

Article

Reduplication in old Armenian and its functional implementations (experience of comparative diachronic analysis)

L. M. Khachatryan¹, V. V. Madoyan^{2,*}

¹ Armenian State Pedagogical University, Yerevan 0010, Republic of Armenia

² Shirakatsi-University of International Relations, Yerevan 0025, Republic of Armenia

* Corresponding author: V. V. Madoyan, v.madoyan@rambler.ru

CITATION

Khachatryan LM, Madoyan VV.
(2024). Reduplication in old
Armenian and its functional
implementations (experience of
comparative diachronic analysis).
Forum for Linguistic Studies. 6(2):
1159.
<https://doi.org/10.59400/fls.v6i2.1159>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 25 October 2023

Accepted: 23 November 2023

Available online: 13 March 2024

COPYRIGHT



Copyright © 2024 by author(s).

Forum for Linguistic Studies is
published by Academic Publishing
Pte. Ltd. This work is licensed under
the Creative Commons Attribution
(CC BY) license.

[https://creativecommons.org/licenses/
by/4.0/](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Abstract: The reduplication in the Indo-European languages has been studied quite thoroughly both in connection with the issues of the origin and development of the language, and with the issues of assessing their functional content. Regarding the latter, scientists are more inclined to believe that this is due to the reproduction of child's or imperfect speech. The article examines the reduplicates in the Armenian language, which is central to the territory of settlement of the Indo-Europeans. Using the example of the translation of the Bible, the authors show that only in Armenian the reduplicates had a stylistic significance, fixed a high style. This conclusion is drawn on the basis of the fact that the synonyms of reduplicates in Armenian in the era of the Bible translation (V century AD) were used in folklore and historical works, that is, the translator used the reduplicates consciously, emphasizing the high importance of the Holy Scriptures. This is also indicated by comparisons of Armenian examples with reduplicates with corresponding examples from the original source and translations of the Bible into Latin, English, Old Bulgarian and German. This testifies to the fact that by the V century AD the Armenian language was not only finally formed, but also contained style awareness.

Keywords: old Armenian; reduplication; stylistic differentiation; high style; bible

1. Introduction

The formal and substantive aspects of reduplication have been studied quite thoroughly on the example of more than one language (Volkova, 2014; Kryuchkova, 2000; Aronoff et al., 2005; etc.), including Armenian (Jaukyan, 1989). Reduplication in a child's speech has been investigated, which is clearly related to the problem of studying speech generation in general and the development of language thinking (Steinberg, 1969). Many words in different languages, including Armenian, lose their parallelism in education over time (reduplicates are formed by doubling the roots or their variations), are transformed into solid roots, which also requires special study. Reduplication is also considered from the stylistic perspective, since, as a rule, reduplicates fix objects of low style, that is why they are determined as its explicit indicators (Sanyarova, 2019). As the text of the Holy Scripture in the Armenian translation initially shows, reduplicates can also be indicators of high style, and this phenomenon is considered in our work for the first time not only in Armenian studies, but also in world linguistics. According to historical information, the translation of the Bible into Armenian (The Bible, 1997) was carried out at the beginning of the fifth century by the creator of the Armenian alphabet Mesrop Mashtots (and his student), who, apart from Armenian and Greek, also spoke Assyrian, Persian, Georgian, Aghvan, i.e. all the languages of Transcaucasia. The translation fully retains both its functional (spiritual) and cultural significance up to the present day (By Maturinus

Veyssi re La Croze, the translation of the Bible into Armenian is the queen of translations). The Bible was translated into Old Bulgarian (Old Church Slavonic) by Cyril and Methodius in the ninth century. The Bible was translated into Latin in the 5th century, too, English into the 14th century, and German into the 16th century (The Bible: Old & New Testament, 1997; Biblia Sacra, 1994; Holy Bible, 2012; The Bible, 1997). Regardless of the chronology of translation, the original language of the Bible has been preserved in multilingual translation books, so it is of particular interest to study the comparative linguistic reality in the above languages.

2. Methods

Since the studied ancient Armenian material is translated, the ancient Greek text of the Holy Scripture and its translations into Latin, English, Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) and German is used (Biblia Sacra, 1994; Holy Bible, 2012; The Bible, 2002; etc.), which makes it possible to compare the semantics and evaluate the functions of reduplicates in Old Armenian in comparison with the semantics and function of their equivalents in these languages (Allen, 1953; Bazell, 1958). In this regard, the material was studied by a comparative method using elements of component analysis in some cases (Fodor and Katz, 1964). The paper describes the structure of reduplicates only in connection with their historical reconstruction and the need to indicate the Indo-European roots. Firstly, an attempt was made to establish the history of the root by the method of internal reconstruction. Units with genetic affinity are determined, which become the material for comparison (Horne, 1966). When comparing the reduplications of different languages, the comparative-historical method with external reconstruction is used (Hartmann, 1956; Knobloch, 1956), and more attention is paid to semantic and stylistic factors, since word-formation features have already been studied (Jandlova, 2018; Brini, 2000). A comparison of the approaches of the Bible translators shows that they brilliantly combined the originality of the vocabulary with the word-formation capabilities of the native language.

The material is grouped and presented according to the word-formation principle only in order not to violate the established tradition.

The work is written using a comparative technique not only in terms of lexical comparison, but also in terms of stylistic and semantic, since only in this way it is possible to show the originality, individual approach of the Armenian translator and characterize the stylistic value of reduplication.

The presence of reduplication in itself does not mean that it is stylistically marked. Modern theoretical stylistics does not yet indicate the real circumstances that make it possible to assess the stylistic value of a word in general or in a sentence. For now, we consider that *վեհույթյուն* “majesty” in the Armenian language is a word of high style, and its synonym in a certain sense *ւե՛ծ* “big” belongs to the middle style. However, the opposite point can be argued as well. In both cases there are no practices to prove it. When analyzing the vocabulary of works (or translations) written in ancient times, this question gets more complicated due to the fact that we do not possess the “internal understanding” of the role of this word in the psychological infrastructure of the language, since it is possible to return to the era when this work was created and perceive its linguistic perception only in comparison with the works of that time. As

long as the mechanisms to determine the stylistic significance in modern linguistics are missing, it seems impossible to search for the stylistic essence of a linguistic unit used a millennium and a half ago. Thus, we can suggest that the stylistic value of a word should be determined by context. This rule may be formulated in the following way: A synonym used in a high style text under logical stress is a unit of high style: a synonym used in a stylistically neutral text is a unit of neutral style, and so on. A word acquires this or that meaning, including a stylistic one, when compared to a synonym in an absolutely similar position. A variant of the textual characterization of the word was proposed by S. Bally, noting, for example, that *chérir* is used only in relation to women, contains a connotation of tender attitude, i.e. it is “to love tenderly”, “to love a tender being” (Bally, 1909, p. 187).

This can be analyzed in synchrony. In diachrony, it should be noted that style is also reflected in semantics. When the author uses *դասերով* instead of *դասադաս*, he seems to apply different semantics: *դասերով* means “in rows”, while *դասադաս* stands for “in orderly rows”, although in the lexical semantics of this word the component “slender” is missing, if the expression *կանոնավոր դասադաս* is considered. Based on this, our rule of diachronic analysis of stylistic markings is as follows: a word is stylistically marked if it contains a connotation of additional semantics associated with the context of use. In this regard, when translating stylistically marked reduplications into English, the lexical shade due to the style is given after the+sign.

3. Reduplicates in old Armenian, their stylistic significance in comparison with Armenian synonyms and Indo-European equivalents

Since the ancient period, a significant number of words in the Armenian language are formed with the help of reduplication. These words (nearly 500) (Ačaryan, 1957) have broad usage in the translated books of the Bible and in the manuscript works of the 5th century¹.

