

Armenian-Germanic Lexical Isoglosses

Nektar M. Simonyan

Department of General and Comparative Linguistics, Language Institute named H. Acharyan of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia

Vazgen G. Hambartsumyan

Department of General and Comparative Linguistics, Language Institute named H. Acharyan of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia;
Khachatur Abovyan Armenian State Pedagogical University, Yerevan, Armenia

Gayane R. Hovhannisyan

European University of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia

Sona A. Mikayelyan*

Department of General and Comparative Linguistics, Language Institute named H. Acharyan of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia;
V. Brusov State University, Yerevan, Armenia

Gayane K. Hovsepyan

Lexicography Department, Language Institute named H. Acharyan of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia

Meri A. Sargsyan

Department of General and Comparative Linguistics, Language Institute named H. Acharyan of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia;
International Scientific-Educational Centre, National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia

Abstract—The study of lexical isoglosses in Indo-European comparative linguistics traditionally focuses on shared inheritance and subgrouping. While Armenian has been extensively compared with branches like Greek and Indo-Iranian, Armenian-Germanic correspondences remain comparatively underexplored. This article reexamines inherited Armenian-Germanic lexemes from common Proto-Indo-European roots, shifting the focus to patterned semantic divergence. Using etymological dictionaries and modern diachronic semantics, the study analyzes agricultural and material culture lexemes (e.g., *asr* 'wool', *gaṛn* 'lamb', *tuar* 'cattle', *amal* 'to pour', *t'ek'el* 'to weave/sharpen', *azazel* 'to dry', *ber-* 'to bear', *mit* 'mind'). The analysis identifies a recurrent semantic asymmetry: Armenian frequently retains verbal, process-oriented, and materially grounded meanings, while Germanic reflexes tend to lexicalize nominalized results, economic abstractions, and object-centered outcomes. Consequently, the article introduces the "semantic isogloss," defined as a structurally recurrent divergence in the semantic development of shared root reflexes across branches. The examined material demonstrates that these divergences follow typologically stable pathways of semantic restructuring, reflecting branch-specific specialization rather than genetic proximity. By situating these correspondences within a theoretically grounded model of semantic change, this study highlights Armenian as a vital witness to the systematic, inherited semantic differentiation within Indo-European lexical evolution.

Index Terms—Indo-European linguistics, Armenian, Germanic languages, semantic isogloss, lexical divergence

I. INTRODUCTION

Armenian, as an independent branch of the Indo-European language family, occupies a distinctive position in comparative-historical linguistics. Since Hübschmann's foundational demonstration of its genetic independence, Armenian has been examined primarily for evidence of shared innovations, archaic retentions, and contact-induced developments within the Indo-European continuum. In this tradition, lexical isoglosses have served chiefly as tools for establishing subgrouping relations or reconstructing aspects of Proto-Indo-European culture. Far less attention, however, has been paid to systematic patterns of *semantic divergence* among inherited lexemes that derive from a common proto-form yet evolve along structurally distinct trajectories in different branches.

The present study assumes that semantic divergence itself is a legitimate object of historical comparison. Rather than

* Corresponding Author. Email: sonmiq20@gmail.com

asking whether Armenian and Germanic share innovations that might suggest closer genetic affiliation, this article investigates how reflexes of the same Proto-Indo-European roots develop contrasting semantic profiles in the two branches. In doing so, it reframes the notion of a lexical isogloss: not merely as a shared feature across languages, but as a structured point of differentiation within inherited vocabulary.

Armenian-Germanic correspondences provide a particularly productive field for such investigation. Although earlier scholarship has occasionally noted parallels between Armenian and Germanic lexemes, these observations have remained descriptively isolated and theoretically under-integrated. The current study proposes that a recurring semantic asymmetry can be observed across several inherited roots: Armenian frequently preserves process-oriented, verbal, or embodied meanings, whereas Germanic reflexes tend to lexicalize resultative, nominalized, or socio-economically abstract outcomes. This pattern is not treated as evidence of subgrouping, but as an instance of branch-specific semantic specialization within a shared Indo-European inheritance.

By systematically examining a series of agricultural and material-culture lexemes whose reflexes can be traced to common Proto-Indo-European roots, this article seeks to identify recurrent pathways of semantic restructuring. The analysis integrates the comparative-historical method with diachronic semantics, distinguishing inherited meaning components from secondary extensions shaped by economic practice, technological change, and patterns of material production. Where relevant, alternative explanations, including independent parallel development or contact-induced reinterpretation, are considered in order to avoid conflating divergence with direct historical linkage.

The broader aim of this study is, therefore, methodological as well as descriptive. By treating semantic divergence as structurally patterned rather than incidental, the article contributes to a more dynamic understanding of lexical evolution within Indo-European. Armenian emerges not merely as a conservator of archaic forms, nor Germanic as a domain of innovation, but as participants in distinct yet typologically interpretable trajectories of inherited meaning transformation. In this sense, the Armenian-Germanic material examined here illustrates how shared etymological origin can give rise to stable and historically meaningful semantic differentiation across branches¹.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of language contact and lexical isoglosses between Armenian and other Indo-European languages has long been central to comparative-historical linguistics. One of the foundational milestones in this domain was Hübschmann's (1875) seminal article *Über die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen*, which provided the first clear evidence that Armenian does not belong to the Iranian branch of the Indo-European family but constitutes an independent branch on its own.

Subsequent research has explored various aspects of Armenian's relationships with other Indo-European languages. Early comparative efforts include studies on Armenian and Etruscan (Bugge, 1890) and Armenian and Albanian (Pedersen, 1900). Scholarship in this area has continued to develop both internationally and within Armenian linguistics. Among the most significant contributions are Solta's (1960) *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen* and Jahukyan's (1967) monographs *Armenian and Ancient Indo-European Languages* (1970) and *The Relationship of Indo-European, Hurro-Urartian, and Caucasian Languages*. A substantial body of research has also addressed lexical correspondences and isoglosses across a range of language pairs, including Agabekyan's (1979) *Armeno-Italic Lexical Isoglosses*, Khachaturova's (1979) *Oldest Armenian-Indo-Iranian Language Contacts*, Harutyunyan's (1984) *Armeno-Greek Exclusive Isoglosses*, Sarajeva's (1983) *Lexical-Semantic Analysis of Genetically Common Vocabulary in Old Armenian and the Slavic Languages*, Clackson's (1994) *The Linguistic Relationship between Armenian and Greek*, and Hambartsumyan's (2020) *Armenian and the Celtic Languages*.

