

A Survey on Loanwords and Borrowings and Their Role in the Reflection of Cultural Values and Democracy Development: the Armenian Paradigm

Elina Stepanyan

PHD, University of Padova

Abstract

With the new wave of social sector becoming a fundamental element in generating and shaping democratic practices in such countries as Armenia, the role and the strategic prominence of language and loanwords has been highly reemphasized in the frames of thorough investigation of word borrowing practice and of its contribution to the egalitarian developments. The current paper aims at disclosing the essential dynamics in regard to the development of loanwords uncovered during a former field work in Armenia, which primarily concerns the process, the causes, the social dynamics through which loanwords emerge, as well as the issues of "purity" of vocabulary and the interconnection between loanwords and local development processes in Armenia. The article is based on qualitative research methods; semi-structured, focus group and informal interviews have been carried out in order to collect the needed data. The results of the article suggest that being the basis of communication among different countries and societies, the process of word borrowing however is not always easy and autonomous, especially in the scope of democracy building; the creation and the development of new words and concepts is a complicated task, which requires cultural exchange, real manifestation of the concepts induced, as well as apt and professional assistance and sustenance. The paper concludes that notwithstanding all the efforts by humans, geopolitical, economic and cultural forces play a significantly stronger role, and thus changes and modifications in a language are inevitable, moreover the process appeals for facilitation and support in such developing countries as Armenia.

Keywords: sociolinguistics, localization of English, loanwords, neologisms in democracy building, local development in English

1. Introduction

Throughout the entire history of human existence, human communication has led to situations where different languages establish interaction and exchange, and

accordingly their mutual influence becomes inevitable causing certain changes in the vocabulary, grammar syntax and phonetics of those languages. The vocabulary of any modern language has overcome a long history of evolution and no language can merely consist of only native words; the words borrowed from other languages play a significant role in supplementing and enriching the language throughout the whole process of its historical development, from ancient to recent times. In fact, the process of one language borrowing words from another language is a common phenomenon, moreover, for certain historical periods, it is even inevitable. Basically, the penetration of a foreign vocabulary enriches the vocabulary of the host language. A good illustration of this phenomenon is the important role played by Greek and Latin languages in Europe, the Old Slavonic language in the Slavic world, and the Arabic language in the Muslim East. The phenomenon of borrowing words from other languages has occurred throughout the entire history of humanity, still occurs and will occur at all times and in the languages of all nations. Furthermore, the changes that take place in certain languages reflect the historical, cultural and moral values of the nation.

The study of foreign vocabulary and, more extensively, the study of linguistic borrowings, presents a serious interest for linguistic analysis and other sciences. Purely linguistic issues related to this area are connected with the issues of "purity" of vocabulary, and in many works, are reflected in conjunction with the problems of cultural and socio-economic contacts between countries and people. Historians, philologists, public figures, writers, critics have always been keenly interested in the processes of penetration of foreign vocabulary into given language and its further expansion and use, expressing their views on the acceptance or non-acceptance of certain words, and very often these statements and arguments go far beyond the linguistic sphere – expanding to the field of ideology, politics, sociology etc.

Some scholars believe that there is no need to resort to foreign words when there are more accurate understandable words in one's own language. This argument shows that the problem of borrowing units of one language by others is complex and multifaceted. And an important role here belongs to the issues of language purity: how much foreign language vocabulary is needed? Is it possible to adjust the borrowing process? Is it possible (and will it be fruitful) to struggle against specific foreign words that most of the authorities in the field of language can seem superfluous, unnecessary, clogging the speech? These and many other issues related to the functioning of foreign words in speech, with their necessity or, on the contrary, undesirability, are put and more or less successfully solved in many practical manuals, books on the culture of speech, popular publications on linguistics. However with all this in mind, loanwords constantly appear in the language no matter whether experts approve this or not.

It is expedient to define the task of the proposed study as a historical and lexical one and to delimit it from questions that are related to normative and stylistic recommendations regarding the use of certain foreign words. In this paper we study the types of lexical borrowings, following the causes and conditions for their penetration and consolidation in the vocabulary of the borrowing language. We will as well explore how this process is reflected in the minor language groups like Armenian.

