ARTICLE

Transformation as a Principle of Language Development
(Based on the Material of the Armenian Language)

Lalik Khachatryan [1]*, *Margush Mirumyan* [2], *Sirarpi Karapetyan* [3]

[1] *Linguistics Research Laboratory of Armenian State Pedagogical University after Kh. Abovyan*

[2] *Department of Mother Tongue and Its Teaching Methodology of Armenian State Pedagogical, University after Kh. Abovyan*

[3] *Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University*

ABSTRACT

Transformation, if all the changes that occur in a language are concentrated in it, represents the "living spirit" of its structure, which allows a huge array of all kinds of names and designations to create a dynamic world of human communication. The term has become especially used since the middle of the last century, after the publication of N. Chomsky's book "Syntactic Structures", however, it is used more in relation to syntactic structures, while not only word formation and form formation, but also syntax itself with its units are a product of transformations. If the latter are considered at the level of synchrony, they find a place in descriptive grammar and lexicology and are defined no more than units of the language system. If they are considered in diachrony, they clearly indicate the development of language and linguistic thinking. Since this is the first time the problem is posed in this way, the paper attempts to show the fruitfulness and importance of studying transformations in the history of one language, using the example of Armenian, described from the very beginning of the 5th century AD. The results, we think, are of great interest to the philosophy of language and the science of the development of thinking.

Keywords: Transformation; Language Development; Armenia Language; Period of Development; Diachronic History of Words

1. Introduction

From the ancient periods of the history of linguistics, it is known that a large place was given to grammatical transformation in rhetorical exercises, and during the formation of stylistics as a separate scientific branch, transformation takes on a key role.

The concept of transformation thoroughly entered the everyday vocabulary of linguists after the publication of N. Chomsky's work "Syntactic Structures" (1957) [1], in which syntactic transformations associated with the expression of various semantic nuances were called transformation, or generation, and the corresponding theory - transformational, or generative grammar, although similar transformations were described earlier by the teacher [2]. At the same time, it should be noted that the transformation, or change, or formation of words or phrases, sentences has been considered in linguistic works since the beginning of the XIX century. If any change is considered a transformation, which corresponds to the meaning of this term, then it can be represented as a simple formula $X1 \pm yn = X2$, where X1 is a phoneme, syllable, word, phrase, sentence, paragraph, yn – any type of complement to X1, resulting in a new unit of type X1, i.e. X2, which differs from X1 only by yn. Thus, in the Armenian language, տն–նակ ("small house") is formed from տունն ("house"), i.e. a "small house", which is a transformation of տունն by adding a diminutive sign. If in this case the transformation leads to lexical changes, then the transformation տունն into տւան leads to grammatical (formative) ones. In this way, we can agree that transformation reflects the facts of objective reality, since it captures the connections between words - the connections of objects and phenomena of objective reality in linguistic thinking.

Modern language science is mostly engaged in the search for convenient modifications to describe synchronous transformations, in the search for their systematic description, while in diachronic terms, the development of transformations indicates the development of both language and linguistic thinking, because hypothetically it can be assumed that a language in which there are no grammatical or lexical transformations is nominative, "appellative." It begins to show "signs of life" when transfor-mations occur in it, perhaps first grammatical (declension, conjugation), and then lexical (this is a matter of separate and not one study). Purely abstract reasoning already shows that if a language forms Հայք ("Armenia") from the word հայ ("Armenian"), its speakers perceive the concept of territory, moreover, the territory inhabited by Armenians. If the word գարուն ("spring") forms գարնանային ("spring"), it means that a native speaker is able to perceive an object as an attribute.

In modern linguistics, the question of transformation is considered within the framework of formal and hidden grammar. Thus, according to S. Sheyranyan, "there are two types of hidden forms: absolutely zero and zero in importance, but in the text they perform the same roles that the units of formal grammar perform" [3]. In both cases, the hidden grammar is described in order to identify concepts (including their nuances) that have a communicative meaning, which in turn suggests that the units of language we are considering are conditioned by practical necessity. For scientists who perceive language as a means of communication, such a conclusion is not something special.

