

VAZGUEN HAMBARDZUMYAN

THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND SOME CURRENT ISSUES IN THE STUDY OF THE CILICIA DIALECT

(Report)

Great contributions are made in the study and the scientific classification of the Armenian dialects especially by A. Aytanyan and K. Patkanyan (19th century 60 – 70s), H. Adjaryan and A. Gharibyan (20th century 10 – 60s), G. Djahukyan (20th century, 60 – 80s).

According to G. Djahukyan the Armenian dialectology has four development periods which are the following: a) the period of fragmentary data and the use of geographico – linguistic classification (5th to the beginning of the 20th century), b) the period of the domination of the morphological principle in classification of the Armenian dialects (the beginning of the 20th century to the early 1940s), c) the period of introducing the phonetic principle of classification as well as of attempts at exacting and particularizing the morphological classification (from early 1940s to 1970s), d) the period of the multi – features classification and preparation of the dialect atlas (1970s to present)'.

It's worthwhile mentioning that the practical bases of geographical, phonetic and morphological classification were established by A. Aytanyan and K. Patkanyan in the second half of the 19th century.

Subsequently, more than three decades later, in the 1910s, H. Adjaryan followed their views and established a separate morphological classification according to only one attribute, i.e. the differences in the structure of the verbs in indicative mood present tense. According to this he distinguishes three branches *um* (Yerevan, Tiflis, Gharabagh, Agulis, Djughia etc), *kə* (Mush, Karin, Van, Cilicia, Tigranakert etc) and *el* (Khoy, Maragha etc).

This type of structure, evidently, is one of the attributes mentioned by the predicators of H. Adjaryan and maybe it is not more important than the other attributes (e.g. the structure of the noun in singular derivative case with the endings *-e* or *-ic*, the structure of the plural genitive case with *-i* or *-u* endings etc).

Later on, in the 70s of the twentieth century they use a new approach according to which not only the number of the attributes is increasing but also the dimension of the study principles and new local variations as dialect units "which make to avoid the partiality, to complete the dialect, sub-dialect and vernacular separations according to objective criteria and to define the phonetic and the grammar peculiarities according the historical and geographical principles".

G. Djahukyan's study "Introduction to Armenian Dialectology" is an essential achievement in the study of the Armenian dialects. According to the author that book becomes the

bases for a new scientific norm i.e. statistical dialectology, mentioning that "its main goal is to decide the interrelation of the dialects and classification of the dialect units"⁵.

As a result a new approach is developed i.e. multi-attribute-statistical classification of the dialects, which one way or another tries to utilize the linguistic-geographic principles⁶.

In G. Djahukyan's classification (with traditional name) the Cilicia dialect is characterized with six locations; Sivrihisar, Hadjin, Zeythun, Marash, Beylan and Kesab and the dialect of Syria or (as an administrative and geographical area) Suedia is presented with its four locations of Hadji – Habibli, Yeoghun – Oluk, Kabusie and Aramo (see op. cit., p. 33 – 34) which, as the author states, are included in the west dialect group with the following distributions.

a) Antioch or southeastern dialect group with its two subgroups of Kesab – Svedia dialect (Kesab, Kabusie, Yeoghun – Oluk, Hadji – Habibli and Aramo territories) and the dialect of Beylan (with homonymous territory),

b) Cilicia or southwestern middialect group with two subgroups of Hadjin dialect (with homonymous area) and Marash – Zeythun dialect (with two homonymous territories)⁷.

The above mentioned ten areas are among the 120 areas (they are shown in the tables with the numbers of 31 – 40 according the mentioned order), for the variative-statistic classification of which G. Djahukyan chooses 100 attributes that denote their dialect condition. Those attributes are equally distributed within 25 branches first according to their phonetic (vowel and consonant) and then to their grammatical (declination and inflection) systems. Thus he names those attributes separately, and makes tables for the each areas using the signs of plus or minus in order to denote the existence of the certain attribute in those territories.

Antioch or southwestern dialect groups as well as most of Cilicia or southwestern middialects have always been the main study matter for the Armenian linguists (H. Adjaryan, A. Gharibyan, E. Aghayan, G. Djahukyan and other) and the authors of the university textbooks (A. Gharibyan, A. Grigoryan and other)⁸.

At late 50s and early 60s of last century many foreign scholars such as J. Fourquet, E. Benveniste, H. Vogt, E. A. Makajev, V. V. Ivanov participated in the discussion on the Armenian dialects and expressed significant points and observations which are also based on the important data of the dialectal consonant system of Cilicia and Syria⁹.