The first group of reduplication is *Reduplicants with a connecting vowel element*. They have the stability of components which is conditioned by separate word stress; each component, while reduplicating, bears separate word stress (Tumanyan, 1971); e. g. *մեծամեծ* (*metsamets*) ‘*very big*’+ noble, *գոյնագոյն* (*goynagoyn*) ‘*colorful, colored*’+ much, *գունդագունդ* (*gundagund*) - ‘*in regiments, in troops*’+harmonious, *դասադաս* (*dasadas*) - ‘*in groups*’+harmonious, *զանազան* (*zanazan*) ‘*differently*’+much, *չարաչար* (*ch’arach’ar*) - ‘*grievously, severely*’+ with difficulty, *կորակոր* (*korakor*) - ‘*round-shouldered; ashamed, confused*’+much.

As it is seen, all the above-mentioned reduplications have a coloring of quality enhancement. This is due to their common initial meaning which is feature, i.e. they are primordially adjectives that can be substantivized in the context and function as a noun.

The root component *մեծ* (*mets*) of reduplicative compound *մեծամեծ* (*metsamets*) etymologically derives from native Indo-European root **meg’a- meg’(h)* “large, big” (Ačaryan, 1977; Jahukyan, 2010). Reduplicative compound *մեծամեծ* has the meaning “very big”, comp. *Եւ արար Աստուած զերկրու յունաւորսն զմեծամեծս* [Yev arar

Astuats zerkus lusnaworsn zmetsametss; And God created two very big moons] (*Gen., 1; 16*)².

In Latin, German, and English the meaning of the great double complexity was expressed by the positive degree of the adjective (simple composition): *magna, gross, great. Fecitque Deus duo magna luminaria* (*Gen., 1, 16*). *Und Gott machte zwei grosse Lichter* (*Gen., 1; 16*). *And God made two great lights* (*Gen., 1; 16*).

It also means «honoured men» in the Bible, comp. Եւ ժողովեցան ի փոքուէ մինչեւ *ցնծամեծ*, քանզի զարմացեալ էին նոքա յոյժ [Yev zhoghovets'an i p'vok'ue minch'ev ts'metsametss, k'anzi zarmats'eal ein nok'a yoyzh; And they gathered from the smallest to the honoured men, because they were very surprised] (*Judith, 13; 15*).

In the languages under consideration, the meaning of doubling a feature (including the one presented as an object) is expressed in the superlative of the agreed adjective; *maximum, greatest*. Comp. *Et concurrerunt ad eam omnes a minimo usque ad maximum quoniam speraverunt eam iam non esse venturam* (*Judith, 13; 15*). *And all ran to meet her from the least to the greatest: for they now had no hopes that she would come* (*Judith, 13; 15*)³.

As the examples show, Armenian reduplicates are used where in the rest of the languages under consideration there are comparative forms of adjectives, including substantivated ones. The lexeme *մեծամեծ* (metsamets) functions not only in the meaning of “noble”, but also “senior”, which indicates that this is not a neologism in the text of the Bible translation, but a word that has sufficient history and frequency in the language. From the point of view of linguistic thinking, this lexeme shows a sufficient abstraction of the Armenian language consciousness, which is confirmed by the material of ancient folklore. Lexemes such as *մեծամեծ* (metsamets) are recorded both in Gokhtan⁴ songs [Gokhtan songs] and in a number of subsequent historical works and translations of philosophical treatises from Greek: *մեծամեծ* (metsamets) - ‘very big’+ noble; *գոյնագոյն* (goynagoyn) - ‘colorful, colored’+much; *արհամարհել* (arhamarhel) - ‘to ignore’+very, vastly; *կարկամ* (karkam) - ‘bent’+thoroughly, smartly, *խառնիխուռն* (kharnikhurn) - ‘in random, confusedly’+very, too much etc. They were formed in the oldest Armenian (XII BC - IV century AD), passed into the ancient Armenian (V-XI centuries AD) (Jahukyan, 1989) and recorded in a number of subsequent historical writings and translations of philosophical treatises from Greek. For example: *արհամարհել* (arhamarhel) - Մեզ ոչ թուի հանոյ *արհամարհել* զուխս [Mez voch' t'ui hachoy arhamarhel zukht; We take no pleasure in ignoring a vow] (Pharp., 1904, p. 74); Եւ զիս'րդ կամ ի՛ւ դու ըմբռնեցար *արհամարհել* զնորա զապատուիրանս [Yev ziard kam iw du ymbrnets'ar arhamarhel znora zapatuirans?; And was it in vain that you understood to despise his commandment?] (Buz., 1913, p. 94); Եւ ոչ աստուածայինսն *արհամարհէ՛* լինելովն սակս մարդկայնոց [Yev voch' astuatsayinsn arhamarhe` lineovn saks mardkaynots'; And do not despise the things of God, being so human] (Anh., 1960, p. 66); *մեծամեծ* (metsamets) – Եւ հրամայէ նախ զամբարտակ գետոյն սպառաժիւք և *մեծամեծ* վիմօք շինել [Yev hramaye nakh zambartak getoyn aparrazhiwk' yev metsamets vimok' shinel; And he ordered first to build a dam and a large embankment on the river] (Khor., 1913, p. 52); Հաւանութեամբ *մեծամեծ* նախարարցն... արարին նամակին պատասխանի [Hawanut'eamb metsamets nakhararts'n... ararin namakin pataskhani; With the

approval the great ministers will reply to the letter] (Egh., 1957, p. 28); *Մեծամեծ* պարգևս քմացն շնորհէր [Metsamets pargevs k'rmats'n shnorher; The greatest gift was given to the priest] (Agat., 1909, p. 19).

By implementing the method of component analysis on this material, it can be concluded that reduplication in Armenian has a similar role in comparison with the degrees of adjectives and adverbs (superlative degree). Such reduplication is observed in all Indo-European languages. However, the lack of consistency in their formation indicates that the substantivation of adjectival reduplications makes it possible to perceive their semantics in a graduated form: *մեծամեծ* in the example of Gen., 1,16, where this word has the meaning of “super-large”. Perhaps reduplication was the original pattern of the comparative or superlative adjective and adverb formation but has since lost its productivity. It is worth emphasizing that all the highlighted reduplications are under logical stress. It is impossible to determine whether the logical stress occurred due to the stylistics and semantics of the words under consideration or the contrary based on the linguistic material examined.

In the material of ancient folklore, in Gokhtan songs, there are prepositional-case forms of reduplicates: *Եւ ուստի՛ տացէ քաջն Արսուշէս Հազարս ի հազարաց և բիրս ի բիրաց*: Ընդ քաջագգւոյ կոյս օրհորդիս Այանաց [Yev usti tats'e k'ajin Artashes Hazars i hazarats' yev biwrs i biwruts' Ynd k'ajazgwoy koys oriordis Alanats'? And that's why the brave Artashes gave a thousand for a thousand and countless out of countless for brave young lady of Alan?] (Khor., 1913, p. 178). The forms have a stylistic connotation (high style) and appear with the meaning of strengthening (doubling) the quantity (as if in the superlative of the ordinal numeral).

They resemble the form of simple repetitions, which suggests that they are the result of ancient derivations preserved in many Indo-European languages. In English: *step by step*, in Russian *эле-эле, едва-едва* etc. The style is determined by both the logical stress and the lexical semantics of the reduplications themselves, denoting the “incredible multitude” in the heroic song.

