

## ON CERTAIN DISPUTABLE AND/OR UNEXPLAINED FORMS OF THE IMPERATIVE IN MODERN ARMENIAN DIALECTS

SARGIS AVETYAN\*   
Yerervan State University

An attempt is made to demonstrate that the historical development of forms of the imperative in modern Armenian dialects has been quite a complex process, significantly influenced by the intense interplay of various analogical and phonetic changes. These changes have frequently obscured the original situation and the synchronic morphological relationships between different formation types of the imperative, as well as the relationship between the imperative and the aorist. On the other hand, because dialectologists have often overlooked relevant evidence from other dialects when describing a particular dialect, this has largely hindered scholars from gaining a deeper understanding of the issues being examined and from thoroughly and accurately investigating the linguistic material. In addition, it should be noted that the investigation of modern Armenian dialects has, for the most part, been of a synchronic-descriptive nature. As a result, the joint effect of the above circumstances has frequently led to various misunderstandings and misinterpretations. Of course, examining all such controversial issues would be going too far. Therefore, this paper will address only some of the most questionable interpretations and/or unexplained phenomena.

**Key Words:** *forms of the imperative, modern Armenian dialects, the intense interplay of various analogical and phonetic changes, the synchronic morphological relationships, imperative, aorist*

So far, research in Armenian dialectology has mostly focused on synchronic and descriptive studies. Accordingly, dialectal forms have often been juxtaposed with their corresponding Old Armenian prototypes without any satisfactory diachronic explanations. Of course, H. Ačaryan and other researchers' dialectological works contain many valuable historical observations scattered throughout. However, there have only rarely been serious attempts to examine the dialectal forms being described from a historical perspective in a systematic manner. Furthermore, dialectologists very often do not consider relevant evidence from other dialects when describing a particular dialect. This has limited scholars' ability to gain deeper insights into the issues being examined and explore the linguistic material

\* **Սարգիս Ավետյան** – բանասիրական գիտությունների թեկնածու, ԵՊՀ հայոց լեզվի պատմության և ընդհանուր լեզվաբանության ամբիոնի դոցենտ

**Саргис Аветян** – кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры истории армянского языка и общего языкознания, ЕГУ

**Sargis Avetyan** – Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor at YSU Chair of Armenian Language History and General Linguistics

Էլ. փոստ՝ [sargisavetyan@ysu.am](mailto:sargisavetyan@ysu.am). ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9474-7129>.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

Մտացվել է՝ 15.10.2024

Գրախոսվել է՝ 01.11.2024

Հաստատվել է՝ 06.11.2024

© The Author(s) 2024

thoroughly and accurately, leading to various misunderstandings and misinterpretations. In this respect, forms of the imperative are no exception. Additionally, uncertainty and misinterpretations often arise partly due to the fact that various analogical and/or phonetic changes have affected the expected and regular development of forms of the imperative, resulting in a blurring of the original situation. A thorough examination of all such disputable issues would go too far and is beyond the scope of the current paper. Here, we will limit ourselves to a synchronic and diachronic consideration of some of the most contentious instances and questionable interpretations of forms of the imperative in Armenian dialects.

In the dialect of Łarabał, verbs of the *u* conjugation with the *uŋ* and *էն* suffixes usually form the imperative singular without any ending; that is, the aorist stem serves as the imperative singular. For example, *հընաց* “go away!”, *հընղաց* “understand!”, etc<sup>1</sup>. K. Davt’yan, trying to account for this phenomenon, states that the dynamic accent falling on the stem has triggered the loss of the corresponding ending<sup>2</sup>. However, in our view, this explanation is not convincing and does not take into account the fact that the same pattern, which was applied only to a few verbs in Classical Armenian, in parallel to the ending *ի ր* (cf. *ընթանաւ, ացայ – ընթացի ր/ընթաւ/ընթա ց* (NHB, Vol. 1, p. 776)<sup>3</sup>, *իմանաւ, ացայ – իմա/իմա ց/իմացի ր* (NHB, Vol. 1, p. 846), also manifests itself in other modern Armenian dialects to varying degrees. In the dialect of Goris, for instance, *uŋ*- and *էն*-suffixed verbs of the *u* conjugation generally mark the imperative singular with the ending *-ի*, but some can also form it without any ending by simply employing the aorist stem in this function, e.g., *ւն լնաց* “forget!”, *հընղա ց* “understand!”, *ի լաց* “know!”, *ւի լաց* “resist!, endure!”, etc.<sup>4</sup> In the dialect of Karčewan, however, the latter type of formation has become a general pattern that is consistently applied to all suffixed, as well as simple, verbs of the *u* conjugation, cf. *ի ըլլալ* “to appear”, 2 sg. imp. *ի ըլլաց* “appear!”, *ւընալ* “to stay”, 2 sg. imp. *ւընաց* “stay!”, *զըրսա լի* “to be surprised”, 2 sg. imp. *զըրսաց* “be surprised!”, *լիլլալ* “to wash”, 2 sg. imp. *լիլլաց* “wash!”, *հընէ լի* “to go away”, 2 sg. imp. *հընէ ց* “go away!”, etc.<sup>5</sup> Almost the same situation obtains in the dialect of Kak’avaberd and in the dialect of Melri<sup>6</sup>. Of course, one should consider that historically most of the previous *u* conjugation simple verbs have been transferred to the *ի* conjugation class in the dialect of Melri<sup>7</sup>. Therefore, it seems quite reasonable to assume that the Old Armenian restricted formation type has later become a more widely usable pattern in some Armenian dialects, with the scope of its application varying from dialect to dialect.