Furthermore, besides the general studies (historical, topological – etymological, philological etc.) published at the end of the 19th century or later in which the authors somehow reflect the linguistic conditions of those areas, new scientific studies (scientific articles, reports, papers, thesis etc.) are being published about the source dialect of those dialect groups¹⁰.

Recently H. Adjaryan's "Study on the Dialect of Cilicia" has been published (Yerevan, 2003). The first part of the book includes the study of the dialects of Zeythun and Hadjin jointly; the second part gives the separate studies of Svedia (Musa ler) dialect conducted with the scheme developed by the author in the 1900s which consisted of phonetics and morphology parts, exponents (origins) of the dialects and a glossary. The data of that study was utilized by G. Djahukyan in his multi-features classification.

A. Gharibyan has an essential contribution in the scientific study of certain dialects of Cilicia and Antioch.

First, Gharibyan separates two new branches (*ka* and *ha*) inside the *kə* branch distinguished by Adjaryan; for one case (*ka* branch) he indicates five dialects (Amasia, Zeythun, Beylan, Svedia and Marash) and for the other case (*ha* branch) two dialects (Kesab and Arabkir).

Then, Gharibyan separately describes the dialects of Aramo and Kabusie and tries to complete the number of the Armenian dialects of *kə* branch (i.e. Kabusie) and *ha* branch (i.e. Aramo)*.

Gharibyan mentions "A rich source is discovered in the area of Antioch. H. Adjaryan considers all the dialects of that source as one dialect and calls it "dialect of Syria". But the consistent study of those dialects shows that there are more differences among those dialects than between the dialects of Araratyan and Gharabagh or Araratyan and Karin. That is why his efforts succeeded. The Svedia dialect with its subdialects and Beylan dialect with its subdialects, Kesab dialect with its subdialects were found in Antioch area. That area was divided into four sub areas those of Svedia, Beylan, Kesab and Djəsər – Shughur. As we already know the language condition of three of them, so we have only to find out the dialectal condition of the Armenian speaking villages of Djəsər–Shughur area"¹⁰.

G. Djahukyan's book "Introduction to Armenian Dialectology" promoted the new scientific study of the Armenian dimensional variations and it supposed further adequate examinations both in the theoretical development and practical utilization of the approaches and principles in the thorough study of the dialect units. That's why it is necessary to apply the approaches and views to both the traditional and new researchers who develop their ideas in the past or modern times, separately or parallel to each other.

Now let's reflect and discuss the statistic results of the phonetic and morphological differentiating attributes of the dialects of Sivrihisar, Hadjin, Zeythun, Marash and Kesab which G. Djahukyan traditionally includes in the dialect of Cilicia¹¹.

1. All the vernaculars have the common expression of the consonant attributes and occurrences of the realization of *h ~ f* (*hot ~ fol* 'ground, land' etc).

- a) The voicedness of the initial voiceless plosives and fricatives (*p ~ b. pat ~ bad* 'wall' etc).
- b) The voicedness of the voiceless plosives and fricatives after *r*– and at the back position (*p ~ b. karpet ~ karbed* 'carpet' etc).
- c) Back position voiced plosives and fricatives or the ones following *→r* change into voiceless aspirates (*b ~ p. nurb ~ nup* 'delecate' etc).
- d) Initial voiced plosives express the feature of voiceless consonants (*b ~ p. ban ~ pan.* 'thing' etc).

The other features have either weak or no expression.

The lack of consonant attribute is common in the dialect of Hadjin and Kesab, then Zeythun and especially Beylan and Sivrihisar. The weakest expression has the dialect of Marash.

2. The vowel attributes have stronger expressions than the consonant attributes. The common attributes are the following.

a) Palatalized vowels are the most common (*a, o. barak ~ barak, parak* 'thin' etc) and the full-voicedness of *a* (*a ~ i, u. bərinj ~ birinj* 'rice' etc).

b) Several attributes are common such as non-labial vowels for *iw* (*aliwr ~ alir* 'flour, meal' etc), palatalized vowels for *a* and *o* (*a ~ a. banjar ~ banjar* 'nettle' etc, *o ~ o. bolor ~ bolor* 'all' etc), presence of the harmony of the vowels (*aliwr ~ alowr* 'flour' etc), stressed vowel or diphthong for stressed *e* and *o* (except for *ei* and *owo. ezn ~ iz* 'ox', *ov ~ owv* 'who' etc), labialization of *a* (*krak ~ krok* 'fire', *hac ~ hoc* 'bread' etc).

c) Several attributes are comparably rare such as palatalized vowel for *ow* (*ow ~ ow. bowrd ~ bowri* 'wool' etc.), stressed vowels of lower and middle groups instead of stressed *i* and *ow* (*mis ~ mes, mays* 'meat', *owl ~ ol* 'eight' etc), or delabialization of *o* (*xrov ~ xrav, xrev* 'offended' etc).

