

Armenian Folia Anglistika – the official peer-reviewed academic journal of the Armenian Association for the Study of English (since 2005) and Yerevan State University (since 2015) aims at fostering research of the English Language, Literature and Culture in Armenia and elsewhere and facilitate intellectual cooperation between high school teachers and scholars.

Armenian Folia Anglistika is intended to be published twice a year. Articles of interest to university-level teachers and scholars in English Studies are warmly welcomed by the multi-national Editorial Board of the Journal. Articles should be directed to the Editor-in-Chief.

In 2007 the Editorial Board of *Armenian Folia Anglistika* announced the opening of a new section in the Journal – Armenological Studies, which invites valuable and innovative contributions from such fields as Armenian Linguistics, Literary Criticism, Ethnic Studies, Cultural History, Gender Studies and a wide range of adjacent disciplines.

Հիմնադիր և գլխավոր խմբագիր՝
ՄԵՂԱ ԳԱՍՊԱՐՅԱՆ
Համարի թողարկման
պատասխանատու՝
ԼԻԼԻ ԿԱՐԱՊԵՏՅԱՆ
Լրատվական գործունեություն
իրականացնող
«ԱՆԳԼԵՐԵՆԻ»
ՈՒՍՈՒՄՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ԱՍՈՑԻԱՑԻԱ» ՀԿ
<http://www.aase.yasu.am>
Վկայական՝ 03Ա 065183
Տրված՝ 28.06.2004 թ.

Yerevan State University
Press

Editor-in-Chief

Seda Gasparyan – Dr. of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Corresponding Member of RA NAS, Honoured Scientist of RA, holder of “Best Scientific Work” award of RA NAS (2010), holder of “Prolific Researcher” award of RA State Committee of Science (2013, 2016, 2017, 2018), Head of Yerevan State University English Philology Department, President of Armenian Association for the Study of English.

Phone: +374 99 25 50 60;

E-mail: sedagasparyan@yandex.ru; sedagasparyan@ysu.am

Editors

Shushanik Paronyan, Dr. of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Gaiane Muradian, Dr. of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Astghik Chubaryan, PhD in Philology, Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Editorial Advisory Board

1. Svetlana Ter-Minasova – Dr. of Sciences (Philology), Professor Emeritus at Lomonosov Moscow State University, President of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Area Studies, Doctor Honoris Causa at the Universities of Birmingham, UK (2002), The State University of New York, USA (2007), the Russian-Armenian Slavonic University, Armenia, Yerevan State University, Armenia (2019), Visiting professor at the National Research Tomsk State University, Russia (2013), Yunshan Professor at Guangdong University of Foreign Languages and International Relations, China (2016), holder of Lomonosov Award (1995), Fulbright’s 50th Anniversary Award (1995), Boris Polevoi Prize (2015), Member of the Council of Experts of the International Academic Forum, Japan (2013).

2. Angela Locatelli – Professor of English Literature, Bergamo University, Italy, Adjunct Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Faculty Member of the International PhD Network established in 2008 by the University of Giessen, Germany, holder of a Fellowship at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington (1999, 2008), one of the three General Editors of EJES (European Journal of English Studies) (2004-2010).

3. Olga Aleksandrova – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of English Linguistics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, holder of Lomonosov Award (2001), Award of the International Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations at FIPLV (2005).

4. John Stotesbury - Adjunct Professor of the Department of English University of Oulu, Finland, Adjunct Professor of Philosophical Faculty, School of Humanities, Finland.

5. Elżbieta Chrzanowska-Kluczevska – Professor, Dr. hab. Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Institute Filologii Angielskiej, Katedra Językoznawstwa Angielskiego. Cracow, Poland.

6. Elżbieta Manczak-Wohlfeld – Professor, Dr. hab. Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Institute Filologii Angielskiej, Katedra Językoznawstwa Angielskiego. Cracow, Poland.

7. Alessandra Giorgi – PhD in Philology, Full Professor, Department of Linguistics and Comparative Cultural Studies, Ca'Foscari University of Venice, Italy.

8. Bunyatova Isabella – Dr. of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Germanic and Romance Philology, Boris Grinchenko Kyiv University, Ukraine.

