Greek uses the dative (SMYTH 1984:341),[16] Armenian here chooses the genitive. As (3.11) shows, however, this differentiation is not absolute, and both ways of expressing possession occur in the Armenian New Testament as well as in non-translated literature.[17] The application of the native case sets the translators of the New Testament apart from their Hellenising successors, who frequently would adopt the case found in the original despite the unavailability of certain Greek case functions in idiomatic Armenian.[18]

---

[16]cf. KULNEFF-ERIKSSON (1999) for a general overview of the development of 'have' in Ancient Greek.

[17]It is unclear whether any differentiation between the possessive usage of genitive or dative can be made; it may be worth taking into account, however, that possession is frequently expressed by means of the genitive, esp. in RCs such as (3.7) above, and that in the nominal paradigm, genitive and dative are identical in form. DUM-TRAGUT (2009:83) mentions that a possible differentiation may be seen in different dependencies of the cases, where the genitive is adnominal, whilst the dative is governed by a verb.

[18]MURADYAN (2012:125-32, 145-8) shows that the imitation of Greek case functions and similarly the change of verbal government are frequent features of the Hellenising School.

The same applies to (3.9), where the direct object RC in Greek is rendered by means of a preposition. The reason for this deviation lies in the rection of the verbs used: Gk. λέγω can take a direct object in the meaning 'talk about, mention', whereas neither Arm. *asem* nor *xawsem* can mirror this syntactic configuration. Therefore, the paraphrasis with the preposition *z=* + ablative is employed; the same preposition is used in (3.10) to render Gk. περί. Further note the rendition of the Greek demonstrative τοῦτον by means of the clitic *=n* in (3.9), and cf. section 4.2.

In general it is safe to say that Greek prepositions, at least in the context of RPros, are often directly equated with an Armenian counterpart, e.g. Gk. εἰc + Acc. > Arm. *i/y=* + Acc. (3.12), Gk. ἐν + Dat. > Arm. *i/y=* +Acc. (3.13), Gk. ἀπό + Gen. > Arm. *i/y=* + Abl. (3.14), Gk. δία + Acc. > Arm. *vasn* + Gen. (3.15, 3.16).

(3.12) Act. 26:17

...	*p'rkel*	*z=k'ez*	*i*	*žołovrdenē=d*	*ew*	*i*
	save.Prs.Inf	Obj=2.Pers.Acc.Sg	from	crowd.Abl.Sg=Det	and	from
	ἐξαιρούμενός	cε		ἐκ	τοῦ λαοῦ	καὶ

het'anosac'	*y=ors*	*es*
gentile.Gen.Pl	to=Rel.Acc.Pl	1.Pers.Nom.Sg
τῶν ἐθνῶν	εἰc οὓc	νῦν

aṙak'ec'ic' *z=k'ez.*
send.1.Sg.Aor.Subj Obj=2.Pers.Acc.Pl
cε ἀποστέλλω.

'... to save you from the crowd, and from the gentiles, to whom I sent you.'

(3.13) 1Cor. 15:1

c'owc'anem	*jez*	*ełbark'*	*z=awetaran=n*
show.1.Sg.Prs	2.Pers.Dat.Pl	brother.Nom.Pl	Obj=gospel.Acc.Sg=Det
Γνωρίζω δὲ	ὑμῖν	ἀδελφοί	τὸ εὐαγγέλιον

im	...	*z=or*	*ew*	*ənkalarowk',*	*y=or*	*ew*
1.Poss.Acc.Sg		Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg	also	receive.2.Pl.Aor	in=Rel.Acc.Sg	also
	...	ὃ	καὶ	παρελάβετε	ἐν ᾧ	καὶ

hastateal=d ek'.
be-firm.Perf.Ptcp=Det be.2.Pl.Prs
ἐστήκατε

'I show you, brethren, my gospel ... which you received, and into which you also are set.'

(3.14) Act. 20:18

dowk'	*jezēn*	*gitēk'*	
2.Pers.Nom.Pl	2.Pers.Abl.Pl	know.2.Pl.Prs	
Ὑμεῖς		ἐπίϲταϲθε	

y=ōrē y=aṙajnmē		*y=ormē*	*eki*
from=day.Abl.Sg from=first.Abl.Sg		from=Rel.Abl.Sg	go.1.Sg.Aor
ἀπὸ πρώτηϲ ἡμέραϲ		ἀφ' ἧϲ	ἐπέβην

y=Asiay   ...
to=Asia
εἰϲ τὴν Ἀϲίαν ...

'You know yourselves that from the first day, from which I went to Asia...'

(3.15) 2Pt. 2:2

ew	*bazowmk'*	*ankeal*	*ert'ic'en*	*z=het*
and	many.Nom.Pl	fall.Perf.Partc	go.3.Pl.Prs.Subj	Obj=path.Acc.Sg
καὶ	πολλοὶ		ἐξακολουθήϲουϲιν	

n(o)c'(a)	*anaṙakowt'e(an)c'=n.*	*v(a)s(n)*	*oroy*
Dem.Gen.Pl	debauchery.Gen.Pl=Det	because	Rel.Gen.Sg
αὐτῶν	ταῖϲ ἀπωλείαιϲ,	δι'	οὓϲ

čšmartow(t')e(an)=n	*čanaparh*	*hayhoyic'i*
truth.Gen.Sg=Det	path	besmirch.3.Sg.Prs.Subj.Pass
ἡ ὁδὸϲ τῆϲ ἀληθείαϲ		βλαϲφημηθήϲεται

'And many, having fallen, followed (went) their path of debauchery, wherefore the path of truth is besmirched.'

(3.16) 2Cor. 4:13

ew	*mek'*	*hawatamk'*	*v(a)s(n)*	*oroy*	*ew*
and	1.Pers.Nom.Pl	believe.1.Pl.Prs	because	Rel.Gen.Sg	and
καὶ	ἡμεῖϲ	πιϲτεύομεν	διὸ		καὶ

xōsimk'	*isk.*
speak.1.Pl.Prs	Int
λαλοῦμεν	

'And we believe, wherefore we say so.'

Occurrences such as (3.12, 3.13, 3.14) exemplify the usage of the same preposition *i/y=* with different cases; in each instance the Greek prepositional phrases (with and without RCs) are the trigger for the Armenian rendition. The non-linear correspondence mechanisms of the various Gk. ἐν, εἰϲ, ἀπό => Arm. *i/y=* are reminiscent of similar

patterns found in the Hellenising School; there, it is mainly the verbal and nominal prefixes that show such close affinities.[19]

Yet, there are numerous examples in which grammaticality is sacrificed for a strict rendition of the Greek. Passage (3.14) demonstrates that Armenian will adopt even rather peculiar phraseology from the Greek original on occasion; here, the repetition of ἀπό before the RPRo and its subsequent genitive inflection is mirrored by the Armenian prepositional ablative *y=ormē*. It could be argued that this is an instance of relative attraction, since the case of the RPRo is hard to justify within the syntax of the RC. Attraction, however, would only mimic the m-case, and not re-iterate its preposition; further, it is well documented that prepositions are not followed by cases they cannot govern.[20] Rather, this is a peculiarity of Greek style as noted by KÜHNER AND GERTH (1869:II.i.550), replicated in Armenian in spite of its odd configuration.

A final of point of interest is presented by (3.15, 3.16). In (3.15), the Greek phrase δι' οὕς relativises on its pivot πολλοί, whereas the Armenian *vasn oroy*, by virtue of being both singular and extremely frequent, undoubtedly takes the whole preceding clause as its sentential pivot. The preposition itself is of Iranian origin, presumably borrowed from Pth. *wsn'd*, cp. OP. *vašna* (AČAṘYAN 1971:IV.309b; DURKIN-MEISTERERNST 2004:346); while in Old Persian it governs the genitive as well, it remains obscure how this could account for the same case in Armenian. Parthian is genetically related to Old Persian, but has lost the fine case distinction still extant in the latter for the benefit of a direct-oblique-distinction.[21] The equation of Gk. διό with

---

[19]Cp. section 2.1 above; for an overview , cf. CLACKSON (1995:124), for examples in context, cf., e.g., MANANDYAN (1928:94). Note, however, that the New Testament translation does not make any attempts at rendering Greek preverbs in a manner comparable to that of the School.

[20]FÖRSTER (1868:30) states: 'Clarissima est haec res in eo vocabulorum genere quod nunquam per se poni potest, in praepositionibus: quae si non nomen substantivum, sed enuntiationem rel. regunt, semper cogunt pronomen rel. ut induat casum eum quem ipsae poscunt'; further cf. MAY (1878:12-14).

[21]The correspondence between the Parthian oblique case and the Armenian genitive has other manifestations as well: in participial constructions, the agent is usually expressed in the genitive. Whilst at present there is too little data to go further than speculation, this may indicate a superstrate influence from Parthian.

Arm. *vasn oroy*, which occurs very frequently, may be explained in different ways: given that διό < δι'ὅ (LSJ 482; also cp. NBHL II:785) it is parallel to the Armenian; this, however, is to assume that such analysis and understanding of the common conjunction was still prevalent amongst the Greek contemporaries. A second possibility lies in the grammaticalisation and subsequent spread of the collocation *vasn oroy*, which due to its semantic proximity was chosen to stand in for διό, having undergone a similar development.

The examples in this section expose a number of peculiarities occurring in the Greco-Armenian translation of the New Testament. Correspondence of word order and construction, which are also common features of the Hellenising School, stand in opposition to the idiomatic usage of cases and semantic deviations from the original, both of which are distinctly non-mechanistic.[22] A sensible unity of these two aspects can be achieved by various models: firstly, the collective of translators may or may not have set up a glossary of terms and phrases, but other questions of translation may have been left to the individual. Alternatively, the pattern demonstrated above may be independent of the author; the observed features may be seen as a compromise between a fully literal rendition of the Greek into Armenian, in complete adherence to the later School, and a free, viz. syntactically unbound, translation, preserving much of the structure of the original version while at the same time providing maximal idiomaticity and comprehensibility. Since it is largely unknown, which passages were translated by whom, this question must remain unanswered; the data does not allow for any particular insight.

---

[22]MALMKJÆR (2005:61) discusses the problems involved in natural language translation and the involved problems of non-linear correspondence and individual interpretation on the basis of the Danish particle jo 'after all; well; of course'. Similarly, early modern translations of the Bible, such as the King James Bible or the Lutheran Bible, are part of a far more natural school of translation.

3.2.2.2 Attraction Phenomena

A general overview of attraction phenomena has been given in section 2.3 above. Here, its interrelations in Greek and Armenian will be considered.

Jensen mentions both proper attraction and inverse attraction briefly (1959:210), with very few examples from the New Testament; it ought to be added, however, that the occurrence of attracted RPros, and thus attraction proper, is restricted to the New Testament, as no instances can be found in other contemporaneous texts. The reason for this will become evident in the ensuing discussion.

It is noteworthy that in the Greek New Testament, relative attraction occurs, too; where this does happen, however, the Armenian version does not usually imitate it, but instead translates in a fully grammatical fashion across the board.

(3.17) Lk. 2:20

ew	*darjan*	*hoviwkʻ=n*		*pʻaṙawor*	*aṙnēin*	*ew*
and	return.3.Pl.Aor	shepherd.Nom.Pl=Det		glorious	make.3.Pl.Pst	and
καὶ	ἐπέστρεψαν	οἱ ποιμένες		δοξάζοντες		καὶ

ōrhnēin	*z=Astowac,*	*vasn*	*amenayn*
praise.3.Pl.Pst	Obj=God.Acc.Sg	because	everything.Gen.Sg
αἰνοῦντες	τὸν θεὸν	ἐπὶ	πᾶσιν

z=or		*lowan*	*ew*	*tesin,*	*orpēs*	*patmecʻaw*
Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg		hear.3.Pl.Aor	and	see.3.Pl.Aor	as	tell.3.Sg.Aor.Pass
οἷς		ἤκουσαν	καὶ	εἶδον	καθὼς	ἐλαλήθη

nocʻa.
Dem.Dat.Pl
πρὸς αὐτούς

'And the shepherds returned, glorified and praised God because of everything that they had heard and seen, as it was told to them.'

In (3.17) the Armenian version employs the nota accusativi *z=* and a RPro in the accusative to render the direct object of the verbs *lsem* 'to hear' and *tesanem* 'to see'; the same would be expected in the Greek original, since ἀκούω 'to hear' is similarly constructed with an accusative or a genitive. In the present examples, however, the

RPro οἷς fulfilling the direct object function presents with dative morphology, caused by its pivot πᾶσιν. Following the hierarchy laid out by GRIMM (2007), the expected r-case should be the (semantically expected) accusative. Whereas the attraction of free RCs seems to have a discourse-based reason (cp. section 2.3), the motivation for proper attraction remains hard to fathom.[23]

This rule has one potential exception, cf. p. 60, which, however, is not a classical one. Yet, there are numerous examples of attraction of free RCs, in which the RPro takes on m-case. This type of attraction occurs both in Greek and Armenian (3.18), and at times in Armenian alone (3.19).

(3.18) Lk. 23:41

ew	*mekʿ*	*y=iravi,*	*zi aržani*	*orocʿ*
and	1.Pers.Nom.Pl	in=justice.Loc.Sg	because worthy	Rel.Gen.Pl
καὶ	ἡμεῖς μὲν	δικαίως	ἄξια γὰρ	ὧν
gorcecʿakʿ=n	*aṙnoumkʿ*	*z=hatowcʿowmn*		
do.1.Pl.Aor=Det	take.1.Pl.Prs	Obj=compensation.Acc.Sg		
ἐπράξαμεν	ἀπολαμβάνομεν			

'And we justly take compensation worthy of what we have done.'

(3.19) Jn. 4:22

dowkʿ	*erkir paganēkʿ*	*orowm*	*očʿ=n*	*gitēkʿ,*	*mekʿ*
2.Pers.Nom.Pl	worship.2.Pl.Prs	Rel.Dat.Sg	Neg=Det	know.2.Pl.Prs	we
ὑμεῖς	προσκυνεῖτε	ὃ	οὐκ	οἴδατε	ἡμεῖς
erkir paganemkʿ	*orowm*	*gitemkʿ=n*			
worship.1.Pl.Prs	Rel.Dat.Sg	know.1.Pl.Prs			
προσκυνοῦμεν	ὃ	οἴδαμεν			

'You worship things you don't know, we worship things we do know.'

The RC verb in (3.18), *gorcem* 'to do, make', usually takes a direct object, wherefore the RPro would be expected to show accusative morphology; as it is, however, the RPro

---

[23]GRIMM (2007) suggests underlying restrictions governing the potential application of relative attraction, but does not attempt an explanation as to why it occurs. FÖRSTER (1868) gives various explanations pertaining to individual examples, not all of which are relative attraction in the strict sense, but in general only concludes that it is used in essential, defining, short statements (1868:30). In the particular case of (3.17) above, one may argue along the lines of CITKO (1999) that light-headed RCs may have features pertaining to both headed and free RCs.

occurs in the genitive instead. The latter is governed by *aržani* and ἄξιος 'worthy of', respectively, both of which regularly take genitive complements.[24] The Armenian version further chose to translate ἀπολαμβάνω 'to take from another; to receive what one is due' as a phrase *aṙnoumkʿ z=hatowcʿowmn* 'to receive one's due' since no single verb is able render the precise nuance of the Greek; cp. LSJ (205), GELS (205). It is self-evident that this instance of attraction is not directly comparable to the one presented in (3.17), since there is no pivot which could exert an 'attractive force'. Therefore, it may be assumed that in instances where no pivot occurs, the RPro may occur in m-case, provided that the sentence would otherwise be less easily comprehensible. It is not evident from (3.18), however, whether this should apply to both languages or to Greek alone, since the Armenian version may well be a direct translation.

Passage (3.19), however, speaks in favour of the independent applicability of this rule in New Testament Armenian as well. Like οἶδα, Arm. *gitem* also takes an accusative as its direct object; while in Greek, the RPro does indeed occur in the accusative, the Armenian version instead shows dative morphology. As per above, this is readily explained: the phrase *erkir paganem* 'to worship' (lit. 'to kiss the earth') is construed with a dative for the beneficiary; once more, this conforms with the hierarchies outlined above. The question remains under which circumstances this construction arose. Smyth (1984:568) outlines the rules governing relative attraction with omitted pivot for Greek (cf. section 2.3 above), but due to the scarcity of examples in Armenian, no such generalisations can be made. As for the historical development of this attraction in free RCs, Quicoli (1972) suggests that, at least for Portuguese, at a prior stage a pivot in the form of a demonstrative pronoun may have existed; the RPro at this stage would have shown r-case morphology. Thereupon followed a stage

---

[24] For *aržani*, cp. NBHL (I:357), Ačaṙyan (1971:315); note also Durkin-Meistererernst (2004:52) - *aržani* is not only a phonological borrowing on Pth. *ʾrjʾn*, but translates its oblique dependencies, construed with *ʾw* 'of' in Parthian, as well. For ἄξιος, cp. Smyth (1984:333), LSJ (171).

of relative attraction, whereby the RPRO acquired m-case from the pivot, followed by loss of the latter due to simplification, and grammaticalisation of the construction. Since relative attraction does, however, not occur in the earliest Greek texts available, and is therefore likely to have developed in historical times, such a development should be, but is not documented. Further, as mentioned above, the constraints for attraction of headed RCs are more restrictive than those of free RCs; should the latter be derived from the former, this would be unusual. The precise provenance of the phenomenon in Greek remains unclear. Whether its occurrence in Armenian has arisen from historical syntactic developments, Greek influence or *variae lectiones* can only be determined with the help of data from original, non-translation texts; cf. section 4.1 below.

