

# The History of Language in Connection with the History of the People: Transformations – Causes – Results

Madoyan Vagharshak Varuzhan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Anania Shirakatsi University of International Relations, Yerevan, Armenia

Correspondence: Madoyan Vagharshak Varuzhan, Anania Shirakatsi University of International Relations, Yerevan, Armenia.

doi:10.63593/JLCS.2026.09.01

## Abstract

Modern historical linguistics describes the development of language systems or individual facts, which is quite logical, but it does not address the causes of linguistic changes that lead to the change of some states by others. At the same time, the identification of the causes solves two extremely important issues: on the one hand, it allows us to determine the history of a language as a result of mixing different languages and dialects, i.e. to establish how the language came to its modern state, with which languages or dialects of individual languages it was mixed, how the dialects of the same language influenced each other, which caused transformations, on the other hand, it allows us to establish the conditions under which language assimilation occurs, which will make it possible to eliminate the conditions of assimilation, since language is the main factor National security. The article proposes to determine the articulatory features of each language, the possibility and results of the mutual influence of languages.

**Keywords:** dialect, mixing, new language, assimilation, history of language, history of people

## 1. Introduction

The problem of language research in connection with the history of a people, put forward in the middle of the before last century, has so far been reduced either to descriptive historical grammar or to the history of a literary language, while the history of a people is its spread or curtailment, assimilation of the other peoples, which means an increase or decrease in the territory of distribution, development due to the mixing of the population of different regions, internal development, etc. Rather, it is the history of the language in its dialects. When studying dialect

phenomena in our science, they are compared with the data of the literary language, commonalities and differences are determined, although it is not the dialect that begins with the literary norm, but the literary norm that begins with dialects, since norm is an artificial version of their processing by the masters of the word.

There is another version: "The whole teaching about the principles of the history of language concentrates ... around one question: how does language usage relate to speech activity? The task is to bring the various changes of usage that occur during the development of language under

general categories and to explore the formation and various stages of development of each individual category" (G. Paul, 1960: P. 54).

Otherwise, these questions are raised in connection with the study of language mixing. U. Weinreich considers first of all such situations of their interaction, where they are in an equal social, cultural, political, etc. position, but this is not the case in reality. One of the contacting languages always has some advantages: in numbers, in political, cultural or other terms, which leads to interference, and then to mixing and assimilation. The purpose of U. Weinreich's research is to determine how a new language is formed on this basis: "In general, when constant deviations from the previously existing norm begin to prevail in speech subject to contact, this means that perhaps a new language is being formed" (U. Weinreich, 1979: P. 113). Even Creole languages and Pingsins, which the author and his supporters always refer to, are not the result of equal interaction, as evidenced by their grammatical systems and lexical composition.

## **2. The History of a Language: Intension and Reasons for Asking the Question**

The history of a language in connection with the history of a people is necessary, firstly, to determine its real ethno- and glottogenesis, and, secondly, more than that, to choose a democratic path of development in the long run, excluding the disappearance of peoples and their languages. Modern science deals with the interaction of languages and assimilation, denying the existence of an alternative to globalization, while the urgent issue is how to avoid assimilation and preserve the diversity of languages and peoples of the world in the same way as our flora and fauna is preserved.

Scientific works, as well as textbooks on the history of a particular language, represent its development as the transformation of a single organism from one integral state to another (W. Arakin, 1985; P. Lippen, 1926; N. Denison, 2019; W. Dressler, 2017; etc.). In fact, for example, in England and France, there were migrations of peoples, their mixing with aborigines, and the mixing of formed dialects in regions with large populations, for example, in Paris, London and their surroundings. What has merged with what: not generally, but specifically, how and why there are modern results at different levels of phonetics and grammar, research on the dialectology of these languages is silent. As you

know, neither modern French nor modern English developed from a single source and today they do not represent a more or less definite unity. Moreover, scientists do not deal with the systematization of the relics of aboriginal speech preserved in modern languages.

Significant phonetic transformations could take place only with a large movement of peoples, when a certain territory turned out to be inhabited by two or more tribes, one of which was mobile (nomadic). The settlers had a certain impact on the local substrate, the volume of which is determined by the time it was in the given territory. Phonetic changes occurred when mixing, and phonetic systems created a new system. These were the conditions under which a certain combination of phonemes was excluded or new phonetic combinations appeared.

The history of the English language is the history of the mixing of Anglo-Saxon German with local Celtic at the beginning of the 5th century, which happened gradually, so the English of the southern part of England differs significantly from northern English. This is due to the fact that assimilation by the Germans took place gradually, German was mixed with different local dialects, which gave different results. We must also take into account the fact that the German of the Anglo-Saxons could not be completely unified, like German in modern Saxon regions of Germany. The lack of cultural superiority prevented the Anglo-Saxons from assimilating all the Celts of Great Britain. The language turned out to be mixed. But after the victory of the French over the British at Hastings in 1071, both the phonetics and vocabulary (more than 50%) of the language of the British population began to change. There was political supremacy here, but, as the history of the Bulgarian language shows, this did not play a decisive role: the cultural superiority of the French over the British played a decisive role. The history of England shows that the numerical superiority of one linguistic ethnic group over another also plays a role, which is why the English language won in England, though it was very transformed. "The present book ... aims to present the historical development of English in such a way as to preserve a proper balance between what may be called internal history—sounds and inflections— and external history—the political, social, and intellectual forces that have determined the course of that development

at different periods" (A. Baugh, 2005: P.5). In fact, the authors described phonetic and morphological changes without touching on their language causes.

If a nomadic tribe became settled, there was naturally a mixture of language systems. An example of the formation of the French language in France is beyond such patterns. Vulgar Latin spread from the 9th century (actually, from the Strasbourg Oath of 842) and became prevalent in this state, not because the country was full of speakers of vulgar Latin, but because it turned out to be a common language for the newcomers Germans (Franks) and local Gauls due its cultural superiority: all business and non- business writing was created in this language, which introduced a huge number of new concepts that the local population did not have. The influence on the spread of vulgar Latin and the Catholic Church was strong. As a result of mixing with local dialects, there were appeared the sounds which vulgar Latin did not know (the articulation was changing!): vowel [ə], nasal vowels, labial diphthongs and triphthongs (in Old French), such consonants as [v], [ʃ], [ʒ], [ŋ], [ʎ], affricates [dz], [ts], [tʃ], [dʒ], which are a result of the prevalence of the phonetic system of one of the dialects and were able result in the formation of new phonemes as the result of converting sound combinations.

