

Armeno-Iranian Structural Interaction: The Case of Parthian *wxd*, Armenian *ink'n**

Robin Meyer
Wolfson College, Oxford

Abstract

While Armenian is not a member of the Iranian language family, its lexicon is replete with borrowings from esp. Parthian. This paper ventures to show that borrowing is not restricted to lexical items alone, but extends to the realm of syntax as well. This will be demonstrated by means of a corpus based investigation of the usage of Middle Persian *xwd*, Parthian *wxd* and its functional counterpart, Armenian *ink'n*; furthermore, parallels regarding the expression of reflexivity in both language families are addressed. The tripartite function of the respective pronouns as intensifier, discourse anaphora and clause level anaphora are the result of extended language contact between Armenian and Western Middle Iranian, the latter of which imposed its features on the substrate language.

Keywords

Armeno-Iranica, Parthian, Armenian, Middle Persian

1. PRELIMINARIES

Armenian and Western Middle Iranian (WMIr.), i.e. Parthian (Pth.) and Middle Persian (MP.), have close links in their lexicon, as has been manifestly demonstrated by Hübschmann (1897) and since then corroborated by Schmitt (1983) and others; Armenian is, however, not a member of the same language group (cf. Hübschmann 1877). Yet, Armenian historiography is quite clear about the role of the Parthians as the initial ruling class, and the strong cultural interlinks have been discussed in e.g. Garsoïan (1976);¹ as yet, however, it is unclear which socio-linguistic status ought to be allotted to either language in this particular context.

* I am very grateful to Dr. Ilya Yakubovich for the inspiration for this paper, as well as for a plethora of very constructive points of criticism. All errors are, of course, mine.

¹ The linguistic relationship of Armenian and WMIr. is a close one, too; while not genetically related, innumerable borrowings from Parthian have made their way into the

In addition to the socio-political relations between speakers of the two languages, and the resulting lexical borrowings, it seems that Armenian and WMlr. also share in an unusual set of syntactic developments. The present paper intends to demonstrate that (1) Indo-Iranian has developed a periphrastic expression of reflexivity, an innovation from the typical Indo-European enclitic reflexives; (2) in WMlr., an adverb with reflexive root has developed into a pronoun proper with a tripartite functional split (intensification, clause-level anaphora, discourse anaphora); and (3) both of these innovations were calqued in (Proto-)Armenian and are used in complete analogy as a result of intense and long-lasting language contact.

Section 2 will look at the Iranian data, outlining first the etymology of the relevant phrases and adverbs and taking into account instances from older Indo-Iranian languages; it will then proceed to a closer analysis of the functional distribution of the pronouns MP. *xwd*, Pth. *wxd* in Manichaean texts. Thereafter, section 3 will deal with the Armenian data in the same terms, first considering the expression of the reflexive periphrasis and then the features that Arm. *ink'n* shares with its WMlr. counterparts. Section 4 will suggest a scenario for the development of the features discussed.

2. INDO-IRANIAN

Brunner (1977: 78ff). devotes three pages to the brief discussion of the MP. and Pth. 'emphatic pronouns', *xwd* and *wxd*. According to his analysis, they serve three main functions: emphasis, i.e. reinforcement of the subject of the clause; adverbial affirmation of the whole clause; possessive marking (in MP. only). Whilst his examples neatly correspond to the perspective argued for, Brunner's explanations hardly represent the whole picture, and are further wanting in terms of linguistic precision. Further, his grammar does not touch upon the question of how this particular distribution arose.

standard lexicon of even the earliest Armenian authors. Given the phonological changes they underwent, Kortlandt (1980: 104) posits their import into the language at a late stage of Proto-Armenian; Arm. *nšan* 'sign' < Pth. *nyšn* 'id.' and Arm. *bžišk* 'doctor' ~ MP. *bys'c* 'id.', etc. demonstrate these phonological correspondences, loan processes and necessary changes common to all Armenian words quite aptly. The true nature of contact between the two languages and the socio-linguistic make-up of early Classical and Proto-Armenian is as yet unclear.

In order to find an answer to this questions, the etymology of the two pronouns needs to be considered; further, as it turns out, it is worth having a look at other cognates, which have developed along similarly interesting lines.

2.1. ETYMOLOGY

Both *xwd* and *wxd* regularly derive from a IIr. form **h₂uatah*.² The PIE precursor to this form in all likelihood features an initial **s₂ue-* cluster, and must thus be cognate with Ved. *sva-* and Gk. *ἑ-* ‘self, own’. The suffix Clr. **-taḥ* < PIE **-tas* indicates an old ablative formation on a pronominal basis. Whilst no corresponding form of this particular word is attested in Old Persian,³ other parallel forms such as YAv. *x^vatō*, Ved. *svatas* suggest that the proto-form was likely petrified and has retained an adverbial character, close in meaning to ‘by itself’ or ‘on one’s own’ as evidenced by Young Avestan (2a) and Sanskrit (2b).

(2a)	... mā. ...	aēša.	yā.	kaine. ...
	<i>not</i>	DEM.NOM.SG.FEM	REL.NOM.SG.FEM	<i>maiden.NOM.SG.FEM</i>
	xvatō.	garəβəm.	raēšaiiāt.	
	<i>by-herself</i>	<i>fetus.ACC.SG.MASC</i>	<i>damage.3.SG.PRS.OPT.ACT</i>	
	‘... let the girl not damage the fruit of her womb by herself.’ (Vidēvdāt 15.11)			
(2b)	agnyād ^h eye	yad	b ^h avati	
	<i>fire-placing.LOC.SG.NTR</i>	REL.NOM.SG.NTR	<i>become.3.SG.PRS</i>	
	yac	ca	sute	
	REL.NOM.SG.NTR	<i>and</i>	<i>Soma.LOC.SG.MASC</i>	<i>pressing.LOC.SG.NTR</i>
	dviija	yac	cetarair	
	<i>twice-born.NOM.SG.MASC</i>	REL.NOM.SG.NTR	<i>and=other.INSTR.PL.MASC</i>	
	mahāyajñairveda	tad		
	<i>great-worship-discipline.NOM.MASC.SG</i>	DEM.NOM.SG.NTR		
	b ^h agavān	svataḥ		
	<i>noble-man.NOM.SG.MASC</i>	<i>by-himself</i>		

² The curious initial metathesis illustrated by the Pth. form is not restricted to this paradigm, and would appear to be a regular correspondence mechanism between MP. and Pth.; as a comparandum may be adduced Pth. *wxrd* ‘eaten’ and MP. *xwrd* ‘id’. The phoneme represented by <xw>/<wx> is likely to be a voiceless rounded velar fricative, but no further information can be gleaned from the data to suggest whether MP. and Pth. realizations would have differed.

³ IE **s₂ue-* developed into OP *^huva-*, which seems to occur only in compounded nouns, e.g. *uvaipašiya-* ‘belonging to the self’.

‘That which by placing the fire on the sacrificial fire-place and by pressed-out Soma the twice-born man becomes, and which others through great worship and disciple attain, the fortunate/noble man is by himself.’ (Mahabhārata 12.260.37)

Both examples clearly show that YAv. *xʷatō* and Ved. *svatas* are adjuncts to the VP; this, as will become evident below, is decidedly not the position *xwd/wxd* take in WMIr.

