Unlike with my primary field of research—the medieval Near East—that begins from the study of texts in languages no longer spoken today, this article emerges from the real-life experience of attempting to transmit Western Armenian to heritage language learners in a weekend school. When I began to teach Armenian at a Sunday School in October 2016, I quickly discovered that of my twenty-eight students, divided by age into two forty-five minute classes (fourth and fifth grade in one class and sixth to ninth grade in the other), there were very wide ranges of background knowledge: some students could carry on a conversation in Armenian—as Armenian was a language used in their home—while others had varying levels of comprehension with little to no ability to produce Armenian, and there were others who could not understand or produce more than a few words. The situation was the same in regards to reading and writing (although knowledge of the alphabet had little connection with listening or speaking competency): there were those who could read a text placed before them—although with limited comprehension—while there were some who knew about half of the letters, and others who recognized just a few. I was charged with teaching Western Armenian to these students of varying levels in the same classroom, meeting for forty-five minutes each Sunday morning.

Determined to not be daunted by what seemed an impossible task—after all, as I encouraged my students on the first day, I had learned to comfortably read, write, and speak this language without knowing so much as the word *Parev* (“Hello”) until my first Armenian-language class at UCLA at the age of twenty-one in Fall 2009—I went home after the first-day and began thinking about previous language learning methods I had had success with over years of studying various languages, searching for what I could apply in this setting, while also
researching contemporary language learning methods. While I cannot claim to have discovered the answer to heritage language instruction in a weekend school, I would like to share some of my experience and the success that I have found with one of the methods that I have employed with a subset of the students. In this article, I will first situate the specific scenario that I encountered in an Armenian weekend school within the wider context of heritage language studies in the United States, with specific reference to my setting of Armenian language instruction in a weekend school. I will then explain one of the methods that I have adopted—known as “Where are your keys?”—for a contingent of the youths in my classrooms, concluded by an evaluation of its strengths as well as some of the challenges that I have met so far.

The situation that I encountered in an Armenian weekend school in Los Angeles is not unlike that of many Armenian and other community or minority language weekend schools in the United States, comprised of young heritage learners. Heritage language studies has become a burgeoning field of research in the last two to three decades. Although no one definition can accurately describe all heritage language learners due to the wide differences in their language abilities, researchers tend to use what has come to be called either a narrow or broad definition of heritage language learners, depending on the focus of their particular
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1 I would like to thank Shushan Karapetian for her assistance in acquainting me with the field of heritage language studies, which was of great help in the preparation of this study. Her 2014 dissertation is an indispensable resource for those interested in knowing how the research of this field applies to Armenian heritage language learners in the American diaspora: Shushan Karapetian, ““How Do I Teach My Kids My Broken Armenian?”: A Study of Eastern Armenian Heritage Language Speakers in Los Angeles” (Ph.D. diss., University of California Los Angeles, 2014). For a recent book that condenses the last twenty years of research in heritage language studies, and discusses relevant and appropriate teaching strategies for such students, see: Marta Ana Fairclough, Sara M. Beaudrie, Ana Roca, and Guadalupe Valdés, *Innovative Strategies for Heritage Language Teaching: A Practical Guide for the Classroom* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2016). As the introduction to this volume states, “This volume presents insights into the research on HL education over the last two decades and aims to take the HL education field a step forward, positioning it at the forefront of innovative and transformative educational practices in order to benefit all learners who choose to continue developing or maintaining their heritage language in an educational setting.”
research.\(^2\) A narrow-definition heritage language learner in the American context refers to a student who is “raised in a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or at least understands the language, and who is to some degree bilingual in that language and in English.”\(^3\) In other words, the kinds of students in my classes who had varying degrees of ability to understand and produce Armenian, as a result of the use of the language in their homes. A broad-definition heritage language learner refers to an individual who has been raised with a strong cultural connection to a language, usually because of the relevance of that language to his or her family’s ethnic background.\(^4\) In other words, this includes the kinds of students who perhaps know just a few words or expressions (or even nothing at all) of the language, because it is not spoken in the home. Heritage language learners then may have any range of linguistic ability in the language of their culture, from native-like communicative competence to relatively nil, and I experienced just this spectrum of linguistic diversity in my classrooms.

