A Comparative Analysis
of the Function
# of Declensional Meanings

Zaven Haroutyunyan

Getting down to the lingo-philosophical analysis of *language-speech* and *speech-language* transformations in conformity with the Armenian and French (partly with Russian) languages we are guided by the methodology according to which it's right and just to compare those linguistic systems which have diverse declensional structures from the point of the transformation of language into speech and the transformation of speech into language. The speech-into language and language-into-speech transformations are the two basic functions being realized both by synthetic and analytical languages.

First of all, the application to analytical languages helps us to digest the essence of *declension* which is typical to synthetic languages. We mean the following; on the one hand the same idea which can be expressed both by synthetic and analytical languages as a synthetic pattern must be different because the declensional interrelations exist only in the structure of the discourse expressed by synthetic languages. On the other hand, if we take into consideration the established fact that the declensional interrelations do not perform only a morphological function but can express certain facts by other linguistic means we'll have to accept that inherently there is an adequate linguistic realia in analytical languages.

Armenian (synthetic language) and French (an analytical one) with their peculiar grammatical structures are complete systems implementing a complete set of transformations of language into speech and of speech into language.

Consequently, the accentuation of generality is methodologically right only when the function of the declinational meanings is observed in the general circles of the lingo-philosophical analysis of the language-speech transformations.

It's appropriate to be convinced of it by the analysis of the several examples when the same meaning in different languages can be expressed syntactically in the same way.

- Ես ճանաչում եմ այդ մարդուն:
- Je connais cet homme.
- Я знаю этого человека.

As we can see, the structure in these three sentences is the same; *subject-predicate-object.* The peculiarity of the meaning in Armenian and Russian is conditioned by means of government, the same in French is done by means of words.

The same regularity, i.e. the certain sameness of syntax can be observed in the case of many-membered sentences.

- Ես կավարտեմ այդ աշխատանքը մինչև տարեվերջ:
- Je terminerai ce travail la fin de l'annee.
- Я закончу эту работу до конца года.

The structure of these sentences is the same again; ***subject-predicate-direct object-inderect object.*** In the Armenian and Russian examples, for the expression of coherent speech not only the function and role of cases but also those of prepositions (до, մինչև) are also of great importance. In French, naturally, the necessary relations of words in the structure of the given sentence are formed by means of the prepositions *avant* & *de.*

It should be a superficial approach to equalize directly the functions of the case system of Russian and English with those of prepositions characteristic to the French language. We also mean that prepositions are also necessary to express certain lexical relations even in the languages endowed with case potentials. Though, as we'll see below, the entrance of prepositions into a certain verbal context is also conditioned by verb-case relation.

Now, let's give an example of a sentence to be convinced that the role of prepositions in Armenian is as important as that of case forms for the precise formulation of a certain discourse.

- Ուրախ եմ ձեզ հետ ծանոթանալու համար:
- Enchante de faire votre connaissance.
- Рад с Вами знакомиться.

As we can see, for the expression of the same meaning in Armenian more prepositions(***հետ, համար***) are used than in Russian(*c*) and French (*de*). Surely, this example is not peculiar to the Armenian language, and all the types of prepositions do not have the very syntactical independence which is characteristic to the French prepositions.

Before initiating a profound analysis let's cite the last example directed to the display of the unification of syntactical and analytical languages.

- Ես նամակ եմ ստացել ընկերոջիցս:
- Je viens de recevoir une letter de mon ami.
- Я получил письмо от моего друга.

For the maintenance of the similar structure Armenian is confined only by the usage of the ablative with the possessive article *u* . As for French and Russian , not only the usage of the prepositions but also the usage of the articles *une, mon* and ***моего*** is necessary.

As a rule, the prepositions in Armenian penetrate into speech by means of certain government. We mean that though the prepositions do not decline instead they require an object with a definite case form for the expression of certain lexical relations.

As for example, preposition + object expressed by the possessive case can express various relations, particularly;

- reference (սեղանի վրա, Վարդանի մոտ)
- accordance (ըստ օրենքի, ըստ Վարդանի)

- replacement (պարզևատրման փոխարեն, Վարդանի փոխարեն)
- comparison (բլւորի պես, Վարդանի պես)

by the dative case

- direction (տոնին ընդառաջ, Վարդանին ընդառաջ)
- contradiction (բողոքներին հակառակ)
- distance (դեսպանատանը կից)

by the accusative case;

- measure (մինչև վերջ, մինչև Վարդանը)
- manner (որպես հետևանք, որպես գերազանցիկ)
- direction (դեպի տուն, դեպի Վարդանը)

by the ablative case

- exclusion (տանից դուրս, Վարդանից բացի)
- distance (քաղաքից հեռու, Վարդանից հեռու)

