

MAIN FACTORS CONDITIONING THE ABSENCE OF THE FINAL *Ը*
AND THE ORIGIN OF THE FINAL *Ի* OF THE IMPERATIVE SINGULAR
IN ARMENIAN DIALECTS

SARGIS AVETYAN

The 2 sg. Imperative, which was formed in several ways in Old Armenian, has displayed a general tendency toward uniformity in the course of the further development of the Armenian language. In this respect, the strong analogical interaction between the imperative forms of simple verbs of the *ե* and *ի* conjugations is especially remarkable. Whereas in some dialects the original distinction between active vs. medio-passive inflection has been preserved, in other dialects simple verbs of the former *ե* and *ի* conjugations have coalesced into a single conjugation type partially or fully, whereby either the ending *-իք* or *-է* (< Old Arm. *-էւ*) of the 2 sg. Imperative has been generalized as a result of analogical extension. Furthermore, on the one hand, the final *ք* of the Imperative sg. ending *-իք* has been lost either by phonetic change or by analogy in a number of dialects, and on the other hand, the final vowel *-է* (going back to the Old Armenian diphthong *-էւ*) of the 2 sg. Imperative has undergone further change *է>ի* in the same dialectal areas. Hence, the final *ի* of the 2 sg. Imperative in such cases may in principle have resulted either from the phonetic and/or analogical loss of the final *ք* in the ending *-իք* or from the phonetic change *է>ի*. It is not infrequently hard to say unequivocally which of the two aforementioned developments is responsible for the appearance of the form in question. Besides, it is sometimes far from clear whether phonetic change or analogy has entailed the actual disappearance of the final *ք* in the ending *-իք* in a particular dialect. In this respect, the retention vs. loss of the final *ք* in the 2 sg. Imperative of irregular verbs mainly serves as a guideline for revealing the actual cause (namely, articulatory vs. analogical motivation) of the lack of the final *ք* in the 2 sg. Imperative of regular verbs, though the final *ք* of the 2 sg. Imperative of some irregular verbs is likely to have been restored secondarily by analogy with the 2 pl. Imperative in a few instances.

Key Words: *Old Armenian, Armenian dialects, analogical interplay, simple verbs of the ե and ի conjugations, analogical extension, the Imperative sg. ending -իք, phonetic change, analogy, the 2 sg. Imperative, irregular verbs, regular verbs*

In Old Armenian, the final *ք* of the imperative singular mainly occurred in the medio-passive ending *-իք*¹. However, not all verbs following

¹ Apart from this, the imperative singular of some irregular verbs was characterized by a root-final or desinential *-ք*, cf. *բերել - բե՛ք*, *ուտել - կե՛ք*, *տալ - տո՛ւք*, *դնել - դի՛ք*, *տանել - տա՛ք*.

the medio-passive inflection in the aorist, took the ending *-իր*. In general, the 2 sg. medio-passive Imperative exhibited formal diversity and sometimes doublets². Root stems of the aorist as well as monosyllabic *g*-aorist stems regularly received the ending *-իր* in the 2 sg. Imperative, cf. *հասանել – հասիր* «հասովի՛ր, կտրվի՛ր», *ուսանիլ – ուսիր*, *զգենում – զգեցիր*, *փախչիլ – փախիր*, *բանամ – բացիր* «բացվի՛ր» etc. Similarly, the ending *-իր* was typical of simple verbs of the *u* conjugation when used in the passive or medio-passive function, and the *են*-suffixed ones in general, cf., e.g., *աղամ, ագայ – աղացիր* «աղացվի՛ր» *մերձենամ, եգայ – մերձեցիր* նւ: As to *ան*-suffixed verbs of the *u* conjugation, they were often characterized by doublets in the 2 sg. Imperative, for the endingless aorist stem of a number of verbs served as the 2 sg. Imperative alongside the regular form with the ending *-իր*. Moreover, the stem-final *g* could be dropped: cf. *ընթանամ, ագայ – ընթացիր/ընթա՛ր/ընթաց* (ՆՀԲ, հ. 1, էջ 776)³, *իմանամ, ագայ – իմա՛ր/իմա՛ց/իմացիր* (ՆՀԲ, հ.1, էջ 846), *մոռանամ, ագայ – մոռացիր/մոռա՛ր* (ՆՀԲ, հ. 2, էջ 297). The canonical form of the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs of the *t* conjugation when used in the passive or medio-passive function, and the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs of the *h* conjugation in general coincided with the accented aorist stem, of which the final *g* was usually preserved: cf. *խորհիլ, aor. stem խորհեաց-*, Imp. sg. *խորհեաց՛*, *բազմիլ, aor. stem բազմեաց-*, Imp. sg. *բազմեաց՛* etc. However, here, too, there often occurred parallel forms without the final *g* as well as ones with the ending *-իր*, cf. *ողորմիլ, aor. stem ողորմեաց-*, Imp. sg. *ողորմեաց՛/ողորմեա՛ր* (ՆՀԲ, 2, էջ 510), *խօսիլ, aor. stem խօսեաց-*, Imp. sg. *խօսեաց՛/խօսեա՛ր* (ՆՀԲ, հ. 1, էջ 997), *երեւիլ, aor. stem երեւեաց-*, Imp. sg. *երեւեաց՛/երեւեցիր* (ՆՀԲ, հ. 1, էջ 678) etc.⁴

