

ՄԵԹՈԴԻԿԱ

Naira GASPARYAN
Eduard ZOHRABYAN
Yerevan State University

LINGUOCOGNITIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING AND INTERPRETATION OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE ISSUES

The aim of the paper is to provide with insights those young teachers who, in the course of their work, happen to participate in face-to-face discussions on various aspects of The Armenian Genocide with their philology, history and communication students. Very often the latter appear to interpret for foreigners, to share or exchange ideas with visitors who lack the knowledge of 'The Armenian Genocide'. Students often have to deal with genocide documentation texts in English while translating, doing linguistic and statistic analyses and investigation. In the framework of the linguocognitive approach the text of non-fiction requires new and wider interpretation. The text which is regarded as a form of reflection of the knowledge about the world is viewed upon as a means of study of the existing knowledge and standpoints. Applying the linguocognitive approach to the texts with the common concept 'The Armenian Genocide' as the basic unit of the text will help both the teachers and philology and communication students to obtain thorough insights on the matter which will enable them to come up with fresh solutions to the teaching and interpreting the matter.

Key words: *linguocognitive approach, philology and communication students, The Armenian Genocide, scientific study of language*

The vitality of the problem is conditioned by rapid developments in the modern world when international security, also called global security, is threatened. Being the first major genocide of the 20th century, the Armenian Genocide by the Ottoman Turks, is said to be one of the best studied genocides after the Jewish Holocaust¹. Anyhow, there are still obscure points that need to be studied and to be taught.

Although the term “**Genocide**” belongs to the sphere of history, any linguistic study is a scientific study of language. Antoine Laurent Lavoisier wrote in 1789 that “*it is impossible to dissociate language from science or science from language*” /Cohen et al, 2011/.

Very often, while delivering various courses – philology, journalism, tourism, linguistics, culturology, psychology, sociology, statistics, pedagogy and many others, high school and university teachers face the problem of the choice of a method and approach towards dealing with the Armenian Genocide issues. Sometimes teachers have to explain, and it is their task to explain to their

philology and communication students the true correlation of the terms synonymous to '*genocide*'. All these synonymous terms together or separately may appear in genocide related official documents to implicitly indicate various attitudes towards the Turkish Genocide of the Armenians in 1915. It is important for both the teachers and students to understand the nuances of meanings of the synonymous terms belonging to the group 'mass killings', to perceive their cognitive message and to be able to select the most appropriate terms which best define the disaster of 1915 on the territory of Armenia. Although many authors, public figures and politicians deliberately use *Ottoman Turkey* instead of the toponym *Armenia* to mention the place where The Turkish Genocide of Armenians was realized in 1915, it is the teacher's task to discuss the terms with the students and reveal the differences, so that the students will become literate on the issue.

We shall proceed with the analysis of the terms '*genocide*' and '*democide*'. The review of the literature on the topic establishes that massacres and slaughters of the Armenians in 1915 did not have religion as its main reason. It was their Armenian ethnicity that mattered. Even if the extermination of the Armenians was organized on the religious background, again, it should have been viewed as an expression of genocide. If the Armenians had been exterminated because of their Christian religion, Christian countries would not have expressed their tacit consent to the Turkish policy of the Armenian extermination campaign. Yet another fact, that religion was not the main reason, is that common Muslim Turks protected Christian Armenians and for this they were killed. Although denial is the final fortress of those who commit genocide, there is no doubt about the Armenian Genocide. For example, German ambassador Count von Wolff-Metternich, Turkey's ally in World War I, wrote to his government in 1916 saying: "*The Committee (of Union and Progress) demands the annihilation of the last remnants of the Armenians and the (Ottoman) government must bow to its demands*" /www.littlearmenia.com/html/genocide/factsheet.asp/. Facts confirm that the Armenian Genocide, like any other genocide in the world, was well-prepared and thoroughly organized /Rummel, 1997/. It is established that the Committee of Union and Progress set up 'butcher battalions', called Teshkilati Mahsusa, which were made up of violent criminals who were intentionally released from prison to direct the killings of Armenians. Facts also confirm that some righteous Ottoman officials such as Celal, governor of Aleppo; Mazhar, governor of Ankara; and Reshid, governor of Kastamonu, were dismissed for not complying with the extermination campaign /El-Ghusein, 1917/.

