

ACTA
LINGUISTICA
PETROPOLITANA

TRANSACTIONS
OF THE INSTITUTE FOR LINGUISTIC STUDIES

Vol. 18, part 1

Editor-in-chief Evgeny V. Golovko

2022

АСТА
LINGUISTICA
PETROPOLITANA

ТРУДЫ
ИНСТИТУТА ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ

Том 18, часть 1

Главный редактор Е. В. Головки

2022

УДК 81
ББК 81.2
А 38

Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Труды Института лингвистических исследований. 2022. — Т. 18. Ч. 1. — 520 с., 1 с. вклейки.

Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Transactions of the Institute for Linguistic Studies. 2022. — Vol. 18. Pt. 1. — 520 p., 1 p. illustration.

Редакторы выпуска

М. Н. Казанская, П. А. Кочаров, А. В. Шацков

Ответственный за выпуск от редколлегии

Г. А. Мольков

Автор фотографии на вклейке

Н. Демина

Статьи отбираются редколлегией журнала
на основе анонимного независимого рецензирования

Материалы выпуска доступны в электронном виде по ссылке:
<https://alp.iling.spb.ru/ru/issues.html>

Журнал основан Н. Н. Казанским в 2003 г.

Адрес журнала: 199004, Санкт-Петербург, Тучков пер., д. 9,
Институт лингвистических исследований РАН,
редакция журнала «Acta Linguistica Petropolitana.
Труды Института лингвистических исследований»

Телефон: + 7 812 328-16-11

E-mail: acta_linguistica@iling.spb.ru

Сайт: <https://alp.iling.spb.ru/>

Свидетельство Роскомнадзора ПИ № ФС 77-60965 от 05.03.2015

ISSN 2306-5737
DOI 10.30842/alp23065737181

© ИЛИ РАН, 2022
© Составление. Редколлегия
журнала, 2022



Магнус

**COLLOQUIA CLASSICA
ET INDOGERMANICA VII**

**MISCELLANEA IN HONOREM
NIKOLAI N. KAZANSKY
SEPTUAGENARII**

EDITORIAL BOARD

Evgeny V. Golovko, editor-in-chief (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Albert K. Baiburin (Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkamera), Russian Academy of Sciences); Adriaan Barentsen (University of Amsterdam); Yuri E. Berezkin (Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkamera), Russian Academy of Sciences); Elena L. Berezovich (Ural Federal University); Petr E. Bukharkin (St. Petersburg State University); Sergey Yu. Dmitrenko (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Andrey Yu. Filchenko (Nazarbaev University, Kazakhstan); Dmitry A. Funk (Miklukho-Maklai Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Russian Academy of Sciences); Lenore Grenoble (University of Chicago); Juha A. Janhunen (University of Helsinki); Vadim B. Kasevich (St. Petersburg State University); Viktor S. Khrakovsky (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Natalia V. Kornienko (Institute of World Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences); Natalia B. Koshkareva (Institute of Philology of the Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences); Aleksandr Yu. Kozhevnikov (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Maksim A. Krongauz (HSE University, Moscow); Georgy A. Molkov (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Irma I. Mullonen (Institute of Linguistics, Literature and History Karelian Research Centre, Russian Academy of Sciences); Sergei A. Myznikov (Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Sergei I. Nikolaev (Institute of Russian Literature, Russian Academy of Sciences); Vera I. Podlesskaya (Russian State University for the Humanities); Konstantin I. Pozdniakov (INALCO, Paris); Ekaterina A. Rudneva, board secretary (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Aleksandr Yu. Rusakov (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); James Russell (Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.); Sergey S. Say (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Andrey N. Sobolev, deputy editor-in-chief (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Sergei G. Tatevosov (Moscow State University); Anna Yu. Urmanchieva (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Nikolai B. Vakhtin (European University at St. Petersburg); Maria D. Voeikova (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences); Natalia M. Zaika (Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences; St. Petersburg State University)

Contents

Editor-in-chief's foreword	15
Editors' preface	17
<i>Katsiaryna Ackermann</i>	
A note on another source of root-extension in IE. The “deep” morphology in OCS adv. <i>skvožě</i> ‘through’ and related cases . . .	23
<i>Nina V. Braginskaya</i>	
How many co-martyrs did Perpetua and Felicitas have?	48
<i>Filip De Decker</i>	
The use and absence of the augment in the forms ἔδωκ(ε)(ν) and δῶκ(ε)(ν) in the <i>Iliad</i> , compared and contrasted with the overall data of <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i>	78
<i>Patrick J. Finglass</i>	
Of centaurs and satyrs: Stesichorus' <i>Geryoneis</i> and satyr drama	114
<i>Michael Janda</i>	
Warum Eos und Orion ein Liebespaar wurden	126
<i>Alexei S. Kassian, Olga V. Popova</i>	
What the Ancient Greek alphabet can say about the Late Babylonian phonology: The sibilants	140
<i>Ronald I. Kim</i>	
Numerative and numeral inflection in Ossetic	147

Daniel Kölligan

Full and calm: Notes on Greek ἡσυχος and Latin *tranquillus* . . . 165

Leonid I. Kulikov

On the etymology of the Greek theonym Κρόνος:

Notes on the morphological type in -όνο- 187

Martin Joachim Kümmel

On new reconstructions of PIE “laryngeals”, especially

as uvular stops 199

Alexander Lubotsky

Young Avestan *pašne* and its etymology 216

Silvia Luraghi

The verb *aréskein* in Ancient Greek: Constructions

and semantic change 226

H. Craig Melchert

Hittite reflexes of the PIE root **welH-* 246

Alexander Nikolaev

Greek *μαπ-* and its congeners 267

Daniel Petit

The prehistory of Old Lithuanian *uþ oβczių* 282

Alexander V. Podossinov

Pig-like Sauromatae on Ptolemy’s map?