The situation of diversity in linguistic competence in the classroom should by no means be surprising when one considers the recent history of Armenian immigration to the United States, coupled with the scholarship on language maintenance among American immigrant communities. The depressing reality is that, according to the results of many studies, the lifespan of heritage or community languages has been proven to last no more than three generations in the United States.\(^5\)

\(^2\) The terms “broad” and “narrow” as ways of differentiating the two major types of heritage learners was first used in Maria Polinsky and Olga Kagan, “Heritage Languages: In the ‘Wild’ and in the Classroom,” *Language and Linguistics Compass* 1/5 (2007): 368-95 at 369-70.


are now large communities of Armenians with fourth and fifth generation descendants alongside second and third generation children from more recent waves of immigration to the wider Los Angeles metropolis, and all of these children may attend the same weekend school, thus giving rise to the situation of wide diversity of linguistic competence in a classroom. Knowing the reason behind linguistic diversity in the classroom, however, does not make navigating it any easier.

Making matters worse is the research that has shown the relative ineffectiveness of weekend schools in facilitating the healthy transmission of heritage languages across generations, revealing their primary effectiveness instead to lie in “filling an important identity-forming and identity-providing function.” They accomplish this by giving heritage youths the opportunity to engage with peers in their community, while at the same time learning about and performing unique aspects of their culture or religion. This has also been borne out by my own experience, where some of the learners who had no input from their home or another context could neither produce nor understand more than a few basic words and expressions, despite attending weekend language classes for multiple years.

Although the literature shows that weekend schools are not an effective means of transmitting a heritage language transgenerationally, the reality is that in Los Angeles County—as in numerous other places in the western diaspora—many parents have relied and will continue to rely solely on weekend schools as the only option available to them to provide language instruction to their children. For example, the enroll-

---

7 J.A. Fishman, M.H. Gertner, E.G. Lowy, and W.G. Milán, eds. Ethnicity in Action: The Community Resources of Ethnic Languages in the United States (Binghamton, NY: Bilingual Press, 1985), 38. See also the remarks on specific languages such as German in Renate Ludanyi, “German in the USA” in Language Diversity in the USA, ed. Kim Potowski (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 146-63 at 158, and in regards to Korean in Hae-Young Kim, “Korean in the USA” in Language Diversity in the USA, 171.
9 This is due to a number of factors involving convenience (location and traffic always being major issues in Los Angeles county), the perceived prestige (or lack thereof) of Armenian daily schools, as well as a number of other factors. The 2010 U.S. Census reports Los Angeles County as home to 179,279
ment at the Sunday School at which I teach counted 72 children in the 2016-2017 year between pre-Kindergarten and Ninth grade, none of whom currently attended a weekday school. As generations go on in the American diaspora and if trends continue as they have, then it will increasingly be the case that Armenian becomes less commonly spoken in the home, which means that increasingly students will enter weekend or weekday schools with little prior knowledge of the language. It is therefore incumbent on teachers to employ the most effective methods for such students’ situation and needs. These methods may in some aspects—at least at an initial stage—draw more from foreign or second language instruction methodologies than from either traditional methods of teaching Western Armenian inherited from the Middle East or from contemporary research into heritage language teaching methodologies. In other words, there is a need to strategize how to teach Western Armenian as a second or foreign language to broad-definition heritage students, all the while of course capitalizing on the significance of the children’s cultural knowledge and the importance of the language and culture to their identity. Although many current Armenian teachers may not be used to teaching Armenian as a second language, and while there is also often a need to employ new instructional materials and methods, this is by no means the first time in modern Armenian history that there has been a need to teach Armenian as a second language to children with new methods. One need look no further than the primer prepared by Mkhitar’ar of Sebastia in Armeno-Turkish (Turkish language rendered in Armenian script) to teach Western Armenian to Turcophone Armenian children who entered his monastery from Eastern Anatolia without prior competence in Western Armenian.10

Americans, who claim full or partial Armenian descent (though the figure is much higher due to a variety of factors that result in not all people indicating their Armenian descent on the census totals). According to official reports from private-day schools, the number of students enrolled is around 5,000. This means that most children of Armenian descent in Los Angeles County are not attending formal instruction in their language at all, while others are attending weekend schools. I did not come across any statistics pertaining to the number of Armenian children enrolled in weekend schools in Los Angeles County. The above statistics are taken from studies cited in Shushan Karapetian, “Armenian Heritage Language Speakers,” 40, 57.