Along with the formation of the French language, the assimilation of the Gallic population took place. How has the Gaulish language changed, which still remains in the very north of France? In principle, France had the same linguistic processes that are typical for other regions with a mixed population. Just as Central Russian dialects appeared in Russia around Moscow, so did Middle French dialects around Paris. "It is not without some surprise that we see how the "Parisian dialect" appears in the 17th century, which nothing corresponds to in the previous period ..." writes A. Dauzat. "As long as the French language was given the opportunity to develop freely, there was no difference in the speech of social circles" (Dauzat, 1956: P. 91). Further, A. Dauzat points out the spread of certain sounds in different parts of modern France, scientifically speaking, records the isoglosses of the spread of certain phonetic phenomena, without mentioning that before the new fragmentation, the spoken language of the French could not be absolutely unified: a new fragmentation was created based on the existing

fragmentation and was as a result of the interaction of certain linguistic factors.

Small nations in the USSR began to disappear under the influence of the superior culture of Russians. The assimilation of those peoples who are lagging behind in culture is also underway. In the twentieth century, science joined culture. English prevails in the world not only because Americans dictate their political terms, but because the world strives to reach the science and culture of the United States. The example of Singapore's transition to English education and its unconditional achievements is clear proof of this. Does it follow from this that languages whose speakers lag behind neighboring peoples in culture will be the first to disappear? Is there a way to stop this process? What is the linguistic component of this process?

The history of Byzantium shows that the Greeks failed to assimilate the Armenians, because culture in that ancient era did not play such a significant role, and the superiority of the Greeks in culture was not so obvious as to reverse the advantage given by the population count, therefore, by the 9th-10th centuries, the Armenian ethnic group in the territory of Byzantium turned out to be predominant, as a result why the Armenian nobility came to power in the empire. Here the language factor turned out to be stronger Modern Dargins are mainly ethnic Armenians, assimilated by the mountaineers after their adoption of Islam in the 9th-10th centuries. (before that, they were Christians of the Armenian-Gregorian faith). There are several Armenian words left in their language, such as *khach* "cross", *kyar* "stone", *hyats* "bread", etc., i.e., mostly words that were frequently used. Currently, the second assimilation of this people is taking place: education in Russian schools, even with a serious course in their native language, is displacing the latter from all spheres of communication except everyday.

Assimilation is also carried out by political coercion. So, Armenians living in Turkey were and are being forced to speak only Turkish. In today's Azerbaijan, Armenians are forced to convert to Islam and speak Azerbaijan on pain of death.

In other words, the assimilation and interaction of languages occurs both *naturally* and *artificially*. The causes of artificial assimilation can be overcome, but how to overcome natural

assimilation caused by purely linguistic factors?

Not a single US state, not even a single city, has an English language that is exactly the same as that of at least one other state or city, not to mention the well-known fact that American English differs significantly from English in Great Britain, India, Australia, New Zealand, etc., not only in pronunciation or vocabulary. Is it possible to identify any patterns of phonetic, lexical, or grammatical order when mixing speech elements? The situation is similar in those American states where the assimilation of local Indians took place. But the task of linguistics is not only to describe linguistic phenomena, but also to understand the causes and interpretation of the experiences themselves.

“What are the psychological prerequisites for the contamination of two languages for an individual speaker and for a collective? What role does the native language play in this process? Is it possible to identify and classify the types of historical situations that cause (condition) language confusion?” writes N.Ya. Yartseva. (N.Yartseva, 1979. P.10). However, the answers to these questions do not always establish historical experiences. How or why the name of the Chinese capital Běijīng [běijīn] sounds in the mouth of an Englishman as Beijing [ber’dʒɪn], and Beijing in the mouth of a Russian is Pekin [Pikin]. Why does *Yerevan*, the capital of Armenia, sound like *āilǐwēn* in Chinese? What phonetic system does not pronounce which sounds and does their alternation occur?

The history of the German language, which is scattered in different dialects from the north to the south of the country, is interesting. For example, the movement of Germanic consonants is quite thoroughly described, but it is not indicated for what internal reason this happened. In modern Germany, the assimilation of the Lusatian Slavs is actively taking place. What are the results of assimilation in their speech? This is not only the use of German speech, but also the presence of Slavic elements in it. What processes are taking place in the speech of modern Slavs in connection with the changing geopolitical situation in Europe? If we go deep into history, we should trace the moving of the Slavic ethnic group in the center of this continent, beautifully described by G.A. Khaburgaev: “any interaction of cultures that can be traced archaeologically, i.e. the interaction of ethnic (or ethnographic) groups of the ancient population, was accompanied by linguistic (or dialectal) interaction of cultural

speakers” (G. Khaburgaev, 1980: P. 33).

The history of the language in connection with the history of the people is extremely important for the Russian, which over the past millennium has undergone significant changes not only in its historical territory, but also in connection with its active movement eastward, up to the Pacific Ocean. Many Russian dialects have long been described, including Siberian ones, in particular, by A.M. Selishchev, but this is not always the Russian language proper, but mixed with the speech of the local ethnic group. Russian Russians assimilated not only the local population, but also transformed the “new” Russian under the influence of the speech of the local substratum. Russian is one variant of the development of Russian speech (Russian speech, not literary Russian!).

The second variant: Russian dialects were mixed around Moscow, which led to the formation of Central Russian dialects. R.I. Avanesov found out that modern Russian “akanie” originated from dissimilative “yakanie” (R. Avanesov, 1974: P. 238-259). But with the mixing of what dialects did such a “yakanie” arise and with what movements of the masses of people did it spread to Moscow and the surrounding area? One should not forget the thesis of I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay that “accepting the presence of causeless phenomena is contrary to common intellect” (B. de Courtenay, 1963: P.34).

There are no causeless phenomena in language, as in all of nature: brown paint can only be obtained by mixing red and black. The phenomenon of “akanie” in the Russian language could arise only with the development or “borrowing” of the law of reduction. Such a law also applies in some Armenian dialects, in particular, in the dialects of the Lori Gorge (Armenia). If the Russian akanie was influenced by the Tatar language, the Volga people would be the first to speak with “akanie”. Under the influence of the Finno-Ugric peoples, the Novgorodians would have been the first who begin to speak with “akanie”. But that didn’t happen. “Akanie” is the result of a mixture of the Russian dialects proper (the result of internal development, which apparently also occurs in the Armenian dialects of Lori), in which, perhaps, the same words had different accents. As the history of Armenian dialects shows, the result of mixing can be not only the predominance of one phonetic system over another, but also the formation of a new system that does not coincide

with any of the source systems.

As you know, the Germans were divided into two parts not by feudal fragmentation, but by the second movement of consonants: [p]>[pf], [t]>[ts], [k]>[kx] at the beginning of a word before a vowel or in the middle of a word after m, n, l, r, or [p]>[f], [t]>[s], [k]>[x] at the end of a word after a vowel. Between two vowels, after a short vowel, these consonants turn into spirants, and after a long vowel, they double.