In all these examples we have observed the declinational usage of the prepositions where they are mainly used as objects to nouns or pronouns. Here we also deal with word-combinations which can't be considered full speech events. Though they are linguistic units, inwardly coherent subjected to certain grammar rules they belong to linguistic events more than to the speech ones. The difference between them is conditioned only by the presence or absence of the verb-predicate. The word-combination Վարդանի վրա can correspond to the different singleness of the purpose of speech communication, express different situations of outer world according to the intention of the speaker. But in such an example as Ձայրացա Վարդանի վրա we express a clear and distinct thought as a complete sentence is formed by means of predication, in its turn the declinational meaning of the object Վարդանի վրա becomes lucid particularly according to the usage of the possessive case with the preposition վրա. Owing to the predication the declinational meaning having been enclosed in the word-combination Վարդանի վրա now gets its extensive verbal meaning.

Thus, if we compare the system of prepositions in Armenian with that of French having syntactical-semantic function, we'll realize that the role of verbs in French is incomparably more decisive. The connective function of prepositions is mostly conditioned by the type of the verb-predicate and most of the prepositions are not used in the structure of the independent word-combinations, as we have observed in the case with the Armenian one, but it is directly motivated by the meaning of the verb-action where the objects are used with prepositions.

Before touching more thoroughly upon the relation between the function of declinational meanings and the type of speech discourse, let's examine the function of the French prepositions which is not directly conditioned by the type of the verb-predicate. Actually, this refers to set expressions, particularly to the relation of attribute-determined, also to the synthesis of prepositions with nouns and pronouns for the purpose of expressing certain government.

*So the preposition *de* is used with nouns and verbs(more exactly with the infinitive) and as a linguistic unit used as attributes to the nouns expresses the following realities:

1. possession
    *   les amis de mon frere-իմ եղբոր ընկերները
    *   la cour de l'ecole-դպրոցի բակը
As we can see, here the preposition *de* coheres two nouns, forms the interrelation between attribute and determined which is expressed in Armenian by the usage of the possessive case.
2. material of the things they are made of
    *   un lit de fer-երկաթյա մահճակալ
    *   les croix de paille-ծղոտե խաչեր
3. time duration
    *   de deux heures a quatre- ժամը երկուսից մինչև չորսը
Here the preposition *de* used with the point in time when the action began is expressed in Armenian by the ablative case and the end of the action is expressed by the preposition *a* corresponding to the Armenian accusative case. The same equivalence functions when the prepositions are used with the point in distance.
    *   de Moscou a Erevan-Մոսկվայից Երևան:
4. reference
    *   au-dessus de la riviere-գետի վրա
As can be seen, the equivalence in Armenian is maintained by the synthesis of the possessive case with the preposition.
The preposition *de* expresses other relations as well performing only joining function as in *tout de suite*(immediately) , *de temps en temps*(from time to time), etc. This preposition furthers the formation of verbal juxtaposition peculiar to the French language. For example, in *continuer de parler*(to continue speaking), finir de parler(to stop speaking) the same preposition *de* provides the access of the infinitive into a sentence. The last example is peculiar to Armenian when the infinitive gets a declensional ending. We may observe that the influence of Russian is evident and this peculiarity of the Armenian language is partially failed;
    *   դադարել խոսել перестать разговаривать.
Before touching upon the function of the preposition *de* conditioned by the peculiarities of verbs we'll examine some prepositions of French which are independent from the verbal character of the discourse.
As we'll be convinced later the usage of the prepositions *a, après, avant, avec, chez, dans, en, entre, par, pendant, pour, sur* in comparison to the preposition *de* is not so frequent with nouns and depends mostly upon the type of the verb-predicate.
    * The preposition *a* is used to express the following linguistic facts and in its declensional meaning corresponds to different cases of the Armenian language.
1. time
    *   a quatre heures-ժամը չորսին (accusative+dative)
2. material
    *   du the au lait-կաթով թեյ(instrumental+ accusative)
3. purpose
    *   une maison a vendre վաճառքի հանվածծ տուն

(possessive+accusative)
4.   possession
   • l'homme a la barbe մորուքով մարդ(instrumental+accusative)