As a rule, stylistic fragmentation of vocabulary is observed in any folklore. If we compare the language of English and German heroic tales, Russian epics, on the one hand, and fairy tales of the same peoples, on the other, then, in the first works there is a (albeit not consistent) desire for sublimity of style. In the ancient Armenian language, this factor is more expressive. The fifth-century Armenian historian Phaulstos Buzand in his “Armenian History” uses similar reduplicates that are not in the translation of the Holy Scriptures and which are due to the influence of folklore works: At the same time, they appear in two versions: a) synthetic: *անձանձրոյթ* (andzandzroyt) – ‘to tirelessly’+absolutely, *բարբարելի* (barbarrel) – ‘to speak’+much, *բորբոքելի* (borbok'em) – ‘to inflame’+unpleasantly, *ձգձգելի* (dzgdzgel) – ‘to drag on’+(for) a long time, *սղսղակելի* (aghaghakel) – ‘to cry out’ aloud; and b) analytic: *ազգի ազգի* (azgi azgi) – ‘different’+in large quantities, *այլ ընդ այլոյ* (ayl ynd ayloy) – ‘to the contrary’+unpleasantly, *կու քան զկու* (yevs k'an zevs) – ‘very much’+more, *մի մի* (mi mi) – ‘one by one’+little, etc. For example, in the following texts: *ձգձգելի* (dzgdzgel) – Ապա մտեալ շուրջ գնովաւ ի տեղուջն *ձգձգէին* գնա սպարակիրքն [Apa mteal shurj znowaw i teghwojn dzgdzgein zna sparakirk'n; Then he went around and they dragged him to his armor bearers] (Buz., 1913, p. 172); *բարբարելի* (barbarrel) – Եւս խստագոյն քան զառաջինսն *բարբարելի* [Yevs khstagoyn k'an zarrajinsn barbarrel;

And he spoke more sternly than the first time] (Buz., 1913, p. 142); *uqqh uqqh* (azgi azgi) – Արար զորութիւնս *uqqh uqqh* նշանս ի ձեռն սրբոց քոց [Arar zorut'iwns azgi azgi nshans i dzern srbot's' k'vots']; That power produced various signs by the hands of your saints] (Buz., 1913, p. 188); *ku pulu qku* (yevs k'an zevs) – Իսկ նս *ku pulu qku* յաճախէր մատուցանել զբարեխօսութիւնն [Isk na yevs k'an zevs yachakher matuts'anel zbarekhusot'iwnn; And he increased the offering of intercession even more] (Buz., 1913, p. 163).

The presence of semantic variants (synonyms) of these reduplicates in Armenian folklore indicates that the latter function in the Bible as lexemes of high style. The stylistic fragmentation of the ancient Armenian vocabulary is already established on folklore material, since poetic works, subsequent historical and philosophical works differ significantly from each other in vocabulary. For example, in the works of Moses of Khoren, Lazar Parpetsi, David Anakht (the Invincible) (all – V century AD) don't use such reduplicates that are found in folklore works (in the epic “David of Sasoon”): *orpuunopit* (orystore) - ‘day by day’+(for) a long time, *zhamezhm* (zhamezhm) - ‘hour by hour’+impatiently, *teghnutegh* (teghnutegh) - ‘place by place’+ instantly, *ink'zink'* (ink'zink') - ‘by ourselves’+quite, *mekmeku* (mekmeku) - ‘each other’+neatly, *arrat-arrat* (arrat-arrat) - ‘very many’+countless, *mets-mets* (mets-mets) - ‘biger’+very, *mek-mek* (mek-mek) - ‘one-by-one’+neatly, *k'ich'-k'ich'* (k'ich'-k'ich') - ‘little-by-little’+neatly, *taq-taq* (taq-taq) - ‘hoter’+quickly, and e.g.

Examples in texts: *orpuunopit* (orystore) - Քանի մի ժամանակ անցավ, Էն ճժերն *orpuunopit* պետացան [K'ani mi zhamanak ants'av, En chzhern orystore petats'an; As time went by, those children became more and more common] (DS, 1988: 76). *teghnutegh* (teghnutegh)-Կուզի *teghnutegh* մեկ դարբով զաղբեր սպանի [Kuzi teghnutegh mek darbov zaghber spani; He would kill the brother with one blow] (DS, 1988: 130). *arrat-arrat* (arrat-arrat) - Աղբրի ջուր վարարեց, Էկավ, Էկավ, Ամեն մարդ *arrat-arrat* ջուր կրեցին [Aghbri jur vararets', ekav, ekav, Amen mard arrat-arrat jur krets'in; Spring water overflowed, came up, came up. Everyone carried plenty of water] (DS, 1988, p. 153). *k'ich'-k'ich'* (k'ich'-k'ich') - Հա *k'ich'-k'ich'*, հա *k'ich'-k'ich'* գնացին էնոնց մոտ, Շատացավ, մեծ քաղաք եղավ Սասուն [Ha k'ich'-k'ich', ha k'ich'-k'ich' gnats'in enonts' mot, Shatats'av, mets k'aghak' eghav Sasoon; Little by little, little by little they went to them, Sasoon became a big city] (DS, 1988, p. 121).

As W. von Humboldt writes, “It is doubtful that a more subtle improvement of the language could be associated with the initial stage of its formation. This perfection presupposes a state that peoples reach only over the long years of their development, and in this process, they usually experience the cross-influence of other peoples” (Humboldt, 1984, p. 309). In this regard, it is quite natural for Greek, Arabic, and Persian languages to influence the Armenian language, especially Persian, which was probably formed as an independent language during the period when the Armenian language and the Armenian people were being formed. At the same time, the influence of European culture went through the Greek language. The influence of the Arab language was carried out only through individual contacts, but the multiplicity of contacts created a new quality. Reduplicants without a connecting vowel element are synthetic compounds of root components, which can be expressed either as separate word units or as derivative stems of the compound. In the Armenian translation of the

Bible, there are the following words of that structure: *այլայլել* (aylaylel) - ‘change, alter’+much, *արծարծել* (artsartsel) - ‘revive, stir up’+miraculously, *խորխորել* (khoghkhoghel) - ‘stab, butcher’+vastly, deeply, *խորխորստ* (khorkhorat) - ‘abyss, precipice’+deep, *ողողել* (voghoghel) - ‘flood, overflow’+fully, *չարչարանք* (ch’arch’arank’) - ‘torment, torture’+painful, *ջախջախ* (jakhjakh) - ‘smash-up’+fully, *փայփայել* (p’ayp’ayel) - ‘to keep, to bring up in love and care’+very, *փոփոփոել* (p’oghp’oghel) - ‘wave, flutter’+strongly and e.g.

If we consider verbs from the point of view of functional grammar, they fix the nature of the localized action in time. Stylistic marking is due to semantics: all actions proceed in a double mode, as if “two in one”, which allows us to state that reduplications make it possible to express the “superlative degree of action” even in a verb. There is no unequivocal interpretation for the root components of these words. Thus, they can be divided into two groups; words with the root components realized as independent word units, and words that show semantic “bleaching”.

a. To the first group belong such reduplicates the root-components of which had independent usage in Old Armenian and are realized by their root meaning. These reduplicants have also become word-building derivative stems for other units, like, *այլայլել* (aylaylel) - ‘to change’, *խորխորստ* (khorkhorat) - ‘abyss, gulf’, *ողողել* (voghoghel) - ‘to inundate’, *չարչարանք* (ch’arch’arank’) - ‘suffering’, *վաղվաղ* (vaghvagh) - ‘very soon’ + early, *ջախջախ* (jakhjakh) - ‘confractum’+fully, and e.g.

In the translated books of the Bible, the reduplicants in proper syntactic structure show intensification of root meaning.

