

## The perfect in Classical Armenian

Daniel Kölligan

The paper will describe the functions of the various formations built on the perfect stem in Classical Armenian, viz. the perfect and the pluperfect indicative and subjunctive and the participle used both as a participium coniunctum and as a main clause predicate. Following the work of Lyonnet (1933) and recently Ouzounian (2002), Ouzounian (2007), Kölligan (2013) it will be argued that the perfect depicts a present state, usually of the subject, resulting from a change of state (e.g. Rom 6.9 *K'ristos yarowc'eal ê i meřeloc* 'Christ has risen from the dead.'). In Nedjalkov's terminology,<sup>1</sup> it might thus be called a (predominantly) "subjective resultative" in contrast to "perfect" expressing "an action (process, or state) in the past which has continuing relevance for the present.", but which is not attributed to any specific participant of the situation (cf. id.:15). It is most frequently used with telic verbs implying an endpoint of a situation. The perfect is opposed both to the present of stative verbs not implying a change of state and to the aorist describing a past event without making implications about a resulting state of affairs (e.g. Rom 5.8 *K'ristos vasn mer meřaw* 'Christ died for us.'). As a category strongly connected with the moment of speaking, it is often accompanied by deictic markers pointing to the here-and-now of the speech situation (e.g. *greal ê i girs yaysmik* 'it is written in this book') involving the addressee (e.g. Jn 18.37 *es y-ayd isk cneal em, ew i doyn isk ekeal em yařxarh, zi ...* 'For this purpose I was born and for this purpose I have come into the world—to ...'). In contrast to the perfect indicative, the derived categories perfect subjunctive and pluperfect seem to allow a broader spectrum of functions, occurring as relative tenses and counterfactuals. Finally, the participle without a copula may be used as a main clause predicate in narrative contexts. While only a few formal PIE perfects survived and were remarked as presents in Armenian (e.g. *gitem* 'I know', *ownim* 'I have', cf. Schindler (1976)), the newly formed perfect in *-eal* seems to continue at least some of the basic functions of the PIE perfect (cf. e.g. Kümmel (2000)).

- Kölligan, Daniel. 2013. "Non-canonical subject marking: Genitive subjects in Classical Armenian." In *The Diachronic Typology of Non-Canonical Subjects*, edited by Ilja A. Seržant and Leonid Kulikov, 73-90. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kümmel, Martin. 2000. *Das Perfekt im Indoiranischen: eine Untersuchung der Form und Funktion einer ererbten Kategorie des Verbums und ihrer Weiterentwicklung in den altindoiranischen Sprachen*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas. 1933. *Le parfait en arménien classique*. Paris: Champion.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., and Sergej Je. Jaxontov. 1988. "The typology of resultative constructions." In *Typology of resultative constructions*, edited by Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, 3-62. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ouzounian, Agnès. 2002. "Le parfait en arménien classique." *Revue des Études Arméniennes* 28:13-27.
- Ouzounian, Agnès. 2007. "Le parfait en arménien classique: notes à propos de Եւթմ Լեմ 'entendre'." *Revue des Études arméniennes* 30:15-30.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1976. "Armenisch *ownim*." *Handes Amsoreay*, 339-344.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988):6f.