Owing to some phonetic and analogical changes, the imperative has exhibited a tendency toward uniformity in the further development of the Armenian language. However, the change has proceeded in different directions in different dialects. In this respect, the strong analogical interaction between the imperative forms of simple verbs of the *t* and *h* conjugations is especially remarkable. The following factors seem to have contributed to or favoured the analogical change. The 2 sg. active Imperative of simple verbs of the *t* conjugation, which represented the accented aorist stem minus the

² Cf. **A. Aytönean**, K'nnakan K'erakanut'iwn ašxarhabar kam ardi hayerēn lezui, [A Critical Grammar of the Ašxarhabar or Modern Armenian language], Vienna, 1866, pp. էջ 449, 453, 459-460, **A. Abrahamyan**, Grabari jernark, [A manual of Grabar], Yer., 1976, pp. 153-157, **P. Šarabxanyan**, Grabari dasynt'ac' [A Course of Grabar], Yer., Եր., 1974, pp. 187-188, **H. Jensen**, Altarmenische Grammatik, Heidelberg, 1959, S. 101.

³ Here and below the dictionary *Nor bərgirk' haykazean lezui* [New Dictionary of the Armenian language], Vol., 1-2, (Venetik, 1836-1837) is referred to by the notation ՆՀԲ [NHB].

⁴ Cf. also **P. Šarabxanyan**, op. cit., p. 188, **J. Klein**, Classical Armenian Morphology, In: **A. S. Kaye** (ed.), Morphologies of Asia and Africa, Vol. 1, Winona Lake, Indiana, 2007, Ch. 37, p. 1077.

final *g* in Classical Armenian (cf. *uḥrku*, aor. stem *uḥrkuḡ*-, Imp. sg. *uḥrku* (< *uḥrkuḡ*), in Middle Armenian underwent the phonetic change *kw* > *t*, the latter having changed further to *h* in some modern Armenian dialects.

It is also significant that the final *t* (>*h*) under consideration as well as the final *w* of the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs pertaining to the *w* conjugation (cf. *uḥw*, aor. stem *uḥwḡ*-, Imp. sg. *uḥw* (< *uḥwḡ*) came to be conceived of as actual endings of Imperative, added to the present stem. This is evidenced by some analogical forms of the 2 sg. Imperative built on the present stem secondarily in Middle Armenian (cf. *ḡwḥw*, Imp. sg. *ḡwḥw* «ḡwḡḥ ḡ», *ḡwḥw*, Imp. sg. *ḡwḥw* «ḡwḡḥ ḡ», *ḡwḥw*, Imp. sg. *ḡwḥw* «ḡḥ ḡ» ևն)⁵: On the other hand, the ending *-hp* of the 2 sg. medio-passive Imperative that was only used occasionally as a by-form with simple verbs of the *h* conjugational class in Old Armenian, takes over in Middle Armenian, displacing the original endingless form of the Imperative, cf. Cl. Arm. *ḡwḥw*, 2 sg. Imp. *ḡwḥwḡ*, Middle Arm. 2 sg. Imp. *ḡwḥwḡḥ* etc.⁶ Furthermore, simple verbs of the *h* conjugation have come to form the 2 sg. Imperative in New Armenian not from the aorist stem as they did formerly, but from the present stem (cf. Middle Arm. 2 sg. Imp. *ḡwḥwḡḥ*, New Arm. 2 sg. Imp. *ḡwḥwḡḥ*), the latter formation type being obviously analogical after the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs of the *t* and *w* conjugational classes. Later, the ending *hp* was extended to the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs of the *t* conjugation in some dialects as a result of analogical extension (more on which below). It follows that, due to a reanalysis of the original morphological relationship by speakers (language users) in New Armenian, a new unitary pattern of forming the 2 sg. Imperative from simple verbs has emerged, namely the model: *present stem (= verbal root) plus the ending (t', -w', -hp)*.

As to the directionality of the analogical changes triggered by the interplay between the imperative forms of simple verbs of the *t* and *h* conjugations, three main lines of development can be singled out.

1. In a number of dialects, the original morphological distinction between active and medio-passive inflection has been retained in the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs of the *t* and *h* conjugational classes, surviving synchronically as an opposition between the ending *t* (<*tw*) and the ending *hp* (<*hp*) or their further modifications. For example, in the dialect of Malatya, the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs of the *t* and *h* conjugations is formed from the present stem by the addition of the endings *-t* (< *-tw* < **-twḡ*) and *-hp* (< *-hp*), respectively, cf. *ḡḡḡḡt* (< *ḡḡḡḡt*), *uḥḡḡt*, 2 sg. Imp. *ḡḡḡḡt*,

⁵ Cf. J. Karst, Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen, Strassburg, 1901, S. 334-335, 338, Anm.