The root component *խոր* (khor) “deep, hole, deepening” of the reduplicative *խորխորստ* (khorkhorat) derives from the native Indo-European root **khorō-*(s)kerd* “cut” (Jahukyan, 2010, p. 343). The reduplicant with this component is a polysemantic word - “deep hole, precipice; grave, hell”. The form *խորխորստ* is testified with those meanings. Comp. Յաժժուցանես դու նմա զաւուրս չարութեան, մինչև փորեսցի *խորխորստ* մեղսորդի [Ts’atsuts’anes du nma zawurs ch’arut’ean, minch’ev p’vorests’i khorkhorat meghawori; Comfort him from the evil days, while a pit is dug for the sinner] (*Psalms*, 93;13).

In the languages under consideration, the meaning of “double amplification” of semantics was expressed in simple nouns; *diebus, die Grube, dug*. Comp. *Ut quiescat a diebus afflictionis donec fodiat impio interitus* (*Psalms*, 93; 13). *Ihm Ruhe zu schaffen vor bösen Tagen, bis dem Gottlosen die Grube gegraben ist* (*Psalms*, 93; 13). *That thou mayst give him rest from the evil days: till a pit be dug for the wicked* (*Psalms*, 93; 13).

There are some *analytical combinations* among reduplicative compounds without a connecting vowel element in Bible, like *արագ արագ* (arag arag) - ‘quickly-quickly’+ with speed, *մանր մանր* (manr-manr) - ‘little-little’+slowly, *դաս դաս* (das das) - ‘by class - by class’+precisely. Here are introduced examples of those words in their original usage. Seemingly, these reduplications were perceived as lexemes of high style again by virtue of their perception on the principle of “two in one”.

b. Scientists note: “Forms of thinking do not have national and linguistic boundaries, they are the same for all mankind, while each language has its own specifics, its own “internal form” (Orlova and Semenovskaya, 2016). In this view, the variety of translation techniques becomes quite understandable. As shown in various

works (see above), reduplicates in the European linguistic consciousness are not perceived as units of high style, and therefore they are not used in translations of the Bible. The form of thinking is manifested in its identity in all languages, and in the linguistic manifestation it differs, and the European languages indicate a greater closeness of linguistic thinking with each other than with ancient Armenian. To the second group belong such reduplicants the root-stems of which do not have independent usage, they have appeared in reduplication as a whole unit (Abrahamyan, 1962). They are either native words or borrowings, that during the time gained semantic “bleaching” and now are interpreted etymologically. Comp. The dead root շախ (jakh) in the reduplication շախշախ (jakhjakh) relates to the verb շախել (jakhel)–‘hit, beat’, derives from Hittite *zah(h)* - ‘beat’ and Georg. *jah* ‘beat’ or *jax* ‘to hammer’ (Ačaryan, 1979; Jahukyan, 2010). The reduplicant with meanings “crumbled, crush, demolished” is used in Old Armenian, comp. Յուսացեալ եւ ի ցուպն եղեգնեալ ի շախշախ յեգիպտացիս [Yusats’eał yes i ts’upn yeghegneay i jakhjakh, yegiptats’in; They hoped for a reed stick to crush the Egyptians] (*Isaiah*, 36; 6).

The meaning “double amplification” of semantics in Latin is expressed by a derivative word; *con-fractum. Ecce confides super baculum harundineum confractum istum super Aegyptum* (*Isaiah*, 36; 6). In the German and English translated books of the Bible this meaning was not manifested. Comp. *Verläßt du dich auf den zerbrochenen Rohrstab Ägypten*, (*Isaiah*, 36; 6). *Lo thou trustest upon this broken staff of a reed, upon Egypt* (*Isaiah*, 36; 6). The basic stem of the reduplicant փայփայել (p’ayp’ayel) - ‘to keep, to bring up in love and care’ derives from unknown stem փայ (p’ay); (Jahukyan, 1989, p. 758). Comp. *Փայփայեցից զնսս որպէս փայփայէ հայր զորդի զբարոք ծառայեալն նմա* [P’ayp’ayets’its’ znosa vorpes p’ayp’aye hayr zordi zbarwok’ tsarrayealn nma; To keep him like a father keeps his son to good serve him] (*Malach.*, 3; 17).

In the languages under consideration, the meaning of “the double verb” is expressed in simple verbs; *parcare, erbarmen sich, (to) spar*. Comp. *Et parcam eis sicut parcit vir filio suo servienti sibi* (*Malach.*, 3; 17). *Und ich will mich ihrer Erbarmen, wie ein Mann sich seines Sohnes erbarmt* (*Malach.*, 3; 17). *I will spare them, as a man spareth his son that serveth him* (*Malach.*, 3; 17).

“A word is not a simple designation of an “image” or “picture” that arises in the speaker’s mind or when pronouncing a word, but a designation of a whole complex of sensations and ideas that arise in the mind in connection with a particular concept” (Romanenko, 2010). In this regard, it is pointless to look for absolute equivalents in the languages used, even at the level of use, when the lexical meaning must be unambiguous, since in each language the word, along with semantics, has its own history, which evokes different associations. The word փայփայել (p’ayp’ayel) in the Armenian language consciousness evokes associations with children, who are always recognized not just by offspring, but by the successors of the family and up to the present day nationality. Along with the features of the first group, the reduplicates considered in this part of the work reveal a number of features that are characteristic mainly of Old Armenian, and then of its subsequent variants up to modern Armenian: The reduplicate is formed not only to denote the corresponding concept, but also as a strengthening of the feature inherent in the semantics. In this regard, the Armenian

զախել corresponds to ‘smash-up’, i.e. the Latin ‘confractum’, and the Armenian ջախջախել is, as it were, a “superlative” ջախել, which in the modern sense of the verb as an indicator of action and state is not perceived either theoretically or practically. It is difficult to assume that such a phenomenon (the degree of comparison of the verb) could be in ancient Armenian, because, firstly, analogues could necessarily be reflected at least in historically close Greek grammars, and secondly, they could be the subject of an analogous influence of the languages of neighboring peoples, which is difficult to establish today, since neither Arabic, nor Persian, nor ancient Assyrian verbs have degrees of comparison. It is hardly legitimate to state “plurality” here, based on the same considerations as regarding the “degree of comparison of the verb”. One could refer to the use of the dialectal form, i.e. the presence in different dialects of parallels such as ջախել and ջախջախել: The translator of the Bible was persecuted by both pagan Rome and Zoroastrian Persia, between which Armenia was divided, and his language could have dialectal variants of the same lexemes. M. Mashtots worked both on the territory of Western Armenia (Karin, Van, Mush, Tigranakert - now Turkey), modern Armenia (Vagharshapat, Dvin), Arakelots (Nagorno-Karabakh), and on the territory of modern Azerbaijan (Gandzak, now - Gyanja). However, none of the 44 Armenian dialects contains close relics. The only possible explanation is a stylistic explication: the sublime style of the Holy Scriptures required an increase in expressiveness, which was reflected in the reduplication, perhaps the neologism of the translator himself.

Change in the first component of the compound is spread enough in Old-Armenian. The compounds in the first component of which have occurred sound changes have some peculiarities. In the translated books of the Bible, while investigating those types of words, it is necessary to show a distinguishing approach.

There are words in the second group of such reduplicants that do not have independent usage and their second component is not realized by its word meaning. In the Bible among that type գրգրիւն (grgirr)— ‘irritation’, դանդաղ (dandagh) - ‘slow’, խարխաբ(փ)ել (kharkhab(p’y)el) - ‘grope along’, ծանծաղ (tsantsagh) - ‘shallow’, կարկուտ (karkut) - ‘hail’, կասկածել (kaskatsel) - ‘suspect, doubt’, շօշափել (shoshap’el) - ‘touch’, պապանձիլ (papandzil) - ‘grow dumb’, սօսափիւն (sosap’iwn) - ‘rustling’, տրտում (trtum) - ‘sad, mournful’, and e.g., with no stylistic markings.