In addition to monographic treatments, survey-level work appears periodically in leading journals. For example, recent syntheses of Indo-European historical linguistics provide a comprehensive overview of Armenian's genetic affiliations and its position within the broader Indo-European family (Olsen & Thorsø, 2022; Clackson, 2010; Ringe & Eska, 2013). Recent scholarship continues to explore complex contact-induced morphosyntactic shifts in Armenian (Fattori, 2024), while contemporary approaches to Proto-Indo-European root semantics demonstrate that polysemy and semantic alternation at the proto-language level can systematically explain divergent developments in daughter branches (Ginevra, 2024). Furthermore, recent work on semantic change has shown that recurrent pathways of meaning extension, such as shifts from material properties to economic or social abstractions, are typologically stable across Indo-European languages; this makes semantic divergence a reliable object of historical comparison rather than an incidental by-product of inheritance (Haspelmath, 2003).

Against this background, Armenian-Germanic lexical isoglosses remain one of the least explored areas in comparative-historical Indo-European linguistics. The existing literature contains only sparse observations on lexical correspondences between Armenian and the Germanic languages. Solta's (1960) *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen*, for example, lists nineteen Armenian-Germanic isoglosses and suggests that their number could be significantly higher with more detailed investigation (pp. 468–469).

However, data from etymological dictionaries indicate a much broader range of potential correspondences. In particular, Armenian etymological dictionaries record Indo-European roots with Germanic reflexes that arguably derive from the

¹ The authors used AI for translation and spelling purposes.

same Proto-Indo-European sources. According to our count, the *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Language*, compiled by Acharyan, contains approximately 300 such root lexemes, of which roughly 80 show notable semantic divergences between Armenian and Germanic reflexes. Indeed, quantitative assessments of inherited Indo-European vocabulary have shown that large-scale etymological inventories can identify patterns of semantic retention and divergence across branches, provided that inheritance is clearly distinguished from later contact-induced developments (Ringe & Eska, 2013).

III. METHODOLOGY

The analytical corpus of this study consists of Armenian lexemes of demonstrable Indo-European origin whose reflexes are independently attested in the Germanic languages and traceable to a shared Proto-Indo-European root. The material was selected on the basis of two strict criteria: (1) the etymological relatedness of the Armenian and Germanic forms must be supported by authoritative lexicographic and comparative sources, and (2) the corresponding reflexes must exhibit a stable and interpretable semantic divergence.

For the purposes of this study, a semantic isogloss is defined as a patterned divergence in meaning among reflexes of a shared Proto-Indo-European root across branches, in which the divergence consistently reflects distinct positions within a common conceptual schema (e.g., process vs. result, action vs. instrument, substance vs. economic abstraction). Unlike traditional lexical isoglosses, which mark shared innovations or retentions across geographically distributed languages, a semantic isogloss in this sense marks a recurrent structural differentiation in inherited semantic development. It does not imply subgrouping or exclusive innovation but identifies a stable axis of semantic specialization within shared lexical material.

The selection process, therefore, does not aim to exhaustively catalog Armenian-Germanic lexical parallels or to propose genetic proximity between the branches. Instead, the focus is on cases in which inherited lexemes exhibit systematic differentiation in semantic orientation. Particular attention is given to lexemes from domains of material culture, animal husbandry, craft activity, and embodied action, since these semantic fields frequently undergo structured diachronic reorganization.

For each lexical item, the analysis proceeds through the following steps:

1. *Etymological grounding*: The Proto-Indo-European root is identified and verified using standard etymological dictionaries. Competing reconstructions are noted where relevant.
2. *Branch-specific reflex analysis*: The semantic range of the Armenian reflex is compared with that of the Germanic reflex(es), drawing on historical attestations rather than exclusively modern meanings.
3. *Semantic trajectory reconstruction*: The direction and type of semantic development are examined, including shifts such as: action → instrument, substance → property, animal → economic abstraction, process → standardized measure, and verbal root → nominal derivative.
4. *Evaluation of alternative explanations*: Independent parallel development, semantic convergence, or contact-induced borrowing are considered and excluded where unsupported by phonological or historical evidence.

In identifying semantic divergence, the study does not treat all meaning differences as equally significant. A divergence is considered structurally relevant when Armenian and Germanic reflexes consistently reflect different functional nodes within the same conceptual domain—for example, when Armenian preserves a verbal or processual meaning while Germanic lexicalizes a nominalized result or socio-economic abstraction derived from the same inherited root. Such divergences are interpreted as branch-specific semantic specializations rather than incidental lexical drift.

This approach is informed by modern theories of semantic change, which demonstrate that shifts from concrete substance to economic abstraction, from process to result, and from action to instrument constitute typologically recurrent pathways across languages (Blank, 1999; Traugott & Dasher, 2002; Haspelmath, 2003). Diachronic semantics has shown that lexical restructuring is often guided by culturally salient domains such as production, exchange, and material practice. By situating Armenian-Germanic divergences within these broader typological mechanisms, the present study treats semantic differentiation not as accidental lexical variance but as historically structured development within inherited Indo-European vocabulary. The focus on diachronic semantic analysis aligns with recent investigations into the stylistic and semantic stratification of dialectal vocabulary, which emphasize the importance of regional vernaculars in reconstructing broader linguistic patterns (Kumunts, 2026).

