

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 04 Volume: 96

Published: 27.04.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Akram Makhmudovich Kuldashev

Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Associate Professor, Doctor of Philosophy,
akramkuldashev@gmail.com

Shakhnoza Akramovna Kuldasheva

Uzbekistan State World Languages University
Senior Lecturer,
skuldasheva@mail.ru

ON THE NATURE OF CHANGES IN GERMANIC LANGUAGES UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE GREAT MIGRATION OF PEOPLES

Abstract: The article deals with the problem of the influence of the Great Migration of Peoples (GMP) (II-VII centuries AD) to the formation and development of Germanic languages. The author discusses the role of GMP in changing the linguistic map of the primary dispersion of Germanic tribes in Europe.

The article discusses the linguistic situation in Europe before GMP, during it and after GMP. The problem is very topical because this migration had greatly changed ethno-social situation in Europe. Three major tribal unions: Germanic, Romance and Turkic tribes were leading components in this migration. They had contacts with each other in the North, West, East and South of Europe. These contacts involved also other tribes belonging to minor groups or families, like Celtic, Iranian, Slavic, Iberian, etc.

At the end of the article the author writes about the role, participation, degree of activeness and fate of the tribes in this process.

Key words: Great Migration of Peoples, Ethnogeography, differentiation, integration, linguistic continuity, wave theory, linguistic map, language variety, tribal dialect, migration, ethnic identity, lingua-franca, language contacts.

Language: English

Citation: Kuldashev, A. M., & Kuldasheva, S. A. (2021). On the nature of changes in Germanic languages under the influence of the great migration of peoples. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 04 (96), 325-331.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-04-96-65> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.04.96.65>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Intoduction

The great Migration of Peoples is one of the most significant events in the History of Eurasia at the beginning of first Millennium, namely in the II-VII centuries, CE.

A great lot of literature was devoted by the scholars – historians, geographers, linguists, archeologists, etc. to this event. [5; 6; 7; 11; 12]

The History of Mankind knows very many migrations of peoples, like – migration of Indo-European speaking people from Central Asia to Europe and South East Asia; Migration of Greek people from the Central part of Europe to Apennine peninsula; Migration of Sumerians to Altai; Migration

of Northern People to Near East; Migration of Goths to Eastern Europe, and others. [11, p. 248]

But here, firstly we observe the Great Migration, not a simple migration of one tribe or one people. Here we observe a great migration of peoples, sometimes united under one name, or sometimes not at all united tribes bearing there own tribal name. They all moved in one direction.

Secondly, the difference was in the fact that it was accomplished by hundreds of tribes moving in different directions. [6, p. 45]

Therefore this process was called A Great Migration of peoples, and it determined the fate of hundreds of tribes living in Europe. Many of them

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

died out in the wars. Some tribes were involved by other tribes, many of them changed their ethnicity due to the result of the wars.

In this article, we will make an attempt to analyse the linguistic situation in Europe before the Great migration and after it. And we will try to explain the events of that period and the fate of the languages spoken by the peoples involved in this process.

One of the greatest thinkers of ancient Greece, an astronomer Ptolomeus (in Latin “Ptolemaeus”, in Italian “Tolomeo”) worked out the theoretical basis of his geocentric system of the world. On the basis of this theory he draw the spheric Map of the Earth. His famous book “Megale Syntaxis” survived to our days. This title can be translated as “Great Construction”, or “Great Combination”. That book was translated into Arabic in Middle Ages under the title “Almagest”. Almagest can be translated into English as “the Greatest of the greats”. [1, p. 237]

In this book, Ptolomeus drew the map of Germany and gave the names of the geographical places and tribes living there.