A further attraction-like phenomenon may be observed in example (3.20) below. As regards word order and semantics, the Greek and the Armenian version correspond completely; interestingly, the correspondence of syntactic elements is unusual.

(3.20) Act. 22:15

zi	*ełicʿes*		*vkay*	*nora*	*aṙ*	*am(enayn)*
for	become.2.Sg.Aor.Subj		witness.Nom.Sg	Dem.Gen.Sg	to	all
ὅτι	ἔcῃ		μάρτυc	αὐτῷ	πρὸc	πάνταc
mardik,	*orocʿ*	*teser=n*		*ew*	*lowar.*	
man.Acc.Coll	Rel.Gen.Pl	see.2.Sg.Aor=Det		and	hear.2.Sg.Aor	
ἀνθρώπουc	ὧν	ἐώρακαc		καὶ	ἤκουcαc	

'For you shall be his witness to all mankind of what you have seen and heard.'

This passage demonstrates an occurrence of attraction which cannot be explained on the basis of lexically required case governance. The RPRO here is dependent on *vkay* and μαρτύc 'witness', respectively, which as a NP does not lexically govern any case. The RPRO and the clause it introduces are thus not complements, but only adjuncts to the NP, showing that attraction occurs in a variety of syntactic relations. Once more,

however, the question arises whether the Armenian version is but a reflection of the Greek, or whether the syntagma occurs naturally in Armenian. It remains to be seen what can be gleaned from the analysis of originally Armenian texts in section 4.1.

Before the discussion of these texts, however, other aspects of Greco-Armenian translation mechanisms need to be considered. The following section will bring to light and explain occurrences of RCs which are unparalleled in Greek.

3.2.2.3 Erroneous Relative Clauses

In at least one instance, the translators of the Greek original committed an error of analysis, which renders the Armenian version of the passage grammatically nonsensical.

(3.21) Lk. 3:23

ew	*inkʿn*	*Yisows ēr*	*amacʿ ibrew*	*eresicʿ*	*skseal*
and	Int	Jesus be.3.Sg.Pst	year.Gen.Pl like	30.Gen.Pl	begin.Perf.Ptcp
Καὶ	αὐτὸς	ἦν ὁ Ἰηϲοῦϲ	ὡϲεὶ ἐτῶν	τριάκοντα	ἀρχόμενος

orocʿ	*orpēs*	*karcēr*	*ordi*	*Yovsepʿay*	...
Rel.Gen.Pl	as	think.3.Sg.Pst	son	Joseph.Gen.Sg	
ὢν	ὡϲ	ἐνομίζετο	υἱόϲ	Ἰωϲὴφ	...

'And Jesus himself had begun to be ca. 30 years of age (of which?), as it was reckoned, [he] the son of Joseph …

As is evident, word order and semantics are roughly equivalent in all but one instance. In the same way that the Armenian version has adopted the periphrastic past tense employed by the koine Greek, the intention to render ὤν as faithfully as possible must have prevailed as well. Here, however, lies the error of analysis: where the Greek uses ὤν, Prs.Ptcp.Nom.Sg.Masc of εἰμί 'to be', the Armenian translator must instead have read ὧν, the Gen.Pl. of the RPro. No information as to whether this may have been an error of accentuation (if present) in the Greek manuscript,[25] or whether

---

[25]This seems unlikely. Whilst accent marks are found from the 3rd century BCE onwards (Vendryes 1904:5-18), most biblical manuscripts of the 4th and 5th century CE were written in uncials and did

the confusion originated with the translator is available; the critical apparatus of the Greek New Testament shows different readings of this sentence, but the participle is not absent in any of them. Equally, ZOHRABIAN also adds only *'omankʿ. Orpēs ew karcēr'* – 'some (mss): "as it was further reckoned"' –, which does not clarify the situation. Due to this fault, the sentence is rendered completely ungrammatical; *orocʿ* has no obvious pivot, nor a verb to be governed by, since *orpēs karcēr* 'as it was reckoned' forms a clause of its own. It is most peculiar that this should not have been noticed or corrected, and raises the question whether the translator of this particular passage actually understood it. While previous examples have shown either a rendition *ad sensum* or a very close adherence to the text, (3.21) belongs to neither of those categories.

3.2.2.4 Armenian Relative Clauses ≈ Greek DPs

In addition to the correspondences between Greek and Armenian RCs, a significant number of the latter correspond to Greek DPs, in which an article is used to nominalise a participial or adverbial phrase. An example will elucidate the general pattern underlying these transpositions.

(3.22) Mt. 14:21

ew orkʿ	*keran=n*	*ēin*	*arkʿ*	*ibrew*
and Rel.Nom.Pl	eat.3.Pl.Aor=Det	be.3.Pl.Pst	man.Nom.Pl	like
οἱ δὲ	ἐcθίοντεc	ἦcαν	ἄνδρεc	ὡcεὶ

hing hazar.
5 thousand
πεντακιcχίλιοι

'And [those] who ate were about five thousand men.'

---

either not bear accents, or only on a minority of words and with a high error rate (BIONDI 1983:11-15). Polytonic accentuation was not universally spread until the advent of minuscule script in the 9th century CE (PROBERT 2006*a*:45-6, 48-9). It is noteworthy, however, that similar mistakes occur in the works of the Hellenising School, as noted by BOLOGNESI (2000*a*:50) for the *Progymnasmata* of Aelius Theon.

Both here and in many earlier examples, the enclitic δέ was rendered by *ew* 'and' since Armenian does not have enclitic connective particles; apart from that, the sentence corresponds to its model in the usual pattern. The observation that the RPᴿᴏ reflects the Greek article in both place and function, and that the RC contains both a fully inflected verb and the determiner clitic in Wackernagel position leads to the question whether in the transposition process, the translators have simply reconfigured such DPs as free relative clauses, as they occur naturally in Armenian.

Passage (3.22) displays the issue at hand in its simplest form; the Armenian RPᴿᴏ occurs in the nominative, whereas the Greek participle is rendered as an inflected verb form; the latter is used absolutely, wherefore the resulting free RC is very simple. The rendition of more difficult constructions does not cause any problems, either.

(3.23) Mt. 17:23

ibrew ekin	*nokʻa*	*i*	*Kapʻaṙnaowm,*	*matean*
when come.3.Pl.Aor	Dem.Nom.Pl	to	Capernaum,	approach.3.Pl.Aor
Ἐλθόντων δὲ	αὐτῶν	εἰς	Καπερναούμ,	προσῆλθον

orkʻ	*z=erkdramean=n*		*pahanǰēin*	*aṙ Petros*
Rel.Nom.Pl	Obj=didrachma.Acc.Sg=Det		claim.3.Pl.Pst	to Peter
οἱ	τὰ δίδραχμα		λαμβάνοντες	τῷ Πέτρῳ

'When they came to Capernaum, those who demanded (Gk. taken) a didrachma went to Peter.'

A number of aspects in this passage are of interest: while (3.23) contains two participles, only one of them is translated into Armenian by means of a RC; the other, as part of a genitive absolute with temporal connotation, was recognised as such and rendered accordingly as a dependent clause.[26] Secondly, it must be noted that (3.23), like (3.22), is a free RC. Finally, the direct object of the participle is seamlessly rendered as direct object of the finite verb in the RC, while at the same time preserving

---

[26]This once more underscores the above mentioned notion that the translators were striving for a balance between close adherence to the original text and an idiomatic and sensible rendition of the content in Armenian, as opposed to the Hellenising School.

the original word order as displayed in the Greek, with the repeated exception of the

clitic.

In the same way that direct objects are rendered without issue in these RCs, other

complements and adjuncts are readily accommodated.

(3.24) Act. 1:11

ays	*Y(isow)s,*	*or*	*verac'aw=n*		*i*
Dem.Nom.Sg	Jesus	Rel.Nom.Sg	elevate.3.Sg.Aor.Pass=Det		from
οὗτος	ὁ Ἰηϲοῦϲ	ὁ	ἀναληφθεὶϲ		ἀφ'
jēnǰ	*y=erkins,*		*soynpēs*	*ekesc'ē*	*z=or*
2.Pers.Abl.Pl	into=heaven.Acc.Pl		this-way	come.3.Sg.Subj	Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg
ὑμῶν	εἰϲ τὸν οὐρανὸν		οὕτωϲ	ἐλεύϲεται	ὃν
ōrinak	*tesēk'*	*z=na*	*ert'eal*		
see.2.Pl.Aor	Obj=he.Acc.Sg	go.Perf.Ptcp	into=heaven.Acc.Pl		
τρόπον	ἐθεάϲαϲθε	αὐτὸν	πορευόμενον		
y=erkins.					

εἰϲ τὸν οὐρανόν
'This Jesus, who was lifted from you into heaven, will come in such a way as
you have seen him go into heaven.'

Once more, the correspondence of word order and function is of note: the second, ad-

verbial RC, which is rendered faithfully in Armenian, requires construing *z=or ōrinak*

and ὃν τρόπον as accusatives of reference (SMYTH 1984:361). In spite of its gram-

matical oddity, it seems as though the Armenian follows the Greek example to the

letter. Passage (3.24) also demonstrates the difference in rendering nominalised and

attributive participles; while the former, here ὁ ἀναληφθεὶϲ, is rendered in Armenian

as a RC containing all its complements and adjuncts, the latter is usually expressed

by means of an Armenian participle. Whilst this is the predominant *modus operandi*,

there are a few exceptions, which will be discussed in section 3.2.2.5 below.

This construction, as mentioned above, is not restricted to translating nominalised

participles alone; other nominalised adverbial phrases undergo the same process of

being rendered as RCs in Armenian; as before, the Greek article is translated as a RPRO. The difference lies in the addition of a copula, which occurs in some but not all instances.

(3.25) Lk. 8:12

ew orkʿ		*aṙ*	*čanaparhaw=n,*	*aynokʿik*	*en,*
and Rel.Nom.Pl		by	path.Instr.Sg=Det	Dem.Nom.Pl	be.3.Pl.Prs
οἱ δὲ		παρὰ	τὴν ὁδόν		εἰςιν
or			*lsen=n...*		
Rel.Nom.Sg			listen.3.Pl.Prs=Det		
οἱ			ἀκούοντες	...	

'Those, who [are] by the wayside, they are the ones who listen.'

(3.26) Rev. 2:24

ayl jez	*asem*	*orkʿ*	*i*	*tʿiwatir*	*ēkʿ,*	*ew*
but 2.Pers.Dat.Pl	say.1.Sg.Prs	Rel.Nom.Pl	in	Thyatira	be.2.Pl.Prs	and
očʿ	*ownikʿ*	*z=vardapetowtʿi(wn)=s*		*z=ays...*		
Neg	have.2.Pl.Prs	Obj=teaching.Acc.Sg=Det		Obj=Dem.Acc.Sg		

ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω καὶ λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείροις ὅςοι οὐκ ἔχουςιν τὴν διδαχὴν ταύτην

'But I say to you, who are in Thyatira, and who have not adopted this teaching ...'

(Gk. 'And I say to you, and to those left in Thyatira, who have not adopted this teaching...')

Passage (3.25) reflects the most common constellation, in which the Greek phrase is rendered verbatim in Armenian; no copula or other elements are added. It also bears witness to one of the more idiosyncratic elements of the language: the coexistence of two morphologically different forms *or* and *orkʿ* relativising on one and the same pivot, here in a partly relative-correlative setting. JENSEN already notes that the nominative singular form is quite common in the plural, too, but it is striking that both should occur in the same sentence; whether the predicative usage of the second phrase may have caused its lack in number marking is unclear.

The less frequent occurrence, represented by example (3.26), is at the same time challenging in a few different respects. The Greek phrase under consideration here

is rendered faithfully in Armenian, with the addition of the copula *ēkʻ*; the fact that the second RC beginning with ὅσοι is integrated into the first may be due to simple economy. What is more unusual, given the general picture presented by the New Testament translation, is the non-adherence to the original not only in matters of word order, but also in meaning. The Greek differentiates two distinct groups of people, ὑμῖν and λοιποῖς, as indicated by the conjunction καί; the Armenian version, on the other hand, clearly does not follow suit. There is no indication of a conjunction between the first NP and a phrase functioning as the pivot of the relative. Furthermore, the form of the copula within the RC implies a second-person subject, and thus by extension the pivot. While the difference in form may not necessitate such a conclusion, the variance of meaning clearly indicates that the Greek original underlying this passage may have had a *varia lectio*; this, however, is not indicated in either the Armenian or Greek critical apparatus.

This type of Armenian RC is not restricted to the nominative plural, but occurs in a great variety of cases; where possible, the Armenian version attempts to retain the case used in the Greek. Yet, this was not possible in a number of instances for very specific reasons.

(3.27) Rev. 2:18

ew	*aṙ*	*hreštak=n*		*or*		*i*	*tʻiwatroy*		*ekełecʻin*
and	to	angel.Acc.Sg=Det		Rel.Nom.Sg		in	Thyatria.Gen.Sg		church.Loc.Sg
Καὶ		τῷ ἀγγέλῳ		τῆς		ἐν	Θυατείροις		ἐκκλησίας

grea.			*ayspēs*	*asē*		*ordi=n*		*a(stowco)y,*
write.2.Sg.Aor.Impv			thus	say.3.Sg.Prs		son.Nom.Sg=Det		God.Gen.Sg
γράψον.			Τάδε	λέγει		ὁ υἱὸς		τοῦ θεοῦ

oroy		*ačʻkʻ*		*iwr*	*en*		*ibrew*
Rel.Gen.Sg		eye.Nom.Pl		3.Poss	be.3.Pl.Prs		like
ὁ		ἔχων	τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς	αὐτοῦ			ὡς

z=bocʻ		*hroy,*		...
Obj=flame.Acc.Sg		fire.Gen.Sg.		
φλόγα		πυρός		...

'And write to the Angel, which [is] in the church of Thyatria: Thus speaks the son of God, whose (his) eyes are like a flame of fire...'
(Gk. '...the angel of the church in Thyatira...')

(3.28) Mt. 26:3

yaynžam	*žołovecʿan*	*kʿahanayapetkʿ=n*	*ew*	*dpirkʿ*	...
then	gather.3.Pl.Aor	high=priest.Nom.Pl=Det	and	scribe.Nom.Pl	
Τότε	συνήχθησαν	οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς	καὶ	οἱ γραμματεῖς	...

i	*srah*	*kʿahanayapeti=n*	*orowm*	*anown*
in	hall.Acc.Sg	high-priest.Gen.Sg=Det	Rel.Dat.Sg	name.Nom.Sg
εἰς	τὴν αὐλὴν	τοῦ ἀρχιερέως	τοῦ	λεγομένου

ēr	*Kayiapʿa.*
be.3.Sg.Pst	Kaiaphas
	Καϊάφα

'Then the high priests and scribes ... gathered in the hall of the high priest whose name was Kaiaphas.'

(3.29) Jn. 5:29

...	*ew*	*ekescʿen*	*artakʿs*	*orocʿ*	*z=baris*
	and	come.3.Pl.Aor.Subj	outside	Rel.Gen.Pl	Obj=good.Acc.Pl
...	καὶ	ἐκπορεύσονται		οἱ	τὰ ἀγαθὰ

gorceal	*icʿē*	*i*	*yarowtʿiwn*	*kenacʿ,*
do.Perf.Ptcp	be.3.Sg.Aor.Subj	in	resurrection.Acc.Sg	life.Gen.Pl
ποιήσαντες		εἰς	ἀνάστασιν	ζωῆς

ew orocʿ	*z=čʿar*	*arareal*	*icʿē*	*i*
and Rel.Gen.Pl	Obj=bad.Acc.Sg	make.Perf.Ptcp	be.3.Sg.Aor.Subj	in
οἱ δὲ	τὰ φαῦλα	πράξαντες		εἰς

yarowtʿiwn	*datastanacʿ.*
resurrection.Acc.Sg	judgement.Gen.Pl
ἀνάστασιν	κρίσεως

'... and they will come forth: those who did good, in the resurrection of life, and those who did evil, in the resurrection of judgement.'

The first RC in passage (3.27) demonstrates that the rendition of adverbial or prepositional phrases as RCs is not restricted to those occurring in a nominalising environment, but also in contexts in which such a phrase is used attributively. Further, the example shows that a change in case is easily accommodated by the transposition mechanism, if the semantics necessitate it; given that Armenian prefers to construct possessive constructions not with a full verb like ἔχω, but with a genitive and copula,

the change is not surprising here. This construction will be of further interest below, where it occurs in yet a different context.

A similar reason underlies the change in case in passage (3.28). The participle λεγομένου could only sensibly be rendered by a paraphrase in Armenian, since the latter does not distinguish passive and active in participles along morphological lines (WEITENBERG 1986).[27] The choice of the dative as the case of the possessor has been mentioned above, p. 42, as has the issue of unusual agency patterns.[28]

The examples given above demonstrate that the rendition of Greek nominalised and attributively used DPs in Armenian is less straightforward than that of Greek RCs. The fact that the translators chose to render participial DPs as free RCs, which can be analysed as DPs with an embedded CP, shows both their understanding of grammar as well as their intention of strict textual adherence. Yet, the various ways in which such phrases are used necessitates an equally variable translation technique, so for example with correlatives as in (3.25) above. Those instances, in which alterations in the meaning of the original occur, are difficult to judge; they may be the result of different readings or of reinterpretations. The picture is further complicated by the occurrence of attraction in free RCs corresponding to Greek DPs.