As the previous preposition this one, as well, is a part of set expressions; *tout a l'heure* հենց այս պահին, *a propos* ի դեպ *au revoir* ցտեսություն, etc.
   *The joining function of the preposition *après* with nouns is strictly limited and expresses mainly the idea of duration.
   • après les classes-դասերից հետո (ablative)
   *The preposition *avant* has an identical usage expressing time relation;
   • avant les classes(ablative)
The set expressions formed by this preposition mostly refer to time reality; **en avant** (առաջ), **avant tout** (ամենից առաջ), etc.
   *The usage of the preposition *avec* as a linguistic means of introducing a noun into the independent speech is also limited and mostly expresses a relation of compatability. (corresponding to the Armenian instrumental case).
   • une cour avec des arbres-ծառերով բակ:
The same idea of compatability is essential in the set expressions formed by the same preposition;   *avec plaisir*(հաճույքով) *avec peine* (դժվարությամբ), etc.
   * The usage of the preposition *dans* ,while expressing an action, as a rule, mainly denotes an adverbial modifier of place (corresponding to the Armenian locative case). Yet it has also a very limited function with nouns expressing time relation (corresponding to the Armenian locative case).
   • dans deux heures-երկու ժամում
   *The identical usage of the preposition *en* includes the following relations of words (things)
1.   of material
   • une maison en pierre- քարից տուն (ablative)
2.   of state
   • riche en poisson - ձկներով հարուստ(instrumental)
3.   of time (aspect)
   • en hiver- ձմռանը(accusative)
   In set expressions this preposition expresses different spatial relations; en avant (առաջ), en bas (ներքևում), en haut (վերև, վերևում), etc.
   * The usage of the preposition *entre* as a linguistic means of introducing a noun into the independent speech, expresses time and spatial relations of things corresponding to the meaning of the Armenian locative case;
   • entre deux arbres- երկու ծառերի միջև
   • entre dix heures et midi –ժամը տասն անց կեսի և կեսօրի միջև

Expressing the meaning of the Armenian locative case the given preposition forms certain set expressions; entre nous soit dit (մեր մեջ ասած), etc.
   * The preposition *par* mostly functions adjacent to verbs and according to the type

of which it corresponds to different cases of the Armenian language and is mainly accompanied by a noun when it expresses time relation;
- une fois par semaine- շաբաթը մեկ (անգամ)

*The preposition *pendant* also expresses time relation while introducing a noun into speech corresponding to the Armenian locative case.
- pendant la lecon- դասի ընթացքում
- pendant une heure – մեկ ժամվա ընթացքում

*Though the preposition *sur* functions adjacent to verbs and is dependent upon them, it also functions adjacent to nouns expressing the following relations and corresponds to the meaning of the dative and possessive cases.
1. place
   - sur la table – սեղանի վրա (dative)
2. reference
   - la victoire sur l'ennemi - հաղթանակ թշնամու հանդեպ (possessive)
   - un film sur les sports - սպորտի մասին կինոնկար (possessive)

If we summarize the analysis of the joining function of the prepositions of French, we'll come to the conclusion that they express the following basic types of reality;
- of time or duration(*a, après, avant, dans, en, entre, pendant*)
- of place (*sur*)
- of material(*a, de*)
- of direction(*a, chez*)
- of possession(*a, de*)
- of compatability(*avec*)
- of state(*en*)
- of purpose (*a, pour*)

This analysis embraces the usage of the prepositions having to do only with nouns and set expressions formed by nouns. As we are going to touch upon the elucidation of the joining function of the prepositions of French, it's appropriate to differentiate them conditionally according to their names.

The prepositions having to do with nouns and set expressions are considerably independent and, as a rule, in speech they are used as ready models. The usage of the prepositions having to do with verbs is directly driven by the peculiarities of speech communication. The first type is much more an interlingual and interverbal fact, the second type is chiefly an interverbal one. Correspondingly, in the first case the joining usage of the French prepositions defines their linguistic declensional meaning, i.e. the comparatively dependent noun-preposition-object model and in the second case it defines its verbal declensional meaning, i.e. verb-preposition-object model conditioned by verbal communicative purposes and formed in the process of enunciation.

Thus, comparing some Armenian and French prepositions we can conclude that the

declensional meaning is a wider phenomenon than declension itself as a means of establishing certain relations between the words. The declinational meaning can be expressed either by a range of words(peculiar both to synthetic and analytical languages), or by a range of words and prepositions (peculiar to two forms of languages) or by a range of words, prepositions and case endings (special only to synthetic languages). The comparison of purely syntactic peculiarities of different languages, i.e. the regularities of the subject and predicate agreement, the usage of the objects, the possibility of inversion and the stylistic means conditioned by it are surely of certain research interest. The investigation of the peculiarities of the prepositional systems of different languages and the formation of certain dependence upon the words also have a cognitive perspective. All the same, we focus our attention on the function of cases taking into consideration their main role of providing with declensional meanings.

