

ARTICLE

Periodization of the Armenian Language in Connection with the History of Its Native Speakers

V. V. Madoyan

Anania Shirakatsi University of International Relations, Rector, Yerevan 0025, Republic of Armenia

ABSTRACT

Modern linguistics interprets the concept of language development as the development of its grammatical factors and lexical composition, which is actually characteristic of its literary version. The concept of language development in its dialects, which is studied in the courses of dialectology and historical dialectology, is interpreted as “gradual and consistent changes” occurring in dialects, which leads to their consistent death under the influence of literary language in connection with consolidating political and economic processes. The article shows that the development of a language as a set of its dialects occurs mainly outside of connection with the development of literary norms and the development of dialects does not lead to their disappearance. The development of the language in its dialects (not a literary language!) is the real history of the development of the national language in connection with the history of its native speakers, which is shown by the example of Armenian. The problem is being raised so fundamentally for the first time and may cause serious objections, as well as become the beginning of a new approach to the study of the history of the language.

Keywords: Language Development; Literary Language Development; Dialects; Statics and Dynamics; History of the People; Language in Its Dialects

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

V. V. Madoyan, Anania Shirakatsi University of International Relations, Rector, Yerevan 0025, Republic of Armenia;
Email: E-v.madoyan@rambler.ru

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 25 July 2024 | Revised: 28 August 2024 | Accepted: 9 September 2024 | Published Online: 13 November 2024
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6944>

CITATION

Madoyan, V.V., 2024. Periodization of the Armenian Language in Connection with the History of Its Native Speakers. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5): 461–470. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6944>

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2024 by the author(s). Published by Bilingual Publishing Co. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution -NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Modern and non-modern works on the history of language and the history of the literary language do not differ much from each other, although the language is always understood in the totality of its dialects, and the literary language is a language processed by masters, standardized, which is used as an official one. The most popular scientific works in this field characterize language in general and literary language in particular in this way^[1].

This allows us to consider these provisions axiomatic.

Equally important is the definition of *language development*, on the one hand, and the *development of a literary language*, on the other. The development of the latter is sufficiently described in the relevant works on modern languages, and in general terms represents a consistently processed version by the masters, which, both in terms of content and stylistically, turned out to be the most convenient for use. In other words, the language of A.S. Pushkin in Russia or V. Teryan's language in Armenia were recognized as literary, because the texts of their works turned out to be exceptionally meaningful, and the linguistic means were exceptionally expressive. But this is not the problem of this essay. Our task is to substantiate the concept of language development (not literary language!) as the history of the development of the national language in its dialects, link it directly with the history of native speakers and show how this took place in the Armenian reality.

2. Materials and Methods

The thesis about the direct connection of the history of language with the history of the people was put forward in the century before last by more than one scientist, including European or Armenian (A. Humboldt, A.A. Shakhmatov, F.F. Fortunatov, H. Acharyan, etc.), however, this thesis was interpreted as a reflection of the history of the people in the history of the language (more – literary) through lexical composition, the mutual influence of different languages whose native speakers lived in the neighborhood, etc., but in no work is there any indication of how dialects developed in interaction within one language and in interaction with other languages.

Since it was said above that a language is a collection of all its dialects, the development of a language should be understood as the history of its dialects in the aggregate. We have already shown that dialects do not experience “constant and consistent development” if they are not in interaction^[2]. They remain static until they are partially or completely mixed. This is an interaction with other dialects and dialects of other languages.

Let's also note how one can theoretically imagine the history of a language in the history of its native speakers.

Firstly, the presence of a set of dialects, the speakers of which understand each other, indicates the formation of a people, although in the most ancient period of human development it is difficult to state national identity. Secondly, the presence of a single dialect in a certain territory indicates that its speakers are connected by a single economic and political life, and the unification of dialect differences is evidence of the presence of large cities in this territory, which play an important role in politics and economics. Thirdly, dialect differences also indicate the ethnic origin of the speakers. Thus, the Armenian dialects of the center of Asia Minor indicate that among their speakers are former ethnic Cappadocians, Assyrians, etc. Fourthly, the spread of dialects indicates the political importance of a given ethnic group in a given territory, and the mixing of dialects with dialects of another language indicates the assimilation of one language by another. Fifth, large differences in the vocabulary and grammar of dialects indicate a political (and, accordingly, economic) gap between them or geographical remoteness from each other. If there are few differences, then the ties were close.