(Greek epigram in “Geography” of Ptolemy) 302

Luka Repanšek

The derivational history of Vedic *sákthi-* ‘(inner) thigh’ 321

Elisabeth Rieken

Der luwische Berg und seine indogermanischen

Verwandten 344

Andrea Scala

- Outremer French loanwords in Cilician Armenian:
Phonetic issues 357

Andrej V. Sideltsev

- Passive or Intransitive? The case of *hark-* ‘perish’ and voice/
transitivity in Hittite 377

Michiel de Vaan

- From inflexion to derivation: The PIE word for ‘salt’ 412

Miguel Villanueva Svensson

- The origin of the Slavic 2 sg. present ending 426

Brent Vine

- Myc. *tu-wo*, Hom. *θύος* and the vocalism of *s*-stems
in Proto-Indo-European 444

Rémy Viredaz

- Notes d'étymologie grecque 463

Ilya Yakubovich

- Morphophonemic variation in Luwian clitic chains
and the origin of the particle [=r] 485

Vsevolod V. Zelchenko

- Two little animals (Ancient Greek *ἀρνίον* and *ῥῆδιον*) 503

- Publication Ethics (in Russian) 512

- Publication Ethics 516

Outremer French loanwords in Cilician Armenian: Phonetic issues

Andrea Scala

Università degli Studi di Milano (Milan, Italy); andrea.scala@unimi.it

Abstract. The political and cultural relations between the Armenian Principality and, later, Kingdom of Cilicia (1198–1375) and the Crusader States were particularly intense and produced a not small number of innovations in the Cilician Armenian lay elites. The high prestige of the French speaking elites of the Crusader States induced the Armenian nobles to import many western cultural innovations in the Armenian society. Among these innovations it is worth to be mentioned that, during the kingdom of Hethum II (1289–1301), the royal chancellery of Sis, in addition to Armenian and Latin, begun to use French as well. A clear trace of the circulation of French among the Armenian cultivated lay elites is represented by the many loanwords attested in Armenian documents and literary works written in the Kingdom of Cilicia. These loanwords are of outstanding interest for the history of French, especially for the French variety usually labelled as Outremer French, which was spoken in the Crusader States. Thanks to the richness in sounds of the Armenian phonological inventory and in letters of the Armenian alphabet, the phonetic shape of the Outremer French loanwords is well preserved and faithfully represented in Cilician Armenian texts. So, the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian can offer valuable information about the phonetics of Outremer French, otherwise scantily documented. The article discusses the Outremer French loanwords in Cilician Armenian, paying particular attention to their dialectal features. The vocalism and the consonantism of these loanwords confirm the non-Francien character of Outremer French and, in addition, show some slightly conservative features. Such phonetic archaisms can be explained in different manners, but in any case they seem to detach Outremer French from some important streams of linguistic innovation that were spreading in France.

Keywords: loanwords, Old French, Outremer French, Levant, Armenian, Middle Armenian, Cilician Armenian, Kingdom of Cilicia.

Старофранцузские заимствования в киликийском армянском: проблемы фонетики

А. Скала

Миланский университет (Милан, Италия); andrea.scala@unimi.it

Аннотация. Активные политические и культурные отношения между Армянским киликийским княжеством, а позднее Армянским киликийским царством (1198–1375) и государствами крестоносцев привели к многочисленным изменениям в жизни киликийской армянской светской элиты. Западные культурные влияния активно распространялись в армянском обществе посредством франкоязычной элиты государств крестоносцев. Так, во время правления Хетума II (1289–1301) в царской канцелярии в Сисе наряду с армянским и латинским использовался и французский. Явным признаком широкого распространения французского среди образованных киликийских армян служат многочисленные заимствования, засвидетельствованные в документах и литературных произведениях, созданных в Армянском киликийском царстве. Эти заимствования представляют особый интерес для истории французского языка, особенно для старофранцузского языка государств крестоносцев (Outremer French). Благодаря богатству фонемного состава армянского языка и особенностям армянского алфавита, фонетический облик старофранцузских заимствований передается в текстах на киликийском армянском с высокой степенью достоверности. Эти заимствования являются важным источником информации о диалектных чертах языка государств крестоносцев, сведения о котором очень фрагментарны. Именно таким диалектным особенностям посвящена данная статья. Анализ вокализма и консонантизма киликийских заимствований подтверждает, что диалект старофранцузского языка государств крестоносцев отличался от франсийского диалекта и сохранял некоторые архаичные особенности. Возможны различные объяснения таких фонетических архаизмов, но, так или иначе, они могут указывать на некоторую изолированность старофранцузского источника киликийских армянских заимствований от фонетических изменений, распространявшихся в этот период во Франции.

Ключевые слова: заимствования, старофранцузский, Левант, армянский, среднеармянский, киликийский армянский, киликийское армянское царство.

1. Introduction

At the end of the 1st millennium AD, the majority of historical Armenia was divided into two Armenian kingdoms: the Kingdom of Ani ruled by the Bagratuni family (884/5–1045; cf. [Garsoïan 2002: 173–194], and the Kingdom of Van, under the leadership of the Arcruni family (908–1021); cf. [Garsoïan 2002: 198–202]. These kingdoms did not long withstand first the Turkic invasions and then Byzantine expansionism. The fall of these two state entities opened a long phase of decadence of historical Armenia, and many Armenian families, having escaped from the destruction of the kingdoms of Ani and Van, united their destinies to give rise to the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia (1198–1375), a new state entity wedged between the Byzantine Empire, the Islamic Sultanates of the Near East, and the Crusader States and, consequently, required to mediate between these stronger states in order to preserve its existence. The Crusaders, coming mainly from Gallo-Romance linguistic areas, had reached Palestine approximately one century before the foundation of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia, and gave rise to important state entities such as the County of Edessa (1098–1149), the Principality of Antioch (1098–1268), the County of Tripoli (1104–1289) and the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1099–1291) with its vassal states. Crusader States, which were enemies of Muslims and Byzantines alike, found in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia a loyal interlocutor and a valuable ally [Pasdermadjan 1986: 202]. In 1342, when other Christian States of the Levant had already waned, the crown of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia even passed to a French family, the Lusignans, originally from Poitou. The connection between Cilician Armenians and Crusader States went beyond the political dimensions, and many cultural and social innovations entered into the life of the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia after contact with the Franks [Dédéyan, Thierry 2002: 247–249]. Among these innovations, one may recall the use of the French word *պարոն*, *պարոնն* *paron*, *parown* [ba'ron]/[ba'run] for 'lord' — a word still in use in Modern Armenian. In the history of Armenian, this loanword also appears in the form *պարոնն տէր* *paron tēr*, i.e. compounded with *տէր* *tēr*

‘lord’, according to a process of lexical adaptation through compounding with a synonymic native lexeme (about the notion of “lexical adaptation”, cf. [Gusmani 2002: 99]). The positive attitude of the Cilician Armenians towards the culture of the Crusader States of the Levant also brought consequences on the linguistic dimension: in particular, the French varieties in use in the Crusader States (usually labelled as Outremer French or French of Outremer) were acquired and used by the Armenian aristocracy [Pasdermadjan 1986: 231]. It bears mentioning that, during the kingdom of Hethum II (1289–1301), the royal chancellery of Sis, in addition to Armenian and Latin, begun to use French as well. A further and very relevant confirmation of the high prestige that Cilician Armenians accorded to Outremer French can be observed in the fact that the loanwords entering into Cilician Armenian from that language are not only necessity loanwords, having the purpose of filling Armenian lexical gaps, but also luxury loanwords, i.e. loanwords acquired only for the prestige of the donor language and in competition with native synonyms.