The other attributes are either expressed very weak or have no expression.

The vowel attributes are most common in Zeythun dialect, the dialects of Kesab, Hadjin and Marash have equal expressions, the dialects of Sivrihisar and Beylan have weak expressions.

3. The areas have common nominal (morphological) attributes.

a) Complete association is observed in four cases: with *en* as well as *an* in the derivative case (*covic' ~ coven, covan* 'from the sea' etc), in pronouns with the presence of *-i* (*inj ~ inji* 'me' etc), the possessive form with articles (*hac 'i ktor ~ hac 'in ktorə* 'a piece of bread' etc), the application of the indefinite article at back possession (*mi asxarh ~ asxarh mi, asxarh mə* 'a world' etc).

b) Two cases are more common such as analytical (with prepositions and back possession or expressed with *-i*), with the structure of instrumental case (*alk 'atov ~ alk 'atin het, alk 'atanov, alk 'atanow* 'with the poor' etc, and *jrov ~ i jowr* 'with water' etc.), with other limited number of proper words and peculiarities (polysyllabic words with the ending *-er. beran ~ beraner* 'mouths' etc, limited application of the article in nominative case *jowr ~ jowrə* 'water' etc., double article for the words ending with vowel *ji ~ jinə* 'horse' etc).

c) Comparably fewer cases with common attributes are used such *-vi* (also *-vni, -vner, -van, -vank' - vdik' ac 'k'er ~ ac 'vi*, also *ac 'ner* 'eyes' etc), *-an* (also *-ank', -anner jier ~ jiank', jianner* 'horses' etc), *-stan* (also *-star aygi ~ aygestan* 'gardens' etc), analytical back position derivative case (*alk 'atic ~ alk 'ati mne* 'from the poor' etc), ordinal numerals with the ending *-inji* (*erkrord ~ erkownji* 'second' etc), preposition *z* (*asxarhə ~ asxarh 'world', golin ~ zgol* 'thief' etc).

d) Much rare are the following attributes *-ni* (also *-ne, -nin, -nik'*, and *-ani, -anik'* etc) plural formation (*alk 'at ~ alk 'atni* 'the poor', *aman ~ amanani* 'pots' etc), derivative case with the ending *m* (*elboric' ~ elbormə* 'from brother' etc.) and declined forms of the demonstrative pronouns with the endings *i* and *d* (*sra ~ sra, estowr* 'this' etc).

The rest of the attribute are either very weak or not expressed.

It's worthwhile mentioning that the dialects of Hadjin, Zeythun and Khesab have the best expressions of attributes, the dialect of Marash has weaker expressions and the other two dialects of Sivrihisar and Beylan have the weakest expressions.

4. The verb (morphological) attributes are:

a) completely common for the structure of the perfect tense with *-r* (*berel em ~ berer em* 'I have brought' etc),

b) somehow common with the verbs *-el*, *-il* (*xosem*, *xosec* 'i ~ *xosim*, *xosec* 'ay 'I'll speak' etc), the existence of the inflexion *-ul* (*t'olnem* ~ *t'olown* 'I'll leave' etc), *-al*, *-el* (*grec* 'ink' ~ *grec* 'ank' 'We have written' etc),

c) less common attributes such as the imperfect form of present and past with *-kow*, as well as back possession (*growm em*, *growm ei* ~ *ka grem*, *ka grei*, also *grem ka*, *grei ka* 'I write, I wrote' etc), present or past indefinite with other endings (*growm em* ~ *ka grem*, *ka grem ka* 'I write' etc), the structure of present continuous (*growm em* ~ *ka grem kor* 'I am writing' etc), adverbs with *-man* (*elac* ~ *elman* 'got up' etc), the structures with *piti* (also *pi*, *ti*. *piti grem* ~ *pi grem*, *ti grem* 'I will write' etc).

The rest of the attributes are either weak or missing.

The vowel attributes are most common in Hadjin and Zeythun dialects, The dialects of Sivrihisar, Kesab and Marash have equal expressions, the dialect of Beylan have weak expressions.