These facts indicate that when describing the history of a language, the internal causes of its development should not be neglected.

Russian historical grammar by K.V. Gorshkova and G.A. Khaburgaev is, in our opinion, the most thorough one on the issue of internal reconstruction of the history of the Russian language (K.V. Gorshkova, 1980), however, the reconstruction of phonetic and morphological processes on the outskirts of the Russian world remains unexplored. Russian dialects have been mixed with each other, or the Russian dialect has been mixed with a foreign language substrate, and the authors have shown the development of phonetic and morphological processes in the historical territory of Russians in a fairly thorough manner. Modern historical grammar, as interpreted by G.A. Khaburgaev, is a system of transitions from one state of language (phonetics, morphology...) to another, which fully corresponds to the objectives of this course. Though the time of the loss of the reduced ones has been determined, but it has not been established under the influence of which processes in the phonetic system of the Old Russian language this loss occurred. After all, "in the new settlement areas, Slavic-speaking tribes entered into new relationships, as a result of which convergent linguistic processes intensified, erasing the previous differences between dialects related to different Proto-Slavic groupings of the previous time." (G. Khaburgaev, 1980: P. 69).

If we proceed from the historical fact that before coming to the ancient Russian space, Slavic tribes actively moved throughout Central Europe, then we have to admit that they settled in their new places of residence, assimilating local tribes over vast territories, which led to different results in the language, to the formation of new large dialect groups and languages that could carry also names related to the names of local tribes (?). So, to a certain extent, Russians who were

homogeneous in speech (Krivichi, Radimichi, Vyatichi, Drevlyane, Polyane, etc.) differentiated in new spaces because they absorbed different local tribes, because they absorbed different local tribes, and the history of the formation of the corresponding dialects should be presented in a causal relationship, as required by any science. If the history of Novgorod "tsokanie" is connected with the assimilation of Karelo-Finnish tribes, then the appearance of the explosive [g] or "akanie" among the Slavic people is clearly the result of interlanguage or dialect interaction. At the same time, there would be no "tsokanie" in the Novgorod dialect if the affricates [ts] and [tʃ] distinguished the sound shells of words.

Perhaps the influence of the minority language is manifested in the fact that it reveals "empty" categories and phenomena (empty cells) in the majority language system. Similarly, French [ʃ] was perceived in English as [tʃ] (*choisir* – *choose*), because in these languages these sounds are not different: by the time of the Norman conquest of England in English [tʃ] already correlated with French [ʃ].

Historical grammars speak about the development of certain processes, for example, in phonetics, but one process covers one area, the other covers another area, and the results may not coincide, which is due to the presence of different linguistic substratum in these territories from time immemorial. So, hypothetically, in the Slavic dialects A, B, C, in certain positions, there was a transition [g] to [zh], but the transition [k] to [tʃ] is allowed by the dialects A, C, D, and [kh] to [ʃ] – is allowed by the dialects B and D, because the mixing dialects they had different phonetic systems, as can be seen from the isoglosses. Is it possible to find an answer to the question of why in Old Slavonic in certain positions in one case [g], [k], [kh] moved to [z], [c], [s], and in another (later) – to [zh], [tʃ], [ʃ]? In general, to restore the Proto-Slavic language, it is necessary not only to look for common isoglosses, but also to try to remove everything related to the influence of the languages that came into contact with it.

If similar phenomena occur in territories separated from each other, especially in different languages, it means that similar systemic conditions have arisen, independent of other linguistic and social factors. As mentioned, the Armenian Lori dialect reduces the vowel of the second pre-stressed syllable to almost zero in much the same way as in Russian.

It is known that the Proto-Slavic incompleteness of the type *trt* in different Slavic languages gave different results. Based on G.A. Khaburgaev's hypothesis about the large movement of Slavs throughout Central Europe in ancient times, it becomes quite clear that the formation of different Slavic languages is associated with both Slavic dialectal differences and the peculiarities of the phonetic systems of assimilated peoples (they must have been Germanic, Italic, or Thracian tribes, because there were no others in the region), why and the results: *golova* – *glova* – *golva*, *bereg* – *breg* – *berg*.

A.M. Selishchev's thorough study of Siberian dialects is a description, which focuses on preserving the features of the Russian language proper in them. Cf.: "Combinations with the loss of a non-syllabic *i* between vowels, assimilation of two vowels and their compressed, represented by Siberian dialects, correspond to the same phenomena of Northern Great Russian dialects" (M. Selishchev, 1968: P. 226); "Russians from different parts of Russia, having settled in Siberia, influenced one another. Assimilation also took place in relation to language. The influence came mainly from speakers of Northern Russian dialects. From the Middle Russians or from the language of the All-Russian (? - *Authors*) were learned in some localities 'akanie' and 'ikanie'" (M. Selishchev, 1968: P. 311). The author does not touch upon facts that differ from similar facts of the Russian dialects of the Russian space proper (he apparently did not raise this problem), the reasons for the appearance of such, the formation of new Russian dialects among speakers of non-Russian speech, i.e. as a result of assimilation, which would allow us to state linguistic changes that can only occur as a result of mixing dialects of the same or different languages. How could "yakanie" have originated in Siberia? Perhaps, as a result of mixing Russian dialects or dialects with local dialects, the same conditions arose here as in the Moscow region, where, according to R.I. Avanesov, the first type of "akanie" appeared - the dissimilative "yakanie" of the Oboyan type?

"There are many words borrowed from the languages of neighboring (for example, Finno-Ugric) peoples in Northern Russian dialects... For example, the words *kurya* 'bay, arm of the river', *la'ida* 'sandbank', *sa'khta* 'shrubby swampy area', *ra'da* 'moss swamp', *mya'nda* 'small-layered swamp pine', *ryu'zha* 'type of fish net', *ki'bas* 'sinker on the seine', *meeva*