This parallelism allows for three explanations. On the one hand, attraction of free RCs may be assumed to be a native feature of Armenian syntax, wherefore its occurrence in the RCs rendering Greek DPs is of no further note. On the other hand, the feature may be the result of, and initially restricted to, translations from the Greek DPs, the case of which was taken over in Armenian, and was later interpreted as

---

[27]In other instances, e.g. Eph. 2:11, the participle *kočʻecʻeal* is used to render the same Greek word; yet, it still occurs in a RC. The mapping of 'naming' phrases (revolving around ὄνομα, λεγόμενος, καλούμενος, etc.) does not yield any particular pattern; the Armenian version shows a similar variety of naming words, e.g. *anown, kočʻ(ecʻ)eal, kočʻi*, which all occur in RCs but seem to be applied not on a mechanistic basis, but on a semantic one.

[28]Here, the agent of an impersonal construction with the perfect participle is expressed by the genitive of the RPro.

m-case, thence spreading to other relative clauses in the New Testament. Thirdly, the developments could have occurred independently in the various categories. In the following, instances of attraction in free RCs translating Greek DPs will be considered for their contribution to the above question. It remains doubtful, however, whether a definitive answer can be extracted. The following passages demonstrate the different contexts in which this kind of attraction occurs.

(3.30) Mt. 5:42

orowm	*xndrē*	*i*	*kēn,*	*towr,*	*ew*
Rel.Dat.Sg	ask.3.Sg.Prs	from	2.Pers.Abl.Sg	give.2.Sg.Aor.Impv	and
Τῷ	αἰτοῦντί		σε	δόϲ	καὶ

or	*kami*	*pʿox aṙnowl i kēn,*	*mi*
Rel.Nom.Sg	want.3.Sg.Prs	loan take.Prs.Inf from 2.Pers.Abl.Sg	Neg
τὸν	θέλοντα	ἀπὸ ϲοῦ δανείϲαϲθαι	μὴ

darjowcʿaner	*z=eres=s.*
turn.2.Sg.Prs.Impv	Obj=face.Acc.Sg=Det
ἀποϲτραφῇϲ	

'Give to him who asks you, and don't turn your face from him who wants to take a loan from you.'

(3.31) Rom. 1:7

amenecʿown	*orocʿ*	*ēkʿ*	*i*	*Hṙovm*	*sireleacʿ*	*a(stowco)y,*
all.Dat.Pl	Rel.Dat.Pl	be.2.Pl.Prs	in	Rome	beloved.Gen.Pl	God.Gen.Sg
πᾶϲιν	τοῖϲ	οὖϲιν	ἐν	Ῥώμῃ	ἀγαπητοῖϲ	θεοῦ,

kočʿecʿelocʿ	*srbocʿ*	*...*
call.Perf.Ptcp.Dat.Pl	holy.Gen.Pl	
κλητοῖϲ	ἁγίοιϲ	

'To you all who are in Rome, beloved by God, called [to be] Saints...'

(3.32) Act. 20:34

dowkʿ	*inkʿnin*	*gitēkʿ,*	*zi*	*z=pēts=n*
2.Pers.Nom.Pl	Int	know.2.Pl.Prs	Comp	Obj=necessity.Acc.Pl=Det
αὐτοὶ δὲ		γινώϲκετε	ὅτι	ταῖϲ χρείαιϲ

im,	*ew*	*orocʿ*	*ənd is=n ēin,*
1.Poss	and	Rel.Gen./Dat.Pl	with 1.Pers.Acc.Sg=Det be.3.Pl.Pst
μου	καὶ	τοῖϲ	οὖϲιν μετ' ἐμοῦ

paštecʿin	*jeṙkʿ=n*	*ays.*
serve.3.Pl.Aor	hand.Nom.Pl	Dem
ὑπηρέτηϲαν	αἱ χεῖρεϲ	αὗται

'You yourselves know that these (my) hands have served my needs and (and the needs?) of those who were with me.'

The pattern occurring in passage (3.30) is quite common: the attracted pronoun stands in clause-initial position, taking the dative as the case of the indirect object assigned by a verb in the main clause, *towr* 'give!'. The second clause, too, reflects the morphological structure of the Greek in rendering τὸν θέλοντα as *or kami* 'who wants'; the rendition of μὴ ἀποϲτραφῇϲ as *mi darjowcʻaner z=eres=s* 'don't turn your face', however, requires a different syntax in that it cannot take an accusative. The accessibility hierarchy mentioned above does not seem to apply to this free RC for one simple reason: the Armenian renderings are not subject to attraction, but only reflections of the Greek.

The same conclusion must be drawn from (3.31). While attraction proper does not always seem to be adopted in the Armenian New Testament, this instance of a (light-)headed RC once more demonstrates the close affinity of the Greek and Armenian texts, and is a good example of the Hellenising quality of the New Testament translation, in which the original wording has primacy as long as comprehensibility is not diminished.[29]

A more problematic situation presents itself in passage (3.32). The subject of the CP governed by *gitēkʻ* 'you know' is found in *jeřkʻ=n ays* 'these hands'; this in itself is unusual, since adjectives and pronouns following their heads usually agree with them in case and number, only the former of which applies in this instance. The dependent verb, *paštecʻin* 'they served', governs the direct object *z=pets=n im* 'my needs'; the adherence to the Greek is somewhat less strict here in not rendering ταῖϲ χρείαιϲ as a dative in Armenian, too. It is not unusual that the Greek and Armenian version have verbs with different valencies. In contradistinction, it is highly unusual that such valency should change within one sentence; this, however, appears to occur for *paštem*, since *orocʻ*, which going by its meaning is a second object of *paštecʻin*,

---

[29]Jensen (1959:210) cites a similar passage, Mk. 4:24.

occurs in the dative like its Greek model. The argument could plausibly be advanced that verbs such as *paštem* expressing aid and service concepts frequently govern the case which usually expresses the beneficiary,[30] and that the verb here displays an animacy-pivot, according to which abstracts occur in the accusative, animates in the dative. Yet, as the entry in NBHL (II.497) demonstrates, this is not known to occur; forms of *paštem* frequently take e.g. *z=na* 'him' as their direct object. Alternatively, an analysis of *oroc'* as genitive is possible, whereby *paštem* would only have one direct object, viz. *z=pets=n*, which is qualified first by *im* 'mine', then by the free RC introduced by *oroc'*.

Judging from the data, esp. the frequent occurrence of relative attraction in this type of Armenian relative clauses, it seems plausible to assume that they form the basis of this phenomenon in the New Testament; whether its occurrence in the other types of clauses is a direct result of this type, or whether it arose independently, remains unclear. Contrarily, it is evident that the direct correspondence of the Armenian RPro and the Greek determiner must be the origin of relative attraction in Armenian; this feature closely relates the New Testament translation with the *modus operandi* of the (pre-)Hellenising School.

3.2.2.5   Armenian Relative Clause ≈ Greek Participle

In addition to DPs, in which Greek article and participle collocations are translated into Armenian RCs, there are a number of instances in which attributive and predicative participles are rendered as RCs, as well;[31] this is particularly prevalent in forms of ἔχω. Even finite forms of this verb are frequently rendered as impersonal RCs ('to whom there is' rather than 'he has').

---

[30]Cp. Pinkster (2011:126-7) on Latin, and consider e.g. NHG 'jemandem helfen', Span. 'ayudar a alguno', Gk. ὠφελεῖν / βοηθεῖν τινι'.

[31]Jinbachian (1998:171) notes this behaviour in the translation of Genesis, too, but does not provide any information concerning other provenances of RCs in this text.

(3.33) Mt. 9:36

ew teseal	*z=žołovowrds=n*	*gt'ac'aw*	*i*
and see.Perf.Ptcp	Obj=multitude.Acc.Pl=Det	pity.3.Sg.Aor	on
Ἰδὼν δὲ	τοὺς ὄχλους	ἐcπλαγχνίcθη	περὶ

nosa.	*zi*	*ēin*	*ašxatealk'*	*ew*
Dem.Acc.Pl	because	be.3.pl.Pst	fatigue.Perf.Ptcp.Nom.Pl	and
αὐτῶν	ὅτι	ἦcαν	ἐκλελυμένοι	καὶ

c'rowealk'	*ibrew*	*z=oč'xars,*	*oroc'*	*oč'*
scatter.Perf.Ptcp.Nom.Pl	like	Obj=sheep.Acc.Pl	Rel.Dat.Pl	Neg
ἐρριμμένοι	ὡcεὶ	πρόβατα	μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα	

ic'ē	*hoviw*
be.3.Sg.Aor.Subj	shepherd.Nom.Sg

'And when he saw the multitudes, he took pity on them, for they were fatigued and scattered like sheep, who did not have a shepherd.'

(3.34) Lk. 13:11

ew	*aha*	*kin*	*mi*	*z=or*	*ownēr*
and	behold	woman.Nom.Sg	Indef.Nom.Sg	Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg	seize.3.Sg.Pst

ays	*hiwandowt'ean...*
demon	infirmity.Gen.Sg

καὶ ἰδού, γυνὴ ἦν πνεῦμα ἔχουcα ἀcθενείαc... 'And behold, a woman whom a evil demon possessed...'
(Gk. 'And behold, a woman whom, having an evil spirit...')

In passage (3.33), the participle ἔχοντα agrees with πρόβατα 'sheep', taking ποιμένα 'shepherd' as its direct object; as above, the question why the participle was not translated as such arises. As far as ἔχω is concerned, the answer may lie in a differentiation of meaning - in those 18 instances, where the participle *kaleal* does occur in the New Testament, it conveys a meaning 'seize', rather than 'possess, own'. A clear-cut differentiation of the nuances expressed in *ownim* 'I have' and *inj ē* 'there is to me', however, is not readily found; the former, it seems, more frequently refers to abstract concepts and often takes a verbal complement (e.g. Jn. 19:10 *išxanowt'iwn ownim hanel z=k'ez i xač'* – 'I have the power to hang you on the cross'), whereas the latter often refers to direct possessions, both alienable and inalienable, such as eyes and sheep.

In this respect, example (3.34) is of further interest, since it demonstrates that the adherence to the Greek model is at times broken for reasons that, it must be presumed, are of a cultural origin; for where the Greek original expresses that the woman in question had an 'unclean spirit [inside her]', the Armenian inverts the activity as explained above.

While ἔχω in attributive or predicative position regularly triggers the use of RCs in Armenian, a number of RCs does not fall under any of the categories discussed above; frequently, this is the result of a different reading of the passage, in others presumably an attempt at clarification.

(3.35) Mt. 1:16

Yakovb	*cnaw*	*z=Jovsēpʿ*	*z=ayr=n*		
Jacob	beget.3.Sg.Aor	Obj=Joseph.Acc.Sg	Obj=man.Acc.Sg=Det		
Ἰακὼβ δὲ	ἐγέννηϲεν	τὸν Ἰωϲὴφ	τὸν ἄνδρα		
Maremay	*orowm*	*xōsecʿeal*	*z=Mariam*	*koys*	
Mary.Gen.Sg	Rel.Dat.Sg	speak.Perf.Ptcp	Obj=Mary	virgin.Nom.Sg	
Μαρίαϲ					

'Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, who is called Mary the Virgin.'

It must be presumed that instances such as (3.34) are either glosses serving to clarify a particular passage, or are the result of different manuscript readings. These irregular occurrences constitute ca. 7.6% of all surveyed occurrences, and are thus relatively speaking common.[32]

---

[32]Bănăţeanu (1937) gives an overview of the Armenian translations of Greek participial phrases; he seems to concern himself mainly, if not exclusively, with the occurrences in the nominative, and does not distinguish categories, which ought to be studied individually, e.g., nominalised and attributive participles (1937:79-81). Some insights, however, are potentially more relevant, so the fact that the Armenian possessive constructions described above may have a Syriac origin (1937:96).

3.3 Statistical Considerations

Table (3.3) represents the present dataset: the occurrences of each morphological form surveyed are grouped according to their presumed Greek origin as either arising from RCs, DPs with a participial phrase as complement (DP-Ptcp), DPs with an adverbial complement (DP-Adv), other attributively or predicatively used participles (Ptcp), or others.

	RC	DP-Ptcp	Ptcp	DP-Adv	Other	Sum	Attr.	=Case	WC
z=or	136	6	4	1	7	154	0	126	22
y=or	33	0	0	0	2	35	0	23	9
oroy	121	8	9	0	11	149	0	43	16
z=oroy	7	0	0	0	0	7	0	5	0
y=oroy	6	1	0	0	0	7	0	0	1
orowm	55	11	2	0	18	86	1	33	12
y=orowm	47	2	1	0	8	58	0	0	3
y=ormē	17	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	0
z=ormē	13	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	5
orov	62	1	0	0	3	66	0	0	8
ork'	72	64	10	9	12	167	0	129	22
ors	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0
y=ors	18	0	0	0	2	20	0	3	0
z=ors	33	1	0	1	0	35	3	30	6
oroc'	57	23	4	4	5	93	20	60	13
y=oroc'	11	1	0	0	0	12	3	0	2
z=oroc'	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	4
orovk'	13	0	0	0	3	16	0	0	3
Total	711	119	30	15	72	947	27	453	126
%	75.1	12.5	3.2	1.6	7.6	100	2.9	47.8	13.3

Table 3.3 – Statistical Distribution of the Armenian Relative Pronoun

While the survey of this dataset yields a considerable amount of binary data as far as features like attraction, occurrence of Wackernagel clitic or case retention are concerned, it presents a challenge to statistical analysis.

Fisher's Exact Test appears to be the most helpful statistical tool for this dataset.[33] It gives the exact likelihood of the obtaining of the Null-Hypothesis even for smaller datasets and does not assume any particular distribution; instead, it evaluates the independence of two or more observations in the same categories for their potential independence from each other based on the theory of hypergeometric distribution. The test will thus yield a p-value indicating the probability that Armenian attraction phenomena are dependent on the Greek construction they render.

Table (3.4) shows the distribution of the feature 'attraction' among the five different syntactic structures which regularly yield Armenian RCs. The table, as presented, allows for the calculation of the probability in form of a p-value by means of Fisher's exact test, and yields p≈2.72×10^{-18}, which lies well below the generally agreed significance level of p=0.05. The likelihood of obtaining such a dataset is, therefore, infinitesimal and the categories surveyed independent from each other in their occurrence. Thence may be tentatively concluded that the, admittedly few, occurrences of this attraction phenomenon are independent from each other, that is to say, its usage in RCs rendering DP-Ptcp is unrelated to that arising from RCs, etc. The translators' decision to 'attract' is therefore likely to have been dependent on the individual case, and was, in all probability, not influenced by the particular construction used in Greek.[34] This does, however, not preclude the above-mentioned possibility that in Armenian itself, the feature may have spread from DP-Ptcps to the other categories, as its prevalence in that particular type may suggest.

---

[33]In recent years, Fisher's Exact Test has generally won favour in the field of corpus linguistics; STEFANOWITSCH AND GRIES (2003), amongst others, make a particularly strong point concerning its value and applicability.

[34]There are, however, two caveats to be kept in mind: firstly, in spite of the convincing statistical data, the test still only yields a probabilistic value; secondly, the expressive strength of this value is diminished by the small sample size.

	DP-Ptcp	RC	DP-Adv	Ptcp	Other	Sum
Attraction	16	5	5	1	0	26
No Attr.	104	706	10	29	72	921
Sum	119	711	15	30	72	947

Table 3.4 – Distribution of Relative Attraction in the Armenian New Testament

Table (3.5) shows the same distribution for the feature 'Wackernagel clitic'.[35] Fisher's Exact Test for this dataset returns a p-value of $p \approx 8.36 \times 10^{-7}$, once more confirming the independent occurrence of the Wackernagel clitic in the surveyed categories, as was to be expected. It should be noted, however, that the distribution of clitic usage is not equal in all categories; particularly in DP-Ptcps, where a clitic occurs in 27% of all instances, this is of interest as a relation to the usage of the Greek article may be sought, once more bringing up the question of specificity or determination as a potential prerequisite for clitic marking.

	DP-Ptcp	RC	DP-Adv	Ptcp	Other	Sum
WC	25	94	1	4	2	126
No WC	94	617	14	26	70	821
Sum	119	711	15	30	72	947

Table 3.5 – Distribution of WCs in the Armenian New Testament

A similar statistical evaluation of the 'same case' feature would be possible as well, but due to the nature of the category seems neither sensible nor necessary; this is largely founded on the fact that the case systems of the two languages match only imperfectly, and that the number given above does not take into account instances, where case function but not morphology match. Further, it seems self-evident that

---

[35]The number of occurrences is based on a cautious approach to the question; only those instances have been counted where there was no independent reason for assuming that a determiner clitic would be appropriate in the context. Therefore, whenever the clitic occurred in Wackernagel position with a direct object marked by *z=*, it was not counted, nor were those instances which may sensibly and by context be derived from the Greek article.

case matching should be a feature independent of original structure rather than internal semantics.

Apart from statistical considerations, two correlations stand out: attraction occurs only into four morphological cases (Dat./Loc.Sg., Acc.Pl. with nota accusativi, Gen./Dat.Pl. and Abl.Pl.); the occurrence of RCs translating Greek D-PPTCPS is particularly prevalent in the Nom.Pl and Gen./Dat.Pl.

The occurrence of attraction in these cases is due to a number of circumstances: other cases frequently occur in prepositional contexts; the contrast between Gen.Sg. and Gen.Pl. may thus lie in the fact that most of the Gen.Sg. occurrences are in the context of *vasn oroy* 'wherefore'. In the Abl.Pl., attraction occurs in order to indicate the partitive function of the original clause; similarly, that is true for the direct-object character of the Acc.Pl. and the indirect-object character of the Dat.Sg./Pl. The need for indicating the function of a phrase paired with the maxim of strictest possible adherence to the Greek original thus seems like a particularly strong conditioning factor for attraction, esp. in the DP-PTCP category where the equation of Greek article and Armenian RPRO seems natural at surface. As appendix A shows, however, relative attraction in Armenian occurs in phrases with nominative r-case, too, namely when rendering Greek nominative DP-PTCPS. This feature, which does not occur in Greek, underlines the rôle of these phrases, and sets the phenomenon apart from its Greek counterpart, in which the nominative is not subject to attraction.