He mentions the following Germanic tribes in his book: “*kimers, funduzes, halls, garuds, kabands, sabalings, sigulons, sakses (or saxe), harks, anivariys, teutons, bars, angivars, langobards, farodnis, teutonbars, sidins, rugiys, rutikleys, elveons, burgunds, guthons, omans, lugs, avarpens, semnons, svevs, silings, korkonts, vatins, venahems, lugiduns, lupfordiys, frisians, hemoes, brukters, sugambrs, tenkters, casuars, dulgubns, angelies, nertervannars, danduts, turons, marulings, curions, hetuaris, vargions, karinns, helvetians, parmehekams, hatts, tubants, teviochems, markomans, sudins, advabekamps, bems, sidons, kogns, visburgs, anartofracts, ombrons, avaarims, frugundions, sulons, yazigs (some authors think that yazigs are related to sarmats)*”. [1, p. 238]

In this article we will not give information about the geographical situation, culture, ethnic and other features of these tribes, also about the political structure of the state where these tribes lived because one can get more than significant information about them in the books and encyclopedias on history and geography. [1, p. 243-261]

Keeping in mind the fact that we are not historians, neither geographers nor ethnographs and all what we want to know is the language spoken by these tribes. Here we are interested in the intralinguistic and extralinguistic causes of their uniting under one name or formation of other languages as a result of some other sociopolitical factors.

We want to find an answer to the question “What would have been with the dialects of those 60 or more tribes if there was no Migration of Peoples?”

We can make hypothesis in relation to what would happen if there was no migration.

1. As a result of the socio-economic and political development on the area these small tribes would develop into greater unions of tribes then forming feudal Kingdoms or Knighthoods. Each 5-10 tribal dialects or languages would integrate into one of the related languages and we’d have now 10-15 Germanic languages and the “Linguistic continuity” could be observed in Europe now. [2, p. 344]

2. If the languages chose differentiation as a trend for their development we would have 50-80 minor Germanic languages now. These languages would be very close, similar and mutually intelligible and the linguistic Situation would prove Iogann Smidt’s famous “Wave theory”.

3. But there is also the third possible way of development where Romance and Slavic languages develop in more greater steps and Europe would consist of two big parts – Romance Europe and Slavic Europe. And Germanic languages would remain as the languages of fishermen and ship-builders living on the islands of Northern Europe. [10, p. 52-53]

4. According to the last variant Celtic tribes would be reborn and the Continent of Europe would be Celtic, where the territories from the English Channel to Southern Russian steppes and the Black Sea would be inhabited by the Celtic speaking tribes.

But none of those 4 scenarios was realized because there developed no socio-economic and political, military conditions for the immanent development for the Romance, Germanic, Celtic and Slavic peoples, because of the invasion, intrusion or penetration of Turkic tribes, who were referred to as strangers (Allies) for European continent.

And the Turkic peoples gave an impulse to a very great socio-political event called “**The Great Migration**” which took place in the II-VII centuries CE.

Earlier we used the statement that “**Turkic tribes were strangers in Europe**”. This thesis has been accepted by everyone, commonly strengthened in the brains of millions in the dissertations, monographs, articles, coursebooks, manuals, lectures and speeches on World History, History of Europe, or even on the History of Uzbekistan. This thesis is accepted as an absolute truth in these works. [2, p. 539]

The followers of this thesis state that Europe in ancient times was inhabited by the above-mentioned Celtic, Germanic and Romance tribes with some Iberian, Slavic, and Iranian tribal elements. [11, p. 252]

Now let’s analyse how all this began.

The Marcoman wars (166-180 CE) can be marked as the beginning of the Great Migration of Peoples. At the end of the IInd century and the beginning of the IIIrd century Goths, Burgundians and Vandals moved to South-East in the direction of the Black Sea. There in the Black – Sea steppes Goths were divided into two groups – Ostgoths and

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

Westgoths. Many other tribes inhabiting those lands, like scythians, getic people and others were involved to the newly formed Gothic union of tribes. [3; 4]

West Germanic tribes, like alemans, franks became very active at the borders of the Roman Empire. Alemans occupied Retia in 261 and came close to Mediolan (now Milan). [8; 6, p. 172]

Franks invaded Gavel in 258-260 from the lower Reine. In 375 the Hunns occupied a greater part of East Europe, made Pannonia their central territory, now Hungary. We will not get into details of this great event in the history of Europe. We can only recommend the special literature on history, where these and other related problems are discussed.

We can mention the names of some other tribes that took part in this Migration in its different periods and territories.