Some subdialects within the dialect of Ararat have an important peculiarity: an *u*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. **K. S. Davt’yan**, *Leinayin Łarabali barbařayin k’arteza* [The dialectal map of the Mountainous Łarabał], Yerevan, 1966, p. 178.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 178, Footnote 1. See also p. 85.

<sup>3</sup> Here the dictionary *Nor bařgirk’ haykazeen lezui* [New Dictionary of the Armenian language], Vol., 1-2, (Venetik, 1836-1837) is referred to by the notation NHB [ՆՀԲ].

<sup>4</sup> Cf. **A. Margaryan**, *Gorisi barbař* [The dialect of Goris], Yer., 1975, pp. 196-197.

<sup>5</sup> For the cited forms, see **H. D. Muradyan**, *Karčewani barbař* [The dialect of Karčewan], Yerevan, 1960, pp. 137-147.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. **H. D. Muradyan**, *Kak’avaberd barbař* [The dialect of Kak’avaberd], Yerevan, 1967, pp. 141-147, **Ē. B. Ařayan**, *Melru barbař* [The dialect of Melri], Yerevan, 1954, pp. 200-203, 215-218.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. **Ē. B. Ařayan**, *op. cit.*, p. 199.

vowel-final rather than *h* vowel-final form in the imperative singular (2 sg. imperative)<sup>8</sup> of transitive simple verbs of the *է* (< Old Arm. *է* and *h*) conjugation. H. Ačaryan, when exemplifying the imperative singular of the *է* (< *է*) conjugation simple verbs in the dialect of Yerevan or Ararat<sup>9</sup>, adduces the doublets *ւհ ըհ/ւհ ըւ* “love!”<sup>10</sup>. He further notes that “the second form of the imperative, which has the ending *ւ*, is peculiar to the Ējmiacin region, e.g., *նւզւ՛, վառւ՛, լցրւ՛, աղանձւ, շալալիւ՛*, etc., whereas the dialect of Erevan proper employs *նւզհ՛, վառհ՛, լցրու, etc.*”<sup>11</sup>. However, H. Ačaryan doesn’t specify whether all simple verbs of the *է* (< *է* and *h*) conjugation in the subdialect of Ējmiacin show the ending *ւ* in the imperative singular. Moreover, he doesn’t touch on the question of the origin of the form under consideration. Other dialectologists either have overlooked the issue altogether<sup>12</sup> or have simply stated, following H. Ačaryan, that the imperative singular of simple verbs of the *է* (< *է* and *h*) conjugation, is usually formed with the ending *h*, and only in some subdialects with the help of the ending *ւ*<sup>13</sup>.

In our view, analogical influence from three high-frequency transitive verbs, namely, *սուել* “to say”, 2 sg. imp. *սուս՛* “say!”, *սծել* (originally meaning “to bring, to adduce!”, later “to fill”), 2 sg. imp. *սծս՛* (originally meaning “bring!, adduce!”, later “fill!”), *սնել* “to do”, 2 sg. imp. *սրս՛* “do!”, is quite likely to have been responsible for the appearance of the form in question. Therefore, it is no accident that only transitive simple verbs of the *է* conjugation usually display the ending *ւ* in the imperative singular, whereas intransitive ones in the same conjugation class have regularly preserved the standard ending *h*. To put it another way, analogical extension appears to have been the most plausible motivation for the remodelling of the imperative singular of the *է* conjugation simple verbs, with the verb *սուել* having played the pivotal role in this process<sup>14</sup>. As is known, this verb, unlike other simple verbs of the *է* conjugation, featured a deviant form ending in the stem vowel *u* in the imperative singular, namely, *սուս՛* (from the aorist stem *սուսց* due to the prehistoric loss of the stem-final *g*) already in Old Armenian. Apart from this, the above analogical change may have been facilitated by the fact that the aorist of the verb *սուել*, in its turn, has been reshaped by analogy with

<sup>8</sup> Here and below the terms “imperative singular” and “2 sg. imperative” are used interchangeably.

<sup>9</sup> In Armenian dialectology, the terms “the dialect of Yerevan” and “the dialect of Ararat” are often used interchangeably (cf., for example, A. Łaribyan, *Hay barbaragitut’yun: hnč’yunabanut’yun ew jewabanut’yun* [Armenian dialectology: phonology and morphology], Yer., 1953, p. 218).

<sup>10</sup> See H. Ačaryan, *Hay barbaragitut’iwn: uruagic ew dasaworut’iwn hay barbaŋneri*, [Armenian dialectology: A sketch and classification of Armenian dialects], Moskua: Nor-Naxijewan, (Ēminean azgagrakan žoťovacu, vol. 8), 1911, p. 43.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 44.

