

Hypoanalysis and aspectual diversification: the Armenian future in diachrony

Robin Meyer

Université de Lausanne,
Section des sciences du langage et de l'information

robin.meyer@unil.ch



Futures of the Past – The Diachrony of Future Constructions across Languages

7 March 2023

<https://bit.ly/FutArm>

Preliminary Remarks

- ▶ Armenian is an Indo-European language, spoken in the southern Caucasus (& diaspora).
- ▶ Over time, it has been heavily influenced by other languages, most recently Russian.
- ▶ Modern Armenian divides *very* roughly into two (families of) varieties: Eastern and Western
- ▶ Today we consider Armenian expressions of futurity in diachrony.
- ▶ Both their morphosyntax and aspectual differentiability has changed significantly.

Goal I Illustrate these changes from Classical to Modern Eastern Armenian (MEA).

Goal II Give a first overview of the aspectual diversity in MEA.

Caveat The Armenian future is pathologically under-researched and the following very much work-in-progress.

Preliminary Remarks

- ▶ Armenian is an Indo-European language, spoken in the southern Caucasus (& diaspora).
- ▶ Over time, it has been heavily influenced by other languages, most recently Russian.
- ▶ Modern Armenian divides *very* roughly into two (families of) varieties: Eastern and Western
- ▶ Today we consider Armenian expressions of futurity in diachrony.
- ▶ Both their morphosyntax and aspectual differentiability has changed significantly.

Goal I Illustrate these changes from Classical to Modern Eastern Armenian (MEA).

Goal II Give a first overview of the aspectual diversity in MEA.

Caveat The Armenian future is pathologically under-researched and the following very much work-in-progress.

Preliminary Remarks

- ▶ Armenian is an Indo-European language, spoken in the southern Caucasus (& diaspora).
- ▶ Over time, it has been heavily influenced by other languages, most recently Russian.
- ▶ Modern Armenian divides *very* roughly into two (families of) varieties: Eastern and Western
- ▶ Today we consider Armenian expressions of futurity in diachrony.
- ▶ Both their morphosyntax and aspectual differentiability has changed significantly.

Goal I Illustrate these changes from Classical to Modern Eastern Armenian (MEA).

Goal II Give a first overview of the aspectual diversity in MEA.

Caveat The Armenian future is pathologically under-researched and the following very much work-in-progress.

Preliminary Remarks

- ▶ Armenian is an Indo-European language, spoken in the southern Caucasus (& diaspora).
- ▶ Over time, it has been heavily influenced by other languages, most recently Russian.
- ▶ Modern Armenian divides *very* roughly into two (families of) varieties: Eastern and Western
- ▶ Today we consider Armenian expressions of futurity in diachrony.
- ▶ Both their morphosyntax and aspectual differentiability has changed significantly.

Goal I Illustrate these changes from Classical to Modern Eastern Armenian (MEA).

Goal II Give a first overview of the aspectual diversity in MEA.

Caveat The Armenian future is pathologically under-researched and the following very much work-in-progress.

Outline

Classical Armenian

Middle Armenian developments

Modern Eastern Armenian

The future of FUT

Terminology & Restrictions

- ▶ We shall concern ourselves with any expression referring to events that have not yet taken place, no matter whether real, possible, unlikely, etc.
(see COMRIE 1985:43–48 for a discussion of definitional issues)
- ▶ The discussion will by necessity be selective and summative.
- ▶ Certain expressions (“future-in-the-past”, future expressions in reported speech) are excluded on purpose.

FUT in Classical Armenian

▶ CArm. does not have a separate FUT category .

▶ References to the future are either expressed

- ▶ by means of SBJV (commonly AOR.SBJV); or
- ▶ through periphrasis (deontic VADJ -oc' + COP).

(MEILLET 1911:118; JENSEN 1959:118, 120; TUMANJAN 1971:363–4)

(1) *erkink' ew erkir anc'c'en*
 heaven.NOM.PL and earth.NOM.SG **pass.3PL.SBJV**

“Heaven and earth shall pass” (Mt. 24:35)

(2) *mi omn i jēnj matneloc' ē z=is*
 one INDF.NOM.SG from 2PL.ABL **betray.PTCP** be.3SG.PRS OBJ=1SG.ACC

“One among you will betray me” (Mk. 14:18)

FUT in Classical Armenian

- ▶ CArm. does not have a separate FUT category .
- ▶ References to the future are either expressed
 - ▶ by means of SBJV (commonly AOR.SBJV); or
 - ▶ through periphrasis (deontic VADJ *-ocʻ* + COP).