"small fish", *loch* 'salmon after throwing caviar' are borrowed from Western Finnish languages" (Russ. Dial., 1990, P.178). For the most part, of course, these are words, which are not found in Russian and which are associated with local life. It is difficult to judge the role of these lexemes in the general process of linguistic development, but northern Russian dialects were finally formed as a result of the assimilation of the local population (cf. the disappearance of the Vodi, Chudi, Izhora, and other Finnish peoples in the territory of the modern Leningrad region during the Soviet period and earlier), therefore it is likely that these are not borrowings, but relics of the local language of a population assimilated by Russians for understandable reasons: political, economic, cultural. However, based on this, it is difficult to conclude that the words of the assimilated dialect are always preserved in the "assimilating" dialects, because they are associated with the vital activity of the local population. In an assimilating dialect, autochthonous words can retain their pronunciation. The change in pronunciation should reflect the combination of two articulatory systems. According to O.A. Ostapchuk, many Polish dialects have been lost in Ukraine, and those who wish to learn Polish in Sunday schools or on their own. "Such a 'learned' language demonstrates features characteristic of the system of Polish peripheral dialects (in the field of phonetics, the replacement of a number of Polish middle-language *ś, ź, ć* with soft dental *s', z', c'*, 'ukanye' (ru *džž'ina*), denazalization of final nasal vowels, asynchronous softness of labial ones; in the field of morphology, the penetration of Ukrainian inflections into the forms of names, the mixing of personally masculine and non-personally masculine forms, etc.)" (O. Ostapchuk, 2004: P. 37). Why? After all, the specified Polish is studied outside the system of the specified Polish dialects. It is not difficult to assume the influence of the Ukrainian dialects spoken by these Poles, and the Ukrainian dialects have been influenced by Polish dialects. On the other hand, this condition may be the result of the interaction of phonetic and morphological systems. As the history of English and French shows, French words that entered English after the French conquest of England "return" to French "in English pronunciation": *interview*, *comfortable*, etc. due to the loss of cultural (+ scientific) and political leadership by the French language (its native speakers). Most researchers

associate phonetic changes in languages with the external influence of a superstrate (another phonetic system – a foreign language or its own dialect) (A. Martinet, 1972a; G. Jahukyan, 1960), as well as through individual and then collective bilingualism, without paying attention to the internal patterns of development of phonetic system.

A. Meillet believed that “social change is the only variable element that can be used to explain linguistic changes, since linguistic changes are the consequences of social variation, sometimes direct and indirect, but much more often indirect” (A. Meillet, 1926. P. 240). L. Bloomfield generally denies the possibility of answering the above questions: “Although many sound changes reduce linguistic forms, simplify the phonetic system, or in any other way reduce the difficulty of utterance, so far no researcher has been able to establish a correlation between sound changes and the previous phenomenon – the cause of the sound change are unknown.” (L. Bloomfield, 1933: P. 386). Even if we keep in mind that only social factors are the cause of language changes, changes occur in language, including as a result of the interaction of different conversational elements, and when linguistic facts change or interact, only linguistic laws can act. As L.V. Shcherba wrote, “we always have a reason to ask ourselves what is the language of which this language is a continuation, in other words, to look for the base language” (L. Shcherba, 1974: P.63), although “where we are dealing with a language with heterogeneous elements, linguistic methods are insufficient” (L. Shcherba, 1974: P. 65).

To deny the internal laws of linguistic transformations is to deny their causes, to deny the internal development of the system in general. The facts show the opposite. In Russian, there is no sound [ɣ], which appears at the junction of the words “Бо[ɣ]даа” (“God gave”), which indicates that in certain positions there may be (in this case) consonantal voicing, which is not typical for this phonetic system. Such facts are found when considering territorial dialects as separate language systems.

In the Armenian language, in some dialects, [h] before vowels turned into [kh]. G.B. Jaukyan, following G. Acharyan, sees in this the influence of the Urartian substratum mixed with Armenian (as an independent language or one of the dialects of the Ararat region) (G. Jahukyan, 1960: P. 267). V.L. Katvalyan suggests that this variant

may be a legacy of an older period (V. Katvalyan, 2014: P. 67). However, the point is different. This could happen only in the absence of a semantic function in these consonants in the appropriate position.

By the tenth century, the process of replacing [y] with [h] at the beginning of a word before vowels in all Armenian dialects is development of additional aspiration in this position. As a result of what? In words where this was hindered by the distinction of meaning (հերթ – յերթ – hert – yert), the process stopped. In the Karin dialect of the Armenian language, [ntʃ] turns into [ʃ] before vowels and at the end of words for certain lexemes (ինչքան > իշքան, ինչպես – իշպես, ինչ կտես – իշ կտես: inchqan > ishqan, inchpes – ishpes, inch kses – ish kses), because these words in these positions do not have a semantic function, similar to the mentioned opposition of French [ʃ] and English [tʃ].

In the historical interpretation of linguistic development, dialectal facts are primarily informative. Thus, [thon] in Western Armenian (Karin) dialects means “rain” (in literary Armenian, [andzreʻv]). This is a native Indo-European root, which in the European area gives *Don, Dnieper, Danube, Dniester* etc., indicating that the Armenian consonant [th] or [t], for example, in Slavic languages corresponds to [d] – [tun] – [dom], [tas] – [dest]). How and why?

The diphthong [ay], as far as modern reconstructions allow, was present in both the Indo-European base language and the Semitic languages. In Armenian, [ay] and [a] are preserved only in the Karin dialects, in the rest we have a contraction of different order [e], [ə], [ye], zero sound (այսպես > էսպես – ըսպես – սպես – սսպես – ayspes > espes – əspes – spes – aspes). If we compare it with the state in Semitic languages (Arabic, Akkadian, Hebrew), then [ay] has a similar development in dialects. Cf.: Arabic bayt /- Hebrew bayit (house) → Aramaic ܒܝܬ (beyt / bāyit) — house; Arabic ʻayn → Aramaic ܐܝܢ (ʻayn / ʻēnā) — the eye. In Akkadian (Old Babylonian and Old Assyrian), the diphthong [ay] also contracted into a vowel [ay]. This indicates that there was a mutual influence of Armenian and Semitic dialects. If we turn to specific material, then, for example, in the Bayazet dialect of Armenian, in some words (mostly borrowed from Arabic) there is no initial [a] (it is replaced by a sound close to [ö]), which can be used to judge the influence of the Arabic superstrate on the Armenian substratum.

However, this is only the first stage of the impact of Arabic, since Armenian words are pronounced in accordance with the Armenian pronunciation. If we consider the material of the Armenian dialects of Sasun, Mush, Bayazet, Van, we find the same development [ay] as in the Semitic languages, however, it is difficult to consider this as the influence of Semitic languages, because the law of diphthong contraction also operated in Armenian, and its results could not but coincide with the results of contraction in Semitic languages (similar conditions!). In Aramaic, the contraction [ay] into [ē] took place in a closed syllable and in the middle of a word, which is not typical for Armenian dialects, i.e. [e] in Aramaic and Armenian are the results of different processes. In Arabic, *zaytun* ("butter") is given in Armenian dialects by [zeytun] already according to the phonetic laws of this Armenian dialect. Hypothetically, the interaction of dialects (languages) can be represented in the following stages: 1) loanwords are pronounced similarly to pronunciation in the source language; 2) the laws of pronunciation of the superstrate apply to the pronunciation of words of the substrate, a "weak" dialect; 3) the vocabulary of the substrate begins to be replaced by the vocabulary of the superstrate; 4) the grammar of the superstrate begins to displace the grammar of the substrate. Naturally, development can stop at any stage. This is assimilation. The formation of a new language is thoroughly described in the works of W. Weinreich used. If these are dialects of the same language, the first stage is excluded.