9. Ірина Шевченко - Dr. of Philology, Full Professor, V. N. Karazin Kharkov National University, Head of the Department of Business Foreign Language and Translation, Academician of Academy of Sciences of the High School of Ukraine, Editor-in-Chief of The International Journal “Cognition, Communication, Discourse”.

10. Ewa Salkiewicz-Munnerlyn – Professor, Doctor of Cracow Academy after Andrej Frycz Modrzewski, Cracow, Poland.

11. Marta Dabrowska – Associate Professor, Dr. hab. , Institute of English Studies, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland.

12. Peter Sutton – Freelance Editor and Translator, UK.

13. Sona Haroutyunian – Doctor of Linguistics, Professor at the Department of Asian and African Studies, Visiting Professor at University of California Los Angeles (2009), Nida School of Translation Studies, New York - Misano Adriatico (2012), California State University Fresno (2013), Yerevan State University (2015), City University of New York (2017).

Managing Editor

Lili Karapetyan – Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia)

Assistant Editor

Gohar Madoyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia)

© Seda Gasparian, 2019

Երևանի պետական համալսարան

**Անգլերենի ուսումնասիրության հայկական
ասոցիացիա (Անգլերենի ուսումնասիրության
եվրոպական ֆեդերացիայի անդամ)**

**ԱՆԳԼԻԱԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ
ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՆԴԵՍ**

**Միջազգային գրախոսվող ամսագիր
համագործակցությամբ՝**

Երևանի Վալերի Բրյուսովի անվան պետական
լեզվահասարակագիտական համալսարանի
(Հայաստան)

Մոսկվայի Մ. Լոմոնոսովի անվ. պետական համալսարանի
(Ռուսաստան)

Կրակովի Յագիելոնյան համալսարանի
(Լեհաստան)

Մոնտենեգրոյի համալսարանի



100



Yerevan State University

**Armenian Association for the Study
of English (Member Association of the
European Society for the Study of English)**

ARMENIAN FOLIA ANGLISTIKA

**Reviewed International Journal
in cooperation with:**

Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages
and Social Sciences
(Armenia)

Lomonosov Moscow State University
(Russia)

Jagiellonian University, Cracow
(Poland)

University of Montenegro
(Montenegro)

YEREVAN – 2019

CONTENTS

Linguistics

Svetlana Decheva

The Phonetic Particulars of Modern English Advertising9

Gevorg Barseghyan

The Language of Advertising in English Sport Magazines20

Karine Abrahamyan

Comparative Analysis of the Category of Diminutiveness in the Russian,
English and Armenian Languages32

Karen Velyan

Syntactic Maxi-Accidents in Spontaneous Speech of Middle-Class
Speakers of English38

Kristine Harutyunyan, Rafayel Harutyunyan

On Some Grammatical Peculiarities of Indian English50

Methodology

Mino Khamesian

On the Role of Phraseological Units in Teaching English as a Foreign
Language to Adult Learners56

Translation Studies

Aschen Mikoyan

Understanding in Literary Translation64

Culture Studies

Marta Dąbrowska

Birthday, Culture, and Social Media86

Literature Studies

Gabriella Elina Imposti

Under Children's Eyes: Armenia in Nina Gabrielian's Work123

Armenological Studies

Anne Elizabeth Redgate

Epigraphy in Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Armenia:

Inscriptions as Bridges and Boundaries135

**To the Centenary
of Yerevan State University**

Syntactic Maxi-Accidents in Spontaneous Speech of Middle-Class Speakers of English

Karen Velyan

*Yerevan Brusov State University of
Languages and Social Sciences*

Abstract

Spontaneous spoken language is known to be rich in fragmented and non-integrated chunks of speech. The latter are the result of syntactic “accidents”, which are indispensable elements of spontaneous talk. Caused by a variety of pragmatic factors, syntactic accidents differ in their formal, lexical, and distributional features. With these features in view, we single out three main varieties of syntactic accidents: 1. *maxi-accidents*, 2. *mini-accidents* and 3. *micro-accidents*, which collectively constitute one whole paradigm.

