Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  1997c   The prepositional group *i y-* and the orthography of Gospel manuscript M (Matenadaran
          6200). *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 18: 39−50.
Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  1999−2000   On the early development of Armenian dialects. II. The monophthongization of
          ay. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 20: 1−26.
Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  2001   Thoughts on Armenian accentuation. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 21: 65−73.
Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  2002   Aspects of Armenian dialectology. In: Jan Berns and Jaap Van Marle (eds.), *Present-
          day Dialectology. Problems and Findings*. (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Mono-
          graphs 137). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 141−157.
Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  2004   Armenian *barwokʻ* 'good, well'. In: Adam Hyllested, Anders Richardt Jørgensen, Jenny
          Helena Larsson, and Thomas Olander (eds.), *Per Aspera ad Asteriscos. Studia Indoger-
          manica in Honorem Jens Elmegaard Rasmussen*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissen-
          schaft der Universität, 627−632.
Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  2006   Aspects of Classical Armenian orthography: Armenian *e*, and the Greek names in the
          Gospels. In: Anna Krasnuolska, Kinga Maciuszak, and Barbara Mękarska (eds.), *In the
          Orient where the Gracious Light ... Satura Orientalis in Honorem Andrzej Pisowicz*.
          Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka, 215−228.
Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  2008   Diphthongization of initial *E-* and the development of initial *Y-* in Armenian. In: Alexan-
          der Lubotsky, Jos Schaeken, and Jeroen Wiedenhof (eds.), *Evidence and Counter-Evi-
          dence. Essays in Honour of Frederik Kortlandt. Volume I. Balto-Slavic and Indo-Euro-
          pean Studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 609−616.

† *Jos J. S. Weitenberg*

66. The evolution of Armenian

(In order to accommodate Armenians, armenologists, and linguists alike we render
all linguistic forms in both Armenian script and the International Phonetic Alphabet.
Bibliographic references, Classical Armenian forms, and names of authors and dialects,
on the other hand, are rendered in the ALA-LC system (http://goo.gl/z0rs0m) so as to
facilitate bibliographic research.)

1. Varieties of Armenian

This chapter outlines the historical development of the dialects making up the Armenian branch of the Indo-European language family. We follow Kortlandt (1985) in referring to the common ancestor of the modern dialects as "Common Armenian"; the language is not attested in any written sources at this stage, and so Common Armenian must be reconstructed based on comparison of the modern dialects and comparative evidence from other branches of Indo-European. The language is first known to have been written down with the introduction of Christianity in around the year 405, when a cleric named Mesrop Mashtots created a new alphabet for writing Armenian translations of Christian texts (Russell 1999). There have been four main literary varieties of Armenian, at different times and places in history:

Classical Armenian was the standard literary language in the fifth century, and is the earliest attested form of the language. No literature from before the Christianization of Armenia survives; most of the early literature in the classical period consists of translations of Christian texts from Greek or Syriac (Thomson 1989).

We cannot identify Common Armenian with Classical Armenian, since some modern dialects preserve archaisms reconstructible from Indo-European that are lost in Classical Armenian, so they must descend from an unwritten earlier language also preserving these archaisms. One example is the form for 'milk', Classical Armenian **կաթն** *kat^hn*, which in comparison with Greek γάλα, γάλακτος and Latin *lac, lactis* suggests a Mediterranean proto-form (if not Indo-European root) *$g_l̥gt$- (Martirosyan 2010). Both the syllabic *$l̥$ and the second *g have been lost in the classical form, while the remaining two stops have undergone the expected shift to k and t^h, respectively (Karst 1901). In the dialect of Agulis, however, we have **կախց** *kaχts^h*, with a -χ- not found in the classical form (but found in certain other dialects; cf. Hawarik **կախս** *kaχs*, Ačaṙyan 1973: 481). Ačaṙyan (1901) takes this -χ- to be the result of a proto-form *kałts^h, where the dark *ł is a reflex of the original *l seen in Latin and Greek. Since these dialects preserve an archaic form not found in the classical language, it seems reasonable to propose that these dialects split off from Common Armenian before Classical Armenian innovated the loss of the *ł, and so Common and Classical Armenian are not the same stage of the language. (See Martirosyan 2010 for extensive discussion of further archaisms found in the modern dialects.)

Middle Armenian is attested from the 11th to the 15th centuries (Karst 1901: 1). Most Armenian varieties of this period have only fragmentary attestation; Cilician Armenian happens to have survived because it was the official literary language of Cilicia, a kingdom founded by Armenian refugees in southern Anatolia. This Cilician variety is ancestral to modern dialects of Cilicia (notably those of Hadjin, Marash, and Zeytun). As Karst (1901) extensively documents, many of the morphological and syntactic features of Modern Armenian already appear in Middle Armenian, such as the agglutinative number-case system in nouns and the use of particles such as **կու** *ku/gu* in the verbal system.

Many scholars, including Parnassian (1985) and Lassiter (2016), believe that there was a further major stage in the evolution of Modern Armenian from Middle Armenian, which following Kostandnupōlsets'i (1674: 3) and Schröder (1711) they call *Civil Armenian* (**քաղաքական Հայերէն** *k^haʁak^hakan hajɛɾɛn*, or for Schröder *lingua civilis*). According to Motalová (*apud* Zgusta 1971: 192−193), this emerged in the seventeenth

century and contained elements of Grabar (the classical literary language) and various non-standard dialects, and was predominantly used in letters, administration, the courts, scientific literature, and newspapers. (Zekiyan 1997: 338 states that Civil Armenian first emerged in the fourteenth century and was initially called ռամկորէն *ramkoren* ['common' or 'vulgar' language].) According to Zekiyan, Civil Armenian predated the split of modern literary Armenian into Eastern and Western varieties in the middle of the nineteenth century; it had "almost a unitary character as much as unity at a formation stage of the language is allowed" and was "a common means of literary expression for all Armenians. Hence most probably it was also, aside from the various dialects, a common means of oral communication, especially used and developed by the travelling merchants" (Zekiyan 1997: 338).

Parnassian (1985) argues that 17th-century Civil Armenian texts such as Zakʿaria Aguletsʿi's diary (1647−1664; cf. Ter-Avetisyan 1938) show a mix of Western and Eastern features; for example, they tend to construct the present tense with forms of կու *ku*, the perfect tense with forms of the -էր -*er* participle, and the ablative case with -է -*e* (all Western); but they tend to employ the locative -ում -*um* (Eastern) and the genitive plural in -ի -*i* (E; Western -ու -*u*). Nichanian (1989: 273−277) adds that Kostandnupōlsetsʿi uses պիտի *piti* as a future (W) rather than an obligatory (E) marker in his version of Civil Armenian.

These generalizations do not hold for all Civil Armenian documents; for example, the version of Civil Armenian described by Schröder (1711), which appears to be based on the speech of his informant Lucas Nurigianides (cf. Schröder 1711: 1.6), uses կու *ku* for the future tense (E) and both W/Classical -է -*e* and E -ից -*its*[h] for the ablative (Lassiter 2016).

Zekiyan (1997: 338) asserts that the power and influence of the Armenian merchant elites in Constantinople, Tbilisi, and Erevan most prominently associated with Civil Armenian began to wane in the mid-eighteenth century, precipitating a decline in the use of this form of the language and ultimately leading to the rise of the Modern Eastern and Western literary languages in the mid-nineteenth century. Zekiyan (1997: 338) echoes the general belief among Armenians and armenologists that these were based on the dialects of Erevan and Constantinople respectively, but dialectologically informed examination of the phonological, morphological, and lexical features of the literary varieties suggests that the situation is more complicated than this.

Consider first *Standard Western Armenian* (SWA), which is normally taken to be based on the dialect of Istanbul (IA). Adjarian (1906) outlines this view of the history of SWA in a series of steps. When the Turks invaded in the 11th century, the survivors spoke Middle Armenian as a lingua franca based on spoken Armenian. This began to fall apart for two reasons: firstly, the Cilician Armenians dispersed in the 15th century, after the kingdom of Cilicia dissolved following the invasion of the Mamluks in the 14th century. Secondly, the Turco-Persian wars of the 15th century onwards were fought mainly in Armenia, scattering the Armenian language as refugees established communities elsewhere, including in Constantinople. With the late 18th century came the establishment of the first Armenian schools in Constantinople; shortly afterwards, the new dialect began to be written in Constantinople, Smyrna, and Venice, and disseminated in print through newspapers, journals, and by missionaries. The 1848 revolutions spurred movements to replace the classical language with this new dialect as a standard, and since

Standard Eastern Armenian (SEA) was banned by the Ottoman government at that point, SWA subsequently developed with minimal influence from eastern varieties.