The exceptional diversity in Armenian dialects is characteristic of the ancient Armenian (and perhaps Proto-Indo-European) diphthong [aj]. It has several variants: [æ], [ə], [a], [i], zero, as well as [aj] at the beginning of the word պայտն – իսպտն – սպտն – ըսպտն - սպտն (ispes - aspes - əspes, spes etc. from aispes). However, this variation is not due to the absence of semantic opposition in words that differ in Armenian, for example, by the phonemes [a] and [i], but to the general movement of Armenian dialectal articulation from diphthongs to monophthongs. Cf.: patmutyun – patmuthun, anarakutyun – ankarakuthen in Armenian Karin dialects.

The wide variety of Armenian dialects may indicate, on the one hand, the once large territory of Armenian settlement, on the other - the widespread assimilation of neighboring foreign dialects by Armenian dialects. According to the history of languages, the change of one language

formation to another is a very normal phenomenon, although, for example, according to the theory of the Armenian origin of the Indo-Europeans (T. Gamkrelidze, 1984), which is proved by the latest DNA analysis data, the Hittites, Urartians, Illyrians in the territory of the Armenian Highlands (or in the other terminology- in Eastern Anatolia), the Hittites, Urartians, Illyrians and others disappeared completely somewhere in the first millennium BC (maybe earlier), and this territory was occupied by Armenians, who had not previously appeared in any sources. Even if we take into account the largest migrations of peoples in the ancient period, they could not migrate completely. Even if there were migrations, the remaining population mixed with others, and in the absence of migration, either the name of the people changed (the Persians, who by that time had become the "leaders" of the Middle East, became to call Armenians Armenian. It passed from them to the Greeks and went around the world) or the politically central dialect changed, and with it the general name of the population (The capital of the Urartian kingdom of Van lost its political significance, which passed to the Ararat region, which is why the name of the people - Armenians - changed). This is a unique process of changing the "main dialect" — later the basis of the literary language — a process that is currently also not studied either in diachrony or synchrony.

We have conducted a small study on the history of the Armenian language in connection with the history of the Armenian people, and our results differ significantly from the results of similar (but not similar!) research in this field. This is an attempt to show the history of the Armenian language in the history of the development of its dialects, which until 1915 were actively spreading throughout Asia Minor, assimilating local foreign- language dialects (V. Madoyan, 2024).

In the last few years, the Armenian linguist A. Davtyan has deciphered the "Manual of Agriculture" of the Sumerians (A. Davtyan, 2022). The expert writes that due to the complete correspondence of the spellings to the Armenian words, it can be concluded that the monument was created in Armenian, which means that either the Sumerians were Armenians, or the Armenians had already assimilated the Sumerians by that time.

All the variations of sounds that make it possible

to “make” the Sumerian text Armenian (i.e., to identify Sumerian spellings with Armenian words) exist in Armenian dialects, i.e., phonemes or phoneme alternations that do not exist in other dialects of the Armenian language do not exist in the Sumerian under consideration. From the point of view of comparative historical linguistics, borrowings from the Persian or Acadian languages are also interpreted. Some facts are explained through Sumerian borrowings in Akkadian and vice versa. Since the territory of the Sumerians, according to modern science, was equivalent to the territory of the Armenian ethnic group, it can rather be assumed that the Sumerian dialects were dialects of Armenian or the Armenian dialects were dialects of Sumerian, which is the same thing. It is difficult to imagine this as the assimilation of native speakers of another language by native speakers of one of these languages, since history does not give grounds to assume cultural or political aggression on the part of Armenians or Sumerians.

According to Strabo, the Armenian generals Artaxias and Zariadria (Artashes and Zarekh), who had freed themselves from the Persian ruler Antiochus the Great (187 BC), created Great and Little Armenia, significantly expanding their territories at the expense of neighboring tribes who “now speak the same language” (Strabo, 1994: p. 495). If we take into account the frequency of contacts between residents of different villages and cities in the prehistoric era, such assimilation is doubtful (Strabo completed his “Geography” by 25 BC, according to some sources). Moreover, in the Armenian dialects of the territories described by Strabo, there are no phonetic features that are characteristic, for example, of the Semitic languages, which could be the languages conquered in the south by Artaxias. Most likely, these were borderline Armenian dialects, which were actively moved forward throughout Asia Minor and the Middle East at that time. According to historical data, the Armenian ethnic group was spread over an area of up to 360 thousand square kilometers. (R. Hewsen, 1997).

### 3. Language Contacts: Methods of Study

Language contacts are diverse and lead to different results. This may be the result of “the unilateral influence of one language on another, or the mutual influence of two or more languages, or, finally, the convergent development of a group of languages” (B.

Havranek: 1972. P.101). If these are dialects of the same language, the speakers of the substrate have separate phenomena of the assimilated dialect. If these are dialects of different languages, the language of the “winning” dialect retains (should it?) systemic facts of assimilated dialect. For example, Russian-speaking Armenians use a soft consonant before [i] in Armenian speech, etc. Other dialects may lack soft consonants. To do this, you need to compare the phonetic (morphological ...) systems of this dialect and the assumed assimilated one. The presence of system fragments may indicate the assimilation of a dialect of another language. If there is a “tsokanie” in the Novgorod speech, it means that there was a very strong non- Russian, Karelo-Finnish substratum assimilated by the Russians.

Armenian settlements in France, losing their native speech and preserving their national identity only because of their religion, adhere to the Armenian standard in pronunciation of Armenian words until they completely lose their native speech, even using Armenian words in their daily French speech. “The desire to generalize distinguishing features and rules of their design ... is expressed ... in simplifying two contacting languages by replacing inflections with lexical and/or syntactic ways of forming semantic relations” (V. Rosenzweig, 1972: P. 21). The same can be said about phonemes. The ways of mutual influence, of course, can be very different: “In some areas (France – *Authors*), where both articulations (un – in – *Authors*) are clearly different, some words containing un, as a result of imitation, will be pronounced with in, while in others it will be preserved a traditional phoneme; over time, the number of words receiving in instead of un will increase, and un will gradually disappear due to the lack of words in which it is heard and pronounced.” (A. Martinet, 1972b: P.89). “A fairly common case of ... pragmatic equivalence is when all the allophones of a phoneme of one language are identified with allophones of the same phoneme of another language” (E. Haugen, 1972: P.280). However, the latter is still just a guess.