Within the framework of the present article, the main focus of the analysis is on maxi-accidents in spontaneous talk of middle-class native speakers of English. Based on the empirical data, the analysis outlines the key functional properties of maxi-accidents, such as their frequency of occurrence, positional characteristics and pragmatic reasons that lie behind maxi-accidents.

Key words: *maxi-accidents, spontaneous talk, distributional properties, planning of ideas, lexical change, interrupted fragment.*

Introduction

Spontaneous and non-spontaneous talks are known to vary in a number of linguistically important respects, including – but not limited to – vocabulary choice, syntactic structures, and intonation contours. Extra-linguistic factors such as time constraints, face-to-face communication, background knowledge have direct correlation with speech production in spontaneous communication. In this regard, one of the key distinctions between planned and non-planned

speech lies in the fact that the latter is mainly organized round *unintegrated*, that is, disconnected syntactic structures. The latter, otherwise called *fragmented syntax* (see, for example, Miller and Weinert 2009) appear when there is a break of the flow of surface syntax at the moment of speech. W. Chafe addresses the phenomenon of fragmented syntax in his article «Integration and involvement in speaking, writing and oral literature», emphasizing fragmented syntax arising from breaks as a property of spoken language (Chafe 1982). In our research, we call this kind of breaks «syntactic accidents», which we define as follows: *interruptions of the surface syntax in the flow of speech production, generated by pragmatic reasons and performance errors and resulting in syntactic fragments.*

Syntactic accidents, however, are far from being homogenous as regards their formal properties, there being different reasons to generate them. Based on lexico-syntactic features, we single out three main varieties of syntactic accidents in our research: *maxi-accidents, mini-accidents, and micro-accidents*, which collectively make up one whole paradigm. Respectively, all three varieties possess their distinctive lexico-syntactic features. Specifically, maxi-accidents arise when there is a break in the middle or at the beginning of the sentence, with a new sentence following, like in the following illustrations:

1. My perspective on this.. You see .. I went .. to a couple of years of undergraduate at UT,...

(interview with J. Duke)

2. I haven't found it.. In different parts, for example, in.. in different um. Employment situations it.. it may be very different.

(interview with C. Preston)

Mini-accidents arise when there is a break of the sentence, with the interrupted word or phrase (but not the sentence) repeated in the sequential segment of the sentence:

1. *Of course, since American literature is my field, I think I.. I have a lot of a deep sense of the things that shape our culture and...*

(interview with S. Kerr)

2. *If I had a chance to live anywhere, I think I would probably.., other than Austin, I would move to New York, probably for all the work opportunities.*

(interview with J. Duke)

And finally, micro-accidents arise when there is a break in the boundaries of a word in the sentence:

1. *... then it would be a very differ.. difference, then I would say that's been a complete transformation.*

(interview with Ch. Tiplady)

2. *Yeah, a lot more, so.. social expectations, more conservative views around race and migration and foreigners and all that sort of things.*

(interview with E. Russell)

However, these three basic types are not homogenous either and are further subdivided into divergent subtypes. In this article, we will be looking at the formal characteristics of maxi-accidents and the pragmatic reasons that lie behind them.

Objectives of the Analysis

It is assumed that syntactic accidents may display different formal features in spontaneous talk of representatives of different social classes: upper, middle, and low. From the wider scope of our research perspectives, it was our interest

to see what kind of syntactic accidents come up to the surface in the talk of middle-class speakers – both males and females. From the narrower scope of the research, we were aimed at carrying out a mixed quantitative-qualitative analysis of syntactic *maxi-accidents* that arise in spontaneous talk of our target social group - middle-class native speakers of English. In terms of the quantitative analysis, it was our interest to see the frequency of occurrence of different formal types of syntactic accidents. We were also curious to take a closer look at what may trigger interruptions in the talk of middle-class speakers, that is, what factors have immediate correlation with syntactic maxi-accidents.