Our statements do not in the least deny the existing concepts of the connection between the history of language and the history of the people. On the contrary, they put them on a broader basis and collectively allow for more convincing conclusions. Real scientific periodization means combining the results obtained in the course of actual language research with the results of research similar to current ones.

The scientific periodization of the Armenian language was discussed in our linguistics in the middle of the last century, as a result of which the following concept was formulated: the pre-written (or ancient) period of the development of the Armenian language^[3] and “I. The Ancient Armenian

¹ *Grabar* is an ancient Armenian written language (used as such until the middle of the 19th century), which is still used for worship in the Armenian Holy Apostolic Church, which adheres to the old Orthodoxy.

period (V-XI centuries). During this period, three stages are distinguished: a) the “classical Grabar¹” (V century), b) the “postclassical Grabar” (VI-VII centuries) and c) the “pre-Middle Armenian stage” (VIII-XI centuries). II. The Middle Armenian period (XII-XVII centuries). During this period, two stages were identified: a) Cilician normalization (XII-XIV centuries) and Ashkharabarization (XV-XVI centuries). III. The New Armenian period (from the XVII century to the present). There are three stages in this period: a) early New Armenian, or early Ashkharabar (from the XVII century to the middle of the XIX century), b) two-branched national Ashkharabar (from the middle of the XIX century to 1920) and c) the stage of the modern national New Armenian language (from 1920 to the present)”^[4]. It is not difficult to determine that there is a confusion of linguistic development with the development of literary language, which is typical, as indicated, for all, at least, European linguistics and serves as the basis for new research.

Strabo² records that “Armenia, formerly a small country, was increased by the wars of Artaxia and Zariadria (in the quotes, Strabo’s terminology. – *Ed.*). They were initially the generals of Antiochus the Great, and subsequently, after his defeat, became kings (the first - king of Sophene, Akisen, Odomantida and some other regions, and the last - king of the country around Artaxata); they expanded their possessions together, cutting off part of the regions of the surrounding nationalities, namely: they captured from the Medes Caspian, Favnitida and Basoropeda; from the Iberians they captured the foothills of Pariadr, Khorzen and Gogaren, which is located on the other side of the Kir River; from the Khalibs and Mosineks they captured Karenitida and Xerksena, which borders or is part of Lesser Armenia; from the Kataons they captured Akilisena and the area around the Antitaur; finally, they captured from the Syrians Taronitida. Therefore, all

these nationalities now speak the same language”^[5]³.

If the Armenian language begins even with Strabo, and not with the III millennium BC⁴, it should be noted that it does not have any real factors that could establish the belonging of a dialect to a certain language or its speakers to a certain ethnic group, as they do not exist today. The only factor that allowed Strabo to write that Armenians lived in Greater and Lesser Armenia is that the population speaking these dialects *understood* each other⁵. Apparently, Strabo himself spoke Armenian, since he was born in Amasya⁶ (Asia Minor) and communicated with Armenians, which is why he distinguished speakers of the dialects he indicated from other peoples, and this is more likely. It is natural to assume that the transition from one dialect to another, neighboring, was not difficult for their speakers, but if Strabo understood the language of all Armenians, then it can be assumed that the Armenian dialects were not particularly different from each other, even those spoken by assimilated Armenians, despite the dispersion of dialects over a large area territories. This indicates that by the time of Strabo, the Armenian dialects were already formed systems that had, in general, common grammatical structures and lexical composition.

Regarding this period, it is difficult to determine the boundaries of dialect division, as well as the features of these dialects themselves, since, naturally, Armenian, for example, former Khalibs, should have been different from Armenian of former Mosikens or Kataons (Strabo’s terminology is used here), as now the English of the French differs from the English of the Hindus. This is the very period that can be called the period of the formation of the Armenian people, when national consciousness developed as a result of communication in one language that is understandable to each other, albeit partially differing in areas. National identity today includes not only language, but also religion, history, culture,

²Strabon (64/63 BC - 23/24 AD) was an ancient Greek geographer and historian.