The issue of language contacts is also related to the fragmentation of languages. For example, it should be established which linguistic factors allowed politicians to divide the Russian people into three parts. “The problem of the formation of related languages (which are East Slavic) is the problem of the divergence and unification of dialects in connection with the processes of the

social history of their speakers” (G. Khaburgaev, 1980: C. 25), however, the social history of, for example, the Armenian language does not provide any grounds for dividing it into Western and Eastern Armenian languages (they are considered as separate groups of dialects). The Germans of the southern lands of Germany understand the speech of the Austrians better than the speech of the inhabitants of Hamburg, but everyone remains German. The development of a research methodology suggested by the principles of this article may allow us to go further into history, separating linguistics from political manipulations that continue to exist. Thus, the most modern research on the origin of language families proves that the Indo-Europeans began to spread across Europe and Asia from the Armenian Highlands, and the Slavs from Central and Eastern Europe<sup>1</sup>. N.Ya. Marr believed that all languages originated from the territory of the South Caucasus (Japhetic theory of language development) (N. Marr, 1937), which is still rejected in all respects, although, as indicated, DNA studies have shown that the ancient Indo-Europeans spread around the world from the Armenian Highlands. DNA research is naturally an important factor, but the history of language should be proven by determining the causes and results of linguistic processes.

Modern scientists pay attention to the fact that Indo-European has borrowings from Semitic languages (one of the factors of the Armenian theory of the ancestral homeland of the Indo-Europeans) (F.M. Muller, T.V. Gamkrelidze, etc.) (F. Müller, 1861; T. Gamkrelidze, 1972). This suggests that Semitic and Indo-European are different languages or branches of speech communication, and these languages or branches lived side by side for a certain period, and in Semitic languages common words are divided into morphemes, while in Indo-European languages they are integral formations, which indicates that the donor languages were Semitic. The fact that Indo-Europeans lived next to Georgians is evidenced by Indo-European borrowings in Georgian. A comparative study of the history of the language of neighboring peoples (by creating their *comparative historical grammars*), dialectal differences and historical changes since the most ancient period (as far as possible) will make it possible to trace the history of the interaction of peoples, languages and

cultures through its results. In general, the method of retrospective study of dialect changes can be based only on the data of modern research. It is known that only the facts of modern dialects can give a definite idea of the processes that took place in the most distant or close to us epochs. First of all, it is a study of phonetic and morphological transformations in neighboring languages in comparison, those transformations that differ from the general linguistic processes (norms) of this language and the results of these processes, those transformations that took place when mixing dialects of a given language. Which sound in which phonetic position, with a certain articulation, takes on a particular expression? How are hybrid forms, hybrid paradigms formed, if any? Each dialect should be described as an independent speech system and compared. “At the phonetic level, it is possible to fully discover such system characteristics as the rules of combination and alternation of phonetic units, the rules for neutralizing phonemic oppositions... Systematic conclusions of diachronic significance can be obtained by comparing synchronous descriptions of individual dialects, provided that differences in the structure of synchronously coexisting dialects can be interpreted as a diachrony expanded in space” (L. Kalnin, 2004: P. 9).

What does give the result of mixing Mongolian [gh] with Russian [g] or Russian [a] with Buryat [æ]. Russian *тюльпан* (tulip) in Tatar gave *chulpan* (= planet Venus, as well as a feminine proper name). What does Bulgarian (Uralic) actually sound like [a] after the word with this sound passed into Slavic pronunciation? What about the positions? If this observed In Russian dialects of the Urals, that there was a mixing of the Russian substratum with the (ancient) Bulgarian proper. As A. Rosetti writes, “the less developed the borrowing language is, the greater the changes the language undergoes (borrowings from the language. – *Authors.*), from which borrowings are made” (A. Rosetti, 1972: P. 115). If this is proven and is a general linguistic law, then it can be used to restore the original forms of borrowed words, especially from currently lost languages. In the Ancient world, there were active phonetic processes in large areas: assimilation and dissimilation. There was a large migration of peoples (tribes) and tribal associations. In the absence of national identity,

<sup>1</sup> Ethnogenesis of the Slavs. Wikipedia. URL:

ru.wikipedia.org. Date of request – 31.01.2026.

different tribes interbred, and in their language there was a mixture of phonetic (morphological ...) systems, which gave a quality that led to new phonetic processes. There are no such large-scale processes today, because there is no movement of peoples. Sound alternations appear due to the fact that due to the influence of another phonetic system (articulation), existing sound syntagmas begin to change (the phonetic system and, accordingly, the principles of phoneme combination change). For example, in Russian dialects, consonants were softened before iotized vowels, after which the consonants began to "dictate" the conditions. This is not found in any Indo-European language, including Old Bulgarian, which had already become a mixed language by the 11th century. The study of phonetic and morphological processes is followed by the study of structural changes in grammar, the backbone of the language. A dialect is vanished if the grammar "breaks down": the population uses not only the words of the majority dialect, but also its grammatical constructions. Grammar, which has disappeared from use, is preserved in phraseological phrases, in folklore material. Before "destroying" the "neighboring" grammar, interference erases morphological differences. Studying the language of folklore will provide very valuable information about its history. Mixed dialects should have many synonyms, one of which belongs to the assimilated substrate (?). For example, in Armenian *apranq* is "product", and in dialects, along with this, *pradukht* (from Russian "product") functions, which means only "food products" (the plural meaning).

The content of isoglosses should be compared when studying border dialects. Can we say that if the isoglosses are not the same as in the central regions, it means that they are associated with an assimilated substrate? Is it possible, in this regard, to formulate such a method of historical reconstruction so that it is possible to distinguish the process of borrowing from the process of assimilation? With the latter, the systems (phonetic, morphological, syntactic) are combined. L. V. Shcherba believed that if there are two separate systems of associations in the linguistic consciousness of a native speaker, then this is borrowing; if there is one system of associations, then borrowing turns into a mixture of languages (L. Shcherba, 1958: P. 48). Is that so? The history of languages shows that dialects eventually form around large cities that have

become political or economic centers. The urban speech is becoming a model for nearby settlements. How does the language of the city affect the formation of the corresponding dialect and language contacts in the absence and functioning of the literary version?

It is necessary to actively apply the method of *timeless analogy* and study the state of modern dialects in a foreign language environment, including the disappearing (!), vocabulary and grammar of assimilated dialects, and project this state to prehistoric times. It should be considered whether the languages are closely related or not. As the history of language contacts shows, when two dialect systems of the same language are mixed at different points, the result is the same. Thus, it is assumed that back in the prehistoric era, there was a mixture of Armenian dialects in different parts of the Vaspurakan region of historical Armenia, which gave basically the same results.