In fact, the borrowed words comprising the new vocabulary in the given language are not homogeneous by structure; they can be subdivided into three subcategories:

a) words structurally coinciding with foreign prototypes. More precisely, these are the words that have been changed graphically and transmitted by appropriate phonemic means of the borrowing language without any structural “morphological-adaptation”, for example: the English word combine, or hydroplane sound the same in the Armenian equivalents for those words. Some of these words can be adapted according to their pronunciation and phonetic appearance in the source language (for example hydroplane is changed to Гидроплан [gidroplan] in Russian following the phonetic peculiarities of the language (specifically the absence of phoneme -H). It should also be noted that it is very common to meet words borrowed from German, Spanish and some other languages where there is no big gap between the pronunciation of the two words and their spelling remains the closest to the prototype word;

b) words morphologically formed by means of a borrowing language by adding suffixes or endings specific for the given language, for example Armenian suffix expressing plurality [er/ner] was added to English words jeans, boots: jeanser, booster;

c) words with a partial morphological substitution (usually an affix part or a second element of a compound word is substituted) for example plural suffix -s is removed from English word shorts and Armenian plural suffix is added obtaining the word shorter.

Here we should note that the second and third subtypes of borrowed words are close to each other. In a number of cases, the formation of a word by grammatical means of a borrowing language is at the same time the substitution of a foreign affix. For example the French words mecanique, pathetique are changed into mechanical, pathetic in English and [mekhanikakan, patetic] in Armenian.

While discussing borrowed words from a foreign language in the given one, we shall pay special attention to the terms with Latin and Greek elements which are central to our research, more precisely the ones with Latin, Greek origin in English (for example, democracy, motivation, project, concept, telephone, telegraph, cinematography, etc.). In fact, the formation of scientific and technical terms through the use of Greek and

Latin roots and word-forming elements is typical to our time, and we actually use them in our daily routine occasionally. As a matter of fact, these words are typically accepted in most languages and are widely used in international practice.

When we elaborate more on these types of borrowings we discover that one of their specificities of the terms created in this way is that they "do not have a homeland," more particularly, these words do not have a living source of borrowing, like most foreign words. These terms, which currently constitute a significant lexical layer in each language, testify about the internationalization of certain categories of vocabulary - a trend that is noted in linguistic literature as a specific feature inherent in the contemporary relationships and interchange between people and languages. According to Akulenko (1973) for modern development of languages two essential but opposing tendencies are typical: on the one hand, the increasing internationalization of vocabulary, primarily scientific and technical terminology, and on the other hand, the tendency to preserve the identity of the vocabulary, sometimes reinforced by the subjective desire of society (or its individual representatives and groups) to limit the borrowing and the use of foreign words (the Armenian case will be revealed further in this paper).

It is interesting to note, that many of the word-terms deriving from Greek and Latin elements, have become international, and as we have mentioned above, not having source of borrowing, they also do not correspond to the real, linguistic environment that has in fact conditioned their appearance. At the same time as the old technical terms usually retain the character of the national language that created them (for example, the predominance of English and Dutch words in the old terminology of navigation), the foundations of the newest names are usually borrowed from the dead Greek and Latin languages (car, balloon, telephone, telegraph), and are devoid of national coloring (M. Donald et al., 1986). And in fact, when it comes to any invention - discovery, including the linguistic ones, the fact of who "invented" and introduced the term of the invention sadly remains secluded, it is usually of interest only historically, but not linguistically: after all, the structure of the word is not marked by national linguistic features (for example, German, if it is a question of the German invention, or English, etc.). And when these very words pass on from one language to another, the only modifications they undergo are of phonetic and graphical kind.

These modifications sometimes allow us to determine the source of a particular term without referring to the history of the designated object (compare, for example, teletype with a phonetic characteristic of the English language: the Greek morpheme -type is pronounced [taip]). However, in most cases the linguistic analysis of the international "Greek-Latin" term does not clarify anything in its history; a decisive role here belongs to historical data on the most signified reality (compare words such as an airplane, telegraph, detector, etc.).

Hence, borrowed words are a complex and structurally non homogeneous group; however, the vocabulary, common to this group, definitely has some inherent features that distinguish it from exoticisms and foreign inclusions.