<sup>12</sup> Cf., for example, A. Łaribyan, *op. cit.*, pp. 225-227, M. Asatryan, *Hay barbaragitut’yan gorenakan ašxatank’neri jeŋnark* [A Manual of practical works of Armenian dialectology], Yer., 1985, p. 128.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example, A. Grigoryan, *Hay barbaragitut’yan dasənt’ac’* [A handbook of Armenian dialectology], Yer., 1957, p. 217, 220-221. Cf. also V. Katvalyan, *Bayazeti barbaŋ ew nra lezvakan arnč’ut’yunnerə šťjaka barbaŋneri het* [The dialect of Bayazet and its linguistic relationships with surrounding dialects], Yer., 2016, p. 140.

<sup>14</sup> More on which see S. Avetyan, *On One Important Peculiarity of the Imperative Singular in the Dialect of Ararat* // *Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut’yun* [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2023, № 3, pp. 30-38.

the *է* conjugation simple verbs in the dialect of Ararat and now it is conjugated regularly just as other simple verbs of the *է* conjugation, cf., for example, *սսւեցի* - aor. 1 sg., *սսւեց* - aor. 3 sg., *սսւեցին* - aor. 3 pl. versus Old Arm. *սսւացի*, *սսւաց*, *սսւացին*, respectively. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the imperative plural of the verb *սսւել* has also been remade on the model of the *է* conjugation simple verbs in the dialect concerned (cf. *սսւէ՛ք* vs. Old Arm. *սսւացէ՛ք*), whereas the form of the imperative singular has remained intact<sup>15</sup>. Incidentally, the above situation is consistent with typological evidence, according to which the imperative singular is usually more resistant to analogical change due to a higher frequency of use than the imperative plural, which frequently and more readily undergoes analogical change and morphological restructuring<sup>16</sup>.

As mentioned above, various analogical and/or phonetic changes have also affected the regular development of forms of the imperative in Armenian dialects, resulting in a blurring of the original situation. This circumstance has also often led to various misunderstandings and misinterpretations.

According to H. Acharyan, the 2 sg. imp. ending *-ը* in the dialect of Marաթա, has developed out of the Old Arm. diphthong *էւ* characteristic of the 2 sg. imperative of simple verbs of the *է* conjugation, having gone through the intermediate stage of *է*, namely by the phonetic change *էւ* > *է* > *ը*<sup>17</sup>. However, in our view, this explanation is questionable if not refutable. It should be noted that H. Acharyan does not provide evidence in support of the alleged phonetic development *էւ* > *է* > *ը* (incidentally, we also failed to find such forms that would confirm either the change *է* > *ը* or *էւ* > *է* > *ը*). On the other hand, not only various verbal forms but also numerous nominal ones clearly point toward the phonetic development *ի* > *ը* in the final syllable in the dialect of Marաթա, cf., for example, *հոգի* > *իւօքը*, *սսւքի* > *սսւքը*, *թշնսսի* > *թշնսսը*, among many others<sup>18</sup>. Therefore, an assumption can be made that the final *ը* of the 2 sg. imperative goes back to the earlier ending *-իը*. Moreover, the loss of the final *ը* is quite likely to have been motivated articulatorily<sup>19</sup>.

A. Margaryan states that in the dialect of Goris, dissyllabic verbs of the *է* conjugation with the reduced vowel *ը* in the first syllable exhibit doublet forms in the 2 sg. imperative, having either the ending *ի՛* or *է՛*. He further notes that the variant with the ending *է* has resulted from the phonetic change *էւ* > *է* > *է՞*<sup>20</sup>. However, the observation that only verbs with the reduced vowel *ը* in the first syllable show such doublets suggests that the variant with the ending *է* is likely to have arisen secondarily from the sound

<sup>15</sup> See *ibid.* for a more detailed discussion of the issue.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. **A. Y. Aikhenvald**, *Imperatives and Commands*, Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 339-351, 362-364.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. **H. Ačařean**, *K'nnut'iwn Marաթայի barbaři* [Study of the dialect of Marաթա]. Yer., 1926, p. 234.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 45-46, 57, 78.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. For a historical account of *ի*-final forms of the Imperative singular in Armenian dialects, see **S. Avetyan**, Main factors conditioning the absence of the final *ը* and the origin of the final *ի* of the Imperative singular in Armenian dialects. // *Banber Yerevani hamalsarani. Banasirut'yun* [Bulletin of Yerevan University: Philology], 2023. № 1, pp. 68-78.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. **A. Margaryan**, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

change of *h* to *t* in the accented word-final position. Note that in the dialect of Goris, word-final accented *h* has regularly turned into *t* in other parts of speech as well if dissyllabic words had a reduced vowel *ɹ* in the first syllable<sup>21</sup>. Furthermore, support for our above assumption appears to come from the fact that verbs with the *ú* and *ɹ* suffixes in the *t* conjugation, which have a reduced vowel *ɹ* in the first syllable, also exhibit such doublets. For example, we see *հրսի/հրստ* (“reach!”) and *սրրծի/սրրծտ* (“finish!”), as opposed to forms like *լորի* (“get lost!”) and *սենի* (“die!”), which have a full vowel in the first syllable<sup>22</sup>. Note further that A. Margaryan’s claim that the ending *-ի* of the imperative singular in the dialect of Goris derives from the Old Armenian stem-final diphthong *ku* (for example, *կապեա՛* > *կապի* “tie up!”, *պահեա՛* > *պահի* “keep!, preserve!”, etc.)<sup>23</sup> cannot be either confirmed or refuted; it is difficult to say unequivocally whether the ending *ի* of the imperative singular in the dialect of Goris, as in many other dialects, has resulted from the sound change *ku* > *t* > *ի* or from the loss of the final *ɹ* in the ending *-ի*<sup>24</sup>.