If we compare the traditional Istanbul dialect described in 1941 by Ačaṙean, himself a speaker of the dialect, to SWA as described by Bardakjian and Thomson (1977), a somewhat different picture emerges. The outcomes of the stop series differ, for example: IA belongs to Group 3 and preserves original word-initial voiced stops unchanged (e.g. *բան* 'thing' → [ban]), whereas SWA, like all Group 5 dialects, devoices and aspirates them ([pʰan]). Word-initial mid vowels diphthongize in SWA (*երկու* [jɛɾgu] 'two', *ոսկի* [vɔsgi] 'gold'), but not in IA ([ɛrgu], [ɔsgi]). Morphologically, IA differs from SWA in negating the present tense with the old preposition *ի* *i* 'in', as in *չեմ ի գար* [tʃʰɛm i gaɾ] 'I'm not coming' vs. SWA *չեմ գար* [tʃʰɛm kʰaɾ]. Yes-no questions employ the Turkish clitic *-մի* *-mi* in IA but not SWA; compare IA *կը սիրէ՞ մի* [gə siɾɛ mi] 'does he love?' with SWA *կը սիրէ՞* [gə siɾɛ]. Numerous verbs belong to the *ա-* *a*-conjugation in IA but the *ե-* *ɛ*- or *ի-* *i*-conjugation in SWA, such as IA *տեսնալ* [dɛsnal] 'see' vs. SWA *տեսնել* [dɛsnɛl], IA *խոսալ* [χɔsal] 'speak' vs. SWA *խոսիլ* [χɔsil].

The lexical differences between Istanbul and SWA are equally striking and pervasive: IA *բայրինկուն* [pʰajɾingun] 'good evening' vs. SWA *բարի իրիկուն* [pʰaɾi iɾigun], IA *օյրորդ* [ɔjɾɔɾtʰ] 'lady' vs. SWA *օրիորդ* [ɔɾiɔɾtʰ], IA *վով* [vɔv] 'who' vs. SWA *ով* [ɔv], etc.

It is similarly difficult to maintain the common belief that *Standard Eastern Armenian* is based on the Erevan dialect (EA) once one examines the relationship between the two. The pronunciation of the vowels is significantly different in the Erevan dialect than in SEA, as was noted by Gharibyan (1948: 75) and remains true at the time of writing this chapter. EA stresses the penultimate syllable, whereas SEA resembles French in stressing the rightmost full vowel in a word; EA also undergoes extensive reduction of unstressed vowels, unlike SEA: contrast SEA *գրում եմ* [gərum ɛm] 'I write' with EA *գ՛ըրըմ էմ* [gʰərəm ɛm] (loc. cit.). This example shows moreover that EA differs from SEA in having a fourth stop series, voiced aspirates, corresponding to SEA (and Classical Armenian) plain voiced stops in word-initial position. EA, but not SEA, also voices original plain voiceless stops in medial and final position, as in SEA *փայտ* [pʰajt] 'wood' : EA *փէդ* [pʰɛd], SEA *կատու* [katu] 'cat' : EA *կադու* [kadu] (Gharibyan 1948: 76). Morphologically, EA differs from SEA in forming the plural of many polysyllabic vowel-final nouns with *ք* -[kʰ], whereas SEA employs the standard polysyllabic plural suffix *-ներ* -[nɛr]: contrast SEA *այգիներ* [ajginɛr] 'vineyards' with EA *իքհիք* [ikʰʲikʰ] (Gharibyan 1948: 77). The obligatory in EA can optionally be formed in a manner not found in SEA, wherein the obligatory marker is placed after the infinitive and conjugated, as in EA *կարթալ պըդեմ* [kaɾtʰal pədɛm] 'I must read' : SEA *պիտի կարդամ* [piti kaɾdam] (Gharibyan 1948: 83; see also Asatryan 1980).

In sum, the literary dialects appear to have arisen not from the dialects of Constantinople and Erevan, but from something like Civil Armenian combined with elements of various Western or Eastern dialects, including but not limited to the varieties spoken in the respective capitals. To take just two SWA examples, the Classical verb *ուղարկել* [uʁarkɛl] 'send' surfaces in current SWA as *ղրկել* [ʁəɾgɛl]; this does not accord with the Istanbul form *խրկել* [χəɾgɛl], but rather is what we find in the dialects of Akhaltskha and Sivas among others. For the verb 'swell', Classical Armenian attests *ուռնուլ* [urnul] and *ուռչիլ* [urtʃʰil]; corresponding to this we find *ուռնալ* [urnal] (HAB [=Acharyan 1973] 607) in Istanbul (as well as Rodosto and Sivas). The SWA form however is *ուռիլ*

[uril] (Guyumchean 1970: 640; Sargsyan 1991: 293), as we find not in Istanbul but in many other Western dialects including Mush, Suczawa, Van, Axalcxa, Erzerum, Moks, Tigranakert, Nor Naxichevan, and Hamshen (HAB 607). The fact that the standard literary varieties draw on dialects beyond those of Constantinople and Erevan is perhaps not surprising, given the diverse regional origins of the speakers and writers of the language from its formative period to the present day.

2. Foreign influences

The evolution of Armenian has been affected not just by the endogenous dialectal forces just described, but also by an array of exogenous influences. One of the hallmarks of Armenian is the extent to which it has adapted elements from other languages, a process which has continued from the pre-historic and Classical periods (cf. Clackson, this handbook) to the present day. While all forms of Armenian have been extensively influenced by, among others, Middle Iranian languages, Turkish and Azeri, and Arabic, over the past two centuries, the modern literary varieties have been differentially affected by the ambient languages of their sociopolitical milieux: Russian in the case of SEA, Persian in the case of Iranian Armenian, and Turkish in the case of SWA (though most of the modern Turkish lexical elements in the latter were excised following the Genocide of 1915−1924).

In the lexical domain, exogenous influences can take the form of direct lexical borrowing, calquing, and semantic differentiation. SEA for instance contains a host of Russian borrowings not found in SWA, such as *մայկա* [majkɑ] and *ֆուտբոլկա* [futbɔlkɑ] '(t-)shirt', from Russian майка and футболка, respectively. The SWA equivalent is *շապիկ* [ʃabig], itself a loan from Middle Iranian *šabīg*, which Mackenzie (1971) glosses as 'Mazdean ritual undershirt', though the derivation from Iranian *xšap-ika- 'night' suggests that it originally meant something like 'night-shirt'. Similarly on a hot day in the Republic of Armenia or Moscow one might ask for *մարոժնի* [mɑrɔʒni] 'ice cream', from Russian мороженое [mɐˈroʑɪnəjə]; compare SWA *պաղպաղակ* [bɑʁbɑʁɑg], a reduplicated derivative of native *պաղ* [bɑʁ] 'cold'. (Some SEA speakers now use their equivalent, [pɑʁpɑʁɑk].)

Calquing from Russian surfaces in words such as *ինքնաթիռ* [inkʰnɑtʰir] 'airplane', based on Russian самолёт [səmɐˈlʲɵt], both of which have the morphological structure 'self-fly'; compare SWA (and Iranian Armenian) *օդանաւ* [ɔtʰɑnɑv], based on archaic English *airship*. The SEA verb *զանգել* [zɑngɛl] 'call on the telephone' is a calque on Russian звонить [zvɐˈnʲitʲ], both literally meaning 'to ring (a bell)'; SWA *հեռաձայնել* [hɛratsʰɑjnɛl] on the other hand is a calque on French *téléphoner*, both being verbal derivatives of 'sound-from-a-distance'. With respect to cars, SEA *ավտոմոբիլ* [ɑvtɔmɔbil] is a direct borrowing from Russian автомобиль [ɐftɐˈbʲilʲ], whereas SWA *ինքնաշարժ* [inkʰnɑʃɑrʒ] is a calque on French *automobile*, literally 'self-moving'.