The methodological framework thus integrates comparative-historical procedure with diachronic semantic analysis, treating semantic divergence as a meaningful dimension of Indo-European comparison. This approach aligns with recent research into the historical development of the Armenian lexicon, which emphasizes the necessity of situating semantic analysis within the broader context of Armenia's linguistic contacts and the diachronic evolution of its literary standards (Kumunts et al., 2023; Kumunts et al., 2026). Furthermore, it draws on systematic etymological investigations of dialectal data, which have demonstrated that the Syunik-Artsakh vernaculars remain a vital resource for reconstructing Armenian lexical history and identifying Indo-European substrata in specialized terminological groups (Kumunts et al., 2025). The aim is not to argue for exclusive Armenian-Germanic innovations but to demonstrate that inherited lexical material may undergo recurrent, patterned differentiation across branches, generating identifiable semantic isoglosses. The recurrent semantic differentiation observed in the following case studies is summarized in Table 1.

TABLE 1
ARMENIAN-GERMANIC SEMANTIC ISOGLOSSES IN SELECTED INHERITED PIE ROOTS

PIE Root	Core PIE Meaning	Armenian Reflex	Armenian Semantic Orientation	Germanic Reflex(es)	Germanic Semantic Orientation	Type of Divergence
*pek'u-	wool; fleece; wool-bearing animal	asr 'wool'	Substance retained; primary material meaning	Gothic <i>faihu</i> 'property'	Livestock → property; economic abstraction	Substance → economic value
yeren	lamb; ram	gaṙn 'lamb'	Concrete animal designation	OE <i>waru</i> ; German Ware 'goods'	Animal → manufactured goods property	Animal → commodity
*dīp-ro-	sacrificial animal; cattle	tuar tavar 'cattle'	Livestock; productive agricultural asset	Gothic <i>tibr</i> ; OHG <i>zēbar</i>	Cultic ritual animal	Productive asset → ritual object
*səm- s̥mā-	to pour; to fill	amal 'to pour'	Verbal process retained	MHG Ohm 'liquid measure'	Standardized unit of liquid	Process → measure
*tek-	to weave; to cut	t'ek'el 'to weave; to sharpen'	Verbal action schema	OHG <i>dehsa</i> 'axe'; MHG <i>Docht</i> 'wick'	Resulting tool object	Action → instrument
*ās- azg(h)-	to burn; to glow	azazel 'to dry'	Verbal process retained	OE <i>æsce</i> ; OHG <i>Asche</i> 'ash'	Nominal residue result	Process → residue
*bher-	to carry; to bear	berel 'to bring, bear'; berk 'harvest'	Verbal + productive outcome retained	OE <i>beran</i> ; birth; burden	Resultative nominalized outcomes	Action → abstract result

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Armenian Noun *Asr* 'Wool' and Its Semantic Development

The Armenian word *asr* (ասր), genitive *asu* (ասու), meaning 'wool', is considered native Armenian and traced to the Indo-European proto-forms **pok'u-* and **pek'u-* (Acharyan, 1971, pp. 282–283). In his *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Pokorny cites the root **pek'-* with the meaning 'to pluck wool or hair' and the forms **pék'u-*, **pék'u-és* denoting 'a wool-bearing animal, sheep'; he also lists the Armenian forms *asr*, genitive *asu* 'sheep's wool', and *asvel* 'wool-bearing'. On this basis, the proto-form **pok'u-* + *r* is reconstructed (Pokorny, 1959, p. 797).

In Old Indic, the corresponding forms are *páśu-*, *paśú-* ('cattle, livestock'); in Gothic, *faihu* ('possession, property'); in Latin, *pecū* ('cattle, domestic animals') and *pecūlium* ('property, possessions, savings, personal property'); and in Old Swedish, *fār* ('sheep').

In *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*, Buck (1949, p. 400), in the entry 'Wool', notes that the root 'wool' generates words associated with wool-bearing animals such as the lamb or the ram.

In addition to Gothic *faihu* ('property'), Acharyan provides further parallels: Old Icelandic *fax* ('mane'), and Greek *pektéō* (πεκτέω) ('to shear') and *pékō* (πέκω) ('to comb, to comb out'). He points out that the primary meaning of the Indo-European root **pok'u-* 'wool' underwent semantic development in a number of Indo-European languages, coming to denote 'wool-bearing livestock, property, to shear, to comb, to pluck'. Thus, the following semantic transitions can be observed: 'wool' → 'wool-bearing animals' → 'mane' → 'property' → 'to comb'. In Armenian, the ancient primary meaning of the root 'wool' has been preserved (Acharyan, 1971, p. 283).

In *Indo-European Language and the Indo-Europeans*, Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1984, pp. 578–579) note in the section on Indo-European terms for wool that an early designation for 'sheep' was derived from the Indo-European root **pek'-*. They observe that in Indo-European dialects, formations from the root **pek'-* can mean 'to comb', 'comb', 'wool', 'fleece', and 'hair'. The authors conclude that "it is necessary to distinguish, formally and semantically, two different formations from the root **pek'-*: one associated with cattle and the meaning 'movable property', and the other with 'fleece', 'wool', 'hair'". The Armenian word *asr* ('sheep's wool') is treated as a derivative of the root **pek'-*.

Clackson also discusses the origin of Armenian *asr*. After a detailed review of the scholarly views of Meillet, Benveniste, and Lamberterie, and a consideration of comparative evidence, he concludes that "the Armenian word *asr* is an archaism and derives directly from **pek'u-*, preserving the primary, ancient meaning of this root" (Clackson, 1994, pp. 160–162). Other Indo-European languages likewise contain words meaning 'fleece' or 'sheepskin' that go back to this proto-form. The following semantic transitions can be traced: 'wool' → 'to shear' → 'to comb' → 'wool-bearing animal (sheep, ram)' → 'domestic cattle' → 'property'.