The Armenian Genocide is known as the Ottoman government's systematic extermination of 1.5 million Armenians in West Armenia, mostly Ottoman citizens within the Ottoman Empire and its successor state, the Republic of Turkey. Turkey, the successor state of the Ottoman Empire, denies the word '*genocide*' as an accurate term for the mass killings of Armenians that began with the help of

Ottoman Kurds under Ottoman rule in 1915. The British ethnographer William Ramsay, after a visit to the Ottoman Empire, in late 1890s, described the conditions of Armenian life as follows:

*We must, however, go back to an older time, if we want to appreciate what uncontrolled Turkish rule meant, alike to Armenians and to Greeks. It did not mean religious persecution; it meant unutterable **contempt** ... They were dogs and pigs; and their nature was to be Christians, to be spat upon, if their shadow darkened a Turk, to be outraged, to be the mats on which **he wiped the mud from his feet**. Conceive the inevitable result of centuries of slavery, of subjection to insult and scorn, centuries in which **nothing that belonged to the Armenian, neither his property, his house, his life, his person, nor his family, was sacred or safe from violence** – capricious, unprovoked violence – **to resist which by violence meant death!** (Ramsay, 1897: 206–207)*

In the passage adduced, the epithets *uncontrolled Turkish rule, unutterable contempt, capricious, unprovoked violence* as well as the metaphoric usage of *dogs and pigs, to be spat upon, if their shadow darkened a Turk, to be the mats on which he wiped the mud from his feet*, and still other connotatively charged collocations are highly cognitive and contain vast implicit information concerning the inhumane conditions of Armenians. In recent years there have been repeated calls to recognize Turkish atrocities as *genocide*. It should be noted that more than 30 countries have officially recognized these mass killings as *genocide*, as have most genocide scholars and historians but what matters here is that almost all these countries mention *Ottoman Turkey* and not *Armenia* as the place where Turkish bloody deeds took place in 1915. Genocide issues have been referred to by experts of various fields – lawyers, psychologists, sociologists, experts of Turkish, Armenian, Oriental studies, philologists, historians – all of them wishing to elucidate the problem at different angles. It is well-known that anti-Armenian and pro-Turkish public and political figures worked hard to hamper the solution of the everlasting problem. According to “*The New York Times*”, February 1915, Signor Filippo Media, MP of Italian Chamber of Deputies, while discussing some aspects of the Armenian situation wrote in an article that the Armenian question could have long been settled if it had not been for Disraeli and his assistant Salisbury /<http://www.cilicia.com/armo10c-ar191602.html/>.

From the observations of E.T. Lawrence, known as Lawrence of Arabia, we learn that Armenians were declared infidel and, hence, ‘*state prisoners*’ that is enemies of Turkey. Lawrence is sure that

The Young Turks had killed the Armenians, not because they were Christians, but because they were Armenians; and for the same reason they herded Arab Moslims and Arab Christians into the same prison, and hanged them together on the same scaffold. (Lawrence, 1922)

The passage adduced states once again that religion was not the main reason of the killings, since both Christian and Muslim Arabs, were intentionally killed together with Armenian Christians.

According to Edgar T.A. Wigram the majority of the Armenians were inoffensive cultivators, they included a considerable number of intelligent and capable men and only a small percentage were active political propagandists, who continued to work persistently to overthrow the existing regime. Wigram stresses that “*under equal political conditions the Armenians would secure dominance. The Turks would never cope with the Armenians in cleverness but they were always able to initiate physical force against unarmed Armenians and succeed*” /Wigram, 1922/.