Close attention should be paid to the fact that the transformation terms are always binary, and in accordance with modern approaches to language, the generating base (word, phrase, etc.) can be called zero, while the derivative turns out to be "burdened" with a certain component, which is indicated by the conditional sign yn both with a positive and with a negative sign, because, for example, in word formation, both the addition and exclusion of some component may take place. Thus, in Armenian, սեր – սիրություն, but սիրել – սեր is the formation of a noun from a noun and a verb. However, the generating form may already be a derivative, so further, in order to avoid inaccuracies, we exclude the use of the null form.

The study of the development of transformations in line with the development of linguistic thinking can be implemented in the description of the history of ancient languages, using more of their written period, although this does not at all mean abandoning the use of pre-written sources.

2. Methods and Materials

Any linguistic research presupposes answers to the

questions what?, how? and why? In this case, the answer to the first question is ready: these are transformations, although it is clear that it is simply impossible to explore all historical experiences in a work that only poses a problem. In this regard, we will limit ourselves to certain vocabulary and syntactic structures.

The answer to the second question is of great importance for obtaining objective results: how? It would seem that the methods of historical research should be applied first of all, in particular, the comparative historical method in its internal reconstruction, especially since all subsequent theories and research were somehow based on the connection of transformations with form and content. However, in this work we consider it necessary to use the rules of substantival grammar developed by G.B. Jahukyan in his famous monograph [4], because language is a reflection of a substance that is constantly changing, more towards complexity, and complexity requires its expression. In other words, if we consider the pair տաք – տաքություն ("warm – warmth"), in addition to the correspondence of form and content to each other, we are interested in the semantics of the transition and the lexical limit that this transition is limited to in a certain period and which expands in another period.

The method of comparing the initial and final points of transformation makes it possible to evaluate the neologism not only from the point of view of meaning, but also from the point of view of style. It becomes possible to determine the probable chronology of the transformation. Modern theoretical stylistics has not yet determined the real factors that make it possible to assess the stylistic value of a word outside the text or in the functional sphere. As long as modern linguistic science does not offer mechanisms for determining the stylistic significance of the transformation process, we are guided by the following principle: the stylistic value of a compound formed as a result of transformation should be determined by context.

Modern linguistics does not have data on when word formation began in a particular language and how, since

the theories about the origin of language themselves are controversial, but the very fact of the emergence of word formation reflexes in consciousness is a big step in the development of language and linguistic consciousness.

In the Armenian language of the beginning of the written era, derivative lexical formations are already fixed, but they are strengthened due to the Greek influence.

The first written monuments already record the following types of word formation:

- adjectives: դաշտ – դաշտային, գույն – գունավոր, անձն – անձնավոր,

- substitutes: կարմիր – կարմրություն, բաց – բացություն,

- verb formation: ջուր – ջրել, երգ – երգել, թառ – թառել, գունդ – գնդել,

- formation of adverbs: ում – ումզին, բաց – բացաբար, կույր – կուրորեն, etc.

Nouns from adjectives are formed in the language of historical and philosophical writings. For example, in the "History of Armenia" by M. Khorenatsi: նշան – նշանավոր, մարմին, մարմնական, Հայկ - հայկական, գովք – գովելի [5]. Eznik Kohbatsi has similar words: հայր – հայրենի, կեանք – կենարար, կամք – կամեցող, զորք – զորավար [6], David Anakht has: ցալ – անցալ, անձն – անձնավոր, աստղ – աստղային, արարիչ – արարչական, արեգակն – արեգակնային [7], etc.

A careful study of the material shows that adjectives are not formed from all nouns. These are primarily the names of objects and objects related to everyday life. So, the գույն in Grabar has several meanings, but the գունավոր is holy only with the real color. It is difficult for us to say whether this is a pattern of Indo-European languages only[1], but it works clearly in Armenian.