As for DP-PTCPS in said cases, it appears most plausible that they should arise due to the nature of the category: such articular participial phrases are commonly used for the description of groups or individuals, 'those doing x', wherefore a Nom.Pl. is a common case by default. The Gen./Dat.Pl. may be of such prevalence due to either its function as indirect object case, or as possessive/partitive marker. It stands to

reason that the Acc.Pl. should be part of this group, and the lack of evidence thereof is puzzling; a larger dataset may have yielded more evenly distributed information.

3.4   Results I

The majority of the examples above speaks in favour of a syntactic bias of the translators in favour of Greek under the proviso that the sentence remain comprehensible.[36] Most occurrences showed attraction of free RCs in which case matching restrictions do not apply. Whilst in a number of cases the argument could be advanced that the ungrammatical behaviour of RPros need not be motivated by Greek but is the result of an internal development, enough examples have been pointed out in which such an explanation is insufficient in that the motivation of these instances is best explained as directly rendering Greek morphology, and where contradictory syntagmata occur within the same sentence. This is further confirmed by the limited number of morphological cases in which such phenomena occur.

It has further been shown that, whilst infrequent, attraction phenomena occur in circumstances where m-case preservation is of semantic import and serves the purpose of discourse accessibility.

Accordingly, the following mechanisms may be tentatively postulated:

(a) a Greek RC is rendered as a RC in Armenian; case attraction phenomena are not generally retained from Greek, but in Armenian occur independently from the Greek. This category, as expected, constitutes the vast majority of cases (ca. 75%).

---

[36]It is difficult to determine when a sentence becomes incomprehensible to a native speaker if the language in question is no longer spoken. Evidence from modern languages suggests, however, that a single error, e.g., in using an improper case, will not completely obfuscate intelligibility, as studies on Spanish (Guntermann 1978:251-2) and Swedish (Olsson 1972) have shown.

(b) the Armenian translation of a Greek nominalised participle or articular adverbial expression is frequently rendered as a RC; the Armenian pronoun's case is at times determined by the matrix clause; this type is the likely origin of case attraction in the Armenian New Testament.

(c) Armenian RCs further render some, but not all attributive and predicative participles in Greek, as well as from variant readings and as glosses.

Adherence to the Greek original is, however, counterbalanced with concerns for proper native-language semantics; as stated above, the original Greek word order and case are frequently retained, except in those instances where the sentence would be rendered unintelligible. The style and method of the (pre-)Hellenising School is frequently recognizable in the sentences provided as examples, but varies more strongly in its application than it would in the School itself. It is obvious from the examples quoted and the data surveyed that this method of translation is mechanistic within reason, and that comparisons with the School can be made in questions of word order, case retention, and willingness to accept a certain amount of ungrammatical features. Whilst it seems unwarranted to envision both 'schools' of translation in a line of immediate succession or development, a relation is hard to deny.

The following chapter will discuss how the original Armenian language differs from the New Testament as far as RCs are concerned, and will deliver proof that attraction as witnessed in the New Testament is not a grammatical feature of Armenian proper. The chapter will further address the question whether some of the features mentioned are of Armenian origin and have thus developed independently from Greek, or whether they occur due to Greek influence, or not at all.

Chapter 4

Comparison with Original Texts

The hypothesis that the occurrence of attraction in free RCs in Armenian is the result of Greek syntactic influence can only be verified by considering non-translated texts, i.e. those originally composed in Armenian. In order to minimise any diachronic interferences that might adversely influence this data comparison, three distinct texts by three different authors from the same time period have been chosen as comparanda: Eznik Kołbacʿi's *Vasn Astowcoy* ʿConcerning God', alternatively also called *Ełc Ałandocʿ* ʿAgainst the Sects'; Ełišē's *Vasn Vardanay ew Hayocʿ paterazmi* ʿConcerning Vardan and the Armenian War'; and Agatʿangełos' *Patmowtʿiwn Hayocʿ* ʿHistory of the Armenians', all of which are conventionally dated to the 5th century CE.[1] Their combined token incidence amounts to roughly the same as that of the New Testament and thus allows for a statistically meaningful and equilibrated comparison.

This comparative effort focusses on three aspects: attraction phenomena, and whether they occur in these texts; the Wackernagel clitics *=s, =d, =n* and their incidence and distribution; and syntactic and typological arguments in favour of a deriva-

---

[1]The corpus thus covers a variety of genres (historiography, hagiography, philosophical writings) while still representing the same stage of the Armenian language. As so often in Armenian literature, critical editions are rare - only the work of Ełišē is currently available as such (THOMSON 1993). For the controversy concerning the dating of Ełišē, cf. section 2.1 above. His work was chosen for this survey in order to accumulate a magnitude of tokens comparable to that of the New Testament; Koriwn's *Life of Maštocʿ* may be more securely dated, but would not have yielded sufficient material.

tion Arm. *or* < *kʷi-/kʷo-. If the hypothesis proposed above is correct, attraction

phenomena are not to be expected; further, judging from the syntactically divergent

behaviour of the New Testament corpus, differences in the employment of the clitics

may be expected due to the potentially corrupting Greek influence.

4.1 Attraction Phenomena

Table (4.1) lists the occurrences of RCs according to morphological form and text,

and further points out the incidence of passages where attraction phenomena may be

suspected due to an unusual employment of cases.

Form	Gloss	Agatʿangełos Total	?	Eznik Total	?	Ełišē Total	?
z=or	Obj=Nom./Acc.Sg.	111	3	153	0	145	0
y=or	into=Acc.Sg.	7	0	14	2	8	1
oroy	Gen.Sg.	33	0	33	0	31	1
z=oroy	Obj=Gen.Sg.	1	0	4	0	0	0
y=oroy	in(to)/from=Gen. Sg.	4	0	0	0	1	0
orowm	Dat./Loc.Sg.	12	0	23	3	37	0
y=orowm	in=Loc.Sg.	7	0	8	0	10	0
z=ormē	about=Abl.Sg.	1	0	5	0	0	0
y=ormē	from=Abl.Sg.	0	0	12	0	2	0
orov	Instr.Sg.	17	1	31	0	11	0
orkʿ	Nom.Pl.	43	0	26	0	40	0
ors	Acc.Pl.	0	0	1	0	1	0
z=ors	Obj=Acc.Pl.	10	0	11	0	3	0
y=ors	into=Acc.Pl.	0	0	3	0	2	0
orocʿ	Gen./Dat.Pl.	17	0	26	8	19	0
z=orocʿ	about=Abl.Pl	2	0	6	0	1	0
y=orocʿ	from-Abl.Pl.	4	0	6	1	2	0
orovkʿ	Instr.Pl.	1	0	8	0	0	0
TOTAL		270	4	370	14	313	2

Table 4.1 – Distribution of Unusual Case Usage in Armenian Relative Clauses

It should be emphasised that these instances are not necessarily due to case at-

traction phenomena, as will become evident shortly; rather, the usage of the case in

question is usually explicable on semantic or syntactic grounds. Further, the distribution of unusual cases is such that it does not occur in any two authors for the same grammatical case; this, presumably, would not occur if a fully grammatical and originally Armenian case attraction phenomenon were the underlying reason, nor if it were a Greek syntagma grammaticalised in Armenian.

Before discussing these specific instances, however, one representative occurrence ought to demonstrate that the RC syntax commonly found in this corpus differs from that of the New Testament. Passage (4.1) contains a free RC with an expected Nom.Pl. r-case RPRO.

(4.1) Eł. Vardan 131

Ew   yandiman   xōsēr   t'agawor=n, ork'   ēin   i
and   in-front-of   say.3.Sg.Pst   king=Det   Rel.Nom.Pl   be.3.Pl.Pst   in
tan=n   ark'owni, et'ē   ...
house.Loc.Sg=Det   royal   Comp
'And before [those] who were at the royal court, the kind said that ...'

This instance is diametrically opposed to quite a number of those found in the New Testament, where the RPRO of free RCs functioning as a sentential object or other adjunct would reflect this function in expressing m-case; in this instance, a Dat.Pl. *oroc'* would occur in that context. The fact that the RPRO reflects the required r-case speaks in favour of supposing that both corpora do indeed adhere to different syntactic rules as far as RCs are concerned.

Furthermore, the occurrence of purely demonstrative oblique case pivots, which is all but inexistent in the New Testament, is quite regular in this corpus, as passage (4.2) witnesses.

(4.2) Ag. PH 9,13

> *nok'a*   *z=merks*   *zgec'owc'anen,* *ew* *z=aynosik,*
> Dem.Nom.Pl Obj=naked.Acc.Pl dress.3Pl.Prs   and Obj=Dem.Acc.Pl
> *ork'*   *mełōk'=n*   *en*   *merkac'eal*   *əst*
> Rel.Nom.Pl sin.Instr.Pl=Det be.3.Pl.Prs undress.Perf.Ptcp in
> *nmanowt'ean=n*   *Adamay,*   *...*
> likeness.Loc.Sg=Det   Adam.Gen.Sg
> 'They dress the naked, and those who through sins have become naked in the likeness of Adam, ...'

Such instances are reminiscent, but of course not immediately related to, early Greek, where attraction is similarly inapplicable; light-headed or relative-correlative structures and free relatives with r-case morphology occur instead (cp. Chantraine 1953:238-9).

In the following, representative examples of more unusual case employment will be discussed in order to determine whether they are the result of case attraction or other syntactic rules. The texts will be considered individually in order to reflect differences more effectively.

4.1.1 Agat'angełos' *Patmowt'iwn Hayoc'*

Of the four instances of unexpected case usage, in Agat'angełos three occur in the Acc.Sg. with prefixed *nota accusativi* and one in the Instr.Sg. The three occurrences presenting in the accusative are all manifestations of the same set phrase, which is found in the other authors as well; the collocation *z=or ōrinak* 'for example' always occurs without a finite verb, wherefore the case marking as accusative is unusual.

(4.3) Ag. PH 79,6

> *Zi*   *z=or*   *ōrinak*   *i* *jeřn* *kowsi=n*
> Comp Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg example   at hand woman.Gen.Sg=Det
> *ařajnoy*   *Ewayi*   *mah*   *emowt*   *y=ašxarh...*
> first.Gen.Sg Eve.Gen.Sg death enter.3.Sg.Aor into=world.Acc.Sg

'For, as an example, at the hand of Eve, the first woman, death entered the
world...'

In all occurrences of this phrase, it presents in an elliptic form; the verb that has been

suppressed must presumably be transitive, and is likely to express either an act of

thinking or saying, such as *asem* 'I say, call', *karcem* 'I believe, think' or *ownim* 'I

hold, take', which would explain the accusative case and the *nota accusativi*. There

are, however, no examples of a fuller phrase of the form *z=or orinak ownim* 'which I

take as an example', wherefore this explanation must remain speculative.[2]

The passage in which an unusual instrumental occurs is more complex; here, the

polyvalence of the finite verbs involved in the RC is prone to cause a certain amount

of confusion.

(4.4)   Ag. PH 68,6

ew	*or*	*en*	*isk*	*čšmartiw*	*araričʻ,*	*tʻšnamanes,*	*ew*
and	Rel.Nom.Pl	be.3.Pl.Prs	Int	truly	creator	insult.2.Sg.Prs	and

z=mec=n		*Anahit,*	*orov*	*keay*	*ew*
Obj=great.Acc.Sg=Det		Anahit	Rel.Instr.Sg	live.3.Sg.Prs	and

z=kendanowtʻiwn	*krē*	*erkir=s*	*Hayocʻ.*
Obj=fertility.Acc.Sg	bear.3.Sg.Prs	land=Det	Armenian.Gen.Pl

'And those who truly are creators you insult, and the great Anahit, through
who[se help] our Armenian fatherland lives and bears fruit.'

Problems in interpreting the syntax of (4.4) relate to two of its constituents: the RPRO

orov, which may indicate the agent of a passive verb as well as an instrument, and

the Nom.Sg. form *erkir=s* 'our fatherland', which is suffixed by a determiner clitic,

---

[2]Note, however, that in Modern Eastern Armenian, *ōrinak* has become a loose apposition (DUM-
TRAGUT 2009:370); this is a cogent development from its classical predecessor, which is presumably
similarly unbound, since, judging by its meaning, it indicates the sentence as a whole. AČAṘYAN
(1971:IV.618-9) derives *ōrinak* 'example, model' from Pth. *awδēnak* 'manner, way'; it is therefore at
least possible that the Armenian collocation reflects a Middle Iranian *izafe* construction.

and is therefore a homograph of the Acc.Pl. *erkirs* 'the lands'. In the latter interpre-
tation,[3] however, the RC is missing a subject, wherefore *orov* would need to function
as an agent, with the verb *keam* 'to live; to let live', which is morphologically ambiva-
lent as to its diathesis; the same, however, is not true for the second verb, *krem* 'to
bear', which is necessarily active. To avoid a stylistically unwarranted anacoluthon,
the readings suggested must be maintained, contra Thomson's (1976:77) translation:
'...who gives life and fertility to our land', which is too free.

It is clear, therefore, that the usage of the Instr.Sg. RPro is fully grammatical in
this instance, and the text of the *Patmowtʻiwn Hayocʻ* accordingly free from relative
attraction, as was to be expected.

4.1.2   Eznik's *Vasn Astowcoy*

In Eznik, RPros occur in unusual cases in the following morphological categories:
Acc.Sg. with preposition *y=*; Dat./Loc.Sg.; Abl.Pl. with preposition *y=*; Gen./Dat.Pl. In
the first three categories, the case of the RPro is the result of a construction *kamim* 'I
wish, want' + infinitive; the irregular occurrences of the Gen./Dat.Pl. have a different
background.

The verb *kamim* may take as its complement either a direct object or VP with an
infinitive head (NHBL I:1042). In passages (4.5) and (4.6), however, neither of these
complements occur.

(4.5) Ez. VA 130

ayl	*orpēs*	*mardoy*	*čʻ=ē*	*hnar*	*pʻoxel*	*i*
but	as	man.Dat.Sg.	Neg=be.3.Sg.Prs	possible	change.Prs.Inf	into

kerparans	*inčʻ*	*y=or*	*ew*	*kamicʻi,*	*noynpēs*	*očʻ*
form.Acc.Pl	Indef	into=Rel.Acc.Sg	Int	want.3.Sg.Prs.Subj	thus	Neg

---

[3]This has happened in the parsed corpus available from the Leiden Armenian Lexical Textbase
(LALT).

> *višapi=n.*
> dragon.Dat.Sg=Det
> 'But since man cannot change into some form into which he wishes [to change], neither can the dragon.'

(4.6) Ez. VA 242 (= Rom. 9:18)

> *... zi   orowm   kami,   ołormi,   ew orowm*
>   because Rel.Dat.Sg want.3.Sg.Prs forgive.3.Sg.Prs and Rel.Dat.Sg
> *kami,   xstanay.*
> want.3.Sg.Prs chastise.3.Sg.Prs
> '... for he pardons whom he wishes, and chastises whom he wishes.'

In both passages, the RC is partly elliptic in that the expected infinitive does not occur. In (4.5), the infinitive occurs as a regular constituent of the matrix clause; the preposition *i/y=* is used with the pivot and the RPro, and thus presumably renders a repetition of the verb in its infinitival form unnecessary. In (4.6), the finite verbs directly following the RC both govern dative objects (NBHL II:510; I:988), which is reflected in the RPros; their case, however, is determined not by the matrix clause directly, but rather by the implicit infinitive within the RC. Eznik as a disciple of Mesrop Maštocʿ and one of the translators of the bible may be particularly prone to use grecising features in his own compositions, too, as witnessed (4.6), a direct quotation from the New Testament;[4] yet, in light of the semantic restrictedness of this particular instance of 'attraction' to the verb *kamim*, it seems more reasonable to advocate ellipsis as a more straightforward explanation, particularly in combination with the evidence from other languages.[5]

---

[4]This is stated most explicitly in Koriwn's *Varkʿ Maštocʿi* 19.2 (MAHÉ 2005-7:84); further cf. THOMSON (1978:334), ORENGO (1996:11), BLANCHARD AND YOUNG (1998:13-6).

[5]Cp. Gk. ʿἀλλὰ μέντοι καὶ τὸ προειδέναι γε τὸν θεὸν τὸ μέλλον καὶ τὸ προσημαίνειν ᾧ Ø βούλεται, ...ʾ, 'But more than that, in regard to God's foreknowledge of the future and his forewarning thereof to whomsoever he will' (Xenophon *Apology* 13), NE 'He spoke to whom he wanted Ø' or NHG 'Er sprach mit wem er Ø wollte', where a similar ellipsis occurs; note that in neither of these languages, proper attraction or attraction of free RCs are grammatical, e.g. NE 'I kissed *whom/*to whom I spoke', NHG 'I küsste *wen/*mit wem ich sprach'; for a definition of ellipsis in general, cf. LOBECK (1995:20-8). Note that as opposed to co-ordination reduction and gapping (cf. GAETA AND LURAGHI 2001 for details on Greek), which occur in co-ordinated clauses, ellipsis does not require the ellipsed V(P) to occur in the same grammatical form or function as the original; as DALRYMPLE (2005) and KEHLER (2000) show, this type of ellipsis must therefore be semantically rather than syntactically licensed.

A different situation presents itself for some occurrences in the Gen.Pl.; here, it is the occurrence of prepositions such as *ənd* + Gen. 'in exchange for' which is problematic.