Let's take *alans, sarmats, gepids, langobards, britts, vestgoths, bulgarians, svevs, franks, saxons, jutes, angles*, and many others. This list would become very long because hundreds of tribes took part in the Migration being a part of a tribal union headed by one of the above-mentioned greater tribes. [9; 10; 12]

This was a kind of brief introduction to the problem planned for this article to discuss. Now we will pass on to the main task of this article, that is to discuss the changes in the structure of Germanic languages as a result of this great migration. Let's take some examples, illustrating the phonetic changes of those times:

ē > ā: OHG: jār, OIcel.: ār; Goth.: jēr.

z > r: OHG: mēro (mehr); OIcel.: meiri; - Goth.: maiza.

þl > fl: OHG: fliohan; OIcel.: flýja; - Goth.: þliuhan.

u + vowel > ō: Goth.: bauan [boan] > OESc.: bōa, OWSc.: gnūa.

d > t: OLG: dēl > OHG: teil (Teil); OLG: dag (Goth. dags) > OHG: tag (Tag); OLG: fadar (Goth.: fadar) > OHG: fater (Vater); OLG: waldan (Goth.: waldan) > OHG: waltan (walten); OLG: hard (Goth.: hardus) > OHG: hart (hart); OLG: bindan (Goth.: bindan) > OHG: bintan (binden); OLG: land (Goth.: land) > OHG: lant (Land).

þ > d: Goth.: þaurnus > OHG: dorn (Dorn); Goth.: þreis > OHG: dri (drei), Goth.: þat > OHG das (das); Goth.: airþa > OHG: erda (Erde). [10, 86-87]

These changes took place in the south of Germany where the contacts between dialects or tribal languages were great. Here Germanic tribes went into contact with the dialects of the Romance territories. For example:

OHG: mûr < Lat.: murus.

OHG: fenstar < Lat.: fenestra.

OHG: ziagal < Lat.: tequila.

OHG: pforta < Lat.: porta.

OHG: pfoſt < Lat.: postem.

OHG: kellari < Lat.: cellarium.

OHG: pfilari < Lat.: pillarium.

OHG: spihhāri < Lat.: spicarium.

Old Germanic tribes learned the words and notions related to agriculture namely horticulture, and viticulture. For example:

OHG: bira < Lat.: pirum

OHG: kirsa < Lat.: cerasea

OHG: pfruma < Lat.: prunum

OHG: kurbiz < Lat.: cucurbita (cucumber)

OHG: pfeffar < Lat.: piper (pepper)

OHG: eplth < Lat.: apium

OHG: kōl < Lat.: Caulis (cabbage)

OHG: wīn < Lat.: winum (wine)

OHG: ezzih < Lat.: acetum (acid)

OHG: most < Lat.: mustum (mustard)

New forms and types of food and cuisine from animals and poultry were borrowed from the Romance peoples by Germanic tribes. Eg.:

OHG: kāst < Lat.: caseum (cheese)

OHG: esil < Lat.: asinus

OHG: mūl < Lat.: mulus

OHG: pfawo < Lat.: pavo

OHG: pferfrid < Lat.: paraveredus

Some words denoting the notions related to commercial activity were also borrowed by the Germanic tribes during those long years of the Great Migration of Peoples. [9, p. 197] Eg.:

OHG: koufon < Lat.: caugo

OHG: munizza < Lat.: moneta (monet)

OHG: mila < Lat.: milia (mile)

OHG: zol < Lat.: toloneum

OHG: pfunt < Lat.: pondus (pound)

And at last the barbarous Germanic tribes who did not know the advantages of domestic utilities borrowed the names of the objects together with the things they saw in Roman Empire. Eg.:

OHG: kista < Lat.: cista

OHG: scrini < Lat.: scrinium

OHG: kezzil < Lat.: catinus

OHG: korb < Lat.: corbis

OHG: kelich < Lat.: calix

OHG: spiagal < Lat.: speculum

As we know military art of the Roman Empire was more developed than that of Nomadic and less developed Germanic, celtic, hunnish, Slavic and other armies who invaded and collapsed Rome. Therefore, it is natural if we find some words denoting arms, ammunition, and military arts borrowed by the Germanic languages. Eg.:

OHG: wal < Lat.: vallum

OHG: pfal < Lat.: palus

OHG: strazza < Lat.: strata [3]

In the period of Migration, especially in the IV-VIII centuries we observe a kind of merry-go-round or carousel of victory of one tribe over another and the turnover, reiteration, etc.