B. The Armenian Noun *Gaṙn* 'Lamb' and Its Semantic Development

The Armenian word *gaṙn* (գառն) 'lamb' is regarded as native Armenian, that is, of Indo-European origin, and is traced back to the Indo-European proto-form **yeren-* (Pokorny, 1959, p. 1170), **vārēn*, **vīrēn* (Acharyan, 1971, pp. 519–520), **uāren* (Jahukyan, 2010, p. 151), **wer-* (Starostin, n.d.), **yren* (Köbler, n.d.). In other Indo-European languages, reflexes

of this proto-form include Old Indic **urana-*, **ura-* ('ram, lamb'), Greek *arēn* (ἀρήν) ('lamb'), and New Persian *barra* ('lamb'). Acharyan also points to the Old Icelandic *vara* ('hide, skin'), Old English *waru*, and German *Ware* ('goods, product'), a semantic trajectory of the Germanic forms that is well-documented in standard etymological sources (Kluge, 2012).

Pokorny additionally cites Homeric Greek *polyrrhēn* (πολύρρην) ('rich in rams or sheep') and *rhēn* (ρήν) ('sheep'). It is noteworthy that in the Germanic languages this proto-form is reflected not with the meaning 'lamb' or 'ram', but rather in meanings associated with 'goods' or 'manufactured products' (Old English *waru*, Old Icelandic *vara*, German *Ware*). It should also be noted that the Armenian word *aprank'* (սարքաւթ) ('product, manufactured item, object of trade'), in addition to its primary meaning, is used in several Armenian dialects (Ararat, Goris, Karabakh) in the sense 'livestock, goat, sheep'.

Thus, the correspondence of the root *gar̥n* ('lamb', **ueren-*) with meanings such as 'property' or 'possessions' in various Indo-European languages (e.g., Germanic 'goods, product', Old Icelandic 'hide') is systematic and reflects a semantic development analogous to that observed earlier for *asr*.

C. The Armenian Noun *Tuar* 'Cattle' and Its Semantic Development

Related to the above example, let's consider the Modern Armenian word *tavar* (տաւար), which denotes 'cattle'. Armenian etymological dictionaries (Acharyan, 1979, pp. 424–425; Jahukyan, 2010, p. 734) record the root *tuar* (տուար) 'calf' (with *tuarac* 'herdsman'), which is traced to the Indo-European proto-form **d̥p̥aro-* / **d̥ipro-* ('bullock, sacrificial animal') and is reflected in Old High German *zēbar* ('sacrificial animal'), Old English *tīfer* ('sacrifice, sacrificial animal'), Old English *tīber* ('sacrifice'), and Gothic *tibr* ('sacrifice, dedication, hymn'). Pokorny (1959, p. 222) likewise reconstructs **d̥ip-ro-* / **d̥ip-erā-* ('sacrificial animal, cattle') and cites Armenian *tvar* (**tivar* < **d̥iprā*) ('ram', 'herd of cattle'), alongside Gothic *tibr* ('sacrifice'), Old High German *zēbar* ('sacrificial animal'), and Old French *atoivre* ('pack animal'). Armenian retains not only *tuar* but also several derived forms, such as *tuarac*, *tuaracakán*, and *tuaracatap*.

Acharyan further notes that the word for 'goods' (*tovar*) became widespread in a number of other languages, including Altaic and Middle Eastern languages, such as Kurdish *davar*, Laz *davari*, and various Caucasian languages. In the Slavic languages, the word appears with initial *t*: Old Church Slavonic *tovaru*, Ukrainian *tovar*, Russian *товар*. In Vasmer's etymological dictionary, the word *tovar* is attested with the meaning 'cattle' (Old Russian *товаръ*), alongside Mongolian *tawar* and Kalmyk *tawr*, noting that these words may derive from Armenian *tavar* 'sheep, flock of sheep' (Vasmer, 1987, pp. 67–68). Vasmer further notes a third meaning of *tovar*: 'cow's udder; a productive cow'.

In Dal's dictionary, *tovar* is recorded with the archaic meaning 'property, possessions, wealth, means', illustrated by the example: "*tovar* or shoemaker's *tovar*: processed, finished leather; calfskin, goatskin, sole leather" (Dal, 1866, pp. 373–374). A similar usage is found in the *Dictionary of the Russian Language* (1984, p. 3711), which cites Serafimovich's story *Epishka*: "...onto the fragrant leather *tovar* of the boot clamped between his knees".

Regarding its origin, some scholars, such as Miklosich, attributed this term to a Turkic source. However, Acharyan (1979, p. 425) and Pedersen (1906, pp. 197–198) argue that these Turkic forms are themselves borrowings from Armenian. This view is supported by the derivational richness of *tuar* in Armenian, including ancient toponyms such as *Tuaracatap* ('a district and plain in Turuberan, Greater Armenia') and *Tuaracini* ('a region and plain in ancient Armenia/Urartu') (Hakobyan et al., 2001, p. 133).

Moreover, it is worth noting that loanwords from Turkic into Armenian tend to retain their original phonological form without significant change (e.g., Turkish *düdük* → Armenian *duduk*; Turkish *dara* → Armenian *dara*; Turkish *dalda* → Armenian *dalda*). In view of these phonetic facts, Armenian *tavar* cannot be regarded as a borrowing from Turkish *davar*. Furthermore, *davar*, the Turkic equivalent, is less productive and less frequent in Turkic languages (Karakurt, 2017, pp. 737, 750; Aksan, 2004, pp. 76–77). By contrast, for clearly Turkic-origin Armenian words like *daganak* ('cudgel'), Sevortyan (1980) lists several dialectal variants in Turkic languages (*degnek*, *dehnek*, *tegenek*, *deynek*, etc.), demonstrating recognizable phonological variation and borrowing patterns, unlike what is observed with *tuar*.

D. The Armenian Verb *Amal* 'to Pour' and Its Semantic Development

The Armenian word *amal* (ամալ) 'to pour' is considered by Acharyan to be native Armenian and of Indo-European origin, traced to the proto-form **am-*. He cites Old Indic *ámatram* ('vessel, container, jug'), Greek *amis* (ἄμις) ('chamber pot'), and *amē* (ἄμη) ('bucket'). Acharyan refers to Hübschmann (2003, p. 416), noting that the word *aman* ('vessel, container') is connected with Sanskrit *ámatra* ('vessel, mug, jug'), Greek *amis* (ἄμις), and *amē* (ἄμη). However, Hübschmann does not provide an Indo-European proto-form for these words and, as Acharyan also observes, does not mention the connection between *aman* and Armenian *amal* 'to pour' (Hübschmann, 2003, pp. 186, 416).