Here are those words introduced from the semantic and structural perspective. *Դանդաղ* is a reduplicant with a simple stem դաղ (dagh), which has its variants; դիլ (dil), դուլ (dul), դլալ (dlal) derives from Indo-European *dhar “raise to one’s feet, to bear” (Ačaryan, 1971, p. 620; Jahukyan, 2010, p. 183). *Դանդաղիլ* (dandaghil) has the following meanings in the Bible ‘to move slowly, linger, be lazy’. Comp. Իբրև հայեցաւ, ետես զզաւրսն, թէ *դանդաղեցան* անցանել ընդ հեղեղատն [Ibrev hayets’aw, yetes zzawrsn, t’e dandaghets’an ants’anel ynd hegheghatn; when (he) turned, (he) saw that they were slowly crossing the stream] (*Maccab. A, 16; 6*).

In English, the meaning of “double amplification” of semantics is expressed by the Past Simple form *were afraid*: *And he and his people pitched their camp over against them, and he saw that the people were afraid to go over the river (Maccab. A., 16; 6)*. In Latin it is expressed only through the verb *trepidantere*: *Et vidit populum trepidantem ad transfretandum torrentem (Maccab. A, 16; 6)*.

An analysis of the semantics of the word *ηυῖηση* shows that translators into English and Latin, on the one hand, and into Armenian, on the other, were guided by different principles. The Armenian *ηυῖηση* has several meanings, in which we are interested: 1. *adj.* Slow. 2. *adv.* Slowly. Used as a verb, *ηυῖησητι* means “to procrastinate”, which indicates the hyperonym “long”, associated more with a temporary sign. The English *afraid* corresponds to the Latin: *trepidatio* “(1) trembling (nervorum); 2) confusion, fear, panic (t. fugaque hostium)” [ABBY]. *Afraid* in English means “frightened, frightened; afraid.” The component analysis of these words shows that the Armenian equivalent does not contain the seme “fear”. Hence it is difficult to assume that the Armenian verb could also be used in the meaning of “to be afraid”. In this case, there is no reason to draw an unreasonable conclusion that people hesitated to cross the river because they were afraid. In this regard, it is necessary to address the dialectal foundations of the ancient Armenian literary language, which served as the literary language of all Armenians until the beginning of the XIX century and serves as the language of the Armenian Church and spiritual Armenian literature to the present day. To assume that it was any one dialect, most likely the dialect of the creator of the Armenian script, would be hasty and unreasonable. Indeed, Grabar (the ancient Armenian literary language) is based on Western Armenian dialects, but dialects, not one dialect. It is a fact that in the V century Eastern Armenia retained its relative independence, had a political center Vagharshapat, and King Vramshapukh himself sent M. Mashtots for the “writings of Daniel”, but the basis of the grabar were Western Armenian dialects. This example might allow us to conclude that in Western Armenia there were larger cities with a mixture of dialects, as a rule, leading to similar confusion of languages (Hellenic *koin'ē*). In addition, the most famous Armenian scientific and educational schools were located in the territory occupied by Byzantium. They corresponded to the level of time. Both culturally and scientifically, the Western Armenian cities were much higher than the Eastern Armenian ones. And this is the case when the basis of the literary language was not the *koin'ē* of the political center, but the *koin'ē* of cultural centers, where, perhaps, *ηυῖησητι* could correspond to the verb with the meaning of “fear”. If we compare it with the use of an analogue of this lexeme in the original, then this assumption is fully justified: *Καὶ παρενέβαλε κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶδεν τὸν λαὸν δειλούμενον διαπερᾶσαι τὸν χειμάρρου;* *Καὶ παρενέβαλε kata pro sopon aftón aftós kaí o laós aftoú kaí eíden tón laón deilóúmenon dia perásai tón cheimárroun;* And he and his people intervened on their behalf and saw the people trembling and crossing the river (*Maccab. A, 16; 6*). Comp. also in Old Bulgarian: *И видѣ люди боѡшыѡса преѣти потокъ и преѣде пѣрвый, и видѣша еѡ мужѣ и преидоша вслѣдъ еѡ* [I vide lyudi boyashchasya prejti potok I prejde pervyj i videsha ego muzhie I preidosha vsled ego; And he saw men who were afraid to cross the stream, and he crossed first, and the men saw him, and crossed after him (*Maccab. A, 16; 6*)].

This example highlights that the Armenian translator considered the peculiarity of the aspect of the action, which in this case lasts longer than the usual one.

Change in the second component. The words of this subgroup can also be classified by the factor of their first components realized as word-building derivative stems.

Thus, the first components of the following reduplicative are realized by their word value; *կարկառկա* (karkatel)+ ‘to mend, to repair’, *սպարսպուն* (sparrspurr) - ‘entirely’+very, *սարսար* (sarsurr) - ‘shudder’+ very.

According to our rule, only the last two signs contain stylistic markings. They are adverbs and denote a high level of quality, which is also fixed by the logical stress. This indicates that these lexemes denote the key position of the utterance, which in turn, adds a stylistic coloring. The stem *սար* (sarrn) - ‘ice, cold’ in the reduplication *սարսար* derives from Indo-European *k’ar-n-` *k’er - ‘get cold’. As a result of semantic broadening the reduplicant, which previously meant ‘rembling from cold or fear’ has the meaning ‘trembling, horror, fear’ and is testified in the Bible. Comp. Հարցէ զքեզ Տէր տարականսանօք, եւ ջերմամբ, եւ սարսարով, եւ երկիւղիւ [Harts’ez zk’ez Ter tarakusanok’, yev jermamb, yev sarsrrov, yev yerkiwghiw; I beseech thee, O Lord, in perplexity, with trembling, and fear, and apprehension] (*Deuter.*, 28; 22).

In the languages under consideration, the meaning of double “double amplification” of semantics was expressed in simple nouns; *frigus*, (*with*) *cold*, (*das*) *Fieber*. Comp. *Percutiat te Dominus egestate febrī et frigore ardore et aestu et aere corrupto ac robigine* (*Deuter.*, 28; 22). *Der HERR wird dich schlagen mit Auszehrung, Entzündung und hitzigem Fieber, Getreidebrand und Dürre* (*Deuter.*, 28; 22). *May the Lord afflict thee with miserable want, with the fever and with cold, with burning and with heat.* (*Deuter.*, 28; 22).

As the component analysis of the equivalents *սարսար* shows, their semantics (hyperonym) is based on “cold”. In all translations, except Old Armenian, the usual equivalent is given. In ancient Armenian, there was also a name for cold - ցուրտ, ցրտութիւն, but M. Mashtots chose a reduplicate, which indicates not only that the translator specifically and consciously aspired to a high style, but also the existence of a wide lexical synonymy, which in turn highlights the lexical richness of the ancient Armenian language. After all, almost all the reduplicates discussed in the article had similar synonyms. The presence of broad synonymy is the basis of the stylistic division of speech. Although the basis of the reduplicate *սարսար*, as well as the basis of its equivalents, is the hyperonym “cold”, these words can denote fear. According to the component analysis, it can be established that “cold” and “fear” do not have the same seme, but psychologically cold comes with a feeling of fear, so all translators followed the original, in which “cold” turned out to be a stylistically high version of the word “fear”. Comp. in Old Bulgarian translation: *Да порази́тъ тѧ̀ Господь неимѣ́нїемъ и́ о́гнѣвицею, и́ стоужею и́ жжѣ́нїемъ* [Da porazit tya Gospod’ neimeniem, i ogniveceju, i stouzheju, i zhzheniem; May the Lord smite you with perplexity, fever, and trembling, and burning] (*Deuter.*, 28; 22). And so, in the original: *πατάξαι σε κύριος ἀπορία καὶ πυρετῶ καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεθισμῶ καὶ φόνω καὶ ἀνεμοφθορία καὶ τῆ ὄχρα καὶ καταδιώξονται σε ἕως ἂν ἀπολέσωσίν σε. Πατάξαι σε κύριος ἀπορία καὶ πυρετό καὶ ῥίγει καὶ ἐρεθισμό καὶ φόνο καὶ ἀνεμοφθορία καὶ τί ὄχρα καὶ κατα διόχον ταί σε ἕως ἂν ἀπολέσωσίν σε; Smite a master with a question and a fever and shouts and incitement and murder and anemofloria and the ochra and they will persecute you until they destroy you* (*Deuter.*, 28; 22).