2.2. CORPUS

Time constraints have limited the current analysis to all those instances of *xwd/wxd* listed in Durkin-Meisterernst (2004) which were accessible at this time; this excludes occurrences in the fragments from the *Museum für Indische Kunst* (MIK), Hutter’s *Manis kosmogonische Šaburagan Texte* and unpublished manuscripts. Non-Manichaean texts and occurrences of the pronouns or their heterograms therein have not been taken into account here.

When reference is made to a text, Durkin-Meisterernst’s abbreviations will be used; correspondences are listed in the reference section at the end of this article.

2.3. EXPRESSIONS OF REFLEXIVITY I

Before going into any detail about *xwd/wxd*, it is worthwhile pointing out a few background details. In spite of their common translation as ‘himself’, the pronouns are synchronically not used as reflexives; while etymologically, they carry a reflexive element, the expression of this concept is handled differently in WMIr.

One common innovation of the Indo-Iranian languages is the expression of reflexivity by periphrasis. Where a host of other Indo-European languages will use cognates of the enclitic **sue-*, Lat. *se*, Gk. *ἐ-(αυτόν)*, OHG *sih*, ON *sik* to express the direct object co-referent with the subject of the clause, Indo-Iranian has introduced NPs which employ a possessive adjective derived from this root together with a noun meaning ‘body’ or ‘soul’.

To give but a few examples of this phenomenon, YAv. *huua- tanu-* (2c) and Ved. (*svaya-*) *tanú-* (2d) may be taken into consideration.

(2c)	paoirīm.	upa.	maγəm.	hakəṛəṭ.	āpō.
	<i>first</i> .ACC.SG.MASC	<i>at</i>	<i>hole</i> .ACC.SG.MASC	<i>once</i>	<i>water</i> .ACC.PL.FEM

āat. huuam. tanum. pairi.yaoždaiṣita.
then own.ACC.SG.FEM body.ACC.SG.FEM cleanse.3.SG.PRS.OPT.MED
 ‘At the first hole he shall purify himself once with water.’ (Vidēvdāt 9.31)

- (2d) ... utá svayám tan_uvāḥ śumbha-mānāḥ
and self body.NOM.PL adorn-PRS.MED.PTCP.NOM.PL.MASC
 ‘... and adorning themselves/their bodies.’ (RV 7.56.11)

This innovation is retained and even expanded in WMIr., where variations on the noun exist; judging from the extant material, the most common way of doing so employs a set phrase *xwys gryw*, lit. ‘own soul’; it occurs frequently, and is in most cases best understood as ‘oneself’, so e.g. in (2e).

- (2e) ‘w=š’n xwd ’z xwys gryw ’ndr ’myxt
and=3.OBL.PL_i ANAPHORA greed 3.POSS_i soul in mix.PST_i
 ‘And they [the plants] then mixed in themselves him [the Third Messenger] and Greed.’ (MMi. B I Ri (6))

Similarly, the collocation *xwys tn*, lit. ‘own body’, is employed in this meaning, as indicated by (2f); this, however, appears to be a less frequently used expression.

- (2f) ‘yg ‘wmyzdg’t’c’ wd ‘zdygr yzd oo ‘y myhr yzd
then Call and Answer Lord REL Mihr Lord
 ‘wd srygrqrb ‘y ‘whrmyzdby m’d ‘br xwys tn [...
and woman REL First Man mother to/upon 3.POSS body
 ‘Then Call and Lord Answer, who is Lord Mihr, and a woman, the mother of the First Man, to/upon himself/themselves ...’ (MMi., 178 (y, 7, 2, M₇₉₈₄, II, Rii, 10))

As will become evident in the later discussion of Armenian parallels with WMIr., this particular innovation is of great interest and significance for questions of structural interactions between the two languages. Before that, however, it is most noteworthy that in Classical Persian the reflex of MP. *xwd*, i.e. CPers. *x^wad*, has amalgamated the functions of both intensifier and reflexive pronoun (cf. Windfuhr 1979: 73ff.). Therefore, a more thorough consideration of this particular form and its usages seems called for.

2.4. THE CASE OF MP. XWD, PTH. WXD

2.4.1. INTENSIFICATION

The historically oldest as well as etymologically and historically most straightforward function of the pronouns seems to be the intensification

of an explicit NP, usually the topic of the clause in question; the corpus generally shows the pronoun only to occur in co-reference with a direct case NP, corresponding in most instances to the sentential subject.⁴ Thus in (2g, h) two occurrences are found in which the pronoun follows the explicit subject.

- (2g) 'c 'ym(y)n hrwyn tw wzrgy(s)tr ['wd] rwšnystr
from this.PL all.PL you great.SUPERL and bright.SUPERL
 'yy oo cy pd [r]'š(t)[y](f)t tw wxd bwt
be.2.SG.PRS because in truth.SG you INT Buddha.SG
 'yy
be.2.SG.PRS
 'Of all these you are the greatest and brightest, for in truth you yourself are Buddha.'
 (MKG 56) [Pth.]
- (2h) 'w=š yyšw' w'(x)t kw nxw(š)[t] tw wxd
and=3.OBL.SG Jesus.SG speak.3.SG.PRS COMP first.SG you INT
 w'xt kw 'z hym ...
speak.3.SG.PRS COMP I be.1.SG.PRS
 'And Jesus said to him: "You yourself said that I am ..."' (MKG 1193) [Pth.]

Both of these Pth. instances occur in direct speech and in combination with personal pronouns acting as subject. The translation 'self' is etymological and customary in instances of such intensification;⁵ given the fact that English, for example, similarly employs a reflexive pronoun for similar intensifying purposes, this usage is sensible.

MP. does not differ in employing the intensifier, and it obeys the same basic rules.

- (2i) ky xwyš gryw byrwn dyd 'ndrwn ny dyd h'n
REL own soul.SG outwardly see.PST inwardly not see.PST he
 xwd qmb bwyd 'ny=c ks qmb kwnd
INT lesser become.3.SG.PRS other=EMPH INDEF lesser make.3.SG.PRS
 'He, who saw himself but from the outside, and did not see the inside, he becomes little and makes others little.' (BBB 549) [MP.]

The degree of intensification can be augmented or upheld by repetition; commonly, the two instances of the intensifier will be separated by a

⁴ As example (2p) below demonstrates, however, the pronoun may also be applied to a direct case NP if it functions as the experiencer in an ergative construction.

⁵ Cf. Eckhart (2001) for a detailed account of intensification and focalization at the example of German 'selbst'.

phrase or clause, as in (2j) below, where *xwd* ... *xwd* is interlaced with a relative clause co-referent with the pronoun; it is noteworthy that the intensifier may be found on either side of the NP it relates to, as is quite evident here.