In his *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Pokorny (1959) assigns to the root **am-* the meanings 'to seize, to hold' (p. 35) and cites Old Indic *ámatram* ('vessel, jug, mug'), Armenian *aman* ('vessel, container'), and Latin *ampla* (**am-lā* 'handle, grip').

Jahukyan (2010) considers it more plausible to derive Armenian *amal* from the Indo-European proto-form **s̥mā-* / **sem-* (p. 42). Pokorny (1959) notes that **sem-* carries the meanings 'to pour, to fill' and cites Greek *amē* (ἄμη) ('bucket'), Latin *sentinō* ('to bail out water'), Hittite *han-* ('to pour'), Middle High German *ome*, *ame*, and Modern High German *Ohm* ('a measure of liquid'), though he does not list an Armenian reflex (pp. 901–902). Starostin proposes the proto-form **samā-* ('to scoop, to bail out') and notes its reflexes in Greek *amē* and Armenian *amal* ('to empty, to pour out') (Starostin, n.d.).

Taking the comparative evidence into account, Jahukyan's hypothesis deriving *amal* from the proto-form **s̥mā-* appears the most convincing. When comparing the reflexes of this proto-form in Armenian and Germanic, a semantic divergence becomes apparent: in Armenian, the verb denotes the action 'to pour', whereas in the Germanic languages the reflexes designate 'a measure of liquid' or 'a unit for liquid substance'.

E. The Armenian Verb *T'ek'el* 'to Weave; to Sharpen' and Its Semantic Development

The Armenian verb *t'ek'el* (թեկել) is regarded as being of Indo-European origin and is traced to the proto-form **tek-* (Acharyan, 1973, pp. 178–179; Jahukyan, 2010, p. 265; Pokorny, 1959, p. 1058). In Armenian, *t'ek'el* carries the meanings 'to weave, to braid' and, as Acharyan (1973, pp. 178–179) records, earlier also 'to sharpen, to hone, to make sharp'.

In the dictionaries of Pokorny and Starostin, the proto-form **tek-* is assigned the meaning 'to weave, to braid'. Reflexes of this proto-form in other Indo-European languages include Ossetian *taxun* ('to weave, to braid'), Old High German *tāht* ('wick, rope'), Modern High German *Docht* ('wick'), and Old Icelandic *pātr* ('strand in a rope'). Also cited are forms related to *t'ek'el* with meanings such as German *drehen* ('to turn, twist, rotate'), *flechten* ('to weave, braid, interlace'), and *wickeln* ('to wind, wrap') (for the detailed etymological development of these Germanic forms, see Kluge, 2012). When comparing these reflexes, a semantic divergence is apparent: in Armenian, the form is a verb denoting the action 'to weave', whereas in the Germanic languages it is reflected as a noun meaning 'wick', representing a braided cord.

Regarding the sense 'to sharpen, to hew', Acharyan (1979, p. 179) provides examples such as *t'ek'el zgerandi* ('to sharpen a scythe') and *t'ek'eac hiusn zgorci iur* ('the carpenter sharpened his tools'). Parallels for this semantic branch include Greek *tektōn* (τέκτων) ('carpenter, builder, craftsman'), Old High German *dehsa* or *dehsala* ('axe'), and Old Church Slavonic *tesla* ('adze'). Pokorny (1959, p. 1058) associates the root **teḱp-* ('wooden implements; carpenter') with Old Indic *taṣṣati* ('to hew, cut, trim') and *tákṣan* ('carpenter'). Starostin (n.d.) proposes the proto-form **tek's-* with the meaning 'to cut, to chop', comparing Avestan *taša-* ('axe') and Celtic **tōkslo-*, reflected in Old Irish *tāl* ('axe'). Vasmer (1987) further adds Old Russian *tesati* ('to cut, to work'), Greek *technē* (τέχνη) ('craft, art'), Latin *texō* ('to weave, to plait, to build'), and Old High German *dehsala* ('axe') (p. 50).

Thus, for *t'ek'el* in both the sense 'to weave' and 'to sharpen, to hew', a systematic semantic divergence is observed: the Armenian verb denotes the process, whereas the Germanic correspondences denote the result in the form of a noun ('to weave' → 'braided cord, wick'; 'to sharpen, to hew' → 'axe, hatchet'). This contrast exemplifies a recurrent pattern of semantic development whereby verbal action schemas in Armenian correspond to nominalized result concepts in the Germanic languages, reinforcing the broader tendency observed in the preceding sections.

F. The Armenian Verb *Azazel* 'to Dry' and Its Semantic Development

The Armenian verb *azazel* (ազազել), meaning 'to dry', is considered to be of native origin, tracing back to the Proto-Indo-European root **ās-*, appearing in Armenian in the forms **azd-* / **azg(h)-* (Acharyan, 1971, p. 82; Jahukyan, 1982, p. 66; Jahukyan, 2010, p. 22; Hübschmann, 2003, p. 412). In Pokorny's (1959, pp. 68–69) dictionary, the root **ās-* → **azd-*, **azg(h)-* is glossed as 'to burn, to glow', with cognates such as Sanskrit *āsa-h* ('ash, dust'), Latin *āreō* ('to be dry, parched'), and Tocharian A *āsar* ('dry'). The Greek forms deriving from **azd-* include *azō* (ἄζω) ('to burn, to dry'), *aza* (ἄζα), and Ionic *azē* (ἄζη) ('soot, rust').

The Armenian root *azg-* aligns with the Germanic form **askōn-*, attested in Old Icelandic *aska*, Old English *asce* / *æsce*, and Old High German *Asche*, all meaning 'ash'. From the PIE root **azgh-*, Armenian also forms the reduplicated verb *azazim* (ազազիմ) 'to become dry repeatedly'. Regarding the phonological shift from PIE **zɡ(h)* to Armenian *z* (*q*), Pokorny (1959) cites Meillet's (1936) *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*.