These transformations make it possible to perceive the basic values of the producing bases as universal, to see them as an object, attribute, action and quality [8]. And this is already at the very beginning of the fifth century. Already at this stage, the following question can be answered: why? Such a position is necessary for a holistic

1   When historical-comparative linguistics was founded, a number of European orientalists (J. Peterman, K. J. Windischmann, Gauche, etc.) considered Armenian an Indo-European language, but noticing the significant Iranian vocabulary in Armenian, they mistakenly considered it a dialect belonging to the Iranian sub-branch. This erroneous view was accepted until 1875, when Heinrich Hübschmann's work "Die Stellung der armenische Sprache im Kreis der indogermanischen Sprachen" ("The position of Armenian among the Indo-European languages") was published. By correctly applying the phonological laws in Armenian in that work, H. Hübshman proved that Armenian is a separate branch of the Indo-European language family and that the Iranian vocabulary in it is the result of borrowings.

reflection of the surrounding reality, and these transformations indicate the beginning of the Armenian language's perception of objects and phenomena of reality in their semantic connection.

Stricter rules are related to the suffixation and prefixation of lexical units formed from phrases. They replace the first and second participles of the Armenian language, expressing the meaning of possession. Such words have been recorded since the 7th century. Derived bases, regardless of the presence or absence of components with a quantity value, contain a quantity value. For example:

-ավետ – ցանկալի, բաղձալի (blessed) – երանաւէտ (happy) [9] - ծաղիկներով լեցուն (full of flowers) - ծաղկավետ (floral) [10],

-ական – երջանիկ, ցանկալի ((happy) – երանական (blessed) [10],

-(ա)լի - արյունով լեցուն (blood) - արյունալի (bloodful) [11], ցավով լեցուն (full of pain) - ցավալի (painful) [12],

-եղ - համ ունեցող (with taste) - համեղ (tastly) [9], զորություն ունեցող (having power) - զորեղ (powerful) [10].

To date, the range of phrases from which these tokens can be formed is quite limited. The restrictions do not apply only to the lexemes with –անի. These units are used only with words that can be combined with numerals.

Restrictions on other formations are determined by the values. So, the suffix -ավետ denotes the presence of a large amount of some attribute or quality (mainly aroma), -(ա)լի - denotes quality or condition, -եղ - the existence of a trait. Accordingly, lexical units are formed from them, in the semantics of which these components are present. In Modern Armenian, restrictions are lifted in colloquial speech, especially in dialects, which suggests that the units in question are due to the Armenian linguistic thinking proper. For example: շահ-ավետ, մարմն-եղ, բաղձ-ալի, հուս-ալի, բերկր-ալի, հանճար-եղ, հյութ-եղ etc:

Prefixal formations from phrases, thanks to the semantics of the prefix, express the meanings of "having nothing, devoid of anything." These units are recorded both in the dialects of ancient Armenian and in written

works on history (M. Khorenatsi, V. V.), philosophy (Davit Anhaght, VI century.), mathematics (An. Shirakatsi, VII century.). These are prefixes with the meaning of negation or absence of an object or feature:

ան - տուն չունեցող (without a home) - անտուն (homeless) [10]; իմաստ չունեցող (It doesn't make sense) - անիմաստ (meaningless) [13], սահման չունեցող (having no boundaries) - անսահման (limitless) [10];

դժ - առանց կամքի (without will) - դժկամակ (weak - willed); զոհություն չունեցող (without gratitude) – դժգոհ (displeased) [9],

ապ – երախտիք չունեցող (without merit) – ապերախտ (ungrateful) [14], առանց ձայնի (mute) – ապաձայն (silent) [10], դատարկաձեռն (empty-handed) - ապաձեռն (the poor, thepoor) [10].

Prefixed lexemes are formed according to the scheme: noun + suffix > adjective, verb base + suffix > adjective, adjective + suffix > adjective.