- (2j) 'wd xwd 'wyš'(n) 'rd'w-'n ky=š 'c byrwn 'wd
and INT DEM.PL *righteous-PL* REL=3.SG.OBL *from outwardly and*
 'c 'br p(yr)['mwn 'y]st'nd 'wyn x(w)[d] 'br h'n
from above around stand.3.PL.PRS DEM.PL INT over DEM.SG
 'dwr wzrg 'wd 'br wysp cy=š 'ndr p'dyxš'y
fire great and over all REL=3.SG.OBL in rulership
 bw'nd [']yb
become.3.PL.PRS fire
 'And those Righteous that will stand around it, outside and above, they shall have power over that Great Fire, and over everything in it.' (Kaw F 62) [MP.]

Given the etymology of the intensifier and its original adverbial function, the most stringent explanation of its change in function seems to be re-analysis as an adnominal; instead of emphasizing or providing focus to the VP, it intensifies the direct case nominal and pronominal topic NPs, occurring as an adjunct on either side of the subject NP. With a view to their further functions, *xwd/wxd* are probably best interpreted as pronominal adjectives.

A somewhat non-canonical usage of *wxd* occurs in example (2k); here the intensifier occurs as the first member of an extraposed NP, presumably with an ellipsed head noun.

- (2k) 'b'w mrd 'yw wzrg '(c) 'bršhr d'ry'w n'm o prw'n
then man_i one great from Abaršahr Dāryāw name before
 hw gd wxd 'd'n dw (b)r'dr-'n ...
 DEM.SG go.PST INT *with two brother-PL*
 'Then a noble man from Abaršahr by the name of Dāryāw went before him, (that is) he with his two brothers...' (MKG 670) [Pth.]

This, of course, is not the only interpretation of this particular occurrence; as will become obvious below, this instance of *wxd* may equally be seen as an anaphoric pronoun, used for stylistic rather than syntactic purposes. The reason for preferring the former analysis in this particular instance lies purely in the fact that extraposition seems like a particularly sensible place for an intensifier. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the manuscript has a lacuna after the passage quoted.

2.4.2. CLAUSE-LEVEL ANAPHORA (CLA)

In another set of instances, and a comparably large one at that, the pronoun is employed in a similar function; here, however, it serves as an explicative, almost defining particle in a relative clause that further elucidates and by metaphor explains a previous NP. That, at any rate, would appear to be the semantic reasoning behind this usage. In the given etymological context, both a derivation from the original ‘by itself’ or from an intensifying function is sensible, and cross-linguistically documented.⁶ Examples of such occurrences are found *en masse* in LN, but equally, if to a lesser degree, in the other compilations, and are common to both MP. and Pth., as below in (2l, m).

- (2l) 'wd jnyd ('w h)[w] d'lwg mrnyh oo cy
and fell.3.SG.PRS OBJ-MARKER DEM.SG tree.SG_i deadly.SG_i REL
 wxd 's(t) [xyn oo
 CLA_i be.3.SG.PRS hatred.SG
 ‘And he fells the Tree of Death, which itself is hatred.’ (LN 27) [Pth.]
- (2m) 'st](w)ynd [b](x)syhy(d) 'y xwd (h)ynd hpt'n drwxš'n
material.SG_i split.3.SG.PRS.PASS REL CLA_i be.3.PL.PRS seven demoness.SG
 ‘... the material (“das Stoffliche”) is split, which itself consists of seven demonesses.’
 (KPT 364) [MP.]

These instances pose an interesting question: would the sense of these statements change if the pronoun were to be omitted? Sentence (2l) seems to exemplify that this may indeed be the case; if construed without *wxd*, it would appear reasonable to assume that the relative clause may not refer to *d'lwg* anymore, but take as its antecedent the whole previous clause, or be ambiguous at any rate.⁷ Example (2m) does not allow for

⁶ Cp. e.g. Lat. *Insanit hic quidem, qui ipse male dicit sibi*. ‘This fellow is mad, who maligns himself.’ (*Plaut. Men. 309*); both *ipse* and *sibi* are co-referent with the matrix subject, but *ipse* is neither semantically nor syntactically necessary, and serves intensifying and explicating purposes only.

⁷ The English translation of this example would be ambiguous, too, if intensification were omitted: ‘And he fells the [Tree of Death]_i, which_i is hatred’ vs ‘[And he fells the Tree of Death]_i, which_i is hatred’. This ambiguity does, however, not occur in languages like Latin (cp. n.3), since gender and grammatical case serve referencing purposes.

such an assumption, largely due to the lack of context; other examples from the corpus, however, seem to show a similar pattern.⁸

In collocation with a relative pronoun, *xwd/wxd* therefore seem to function as clause-level anaphoras, co-referencing a matrix clause NP within the domain of the relative clause. Excerpt (2l) and the vast majority of other cases of CLA further seem to indicate that *xwd/wxd* may further indicate a switch in syntactic function; in most instances, this means that a matrix-level object will in the relative clause take subject function. As (2m) indicates, however, this is not a hard and fast rule, but rather a tendency.⁹ A potential reason for this may lie in the morphological poverty of the language, which does not allow for marking co-reference in any other way.¹⁰

CLA, whether used as a switch-function marker or not, appears not only in defining relative clauses, as above, but further finds use in other subordinate clauses, e.g.:

- (2n) 'w=š tgnbnd ds(t) bwrđ 'w=š hw w'drwng
and=3.OBL.SG quickly hand bring.PST and=3.OBL.SG DEM.SG ?melissa.SG
nx'p'd wŧ šwd 'w=š prw'n s'h hndym'n kyr[d]
?distill.PST and go.PST and=3.OBL.SG before king, before make.PST
kd wxd 'd ws-'n 'z'd-'(n) ['](wŧ wzrg)-'n bzm s'y'd
when CLA_i with many-PL noble-PL and great-PL banquet lie.PST
 'And she quickly carried it away (dst bwrđ), and she distilled the melissa, and went
 and put it before the king when he was banqueting with many noble and rich men.'
 (MKG 715) [Pth.]

In this instance, the CLA occurs in a temporal clause, but operates essentially along the same lines as stated above, i.e. co-referencing an

⁸ Cp. BBB 186ff. (MP.): 'pryd 'wd 'stwwd hyb byh yyšw' ... 'yg xwd m'd zywyn'g ... 'Blessed and praised be Jesus ... who/which himself is the life-giving mother ...'; a similar syntactic ambiguity may be observed upon excision of *xwd*; the pragmatic validity, of course, is a different matter completely.

⁹ Switch-function marking can be compared to, and to a certain extent is analogous to, switch-reference marking; both phenomena are cross-linguistically not uncommon, but rarely found in Indo-European languages; for a definition and overview, cf. Jacobsen (1967: 240).

¹⁰ Older Iranian languages, i.e. Old Persian and Avestan, on the other hand do mark gender, case and number on relative pronouns, and therefore have no particular need for separate co-reference marking anaphora.

oblique case object NP in the matrix clause and a direct case subject NP in the subordinate clause.