This verbal root has been preserved only in Armenian; no verbal cognates are attested in the Germanic branch, where only nominal derivatives appear. Both Acharyan (1971, p. 82) and Jahukyan (2010, p. 22) cite Gothic *azgo* ('ash') as a lexical parallel. Likewise, Pokorny notes that Gothic *azgo* (reconstructed as **azgōn-*) is the cognate of Armenian *azazim*. Guxman (1958, p. 257) also includes Gothic *azgo* ('ash') in this correspondence.

Thus, a clear semantic divergence is observed: in Armenian, the verbal root stemming from PIE **ās-* / **azg(h)-* has survived uniquely, preserving the process-oriented meaning 'to dry', while the Germanic languages preserve only nominal reflexes of the same root, lexicalizing the result of the process as 'ash'.

G. The Armenian Root *Ber-* 'to Bear' and Its Semantic Development

The Armenian root *ber-* (բեր-) is regarded as native and of Indo-European origin. Acharyan (1971, pp. 440–441) notes that the verb *berel* ('to bring, carry, bear, yield fruit') derives from this root. Jahukyan (2010, pp. 125–126) further expands the semantic field of *ber-* to include nominal meanings such as 'fruit', 'birth', and 'childbirth'. The root ultimately traces back to the Proto-Indo-European root **bher-*, meaning 'to carry, to bring', which is widely attested in other Indo-European languages: Sanskrit *bhārati*, Avestan *baraiti*, Old Persian *barantiy*, and Gothic *baíran* ('to bring, to bear').

This PIE root also underlies various nominal formations in other Indo-European branches, often reflecting the result of the action. In Albanian, for instance, *bir* means 'son' and *burrë* means 'man'. In Old English, *bearn* denotes 'child', while Old High German *baro* means 'man'. In Gothic, beyond the verbal form *baíran*, Guxman (1958, p. 257) records the noun *baur* ('son, born one'), further supporting the semantic development from the action 'to bear' to the result 'offspring'.

Furthermore, some scholars suggest that Gothic *baurgs* ('city, tower') and *baurgja* ('citizen') may also reflect this semantic field of productive bearing or containment. Thus, while Armenian preserves both the primary verbal process

(*berel*) and its immediate productive outcomes (*berk* 'harvest', *cnund* 'birth'), the Germanic languages exhibit a strong tendency to lexicalize the outcomes into specific socio-economic or biological categories ('child', 'son', 'citizen'). This is consistent with the patterned semantic divergence observed in the preceding sections, where Armenian retains the verbal action schema while Germanic focuses on nominalized results.

H. The Armenian Root *Mit* 'Mind' and Its Semantic Development

The Armenian root *mit* (միտ), meaning 'mind, wit, heed, meaning', is of native Indo-European origin (Acharyan, 1977, p. 325; Jahukyan, 2010, p. 528; Hübschmann, 2003, pp. 474–475) and derives from the Proto-Indo-European root **med-* / **mēdos-* 'to measure'. In other Indo-European branches, this root yields forms such as Old Indic *masti-* 'measure', Greek *mēdomai* (μῆδομαι) 'to ponder, to consider' and *mēdos* (μῆδος) 'mind, intention', as well as Latin *meditor* ('to ponder, to consider') (Pokorny, 1959, p. 705). Pokorny also cites the Armenian *mit* (genitive *mti*) 'mind, meaning'. Furthermore, he notes the meaning 'to think, to ponder, to judge' for the Old Irish *midiur*, whereas the primary meaning of a measurable action is preserved in the Germanic verbal forms: Anglo-Saxon *metan*, Old High German *mezzan*, and Gothic *mitan*.

Interestingly, this root illustrates another, highly complementary dimension of the Armenian-Germanic semantic divergence. In contrast to the previously discussed roots where Armenian preserved the verbal process, here the Germanic languages retain the verbal root indicating a measurable process ('to measure'), while Armenian lexicalizes a nominalized root denoting an abstract mental state ('mind, meaning'). In Armenian, the corresponding verbal actions are formed analytically or derivationally from the nominal base. This is evident in Classical Armenian expressions such as *zmtav acel* or *i mits gal*, which eventually developed into the Modern Armenian compound verbs *mtacel* ('to think') and *mtaberel* ('to remember').

V. CONCLUSION

The systematic examination of Armenian-Germanic lexical correspondences undertaken in this study demonstrates that inherited Indo-European lexemes undergo structurally recurrent, yet branch-specific, semantic differentiation. Through the analysis of agricultural and material-culture terms—specifically *asr*, *ga'n*, *tuar*, *amal*, *t'ek'el*, *azazel*, and *ber-*—we have traced the divergent evolutionary trajectories of shared Proto-Indo-European roots.

The findings reveal a consistent and patterned semantic asymmetry: Armenian frequently preserves verbal, process-oriented, and materially grounded meanings, whereas the Germanic reflexes tend to lexicalize nominalized results, object-centered outcomes, and economic abstractions. These transitions (e.g., from an action to an instrument, a process to a standardized measure, or livestock to abstract property) illustrate typologically stable pathways of semantic change driven by material production and cultural evolution.

Crucially, these parallel developments are not interpreted here merely as indicators of genetic proximity or exclusive shared innovations. Rather, they exemplify "semantic isoglosses"—patterned reorganizations within inherited conceptual schemas across different branches. By treating semantic divergence as a structurally significant historical phenomenon, this approach shifts the comparative focus from mere formal reconstruction to the dynamics of meaning transformation.

Ultimately, this study contributes to a more nuanced model of Indo-European lexical history. In this framework, Armenian stands out not only as a crucial conservator of archaic forms but as a vital witness to the systematic and historically meaningful semantic differentiation of the early Indo-European lexicon. Expanding the empirical scope of semantic isoglosses in future research will further illuminate how shared etymological heritage adapts to the distinct socioeconomic realities of individual language branches.