⁶ Ibid., p. 338.

uhrk' on the one hand and *hujh*, *huoh*, 2 sg. Imp. *hujh'p*, *huoh'p* on the other hand⁷. Insofar as the formation of the 2 sg. Imperative is concerned, a similar situation obtains in the dialect of Shapin Garahisar⁸. In the dialect of Tigranakert, the distinction between active and medio-passive inflection is expressed by the opposition of the active ending *-t* (< *-tu'*) to the medio-passive *-h* (< *hp*), cf. on the one hand, *pprh* (< *prt*), *hprh* (< *hpr*), Imp. sg. *pprt'*, *hprt'* 'n, and on the other hand, *hprh*, *pprh* «*hprh*, *pprh*», Imp. sg. *hprh'*, *pprh'* 'n⁹. Similarly, in the dialect of Karno, the above morphological distinction is manifested as an opposition between the ending *t* (< *tu'*) and the ending *h* (< *hp*), respectively (cf. *pprt*, 2 sg. Imp. *pprt'*, *huoh*, 2 sg. Imp. *huoh'* 'n)¹⁰, while in the dialect of Bayazet, the active ending *u* (< *tu'*) and the medio-passive *h* (< *hp*) are opposed to each other in the 2 sg. Imperative, cf. *pprt*, 2 sg. Imp. *ppru'*, *hpru*, 2 sg. Imp. *hpru'*, as well as *hpru*, 2 sg. Imp. active *hpru* «*hpru*» and 2 sg. Imp. medio-passive *hpru* «*hpru*»¹¹:

2. In other dialects, the 2 sg. Imperative marker *-t* (< *tu'*) of simple verbs of the *t* conjugation was extended to simple verbs of the former *h* conjugation analogically¹². Moreover, the Old Arm. diphthong *tu'*, depending on the place of the stress, underwent twofold further change in some dialects. For example, in the dialect of Agulis carrying the stress on the penultimate syllable, *tu'* yielded *t'* in the accented position and *u* in the unaccented one, cf. *prt* (< *prt*), 2 sg. Imp. *prt'*, *hpr* (< *hpr*), 2 sg. Imp. *hpr'*, *u* (< *u*), 2 sg. Imp. *u* on the one hand, and *hpr* (< *hpr*), 2 sg. Imp. *hpru'*, *u* (< *u*), 2 sg. Imp. *u* on the other hand¹³: This is also the case in the dialect of Karchevan¹⁴.

⁷ See T'. Danielyan, Malat'iyi barbař [The dialect of Malat'ia], Yer., 1967, pp. 119-123, 127-131.

⁸ See H. Xač'atryan, Šapin Garahisari barbař (holovumə ew xonarhumə) [The dialect of Šapin Garahisar: declension and conjugation]. In Hayereni barbařagitakan atlas: usumnasirut'yunner ew nyut'er, Vol. 2, Yer., 1985, pp. 151-155.

⁹ A. Haneyan, Tigranakerti barbař [The dialect of Tigranakert]. Yer., 1978, pp. 126, 133-135. Cf. also pp. 112-113, 144-145.

¹⁰ Cf. H. Mkrtč'yan, Karno barbař [The dialect of Karin]. Yer., 1952, pp. 69, 71-75, 78-80.

¹¹ See V. Katvalyan, Bayazeti barbař yev nra lezvakan ařnč'ut'yunnerə řjaka barbařneri het [The dialect of Bayazet and its linguistic relationships with surrounding dialects], Yer., 2016, pp. 382, 426, cf. also p. 140.

¹² Cf., for example, H. Ač'aryan, K'nmut'iwn Nor-Naxijewani (Xrimi) barbaři [Study of the dialect of Nor-Naxijewan (Crimea)], Yer., 1925, pp. 261-262, 264-265, D. Kostandyan, Erznkayi barbař [The dialect of Erznka]. Yer., 1979, pp. 103, 105-109, Melik' S. Dawit'-Bėk, Arabkiri gawařabarbař: jaynabanakan ew k'erakanakan usumnasiru'iwn [The dialect of Arabkir: a phonetic and grammatical study], Vienna, 1919, pp. 258-261, cf. also 118-119, 129-130, H. Muradyan, Kak'avabardi barbař [The dialect of Kak'avaberd], Yer., 1967, pp. 62-63, 138-140, M. Maxudianz, Le parler armėnien d'Akn (quartier bas), Paris, 1911, pp. 86-88, 90. The 2 sg. Imp. ending *m* of simple verbs of the *t* and *h* conjugations in the dialect of Hamshen, is also likely to continue the earlier *t* (< Old Arm. *tu'*), as evidenced by the same phonetic development *t* > *m* in the 3 sg. of the present subjunctive (otherwise termed present optative) (cf. H. Ač'aryan, K'nmut'yun Hamšeni barbaři [Study of the dialect of Hamšen], Yer., 1947, pp. 127-128).

¹³ See S. Sargseanc', Agulec'oc' barbař (zōkeri lezun): lezuabanakan hetazōtut'iwn [The dialect of Agulis: a linguistic study]. Vols. 1-2, Moscow, 1883, pp. 119-120, also pp. 34, 49-52, 108-109.

