

SUMMARIES AND KEYWORDS

I. The Armenian and Proto-Indo-European Preterite: Forms and Functions

A. Donabédian. The aorist in Modern Armenian: core value and contextual meanings

The Modern Armenian aorist, with a remarkably stable morphology since Classical Armenian, has a very special place in the TMA system of Modern Armenian: since all tenses need either a particle or an auxiliary to be actualized, the aorist is the only synthetic, self-actualized form. The aim of this paper is to account for the variety of contextual meanings that the Armenian aorist can display, refuting generalizations previously made by grammarians and typologists. Foregrounding enunciative criteria (following A. Culioli) rather than referential ones (durativity, temporal meaning, chaining of events, etc.), we identify three parameters able to explain the specificity of the aorist in Modern Armenian with regard to other tenses, and with regard to the aorist in other Indo-European languages.

Keywords: Modern Armenian, event, discourse, narration, preterit, aorist, aspect, TAM

V. K. Kazaryan. *Indo-European origins of Armenian aorist stems*

The paper addresses the characteristic traits of the aorist as opposed to the present in Proto-Indo-European and Old Armenian. At the second and third stages in the development of Proto-Indo-European, the tense was marked by verbal endings, while the aspect was marked by stems. The root aorist stem could be recharacterised by secondary imperfective markers (affixes, reduplication) and the root present could be recharacterised by secondary perfective markers (reduplication, the sigmatic suffix). The resulting morphological make-up of an opposition of the present and aorist stems was verb-specific; one of the two stems was marked while another one non-marked.

The Proto-Indo-European opposition of tense-aspect stems was strengthened by the development of the imperfect, because the formal match of the present and aorist stems would yield the non-distinction of

the aorist and imperfect tenses. This state of affairs is represented in Old Indic and, to some extent, in Ancient Greek and Old Church Slavic. Similarly, Old Armenian retained and developed the binary opposition of the present and aorist stems, which resulted in the rise of regular verbal classes with stable combinations of marked and non-marked stems.

Keywords: Armenian verb, tense-aspect system, Indo-European aorist, time-space model, opposition of verbal stems, marked and non-marked stems.

R. I. Kim. The prehistory of the Classical Armenian weak aorist

Classical Armenian aorists are traditionally divided into strong (root) and weak, the latter characterized by a stem-final *-c'*. The great majority of weak aorists to presents in *-em* and *-im* take the suffix *-eac'* ~ *-ec'* (e.g. *sirec'i*, 3 sg. *sireac'* 'loved' to pres. *sirem*), but a small group are in *-ac'* (e.g. *asac'i* 'said' to pres. *asem*). Weak aorists to presents in *-am* always take the suffix *-ac'* (e.g. *yusac'ay* 'hoped', *luac'i* 'washed' to pres. *yusam*, *luanam*), while a small set have a bare *-c'* following the root (e.g. *lc'i* 'filled', 3sg. *elic'*). The origin of these suffixes has been debated for over a century, but no satisfactory explanation of their shape and distribution has yet been proposed.

It is argued that the weak aorist suffix goes back to **-ā-*, in origin a (post-)PIE optative in **-e-h₂-*, and is cognate with Balto-Slavic preterite **-ā-* and Italic imperfect **-ā-*. The productive denominative and factitive presents in PIE **-eye/o-* thus formed an aorist in **-eyā-*. Contrary to received opinion, unlike vowels which came into contact following the loss of intervocalic **y* did not contract, so the sequence **-eyā-* yielded the diphthong **ea* and spread to the aorists of almost all presents in *-em*, leaving only a small relic group in *-ac'*. The **-c^h-* of the weak aorist marker continues PIE **-s^hke/o-* and was generalized from iterative-intensive imperfects to all imperfect-aorists, before the creation of the new imperfect in *-i/y-*. These hypotheses are integrated into a unified model of the evolution of the Classical Armenian verb that also accounts for the relic type of *berem* 'carry', aor. *beri* and the distribution of strong and weak aorists to nasal presents, e.g. *erduay* 'feared' (pres. *erdnum*) vs. *lc'i* 'filled' (pres. *lnum*).