Yet another controversial instance in the dialect of Goris is that the verb *նի սննել* “to enter” also exhibits doublets in the 2 sg. imperative, specifically, *նի սրսի* and *նի սրս* “enter!”<sup>25</sup>. A. Margaryan believes that the form (*նի*) *սրս* directly goes back to the Old Armenian 2 sg. imp. *սն լս* “enter!”<sup>26</sup>. However, he doesn’t exemplify the alleged phonetic change of *ni* to *ɹ* (*նի* մնս > *նի* *սրս*), nor does he provide any reliable arguments to support his assumption<sup>27</sup>.

According to our assessment, the form (*նի*) *սրս* should be viewed on par with similar phenomena in other dialects and, therefore, regarded as an analogical formation based on the infinitive. This is consistent with the morphological relationships of similar forms, such as inf. *սննել* “to take, to buy” and 2 sg. imp. *սն* “take!, buy!”, inf. *սնսնալ* “to see” and 2 sg. imp. *սնս* “see!”, etc.<sup>28</sup>, and, similarly, inf. *նի սննել* “to enter” and 2 sg. imp. X, where X = (*նի*) *սրս* “enter!”. As for the form *նի սրսի* “enter”, it seems to be a regular dialectal outcome of the earlier form *նեքս սնիք* “enter!”. However, this is not the case with similar doublets, such as 2 sg. imp. *թո(ղ)/թողի* “leave!”<sup>29</sup>, where the variant with the ending *-ի* appears to have been created secondarily through the principle of proportional analogy<sup>30</sup>. Interestingly, the Old Armenian verb *թողուլ* “to leave”, which makes all its conjugational forms, including the imperative plural, according to the principle of u conjugation verbs in

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, p. 50.

<sup>22</sup> For the cited forms, see *Ibid.*, p. 196.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 195. Cf. also p. 69.

<sup>24</sup> For a more detailed discussion of the issue, see S. Avetyan, Main factors conditioning the absence of the final *ɹ* and the origin of the final *ի*..., pp. 68-78.

<sup>25</sup> See A. Margaryan, *op. cit.*, p. 196.

<sup>26</sup> See *ibid.*, p. 196.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 58-63, 196.

<sup>28</sup> For the cited forms, see *ibid.*, pp. 217, 219.

<sup>29</sup> For the cited doublets, see A. Margaryan, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

<sup>30</sup> For proportional analogy, see R. S. P. Beekes, Comparative Indo-European Linguistics: An Introduction, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., revised and corrected by M. de Vaan, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2011, pp. 75-76.

the dialect of Goris (cf. aor. *թուղացի* “I left”, *թուղացիք* “you left”, *թողաց* “he/she left”, etc., and imp. pl. *թուղացեք(աք)* “leave!” and so on), has retained the original form of the imperative singular almost intact (cf. 2 sg. imp. *թօ(ղ)* “leave!” < Old Armenian *թոն ր*)<sup>31</sup>, though a new analogical form has been created with the productive ending *-ի*. Doubtless, the retention of the ancient singular imperative form *թօ(ղ)* (< Old Arm. *թոն ր*) here and in almost all other dialects, as well as in Modern Literary Standard, can be attributed to its high frequency of use. In this respect, note that the form *թոն ր* in the Armenian language not only carries its primary lexical meaning of “leave!” but also serves as a formative for the 3rd singular imperative, as seen in examples like *թոն ր մնա* “let him/her stay” or “may he/she stay”, *թոն ր խոսի* “let him/her speak” or “may he/she speak”, *թոն ր երգի* “let him/her sing” or “may he/she sing”, etc.

Analogical change also gave rise to similar doublets of the imperative singular in the dialect of Hamšen. It is a common knowledge that *ի*-suffixed (< Old Arm. *ուի*-suffixed) verbs of the *ե* conjugation in Modern Literary Armenian as well as in nearly all Armenian dialects, generally form the 2 sg. imperative with the ending *-ի ք/-ի ր* (e.g., *անցի/անցի ք* “pass!”, *գտի/գտի ք* “find!”, *հասի/հասի ք* “reach!”, etc.), which dates back to the Old Armenian medio-passive ending *-ի ք* of the imperative singular. In this respect, the Old Armenian verb *տեսանել* “to see” stands apart from other verbs in the same conjugation class, as reflexes of the Old Armenian imperative singular form *տես ւ* “see!” of this verb regularly survive in nearly all Armenian dialects and Modern Literary Armenian. It can be argued that, similarly to the form *թօ(ղ)/թոն ր* (< Old Arm. *թոն ր* “leave!”) mentioned above, the form of the 2 sg. imperative *տես ւ/տես ւ* (< Old Arm. *տես ւ* “see!”) has also been preserved almost intact due to its high frequency of use. Note that, in addition to expressing the core lexical meaning of *նայի ք* “look!” or *տես ւ* “see!”, it is also used in the sense of *ստի ք*, meaning “here”s or “behold”. As a result, this form is also characterized by a high frequency of use, which accounts for its retention in nearly all Armenian dialects.