There is a lot of factual proof that Armenians were to be abolished because of their national identity which aroused much *contempt and jealousy* since Armenians were witty, creative, intelligent, inventive, successful and easily adapted to any situation and always showed interest in education /Steffens, 1919/. Moreover, foreigners seemed to be greatly impressed to have met village teachers in far away Armenian villages who had dedicated their lives to the national cause. The Buxtons write:

We seemed to be suddenly transported to a centre of civilisation. This educational activity is beyond all praise. Here was a man of some ability, prepared to live a lonely life in an isolated village for the sake of his nation and the younger generation. (Buxton & Buxton, 1914: 39)

Although life conditions in West Armenia were unbearable and nothing was done by the government to improve the quality of life, the Buxtons mention that Armenian schools were able to survive at their own risk.

A certain number of better equipped schools and training colleges are financed by the Union Committee which raises its funds in Egypt and among wealthy Armenians. (Buxton & Buxton, 1914: 39)

The Buxtons greatly appreciate the fact, that when Armenian schools became targets of Turkish and Kurdish attacks, teachers and students who were still alive, immediately began the restoration work and the corresponding Armenian organizations came to help in equipping them, so that the educational process was not interrupted.

According to Rev. Herald Buxton’s opinion, based on his own experience during the journey in Armenia, *the real cause* of misfortunes of the Armenians *is the jealousy towards their success* /Buxton & Buxton, 1914: 64/. It is quite unimaginable, but this same strange idea is confirmed in a considerable amount of publications. *Armenians should be eliminated since they are ‘skilled business competitors’* /http://www.whale.to/b/Jewish_Genocide.pdf/. Even nine-year-old Armenian boys were perceived as potential enemy soldiers and thirteen-year-old Armenian boys - ‘infidels’ - enemy of the state. We learn the facts from Maria Jacobsen, a Danish missionary and a key witness to the Armenian Genocide, whose

Diaries are a “documentation of the utmost significance” /https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hgrSqbcy_w/.

Bryce’s Introduction of the Buxtons’ book “*Travel And Politics in Armenia*” informs:

*In the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries they gave to the Eastern Empire some of its best generals and ablest sovereigns. When their kingdom had been destroyed by the Turks, a large part of the nation was scattered over Asia Minor and Northern Syria, and in some of the wild valleys of the Taurus Mountains they maintained, like the Montenegrins in Europe, an independence often threatened but never destroyed. Scattered as they were, they have clung to their national traditions and their faith. The fullest proof of their constancy and courage was given when, in the **massacres** of 1895 and 1896, thousands died as martyrs rather than save their lives by accepting Islam. (Buxton & Buxton, 1914)*

Actually the passage witnesses the continuous and constant policy of the Turkish government towards the Christian population of the empire, specifically towards Armenians, who became victims, irrespective of the fact *they gave to the Eastern Empire some of its best generals and ablest sovereigns*. Later in 1915 after the bloody genocide in West Armenia Bryce published his famous report where he spoke about the atrocities *carried out by the **gang of unscrupulous adventurers** in possession of the Government of the Turkish Empire* /Bryce, 1915/.

There was no Moslem passion against the Armenian Christians. All was done by the will of the Government, and done not from any religious fanaticism, but simply because they wished, for reasons purely political, to get rid of a non-Moslem element which impaired the homogeneity of the Empire, and constituted an element that might not always submit to oppression. (Bryce, 1915)

Discussing the massacres of Armenians Bryce shows a firm standpoint on the issue and uses a periphrasis to make his speech rather sarcastic. This roundabout device - ***gang of unscrupulous adventurers** in possession of the Government* – highlights his intolerance of the barbaric rulers. Having enough witnesses and documentation at hand, Bryce declares without hesitation:

