NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Nina Dobrushina

CONTACT-INDUCED USAGES OF VOLITIONAL MOODS IN EAST CAUCASIAN LANGUAGES

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: LINGUISTICS

WP BRP 42/LNG/2016

Nina Dobrushina[1]

CONTACT-INDUCED USAGES OF VOLITIONAL MOODS IN EAST CAUCASIAN LANGUAGES[2][3]

- Aims and Objectives/Purpose/Research Questions

The aim of this article is to test the hypothesis that the uses of volitional forms (e.g. optative, imperative, hortative and jussive) in subordinate clauses, in particular in complement clauses of the verbs of 'wish' and in purpose clauses, in East Caucasian languages evolves under the influence of Azerbaijanian (Turkic).

- Design/Methodology/Approach and Data and Analysis

The data of thirteen languages spoken in Daghestan and Azerbaijan are considered in the paper. To prove that shared features are contact-induced rather than co-inherited, two control languages are included in the sample: Archi, which belongs to the same genetic group as the languages which use volitionals in subordinate clauses (Lezgic), but is exposed to Azerbaijanian to a much lesser extent, and Axaxdərə Akhvakh, which belongs to another group, but whose contacts with Azerbaijani are strong due to recent migration.

- Findings/Conclusions

A survey shows that volitionals are used in subordinate clauses most extensively in those languages whose speakers show a high level of bilingualism in Azerbaijanian, and where the contact has been longer. I also show that there is a hierarchy of borrowability of subordinate constructions involving volitionals.

- Originality

Although the consequences of the influence of Turkic languages on the languages of the Caucasus in the domain of syntax have been previously discussed, the usage of volitionals in subordinate clauses was not.

- Significance/Implications

It is usually acknowledged that social factors play an important role in shaping the linguistic consequences of language contact. However, evidence of the correspondence between social factors and structural outcomes of language contact is still very scarce. The relevance of two social factors is shown in this paper: the ratio of bilingual speakers and the duration of contact.

- Limitations

The hierarchy of borrowability of the considered constructions remains essentially unexplained. I advance the hypothesis that connects the borrowability of particular constructions to their typological frequency, but the typology of subordinate uses of volitionals is well enough investigated to make final conclusions.

Keywords: language contact, bilingualism, syntactic borrowing, volitionals, imperative, optative, purpose clause, complement clause, East Caucasian languages, Turkic languages

JEL Classification: Z

---

[1] National Research University Higher School of Economics, School of Linguistics, ndobrushina@hse.ru

[2] The research leading to these results has received funding from the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics.

[3] The paper is submitted to the International Journal of Bilingualism.

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to verify whether a particular syntactic construction in East Caucasian languages is due to the influence of Azerbaijanian (Turkic), or, to put it in other words, to introduce a case of syntactic borrowing (pattern replication in terms of Matras & Sakel (2007, p. 15), structural copying in terms of Johanson, 2013).

Azerbaijanian and most other Turkic languages (if not all) widely use volitional forms (imperatives, hortative, jussives, and optatives) as the main predicate of subordinate clauses of certain types, in particular purpose clauses and complement clauses of verbs of 'wish':

(1) Azerbaijanian, Jussive in purpose clause (personal fieldnotes)

ana	*balas-ɨ*	*juxla-sɨn*	*dije*	*oxu-j-ur*
mother	child-III	sleep-JUSS	COMPL	sing-PRS-IIISG

'Mother sings to make us fall asleep', lit. 'Mother sings, saying let us be asleep'.

The usage of imperatives and optatives in purpose and complement clauses is an infrequent phenomenon, sporadically attested in different languages of the world (Aikhenvald, 2010, p. 240-241; Schmidtke-Bode, 2009, p. 42-49). Most East Caucasian languages don't have it, but some do. I propose that the pattern of using the volitional mood in subordinate clauses was transferred to East Caucasian languages from Azerbaijanian.