Some formations with the above-mentioned prefixes and suffixes have expanded the scope of application, which is reflected in written monuments and shows the active role of a living language in the formation of general linguistic trends. Words ending in an affixoid form a separate group. They are formed according to the scheme verb-base + suffixoid[2] > noun with the meaning of the name of the specialty:

-գետ - (< գիտենալ, իմացող. to know, knowledgeable) - knowing the language - լեզուագէտ – linguist [15], a connoisseur of literature - գրականագէտ (literary critic) [15], who knows the law - իրավագէտ (lawyer) [15], knowing nature - բնագէտ (a naturalist) [15];

- գործ (< գործել to do something – someone who is engaged in any kind of work) - a man working with the earth – հողագործ – a farmer [15], գորգ գործող (weaving carpets) - գորգագործ (carpet maker) [15],

- վար - (< վարել conduct business, վարող leading the case, doing) – telephone connection operator - հեռախոսավար – telephone operator [16], մեքենավար - the driver of the car - a driver [16], director (երգչախումբ orchestra) - a conductor (дирижер) [16],

-բան (one who knows any teaching) – specialist

---

2   *Suffixoid* is any group of phonemes in word formation has a derivational value in one case (*work*: *garden-worker, carpet-worker*), in the other it acts as a root (*work-giver, work- trip, work-place*). In other words, roots can also act as affixes.

in law - իրավաբան (lawyer) [15], a language specialist - լեզվաբան (linguist) [15], a specialist in psychology - հոգեբան (psychologist) [15], etc.

Such lexical units have been known since the tenth century and currently have an active word-formation valence. This is explained not only by the practical necessity of these words (in the history of mankind, professions are constantly expanding, some crafts are replacing others), but also by their attachment to lexemes of a certain semantics.

Such derived structures are a consequence of the process of gradual abstraction of the language. At the last stage of transformation, the material content is abstracted, and units with an object value (the last components of the compound) turn into secondary word-formation forms and express the content of the last component of the compound with their word-formation meaning.

Later formations are complex words – the result of the transformation of both phrases and sentences. They are known in written monuments from the 5th to the 17th century, but in reality, they have been recorded in sufficient numbers since the 12th century.

Thus, in the bibliographic works of the 5th century we come across compound words, which were created by means of the fusion of the components of the phrase, by transformation. Moreover, such transformations can be shown both in pre-written Armenian and in the modern period of written Armenian. Some of the compounds formed in pre-written Armenian were transferred to the 5th century and are used in the Armenian literature, comp. the compounds with the following final component. -խոս. ճշմարտախոս (truthfu) [17], արագախոս (patter speaker) [9], մեծախոս (boastful) [5], ընկէց. քարընկէց (stone-throwing) [9], հրընկէց (fire thrower) [5], շարժ. արագաշարժ agile [18], դիւրաշարժ portable [9], խեղ. անդամախեղ (disabled) [9] etc.

We do not come across generating patterns of these compound words in Old Armenian.

Significant transformational compounds arose in the written period of Armenian (in the 5th century), which are used in parallel with their generating patterns (juxtapositions), such as: խնդրեմ զվրէժ – վրէժխնդիր (seek revenge – revenger) [19], ծունր դնեմ – ծնրադիր (kneel down - knee brace), խունկ արկանեմ – խնկարկեմ (throw incense - burn incense) [9], յուղի արկանել – ուղարկել (get in the way- send) [20], ի ձեռն հասանել - ձեռնհաս (to reach – achieved) [21], ակն արկանել – ակնարկել (take a look - hint at) [22], լուծեալ անդամօք -անդամալոյծ (member off disabled -disabled) [11], հեղու զարիւն – արյունահեղ (to shed blood – bloody) [19], զբանս արկանել – բանսարկու (to drop a word – slanderous) [23] etc.

Such formations are the result of further transformations of phrases and secondary sentences, participial phrases. Complex words are one step above phrases in terms of abstraction: these are manifestations of a higher degree of abstract linguistic thinking than their generating patterns (phrases). Derived formations with a higher degree of abstraction are followed by compounds that complete the transformation process.

The transformational compounds created in pre-written Armenian and the written period were transferred to Modern Armenian in the process of the development of language and are used in various styles.