Traditional dialectology completely neglects the syntactical attributes with definite reasons. H. Adjaryan's dialectological works denote a number of examples and quotations from adequate studies, conducts theoretical, phonetic, morphological analysis but never syntactical analyses. The future researchers mainly follow H. Adjaryan's ideas. This view completely concerns to Cilicia dialects, because their syntactical structure have never been a matter of study. The solution of this problem is essential for the Armenian dialectology.

The studies of non-adjaryan school representatives denote that some Armenian dialects have such archaic phonetic attributes which are significant for the etymological – typological study of the phonetic structure and especially consonant system of the IE languages.

From this viewpoint the consonant system of Cilicia dialect can have its contributions. As a result there occur Armenian local variations and the necessity to study the units of Cilicia dialect. The scientific study of those problems with new criteria can promote the clarification of the history of the Armenian language and its interrelation with other IE languages.

ՕԱՆՈՒԹԱԳՐՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐ

¹ G. Djahukyan, Introduction to the Armenian Dialectology, Yerevan, 1972, pp. 16–28 (in Arm.). We should mention that later Djahukyan distinguishes five periods making chronological and conceptual shifts within those four periods. Cf. A Handbook of Armenian Dialectology by John A. C. Greppin and Amalia A. Khachaturyan, Delmar, New York, 1986, pp. 9–26:

² G. Djahukyan, op. cit., p. 28.

³ G. Djahukyan, op. cit., p. 14.

⁴ G. Djahukyan, op. cit., p. 25.

⁵ In dialectological Studies we often mention areas not less important from the view of differences of dialectal attributes (even the separate parts of the same area e.g. Zeithun, Larañlar or Yalowbyan, also Shorvayan have different consonant system i.e. the existence of the voiceless consonants for voiced and vice versa, the voiced consonants for voiceless).

⁶ Cf. H. Adjaryan, Classification des dialects arméniens, Paris, 1909, H. Adjaryan, Armenian dialectology, Moskva–Nor–Naxichevan, 1911 (in Arm.), A. Gharibyan, Armenian dialectol-

- ogy, Yerevan, 1953 (in Arm.), *A. Gharibyan*, A New Group of the New Armenian Dialects, Yerevan, 1958 (in Arm.), *E. Aghayan*, The Dialect of Meghri Yerevan, 1954 (in Arm.), *G. Jahukyan*, op. cit., *A. Grigoryan*, Course of the Armenian Dialectology, Yerevan, 1957 (in Arm.).
- ՏՃ «Вопросы языкознания, 1959, 5-6, 1960, 4-6, 1961, 3-6.
- ⁸ See, for example, *M.S. Dawuth-Bek*, "Sound study of Marash Dialect", ("Handes amsoareay", 1896, in Arm.), *A. Pashaian*, About the Suedia dialect ("Patma-banasirakan handes", 1963, 4, in Arm.), *A. Pashaian*, Morphology of the Svedia dialect ("Telekagit" of the Academy of Science, 1964, 3, in Arm.), *H. Gasparian*, The Dialect of Hadjin, Yerevan, 1966 (in Arm.), *T. Andreasyan*, The Dialect of Svedia, Yerevan, 1967 (in Arm.), *H. Adjarian*, Study of Dialect of Cilicia, Yerevan, 2003 (in Arm.), *H. Cholakhyan*, The Dialect of Kesab, Halep, 1986 (in Arm.).
- ⁹ See *A. Gharibyan*, A New Group of the New Armenian Dialects, pp. 9-147.
- ¹⁰ *A. Gharibyan*, op. cit., p. 5.
- ¹¹ We should mention that Djahukyan includes the areas Hadji-Habibli, Yeolun - Oluk, Kabusie and Aramo into Syria, more specific in Svedia, except for Aramo. See *G. Djahukyan*, op. cit., p. 34.