2. Methodology

The general objective of the article is to serve the outcomes for contributing to the overall research problem “Non-state Actors in Internationalizing and Localizing English in the Process of Non-formal Education in Armenia; Linguistic Analysis of Language Patterns of Democratic Style” through theoretical investigation, field research findings and practices. The research is theory-based and has been carried out by means of content analysis. The paper applied qualitative research methods in order to fulfill its aim, the case studies have been carried out in Armenia. In order to collect the required data for finalizing the research, observation with purpose sampling has been applied using semi-structured, focus group and informal interviews, however, the results of the interview aimed at resolving the general research question are not directly quoted but rather reflected in the current article.

3. Types of Borrowings

It is necessary to point out at this point of discussion, that the concept of borrowing indicates the process of moving different elements from one language to another. Different elements are understood as units of different levels of the structure of the languages - phonology, morphology, syntax, vocabulary and semantics. In accordance with this, it is essential to limit the term "borrowing" when it comes to moving elements of the same level: for example, "lexical borrowing."

Thus, we can distinguish the following types of borrowings:

- a) Borrowing a word - the most frequent and typical case of borrowing;
- b) Borrowing a phoneme- the most rare and particular case, depending on the degree of contact between the two languages;
- c) Borrowing a morpheme - usually, the morpheme is selected on the basis of a verbal series consisting of words with a common lexical meaning, characterized by the repetition of a structural element, for example a businessman, a barman, an athlete, etc.;
- d) Syntactical or structural borrowing - the word is borrowed syntactically, when the construction of phrases in a language is influenced by foreign syntactic constructions- for example, the influence of English newspaper clichés, mainly headlines, on the headlines of the modern press;
- e) Semantic borrowings - the meaning of the word is created "under the pressure" of a foreign sample – calque. This type of borrowing is the most common in Armenian language.

All these types of borrowings are in some hierarchical relationship. Lexical borrowing seems to be the first stage of foreign-language influence and its specificity is represented by the fact that the word is borrowed "not entirely, as a complete, finished, grammatically formed word, but only, as a more or less formless piece of lexical material, receiving a new form only in the system and by means of another Language (V. Akulenko, 1973).

A borrowed word acquires certain grammatical characteristics inherent to the given language, and in this case, the word is subordinated to one or another grammatical category; for example, in Russian, there is gender-related correlation of words depending on their formal appearance (words ending with consonants, as a rule, refer to the masculine gender, words ending with -o, -e, to the nouns of the neutral gender, etc.).

4. The Causes of Loanwords

Generation of loanwords is a process that is habitually caused by a complex set of linguistic as well as extra-linguistic causes. And undoubtedly, there can be distinguished external and internal causes that directly or indirectly contribute to the process.

4.1 External Causes

While referring to the external causes, we should mention that the non-linguistic reasons for borrowing words of one language by another should include the presence of more or less close political, social, economic, cultural and/or industrial ties between different groups of native speakers of both countries.

It is a common knowledge, and we have mentioned in our former discussions that vocabulary of each language is the area that is most affected by the factors that undergo any alterations in the above mentioned above fields: culture, economy, politics and industry. Vocabulary is the mirror reflecting the social, economic, cultural and political life of the country, as it absorbs rapidly all the new concepts and endorses their circulation even if the new words and concepts are yet foreign and do not have the equivalents in the native language. Therefore, the intensification or, on the contrary, the weakening of the ties between countries in a certain way may naturally affect the process of lexical loanwords. However, it should be noted that, despite the generally accepted view that social factors have the most direct impact on the vocabulary of the language, the impact of socio-political and other factors on lexical borrowings is not always reciprocally straightforward, or simple as it may seem. In other words, the intensification of political, economic and other ties does not necessarily trigger the activation of the process of developing loanwords in both languages. In some cases only one language is dominant. So, with well-established cultural and economic contacts, there may not be an intensive movement of vocabulary from necessarily both languages reciprocally. For example, the

relationship between Russian and Armenian languages is characterized by the "unilaterality" of the process of borrowing words: from Russian into Armenian and, to a much lesser extent, almost none in the opposite direction.

On the other hand, generating loanwords intensively is possible with relatively weaker economic, social, political, cultural and industrial ties, but with the active influence of other factors: the political role of the country and language, the constant renewal of lexical means by the formation of words that denote new, relevant or popular ideas, devices or phenomena, and so on. Thus, for instance, there can be noticed a spread of "Americanisms", which became the part of international vocabulary, and is used in many languages (iPhone, booklet, bestseller, comics, etc.).