However, it is noteworthy that in the dialect of Hamšen, on one hand, a new analogical form of the imperative singular has been created for the verb *տեսանել* > *դեսանել* “to see,” with the regular ending *-ի ք/-ի ր*, while on the other hand, alongside the existing regular imperative singular form with the same ending for a number of verbs in the same conjugation class, a new root form of the imperative singular without any ending has also emerged secondarily. Cf. on one hand, *տեսանել* > *դեսանել* “to see”, 2 sg. imp. *դես ւ/դեսի/դեսի ք* “see!”, and on the other hand, *մտանել* > *մնանել* “to enter”, 2 sg. imp. *մն ւ/մնի/մնի ք* “enter!”, *գտանել* > *գտանել* “to find”, 2 sg. imp. *գտի/գտի/գտի ք* “find!”, *իջանել* > *իջանել* “to get down, to come down”, 2 sg. imp. *իջ ւ/իջի/իջի ք/իջնի/իջնի ք* “get down!, come down!”, etc.<sup>32</sup> It is obvious that at least

<sup>31</sup> For the cited forms, see *ibid.*, p. 218.

<sup>32</sup> For the cited forms, see **H. Ačaryan**, *K'nnut'yun Hamšeni barbari* [Study of the dialect of Hamšen], Yerevan, 1947, pp. 132-133. See also *Hamšeni Čeniki (Dženiki) xosvack'ə*. *Hayereni barbařagitakan atlası antip nyut'er* [The subdialect of Čenik (Dženik) of Hamšen. Unpublished materials of Armenian dialectological atlas], tetr № 39, point 642.

the imperative singular forms *ւհ'ն* “enter!” and *հ'ջ* “come down” are analogical formations created secondarily from the infinitive. Otherwise, had they developed through regular phonetic processes, they would have survived as *ւն'ն* and *է'ջ*, respectively. Note, incidentally, that the initial vowel *է* has been consistently preserved in the dialect of Hamšen, cf. *էգ* > *էք* “female”, *էշ* > *էշ* “donkey”<sup>33</sup>. However, it is difficult to determine unequivocally whether the 2 sg. imperative *կհն* “find!” in the dialect of Hamšen is a direct survival of the Old Armenian 2 sg. imperative *գհ ն* “find!” or if it is an analogical formation that emerged secondarily.

Similarly, analogical change gave rise to another kind of doublets in the 2 sg. imperative in the dialect of Melri. To begin with, there seems to have been a mixture and redistribution of verbs from the former *է* and *հ* conjugations. As a result, disyllabic verbs that contain the reduced vowel *ը* in the first syllable are now classified under the *է* conjugation (e.g., *խտել* > *խըտել* “to drink”, *կրել* > *կըրել* “to carry”, *սրել* > *սըրել* “to sharpen”, *նստիլ* > *նըստել* “to sit down”, *ծնանիլ* > *ծընել* “to give birth”, etc.). In contrast, verbs with a full vowel in the first syllable belong to the *հ* conjugational class (e.g., *սիրել* > *սիրիլ* “to love”, *խօսիլ* > *խօսիլ* “to speak”, etc.). In addition, most verbs that were originally part of the *ւ* conjugation have also been transferred to the *հ* conjugation (cf. *աղալ* > *աղիլ*, etc.)<sup>34</sup>. However, what is more relevant to our discussion is that verbs in the *է* conjugation form the 2 sg. imperative with the ending *-էք* (< *-հ'ք*) alone<sup>35</sup>. In contrast, verbs in the *հ* conjugation can take either the ending *-ու* (< *էւ'*) or *-էք* (< *ի'ք*) for the 2 sg. imperative. For instance, consider *սըրել* (< *սրել* “to sharpen”), which has the 2 sg. imperative as *սըրէք* “sharpen!” compared to *սէրիլ* (< *սիրել* “to love”), which has the 2 sg. imperative as *սէրա/սէրէք* “love!”<sup>36</sup>. Է. Աթայան's analysis of the formation of the imperative in the Melri dialect only provides a synchronic perspective but does not address the historical relationships between the two above-mentioned formation types. However, a historical account of the relevant linguistic evidence suggests that the doublets with the endings *-ու* (< *էւ'*) and *-էք* (< *ի'ք*) have emerged through the analogical extension of the ending *-էք* (< *ի'ք*). The transitional stage remains evident in the new *հ* conjugation, whereas in the new *է* conjugation, the original ending *-ու* (going back to the Old Arm. stem-final diphthong *էւ'*) has been completely replaced by the ending *-էք* (< *ի'ք*).

In the dialect of K'esap, simple verbs of the former *է* conjugation survive as verbs of the *հ* conjugation and, vice versa, those of the former *հ* conjugation are manifested as verbs of the *է* conjugation. Continuations of the Old Armenian suffixed verbs, too, usually occur as verbs of the *է* conjugation<sup>37</sup>. Regarding the formation of the imperative singular, the descendants of Old Armenian simple verbs in the *է* conjugation form it by

<sup>33</sup> For the cited forms, see **H. Ačařyan**, *K'nnut'yun Hamšeni...*, p. 28.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. **Է. Աթայան**, *op. cit.*, pp. 203-210, also p. 199.