Data and Methods of the Analysis

To obtain empirical data for the analysis, a substantial number of informal audio-interviews were conducted with middle-aged (35-60) representatives of middle class in different areas of England (Newcastle / Northumbria), Brighton / Sussex), York City / Yorkshire) and the USA (Austin / Texas), Los Angeles / California), Columbia / South Carolina). Coming from our current objectives, we analyzed 16 interviews (8 interviewees per gender), with the average duration of 6.5 minutes. The interviews were then transcribed into written texts, which became the source for the analysis. To ensure communicative equality, all interviewees were asked the same questions, which have no linguistic relevance, namely: 1. “Do you think that in the last 15 to 20 years there has been a transformation or at least a change of gender roles in your home city?”; 2. “How do you find social life in your home city?”. These two questions are contextually different and assume different content, which would provide different kinds of narrative and, respectively, a wider scope of syntactic structures in responses. In order to find out the *varying frequency* of maxi-accidents in spontaneous talk of our target social group, we implemented *statistic* analysis. Dealing with the phenomenon of syntactic accidents, we could not but implement *structural* analysis.

Outcomes of the Analysis

As indicated in the introductory part of the article, each type of syntactic accidents is not homogenous and may display different formal, lexical, and distributional properties. In this part of the article, we will lay out the main findings that came up as a result of our analysis. The overall number of the maxi-accidents turned out to be **88**. But this number will get broken down into smaller numbers as we look more closely at the different subtypes of maxi-accidents, which will be presented below.

In terms of frequency of occurrence, it is maxi-accidents with a **complete lexical change** after the interruption that stand out in spontaneous talk. The overall number of maxi-accidents with a complete lexical change is **39**, which makes up almost half the overall number of maxi-accidents. Let us take a look at the illustrations extracted from different interviews with native speakers (the interrupted fragments are indicated as italic and bold, followed by double dots):

1. ***I mean..** 'Cause remember the.. the prosecutors, they.. they worked together with the police, you know.*

(interview with P. Boham)

2. ***I haven't found it..** In different parts, for example, in.. in different um. employment situations it.. it may be very different.*

(interview with C. Preston)

3. ***It was a good..** Well, it's an interesting organization called "Meet up", and you might want to research this, "Meet up Brighton", "Meet up Newcastle", "Meet up London".*

(interview with Ch. Tiplady)

It seems obvious from the examples that the interruptions of the initial sentences (*I mean.., I haven't found it.., It was a good..*) are triggered by the *new ideas* that “pop up” in the minds of the speakers, which entails the interruption of the preceding sentence, with the latter being left “hanging”. The factor of new ideas is also justified by totally different lexical set in the sentences that follow the interrupted segments.

Maxi-accidents with a complete lexical change may also arise because of *experiencing difficulty in phrasing and changing the planning of ideas*. Otherwise stated, when a speaker finds it difficult to carry on the wording of his discourse down the syntactic “path” that he originally chose, he has to shift to a phrasing which is more likely to better express the idea meant to be conveyed. The following segment of the interview with a speaker from Newcastle would be a good illustration:

L.H. *In that, when I was a child, most of the men would be engaged in the coal mining or ship building activities which this region is still ...*

K.V. *Right.*

L.H. *... indeed, where many men were employed, and I am talking about not too long after the Second World War, when, obviously, we could have needed rebuilding and um. **there was.. um. when the employment was not a problem.***

(interview with L. Heslop)

As can be seen from the passage, the interruption arises after the predicate *there was*. Most likely, the speaker found the syntactic structure that he had in his mind inappropriate, so after some hesitation he switched to another syntactic structure and phrased his idea differently, leaving the fragment *there was* “hanging”. The valid indicator of the difficulty the speaker experiences in phrasing is the hesitation mark *um*, which appears twice in the same passage of the discourse.