(4.7) Ez. VA 49

> *Na ew z=mardoy   yirawi, asemkʿ,   krel*
> also   concerning=man.Abl.Sg justly   say.1.Pl.Prs endure.Prs.Inf
> *patowhas   ənd oroc   gorcicʿe.*
> punishment.Acc.Sg   for   Rel.Gen.Pl work.3.Sg.Prs.Subj
> 'We also say about man that he rightly endures the punishment for (the deeds) which he has done.'

The entry for *gorcem* in NBHL (I:556) lists, among others, a collocation with *ənd*, meaning 'to work for something'. This, however, is unlikely to help the correct grammatical understanding of the passage: firstly, because a translation 'punishment for which he worked' seems rather unfortunate; secondly due to the disagreement of pivot and RPro in number. Supposing that, as in Greek, prepositions need to be followed by a dependent in the case they govern, it would appear that in this instance attraction of a free RC may be the best explanation for the occurrence of this particular case form, as indeed it is for another passage, Ez. VA 51. All other instances of unusual cases may be explained along the same lines as have been outlined above.

In view of Eznik's role as one of the translators of the New Testament, and potentially also due to the topic of the *Vasn Astowcoy* and his long residence in the Greek-speaking world,[6] it may not be surprising that certain elements of biblical language should have found their way into his idiolect. Still, at two occurrences, it seems unlikely that this should have been a regular feature of Armenian syntax.

---

[6]Eznik sets out to argue against a multitude of different understandings of God, in the form of both other religions and Christian 'heresies', esp. the teachings of Marcion of Sinope (Orengo 1996:13-5); the topic is thus in nature relatively close to biblical matters, although styles vary vastly. Given his extended exposure to a foreign language, the influence of L2 proficiency on L1 usage may be of interest; on this, cf. Schmid and Köpke (2007:3-4), Köpke and Schmid (2004:17-8), Pavlenko (2004:50-2).

4.1.3 Ełišē's *Vasn Vardanay ew Hayocʻ paterazmi*

In Ełišē, there are only two instances in which the case of the RPro is of any note. In the first instance, as in those above, ellipsis plays a significant role in that an avoided phrase repetition may be mistaken for an instance of attraction.

(4.8) Eł. Vardan 14

> *... orpēs   ew   tesanemkʻ isk, očʻ   miayn i   čʻapʻawor mardik,*
>   Comp also see.1.Pl.Prs Int Neg only   in   poor   man.Acc.Coll
> *ayl ew   y=or   mec=n   ē   kʻan z=amenayn*
> but also in=Rel.Nom.Sg great=Det be.3.Sg.Prs than Obj=all.Acc.Sg
> '... as we see not only in the moderate men, but even in (men), who are greater than all.'

In (4.8), the preposition *i/y=* 'in, into' is used with the RPro, the latter of which is morphologically ambivalent and represents both Nom.Sg. and Acc.Sg. An accusative reading would, however, necessitate that attraction of free RCs were applied since the RPro needs to fulfil the subject function in the subordinate clause. In this instance, however, the preceding accusative NP *čʻapʻawor mardik* 'moderate men', which is dependent on the same preposition *i*, suggests that instead of attraction, the form of the RPro is due, once again, to ellipsis. The clause would then read:

(4.9) Eł. Vardan 14*

> *†... i   čʻapʻawor mardik,   ew   ayl i   Ø   or   mec=n*
>   in moderate man.Acc.Coll$_i$ but also in [e]$_i$ Rel.Nom.Sg great=Det
> *ē   kʻan z=amenayn*
> be.3.Sg.Prs than Obj=all.Acc.Sg

This is a common phenomenon in a number of languages,[7] and allows for phrases, or parts thereof, to be omitted if they are also a constituent of a preceding or following

---

[7]Taking ellipsis as a covering term, there are a great variety of such reduction phenomena, all of which have more specific definitions. For an example of VP ellipsis, also called gapping, cp. e.g. Lat. 'Gallos ab Aquitanis Garunna flumen Ø, a Belgis Matrona et Sequana dividit' (Caesar *De Bello Gallico* 1.1.2); also cf. PANHUIS (1980).

clause. In this instance, both co-ordinated clauses contain a PREPP with a head *i*, whose complement is an NP *č'ap'awor mardik* in the first clause. In the second clause, this NP is partly ellipsed; consisting of head N and a modifier ADJP, it is only the head *mardik* that is reflected by the gap, whereas the RC takes the function of the modifier.[8] Therefore, (4.8) is best explained along these lines and not as relative attraction.

The second unusual passage in Ełišē documents a particular sort of RC, which is not uncommon in Armenian, and largely absent from the New Testament variation, but occurs widely in other Indo-European languages such as Vedic and Latin.

(4.10) Eł. Vardan 33

> *Ew   oroy   astowcoy   ararack'=n   apakanelik'*
> and Rel.Gen.Sg God.Gen.Sg creature.Nom.Pl=Det corruptible.Nom.Pl
> *en   ew   ełcanelik',   nma   anełc*
> be.3.Pl.Prs and destructible.Nom.Pl Dem.Dat.Sg indestructible
> *Astowac   č'=mart'i   asel*
> God.Nom.Sg Neg=be-possible.3.Sg.Prs say.Prs.Inf
> 'The creatures of which god are corruptible and destructible, him one cannot call an indestructible god.'

Passage (4.10) contains a relative-correlative clause; the preposed RC, introduced by the expected r-case RPRO *orov*, is 'picked up' by the correlative pronoun *nma* in the matrix clause. Instead of a pivot proper, the RC is contains a pseudo-pivot, viz. *Astowcoy* 'of god', which agrees in case and number with the RPRO.[9] Since the RPRO shows r-case, this is not an instance of relative attraction; instead, RPRO and pseudo-pivot are part of the same constituent phrase. Equally, it is not necessary or helpful to speak of *attractio inversa*,[10] since, on the one hand, *Astowcoy* is the expected morphological

---

[8]This is a common mechanism, so found also in Modern Armenian, cp. DUM-TRAGUT (2009:421-3) as well as in e.g. NHG 'Peter kaufte das blaue Buch_i, und Karl das Ø_i, welches ihm gefiel'.

[9]cp. e.g. Lat. 'Quibus diebus Cumae liberatae sunt obsidione, isdem diebus … Tib. Sempronius … prospere pugnat.' (Livius *Ab urbe condita* 23.37,10); for a formal account, which sensibly rejects the descriptive analysis as apposition or adjunct, cf. BIANCHI (2000:54-8).

[10]cf. section 2.3 and JENSEN (1959:210).

form for both the dative, as required by the matrix clause, and the genitive in agreement with the RPRO; on the other hand, because *attractio inversa* usually requires the 'attracted' pivot of the RC to precede.[11]

4.1.4 Results II

As has been shown in the above discussion, out of a total of 20 instances of RPROs exhibiting unexpected cases, only two instances were found to be the result of attraction of free RCs. Both occurrences pertain to the writing of a single author, who was one of the translators of the New Testament, and are dependent on prepositions in the matrix clause. Alternatively, it is possible that the regular appearance of free RCs with r-case morphology, as demonstrated by (4.1) above, is overruled by the requirement of prepositions to govern the 'right' case.[12] Due to the restricted occurrence of this phenomenon to one author, and its comparatively small incidence in a corpus of RCs of roughly the same magnitude as that of the New Testament, no further argument in favour of either explanation can be advanced at this time. For the same reasons, however, it is plausible to deduce that attraction phenomena are not an inherited feature of Armenian syntax. As suggested in section 3.4 above, they are likely to have arisen in the process of the translation of the New Testament. Whether attraction first occurred in the rendering of Greek DPs into Armenian still cannot be determined, since the New Testament corpus cannot be chronologically stratified.

The implications of this disparity between New Testament and original Armenian are diverse. Primarily, it is now evident that the influence of Greek syntax on early,

---

[11]cp. e.g. Lat. 'Mulier quae se suamque aetatem spernit, speculo ei usus est', lit. 'A woman, who is dissatisfied with her age, to her a mirror is a necessity', where the head mulier takes r-case, although the m-case, here indicated by the resumptive pronoun *ei*, differs.

[12]This would, however, require that in this instance Armenian adhere to the discourse accessibility hierarchy proposed above, whereas in general, without the involvement of prepositions, it does not; this seems incongruous.

'Classical' Armenian was both greater than historically presumed, but at the same time restricted to translation contexts. Further, it adds substance to the challenges of the assumption that the Hellenising School arose only in the late 5th or early 6th century CE (cf. section 2.1 above); while it would be overstating the matter to call the Armenian New Testament a product of this School, it may well be seen part of the greater continuum. Accordingly, the data agrees with Cowe (1994-5:129) in calling into doubt the general practice of using the New Testament as a basic corpus in Armenian historical linguistics.

4.2   Wackernagel Clitics

The conditioning factors of the determiner clitics *=s, =d, =n* remain unclear.[13] This section will present three statistical observations that relate to its occurrence; whilst these will provide further insight into the reasons for which clitics appear in the New Testament, they cannot further specify conditioning environments or make far-reaching claims about clitics in original Armenian texts.

   Firstly, their occurrence in both corpora will be compared on a statistical basis, showing that the different frequencies of the clitics are likely to be more than coincidental, but rather, in a manner of speaking, a further result of the Greek influence on the New Testament translation. Secondly, a brief overview of the different phrases to which they attach will be given.

   Table (4.2) outlines the total number of RCs contained within the respective texts, and the incidence of clitics within that total. Taking the three original texts as an indication of the standard, a mean value of $\bar{x} \approx 10.18\%$ may be calculated, with the

---

[13]For a brief discussion of this, cf. section 3.2.1 above and Vaux (1994-5); the latter's plausible argument for the existence of a topicalisation phrase to which the clitic attaches may provide sensible restrictions, but still does not explain all occurrences, as will be pointed out below, and does not account for the great number of monophrasal clauses, in which topicalisation seems an inappropriate category.

help of which may further be gained the standard deviation s´ ≈ 0.75 and the absolute average deviation D ≈ 0.80.

	Total RCs		WC occurrence		Percentage	
New Testament	947		126		13.31%	
Agatʿangełos	270		31		11.48%	
Eznik	370	Σ=953	35	Σ=97	9.46%	x̄≈10.18%
Ełišē	313		31		9.90%	

Table 4.2 – Distribution of WCs in the Armenian Original Corpus

Whilst the dataset is extremely small, it is still of note that all three of the original texts lie within a dispersion range of less than 1.5s´ or 1.5D, whereas the corpus of the New Testament deviates far more significantly. There is no simple explanation for this discrepancy, but two factors ought to be taken into account: firstly, the statistical impact of those RCs deriving from Greek DPs, in which the incidence of clitics is higher yet (19.40%); secondly, the occurrence of erroneous clitics, which occur in non-second position and are not found in the non-translated corpus. Yet, even considering only those RCs reflecting Greek RCs, the incidence still lies at >13% and thus still outside the dispersion range, and will only be reduced negligibly by further discounting occurrences such as (4.11).

(4.11) 2Pt. 1:1

Šmawon	*Petros*	*caṙay*		*ew*	*aṙakʿeal*	*y(isow)si*
Simon	Peter	servant.Nom.Sg	and	send.Perf.Ptcp	Jesus.Gen.Sg
Cυμεὼν	Πέτρος	δοῦλος		καὶ	ἀπόστολος	Ἰηςοῦ

kʿ(risto)si,	*orocʿ*	*hangitapatiw*	*mez*
Christ.Gen.Sg	Rel.Dat.Pl	equally-honored	1.Pers.Dat.Pl
Χριστοῦ	τοῖς	ἰςότιμον	ἡμῖν

hasēkʿ=d	*hawatocʿ*	*y=ardarowtʿi(wn)*	...
arrive.2.Pl.Aor=Det	faith.Gen.Pl	in=righteousness.Acc.Sg	
λαχοῦcιν	πίcτιν	ἐν δικαιοcύνῃ	

'Simon Peter, servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, [writes] to [you] who, equal to us in honour, have arrived in the righteousness of faith ...'

Passage (4.11), in addition to showing yet another example of attraction of free RCs caused by Greek DPs, demonstrates the type of anomaly described above, wherein the clitic does not attach to the first phrase or its head, as described by e.g. Vaux (1994-5:25), but instead attaches to the finite verb.

There are two distinct analyses of this usage: on the one hand, it is not implausible to assume that, since the clitic in the great majority of instances attaches to the verb, the translator should have chosen to adhere to this general tendency here, as well; under these circumstances, the preceding *hangitapatiw mez* may have been analysed as an adverbial adjunct, and thus counted as part of the VP (cp. DE LAMBERTERIE 1997:317). Given the context of imitating Greek, however, there is a different approach that is worth considering. The clitic may be used to reflect the agreement structure between the Greek article τοῖc and the head of the NP it determines, λαχοῦcιν. The Armenian version may thus have attempted to parallel this notion by introducing the clitic at this late position.[14]

Since occurrences such as (4.11) are comparatively rare and do not amount to more than a handful, their influence on the above statistic is, if not negligible, at least not significant enough so as to adjust the incidence of clitics in the New Testament to within range of the non-translation mean. Whether this higher frequency within the biblical corpus is of any significance remains hard to judge, since the evidence presented so far is statistically too weak. For this reason, the occurrence of the clitic has further been analysed along two further categories: clause complexity[15] and type of clitic-bearing constituent. These datasets are presented in tables (4.3) and (4.4); further cf. appendices B and C.

---

[14]Note further that MERCIER (1978-9:71) finds the determiner to be generally more frequent in the works of the School; a Greek influence seems likely.

[15]For the present purpose, complexity is taken to indicate the number of constituents within a RC, relative pronoun discounted; thus, a clause with complexity '1' contains but a VP (or rarely NP), whilst at '2', the clause may consist of VP and subject or direct object NP, etc. Intensifiers and adverbs have been discounted.

	NT	Orig.	Ag.	Ez.	Eł.
1	67 (53.2%)	36 (37.1%)	9 (29.0%)	14 (40.0%)	13 (41.9%)
2	48 (38.1%)	41 (42.3%)	14 (45.2%)	15 (42.9%)	12 (38.7%)
3	10 (7.9%)	17 (17.5%)	6 (19.4%)	5 (14.3%)	6 (19.4%)
>3	1 (0.8%)	3 (3.1%)	2 (6.4%)	1 (2.9%)	0

Table 4.3 – Complexity of Relative Clauses with WCs in Both Corpora

The complexity table (4.3) compares the absolute and relative frequency of clauses with different numbers of constituents; as is evident from the data, the corpus of original texts presents with frequencies of comparable magnitude for clauses containing one or two constituents, with a slight favour towards those containing two. This stands in distinct contrast to the New Testament, where monophrasal clauses predominate by a large margin.

In all New Testament clauses containing only a single phrase, this is a VP. The prevalence of VPs as bearers of the clitic is similarly clear from the data in table (4.4), in which the New Testament distribution, leaning strongly in favour of VPs (68.2%, as compared to 14.3% subject NPs), is at variance with the data of the original corpus, where the distribution is more balanced (43.3% VPs vs 30.9% subject NPs).

	NT	Orig.	Ag.	Ez.	Eł.
VP (infl.)	73 (57.9%)	33 (34.0%)	10 (32.3%)	12 (34.3%)	11 (35.5%)
VP (Ptcp)	13 (10.3%)	9 (9.3%)	3 (9.7%)	2 (5.7%)	4 (12.9%)
Subject NP	18 (14.3%)	30 (30.9%)	9 (29.0%)	13 (37.1%)	8 (25.8%)
PrepP	3 (2.4%)	7 (7.2%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (8.6%)	3 (9.7%)
Neg	5 (4.0%)	5 (5.2%)	3 (9.7%)	2 (5.7%)	0
DO/App	8 (6.3%)	8 (8.2%)	4 (12.9%)	0	4 (12.9%)
Other	6 (4.8%)	5 (5.2%)	1 (3.2%)	3 (8.6%)	1 (3.2%)

Table 4.4 – Distribution of Constituent Phrases to which the WC Attaches

Given these pieces of information, viz. that in the Armenian New Testament by
a considerable margin Wackernagel clitics are more frequent, occur more often in
monophrasal clauses, and further dominate in VPs, it is not unreasonable to assume
that these factors are related. Passage (4.12) will serve as an example of such brief
expressions.

(4.12) Lk. 6:46

> *Zi?   koč'ēk'   z=is   tēr   tēr,   ew   z=or*
> Why call.2.Pl.Prs Obj=1.Pers.Acc.Sg Lord Lord and Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg
> *asem=n   oč' aṙnēk'.*
> say.1.Sg.Prs=Det Neg do.2.Pl.Prs
> Τί δέ με καλεῖτε Κύριε Κύριε καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω
> 'Why do you call upon me "Lord, Lord", but do not do what I say?'

Since little is known as yet concerning the true conditioning environment of the cli-
tics, any attempt at establishing a causal relationship between these elements is by
nature speculative. Yet, the most plausible approach sees hypercorrect usage of *=s,
=d, =n* in the New Testament as a potential cause of the above statistics, wherein the
translators, aware of the common usage of the clitics in short, monophrasal clauses,
overused them for the sake of idiomaticity, or to resemble the Greek article. At the
same time, however, the nature of the New Testament corpus as a translation ought to
be remembered, in so far as, e.g., the dominance of such short clauses may be a result
of Greek style rather than Armenian syntax, particularly in light of the differences in
frequency also shown within the original corpus.

The above arguments are all based on statistical evidence, and are therefore limited
by the small sample size; in light of the paucity of evidence concerning the clitics,
their nature and usage, however, the above attempt at rationalisation provides new
data and insights, if no definite solution to the question.[16]

---

[16]Such solution can only be arrived at through a very comprehensive syntactic and possibly seman-

4.3 Syntactical Arguments for Arm. *or* <
PIE *kʷi-/kʷo-

As has been mentioned above, section 3.1.2, opinions concerning the etymological provenance of the Armenian RPro are divided; most recently, Kölligan (2006) has brought forward a number of plausible phonological and syntactic arguments in favour of Meillet's (1936:89-90) analysis of the relative as derived from the PIE stem *kʷi-/kʷo-;[17] Kölligan's work, however, focuses on the interrogative pronoun *o(v)*, and only mentions RCs in passing (2006:118).