<sup>35</sup> By the way, in the dialect of Melri, the regular phonetic change *ի > է* is attested in accented as well as in posttonic syllable (see *ibid.*, pp. 39-42).

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 203-210.

<sup>37</sup> See **Y. Č'olak'ean**, *K'esapi barbarə* [The dialect of K'esap], *Yer.*, 2009, pp. 124-125.

adding the ending *-h'*. In contrast, the continuations of Old Armenian simple verbs in the *h* conjugation, as well as the suffixed verbs from both the *t* and *h* conjugations, can form the 2 sg. imperative with either the endings *-h'* or *-t'*. However, from the suffixed verbs of the *w* conjugation, the 2 sg. imperative is only made by the addition of the ending *-t'*, cf. *uhrhul* (< *uhrkēl*) “to love”, 2 sg. imp. *uhrh'* “love!”, *huniul* (< *hounil*) “to speak”, 2 sg. imp. *huniu'h'/huniut'* “speak!”, *թռռնլ* (< *թռնլիլ*) “to fly”, 2 sg. imp. *թռռնի'/թռռնե'* “fly!”, *հառվընուլ* (< *հենաւնաւ*) “to go away”, 2 sg. imp. *հառվընե'* “go away!”, etc.<sup>38</sup> Y. Čolak'ean doesn't even touch on the issue of the origin of the 2 sg. imp. endings *-h'* and *-t'* in his description of the dialect. However, an analysis of the pertinent synchronic and diachronic evidence suggests that the ending *-t'* continues the Old Armenian ending *-h'p* (with the phonetic development *-h'p > -t'*, as seen in the 2 sg. imp. *դե' < Old Arm. դե'p* “put!”<sup>39</sup>). Meanwhile, the ending *-h'* appears to have evolved from *-t'*, going back to the Old Armenian stem-final diphthong *-tu'*. Consequently, the 2 sg. imp. ending *-h'* (< *t' < tu'*), originally characteristic of simple verbs in the *t* conjugation, later was extended to both simple and suffixed verbs of the former *h* conjugation through a process of analogical extension. However, the continuation of the Old Arm. ending *-h'p*, too, still persists in this case, hence the existence of the above doublets with the endings *-h'/-t'* (*huniul < hounil*), 2 sg. imp. *huniu'h'/huniut'* “speak!”, 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 a high frequency of use) also have regularly undergone the same change, cf. *բիրիլ < բերեւլ*, 2 sg. imp. *բի' < բե'p* “bring!”, 2 pl. imp. *բիրիե'ք*, *ուտիլ < ուտեւլ*, 2 sg. imp. *լի' < կե'p* “eat!”, 2 pl. imp. *կիրիե'ք*, *ուտուլ < տուլ*, 2 sg. imp. *տե' < տն'ip* “give!”, 2 pl. imp. *տըվիե'ք*, *դընլ < դնեւլ*, 2 sg. imp. *դե' < դե'p* “put!”, 2 pl. imp. *դըրիե'ք*<sup>40</sup>. Furthermore, the fact that the phonetic change *h > t* has usually taken place in the last closed syllable in the dialect of K'esap<sup>41</sup>, plausibly suggests that the disappearance of the final *p* in the ending *-h'p* is chronologically a later phenomenon than the change of *h* to *t*. To put it another way, the change seems to have proceeded in the following steps: *-h'p > -t'p > -t'*.

Regarding the controversial forms of the imperative, we would also like to address certain forms of the 3 sg. aorist, formed secondarily from the 2 sg. imperative in the dialect of Šatax, which have caused some misunderstandings.

M. Muradyan, when examining the irregular verbs in the dialect of Šatax, writes about the 3 sg. aorist forms of the verbs *տընել* (< *դնել*) “to put” and *տուլ* “to give”, stating that “the final vowels *h* and *ni* of the aorist forms *հտի* (he/she put) and *հտու* (he/she gave) are stem-final vowels (from the stems *դի-* and *տու-*, respectively), which have not been retained in the Classical Armenian corresponding forms (*եղ* “he/she put”,

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., pp. 133-134.

<sup>39</sup> For the form of the 2 sg. imperative *դե'* “put!”, see *ibid.*, pp. 134, 162-164.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 164.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 36.