2. Sources for the study of Outremer French loanwords in Cilician Armenian

A very significant product of the contact between Armenians and Franks of the Levant is the translation into Armenian of *The Assizes of Antioch* [Nichanian 1989: 222–224]. This important collection of laws had been written in French, but its original text is lost. The *Assizes* were translated into Armenian before 1265 by Smbat Sparapet (“Smbat the constable”, 1208–1276), brother of the Cilicia’s King Hethum I and uncle of Hethum of Corycus, who also lived in Cyprus and France and in 1307 dictated for Pope Clement V the famous work *La Flor des Estoires d’Orient*. The Armenian text of the *Assizes* was published in Venice in 1876 on the basis of just one, very old manuscript (1330–1331) [Ališan 1876]. The work had been composed in the Principality of Antioch, which in November 1098 had fallen into

the hands of Bohemond I, a Norman nobleman from Southern Italy. As a standard variety of French did not yet exist, it is quite probable that the French variety used in the Principality of Antioch was somehow in continuity with the variety spoken by the Normans of Southern Italy. This variety of French, although quite scantily known, was probably characterized by Northern features like all the varieties spoken by Normans. Günter Reichenkron (1957) proposed that also the Armenian translation of the *Assizes* had been made from a French text with Northern dialectal features, as the phonetic form of some loanwords present in the translation seems to suggest (on the topic cf. also [Folena 1990: 276, n. 8]).

More recent explorations of the French manuscripts written in the Levant [Minervini 2010] have partially enriched and remodelled the approach to the issue of the linguistic features of Outremer French: the French variety that emerges from the Levant manuscripts shows a mixture of peripheral and non-Francien dialectal features, which on French soil can be found in the northwestern and northeastern dialect areas. The linguistic remnants of Outremer French preserved in Cilician Armenian are not limited to the loanwords documented in the *Assizes*, but there are also many other loanwords that can be found in other Cilician prose works, such as the *Cronicle (Taregirk')* of Smbat Sparapet and his *Judgement Book of Armenians (Datastanagirk' Hayoc')*, a reworking of the code of laws (*Datastanagirk')* of Mxit'ar Goš (1130–1213), both prior to 1265. French loanwords are also present in the diplomas of the chancellery of the Rubenids, the family that ruled Cilicia until 1122; in works regarding the Syro-Roman code (12th and 13th century); and in many historical works published by Vazgen Artašesi Hakobyan in his fundamental *Minor Chronicles (Manr žamanakagrowth' yownner, 2 volumes, Yerevan 1951–1956, hereafter MŽ)*, a rich collection of texts containing many Cilician works composed in 13th or 14th centuries. With reference to these sources, it may be observed that the role of prose in the Armenian documentation of Outremer French is quite central. Prose is indeed more open to lexical innovations, whereas Armenian poetry seems more reluctant in this regard. Cilician Armenian poetry is mainly religious, and the poets often belonged to the clergy;

Cilician poems are therefore composed in the traditional classical language used by the Armenian Church (Grabar) and are linguistically rather conservative. To the contrary, prose works, especially practical works, are often written by the lay learned, and leave more room for Medieval Armenian, i.e. Cilician Armenian, with all its innovations already well-established in the spoken varieties. Among these innovations, prose works also welcome many lexical innovations, in the form of loanwords from Outremer French as well as from Arabic, Persian and Turkic varieties. In any case, the more innovative character of prose can be ascribed only partially to historical reasons, and seems instead to represent a general, almost universal trend, intrinsic to the nature of prose textuality [Andersen 2001: 32].

A comprehensive corpus of the French — but not necessarily Francien — loanwords documented by the Cilician Armenian literature is not yet available, but the loanwords detected so far are enough to stimulate reflection on their phonetic shape, a dimension we can define as mainly linguistic, but not devoid of cultural and historical interest as well. French loanwords in Cilician Armenian attracted the attention of Heinrich Hübschmann [1897: 389–391]: information later incorporated into the *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* by Walther von Wartburg) and his pupil Josef Karst [1901, *passim*]. A first attempt to analyze the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian from a dialectal perspective was proposed by Reichenkron [1957]. Mildonian [1980] contributed to the topic, gathering a richer corpus based on [Ačaryan 1951: 299–301] and on personal research. Lastly, a short discussion on the topic may be read in [Aslanov 2006: 39–43]. However, the topic would merit a general revision in the light of a wider exploration of the Armenian sources. A good starting point to expand the corpus and, consequently, the study of the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian can also be represented by such lexicographic works as the dictionary of Middle Armenian *Mijin Hayereni Bařaran* (MHB) compiled by Rowben Serobi Łazaryan and Henrik Misaki Avetisyan ([Łazaryan, Avetisyan 1987–1992], 2 vols.; reprint 2009 in a single volume). Josef Karst's *Wörterbuch des Mittelarmenischen* might be another valuable lexicographic source; this work, however, still remains unpublished.

3. Vocalism of French loanwords in Cilician Armenian

Before presenting some remarkable phonetic aspects of the French loanwords documented in Cilician Armenian texts, it might be useful to recall that the Armenian alphabet allows a very detailed representation of the French words, surely better than French orthography could offer. The presence in the Cilician Armenian alphabet of 8 letters denoting vowels and 10 letters denoting anterior fricatives and affricates enabled Armenian writers to represent the pronunciation of French loanwords in a reliable way. Moreover, the Cilician Armenian phonological inventory — although reduced with respect to Classical Armenian — was very rich, and included all Old French sounds. Consequently, phenomena of phonological adaptation in these loanwords appear to be quite scant and easily predictable. They can probably be reduced to three processes, depending on positional constraints (notably [ə]-prosthesis before initial vibrant, [ə]-epenthesis in some consonant cluster and deletion of final [-ə]). Except for these few adaptation rules, French loanwords in Cilician Armenian appear rather well conserved in their phonetic shape. Nevertheless, in a few cases, some minor doubts remain.