Difficulty in phrasing and, as a consequence, change in planning of ideas may arise at the *very beginning of the sentence*, which serves as another case of maxi-accidents with a complete lexical change. The overall number of this kind of maxi-accidents turned out to be **26**, which is much smaller than that of the previous maxi-accidents we discussed above (39). As our data indicate, in the vast majority of cases the interrupted element is a conjunction, as exemplified in the following passages from the interviews:

1. *And..So I changed my academic focus in Ph. D working in ESL, with that in mind.*

(interview with J. Duke)

2. *And.. So I think my creative writing is a part of what helps me, helps my students write.*

(interview with S. Kerr)

3. *But.. I think it depends on the context and the field of.. of the potential.*

(interview with P. Boham)

Maxi-accidents may arise with a *partial lexical change* in the subsequent part. This normally happens when the speaker at some point realizes that he needs to insert contextually important information, so he abandons his original message and fills in the *missing information*, which, from the speaker's perspective, is needful in making a particular point. The overall number of this subtype of maxi-accidents in our data is **13**, which is twice as little as the previous case (26). The following examples will illustrate the point.

1. *In the past, men. [if the wife had a baby, she got a maternity leave], the man had to come straight to work.*

(interview with C. Preston)

2. *People pawn cars longer, people. [The real estate market has changed], people were moving more, and now they are not.*

(interview with T. England)

3. *And if one is an older single person, **it's probably harder to have an active social life as**. [than it is before] as a student.*

(interview with T. England)

In the first example, the speaker abandons the sentence at the word *men*, since she feels that contextually relevant information should be provided (*if the wife had a baby, she got a maternity leave*), and she then makes a transition back to her original statement, continuing with the abandoned word (*men*). Similar pragmatic interpretations can be offered with respect to examples 2 and 3, in which the inserted pieces of information - *the real estate market has changed, than it is before* - interrupt the speaker's narrative discourse. In all the examples, the insertions are followed by the same interrupted word (*men... the man, people... people, as... as*). This kind of syntactic performance can be explained by the fact that, though left abandoned, the aimed syntactic structure was still in the speaker's mind.

Maxi-accidents with a partial lexical change also arise when the speaker inserts *explanatory background information in the narrative*, as illustrated in the following examples:

1. *For example, there are more women today who feel it's possible,.. [and we do work within certain industries], for example, you see more women bus drivers, taxi drivers, whereas that was before, for example, in my profession, mechanics, for example, as well, you read or you see female mechanics who are working.*

(interview with Ch. Tiplady)

2. *They still have to .. children, they still have to look after the home, because **they tend to be the ones who..** [whether through nature or not] they still tend the ones that are capable a lot more or more capable or, perhaps, are more used to it.*

(interview with Ch. Tiplady)

3. ***Many large organizations..** [I used to work for the government, I was a civil servant], and they have the provision for what we call “paternity leave”.*

(interview with L. Heslop)

From the pragmatic perspective, this functional type of interruption seems to be similar to the one discussed above. The only difference being here is that in the previous case the speakers would have started their discourse with the inserted information if they had remembered it at the starting point of speech. Contrastively, in the last case the speakers make an interruption at some point in speech because they want to introduce some clarification in the discourse, making it semantically more transparent – something that has not been planned before.

The last two subtypes of maxi-accidents with partial lexical change also differ in terms of syntactic arrangement. Thus, in the former case it is the *last word* that is repeated after the insertion, whereas in the latter case *the whole interrupted fragment* gets repeated after the insertion. Compare:

People pawn cars longer, [people..] [The real estate market has changed], [people] were moving more, and now they are not.

[For example, there are more women today who feel it's possible,..] [and we do work within certain industries], [for example, you see more women] bus drivers, taxi drivers, whereas that was before, for example, in my profession, mechanics, for example, as

well, you read or you see female mechanics who are working.

In either case, however, the speakers stick to the syntactic structure that they had in mind in the beginning. This fact is very relevant to speakers' memory limitations as reflected in their syntactic performance - "limitations on performance imposed by organization of memory and bounds on memory..." (Chomsky 1970:10).

Finally, in our analysis we single out one more subtype of syntactic maxi-accidents – those with *no lexical change* in the subsequent part of the narrative. Most typically, syntactic accidents of this kind arise when a speaker runs into some *difficulty in phrasing*, especially at the beginning of the sentence, which eventually results in the repetition of the interrupted chunk. As far as the frequency of occurrence is concerned, this subtype of maxi-accidents is met rather infrequently. As our data indicate, the overall number turned out to be 10. The following examples can serve as illustrations.