3. In still other dialects, conversely, simple verbs of the *t* conjugation acquired the ending *-h̄p* in the 2 sg. Imperative by analogy with simple verbs of the *h* conjugation. For example, in the dialect of Jugha simple verbs pertaining to the former *t* *h* conjugational classes, have coalesced into a single conjugation (namely, *t* conjugation) and generally follow the active inflection. However, the 2 sg. Imperative is not formed with the ending *t̄* (incidentally, the Old Arm. *t̄w* would have yielded *t̄* by the regular phonetic change) but with the ending *-h̄p*, as *uḥpḥt̄l*, 2 sg. Imp. *uḥpḥp̄*, *ḥout̄l* (< *ḥouh̄l*), 2 sg. Imp. *ḥouh̄p̄*¹⁵.

It should be noted that the above processes of analogical extension have not always come to an end, and the transitional stage characterized by coexisting doublets still persists in some dialects. In the dialect of Kesab, for example, simple verbs of the former *t* conjugation survive as verbs of the *h* conjugation and, vice versa, those of the former *h* conjugation are manifested as verbs of the *t* conjugation. The continuations of the Old Armenian suffixed verbs, too, usually occur as verbs of the *t* conjugation¹⁶. As far as the formation of the Imperative singular is concerned, the descendants of the Old Armenian simple verbs of the *t* conjugation form it through the addition of the ending *h̄*, while the continuations of the Old Armenian simple verbs of the *h* conjugation as well as those of the Old Armenian suffixed verbs of both *t* and *h* conjugations make the 2 sg. Imp. either with the ending *h̄* or *t̄*. However, from the suffixed verbs of the *w* conjugation, the 2 sg. Imperative is only made by the addition of the ending *t̄*, cf. *uḥp̄h̄* (< *uḥp̄h̄t̄*), 2 sg. Imp. *uḥp̄h̄*, *ḥout̄t̄* (< *ḥouh̄t̄*), 2 sg. Imp. *ḥout̄h̄*//*ḥout̄t̄*, *ḥout̄t̄* (< *ḥout̄h̄t̄*), 2 sg. Imp. *ḥout̄h̄*//*ḥout̄t̄*, *h̄out̄t̄* (< *h̄out̄h̄t̄*), 2 sg. Imp. *h̄out̄t̄*//*h̄out̄h̄t̄*, *h̄out̄t̄* (< *h̄out̄h̄t̄*), 2 sg. Imp. *h̄out̄t̄*¹⁷. Cholakyan, doesn't even touch on the issue of the origin of the 2 sg. Imp. endings *h̄* and *t̄* in his description of the dialect. However, an analysis of the relevant synchronic as well as diachronic evidence allows us to infer that the ending *t̄* continues the Old Arm. ending *h̄p̄*, (for the phonetic development *-h̄p̄* > *-t̄*, cf. 2 sg. Imp. *ḥt̄* < Old Arm. *ḥh̄p̄*¹⁸), while the ending *h̄* has developed out of *t̄* going back to the Old Arm. diphthong *t̄w*. It follows that the 2 sg. Imp. ending *h̄* (< *t̄* < *t̄w*) that was originally typical of simple verbs of the *t* conjugation, was later spread to simple as well as suffixed verbs of the former *h* conjugation as a result of analogical extension. But the continuation of the Old Arm. ending *h̄p̄*, too, still persists in this case, hence the existence of the above doublets with the

¹⁴ See H. Muradyan, *Karčewani barbaṙə* [The dialect of Karčewan], Yer., 1960, pp. 130-136.

¹⁵ Cf. H. Ačaṙyan, *K'nnut'jwn Nor-Julayi barbaṙi* [Study of the dialect of Nor-Julai], Yer., 1940, pp. 228-232, also pp. 177-178, Note.

¹⁶ See Y. Č'olak'ean, *K'esapi barbaṙə* [The dialect of K'esap], Yer., 2009, pp. 124-125.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 133-134:

¹⁸ For the form of the 2 sg. Imperative *ḥt̄*, see *ibid.*, pp. 134, 162-164.

endings $-h' / -t'$ (խուսէմ (< խօսիմ), Imp. sg. խուսի՛ // խուսէ՛ etc.). As to the loss of the final $-p$ in the ending $h' p$, the articulatory motivation seems more likely in view of the fact that irregular verbs (being generally characterized by high frequency of use) also have regularly undergone the same change, cf. $բիրիմ < բերեմ$, 2 sg. Imp. $բի՛ < բե՛ p$, 2 pl. Imp. $բիրիե՛ք, ուտիմ < ուտեմ$, 2 sg. Imp. $կի՛ < կե՛ p$, 2 pl. Imp. $կիրիե՛ք, ուտում < տամ$, 2 sg. Imp. $տե՛ < տի՛ p$, 2 pl. Imp. $տրվիե՛ք, դընեմ < դնեմ$, 2 sg. Imp. $դե՛ < դի՛ p$, 2 pl. Imp. $դրիե՛ք$ ¹⁹. Furthermore, the fact that the phonetic change $h > t$ has usually taken place in the last closed syllable in the dialect of Kesab²⁰, plausibly suggests that the disappearance of the final p in the ending $h' p$ is chronologically a later phenomenon than the change $h' > t'$. To put it another way, the change seems to have proceeded in the following steps: $-h' p > -t' p > -t'$.