Keywords: Classical Armenian, verb, present, aorist, imperfect, Proto-Indo-European

P. A. Kocharov. A note on the origin of the Old Armenian mediopassive endings

The paper addresses the question of the origin of the mediopassive endings in Old Armenian. The main difficulty in the diachronic analysis of these endings consists in the explanation of the element *-a-* that distinguishes the mediopassive endings from the active ones. According to a wide-spread opinion, *-a-* is explained by the reanalysis of PArm. 3 pl. mp. aor. **-anto* from athematic PIE **-nto*. This solution has several formal weaknesses. The paper proposes additional arguments in favour of an alternative solution that derives *-a-* from PIE **-eh₂-* in intransitive verbs.

Keywords: Old Armenian, mediopassive voice, intransitive verbs, aorist

F. Kortlandt. The development of the sigmatic aorist in Armenian

If sigmatic stems were productive in Proto-Armenian and they spread to the inherited root aorists, why so many root aorists remained intact? The essential point is that there were two periods of expansion of the sigmatic aorist, viz. before and after the loss of intervocalic **h < *s*.

Keywords: sigmatic aorist, root aorist, loss of intervocalic **h < *s*

H. Martirosyan. The development of the Classical Armenian aorist in modern dialects

This paper aims to present a sketch on the development of the Classical Armenian aorist in the dialects with particular attention on Hamšen, Aramo, and other peripheral dialects, as well as some related issues, such as the aorist augment *e-* and the vowel *-a-* of the first person plural endings in the aorist and imperfect paradigms. The treatment of paradigms demonstrates that various analogical developments have taken place in dialects. Some peripheral dialects preserve archaic features. One finds more than one line of developments from Classical Armenian to modern dialects (not always through Middle Armenian). Inscriptions from North-East of historical Armenia in the 11th century onwards deviate from Middle Armenian but correspond to a dialectal development in Aramo (Syria), the farthest and most isolated dialect in the South-West corner.

Keywords: Armenian verbal morphology, Middle Armenian, Armenian inscriptions, Armenian dialects, dialectal archaisms, dialectal innovations

R. Viredaz. Armenian aorist and imperfect endings

Armenian aorists go back to PIE aorists (*elik'*), imperfects (*eharc'*), or even durative imperfects (*ekeac'*).

Armenian imperfects, as in Slavic, all go back to **ēs-* 'was/were', either by itself (*běxъ, ei*), or in periphrastic constructions (*nesěaxъ, berei*), whose first element has perhaps been identified [Jasanoff 1978, 2003].

Endings show numerous innovations:

a) 1 sg. **-m* → **-om*, as in Slavic: **ēsṃ* 'I was' → **ēsom* (cf. [Bonfante 1942]; hence the loss of the final nasal in Armenian). — Motive: probably the personal pronoun **egjom*.

b) 1 sg. athematic **-m* (after vowels) and **-om* (after consonants) → **-som*, again as in Slavic: **(e)dōm* 'I gave' → **(e)dōsom*, hence *daxъ, etu*. — Motive: presumably an opposite substitution 3 sg. **-s-t* > **-s* → **-t* in sigmatic aorists and the imperfect **ēst*.

c) In the plural, Armenian did not share in the reshaping to **dōs-* seen in Slavic *daxomъ*, witness *edak'* 'we put' ← **(e)d^hames*. This means that *etun* 'they gave' is not identical to Slavic *dašę* ← **dōsnt*, but rather a late reshaping of **etn* < **(e)dont*.

d) After the loss of final consonants in 2 sg. **(e)b^heres*, **(e)dōs* and 3 sg. **(e)b^heret*, **(e)dōt*, the personal pronoun was added to restore the distinction: 3 sg. **(e)bere*, **(e)tō* > *eber*, *et*, but 2 sg. **(e)bere-du*, **(e)tō-du* > *berer*, *etur*.