We can discuss any of these tribes mentioned here, but the volume of the article would not let it do so. We can mention the fate of the name "franc". The

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

term “franc” was firstly mentioned by historians in the 3rd century CE, namely in 256. At that time they were crossing the river Rein in lower parts of it. In 231 CE Roman army fought with Germanic tribes near Bonn. We think those were francs, because Roman authors did not know their tribal names. As it was mentioned by Gregory Tursky, francs used to say that they came from the tribe – *sikambis*. And, *sikambis* were a branch of *scythians*, which were Turkic tribes. Batavs, Brukters, Tungs, Sugambrs were close to Francs. And these tribes together with hamavs, batavs, Hattuars, Amsivars, Uzipets and others played a great role in the formation of francs and their becoming one of the leading groups of Germanic tribes. [1; 2; 10]

Now let’s come back to the statement, that “Turkic tribes were strangers in Europe” which was formulated by Gotfried Gerder, one of the outstanding philosophers and historians of the XVIII century. [13]

G. Gerder was one of the greatest thinkers of the world, but still he was not right in this respect. Turkic peoples were not strangers in Europe. He was mistaken. He was misled by the authors who lived before them. He took their words as truth and worth to rely on, and thought, and considered that Turkic tribes were strangers who came to Europe in the XIV century as invaders.

The thing is that later investigations showed that Turkic tribes were in Europe in the 5 centuries CE and earlier. They lived near the Black sea, on the estuaries of Danube, Balkans, in the Northern Part of the Minor Asia from the ancient times to say nothing of their Asian relatives, who lived as far as to the shores of Pacific Ocean.

In the Early centuries the Europeans named them as “*scythians*”, as greeks called them. Scythians were not one tribe. It was a name of tribal group, which existed there from the III c BC to IV c CE (for about 500-600 years).

Later, beginning from the III-IV th centuries of our era Greeks and Roman people, began calling them as **Huns**. The term “Scythian” was momentarily replaced by the term “**Huns**” throughout the territories where they lived. And this fact puzzled everyone, starting with historians ending with linguists, who thought that Scythians belonged to Iranian speaking peoples and Huns were found on their territories, spoke another language – Turkic.

Only very few people understood that the real facts spoke about the real nature of the things. Scythians were not Iranic speaking people as some people like to say, repeat to say and want to say to be so even now. Some linguists found unlawful “sons” to Scythians from the Iranian group – saying that “*ossetins*” were Scythians. [2, p. 210]

We can remind one interesting fact that in the XIV-XV centuries when people spoke about the Turkic – speaking people in Europe some authors still used the name “Scythians”.

Some ultra-modernists in Uzbek linguistics dared deny the theoretical and practical value of ethnogenetic studies stating that in the era of post-structural anthropocentric paradigm there is no need for learning the history of the language even for the linguistics.

But that is not at all shared by the majority of the linguistics, who understand the importance of the knowledge of language history to the linguist and language teacher.

As a rule, people deny things when they have no information about the object being denied. They think “As I don’t know, no one is learning the History. If someone analysed the problems of History I would know.” Such kind of approach is used to cover one’s ignorance.

Ethnogenetic investigations have never been put off or aside from the agenda by the Europeans as something non-topical and non-actual. A quick mentioning the names of the fundamental works published by B.L. Anderson (2008); R. Eaton, O. Fischer, W. Koopman (1986); F. Kortlandt (2010); A.V. Dybo (2009); S. Brown, S. Attardo (2005); D. Malvern, B. Richards (2009); J.R. Hurtord (2011); R.S.P. Beekes, M. de Yaan (2011); P.J. Hopper (2000); A.D.M. Smith (2010); M. Edwardes (2010); L. Campbell (1999); I. Roberts (2007); S. Luraghi, Vit. Bubenik (2010); M.J. Mixco (2007) and many others show that the problems related to the formation and development of the English language have never been forgotten by the linguists in the last two decades of our century.