Proceeding from the need to emphasize the figurative meaning or to point out the direct connection of this word with the word “fear”, M. Mashtots uses երկիւղ (“fear”) at the end of the sentence.

The first components of some reduplicants are not recognized by word meaning; բոցբոց (boghboj) - 'blossom'+magnificent, կարկամ (karkam) - 'bent', հայհոյել (hayhoyel) - 'to scold, abuse'+very, strongly, մարմարել (marmajel) - 'to itching'+very, մորմորել (mormok'el) - 'to cause great regret'+lamentably, պարպառ (paghpaj) - 'shining, bright'+very, սպարսպար (sparrspurr) - 'entirely' and e.g.

Here are observed the semantic-structural peculiarities of these words. The form բոցբոց (boghboj)⁵ has the meaning of 'plant, sprout' and derives from the Indo-European morpheme *bhol* with the same meaning. As a result of the sound alternation of the second component the reduplicant բոցբոց is formed. This form has semantic different developments 'sprout, shoot; generation, kin; bubble'. It is used in Bible with the meanings 'sprout, shoots'. *Comp.* Թգեմի արձակեաց գրոցբոց իր [T'zeni ardzakeats' zboghboj iwr; The fig tree has blossomed its flowers] (*Song.*, 2; 13).

The literal meaning of "double amplification" of semantics in Latin and in German was expressed in simple lexical units, in the semantic structure of which severity was not manifested; *grossos*, (das) *Knoten*. *Comp.* *Ficus protulit grossos suos* (*Song.*, 2; 13)⁶. *Der Feigenbaum hat Knoten gewonnen* (*Song.*, 2; 13). The meaning of the word in English is expressed analytically. *Comp.* *The fig tree putteth forth her green figs...* (*Song.* 2; 13). Although the time between the Armenian and English translations is nine hundred years. Note that in none of our comparisons was the Armenian version descriptive. It is impossible to explain this fact in purely linguistic parameters, especially with reference to linguistic thinking. It is due to sociolinguistic factors. Armenia of the fifth century was close to both Greece and Israel. There was an interethnic community, even at the level of the "intelligent" part of society, which was due to both constant political and economic relations, and the cultural influence of Greece on neighboring countries. In Armenian life, there were the same objects and concepts that existed in Greece. In both languages, there could be not only a functional, but also a sound connection between the word and the object denoted by it. "In general, the association of thought with sound form allows language to function as a complex means of communication, simultaneously organizing our thought" (Chafe, 2015, p. 61). There was no similar connection between Greece and England, that is why some objects, concepts, phenomena could receive a descriptive interpretation in English.

In connection with the development of polysemy in reduplicates, the word բոցբոց (boghboj) should be considered. In the text of the translation of the Bible: Թգեմի արձակեաց գրոցբոց իր (*Song.*, 2; 13); see transcription above), vol. e. as in the original: ἡ συκὴ ἐξήνεγκεν ὀλύνθους αὐτῆς αἱ ἄμπελοι κυπρίζουσιν ἔδωκαν ὄσμήν ἀνάστα ἐλθέ ἡ πλησίον μου καλή μου περιστερά μου; i syki exínenken olýnthous aftís ai ámpeloi kyprízousin édokan osmín anásta elthé i plisión mou kalí mou peristerá mou; The fig tree shed its flowers, the vines blossomed, they gave off a scent, come, my neighbor, my dear dove (*ASMA ASMATON*, 2; 13); which is not so reflected in the Old Bulgarian version: *Смóквѣ изнесе цвѣтъ своѣ* [Smokva iznese cvet svoj; The fig tree has blossomed its flowers (*ASMA ASMATON*, 2; 13)]. In modern Armenian dialects, this word has developed several meanings: 1. flower; 2. bud (on the branches of fruit trees); 3. (figurative sense) Beginning, growth. There is no doubt. that the Armenian translator took the Greek word in the second sense, and the Old Bulgarian in the first. Turning to the etymology of the reduplicates under consideration, scientists usually point to their Indo-European origin, which we follow in this work. In other

words, not only the Armenian dialects themselves crossed on the territory of historical Armenia, but also different languages and language groups, which gives reason to consider the “new theory of language” by N.Y. Marr, about a single basis for the origin of all languages, not devoid of a rational grain (Marr, 1937).

In the plan of expression of *root-augmentative reduplicative compounds*, their second component has the augmentative.

The root-determinative is a formal index that distinguishes word-building components and has a unique expression in the process of word-building. The root-determinative is usually added to the second component of the reduplicant and causes either alternation of root-phoneme or root-extension (Akhmanova, 1969, p. 129). The following words are attested in the Bible, *արհամարհել* (arhamarhel) - ‘to ignore’, *սղջամուղջ* (aghjamughj) - ‘twilight, dusk’+easy, *կոկորդ* (kokord)—‘throat’, *տատասուկ* (tatask) - ‘blackthorn’+cutting, unpleasant, *սրբունկ* (trtunj) - ‘lamentation, murmur’+very, *ճաճաճ* (chachanch’) - ‘ray’+brightly, and e.g.

These compounds are divided into two types; with a connecting vowel, and without a connecting vowel.

The second component of reduplicants *with a connecting vowel* takes an appendix phonetic index, on the other hand, the stem can remain the same or can have a sound change (vowel alternation).

The main component of the reduplicant *արհամարհել* (arhamarhel) ‘despise’ is the morpheme *արհ* (< Iranian *ahr*), (Ačaryan, 1971, p. 323). The appendix index *ւ(ւարհ)* does not influence the wholeness of the form of the word.

Consider the use of the word *արհամարհել* (arhamarhel) - ‘to ignore’. Cp.: Անձն էթէ որ մեղիցէ, եւ արհամարհելոյ արհամարհիցէ զսասունիբանս Տեսնն [Andzn yet’e vok’ meghits’e, yev arhamarhelov arhamarhits’e zpatuirans Tearnn; Man, who sins and despises the commandments of the Lord] (*Levit.*, 6; 2).

If we bear in mind that in ancient Armenian reduplication is used as a stylistic device for enhancing the meaning of a sign, object or action, then in this case we have an example of a kind of “double reduplication”, which rigidly reflects the meaning of the original: ψυχή ἐὰν ἀμάρτη καὶ παριδὼν παρίδη τὰς ἐντολάς κυρίου καὶ ψεύσεται τὰ πρὸς τὸν πλησίον ἐν παραθήκῃ ἢ περὶ κοινωνίας ἢ περὶ ἀρπαγῆς ἢ ἰδίκτησέν τι τὸν πλησίον; Psychí eán amárti kaí paridón parídi tás en tolás kyriou kaí pséf sitai tá pro s tón pli sion en parathíki í perí koinonías í perí arpagís í idíkisén ti tón plisíon; A soul if it sins and forsakes the commandments of the Lord and lies to its neighbor in a lie or about fellowship or about robbery or if it judges that neighbor (*Levit.*, 6;2). The fact that our arguments about “double reduplication” are fully justified is also evidenced by the Old Bulgarian translation: Досуа ѣже аше согрешитъ, и презрѣвъ презритъ зѣнвѣрѣду гдѣа [Dousha jazhe ashche sogreshit, i prezrev prezrit zapovedi gospodnja; Soul, who sins and despises the commandments of the Lord (*Levit.*, 6; 2).