When borrowed words come into competition with pre-existing native forms, semantic differentiation (change in the meaning of either the original or the incoming synonym) often results. An SEA example involves the edible tuber of the Solanum tuberosum

plant, or 'potato'. Originally cultivated in the Andes, this vegetable made its way to Europe following the Spanish conquest in the mid-16th century, and shows up in Armenian as *գետնախնձոր getnaxnjor* (literally 'earth-apple') soon thereafter. (Awetikʿean et al. 1836: 540 cites the two earliest examples as being from an unspecified medical text [*Բժշկարան Bžškaran*], but this must be later than the most famous Bžškaran by Amirdovlatʿ Amasiatsʿi, which dates to the late fifteenth century, before the introduction of the potato to the Old World. It is not clear to us how to square the linguistic evidence from Armenian with the proposal that the potato was introduced to Iran [and hence presumably Armenia] by John Malcolm in the early 19th century [Reader 2008: 246].) The Armenian form *գետնախնձոր getnaxnjor* appears to be a calque on French *pomme de terre* (perhaps via Persian *sebi zamīnī*), and remains the form for 'potato' in SWA and Iranian Armenian. Modern SEA has now imported Russian картофель [kɐrˈtofʲɪlʲ] as *կարտոֆիլ* [kɑrtɔfil], and this serves as the word for potato for many speakers, whereas [gɛtnɑχəndzɔr] has shifted in meaning to 'yam' or 'Jerusalem artichoke'.

3. Phonology

Turning to the phonological evolution of Armenian in the historical period, one significant way in which the varieties of the language vary is in their treatment of the three stop series inherited from Proto-Indo-European. The outcomes of these series vary mostly with respect to Voice Onset Time (and indeed, Adjarian first came up with the concept of Voice Onset Time while studying laryngeal contrasts across Armenian dialects; cf. Adjarian 1889 and Braun 2013). A summary of the outcomes of word-initial stops is given in Table 66.1, together with the traditional classification and representative dialects from each group.

Tab. 66.1: Armenian dialect stop series

group	*D	*D^h	*T	example dialects
1	D	D^h	T^h	Sivas
2	T	D^h	D	Erevan, New Julfa
3	D	D	T^h	Istanbul
4	D	T	T^h	Sasun, MidA, Kesab
5	D	T^h	T^h	Malatya, SWA
6	T	D	T^h	Classical, SEA
7	T	T	T^h	Van

Here D stands for voiced stops, D^h for voiced aspirated stops, T for voiceless stops, and T^h for voiceless aspirated stops. Note that in some dialects, such as Van, we see a merger of two of the series. The behavior of loanwords suggests that these changes occurred across the dialects between the 6th and 13th centuries (Weitenberg 2002: 148). By way

of example, consider the PIE words for 'ten', 'I carry', and 'eight', and their reflexes in a sample of dialects in Table 66.2:

Tab. 66.2: Reflexes of the PIE stop series

group	*D	*Dʰ	*T	variety
	*deḱm̥t	*bʰer-	*oḱtō:	PIE
	'ten'	'I carry'	'eight'	
1	dasə	bʰɛɾɛm	utʰə	Sivas
2	tasə	bʰiɛɹiɛm	utʰ	New Julfa
3	dasə	bɛɾɛm	utʰu	Istanbul
4	das	pɛɾəm	utʰ	Sasun
5	dasə	pʰɛɾɛm	utʰə	SWA
6	tasn	bɛɾɛm	utʰ	Classical
7	tas	piɾɛm	utʰ	Van

Under the assumption that Group 6 represents the Proto-Armenian situation (see Pisowicz 1976), as Classical Armenian is the oldest attested variety, an ordering paradox arises in deriving the Group 4 series. The problem is that we seem to have an inversion of the *D and *Dʰ series: Classical *tełi* 'place' corresponds to Kesab *diɛʁ*, while Classical *deł* 'drug' to Kesab *tiɛʁ*. But if either the d > t or the t > d change happened prior to the other, we would see a merger, as the second change would in each case restore the original sound, extending it to both original series.

One solution to this problem would be to take another series to be original; taking Group 6 to be original produces, as we have seen, an ordering paradox with respect to 4; and 3, 5, and 7 all involve mergers and so cannot be original; therefore, it appears that either 1 or 2 must be original. If so, this has the consequence that the voiced aspirates in groups 1 and 2 descend directly from the original Proto-Indo-European voiced aspirates, and so also avoids the complication of having to propose any sound changes in between (Garrett 1998).

The behavior of Greek and Iranian loanwords poses problems for this analysis of the voiced aspirates as original, however. If Group 1 is original, the incoming voiced stops should be assigned to the *D series, which would then come out as plain voiceless in Group 6; a /b/ borrowed into Common Armenian should come out as a /p/ in Classical Armenian, for example. But we see loanwords present in multiple dialects (and so reconstructible for Common Armenian) that do not show this behavior: Greek *bēma* 'stage' appears as Classical բեմ *bēm*, and not *pēm. By the same reasoning, the change w > g ought to give *k in Group 6, if Group 1 were original, whereas from the word 'wine' we see Classical գինի *gini*, and not *kini, as we would expect if it were first borrowed into an ancestral Group 1 dialect as *gini*.

We therefore need to treat Group 6 as original after all, and somehow derive the Group 4 situation. Taking inspiration from our last hypothesis, we can propose that Group 4 arose via an intermediate Group 1 stage, even though this stage was not part

of Common Armenian. We need to propose a sound change *D > *Dʰ in Groups 1 and 2, whereby the original Group 6 voiced series (which in turn came from the Proto-Indo-European voiced aspirate series) became a voiced aspirate series. Pisowicz (1976) proposes that this sound change happened in Group 4 as well; Group 4 can then be derived from Group 1 by deaspirating (and subsequently devoicing) the voiced aspirate series, to reach the attested facts.

An interesting change affecting vowels in some modern dialects is Adjarian's Law, in which back vowels undergo certain changes after voiced obstruents (Vaux 1992). Adjarian first noticed this change in the modern dialect of Van, in which back vowels are consistently fronted after historically voiced obstruents (which are synchronically voiceless in Van) as shown in Table 66.3:

Tab. 66.3: Examples of Adjarian's Law

Classical form	Modern form	Gloss
bah	pæχ	'spade'
danak	tænæk	'knife'
gaṙn	kʲær	'sheep'
bołk	pøχk	'radish'
dzu	tsy	'egg'

Some dialects exhibit a similar rule affecting vowel quality without fronting, giving a clue as to the origin of this change. Consider the data from Malatya Armenian in Table 66.4 (Danielyan 1967); these IPA values are the authors' interpretation of Danielyan's phonetic descriptions.

Tab. 66.4: Vowel differentiation in Malatya Armenian

Earlier form	Malatya	Gloss
tʰas	tʰɑs	'cup'
pʰotʰ	pʰɔtʰ	'plait'
pʰukʰ	pʰʊkʰ	'breath'
das	tʰɐs	'lesson'
boytʰ	pʰotʰ	'thumb'
bukʰ	pʰukʰ	'snowstorm'

The Malatya minimal pairs in Table 66.4 suggest that the historical contrast in voicing on consonants has turned into a different contrast in vowels, involving [atr] (advanced tongue root); /ɐ o u/ can be analysed as [+atr], and /ɑ ɔ ʊ/ as [-atr]. If voiced consonants are specified with the feature [+atr] (Vaux 1998), this change is simply represented as the spreading of [atr] from consonants to their following vowels. In Malatya, voicing on stops has then neutralized, phonologizing this change.

This can be seen as similar to an earlier stage of the rule in dialects such as Van, where the rule specifies fronting rather than a change in [atr]. In the relevant dialects, the first change was that the feature [atr] spread from consonants to their following vowels. Dialects such as Van then innovated a further rule, whereby [αatr] → [-αback]; the contrast in [atr] on vowels was mapped by this second rule into a contrast in [back], the end result of which is equivalent to back vowels being fronted after historical voiced obstruents. Then, in Van, Malatya, and many other dialects, the voicing contrast in stops was neutralized.

A significant number of modern Armenian dialects have innovated a system of vowel harmony that was not present in Classical Armenian; these systems are typologically very common, and their presence in Armenian likely reflects areal influence from other neighbouring vowel harmony systems like that of Turkish (Vaux 1998).

The dialect of Aresh, for example, was spoken until 1918 in the region around the southeast corner of the Mingachevir reservoir, near Yevlax and Mingachevir (Lusentsʿ 1982). We may interpret the description of the surface vowel inventory in Aresh provided by Lusentsʿ in the following way:

Tab. 66.5: Aresh vowel inventory

i	y	əi		u
ɛ	œ	ə	ə̊	ɔ
æ		ɑ		

Of these vowels, Lusentsʿ designates [ɑ ə ə̊ əi u ɔ] as "heavy", [i æ y œ] as "light", and [ɛ] as "neutral".