(MEILLET 1911:118; JENSEN 1959:118, 120; TUMANJAN 1971:363–4)

- (1) *erkinkʻ ew erkir ancʻcʻen*
 heaven.NOM.PL and earth.NOM.SG **pass.3PL.SBJV**

“Heaven and earth shall pass” (Mt. 24:35)

- (2) *mi omn i jēnj matnelocʻ ē z=is*
 one INDF.NOM.SG from 2PL.ABL **betray.PTCP** be.3SG.PRS OBJ=1SG.ACC

“One among you will betray me” (Mk. 14:18)

FUT in Classical Armenian

- ▶ CArm. does not have a separate FUT category .
- ▶ References to the future are either expressed
 - ▶ by means of SBJV (commonly AOR.SBJV); or
 - ▶ through periphrasis (deontic VADJ *-oc´* + COP).
 (MEILLET 1911:118; JENSEN 1959:118, 120; TUMANJAN 1971:363–4)

(1) *erkink´ ew erkir anc´c´en*
 heaven.NOM.PL and earth.NOM.SG pass.3PL.SBJV
 “Heaven and earth shall pass” (Mt. 24:35)

(2) *mi omn i jēnj matneloc´ ē z=is*
 one INDF.NOM.SG from 2PL.ABL betray.PTCP be.3SG.PRS OBJ=1SG.ACC
 “One among you will betray me” (Mk. 14:18)

FUT in Classical Armenian

- ▶ The lack of a distinct FUT category has drawbacks:
ambiguity between: subjunctive/future uses; necessity/future;
- but it is far from unprecedented.
- ▶ Many ancient IE languages do not have a separate FUT category (Hittite, Tokharian, Gothic, OCS, etc.; cf. LEHMANN 1974:139–51)
 - ▶ inflectionally-marked futures (as opposed to \pm grammaticalised periphrases) exist in only about half of a large sample of surveyed languages (DAHL AND VELUPILLAI 2013)
 - ▶ Both subjunctive forms and deontic expressions are (among others) the source of later, independent FUT expressions, however.
 - ▶ Cp. FUT in Latin and Romance, Arabic, or Nile-Nubian languages (BYBEE ET AL. 1994:159; ABDEL-HAFIZ 2017)

FUT in Classical Armenian

- ▶ The lack of a distinct FUT category has drawbacks:
ambiguity between: subjunctive/future uses; necessity/future;
- but it is far from unprecedented.
- ▶ Many ancient IE languages do not have a separate FUT category (Hittite, Tokharian, Gothic, OCS, etc.; cf. LEHMANN 1974:139–51)
 - ▶ inflectionally-marked futures (as opposed to \pm grammaticalised periphrases) exist in only about half of a large sample of surveyed languages (DAHL AND VELUPILLAI 2013)
 - ▶ Both subjunctive forms and deontic expressions are (among others) the source of later, independent FUT expressions, however.
 - ▶ Cp. FUT in Latin and Romance, Arabic, or Nile-Nubian languages (BYBEE ET AL. 1994:159; ABDEL-HAFIZ 2017)

FUT in Classical Armenian

- ▶ The lack of a distinct FUT category has drawbacks:
ambiguity between: subjunctive/future uses; necessity/future;
- but it is far from unprecedented.
- ▶ Many ancient IE languages do not have a separate FUT category (Hittite, Tokharian, Gothic, OCS, etc.; cf. LEHMANN 1974:139–51)
 - ▶ inflectionally-marked futures (as opposed to \pm grammaticalised periphrases) exist in only about half of a large sample of surveyed languages (DAHL AND VELUPILLAI 2013)
 - ▶ Both subjunctive forms and deontic expressions are (among others) the source of later, independent FUT expressions, however.
 - ▶ Cp. FUT in Latin and Romance, Arabic, or Nile-Nubian languages (BYBEE ET AL. 1994:159; ABDEL-HAFIZ 2017)