³It is difficult to assume that the entire population of these territories began to speak Armenian only because they found themselves within the borders of the Armenian kingdoms. Strabo himself testifies to the influence of the Armenian ethnic group on the political, military and everyday reality of neighboring peoples: “The Mosch country ... is divided into three parts: one part is ruled by the Colchians, the other by the Iberians, and the third is owned by the Armenians”^[5]; “The Iberian plain is inhabited by a population more inclined to towards agriculture and peace, which dresses in the Armenian and Median way”^[6]; “They (Albanians) fight both on foot and on horseback in light and heavy weapons like the Armenians”^[7].

⁴The issues of Armenian ethno- and glottogenesis have been considered since the third millennium BC. ^[8-12]

⁵Compare the remark of the same Strabo: “They (Albanians) have 26 languages, so they do not easily communicate with each other”^[13]. Strabo’s lack of a clear geographical connection between the Albanians and a certain territory suggests that, perhaps, he is talking about the ancestors of modern Dagestan peoples.

⁶From 281 BC to 183 BC Amasya was the capital of the Greek Kingdom of Pontus. In 63 BC, it was conquered by Rome. The city was inhabited by Greeks and Armenians. The latter made up the majority until 1915.

psychology, everyday life, etc., but in the ancient period, of course, language was the main thing, since other factors were too insignificant. He became the basis of the national association.

Naturally, each language periodization begins with a pre-written stage, the most “dark” from a historical point of view. This period can only be judged by retrospective comparative studies, which always raise doubts, because the methods of historical reconstruction are constantly being improved and new data are constantly emerging. At the same time, from the point of view of the spread of the Armenian language, the pre-written period should be considered quite significant. No matter how modern historiography characterizes the issues of Armenian ethnogenesis, the Armenian substrate, whether it was Chaldean, Urartian or Hayas proper, whether it was mixed Armenian with the named peoples, it was not only the most widespread, but also politically quite strong, which allowed it to create an empire in the I century BC. However, because of the unsuccessful wars with Rome, which lasted only a few decades. By the beginning of the Armenian Empire, the Armenian language was widespread throughout Transcaucasia and not only around Mount Ararat and Lake Van, the territory that is considered the cradle of Armenian civilization. Scientists who attribute the Armenian language to one of the branches of the Iranian group of the Indo-European family^[14, 15], as a rule, relied on this chronological cross-section and pointed to a large lexical group of Iranisms in Armenian - both with a common Indo-European root and borrowings, which was also due to the common political life: the Armenian kings considered the Persian Shahinshah the king of kings, and the Armenian feudal lords themselves often ascended to the Parthian throne or subjugated Persia (the Yervandids –323–200 BC, the Artashesids – 190 BC–14): in the absence of national identity, administrative and state associations played a decisive role.

The conquests of the Armenian king Tigran the Great (95–55 BC), who became the king of kings, dramatically increased the role of the Armenian ethnic group in Asia Minor. The conquests were followed by resettlement, in which, of course, the emperor himself was interested, since thereby a certain area was permanently assigned to him, and the Armenian population itself, since it acquired not only new territories, but also more favorable living conditions already provided by the local population. Cappadocians, Assyrians,

Illyrians, Lycians, Thracians, Macedonians, maybe Pelasgians and others lived on the territory of Asia Minor, which turned out to be in the zone of Armenian conquests^[16, 17]. This is the stage of the *first advance* of the Armenian ethnic group to the western part of Asia Minor.

The studies of the classic of Armenian linguistics H. Acharyan, according to the comparative methodology, indicate that Armenian is an independent branch of the Indo-European proto-language^[18, 19]; in the period under review, it was the formed language of the formed people.

The assimilation of the local population by the Armenian ethnic group led to the emergence of new dialects, the grammatical and lexical corpus of which consisted of Armenian (mainly) and local elements, but “it is necessary to take into account ... all varieties of this language (territorial, social, stylistic) in relationships and in changes in these relationships”^[20]. These were Armenian dialects moving compactly to the west. The fact that the Armenian ethnic group was predominant in this area is evidenced by the subsequent periods of the political history of Asia Minor.