REFERENCES

- [1] Acharyan, H. (1971). *Hayeren armatakan ba'aran* [Armenian root dictionary] (Vol. 1). Yerevan University Press.
- [2] Acharyan, H. (1973). *Hayeren armatakan ba'aran* [Armenian root dictionary] (Vol. 2). Yerevan University Press.
- [3] Acharyan, H. (1977). *Hayeren armatakan ba'aran* [Armenian root dictionary] (Vol. 3). Yerevan University Press.
- [4] Acharyan, H. (1979). *Hayeren armatakan ba'aran* [Armenian root dictionary] (Vol. 4). Yerevan University Press.
- [5] Agabekyan, M. A. (1979). *Armeniano-italiyanskiye leksicheskiye izoglossy* [Armeno-Italic lexical isoglosses]. Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
- [6] Aksan, D. (2004). *Türkçenin sözcük varlığı* [The vocabulary of Turkish] (3rd ed.). Engin Yayınevi.
- [7] Blank, A. (1999). Why do new meanings occur? A cognitive typology of the motivations for lexical semantic change. In A. Blank & P. Koch (Eds.), *Historical semantics and cognition* (pp. 61–90). Mouton de Gruyter.
- [8] Buck, C. D. (1949). *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. University of Chicago Press.
- [9] Bugge, S. (1890). *Etruskisch und Armenisch: Sprachvergleichende Forschungen* [Etruscan and Armenian: Comparative linguistic research]. H. Aschehoug.
- [10] Clackson, J. (2010). *Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Clackson, J. P. T. (1994). *The linguistic relationship between Armenian and Greek*. Oxford University Press.
- [12] Dal, V. (1866). *Tolkovnyy slovar' zhivogo velikorusskogo yazyka* [Explanatory dictionary of the living Great Russian language] (Vol. 4). Tipografiya T. Risy.
- [13] Fattori, M. (2024). Constructions in contact between Armenian and Iranian: Arm. *karem*, the Iranian "potential" construction, and marginal notes on Arm. *bawem* and *kari*. *Indo-European Linguistics*, 12(1), 1–25.
- [14] Gamkrelidze, T. V., & Ivanov, V. V. (1984). *Indoevropskiy yazyk i indoevropytsy* [Indo-European language and Indo-

- Europeans]. Tbilisi University Press.
- [15] Ginevra, R. (2024). Locative alternation in Proto-Indo-European: A Lexical-Constructional approach to the morpho-syntax and semantics of polysemous roots (PIE **leug-*, **uel-*, and **pleh-*). *Indo-European Linguistics*, 12(1), 26–61.
 - [16] Guxman, M. M. (1958). *Gotskiy yazyk* [The Gothic language]. Izdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannyx yazykax.
 - [17] Hakobyan, T. Kh., Melik-Bakhshyan, S. T., & Barseghyan, H. Kh. (2001). *Hayastani ev harakic shrjanneri teghanunneri bararan* [Dictionary of toponyms of Armenia and adjacent territories] (Vol. 5). Yerevan University Press.
 - [18] Hambartsumyan, V. G. (2020). *Hayeren-keltakan zugabanutyunner* [Armenian and the Celtic languages]. Gitutyun.
 - [19] Harutyunyan, T. R. (1984). *Hay-hunakan bac'arik zugabanutyunner* [Exclusive Armenian–Greek isoglosses]. Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
 - [20] Haspelmath, M. (2003). The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison. In M. Tomasello (Ed.), *The new psychology of language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure* (Vol. 2, pp. 211–242). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 - [21] Hübschmann, H. (1875). Über die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen [On the position of Armenian within the Indo-European languages]. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 23(1), 5–49.
 - [22] Hübschmann, H. (2003). *Armenische Grammatik* [Armenian grammar]. Yerevan State University Press.
 - [23] Jahukyan, G. B. (1967). *Ocherki po istorii dopismennogo perioda armyanskogo yazyka* [Essays on the history of the pre-written period of the Armenian language]. Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
 - [24] Jahukyan, G. B. (1970). *Hayerenē ev hndevropakan hin lezunerē* [Armenian and ancient Indo-European languages]. Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
 - [25] Jahukyan, G. B. (1982). *Sravnitel'naya grammatika armyanskogo yazyka* [The comparative grammar of the Armenian language]. Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
 - [26] Jahukyan, G. B. (2010). *Hayeren stugabanakan bararan* [Armenian etymological dictionary]. Asoghik Press.
 - [27] Karakurt, D. (2017). *Aktarma sözlüğü: Açıklamalı Türk dillerinden Anadolu Türkçesi'ne* [Transfer dictionary: From Turkic languages to Anatolian Turkish]. E-Kitap.
 - [28] Khachaturova, E. G. (1979). *Drevneyshie armyano-indo-iranskiye yazykovye kontakty* [The earliest Armenian–Indo-Iranian language contacts]. Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
 - [29] Kluge, F. (2012). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* [Etymological dictionary of the German language] (E. Seebold, Ed.; 25th ed.). De Gruyter.
 - [30] Köbler, G. (n.d.). *Indogermanisches Wörterbuch* [Indo-European dictionary]. Proto-Indo-European.ru. Retrieved March 19, 2025, from <https://www.proto-indo-european.ru/dic-kobler/ig-a.htm>
 - [31] Kumunts, M. S. (2026). Semantic and stylistic variations of synonyms and conceptually related terms in Syunik-Artsakh dialect. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 16(2), 385–394.
 - [32] Kumunts, M. S., Khachatryan, H. R., Simonyan, N. M., Sukiasyan, H. V., Falakyan, M. H., Telyan, L. G., Papikyan, S. V., Mkrtumyan, A. A., Khalatyan, G. L., Arakelyan, K. L., & Baghramyan, V. M. (2026). Comprehension of historical PhBWs and contemporary PhCFs in Armenian: Linguistic analysis, generational differences, and pedagogical implications. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 16(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1601.01>
 - [33] Kumunts, M., Margaryan, I., Miqayelyan, S., Khachatryan, V., Gevorgyan, G., Khachatryan, H., Grigoryan, S., & Nersisyan, L. (2025). Indo-European Origins of Syunik-Artsakh Agricultural Terms. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 7(5), 535–548. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v7i5.9112>
 - [34] Kumunts, M., Nersisyan, L., & Margaryan, I. (2023). Semantic and Formal Image of Concepts Related to “Sensory Perceptions” Preserved from the Indo-European Language in the Dialect Area. *Wisdom*, 25(1), 189–202. <https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v25i1.959>
 - [35] Meillet, A. (1936). *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique* [Outline of a comparative grammar of Classical Armenian] (2nd ed.). Imprimerie des PP. Mekhitharistes.
 - [36] Olsen, B. A., & Thorsø, R. (2022). Armenian. In T. Olander (Ed.), *The Indo-European Language Family: A Phylogenetic Perspective* (pp. 202–222). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108758666.012>
 - [37] Pedersen, H. (1900). Remarks on Armenian–Albanian linguistic parallels [Unpublished comparative observations].
 - [38] Pedersen, H. (1906). *Armenisch und die Nachbarsprachen* [Armenian and the neighboring languages]. Verlag von L. C. Wittich.
 - [39] Pokorny, J. (1959). *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* [Indo-European etymological dictionary]. Francke Verlag.
 - [40] Ringe, D., & Eska, J. F. (2013). *Historical linguistics: Toward a twenty-first century reintegration*. Cambridge University Press.
 - [41] Sarajeva, L. A. (1983). *Leksiko-semanticheskiy analiz geneticheskii obshchey leksiki drevnearmyanskogo i slavyanskikh yazykov* [Lexical-semantic analysis of genetically common vocabulary in Old Armenian and the Slavic languages]. Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR.
 - [42] Sevortyan, E. V. (1980). *Etimologicheskii slovar' tyurkskikh yazykov* [Etymological dictionary of Turkic languages]. Nauka.
 - [43] *Slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Dictionary of the Russian language]. (1984). (Vol. 4). Russkiy Yazyk Press.
 - [44] Solta, G. R. (1960). *Die Stellung des Armenischen im Kreise der indogermanischen Sprachen* [The position of Armenian within the Indo-European languages]. Wiener Studien zur Lebenswelt der Antike.
 - [45] Starostin, A. N. (n.d.). *Proto-Indo-European etymological database* [Online database]. Proto-Indo-European.ru. Retrieved March 20, 2025, from <https://www.proto-indo-european.ru/dic-starostin/iee-a.htm>
 - [46] Traugott, E. C., & Dasher, R. B. (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge University Press.
 - [47] Vasmer, M. (1987). *Etimologicheskii slovar' russkogo yazyka* [Etymological dictionary of the Russian language] (Vol. 4). Progress Press.