Each affix in Aresh comes in two forms: a "heavy" (back) one and a "light" (front) one, determined by the vowel in the root of the word. For the Classical derivational suffix -*akan*, for example, we have allomorphs -*akan* and -*ækæn*; Aresh *talakan* 'debt' < *tal* 'give', while *gʲœlækæn* 'future' (with root vowel fronted by Adjarian's Law) < *gal* 'come'. The same holds for inflectional affixes, such as the genitive ending -*i* > -*a* ~ r -*æ*. For *kʰaɾ* 'stone' we have *kʰaɾ*, gen. *kʰaɾa*; but for *amis* 'month' we have *æmis*, gen. *æmisæ*.

4. Morphology

The nominal morphology of Armenian has been radically slimmed down over its history from Classical Armenian, and even more so from Proto-Indo-European. Classical Armenian has seven nominal declensions showing limited ablaut, a change from the Indo-European system in which the vowels in roots, suffixes, and endings underwent extensive ablaut in accordance with the position of the mobile accent (Beekes 2011). Classical Armenian had already lost the inherited gender distinction of masculine, feminine, and neuter, so nominals were inflected only for number and case; this was entirely done by fusional markers, where for the most part a single morpheme marked each number-case combination (Meillet 1936; Olsen 1999).

Modern Armenian, by contrast, has only one productive declension, with separate number and case morphemes and no fusion (Halle and Vaux 1998). We can see the contrast between Classical Armenian's multiple fusional genitive plural affixes and SEA's separation of number and case and levelling of declensions in the forms for 'water' and 'hair' (Table 66.6).

Tab. 66.6: Development of agglutination in the SEA genitive plural

Classical	*ǯrng*	ǰ(u)r		ocʿ
	herac	her		acʿ
			⌢	
	gen. pl.	ROOT	PL	GEN
			|	|
SEA	*ǯ(u)reri*	dʒ(u)ɾ	ɛɾ	i
	hereri	hɛɾ	ɛɾ	i

The verbal system has undergone a significant realignment since the Classical Armenian period, in which each morphological form shifts in meaning to become the marker for a different verbal category, and new grammaticalized forms are created for categories to which no previously existing morphological form has shifted. The overall picture is something resembling a chain shift, although it should be noted that this shift is not a single entity, since the individual changes did not take place in the same period. There is also considerable dialectal variation with regard to which shifts took place, and which new grammaticalized forms were created.

The Classical Armenian verb has a present, an aorist, and an imperfect; of these, the present and aorist have indicative and subjunctive forms. There is no future tense inherited from Indo-European, but the aorist subjunctive endings already come to have future meaning by the classical period, as well as conveying intention or desire (Vaux 1995). Also during the classical period, the present subjunctive form disappears, and it is preserved in none of the modern dialects (Weitenberg 1993).

In Cilician Middle Armenian, the function of the present subjunctive comes to be filled by the original present indicative of Classical Armenian, inherited from Indo-European; in almost all of the modern dialects, this form continues to have subjunctive rather than indicative force (see Vaux 2013 for one exception − the Khodorjur dialect − which preserves it as an indicative in certain contexts).

In turn, the present indicative function is filled by a periphrastic formation that arose late in the classical period. This uses the collocation *kay ew kay ew*, literally 'there exists and', followed by a conjugated form of the classical present (Karst 1901). This formation may originally have had a progressive meaning, evidenced by certain grammatical restrictions in the modern dialects; in SWA, for example, the descendant *ku* /gu/ of *kay ew* cannot normally be used with stative verbs, resembling the behavior of progressive forms in other languages such as English. In Cilician Middle Armenian, the reduced form /gu/ had become the standard marker of the present tense. In SWA and many other western dialects, this marker continues the present tense function, but in SEA and other eastern dialects, it has become a future tense marker.

The late Classical Armenian future tense, expressed by the original aorist subjunctive, disappears in Middle Armenian and the modern dialects, to be replaced by various periphrastic formations. In Middle Armenian, the future tense is expressed by the conjugated verb *կամիմ gamim* 'want' followed by the infinitive; none of the modern dialects retain this formation. As noted above, most eastern dialects have the future function performed by the Middle Armenian present tense, from the original progressive. This use of 'want' to form the future, as well as being cross-linguistically common, is a characteristic of the Balkan Sprachbund (Joseph 1983); this is geographically linked to the Byzantine and Ottoman empires, which also happen to be the most plausible sources of influence on Cilician Armenian.

In most modern western dialects, the future is instead expressed by an old periphrastic form that came from an obligatory mood formation in Middle Armenian: this was an invariant form *պիտի piti* 'it is necessary' followed by a conjugated form of the classical present. This was not present as a separate mood as such in Classical Armenian, but the formation developed from an impersonal construction *պիտի որ piti or* 'it is necessary that'. In SEA and many other eastern dialects, this obligatory formation survives with its original force (Dum-Tragut 2009).

An interesting new verbal formation has developed in some Western dialects. The Balkan Sprachbund was coextensive with the Byzantine domain (Sandfeld 1930) and the Ottoman domain, and Armenia was under the control of both of these for around one thousand years, so we might expect there to be some Balkan influence on the morphology of modern Armenian. One potential such feature is the evidential, or mediative (Donabédian 1996, 2001).

The normal shape of the perfect in Standard Western Armenian is periphrastic: it consists of the aorist stem marked with a perfect participle suffix, followed by a form of the auxiliary 'be' inflected for tense, person, and number. But many varieties of spoken Western Armenian contain two different perfect participle suffixes which impart two slightly different meanings, as in the following two constructions:

(1) a. **պառկած   են**
      bɑɾg-ɑdz   ɛ-n
      lie.down-PPL be-3.PL
      'they are lying down'

    b. **պառկեր   են**
      bɑɾg-ɛɾ   ɛ-n
      lie.down-MED be-3.PL
      'they are supposedly/probably/unfortunately lying down'

The former of these is the unmarked perfect, using the perfect participle suffix *-ած -adz*. The latter is the marked, "mediative" perfect, using *-եր -ɛɾ*. Donabédian (1996, 2001) reports that there are significant differences in the interpretation of the evidential participle that distinguish it from the unmarked perfect participle in *-adz*; these differences have to do with aspect, modality, and discourse conditions.

The evidential is appropriate when there is some contribution from the speaker over and above the assertion that the proposition P expressed by the sentence is true. This contribution can take the following forms, hence the variable gloss 'supposedly/probably/unfortunately' above:

– The speaker did not witness the event reported in P; P is asserted on the basis of
  hearsay or inference.
– P is contrary to the speaker's expectation or accidental.
– The speaker does not approve of what is related in P.
– The speaker does not commit herself to the veracity of P.

Taking the 'lying down' example in (1), Donabédian (2001) observes that if the media-
tive perfect *bargɛɾ ɛn* is uttered by a mother-in-law about her daughters-in-law, a likely
interpretation would be that the former does not approve of or is surprised by the latters'
behavior. If, on the other hand, the unmarked perfect participle *bargadz* is used, the
utterance has a more matter-of-fact flavor, in which the speaker does not include any
implicit commentary on how she feels about the fact that her daughters-in-law are rest-
ing.

   One can also use a fixed 3rd singular past subjunctive form of 'be', *ɛɡɛ̄ɾ jɛʁɛɾ*, as an
evidential particle with predicates of any form, mediative or otherwise; this encodes the
same four properties already seen. Aytĕnean (1883) attributes this use of the form to
influence from Turkish *-mɪʂ*.