Examining the diachronic history of words of this type allows us to comment on the stagedness of the transformation process, on the other hand, with this approach, their chronological distribution is determined according to the state of Armenian. Analogous linguistic phenomena, on the other hand, ensure the logical connection of language stages.

The generating of compounds in the way of transformation continues in the Middle Armenian stage of development (XII-XVII centuries), in the result of which the Middle Armenian vocabulary is replenished. During that period the following compounds were formed: անդամահատ - (disabled), աղուէսագիրք (collection of fables), դատաստանագիրք (judgment book), նետընկէց (the capacity of arrow in flight), բացաճառ (free speech), բարոյաբարուր (possessor of moral character), բերդագիւղ (village with a fortress), աղիւսաբարտար (built of brick), շնորհապայծառ (honorable, gracious), սովամածոյց (bringing hunger), աղջկնամայր (daughter's mother), այլահամել (get a different taste), դշխոյափառ (royal glory), թիթեղնակապ - (sheet metal) etc.[3]:

In Middle Armenian, basic idioms and the com-

---

3   Complex transformations and examples of their application in [24].

pounds derived from them are also used simultaneously, such as: աղմուկ հանել (to make noise)– աղմկութիւն (noise), դարդամահ լինել (to be dying of grief) - դարդամահ (dead of grief), ի դող ելնել (to tremble) – դողալ (to tremble) etc.[4]:

In the later stages of language development, transformative neologisms appear, for example, the words: յոթգլխանի (seven-headed), երկհարկանի (two-storeyed), ցավալի (painful), ապարախիստ (unfortunate), with the suffixes - անի, -ալի and ապ- do not meet in Old Armenian; they are Modern Armenian neologisms [24].

Connections can be considered according to the plan of expression of the final component. According to this principle, there are three types of compounds: with a verbal basis, with a nominal component, with a verbal component.

Connections with the verb base support syntactic (subordinate) relations of the components of the forming structures. The whole compound is characterized by the values of the participles. In composite transformation, compound components express subordinate relationships while preserving the syntactic meanings of the derived components. Such compounds arose according to the scheme noun + verb base > noun. For example: խաղաց - (< խաղալ play) - լարերի վրա խաղացող (playing on the rope) - լարախաղաց (kanatoko) [9], ամպերի վրա խաղացող (walking in the clouds) - ամպախաղաց (one who walks in the clouds) [13]: կէզ - (< կիզուլ - burn), հրով կիզված > հրկիզել (fire) [12].

Later, similar tokens were formed:

մատոյց - (an outskirts, an edge < մատուցանել - provide) - կառամատույց (platform) [15], նավ մատուցող (մտեցնող) - providing the vessel) - pier (a docking station) [15],

ասաց - (< ասել - tell) - տաղ ասող (reading poetry) - տաղասաց (the one who writes/ speaks odes) [15], երգ ասող (singer) - երգասաց (the one who composes songs / sings) [15], բան (word) ասող (saying something) - բանասաց (the one who writes / speaks in verse) [15].

Some compounds have arisen with the noun + verb base > adjective:

ցոյց (< ցուցանել - show) - ուղի ցույց տվող (show

the path) - ուղեցույց (road sign) [25], կողմ ցույց տվող (showing side) - կողմնացույց (compass) [25],

աղաց - (< աղալ – grind) սուրճ աղացող > սրճաղաց (coffee grinder) [25], ոսկոր աղացող > ոսկրաղաց (bone mill) [25].

G.B. Jaukyan notes that generative models of compound words with verbal bases are often difficult to distinguish from nouns and adjectives consisting of verbal bases formed in a secondary way. This is described in detail in the study by A.Martirosyan [26].

Compounds of this kind are known from the 18th century:

- արդյունքը հանել (to get the result/ product) - արդյունահանել – to produce [15],

- արծաթով պատել (to silver cover) - արծաթապատել to silver [15],

- ոսկով (q)ոծել > ոսկեզօծել – (cover with gold, to gild) [15],

- ասեղ(ներ)ով գործել (sewing with a needle) - ասեղնագործել - (embroidery) [15], etc.