I have applied the method that is the subject of this article to broad-definition Armenian heritage learners, who have had little to no exposure to the language outside of the classroom, but who have an important cultural or familial connection to the language, as well as those with some home exposure to the language, but who have varying levels of comprehension with little ability to produce language. Ten such students began meeting for an extra forty-five minute session of language instruction before the formally scheduled classes began in early March 2017 and continued until early June 2017. Many of these students could read and write, having spent many hours over the course of years in a classroom learning the alphabet, although they were not able to comprehend much of what they read.\textsuperscript{11} What was necessary then was a communicative-based approach that laid the emphasis on hearing and producing comprehensible language in a gradually ascending order. The method I chose to address this need is known as “Where are your keys?” (WAYK), and the next portion of my article is devoted to explaining it.

The WAYK system is a comprehensive language learning method that was developed by Evan Gardner in the 2000s to revitalize endangered languages.\textsuperscript{12} Since its inception it has been employed for the most part among indigenous, endangered languages in the United States, including Alutiiq (Kodiak, Alaska); Chinuk Wawa (Oregon/Washington State); Northern Paiute (Warm Springs, Oregon); and Yurok (the

\textsuperscript{11} The Armenian alphabet is one of the key symbols of Armenian identity, and it is not uncommon for Armenians in the diaspora to be able to read the alphabet or have it hung reverently in their homes, without those same people ever regularly reading in the language, or sometimes even using it to speak. On this (specifically in regard to the French-Armenian context), see Anahid Donabedian-Demopoulos, Anke Al-Bataineh, 	extit{L’arménien occidental en France: dynamiques actuelles} [Rapport de recherche] Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales (INALCO); Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD). 2014. <hal-01103172>, pages 9; 30. This may be accessed at https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01103172 (Accessed 10 November 2017).

\textsuperscript{12} Most of the information in this section is derived from the WAYK website: https://whereareyourkeys.org/. I could not find WAYK discussed in scholarly literature. That WAYK has been used to revive endangered languages ought of course to immediately grab the attention of those with a vested interest in the maintenance of Western Armenian, as this language has been declared “definitely endangered” since a UNESCO Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger report in 2010.
Redwood Forest of Northern California); as well as Latin. It is through the latter language that I learned of its existence, when while working on my Master’s degree at the University of Notre Dame, I befriended someone who had learned to speak Latin via this method. Over the course of a year and a half, I learned to speak Latin from him, in part through a number of strategies from the WAYK method.

This method is effective because it employs some of the most efficient techniques for language acquisition, as discovered through scientific studies as well as the personal experience of its users. These include: Total Physical Response, wherein the target language is taught through whole-body movement; Comprehensible Input, wherein new facets of the target language are introduced in controlled stages that allow learners to understand language containing unacquired vocabulary and grammar one stage beyond their current level of competency through the help of context and extra-linguistic information; and the use of a variety of techniques to facilitate an immersive language context, such as—most notably—sign language, which is used as a memory aid and bridge between the target language and reality. I will discuss each of these facets briefly in turn.

Total Physical Response (TPR) is a theoretically-based strategy in second-language acquisition developed in the 1960s by James J. Asher. Stemming from the observation that most people quit in their effort to learn a language because of unbearable stress resulting from left-brain instructional strategies, Asher developed TPR to mirror the stress-free process of children acquiring their first language, an approach that was further developed and refined in the 1970s and 1980s by Stephen Krashen and Tracy Terrell, which they named the “natural approach” to language acquisition. TPR, as its name implies, targets not just the mind but the body as well in language instruction, correlating language with physical movement. One of the innovative ways that this has been performed is by making the core of language interaction in the classroom
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13 A website devoted to this methodology, which provides a number of resources and studies is maintained here: http://www.tpr-world.com/. For a helpful introduction to the theory and its application, with references to studies on its use with a number of different languages see: James J. Asher, “The Total Physical Response: Theory and Practice,” Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 379 (1981): 324–331.