The solution to the problem of collation of declensional meanings brings us back to the specification of **double-planning.** It's necessary to make more precise once more that a linguistic phenomenon can't be considered linguistic-grammatical or **verbal-meaningful** without clarifying the function it performs. It's a subject to review that the category of case, as we have already mentioned, at the same time represents realia belonging to two aspects. First of all, it is a linguistic unit belonging to the given linguistic system, therefore it performs certain inter- systemic functions. It contributes to the binding of nouns together with other linguistic means, in other words the category of case leads to the phenomenon of syntax. At the same time, case is a phenomenon belonging to linguistic fact as it expresses a certain section of that reality. If the latter performs the function declinational meaning the former creates conditions for the formal aspect of speech formation, i.e. the aspect of the expression of meaning conditioned by linguistic affiliation.

We have already clarified that the category of case as a certain grammatical structure can have more than one function in the process of speech formation and expression. In other words, this category in the sphere of speech formation and expression is a multifunctional fact capable of expressing different thoughts. Consequently, the same meaning can be expressed by different linguistic-grammatical units; not only by cases, but also by prepositions, word order, etc.

It's of great importance to lay emphasis once more on the fact that neither the analysis of analytical and synthetic languages, nor the reflection of declensional system of languages is an end in itself. These are directed to our sole purpose of investigating the language -speech transformations.

The minimum area in which these transformations, the usage of cases and their similar functions performed by other linguistic means can be viewed is the sentence. Each sentence is a relatively independent, completed thought with its inner structure, with the correlation of its members making feasible not only the similar incarnation of the idea by the given linguistic means, but the development of the idea by successive sentences. The correlation of the sentences is conditioned by the singleness of the purpose of the speaker liable to purpose.

Either the structure of a single sentence or the range of successive sentences as the

realization of the purpose of speech is carried out by the usage of all linguistic means; by the choice of words and by the usage of words, by context, by timber(in oral speech) and by other articulatory features.

The members of the sentence are united by the purpose regulating their function. Thus, what is accepted to be called *case kinetics* is to a certain extent really inherent to all the words of the sentence being either notional or auxiliary (Poladyan, 2002). This is the kinetics of idea-purpose, i.e. the gradual extension of discourse directed to a listener (reader).

Therefore, the case kinetics and its adequate means realizing the same extension of discourse in analytical languages being subject to the purpose of speech must be investigated in the structure of the sentence with all their functions. Here the subject and predicate are distinguished as the basis of the formation and expression of the single thought is predication, i.e. the agent performs a certain action or is submitted to an action. For the expression of the same action a certain connection between the subject and predicate is required.

What relation does the category of case have to the subject-predicate connection? From the first sight it has to do with the subject, as it is an accepted idea that only nouns and the words expressed by nouns admit case forms. The verb-predicate is dependent on the noun-subject as the transformation of speech into language is realized by it. The subject defines the aspect of the action, thus the meaning, the person and the number categories. So the case forms seem to be driven by the subject and are dependent upon it. But as we'll see later, especially verbs stipulate the usage of cases making for their kinetics as a means of realizing the kinetics of thought.

Surely, the entrance of cases into linguistic- semantic sphere is implemented independently without the interference of verbs. It refers not only to the guaranteeing of the synthetic functions of single words but also to the inner-formation of word-combinations; the interrelation of attribute-attributive, attribute-determined, the fixed forms of set-expressions, the intrinsic agreement of compound collocations.

Regardless of the key verb expressing the main meaning of the sentence the possessive case denoting possession preserves its attributive function. In Վարդանի գիրքը կորգրի or Վարդանի գիրքը գտա expressions reacting to two contrary realities the correlation between attribute and determined remains unchangeable. The same refers to the correlation denoting the origin of things. Thus in the follwing contrary statements Ծաղիկների բուրմունքն ուժեղացավ and Ծաղիկների բուրմունքն վերացավ the usage of case form remains unchangeable as the possessive case having a close relation with the subject can't be changed in accordance with the alteration of the voice and direction of the predicate. The same we can't say about the function of cases having to do with verbs and objects.

Let's first clarify why we direct our steps especially to verbs. Essentially, speech in its nature is a motion. It reflects and expresses not only the motion of outer world but as a purposeful functioning of linguistic means it is a form of motion itself. And the linguistic facts including the category of cases providing the very motion-process have their peculiar functioning. All the same, the motion of speech is conditioned first of all

by verbs.

The extension of thought or the whole range and motion of a sentence are descended from the motion inherent to the verb performing the key function. So the function of used cases is conditioned by the given verb. As Poladyan states, " The dynamics of verbs presupposes a *source*(an opening place) corresponding to the nominative case, *an assembly place* (a closure) corresponding to the accusative case, *an address* (an extra place) corresponding to the dative. So cases are like little houses where the kinetics are registered" (Poladyan 2002:22).