Recent transformations: ազգավեր, (devoted to the nation >) nation-devoted, ազգադավան (raitor to the nation >) nation-traitored, ալգածուլում (assimilation of the nation >) nation-assimilation, ազգայնապաշտություն (worship of the nation >) nation-worship, ակնգարկ (eye catching >) eye-catching, աղոթամռմունչ (prayer muttering >) prayer-muttering, ժամագոտի (time zone >) time-zone, մահակավորվել (to be armed with clubs >) club-armed, նախագահամեծար (honoring the president >) president-honoring [27].

It is easy to see that the semantics of derived words is constantly becoming more complicated. If we perform a componential analysis of the pair տուն – անտուն, on the one hand, and ասեղով գործել – ասեղնագործել, on the other, then the derivative of the second pair turns out to be semantically more complex, which indicates the development of concepts in the Armenian language that include multicomponent units.

Structural syntactic transformations are characteristic of developed languages, and the transformations described for English sentences by N.Chomsky [1] and E. Harris [2] relate to the current state of English. The systematic

---

4   Ibid.

description of Russian sentences shows that all transformations can be done in one or at most three steps [28]. The history of sentence transformations in the history of the Armenian language shows that they begin with grammatical transformations.   Such transformations have been observed in Armenian written monuments since the XVIII century and by the XIX century they had become normative.

The phrase and the compound formed from it are used in various styles as synonyms: A phrase (as an initial unit) is a unit of a neutral style, a complex word (the result of transformation) is used in high styles as a manifestation of an abstract mechanism. The stylistic value of the transformed complex is emphasized by the contrast method, when the initial and final points of the transformation are opposed to each other. Moreover, the chronology of the phenomenon of transformation at the levels of Grabar and Modern Armenian languages is revealed by the method of diachronic analysis, which is essential from the point of view of a complete description of the transformational word formation of the Armenian language as a whole.

In the works of the classics of Armenian literature of the XVIII century Sayat-Nova sentences are transformed into phrases that serve as definitions, becoming participial phrases: Ծովի միջեն հանած անգին գոհար ես [29].You are a priceless jewel taken out of the sea [29]. (The generating pattern: … jewel, that was taken out of the sea). Մոտդ նստողն կու հարփի [29] – The person sitting next to you will get drunk (generating pattern: The person, who sits near you, will get drunk).

The result of the transformation of the sentence can also be a word: Լեզուդ շաքար ու նաբաթ է. Խմողին վնաս չի անի [29]. - Your tongue is sugar and nabat ("cold-sugar"). It will not harm the drinker [29]. (generating pattern: He, who drinks ,will do no harm). Կանչողդ դարդակ է գնում [29]. My caller goes empty [29] - (generating pattern: He, who calls to me, goes empty).

During the transformation, a subordinate clause with verbal additions turns into a synonymous phrase. A nominal impersonal sentence appears with a group of nominal members.

This transformation is called nominalization. This is a syntactic transformation in which the verb group of a sentence (predicate with its additions) turns into a nominal group (into a participle together with its additions). For example, in Modern Armenian:

Մխիթարը վերադարձավ Հալիձոր (Mkhitar returned to Halidzor) - Մխիթարի վերադարձը Հալիձոր (Mkhitar's return to Halidzor); Ինքնաթիռը թռչում է Մոսկվայի երկնքով (The plan is flying through Moscow sky) - Ինքնաթիռի թռիչքը Մոսկվայի երկնքով (The flight of the aeroplane through the Moscow sky - The flight of the aircraft through the Moscow sky).