based not on the declarative tense, but the imperative. More complicated forms of speech and other tenses are progressively embedded within imperative structures, such that the full spectrum of the language may be covered with gradually increasing complexity, according to a natural progression. As a result, the focus lies on transactions, commands, and person-to-person interaction, wherein things are done with language in the classroom, all the while incorporating bodily movement. This also allows for an initial period of input and intake on the part of learners, where they may absorb and respond to linguistic input during a so-called “silent period” where they are not forced to speak. This serves to avoid the kind of stress that leads to discouragement, while also mirroring the natural acquisition of language by infants.\(^\text{15}\) Learners’ production of language gradually evolves from physical response, to one-word utterances such as yes or no, to mimicking speech they hear, to more complex responses and production of original speech.

The importance of introducing input in a gradually more complex manner has been discussed at great length in a number of studies by Stephen Krashen.\(^\text{16}\) One of his fundamental contributions is the idea that the only way that human beings acquire and retain language is by understanding comprehensible input or utterances in the language—not by abstract, declarative teaching of the language and its rules.\(^\text{17}\) Given enough comprehensible input introduced in a way that proceeds along a natural order of language development, speaking will eventually emerge after a silent period. It is important then to introduce new features of language through the help of context, extra-linguistic information, general knowledge of the world, and surrounded by previously-acquired linguistic content, such that the new input is made comprehensible to the learner.\(^\text{18}\)

One unique feature of the WAYK method is the introduction of a number of techniques, which are employed to facilitate rapid acquisition and retention of language. They have been developed to facilitate an immersive environment, so that learners are hearing as much comprehensible input as they can without recourse to another language—

\(^{15}\) Asher, “Total Physical Response,” 324-7.
\(^{17}\) Krashen, *The Input Hypothesis*, vii.
\(^{18}\) Ibid., 2.
whether through translation or explanation.\textsuperscript{19} One of the most important techniques employed is sign language, which serves as a memory aid and bridge between the target language and reality. By giving a sign to each word and action, students involve multiple senses and their entire body in the process of acquiring language, which facilitates both memory and retention.\textsuperscript{20} Additionally, when a particular word escapes them, they may be able to remember the sign and perform it in order to prompt another participant to give them the language item, which allows the immersive context to be maintained.

WAYK has developed a curriculum outline to assist in guiding a learner from a level of no knowledge in a language to intermediate-level fluency according to a natural order of progression, known as the “Universal Speed Curriculum” (because it can be applied to any language).\textsuperscript{21} The teacher can modify this resource to their target language, in order to have a road-map for how to get learners with no background knowledge to an intermediate level of comprehension and language production. More detailed sample curricula are available for some of the initial competency stages.\textsuperscript{22} I have translated these sample curricula into Western Armenian (attached in an Appendix to this paper), and made use of them in my classes. As part of the instruction, objects are employed so as to facilitate TPR, and ensure that the input is concrete, real and thus comprehensible. When introducing a new competency, the progression always follows the following order: comprehensible input (performed by the teacher and understood by the learner); imitation (performed by the teacher and mimicked by the learner); and only then production of language unprompted by the teacher (performed by the learner). Once a targeted competency is fully acquired, movement is made to the next stage. In terms of the traditional four skills of language, the progression of acquisition follows the natural order of children by starting with comprehension, then moving to speaking, before introducing reading and writing. There is not much

\textsuperscript{19} For a listing and discussion of these techniques, see: https://whereareyourkeys.org/technique-glossary/ (Accessed 8 November 2017).
\textsuperscript{20} On the use of sign language in WAYK, see for example: http://whereareyourkeys.org/technique-glossary/#signlanguage (Accessed 8 November 2017).
\textsuperscript{21} This guide is available at the WAYK website: https://whereareyourkeys.org/resources/.
\textsuperscript{22} These resources are available here: https://whereareyourkeys.org/resources/ (Accessed 8 November 2017).
guidance, however, on how to incorporate reading and writing into the learning environment, particularly for languages that do not employ the Latin alphabet, since WAYK has—as far as I am aware—been used exclusively with languages that employ Latin characters.