MP. also shows *xwd* in this function in non-defining relative clauses:

- (20) sdyg kw 'wyš'n gy'n-'n pyšyng-'n 'yg pd xwyš dyn
thirdly COMP DEM.PL *soul-PL* *ancient-PL* REL *in* 3.POSS *religion*
 qyrdg'n ny hnzft 'w dyn 'yg mn "ynd
deed *not* *finish.PST* *to* *religion* IZAFET *my* *come.3.PL.PRS*
 'y=š'n xwd dr 'y 'wzynyšn bwyd.
Rel=3.OBL.PL *CLA* *gate* IZAFET *redeeming* *become.3.SG.PRS*
 'Thirdly, that those ancient souls, which in their own religion did not complete good
 deeds, come to my religion, which in turn becomes the gate of salvation to them.'
 (MMii T II D 126 I V (9)) [MP.]

The genesis of the pronoun's tendency to function as a switch-function marker is most probably conditioned by the need to disambiguate the subject identity in CPs and the pronoun's ability to intensify the topic.¹¹ As such, it would not be implausible to describe this function in semantic or pragmatic terms; yet, the fact that *xwd/wxd* do not only occur as intensifying adjuncts of NPs or their adjuncts (and thus within the domain of the c-commanding NP), but also in CPs which are dominated by VPs, almost necessitates that they construct a syntactic link to the co-referent NP, irrespective of whether this was its original function or not.

In example (2p), Pth. *wxd* would appear to occur also in logophoric function in indirect statements; this function, however, only appears once in the corpus, and may be best explained otherwise.

- (2p) (')[w]=š (kd) [d]yd kw p(t) wysp s(xwn) wxd
and=3.SG.OBL *when* *see.PST* COMP *with* *every* *word* CLA
 'ndrxt 'dy'n ...
condemn.PST *then*
 'When he saw that with every word he condemned himself, then ...' (MKG 1217)
 [Pth.]

The issue lies with the ergative construction of this sentence; *'ndrxt* is the past participle of the transitive verb *'ndrynj*, and as such is expected to take an oblique case agent and a direct case patient. The latter is provided by *wxd*, whilst the agentive part is probably best sought in the preposi-

¹¹ In terms of processes, it is plausible to assume that initially, the usage was restricted to relative pronouns, which are close in meaning and function to actual NPs, before a generalization to include all CPs was effected.

tional phrase *pt wysp sxwn*. Although functionally *wxd* operates like a logophore in this instance,¹² no further comparable evidence can be provided. This apparent logophoric usage is therefore best explained as yet another instance of CLA; the oblique agent of the matrix clause, here the enclitic *-š*, is represented in the subordinate clause by the direct case *wxd*, thus taking the patient role of the ergative construction.

2.4.3. DISCOURSE ANAPHORA (DA)

A further reason to categorize the pronouns as a syntactic marker lies in another set of functions, namely that of discourse anaphora; they are distinct from the above CLA in that both antecedent and anaphor are found on the same clausal level, and the fact that both will necessarily be in the direct case. That is to say that *xwd/wxd* are able to signal subject re-up-take on the same level within a sentence, or, independently of such levels, between sentences.

- (2q) 'wt pt r'h kw šwyd tgnbnd 'w dšt 'yw wzrg yw
and on path when go.3.SG.PRS quickly to steppe_i one great and
 wy'b'n y'dyndyh 'wt 'škyft grm 'hyn(dy)h 'wt wxd
desolate reach.3.SG.OPT_j and very hot be.3.SG.OPT_i and DA_j
 wgw d wšynd 'wt tšynd 'hyndyh
be malnourished.PTCP hungry and thirsty be.3.SG.OPT_j
 'And on the path, as he walks, he quickly reaches a great and desolate steppe. And it
 was very hot, and he was starving, hungry and thirsty.' (MKG 797) [Pth.]

Example (2q) demonstrates the DA function of the pronoun, referencing the last pragmatically plausible subject.¹³ The change of subject, as it occurs in the clause *'wt 'škyft grm 'hyn(dy)h*, is not indicated syntactically; on the contrary, it is *prima facie* not implausible to assume that *grm* may refer to the same NP as do *wšynd*, etc. Two arguments, however,

¹² Strictly speaking, logophoric pronouns should form a distinct paradigm of expressions always in co-reference with the author of secondary discourse (cp. Hagège 1974: 305); this, of course, is not strictly the case here, but the parallels are evident.

¹³ There does not seem to be any formal syntactic way of determining which NP should be the antecedent to the pronoun; such judgment, it would appear, must be made on other grounds. One possibility, as long as the sentence boundary is not broken, lies with the minimal distance principle; as defined by Huang (2000: 43), the controllee is co-indexed with its closest, c-commanding NP. In particular, DA occurs when pronoun and NP are siblings, while CLA, esp. with switch-function marking, necessitates that the referenced NP c-command the mother-node of the pronoun, commonly a CP.

speak in favour of construing the clause with a different subject: firstly, the lexicon would suggest that in WMlr., *grm* ought to refer to an inanimate object rather than an animate one, at any rate in the meaning ‘hot, warm’, and must thus apply to *dšt* rather than anything else;¹⁴ secondly, the position of *wxd* in the second clause as well as the repetition of the predicate *’hyndyh* suggest that two different subjects occur within the sentence.

Where in (2q) the change of subject can only be inferred from context, (2r) exhibits subject re-uptake after syntactically overt change of subject.

- (2r) h’n gnwm ’bwsyd ’wd ’w xwyš qndwg bryd
 DEM.SG wheat_i collect.3.SG.PRS_j and to 3.POSS_j jug bring.3.SG.PRS_j
 ky ’cy=š ’wzyd oo ’wd xwdyc ’w h’n xwybš
 REL from=3.OBL.SG_i come out.PST and DA.EMPH_j to DEM.SG 3.POSS_j
 m’nd šwyd ky ’cy=š ’md
 house go.3.SG.PRS_j REL from=3.OBL.SG_j come.PST
 ‘He collected that wheat and brought it to his jug (“Vorratskrug”) from which it had come. And he went back to his house, from which he had come.’ (KPT 2066) [MP.]

The clause introduced by *ky ’cyš* refers back to *qndwg*, and as its subject, inferred by context, takes *h’n gnwm*.¹⁵ This change of subject would have been carried over to the next sentence, since WMlr. readily employs null-anaphora; thus, to refer back to the subject of the previous matrix clause, *xwdyc* is employed as a DA.

Both of the above examples contain instances of anaphora after different kinds of subject change. The role and functional mechanism of the anaphoric pronoun is evident in both instances, and clearly does not warrant for the hitherto sensible translation ‘self’ or the like; rather a straightforward repetition of the subject, or a pronominal representation thereof, seem reasonable tools to render this phenomenon.

Further, it is patent that in cases where no referential ambiguity between matrix and subordinate clause exists, no CLA marking is required, either; instead, change of subject to the ‘original’ subject is effected by

¹⁴ Cp. e.g. Gk. θερμός, a cognate of *grm*: when referring to inanimates, its meaning ranges from ‘warm’ over ‘hot’ to ‘feverish’; when, metaphorically, applied to animates, however, it means ‘rash, hot-headed’.

¹⁵ While this could have been signaled by CLA, the context seems to be rather unambiguous, esp. given the sentence that ensues.

means of anaphora. As will be discussed below, this seems to hint at an interlinked paradigm of co-referentiality.