The following discussion aims to supplement his syntactical argument in showing that Armenian exhibits features frequently associated with other languages featuring *kʷi-/kʷo- stem RPros. Amongst these may be counted the placement of RCs before the matrix clause and the occurrence of correlative pronouns; pseudo-pivot RCs; and occurrences of resumptive pronouns. This section does not aim, however, to compare the two corpora in terms of prevalent syntactic function,[18] wherefore a statistical analysis of the material will be foregone. The latter would only be relevant for the etymological questions, if Armenian had been attested closer to the earliest attestation of comparable languages, e.g., Vedic or Latin.

No definite answer to the question concerning the original difference between PIE *yo- and *kʷi-/kʷo- based RPros has been provided yet, but attempts at explanations abound.[19] In spite of this lack of definitness, a number of features more commonly

---

tic analysis of all RCs in a large corpus of non-translated Armenian literature; even then, however, an answer cannot be guaranteed, since the occurrence of these clitics may not be fully regular.

[17]Although called into question by Martirosyan (2010:523), Olsen (1999:806) gives other examples where PIE *#kʷo- > Arm. *o-*: Arm. *oɫn* 'spine, backbone' < PIE *kʷolso, cp. Lat. *collus, collum*, Goth. *hals*; the ordinal suffix Arm. *-ord* < PIE *kʷr̥t (where *-r̥- > -or-), cp. Skt. *-kr̥t*. Martirosyan (2010:530) prefers Arm. *oɫn* < PIE *ol-ēn- 'elbow', cp. Gr. ὠλένη, Lat. *ulna*; the semantics of this choice, if not implausible, seem less convincing than Olsen's connection; no mention of the ordinal suffix is made by Martirosyan, but cf. Kölligan (2006:111) for a summary of caveats.

[18]It has been shown above that the New Testament corpus largely adheres to Greek syntax, for which reason a comparison seems pointless.

[19]The two relative pronouns are often analysed as deriving from anaphoric and interrogative pro-

pertaining to one group than the other have been identified; amongst these, as evidenced by early Latin and Old Hittite, is the tendency of languages with *kʷi-/kʷo-stem pronouns to have RCs preceding the main clause containing the pivot (Sturtevant 1930:143; Hahn 1964:120-1). Passages (4.13) and (4.14) exemplify this usage.

(4.13) Apology of Hattušiliš III, iv 68

[an]nallan	*kuit*	*ēšta*	*apāt=ši*	*parā*
earlier.Nom	Rel.Nom	be.3.Sg.Pst	Dem.Acc=3.Sg.Dat	onward

piḫḫun
give.1.Sg.Past
'What was earlier, that I handed over to her.'

(4.14) Cato *De Agricultura* 1.4

qui		*in*	*his*	*agris*	*praedia*	*vendiderint,*
Rel.Nom.Pl.Masc		in	Dem.Abl.Pl	field.Abl.Pl	farm.Acc.Pl	sell.3.Pl.Fperf

eos	*pigeat*	*vendidisse.*
Dem.Acc.Pl.Masc	pain.3.Sg.Prs.Subj	sell.Perf.Inf

'(Those) who have sold farms in these fields, let it pain them to have sold them.'

In both of these instances, the RC is not only sentence-initial, but also followed by a correlative demonstrative pronoun in m-case, i.e. *kuit … apāt* and *qui … eos*, respectively. This arrangement is demonstrably common in the original corpus as well, as (4.15) indicates.

(4.15) Eł. Vardan 131

orkʿ	*očʿ*	*sirov*	*ownin*	*z=deni*	*mazdezn,*
Rel.Nom.Pl	Neg	love.Instr.Sg	have.3.Pl.Prs	Obj=religion.Acc.Sg	Mazdean

aynpiseacʿ	*ew*	*astowackʿ=n*	*en*	*cʿasowcʿeal*
Dem.Dat.Pl	Int	god.Nom.Pl=Det	be.3.Pl.Prs	offend.Perf.Ptcp

'(Those) who do not happily accept the Mazdean religion, at them the Gods are angered,'

---

nouns, respectively (Monteil 1963:11-4; Ruijgh 1971:319). It is, however, unclear whether they had relative functions in Proto-Indo-European already, or whether these developed in the individual daughter languages. Hettrich (1988:757-63), for example, argues that Indo-Iranian and Greek replaced the original *kʷi-/kʷo- pronoun with a *yo- stem, both of which he takes to be relative pronouns with different functions, with the latter encroaching on the functional domain of the former.

While a dominant feature in Old Hittite,[20] and very frequent in early Latin, this constellation is not the only one used in either of these languages; RCs following their pivots are just as common in later stages of Latin and Hittite, and generally common in Armenian. It must further be noted that this type of restrictive RCs, which generalises over a spectrum of entities or specifies a subset, is particularly common in the genre of texts found in early Latin and Old Hittite legal texts; their less frequent occurrence in e.g. Vedic, which has a *yo- based RPro, may be the result of literary rather than linguistic development (Hock 1993:177-8). The late attestation of Armenian does not allow for any judgment concerning an earlier state of the language, but the existence of such pre-posed and relative-correlative structures at least speaks in favour of an association of these languages.

Another commonality shared by Hittite, Latin, and the Sabellic languages lies in the shared etymology of interrogative, relative and generalising pronouns;[21] in Armenian, the former two are standardly listed as morphologically identical,[22] while for the indefinite pronoun, cp. Lat. *quisquis*, Hitt. *kuiš kuiš*, Osc. *pispis*, which developed from the reduplicated *kʷi-/kʷo- stem, Armenian may only have a comparable, but not identical form *okʻ*, which is commonly used with the relative *or* as *or okʻ* to denote 'whoever'.[23]

---

[20]Probert (2006*b*:53) indicates one instance which does not comply with this structure.

[21]This further speaks against Martirosyan's (2010) derivation of *o(v)* etc. < *yo-; in all Proto-Indo-European languages in which interrogative, relative and indefinite pronouns are of related forms, the interrogative derives from the *kʷi-/kʷo- stem. In addition, the great majority of Indo-European languages, even those with *yo- relatives, still retain *kʷi-/kʷo- interrogatives.

[22]The morphological identity is that between RPro and interrogative adjective, whereas the interrogative and generalising pronouns have distinct, but phonologically closely comparable forms; cf. Jensen (1959:84-8).

[23]Ačaṙyan (1971:III.620) relates this to e.g. Lat. *(ali-)quis, quisque* < *kʷis-kʷe, supported by de Lamberterie (1989:250, 267); Kölligan is right in admonishing that there are no parallels supporting the argument that a dissimilation *kʷ-... kʷ- > Ø...kʻ might have given rise to *o(v)*, but the typological parallels with other Indo-European languages in showing a related triad of interrogative, generalising and relative pronouns are hard to deny and speak in favour such or a similar reconstruction for *okʻ* (cf. n. 25 below).

Further corroboration of this etymology is provided by instances in which the supposed pivot of the RC occurs within the clause itself, a feature again typical of Latin, Sabellian and other *kʷi-/kʷo- languages, as well as Armenian.

(4.16) Livius *Ab urbe condita* I.1,3

et	*in*	*quem*	*primum*	*egressi sunt*
and	in	Rel.Acc.Sg.Masc	first	disembark.3.Pl.Perf.Act

locum	*Troia*	*vocatur*
place.Acc.Sg.Masc	Troy	call.3.Sg.Prs.Pass

'And the place, in which first they landed, is called Troy.'

(4.17) Eł. PH 135

bayc'	*y=or*	*dēms*	*cackec'ēk'=n*	*dowk'*
but	into=Rel.Acc.Sg	guise.Acc.Pl	disguise.2.Pl.Aor=Dem	2.Pers.Nom.Pl

jezēn	*isk*	*k'aǰ*	*gitēk'*
2.Pers.Abl.Pl	Int	valorous	know.2.Pl.Prs

'But in which(ever) you disguise (yourselves), you yourselves know (it) well, indeed.'

In both (4.16) and (4.17), the pivot agrees in case and number with the RPro upon which it follows;[24] while these instances do not contain correlative pronouns, the latter occur often. (4.17) further shows, that pseudo-pivot free RCs may but need not fulfil generalising functions. The agreement pattern is reminiscent of that of interrogative adjectives, which in Latin, Hittite and most probably Armenian derive from the same *kʷi-/kʷo- stem. Luján (2009:231-2) takes this as an argument in favour of the interrogative background of this RPro.[25]

A third category of commonalities lies in the occurrence of resumptive pronouns within the RC; where they occur, they are coreferential with the pivot of the RPro and used pleonastically, not adding any information to the clause. In Armenian, their

---

[24]*demk'* 'face, aspect; guise' may exhibit plural morphology, but is a collective noun and as such closer to the singular in meaning.

[25]Lehmann's observation that languages never share relative and indefinite morphology, unless the same is shared by the interrogative pronoun seems to square well with this hypothesis (1984:325).

form is variable, but will often be either a possessive pronoun or a demonstrative; both in Armenian and in other Indo-European languages such as Latin, however, this phenomenon is overall rather rare.[26]

(4.18) Ag. PH 62,8

> *Ayl očʿ tʿołicʿ*   *kʿez*   *z=anargans*
> but Neg forgive.1.Sg.Aor.Subj 2.Pers.Sg.Dat Obj=ignominy.Acc.Sg
> *dicʿ=n*   *z=or*   *tʿšnamanecʿer*   *z=nosa*
> god.Gen.Pl=Det Obj=Rel.Acc.Sg insult.2.Sg.Aor Obj=Dem.Acc.Pl
> 'But I will not forgive you the ignominy towards the Gods, whom you have insulted (them).'

(4.19) Plautus *Cistellaria* 691-2

> *ille*   *nunc laetus*   *est,*
> Dem.Nom.Sg.Masc now happy.Nom.Sg.Masc be.3.Sg.Prs
> *quisquis*   *est,*   *qui*   *illam*
> Indef.Nom.Sg.Masc be.3.Sg.Prs Rel.Nom.Sg.Masc Dem.Acc.Sg.Fem
> *habet,*   *quae*   *ne=que*   *illa*
> have.3.Sg.Prs Rel.Nom.Sg.Fem Neg=and Dem.Nom.Sg.Fem
> *illi*   *quicquam*   *usui*   *et*   *mi*
> Dem.Dat.Sg.Masc Indef.Nom.Sg.Ntr use.Dat.Sg and 1.Pers.Dat.Sg
> *exitio*   *est.*
> ruin.Dat.Sg be.3.Sg.Prs
> 'He is now happy, whoever he is, who has it, which (it) is of no use to anyone, but for me.'

Both (4.18) and (4.19) demonstrate this co-reference of RPro and retained demonstrative. In the light of the other correspondences between *kʷi-/kʷo- stem languages, it seems plausible to assume that this, too, may be an inherited feature; its scarce attestation, and the fact that it does not seem to occur in Hittite, however, make it difficult to ascertain, what the origin of this pronoun might be.

---

[26]Rubio (2009-11:212) relates the occurrence of such resumptive pronouns in the Vulgate to the Hebrew indeclinable relative particle אֲשֶׁר *ʾăšær* which is necessarily supplemented by a resumptive pronoun; Hofmann and Szantyr (1965:556-7), however, list a few examples in early and classical Latin as well.

Finally, Armenian further exhibits connective RCs, which are most frequently found in sentence-initial position and have no sentence-internal pivot, but rather refer to an entity in the foregone sentence or passage. This class of RCs, however, is of little decisive value as far as pronominal etymology is concerned, since the same constellation is frequent in both Latin and Sanskrit, the latter of which is an exponent of the *yo- pronouns.

While the above arguments do speak in favour of a *kʷi-/kʷo- stem for Armenian *or*, it ought to be kept in mind that no definitive or even fully consistent approach to RPros and RCs in Proto-Indo-European has been brought forward, yet. Many competing theories present persuasive arguments in favour of reconstructing e.g. no RPros at all,[27] or different relativising functions for *kʷi-/kʷo- and *yo respectively.[28] The point speaking in favour of Arm. *or* < *kʷi-/kʷo- most strongly, therefore, is that of the consistent etymology of Armenian relative, interrogative and generalising pronouns.

4.4   Results III

This chapter has made use of the compiled corpus of three 5th-century original Armenian texts in three distinct ways: it has shown that the attraction of RPros into m-case is not a feature of native Armenian syntax. Although two very similar instances occur, in which attraction motivates the morphological form of the RPro, these can be ascribed to the author's involvement in the translation of the New Tes-

---

[27]Monteil (1963) and others argue, that neither *kʷi-/kʷo- nor *yo- were relative pronouns in Proto-Indo-European times, but indefinite and anaphoric pronouns, respectively. This were to mean that at that time, subordination by relativisation was not possible, wherefore the syntagma may have developed differently in the individual languages; for an alternative approach based on adjoining instead of embedded subordinate clauses, cf. Kiparsky (1995).

[28]Hajnal (1997:58-64), like Hettrich (1988), argues for two distinct relative pronouns, which fulfil different semantic functions on a synchronous Proto-Indo-European level, i.e. *yo- forms non-restrictive, appositive RCs, whilst *kʷi-/kʷo- is used in maximalising and restrictive contexts.

tament and his residence in the Greek-speaking world, and are thus likely to be the result of extraneous interference.

Based on statistical data, new observations concerning the Wackernagel clitics *=s, =d, =n* have been made. While no advance in determining their conditioning environment or synchronic function could be made, it seems both plausible and likely that their higher frequency in the New Testament corpus results from hypercorrect usage within monophrasal RCs; this may be taken as further evidence for the translator's goal to provide a translation both faithful to the Greek original text and as close to Armenian idiom as possible.

Finally, the argument in favour of an etymological derivation of Arm. *o(v), or, okʽ* < PIE *kʷi-/kʷo- as presented in part by KÖLLIGAN (2006) has been supplemented with further syntactic and typological observations; while none of them can provide definite proof of this etymology, they do lend the argument a firmer basis, particularly given the parallels found in a number of other Indo-European languages.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This study has aimed to provide an insight into the workings of Armenian relative clauses and their relevance for the question of 'Classical' Armenian.

As the data suggests, there are statistically significant differences between the realisation of relative clauses in the Armenian of the New Testament on the one hand, and that of non-translated texts on the other hand. Free relative clauses in the New Testament are subject to different case matching restrictions than those applying in the works of Agatʻangełos, Eznik and Ełišē; whilst the New Testament readily uses free relative clauses with m-case morphology and seems not to be subject to such restrictions, the original authors tend to avoid such clauses when r-case and m-case do not match, or choose to employ r-case RPros. At the same time, however, it ought to be pointed out that in the Biblical corpus, too, this attraction did not happen in all possible instances. Attraction, when it occurs, presents almost exclusively in free relative clauses, with one exception in what may be called a light-headed relative clause; it is frequently found in instances where it occurs in Greek, but equally occurs independently from the *Vorlage*; this suggests that the concept of attraction has been partially grammaticalised by the translators. The grammaticalisation process

did, however, not result in a wholesale adoption of the phenomenon into the grammar of the language, since it is essentially restricted to the context of Biblical Armenian. Jensen's wholesale assertions (1959:210) must therefore be relativised, since this is a severely restricted phenomenon. Given that the phenomenon appears to be subject to the same basic constraints in Armenian as in Greek, its purpose as facilitating the comprehensibility of a sentence in the sense of a discourse accessibility hierarchy, as suggested in section 2.3 above, seems confirmed, esp. in view of the occurrence of attraction from the nominative in Armenian. Further corroboration of the Greek influence on relative clauses in particular may be sought in the frequent rendition of Greek participial DPs as Armenian relative clauses, in which the relative pronoun in function corresponds exactly to the Greek determiner, and in which attraction in Armenian must be presumed to originate.

The differences in the employment of the clitics *=s, =d, =n* within the relative clause give further credence to the hypothesis that the structure and syntax of relative clauses in Biblical and non-translated Armenian are not the same. While the precise conditioning environments of the clitics remain obscure, statistical data suggests that they are more commonly employed in relative clauses containing one or two constituents; the original corpus further suggests that they attach to subject NPs and VPs at approximately the same frequency. It has further been suggested that the higher incidence of these clitics in the New Testament corpus is the result of hypercorrect usage by the translators, presumably the result of their striving to produce idiomatic Armenian whilst still maintaining a very close reading of the text.

Finally, it has been argued that the Armenian relative, interrogative and indefinite pronouns are most likely to all derive from PIE *kʷi-/kʷo-. The argument is based both on the distribution of certain syntactical features that are particularly common

in languages which have developed pronouns from the same root. The main emphasis, however, lies on the typological Indo-European data: due to the phonological similarity of the pronouns, they must derive from the same root; features like stem reduplication in indefinite pronouns and the general tendency of Indo-European interrogatives to derive from *kʷi-/kʷo- strongly suggest this root to be the origin of the Armenian pronouns, too.

All this data, together with the evident parallels in word order frequently indicated in the glosses, allow for the conclusion that the Armenian New Testament, and thus by extension the entirety of the Bible, is far closer to its Greek *Vorlage* than is commonly presumed. This gravely impacts the accepted views concerning both the stratification of the development of the Armenian language, as well as the those concerning the (pre-)Hellenising School and the onset of this particular method of translating into Armenian. As has been argued above, the Bible translation differs from the School in just as many respects as it is similar to it, and for that reason cannot be called its predecessor; at the same time, taking into account the so-called pre-Hellenising School, this literary tradition is best conceptualised as a continuum, spanning from the beginning of the Armenian literary tradition in the early 5th century up to Stepʻanos Siwnecʻi in the 8th century, or potentially even further to Grigor Magistros in the 11th century. The exponents of this style of translation vary in the degree to which they adhere to the Greek original, but usually either strictly follow Greek syntax and word order, as is the case for the New Testament and the pre-Hellenising School, or use the Greek lexical material as the basis for calquing.