Turkic languages were highly influential in the Caucasus and Anatolia. Turkic languages were highly influential in the Caucasus and Anatolia. The structural consequences of this influence in the domain of syntax have often been discussed (Johanson, 2006; Haig, 2001; Harris & Campbell, 1995), but the usage of volitionals in subordinate clauses was not brought to the light of contact linguistics.

I will show that the phenomenon has different degrees of expansion in terms of which constructions are covered, and claim that there is a correlation between the degree of expansion and the circumstances of the language contact. It is usually acknowledged that "social factors play a significant, and in some cases a more important role than linguistic factors, in shaping the consequences of language contact" (Winford, 2013, p. 365), but the particular evidence of the correspondence between social factors and linguistic outcomes from contact is still very scarce. East Caucasian language communities, similar in a social and cultural perspective but different in terms of neighbor language inventories, provide a unique context that allows a comparison of different outcomes from similar contact situations. In this paper, I will show the relevance of two social factors: the ratio of bilingual speakers and the duration of contact.

To support my hypothesis, I consider the data of nine East Caucasian languages spoken in Daghestan, three East Caucasian languages spoken in Azerbaijan and one Turkic language spoken in Daghestan.

The structure of the article is as follows. Section 2 provides a preliminary discussion of Azerbaijanian - East Caucasian linguistic contact (2.1), justifies the choice of the languages in the sample (2.2), provides information on the contact situation for each of the languages (2.3), gives an overview of the imperative / optative forms in each language (2.4), argues that the subordinate usages of

imperatives / optatives is a structural feature of Turkic languages (2.5), and introduces the constructions which will be the diagnostic for the study (2.6). Languages which use volitional forms both in purpose clauses and in wish complement clauses are considered in Section 3, languages which have volitional forms only in purpose clauses are considered in Section 4, and Section 5 lists the languages which do not use volitional forms in subordinate clauses. Section 6 summarizes the discussion.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Contacts between East-Caucasian languages and Azerbaijanian

The Republic of Daghestan is a part of the North Caucasus. More than forty languages are spoken in a territory of 50 000 km2 (for an overview see Berg, 2005; Tuite, 1999; Hewitt 1981; Geiger, Halasi-Kun, Kuipers, and Menges 1959; Wixman 1980). On the South, it borders Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan was a part of the Soviet Union in the recent past, and the contacts between the speakers of East Caucasian languages and Azerbajanian were very intensive. Some Azerbaijanian-speaking villages are located in Daghestan; according to official counts, Azerbaijanians constitute 4% to 5% of the population of Daghestan[4]. There are also several communities which speak East Caucasian languages in Azerbaijan.

Bilingualism in Azerbaijanian was typical for the residents of South Daghestan. Ronald Wixman claims that "the Azeri language was known and used as a common second language (and often as first language) by the entire male population, not only of all the previously mentioned peoples of northern Azerbaijan and southern Daghestan, but also by many southern Avars, Laks, Dargins, Archi, and Mountain Jews as well" (Wixman, 1980, p. 111), echoed by Viacheslav Chirikba: "The peoples of South-Daghestan used Azerbaijanian for communication not only with Azerbaijanians, but also among themselves and with the speakers of Tat" (Chirikba, 2008, p. 73). With reference to Ibragimov (1991, p. 51), Chirikba suggests that the following languages of Daghestan are exposed to the influence of Azerbaijanian: Lezgi, north Tabassaran, Kryz, Budukh, Khinalug, South Avar, Rutul, Tsakhur, Udi (Chirikba, 2008, p. 70).

According to this preliminary information, we can expect that the languages of South Daghestan are more likely to be influenced by Azerbaijanian than the languages of other parts of Daghestan, and thus the construction under question should be present in Southern languages and lacking in other Daghestanian languages[5].

2.2. Overview of the languages

Several factors influenced the sampling of languages for this study.

First, I avoided using data from standard languages, such as standard Avar, Dargwa, or Lezgian. Though certain phenomena in standard languages may have developed under the influence of other languages, it could hardly be proven because standard language is not unambiguously associated with any particular area and

[4] Information from Russian Census 2010.