Contemplating on the influence of external socio-economic, political, cultural and other ties of society on the process of lexical borrowings, one can say that the most typical form of such an influence is the borrowing of the word together with the borrowing of a phenomenon or the concept. Vocabulary, borrowed in this way, actually comprises a significant group of words in each language. However, this influence can also be manifested by the fact that words begin to penetrate into the language in parallel to already existing names. In this case, the semantic and stylistic differentiation occurs through creation of synonymous pairs. For instance, in Russian and Armenian there coexist certain loanwords alongside their national equivalents: удобство - комфорт [udobstvo - comfort], обслуживание - сервис [obsluzhivanie - service], слуга - портъе [sluga-portie], ограничивать - лимитировать [ogranichivat' - limitirovat'], существенный - релевантный [sushestvennyj - relevantnyj]. In Armenian: համակարգիչ-կոմպյուտեր [hamakargich -computer], ծառայութուն - սերվիս [tsarayutjun - service], սահմանապակել-լիմիտավորել [limitavorel-to limit].

With this kind of borrowing, the reasons must be sought, apparently, not only outside the language, in the influence of external social contacts on the borrowing process, but also in the perceiving language itself.

4.2 Internal (linguistic) Causes

It is interesting to note that the borrowed word is usually is less complicated, in fact easier to be absorbed by people and rooted in the language if there are some sorts of prerequisites for borrowing in the lexical system of the latter. Loaning a word from a foreign language can occur due to the tendency to eliminate the polysemy of the original word, to simplify its semantic structure. In addition, often the reason for the creation or the augmentation o the quantity of loanwords is the need to clarify or specify the corresponding concept, to delineate certain semantic nuances, (compare jam with Russian варенье, джем [varenie - jam], sexual with Russian сексуальный и половой [sexualnij - polovoi], reportage with Russian репортаж [reportazh] and story with Russian рассказ [raskaz], total with Russian, тотальный and всеобщий - general [totalnyj - vseobshij], hobby with Russian хобби [khobi] etc.). Thus, the word

already existing in the language together with the borrowed one divide the spheres of semantic influence and these spheres can more or less intersect, but never completely coincide.

An important factor that stimulates, or at least facilitates the process of borrowing, is the tendency in the borrowing language to form structurally analogous words or the existence of a class of words structurally belonging to the same type as a perceived lexical unit. For example, in the 20th century, The Russian language borrowed from French, German and other languages the word-truncation of the words like cinematography, automobile, taxicab, metropolitan - In Russian кино, авто, такси, метро [kino, avto, taksi, metro]. And from Russian these very words have penetrated in Armenian in the same truncated form. The integration of these words into Russian and later into Armenian was facilitated by the fact that in the very system of the Russian language of that time there was a strong tendency to abbreviation of words and phrases, resulting in words that were similar to those borrowed in its structure.

While considering the causes that contribute to the penetration of a foreign word into the language, it is interesting to note the following regularity: if the language establishes the gain and the use of loanwords that can be combined into a certain lexical series, based on their common meaning and repeatability of any one structural element, then borrowing or at least the use of a new foreign word, similar to the words of this series, is greatly facilitated. So, in the modern Russian language there are a number of words borrowed from English, that have the common meaning of a person and a common element is a -man - Russian -мен: джентльмен, полисмен, спортсмен, рекордсмен, конгрессмен borrowed correspondingly from gentleman, policeman, sportsman, recordsman, congressman. In Armenian these words have their equivalents in the official, written language, but are used exactly as in Russian in colloquial speech.

The linguistic reasons for the vast creation of loanwords also include the tendency to denote the notion with a single word implying indivisibility of this notion. In other words, if the designated concept is a single whole ("one thing", "one object", "one phenomenon", etc.), then the language tends to call it one word, not a word combination. "In the vocabulary of each language there are constant processes that are caused by the need to eliminate the internal contradictions between the disintegration of the form and the unity, the monolithic nature of the designated subject of thought... the absence of the formal and semantic disintegration of the notion is one of the laws of the development of vocabulary ... " wrote Isachenko (A. Isachenko, 1954).