Today, judging the spoken language of the peoples of the pre-written epochs is like arguing who and when drove along a well-traveled road, however, data on the Armenian dialects of A.Gharibyan indicate that the Armenian dialects of the western part of Asia Minor have a greater number of vowels and consonants than the dialects of the Armenian Highlands proper, from which one can assume (but not assert!), that the sounds outside the Armenian dialects of the center of the country belonged to those dialects that merged with the Armenian ones^[21].

According to G.B. Jahukyan’s research, by the beginning of the 20th century, from which Armenian dialectology actually begins, the Armenian dialects of the western part of Asia Minor no longer cover large areas^[22], but they persist until 1915, reflecting the historical way of previous eras. Compare the data on vocalism and consonantism of the Syrian, Rhodian and Cilician Armenian dialects, on the one hand, and Van, Yerevan, on the other^[23]: the predominance of the sound composition in the former indicates their “mixed origin”.

The importance of this stage in the history of Armenian glottogenesis, however, is not only in the spread of the Armenian language to the western part of Asia Minor. Tigran the Great built large cities that bore the name Tigranakert (as

the facts show, the founders did not give names to the cities; they were called by the people: Tigranakert – “the city built by Tigran”, and there were several cities with that name). The foundation of large cities was, of course, of military and strategic importance, it was aimed at the development of crafts, trade, social and political life, but they also played a very significant role from a linguistic point of view. In the cities where representatives of different dialects moved, there was a mixture of dialects, which led to the development of the Armenian language. The urban coin became to a certain extent exemplary for the rest of the population, i.e., The appearance of large cities played a unifying role for the language, at the same time it was lexically enriched, since it reflected in its vocabulary the entire linguistic arsenal of several Armenian dialects. From a linguistic point of view, as indicated, this was the period of formation of the Armenian people through a single language, and then a single linguistic thinking, which is why the Armenian ethnic group continued to prevail in the area that Tigran the Great ceded to Rome.

Due to the fact that urban koine became an example for the population of nearby regions, dialect groups began to form around cities as language systems with a single grammatical structure and a single lexical composition, i.e., the stage of formation of Armenian ethno- and glottogenesis is followed by the stage of dialect development. It is no coincidence that modern Armenian dialects are named after the cities that were the economic, and more often the political centers of the regions: Mush, Van, Sasun, Bayazet, Karin (Arzrum), Kars, Ayrarat, etc. This period continues up to the VIII – IX centuries, since at this stage of our history there were no fundamental changes in the geographical location of the Armenian dialects.

Speaking about the development of dialects, it should be established that this means that If lexical neologisms or borrowings penetrate into the speech of native speakers of a spoken language, while grammar remains unchanged, it is difficult to state linguistic development, since grammar is the main core of language independence. In this regard, it is difficult to assume the progress of dialects until the middle of the twentieth century, although even after the advent of radio and television, they mostly retain their grammatical and phonetic features. In this regard, the development of dialects, or rather, the development of the language in its dialects occurs, as noted, for example, in large cities, where a

coin– crossing of dialects is formed. Such cities in medieval Armenia were Arzrum, Kars, Mush, Erzna, Bitlis, Ani, Yerevan, as well as Constantinople (Istanbul), which, according to various sources, was inhabited by up to 100 thousand Armenians even under the Greeks. During the assimilation of some peoples by others, there is also a crossing of dialects, the emergence of new types of colloquial speech, which also means the development of the language.

Our historiography quite reasonably believes that the creation of the Armenian script by Mesrop Mashtots with the assistance of King Vramshapukh and Catholicos Sahak Partev in 405 AD was dictated by political motives, but it was dictated by the formed national identity of the Armenian people, and the dramatic development of Armenian writing and culture in the subsequent period is proof of this. In parallel with the formation of dialects, the stage of written fixation of the Armenian language begins, i.e., the beginning of the perception of some text as exemplary throughout the territory of the Armenian population (200–220 thousand square kilometers). The language of Ayrarat, the central regions of Armenia (around Mount Ararat), which were the possessions of the Armenian kings Arshakuni, was adopted as a written language.

In 387, the first partition of Armenia took place between Byzantium and Persia. It coincided with the stage of formation of dialect groups and led to their differentiation into two dialects: Western and Eastern Armenian. However, this process is connected not only with political events, especially in such a historical period when relations even between neighboring villages (not only cities and regions!) they were very limited in nature. Most likely, this was due to the strengthening of the Persian substrate in Eastern Armenia, which was reflected in the lexical composition of the Eastern Armenian dialects, and with the strengthening of the Greek substrate in Western Armenia, which was reflected in the lexical composition of the Western Armenian dialects.