It is possible to give some construction that coincides with the construction of the assimilated dialect. How many subjects can understand and interpret it? How is this construction perceived (in what structure) the subjects?

What does the proposed study of the history of language provide in relation to the history of the people? First of all, without studying language contacts and their results, no language history can be complete. We ask the question, how to understand that this dialect is a mixture of two dialects of the same or different languages, including those with assimilation? How can we determine the time of dialect mixing and the reasons?

The fact that pronunciation directly depends on the articulatory capabilities of native speakers is evidenced by the facts of pronunciation of the same word in different ways in different languages, completely distant from each other. So, *Москва* (Moscow) in English is *Moscow* [moskəu], in French *Moscou* [mosku]; the French *confortable*, having switched to English, became [ˈkʌmf(ə)təbl], although in French it is [kɔfɔrtabl]. The word *interview* became [ˈntəvju:] in English and returned to French as [etɛrvju]. Cf. is the pronunciation of the words *Beijing*, *Yerevan*, in different languages?

As the phonetic systems of modern languages show, alternation of consonants occurs in languages that have hard and soft consonants. In a position where a hard consonant phoneme

appears before an iotized vowel, it is replaced by a soft paired variant (*кот – котята* in Russian). If there is no soft paired, alternation occurs: *бог – божий* in Russian. By alternating consonants, it can be determined when which hard consonant acquired a pair, because in Russian *город* (town) – *горожане* (“townspeople”, apparently from *городжане*, which could not be) were by *в городе*. Another position is the doubling of consonants. Thus, the Armenian language doubles [k], while in Russian [k] alternates with [c] before [k]: *казак – казацкий*, in modern English, the word *Rasputin* is pronounced *Raspuchi’n*, i.e. with the alternation [t’] – [tʃ]. At the same time, why is the reduction to zero of the second pre-stressed vowel possible in both Russian and Armenian (according to dialects of Lori – [pətəskhanel]) and in English. Other positions are also acceptable. This requires special research.

The alternation of consonants occurs when the phonetic structure of one dialect changes under the influence of a superstrate in which a certain combination of phonemes is impossible. One could even say that the beginning of the alternation indicates the beginning of the interaction of speakers of two unrelated dialects. Alternation occurs because with a different articulation, the pronunciation of certain combinations of consonants is impossible. Before determining the results of mixing different articulations, it is necessary to determine how the phonetic structure is formed, on which one or another articulation depends. This issue must first be solved in synchrony, and then proceed to diachrony.

This is a very difficult and, perhaps, difficult area of linguistic research, since it involves knowledge of both language theory and several languages. This is the study of the nature (composition and interaction of phonemes) of phonetic systems.

The results of the synchronic studies will allow, as indicated to carry out diachronic research and create a *comparative historical grammar of different languages*, which will be especially valuable not only in matters of interaction between different language systems, but also for reconstructing the history of mankind from the pre-written period.

The history of language in this context allows us to answer many questions: which peoples lived where, how they were assimilated (or how they interacted with their neighbors, whom they assimilated themselves), why, and what factors (political, economic, cultural, and religious) led

to assimilation, how does phonetic and grammatical systems change. These issues can be solved by separating the external development of a phonetic or morphological system from the internal one and establishing the principles of the latter. This approach to comparative historical grammar opens up a wide scope for new linguistic research and for the establishment of new linguistic laws.

It is necessary to determine the articulatory capabilities of native speakers of modern languages (which sounds they can pronounce and which cannot), then, based on phonetic changes that have occurred in history, to establish the articulatory capabilities of ancient speakers, which led to certain alternations when mixing their language, for example, with Old Slavonic. The native speaker of modern Armenian, studying Russian, must go through the stage of adapting to soft consonants, to Russian alternations of consonants, because there are no soft consonants and corresponding alternations in Armenian. A Russian studying German should “abandon” alternations in his native language, the system of correlation hard and soft consonants, and learn how to pronounce some vowels with umlaut. If we hypothetically imagine that Slavs speaking modern Russian are in the center of Europe, as recorded by G.A. Khaburgaev in the above-mentioned work and were confronted with the Germans, as a result of which there was a confusion of languages, then the alternations corresponding to Russian should have begun in the German language, and in Russian several soft consonants should have been lost, an umlaut could appear, etc. Based on the data obtained on the changes in the phonetic structure, it is possible to determine the articulatory capabilities of native speakers of ancient languages and languages (dialects), which have been mixed with other languages (dialects).

There is no alternation of [g] with [dž] in the Armenian language, however, in the (Armenian) speech of Armenians living in the United States, this alternation applies to all positions in which [g] appears before iotized vowels or soft consonants: *[dže]vork*, *ar[dže]lak*, etc., i.e. in positions where such alternation occurs in English. There is no such phenomenon in the speech of Armenians living in Armenia who speak excellent English. The alternation is facilitated by the political and numerical advantage of native English speakers. Hence, it

can be hypothetically assumed that changes related to the peculiarities of articulation could occur in a nomadic people under the influence of a local substrate, including by borrowing appropriate lexemes. If in the language of the ancient Slavs [g], [k], [x (kh)] in some positions in one period moved to [z], [c], [s], and in another period to [zh], [ch], [sh], it means that they, wandering, at different times were influenced by different languages of Central and Eastern Europe. Thus, the transition [g] to [z] exists in German dialects, the alternation [g] – [dž]/[zh] is observed in Italian dialects. It is possible (this requires serious research) that there could be a reverse influence of Proto-Slavic on these languages, since today it is difficult to say from what time the law of syllabic synharmonism began to operate in Proto-Slavic.

In Western Armenian dialects, the initial [h] of proper names has been lost, i.e. *Ovannes* instead of *Hovannes*, *Arutyun* instead of *Harutyun*, although geographically Western Armenians were closer to the Greeks, from whom these Christian names were borrowed, and had direct, close contacts with them, living in a single Byzantine Empire. Naturally, the mixing of dialects led to the establishment of variants without the initial [h] in this territory, while in East Armenian the mixing of dialects (if it took place) did not lose this sound.

#### 4. Conclusion

The paper only poses a problem, the solution of which is possible by means of not so much theoretical as applied phonetics. If the systemic relationships of the results of linguistic transformations in history and their causes are investigated and established, the history of mankind will be absolutely definite. Very interesting results can be obtained by analogy with the data of bilingualism, interference, etc., which U. Weinreich drew attention to at the time. He, in fact, warned the new direction of sociolinguistics. “From a linguistic point of view,” - he wrote, - “the problem of bilingualism is to describe those several language systems that come into contact with each other; to identify those differences between these systems that make it difficult to master them simultaneously, and thus predict the most likely manifestations of interference that occurs as a result of language contact, and finally, to indicate in the behavior of bilingual speakers those deviations from the norms of each of the languages that are associated with their bilingualism” (U.