The stylistic expression of Old Armenian ignored from the Romanic languages has different expressions: lat. *contemprare*, deutsch. *an dem vergreifen*, Engl. *Despise*. Comp. *Anima quae peccaverit et contempto Domino negaverit depositum proximo suo* (*Levit.*, 6; 2). *Wenn jemand sündigen würde und sich damit an dem Herrn vergreifen* (*Levit.*, 6; 2). *Whosoever shall sin, and despising the Lord shall deny to his neighbour the thing delivered to his keeping* (*Levit.*, 6; 2)⁷.

Features in the use and stylistic plane are found by the lexeme կոկորդ (kokord). In the Bible, it is used in four meanings: ‘throat’ (1), ‘palate’ (2), ‘mouth’ (3), ‘mouth (of animal), ‘gullet’ (4): 1) Չի ունիլն զբաւս քնիւ, եւ կոկորդ զկերակուրս ճաշակէ [Zi unkn zbans k’ne, yev kokord zkerakurs chashake; May his ear examine my speech, and his throat tastes food] (*John.*, 34; 3); ὅτι οὗς λόγους δοκιμάζει καὶ λάρυγγ γέυεται βρῶσιν; ὅτι οὐς λόγους dokimázei kaí lárynx géf etai vrósin; For the ear (words tries) and the throat tastes food (*John.*, 34; 3). Иакв оу́хо словеса̀ и́скоуша́етъ, зортáнь же вкоуша́етъ бра́шна); [Jako oukho slovesa iskoushajet, gortan’ zhe vkoushaet brashna; As the ear perceives words, so the larynx tastes food (*John.*, 34; 3)]; 2) Չի ճշմարտութիւն իսկասցէ կոկորդ իմ [Zi chshmartut’iwn khokasts’e kokord im; As the truth is stuck in my throat] (*Parable*, 8; 7); ὅτι ἀλήθειαν μελετήσῃ ὁ φάρυγγ μου; ὅτι alítheian meletísei o fárynkh mou; For my throat shall meditate truth (*Parable*, 8; 7); Иакв и́стинѣ поучи́тсѧ зортáнь моѣ [Jako istine pouchitsja gortan’ moj; For my throat has learned to tell the truth] (*Parable*, 8; 7); 3) Պսոնի նրա քաղցր է ի կոկորդի իմում [Ptugh nora k’aghts’r e i kokordi imum; Its fruit is sweet in my throat] (*Song.*, 2; 3). Καὶ ἐκάθισα καὶ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ γλυκὺς ἐν λάρυγγί μου; Καὶ ekáthisa kaí karpós aftoú glykús en lárynzí mou; But I sat and his fruit was sweet in my throat (*Song.*, 2; 3); И пло́дъ е́гѡ сла́докъ въ зортáни моѣмѣ [I plod ego sladok v gortani mojem; And its fruit is sweet in my throat (*Song.*, 2; 3)]; 4) Որպէս զերկաւան բաց են կոկորդիք նոցա [Vorpes gerezman bats’ yen kokordk’ nots’a; They opened their throats like a grave]; (*Psalms.*, 5; 11). τάφος ἀνεῳγμένος ὁ λάρυγγ αὐτῶν; táfos aneogménos o lárynkh aftón; grave opened their larynx (*Psalms.*, 5; 10); Грѡ́бъ ѿ́верстъ зортáнь и́хъ; [Grob otverst gortan’ ikh; They opened their throats like a grave] (*Psalms.*, 5; 10). In the second and third meanings, կոկորդ is used in high style (+sensible), in the first meaning in neutral, and in the fourth - as a factor of low style (+eager, grasping).

The lexeme աղջամուղ (aghjamughj) - ‘twilight, dusk’ is also used in the modern Armenian literary language, and as a sign of high style, especially in the poetry of the classic of Armenian literature V. Teryan. Unfortunately, due to the lack of its own statehood from the tenth century to 1921 and being under the yoke of two states (Byzantium until the XIV century and Iran until the XIX century, then Turkey and Russia), Grabar functioned as the Armenian literary language, the new Armenian literary language began to form from the beginning of the XIX century, but the transformations concerned not so much vocabulary as grammar, therefore, it can be assumed that lexemes in connection with the formation of a new literary language have retained their stylistic features.

4. Findings and conclusion

Thus, as the material shows, already in ancient times, at the beginning of the V century AD, at the very beginning of the appearance of the Armenian script (405 year), the Armenian people already had their own linguistic thinking, a formed language, which testifies to the formation of the Armenian people as a single spiritual and linguistic community from the Caspian Sea to the Aegean, and the stylistic use of reduplicates in the translated text of the Holy Scriptures confirms the presence of rich spiritual literature in the form of folklore, in which, perhaps even unconsciously, the

concept of style already existed, especially in the works of Gokhtan singers and storytellers.

The peculiarity of the lexemes under consideration is that they are not onomatopoeias, imitation of sounds, etc., which exist in many languages and have been sufficiently studied. The considered reduplications are formed on the basis of already existing lexical units, or specially selected lexemes to express the stylistic sublimity of the text. Reduplication in such a function (sublime style) is not consistently found in any other old text written in Indo-European languages a peculiarity to which we intend to draw the attention of the linguistic community. The comparison of the Bible translations into other languages shows that adding a stylistic pathos to the text was a personal initiative by the Armenian translator, who was merely guided by own artistic taste.

Giving the text of the Holy Script a high style is also because of the perception that the Armenian public considers. The history of this work in Armenian finds it as an opportunity to communicate with God (also used in works of a later period). The transmission of the main ideas of the Bible by Grigor of Narek (10th century) as a dialogue with God is a clear confirmation of the above-mentioned. Within the framework of this article, it is not possible to make a psychological analysis of the perception of the Bible by the Latins, Germans, Englishmen, Greeks, and Bulgarians. The fact that the perception of the Holy Script differs in various countries (possibly in different periods) is determined by the stylistic marking of key concepts, though marking is possible if stylistically differentiated synonyms are apparent.

The translation of the Holy Scriptures, it would seem, can be considered the beginning of Armenian religious and philosophical literature, however, as the history of the Armenian people testifies, long before the appearance of Armenian writing in the territory of historical Armenia, especially in Western Armenia, there were universities and intellectual schools of the Greek type, prominent representatives of which not only studied in Greece and Rome, but also became outstanding spiritual and political figures there⁸. Stylistic processing of the text was known to Armenian authors, who in this case used reduplication.

Reduplication is not only a complex phenomenon, but also quite informative, the secrets of which can help not only to delve into the history of the language and its speaker, but also to determine its role as a stylistic factor, which is the most indicative in the movement of modern languages to enhance expressiveness.