In the final section of this article, I would like to discuss some of the advantages and also challenges that I have confronted so far in adapting this methodology for Western Armenian in my weekend school setting. One of the main advantages I have noticed is the rapid activation of speech in the learners, in particular those broad-definition learners who do not have Armenian in the home. This has provided an immediate confidence boost to these youths, and made them eager to continue. After the first day, one of them approached me, and said that he learned more in one day with this method than he had in all of his previous years of going to weekend school. While this of course was an exaggeration and cannot possibly be true, it speaks to the confidence, sense of accomplishment, and rapid acquisition and retention of language that can be experienced in a very short time by learners, because of the immersive classroom environment and efficiency of the method. And since motivation and attitude are two of the most important factors in language acquisition, these methodological strengths are very significant. The next major advantage of this method is its ability to accommodate a variety of age differences. In the special class that I have started before the normal Sunday school hours, the age range in the classroom spans first grade to high school, and yet there has been no difficulty in maintaining interest or engagement among any of the learners. This is

significant as many weekend schools often have a variety of age levels in the same classroom. Another advantage is the openness and engagement promoted in the learners, which was noticeable from the first day of employing the WAYK method. Students are more engaged, attentive, and are participating more in the target language itself. Some of this is due to the fun, lively, and engaging environment facilitated by this method, which includes a significantly altered teacher-student position. The dynamics of the classroom are shifted such that the teacher is no longer at the front of the classroom teaching, but rather amongst the students on an equal level facilitating their acquisition. This puts the students at ease, and helps facilitate a frame of mind and environment that is most conducive to language acquisition.

WAYK cannot solve all the problems of Armenian weekend language instruction. It is probably not appropriate to use this method with both narrow- and broad-definition heritage learners in the same group, because those with general proficiency in listening and speaking would undoubtedly become bored by the basic linguistic competencies being targeted in the initial stages of WAYK (although the advanced stages could certainly be helpful to narrow-definition heritage learners). Therefore, this year in the morning classes where I now have more advanced students coming as well as in the normal classes which is always a mixed environment, I have begun to employ project-based learning instruction, where the students are often working in groups, usually based on their knowledge of the language. This has sometimes required the assistance of others in the classroom, which often has materialized in the form of parents coming to help. Another major challenge has been incorporating reading and writing, particularly since Armenian presents a significant challenge from most languages in that it has a unique, non-Latin script with thirty-eight letters. Because most of
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24 Project-based learning (PBL) is an entire subject in its own right that falls outside the scope of the present paper. Many materials relating to PBL as regards Western Armenian in particular may be accessed at the following website: http://www.ankebataineh.com/language/ (Accessed November 10, 2017). On PBL in general, one may begin with the following website: http://www.bie.org/ (Accessed November 10, 2017). I began to employ PBL in my classrooms following my participation in the 2017 teacher training program “Teaching Western Armenian in the Diaspora” under the aegis of INALCO (Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales) and the Armenian Communities Department of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in conjunction with the Zarmanazan summer camp. See http://www.zarmanazan.com/.
the broad-definition learners are able to read and write (due to years of going to weekend schools with an emphasis laid on mastering the alphabet and being able to pronounce text out-loud), I have begun to incorporate reading and writing by giving them the texts of the curriculum guides to read, along with some creative writing exercises. This is useful in part because it is language that they have already heard and had experience producing, and thus they are reading material that they can comprehend.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few final broad points about instruction in a heritage-language weekend school, with special attention to what WAYK may offer an instructor in this unique setting. First, WAYK provides a rapid and efficient way to get broad-definition heritage learners up to an intermediate level of comprehension so as to lessen the gap that exists between them and narrow-definition heritage language learners. This then lessens the need for splitting up the classroom into different groups based on different linguistic competency levels, which is never easy particularly when the teacher is working alone without any assistance. As a result, time can be spent in Project-based learning and other of the most effective methods of transmitting language that research on the teaching of heritage and second languages has developed.