Thus, borrowing words from another language is one of the ways to replace a two-term concept with one-term. Therefore, it can probably be argued that a foreign language is preferred to the descriptive phrase, if both serve as nouns of an undifferentiated concept: Sniper- снайпер [snaiper]. - instead of ' меткий стрелок

[metkij strelak] the "sharp shooter", the tour- турне [turne] - instead of 'путешествие по круговому маршруту [puteshestvie po krugovomu marshrutu] 'traveling around the circular route', the motel – мотель [motel'] -instead of 'гостиница для автотуристов [gostinica dlya avtoturistov] 'hotel for campers', a sprint -, спринт [sprint]- instead of 'running for short distances "бер на короткие дистанции' [beg na korotkie distancii], etc. It's fascinating to note that in Armenian we deal with calques and loan renditions (semantic borrowings) which, despite the fact that they were translated providing the descriptive characteristics of the notion, resulted due to the flexibility of the Armenian language in the creation of single word notions (դիպուկահար -dipukahar - sniper, զբոսաշրջութիւն – zbosashrjutun - tourism etc).

5. The Armenian Paradigm

When we refer to Armenian language in this context, the situation becomes slightly different. Like most of languages, throughout its centuries-old history, the Armenian language, due to the influence of the internal laws of development, and also through contacts with many related and unrelated languages, has improved its structure and enriched the vocabulary, supplementing it with thousands of borrowings. Historically, the close contacts between Armenians and their neighboring countries demonstrate the complexity of and the reasons behind the loanwords in the Armenian language.

The major part of lexical loanwords in Armenian comes from Sanskrit/Persian and Greek amounting to almost 2500 root words. Armenian is also often described as close relative of Latin as we have stated and elaborated much more detailed in our previous paper. Another interesting note is mentioned about the presence of Hellenic culture in Armenian; there is some historical and archeological evidence that demonstrates the existence of Hellenic culture in the Armenian homeland by the 4th century BC. Moreover, documented sources including history refer to Armenian rulers making coins in Greek letters and Greek was the language of the court during the reign of Dickran the II, (96-56 BC.) Besides, the proclamation of Christianity by the Armenians in 301 AD contributed to the introduction of Greek words into Armenian through the translation of theological and ecclesiastic literature from Greek into Armenian. Nonetheless, the number of loanwords in the modern Armenian vocabulary that derived from Greek is less than 200 root words.

Later, a significant layer of borrowed words in the Armenian language was accelerated by Arabic influence between the 7th and 11th centuries.

However, during the years of Soviet power, the replenishment of the vocabulary of the Armenian language with borrowings came exclusively from the Russian language and through Russian. Thus, for modern Armenian, Russian is the language from which the borrowings of both Russian and international vocabulary are directly made. Also a lot of Russian and English words and expressions have penetrated into Armenian

everyday oral speech, for which there are official equivalents in Armenian. In fact, the role of English in Armenian is not the same as in the countries where it is the first or second language or where it represents the earlier spread of English in non-native contexts, by being the part of the country's leading institutions, playing a second-language role in a multilingual society such as in countries like Singapore, India, Malawi and other territories.

Armenia is the country which commenced comprehending the importance of English as an international language only after opening its borders to the world, thus opening the doors to other countries of world rather than only to those of USSR at the end of the communist regime in the 1990s. And hence only then it was that Armenia started to integrate to the global English speaking society notwithstanding the fact that it had never had history of colonization and English had never had special administrative status. In Armenia English has merely a status of a foreign language (A. Fennell, 2008). In Armenia English is used primarily as an international language, specifically in the contexts of politics, NGO field, business field, scientific milieu, legal matters and academic communication.

The social factors play a significant role in controlling which parts of the Armenian society and context shall be mostly affected by the English language and culture. In the period following the collapse of the Soviet Union and gaining its independence Armenia went through major changes as a result of which language simply could not remain intact and unaffected. This was the period of intense borrowings. Political figures, journalists, celebrities, students, professors and many other representatives of the Armenian society recognized that English was the language of technology, innovation and there could be noticed an overall progress in usage of English words and phrases triggering the influx of the number of English loanwords in the language.

The above mentioned cases mostly include linguistic elements that are linked to particular professions or issues, and naturally some of these sectors in the Armenian context were more affected compared to others, in terms of the borrowings and the impact by the English world, culture and language including the areas of diplomacy, law, economy, politics, culture and especially computer science, due to the most frequent contacts and contracts.