FUT in Classical Armenian

- ▶ The lack of a distinct FUT category has drawbacks:
ambiguity between: subjunctive/future uses; necessity/future;
- but it is far from unprecedented.
- ▶ Many ancient IE languages do not have a separate FUT category (Hittite, Tokharian, Gothic, OCS, etc.; cf. LEHMANN 1974:139–51)
 - ▶ inflectionally-marked futures (as opposed to \pm grammaticalised periphrases) exist in only about half of a large sample of surveyed languages (DAHL AND VELUPILLAI 2013)
 - ▶ Both subjunctive forms and deontic expressions are (among others) the source of later, independent FUT expressions, however.
 - ▶ Cp. FUT in Latin and Romance, Arabic, or Nile-Nubian languages (BYBEE ET AL. 1994:159; ABDEL-HAFIZ 2017)

Developments in Middle Armenian

- ▶ The Middle Armenian period is marked by a simplification of the verbal system (etc.).
- ▶ Synthetic forms are replaced by analytical ones, including PRS.IND (KARST 1901:299–309).
- ▶ The CArm. IND form takes on SBJV function, while a new PROG periphrasis is grammaticalised as IND (12th c., Mxit'ar Herac'i)
- ▶ FUT is now expressed mainly by PRS or through volitive periphrases (*kamim* + INF)

	PRS	SBJV	FUT periphrasis
CArm.	<i>ber-es</i> carry.PRS.IND-2SG	<i>ber-c' -es</i> carry-AOR.SBJV-2SG	<i>ber-oc' es</i> carry-PTCP be.2SG.PRS
MArm.	<i>ku ber-es</i> PROG.PRS.IND carry-2SG	<i>ber-es</i> carry-2SG.PRS.SBJV	<i>ber-el kam-is</i> carry-INF want-2SG.PRS

Developments in Middle Armenian

- ▶ The Middle Armenian period is marked by a simplification of the verbal system (etc.).
- ▶ Synthetic forms are replaced by analytical ones, including PRS.IND (KARST 1901:299–309).
- ▶ The CArm. IND form takes on SBJV function, while a new PROG periphrasis is grammaticalised as IND (12th c., Mxit‘ar Herac‘i)
- ▶ FUT is now expressed mainly by PRS or through volitive periphrases (*kamim* + INF)

	PRS	SBJV	FUT periphrasis
CArm.	<i>ber-es</i> carry.PRS.IND-2SG	<i>ber-c‘-es</i> carry-AOR.SBJV-2SG	<i>ber-oc‘es</i> carry-PTCP be.2SG.PRS
MArm.	<i>ku ber-es</i> PROG.PRS.IND carry-2SG	<i>ber-es</i> carry-2SG.PRS.SBJV	<i>ber-el kam-is</i> carry-INF want-2SG.PRS

MArm. examples

- (3) *menk' ekel enk' u ku hrawirenk' z=k'ez or*
 1PL.NOM come.PTCP be.1PL.PRS and **PROG.PRS.IND invite.1PL** OBJ=2SG.ACC COMP
gas sur i darpas=n
go.2SG.PRS.SBJV immediately to court.ACC.SG=DEF

“We have come and invite you to go to court immediately” (Ass. Ant. 13.13ff.)

- (4) *es ku asem u ku c'uc'anem alani u yerewan*
 1SG.NOM **PROG.PRS.IND say.1SG** and **PROG.PRS.IND demonstrate.1SG** clearly and evidently
 “I will speak (at court) and will demonstrate clearly and evidently...” (Ass. Ant. 27.11)

MArm. examples

- (3) *menk' ekel enk' u ku hrawirenk' z=k'ez or*
 1PL.NOM come.PTCP be.1PL.PRS and **PROG.PRS.IND** invite.1PL OBJ=2SG.ACC COMP
gas sur i darpas=n
 go.2SG.PRS.SBJV immediately to court.ACC.SG=DEF

“We have come and invite you to go to court immediately” (Ass. Ant. 13.13ff.)

- (4) *es ku asem u ku c'uc'anem alani u yerewan*
 1SG.NOM **PROG.PRS.IND** say.1SG and **PROG.PRS.IND** demonstrate.1SG clearly and evidently
 “I will speak (at court) and will demonstrate clearly and evidently...” (Ass. Ant. 27.11)

Developments in Middle Armenian

- ▶ Modern Western Armenian varieties retain a PRS involving a reflex of the particle *ku*.
- ▶ They grammaticalise a periphrastic FUT in deontic *piti*.
- ▶ In other varieties (including the precursors of Modern Eastern Armenian), the earlier PRS periphrasis was re-analysed as FUT and univerbated.
- ▶ In these varieties, PRS is expressed through a LOC periphrasis in *-um*.