The Armenian language in Asia Minor began to spread in the period from the VIII to the XIII centuries, when political life in the Byzantine Empire was dictated by the Armenian feudal lords^[24, 25]. In 711–713, the first Armenian emperor Vardan reigned on the Byzantine throne, he was succeeded by the Armenian emperors Anastas (713–715) and Theodoros (715–717) (since the latter two are mentioned only in Greek chronicles, their names are given in the Greek

interpretation). In 813–820, Levon V. wore the Byzantine crown from 867 to 1056. Byzantium was ruled by the Macedonian (Armenian) dynasty, under which the country reached its highest power. They were followed by the Komnenos (1057–1059, 1081–1185, in Trebizond in 1204–1461). The influence of the Armenian ethnic group was so great that Armenian speech became common in the emperor's palace. This is evidenced by the names of the Armenian military leaders of the empire, which Greek writers recorded in the Armenian sound. For example, the outstanding Byzantine Armenian commander Mlekh is referred to in Greek letters as Mlekh *Mendz* (arm. The Great One). However, before and after the Armenian emperors, Armenians were usually the rulers of the country. It was during this period that the second advance of the Armenian ethnic group to the west of Asia Minor, to the Mediterranean Sea, was observed, which was also accompanied by the assimilation of the local population, since Armenians formed the majority.

In the XI century, an independent Cilician Armenian kingdom was created on the southwestern outskirts of Asia Minor (1080–1424), where a lot of work was carried out to unify the Armenian script, which, on the one hand, played a significant role in further rationing Grabar as an Armenian literary language, on the other hand, normalized the spoken language as the language of state administration. According to Armenian scholars, “favorable conditions are being created in Cilicia to strengthen the position of the written “middle (medieval. – V.M.) Armenian language.” The spoken language of Cilicia was the variant that was close to the average Armenian of early monuments”^[26]. It did not correspond to any of the Armenian dialects completely, but was a mixture of the spoken languages of the settlers and was quite close to the average Armenian of historical Armenia.

The Persian influence on the development of the Armenian language in its dialects was manifested in a large number of loanwords. Basically, it was household vocabulary, as well as political vocabulary, because the political life of Armenia was still closely connected with the Persian state from the very beginning of its existence. However, these were not new concepts, as well as concepts combining several conceptual components, indicating the development of linguistic thinking and thinking in general.

The Greek influence in Western Armenia has a completely different character. As shown by the historical and philosophical works of M. Khorenatsi, V. V.^[27], D. Anakht, the end of the V–beginning of the VI century^[28], P. Buzanda, the end of the IV–beginning of the V century^[29], geographical and mathematical studies of An.Shirakatsi, 610–685^[30], etc., in the Armenian language, Greek vocabulary is not so much borrowed as calculated, i.e., conscious word formation occurs, first at the level of the intellectual elite, and then at the level of the spoken language.

Thus, during this period, on the one hand, the spread of the Armenian language and the formation of new dialects continued, because, as indicated, assimilating other tribes, the Armenians borrowed both separate vocabulary and pronunciation, on the other hand, enriched their vocabulary at the expense of Greek and Persian. This is *the second stage of the spread of the Armenian language*. At the same time, Grabar is losing its “living positions”, because the dialects that served as its basis have lost their political role: the Arshakuni dynasty, which owned Airarat, has disappeared from the historical scene. As a result of the development of folklore, the appearance of works by individual writers, which, being passed from mouth to mouth, although constantly “corrected” by singers and storytellers, the formation of the New Armenian national language began, which later became literary.