Historically, loanwords significantly contributed to the development of the Armenian language in the result of long term economic, political, social, religious and cultural relations with other countries. Numerous foreign words penetrated into and remained in Armenian vocabulary. Armenian linguist A. Sukiassyan suggests that loanwords in Armenian mainly refer to the following categories (A. Sukiassyan, 2001: 203):

- a. socio-political, scientific and technological words,
- b. domestic, colloquial vocabulary, names of dishes, instruments, sports etc,

- c. names of people and countries,
- d. geographic names.

It should be noted that as a rule, the words comprising the core of language vocabulary, as well as pronouns, numerals and adjectives are in fact rarely borrowed.

The loanwords of modern literary Armenian can be subdivided into two main periods: the New and the Newest stages. The New period comprises the loanwords that appeared in the modern Armenian in the beginning of its formation prior to the Soviet years, and the Newest period, correspondingly, extends throughout the years when Armenia was under the Soviet rule.

The loanwords of the New period refer to the formation of modern literary Armenian and further functionality of its two variants:

- a. the period when loanwords penetrated into Armenian from European languages: first Italian, then Greek, French, and later English German and others languages. They mainly referred to cultural, socio-economic, administrative spheres, included scientific and technological terms etc. (The influx of European loanwords into Eastern Literary Armenian became evident in the beginning of the 11th century),
- b. the period when the formation of the modern Armenian had two literary variants (Eastern Armenian and Western Armenian) which were also supplemented with Persian, and Arabic.

There is another group of loanwords from European languages that occurred in Armenian through Russian. This group of words refers to socio-political, scientific, technological spheres, which was especially significant not only for the development of the language but for the development of the country, contributing to the establishment of international relations, fostering the progress and leading to experience exchange in all the spheres of life of people of the given country. The loanwords of this type typically include professional terminology and are widely used in scientific literature press and colloquial speech (A. Sukiassyan, 2001).

One of the biggest minds in Armenia, the senior master of linguistics, Hrachya Atcharyan, not only took records of all the mentioned above historical events and developments carrying imperative role for the language, its systemic modifications, supplementation by other languages and simply generation through time. He also highlighted the main linguistic alterations, or more precisely the influence of Italy, France and other European nations, and thus mostly the influence of Latin as well as Greek that Armenian was subjected to. It is important to mention here that we can observe more than 6000 calques from French in Armenian as well as more than 2000 borrowed words in Armenian from French and Italian altogether.

Here we have to point out a very significant fact; to our greatest surprise, old Armenian (5-12th century) and medieval Armenian (12-17th century) were

incomparably much more abundant, enriched and filled with pure Italian, French and Greek words that were integrated to the language as loanwords and calques than the modern Armenian (m. 17th century) (H. Atcharyan, 1998: 304). This seems to certify a very bizarre fact, a fact that proves, that notwithstanding the modern reality, where the domain of communication is multilingual, where the advanced technology allows people to interconnect and exchange information in milliseconds instead of travelling for months as in medieval ages, where international exchange, economic, political and cultural interchange and thus interaction by numerous languages, simultaneous translations worldwide and multilingualism are common phenomena, Armenian nevertheless confronts issues, that were resolved easier in medieval ages than now. This statement regards the conveyance and the proper transmission of various concepts and perceptions during interactions between different people who belong to different culture, socio-economic and political background.

At this point, it is substantial raise the argument (P. Durkin, 2014) claiming that it is not only, or in some cases not at all the fact of the neighborhood, geographical proximity, close contact or economic, cultural or political vicinity that unavoidably conditions the development of loanwords from the given language. Scientists argue that the biggest role in borrowing words from another language and appropriately integrating them to the linguistic system is played by the fact of sharing and generating common activities, of delegating political, economic and social affairs, of starting to share in common various phenomena, which from being new and strange rapidly become habitual and common, and thus the new concepts do. And we more than agree with this viewpoint, as this is what completely dominates today's situation in Armenia in the sphere of localization of English in the process of non-formal education. One of the core reasons that causes the ambiguity in the field is the fact that people are completely unaware of the new concepts that penetrate into the vocabulary on daily basis; in Armenia western democratic values and models are talked and discussed vastly, but there is no practice of those western democratic values at all in Middle Caucasian countries such as Armenia, and even though the diplomatic relations seem to be favorable with Europe and Armenia, the country's governance is still keen to monopoly and totalitarian authority and notwithstanding the so many European conventions and pacts, in fact, very little is incorporated or merged into our system and the way the country is run. The practices of common procedures in the sphere of human rights, justice, economy, culture and common regulations do not unfortunately comprise western democratic practices. Corruption, human rights violation, economic monopoly, social inequality, political infractions and domination are still among the common issues in the country. So the familiarity of population with democratic pacts and practices is still low in Armenia, even though, we have to necessary mention that they are at least starting to generate even if their appearance is now minor, but it is very significant as the country now is in pioneering stage of acquiring democratic values and practices.