Stable phrases occur in sentences of free word order due to corresponding shifts in the syntactic position of components or due to their reduction. This is how a number of stable verbal and nominal phrases are formed. For example: խոսքը նոր է ասել – just said the word, having said a new word > նոր խոսք ասած, say a new word > նոր խոսք (ասել) (in a figurative sense) (to say) something new; աշխարհը նոր է հայտնաբերվել - the world has just been discovered > հայտնաբերված նոր աշխարհ - a newly-discovered world > նոր աշխարհ հայտնաբերել (in a figurative sense) - discover something new; Նա էջը նոր է բացել – he has just opened the page. > բացած նոր էջ - a newly opened page > նոր էջ բացել (in a figurative sense) - discover a new page; աստղը վատ է լույս տալիս- the star is shining badly > վատ լույս տվող աստղ - a badly glowing star > վատ աստղ (-ի տակ ծնվել) - a bad star (to be born under a bad star); աչքը լավ է տեսնում - the eye sees well > լավ տեսնող աչք – a well-trained eye, etc. [30].

3. Findings and Conclusion

The structures of compound and derived words are characterized by varying degrees of abstraction. Word-formation models of compound words are characterized by the presence of finite components represented in various constructions. They are characterized from two points of view: prefixed and suffixed.

In the process of transformation, the semantic load of transformations is carried by the verbal component, which turns from a simple predicate sentence into a derivative phrase, and in complex words into a verb–stimulus, acting as the dominant component.

The process of transformation is characteristic of various forms of language existence, it shows trends in the development of its vocabulary and syntactic structures. Their formal and semantic analysis shows that some transformation phenomena are characteristic of the modern period of language development: in the ancient Armenian period we do not meet them, which is due to the degree of abstraction of the last components of the transformational compound. This is especially true for compounds ending in a suffix, which represents a higher level of abstraction.

The transformation of syntactic structures is carried out at the stages of sentence construction, which are characterized by varying degrees of abstraction.

The generating models of the transformation of a sentence into a phrase are subordinate phrases, which turn from verbal into nominal units (free and fixed combinations). Fixed combinations are formed by appropriately shifting the syntactic position of a free combination or by replacing components.

The study of linguistic phenomena shows that the transformation is realized in a certain hierarchical sequence, which is represented by the following language sections: secondary clause - adverbial phrase - compounding. These are syntactic synonyms. "Syntactic synonyms are structurally diverse constructions united by a common meaning" [31].

Transformational grammar is based on the principle of nuclear clauses (starting units) and transformations (the result of the process) [32]. The first is considered the main (base/launching/starting) unit, to which the rules of analysis with direct components are applied, the others are considered secondary, which differ from the starting/base unit in certain features and are transformed with special rules.

Linguistic units (structures) included in the field of transformation are in synonymous relationship with each other. In this case, we mean the content plan of the structures and of that of compounding [33].

The quantitative analysis of transformations can be carried out within the framework of the same state of language development, afterwards, a comparative investigation can be done, which is a matter of a separate statistical study. Based on the results of our study, we can state with confidence that the statistics of transformations are particularly high in Modern Armenian, which is due to the creative worldview of famous writers. In other words, in modern times, the transformative process is mostly authorial in nature. Over time, authorial neologisms created by transformation can be assimilated into the lexical structure of the language and become independent as separate lexical units, such as: covered with fog – fog-covered, lose one's mind – mind-free/mind-lost, having curly hair - curly-haired, homeless – home-free.

The Armenian language contains significant linguistic material, the study of which can complement both the synchronic and diachronic description of the phenomenon of transformation, becoming a criterion for characterizing the phenomenon under consideration.

Author Contributions

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.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Chomsky, N., 1957. Syntactic structures. New in linguistics. Issue 11. Moscow. Russia. – Pp.412–527.

[2] Harris, Z.S., 1954. Distributional structure. "Linguistics today". "Word". 10, 1954. – Pp. 142–162.

[3] Sheyranyan, S. Z., 2021. Hidden forms of expression in Indo-European languages and their

semantic valence. Research on linguistics and foreign language teaching. Yerevan, Armenia, An. Shirakatsi-Press. P. 47.

[4] Jahukyan, G.B., 1999. A universal linguistic theory. Prolegomena to substantive grammar.

Moscow. Russia. –560 p.