From the 14th century, with the conquest of Asia Minor by the Ottomans, a *period of Turkish influence* began. In the speech of the Armenian population, at the dialect level, words used in Turkish appear, such as *çamaşır* (linen), *çağ* (time period), *çay* (river), *göl* (lake), *gözlük* (glasses), *hava* (air), *kafa* (head), *kelle* (head of sugar, cheese), *kör* (blind), *köşe* (corner), *saat* (time, hour), *şeker* (sugar), etc., (all of them, except *gözlük*, are of Iranian or Arabic origin). They are beginning to replace adequate Armenian lexical units, as the Turkish authorities sought to ban Armenian speech throughout the distribution area. However, the Turkish ethnic group was culturally backward, Armenians were needed to support the formation of the Turkish language, culture, architecture, for the development of the economy and political life. Thus, the legislator of the modern Turkish literary language, and in parallel the Azerbaijani one, is the Armenian

⁷Hakob Martayan (1895–1979) was an outstanding linguist of Armenian origin. Besides Armenian and Turkish, he knew nineteen other languages. During the First World War he served as a translator. He was arrested on charges of secret contacts with the British and taken to Damascus to the commander of the seventh division of the Ottoman Army, Mustafa Kemal. Kemal was amazed by the

linguist Hakob Martayan⁷, nicknamed Ataturk Dilyachar.

This period covers several hundred years (from the XIV century up to 1915). It is characterized not only by the Turkish influence on the language: unlike the Byzantines and Persians, the Turks established their full control over public services and tried to seize the initiative in the economy. The Turks also sought to win by numbers (and even before the middle of the XVIII century. 2/3 of the population of Asia Minor were Armenians and Greeks), therefore, they developed polygamy at the expense of the local population and forced them to feed their families, which could not but give rise to the liberation movement, which continues to this day.

Due to the constant military operations on the territory of historical Armenia, the population has migrated to peaceful places since the first century BC. Since the 14th century, the exodus of the Armenian population from the ancestral lands has been on a large scale. The main stream is moving towards Russia and Poland. The settlers mainly consisted of the communities of Shirak, since the capital of Armenia, Ani, was destroyed in 1319 as a result of a terrible earthquake. The population of this city alone, according to travelers, was more than 100,000 people. It was one of the five largest cities in the world^[31].

Armenians lived in a separate diaspora in Moscow, Astrakhan, Lviv, Crimea, etc. Sometimes they founded new cities themselves. These include Armavir, Armyansk, Novy Nakhichevan, Kizlyar, etc. in Russia, Vani in Georgia.

The other stream was heading east. Especially large colonies of Armenians were established in India. The first Armenian periodical “Azdarar” (1794) was published in Madras.

However, the Armenian language in foreign territories lasted no more than 30–40 years, if there were no Armenian churches and schools attached to them. In the latter case, the Armenians continued to speak their native language. After the revolution of 1917, the separation of the school from the church took place, which led to the complete loss of native speech by the Armenians of Russia, although Armenian “traces” still remain in the spoken language of the local pop-

ulation: *panir* (cheese), *badrijan* (eggplant), borrowed by Armenians from Persian, *tyrtyr* (*թրթր* - “caterpillar”) and others. The period of narrowing of the dialect field of the Armenian language begins. And it is accompanied by the disappearance of entire dialects and dialect groups, which is especially intensified during the period of increasing Turkish oppression.

Russian Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich found an opportunity to meet with Karabakh (Armenian) merchants in 1660, to present him with a throne encrusted with precious diamonds, hoping for help in liberating the motherland (the throne is now in the Russian Museum in Moscow). Help was promised, and Russophile patriotic work began throughout the Armenian language distribution area.

Russian troops took Arzrum, which is located 200 kilometers from the Turkish capital Ankara, in 1828 as a result of the Russo-Turkish war. The war was also fought on the Balkan Peninsula, but the Russian army achieved great success in Transcaucasia thanks to the powerful help of the local population. The withdrawal of Russian troops in connection with the peace treaty had disastrous consequences for the Armenians, which significantly strengthened the liberation movement. History repeated itself in 1878 and 1916.

In 1828, as a result of the Russian-Persian War (1826–1828), Eastern Armenia joined Russia. The period of Russian influence on the development of the Armenian language begins, which continues until the Republic of Armenia gained full independence (1990).

During the 19th century, political vocabulary and artistic expression flourished in Eastern Armenia. Armenian educational institutions are being established in large cities inhabited by Armenians, Tiflis (now Tbilisi), Baku, Gandzak (now Ganja), Shushi, Nakhichevan. The Lazarev Institute of Oriental Languages is being created in Moscow. Speakers of different dialects are moving to these cities, as a result of which new urban coins are being created. Thus, the Tiflis koine is a mixture of different dialects (both Eastern and Western Armenian) with the Artsakh (Karabakh) dialect. The Baku koine was a mixture of Eastern Armenian dialects with the dialects of Lowland and Mountainous Artsakh (Karabakh).