	PRS	FUT
early MArm.	<i>ku ber-es</i> PROG.PRS.IND carry-2SG	<i>ber-el kam-is</i> carry-INF want-2SG.PRS
later MArm. → MEA	<i>ber-um es</i> carry-PTCP.IPFV be-2SG.PRS	<i>k-ber-es</i> FUT-carry-2SG

Developments in Middle Armenian

- ▶ Modern Western Armenian varieties retain a PRS involving a reflex of the particle *ku*.
- ▶ They grammaticalise a periphrastic FUT in deontic *piti*.
- ▶ In other varieties (including the precursors of Modern Eastern Armenian), the earlier PRS periphrasis was re-analysed as FUT and univerbated.
- ▶ In these varieties, PRS is expressed through a LOC periphrasis in *-um*.

	PRS	FUT
early MArm.	<i>ku ber-es</i> PROG.PRS.IND carry-2SG	<i>ber-el kam-is</i> carry-INF want-2SG.PRS
later MArm. → MEA	<i>ber-um es</i> carry-PTCP.IPFV be-2SG.PRS	<i>k-ber-es</i> FUT-carry-2SG

MEA reflexes of MArm. developments

Examples of MEA reflexes of these developments:

(5) *vałə* *namak* *k-gr-em.*

tomorrow letter.ACC **FUT-write-1SG.IND**

“Tomorrow, I will write a letter.” (DUM-TRAGUT 2009:253)

(6) *tarekan gradaran=n* *unen-um* *ē* *750 hazar ayc'elu*

yearly library.NOM.SG=DET **have-PTCP.PRS be.3SG.IND.PRS** 750'000 visitor.ACC.PL

“The library has 750'000 visitors a year” (Armenpress 08.12.2005)

Summary of developments

- ▶ These changes proceeded gradually, of course, with multiple expressions being used concurrently over the course of time.
- ▶ The table below gives a summary of these developments *grosso modo* (MEYER 2022).

CArm.		Early MArm.		Late MArm.		MEA		MWA
<i>grem</i>		<i>grem</i>		<i>grem</i>		<i>grem</i>		<i>grem</i>
IND	→	IND/SBJV	→	SBJV	→	SBJV	~	SBJV
			↘	<i>ku grem</i>		<i>kgrem</i>		<i>kə grem</i>
			↗	IND	→	COND/FUT	≠	IND
		[modal particle]						
				[PTCP periphrasis]	↗	<i>grum em</i>		
						IND		

Two cases of hypoanalysis

In HYPOANALYSIS, the listener reanalyzes a contextual semantic/functional property as an inherent property of the syntactic unit. In the reanalysis, the inherent property of the context [...] is then attributed to the syntactic unit, and so the syntactic unit in question gains a new meaning or function. (CROFT 2000:126–7)

- ▶ This happens twice in the development of Classical to Modern Armenian:
 - ▶ the CArm. PRS is reanalysed as SBJV under the contrastive influence of PROG periphrases
 - ▶ the MArm. periphrastic PRS is reanalysed as FUT due to contextual clues and under contrastive pressure from *-um* periphrasis

Periphrastic expressions of FUT in MEA

- ▶ MEA has a highly-developed TAM system, in which many aspect and aktionsart differences can be distinguished (DUM-TRAGUT 2009:193)
 - ▶ perfective vs imperfective
 - ▶ habitual-iterative vs processual
 - ▶ actional vs stative
- ▶ This degree of differentiation is available also with future time reference:
 - ▶ dynamic (imminent, planned action): *grelu em* “I shall write”
 - ▶ stative (state; mainly after position verbs): *parkac em linelu* “I shall be laid down”
 - ▶ processual (continuous action): *gnalis em linelu* “I shall be going”
- ▶ The most elementary form, on which all others are based, is the dynamic future in *-u*.
- ▶ This verbal adjective is attested already in MArm. (orig. *-oy*; cf. KARST 1901:344–5).