A peculiar form of the anaphoric function can be observed in a number of instances, where no syntactic or contextual change of subject has occurred previously. It appears rather that the pronoun occurs in order to switch focus from the previous clause, or its object; this seems like a cogent development from the original function of the pronoun, but cannot be grouped within that category, since in the present cases it is used *qua* subject, rather than as a functional adjunct.

- (2s) byd m'nh'g ('hy)nd 'w 'skynd ky ('w 'n)y kyc r'h
then like be.3.SG.PRS to lame REL to other INDEF road
 nm'yd 'w nydfryd oo 'wd wxd nšst 'št(y)d ...
show.3.SG.PRS and hasten.3.SG.PRS and DA/INT set.PTCP stand.3.SG.PRS
 'And they are comparable to the lame, who shows the way to another man and urges him to hurry, but himself remains seated ...' (GW 79) [Pth.]

- (2t) pš kdy=š 'ndr bnd 'n'by'd bndynd ... u wxd
after when=3.OBL.SG in prison forgotten bind.3.PL.PRS and DA/INT
 'ž 'br pdyxš'hynd ...
from above rule.3.PL.PRS
 'And after they bound him in a prison of oblivion and took charge from above themselves ...' (MMiii T II D 79, 79) [Pth.]

In (2s, t), two clauses with the same subject are coordinated; the pronoun, it seems, serves no syntactically necessary purpose here, but in its anaphoric function, re-iterating the subject, may create a shift of focus from the first to the second clause for stylistic reasons.¹⁶ Alternatively, a solution of this issue may be sought in an analysis of *xwd/wxd* as intensifiers; in this instance, the supposition would have to be that an NP must

¹⁶ It is noteworthy that in both instances, the shift occurs from transitive to an intransitive construction. Depending on the stage of development of the verbal system at that time, the pronoun may serve the purpose of co-referencing the subject of transitive and intransitive verbs in the past; yet, since (2k) is set in the present, such a distinction seems unnecessary, and can only be speculative.

have been ellipsed. In any case, it seems obvious that the reasoning behind the usage of the pronouns here is not syntactically motivated.¹⁷

2.5. SUMMARY

In summary, *xwd* and *wxd* can be categorized as follows:

- (a) Intensifier - serves to provide emphasis as adjunct to a topic NP; by extension, it may further do so with any c-commanding NP on a superordinate nodal level. Applies to both MP. and Pth.
- (b) Clause-level anaphora (CLA) - possibly an extension of the above, occurring in CPs irrespective of c-command of the relevant NP; often (but not always) indicates co-reference with matrix clause oblique case NP, usually acting as subject of subordinate clause; found in both MP. and Pth. as part of subordinate clauses.
- (c) Discourse Anaphora (DA) - in all likelihood a further extension of the intensifier function; co-reference only with NPs on same clause level; commonly employed for disambiguating and stylistic purposes. Applies to both MP. and Pth.

The tripartite development of this etymologically reflexive adverb is a characteristic of WMIr. alone, it would seem; the older languages of the Indo-Iranian phylum have retained the original meaning as shown above quite neatly, and do not show any functional application of the relevant cognates that mirrors or foreshadows this outcome.

The situation in Classical Persian, however, is quite different, as noted above. The domain of the pronoun has been further enlarged as it can provide emphasis to NPs in all cases and further functions as a canonical reflexive pronoun as well. Once more, this transition is probably best explained in terms of re-analysis: the ability of *xwd* to co-reference and intensify subjects, and its occurrence in non-subject function (e.g. in ergative constructions) make it rather prone to be mistaken for, and consequently used as a reflexive pronoun, ever the more so since a pronoun proper avoids potentially ambiguous periphrases.

¹⁷ One must remark, however, that in most examples presented, the pronouns in question also happen to mark a transition of transitive to intransitive verbs; this, however, does not generally hold true, cp. (2p).

3. ARMENIAN

With the development, functional distribution and distinction between co-referent expressions in mind, it should now be very rewarding to consider the situation in Classical Armenian.

Jensen (1959: 78) has very little to say about the precise usage of the pronoun *ink'n*, noting that it serves as one of several reflexive pronouns and may be employed for all three persons, usually accompanied by the personal pronoun in the case of the first and second person. In contradistinction to the WMr. pronouns in question, *ink'n* is fully declinable and in fact seems to occur most frequently in prepositional phrases, and thus in non-nominative cases. As shall become evident, however, in a great number of respects it possesses a functional distribution so close to that of its WMr. counterparts that coincidence or unrelated developments in both families seem implausible.

3.1. ETYMOLOGY

The lack of phonemic correspondence between *wxd* and *ink'n* precludes lexical or phonetic borrowing; any parallels must therefore be explained on a different basis. In terms of the etymology of *ink'n*, no fully satisfying analysis has been provided yet; Matirosyan (2010: 303) derives the *-k'* of *ink'n* from the same root **sue-* as indicated above, and further links it with the possessive reflexive *iwr*. A further connection to the IIr. cognate may be sought in an analysis as **en-suom*, that is the accusative singular of the pronoun, prefixed by a preposition 'in'; the cluster **-su-* regularly develops into Arm. *-k'*, cf. e.g. **suesor-* 'sister', Skt. *svásar-* 'id.', Arm. *k'oyr*, and **suop-no-*, Skt. *svápna-*, Arm. *k'un*. Final syllables, on the other hand, are regularly lost or weakened, which should explain the reduction **-suom* > PArm. **-k'om* > PArm. **k'm*;¹⁸ the assimilation of the bilabial nasal to the preceding guttural then yielded Arm. *-k'n*. In terms of meaning, the hypothetical 'in itself' compares quite well to IIr. 'by itself', which suggests that the original functions of both petrified expressions may have been similar.

3.2. CORPUS

¹⁸ The latter assimilatory process also occurs frequently, e.g. also in **dek'm* > Arm. *tasn*.

In order to establish how far the linguistic relationship between IIr. **sʰuatas* and PArm. **insuom* had an impact on the attested usage of their reflexes, it is worthwhile consulting the earliest written works Armenian has to offer. The New Testament is frequently taken as a basic corpus for linguistic studies in Classical Armenian; often, however, this evidence is problematic due to the style of translation. Since the Greek text of the Septuagint served as the original,¹⁹ it is at times difficult to determine whether the syntactic usage of the pronoun employed in the NT is fully indigenous to the Armenian language, or whether it was a mechanic adaptation from the Greek. αὐτός in many instances works along very similar lines as do *ink'n* and *xwd/wxd*, but may of course in specific cases work rather differently.

NT examples must therefore be compared to and corroborated by instances from early Armenian authors, whose works are not based on Greek originals, and which may thus be adduced as evidence in favour of a particular function; in this light, Agat'angelos' *Patmut'wn Hayoc'* and Eznik Kolbac'i's *Etc Aʿandoc'* have been consulted as well.

3.3. EXPRESSIONS OF REFLEXIVITY II

The fact that Indo-Iranian employed an innovative set of periphrastic reflexive constructions, consisting of a cognate of PIE **sʰe-* and a noun meaning 'body' or 'soul', has been established above.