[5] Even more numerous are the Kumyk people, the speakers of another Turkic language, endemic in Daghestan – 15% of the population. Though the idioms which had intensive contact with the Kumyk were not considered in this paper, I expect that the effects of the Kumyk influence on East Caucasian languages should be very similar to those of Azerbaijani, since these two languages are linguistically very close (Daghestanian people who report themselves to speak one of them can usually speak and understand the other as well). The third Turkic language of Daghestan, Noghaj, is much less spread.

neighbourhood and is shielded from occasional changes by dictionaries and standard grammars. Therefore, the main source of information was the data from dialectal varieties which are spoken in villages.

Second, most languages which are exposed to the influence of Azerbaijanian belong to the same genetic group (Lezgic languages of East Caucasian family). It is therefore not easy to distinguish between the genetically inherited structural features and the features acquired through contact (cf. Dench, 2001, p. 113). The dialects of Aghul, Kryz, Lezgian, Tabasaran, Tsakhur, and Udi are both genetically closely related (they belong to the Lezgic group) and exposed to the influence of Azerbaijanian. It would be hard to tell whether these languages share certain structural features due to their genetic affinity or to contacts with Azerbaijanian. Hence it was important to include data from Lezgic languages which have less contact with Azerbaijanian. Similar methodology for determining contact phenomena was suggested by Mougeon, Nadasdi, and Rehner (2005, p. 103): "Ideally, the control varieties of language A should be genetically related to ensure that the systems in which the innovations are found are similar and hence comparable".

Archi, the Lezgic language which is located in central Daghestan and surrounded by Lak and Avar, has served this purpose. Archi is genetically related to the languages which are exposed to Azerbaijanian influence but had much less contact with Azerbaijanian than other Lezgic languages.

Third, following the idea to distinguish between the genetic and contact origins of the phenomenon, it would be more valuable to have data from an idiom which is in contact with Azerbaijanian but belongs to any genetic group except Lezgic. This idiom is Axaxdərə Akhvakh, an Avar-Andic language. The languages of this group are mostly located in the Western part of Daghestan, and thus are not exposed to the influence of Turkic languages. The Axaxdərə dialect of Akhvakh, on the contrary, is spoken in Azerbaijan (Creissels, 2009). There is no reliable information about the time when Akhvakh people migrated to Azerbaijan. Oral tradition suggests that the migration was progressive rather than timely, and started one century ago (p.c. with Denis Creissels). The last wave of migration was immediately after the Second World War. According to Creissels, this variety of Akhvakh is still very close to the dialect spoken in the Akhvakhskij region of Daghestan.

Therefore, Archi and Axaxdərə Akhvakh serve as diagnostic languages, which helps to distinguish between the contact and genetic origin of the phenomenon.

Another sampling factor was the availability of the required data. As mentioned, only dialectal varieties of languages were taken into account. The data were obtained by interviewing speakers, using electronic corpora and grammars, and consulting language experts[6].

[6] In this study I have used electronic corpora of Aghul (by Dmitry Ganenkov, Timur Maisak and Solmaz Merdanova) and Udi (by Dmitry Ganenkov, Yury Lander and Timur Maisak). It is my pleasure to thank all the linguists who helped me with language data: Alikram Gasanov (Maraga Azerbaijanian), Gilles Authier (Kryz), Denis Creissels (Akhvakh), Zaira Khalilova (Khwarshi and Bezhta), Timur Maisak (Udi), Solmaz Merdanova (Aghul), Bulbul Musaeva (Archi), Rasul Mutalov (Icari), Sabrina Shikhalieva (Tabassaran), and all my language consultants for their time and patience. I am also grateful to Irina Nevskaya for her help with Turkic languages, and two anonymous reviewers whose comments have improved the paper.