The French loanwords preserved in the text of the *Assizes of Antioch* [Ališan 1876] and in other Armenian prose works offer interesting evidence about the vocalism of Outremer French. The loanword *hurnūṭq harnēz* ‘equipment’ [Ališan 1876: 19] may be used as starting point to discuss an initial graphic and phonetic issue. In Cilician Armenian, the grapheme *ṭ* in stressed syllables is used to denote a front middle non-rounded vowel, that Karst affirms to be mid-low, i.e. [ɛ] [1901: 18]. To justify this phonetic content, Karst points out that *ṭ* is used in many loanwords to reproduce Persian and Arabic short /a/, which already tended to be pronounced [æ] or [ɛ]. This statement seems a little forced (and the examples given by Karst rather doubtful), and it bears noting that Cilician Armenian shows no reliable traces of a distinction between [ɛ] and [e], as Karst himself maintains elsewhere [1901: 19]. If we follow this latter view of Karst, the Classical Armenian /e/ <ṭ> and /ɛ/ <ṭ> would have already merged into a single front mid non-rounded vowel (cf. [Godel

1975: 7], whose pronunciation could be [ɛ], especially in a stressed syllable. Such a situation would match what we find in Standard Western Armenian [Vaux 1998: 16]. Here, we accept this hypothesis in the transcription, but given the absence of a /e/ that phonologically contrasted with /ɛ/, every front mid non rounded vowel in foreign words could be reproduced with <ɛ>. The existence of graphic variants with the grapheme <ɛ> in French loanwords does not represent a trace of a different pronunciation, since the exchange between <ɛ> and <ɛ̄> is very common in every age of the Armenian manuscript tradition. In Cilician Armenian, the grapheme <ɛ̄> could denote two sounds: the first was identical to that denoted by <ɛ>, the second one was slightly pre-yodized [ɛ̄V], especially but not only in word-initial position. Returning to *hunnúṭq harnēz* ‘equipment’ [Ališan 1876: 19], this word must be traced back to the OFr. lexeme *harneis*. For this word, Old French knew the variants *herneis* and *harneis*, later *harnois*, always with a diphthong in the last syllable. The development of Romance /e/ in stressed syllables (from Lat. ĭ, Ē, OE), as is known, is rather complex in the history of French: the ancient diphthongization in [ei] evolved into [ɛi] and then into [ɔi] in the easternmost French dialects as early as the 10th century. The [ɔi] stage became the only outcome in the 12th century in the Francien area ([Darmesteter 1891, § 93; Alesio 1951: 55; Regula 1955: 32–35; Rheinfelder 1968, § 41; Zink 1986, 58–59]; cf. also the documentation in [Dees 1980: 6, 116, 58, 165, 191, 194, 238–239, 261, 269]. This diphthongized outcome of Romance /e/ in stressed syllables, that in the 13th century was to change further into [‘œe] > [ɔ‘e] > [we] > [wɛ] and, later, [wa], is not the only one attested in the French dialects. Also in the later fixation of the standard language, an outcome [ɛ] (< [wɛ]), usually written <ai>, is well documented, cf. for instance the ethnic *anglais* and the family name *Langlois* ([Regula 1954: 34–35]; cf. also [Fouché 1958: 269–281] who proposes for <ei> a pronounce [‘ei] and an evolution [‘oi] > [‘œe] > [o‘e] > [we] > [wɛ]). In the case of the loanwords that penetrated into Cilician Armenian, the possibility that the Outremer French showed the outcome [ɛ] from Romance /e/ in stressed syllables, and that consequently *hunnúṭq harnēz* were pronounced [har‘nez], has to be taken into serious consideration. In this case, we would be dealing with a phonetic outcome that in France is typical

of the western and northwestern dialects, and that is abundantly documented in the French manuscripts written in the Levant [Minervini 2010: 156–159]. A problem that cannot be neglected here is how a diphthong [ei] could be written in Cilician Armenian, perhaps with <łh> *ēi* or <łj> *ēy*, but these spellings are rare. Some cases, cf. ւլխլտր *pēxēr* from Pers. *bi-xeyr* ‘useless’ [MHB s. v.], seem to suggest that <ł> could reflect, by phonological adaptation or by graphic ambivalence, the diphthong [ei] as well. However, following Karst [1901: 39–40], it must be admitted that the vocalism of the Persian and Arabic loanwords in Cilician Armenian raises many problems and presents many unexpected outcomes, only partially explainable through a Turkic intermediation (cf. [Pisowicz 1995]). It therefore seems highly hypothetical to infer the use of <ł> to note [ei], relying on this sole example. Hence, if the phonetic content of ł in *hurnłtq harnēz* was [ε] and not a diphthong, as more probable, the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian would confirm an outcome well attested in Outremer French [Aslanov 2006: 42]; if instead — as however appears less likely — <ł> was used to note [ei] in the 13th century, we would be dealing with an archaism. We would also have to admit the same in the case in which we were to believe that Arm. [ε] written <ł> was a way phonologically to adapt [ei], as an unusual phonetic sequence. Of course, in *harneis* (a loanword from ONor. HER(R)NEST ‘provision for soldiers’), the diphthong [ei] is not etymological, but analogical on the very common suffix *eis* < -ē(n)se (cf. [Malkiel, Uitti 1968: 158–160]). The analogy is however very old here (*harneis* has been attested since 11th century). Outside of the *Assizes*, Cilician Armenian offers many other cases of <ł> in correspondence with Romance /e/ in stressed syllables, cf. րնł *arē* [əˈrɛ] (or [əˈrei]) ‘king’ (in a *Chronicle* of 1296 by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 38]; in the contemporary Byzantine sources we find ροε, cf. [Reichenkron 1957: 101] and OFr. *rei, roi*, գուրղłtq *gowrdēz* [k^(h)urˈtʰɛz] (or [k^(h)urˈtʰɛiz]) ‘courteous’ (in the *Chronicle* of Martin of Poland, translated into Armenian in the 14th century, cf. [MHB, s. v.]) and OFr. *courteis, courtois* (with *-eis/-ois* from -Ē(N)SE), Ֆրանղłtq *francˈēz* [fəranˈtʰɛz] (or [fəranˈtʰɛiz]) ‘French’ (in a *Chronicle* of 1296 by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 53]) and OFr. *franceis* (in this case with *-eis* from -ĪSCU, cf. [Fouché 1958: 269]). Whatever pronunciation we assign to <ł>, it is

clear that Outremer French loanwords that penetrated into Cilician Armenian bear no trace of the innovating pronunciation [ɔi] (or [oi]), already attested in France in the 10th century, which became the usual pronunciation in the Francien area in the 12th century. As for Hethum of Corycus, this testimony must be carefully evaluated. Hethum of Corycus surely spoke Outremer French fluently and spent part of his life as a monk in the Abbaye de la Belle Paix in Cyprus, but he lived in France as well — in Paris and in Poitou. The French loanwords present in his works have a phonetic shape consistent with what we find in other Cilician Armenian texts; such a consistency might suggest that these loanwords were already well inserted into the Armenian lexicon or, more in general, that the French variety in use in the Cilician royal court and among the Cilician nobles had an inner consistency, i.e. it was phonetically rather homogeneous.