*էտ* “he/she gave”) but appear in the dialect (*իտի, իտու*)<sup>42</sup>. In our opinion, M. Muradyan’s claim is objectionable, primarily in view of the fact that the loss of final syllables in pre-written Armenian has been common to all dialectal varieties of the language, and there are no exceptions in this regard. On the other hand, the corresponding data from the historical grammar of the Armenian language, along with evidence from various dialects clearly indicate that the above forms of the 3 sg. aorist are analogical formations that emerged secondarily. Thus, it is known that in the Middle Armenian period, the form *դիր* “put!” of the imperative singular inherited from Old Armenian came to be employed simultaneously as a root stem of the aorist. Moreover, this was facilitated by the fact that, since the Old Armenian period, in a number of verbs, the form of the singular imperative and the root stem of the aorist coincided, such as: 2 sg. imp. *թն ի* “leave!” and aorist stem *թնի-*, 2 sg. imp. *բե ը* “bring!” and aorist stem *բեր-*, etc.<sup>43</sup> Therefore, just like in other dialects of the Armenian language, in the dialect of Šatax, the Classical Armenian form of the 2 sg. imperative *դիր* “put!” also came to function simultaneously as an aorist stem, from which new analogical forms of the aorist have been created by adding the appropriate endings. However, in this case, unlike the general trend of historical development of the Armenian language, the 3 sg. aorist in the dialect of Šatax, doesn’t take the ending *ւիլ* and/or *եց*, but rather employs the reflex of the Old Armenian vocalic augment *է* or its later modifications<sup>44</sup>. The latter, having inherited this usage through a number of verbs (cf. Old Arm. *բերել* and 3 sg. aor. *է-բեր* “he/she brought”, and similarly, Old Arm. *թնիւել* and 3 sg. aor. *է-թնի* “he/she left”, etc.), has somewhat expanded its range of applications and has been analogically applied to other verbs as well.

By the way, a formal coincidence of the 2 sg. imperative and of the 3 sg. aorist is also observed in a number of other irregular verbs in the dialect of Šatax (excluding the vocalic augment, which is naturally absent in the imperative form). For example, we see 2 sg. imp. *թն ի* “leave!” and 3 sg. aor. *է-թնի* “he/she left”, similarly, 2 sg. imp. *ւի ի* “bring!” and 3 sg. aor. *ի-ւիլ* / < \**ի-ւիլիլ* / “he/she brought”, 2 sg. imp. *զարկ/զար* “hit!” and 3 sg. aor. *է-զար* “he/she hit”, and, accordingly, also 2 sg. imp. *ւի ը/ւի ի* “put!” and 3 sg. aor. *ի-ւի* < \**ի-ւիլի* “he/she put”<sup>45</sup>. As for the origin of the 3 sg. aorist form *ի-տու* “he/she gave”, it seems more plausible to us that it is an analogical formation from the imperative form *տն ի/տն իլ* “give!” which could easily arise based on the principle of proportional analogy; that is to say, 2 sg. imp. *ւի ը/ւի ի* “put!” - 3 sg. aor. *ի-ւի* “he/she put”, similarly, 2 sg. imp. *ւի ի* “bring!” - 3 sg. aor. *ի-ւիլ* “he/she brought”, and

<sup>42</sup> M. Muradyan, *Šataxi barba* [The dialect of Šatax], Yerevan, 1962, p. 150.

<sup>43</sup> J. Karst, *Historische Grammatik des Kilikisch-Armenischen*, Strassburg, 1901, S. 315-317.

<sup>44</sup> For more information on the employment of the vocalic augment in forms of the aorist in modern Armenian dialects, see H. Martirosyan, *The development of the Classical Armenian aorist in modern dialects*. In: *Acta linguistica Petropolitana: Труды Института лингвистических исследований XIV.1*; Part 1: *The Armenian and Indo-European preterite: forms and functions* (ed. by Anaïd Donabédian, Nikolai Kazansky, Petr Kocharov, Hrach Martirosyan; editor-in-chief Evgeny V. Golovko), St. Petersburg, 2018, pp. 153-162.

<sup>45</sup> For the cited forms, see M. Muradyan, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-149.

accordingly, 2 sg. imp. *unn íp/unn í* “give!” – 3 sg. aor. X, where X = *h-unní* “he/she gave”. Indirect support for our assumption comes from the fact that in several dialects, the form of the imperative singular *unn íp* “give!” has historically been conceived of and used as the root stem of the aorist active (rather than just as a stem of the aorist passive, contrary to J. Karst’s observation<sup>46</sup>), as evidenced by corresponding forms in some subdialects within the dialect of Šamaxi, such as *unníph* “I gave”, *unníphp* “you gave”, *unnípuw* “he/she gave”, etc.<sup>47</sup>. In addition, and what is more important for the current purpose of this paper, in some dialects, a new analogical form has been created from the 2 sg. imperative form only for the 3 sg. aorist, whereas the stem *unpí-* is used for the other persons of the aorist. This is the case, for example, in the dialect of Svedia (e.g., 2 sg. imp. *ηξοίρ* “give!” and 1 sg. aor. *ηψω* “I gave”, 2 sg. aor. *ηψիր* “you gave”, 3 sg. aor. *ηξορ* “he/she gave”<sup>48</sup>), as well as in the dialect of Van (e.g., 2 sg. imp. *unní/unníp* “give!” and 1 sg. aor. *unpíh/unpíhgh* “I gave”, 2 sg. aor. *unpíhp/unpíhghp* “you gave”, 3 sg. aor. *unpítg/hunníp/hunní* “he/she gave”<sup>49</sup>), etc.