As it turns out, Armenian also employs a periphrastic construction to express canonical reflexivity, consisting of the noun *anjn* 'person, soul, self' and a possessive pronoun, e.g. *im* 'my', *k'o* 'thy', *iwr* 'his/her/its'. The latter, particularly, is of interest, as Arm. *iwr* < **seue/o-ro-* (Martirosyan 2010: 303).

- (3a) Yet aysorik darjeal yaytneac' z=anjn iwr
 after DEM.GEN.SG *again* *reveal.3.SG.AOR* OBJ=*soul*.ACC.SG 3.POSS
 Yisus ašakertac'=n iwroc' aš covezerb=n
 Jesus.NOM.SG *disciple*.DAT.PL=DET 3.POSS.GEN.PL *at* *sea-shore*.INSTR.SG

Tibereay

¹⁹ There are a few instances where an earlier translation from Syriac survives in the manuscript tradition; for all intents and purposes, however, this is irrelevant to most linguistic studies.

Tiberias.GEN.SG

'Thereafter Jesus revealed himself again to his disciples, at the shore of Lake Tiberias.' (Jn. 21: 1)

- (3b) ... Yisus K'ristos, or i k'en=d aṛak'ec'aw
Jesus.NOM.SG Christ.NOM.SG REL by you.ABL.SG=DET send.3.SG.AOR.PASS
 aṛ mez ... ew nkareac' ew tpaworeac' z=anjn
to we.ACC.PL and depict.3.SG.AOR and imprint.3.SG.AOR OBJ=soul.ACC.SG
 iwr i stelcowacs jeṛac' iwroc'
3.POSS in creature.ACC.PL hand.GEN.PL 3.POSS.GEN.PL
 'Jesus Christ, who was sent by you to us, ... and who depicted and imprinted himself
 on the creatures of his own hands ...' (Agat'. 95)

While the periphrasis works along very similar lines as the ones commonly used in Young Avestan and Vedic, Arm. *anjn* is not cognate with YAv. *tanu-* or Ved. *tanú-* or *ātmán-*, and rather belongs with OIc. *angi*, 'smell, scent', Dan. *ange* 'steam', probably from **h₂enh₁-* 'to breathe' (cf. Martirosyan 2010: 94).

Examples (3a, b) show a striking similarity between Indo-Iranian and Armenian expressions, to such a degree of congruence indeed that assuming a random occurrence or individual development in both languages seems hardly plausible. Rather, the expressions must be a direct calque from WMlr.; yet, while numerous studies have pointed out direct loan words from this language family, such calques, esp. in expressions of grammatical function, are less common and require wide-spread bilingualism in the society in question (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 37). As the following sections will show, however, the calquing does not end with these reflexives.

3.4 THE CASE OF INK'N

3.4.1. INTENSIFICATION

To show that an underlying connection between syntactic phenomena in WMlr. and Armenian exists, it suffices to demonstrate that Arm. *ink'n* shares in the features under section 2; since Armenian is not a member of the Indo-Iranian phylum, any parallels must be calques on the WMlr. original.

As in MP. and Pth., the pronoun *ink'n* is used as an intensifier, adjunct to the NP in question.

- (3c) ew ink'n Davit' hogwov=n srbov asē.

and INT *David*.NOM *spirit*.INSTR.SG=DET *holy*.INSTR.SG *say*.3.SG.PRS
 asac' tēr c'=tēr im, ...
say.3.SG.AOR *Lord*.NOM.SG INDIR.OBJ=*Lord*.ACC.SG *my*.ACC.SG
 'And David himself said by the Holy Spirit: the Lord said to my lord, ...' (Mk. 12: 36)

- (3d) kam orpes z=noyn ink'n ašxarhi hoviw
or how DIR.OBJ=*same*.ACC.SG INT *land*.GEN.SG *shepherd*.ACC.SG
 kac'uc'eal, vayelēin i norun vardapetut'ean=n
appoint.PTCP.NOM *enjoy*.3.PL.IMPF *in same*.GEN.SG *teaching*.LOC.SG=DET
 'Or how they appointed the very same man as shepherd of the land, and enjoyed his
 teaching.' (Agat'. 14)

Since the pronoun is fully declinable in Classical Armenian, it is unsurprising that it should have widened its domain and be applicable not only to subject NPs, as was the case for WMIr., but can occur as an adjunct to any NP; as noted above, Classical Persian *x^wad* underwent a similar development.

3.4.2. DISCOURSE ANAPHORA (DA)

It further occurs in the same usage as discourse anaphora, serving the purpose of subject co-reference in same-level clauses and general disambiguation. As with WMIr., *ink'n* does not require a change of subject, and is in fact frequently used along similar lines as the personal pronoun.

- (3e) ew ibrew emut i nawn, gnac'in zkni nora
and when enter.3.SG.AOR *in ship*.ACC.SG *go*.3.PL.AOR *after* DEM.GEN.SG
 ašakert-k'=n. ew aha šaržumn mec elew
disciple-PL=DET *and behold earthquake*.NOM.SG *big*.NOM.SG *become*.3.SG.AOR
 i covun ... ew ink'n nnjēr
in sea.LOC.SG *and DA sleep*.3.SG.IMPF
 'And when he embarked upon the ship, his disciples followed him. And behold,
 there was a great earthquake in the sea And he was asleep.' (Mt. 8: 24)

- (3f) zi, yoržam z=ordin iwr ibrew z=mard
for when DIR.OBJ=*son*.ACC.SG 3.POSS *as* DIR.OBJ=*man*.ACC.SG
 y=ašxarh ašak'esc'ē, mi awtaroti inč'
in=world.ACC.SG *send*.3.SG.AOR.SUBJ *not strange* INDEF
 z=irs=n hamaresc'in. manawand, zi
 DIR.OBJ=*thing*.ACC.PL=DET *consider*.3.PL.AOR.SUBJ *mainly because*
 gitic'en t'e ink'n isk ayn kerparanawk' yaytnēr.
know.3.PL.AOR.SUBJ COMP DA INT DEM *form*.INSTR.PL *reveal*.3.SG.IMPF

‘For He would send his own son as man to the world, and they would not consider it strange at all; above all, they would know that He was actually revealing Himself in this form.’ (Eznik 118)

Due to the fact that Armenian has a far richer pronominal morphology than either of the WMIr. languages, it is not surprising that in addition to subject function, *ink’n* also readily appears in the oblique cases, whether as direct object or prepositional genitive:

- (3g) ew koč’ec’eal aṛ ink’n z=erkotasanesin ašakerts=n iwr, ...
and call.PERF.PTCP to DA.ACC.SG DIR.OBJ=twelve disciple.ACC.PL=DET 3.POSS
 ‘And he called to himself his twelve disciples ...’ (Mt. 10:1)

- (3h) ... ur ew ink’ean iwrov anjamb=n isk ōrinak
where also DA.GEN.SG 3.POSS.INSTR.SG soul.INSTR.SG=DET INT example
c’uc’anēr.
show.3.SG.IMPF
 ‘..., where by himself he indeed made an example of himself.’ (Agat’. 846)

The exact binding conditions of the pronoun in DA function are similarly vague as those for WMIr.; co-reference is most probably conditioned on distance, as pointed out above, or topicality of the antecedent.