There is some mechanical approach in the perception of the motion of verbs and the function of cases become derived from them. Verbs and context refer to the already expressed and substantivized thought, therefore we shouldn't forget that the essence of the future syntactical structure is conditioned by the process of the main formation of thought. The syntactical structure of the expression of speech is not optional at all (surely in the case of the formation and wording of natural speech), it is derivative and is descended (according to Chomski's terminology) and shaped (according to Jahukyan's)from the semantic fact. The latter is mostly conditioned by the semantic direction of key words. Besides, we think that the case dynamics proceed from the dynamics of verbs. Nevertheless, proceeding with the above mentioned descriptive comparison, we can state that cases are not little houses, they are unique accumulators getting incitements from the inner stiffness of verbs, accumulate them and then transfer guaranteeing the range of speech as a successive extension of the speaker's thought.

The frequency of the usage of cases and corresponding linguistic means guaranteeing their semantic function is conditioned by the peculiarities of verbs. If we neglect this important feature we'll be deprived of the possibility to understand one of the important regularities of the transformation of language into speech getting down to a low level of descriptive perception.

So, it is registered that cases have different applied weights. "Some cases carry more burden and are more often used and others considerably concede them and having comparatively a seldom usage" (Margaryan 2000:187). Particularly, on the basis of the Armenian classical literature we conclude that " according to the frequency of their usage and specific weight the nominative case is in the first place, the possessive in the second, the accusative in the third, the dative in the fourth, the instrumental in the fifth, the ablative in the sixth and the locative in the seventh"(ibid:187).

But we think that the decisive factor here is the qualitative peculiarity of the verb-predicate, i.e. the aspect, direction and semantic content. If, for example, we analyze the stenography of commercial negotiations, surely, the usage of the accusative and possessive cases is predominant conditioned by the key verbs expressing the main logic of the negotiation, i.e. *to offer, to sell, to buy* requiring direct objects. But if the analyzed text represents the process of a diplomatic procedure, the key verbs here will be *to meet, to accept, to visit, to welcome, to greet* requiring objects which can be mainly expressed by the dative case. So, our task is to observe the regularities of the language - speech transformations in the circles of analytical and synthetic languages by the comparison of the extension of declensional and verbal meanings.

First of all, we should examine the verb-predicate as a linguistic means guaranteeing the direction and perspective of a certain discourse. Generally, if we try to outline the function of the verb-predicate, we'll notice the vivid fact that the predicate takes an intermediate position guaranteeing the logical motivation of the discourse *connecting* the agent and the doer of the action.

Agent- action- object

There are also exceptions from the above mentioned general fact i.e. impersonal, incomplete and elliptical sentence-discourses. Surely, the regularity is based on the intermediary function of a verb, and by the peculiarities of the verb is conditioned the type of government, the usage of adjacent prepositions in synthetic languages and the usage of the prepositions adequately expressing declensional meanings in analytical languages.

Here it is easy to be convinced that the definiteness of cases is conditioned by the type of a verb, moreover, the verbs expressing different speech events put in claims differently.

For example, the usage of the verb "հպարտանալ" requires excellently the instrumental case. As for the verb "զտնել" it chiefly requires the usage of the locative case. Very seldom the usage of the accusative is also possible. .

There are certain verbs requiring different cases, e.g. the verb "թարգվել" requires the usage of the two cases- ablative and locative, the verb " երգել" of ablative, instrumental and locative, etc.

As for the prepositions of the Armenian language as an additional means of guaranteeing declensional meanings, they penetrate into speech either by verbal reasoning, or independently but always with certain government. For example, in the textbooks the preposition "դեպի"(to, towards) is accepted to require the usage of the accusative case, e.g. "շարժվել դեպի կայարան" (to move to the station) "սերը դեպի հայրենիքը" (love towards fatherland),etc. Similarly, the postposition "մասին" is used with the object in the possessive case independent upon the verb, e.g. "խոսել ընկերոջ մասին" (to speak about a friend), "պատմել երկրի մասին" (to speak about a country) etc. There are certain prepositions requiring several case forms; "Վարդանից *առաջ*" ablative, "Վարդանի *առաջ*" possessive, "մի քանի տարի *առաջ*" accusative.

We are also for the viewpoint of the verb +case form (object)+preposition correlation, in other words, the prepositional government of verbs is displayed by the application of different case forms. It is even calculated that in Armenian the objects in the possessive case have more frequent usage than the ones in the dative, accusative, ablative and instrumental cases (Abrahamyan, Arakelyan, Kosyan,1975:92-93).