The relevance of this observation for determining what is 'Classical' Armenian is obvious: if the language of the Bible, so often taken as the pinnacle of Armenian style and simultaneously as the basis for linguistic study, is essentially dependent

on Greek syntax and ostentatiously contravenes syntactic rules applying to original, non-translated text, it is not actually a fitting representation of 'native' 5th-century Armenian. Due to its vast cultural and literary influence, it cannot be neglected, and deserves its rôle in chrestomathies and textbooks; yet, literature originally composed in Armenian, and thus largely free from Greek influence, is a far better representation of Classical Armenian proper, and should therefore be accepted as such.

WEITENBERG's assessment that a thorough understanding of the development of Armenian can only be gained through the comparison of syntactic features from the various stages, must be expanded to include not only Armenian evidence, but also that of Greek in the context of the early attested stages of the language, or of Middle Iranian for the study of its prehistory. This study does not purport to prove the significance of the Greek original for the Bible translation, nor to overthrow the views developed over the last century of scholarship. It merely suggests alternative perspectives providing different, and in certain respects more cogent explanations to questions in the field of Armenian historical linguistics, and hopes to demonstrate the relevance of considering syntactic features on both a cross-linguistic and historical level. Confirmation of some of the arguments advocated here must be sought in further, more extensive studies of, e.g., the word order correspondence between the Greek and Armenian Bible, as well as in the more detailed exploration of the conditioning environments of clitics in relative clauses. Only such large-scale investigations can provide a definitive answer to the question of 'Classical' Armenian.

Appendix A

List of Attraction Phenomena

Passage	r-case (expected)	m-case (actual)	≈ Greek
Mt. 4:16	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Mt. 5:42	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Mt. 12:4	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Adv
Mt. 23:13	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Mk. 4:24	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Mk. 11:5	Nom.	Abl.	DP-Ptcp
Lk. 1:79	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Lk. 9:36	Acc.	Gen.	RC
Lk. 23:41	Acc.	Gen.	RC
Lk. 23:47	Nom.	Acc.	DP-Ptcp
Lk. 24:33	Nom.	Acc.	DP-Adv
Jn. 1:12	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Jn. 1:22	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Act. 20:34	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Act. 21:21	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Adv
Act. 26:16	Acc.	Gen.	RC
Act. 26:16	Acc.	Gen.	RC
Act. 26:20	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Adv
Rom. 1:7	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Rom. 4:12	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Adv
Rom. 4:12	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Rom. 8:28	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
1Cor. 9:14	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Heb. 11:1	Nom.	Gen.	PTCP
2Pt. 1:1	Nom.	Dat.	DP-Ptcp
Rev. 13:14	Nom.	Acc.	DP-Ptcp
Rev. 20:4	Nom.	Acc.	RC

List of Relative Clauses in the Armenian New Testament in which Attraction Occurs

Appendix B

Wackernagel Clitics I

Passage	WC attaches to	Complexity	Type of WC
Mt. 11:10	VP (Ptcp)	1	*=n*
Mt. 13:17	VP	1	*=d*
Mt. 13:17	VP	1	*=d*
Mt. 14:21	VP	1	*=n*
Mt. 15:38	VP	1	*=n*
Mt. 20:22	VP (Ptcp)	2	*=n*
Mt. 20:22	VP (Ptcp)	2	*=n*
Mk. 4:24	VP	1	*=d*
Mk. 5:16	VP (Ptcp)	1	*=n*
Mk. 6:44	VP	1	*=n*
Mk. 6:56	VP	1	*=n*
Mk. 8:9	VP	1	*=n*
Mk. 9:8	VP	1	*=n*
Mk. 13:37	NP (IO)	2	*=d*
Mk. 14:8	VP	1	*=d*
Mk. 14:71	NP (Subj)	2	*=d*
Mk. 15:29	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 2:5	VP (Ptcp)	2	*=n*
Lk. 5:25	VP (Ptcp)		*=n*
Lk. 6:3	VP	2	*=n*
Lk. 6:14	NP (DO/App)	2	*=n*
Lk. 6:25	VP (Ptcp)	1	*=d*
Lk. 6:46	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 7:22	VP	1	*=d*
Lk. 7:27	VP (Ptcp)	1	*=n*
Lk. 8:36	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 9:36	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 10:23	VP	1	*=d*
Lk. 10:24	NP (Subj)	2	*=d*
Lk. 10:24	VP	1	*=d*
Lk. 12:20	VP	1	*=n*

Lk. 14:22	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 23:25	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 23:47	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 24:17	VP	2	*=d*
Lk. 23:41	VP	1	*=n*
Lk. 23:14	VP	3	*=d*
Jn. 1:22	VP	2	*=n*
Jn. 1:24	VP	1	*=n*
Jn. 1:27	VP	2	*=n*
Jn. 1:30	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Jn. 3:26	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Jn. 4:22	Neg	1	*=n*
Jn. 4:22	VP	1	*=n*
Jn. 5:45	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Jn. 8:54	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Jn. 9:8	VP (Ptcp)	2	*=n*
Jn. 9:11	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Jn. 9:19	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Jn. 9:39	VP	1	*=n*
Jn. 13:18	VP	1	*=d*
Jn. 17:11	VP	2	*=n*
Jn. 17:12	VP	2	*=n*
Jn. 17:24	VP	2	*=n*
Jn. 18:9	VP	2	*=n*
Jn. 19:37	VP	1	*=n*
Act. 1:2	VP	1	*=n*
Act. 1:11	VP	1	*=n*
Act. 1:23	NP (DO/App)	2	*=n*
Act. 7:33	NP (Subj)	2	*=d*
Act. 9:17	VP	1	*=n*
Act. 10:6	NP (Subj)	3	*=n*
Act. 10:21	VP	1	*=n*
Act. 20:34	PrepP	2	*=n*
Act. 21:21	PrepP	3	*=s*
Act. 21:24	VP	2	*=n*
Act. 22:5	NP (DO/App)	3	*=s*
Act. 22:15	VP	1	*=n*
Act. 24:8	NP (DO/App)	3	*=s*
Act. 24:13	AdvP	2	*=s*
Act. 25:18	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Act. 26:16	VP	2	*=d*
Act. 27:23	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Act. 28:18	VP	2	*=n*
Rom. 4:14	PrepP	2	*=n*
Rom. 4:17	VP	1	*=n*
Rom. 6:16	VP	1	*=n*
Rom. 6:21	AdvP	2	*=d*
Rom. 7:6	VP (Ptcp)	1	*=n*
Rom. 8:3	VP	2	*=n*
Rom. 8:28	AdvP	2	*=n*

Rom. 8:28	VP	2	=*n*
Rom. 8:30	AdvP	1	=*n*
Rom. 9:15	VP	1	=*n*
Rom. 9:15	VP	1	=*n*
Rom. 10:14	Neg	1	=*n*
Rom. 10:14	Neg	1	=*n*
Rom. 14:15	NP (Subj)	2	=*n*
Rom. 16:7	NP (DO/App)	3	=*n*
1Cor. 3:5	VP	1	=*n*
1Cor. 7:1	VP	2	=*n*
1Cor. 8:11	NP (Subj)	2	=*n*
1Cor. 10:30	NP (Subj)	2	=*n*
1Cor. 12:28	VP	3	=*n*
1Cor. 15:2	VP	1	=*n*
2Cor. 11:12	VP	1	=*n*
2Cor. 12:17	VP	2	=*n*
Gal. 3:19	VP (Ptcp)	1	=*n*
Phil. 3:16	VP	1	=*s*
Col. 3:15	VP	2	=*n*
Col. 4:3	VP (Ptcp)	1	=*s*
2Thess. 1:4	NP (Subj)	2	=*n*
1Tim. 6:9	VP	1	=*n*
1Tim. 6:12	VP	1	=*n*
2Tim. 3:14	VP	1	=*d*
Tit. 1:12	NP (DO/App)	2	=*s*
1Pt. 1:8	Neg	1	=*n*
1Pt. 1:12	VP	1	=*n*
1Pt. 3:6	VP	3	=*n*
2Pt. 1:1	VP	>3	=*d*
2Pt. 1:9	Neg	3	=*n*
2Pt. 2:12	VP	2	=*n*
2Pt. 3:5	NP (DO/App)	2	=*n*
1Jn. 1:1	VP	1	=*n*
1Jn. 1:3	VP	1	=*n*
1Jn. 4:3	VP	1	=*n*
Heb 2:5	NP (Subj)	2	=*s*
Heb 3:6	NP (Subj)	3	=*n*
Heb. 4:3	VP	1	=*s*
Heb. 4:6	VP (Ptcp)	1	=*n*
Heb. 10:29	VP	1	=*n*
Heb. 11:14	NP (DO/App)	2	=*n*
Heb. 11:18	VP	1	=*n*
Heb. 12:19	VP	1	=*n*
Heb. 13:9	AdvP	1	=*n*
Rev. 18:6	VP	1	=*n*

List of Relative Clauses in the Armenian New Testament in which a WC Occurs

Appendix C

Wackernagel Clitics II

Passage	WC attaches to	Complexity	Type of WC
Ag. PH 8.3	NP (DO/App)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 48.2	NP (DO/App)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 55.1	VP	1	*=n*
Ag. PH 55.1	NP (Subj)	3	*=n*
Ag. PH 59.1	NP (Subj)	3	*=d*
Ag. PH 59.5	NP (Subj)	>3	*=n*
Ag. PH 59.6	PrepP	2	*=d*
Ag. PH 61.10	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 64.8	NP (Subj)	2	*=d*
Ag. PH 67.1	VP	1	*=n*
Ag. PH 68.3	VP (Ptcp)	2	*=d*
Ag. PH 68.3	Neg	3	*=d*
Ag. PH 93.1	VP	1	*=s*
Ag. PH 103.6	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 105.12	VP	1	*=d*
Ag. PH 117.3	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 131.1	VP (Ptcp)	1	*=d*
Ag. PH 150.1	NP (DO/App)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 168.1	VP	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 185.6	NP (IO)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 190.1	VP	3	*=n*
Ag. PH 218.4	VP	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 228.2	Neg	1	*=n*
Ag. PH 239.7	VP (Ptcp)	>3	*=n*
Ag. PH 241.2	NP (Subj)	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 245.1	Neg	1	*=n*
Ag. PH 247.1	NP (Subj)	3	*=n*
Ag. PH 790.1	NP (DO/App)	3	*=n*
Ag. PH 860.2	VP	2	*=n*
Ag. PH 850.5	VP	1	*=n*
Ag. PH 814.5	VP	1	*=n*

Eł. Vardan 11	VP	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 11	NP (DO/App)	2		*=s*
Eł. Vardan 14	NP (DO/App)	3		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 22	NP (Subj)	3		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 26	NP (DO/App)	2		*=d*
Eł. Vardan 27	VP	1		*=d*
Eł. Vardan 34	NP (Subj)	2		*=s*
Eł. Vardan 37	Adv	2		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 37	NP (Subj)	2		*=d*
Eł. Vardan 45	VP (Ptcp)	1		*=s*
Eł. Vardan 48	VP (Ptcp)	1		*=d*
Eł. Vardan 50	VP	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 59	VP (Ptcp)	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 75	NP (Subj)	3		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 85	NP (DO/App)	2		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 90	VP	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 91	VP	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 91	VP	2		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 105	PrepP	2		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 112	VP	2		*=d*
Eł. Vardan 126	NP (Subj)	3		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 133	PrepP	2		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 133	NP (Subj)	3		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 135	VP	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 137	VP	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 138	VP (Ptcp)	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 139	PrepP	2		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 143	NP (Subj)	3		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 146	VP	1		*=n*
Eł. Vardan 153	NP (Subj)	2		*=d*
Eł. Vardan 171	VP	1		*=d*
Ez. VA 3	Adv	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 3	PrepP	2		*=n*
Ez. VA 15	PrepP	2		*=n*
Ez. VA 34	NP (Subj)	3		*=n*
Ez. VA 43	VP	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 44	VP	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 44	VP (Ptcp)	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 44	NP (Subj)	2		*=n*
Ez. VA 44	NP (Subj)	2		*=n*
Ez. VA 48	VP	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 51	VP	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 51	VP	3		*=n*
Ez. VA 51	NP (Subj)	2		*=n*
Ez. VA 52	Neg	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 58	VP	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 65	VP	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 75	VP	1		*=n*
Ez. VA 133	NP (Subj)	2		*=n*

Ez. VA 145	NP (Subj)	2	=n
Ez. VA 145	NP (Subj)	2	=n
Ez. VA 157	NP (Obl)	3	=n
Ez. VA 188	NP (Subj)	3	=n
Ez. VA 205	NP (Subj)	>3	=n
Ez. VA 228	VP	1	=n
Ez. VA 246	PrepP	2	=n
Ez. VA 264	Neg	2	=n
Ez. VA 266	VP	1	=n
Ez. VA 280	NP (Subj)	2	=n
Ez. VA 316	VP	2	=n
Ez. VA 353	VP (Ptcp)	1	=n
Ez. VA 392	NP (Subj)	2	=n
Ez. VA 397	NP (Subj)	2	=n
Ez. VA 401	VP	1	=n
Ez. VA 404	NP (Obl)	3	=n
Ez. VA 428	NP (Subj)	2	=n

List of Relative Clauses in the Original Corpus in which the WC Occurs

References

Ačaṙyan, H. (1954) *Liakatar kʿerakanowtʿyown hayocʿ lezvi*, Erevan: Haykakan SSR GA Hratarakc'owt'yown.

——— (1971) *Hayeren armatakan baṙaran*, Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hrat.

Adontz, N. (1970) *Denys de Thrace et les commentateurs arméniens (transl. from Russian)*, Imprimerie Orientaliste.

Ajello, R. (1971) "La traduzione armena dei composti nominali in *-phoros* del testo biblico," *Studi e saggi linguistici* 11, 56–68.

Akinian, N. (1932*a*) "Hayerēn lezowi əntʿacʿkʿə 5. – 19. darerown 450–1850," *Handēs Amsōrya* 46, 128–136.

——— (1932*b*) "Yownaban drpocʿə (572-603)," *Handēs Amsōrya* 46, 171–192.

Alexanian, J.M. (1984) "The Armenian Gospel Text from the Fifth through the Fourteenth Centuries," in T.J. Samuelian and M. Stone (eds.), *Medieval Armenian Culture*, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 381–94.

Awetikʿean, G.; Siwrmēlean, X.; and Awgerean, M. (eds.) (1979-80) *Nor baṙgirkʿ haykazean lezui*, volume 2, reprint of the 1836-37 ed. edition, Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hratarakchʿutʿyun.

Bănăţeanu, V. (1937) *La traduction arménienne des tours participiaux grecs*, Bucarest: Librăria Academică.

Barr, J. (1979) *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens (MSU) XV, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bianchi, V. (2000) "Some issues in the syntax of relative determiners," in A. Alexiadou (ed.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses*, Philadelphia, PA: Benjamins, 53–81.

Biondi, A. (1983) *Gli accenti nei papiri greci biblici*, Roma: Papyrologica Castroctaviana – Biblical Institute Press.

Blanchard, M.J. and Young, R.D. (1998) *A treatise on God written in Armenian by Eznik of Kołb (floruit c.430-c.450)*, Leuven: Peeters.

Bolognesi, G. (1990) *Studi glottologici filologici orientali*, Brescia: Paideia.

——— (2000*a*) "La traduzione armena dei Progymnasmata di Elio Teone Parte prima," in G. Bolognesi and U. Cozzoli (eds.), *Studi e ricerche sulle antiche traduzioni armene di testi greci*, Edizioni dell'Orso, 29–69.

——— (2000*b*) "La traduzione armena del Vangelo," in G. Bolognesi and U. Cozzoli (eds.), *Studi e ricerche sulle antiche traduzioni armene di testi greci*, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 279–296.

Brugmann, C. (1897) *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (Zweite Bearbeitung)*, Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Burchard, C. (1993) *Armenia and the Bible: papers presented to the international symposium held at Heidelberg, July 16-19, 1990*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Calzolari, V. (1989) "L'école hellénisante: les circonstances," in M. Nichanian (ed.), *Ages et usages de la langue arménienne*, Paris: Editions Entente, 110–130.

Chantraine, P. (1953) *Grammaire Homérique: Syntaxe*, Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Citko, B. (1999) "Light-headed relatives," *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 6.

Clackson, J. (1994) *The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek*, Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

——— (1995) "The Technē in Armenian," in V. Law and I. Sluiter (eds.), *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē grammatikē*, Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 121–133.

Coulie, B. (1994-5) "Style et Traduction: Réflexions sur les versions arméniennes de textes grecs," *REArm (NS)* 25, 43–62.

Cowe, S.P. (1984) "A Typology of Armenian Biblical Manuscripts," *REArm (NS)* 18, 49–67.

——— (1990-1*a*) "Tendentious Translation and the Evangelical Imperative: Religious Polemic in the Early Armenian Church," *REArm (NS)* 22, 97–114.

——— (1990-1*b*) "The two Armenian versions of Chronicles, their origin and translation technique," *REArm (NS)* 22, 53–96.

——— (1992*a*) "Amēn teł hay kay: Armenian as a pluricentric language," in M.G. Clyne (ed.), *Pluricentric languages : differing norms in different nations*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 325–346.