Periphrastic expressions of FUT in MEA

- ▶ MEA has a highly-developed TAM system, in which many aspect and aktionsart differences can be distinguished (DUM-TRAGUT 2009:193)
 - ▶ perfective vs imperfective
 - ▶ habitual-iterative vs processual
 - ▶ actional vs stative

- ▶ This degree of differentiation is available also with future time reference:
 - ▶ dynamic (imminent, planned action): *grelu em* “I shall write”
 - ▶ stative (state; mainly after position verbs): *parkac em **linelu*** “I shall be laid down”
 - ▶ processual (continuous action): *gnalis em **linelu*** “I shall be going”

- ▶ The most elementary form, on which all others are based, is the dynamic future in *-u*.
- ▶ This verbal adjective is attested already in MArm. (orig. *-oy*; cf. KARST 1901:344–5).

Periphrastic expressions of FUT in MEA

- ▶ MEA has a highly-developed TAM system, in which many aspect and aktionsart differences can be distinguished (DUM-TRAGUT 2009:193)
 - ▶ perfective vs imperfective
 - ▶ habitual-iterative vs processual
 - ▶ actional vs stative

- ▶ This degree of differentiation is available also with future time reference:
 - ▶ dynamic (imminent, planned action): *grelu em* “I shall write”
 - ▶ stative (state; mainly after position verbs): *parkac em linelu* “I shall be laid down”
 - ▶ processual (continuous action): *gnalis em linelu* “I shall be going”

- ▶ The most elementary form, on which all others are based, is the dynamic future in *-u*.
- ▶ This verbal adjective is attested already in MArm. (orig. *-oy*; cf. KARST 1901:344–5).

Some examples

- (7) *Lewon, varə ... meladrakan t'lt'i-d mej hastat im anunə*
 PN tomorrow accusatory letter.DAT.SG-2POSS in surely 1SG.POSS name.ACC.SG
grelu es, č'ē?
 write.PTCP.FUT be.2SG.PRS, NEG.TAG

“Lewon, tomorrow [...] you are surely going to mention my name in your accusatory letter, aren't you?” (*Lur č'ka*, Gurgen Xanĵyan, 2016)

- (8) *erewum ē du stipvac es linelu aystel*
 seem.PRS.IMPF be.3SG.PRS 2SG.NOM force.PASS.PTCP.RES be.2SG.PRS become.PTCP.FUT here
arazel mi k'ani žam, et'e oč' amboļj gišerə
 graze.INF for-some-time if NEG all evening.DET

“It seems you'll be forced to graze here for some time, if not the whole evening.” (tr. of *The Headless Horseman*, Mayne Reed, 1958)

- (9) [*vacat*]

Some examples

- (7) *Lewon, varə ... meladrakan t'lt'i-d mej hastat im anunə*
 PN tomorrow accusatory letter.DAT.SG-2POSS in surely 1SG.POSS name.ACC.SG
grelu es, č'ē?
 write.PTCP.FUT be.2SG.PRS, NEG.TAG

“Lewon, tomorrow [...] you are surely going to mention my name in your accusatory letter, aren't you?” (*Lur č'ka*, Gurgen Xanĵyan, 2016)

- (8) *erewum ē du stipvac es linelu aystel*
 seem.PRS.IMPF be.3SG.PRS 2SG.NOM force.PASS.PTCP.RES be.2SG.PRS become.PTCP.FUT here
arazel mi k'ani žam, et'e oč' ambołj gišerə
 graze.INF for-some-time if NEG all evening.DET

“It seems you'll be forced to graze here for some time, if not the whole evening.” (tr. of *The Headless Horseman*, Mayne Reed, 1958)

- (9) [*vacat*]

Some examples

- (7) *Lewon, varə ... meladrakan t'lt'i-d mej hastat im anuna*
 PN tomorrow accusatory letter.DAT.SG-2POSS in surely 1SG.POSS name.ACC.SG
grelu es, č'ē?
 write.PTCP.FUT be.2SG.PRS, NEG.TAG

“Lewon, tomorrow [...] you are surely going to mention my name in your accusatory letter, aren't you?” (*Lur č'ka*, Gurgen Xanĵyan, 2016)

- (8) *erewum ē du stipvac es linelu aystel*
 seem.PRS.IMPF be.3SG.PRS 2SG.NOM force.PASS.PTCP.RES be.2SG.PRS become.PTCP.FUT here
arazel mi k'ani žam, et'e oč' amboļj gišera
 graze.INF for-some-time if NEG all evening.DET