The main trends worked out or put forward by the authors are as follows:

- Introduction and apprehension of the new linguistic materials concerning phonetic and morphological levels in Old Indo-European languages (F. Sommer, E. Forrer, A. Goetze, E. Sturtevant, I. Fridrich, H. Bossert, H. Pedersen, E. Benvenist, etc.).
- Proving the historical and genetical ties between ancient and late analolian languages (H. Pederson, R. Goosmani, O. Karruba, A. Heubeck, G. Neuman, O. Masson).
- Desiphering the greek-micken tablets (M. Ventrice, J. Chodwicka).
- Localisation of the migrations of indoarians in Anatolia (Middle East) (O.N. Trubachev).
- Introducing rich materials of Middle-Iranian languages (P. Gotio, E. Benvenist, K.G. Zaleman, R. Baily, I. Gershevich).
- Investigating the relicts of the Scythian language (V. Abayev, Ya. Harmagga).
- Fundamental investigation of the Tocharian languages, A and B (E. Zieg, W.V. Ziegling, W. Schultze, V. Crause, G. Bailey, I. Gerschevitch, V. Henning, H. Humbach, M. Dresalen, S. Konor, P. Emerich, A. Marik, A. Freiman, V. Liefshitz, etc.)
- Investigating the poor materials of Illirian, messapian, venetian, fracian, frigian, Macedonian

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

languages (N. Yogle, H. Crahe, I. Friedrich, Y. Pokkorny, J. Bonfante, V. Pisani, A. Blumentahl, M.S. Bieber, D. Dechev, A. Meyer, etc.).

- The methodology of the historical-comparative method was improved (A. Meillet, E. Kurilovich, E. Benvenist, V. Georgiev, A. Selischev, L. Bulakhovsky, V. Jirmunsky, O. Trubachev, E. A. Makayev, etc.).

A quick referring these authors arises an idea how rich is the arsenal of the ethnogenetic investigation in Present Day linguistics and how large is the sphere of interests demonstrated by the linguists.

In this article we'll make an attempt at applying the principles of historical ethnogenetic approach to the investigation of some facts of the History of the English language.

As a subject for this analysis we've chosen religion, religious factors to the development of the English language as well as the Turkic languages. It is because religion goes hand in hand with the language in the contacts of languages. Sometimes language comes and religion follows it, like as it was observed with Islam, and the Arabic language. Or else language may proceed religion as it had once been, with the Latin language and Christianity in Europe.

Let's begin the analysis with some English or French words of Latin origin. In the South west of France the word "festum martyrodum" is used and in the West of Germany the words "Ehrtag" and "Pfinztag" are widely used. All these words developed from the Latin words used in the territories neighbouring Eastern Mediterranean. They were the words used by the Western Goths who confessed Christianity of Arian Church (Toend). They brought there in the V century.

This fact illustrates that Arianism existed in the South of Germany, alongside with other words like, Ertag and Pfinztag. It presents an answer to the question whether the Emperor Bonifacy was right or wrong saying that Arianian church of Christianity existed in Germany even at the beginning of the VIII century as a widely spread religion.

If we remember the fact how arians appeared in the Central Europe, who brought this religion here, we surely understand the great role and significance of the Great Migration of Nations (or Peoples) in the History of Europe, and European languages.

Arianity was founded by Alexandrian presbyter Arius. It was a religious trend uniting the followers whose opinions was contradictory to one of the main dogmas of Christianity. According to him: "Jesus Christ was not God's son and He was not a living being of the God's degree. Jesus Christ was the most perfect living being that has ever been created". This statement made a great a resonance in the IV century when Christianity was making its first steps to invade the minds and faiths of the millions in this world.

The negotiations, contradictions in the Church caused great clashes in the social life of the peoples.

Of course, arianity was not the only religion confessed by Turkic speaking peoples. One of the widely spread religions among Turkic speaking peoples was Monism in the II-III centuries, AD.

As it written in the Philosophical Encyclopedia [1983, p. 339]. Monism as a religion was founded by Moniy, the Persian, who lived in Babylon. In the VIII-XIXth centuries. Monism was the religion confessed by the Uygurs. This encyclopedia is one of the reliable sources, as it was worked by the Research Institute of the Academy of Sciences.