As in (2p) above, Armenian also displays an apparently logophoric usage of the pronoun in (3i, j); in the dataset surveyed here, however, these were the only occurrences. Therefore, it seems more reasonable to attribute these particular occurrences not to logophoricity, but rather to keep it within the realm of general anaphora, re-iterating the subject after a syntactic break.

- (3i) isk p’estos arar patasxani. pabel z=na
but Festus.NOM.SG make.3.SG.AOR answer.ACC.SG keep.INF.PRS OBJ=DEM
i kesaria. t’ē ink’n isk ənd hup andr ert’aloc’
in Caesarea.LOC.SG COMP DA INT with near thither go.FUT.PTCP
ēr.
be.3.SG.IMPF
 ‘But Festus answered [them], that they should keep him[Paul] at Caesarea, and that he himself would depart shortly thither.’ (Act. 25: 4)

- (3j) isk t’agawor=n šat alač’eac’ z=Grigor vasn
but king.NOM.SG=DET INT implore.3.SG.AOR OBJ=Gregory.ACC.SG concerning
hanapazord aṛ nma kaloy, zi ənd ink’ean
continual beside DEM.LOC.SG remain.INF.GEN.SG so that with CLA.LOC.SG
šrjec’usc’e
travel.3.SG.AOR.SUBJ

'The king greatly implored Grigor to remain with him continuously, and to travel around with him.' (Agat'. 858)

It is worth noting, however, that in Modern Western Armenian, *ink'n* does exhibit logophoric characteristics as well as regular anaphoric functions, as detailed by Sigler (2001).

3.4.3. CLAUSE-LEVEL ANAPHORA (CLA)

CLA can be observed in Armenian as well, and shows the same tendency towards switch-function marking as its counterpart in WMIr., which is most uncommon in other Indo-European languages;²⁰ the frequency of this phenomenon is, however, far lower. An explanation thereof is best sought in the relative richness of Armenian nominal morphology as compared to WMIr.; due to more explicit case and number marking, disambiguation is required to a lesser degree. It seems likely that a CLA and switch-function marking of the WMIr. kind would not have fully developed in Armenian for that very reason, but (3k, l) still show that the extension of the intensifying function has occurred at least sporadically.

- (3k) ... ew yišel z=ban=n t(eaṛ)n y(isu)si
and remember.INF.PRS OBJ=WORD.ACC.SG=DET Lord.GEN.SG Jesus.GEN.SG
 z=or ink'n isk asac'. ...
 DIR.OBJ=REL CLA INT say.3.SG.AOR
 '... and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, which indeed he said ...' (Act. 20: 35)

- (3l) ... ork' ... vkayec'in z=miasakan
 REL.NOM.PL witness.3.PL.AOR OBJ=consubstantial.ACC.SG
 tērut'iwn=n Errordakan, ənd amenayn i veray
lordship.ACC.SG=DET Trinitarian.ACC.SG with all.ACC.SG on over
 amenayni z=Astuac, or na ink'n ē
all.GEN.SG OBJ=God.ACC.SG REL DEM.NOM.SG CLA be.3.SG.PRS
 y=awiteans y=awitenic'.
in=eternity.ACC.PL from=eternity.ABL.PL

²⁰ Typologically speaking, however Armenian and WMIr. are not the only languages to show a switch-function marking, or a general anaphoric pivot along functional lines: as Huang (2000: 287f.) demonstrates, Native American languages such as Capanahua have similar systems linking the subject of the dependent clause with the object of the matrix clause; he does, however, point out (280) that a number of Native American languages, e.g. Lakota, utilize independent morphemes for this purpose, which fulfil no other function.

‘..., who in their martyrdom bore witness to the consubstantial majesty of the Trinity, to God with all and above all, who exists for all eternity.’ (Agat’. 237)

In (3k), *ink’n* references the genitive *y(isu)si*; the change of subject is of course further marked on the verb *asac’*, but double marking is not uncommon over all. The case of (3l) is more open to interpretation, and may well be seen as an instance of simple intensification due to its occurrence with *na*; yet, given the host of NPs in the sentence, *ink’n* may have been employed to further disambiguate and co-reference the closest NP.

3.5. SUMMARY

The functional distribution of Arm. *ink’n* may therefore be summarized as follows:

- (a) Intensifier - serves to provide emphasis as adjunct to a topic NP; as opposed to WMIr., it is not restricted to the direct case alone.
- (b) Clause-level anaphora (CLA) - occurs less frequently than in WMIr., but works along the same lines; the need for co-referential disambiguation is less pronounced in Armenian.
- (c) Discourse Anaphora (DA) - as with the intensifier, *ink’n* may occur in all cases; otherwise, it fulfills the same function as its WMIr. counterpart.

The evidence from Classical Armenian shows significant functional overlap of Arm. *ink’n* and WMIr. *xwd/wxd*, as well as strong similarities between periphrastic reflexive expressions in Armenian and earlier Indo-Iranian languages; *ink’n*, however, is not a direct cognate of *xwd/wxd*, nor can direct etymological connections be established between the periphrastic constructions. It is thus evident that the *xwd/wxd* must have influenced the functional distribution and usage of *ink’n* significantly, and that the reflexive periphrasis must have been a calque from the Iranian languages.

Differences in the usage of the **sue-* pronouns do exist, esp. concerning the degree to which certain features have evolved or are employed; CLA and switch-function marking are used more sparingly, presumably since no grave need for disambiguation in these syntactic circumstances existed. Furthermore, the inflection of *ink’n* must be a secondary development, if this analysis is correct.

4. ARMENIAN-IRANIAN STRUCTURAL INTERACTIONS

The situation, cross-linguistically and diachronically speaking, is thus as follows:

(4a) the oldest strands of Indo-Iranian, specifically Young Avestan and Vedic Sanskrit, show an adverb derived from PIE **suetos*, meaning roughly ‘by itself; by nature; by one’s own volition’; they further employ a combination of **sue-* based reflexive possessive and a noun meaning ‘body, person; soul’ to express reflexivity.²¹ In Old Persian, cognates of **sue-* are attested only in compound nouns.

(4b) WMIr. retains reflexes of both expressions; *xwd/wxd* < **suetos* develop into pronouns proper, losing their adverbial character. They develop a tripartite set of historically interconnected functions (intensification, clause-level anaphora with switch-function tendencies, discourse anaphora), which are not present in earlier Indo-Iranian; they further occur only in the direct case. A reflex of the Indo-Iranian reflexive periphrasis is retained.

(4c) Armenian, albeit not a member of the Indo-Iranian phylum, shows a setup very close to that of WMIr.; a functionally tripartite **sue-* based pronoun, whose origin may well be sought in a similar petrified adverbial form, as well as a periphrastic construction very close to the Indo-Iranian ones, related not on an etymological, but rather on a semantic level.