We are inclined to consider the historical relationships between the 2 sg. imp. *unn í* “give!” and 1 sg. aor. *unpíw* “I gave”, 2 sg. aor. *unpíwir* “you gave”, 3 sg. aor. *hunní* “he/she gave”<sup>50</sup> in the dialect of Moks in the same way. That is to say, again only the 3 sg. aorist has been created analogically from the form of the imperative singular, whereas the other forms of the aorist are built on the aorist stem *unpí-*. Note, by the way, that in the dialect of Moks, the weakening and loss of the final consonant *p* in the imperative singular, has equally affected the stem-final as well as root-final *p*, e.g., 2 sg. imp. *լի* (<լէր) “eat!”, 2 sg. imp. *ւլի* (<բէր) “bring!” and 3 sg. aor. *իւլրէ* “he/she brought”, etc.<sup>51</sup>

To sum up, the historical development of the imperative in modern Armenian dialects has been quite a complicated process due to the intense interplay of various analogical and phonetic changes. These changes have often obscured the original situation and the synchronic morphological relationships between different formation types of the imperative, as well as the relationship between the imperative and the aorist. On the other hand, because dialectologists have often overlooked relevant evidence from other dialects when describing a particular dialect, this has limited scholars’ ability to gain deeper insights into the issues being considered and explore the linguistic material thoroughly and accurately. As a result, the joint effect of the above circumstances has frequently led to various misunderstandings and misinterpretations.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. J. Karst, op. cit., p. 317.

<sup>47</sup> R. Bařramyan, Šamaxii barbařə [The dialect of Šamaxi], Yerevan, 1964, p. 162.

<sup>48</sup> For the cited forms, see H. Ačarjan, K’nnut’yun Kilikiayi barbaři [Study of the dialect of Cilicia], Yerevan, 2003, p. 494:

<sup>49</sup> For the cited forms, see H. Ačarjan, K’nnut’yun Vani barbaři [Study of the dialect of Van], Yerevan, 1952, p. 173.

<sup>50</sup> For the cited forms, see M. Muradyan, Urvagic Moksi barbaři [An outline of the dialect of Moks]. In Hayereni barbařagitakan atlas: usumnasirut’yunner ew nyut’er 1, Yerevan, 1982, p. 173.

<sup>51</sup> For the cited forms, see *ibid.*, pp. 172-174.

**ՄԱՐԳԻՍ ԱՎԵՏՅԱՆ – Հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառներում հրամայականի որոշ վիճակարույց և/կամ չբացատրված ձևերի շուրջ** – Փորձ է արվում ցույց տալ, որ հրամայականի ձևերի պատմական զարգացումը հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառներում եղել է համաբանական և հնչյունական փոփոխություններով պայմանավորված բավականին բարդ գործընթաց, որոնք հաճախ մթագնել են սկզբնական դրությունը և հրամայականի կազմության տարբեր տիպերի, ինչպես նաև հրամայականի և աորիստի համաժամանակյա ձևաբանական փոխհարաբերությունը: Մյուս կողմից՝ քանի որ բարբառագետները այս կամ այն կոնկրետ բարբառը նկարագրելիս հաճախ անտեսել են մյուս բարբառների ընձեռած համապատասխան փաստերը, դա մեծապես խանգարել է նրանց պատշաճ խորանալու դիտարկվող հարցերի մեջ և համապարփակ ու ճշգրիտ քննելու լեզվական նյութը: Բացի այդ՝ հարկ է նշել, որ հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառների ուսումնասիրությունը հիմնականում եղել է համաժամանակյանկարագրական բնույթի: Հետևաբար վերոնշյալ հանգամանքները միասին հաճախ թուրքմբռնումների և սխալ մեկնաբանությունների տեղիք են տվել: Իհարկե, այս կարգի բոլոր վիճակարույց հարցերի քննությունը մեզ շատ հեռուն կտաներ: Ուստի սույն հոդվածում կդիրտարկվեն ցայսօր առաջարկված առավել խնդրահարույց մեկնաբանություններից և/կամ չբացատրված երևույթներից միայն մի քանիսը:

**Բանալի բառեր** — *հրամայականի ձևեր, հայերենի ժամանակակից բարբառներ, զանազան համաբանական և հնչյունական փոփոխությունների ուժեղ փոխներգործությունը, համաժամանակյա ձևաբանական փոխհարաբերությունը, հրամայական, աորիստ*

**САРГИС АВЕТЯН – О некоторых спорных и/или необъясненных формах императива в современных армянских диалектах.** – Сделана попытка показать, что историческое развитие форм императива в современных армянских диалектах было довольно сложным процессом, так как интенсивное взаимодействие различных аналогических и фонетических изменений значительно влияло на это. Эти изменения часто затемняли исходное положение и синхроническое морфологическое взаимоотношение между разными типами формирования императива, а также между императивом и аористом. С другой стороны, поскольку диалектологи часто игнорировали соответствующие данные из других диалектов при описании того или иного конкретного диалекта, это в значительной степени помешало ученым глубже понять исследуемые вопросы и тщательно и точно проанализировать языковой материал. Кроме того, следует отметить, что исследование современных армянских диалектов в основном носило синхроническо-дескриптивный характер. В результате совместное воздействие вышеуказанных обстоятельств часто приводило к различным недопониманиям и ошибочным интерпретациям. Конечно, рассмотрение всех таких спорных вопросов было бы чрезмерным. Следовательно, в данной статье будут рассмотрены только некоторые из наиболее сомнительных интерпретаций и/или необъясненных явлений.

**Ключевые слова:** *формы императива, современные армянские диалекты, интенсивное взаимодействие различных аналогических и фонетических изменений, синхроническое морфологическое взаимоотношение, императив, аорист*