“It seems you'll be forced to graze here for some time, if not the whole evening.” (tr. of *The Headless Horseman*, Mayne Reed, 1958)

- (9) [vacat]

MEA forms in *k-*

- ▶ Forms in *k-* persist (traditionally referred to as COND), also showing different aspectual forms (as well as past tense forms).
 - ▶ [unmarked]: *kgnam* “I shall go”
 - ▶ stative: *gnac‘ac klinem* “I shall have gone”
 - ▶ processual: *gnalis klinem* “I shall be going”
 - ▶ dynamic: *gnalu klinem* “I shall be about to go”

- ▶ The unmarked form is the most morphosyntactically simple (and historically oldest) form.
- ▶ The dynamic FUT and unmarked COND forms express very closely related ideas (cp. Engl. *will* vs *going to*; Fr. *je dirai* vs *je vais dire*).
- ▶ COND forms do, however, have other uses, too (e.g. concessive, generalisation, potential, etc.)

Examples of non-FUT uses

- (10) *K'ami=n k-p'č'i anjrew=ə k-tela bayc' leṛ-ə*
 wind.NOM=DET **COND-blow.3SG** rain.NOM=DET **COND-fall.3SG** CONJ mountain.NOM=DET
k-mna kangun.
COND-stay.3SG standing.

“The wind blows, the rain falls, but the mountain remains standing.” (DUM-TRAGUT 2009:254–5)

- (11) *ays hin patmut'yun-ə der k-lses gyuṭ-i tarec mardkanc'ic'*
 DEM old story.ACC-DET still **COND-hear.2SG** village-DAT aged man.DAT.PL

“This old story you may still hear from old village folk” (DUM-TRAGUT 2009:255)

Distribution

- ▶ An enquiry into these variable patterns in the Eastern Armenian National Corpus (EANC) provides the results below.
- ▶ EANC: 1850s to present day MEA, c. 110'000'000 tokens, variety of genres.

Type	+COP (Texts)	Year	+COND (Texts)	Year
stative (-ac)	1'289 (1'033)	1958	8'662 (3'262)	1841
dynamic (-lu)	71'300 (7'400)	1860	40 (39)	1870/1955
processual (-lis)	3 (2)	2005	103 (66)	1870/1950

- ▶ The COND itself is ubiquitous (630'680 tokens over 9'290 texts).
- ▶ At least in this corpus, the occurrence of the more recent patterns in red is almost negligible.

Distribution

- ▶ An enquiry into these variable patterns in the Eastern Armenian National Corpus (EANC) provides the results below.
- ▶ EANC: 1850s to present day MEA, c. 110'000'000 tokens, variety of genres.

Type	+COP (Texts)	Year	+COND (Texts)	Year
stative (-ac)	1'289 (1'033)	1958	8'662 (3'262)	1841
dynamic (-lu)	71'300 (7'400)	1860	40 (39)	1870/1955
processual (-lis)	3 (2)	2005	103 (66)	1870/1950

- ▶ The COND itself is ubiquitous (630'680 tokens over 9'290 texts).
- ▶ At least in this corpus, the occurrence of the more recent patterns in red is almost negligible.

Distribution

- ▶ An enquiry into these variable patterns in the Eastern Armenian National Corpus (EANC) provides the results below.
- ▶ EANC: 1850s to present day MEA, c. 110'000'000 tokens, variety of genres.

Type	+COP (Texts)	Year	+COND (Texts)	Year
stative (- <i>ac</i>)	1'289 (1'033)	1958	8'662 (3'262)	1841
dynamic (- <i>lu</i>)	71'300 (7'400)	1860	40 (39)	1870/1955
processual (- <i>lis</i>)	3 (2)	2005	103 (66)	1870/1950

- ▶ The COND itself is ubiquitous (630'680 tokens over 9'290 texts).
- ▶ At least in this corpus, the occurrence of the more recent patterns in red is almost negligible.

FUT in MEA: hypotheses

A multiplicity of future expressions (esp. synthetic + analytic) is not uncommon.

Why are certain forms so rare?

- ▶ inutility / hyperspecificity
 - ▶ dynamic COND “I shall be about to come”
 - ▶ processual FUT/COND “I shall be (in the process of) going”
- ▶ owing to the indeterminacy of the future

How can we explain the use and co-existence of the other forms?