In a form like ըմբրուր *əmbrowr* [əmp^(h)ə'ruɾ] 'emperor' (in a *Chronicle* of 1296 by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 57]), cf. OFr. *empereour*, the final [-ur] deserves attention because it supposes a French model having [u] as the outcome of Romance /o/ in open syllable, in this case from -ōRE(M). This outcome is not likely to be a phonological adaptation of OFr. [œ] and probably reflects a non-Francien vocalism. To the contrary, the variant ըմբրիօր *əmbriōr* [Karst 1901: 21] seems to suppose a French model with a front round vowel, cf. the strategy of noting Turkic [y] with Arm. <իւ> *iw* [ju] in a word such as տիւկմէ *tiwkmē* [dju'gmɛ] < Turkic *düğme* 'button'. If so, the outcome of Romance /o/ in open syllable in ըմբրիօր *əmbriōr* [əmp^(h)ə'ɾjɔɾ] appears closer to the Francien outcome [ø], soon lowered in [œ], which arose in the northeastern French dialects and then reached the Francien area, where it successively prevailed [Bourciez 1958, § 72]. Another example of a non-front outcome of Romance /o/ in open syllable can be seen in քուսմանուր *k'owmantowr* [k^(h)uman'dur] 'commander' (in a 1296 *Chronicle* by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 79], cf. OFr. *comandeor*. As remarked by many scholars [Reichenkron 1957: 100–101; Dees 1980: 18, 94–95, 208; Aslanov 2006: 42], the outcome [u] is very widespread in western and northwestern France, but it can also be found in the eastern regions (Burgundy, Lorraine; cf. [Minervini 2010: 156]). The French manuscripts written in the Levant provide a rich documentation of this pronunciation and the spellings <ou> and <u> are very

frequent, whereas the spelling <eu> is rare [Minervini 2010: 155–156]. In this case as well, the French loanwords that entered into Cilician Armenian seem to confirm the phonetic evidence emerging from the French texts written in the Crusader States.

Lastly, again concerning vocalism, the *Assize of Antioch*, as remarked also by Aslanov [2006: 41], preserve some further phonetically remarkable forms such as սայզել *sayzel* [sai'zʲɛl] ‘assign, appoint, put in possession of goods or properties’ [Ališan 1876: 17], cf. OFr. *saisir*, from Germ. *sazjan* ‘put someone as owner’, բլայթ *blayt* [p^(h)ə'laɪt^h] ‘trial, judiciary complaint’ [Ališan 1876: 39], cf. OFr. *plaid*, from Lat. PLACITU(M) and վիգայր *vigayr* [vi'k^(h)air] ‘substitute’ (in a Chronicle of 1296 by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 71]), cf. OFr. *vicaire*, from Lat. VICARIU(M). In all these cases, the diphthong [ai] appear well preserved. This feature seems to be conservative, too. In the historical evolution of French, the monophthongization of [ai] passed through a phase [ei] and reached the final stage [ɛ] in the 12th and 13th centuries, in closed syllables before open ones, and in unstressed syllable before stressed ones [Rheinfelder 1968, § 272]. The French manuscripts written in the Levant show some fluctuation between the spelling <ai> and <e>. This fact suggests that the monophthongization of [ai] had already taken place in the Levant [Minervini 2010: 162–163], while the French loanwords documented in Cilician Armenian show no trace of vowel raising or monophthongization.

4. The consonantism of the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian

The case of ֆրանցէզ *franc'ēz* [fəran'ts^hɛz] (or, less probably, [fəran'ts^hɛiz]) ‘French’, cited above, can be a starting point for the reflection on another phonetic issue, that is the outcomes of the fronting of Latin velar stops in Outremer French. The phases of fronting the Latin velars passed through in the history of French could be perfectly represented by mean of the Armenian alphabet. Where Old French written documents represent the outcomes of Latin velars fronting through <c>, <g>

<ch>, <s>, <z>, <j>, using historical spellings that endure to this day, the richness of letters in the Armenian alphabet makes it possible to more reliably represent the phonetic dimension of Outremer French words. In particular the abundance of Armenian letters denoting fricatives and affricates is noteworthy: cf. <u> *s* Classical Armenian and Cilician Armenian [s], <q> *z* Cl. and Cilic. Arm. [z], <ʔ> *š* Cl. and Cilic. Arm. [ʃ], <ɖ> *ž* Cl. and Cilic. Arm. [ʒ], <ã> *j* Cl. Arm. [dz^(h)], Cilic. Arm. [ts^(h)], <g> *c* Cl. and Cilic. Arm. [ts^h], <ð> *c* Cl. Arm. [ts], Cilic. Arm. [dz], <ʒ> *j* Cl. Arm. [dʒ^(h)], Cilic. Arm. [tʃ^(h)], <ʒ> *č* Cl. and Cilic. Arm. [tʃ^h], <ă> *č* Cl. Arm. [tʃ], Cilic. Arm. [dʒ]. This detailed representation of fricatives and affricates increases the importance of Cilician Armenian as bearing witness to the phonetics of Outremer French and the incertitude about the presence or absence of aspiration in some Cilician Armenian affricates (as in some occlusives) does not invalidate the value of Cilician Armenian as a source about Outremer French sounds.

However, a correct evaluation of the consonantism of Outremer French loanwords in Cilician Armenian cannot disregard some facts concerning the phonetics of Cilician Armenian that have sometimes been ignored in previous studies (for instance in [Reichenkron 1957]). In the *Assizes of Antioch* we find բրինձ *brinj* [p^(h)ə'rints^h] 'prince' [Ališan 1876: 3], OFr. *prince*, and Ալիձի *Alici* [ali'dzi] [Ališan 1876: 93] genitive of Ալիձ *Alic* [a'lidz] 'Alis, Alix', the mother of Smbat Sparapet. These two testimonies have different values. Without any doubt, the presence of alveolar affricates in 13th century represents an archaism. In the same century in France, the deaffrication of these sounds was already very widespread [Bourciez 1958, §§ 114–115], and the French manuscripts written in the Levant, with their fluctuations between <s>, <c>, <ss> and <z>, also seem to confirm the spread of this innovation in Outremer French [Minervini 2010: 167–169]. However, if the testimony of Ալիձ *Alic* [a'lidz] is likely to be reliable as to the persistence of alveolar affricates, that of բրինձ *brinj* [p^(h)ə'rints^h] for OFr. *prince* must be considered as irrelevant. In Cilician Armenian, the Classical Armenian sequence <lu> *ns* [ns] is often written <ւց> *nc* or <ւճ> *nj* in both cases with the phonetic value [nts^h] [Karst 1901: 105–106]. This fact bears witness to a process of fortition of alveolar fricatives after nasals — a process not very different from that