Therefore, going back to the argument of the complications that arise exceedingly when a country has to go through the process of acquiring new vocabulary from another language while having almost no real life practices of those concepts that it faces linguistically, here we have to agree, that this fact plays an imperative role in carrying numerous impediments that make the process more complex and impervious. And this issue is discussed in our research. This viewpoint is strongly supported by the historical facts, such as in middle ages in Armenia, where, as mentioned above due to commercial and also political relations and cooperation the amount of loanwords and root words from Latin, old French and Greek grew unprecedentedly mainly because the phenomena named and used as new words were practiced a highly integrated into the life of people. A very bright example for supporting this argument would be the geographical proximity between Armenia and Georgia. Being in a very peaceful and actually favorable relationship for ages, Armenian has borrowed scarcely some 40 words from Georgian, over the span of thousands of years of neighborhood. This can be explained by first of all the political, social, economic and cultural circumstances. Even though the relationship between Armenia and Georgia has been always qualified as favorable and kind, there has not been noticeable exchange, cooperation, commonly established commercial collectivities, social sets, dynamics and collaboration in the field of art or handicrafts, novelties in the field of social system, that would submerge and thus create common procedures which on their turn would lead the generation of loan words and/or neologisms. Secondly, for as many years as Russian Empire was recorded to be powerful and dominant in the territory, there was a common language to communicate for Georgians and Armenians between them without having any obligations to learn each other's language for communicative purposes.

Thus, only shared activities exchange and application of new commonly practiced and joint phenomena in the sphere of culture, economy, policy and/or commerce leading to people's rapid recognition and acknowledgment and the beneficial exploitation of the phenomena, are what result in the generation of linguistic modification, amplification of the vocabulary in a certain language, by providing significant growth in the amount of useful and at the same time necessary loan words and also neologisms.

However the modern reality has forced some changes in the habitual flow of linguistic procedures. Before the 21st century, first was the phenomenon, and only then the word to call it, at least this was the natural way to recognize new phenomena and call the concepts. Nowadays in many developing countries such as Armenia, first comes the word, naming an unknown concept to the society, and in some rare fortunate cases an explanation follows, which even does not occur very frequently. Thus the audience is very often left to self-contemplation as to uncover the new words and therefore the new concepts describing the new phenomenon that are unknown and strange to the local people.

Unfortunately this has become a widely spread phenomenon in the field of democracy building in many countries including Armenia. With miscellaneous and exceedingly rapid developments taking place in dozens of countries worldwide in various fields, it has become very difficult for the developing countries to succeed in keeping a record of those developments and make acquainted their societies to these new concepts by guaranteeing prompt and appropriate communication. For example in Armenia the system controlling the linguistic developments is still poor in organization; there is an evident lack of subordinate departments and assemblies that would regulate various challenges and issues that the language in fact is inevitably going through in order to manage to tackle the speed of reality, to succeed in captivating the newness and somehow to absorb it, which is often palpable necessity for development. And this lack often results in inarticulate outcomes, preceded by a process that creates inadequate and incompetent equivalents in the given language, equivalents in the form of loan words or neologisms that:

- do not have parallels in the culture, thus are exempt from any familiar association to the local people,
- do not recall any recognized notion or phenomenon and thus do not convey any message to deliver to local people.

This phenomenon can be described as skipping over, or literally omitting a very important phase in creation and adaptation of new words in the language; the phase of introduction in a natural way, followed by recognition due to witnessing, and therefore awareness and familiarity to the concept by acknowledging it.