e) After 1 sg. aorist **ebéro* > **ebér* had merged with 3 sg. **ebére* > *ebér*, the former was replaced by *berí*, presumably the then imperfect form. In its imperfect function, **berí* was reshaped to *beréi*.

f) The *y* in *keray* 'I ate' possibly arose when **(e-)g^wera-som* 'I swallowed' > **ekéro* 'I ate' was remade to **kerá-yo* after **eí(y)o* 'I was', **edí(y)o* 'I put'.

g) In the imperfect *ei*, *êr* 'I was, he was', the stem *e-* was added to the inherited forms **ío*, **í* < **ēsom*, **ēt* ← **ēsṃ*, **ēst*; 3 sg. *-r* might reflect an old demonstrative.

The medio-passive endings are more briefly treated. Klingenschmitt's views on the origin of present *i* and aorist *a* are endorsed.

Keywords: Armenian language, historical morphology, verbal morphology, historical phonology, homophony avoidance, Indo-European dialects, Slavic

II. Varia

Sh. M. Alamshoev. Borrowed phraseology in Shughni

The Shughni phraseological units include common-Iranian, indigenous-Shughni, borrowed phraseological units, phraseological calques and semi-calques. The vocabulary of the phraseologisms comprises borrowed words of Turkish, Arabic and Russian origin, which are phonetically, grammatically and semantically adapted in the language. As a result native-Shughni words and phrases are modified or superseded.

Keywords: phraseological units, calque, semi-calque, loanwords, common-Iranian phraseologisms.

V. A. Bondar'. Semantics of the perfect and its implementations in American English

The paper deals with the analysis of the perfect/preterit distribution in American English from a diachronic perspective. Prevalence of preterits in contexts with temporal adverbs, in which British English, as a rule, gives preference to the perfect in its immediate meaning, is interpreted as a consequence of a language shift caused by substratum interference. These changes emerge due to wrong perception of the perfect category by native speakers of foreign languages in the process of L2 acquisition. The spread of the preterit in the contexts of resultative-immediate eventualities is enhanced by the use of respective temporal adverbs like *already*, *yet*, *just* as well as verbs with respective Aktionsart characteristics. In the course of the so-called hypoanalysis the semantics of a context is attributed to the preterit which thus acquires a new function of expressing results in resultative-immediate contexts. The perfect, which retains certain pragmatic properties (current relevancy), is used to highlight a certain significance of the context for the speaker.

Keywords: perfect, preterit, semantics, pragmatics, American English, free variation

Y. A. Dzitssoity. Archaisms in toponymy of Ossetia: the names of grasslands

The toponyms, reflecting the stock-raising terminology of Ossetian language (the names of grasslands), that were partly or entirely lost in modern language, are considered in this article. The meanings of some of them are reconstructed by informant's survey (*cyrt* 'monument, tombstone', *kært* 'the animal farm, barnyard'). The other part is reconstructed with the help of etymological analyses (**car-* 'pasture', **cævaen* 'id.'). Most of the reviewed terms are not presented in the dictionaries of Ossetian language. Not only allows the conducted analysis reconstruct the lost lexical unit or its meaning, but also clarify the pattern of Ossetian pastoral farming.

Keywords: Ossetia, toponymy, ethnography, grassland, landmark, reconstruction, etymology.

A. V. Kotova. *Veneres Cupidinesque* (Catul. 3. 1)

The article deals with *Veneres Cupidinesque* in Catullus' carm. 3. 1. The author analyzes and classifies different interpretations of this phrase that are found in scientific literature: philosophic allusion, commonplace of Alexandrian poetry, generalizing plural, elliptic plural, attraction by number, abstract meaning, prosodic reason. According to the analysis of this material, the author concludes that plural in Catul. 3. 1 is caused by metrics.