4. Համբարձումյան

ԿԻԼԻԿԻԱՅԻ ԲԱՐԲԱՈՒ ՈՒՍՈՒՄԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ ՁԵՈՔԵՐԵՐՈՒՄՆԵՐԸ ԵՎ ԱՐԴԻ ԽՆԴԻՐՆԵՐԸ

Կիլիկիայի բարբառ անվանումը նշանակում է «մի բարբառային միություն» (մծառյան) կամ որոշակի թվով բարբառներ և խոսվածքներ ընդգրկող «միջբարբառախոսը» (Ջահուկյան): Վերջինիս մեջ մտնում են Հաջընի և Սարաշ-Ջեյթունի բարբառները՝ իրենց բարբառախոս վայրերով, այլև Քեսաբ-Ավեդիայի և Բեյլանի բարբառները, մի ղեկավարում՝ Քեսաբ, Քաբուսիե, Յողուն-Օլուկ, Հաջի-Հաբիբլի, Արամո, մյուս ղեկավարում՝ Բեյլան բարբառախոս վայրերով: Իսկ Սիվիդիիսարն, իբրև բարբառախոս վայր, դրվում է մեկ այլ՝ արևմտյան բարբառախոսի մեջ առանձին, միջբարբառ անվանումով: Կիլիկիայի կամ հարավարևմտյան, ինչպես նաև ծայր հարավարևմտյան բարբառախոսների մեջ մտնող բարբառները բավարար չափով ուսումնասիրված են, կան զգալի թվով բարբառագիտական հոդվածներ և մենագրություններ, բանասիրական և ազգագրական բնույթի աշխատանքներ: Այդ բնագավառում շարունակվում են գիտական ուսումնասիրությունները: Հիշյալ տարածքների բարբառները քննության են առնվել թե անցյալում և թե նոր ժամանակներում՝ կատարված առանձին նկարագրության և աշխարհագրական (տարածքային) քաշիման, ծնաբանական և ինչյունաբանական, այլև բազմահատկանիշ-վիճակագրական դասակարգման և բարբառների առկայի (քարտեզագրման) սկզբունքներով և մոտեցումներով: Վերջին երեք-չորս տասնամյակներում հնդեվրոպական լեզուների համեմատական-տիպաբանական և տարբերակային-տիպաբանական ուսումնասիրության բնագավառում բավականին մեծ տեղ է տրվում հայերենի (և վերջինիս որոշակի բարբառների) հնչյունական համակարգին վերաբերող տվյալներին, և ըստ այդմ առաջ են քաշվում ընդհանուր հնդեվրոպական վիճակի վերականգնման և զնահատության նոր մոտեցումներ և սկզբունքներ: Այս տեսակետից առաջ են գալիս հայերենի տարածքային տարբերակների, ընդ որում նաև Կիլիկիայի բարբառի մեջ մտնող միավորների լայն ուսումնասիրության հետ կապված խնդիրներ:

Այդ խնդիրների գիտական նոր չափանիշներով լուծումը կարող է նպաստել ոչ միայն առանձին վերցված հայերենի, այլև հայերենի և հնդեվրոպական մյուս լեզուների պատմության առաջել իրական պարզաբանմանը:

В. Амбарцумян

РЕЗУЛЬТАТЫ И АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ КИЛИКИЙСКОГО ДИАЛЕКТА АРМЯНСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Название Киликийский диалект означает “отдельный диалектный союз” (Ачарян) или “междиалектная группа, которая содержит определенное количество диалектов” (Джаукян). В эту группу входят Аджинский и Мараш—Зейтунский диалекты со своими территориальными разновидностями (поддиалектами), а также Кесаб—Сведийский и Бейланский диалекты, причем с определенными территориальными наречиями, с одной стороны, Кесаб, Кабусие, Йогун—Олук, Хаджи—Хабибли и Арамо, с другой стороны — Бейланский. А Сивригисар как отдельная диалектная разновидность относится к другой, т. е. западной диалектной группе как междиалект.

Исследование Киликийского или югозападного, а также других диалектов, входящих в крайне югозападную группу, считается удовлетворительным; имеется значительное количество научных статей и монографий, а также филологических и этнографических трудов. Исследования в этой области продолжаются.

Диалекты упомянутой территории изучались как в прошлом, так и в наши дни, исходя из принципов отдельного описания и географического (территориального) распределения, с применением подходов морфологической, фонологической, а также многопризнаково—статистической классификации и составления диалектологического атласа (картографии).

Последние три—четыре десятилетия в области сравнительно—типологического и вариативно—типологического исследования индоевропейских языков большое место уделяется данным фонологической системы армянского языка и его диалектов, и тем самым выдвигаются новые подходы и принципы реконструкции и оценки общиндоевропейского языкового состояния. С этой точки зрения возникают определенные проблемы, связанные с пересмотром некоторых вопросов исследования территориальных вариантов армянского языка, в том числе с отдельными разновидностями Киликийской диалектной группы.

Решение этих вопросов может способствовать более полному представлению истории как армянского, так и армянского в связи с другими индоевропейскими языками.