The massacres are the result of a policy which, as far as can be ascertained, has been entertained for some considerable time. They hesitated to put it in practice until they thought the favourable moment had come, and that moment seems to have arrived about the month of April, 1915. That was the time when these orders were issued, orders which came down in every case from Constantinople, and which the officials found themselves obliged to carry out on pain of dismissal.[...] In some cases the governors, being pious and humane men, refused to execute the orders that had reached them, and endeavoured to give what protection they could to the unfortunate Armenians. (Bryce, 1915)

Explicit information is given how the killings began and who their initiator was, and, it is beyond doubt that the Turkish Government had organized them according to an elaborate plan... Bryce also informs about two cases when the governors were immediately dismissed for refusing to obey the orders. Data analyses help Bryce to conclude that *'three-fourths or four-fifths of the whole nation has been wiped out, and there is no case in history, certainly not since the time of Tamerlane, in which any crime so hideous and upon so large a scale has been recorded'*.

History knows many terms equivalent or synonymous to 'genocide' - among them *ethnic cleansing, massacres, killings, deportations* and so on. Yet every nation who happened to have faced such a disaster, called the inhumane deed in their own national language: thus appeared the Mets Eghern, Holocaust, Seifo, Shoah. It should be noted here that the best Armenian equivalent of *genocide* is ցեղասպանություն, not Եղեռն (Eghern), although in Armenian these two terms are used interchangeably. The point is that Եղեռն means severe killings, massacres, slaughters but never *genocide*²⁰. Although the Armenian collocation Մեծ Եղեռն (Mets Eghern) is used to mean *genocide* it does not fully overlap with the term *genocide*, since *genocide* is defined in Article 2 of the Genocide Convention as *...any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group*, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
 - (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
 - (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
 - (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
 - (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group
- (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Office_of_the_United_Nations_High_Commissioner_for_HumanRights).

The term *genocide*, a coinage of the Greek word *génos* (race, people) and the Latin suffix *-cide* (act of killing), introduced by lawyer R. Lemkin in response to the Armenian Genocide and the Holocaust/Gasparyan, 2014/.

To establish the most appropriate terms that best define the massacres of Armenians of 1915, let us adduce a passage for analysis from Noel and Harold Buxtons' documentary book *'Travel and Politics in Armenia'* which actually presents the accounts of the great humanists and outstanding public figures written for the British Parliament after their long journey in West and East Armenia which they call Turkish Armenia and Russian Armenia, correspondingly. They write:

*"Yet it remains true, and I have never heard the statement seriously challenged, that **there are no massacres in Turkey except when ordered by the Government.** The massacres of 1895-96; the massacres at Van,*

March 1908; the massacres at Adana and in Cilicia, 1909 – have all been by the consent of authority” (Buxton & Buxton, 1914: 43).

The authors never expected to learn the above-mentioned trustworthy yet challenging fact *that there were no massacres in Turkey except when ordered by the Government*. Their astonishment makes them emphasize the same idea by paraphrasing it as if willing to make it clear, first of all, for themselves. The shocking part of the idea for civilized European nobles is that the massacres were organized *by the consent of authority* – the Turkish government.

The 733 paged book published by Lord James Bryce and known in the history of genocides as “The Blue Book” is qualified by Michelle Tusan, professor of History from Nevada University, as *an atrocity chronicle*. The book includes the most complete set of testimonies on the massacres of Armenian civilians that started in the spring of 1915. The book was a kind of *a document that would make the case in the international arena against Turkey for committing crimes against humanity and violating the laws of war during World War I* /Tusan, 2015: 41/.