Author contributions: Conceptualization, LMK and VVM; methodology, LMK and VVM; software, LMK and VVM; validation, LMK and VVM; formal analysis, LMK and VVM; investigation, LMK and VVM; resources, LMK and VVM; data curation, LMK and VVM; writing—original draft preparation, LMK and VVM; writing—review and editing, LMK and VVM; visualization, LMK and VVM; supervision, LMK and VVM; project administration, LMK and VVM; funding acquisition, LMK and VVM. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Notes

1. We present the original sources of linguistic materials and their equivalents in the following order: 1. Old Armenian, 2. Latin, 3. German and English.
2. Its ancient stem բնդ—Bogh.
3. Hereinafter, the translations with the missing examined parts of the Bible text are not mentioned.
4. *Gokht*—The old Armenian region—The territory of the modern Nakhichevan region of the Republic of Azerbaijan, transferred to the neighboring country by the decision of the communist authorities of the USSR in 1921.
5. The book “Liber Canticum Canticorum” is given “Song of Solomon” in German, “Song of Songs” in English.
6. The book “Liber Iob” is given in German as “Hob”, in English as “Job”.
7. As in this and in previous cases, it should be noted quite successful translations into English literary, the basic structure of which was formed by the XIV century. On the example of the development of the English language, as well as a little earlier German, it can be stated that the conclusions of W. von Humboldt about the development of “backward” languages are incorrect: “If the language has acquired its structure, then the basic grammatical forms do not undergo any changes; a language that does not know differences in gender, case, passive or neuter voice will no longer fill these gaps” (Humboldt 1984: 307).
8. One of them is Proeresius the Armenian, or Paruyr Haykazn (276-368). He was born in Eastern Armenia. He received an excellent education at that time in his homeland. In order to improve his knowledge, he went to Greece, where he founded his own school, became the author of a number of famous works on philosophy and rhetoric, the head of the philosophical and rhetorical direction of Neoplatonism in Athens. He was educated by several prominent representatives of Christianity - the Church Fathers Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, etc. However, contrary to Haykazn, who was a strong follower of the teachings of the Savior, Julian became an Apostate, which is why his teacher was forced to close the school and go to Rome at the invitation of the emperor Constans. Here he became so famous for his oratory that he, like emperors, erected a monument with the inscription: “Queen of the powers Rome the king of eloquence.” («Rerum regina Romaregi eloquentiae»). (Wikipedia. Retrieved: 20.03.2023).

References

- ABBY (2014). Available online: <https://help.abby.com/en-us/flexicapture/12/developer/connecting/> (accessed on 12 May 2023).
- Abrahamyan, A. (1962). *The verb in Modern Armenian (Armenian)*. Yerevan.
- Ačaryan, H. (1957). *Complete grammar of the Armenian language in comparison with 562 languages (Armenian)*. Yerevan.
- Ačaryan, H. (1971). *Etimological dictionary of Armenian (Armenian)*. Yerevan. Volume 1.
- Ačaryan, H. (1977). *Etimological dictionary of Armenian (Armenian)*. Yerevan. Volume 3.
- Ačaryan, H. (1979). *Etimological dictionary of Armenian (Armenian)*. Yerevan. Volume 4.
- Agat. (1909). *Agatangeghay. History of Armenian (Old Armenian)*, Tp’khis.
- Akhmanova, O. (1969). *Dictionary of Linguistic Terms (Russian)*. Moscow.
- Allen, W. S. (1953). Relationship in comparative linguistics. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 52(1), 52–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968x.1953.tb00270.x>
- Anh. (1960). *Davit Anghat. The Limits of Philosophy (Old Armenian)*, Yerevan.
- Aronoff, M., Meir, I., & Sandler, W. (2005). The Paradox of Sign Language Morphology. *Language*, 81(2), 301–344. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2005.0043>
- Bally, C. (1909). *A treatise on French stylistics (French)*. Genève. p. 187.
- Battison, R. (1978). *Lexical Borrowing in American Sign Language*. Silver Spring.
- Bazell, C. E. (1958). *Linguistic Typology*. London.
- Bibel, D. (2021). By Anacomda Verlag, German Luther Translation (German). München.
- Bible, T. (2002). *The Book of Scripture of the Old and New Testaments (Russian)*. Donetsk: Slavic Bible.
- Brini, H. (2002). On Language, Translation and Comparative Stylistics. *Meta*, 45(3), 491–496. <https://doi.org/10.7202/002143ar>
- Broselow, E., & McCarthy, J. (1983). A theory of internal reduplication. *The Linguistic Review*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.1983.3.1.25>
- Buz. (1913). *Phaustos’ Byzantine. History of Armenian (Old Armenian)*. Tiflis.

- Chafe, W. (2015). *On the Way to Linguistics Based on Thinking – Coll: Language and Thought: Modern Cognitive Linguistics* (Russian). Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture. pp. 60-88.
- DS. (1988). *David from Sassoon. Armenian folk epic* (Armenian). Yerevan.
- Egh. (1957). *Yeghishei. About Vardan and the Armenian War* (Old Armenian). Yerevan.
- Fodor, J., Katz, J. (1964). *The structure of language*. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice Hall.
- Gokhtan songs (Armenian). Yerevan: 1964. 154.
- Hartmann, P. (1956). *On the typology of Indo-European* (German). Heidelberg.
- Holy Bible. (2012). *Easy-to-Read Version*. Bible League International, PO Box 820648, Fort Worth, TX 76182, USA.
- Horn, K. M. (1966). *Language typology*. Washington.
- Humboldt, W. (1984). *Selected Works on Linguistics* (Russian). Moscow. pp. 307-323.
- Hunger, B. (2006). *Noun/Verb Pairs in Austrian Sign Language (ÖGS)*. *Sign Language and Linguistics*, 9(1–2), 71–94.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/sll.9.1.06hun>
- Jahukyan, G. (1989). *The semantic & word -formation of Modern Armenian* (Armenian). Yerevan.
- Jahukyan, G. (2010). *Etymological dictionary of Armenian* (Armenian). Yerevan.
- Jandlova, M. G. (2018). *A Comparative Stylistic Analysis of Original English legal Text and their Czech Equivalents*. Brno.
- Khor. (1913). *Movsisi Khorenatsvoy. History of Armenians* (Old Armenian). Tpkhis.
- Knobloch, J. (1956). *The historical-comparative method and the general comparative method. Time writing for phonetics and general linguistics* (German).
- Kryuchkova, O. Y. (2000). *Reduplication in the aspect of language typology // Questions of Linguistics*. Available online:
<http://sarteorlingv.narod.ru/reduplikacia.htm> (accessed on 12 May 2023).
- Marr, N. Y. (1937). *The main issues of the history of the language* (Russian). Moscow.
- Orlova, N. M., Semenovskaya, S. A. (2016). *Fundamentals of the science of language* (Russian). Saratov.
- Pfau, R., Steinbach, M. (2007). *Excluding each other: Spatial modulations*. Available online:
<http://language.link.let.uu.nl/burs/RCL07> (accessed on 12 May 2023).
- Pharp. (1904) *Ghazaray Pharpetsvo. History of Armenians and Paper on Vahan Mamikonian* (Old Armenian). Tpkhis.
- Romanenko, E. K. (2010). *Language and Thinking in the Philosophical and Linguistic Teachings of W. von Humboldt and H. Steintal* (Russian). *Philosophy of Science*.
- Sacra, B. (1994). *Luxta Vulgatam Versionem*, German Bible Society (Latin). München.
- Sanyarova, N. S. (2019). *Reduplication in Russian language: structural-semantic, functional, linguodidactic aspects* (Russian). Moscow.
- Steinberg, N. M. (1969). *Reduplication in modern French*. Leningrad: Leningrad State University. p. 70.
- The Bible. (1997). *Old & New Testament*. Yerevan (Armenian). The Bible Society of Armenia.
- Tumanyan, E. (1971). *The Old Armenian* (Russian). Moscow.
- Volkova, E. V. (2014). *Language game as a lexical and stylistic device//Young scientist* (Russian). Available online:
<https://moluch.ru/archive/61/8899/> (accessed on 12 May 2023).