affecting Central and Southern Italo-Romance dialects (cf. in the Roman variety [pen'tsa] 'to think', [kon'tsijjo] 'advice' vs. It. *pensare* and *consiglio*). Hence, բրիւն *brinj* [p^(h)ə'rints^h] might take both OFr. ['printsə] and ['prinsə] as a model — in the latter case with phonological adaptation of the sequence [ns] in [nts^h]. To sum up, in a French loanword in Cilician Armenian, only the presence of an alveolar affricate after a sound different from a nasal can truly reflect the presence of an alveolar affricate in the French model; in this perspective, a loanword such as Arm. պսղիւն *pac'in* [ba'ts^hin] 'basin, bucket' [Ališan 1876: 45], cf. OFr. *basin*, Fr. *basin*, surely reflects an affricate pronunciation in French.

The same argument can be applied to postalveolar affricates as well. In the *Assizes of Antioch* the forms շալունջ *şalownj* [ʃ^(h)a'lundʒ] 'judiciary complaint' [Ališan 1876: 19], OFr. *chalonge*, from CALUMNIA and ջաստել *ǰastel* [ʃ^(h)as't^(h)ɛl] 'to punish' [Ališan 1876: 65], OFr. *chastier*, Fr. *châtier*, from CASTIGARE show the absence of deaffrication of postalveolar affricates. The lexicon of Cilician Armenian has no French loanwords beginning with [ʃ-], or variants in [ʃ-] of loanwords beginning with [ʃ^(h)-], cf. also ջաստել *ǰastel* [ʃ^(h)as't^(h)ɛl] 'castle' (in a *Chronicle* of 1296 by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 1: 74]; the word is a homonym of the earlier ջաստել *ǰastel* [ʃ^(h)as't^(h)ɛl] 'to punish'), OFr. *chastel*, ջամն, ջամբն *ǰamr, ǰambr* ['ʃ^(h)am(b)ər] 'chamber of the treasure, treasury' (in Smbat Sparapet's *Judgement Book of Armenians* [MHB, s. v.]), OFr. *chambre*, ջաբրոն, ջաբրոնի *ǰabron, ǰabrown* [ʃ^(h)ap^(h)ə'ron, ʃ^(h)ap^(h)ə'run] 'ecclesiastical headgear' (in the *Chronicle* of Martin of Poland, translated into Armenian in the 14th century, cf. [MHB, s. v.]), OFr. *chaperon*, and also the anthroponym Ջարլ *ǰarl* [ʃ^(h)arl] (in a *Chronicle* of 1296 by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 51]), OFr. *Charles*. An example having [ʃ^(h)] in internal position is Ընիջարդ *Ərijard* [əri'ʃ^(h)ar^h] (in the *Genealogy of the princes of Antioch* by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 110]), OFr. *Richart*. As Armenian words beginning with [ʃ-] are quite numerous, it is clear that French loanwords in [ʃ-] could not undergo any phonological adaptation, much less into [ʃ^(h)-]. The stability of [ʃ-] in the loanwords absorbed by Cilician Armenian is confirmed by the Persian and Arabic loanwords in [ʃa-], such as շահիւն *şahin* [ʃa'hin] 'peregrine falcon', from Pers. *šāhīn* 'hawk, falcon' and շահվայ *şahvay* [ʃah'va] 'wish, desire' from Arab. *şahwa(t)* 'wish'. As for voiced postalveolar

affricates the case of the anthroponym Ճաւսլիւն *Čawslin* [dʒə'slin] (in the *Genealogy of the princes of Antioch* by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 106]), OFr. *Josselin*, may be mentioned. The affricate pronunciation of postalveolars, coming from the original Latin velars before *a*, is certain for French words that penetrated into Cilician Armenian in word initial position and in non-post-nasal position; in a case such as ջալուռ յալառնյ [ʃ^(h)a'lundʒ], the second affricate [dʒ] can have a secondary origin due to a fortition phenomenon, as also occurs for alveolar affricates (cf. *supra*). Returning to voiceless alveolar affricates, in Cilician Armenian we also find rare doublets such as ֆրանցեղ/ֆրանսեղ *franc'ēz/fransēz* [fəran'ts^hɛz]/[fəran'sɛz] (or, less probably, [fəran'ts^hɛiz]/[fəran'sɛiz]) 'French' and ջանցլեր/ջանսլեր *ǰanc'ler/ǰansler* [ʃ^(h)ants^hə'liɛr]/[ʃ^(h)ansə'liɛr] 'court's first officer of Justice' [MHB, ss.vv.], OFr. *franceis* and *chancelier*; these forms might suggest that variants with alveolar fricatives instead of affricates were current in Cilician Armenian, but their interpretation is not univocal. Indeed, it cannot be ruled out that such variants depend on different degrees of phonological integration or on phenomena of orthographic incertitude between <ւց> *nc'* and <ւս> *ns*, both pronounced [nts^h] in Cilician Armenian.

The case of OFr. [dʒ] as the outcome of the fronting of the Romance voiced velar stop *G-* before *I* and *E*, also merits some discussion. The asymmetrical evolution of the voiced velar stop compared to the voiceless ones is a well-known fact: if the Old French outcome of Romance *c-* before front vowels was an alveolar affricate [ts], the voiced stop *G-* in the same conditions became a postalveolar affricate [dʒ], cf. OFr. *geler* [dʒə'ler] 'to freeze' < GELARE, *genoil* [dʒə'noʌ] 'knee' (fr. *genou*) < GENŪCŪLU(M). The same outcome is the final point in the development in Old French of the sequence -VTĪCU(M) (cf. AETĀTĪCU(M) > OFr. *eage*, *aage* > Fr. *âge* 'age'), perhaps via the path -VDIGU > -VDJU > [-Vdʒə] > [-Vdʒ] (cf. also MEDICU > OFr. *miege* 'physician', [Rheinfelder 1968, § 719]). Also belonging to this pattern of evolution is OFr. *lige* 'liege' ([FEW, 16: 463–464] **let-*) from LĪTĪCU(M) or LAETĪCU(M), a Germanic loanword documented as *litus* / *laetus* in the Lex Salica (first years of the 6th century) and indicating an intermediate social status between 'free' and 'slave', a 'half-free man'. In OFr. the pronunciation was probably ['lidʒə], and in Cilician Armenian we find լիճ *lič* [lidʒ] 'liege' [Ališan 1876: 9],