The resulting sample includes 13 languages, presented in Table 1.

family	***group***	***area, village***	***language***
East Caucasian	Avar-Andic	Azerbaijan, Axaxdərə	Akhvakh
		Western Daghestan, Kvanada	Bagvalal
	Tsezic	Western Daghestan, Bezhta	Bezhta
		Eastern Daghestan, Khwarshi	Khwarshi
	Lezgic	Southern Daghestan, Huppuq’	Aghul
		Central Daghestan, Archi	Archi
		Azerbaijan, Kryz	Kryz
		Southern Daghestan, Khiv	Tabassaran
		Southern Daghestan, Mishlesh	Tsakhur
		Azerbaijan, Nidzh	Udi
	Dargi	Central Daghestan, Icari	Icari
	Lak	Central Daghestan, Shalib	Lak
Turkic	Oguz	Southern Daghestan, Maraga	Azerbaijanian

Table 1. Languages of the sample.

2.3. Languages of the sample: an overview of contacts.

Since the main aim of the paper is to test the hypothesis that certain changes in the structure of East Caucasian languages resulted from an Azerbaijanian influence, it is essential to know whether the chosen dialects have contacts with Azerbaijanian.

This is not a yes-no question. There are many factors which differentiate the type of language contact and its possible consequences. Two of them are of special importance (Weinreich, 1979, p. 3–4; Trudgill, 1986; Ross, 1997, p. 233; Thomason, 2001, p. 66; Aikhenvald & Dixon, 2001, p. 13-15; Field, 2005):

- the intensity of contact, which primarily manifests itself in the number of people who speak the contact language (what was called the degree of ‘lingualism’ in Aikhenvald & Dixon, 2001);
- the duration of contact.

The intensity of contact between East Caucasian languages and Azerbaijanian varies significantly. For example, all speakers of Kryz are bilingual, children are more fluent in Azerbaijanian then in Kryz, and the language situation is on the verge of shifting to Azerbaijanian (Authier, 2009). The speakers of Tabassaran in the village Khiv also spoke Azerbaijanian, because the male residents of the village had seasonal jobs in oil production in Baku and Derbent. According to my information from field

research, about 35% of the population of Khiv born before 1919 could speak Azerbaijanian. The male speakers of Archi also communicated with Azerbaijanian people during their seasonal jobs in Azerbaijan but the contacts were infrequent and less regular because the distance from Archib to Azerbaijan is bigger. Among Archi people born before 1919 only 23% could speak some Azerbaijanian. Therefore, Kryz, Tabassaran and Archi all had contact with Azerbaijanian, but the intensity of the contact is different, and the influence of Azerbaijanian on the structure of these languages is also expected to be different.

The duration of contact also differs. Daghestan is switching from neighbor bilingualism in local Daghestanian languages to bilingualism in Russian as a lingua franca (as happened throughout the entire Soviet Union – Pavlenko, 2006). Daghestani people are losing a command of the languages of their neighbors and communicate with them in Russian. The language situation in Daghestan is constantly changing, at least during the last century. For example, communication with Azerbaijanians was more important for Aghuls at the beginning of the 20th century than at the end. Therefore, if we choose the contemporary language situation of Aghul village Huppuq' as the only starting point, we may come to the false conclusion that the level of bilingualism in Azerbaijanian in Huppuq' is very low.

The opposite case is that of Axaxdərə Akhvakh. Though all speakers of this idiom are now bilingual in Azerbaijanian, it is a recent occurrence. The Akhvakhs moved to Azerbaijan at the beginning of the 20th century and thus have been exposed to the influence of Azerbaijanian only for one hundred years (Creissels, 2009, p. 106), while the speakers of the Mishlesh variety of Tsakhur have been in contact with Azerbaijanian as long as it is possible to trace back.

Presently, there is no way to account for the situations of contact in sufficient detail, because only scarce information is available for most of the languages studied in this paper. For this reason, I adopted the following methodology. For those languages where I could contact the speakers personally, I asked them about the linguistic repertoire of their elder relatives (retrospective family interview method – for a discussion on the shortcomings of the method see Dobrushina, 2013). By doing this, I could address the language repertoire of the beginning of the 20th century, since 50-60 year old speakers are usually aware of the languages which were spoken by their grandparents.