5. Syntax

With respect to a specific cluster of syntactic features, the varieties of Armenian fall into
two typological categories, summarized in Table 66.7:

Tab. 66.7: Typological categorization of Armenian varieties

	Type	Varieties of Armenian	Features
i.	head-initial	Classical Armenian Middle Armenian	unmarked SVO word order prepositions adjectives can follow head noun Indo-European (fusional) inflection
ii.	head-final	Modern Armenian	unmarked SOV word order postpositions preposed modifiers agglutinative inflection

To illustrate the differences between the two categories in Table 66.7, consider the fol-
lowing representative noun phrases and relative clauses in Classical and Modern Armeni-
an (data modified from Acharyan 1911: 24):

(2) noun phrase: 'my neighbor's son Leon's books' pages'
    a. Classical

թերթք	*գրոց*	*Լեռնի*	*որդւոյ*	*դրացւոյ*	*իմոյ*
tʰɛɾtʰ-kʰ	gɾ-ɔtsʰ	Lɛwɔn-i	ɔɾdw-ɔj	dɾɑtsʰw-ɔj	im-ɔj
page-PL	book-GEN.PL	Leon-GEN	son-GEN	neighbor-GEN	my-GEN

b. MWA

դրացիիս	սղուն	Լեւոնին	գիրքերուն
tʰəɾatsʰi-i-s	dəʁ-u-n	lɛvɔn-i-n	kʰiɾkʰ-ɛɾ-u-n
neighbor-GEN-1.POSS	son-GEN-DEF	Leon-GEN-DEF	book-PL-GEN-DEF

թերթերը
tʰɛɾtʰ-ɛɾ-ə
page-PL-DEF

(3) relative clause: 'I saw the bird that was singing in the tree'
   a. Classical

տեսի	զթռչունն	որ	երգէր	ի	վերայ	ծառոյն
tɛs-i	z-tʰɾtʃʰun-n	ɔɾ	ɛɾg-ɛːɾ	i	vɛɾaj	tsaɾ-ɔj-n
see-AOR.1.SG	SPEC-bird-DEF	REL	sing-3.SG.IMF	in	on	tree-GEN-DEF

   b. MWA

ծառին	վրայ	երգող	թռչունը	տեսայ
dzaɾ-i-n	vəɾa	jɛɾkʰ-ɔʁ	tʰəɾtʃʰun-ə	dɛs-a
tree-GEN-DEF	on	sing-SUBJ.PPL	bird-DEF	see-AOR.1.SG

As the facts in (2) and (3) demonstrate, a significant syntactic realignment occurred at some point between the Middle and Modern Armenian periods (according to Karst 1901: 407, Middle Armenian preserved "pure [Classical] Armenian syntax"). (One should not infer from this that all of the changes that now distinguish Modern Armenian from Classical Armenian happened after the Middle Armenian period. In fact, many of the characteristics of Modern Armenian first appear in Middle Armenian, such as periphrastic verb formations [e.g. Middle Armenian and MWA *gu dam* 'I give', *bidi dam* 'I will/ must give' vs. Classical *tam, tacʰ*, respectively] and the Modern *-[n]er* plural morpheme [cf. Classical *-kʰ*].) This realignment is traditionally linked to the significant influence of Turkish in the Armenian-speaking world following the invasion of Asia Minor by various Turkic tribes beginning in the eleventh century. In fact, it is often observed anecdotally that Modern Armenian is simply Armenian phonology and morphology with Turkish syntax (cf. Pedersen 1906: 472; Adjarian 1909: 8). The syntactic similarities between Modern Armenian and Turkish can be seen by comparing the Modern Armenian structures in (2b) and (3b) to their Turkish equivalents in (4a) and (4b) respectively; the primary difference is in the relative order of the genitive and possessive markers − GEN-POSS in Armenian but POSS-GEN in Turkish.

(4) Comparison of Modern Armenian and Turkish noun phrases and relative clauses
   a. 'my neighbor's son Leon's books' pages'

tʰəɾatsʰi-i-s	dəʁ-u-n	lɛvɔn-i-n	kʰiɾkʰ-ɛɾ-u-n
neighbor-GEN-1.POSS	son-GEN-DEF	Leon-GEN-DEF	book-PL-GEN-DEF
komʂu-m-un	oğl-u	Levon-ın	kitab-lar-ı-nın
neighbor-1.POSS-GEN	son-GEN	Leon-GEN	book-PL-3-GEN

tʰɛɾtʰ-ɛɾ-ə
page-PL-DEF
yaprak-lar-ı
page-PL-3

  b. 'I saw the bird that was singing in the tree'
      dzaɾ-i-n   vəɾa   jɛɾkʰ-ɔʁ   tʰəɾtʃʰun-ə   dɛs-ɑ
      tree-GEN-DEF   on   sing-SUBJ.PPL   bird-DEF   see-AOR.1.SG
      ağac-ın   üstün-de   öt-en   kuş-u   gör-dü-m
      tree-GEN   on-LOC   sing-SUBJ.PPL   bird-DEF.ACC   see-AOR-1.SG

Other morphosyntactic innovations in Modern Armenian that have been attributed to
Turkish influence include the development of agglutinative nominal morphology (dis-
cussed above, 4), the appearance of a fixed position for nonspecific objects (immediately
before the verb; cf. Comrie 1984), the creation of a special construction for yes-no
questions, the development of periphrastic passive formations with ablative agents, and
the declension of adpositions (Acharyan 1952: 198, section 7.5).

   Armenian has had extensive contact with other languages as well; in fact most speak-
ers of Armenian are bilingual, typically also speaking one or more of the languages
Russian, Turkish, Georgian, Arabic, English, and French. However, these languages do
not (with the exception of Turkish) appear to have had a significant influence on Armeni-
an syntax. A notable exception is Persian, which has noticeably influenced the syntax
of several Iranian Armenian varieties. Acharyan (1911: 284) noted that the Maragha
dialect appears to have borrowed from Persian the ability to attach direct object clitics
to verbs; in Maragha these clitics are homophonous with the possessive clitics, as in (5).

(5) direct object clitics in Maragha (Acharyan 1911: 284)
    a. *մէ ձի   պռնենքտ*
        mɛ dzi   pərn-ɛ-nkʰ-ət
        a horse take-THEME.V-1PL-2SG.CLITIC
        'let's take a horse for you'

        SEA equivalent:
        մի ձի   բռնենք   քեզ   համար
        mi dzi   bərn-ɛ-nkʰ   kʰɛz   hamaɾ
        a horse take-THEME.V-1PL you.SG.ACC for

    b. *փստտես   էրդ*
        pʰətət-ɛ-s   ɛɾ-əd
        seek-THEME.V-PPL   PAST-2SG.CLITIC
        'he/she/it was looking for you'

        SEA equivalent:
        քեզ   կը   փնտրէր
        kʰɛz   kə   pʰəntr-ɛɾ
        you.SG.ACC IMF   seek-3SG.IMF

The same construction is found in Teheran Armenian, as in (6) (from Karine Megerdoo-
mian (p.c.); cf. also Muradyan et al. 1977, feature 675).

(6) *կխփեմտ*
    kə-χəpʰ-ɛ-m-ət
    FUT-hit-THEME.V-1SG-2SG.CLITIC
    'I will hit you'

Syntactic influence from Persian arguably also surfaces in the formation of relative clauses with a resumptive pronoun in Teheran Armenian, as with *իրանից* iɹan-its^h in (7) (data from Karine Megerdoomian, p.c.).

(7) **էն   կինը   որ   ես իրանից էս գիրքը   վերցրամ**
    ɛn   kin-ə   vɔɹ jɛs iɹan-its^h ɛs giɹk^h-ə   vɛɹts^həɹ-ɑ-m
    that woman-DEF which I   her-ABL this book-DEF buy-THEME.V-1SG
    'the woman I bought this book from'

    SEA equivalent:
    այն կինը   որից   այս գիրքը   վերցրեցի
    ajn kin-ə   vɔr-its^h   ajs giɹk^h-ə   vɛɹts^hər-ɛ-ts^h-i
    that woman-DEF which-ABL this book-DEF buy-THEME-AOR-1SG

One syntactic similarity between Armenian dialects (past and present) and European languages such as French, German, and Dutch is in the formation of the perfect using an auxiliary 'have' or 'be'. In Benveniste's (1952) analysis, he draws an analogy between the so-called "transitive perfect" − which he describes as being used with transitive verbs − and a possessive construction:

(8) "transitive perfect"
    նորա   է   գործեալ
    nora   ē   gorc-eal
    3SG.GEN be.3SG do-PPL
    '(s)he/it has done/accomplished'

(9) possession
    նորա   է   հանդերձ
    nora   ē   handerj
    3SG.GEN be.3SG garment
    '(s)he has a garment'

In both constructions, we have a copula whose "subject" is in the genitive. This is supported by the fact that the lexical verb *unim* 'have' is sometimes used to express the perfect in Middle Armenian, as in *զքաղաքն առած ունէին* zkʿałakʿn aṙac unēin 'they had taken the city', *ի ներքսէ պահած ունի* i nerkʿsē pahac uni 'he has kept [it] inside' (Aytĕnean 1866.2: 96−97).

This can also be seen in the development of some modern dialects. In the Hamshen subdialect of Köprücü, for example, we see by comparing the forms in (10a) with those in (10b) that the perfect is expressed using a marker *-ui*.