So we propose a new cognitive pattern uniting, on the one hand, the fact of the regular government of the prepositions(in the structure of object construction),on the other hand it displays the decisive role of the verb-predicate in the given trinomial system.

Verb-Preposition ↔ Case

So, the fact of prepositions conditioned by a verb type and the usage of them on the purpose of expressing declensional meaning either partially (in synthetic languages) or

wholly (in analytical languages) facilitate the collation of the expressed meanings in the identical discourses formed by different languages.

Let's be convinced of the decisive role of a verb in the examples mentioned below.

- repetez *après* moi

    Կրկնեցէք ինձ հետ (dative case)

- courir *après* la balle

    վազել գնդակի հետևից (ablative case)

The same preposition ***après*** being dependent on the type of a verb in the first case requires and guarantees the meaning of the usage of the dative, in the second case of the ablative case. In fact, this regularity which is peculiar to the French *verb-preposition* word chain is present in the Armenian translation. As French with its linguistic means can't reveal the peculiarities of government according to the verb type it needs a mediator, especially the usage of a declinational language. By *verb type* we mean neither the word-building peculiarities of a verb   nor the grammatical category (voice, aspect, etc) but the correlation of a verb with other parts of a sentence. The meaning of a verb, as we have mentioned above, is not defined literally.

This is the reason why we've deliberately narrowed the verbal encirclement within the discourse on the purpose of distinguishing more expressively the realization of the function of this or that case conditioned by the usage of prepositions and for our comparative analysis we've chiefly used lexical linguistic models.As a certain linguistic existence the *verb-preposition-object* unity always functions conditioned by certain speech events. In the real communicative process, in virtue of a certain address of each discourse, of the perception peculiarities of the addressee and of other conditional factors the meaning of a verb can get different additional nuances.

So, in the above mentioned example referring to the usage of the preposition *après*, the verb ***repetez*** means *to follow someone, to say(to do) an   already mentioned thing*. And as for ***courir*** it is an independent action performed by the subject which is compelled and obliged by another object or subject.

Let's examine the manifestation of the given regularity by the verbal usage of the preposition *avec*.

- parler avec son frere

    խոսել իր եղբոր հետ (possessive- dative)

- ecrire avec un crayon

    գրել գրիչով (instrumental)

As can be seen, in this case too the type of a verb and its semantic peculiarity play a decisive role differentiating the government in the adequate phrases expressed in Armenian. The verb ***parler*** and the preposition ***avec*** suppose compatability, a certain direction, but the verb ***ecrire*** supposes an action for the realization of which it requires certain means.

The next preposition *a* when used adjacent to a verb expresses different declensional meanings   conditioned by the definiteness of the verb type and preposition correlation.

- parler a la radio

խոսել ռադիոյով (instrumental case)
- travailler a l'usine
  աշխատել գործարանում (locative case)
- jouer a la balle
  գնդակ խաղալ (accusative case)
- aller a la gare
  մեկնել կայարան (accusative case)
- s'interesser a cinema
  հետաքրքրվել կինոմատոգրաֆիայով (instrumental case)
- donner le livre a Vardan
  գիրքը տալ Վարդանին (dative case)

Here such variations have their explanations. Thus, the verb *parler* supposes not only a listener but a discourse directed to radio listeners and intermediate- instrumental existence expressed by the instrumental case. In the same way the verb *s' interesser* requires the usage of the instrumental case as it is an action which always demands smth the person is interested in.

The similar usage of the preposition *en* includes the following declensional meanings.
- Aller en Armenie
  մեկնել Հայաստան (accusative)
- Vivre en Armenie
  ապրել Հայաստանում (locative)
- Aller en avion
  մեկնել ինքնաթիռով (instrumental)

In this example *aller* is compatible with the purpose of the given action in the sense of *to leave for, to reach*, therefore the usage of the preposition *en* corresponds to the Armenian accusative case. But the verb *aller* in the sense of *to move* corresponds to the Armenian instrumental case in combination with the same preposition **en**. So, if the verb *aller* in conjunction with the preposition *en* requires the meaning of the accusative and instrumental case, the verb *vivre* has no connection with the meaning of displacement direction   and spontaneously supposes a certain place, also time. In this sense it corresponds to the function of the Armenian locative case.