Table 2 provides information about the languages which are in contact with the languages of my sample. The language was included in the table if there were grounds to assume that more than 50% of people (both male and female) spoke Azerbaijanian. The information in the table is based mainly on the opinions of languages experts and speakers, but I also used the information from Clifton (2005a,b; Kibrik, 1999; Kibrik 2001).

genetic group	language (village)	*other languages spoken by most villagers at the beginning of the 20th century*	*other languages spoken by most villagers at the beginning of the 21st century*
Lezgic	**Aghul** (Huppuq')	Lezgian, Azerbaijanian	Lezgian, Russian, Azerbaijanian
	Kryz (Kryz)	Azerbaijanian	Azerbaijanian
	Tabassaran (Khiv)	Lezgian, Azerbaijanian	Lezgian, Russian
	Tsakhur (Mishlesh)	Azerbaijanian	Azerbaijanian, Russian
	Udi (Nidzh)	Azerbaijanian, Russian	Azerbaijanian, Russian
	Archi (Archib)	Lak, Avar	Avar, Russian
Avar-Andic	**Akhvakh** (Axaxdərə)	Avar	Azerbaijanian
	Bagvalal (Kvanada)	Avar	Avar, Russian
Tsezic	**Bezhta** (Bezhta)	Avar, Georgian	Avar, Russian
	Khwarshi (Khwarshi)	Avar, Georgian	Avar, Russian
Dargwa	**Icari** (Icari)	local Dargwa dialects	Standard Dargwa, Russian
Lak	**Lak** (Shalib)	Avar	Russian
Turkic family	**Azerbaijanian** (Maraga)	standard Azerbaijanian	Russian, standard Azerbaijanian

Table 2. Languages of the sample: overview of contact situations.

2.4. Overview of volitional forms

Before proceeding to the constructions which are studied in this paper, I will clarify what I understand by volitional forms. Several attempts were made to define the main notions in the domain of volitional modality (Palmer, 2001; Ammann & van der Auwera, 2004; van der Auwera, Dobrushina & Goussev, 2004; König & Siemund, 2007; Timberlake, 2007; Nikolaeva, 2014). The terminology still varies significantly even in these typological works, not to mention local traditions describing particular languages. Below I list the verbal categories which are relevant for this paper, give their definitions and provide examples.

I focus on morphologically specialized forms of volitional moods. Many languages have various ways to express the 2nd person imperative, but it is less common to have dedicated morphology for the expression of an invitation to the

addressee to carry out an action together with the speaker (Hortative = 1st person plural imperative) or for the indirect command (Jussive = 3rd person imperative). Most Turkic languages use distinct morphological forms for each of these functions (Johanson, 2014; Nasilov, Isxakova, Safarov, and Nevskaya, 2001; Dobrushina, 2007a). East Caucasian languages, on the contrary, often have no dedicated form for 1st person plural and 3rd person imperatives, but have dedicated optatives. If volitional meanings are regularly expressed by means of other non-indicative moods (like subjunctive), I did not take them into consideration. Subjunctives are polysemous, and there is no easy way to understand which meaning of the form triggers its usage in subordinate clauses.

The following morphologically dedicated forms with volitional meaning were considered.

2nd person imperative is used to express the speaker's wish and his appeal to the addressee to carry out certain action. This form is usually available in the 2nd person only.

(2) Aghul, 2nd person imperative

sa	*meʃn i*	*q'-e*	*sara*	*čun*	*ʔuji=ra*
one	song	**do-IMP**	PTCL	you.PL	two(ERG)=ADD

'Please, you two, sing a song'.

Hortative expresses the speaker's wish and his appeal to the addressee to carry out an action together. This form is usually available in the 1st person plural only. This category is also called *cohortative* (Ammann, van der Auwera, 2004), *1st person plural imperative* (Xrakovskij, 2001), and *inclusive imperative* (Dobrushina, Goussev, 2005).

(3) Udi, Hortative

uk-sun	*čur-un-sa,*	*za-χun*	***taʁ-en***
eat-MSD	want-IISG-LV+PRS	I-ABL	**go-HORT**

'If you want to eat – let's come with me'.