Weinreich, 1972: P. 28). The mixing of dialects of the same or different languages always goes through several stages: mutual influence - interference (mixing) - convergence - assimilation, and a similar transfer of the patterns of modern development to the development of ancient or medieval times is quite logical.

Another aspect of language history research is the identification of ways to prevent assimilation. Social conditions contribute to assimilation today: the absence of schools in the mother tongue, the absence of modern cultural attributes, more favorable conditions and prospects for learning in a more widespread (or official) language, etc. The details of assimilation are important not in themselves, but only in order to prevent further assimilation, especially at the state level.

Today, thanks to these studies, it will be possible to determine many factors of the state’s language policy: in which countries have the most “successful” conditions for assimilation been created and how do they relate in this regard to the creation of democratic foundations in society, how does the process of assimilation intensify in connection with the development of civilization. From a purely linguistic point of view, it is possible to establish the conditions for mixing dialects of different languages, the results of such processes, and evaluate them in terms of language development and linguistic thinking; what is the main thing for preserving linguistic identity; where does assimilation begin and why does globalization lead to the disappearance of the languages of small nations, and how to stop (!) this process, since the ideology of democracy and the ideology of assimilation of peoples are incompatible.

#### Funding

This study was carried out without external funding.

#### 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 of Author. They can be used in similar studies, which will be another confirmation of them.

#### Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

- Arakin, V. D. (1985). *History of the English language*. Prosveshchenie. [In Russian].
- Avanesov, R. I. (1974). *Russian literary and dialectal phonetics*. Prosveshchenie. [In Russian].
- Baudouin de Courtenay, J. N. (1963). *Selected works* (Vol. 1). AofS of USSR. [In Russian].
- Baugh, A. C., & Cable, Th. (2005). *A history of the English language* (5th ed.). Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Bloomfield, L. (1933). *Language*. Henry Holt.
- Davtyan, A. (2022). *The Sumerians' "Manual of Agriculture" is written in Armenian*. Samizdat. [In Armenian].
- Denison, N. (2019). Language change in progress: Variation as it happens. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *The handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 65–80). Blackwell Publishing.
- Dauzat, A. (1956). *The history of the French language*. IL. [In Russian].
- Dressler, W., & de Cillia, R. (2017). Spracherhaltung, Sprachverfall, Sprachtod. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics / Soziolinguistik* (Vol. 3, pp. 2258–2271). Walter de Gruyter.
- Gamkrelidze, T. V., & Ivanov, V. V. (1984). *Indo-European language and Indo-Europeans* (Vols. 1–2). TSU. [In Russian].
- Gorshkova, K. V., & Khaburgaev, G. A. (1980). *Historical grammar of the Russian language*. VSh. [In Russian].
- Haugen, E. (1972). Problems of bilingual description. In *New in linguistics* (Issue 6: Language contacts, pp. 277–289). IL. [In Russian].
- Havranek, B. (1972). On the issue of language mixing. In *New in linguistics* (Issue 6: Language contacts, pp. 97–113). IL. [In Russian].
- Hewsen, R. H. (1997). The geography of Armenia. In R. G. Hovannisian (Ed.), *The Armenian people from ancient to modern times: The dynastic periods: From antiquity to the fourteenth century* (Vol. 1, p. 5). St. Martin's Press.
- Jahukyan, G. B. (1960). *Introduction to Armenian dialectology* (Vol. 1, pp. 39–270). AofS ASSR. [In Armenian].
- Kalnin, L. E. (2004). On the hierarchy of methods of studying Slavic dialects. In *Research on Slavic dialectology* (Issue 9: Methods of studying territorial and social dialects. To the results of the experience of Slavic dialectology of the twentieth century, pp. 4–12). RAofS. [In Russian].
- Katvalyan, V. L. (2014). *Questions of Armenian dialectology*. Hajastan. [In Armenian].
- Khaburgaev, G. A. (1980). *The formation of the Russian language*. VSh. [In Russian].
- Lippen, P. (1926). *Vois d'outre-tombe. La question flamande*.
- Madoyan, V. (2024). Periodization of the Armenian language in connection with the history of its native speakers. *Forum for Linguistic Studies*, 6(5), 461–470. <https://doi.org/10.30564/fls.v6i5.6944>
- Marr, N. Ya. (1937). *The main issues of the history of the language*. Sotsecgiz. [In Russian].
- Martinet, A. (1972a). Contacts of structures: Deafening whistlers in Spanish. In *New in linguistics* (Language contacts, pp. 290–320). IL. [In Russian].
- Martinet, A. (1972b). Language propagation and structural linguistics. In *New in linguistics* (Issue 6: Language contacts, pp. 81–96). IL. [In Russian].
- Meillet, A. (1926). *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale* (Vol. 1).
- Müller, F. M. (1861). *Lectures on the science of language*.
- Ostapchuk, O. A. (2004). Sociolinguistic method in dialectological research (the situation of the dialect of a linguistic minority). In *Research on Slavic dialectology* (Issue 9: Methods of studying territorial and social dialects. To the results of the experience of Slavic dialectology of the twentieth century, pp. 32–44). RAofS. [In Russian].
- Paul, G. (n.d.). *Principles of language history*. IL. [In Russian].
- Rosenzweig, V. Yu. (1972). The main issues of the theory of language contacts. In *New in linguistics* (Language contacts, pp. 5–25). IL. [In Russian].
- Rosetti, A. (1972). Mixed language or a mix of languages. In *New in linguistics* (Issue 6: Language contacts, pp. 112–119). IL. [In Russian].
- Russian dialectology (V. V. Kolesov, Ed.). (1990).

- VSh. [In Russian].
- Selishchev, A. M. (1968). *Selected works* (pp. 223–388). Prosveshchenie. [In Russian].
- Shcherba, L. V. (1958). *Selected works on linguistics and phonetics* (pp. 45–50). LSU. [In Russian].
- Shcherba, L. V. (1974). *Language system and speech activity* (pp. 63–69). [In Russian].
- Strabo. (1994). *Geography* (pp. 490–523). Ladomir. [In Russian].
- Weinreich, U. (1972). Monolingualism and multilingualism. In *New in linguistics (Issue 6: Language contacts)*, pp. 25–60. IL. [In Russian].
- Weinreich, U. (1979). *Language contacts*. Vishcha shkola. [In Russian].
- Yartseva, V. N. (1979). The theory of language interaction and the work of U. Weinreich's "Language contacts." In U. Weinreich, *Language contacts*. Vishcha shkola. [In Russian].