1. *And... I went to.. I went to the academic program in Russian,...* (interview with J. Duke)

2. *Well, I like to.. I like to write.* (interview with S. Kerr)

3. *But I think.. I think . for most people it's probably the greatest means of socialization, to get together.* (interview with J. Greenwood)

As mentioned above, this subtype of maxi-accidents arises when a speaker is experiencing some difficulty in phrasing his ideas. Still, as compared to the above-discussed cases related to experiencing difficulties, in this particular case the difficulty is of a very temporary character, which is signaled by very short pauses between the repeated segments. We assume that the difficulty lies not in the choice of the appropriate syntactic structure, but rather in the choice of the

relevant vocabulary to carry on within the limits of the same syntactic structure.

Conclusion

Thus, within the framework of this article we have presented the outcomes of our analysis of maxi-accidents as a kind of syntactic performance in spontaneous talk. As our empirical data indicate, maxi-accidents in the spontaneous talk of middle-class speakers can take a wide range of forms based on their distributional and lexical characteristics. Different subtypes of maxi-accidents may be generated by different pragmatic reasons and syntactic competences of speakers.

In the whole paradigm of maxi-accidents it is those with a *complete change* of lexical arrangement in the subsequent narrative that stand out in frequency. They also dominate in terms of the distribution, arising both in the mid- and front positions of the sentence. Of course, the quantitative distribution of maxi-accidents across all social classes will demand further similar analyses with respect to the other social classes.

References:

1. Chafe, W. (1982) *Integration and Involvement in Speaking, Writing, and Oral Literature*. // Spoken and Written Language: Exploring Orality and Literacy. Norwood, New Jersey.
2. Chomsky, N. (1970) *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press.
3. Miller, J.; Weinert R. (2009) *Spontaneous Spoken Language. Syntax and Discourse*. Oxford: OUP.

Շարահյուսական «վթարները» միջին խավի անզխախոս լեզվակիրների հանպատրաստից խոսքում

Հայտնի է, որ հանպատրաստից խոսքում հանդիպում են շարակարգային հարաբերություններից զուրկ բազմաթիվ հատույթներ: Վերջին-

ներս այսպես կոչված շարահյուսական «վթարների» (syntactic accidents) արդյունք են, որոնք հանպատրաստից խոսքի անքակտելի մասն են կազմում: Դրանք առաջանում են տարբեր գործաբանական գործոններով պայմանավորված և տարբերվում են իրենց կառուցվածքային և բաշխումային հատկանիշներով: Հիմք ընդունելով կառուցվածքային հատկանիշները՝ մենք առանձնացնում ենք շարահյուսական «վթարների» երեք հիմնական տեսակ. 1. «մաքսի-վթարներ», 2. «մինի-վթարներ» և 3. «միկրո-վթարներ», որոնք կազմում են շարահյուսական «վթարների» մի ամբողջական հարացույց:

Սույն հոդվածի շրջանակներում հիմնական շեշտադրումը անգլախոս միջին խավի լեզվակիրների հանպատրաստից խոսքում մաքսի-վթարների վրա է: Հիմք ընդունելով Էմպիրիկ տվյալները՝ հոդվածի շրջանակներում ներկայացվում են մաքսի-վթարների հիմնական պատճառները՝ գործածության հաճախականություն, գործաբանական գործոններ, բաշխումային առանձնահատկություններ:

Received by Editorial Board 17.08.2019

Recommended for publication by Reviewers 15.10.2019

Accepted for Print 01.10.2019

Our Authors

Anne Elizabeth Redgate – MA, Ms, School of History, Classics and Archaeology, Newcastle University, UK.

E-mail: Anne.Redgate@ncl.ac.uk

Aschen Mikoyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of English Linguistics of the Faculty of Philology, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia.

E-mail: aschen@wdcbr.ru

Gabriella Elina Imposti – PhD in Philology, Professor of Russian Literature, Department of Modern Languages, Literatures and Cultures University of Bologna, Italy.

E-mail: gabriella.imposti@unibo.it

Gevorg Barseghyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Dean of the Faculty of European Languages and Communication, Yerevan State University, Armenia.