Armenian’s knowledge and realized that he needed to be used for the benefit of the Turkish nation. Thanks to Kemal’s patronage, Martayan conducted a study of the Turkish language as the chief specialist and Secretary General of the Turkish Language Association in Ankara. In 1934, when according to the “Law on Surnames” Armenian surnames were banned, Kemal offered him the surname Dilyachar (“discoverer of the language”). A. Martayan was the editor-in-chief of the Turkish encyclopedia. The author of the study “Language, Languages and Linguistics”, which describes the formation of the Armenian literary language at various stages of development.

The peculiarity of this period is the formation of the Eastern Armenian literary language as a result of the rapid development of Armenian fiction.

The Russian influence on the Armenian language coincided with the beginning of the scientific and technical revolution in the world, and in the Soviet period with the rapid development of science, technology, and education in Armenia. It manifested itself:

- in enriching the vocabulary at the expense of Russian vocabulary, which has no analogues in Armenian;
- in enriching the Armenian language with borrowings of scientific and technical terminology from the Russian language or through Russian, as well as by calculus;
- in the formation of Armenian political terminology by calculus^[32].

After the Armenian Genocide in the Ottoman Empire (1915–1923), the functioning of the Armenian language ceased in Western Armenia on the territory of more than 160 thousand square kilometers. The spread of Armenian diasporas in Europe and America (USA, Uruguay, Canada, etc.) begins. Due to the quantitative superiority of the local population, the Armenians are beginning to lose their national identity, the language includes constructions of Romano-Germanic languages, in particular, the verbal temporary constructions of the English language are used. So, in the Armenian language: *Փարիզին եկած էմ; արդր մասին շատ անհանգստացած էմ* (perfect forms).

Speakers of Western Armenian dialects who migrated to Eastern Armenia continue to speak their own dialect, despite living in separate islands inside settlements – speakers of other Armenian dialects. The mixing of dialects occurs only in cities – administrative or economic centers, but families often continue to speak their original dialect. The situation has not changed so far, despite the continuous spread of radio and television.

After Armenia's independence, the period of English influence on the Armenian language begins, which is due to the general direction of world integration processes.

Thus, the periodization of the Armenian language as a set of its dialects in connection with the history of its speakers can generally be represented as follows:

1. The ancient period of the spread of Armenian dialects, the development of new dialects and dialect groups (III

millennium BC – 1st century AD); the first advance of Armenian dialects to the western part of Asia Minor. The stage of formation of the Armenian people on the basis of a common language;

2. The period of Greek and Persian influence, the beginning of the formation of dialects and dialect groups of the Armenian language: the Western and Eastern Armenian groups (1st century AD - XIII century.), which coincided with the period of written fixation of the Armenian speech and the beginning of the formation of the ancient Armenian literary language. The second or Byzantine period of the spread of the Armenian language (VIII–XIII centuries), the development of new dialect groups in Cilicia and on the western outskirts of Asia Minor;
3. The period of Turkish influence in Western Armenia (XIV–XIX centuries). The beginning of the exodus of large flows of the Armenian population from their native lands. The beginning of the narrowing of the dialect areas of the Armenian language.
4. The period of Russian influence in Eastern Armenia (XIX–XX centuries). The development of political and fiction literature. The development of Western and Eastern Armenian literary languages;
5. The period of the disappearance of Western Armenian dialects and the formation of diasporas abroad (since 1915). Enriching the Eastern Armenian literary language with scientific terminology at the expense of its own language resources;
6. The development of the Armenian language in the general process of globalization of modern society (XXI century).

As the Armenian material shows, the history of the people in all its details, in connection with its political vicissitudes, reflects a living language – dialects in statics and dynamics. The expansion or narrowing of the distribution area, mixing with dialects of other peoples and their assimilation, the formation of separate dialects around large cities, the mixing (development) of dialects in them, the influence of other languages (positive or negative) is a real mirror that can characterize any language and the history of its speakers. Dialects persist at any stage of language development, even in conditions of functioning within other dialect groups – contrary to established scientific forecasts.