Similarly, analogical change gave rise to doublets in the 2 sg. Imperative in the dialect of Meghri. To begin with, a mixing and redistribution of verbs pertaining to the former t and h conjugations have taken place with the result that now two syllabic verbs containing the reduced vowel p in the first syllable belong to the t conjugation (cf. $խսեմ > խսեմէլ, կրեմ, > կրեմէլ, արեմ > արեմէլ, նստիմ > նրստեմ, ծնանիմ > ծրնեմ$ etc.), whereas verbs having a full vowel in the first syllable are included in the h conjugational class (cf. $սիրեմ > սերիմ, քերեմ > քիրիմ, խօսիմ > խօսիմ$ etc.). Besides, most of the verbs coming from the erstwhile w conjugation have also been transferred to the h conjugation (cf. $աղամ > աղիմ$ etc.)²¹. But what is more important for our present purpose is the fact that verbs of the t conjugation make the 2 sg. Imperative with the ending $եմ$ (< $h' p$) alone²², while verbs of the h conjugation take either the ending $ամ$ (< $t u$) or $եմ$ (< $h' p$) in the 2 sg. Imperative, cf. $արեմէլ$ (< $արեմ$), 2 sg. Imp. $արեմէր$ «արի՛ p» on the one hand, and $սերիմ$ (< $սիրեմ$), 2 sg. Imp. $սերամ / սերեմ$ «սիրի՛ p» on the other hand²³. It goes without saying that the doublets with the endings $ամ$ (< $t u$) and $եմ$ (< $h' p$) have resulted from the analogical extension of the ending $եմ$ (< $h' p$), with the transitional stage still persisting in the case of the new h conjugation, while with the new t conjugation the original ending $-ամ$ (< $t u$) has been ousted completely by the ending $-եմ$ (< $h' p$).

However, it is sometimes hard to ascertain which of the above analogical changes has occurred in a particular dialect, the effects having often been blurred by later analogical and/or phonetic developments. Examining all the relevant changes in detail in modern Armenian dialects would be going too

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 164.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 36.

²¹ Cf. **Ē. Atayan**, *Metru barbar* [The dialect of Metri], Yer., 1954, pp. 203-210, also p. 199.

²² By the way, in the dialect of Metri, the regular phonetic change $h > t$ is attested in accented as well as in posttonic syllable (see *ibid.*, pp. 39-42).

²³ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 203-210.

far, hence we will only elucidate the issue by considering some typical instances. In the middialect of Vayots Dzor, verbs of the former *t* and *h* conjugations have been merged into a single *t* conjugation and usually follow the active inflection, although they have preserved the characteristic verbal vowel *h* in the infinitive. Nevertheless, it is difficult to say unequivocally whether the ending *h'* of the 2 sg. Imperative has arisen from the phonetic change *tu' > t' > h'* or is due to the loss of the final *n* in the former ending-*h'n*. The reason for this unclarity lies in the fact that the 3 sg. Optative also ends in *-h²⁴*, which is to say, with simple verbs of the *t* conjugation the 2 sg. Imperative and the 3 sg. Optative have fallen together historically in the middialect of Vayots Dzor (as is also true of the situation in many other dialects²⁵). On the other hand, the final *n* of the ending *-h'n* has obviously been dropped in the 2 sg. Imperative of suffixed verbs of the former *h* and *u* conjugations, cf. *թըռնիլ* (< *թոնչիլ*), 2 sg. Imp. *թըռնի'* (< *թըռնի'ն*), *թիլսնսլ* (< *թոլսնսլ*), 2 sg. Imp. *թիլս գի* (< *թիլս'ն գի*) etc.²⁶ In the latter case the elimination of the final *n* appears to have been analogical after the simple verbs of the former *u* and *t* conjugations, of which the 2 sg. Imperative has been ending in a vowel since the Old Armenian period. The point is that the final *n* has not been lost in the 2 sg. Imperative of irregular verbs, cf. *տընիլ* (< *նիլ*), 2 sg. Imp. *տի'ն*, *ուղիլ* (< *ուտիլ*), 2 sg. Imp. *լի'ն*, *տսլ*, 2 sg. Imp. *տոն'ը*, *պերիլ* (< *բերիլ*), 2 sg. Imp. *պե'ր*²⁷. On the other hand, it is a common knowledge that irregular verbs (and irregular linguistic forms in general) are usually characterized by high frequency of use in the languages of the world, and that high frequency words, as a rule, undergo sound change earlier than low frequency ones do. As regards analogical change, the reverse situation is the case, namely analogical change takes place in low frequency words earlier than in high frequency ones²⁸. Accordingly, if the loss of the final *n* of the 2 sg. Imperative in the middialect of Vayots Dzor were motivated articulatorily, the irregular verbs would have undergone the change earlier than the regular ones. However, the constant presence of the final *n* in the 2 sg. Imperative of irregular verbs seems to speak in favour of the analogical motivation of its loss in the ending *-h'n* of the 2 sg. Imperative of regular verbs.