In all likelihood, Western Armenian will not be transmitted to the next generation sufficiently by weekend schools alone. Thus, I believe it is critical for teachers in weekend schools to inspire students to become independent learners and equip them with the resources and wherewithal to continue their learning and engagement with the language outside of the classroom. The WAYK method is successful in this regard for being fun and enjoyable, and thus giving the learners positive experiences and associations with their heritage language, which will certainly contribute to making them desire to engage with and pursue their language outside of the classroom. Finally, there is a growing number of digital resources available online, and I have made it a point to share one digital resource with my students and their parents each week, so that they have many options of accessing the language outside of the classroom. Digital resources are especially useful for broad-definition heritage learners in the diaspora, because they are not in a context where they are surrounded by the language in their homes, and thus need to go out of their way in order to hear or read in it. Putting resources within their grasp is an important role of the weekend school language teacher, so that motivated
and inspired students can engage and grow in the language outside of the classroom.
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Appendix

Western Armenian Universal Speed Curriculum:
Initial Lesson Guides

“Where Are Your Keys?” — Evan Gardner — Universal Speed Curriculum — Initial Lesson Guides

Original English document prepared by Justin Robinson and available at https://whereareyourkeys.org/resources/
Western Armenian Translation by Jesse Siragan Arlen

Սաղbrush: Ատիկա ի՞նչ է

Ատիկա ի՞նչ է։
Ասիկա քար մըն է։
Ա՛հ, ատիկա քա՞ր մըն է։
Այո, ասիկա քար մըն է։
Ասիկա ի՞նչ է։
Ատիկա փայտ մըն է։
Ա՛հ, ասիկա փա՞յտ մըն է։
Այո, ատիկա փայտ մըն է։
Ատիկա փա՞յտ մըն է։
Ոչ, ասիկա փայտ մը չէ, ասիկա քար մըն է։
Ճիշ դ, ատիկա քար մըն է։
Ասիկա քա՞ր մըն է։
Ոչ, ատիկա քար մը չէ, ատիկա փայտ մըն է։
Առաջին քայլ՝ մենք փայտի մեջ ենք մտնել: Մենք կարող ենք հայկական լեզուից սկիզբ առաջնել։ Այստեղ մենք կնոջ վերաբերած պատմություն հայտնելու համար փայտով բացահայտելու կարողություն ունենք։

Մաս 2: Ռուս եւ ռուսեր

Առաջին քայլ՝ մենք փայտի մեջ ենք մտնել: Այստեղ մենք կարող ենք հայկական լեզուից սկիզբ առաջնել։ Այստեղ մենք կնոջ պատմություն հայտնելու համար փայտով բացահայտելու կարողություն ունենք։

Ոչ, սակայն նույն մի փայտում ենք ասենք։ Այստեղ մենք կարող ենք հայկական լեզուից սկիզբ առաջնել։ Այստեղ մենք կնոջ պատմություն հայտնելու համար փայտով բացահայտելու կարողություն ունենք։
Մաս 3: Կուզեմ

Ասիկա ի՞նչ է:

Ասիկա քար մընէ:

Ատիկա ի՞նչ է:

Ասիկա իմ քարս է:

Քու քարդ կուզե՞ս:

Ասիկա իմ քարի փայտ է:

Ասիկա քո՞ւ փայտդ է:

Ոչ, ատիկա իմ փայտիս չէ. ատիկա իմ փայտի է:

Ին փայտու ինիքե՞ւ:

Ոչ, իմ փայտի փայտվի բայց իմ քարիս չես ուզեր:

Ուրեմն, իմ քարի փայտի բայց իմ փայտի չեմ ուզեր:

Ասիկա իմ քարի փայտի բայց իմ փայտի չեմ ուզեր:
Անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Այսօր, անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Այսօր, անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Այսօր, անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Այսօր, անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:

Այսօր, անվերջության համար են անկախ ենթակազմություններ:
Ես բան մը չունիմ։
Ես ամէն ինչ ունիմ, իսկ դուն ոչինչ ունիս։
Այո, ոչինչ ունիմ։