(10) a. dzidzaʁ-adz ɑ 'he laughed'
        mɛɹ-adz ɑ   'he died'
        ɛg-adz ɑ   'he came'

     b. dzidzaʁ-adz ui 'I (have) laughed'
        *mɛɹ-adz ui   'I (have) died'
        *eg-adz ui   'I (have) come'

In the second person singular we have -*uɛs*, in the third person singular -*ua*. Given its use in the past tense, deriving from the original perfect, we can take this -*ui, -uɛs, -ua* marker to come from a grammaticalization of the original lexical verb *unim*.

Benveniste analyzes the Classical Armenian data in (8) as part of a split ergative system, in which transitives behave differently from intransitives in taking this kind of perfect construction; split ergativity is common to other languages of the region. Indeed, the similarity between this system and that of western European languages had already been noticed by earlier Armenian writers; Aytĕnean (1866, 2: 96−97) commented: "The modern European languages seem to parallel our 12th century language, using *have* with transitive verbs and *be* with intransitives and middles."

In fact, after Benveniste's time (Burzio 1986), it was realized that the division in the western European perfect is not transitive-intransitive, but unaccusative-non-unaccusative. Unaccusative verbs (passives, raising verbs [*seem, appear*], *come, go, arrive, fall* …) take only an internal argument, prototypically when this argument is a patient or undergoes a change of state. The rest of intransitive verbs, unergative verbs (*work, sing, dance, cough, laugh* …) take an external argument, which prototypically plays an agentive thematic role.

6. Lexicon

As well as changes to the lexicon in the form of loanwords, there have been various idiosyncratic semantic changes to individual native Armenian words. We quickly outline two examples here to give a flavor of historical Armenian-internal lexicology.

− The word Հաւ *haw* is often glossed for Classical Armenian as 'bird', which is the reconstructed meaning of its PIE etymon *$h_2$éwis (Martirosyan 2010), cf. Latin *avis*, Greek αἰετός 'eagle'. Strohmeyer (1983) concludes from a philological investigation that the word has a somewhat narrower meaning in Armenian than its etymon, primarily referring to "birds which are useful to men" (Martirosyan 2010). In most modern dialects (with the exception of Van), the word's range has narrowed further to mean only 'chicken'; the frozen plural *haw-k^h* has come to mean the more generic 'bird'.
− The Classical Armenian verb քունեմ *kʿunem* 'sleep' has two reflexes in the modern dialects. The original sense of 'sleep' is continued in the irregularly altered form *k^{h}ənɛl*, perhaps generalized from the oblique stem *kʿn-* of the associated noun *kʿun* 'sleep'. The regular outcome *k^{h}unɛl* has come to mean 'futuere' throughout the informal registers of the modern dialects. Petrosyan (2007) suggests that this meaning was influenced by a reflex of PIE *keh$_2$- 'love' (cf. Sanskrit *kā-* 'desire', English *whore*), but Martirosyan (2010) contests that the two roots are formally too distant, and argues that the shift 'sleep' > 'futuere' is semantically plausible without interference from other lexemes.

7. Texts

To illustrate the evolution of Armenian in the historical period, we give the text of the Lord's Prayer in several varieties of Armenian dialects.

(11) Classical Armenian (Ējmiacin ms. 229, 989 A.D.)

Հայր մեր որ յերկինս. սուրբ եղիցի անուն քո. եկեսցէ արքայութիւն քո. եղիցին կամք քո
որպէս յերկինս եւ յերկրի. զՀաց մեր հանապազորդ տուր մեզ այսաւր. եւ թող
մեզ զպարտիս մեր. որպէս եւ մեք թողումք մերոց պարտապանաց. եւ մի տանիր
զմեզ ի փորձութիւն. այլ փրկեա զմեզ ի չարէ. զի քո է արքայութիւն եւ զաւրութիւն
եւ փառք յաւիտեանս ամէն.

hayr mer or yerkins. surb ełic'i anun k'o. ekec'ē ark'ayut'iwn k'o. ełic'in kamk' k'o
orpēs yerkins ew yerkri. zhac' mer hanapazord tur mez aysawr. ew t'oł mez zpartis
mer. orpēs ew mek' t'ołumk' meroc' partapanac'. ew mi tanir zmez i p'ordzut'iwn.
aył p'rkea zmez i č'arē. zi k'o ē ark'ayut'iwn ew zawrut'iwn ew p'ařk' yawiteans
amēn.

(12) Standard Eastern Armenian

Հայր մեր, վոր յերկնքում ես. սուրբ թող լինի քո անունը. քո թագավորությունը թող
գա. քո կամքը թող լինի յերկրի վրա, ինչպես վոր յերկնքում է. մեր Հանապազորդյա
Հացը տուր մեզ այսոր. յեվ թող մեզ մեր պարտքերը ինչպես յեվ մենք ենք թողնում
մեր պարտականներին. յեվ մի տար մեզ փորձության, այլ փրկիր մեզ չարից.
վորովՀետեվ քոնն է թագավորությունը յեվ գորությունը յեվ փառքը Հավիտյանս.
ամէն.

hajr mɛr, vɔr jɛrkənkʰum ɛs. surpʰ tʰɔʁ lini kʰɔ anunə. kʰɔ tʰagavɔrutʰjunə tʰɔʁ
ga. kʰɔ kamkʰə tʰɔʁ lini jɛrkri vəra, intʃʰpɛs vɔr jɛrkənkʰum ɛ. mɛr hanapazɔrja
hatsʰə tur mɛz ajsɔr. jɛv tʰɔʁ mɛz mɛr partkʰɛrə intʃʰpɛs jɛv mɛnkʰ ɛnkʰ tʰɔʁnum
mɛr partakannɛrin. jɛv mi tar mɛz pʰɔrdzutʰjan, ajl pʰərkir mɛz tʃʰaritsʰ.
vɔrɔvhɛtɛv kʰɔn: ɛ tʰagavɔrutʰjunə jɛv zɔrutʰjunə jɛv pʰarkʰə havitjanəs. amɛn.

(13) Standard Western Armenian

Ով Հայր մեր որ երկինքն ես, քու անունդ սուրբ ըլլայ. քու Թագաւորութիւնդ գայ.
քու կամքդ ըլլայ ինչպէս երկինքը՝ նոյնպէս երկրի վրայ. մեր ամէնօրուան Հացը
այսօր ալ մեզի տուր, մեզի ներէ մեր պարտքերը ինչպէս մենք ալ կը ներենք մեր
պարտականներուն. ու մեզ փորձութեան մի տանիր, Հապա չարէն մեզ ազատէ.
քանզի քուկդ է Թագաւորութիւնը եւ գօրութիւնը ու փառքը յաւիտեանս: Ամէն.

ɔv hajr mɛr vɔr jɛrginkʰn ɛs, kʰu anunətʰ surpʰ əl:a. kʰu tʰakʰavɔrutʰjunətʰ kʰa.
kʰu gamkʰətʰ əl:a intʃʰbɛs jɛrginkʰə nujnbɛs jɛrgri vəra. mɛr amɛnɔrvan hatsʰə
ajsɔr al mɛzi dur, mɛzi nɛrɛ mɛr bardkʰɛrə intʃʰbɛs mɛnkʰ al gə nɛrɛnkʰ mɛr
bardagan:ɛrun. u mɛz pʰɔrtsʰutʰjan mi danir, haba tʃʰaɛn mɛz azadɛ. kʰanzi
kʰugətʰ ɛ tʰakʰavɔrutʰjunə jɛv zɔrutʰjunə u pʰarkʰə havidjanəs: amɛn.

(14) Zok (Vaux 2008)

Անուն Հօր եւ օրթօ եւ օքույն սրփօ ամՄէն: Միր ապի որ երկնքումնըս, սուրի նշան
քու անունու. քու թաքավորությունը մեր վշարին մնօ միշտ, Համման ըզձահՀաձըթ
կատարվի, ուրտի երկնքումն, անտի չալ երկրի վշարին: Մեր օրվա Հօցը Հրսանի մեզ,
եւ թուլ միշտ մեզ պարտական, որ միք չալ պօրտօ չըմընօնք միրուց, եւ միշտ
մեզ Հշարի պեշշիս չարից, մեկանքալ վրկիս չարությունից. քանի որ ըշխարքամըս
թաքավորությունու, ուժու, նշան պատիվը, քունն ա միշտ: ԱմՄէն:

ánun hɔr jɛv ɔrtʰɔ jɛv ɔkʰújn sərpʰɔ ám:ɛn. mir apʰí ɔr jɛrkənkʰúmnəs, surpʰ næn
kʰu ánunu. kʰu tʰakʰavɔrutʰjúnə mir værín mənɔ miʃt, ham:an əzæhætsətʰ

katarvi, úrti jɛrkənkʰúmn, ánti æl jɛrkrí værín: mir ɔrva hɔtsʰə həsáni miz, jɛv tʰuʁ miʃt miz partakan, ɔr mikʰ æl pɔrtkʰ tʃʰəmənɔnkʰ mirutsʰ, jɛv miʃt miz hǽri pǽhis tʃʰaritsʰ, mænæk pʰərkis tʃʰarutʰjúnitsʰ. kʰani ɔr əʃχárkʰaməs tʰakʰavɔrutʰjúnu, úʒu, næn pátivə, kʰunn ɑ miʃt: am:ɛn.