²⁴ Cf. **A. Vardanyan**, Vayoc' jori mijbararə [The middialect of Vayoc' jor], Yer., 2004, pp. էջ 60-63.

²⁵ Cf. **A. Margaryan**, 1975 Gorisi barbarə [The dialect of Goris], Yer., 1975, pp. 195-201, **M. Asatryan**, Urmiai (Xoyi) barbarə [The dialect of Urmia (Xoy)], Yer., 1962, pp. 103-116, **B. Mežunc'**, Šamšadin-Dilijani xosvack'ə [The subdialect of Šamšadin-Dilijan], Yer., 1989, pp. 80-81, 83-88, to mention just a few.

²⁶ Cf. **A. Vardanyan**, op. cit., pp. 60, 63.

²⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 52.

²⁸ Cf. **S. Avetyan**, Ardi hayereni ynt'ac'ik p'op'oxut'yunneric' mekə kirarəhen lezvabanut'yan luysi nerk'o [One of the Ongoing Changes in Modern Armenian in the Light of Usage-Based Linguistics] // Banber Yerevani hamalsarani: Banasirut'yunn, 2019, № 2 (29), pp. 48-62.

Similarly, the historical interpretation of the lack of the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imp. ending *-h* (< Old Arm. *-hp*) in the dialect of Karno is far from simple. The final *p* is missing altogether in the 2 sg. Imperative of regular verbs, whereas some irregular verbs show doublets with and without the final *p*, cf. *pʰpʰtʰ*, 2 sg. Imp. *pʰtʰ(p)*, 2 pl. Imp. *pʰtʰpʰtʰpʰ*, *nɪnʰtʰ*, 2 sg. Imp. *ʎtʰ(p)*, 2 pl. Imp. *ʎtʰpʰtʰpʰ*, *unw*, 2 sg. Imp. *unn i(p)*, 2 pl. Imp. *unpʰtʰpʰ*²⁹. Accordingly, the disappearance of the final *p* is more likely to have been motivated analogically in view of the fact that high frequency words, as stated above, are generally more resistant to analogical change. However, this assumption is not without controversy because causative verbs also display similar doublets with and without the final *p*, cf. *ʃupʰʃpʰtʰ*, 2 sg. Imp. *ʃupʰʃgn i(p)*³⁰. Obviously, it would not be right to think that causative verbs are characterized by higher frequency of use as compared to non-causative regular verbs. Nevertheless, the constant presence of the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imperative of the irregular verb *npʰtʰ* (cf. 2 sg. Imp. *npʰ*, 2 pl. Imp. *npʰpʰtʰpʰ*)³¹ appears to be more decisive and to speak against the possible articulatory motivation of the loss of the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imperative of other verbs. Therefore, it seems more reasonable to assume that the final *p* in the ending *-hp* in the dialect of Karno has disappeared by analogy with the original vowel-final forms of the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs pertaining to the *t* and *w* conjugational classes³². On the other hand, the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imperative of causative verbs may have been restored analogically after the doublets of irregular verbs (cf. especially the adduced 2 sg. Imperative *unn i(p)* of the verb *unw*).

In our view, the situation is relatively clear in the dialect of Tigranaker, for the final *p* is always missing in the ending *-h p* of the 2 sg. Imperative with regular verbs, whereas all the relevant irregular verbs have retained the final *p* in the Imperative singular³³. Therefore, in the light of the above discussion, the loss of the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imperative of regular verbs is quite likely to have been motivated analogically after the vowel-final forms of simple verbs of the *t* and *w* conjugations.

In the dialect of Maragha, conversely, the disappearance of the final *p* appears to have been motivated articulatorily. Above all, H. Acharyan's claim that the 2 sg. Imp. ending *-p* has developed out of the Old Arm. diphthong *kw* characteristic of the 2 sg. Imperative of simple verbs of the *t* conjugation, having gone through the intermediate stage *t*, namely by the phonetic change *kw > t > p*,³⁴ seems questionable if not refutable. It should be noted the H. Acharyan does not adduce evidence in support of the alleged

²⁹ Cf. H. Mkrtč'yan, op. cit., pp. 69-70, 86.

³⁰ Cf. ibid., pp. 81-82.

³¹ Cf. ibid., 85.

³² For the original vowel-final forms of the Imperative singular in the dialect of Karno, see ibid., pp. 71-78.

³³ Cf. A. Haneyan, op. cit., pp. 126, 131-132.