Մաս 5: Կու տամ

Ասիկա ի՞նչ է։
Ասիկա քար մըն է։
Ասիկա քո՞ւ քարդ է։
Այո, ատիկա իմ քարս է։
Քարդ ունի՞ս։
Ոչ, քարս չունիմ։
Քարդ կ'ուզե՞ս։
Այո, քարս կ'ուզեմ։
Կ'ուզե՞ս քարդ տալ ինծի ։
Ոչ, չեմ ուզեր քարս տալ քեզի։
Ասիկա ի՞նչ է։
Ասիկա փայտ մըն է։
Ասիկա քո՞ւ փայտդ է։
Մաս 6: Կ’առնեմ

Այո, քարդ ուզե՞ս։

Այո, քարս չեմ ուզեր։

Այո, քարդ կուզե՞ս։

Արևելյան պահարն է։

Արևելյան քարդ է։

Այո, քարու նույն։

Այո, թերթուն նույն։

Ասիկա քար մըն է։

Ատիկա քու քարդ է։

Այո, քարս մնա քար է։

Այո, քարդ ունի՞ս։

Այո, քարս ունիմ։

Այո, քարդ կուզե՞ս։

Արևելյան պահարն է։

Արևելյան քարդ է։

Այո, թերթուն նույն։

Այո, թերթուն նույն։

Ոչ, ատիկա իմ փայտս չէ։

Ոչ, ատիկա քու փայտդ է։

Քարս կ’ուզե՞ս։

Այո, քարդ կուզե՞մ։

Կ’ուզես քու փայտս տա՞մ քեզի։

Այո, քարս տաս ինծի։

Այո, քարս տաս ինծի, իսկ քարդ տալ ինծի։

Այո, քարս տաս ինծի, իսկ չեմ ուզեր քարս տալ քեզի։
Այո, իմ քարս սիրում եմ:

Կ'ուզեմ քարս տալու համար:

Այո, իմ քարս սիրում եմ:

Կ'ուզեմ քարս առնեմ:

Այո, իմ քարս սիրում եմ:

Երջի պիտի առնեմ:

Ա՛ռջական:

Շնորհակալ եմ:

Խնդրեմ:

Մաս 7: Օրինակ

Առաջին հաղթական:

Առաջին քար մեկ է:

Առաջին քար հայտ չունի:

Այո, իմ քարս է:

Քարը պիտի առնեմ:

Այո, քարս ունիմ:

Քարը կուզեմ տալու համար:

Ոչ, քարս չեմ ուզեր:

Կ'ուզեմ քար տալու համար: 
Այո, կ'ուզեմ քարս տալ քեզի։
Կ'ուզե՞ս որ քարդ առնեմ։
Այո, կ'ուզեմ որ քարս առնես։
Քարդ պիտի առնեմ։
Ա՛ռ։
Շնորհակալ եմ։
Խնդրեմ։

Մաս 8: Օրինակ

Ասիկա ի՞նչ է։
Ատիկա փայտ մըն է։
Ասիկա քո՞ւ փայտդ է։
Ոչ, ատիկա իմ փայտս չէ ատիկա քու փայտդ է։
Փայտս ունի՞մ։
Այո, փայտդ ունիս։
Փայտս կ'ուզե՞ս։
Այո, փայտդ կ'ուզեմ։
Կ'ուզե՞ս որ փայտս տամ քեզի։

Անսովոր վերաբերյալ այս քարդի ստեղծման։

Ասիկա ի՞նչ է։
Ատիկա փայտ մըն է։
Ասիկա քո՞ւ փայտդ է։
Ոչ, ատիկա իմ փայտս չէ ատիկա քու փայտդ է։
Փայտս ունի՞մ։
Այո, փայտդ ունիս։
Փայտս կ'ուզե՞ս։
Այո, փայտդ կ'ուզեմ։
Կ'ուզե՞ս որ փայտս տամ քեզի։
Այո, կ’ներին ուր փայտեր տամ հինգ:

Կ’ներին փայտեր փայտափոխելու բարձր հինգ:

Այո, կ’ներին բարձր փայտափոխող փայտերի հինգ:

Եղավ, փայտեր պիտի տամ քեզի, և քարե տուր իր հինգ:

Ահա, քար։ Ահա, փայտ։ Լավ փոխանակություն։

Այո, լավ փոխանակություն։