——— (1992*b*) *The Armenian version of Daniel*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

——— (1994-5) "Yovhannēs Sarkawag's 'Discourse on Wisdom'," *REArm (NS)* 25, 125–156.

Cox, C.E. (2006) *Armenian Job : reconstructed Greek text, critical edition of the Armenian with English translation*, Leuven/Dudley, MA: Peeters.

Dalrymple, M. (2005) "Against Reconstruction in Ellipsis," in R. Elugardo and J. Stainton (eds.), *Ellipsis and Nonsentential Speech*, Dordrecht: Springer, 31–55.

de Lamberterie, C. (1989) "Introduction à l'Arménien classique," *LALIES (Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature)* 10, 234–289.

——— (1997) "L'article dans la relative en arménien classique," in E. Crespo and J.L. García-Ramón (eds.), *Berthold Delbrück y la sintaxis indoeuropea hoy: actas del Coloquio de la Indogermanische Gesellschaft, Madrid, 21-24 de septiembre de 1994*, Wiesbaden/Madrid: Reichert, 311–26.

DE VRIES, M. (2002) *The syntax of relativization: akademisch proefschrift*, Utrecht: LOT.

DUM-TRAGUT, J. (2009) *Armenian: Modern Eastern Armenian*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

DURKIN-MEISTERERNST, D. (2004) *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, Turnhout: Brepols.

FÖRSTER, R. (1868) *De attractione enuntiarum relativarum qualis quum in aliis tum in graeca lingua potissimumque apud graecos poetas fuerit*, Berlin: Mitscher und Röstell.

GAETA, L. and LURAGHI, S. (2001) "Gapping in Classical Greek Prose," *Studies in Language* 25 (1), 89–113.

GARRETT, A. (1994) "Relative clause syntax in Lycian and Hittite," *Die Sprache* 36, 29–69.

GRIMM, S. (2007) "Case Attraction in Ancient Greek," in B. TEN CATE and H. ZEEVAT (eds.), *Logic, language, and computation : 6th International Tbilisi Symposium on Logic, Language, and Computation, TbiLLC 2005, Batumi, Georgia, September 12-16, 2005 revised selected papers*, Berlin: Springer, 139–153.

GRIMSHAW, J. (1977) *English wh-constructions and the theory of grammar*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

GROOS, A. and VAN RIEMSDIJK, H. (1981) "Matching Effects in Free Relatives: A Parameter of Core Grammar," in A. BELLETTI; L. BRANDI; and L. RIZZI (eds.), *Theory of Markedness in Generative Grammar (Proceedings of the 1979 GLOW Conference)*, Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore, 171–216.

GROSU, A. (1994) *Three studies in locality and case*, London/New York: Routledge.

GUNTERMANN, G. (1978) "A Study of the Frequency and Communicative Effects of Errors in Spanish," *The Modern Language Journal* , 249–253.

GVOZDANOVIĆ, J. (1992) *Indo-European numerals*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

HAHN, E.A. (1964) "Relative and Antecedent," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 95, 111–141.

HAJNAL, I. (1997) "Definite Nominale Determination im Indogermanischen," *Indogermanische Forschungen* 102, 38–73.

HETTRICH, H. (1988) *Untersuchungen zur Hypotaxe im Vedischen*, Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.

HEWITT, B. (1978) "The Armenian Relative Clause," *International Review of Slavic Linguistics* 3, 99–138.

HIRSCHBÜHLER, P. (1977) "Headed and headless free relatives. A study in Modern French and classical Greek," in *Les Contraintes sur les règles, Rapport de recherche no 1 (soumis au Conseil des arts du Canada, subvention S74-0740, Projet 'CORE', Philippe Barbaud chercheur principal)*, Montréal: Département de linguistique, Université du Québec, 176–229.

——— (1979) *The syntax and semantics of WH-constructions*, Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Hirschbühler, P. and Rivero, M.L. (1981) "Catalan Restrictive Relatives: Core and Periphery," *Language* 57, 591–625.

——— (1983) "Remarks on Free Relatives and Matching Phenomena," *Linguistics Inquiry* 14, 505–520.

Hock, H.H. (1993) "Some peculiarities of Vedic-Prose relative clauses," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens und Archiv für Indische Philosophie, Supplementband* 26, 19–29.

Hofmann, J.B. and Szantyr, A. (1965) *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik: mit dem allgemeinen Teil der lateinischen Grammatik*, München: Beck.

Inglisian, V. (1963) "Die Armenische Literatur," in B. Spuler (ed.), *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, volume I.7, Leiden: Brill, 156–250.

Jahowkyan, G. (1954) *K'erakanakan ev owłłagrakan ašxatowt'yownnerə hin ev miǰnadaryan hayastanowm (v-xv dd.)*, Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hratarakch'ut'yun.

Jensen, H. (1959) *Altarmenische Grammatik*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.

——— (1964) *Altarmenische Chrestomathie, mit einem Glossar*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Jinbachian, M. (1998) *Les techniques de traduction dans la Genèse en arménien classique*, Lisbonne: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Johnson, B. (1984) "Armenian Biblical Tradition in Comparison with the Vulgate and Septuagint," in *Medieval Armenian Culture*, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 357–64.

Kazhdan, A.P.; Talbot, A.M.; Cutler, A.; Gregory, T.E.; and Ševčenko, N.P. (eds.) (1991) *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Keenan, E.L. (1985) "Relative clauses," in T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic description, vol. 2*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141–170.

Keenan, E.L. and Comrie, B. (1977) "Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar," *Linguistics Inquiry* 8, 63–99.

Kehler, A. (2000) "Coherence and the Resolution of Ellipsis," *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23 (6), 533–575.

Kellens, J. and Pirart, E. (1988) *Les Textes vieil-avestiques*, Wiesbaden: L. Reichert.

Kiparsky, P. (1968) "Tense and Mood in Indo-European Syntax," *Foundations of Language* 4, 30–57.

——— (1995) "Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax," in A. Battye and I. Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, New York: Oxford University Press, 140–69.

Kölligan, D. (2006) "Armenian o(v)," *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology and Phonetics* 11, 110–21.

——— (2012) "Regular sound change and word-initial */i̯/- in Armenian," in P. PROBERT and A. WILLI (eds.), *Laws and Rules in Indo-European*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 134–146.

KÖPKE, B. and SCHMID, M. (2004) "Language Attrition: The next phase," in M. SCHMID; B. KÖPKE; M. KEIJZER; and L. WEILEMAR (eds.), *First Language Attrition: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Methodological Issues*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1–46.

KORTLANDT, F. (1985) "The syncretism of nominative and accusative singular in Armenian," *REArm (NS)* 19, 19–24.

KÜHNER, R. and GERTH, B. (1869) *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache: wissenschaftlich und mit Rücksicht auf den Schulgebrauch*, 2. aufl. in durchaus neuer bearb. edition, Hannover: Hahn.

KÜHNER, R.W.; HOLZWEISSIG, F.W.; and STEGMANN, C. (1912) *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, Hannover: Hahn.

KULNEFF-ERIKSSON, K. (1999) *On 'have' in ancient Greek: an investigation on echō and the construction einai with a dative as expressions for 'have'*, Lund: Lund University Press.

KÜNZLE, B.O. (1984) *Das altarmenische Evangelium*, Bern: Lang.

LAFONTAINE, G. and COULIE, B. (1983) *La version arménienne des discours de Grégoire de Nazianze: tradition manuscrite et histoire de texte*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium Subsidia, Leuven: Peeters.

LALT (2003) *Leiden Armenian Lexical Textbase (ed. J.J.S. Weitenberg)*, accessed 20/08/2012.

LAW, V. and SLUITER, I. (1995) *Dionysius Thrax and the Technē grammatikē*, Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

LEHMANN, C. (1984) *Der Relativsatz*, Tübingen: Narr.

LEHMANN, W. (1974) *Proto-Indo-European syntax*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

LELOIR, L. (1972) "La version arménienne du Nouveau Testament," in K. ALAND (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 5, Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 300–13.

LEROY, M. (1983) "Emprunts iraniens dans la composition nominale en arménien classique," *REArm (NS)* 17, 51–72.

LIDDELL, H.; SCOTT, R.; and JONES, H. (1968) *A Greek-English lexicon*, 9th rev. and augm. edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

LOBECK, A. (1995) *Ellipsis: functional heads, licensing, and identification*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Luján, E.R. (2009) "On the grammaticalization of *kʷi-/kʷo- relative clauses in Proto-Indo-European," in V. Bubeník; J. Hewson; ; and S. Rose (eds.), *Grammatical change in Indo-European Languages*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 221–34.

Lust, J.; Eynikel, E.; and Hauspin, K. (1992) *A Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Mahé, J.P. (2005-7) "Koriwn, la Vie de Maštocʻ, traduction annotée," *REArm (NS)* 30, 59–97.

Malmkjær, K. (2005) *Linguistics and the language of translation*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Manandyan, H. (1928) *Hownaban dprocʻə ew nra zargacʻman shrjannerə: kʻnnakan owsowmnasirowtʻiwn*, Vienna: Mkhitʻarean Tp.

Martirosyan, H. (2010) *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*, Leiden/Boston: Brill.

Matzinger, J. (2005) *Untersuchungen zum altarmenischen Nomen: die Flexion des Substantivs*, Dettelbach: J.H. Röll.

May, O. (1878) *De attractionis usu herodoteo*, Ph.D. thesis, Alma Litterarum Universitate Viadrina, Vratislavia.

Meillet, A. (1897-8) "Les démonstratifs," in Meillet (1962), 5–38.

——— (1913) *Altarmenisches Elementarbuch*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.

——— (1920-21) "De l'influence parthe sur la langue arménienne," *REArm* 1, 9–14.

——— (1925) "Sur l'étymologie de or," *REArm* 5, 183–4.

——— (1927) "A propos de l'interrogatif et relatif or," *REArm* 7, 1–3.

——— (1936) *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique (2. éd., entièrement remaniée)*, Vienne: Impr. des Pp. Mékhitharistes.

——— (1962) *Études de linguistique et de philologie arméniennes I: Recherches sur la syntaxe comparée de l'arménien*, Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional.

Mercier, C. (1978-9) "L'école hellénistique dans la littérature arménienne," *REArm (NS)* 13, 59–75.

Migne, J.P. (1857-66) *Patrologiae cursus completus sive bibliotheca universalis, integra, uniformis, commoda, oeconomica, omnium SS. Patrum, doctorum scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum ... Series prima in qua prodeunt patres*, Parisiis: Excudebatur apud Migne.

Minassian, M. (1981) "L'article du premier terme non substantivé d'une subordonnée en arménien classique," *Le Muséon* 94, 97–158.

Monteil, P. (1963) *La phrase relative en Grec ancien: sa formation, son développement, sa structure des origines à la fin du Ve siècle A.C.*, Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Mowradyan, A.N. (1971) *Hownaban dprocʻə ev nra derə hayereni kʻerakanakan terminabanowtʻyan stełcman gorcowm*, Erevan: Haykakan SSH GA Hrat.

Muradyan, G. (2005) *Physiologus: The Greek and Armenian Versions with a Study of Translation Technique*, Leuven/Paris/Dudley: Peeters.

——— (2012) *Grecisms in ancient Armenian*, Leuven: Peeters.

Nersessian, V. (2001) *The Bible in the Armenian tradition*, Los Angeles, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Nestle, E. and Aland, K. (eds.) (2001) *Greek-English New Testament: Greek text Novum Testamentum Graece, in the tradition of Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle*, 9th rev. ed. edition, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Nichanian, M. (1989) "L'école hellénisante: traduction et commentaire," in M. Nichanian (ed.), *Ages et usages de la langue arménienne*, Editions Entente, 130–142.

Olsen, B.A. (1999) *The Noun in biblical Armenian: origin and word-formation: with special emphasis on the Indo-European heritage*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Olsson, M. (1972) *Intelligibility. A Study of Errors and Their Importance*, Gothenburg School of Education.

Orengo, A. (1996) *Confutazione delle sette (Ełc ałanadocʻ)*, Pisa: ETS.

Ouzounian, A. (1992) *Le discours rapporté en arménien classique*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.

Panhuis, D. (1980) "Gapping in Latin," *The Classical Journal* 75 (3), 229–241.

Pavlenko, A. (2004) "L2 influence and L1 attrition in adult bilingualism," in M. Schmid; B. Köpke; M. Keijzer; and L. Weilemar (eds.), *First Language Attrition: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Methodological Issues*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 47–61.

Pinkster, H. (2011) "The use of the dative with Latin compounds," *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 64, 126–135.

Probert, P. (2006a) *Ancient Greek accentuation: synchronic patterns, frequency effects, and prehistory*, Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

——— (2006b) "Clause boundaries in Old Hittite relative sentences," *Transactions of the Philological Society* 104, 17–83.

Quicoli, C. (1972) *Aspects of Portuguese complementation*, Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York, Buffalo.

Rubio, G. (2009-11) "Semitic influence in the history of Latin syntax," in P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds.), *New Persepectives on Historical Latin Syntax*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 195–240.

Ruijgh, C.J. (1971) *Autour de „te épique": Études sur la syntaxe grecque*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Scala, A. (2011) "Differential object marking in classical Armenian," Presented at the 12th General Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary, 6-8 October 2011.

SCHMID, M. and KÖPKE, B. (2007) "Bilingualism and Attrition," in B. KÖPKE (ed.), *Language Attrition: Theoretical Perspectives*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1–7.

SCHMITT, R. (1981) *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen*, Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.

——— (1983) "Iranisches Lehngut im Armenischen," *REArm (NS)* 17, 73–112.

SIHLER, A.L. (1995) *New comparative grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York: Oxford University Press.

SKJÆRVØ, P. (2012) "Old Iranian," in G. WINDFUHR (ed.), *The Iranian languages*, London/New York: Routledge, 43–195.

SMYTH, H.W. (1984) *Greek grammar*, rev. edition, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

STEFANOWITSCH, A. and GRIES, S. (2003) "Collostructions: Investigating the interaction of words and constructions," *International Journal of corpus linguistics* 8, 209–243.

STEMPEL, R. (1983) *Die infiniten Verbalformen des Armenischen*, Frankfurt am Main/New York: P. Lang.

STURTEVANT, E. (1930) "Relatives in Indo-European and Hittite," *Language* 6.

TEN CATE, B. and SLUITER, I. (2007) *Logic, language, and computation : 6th International Tbilisi Symposium on Logic, Language, and Computation, TbiLLC 2005, Batumi, Georgia, September 12-16, 2005 revised selected papers*, Berlin [u.a.]: Springer.

TERIAN, A. (1980) "Syntactical peculiarities in the Translations of the Hellenizing School," in J. GREPPIN (ed.), *First International Conference on Armenian Linguistics: Proceedings, The University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, July 11-14, 1979*, Delmar, N.Y.: Caravan Books, 197–207.

——— (1981) *Philonis Alexandrini De animalibus : the Armenian text with an introduction, translation, and commentary*, Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

——— (1982) "The Hellenizing School: Its Time place, and Scope of Activities Reconsidered," in N. GARSOÏAN; T. MATTHEWS; and R. THOMSON (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period (Dumbarton Oaks Synposium, 1980)*, Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 175–86.

TERIAN, A. and SANJIAN, A.K. (1985-6) "An Enigmatic Letter of Gregory Magistros," *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 2, 85–95.

THOMSON, R. (1975) *An introduction to classical Armenian*, 1st ed. edition, Delmar N.Y.: Caravan Books.

——— (1976) *Agatʿangełos: History of the Armenians*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

——— (1978) *Movsēs Xorenacʿi: History of the Armenians*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

——— (1993) *The history of Vardan and the Armenian war*, Delmar, N.Y.: Caravan Books.

——— (2010) *The lives of Saint Gregory: the Armenian, Greek, Arabic, and Syriac versions of the history attributed to Agathangelos*, Ann Arbor, Mich.: Caravan Books.

Titus (1991) *Titus Project (http://titus.uni-frankfurt.de/indexe.htm)*, accessed 20/08/2012.

Uluhogian, G. (1989) "«Teaṙn aselov». hownareni bacʿarjak seṙakani tʿargmanowtʿyownə Barseł Kesaracʿow hayeren bnagrowm," *Patma-Banasirakan handes* 1, 167–176.

——— (1993) *Il libro delle domande (Le regole)*, Leuven: Peeters.

van Riemsdijk, H. (2006) "Free Relatives," in M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Blackwell, 338–382.

Vaux, B. (1994-5) "Wackernagel's Law in Classical Armenian," *REArm (NS)* 25, 17–42.

Vendryes, J. (1904) *Traité d'accentuation grecque*, Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Weitenberg, J. (1986) "Infinitive and Participle in Armenian," *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 7, 1–26.

——— (1993) "The Language of Mesrop: L'Arménien pour lui-même?" in C. Burchard (ed.), *Armenia and the Bible : papers presented to the international symposium held at Heidelberg, July 16-19, 1990*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 221–231.

Windfuhr, G. (2012) *The Iranian languages*, London/New York: Routledge.

Winkler, G. (1994) *Koriwns Biographie des Mesrop Maštocʿ: Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale.

Winter, W. (1992) "Armenian," in Gvozdanović (1992), 347–359.

Zeitounian, A. (1993) "Les divergences des manuscrits grecs et arméniens du 'Livre de la Genèse'," in C. Burchard (ed.), *Armenia and the Bible: papers presented to the international symposium held at Heidelberg, July 16-19, 1990*, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 233–243.

Zohrabian, H. (1805) *Astowacašownčʿ matean Hin ew Nor Ktakaranacʿ: əst čšgrit tʿargmanowtʿean Naxneacʿ merocʿ, i hellenakann hawatarmagoyn bnagrē i haykakans barbaṙ*, Venetik: I Gorcarani Srboyn Łazarow.