E-mail: gevorgbarseghyan@ysu.am

Karen Velyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Chair of General Linguistics and Theory of Communication, Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages and Social Sciences, Armenia.

E-mail: kvelyan@yahoo.com

Karine Abrahamyan – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor of the Chair of General Linguistics and Theory of Communication, Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages and Social Sciences, Armenia.

E-mail: abrahamyan1959@mail.ru

Kristine Harutyunyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University, Armenia.

E-mail: kristineharutyunyan@ysu.am

Marta Dąbrowska – Dr hab., Associate Professor at the Institute of English Studies, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland.

E-mail: marta.b.dabrowska@uj.edu.pl

Minoo Khamesian – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at Sanaati Noushirvani University, Iran.

E-mail: khamesian2006@yahoo.com

Rafayel Harutyunyan – MA student at English Philology Department, Yerevan State University, Armenia.

E-mail: rafayel.harutyunyan22@gmail.com

Svetlana Decheva – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor at English Linguistics Department, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Russia.

E-mail: dechevasv@gmail.com

Author Guidelines

Manuscript Submission

Manuscripts should be submitted by one of the authors of the manuscript through the online manuscript management system. Only electronic Word (.doc, .docx) files can be submitted. Only online submissions are advised strongly to facilitate rapid publication and to minimize administrative costs. Submissions by anyone other than one of the authors will not be accepted. The submitting author takes responsibility for the paper during submission and peer review. If for some technical reason submission through the online Manuscript Management System is not possible, the author can send manuscript as email attachment. Email submission: afajournal@ysu.am

Editorial Policy

Armenian Folia Anglistika is concerned with such fields as Linguistics, Literary Criticism, Translation Studies, Methodology, Ethnic Studies, Cultural History, Gender Studies, Armenian Studies and a wide range of adjacent disciplines. The articles address a wide range of interesting questions and are of consistently high quality. The reviewing is timely, knowledgeable and objective. The book reviews are very balanced and informative. The language of submission and publication is English.

Editorial Process

This journal follows strict double blind fold review policy to ensure neutral evaluation. All manuscripts are subject to peer review and are expected to meet standards of academic excellence. High quality manuscripts are peer-reviewed by minimum two peers of the same field. The reviewers submit their reports on the manuscripts along with their recommendation of one of the following actions to the Editor-in-Chief:

Recommendation regarding the paper:

1. I recommend the paper for publication
2. I recommend the paper for publication after major/minor corrections
3. I do not recommend the paper for publication

The Editor-in-Chief makes a **decision** accordingly:

1. to publish the paper
2. to consider the paper for publication after major/minor corrections

In these cases the authors are notified to prepare and submit a final copy of their manuscript with the required major/minor changes in a timely manner. The Editor-in-

Chief reviews the revised manuscript after the changes have been made by the authors. Once the Editor-in-Chief is satisfied with the final manuscript, the manuscript can be accepted. The Editor-in-Chief can also reject the manuscript if the paper still doesn't meet the requirements.

3. to reject the paper

The editorial workflow gives the Editor-in-Chief the authority to reject any manuscript because of inappropriateness of its subject, lack of quality, incorrectness, or irrelevance. The Editor-in-Chief cannot assign himself/herself as an external reviewer of the manuscript. This is to ensure a high-quality, fair, and unbiased peer-review process of every manuscript submitted to the journal, since any manuscript must be recommended by one or more (usually two) external reviewers along with the Editor in charge of the manuscript in order to accept it for publication in the journal.

Ethical Issues:

Authors cannot submit the manuscript for publication to other journals simultaneously. The authors should submit original, new and unpublished research work to the journal. The ethical issues such as plagiarism, fraudulent and duplicate publication, violation of copyrights, authorship and conflict of interests are serious issues concerning ethical integrity when submitting a manuscript to a journal for publication.

Withdrawal of Manuscripts:

The author can request withdrawal of manuscript after submission within the time span when the manuscript is still in the peer-reviewing process. After the manuscript is accepted for publication, the withdrawal is not permitted.

Armenian Folia Anglistika (AFA) Stylesheet

1. Style and Format

Use Win(Word), Sylfaen, set all margins to 25mm.