A close consideration of the documentary writing on The Armenian Genocide and the collection of documents in “The Blue Book”, in particular, comes to confirm that what happened to the Armenians in West Armenia, which was part of The Ottoman Empire, was a well-organized and well-calculated mass murder on the ethnic background. It is hardly surprising that Raphael Lemkin referred to Bryce’s “The Blue Book” as a source when, using the Armenian case, he set out to define what he first identified as ‘*genocide*’ or ‘*race murder*’ /Lemkin, 2016: 154/. The massacres of 1915, Lord Bryce argued, had political rather than religious origins:

“There was no Moslem passion against the Armenian Christians. All was done by the will of the Government, and done not from any religious fanaticism, but simply because they wished, for reasons purely political, to get rid of a non-Moslem element which impaired the homogeneity of the Empire, and constituted an element that might not always submit to oppression” (Bryce, 1915)

Thus, in addition to blaming Germany, “The Blue Book” presented the motivation for the massacres as rooted in the politics of the empire. Over and above sectarian hatred, the Ottoman attempt to preserve its empire was what motivated the killings. “The Blue Book” charted the *systematic nature of the massacres by the government*, documenting the presence of concurrent massacres throughout the whole of Anatolia.

In literature and in international conventions, in particular, the concept of ‘*genocide*’ has been defined as *intentional killing by government of people because of their race, religion, ethnicity, or other indelible group membership*. While killing people because of their politics or for political reasons has been explicitly excluded from the international Genocide Convention, some scholars nonetheless have included such killings in their study of genocide. Some, like

R. J. Rummel, have extended the definition of genocide to cover any mass murder by government. Rummel R.J. offers to use the term ‘*democide*’ for defining the killing by states as the concept of murder does individual killing in domestic society. R.J. Rummel managed to notice that ‘*genocide*’, however, *is a confused and confusing concept. It may or may not include government murder, refer to wholly or partially eliminating some group, or involve psychological damage. If it includes government murder, it may mean all such murder or just some.* In his work he thoroughly discusses the overlapping parts of the meanings of ‘*genocide*’ and ‘*democide*’. R.J. Rummel introduced the term ‘*democide*’ to clearly point out that this very term ‘*democide*’ includes all the aspects of ‘*genocide*’. He adds that the importance of the concept of ‘*government murder*’ in certain cases, like the Armenian Genocide, the Holocaust of the Jews, should not be ignored since the concept ‘*genocide*’ hardly covers the variety and extent of ruthless murder carried out by governments. R.J. Rummel suggests using the concept ‘*democide*’ to cover all such murder (the intentional killing by government of people because of their race, religion, ethnicity, or other indelible group membership), any kind of cold-blooded deliberate government killings extending beyond genocide defined as of *starving civilians to death by a blockade, assassinating supposed sympathizers of anti-government guerrillas, purposely creating a famine, executing prisoners of war, shooting political opponents, or murder by quota.* A close study of R. J. Rummel’s theoretical and practical surveys of *genocide* issues, even with a naked eye, makes it obvious that the situation in Turkey as well as the international situation of that particular period could greatly help in realizing the elaborate plan of annihilating of the ethnic group, race *who were hated, despised, or conversely envied or resented.* Moreover, Rummel R.J. views ***denial as essential part or continuation of the act of genocide*** /Rummel, 1997: 367/. He establishes denial as the last stage of *genocide*:

The final stage is the perpetrator's denial of their genocide. They destroy or hide the relevant official evidence, burn bodies, leave unmarked graves, or invent a reasonable rational for the killing (“they were in rebellion”, “were killed during the civil war”, or “were helpmates to our enemies.”). Moreover, the perpetrators may harass those who claim that a genocide occurred. The most coherent and far reaching official denial today is that of the Turkish government that the murder of over a million Armenians during World War I was genocide. According to the Turks, they died as a result of a civil war, an invasion by Russia, and the attempt of the Young Turk government to deport potential and actual hostile Armenians to a different part of the country for their own protection (Rummel, 1997: 367).