As for the preposition *dans* when used adjacent to a verb mainly corresponds to the function of the Armenian locative case.
- habiter dans une belle chamber
  բնակվել մի գեղեցիկ սենյակում
- mettre dans la serviette
  դնել պայուսակի մեջ
- rencontrer dans la rue
  հանդիպել փողոցում

The same preposition being dependent on the kind of verb, expresses the meaning of the accusative case, as in the following example.
- Aller dans la rue

ելնել փողոց

Here the basic and common peculiarity is the usage of the locative case which we think is conditioned by the type of the verb requiring the preposition *dans.*

The same is evident in the case of the preposition *de.* The verbal usage of this preposition also displays a certain dependence upon the meaning of the verb expressing corresponding declensional meanings.

- decore de l'ordre
  պարգևատրված շքանշանով (instrumental case)
- donner de ses nouvelles
  հայտնել իր մասին տեղեկություններ(accusative case)
- descendre de la montagne
  իջնել սարից (ablative case)
- je n'ai pas de temps
  ժամանակ չունեմ(accusative case)

It's easy to be convinced that if the verb *descendre* denotes a disjunctive action therefore requiring the answer to the question *where from,* consequently, the function of the preposition *de* corresponds to the function of the Armenian ablative case, but the verbs *donner* in the sense of *to give* and *avoir* of *to have* require direct objects that's why the function of the preposition *de* corresponds to the meaning of the Armenian accusative case.

Let's examine the function of the next preposition *cher* which is also brought to life by verbs. As a rule, *chez* shows the direction of the action of the subject (or the direction peculiar to the state of the subject) expressing the meanings of the Armenian possessive, dative and accusative cases.

- aller chez des amis
  գնալ իր բարեկամների մոտ (possessive-dative)
- je rentre chez moi
  վերադառնում եմ տուն (accusative)
- je suis chez moi
  ես տանն եմ (accusative)
- elle habite loin de chez nous
  Նա մեզանից հեռու է ապրում

In the last example the two prepositions are confronted, if *chez* indicates closeness, *de* in this particular case guarantees the meaning of disjunction thus securing the meaning of the discourse.

The preposition *par* belongs to the number of those prepositions which penetrate into context and perform certain functions mainly in the structures of adverbial modifiers. This preposition has a wide range of usage and when it expresses the aspect or the means of realization of the action, it mainly corresponds to the function of the Armenian instrumental case.

- passer par la cour
  անցնել բակով (instrumental case)
- cacher le visage par ses mains

 դեմքը ձեռքերով ծածկել (instrumental case)
* envoyer une letter par avion
  Նամակ ուղարկել փոստով(instrumental case)
* courir par les rues
  վազել փողոցներով(instrumental case)

The usage of other declensional meanings is very sparse, as in the following example.
* jeter par terre
  գցել գետնին (dative case)

The difference, possibly, is the meaning of the verb being an axle of the given discourse- word combination. So, the verbs *passer* and *courir* indicate continuous actions, their supplements are adverbial modifiers, but in French they mainly refer to the aspect of the action. As for *jeter* it expresses a complete and one-off action, the object here is again an adverbial modifier of place, here the grammatical structures of the Armenian and French languages coincide and the preposition *par* performs the function of the dative case. Outwardly, the verbs *envoyer* (to send) and *cacher* (to cover) indicate complete actions, but in the context, however, they express continuity , as the intention of a letter-sender is not confined to the one-off action of sending a letter, the purpose-intention is the delivery of letters to the addressee, in other words, the sending is only the first link of the whole action. In the same way, *covering one's face* is a continuous state, in difference to the complete action of the same verb in the expression *covered with snow.*

The preposition *pour* is used adjacent to a verb and a noun, in both cases it expresses purpose , intention and singleness of purpose, that's why it corresponds to the usage of the Armenian prepositions համար(for), հանուն(in sake for). Used with nouns this preposition, in fact, performs the function of the organizer of the attribute-determined interrelation, e.g. *un film pour enfants* which means *a film for children*, or *la viandre pour le diner* in the sense of *meat for dinner* the function of the preposition *pour* corresponds to that of the Armenian possessive case. Used with verbs expressing the relation of the same intention the same preposition, as a rule, corresponds to the meaning of the possessive and instrumental cases. The two meanings proceed from the essence of the preposition which is the ability to express the purpose of the doer of the action.
* mourir pour sa patrie
  մեռնել հայրենիքի համար(possessive case)
* c'est assez pour aujourd'hui
  բավական է այսօրվա համար(instrumental case)
* sortir pour quelques minutes
  դուրս գալ մի քանի րոպեով (instrumental case)
* etre libre pour trois jours
  ազատ լինել երեք օրով(instrumental case)
* etre en retard pour la lecon
  ուշանալ դասին (possessive-dative)

The preposition ***pour*** is widely used with the infinitive and in the Armenian language it is translated into   համար

The preposition ***sur*** in the structures of adverbial modifiers mainly performs the function of the Armenian dative and instrumental cases.