Keywords: poetry, Roman literature, Catullus, carmen 3, pluralis

V. V. Kozak. Lexical borrowings in the 16th century Glagolitic Vrbnik Statute

This study, based on the etymological, semantic, grammatical and quantitative analysis of lexical borrowings in the Glagolitic Vrbnik Statute (Krk, 16th c.), shows that the language of the monument, contrary to the social and linguistic dominance of the Latin-Roman superstate and the existence of a centuries-old Romance substrate, demonstrates significant resistance to the penetration of

lexical borrowings. The low level of lexical interference and the extremely low level of structural interference characterize Slavic-Romance interaction in the domain of Glagolitic script as insignificant cultural pressure. This observation confirms the thesis about the general opposition of Romance and Slavic written cultures in Dalmatia and the hypothesis that the Glagolitic script is a cultural “antibalkanism”.

Keywords: Glagolitic script, Čakavian language, Croatian language, 16th century, lexical borrowings, Vrbnik Statute, Slavic-Romance language contacts, Krk, Kvarner, Dalmatia.

V. M. Kruglov. On the publication of unknown pages of the academic “Russian Language Dictionary” (1930–1936): general characteristics of the archival materials, publication rules, trial fragment

The last period of working on the academic explanatory “Russian Language Dictionary” (1891–1937), which is usually called “Dictionary of Grot-Shakhmatov”, belongs to the first half of 1930s. At this time there also had started the work on its revised and replenished version, which however was never to be completed as well as the previous one. In the Large Lexicographic Card-Catalog of the Institute for Linguistic Studies of RAS there had been stored unpublished proof-sheets of this edition, that contain extensive comments from the editors. The article is devoted to the detailed description of these archival materials and the rules for its forthcoming publication.

Keywords: Russian language, lexicography, explanatory dictionary, Grot-Shakhmatov dictionary, textology

A. M. Pevnov. Linguistic evidence of historical contacts of Oroks with Orochs on Sakhalin

Oroks (Uilta) and Orochs are ethnic minorities in the Russian Far East. Linguistically they belong to Manchu-Tungusic family. The former people live exclusively on the Sakhalin island (Val, Nogliki, Poronaysk), the latter one live in the vicinity of Sovetskaya Gavan’. The languages of both peoples are either close to extinction (Orok), or apparently are already extinct (Oroch). The present paper deals with not numerous facts testifying to language contact between Oroks and

Orochs presumably some centuries ago. Mostly these are lexical borrowings from Oroch into Orok. For the time being only one grammatical borrowing (from Oroch into Orok, too) is found. Especially interesting are 5 variants of the Orok name for the Poronay river: all of them indicate that Orochs borrowed the hydronym from a group of Orochs which migrated to Sakhalin from the continent.

Keywords: Orok (Uilta), Oroch, historical contacts, borrowings, hydronym

N. D. Svetozarova. This mysterious Boyanus

The life of Semjon Karlovič Boyanus (1871–1952) was long and so productive that one might think that Boyanus was several authors' nom-de-plume. A graduate of St. Petersburg University, Boyanus was an actor and theatre director; he studied the history of theatre and worked at the Institute of the History of Arts; he was Lev Vladimirovič Ščerba's student of phonetics and Ščerba's co-organizer of the Institute of Phonetics. In the 1920s, he studied phonetics in London, under Daniel Jones and Liliás Eveline Armstrong. Later on, he taught various subjects of the Germanic cycle at Leningrad State University and published the first textbook of English phonetics for speakers of Russian (1926). He was Vladimir Karlovič Mueller's co-editor of English-Russian and Russian-English dictionaries. In 1934, Boyanus left for Great Britain, where he established School of Russian and published a manual of Russian phonetics that combined the achievements of Russian and British phonetic science.

Keywords: Semjon Karlovič Boyanus, Lev Valdimirovič Ščerba, history of phonetics, phonetic method of language teaching, phrasal intonation, lexicography