The development of a literary language is a process

parallel to the history of dialects and is not directly related to it.

Funding

This study was carried out without external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement

The data confirming the results of the work are contained in the literature used. They are new and are the result of inductive and deductive generalizations. They can be used in similar studies, which will be another confirmation of them.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Vakhtel, N.M., Kozelskaja, N.A., 2016. Introduction to linguistics. Voronezh, Russia. pp. 23–25.
- [2] Madoyan, V.V., 2022. The formation of a literary norm as a result of mixing variations of oral and written speech. *Scientific reports of the higher school. Philological Sciences.* 2022(2), 10–17.
- [3] Kapantsyan, G.A., 1961. History of the Armenian language. The ancient period. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–362.
- [4] Jahukyan, G.B., 1956. Issues of periodization of the history of the Armenian language. Yerevan. Armenia. p. 102.
- [5] Strabo, 1964. Geography. In 17 books. – Moscow, Russia. p. 498.
- [6] Strabo, 1964. Geography. In 17 books. – Moscow, Russia. p. 473.
- [7] Strabo, 1964. Geography. In 17 books. – Moscow, Russia. p. 476.
- [8] Sarksyian, G.K., Hakobyan, T.K., Abrahamyan, A.G., 1980. The history of the Armenian people: from ancient times to the present day. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–460.
- [9] Trever, K.V., 1953. Essays on the cultural history of ancient Armenia (II century BC-IV century AD). Moscow-Leningrad, Russia. pp. 3–300.
- [10] Jahukyan, G.B., 1987. The history of the Armenian language of the pre-written period. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–748.
- [11] Movsisyan, A., 2005. Armenia in the third millennium before Christ (according to written sources). Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–55.
- [12] Petrosyan, A., 2018. The problem of Armenian origins. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–256.
- [13] Strabo, 1964. Geography. In 17 books. – Moscow, Russia, p. 476.
- [14] Meillet, A., 1936. Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique. Vienne. Austria. pp. I- XX-116.
- [15] Meillet, A., 2012. Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes. Cambridge. pp. I-XXIV-434.
- [16] Jahukyan, G.B., 1970. Armenian and ancient Indo-European languages. Yerevan, Armenia. p. 174
- [17] Jahukyan, G.B., 1987. The history of the Armenian language of the pre-written period. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–748.
- [18] Acharyan, H., 1941. History of the Armenian language, vol. 1. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 12–541.
- [19] Acharyan, H., 1951. History of the Armenian language, vol. 2. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 26–144.
- [20] Jahukyan, G.B., 1956. Issues of periodization of the history of the Armenian language. Yerevan, Armenia. p. 101.
- [21] Garibyan, A., 1937. Introduction of the research of the history of Armenian language. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 213–215, 223, 226.
- [22] Jahukyan, G.B., 1972. Introduction of Armenian dialectology. Yerevan, Armenia, map between. pp. 142–143.
- [23] Garibyan, A., 1937. Introduction of the research of the history of Armenian language. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 213–215, 223, 226.
- [24] Kazhdan, A.P., 1976. Armenians as part of the ruling class of the Byzantine Empire in the XI-XII centuries. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–170.
- [25] Kazhdan, A.P., 1974. The social composition of the ruling class of Byzantium in the XI—XII centuries. Moscow, Russia. pp. 3–292.
- [26] Mkrtychyan, E.S., Khachatryan, L.M., 2016. The course of the history of the Armenian language. Yerevan. Armenia. p. 132.
- [27] Khor, 1913. Movsisi Khorenatsvoy. History of Armenians (Old Armenian). Tppghis, Georgia.
- [28] Anh, 1960. Davit Anhaght. The Limits of Philosophy (Old Armenian), Yerevan, Armenia.
- [29] Buz, 1913. Phaustos' Byzantine. History of Armenian

(Old Armenian). Tiflis. Georgia.

- [30] Shir, 1940. Anania Shirakatsi. Astronomy. Yerevan, Armenia. pp. 3–44.
- [31] Hakobyan, T.K., 1982. The History of Ani, from 1045 until its Collapse and Desolation. Yerevan, Armenia. p. 18.
- [32] Sevak, G., 1948. The short history of the modern Armenian language. Yerevan. Armenia, pp. 12–140.