³⁴ Cf. H. Ačarean, K'nnut'iwñ Maratayi barbari [Study of the dialect of Maratā]. Yer., 1926, p. 234.

phonetic development *tʷ > t > p* (incidentally, we also failed to find such forms that would confirm either the change *t > p* or *tʷ > t > p*). On the other hand, not only various verbal forms but also numerous nominal ones clearly point toward the phonetic development *h > p* in the final syllable in the dialect of Maragha, cf., for example, *hnqh > huopʰ, úwaph > úwappʰ, pʰzúwafh > pʰzúwafpʰ*, among many others³⁵. Therefore, an assumption can be made that the final *pʰ* of the 2 sg. Imperative goes back to the earlier ending *-hp*. Moreover, the loss of the final *p* is quite likely to have been motivated articulatorily, especially considering the fact that the final *p* (and sometimes other consonants as well) has also been dropped in the 2 sg. Imperative of irregular verbs, cf. *տինէլ* (< դնէլ), 2 sg. Imp. *տի*, 2 pl. Imp. *տիրէք, ուտէլ* (< ուտէլ), 2 sg. Imp. *լի*, 2 pl. Imp. *լիրէք, տալ*, 2 sg. Imp. *տու*, 2 pl. Imp. *տուվէք/տուվրէք, տրսնէլ* (< տեսնէլ), 2 sg. Imp. *տիս/տի*, 2 pl. Imp. *տիսսէք/տսսէք, թօղնէլ* (< թողնուլ), 2 sg. Imp. *թօղ/թօ*, 2 pl. Imp. *թօղէք, պէրէլ* (< բերէլ), 2 sg. *պի/պիր*, 2 pl. Imp. *պիրէք*³⁶. As far as the doublets *տիս/տի, թօղ/թօ, պի/պիր* are concerned, the final consonants *u, η, p* seem to have been restored analogically after the corresponding forms of the 2 pl. Imperative, namely *տիսսէք, թօղէք, պիրէք*.

Similarly, in the dialect of Hamshen there are indications suggesting that the elimination of the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imperative has been motivated articulatorily. Moreover, the preponderance of doublets with and without the final *p* (and with some verbs, the existence of only one variant) in the 2 sg. Imperative of both regular and irregular verbs³⁷ plausibly suggests that we have to do with an ongoing sound change.

To conclude, the 2 sg. Imperative, which was formed in several ways in Old Armenian, has displayed a general tendency toward uniformity in the course of the further development of the Armenian language. In this respect, the strong analogical interplay between the imperative forms of simple verbs of the *t* and *h* conjugations is quite remarkable. Whereas in some dialects the original distinction between the active vs. medio-passive inflection has been preserved, in other dialects, simple verbs of the former *t* and *h* conjugations have coalesced into a single conjugation type partially or fully, whereby either the ending *-hp* or *-t* (< Old Arm. *-tʷ*) of the 2 sg. Imperative has been generalized as a result of analogical extension. Furthermore, on the one hand, the final *p* of the Imperative sg. ending *-hp* has been lost either by phonetic change or by analogy in a number of dialects, and on the other hand, the final vowel *-t* (going back to the Old Armenian diphthong *-tʷ*) of the 2 sg. Imperative has undergone further change *t > h* in the same

³⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 45-46, 57, 78.

³⁶ For the adduced forms, see *ibid.*, pp. 252-263, 237-238.

³⁷ Cf. **H. Ačařyan**, *K'nnut'yun Hamšeni...*, pp. 130-137.

dialectal areas. Hence, the final *h* of the 2 sg. Imperative in such cases may in principle have resulted either from the phonetic and/or analogical loss of the final *p* in the ending *-hp* or from the phonetic change *t>h*. It is not infrequently hard to say unequivocally which of the two aforementioned developments is responsible for the appearance of the form in question. Besides, it is sometimes far from clear whether phonetic change or analogy has entailed the actual disappearance of the final *p* in the ending *-hp* in a particular dialect. In this respect, the retention vs. loss of the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imperative of irregular verbs in general can serve as quite a reliable guideline for revealing the actual cause (namely, articulatory vs. analogical motivation) of the lack of the final *p* in the 2 sg. Imperative of regular verbs, though in a few instances, the final *p* of the 2 sg. Imperative of some irregular verbs is likely to have been restored by analogy with the 2 pl. Imperative.