(15) Marash (http://hyeforum.com/index.php?showtopic=15940)

Մեր պապա քի իրկինքն իս Քինիտ ասունիլդ սուրբ Թօննօ Քինիդ Թէզէվկերիւթինդ Թող գօ Քինիտ կոմքիդ Թօննօ չոց քի իրկինքի ինսէն է կիտենան իվրէն Մէր ամէնավիր Հոզը էօսէօր միզ սուր Հէմ մէր պորտէքը միզ պաղշէ չոց քի մինք է մէր պարտականոցը կը պաղշինք: Հէմ միզ փորձէման մի տանա Հապօ չօրէն միզ վրկէ: Ինչու քի Քինիտ է Թէզէվկերիւթինը զօրութինը փարքը յախտէանս յախտէնից Ամէն:

mir bɔbə kʰi irginkʰn is kʰínid adunit suʁp tʰɔn:ɔ kʰínit tʰɛkɛvyrytʰynət tʰuʁ kɔ kʰínid gɔmkʰit tʰɔn:ɔ tʃʰɔtsʰ kʰi irginkʰi indɛn ɛ gidɛnan ivʁɛn mir amɛnavyr hɔtsʰə œsœr miz duʁ hɛm mir bɔrdɛkʰə miz baʁəʃɛ tʃʰɔtsʰ kʰi minkʰ ɛ mir bardaganɔtsʰə gə baʁəʃinkʰ: hɛm miz pʰərtsətʰan mi dana habɔ tʃʰɔʁɛn miz pʰərgɛ: intʃʰu kʰi kʰínid ɛ tʰɛkɛvyrytʰynə zɔrytʰynə pʰarkʰə havidjanəs havidɛnitsʰ amɛn.

(16) Zeytun (http://hyeforum.com/index.php?showtopic=15940)

Ով մեզ պօպը ոչ իչկինքն իս Քու անունդ սոյբ Թողնա Քու Թէզէվկլիլիթինդ Թող գօ Քու կոմքը Թող լա ինչպէս իչկինքը ինսէն էլ իչկէին վիչօ Մէչ ամէնօչվէն Հոզը էսէօչ միզ սուչ: Եւ միզ նեչէ մէձ պօյօքը չոց որ մինք էլ կը նեչինք մէչ պօյօքի տէչէյուն Եւ միզ փոչձուման մի տանեչ Հապօ չոչէն միզ ազատէ ոչեւՀէտեւ Քինն է Թէզէվկլիլիթինը Եւ զոչուգինը ու փարքը Յախտէանս յախտէնից Ամէն:

ɔv mɛj bɔbə ɔj ijginkʰn is kʰu anunət sujp tʰɔʁna. kʰu tʰɛkɛvyjytʰynət tʰuʁ kɔ. kʰu gɔmkʰət tʰuʁ la, intʃʰbɛs ijginkʰə indɛn ɛl ijgɛjin vijɔ: mij amɛnœjvɛn hɔtsʰə ɛsœj miz duj: yɛv miz nɛjɛ mits bɔjdkʰə, tʃʰɔtsʰ ɔr minkʰ ɛl gə nɛjinkʰ mij bɔjdkʰi dɛjɛjun. jɛv miz pʰəjtsutʰan mi danɛj, habɔ tʃʰɔjɛn miz azadɛ. vɔjɛvhɛdɛv kʰinn ɛ tʰɛkɛvyjytʰynə jɛv zɔjutʰynə u pʰarkʰə. havidjanəs havidɛnitsʰ amɛn:

(17) Kesab (Adjarian 1911)

Էօվ մեր բիւբը, սուրի էղնի քէ անուս, քէ Թէքէվիլրուգինը Թղ գ՛օ. քէ իրադէթղ ըննօ, չից օր քի իրգյանքը, Թըրգէն էլ ի գ՛էղինէ. Մէր ամէնէվիր Հոզըր դուր մէզ էս էվիր էլ, մէր բօրդքը մէզի բաղշլամուշ ըրօ, չից օր քի մէնք գինօնք մէրօնցը, վէ զըզմէզ փոչգիւթյան մի դանօ. Հապօ խալըսօ ի չարէն, չինքի քէ է Թէքէվիլրուգինը, շէրէֆը, ղուվէթը, Հավիդիջինս Հավիդօնից ամօն:

œv mɛʁ bybə, surpʰ ɛʁni kʰɛ ænun, kʰɛ tʰɛkʰɛvyrutʰynə tʰɔʁ gʰɔ. kʰɛ iradɛtʰəd ən:ɔ, tʃʰytsʰ ɔr kʰi irgjankʰə, tʰərzɛn ɛl i gʰɛdina. mɛʁ amɛnavyr hɔtsʰə duʁ mɛz ɛs ɛvyr ɛl, mɛʁ bɔrdkʰə mɛzi baʁəʃlamuʃ ərɔ, tʃʰytsʰ ɔr kʰi mɛnkʰ ginɔnkʰ mɛʁɔntsʰə, vɛ zəzmɛz pʰɔrtsʰiutʰjan mí danɔ. habɔ χaləsɔ i tʃʰaʁɛn, tʃʰynkʰi kʰɛ ɛ tʰɛkʰɛvyrutʰynə, ʃɛʁɛfə, ʁuvɛtʰə, havidijins havidɔnitsʰ amɔn.

8. References

Adjarian, Hrachea [= Acharyan, Hrachʻya]
    1889   Les explosives de l'ancien arménien étudiées dans les dialectes modernes. *La Parole ou Revue internationale de Rhinologie, Otologie, Laryngologie et Phonétique expérimentale* 1: 119−127.

Acharyan, Hrachʻya
    1901   Barbaṛakhōsutʻean ōgutnerē ew matenakhōsakan ʻEwdokioy gawaṛabarbaṛ'-in [Useful spoken and literary expressions of the regional dialect of Eudokia]. (Review of Gazanchean 1899.) *Banasēr* (Paris) 3: 76−82.

Acharyan, Hrachʻya
    1906   *Patmutʻiwn Hayotsʻ Nor Grakanutʻean* [History of Modern Armenian Literature]. Vagharshapat. [Reprinted 1939. Beirut: Yoys Tparan.]

Adjarian, Hrachea [= Acharyan, Hrachʻya]
    1909   *Classification des dialectes arméniens.* Paris: Champion.

Acharyan, Hrachʻya
    1911   *Hay barbaṛagitutʻiwn* [Armenian Dialectology]. Ēminean Azgagrakan Zhoghovatsu 8. Moscow: Lazarean Chemaran.

Acharyan, Hrachʻya
    1941   *Kʻnnutʻyun polsahay barbaṛi* [A study of the Istanbul dialect]. *Gitakan ashkhatutʻyunner* [Scientific works]. Vol. 19. Erevan: Petakan Hamalsarani Hratarakchʻutʻyun, 19−250.

Acharyan, Hrachʻya
    1952   *Kʻnnutʻyunyun Vani barbaṛi* [A study of the Van dialect]. Erevan: Erevani Petakan Hamalsarani Hratarakchʻutʻyun.

Acharyan, Hrachʻya
    1973   *Hayeren armatakan baṛaran* [Armenian Etymological Dictionary]. Hator 2: E−K. Erevan: Erevani Hamalsarani Hratarakchʻutʻyun.

Asatryan, Manvel
    1980   Arevelahay grakan lezvi ev araratyan barbaṛi dzevabanakan hamakargeri pʻokhharaberutʻyunnerē [The relationships between the morphological systems of the Eastern Armenian literary language and the Ararat dialect]. *Banber Erevani Hamalsarani* 3 (42): 81−95.

Awetikʻean, Gabriēl, Khachʻatur Siwrmēlean, and Mkrtichʻ Awgerean
    1836   *Nor baṛgirkʻ haykazean lezui* [New dictionary of Armenian]. Venice: Tparan i Srboyn Ghazaru.