It is more than obvious that **no government can ever happen to be unaware of what is happening on the territory of the state...**

Israel Charny writes that the denial constitutes "*an attack on the collective identity and national-cultural continuity of the victim group*" and "*makes their recovery even more difficult.*" Charny thinks that denial is not just a way to exonerate the perpetrators of a committed genocide or to avoid compensating the victims (the perpetrator's perspective), but also to avoid any responsibility and obligation to intervene (the outside world perspective). Charny confirms that denial is also implemented by the third parties, the so-called 'bystanders' (spectators), who would prefer to avoid having to acknowledge the problem and thus become involved in the problem /Charny, 2000: 159/.

The terms '*Mets Yeghern*', '*Deportation*', '*Slaughtering*', '*Massacres*', '*Genocide*', '*Democide*' '*Ethnic cleansing*' '*demographic engineering*', explicitly or implicitly, mean '*killings of people*' and define the disaster of 1915. '*Ethnic cleansing*' and '*demographic engineering*' are periphrasis which indicate mass killings indirectly and not so 'harshly'.

The verb '*deport*' is defined by the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary as "*to force someone to leave a country, usually because they have no legal right to be there*" /Hornby, 2006: 392; see also Gasparyan, 2015/. The linguistic investigation establishes '*deportation*' to be linguistically equal with '*ethnic cleansing*' which the same dictionary defines as "*the policy of forcing the people of a particular race or religion to leave an area or a country*" /Hornby, 2006: 498/. It is obvious that '*ethnic cleansing*' is stylistically more expressive and impressive and its cognitive function is comparatively more highlighted than those of '*deportation*'. It can be inferred that when these terms are used to define policies about millions or even several thousands of people who are left without clothes, food, water, in inhumane conditions, anyhow, the first thought that can cross anyone's mind is 'death by torture'. The term '*deportation*', the pro-Turkish preference, gives clear hints: everything was planned beforehand; the choice of the words was sophisticated /Gasparyan, 2016: 139-150/.

A rather interesting approach is exercised in this respect by Turkish researcher Nesim Şeker:

*[...]Governments widely attempted to homogenize territories within their jurisdiction by employing the methods of **demographic engineering**. Manipulation of population figures by statistical records, deportation, assimilation, massacres and ethnic cleansing were the most frequently used methods (Şeker, 2013).*

The concept of **demographic engineering**, a periphrasis, seems a rather civil way to define *genocide*. Anyhow, Nesim Şeker keeps to the opinion that the central role of the state in moving the population is *emphasized by Weiner and Teitelbaum who suggest that:*

*The implication of the notion of **demographic engineering** is that the movement of peoples is not the consequence of social and economic trends – such as differentials in wages or employment opportunities*

across regions. Nor does demographic engineering refer to all actions by the state that result in the large-scale movement of populations – for example, the failure of government to deal with a famine, or the neglect of the environment, or the construction of a large dam which will displace a segment of society. Demographic engineering implies that the movement itself is deliberately induced by the state; it is not the consequence of another policy or program (Weiner & Teitelbaum, 2001).

As it can be inferred from the passage above - even though Nesim Şeker makes an attempt to present Weiner and Teitelbaum's message in a negative light, the cognitive units *deliberately* and *demographic engineering* make the Turkish policy towards Armenians fully obvious.

So, the analysis reveals that the massacres of 1915, organized and realized by the Turkish Government, were not only acts of 'genocide' but also those of 'democide', taken into consideration R.J. Rummel's definition - '**democide' is any murder by government including the form of 'genocide'**.

Thus, the analysis has also established:

1. In 1915 the Turks annihilated Armenians in their homeland – in Armenia – as a result of which **Armenians became depatriated**;
2. In 1915 Armenians were massacred because of their **ethnic** and **not religious** origin;
3. Turkish atrocities against Armenians in 1915 were thoroughly **planned and organized**;
4. The choice of the synonyms to 'genocide' was deliberate and thoroughly thought over;
5. This choice of the terms **secures further carefree and irresponsible behaviour for those who classified, symbolized, dehumanized, organized, polarized, prepared and realized the act of genocide, and deny it at any rate without remorse.**

It can be concluded: when dealing with textual analysis, text interpretation, translation, linguistic research, etc, special attention should be paid to the discussion, interpretation and usage of certain terms which define Armenian Genocide issues. The problem has become even vital today when global security is threatened, whereas the lessons of the Armenian Genocide have not been learnt yet.