The development from (4a) to (4b) would appear to be straightforward enough; the reflexive periphrasis remains intact, while the predecessors of *xwd/wxd* are re-analysed as adnominals rather than adverbs. The emphatic and intensifying function is retained throughout Middle Iranian, and gives rise to various anaphoric functions.

The similarities between (4b) and (4c), on the other hand, cannot be explained quite as stringently. Since the periphrastic expression ‘his own body’ is not a remnant from Indo-European times, but rather an innovation within Indo-Iranian, Armenian cannot have inherited it. Similarly, the functional split occurring both in Arm. *ink’n* and WMIr. *xwd/wxd*, which is a further development within the Iranian phylum, must be a calque from the Iranian language family.

Armenian as the perceived social substratum to the language of the Parthian ruling class is more likely to have been the target language; this

²¹ For a detailed account of the different reflexive constructions and their usage in Vedic, cf. Kulikov (2007).

is further corroborated by the sheer number of lexical material borrowed from WMlr. into Armenian. As Field (2002: 38) points out, the likelihood that a substrate language would borrow function words from a dominant language is, compared to other forms of borrowings, relatively high. Yet, it is not the lexical item that is borrowed, nor its phonetic realisation; it is its function, rather, that is transferred onto a semantically compatible lexical item in the substrate language.²² As such, the equation of *xwd/wxd* with *ink'n* may best be explained as a borrowing by imposition - speakers of Armenian were in constant contact with WMlr. speakers, and in all likelihood bilingual to a certain extent; the prolonged contact resulted in the inadvertent borrowing of functional as well as lexical items.²³

The lower frequency of CLA in Armenian is best explained as a typological mismatch: intensification and anaphora are concepts that were already present in Armenian, and were thus only enriched by a further expression, whilst especially the switch-function tendency of CLA is a foreign concept, and therefore more difficult to grasp and apply.

The choice of *ink'n* as a counterpart to *xwd/wxd* must lie with its original function and usage, which, judging from the hypothesized etymology above, was very close to the original meaning of Ilr. **sūatas*. It is unclear, however, whether *ink'n* was declinable prior to its adoption of the WMlr. functional pattern, or not, and indeed which was its true original function within Proto-Armenian.

5. CONCLUSION

The data presented above clearly indicates that the contact between Armenian and Parthian as the most likely representative of the Western Middle Iranian languages went far beyond the mere acquisition of loan words and *verbum pro verbo* calques. The adoption of the reflexive periphrasis and the functional calque of the tripartite functions of WMlr. *xwd/wxd* necessitate far closer links and more intense interaction; this is likely to be the result of prolonged contact between the two languages, possibly in a bilingual context. The history of the pronoun in the Iranian

²² For examples of structural borrowings between language families, cf. Harris (1995: 124).

²³ A parallel is presented by the Greek dialects of Asia Minor, which adopted features of the surrounding language, Turkish (Thomason/Kaufman 1988: 215-22).

branch demonstrates its development from an adverb into a functional pronoun and finally into a reflexive pronoun proper in Classical Persian, a process that is mirrored well within Armenian, where *ink'n* took a very similar path (Dum-Tragut 2009: 126-8).

Further studies will have to show whether other structural interactions between Armenian and its contemporary Iranian languages exist and can paint a more detailed picture of the socio-linguistic situation and the constraints governing the borrowing and calquing processes; given the strong socio-political and cultural ties between Parthians and Armenians at the time in question, and the already well established plethora of lexical borrowings, the likelihood that such should be found is rather high.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agat'. = Thomson 1980.
- Andreas, F. C. / W. Henning (1932), "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I", *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1932: 173-222.
- (1933) "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan II", *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1933: 294-363.
- (1934) "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III", *Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1934: 848-912.
- Brunner, C. J. (1977), *A Syntax of Western Middle Iranian*, Delmar, NY.
- BBB = Henning 1937.
- Comrie, B. (1989), "Some General Properties of Reference-tracking Systems", D. Arnold et al. (eds.), *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*. Oxford.
- Durkin-Meisterernst, D. (2004), "Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian", Sims-Williams, N. (ed.), *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts*, vol. III. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Dum-Tragut, J. (2009), *Armenian: Modern Eastern Armenian*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Eckardt, R. (2001), "Reanalysing *selbst*", *Natural Language Semantics* 9 (2001): 371-412.
- Field, F. W. (2002), *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Finer, D. L. (1985) "The Syntax of Switch-Reference", *Linguistic Inquiry* 16 (1985): 35-55.
- Garsoïan, N. G. (1976), "Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Elements in Arsacid Armenia", *Handes Amsorya* 90 (1976): 177-234.
- GW = Sundermann 1997.
- Harris, A. C. / L. Campbell (1995), *Historical Syntax in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, CUP.
- Henning, W. B. (1937), "Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch", *Abhandlungen der königlichen Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 10 (1936).
- (1943), "The Book of Giants", *BSOAS* 11 (1943): 52-74.

- Huang, Y. (2000), *Anaphora. A Cross-linguistic Study*, OUP.
- Hübschmann, H. (1877), "Ueber die Stellung des armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen", *ZVS* 23 (1877): 5-49.
- (1897), *Armenische Grammatik*, Leipzig.
- Jacobsen, W. (1967), "Switch-Reference in Hokan-Coahuiltecan", D. Hymes / W. Biddle (eds.), *Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics*: 238-263.
- Jensen, H. (1959), *Altarmenische Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- Kaw = Henning 1943.
- Kortlandt, F. (1980), "On the Relative Chronology of Armenian Sound Changes", J. A. C. Greppin (ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Armenian Linguistics*, Delmar, NY.
- Kulikov, L. (2007), "The Reflexive Pronouns in Vedic: A Diachronic and Typological Perspective", *Lingua* 117 (2007): 1412-1433.
- KPT = Sundermann 1973.
- LN = Sundermann 1992.
- MacKenzie, D. N. (1980), "Mani's 'Šābuhragān' - II", *BSOAS* 43 (1980): 288-310.
- Mariès, L. / Ch. Mercier (1959), *De Deo. Patrologia Orientalis* 28.3, Turnhout.
- Martirosyan, H. K. (2010), *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon*, Leiden.
- MKG = Sundermann 1981.
- MMi = Andreas-Henning 1932.
- MMii = Andreas-Henning 1933.
- MMiii = Andreas-Henning 1934.
- Schmitt, R. (1983), "Iranisches Lehnwort im Armenischen", *REArm* 17 (1983), 73-112.
- Sigler, M. (2001), "A Logophoric Pronoun in Western Armenian", *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 21 (2001), 13-30.
- Sundermann, W. (1973), *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer*. Berlin.
- (1981), *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts*, Berlin.
- (1992), *Der Sermon vom Licht-Nous*, Berlin.
- (1997), *Der Sermon von der Seele*, Turnhout.
- Thomason, S. G. / T. Kaufman (1988), *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*, University of California Press.
- Thomson, R. W. (1980), *Patmut'wn Hayots' - History of the Armenians*, Delmar, NY.
- Windfuhr, G. L. (1979), *Persian Grammar. History and State of its Study*, The Hague.