[5] 1913. History of Armenian Movsis Khorenatsvo. Tpkhis, Georgia. - Pp. 18–39.

[6] Koghbatsi, E., 1826. The sect of eresey Yeznkai Koghbatsvoy. Venice, Italy. - Pp.34

[7] Anhaght, D., 1960. The limit of rationality, Yerevan, Armenia. - P.14.

[8] Madoyan, V. V., 2022. Foreign language in a technical university: the experience of variation

of the material and method. Proceedings of the III anniversary international conference "Actual

problems of language training in a technical university". Collected articles. - P.30.

[9] 1836-37. New dictionary of Haykazian language, vv. A-B, Venice, Italy.

[10] Narekatsi, G., 1947.Book of tragedy, Buenos Aires, Argentina. – P.12.

[11] Arzruhvoy, T., 1887. History, Petersburg, Russia. – P.15.

[12] 2000. Bible. Book one and two. Ezr. - P. 196.

[13] Agatangeghel, 1909. History of Armenian, Tpkhis, Georgia. - P.24.

[14] Magistros, Gr., 1910. Papers, Alexandrapol, Armenia. – P.12.

[15] Malkhaseants, St., 1944-45. Armenian Explanatory Dictionary, vv. -4, Yerevan, Armenia.

[16] 1969-1980. Explanatory dictionary of the Modern Armenian language, vv. 1-4, Yerevan, Armenia.

[17] 1887. History of Armenians of the great Bishop Ghevondeyan. Petersburg, Russia, – P.19.

[18] Khorenatsvoi, M., 1865. Matenagroutionk, Venice, Italy. - P.14.

[19] 1999. Bible. Prophecy of Ezekiel. Yerevan, Armenia. – P.65.

[20] Catholicos, Yovh., 1912. History of Armenian, Tiflis, Georgia. – P.21.

[21] 1999. Bible. Proverbs of Solomon. Yerevan, Armenia. – P.94.

[22] Yeghishei, 1957. Pro Vardan and the Armenian War, Yerevan, Armenia. – P. 71.

[23] 1904. History of Armenian by Ghazaray Parpetsvoy, Tpkhis, Georgia. – P.45.

[24] Avetisyan, H., Ghazaryan, R., A-1987, B-1992. Dictionary of the Middle Armenian language. Yerevan, Armenia.

[25] Aghayan, Ed., 1976. Explanatory Dictionary of Modern Armenian. Yerevan, Armenia.

[26] Martirosyan, A., 2001. The study of verbal formations in the Armenian language. // Materials of the International Conference on Armenian Studies "The Armenian Language in Modern Society". Yerevan, Armenia. – P. 21.

[27] Eloyan, S., 2002. The dictionary of Modern Aneologisms, Yerevan, Armenia.

[28] Madoyan, V.V., 2014. Meaning and thought in the statics and dynamics of two languages. Moscow. Russia. - Pp.264-277.

[29] Sayat-Nova, Poems, Yerevan, Armenia, 2007. – Pp.19-23.

[30] Khachatryan, L., 1996. Semantic significance in stable phrases of the modern Armenian language.Yerevan. Armenia. - Pp. 79 -125.

[31] Gnatyuk O.A., 2024. On the issue of the differentiation of concepts: "synonymy", "variability", "parallelism" (theoretical review) // Philological aspect: international scientific and practical journal. Nizhny Novgorod, Russia: Scientific and publishing center "Open Knowledge", 2024. №3 (107). - P. 45. URL: https://scipress.ru/upload/philology/fa032024-1.pdf (date of application 18.04.2024).

[32] Müller, St., 2020. Grammatical theory: From transformational grammar to constraint-based approaches. Fourth revised and extended edition. (Textbooks in Language Sciences 1). Berlin: Language Science Press. Germany. – P. 22

[33] Kabanova, S.A., 2019. Grammatical synonymy in the field of attributive constructions // Philology and culture. Kazan: Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University. Russia, 3(57), 38. DOI 10.26907/2074-0239-2019-57-3-38-46.