NOTES

1. The difference of the mentioned two is that the Turkish genocide of the Armenians was realized in the homeland of Armenians as a result of which Armenians were *depatriated*, meaning *withdrawn, or caused to withdraw, from one's country; to be banished*) (<https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/depatriate>), while The Jewish Holocaust was realized on the territory of other countries.

REFERENCE

1. Armenian Genocide Fact Sheet - Little Armenia.com // URL: <http://www.littlearmenia.com/html/genocide/factsheet.asp> (Retrieved March, 2017).
2. Bryce J. British Government Report on the Armenian Massacres of April-December 1915 // URL: http://www.firstworldwar.com/source/brycereport_armenia.htm (Retrieved July, 2017).
3. Buxton N., Buxton H. Travel and Politics in Armenia. London: Smith, Elder & Co, 1914.
4. Charny I. W. Encyclopedia of Genocide, vol. 1. Oxford: ABC-CLIO, 2000.
5. Cohen L., Poor H. V. Scully M. O. (Eds.) Classical, Semi-classical and Quantum Noise. New York: Springer, 2011.
6. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, Article 2, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Office_of_the_United_Nations_High_Commissioner_for_HumanRights, Accessed March 2017.
7. El-Ghusein Fa'iz, Martyred Armenia. London: C. Arthur Pearson Ltd., 1917.
8. Gasparyan N. Analysis and Interpretation of Genocide Related Terms // *Armenian Folia Anglistika*, № 1/16. Yerevan: Lusakn, 2016.
9. Gasparyan S. The Armenian Genocide: A Linguocognitive Perspective. Yerevan: YSU Press, 2014.
10. Gasparyan S. Forced Migration: The Case of Armenia - 1915 and beyond // *Armenian Folia Anglistika*. № 2/14. Yerevan: YSU, 2015.
11. Hornby A.S. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, 7th edition. USA, 2006.
12. Lawrence E. T. Seven Pillars of Wisdom. UK: Private Edition, 1922.
13. Lemkin R. C. Manuscript on Turkish Massacres. NY: Am. Jewish Hist. Society, 2016.
14. Ramsay W.M. Impressions of Turkey during Twelve Years' Wanderings. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897.
15. Rummel R., Statistics of Democide. Charlottesville, 1997 // URL: <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/GENOCIDE.HTM> (Retrieved March, 2016).
16. Rummel R. J. democide Versus Genocide: Which is What? // URL: <https://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/GENOCIDE.HTM> (Retrieved January, 2017).
17. Şeker Nesim, Forced Population Movements in the Ottoman Empire and the Early Turkish Republic: An Attempt at Reassessment through Demographic Engineering // *EJTS*, 16/2013 // URL: <https://ejts.revues.org/439> (Retrieved March, 2017).

18. Steffens L. Armenians are Impossible: Interview with Lawrence of Arabia in 1919 // URL: armenians-1915.blogspot.com/2008/.../2471-armenians-are-impossible-interview.htm (Retrieved March, 2017).
19. The Armenian Genocide - News Accounts from the American Press: 1915-1922. Compiled by Kloian R. // URL: <http://www.cilicia.com/armo10c-ar191602.html> (Retrieved March, 2017).
20. Tusan M. James Bryce's Blue Book as Evidence // *Journal of Levantine Studies* 5/2, Las Vegas, 2015.
21. Weiner M., Teitelbaum M. S. Political Demography, Demographic Engineering. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2001.
22. Wigram E. T.A. The Cradle Of Mankind. Life In Eastern Kurdistan. London: A&C Black Ltd, 1922.
23. http://www.whale.to/b/Jewish_Genocide.pdf (Retrieved March, 2017).
24. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hgrSqbcby_w (Retrieved June, 2017).
25. <https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/depatriate> (Retrieved June, 2017).