Thus the phase of acquaintance and absorption of the concept by the society is omitted, and this creates an immense gap for societies to properly conform and shape themselves in the new development processes and important procedures. For example in the field of informal as well as some aspect of formal education in the sphere of democracy building and social activism in Armenia is carried out mainly in English, or at least in Armenian which is filled with English words (mostly of Latin origin), loanwords and neologisms. This is conditioned by the utter dominance of foreign available literature and practices that come all in English or by foreign experts in the field who communicate to the locals in English. Subsequently, the process requires not less than at least fair knowledge of English language, but this is still not enough, since as mentioned above possessing good knowledge of any language does not assure a prerequisite, neither provides a guaranty of familiarity to the concepts in the field of democracy, economy or culture, and this is how issues evolve. There are more than 400 non-governmental organizations registered to be actively working in the field of democracy development and education in Armenia which all carry out important and rooting activities in the country, and the activities of all these organizations contain borrowed words in English, the meaning of which is unfortunately not distinguished for the society and in most cases is simply unknown.

6. Conclusion

The process of word borrowing is not always easy and autonomous as the creation and the development of new words and concepts can be a very challenging and demanding task which often requires an apt and professional assistance and sustenance.

As language expresses cultural reality according to Kramersch (C. Kramersch, 2003) then it highly affects language patterns and vocabulary used, behavioral manifestation during communication, social values expressed by language and the overall communication process in a given culture.

Moreover, the process of democracy building is a very complicated process as well, it entails the incorporation and rooting of foreign ideas and believes, manifestations of social behavior and customs the culture and thus in the society of given county, where all these believes are still very new and peculiar in the mentality of people. This implies many issues such as cultural, behavioral, psychological and of undoubtedly linguistic.

Eventually language evolves, as do people, and this is an irreversible process. Overall, borrowing foreign words is the basis of communication between countries and people. And these countries and people in the process of their communication adopt one another's concepts, phenomena and ideas in the form of words, and rearrange them according to the internal rules of their language.

Despite all the efforts that people might make, geopolitical, economic and cultural forces play a significantly stronger role and if the language is destined to prosper and develop, it will.

References

- [1] Actahryan H., (1951). *The History of Armenian Language*. Yerevan: Haypethrat.//Variant title: Աճարյան Հ., (1951). Հայոց լեզվի պատմություն, Երևան` Հայտպետհրատ.
- [2] Bettoni C., (2006). *Usare un Altra Lingua. Guida alla Pragmatica Interculturale*, Editori Laterza. Bari: GLF.
- [3] Bowerman M., (2001). *Language Acquisition and Conceptual Development*. Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Donald M. Ayers, R. L. (1986). *Cherry English Words from Latin and Greek Elements* University of Arizona Press.
- [5] Durkin P. (2014). *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford University Press.
- [6] Fennell A. B. (2008). *A History of English, A Sociolinguistic Approach*. Blackwell Publishing.
- [7] Isachenko A. Gramaticheskij (2002). *Stroi Russkogo Jazyka w Sopostawlenii So Slowackim, Moscow Press.*//Variant title: Исаченко А. Грамматический

строй русского языка в сопоставлении с словацким; Изд-во Словацкой АН.

- [8] Lercler J., (2007). *Histoire de la Langue Française*. Larousse Paris.
- [9] Mouat C., (2004). *Pragmatic Knowledge and Subjective Evaluation in the Acquisition of English*. University of Florida.
- [10] Hoffer, B. L. (2002), *Language Borrowing and Language Diffusion: An Overview of Intercultural Communication Studies XI-2*, pp.1-36. [Online] Available: <https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/01-Bates-L.-Hoffer.pdf>
- [11] Hovhannisyan P. and A Movsisyan, (2007). *The History of Armenian Nation*. Yerevan State University Press. / Variant title: Հովհաննիսյան Պ., Մովսիսյան Ա. (2007). Հայ ժողովրդի Պատմություն, ԵՊՀ հրատ. , Երևան.
- [12] Thomason Sarah G. (2008). *Social and Linguistic Factors as Predictors of Contact-induced Change*. University of Michigan
- [13] Kramsch C., (2003). *Language and Culture*. Oxford Univeristy Press.
- [14] Sukiassyan K., (2001). *Languages in Development*. Yerevan.