with no trace of deaffrication. Other loanwords such as մարիաճ *mariač* [mari'adʒ] or, less probably, [ma'ɾjadʒ] 'marriage' ([Ališan 1876: 45] in the title of a section and in the text of the *Genealogy of the princes of Antioch* by Hethum of Corycus [MŽ, 2: 110]), OFr. *mariage*, and ընդհիսոյն *ərēčistr* [əɾ'ɟist^(h)əɾ] 'register' (in the *Chronicle* of Martin of Poland, translated into Armenian in the 14th century, [MHB, s. v.]), OFr. *registre*, seem to confirm that postalveolar voiced affricates were well preserved in Outremer French. Incidentally, it might be useful to recall that [ʒ] is a very frequent sound in Armenian, without positional constraints and regularly spelled with <ժ> [Karst 1901: 91] and therefore no phenomena of phonological adaptation can be assumed as a source of [dʒ] in Outremer French loanwords in Armenian: in more explicit terms, in the event that a French word had [ʒ], this sound could be reproduced with no problem by Armenian speakers and writers. French spoken in the Levant probably did not undergo the deaffrication of [tʃ] and [dʒ] in [ʃ] and [ʒ], a change that in France is dated to the 13th century [Bourciez 1958, §§ 120–121; Short 2007, 105, 112–113; Minervini 2010: 167–169]. As for the dialectal dimension, the presence of a process of fronting in the outcome of Lat. CA- (cf. the examples given above) seems to detach these forms from northern and northeastern French dialects, which preserve this sequence unchanged to this day (cf. [ALF: 225 *champ*, 250 *chat*, 251 *châtaigne* etc.]).

Lastly, returning to զսսոնկլ *ʒastel* [ʃ^(h)as't^(h)jɛl] 'to punish' and 'castle', OFr. *chastier*, Fr. *châtier* from CASTIGARE and OFr. *chastel*, Fr. *château* from CASTELLU(M), the preservation of [s] before a consonant is noteworthy. French loanwords in Middle English suggest that [s] disappeared rather early, first before voiced consonants and before [f], and later before voiceless consonants [Regula 1954: 145–146; Gusmani 2002: 101–102]. In any event, in the 13th century [s] should already have disappeared before voiceless consonants as well [Regula 1955: 146; Rheinfelder 1968, § 557], but the Outremer French loanwords in Cilician Armenian preserve it without exceptions. In this case, the Armenian testimony also contrasts with the French manuscripts written in the Levant, which display frequent fluctuations between <s>, <h> and <Ø> [Minervini 2010: 148–149, 167–168] indicating that [s] before consonants was undergoing phonetic alteration or deletion.

5. An overview

Summarizing the evidence discussed above, we can maintain that the Cilician Armenian tradition, especially in the literary prose works, preserves an interesting quantity of French lexemes and anthroponyms, which were essentially transcribed from the pronunciation they had among the Armenian cultivated elites, and not transliterated from French written documents. This pronunciation should reflect rather faithfully the phonetics of Outremer French, almost without phonological adaptation. Interestingly, the phonetics of these French loanwords differs from what we find in the Francien area. In some features, notably [ɛ] or, less probably, [ei] instead of [ɔi] or [oi], preservation of [ai], [u] instead of [ø] or [œ], [ts], [tʃ] and [dʒ] instead of [s], [ʃ] and [ʒ], and preservation of [s] before [t], the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian show a dialectal look that might be defined as peripheral and slightly archaic. As to the presence of non-Francien features in Outremer French, the testimony of Cilician Armenian largely confirms the phonetic look of this French variety independently proposed on account of the manuscripts written in the Levant [Minervini 2010: 148–179]. This non-Francien aspect of Outremer French must depend on the geographical area of origin of the Francophones who emigrated to the Crusader States, coming mainly from western, northern, and northeastern regions of France. As well illustrated by Minervini [2010; 2018], Outremer French was the result of the meeting of different French dialects. The initial pluridialectalism probably engendered a new diatopic variety through social negotiation and selection of the variants brought by the different dialects. As for the slightly archaic phonetics of the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian, three hypothesis are viable:

- 1) Outremer French had features typical of an *area serior*, generally more conservative and less exposed to the streams of innovation spreading in France;
- 2) the French loanwords attested in Cilician texts belonging to the 13th century had penetrated into Cilician Armenian earlier, i.e. in the

12th century, at the time of the first contacts between Armenians and Francophones in the Levant;

- 3) the variety of French used in the Cilician royal court in the 13th century had already been acquired in the 12th century by the Armenian social elites, and became a crystallized court variety, i.e. a frozen variety, scarcely prone to the phonetic innovations that, in the subsequent decades, were also spreading in Outremer French.

In general, it is very difficult to decide which of these three explanations is likely to be preferable. Unfortunately, many cultural and historical issues related to French in the Levant have yet to be sufficiently investigated, and many questions remain open: for example, what was the role played in Cilicia by the French spoken in the County of Edessa? This County fell very early (1149), but during its existence it had close relations with the Armenian Principality of Cilicia. Might this Crusader State be identified as a relevant place of interaction between French and Armenian already as early as the 12th century? Further historical research about the Crusader States will, it is hoped, enlighten these and other as yet less considered issues. Of course, not only historical research is needed, but Armenian philology can also contribute to a better understanding of the French loanwords in Cilician Armenian. Indeed, the corpus of French loanwords in Cilician Armenian is not still closed, and possible contributions to its knowledge may derive from new editions of Cilician Armenian literary works and documents and, as said above, from the edition of the monumental *Wörterbuch des Mittelarmenischen* compiled by J. Karst at the beginning of the 20th century. This important and still unpublished lexicographical work is currently under study at the University of Halle. While awaiting further historical, philological and linguistic research that will surely improve our knowledge of Outremer French loanwords in Cilician Armenian, it can however be stressed that the high historical value of the Armenian testimony concerning Outremer French is already clear and unquestionable. In this regard, it does not seem out of place to affirm that Cilician Armenian, thanks especially to the high number of French loanwords and their clear phonetic representation through the Armenian

alphabet, represents the most important indirect source for the reconstruction of the phonetics of Outremer French, a Gallo-Romance variety that for a long time seemed to dominate the Levant, but was destined to be extinguished.