Ն. ԳԱՍՊԱՐՅԱՆ, Է. ԶՈՎՐԱԲՅԱՆ - Հայոց ցեղասպանության հարցերի ուսուցումն ու մեկնաբանումը լեզվաճանաչողական մոտեցմամբ. – Հոդվածի նպատակն է երիտասարդ դասավանդողներին ուղղորդել՝ բանասեր, լրագրող, լեզվաբան-մշակութաբան, պատմաբան և այլ ուսանողների հետ Հայոց ցեղասպանությանն առնչվող նյութեր և փաստաթղթեր ուսումնասիրելիս: Ուսուցումն ու քննարկումները դառնում են առավել արդյունավետ, երբ նյութի մատուցման մեթոդաբանությունը զուգորդվում է լեզվաճանաչողական մոտեցմամբ: Դրա արդյունքում կարևորվում է արտալեզվական հիմքի ճիշտ ներկայացումը անհրաժեշտ հատկանվան ընտրությամբ՝ Հայոց ցեղասպանությունը տեղի է ունեցել ոչ թե Օսմանյան Կայսրությունում, այլ Հայաստանում, հայի բնօրրանում, որի հետևանքով հայը ենթարկվել է հայրենագրկման: Կարևորվում է նաև այն, որ 1915 Հայոց ցեղասպանությունն իրագործվել է պետականորեն՝ թուրքական կառավարության անմիջական որոշմամբ և վերահսկողությամբ՝ հայ գեներ և հայ ժողովրդին բնաջնջելու միտումով: Հետևաբար, էական է այդ թեման քննարկելիս «զանգվածային սպանություններ» հոմանշային շարքից կատարել գիտաբանի ճիշտ ընտրություն՝ ‘genocide’ (ցեղասպանություն) և ‘democide’ - (պետական իշխանությունների կողմից կազմակերպված ցեղասպանություն՝ առաջարկված Ռումմելի կողմից) գիտաբանների ընտրությամբ՝ շեշտելով 1915 թ. տեղի ունեցած ցեղասպանության բուն էությունն ու նպատակները:

Բանալի բառեր. լեզվաճանաչողական մոտեցում, բանասեր և միջմշակութային հաղորդակցման ոլորտի ուսանողներ, Հայոց ցեղասպանություն, լեզվի գիտական ուսումնասիրություն

Н. ГАСПАРЯН, Э. ЗОГРАБЯН – *Лингвокогнитивный подход при обучении и интерпретации вопросов геноцида армян.* – В рамках лингвокогнитивного подхода с учетом экстралингвистических факторов документальный текст понимается как отражение знаний об окружающем мире, и одновременно, как средство изучения особенностей этих знаний и представлений. Целью статьи является направление молодых преподавателей при работе со студентами-филологами, журналистами и лингвистами-культурологами, историками с различными международными документами и материалами по теме Геноцида армян 1915 года. В статье отмечается, что преподавание и дискуссии становятся более эффективными, если материал приподносится с учетом экстралингвистических особенностей и с введением определенных топонимов, связанных с данной тематикой, в частности, подчеркивая то, что Геноцид армян 1915 года имел место не на территории Османской Империи, а именно в Западной Армении (здесь ключевым словом является топоним Армения). При анализе и интерпретации разных когнитивных единиц выявляется, что применение лингвокогнитивного подхода способствует эффективному определению синонимов из группы ‘массовое уничтожение’, а именно терминов ‘геноцид’ и ‘демоцид’ (предложен Руммелом), которые наиболее правдиво указывают на суть и предпосылки кровавых событий 1915 года.

Ключевые слова: лингвокогнитивный подход, Геноцид армян, научное изучение языка, филологи, студенты в области межкультурной коммуникации