Nektar M. Simonyan was born in Yerevan, Armenia. She earned her PhD in Philology from the H. Acharyan Institute of Language of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia (NAS RA), Yerevan, Armenia.

She is currently a Senior Researcher at the Department of General and Comparative Linguistics at the H. Acharyan Institute of Language, Yerevan, Armenia. Her research focuses on comparative linguistics and the historical development of the Armenian language.

Dr. Simonyan holds the academic title of Associate Professor.

E-mail: inslcouncil@sci.am (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-0727-1198>).

Vazgen G. Hambardzumyan was born in Yerevan, Armenia. He earned his PhD in Philology from the H. Acharyan Institute of Language of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia (NAS RA), Yerevan, Armenia.

He serves as the Head of the Department of General and Comparative Linguistics at the H. Acharyan Institute of Language, Yerevan, Armenia. His research is focused on comparative linguistics and the historical development of the Armenian language.

Dr. Hambardzumyan holds the academic title of Professor.

E-mail: vazgenhambardzumyan@aspu.am (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3690-8750>).

Gayane R. Hovhannisyan was born in Yerevan, Armenia, in 1965. She received her PhD in Linguistics from the Moscow Institute of Linguistics, Russian Academy of Sciences, in 1993, and earned her Habilitation in General and Applied Linguistics from the H. Acharyan Institute of Language of the NAS RA and Yerevan State University in 2000.

She is currently a Professor at the European University of Armenia, Yerevan.

Prof. Hovhannisyan holds the academic title of Professor of Linguistics.

E-mail: g.hovhannisyan@eua.am (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3480-3755>).

Sona A. Mikayelyan was born in Goris, Armenia, in 1985. She graduated from the Faculty of Oriental Studies at Yerevan State University, Armenia, in 2007, and earned her PhD in Philology in 2016 from the H. Acharyan Institute of Language of the NAS RA.

She is currently a Researcher at the Department of General and Comparative Linguistics at the H. Acharyan Institute of Language and an Associate Professor at Yerevan V. Brusov State University. Her research interests include Armenian studies, typological linguistics, and contact linguistics.

Prof. Mikayelyan holds the academic title of Associate Professor.

E-mail: sonmiq20@gmail.com (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4205-9104>).

Gayane K. Hovsepyan was born in Spitak, Armenia, in 1961. She graduated from the Faculty of Bibliography at Yerevan State Pedagogical University, Yerevan, Armenia, in 1985.

She is currently a Researcher at the Department of Lexicography at the H. Acharyan Institute of Language, Yerevan, Armenia. Her research interests focus on the lexicography of the modern Armenian language.

Ms. Hovsepyan is an academic researcher at the H. Acharyan Institute of Language.

E-mail: gayanehov77@gmail.com (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-2524-7790>).

Meri A. Sargsyan was born in Yerevan, Armenia, on June 6, 1988. She earned her PhD in Philology in 2016 from the H. Acharyan Institute of Language of the NAS RA.

She is a Researcher at the H. Acharyan Institute of Language and serves as the Scientific Secretary and Head of the Chair of Linguistics at the International Scientific-Educational Centre of the NAS RA. She has published more than 50 scientific articles and 9 books. Her research interests include applied linguistics, history of linguistics, and Armenian studies.

Prof. Sargsyan holds the academic title of Associate Professor.

E-mail: meri.sargsyan@isec.am (ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2913-2819>).