Abbreviations

Arab. — Arabic; Arm. — Armenian; Cilic. Arm. — Cilician Armenian; Cl. Arm. — Classical Armenian; Fr. — French; Germ. — German; It. — Italian; Lat. — Latin; OFr. — Old French; Pers. — Persian.

References

- Ačaryan 1951 — H. Ačaryan. *Hayoc' lezvi patmowt'yown*. Vol. 2. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1951.
- Alessio 1951 — G. Alessio. *Grammatica storica francese: Introduzione. Fonetica*. Bari: Leonardo da Vinci, 1951.
- ALF — J. Gilliéron, E. Edmont. *Atlas linguistique de la France*. 9 vols. Paris: Champion, 1902–1910.
- Ališan 1876 — Ł. Ališan (ed.). *Assises d'Antioche. Reproduites en français et publiées au sixième centenaire de la mort de Sempad le Connétable leur ancien traducteur arménien*. Venise: Imprimerie arménienne médaillée, 1876.
- Andersen 2001 — H. Andresen. Markedness and theory of linguistic change. H. Andresen (ed.). *Actualization. Linguistic Change in Progress*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2001. P. 21–57.
- Aslanov 2006 — C. Aslanov. *Le français au Levant, jadis et naguère: à la recherche d'une langue perdue*, Paris: Champion, 2006.
- Bourciez 1958 — E. Bourciez. *Précis historique de phonétique française*. 9 ed. Paris: Klincksiek, 1958.
- Darmesteter 1891 — A. Darmesteter. *Cours de grammaire historique de la langue française. Première Partie: Phonétique*. Paris: Delagrave, 1891.
- Dédéyan, Thierry 2002 — G. Dédéyan, N. Thierry. Il tempo della Crociata (fine xi — fine xiv secolo). G. Dédéyan (ed.). *Storia degli armeni*. Ed. italiana a cura di A. Arslan e B. L. Zekiyan. Milano: Guerini e Associati, 2002. P. 235–267.
- Dees 1980 — A. Dees. *Atlas des formes et des constructions des chartes françaises du 13e siècle*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1980.

- FEW — W. von Wartburg (ed.). *Französisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch. Eine Darstellung des galloromanischen Sprachschatzes*. 25 vols. Bonn; Heidelberg; Leipzig; Berlin; Basel: Klopp; Winter; Teubner; Zbinden, 1922–2002.
- Folena 1990 — G. Folena. La Romània d'Oltremare: francese e veneziano nel Levante. G. Folena. *Culture e lingue nel Veneto medievale*. Padova: Editoriale programma, 1990. P. 269–286.
- Fouché 1958 — P. Fouché. *Phonétique historique du français*. Vol. 2: Le voyelles. Paris: Klincksieck, 1958.
- Garsoïan 2002 — N. Garsoïan. L'indipendenza ritrovata: regno del nord e regno del sud (secoli ix–xi). G. Dédéyan (ed.). *Storia degli armeni*. Ed. italiana a cura di A. Arslan e B. L. Zekiyian. Milano: Guerini e Associati, 2002. P. 173–213.
- Godel 1975 — R. Godel. *An introduction to the study of Classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1975.
- Gusmani 2002 — R. Gusmani. Interlinguistica. R. Lazzeroni (ed.). *Linguistica storica*. Roma: Carocci, 2002. P. 87–114.
- Hübschmann 1897 — H. Hübschmann. *Armenische Grammatik. I. Teil: Armenische Etymologie*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1897.
- Karst 1901 — J. Karst. *Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen*. Strassburg: Trübner, 1901.
- Malkiel, Uitti 1968 — Y. Malkiel, K. D. Uitti. L'ancien français *gab-ois, ir-ois, jargon-ois* et leur contreparties dans l'anglais d'Amérique. *Revue de linguistique romane*. 1968. Vol. 32. P. 126–174.
- Manoukian 1986 — A. Manoukian. La struttura sociale del popolo armeno. A. Alpagò Novello (ed.). *Gli Armeni*. Milano: Jaka Book, 1986.
- MHB — Ğ. S. Łazaryan, H. M. Avetisyan. *Mijin hayereni bařaran*. 2 vols. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1987–1992.
- Mildonian 1980 — P. Mildonian. Influenze del lessico romanzo nell'armeno medievale. S. Curzu, L. S. Loi (eds.). *Transcaucasica II, Quaderni del seminario di Iranistica, Uralo-Altaistica e Caucasologia dell'Università degli Studi di Venezia*. Venezia: Università degli studi, 1980. P. 48–67.
- Minervini 2010 — L. Minervini. Le français dans l'Orient latin (xiiiè–xive siècles). Éléments pour la caractérisation d'une *scripta* du Levant. *Revue de linguistique romane*. 2010. Vol. 74. P. 119–198.
- Minervini 2018 — L. Minervini. What we know and don't yet know about Outremer French. L. K. Morreale, N. L. Paul (eds.). *The French of Outremer: Communities and Communications in the Crusading Mediterranean*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2018.
- MŽ — V. A. Hakobyan (ed.). *Manr řamanakagrowt' yownner XIII–XVIII dd*. 2 vols. Yerevan: Academy Press, 1951–1956.

- Nichanian 1989 — M. Nichanian. *Ages et usages de la langue arménienne*. Paris: Editions Entente, 1989.
- Pisowicz 1995 — A. Pisowicz. How did New Persian and Arabic Words Penetrate the Middle Armenian Vocabulary? Remarks on the Material of Kostandin Erznkac'i's Poetry. J. J. S. Weitemberg (ed.). *New Approaches to Medieval Armenian Language and Literature*. Amsterdam; Atlanta: Rodopi, 1995. P. 95–109.
- Pasdermadjan 1986 — H. Pasdermadjan. *Histoire de l'Arménie. Depuis les origines jusqu'au Traité de Lausanne*. Paris: Librairie Orientale H. Samuelian, 1986.
- Reichenkron 1957 — G. Reichenkron. Per la lingua dei Normanni di Sicilia e dell'Italia meridionale. *Bollettino. Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani*. 1957. Vol. 5. P. 97–103.
- Regula 1955 — M. Regula. *Historische Grammatik des Französischen. I. Teil: Lautlehre*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1955.
- Rheinfelder 1968 — H. Rheinfelder. *Altfranzösische Grammatik. I. Teil: Lautlehre*. 4. Aufl. München: Hueber, 1968.
- Short 2007 — I. Short. *Manual of Anglo-Norman*. London: Anglo-Norman Text Society, 2007.
- Zink 1986 — G. Zink. *Phonétique historique du français*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1986.