- passer sur le pont

  անցնել կամրջով (instrumental case)

- patiner sur la glace

  չմուշկներով սահել(instrumental case)

- poser le livre sur la table

  գիրքը դնել սեղանին (dative case)

It's evident that the distinction of declensional functions proceeds from the differences of the meanings of the verbs; if the verbs ***passer*** (to pass) and ***patiner*** (to slide) suppose a certain manner and means of the given action, the verb ***poser(*** to put) as a reposing action with its required preposition denotes the end of the given action; i.e. the verb *to put* is not an action any more when the *book is already on the table.*

The examined prepositions give a general idea about the functions of declensional meanings. On the analysis of the given examples we clarified certain coincidences between the French prepositions and Armenian cases, but surely we have no basis to speak about the existence of distinct, indubitable regularities. Such a fact has been stated by those researchers who tried to include the cases of the usage of the French prepositions taking into consideration their dependence upon parts of speech. "It's necessary to state that our speech doesn't belong to the absolute rules. It belongs to its usage more. We can bring many facts certifying that language doesn't make differentiation among structures, that's why different prepositions are possible in conforming with certain circumstances" (Ter-Avakyan 1977:253).

So our investigation is also the affirmation of this point. However, if we examine our matter from the point of view of the investigation of the regularities of the language-speech and speech language transformations, we can conclude that the correlation between the French prepositions and Armenian declensional meanings is essentially conditioned by the kind of a verb in use. Especially the verb, as a special axis for the speech and linguistic event transformation, plays a semantic-decisive role for the declensional function of prepositions.

References:

1. Poladyan, M. (2002) *Hayereni holovnere ev mtqi kinetikan.* // Astghik. Yerevan: Sahak Partev.
2. Margaryan, A. (2000) *Hayereni holovnere.*Yerevan: Yerevan State University Press.
3. Abrahamyan, S., Arakelyan, V., Kosyan, V. (1975) *Hayots lezu.* Yerevan: Luys.
4. Ter-Avakyan, G. (1977) *Predlogi frantsuzskogo yazika.* Moscow: Vishaya Shkola.

Հոլովական իմաստների գործառության
համեմատական վերլուծություն

Լեզվից խոսք անցումը ամեն մի լեզվական համակարգի գոյության և գործա-
ռության էությենական բնութագիրն է. լեզուն ծագել է հանրության զանազան
կարիքները սպասարկելու, հատկապես խոսքային հաղորդակցումը ապահո-
վելու համար: Լեզվի այս հիմնարար գործառության ընդհանուր դիտարկումը
մենք, սույն հոդվածի սահմաններում, մասնավորեցնում ենք հոլովների դերա-
կատարման լեզվափիլիսոփայական ուսումնասիրությամբ:Մեր նպատակը ոչ
թե սոսկ քերականական կապերի պարզաբանումն է կամ էլ նախադասության
կազմում հոլովների շարահյուսական-ձևաբանական գործառույթների թվար-
կում-բնութագրումը, այլ ամենից առաջ իմաստաբանական վերլուծությունը:
Հոլովների խնդիրը, մեր հայեցակետով, ոչ միայն էապես առնչվում է "լեզու-
խոսք" փոխադարձ անցումներին, այլն վերջիններիս քնորոշ օրինաչափութ-
յունների առարկայական դիտարկման լավ հնարավորություն է ընձեռում:
Դրանում համոզվում ենք, համեմատելով համադրական լեզվ՝ հայերենի հո-
լովական համակարգը վերլուծական լեզվի՝ ֆրանսերենի նույնաբնույթ հոլո-
վական իմաստների գործառության հետ: Դիտարկելով հոլովական համակար-
գը որպես "լեզու-խոսք" անցումների միջնորդավորում՝ փորձել ենք ներկա-
յացնել, մի կողմից՝ամբողջական հիմնախնդրի մասնավորեցում հոլովների
դիտարկման տեսանկյունից, իսկ մյուս կողմից հոլովների էության պարզաբա-
նում հատկապես"լեզու-խոսք" անցումների իրականացման շրջանակներում:
Լեզվի խոսքայնացումը հրամայաբար պահանջում է շարահյուսական որոշա-
կի կառույցների գոյացում: Հոլովական համակարգը՝ որպես նման կառույցնե-
րի սերման ներուժ, համադրական լեզուներում և նույնաբնույթ գործառույթ
կատարող լեզվամիավորները վերլուծական լեզուներում յուրահատուկ
"կմախքի" դեր են կատարում "լեզու-խոսք" անցման գործընթացներում: