Scientific Research Publishing

Key Narratives of National History in Armenian Social Memory

Gevorg A. Poghosyan, Rimma M. Poghosyan

Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Law of Armenian National Academy of Sciences, Yerevan, Armenia
Email: gevork@sci.am, rimapoghosyan3@gmail.com

Abstract

This article presents the main results of the sociological survey devoted to the study of depth and structure of the historical memory of modern Armenian society. Our research was devoted to identifying historical memory in modern Armenian society; its depth and perception of historical boundaries, the structure of this memory in modern society. The historical period of memory discourse in the social sciences today is manifested in the widespread dissemination of memory studies also in the sociological research. Despite some incompleteness, social memory has the ability to retain in the collective consciousness the main historical narratives that are very necessary for the construction of national identity. This article analyzes the main results of a nationwide sociological survey, which made it possible to identify the features of the historical consciousness of modern Armenian society. To verify the collective ideas about the time of formation of the Armenian people, Armenian language and spiritual culture. The study revealed the key events in history, commemorative set of national heroes and rulers, as well as the temporal information accumulated in the common historical memory of social groups.

Keywords

Social Memory, Armenian History, National Narratives

1. Introduction

As historians say, "history is an endless debate." In principle, any historical presentation and historical text is a set of historical facts, interpretations and comments. According to the Christian theology and philosopher Aurelius Augustine (Aurelius, 1991; Sokolov, 1979) the history of mankind develops not in cycles, but in a straight line. Augustine formed the first philosophical concept of history, and managed to create a holistic picture of the universe. The painting

was so complete that it remained unchanged for more than eight centuries in the West. Augustine is credited with famously saying about time: "There is no past, present, or future. There is the past of the present, the present of the present and the future of the present." Over time, historical facts can be supplemented and clarified; completely new information about the same event can be discovered, since, for example, new sources appear, archives are opened, etc. On the other hand, already discovered facts may receive a different interpretation or reconstruction. Controversial, sometimes mutually exclusive points of view on the same historical facts arise. Depending on the ideological situation, some historical facts may be obscured, pushed into the background, or even simply consigned to oblivion. In different periods, different events can be classified as the most important. Under the influence of the current political situation, assessments of historical events may change significantly. Historical memory, despite its incompleteness, has the ability to retain the main historical events in people's minds, turning them into historical knowledge (Toshchenko, 1998). For many centuries, ideas about the phenomenon of memory were formed on the basis of the ideas of ancient philosophy. Plato believed that memory preserves the ideological forms and patterns of people previously known to the human soul. "Recognition is the memory of the immortal soul of everything that he has ever seen" (Plato, 1970). Aristotle argued that memory only returns previously existing knowledge, and the subject of memory was the past, which is associated with sensory impressions (Aristotle, 1927). In the 17th century, European philosophy turned to the study of historical, cultural, social and collective memory. There has come an understanding that the functional significance of memory lies in the transmission of accumulated cultural values and human experience to future generations.

2. Overview of Subject Field

Current interest in memory is associated with the rapid and accelerating pace of development of civilization. Research interest in the problem of memory in the humanities has become relevant, including due to the expansion of interdisciplinary researches. Interest in historical memory indicates both a return of society to historical origins and a sense of risk of loss of historical identity (Chernikov, 2016). Historical and social memory complement each other, since the functioning of social memory takes place within the historical process. Thus, the close intertwining of social memory and the historical process was emphasized, in particular, by the Estonian philosopher Jan Rebane. He understood social memory "as information accumulated during socio-historical development, recorded in the results of practical and cognitive activity, transmitted from generation to generation using sociocultural means and being the basis of individual and social cognition at each specific stage of historical development" (Rebane, 1980).

By Maurice Halbwachs the distinguished between the social and historical memory is that the social memory stores what is alive in the consciousness of the

group, but the history artificially revives what is no longer exists (Halbwachs, 2007: p. 20). Oral folk tradition does not require written confirmation. History replaces tradition and the desacralization of the past occurs in it. In history, the past stored in memory is not destroyed, but is rationalized and comprehended. Halbwachs wrote that "the picture of the past we reconstruct in one respect gives us an image of the past that is more consistent with reality. In another respect, since this image was intended to recreate our past perception, it turns out to be inaccurate… since new features have been added to them that we had not noticed before." (Halbwachs, 2007: p. 148). Speaking about the social framework of memory, Halbwachs meant that the content of memory is deeply individual, but it unfolds in a matrix that is generated in a specific society. "The central thesis pursued in all of Halbwachs's works is the social conditioning of memory… Memory arises in a person only in the process of his socialization…and this memory is formed by the team" (Assman, 2004: p. 36). He goes further and creates the concepts of "group memory" and "memory of the nation." In his opinion, memory is a function of the individual's involvement in various social groups, from the family to the religious and national community (Assman, 2004: p. 37). In postmodern society, the social norms are blurred, and therefore history and memory do not contain identical properties. The past and the future, of course, to varying degrees, but equally have the property of great uncertainty.

According to French historians, memory is rooted in the concrete, in space, gesture, image and object. History is not attached to anything other than temporal extensions and evolution. History is a kind of delegitimating of the lived past (Nora et al., 1999). At the same time, history is not only a treasury of memory, but also a "mechanism for erasing" this memory. It is no secret that the past is often constructed in accordance with current political curs. In this sense, historical science has a large share of politicization. In fact, a special selective process of "memorizing-forgetting" constantly occurs in it. Thus, any historical event is an open, dynamic structure; this is a narrative that is a lever in the hands of power for political determination, for adjusting public perception of the past.

German researcher Aleida Assmann describes the relationship between memory and amnesia in social, political and cultural contexts. It shows how the single national narrative of the 19th century is being replaced by pluralistic and contradictory approaches to the past within the framework of the "new historicism of the 21st century" (Assman, 2019). One can cite hundreds of examples from the history of any country illustrating the manipulative nature of the presentation of events. Even the idea of the shape of the Earth itself has been a subject of debate for many centuries between supporters of a flat and spherical Earth. For centuries, church fathers and millions of people believed that the sun and moon circulated around a stationary Earth. While the Armenian philosopher Anania Shirakatsi in the 6th century in his work "Cosmography," cogently expressed thoughts about the sphericity of the Earth and its rotation around the Sun (Shirakatsi, 1962).

The manipulative policy of oblivion is aimed at keeping silent, concealing or

distorting generally valid meanings. Much of this technology can be seen in our contemporary political discourse. This includes the large-scale use of "soft power", and the use of the mobilization potential of social networks, and the technology of "Overton windows" (Beck, 2010) and much more. The politicization of historical science once again demonstrates that historical memory is largely the result of a historical reconstruction of the past. Historical memory, as a rule, is recorded in written sources, birch bark letters, clay tablets, in cuneiform writing, in rock carvings, in extant historiography, manuscripts, handwritten and printed publications and books, in monuments, sculptures and memorial complexes, in paintings by artists, documentaries and feature films: in any material media.

The social memory has a dynamic structure in which the communicative process takes place. The past contains not only the reality of life, but also ontological completeness. Social memory is concentrated in the social consciousness of people, large and small groups of peoples; in oral folk traditions, tales and myths passed down from generation to generation. Sometimes, with the passing of one generation, a whole layer of social memory may disappear. Social memory is changeable and can be erased. But for the sake of fairness, it must be said that history knows many cases when books were burned, libraries were destroyed, monuments were demolished, churches were destroyed, even cemeteries were destroyed.

In our days, the attitude towards history as some visible whole is being overcome. We are inside not a completed, but only a possible, constantly disintegrating historical integrity (Jaspers, 1991: p. 272). Karl Jaspers perceived world history as a chaotic accumulation of random events, as a disorderly heap, as a whirlpool of the abyss. "The riddle of the filled "now" will never be resolved, but it is increasingly deepened by historical consciousness. The depth of this "now" is revealed only together with the past and the future." (Jaspers, 1991: p. 275). The present is accomplished on the basis of the historical past. "On the other hand, the accomplishment of the present is determined by the future hidden in it" (Jaspers, 1991: p. 28). Martin Heidegger noted that time is not something external: "a kind of matrix for the events of the world; just as little is it something that hums somewhere inside, in consciousness" (Heidegger, 1998).

Since social memory, like individual memory, is selective, according to Peter Bark, it is necessary to determine the principles of selection and note how they change from place to place, or from one group of people to another, and how they change over time. Memories are malleable, and one must understand how and by whom they are formed (Burke, 1978, 1991, 1992, 2004).

3. Research Methodology

In the spring of 2022, our research team began developing a program for a nationally representative sociological survey among the adult population of the Republic of Armenia. Basic concepts, categories, methodology and key units of research were developed, as well as a list of thematic blocks and questions for in-

clusion in the questionnaire of sociological research.

The empirical sociological study was carried out by the professionals of Armenian Sociological Association, using the personal interviews in the homes of 1500 respondents—permanent residents of Armenia. The methodology of empirical sociological survey, sampling methodology, questionnaire design (included more than 50 questions) the guide-line of the interview and field control were used during the sociological survey according to the international standards by the professionals of Armenian Sociological Association (ASA), which is the national member of International Sociological Association (ISA, since 1992), European Sociological Association (ESA, since 2006) and ESOMAR (in 1998-2017). The empirical study used a multistage nationwide representative random sample was done in August-September of 2022. The study was conducted through personal interviews (F2F) in the homes of respondents using a route sampling technique. The final selection of respondents was made using the simplified Kish method. The sample confidence level correspondence coefficient is 97%. The sampling error does not exceed the interval ±2.5% for the entire sample. The results obtained during the field research, after the preliminary control, editing and the procedure for closing of open questions, were entered into the database and subjected to statistical processing by using the SPSS special programme for statistical analyzing of sociological information.

4. Depth and Structure of the Historical Memory

It is known from history that the Armenians arose many thousands of years ago. According to ancient legend, Noah's great-grandson Hayk inherited the rule of the territory of Armenia from his father Torgom. He became the founder of the nation and the first king. Since ancient times, Persian sources testify about the ancient Armenians and Armenia, calling it "Arminia". The ancient Greek historian Herodotus repeatedly mentioned the "Armen" people in his works. And in Homer's "Iliad" the Armenians are mentioned under the name "Arima". Assyrian sources mention the Hayasa people, tablets with their name were found by archaeologists during excavations of the ancient capital Hattusashi of the Hittites. Hayasa comes from the self-name of the Armenians—Hay. According to historians, the Armenians were formed in the 12th century. BC e. (Khorenatsi, 1990; Dyakonov, 1968; de Morgan, 1965; Sargsyan et al., 1980). Thus, it turns out that the Armenian people were formed about 4 thousand years ago. We were interested to find out how the historical dates of the emergence of Armenians are represented in the modern social consciousness of Armenians (Table 1).

Table 1. How many years ago the Armenians arose? %.

How many years ago	%
Up to 2000 years	19.2
2000 - 4000 years	28.5

Continued

4000 - 6000 years	27.0
6000 - 8000 years	8.1
8000 - 10,000 years	7.1
10,000 - 20,000 years	5.6
More 20,000 years	4.5
Total	100

The results of our sociological research showed a wider range of opinions. Thus, a considerable proportion of respondents (19.3%) named much shorter periods of time for the formation of Armenians—up to 2 thousand years. The 27.5% of respondents indicated a time of up to 4000 years, which coincides with historical sources. The 27% of respondents are sure that the Armenians arose even earlier—before 6000 years; and 25.3% of respondents named much longer periods—from 8000 to 20,000 or more years. Thus, the opinion about the rather ancient origin of the Armenians has taken root in public discourse. The historical depth of memory in social consciousness about the time of the emergence of a people far exceeds the existing historical framework. Below is the distribution of respondents' opinions varied depending on their socio-demographic indicators (Table 2).

Table 2. How many years ago the Armenians arose? % (by the age and gender of respondents).

How many years ago	Age	(years)	%		Gender	%	Total
	18 - 29	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	Male	Female	%
Up to 2000 years	19.5	18.3	15.5	30.2	18.8	19.8	19.3
2000 - 4000 years	28.6	29.0	30.1	21.9	28.3	26.7	28.5
4000 - 6000 years	27.5	27.9	28.1	20.8	26.7	27.8	27.0
6000 - 8000 years	7.2	9.2	7.1	8.9	7.9	8.7	8.1
8000 - 10,000 years	8.0	6.0	7.5	6.5	7.3	6.9	7.1
10,000 - 20,000 years	5.6	5.4	6.6	6.4	6.2	5.7	5.6
More 20,000 years	3.6	4.2	5.1	5.3	4.8	4.4	4.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	**100**

In general, the main answers of the respondents ranged from 2 to 6 thousand years (55.5%). Among representatives of the older generation (70 years and older), almost a third of respondents (30.2%) indicated the date of the emergence of Armenians—before 2000 years, which almost corresponds to the beginning of our era. This is quite strange, considering that the reign of the most famous king of Armenia, Tigran the Great, spanned the period from 95 to 55 BC. As for the gender of the respondents, there were no significant differences in the opinions

of men and women on the issue of the time of origin of the Armenians. City residents, especially in the capital, turned out to be somewhat more informed than rural residents. In addition, the higher the level of education of the respondents, the more their answers corresponded to the period of formation of the Armenian people common in historiography.

In 2017, the foreign ministers of Greece and China founded an international initiative called the *Ancient Civilizations Forum*[1]. This is a conference with the participation of 10 countries: Greece, China, Egypt, Bolivia, India, Iraq, Iran, Italy, Mexico and Peru, which represent more than 40% of the world's population. In 2018, Armenia also joined this annual forum of ancient civilizations as a representative of the Urartian civilization[2]. We tried to find out which of the ancient peoples the Armenians compare themselves with, and which of them is considered more ancient. In a sociological study, to the question of who they consider to be more ancient peoples than the Armenians, the following answers were received depending on the age and gender of the respondents.

Table 3. Armenians are a more ancient people, or...? % (by the age and gender of respondents).

Nations	Age	(years)	%	Gender	%	Total
	18 - 29	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	Male	Female	%
Egyptians	34.5	33.2	31.2	23.7	33.6	30.6	31.9
Greeks	23.4	21.5	22.0	20.7	22.1	22.0	22.1
Romans	26.3	21.1	18.9	15.4	21.7	20.9	21.3
Jews	17.6	18.5	16.9	12.4	17.5	16.8	17.1
Asyrians	14.7	14.5	14.8	11.2	15.4	13.4	14.3
Persians	13.3	13.1	12.1	10.1	12.6	12.5	12.5
Chinese	10.8	11.9	12.1	6.5	10.8	11.3	11.1
Hindus	8.4	10.9	10.7	9.5	9.6	10.4	10.0
No one	25.8	28.4	31.1	36.7	29.6	29.2	29.4

Almost a third of respondents (31.9%) indicated the Egyptians as more ancient peoples, and 21% - 22% indicated the Greeks and Romans. In addition to these ancient peoples, Jews, Assyrians and Persians were also indicated. A little more than a quarter of respondents (29.4%) did not point to any other people, obviously assuming that there is no one older than the Armenians. Representatives of the older generation (70 years or more) pointed to more ancient peoples significantly less than the younger ones. In addition, they, more than others, believe that no one is older than the Armenians (36.7%). The opinions of the surveyed men and women on this issue were also practically the same. The greatest

[1]https://thenewgreece.com/interesting/ancient-civilizations-forum/ [Accessed date: 10.01.2022].
[2]https://www.armmuseum.ru/news-blog/2022/11/24/armenia-the-forum-of-ancient-civilizations-in-iraq [Accessed date: 10.01.2022].

awareness of this issue was demonstrated by people with general secondary education and those who completed a master's degree at a university. It can be assumed that the first group of respondents has well-remembered knowledge from a school history course, and the second group has still fresh university knowledge of history.

Rural residents turned out to be somewhat more informed about other ancient peoples than residents of cities and the capital. Perhaps the firmly acquired school history curriculum was also evident here, but it is also possible that there was insufficient availability of other sources of information. As can be seen from Table 3, such ancient peoples of Latin America as Mexicans, Peruvians and Bolivians are completely absent from the list of peoples they indicated.

The Christian religion plays a huge role in the basis of the national identity of Armenians. In this regard, it was interesting to identify the population's knowledge of what religion the Armenians adhered to before adopting Christianity. According to the majority of respondents, Armenians in the pre-Christian period were pagans (See Table 4).

Table 4. What religion did the Armenians profess before Christianity? %.

Types of beliefs	%
Paganism	68.8
Zoroastrianism	10.9
Sun Worship	11.5
Other	1.3
Difficult to answer	7.4
Total	100

The majority indicated "paganism," demonstrating a fairly high awareness of the distant past of their people. As for the time of adoption of Christianity as the state religion in historical Armenia, here the majority opinion unanimously agreed on the fourth century AD, or more precisely on 301 (and close) years (Table 5).

Table 5. In what year did the Armenians adopt Christianity? %.

Date of adoption of Christianity	%
301 - 310 years	82.1
Other dates	6.2
Difficult to answer	11.7
Total	100

The overwhelming majority did not hesitate to name the historical date for the adoption of Christianity. Armenia is the oldest Christian state still in exis-

tence, which adopted Christianity in 301 during the reign of King Trdat III. Saint Gregory the Illuminator, thanks to whose persistent efforts Armenia accepted the Christian faith, became in 302 the first patriarch and Catholicos of all Armenians. And the next year, 303, the Etchmiadzin Cathedral was built, which to this day is the religious center of the Armenians and the residence of all Armenian Catholicoses. The historical fact of the adoption of Christianity is one of the foundations of the national identity of Armenians. Only a small percentage (6.2%) of respondents indicated the wrong date for the adoption of Christianity in Armenia, and 11.7% of respondents found it difficult to answer this question. A large number of those who found it difficult to answer were among people with primary education (52.6%), with general secondary education (29.2%) and pensioners (29.0%). Among rural residents, the proportion who gave the correct answer was slightly lower (77.8%) than among urban residents (84%).

In terms of identifying the depth and structure of the historical memory of modern Armenian society, the answers to the question about the historical date of the creation of the Armenian alphabet were of no less interest (Table 6).

Table 6. In what year was the Armenian alphabet created? %.

Year of creation of alphabet	%
405 - 406 years	65.7
Other dates	12.4
Difficult to answer	21.9
Total	100

Here the share of correct answers turned out to be slightly lower (65.7%), and the number of those who found it difficult to answer (21.9%) or gave the wrong answer (12.4%) turned out to be higher than in the question about the time of adoption of Christianity. As the level of education of respondents increases, the proportion of correct answers increases. For example, 78.9% of respondents with a bachelor's degree gave the correct answer, 83.9% with a master's degree. But among respondents with primary education, only 57.9% gave the correct answer; among persons with general secondary education—44.6%; and among people with complete secondary education it is even less—30.9%. The vast majority (71% - 72%) of young respondents (18 - 29 and 30 - 49 years old) correctly indicated the date of creation of the Armenian alphabet. And among pensioners and people over 70 years old, only 39% - 44%. Rural residents gave fewer correct answers (57.4%) than urban residents (70.6%).

At the same time, to the question of who created the Armenian alphabet, the correct answer was given by the absolute majority of respondents—98.7%. Our respondents noted the name of Saint Mesrop Mashtots (creator of the Armenian alphabet, educator, theologian and translator of the Bible) immediately and without hesitation.

By exploring the depths of the historical memory of modern Armenians, we

tried to find out the degree of their knowledge and awareness of such historical phenomena as the dynasties of the Armenian kings, and the reign of the most famous of them, revered by the people as great kings.

Table 7. Which kings are considered great in the history of Armenia? % (The respondents could name several names).

Names of kings	Age of	respondents	(years)		Total
	18 - 29	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	%
Tigran the Great	75.8	71.4	68.2	68.1	71.4
King Pap	17.2	19.4	17.8	19.4	18.4
Ashot Erkat (Iron)	15.0	15.1	13.5	15.0	14.6
Artavazd 2nd	11.7	12.1	10.9	11.3	11.6
Trdat the Great	10.2	9.8	9.2	8.8	9.6
Argishti A	10.0	9.0	8.4	6.3	8.8
Arshak 2nd	6.5	7.6	8.1	5.6	7.2
Levon the Great Rubinyan	4.5	5.5	4.6	6.9	5.1
King Menua	4.0	4.9	3.8	1.3	4.0
King Abgar	1.0	1.4	0.8	0.6	1.0
Other names	21.4	23.3	20.1	20.6	21.6

As one would expect, the greatest king in history, according to the overwhelming majority of respondents, was Tigran the Great—founder of Great Armenia, who ruled from 95 to 55 BC. As can be seen from Table 7, respondents of all ages answered this question almost identically. Such unanimity is usually rare in sociological surveys. Apparently, this is precisely the layer of historical memory that is firmly entrenched in the public consciousness of modern Armenians. There were also no discrepancies or disagreements observed on this issue, depending on the socio-demographic data of the respondents. It can be assumed that we have encountered a certain basic layer of historical memory, which is the basis for the entire subsequent construction. It is interesting to note that the respondents named a fairly large number of Armenian kings who ruled in various historical periods of Armenian history. One fifth of the respondents named the names of the kings who were on the long list in the last line of the table— "Other names". The table shows the names of only 10 kings, which were indicated by at least one percent of respondents (i.e. 150 people). The total number of names named exceeded two dozen. It should also be noted that young people aged 18 - 29 are quite active; more than two-thirds of young people answered this question, showing considerable interest in national history. For comparison, here are the results of a VCIOM (Russian Public Opinion Research Center) survey in 2022, according to which three from four young people (76%) in Russia know the history of their country well. At the same time, the highest level of knowledge about the country was found among young people aged 18 - 24 years

(80%). This is quite an interesting coincidence from the point of view of cross-cultural studies of collective memory.

But on the question of the most successful periods of our history, no such unanimity was found between representatives of different generations (Table 8).

Table 8. Which period of Armenian history was the most successful? (by the age of respondents) (The respondents could give several answers).

Successful periods of Armenian history	Age	(years)		%	Total
	18 - 29	30 - 49	50 - 69	70+	%
Reign of king Tigran the Great	64.8	62.2	56.2	49.1	59.8
Soviet period	9.4	18.3	30.0	48.5	22.5
Period of Hayk Nahapet (progenitor of the Armenians)	16.6	15.5	10.7	13.6	14.3
Independent Armenia (modern period)	15.4	12.9	9.4	7.7	12.1
Middle Ages	12.0	10.3	8.2	7.1	9.9
Other	0.5	0.2	0.2	2.4	0.5

According to the majority of respondents, the most successful period of our history was the reign of King Tigran the Great (99-55. BC). As respondents age, the percentage of those who indicated such periods of history as the reign of Tigran the Great, the ancestor of the Armenians Hayk Nahapet (approximately 2492. BC), the modern period of Armenia and the long years of the Middle Ages steadily decreases. The only period of history for which respondents' assessments increase significantly with the age is the years of Soviet Armenia (1921-1991). Obviously, the older generation clearly considers the years of Soviet Union, or the recent past, of which they were direct witnesses, to be the most successful period of Armenian history. At the same time, the periods of our deep history and the modern period of independent Armenia were also successful for young people and middle-aged people.

The assessments of representatives of the "fathers and sons" generation on this issue seriously differed. There were no significant differences in the assessments of the surveyed men and women. Here the property of collective or social memory to be a way of constructing one's past for each generation is quite clearly manifested. This possibility of constructing social memory is an axiom for researchers in the scientific direction of memory studies (Safronova, 2019). Memory in this sense is social, especially collective memory, interpreted as one of the types of collective representations, "finds itself in the foundation of the social" (Golovashina, 2022: p. 67). However, despite almost a century of development of memory studies, definitions of collective, historical, social and cultural memory have not yet received complete conceptual design and remain rather

a kind of metaphor (Golovashina, 2022: p. 60).

5. Conclusion

The historical memory of society has some main sources: first of all, these are the school textbooks on the history of Armenian people. Additional sources for the formation of historical memory are literature, fiction novels and books, films on historical themes, as well as national legends and traditions. The source of the formation of historical memory for the general public is also family stories, family legends, albums of family and personal photographs, and family archival documents. To varying degrees, they also shape and influence the content of historical memory.

Our research has revealed that the depth of historical memory of modern Armenians extends over two thousand years of national history. The structure of historical memory is heterogeneous: it is somewhat fragmented, with noticeable gaps and omissions in historical periods. Some historical episodes were consigned to oblivion, apparently based on the current political situation. Often, a single national narrative is replaced by conflicting approaches to the past, including the recent historical past. In fact, in the national history, a certain selection process is constantly taking place, which introduces an element of relative uncertainty into the historical past.

The analysis of only small part of our unique national sociological survey presented in the article, a comprehensive theoretical generalization of the results of which has still to be done, allows us to demonstrate the significant gap in the perception of national history and national narratives, enshrined in the public consciousness of modern Armenians and in the political discourse that the power is trying to disseminate today after victory of the "Velvet revolution" in Armenia. In this article, we deliberately did not turn to a detailed analysis of the identified deep differences existing in the public consciousness of Armenians and in the official political discourse, since serious processes of confrontation between the people and the authorities continue and are currently increasing and taking a character of political crisis.

A scientific analysis of results of our sociological study showed that the opinions, value orientations and temporal ideas of the respondents differed not so much in the socio-demographic indicators of gender, employment, education level and locality of residence (city-rural), but rather in the age of the interviewed respondents. In fact, generational differences, in particular the perceptions of the younger generation of Armenians, have demonstrated significant differences both in terms of the content of historical memory and in terms of elements of national identity. In particular, young people consider self-orientation important as a basis for national identification. Meanwhile, the older generation of parents considers consanguinity, language, and religion important. The intergenerational dissonance revealed in the study indicates the presence of a certain value trends among the young Armenian generation, despite the generally

sufficient stability of the architectonics of national identity and the main narratives of national memory.

Acknowledgements

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

References

Aristotle, P. L. (1927). *Academia*. 120 p. (In Russian)
https://www.litfund.ru/auction/12/198/
https://imwerden.de/pdf/aristotel_poetika_academia_1927__ocr.pdf

Assman, A. (2019). The Oblivion of History is the Obsession with History. *New Literary Review,* 552. (In Russian)
https://www.nlobooks.ru/upload/iblock/78a/qesyvvptr78zcanuus5kqyhdpfhi6uwy/Assman_2ed.pdf

Assman, J. (2004). *Cultural Memory. Writing, Memory of the Past and Political Identity in the High Cultures of Antiquity*. (In Russian)
https://www.philol.msu.ru/~discours/images/stories/speckurs/assman.pdf

Aurelius, A. (1991). *Confession of Blessed Augustine, Bishop of Hippo.* "Renaissance" Publ. House, 488 p. (In Russian)
https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/istorija_srednevekovaja/avgustin_a_ispoved/8-1-0-3705

Beck, G. (2010). *The Overton Window.* Publisher "Threshold Editions".

Burke, P. (1978). *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe.* Routledge.

Burke, P. (1991). *New Perspectives on Historical Writing.* Penn State University Press.

Burke, P. (1992). *History and Social Theory.* Cornell University Press.

Burke, P. (2004). *What Is Cultural History?* Wiley.

Chernikov, P. Y. (2016). The Problem of Study Historical and Social Memory. *Vestnik of the Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, 5,* 189-194. (In Russian)

de Morgan, J. (1965). *The History of the Armenian People. From the Remotest Times to the Present Day.* Centerpoligraf, 557 p. (In Russian)
https://iknigi.net/avtor-zhak-morgan/180892-istoriya-armyanskogo-naroda-doblestnye-potomki-velikogo-noya-zhak-morgan/read/page-1.html

Dyakonov, I. M. (1968). *Prehistory of the Armenian People.* Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences of the Armenian SSR, 264 p. (In Russian)

Golovashina, O. (2022). Back to Representations: in Search of Grounds for Collective Memory. *Russian Sociological Review, 21,* 59-83.
https://doi.org/10.17323/1728-192x-2022-3-59-83

Halbwachs, M. (2007). *Social Framework of Memory.* New Publishing House. (In Russian)

Heidegger, M. (1998). *Prolegomena to the History of the Concept of Time.* Publishing House "Vodolei". (In Russian)

Jaspers, K. (1991). *The Origin and Goal of History.* Politizdat. (In Russian)

Khorenatsi, M. (1990). *History of Armenia.* Hayastan. (In Russian)

Nora P. et al. (1999). *France-Memory.* Publishing House of St. Petersburg University.

Plato (1970). *Collected Works.* In 3 vols. V. 2. Moscow. 185. (In Russian)

Rebane, Y. K. (1980). Social Determination of Knowledge: Complex Problem of a Research. *Obshchestvennye nauki, No. 4,* 102-115. (In Russian)

Safronova, J. A. (2019). *Historical Memory: An Introduction.* Publishing House of European University of Sankt-Petersburg. (In Russian)

Sargsyan, G. X., Hakobyan, T. X., Abrahamyan, A. G., & Nersisyan, M. G. (1980). *History of the Armenian People: From Ancient Times to the Present Day.* Yrevan YSU Publishing House, 460 p. (In Russian)

Shirakatsi, A. (1962). *Cosmography.* Yerevan (In Russian)

Sokolov, V.V. (1979). *Medieval Philosophy.* 448 p. (In Russian) http://mts.edu.27.ru/biblio/Phil/colection/pdf/1979_sokolov.pdf

Toshchenko, Zh. T. (1998). Historical Memory and Sociology. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya, No. 5,* 3-6. (In Russian) https://cdclv.unlv.edu/archives/pub/toshchenko.html