- (1) COND is the oldest, aspectually unmarked form (type *kgnam*)
- (2) the stative COND develops similarly early as a perfective / stative future
- (3) the dynamic FUT is of a similar age, originally likely with intentional semantics
- (4) the rarer forms (cf. above) developed in analogy but either late, in specific genres (poetry?) or colloquially

FUT in MEA: hypotheses

A multiplicity of future expressions (esp. synthetic + analytic) is not uncommon.

Why are certain forms so rare?

- ▶ inutility / hyperspecificity
 - ▶ dynamic COND “I shall be about to come”
 - ▶ processual FUT/COND “I shall be (in the process of) going”
- ▶ owing to the indeterminacy of the future

How can we explain the use and co-existence of the other forms?

- (1) COND is the oldest, aspectually unmarked form (type *kgnam*)
- (2) the stative COND develops similarly early as a perfective / stative future
- (3) the dynamic FUT is of a similar age, originally likely with intentional semantics
- (4) the rarer forms (cf. above) developed in analogy but either late, in specific genres (poetry?) or colloquially

In lieu of conclusions: next steps

Smaller scale study of the rare patterns:

- ▶ register / author
- ▶ aspect and aktionsart of the verbs
- ▶ compare and contrast with ADJ use of the relevant forms

Larger scale study of the common patterns, esp. the contrastive pairs:

- ▶ stative COND vs stative FUT (*gnac'ac klinem vs gnac'ac em linelu*)
- ▶ unmarked COND vs dynamic FUT (*kgnam vs gnalu em*)

Broader question:

- ▶ Are these developments internal to Armenian (e.g. by analogical extension) or is external influence at play (e.g. from Russian)?

In lieu of conclusions: next steps

Smaller scale study of the rare patterns:

- ▶ register / author
- ▶ aspect and aktionsart of the verbs
- ▶ compare and contrast with ADJ use of the relevant forms

Larger scale study of the common patterns, esp. the contrastive pairs:

- ▶ stative COND vs stative FUT (*gnac'ac klinem* vs *gnac'ac em linelu*)
- ▶ unmarked COND vs dynamic FUT (*kgnam* vs *gnalu em*)

Broader question:

- ▶ Are these developments internal to Armenian (e.g. by analogical extension) or is external influence at play (e.g. from Russian)?

In lieu of conclusions: next steps

Smaller scale study of the rare patterns:

- ▶ register / author
- ▶ aspect and aktionsart of the verbs
- ▶ compare and contrast with ADJ use of the relevant forms

Larger scale study of the common patterns, esp. the contrastive pairs:

- ▶ stative COND vs stative FUT (*gnac'ac klinem* vs *gnac'ac em linelu*)
- ▶ unmarked COND vs dynamic FUT (*kgnam* vs *gnalu em*)

Broader question:

- ▶ Are these developments internal to Armenian (e.g. by analogical extension) or is external influence at play (e.g. from Russian)?

Շատ շնորհակալություն Ձեր սիրելի ուշադրության համար!

Many thanks for your attention!

References I

- ABDEL-HAFIZ, A.S. (2017) “The Development of Future markers in Arabic and the Nile Nubian Languages,” *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 6, 64–79.
- BYBEE, J.; PERKINS, R.; and PAGLIUCA, W. (1994) *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- COMRIE, B. (1985) *Tense*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CROFT, W. (2000) *Explaining Language Change: An Evolutionary Approach*, New York: Longman.
- DAHL, Ö. and VELUPILLAI, V. (2013) “The Future Tense,” in *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, chapter 67, Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (<http://wals.info/chapter/67>).
- DUM-TRAGUT, J. (2009) *Armenian: Modern Eastern Armenian*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- JENSEN, H. (1959) *Altarmenische Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- KARST, J. (1901) *Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen*, Strassburg: Trübner.
- LEHMANN, W.P. (1974) *Proto-Indo-European Syntax*, Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

References II

MEILLET, A. (1911) “Recherches sur la syntaxe comparée de l’arménien. Emploi de formes personnelles des verbes,” *Mémoires de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 16, 92–131.

MEYER, R. (2022) “Armenian Morphosyntactic Alignment in Diachrony,” in E. DAHL (ed.), *Alignment and Alignment Change in the Indo-European family*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 277–299.

TUMANJAN, È. (1971) *Древнеармянский язык (The Old Armenian Language)*, Moscow: Nauka.