Jussive expresses the speaker's wish and his appeal to the 3rd person to carry out an action; Jussive is usually available in the 3rd person only, though it is directed towards the addressee who is supposed to be a mediator between the speaker and the 3rd person (for a discussion on the forms and meanings of Daghestanian Jussive see Dobrushina, 2012). This category is also referred to as *Exhortative* (Ammann, van der Auwera, 2004), and *3rd person Imperative* (Xrakovskij, 2001).

(4) Tsakhur, Jussive

zaʔatexnik'-ē=d	*či-s*	*āʔid-ɨn*	*ǯawab*
zootechnician-ERG=ADD.4	self.4-DAT	deserving-ATTR	answer

qil-e-ǯe

4.give-IMP-JUSS
‘Let the zootechnician answer this in a proper way.’ (Kibrik, 1999, 833)

Optative is a category which is rarely expressed by a specialised morphological form in European languages. It is very widespread in the languages of the Caucasus (see Dobrushina, 2011). The main function of the Optative is to express the wish of the speaker; the crucial difference from the Imperative is that the speaker does not attempt to cause any particular person to carry out the action. In the languages of Daghestan, the Optative is used to bless or curse the addressee, the 3rd person or the speaker himself. It is commonly available in 1/2/3 persons. The functions of ***Jussive*** and ***Optative*** are often combined in the same form. In the languages of Daghestan, the typical pattern is that the form expresses blessings and curses in 1/2/3 persons, and is also used to express indirect commands in the 3rd person. In this case, I refer to this form as Optative.

(5) Aghul, Optative (in the meaning of 2nd person curse)

waʔ,	*cʼa-f-tːawa,*	*wun*	*bagʷ*	***xu-raj,***	***čurqu-raj***
no	give.IPF-S-COP.NEG	you	Side	**become.PF-OPT**	**burst.PF-OPT**

‘No, I won’t give it, go to hell!’ (lit. let your side burst open)

(6) Aghul, Optative (in the meaning of 3rd person command)

Mi	*ʁa-a,*	*alajš*	*xä-s,*	***alajši-raj***
DEM.ERG	say.IPF-PRS	visit.IMP	we.INCL-DAT	**visit.PF-OPT**

‘She says, (tell her to) pay us a visit, let her pay us a visit’.

2.5. Subordinate usage of volitional forms in Turkic languages

Most Turkic languages have a full paradigm of imperative forms (Johanson, 2014; Nasilov, Isxakova, Safarov & Nevskaya, 2001). This is a clear genetic feature of Turkic languages since it is common to languages which had no areal contacts between them during the last 6-7 centuries at least, like Khakas (Northern Turkic, spoken in Siberia), Mishar Tatar (Eastern Turkic, spoken in Tatarstan) or Azerbaijanian (Southern Turkic, spoken in South Caucasus). These forms are not only used to express commands (2nd person imperative), invitations to a common action (Hortative) and indirect commands (Jussive), but are also widely used in subordinate clauses. While the usual subordination technique in Turkic languages involves non-finite verbal forms (Johanson 2013), most Turkic languages can also embed subordinate clauses with a marker which derives from the verb ‘to say’ and volitional forms (Pakendorf & Matić, 2013, p. 376, Khanina 2007).

Below I give examples from Khakas (Northern Turkic, spoken in Siberia) to show that the phenomenon is typical for Turkic languages irrespective of their geographical localization. Khakas has morphologically distinct imperative forms for 1/2/3 persons.

1sg	*al-ɨm*	‘let me take’	1pl	*al-aŋ*	‘let us take!’
2sg	*al*	‘take!’	2pl	*al-ɨŋar*	‘take (you-pl)!’
3sg	*al-zɨn*	‘let him take’	3pl	*al-zɨnnar*	‘let them take!

These forms can be used in purpose clauses and in complement clauses of verbs of wish. The following examples were collected by the author:

(7) Khakas, 1st person singular Imperative in purpose clause

iže-m	*ta:bra x*	***uz-im***	*tip*	*knig a*	*xɨr-še*
mother-ISG	quickly	**fall.asleep-IMP.ISG**	COMPL	book	read-PRS

'Mom reads to (help herself to) fall asleep quickly.'