Main text	11pt, 1,15 spacing throughout, justified
Notes and references	11pt.
Title	12pt bold, centered.
Name Surname	11pt, bold, right, separated from the text by one space line.
Abstract and key words:	11pt, left, separated from the text by one space line, (up to 100 words).
Subtitles	11pt bold, separated from the text above by one space line.
Info about the author	11pt (affiliation, current position, title, email).

Titles and subtitles

E.g.: **Title of the Article**

Name Surname

Affiliation

Abstract

Key words: (5-7 word)

Introduction

The body of a manuscript opens with an introduction that presents the specific problem under study and describes the research strategy. The structure of the introduction should necessarily comprise the author's aims / tasks / objectives, the subject-matter and the material of the study. The necessary requirements run as follows:

- Exploration of the importance of the problem. The article should state how it is related to previous work in the area.
- The description of the relevant related literature. This section should review studies to establish the general area, and then move towards studies that more specifically define or are more specifically related to the research you are conducting.
- The statement of hypotheses and objectives, their correspondence to research. The present tense is used to state your hypotheses and objectives.

Conclusions

This section simply states what the researcher thinks the data mean, and, as such, should relate directly back to the problem/question stated in the introduction. By looking at only the Introduction and Conclusions sections, a reader should have a good idea of what the researcher has investigated and discovered even though the specific details of how the work was done would not be known. After moving from general to specific information in the introduction and body paragraphs, your conclusion should restate the main points of your argument.

- Pages are to be numbered consecutively throughout the manuscript (including notes).
- The numbering of notes and references should **not** be done automatically.
- Quotations should correspond exactly with the originals in wording, spelling and interior punctuation, should be italicized, and have one space line above and below. Omissions or additions within quotations are indicated by **three stops: ...**
- Quotations from scientific literature should be enclosed in inverted commas. Square brackets are used to enclose phonetic transcriptions; phonemic transcriptions are placed between slanting virgules (/). Quotations run on as part of the text are enclosed in double quotation marks, quotations within quotations in single quotation marks. **Please use the single and double quotation marks in the Anglo-Saxon way, i.e. in superscript position.** The superscript number which indicates the place in the main text to which there is a note, should follow adjacent punctuation: (“ .”¹).
- Paragraphs should be indented.
- Titles of articles and essays, etc. used in the text should be italicized. Capitalize the first word and all the principal words in English titles of publications, in divisions of works, etc.
- The words and expressions that are in the focus of analysis should be made bold.
- Avoid using contracted grammatical forms.

References:

- Short references within the text should be referred to by the name/date system. E.g.: (Bronfen 1992:330).

- The corresponding full references should be given in the list of References at the end of your article, after the Notes, separated from the list of Notes by one space line.
- No quotation marks should be used in the references.

References should be listed as indicated below:

1. Author's Surname, Initials. (year) *Article title*. // Journal or book title. / Ed. by Vol. (number). Publishing place: Publishing house.
2. Author's Surname, Initials. (year) Book title. / Tr. by..... . Publishing place: Publishing house.
3. (year) *Dictionary title*. Publishing place.
4. (year) *Article title*. / Available at: <Internet address> [Accessed month year]

Examples:

1. Svartvik, J. (2005) *A Life in Linguistics*. // The European English Messenger. / Ed. by John A. Stotesbury. Vol.14 (1). Portugal: Grafica de Coimbra.
2. Eisenstein, E.L. (1979) *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*. Cambridge: CUP.
3. Kofman, S. (1991) *Freud and Fiction*. / Tr. by Sarah Wykes. Cambridge: Polity Press.
4. (1998) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford.
5. (2012) *Conceptual Blending*. Available at:
<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Conceptual_blending> [Accessed June 2012].

Transliteration

References both in and out of text other than in English should be given in a transliterated form.

Dual Submissions

Submission of a paper to *AFA* implies that it has not been published before and that it is not being considered for publication elsewhere.

Please, send the papers to

Seda Gasparyan, Editor-in-Chief: sedagasparyan@yandex.ru

Lili Karapetyan, Managing Editor: afajournal@ysu.am