But one thing makes us say that different copies of its manuscript have some differences in some passages of the prayer. Three copies of this written record survived to our days. They are a) London copy; b) Sanct-Petersburgh's copy; c) Berlin copy. This manuscript is called as "Huastuanift". The most complete copy is in London and it was written in Uighur alphabet. Sanct-Petersburgh copy was written in Uigur alphabet, and some passages are lacking. The Berlin copy, written in Manichean letters is the most damaged one. Here some pages are lacking in the text. [p. 176]

The Medieval followers of Manicheans were called "catars" and they had some features in their faith. For example, they believed that it was a sin to kill a living being with warm blood. And so they did not kill people and animals. One event which happened in the XIIIth century illustrates that habit. During the war against Albigoys, it was ordered that they should determine who is a Catholic and who is Catar. In order to do it the captives were ordered to kill a hen. If the captive was a catholic he could easily kill the hen. But if he was a Katar the captive refused killing the hen. So the task was easily accomplished. All the Katars singled out among the mass of captives were immediately put to death either by hanging or by be-heading. [p. 177]

In 325 CE the World Forum of the Christians took place in Nikeia when Arianity was announced as "heretical" and Arianity was found deprived from the Church.

But in spite of this order this religious trend remained as functioning in the Roman Empire and some countries of Western Europe and its followers did not change their faith. Ulfila or (Wulfila), (311-383), His announcing the first Gothic Bishop led to strengthening the positions of arianity as a branch of Christianity among Eastern Germans.

This lasted so in Germany and Eastern and Central Europe for about 150 years and at last in 497 when Hlodwig, the King of Franks became king of the Gothic lands. Arianity was substituted by Catholicism and Arianity was soon forgotten as a result of its loosing the political base for its existence.

One fact is worth reminding, that when Bonifacy, the Roman Pope, visited Germany 300 years later than Hlodwig became the king of these lands, was greatly surprised seeing that Arianity was

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

still alive. Because to that period arianity could become a form of the social consciousness in the minds of the people, and of the course, religious thinking, consciousness and faith are not subjected to the change easily.

The cause of the survival of Arianity among Germanic tribes was that the peoples confessing arianity were different in composition. The peoples who lived and fought during the great migration of peoples, like Goths, Huns, Sarmats, Bulgarians and many others confessed arianity and they were not as one Western author wrote: "...they were godless people, thinking, praying to different stones. They had no religion". This author was wrong. Eastern Germans were more religious than any other peoples in Roman Empire.

That the Goths and other East Germanic tribes were more developed and more religiously organized is proved by the fact of translating the Bible from Greek into Gothic by Wulfila in the IV century. For this purpose he worked out a new alphabet for the gothic people. And when the Roman saw that Goths, "uncivilized, barbarous" peoples of the periphery were reading the Bible in their mother tongue (muttersprache) the Romans were greatly puzzled, ashamed because they read the Bible in Greek and had no Latin translation of the Bible. This fact was disappointing for the arrogant Romans, who later also followed the Goths and began translating the Bible into Latin which appeared only in the Vth century. It means they lagged behind the Goths in this respect for about a hundred years.

Earlier we wrote that Church and Religion had a great impact on the formation and development of Germanic languages. The Romance languages have more opportunities here because if we divide the vocabulary of the Church into two layers as: Latin and Greek everything becomes clear. But in some cases Latin layer can include Greek elements. They are a bit different in structure.

- 1) Latin – Greek layer
- 2) Greek layer.

As an example to the first layer we can give the word "**basilica**". It means "Church, something related to church". "Quingagesima" (triplet) – this was the meaning which was denoted by basilica, and it was once widely used, later "baselgia" survived from this word and in the French place name "Boschoe" we find the traces of that word.

In the struggle of words two words of Greek origin won the battle.

- 1) "ecclesia" changed into "eglise" in French.
- 2) "kuriakon" changed into "Kirche" in Germany.

The word "eglise" denoted the Church in Lion. "Kirche" was used to denote the church in Trir. We notice such a trend here. In the territories, close to the Mediterranean the Greek word was used, and in the areas farther from the Mediterranean Sea the Latin

word was used. This explains the fact that there existed a great difference between the territories among Roman Empire in culture, way of life and of course all these found their reflection in their language.

Roman Church had a tradition to celebrate the 50th day after Easter and their holiday was called "quingagesima" and this was the translation of the Greek word "pentecoste". In the VI-VIII centuries the Religious ceremonies around Mediterranean were named with Greek words. Pentecoste was accepted in Bordo, Trir and Rames after Lion. The word "quingagesima" was used in Britain where the celtic population was more than Germanic population. On the continent this word was used in Flandria, Wallonia, and Engadin, Cöln and Mainz.