ՄԱՐԳԻՍ ԱՎԵՏՅԱՆ – *Եզակի հրամայականի վերջահանգ ռ-ի բացակայությունը և վերջահանգ ի-ի ծագումը պայմանավորող հիմնական գործոնները հայերենի բարբառներում* – Եզակի հրամայականը, որը հին հայերենում կազմվում էր մի քանի եղանակով, հայերենի հետագա զարգացման ընթացքում ձևային միասնականացման ընդհանուր միտում է ցուցաբերել: Այդ առումով հատկապես նշանակալից է *է* և *ի* խոնարհման պարզ բայերի հրամայականի ձևերի համաբանական փոխներգործությունը: Եթե մի շարք բարբառներում սկզբնական ներգործաձև խոնարհման և կրավորաձև խոնարհման հակադրությունը պահպանվել է, ապա այլ բարբառներում նախկին *է* և *ի* խոնարհման պարզ բայերը լիովին կամ մասնակիորեն համընկել են մեկ միասնական խոնարհման տիպի մեջ, որի դեպքում համաբանական ընդլայնմամբ ընդհանրացել է հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դեմքի կա՛մ *-hp* վերջավորությունը, կա՛մ *-է* (< Old Arm. *-tu*)-ն: Բացի այդ՝ մի կողմից մի շարք բարբառներում եզակի հրամայականի *-hp* վերջավորության վերջահանգ *p*-ն անհետացել է հնչյունափոխությամբ կամ համաբանությամբ, մյուս կողմից՝ եզակի հրամայականի վերջահանգ *-է* ձայնավորը (< h. հայ. *-tu*՝ երկբարբառից) հետագա *t>h* հնչյունական զարգացման է ենթարկվել այդ նույն բարբառային տարածքներում: Հետևաբար այդպիսի դեպքերում եզակի հրամայականի վերջահանգ *h*-ն սկզբունքորեն կարող է առաջացած լինել կա՛մ *-hp* վերջավորության վերջահանգ *p*-ի հնչյունական կամ համաբանական անկմամբ, կա՛մ էլ *t>h* հնչյունափոխությամբ: Եվ երբեմն դժվար է միանշանակ ասել, թե վերոնշյալ երկու զարգացումներից որ մեկն է հանգեցրել տվյալ ձևի առաջացմանը: Բացի այդ՝ երբեմն այնքան էլ պարզ չէ՝ արդյոք տվյալ բարբառում *-hp* վերջավորության վերջահանգ *p*-ի անհետացումը հնչյունական, թե՛ համաբանական պայմանավորվածություն ունի: Այդ առումով անկանոն բայերի հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ. ձևում վերջահանգ *p*-ի պահպանված կամ չպահպանված լինելը հիմնականում կողմնորոշիչ միջոց է կանոնավոր բայերի հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ. ձևում վերջահանգ *p*-ի բացակայության իրական պատճառը (այն է՝ հնչյունական կամ համաբանական պայմանավորվածությունը) վերհանելու հարցում, թեև ա-

ռանձին դեպքերում որոշ անկանոն բայերի հրամ. եզ. 2-րդ դ. ձևի վերջահանգ *ր*-ն, հավանաբար, վերականգնվել է երկրորդաբար՝ հրամ. հոգ. 2-րդ դ. ձևի համարանությունը:

Բանալի բառեր – *հին հայերեն, հայերենի բարբառներ, համարանական փոխներգործություն, է և ի խոնարհման պարզ բայեր, համարանական ընդայնում, եզակի հրամ. -իր վերջավորություն, հնչյունափոխություն, համարանություն, հրամայականի եզ. 2-րդ դ., անկանոն բայեր, կանոնավոր բայեր*

САРГИС АВЕТЯН – Основные факторы, обуславливающие отсутствие конечного *р* и возникновение конечного *ի* императива единственного числа в армянских диалектах. – Императив 2-ого л. ед. ч., который образовался несколькими способами в древнеармянском языке, проявлял общую тенденцию к единообразию в дальнейшем развитии армянского языка. В этом отношении сильное аналогическое взаимодействие между формами императива простых глаголов спряжений *է* и *ի* весьма примечательно. Тогда как в некоторых диалектах первоначальное различие между активным и медио-пассивным типами спряжения сохранилось, в других диалектах простые глаголы бывших спряжений *է* и *ի* объединились в один общий тип спряжения частично или полностью, при котором либо окончание *-իր*, либо окончание *-է* (< Old Arm. *-hii*) было обобщено в результате аналогического расширения. Кроме того, с одной стороны конечный *р* окончания *-իր* императива единственного числа был потерян либо в результате фонетического изменения, либо по аналогии в ряде диалектов, с другой стороны, конечный гласный *-է* (восходящий к древнеармянскому дифтонгу *-hii*) императива единственного числа претерпел дальнейшее изменение *է > ի* в тех же диалектных областях. Следовательно, конечный гласный *ի* императива 2-ого л. ед. ч. в таких случаях в принципе может быть либо результатом фонетической и/или аналогической потери конечного *р* в окончания *-իր* 2-ого л. ед. ч., либо результатом звукового изменения *է > ի*. Иногда трудно с уверенностью сказать, какое из двух вышеупомянутых изменений является причиной появления данной формы. Кроме того, иногда не совсем ясно, повлекло ли за собой фонетическое изменение или аналогия фактическое исчезновение конечного *р* окончания *-իր* в том или ином диалекте. В этом отношении, сохранение или потеря конечного *р* в форме императива 2-ого л. ед. ч. неправильных глаголов в основном служит ориентиром для выявления реальной причины (а именно, артикуляционной или аналогической мотивации) отсутствия конечного *р* в форме императива 2-ого л. ед. ч. правильных глаголов, хотя в отдельных случаях конечный *р* императива 2-ого л. ед. ч. некоторых неправильных глаголов, вероятно, был восстановлен вторично по аналогии с формой императива 2-ого л. мн. ч.

Ключевые слова: *древнеармянский язык, армянские диалекты, сильное аналогическое взаимодействие, простые глаголы спряжений է и ի, аналогическое расширение, окончание -իր императива единственного числа, фонетическое изменение, аналогия, 2-ое л. ед. ч. императива, неправильные глаголы, правильные глаголы*