Aytĕnean, Arsēn
    1866   *Kʻnnakan kʻerakanutʻiwn ashkharhabar kam ardi hayerēn lezui* [A critical grammar of the colloquial or modern Armenian language]. Vienna: Mkhitʻareantsʻ Tparan.

Aytĕnean, Arsēn
    1883   *Kʻnnakan kʻerakanutʻiwn ashkharhabar kam ardi hayerēn lezui* [A critical grammar of the colloquial or modern Armenian language], 2nd edn. Vienna: Mkhitʻareantsʻ Tparan.

Bardakjian, Kevork and Robert Thomson
    1977   *A textbook of Modern Western Armenian.* Delmar, NY: Caravan.

Beekes, Robert S. P.
    2011   *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Benveniste, Émile
    1952   La construction passive du parfait transitif. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 48: 52−62.

Braun, Angelika
    2013   An early case of "VOT". *Interspeech* 14: 119−122.

Burzio, Luigi
    1986   *Italian syntax: A government-binding approach.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Comrie, Bernard
  1984   Some formal properties of focus in Modern Eastern Armenian. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 5: 1−21.

Danielyan, Tʻewan
  1967   *Malatʻiayi barbařě* [The dialect of Malatya]. Erevan: Haykakan SSH GA Hratarakchʻutʻyun.

Donabédian, Anaïd
  1996   Perfect and Mediative in Modern Western Armenian. In: Dora Sakayan (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Armenian linguistics: McGill University Montreal, Quebec, Canada May 1−5, 1995*. Delmar, NY: Caravan, 149−166.

Donabédian, Anaïd
  2001   Towards a semasiological account of evidentials: An enunciative approach of *-er* in Modern Western Armenian. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 421−442.

Dum-Tragut, Jasmine
  2009   *Armenian: Modern Eastern Armenian*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Fortson, Benjamin W. IV.
  2004   *Indo-European language and culture: an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Garrett, Andrew
  1998   Adjarian's law, the glottalic theory, and the position of Armenian. In: Benjamin K. Bergen, Madelaine C. Plauché, and Ashlee C. Bailey (eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (February 14−16, 1998): Special session on Indo-European subgrouping and internal relations (February 14, 1998)*. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 12−23.

Gharibyan, Ararat
  1948   *Hay barbaṛagitutʻyun* [Armenian dialectology]. Erevan: Haykakan SSṘ Petakan Heṛaka Mankavarzhakan Institut.

Guyumchean, Mesrop
  1970   *Ěndardzak baṛaran hayerēnē anglierēn* [Large Armenian-English dictionary]. Beirut: Tparan Atlas.

HAB
  1973   See Achaṛyan.

Halle, Morris and Bert Vaux
  1998   Theoretical Aspects of Indo-European Nominal Morphology: The Nominal Declensions of Latin and Armenian. In: Jay Jasanoff, H. Craig Melchert, and Lisi Oliver (eds.), *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität, 223−240.

Joseph, Brian
  1983   *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karst, Josef
  1901   *Historische grammatik des kilikisch-armenischen*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Kortlandt, Frederik
  1985   Proto-Indo-European glottalic stops: The comparative evidence. *Folia linguistica historica* 6: 183−202.

Kostandnupōlsetsʻi, Yovhannēs
  1674   *Pvritas lingvae armenicæ = Ztowtíwn haykabanowtéan, kam kérakanowtíwn haykakan* [Purity of the Armenian language or Armenian grammar]. Rome: Ex Typographia Sacrae Congreg. de Propaganda Fide.

Lassiter, Daniel
  2016   The Dialectal Position of Civil Armenian as Recorded in Schröder's *Thesaurus Linguae Armenicae*. Manuscript, Stanford University.

Lusentsʼ, Ashot
   1982   *Areshi Barbaṛĕ* [The dialect of Aresh]. Erevan: Erevani Petakan Hamalsarani Hrata-
           rakchʻutʻyun.
Mackenzie, D. Neil
   1971   *A concise Pahlavi dictionary.* London: Oxford University Press.
Martirosyan, Hrach
   2010   *Etymological dictionary of the Armenian inherited lexicon.* Leiden: Brill.
Meillet, Antoine
   1936   *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique.* 2nd edn. Vienna: Mekhita-
           ristes.
Muradyan, Hovhannes, Dariko Kostandyan, Anahit Haneyan, Matʻevos Muradyan, and Aharon
Grigoryan
   1977   *Hayereni barbaṛagitakan atlasi nyutʻeri havakʻman dzragir* [Program for the collection
           of materials for an Armenian dialectological atlas]. Erevan: Haykakan SSH Gitutʻyun-
           neri Akademiayi hratarakchʻutʻyun.
Nichanian, Marc
   1989   *Ages et usages de la langue arménienne.* Paris: Entente.
Olsen, Birgit Anette
   1999   *The noun in biblical Armenian: with Special Emphasis on the Indo-European Heritage.*
           Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Parnassian, Nevard
   1985   On the Formation of Ashkharhabar. *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 6: 67−73.
Pedersen, Holger
   1906   Armenisch und die Nachbarsprachen. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 39:
           334−484.
Petrosyan, Armen
   2007   Stugabanutʻiwnner [Etymologies]. *Handēs Amsōreay* 121: 1−24.
Pisowicz, Andrzej
   1976   *Le développement du consonantisme arménien.* (Polska Akademia Nauk. Oddział w
           Krakowie. Prace Komisji Językoznawstwa 43). Warsaw: Polska akademia nauk.
Reader, John
   2008   *The untold history of the potato.* London: Vintage Books.
Russell, James
   1999   Alphabets. In: Glen Warren Bowersock, Peter Robert Lamont Brown, and Oleg Grabar,
           (eds.), *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard
           University Press, 289.
Sandfeld, Kristian
   1930   *Linguistique balkanique: Problèmes et résultats.* Paris: Klincksieck.
Sargsyan, Artem
   1991   *Arewmtahayereni baṛaran* [Western Armenian dictionary]. Erevan: Arewik.
Schröder, Johann Joachim
   1711   *Thesaurus Linguae Armenicae, antiquae et hodiernae* ... [A thesaurus of the Armenian
           language, old and modern …]. Amsterdam: Amstelodanum.
Strohmeyer, Virgil B.
   1983   The meaning of *haw* and *tʻṙčʻun* in Classical Armenian. *Revue des Études Arméniennes*
           13: 43−48.
Ter-Avetisyan, Smbat
   1938   *Zakʻaria Aguletsʻu Ōragrutʻiwnĕ* [The diary of Zakʻaria Aguletsʻ]. SSHS GA Haykakan
           Filiali Hratarakutʻyun.
Thomson, Robert
   1989 [1975]   *An Introduction to Classical Armenian.* 2nd edn. Delmar, NY: Caravan.

Vaux, Bert
  1992   Adjarian's Law and consonantal ATR in Armenian. In: John A. C. Greppin (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of Armenian Linguistics*. Delmar, NY: Caravan, 271−293.
Vaux, Bert
  1995   A problem in diachronic Armenian verbal morphology. In: Jos Weitenberg (ed.), *New approaches to the medieval Armenian language and literature*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 135−148.
Vaux, Bert
  1998   *The phonology of Armenian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Vaux, Bert
  2008   Zok: The Armenian dialect of Agulis. In: Barlow Der Mugrdichian (ed.), *Between Paris and Fresno. Armenian Studies in Honor of Dickran Kouymjian*. (Armenian Studies Series 10). Costa Mesa, CA: Mazda Press, 283−301.
Vaux, Bert
  2012   The Armenian dialect of Khodorjur. In: Aram Arkun and Victoria Rowe (eds.), *Khodorchur: Lost Paradise. Memories of a land and its people*. Monterey, CA: Mayreni Publishing, 555−572.
Weitenberg, Jos J. S.
  1993   The use of the classical Armenian subjunctive forms in the fifth century and in middle Armenian Grabar texts: Koriwn and Grigor Aknercʻi. In: Suren Simonian and Jos Weitenberg (eds.), *Computers in Armenian Philology*. Erevan: Armenian Academy Press, 72−100.
Zekiyan, Boghos Levon
  1997   Modern Armenian culture: some basic trends between continuity and change, specificity and universality. In: Nicholas Awde (ed.), *Armenian Perspectives. 10th Anniversary Conference of the Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes. School of Oriental and African Studies. London*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon, 323−354.
Zgusta, Ladislav
  1971   *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague: Mouton.

Ollie Sayeed and Bert Vaux, Cambridge (UK)