The word "pentecoste" was used in Germany from the ancient times. This word was brought here by the Eastern Goths-arians through Danube. As a result the territories of French "pentocote" and German "pfingsten" became common. Between French and German speaking territories, there were areas (buffer) where the Latin word "quingagesima" survived.

In England very soon the word "pentecosten" was replaced by "White Sunday". It denoted "the first Sunday after the Easter". It corresponded to German "Weisser Sonntag" (White Sunday), it goes back to Latin "dominica in albus".

In Germany we observe 5 layers instead of 2 layers in France, and these layers presented additional difficulties with subsequent and systematic changes.

The first layers represent Greek-Latin words. They belong to the period before the IV century in Rein and Danube. In the Vth century this layer was supported by the gothic-arian missionaries. Here we find the words, like: pentocoste (Pfungston); operari (opfern), Ertag, Pfungstag, Samstag.

If we discuss the word "Samstag" (Saturday) we should state the difference between "sabbaton" which was used around Mediterranean and the word "Saturni dies" (Saturn's day) used in the continent. Then we'll analyse the word "Sambaton" - with "m" used in the South-West and West of Europe. This word came to Europe in this form in the IVth century. This word reached Trir and Cöln from Danube. So Sambaton took the following route "Danube – Augsburg – Mainz - Trir."

Conclusion

As a conclusion we can state that the period of the Great Migration of Peoples which took part in the II-VII centuries was the period of "**linguistic experiments**" when three leading language groups: Germanic, Romance and Turkic representing two families of languages, had very intensive contacts, and Europe was the battle-place for hundreds of ancient and new tribes like Greek, Celtic, Iranian, Slavic, and others. Here the representatives of eight or more

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

language groups boiled in one big language pot. Latin and Greek were used as the language used by the rulers, religious leaders, tradesmen and translator – interpreters. Gothic and other major Germanic languages alongside with language of Hunns were used in the battle-fields.

Common conditions, similar way of life, needs, determined the general tendencies of language development for the languages which had no alphabet

and written forms. Borrowing became mutual between the languages and it influenced to improve their phonomorphological and vocabulary resources and enriching their syntactical potentials.

The warriors were bilingual (Germanic, Latin) or trilingual or (Germanic, Latin, Turkic). And this formula determined the tendencies of developing the language situation throughout the migration period.

References:

1. Paul, H. (1937). *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. (p.500). Halle.
2. (2001). *Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. (p.900). Moscow: Russkiy Yazik Publishing House. (in Russian).
3. Wrede, F. (1999). Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der deutschen Mundaartenforschung, “*Zeitschr.f.deutsche Mundarten*”, pp. 3–4.
4. Guchmann, M.M. (1972). *Vzaimodeistviye yazykovikh arealov i razvitiye naddialektnykh form v donatsionalniy period*. – V kn.: “Aktualniye problemy yazykoznaniiya,,. (p.380). Moskva: Nauka. (In Russian)
5. Aytmuratov, D. (1988). *Turkskaya etnonimiya*. (p.260). Tashkent: Fan. (In Russian)
6. Budanova, A. (2005). *The Great Migration of Peoples*. (p.248). Novosibirsk: NSU Publishing House.
7. Tomsen, J.O. (2003). *A History of Ancient Geography*. (p.592). Moscow: Progress.
8. Makayev, E.A. (1964). *Problems of indo-European areal linguistics*. (p.380). M.-L., nauka. (In Russian)
9. Sergiyevskiy, M.V. (2000). *A History of the French language*. (p.304). Moscow, Progress Publishers.
10. Jirmunskiy, V.M. (2002). *A History of the German language*. (p.380). Moscow: Progress Publishers. (in Russian)
11. (1963). *Encyclopedia of History*, Moscow, Russkiy Yazik Publishers, 1962-1970. In 14 volumes, vol. 3, pp. 248-251. (in Russian)
12. Altheim, F. (n.d.). *Geschichte des Hunnen*, Bd. 1-2, 1959-1960, Munchen.
13. Herder, G.G. (1969). *Filosofiya istorii*. (p.800). Moscow: Izd. lit. na inostr. Yazikah. (in Russian)