(8) Khakas, Jussive in purpose clause

iže-m	*sini*	*ta:brax*	***uzu-zun***	*tip*	*kniga*	*xɨr-še*
mother-ISG	you.ACC	quickly	**fall.asleep-JUSS**	COMPL	book	read-PRS

'Mom reads to make you fall asleep quickly.'

(9) Khakas, Jussive in wish complement clause

(a) *ajdo*	*ipši-zin*	*to:gɨ s*	*ta:p*	***al-zɨn***	*tip*	*sagɨn-še*
Ajdo	wife-IIISG.ACC	job	find.CVB	**take-JUSS**	COMPL	want-PRS

'Ajdo wants his wife to find a job'

(b) *aba-m*	*Ajdo-nɨ*	*ib-zer*	***ajlan-zɨn***	*tip*	*sur-dɨr-še*
father-ISG	Ajdo-ACC	house-DIR	**come.back-JUSS**	COMPL	ask-CAUS-PRS

'Father demands that Ajdo comes home.'

To the best of my knowledge, imperatives are also used in purpose and complement clauses in Turkish, Tatar, Balkar, Altaj and many other languages of the Turkic family (Dyrenkova, 1941, p. 171; Baskakov, 1952, p. 450; Pokrovskaya, 1964, p. 206; Musaev, 1964, p. 288; Agazade, 1967, p. 164; Dobrushina, 2007b, p. 281)

Some Turkic languages have morphological optatives apart from imperatives. Turkic optatives tend to be used in subordinate clauses just as imperatives. For instance, Balkar (Western Turkic) has a morphologically distinct Optative which expresses the wish of the speaker (examples are collected by the author).

(10) Balkar Optative (3rd person reference)

ders	*terk-iraq*	***bošal-ʁa***	***e-d-i***
lesson	soon-CMPR	**finish-OPT**	**AUX-PST-3**

'I wish this lesson was over soon!'

(11) Balkar Optative (3rd person reference)

zaš ***tap-xɨ*** ***e-d-iŋ***

boy **get-OPT** **AUX-PST-IISG**
'I wish you had a boy!'

This form also occurs in purpose clauses:

(12) Balkar Optative in purpose clauses

(a) *me-n* ***zuqla-ʁi*** ***e-d-im*** *dep* *oqu-j-ma*
I sleep-OPT **AUX-PST-ISG** COMPL read-PRS-ISG
'I am reading to (help myself to) fall asleep'

(b) *me-n* *säbi* ***zuqla-ʁi*** ***e-d-i*** *dep* *oqu-j-ma*
I child **sleep-OPT** **AUX-PST-III** COMPL read-PRS-ISG
'I am reading to make the child fall asleep'

(c) *me-n* ***aša-ʁi*** ***e-d-im*** *dep* *kak* *et-e-me*
I **eat-OPT** **AUX-PST-ISG** COMPL porridge make-PRS-ISG
'I am cooking porridge to eat (it)'.

Therefore, the usage of imperatives and optatives in subordinate clauses is likely to be a genetic feature of Turkic languages, irrespective of their geographical localization. On the contrary, in East Caucasian languages this phenomenon occurs only sporadically. As I will show in this paper, it is reported in those East Caucasian languages that are in close contact with Azerbaijanian.

2.6. Establishing contact-induced phenomenon: diagnostic constructions and procedure of analysis

The following types of subordinate constructions were chosen as a diagnostic to establish the presence of Turkic influence: same-subject and different-subject purpose clauses, and same-subject and different-subject wish complement clauses. Cf. English:

a) Same-subject purpose clause: *The mother is reading in order (to help herself) to fall asleep*.
b) Different-subject purpose clause: *The mother is reading in order to help the child to fall asleep*.
c) Same-subject wish-complement: *I want to stay in the village*.
d) Different-subject wish-complement: *My father wants me to stay in the village*.

Apart from these four constructions, imperatives and optatives can be used in the complement clauses of manipulation verbs (*to ask, to request, to order*) (Ex. (1) and (2) in Appendix 10). However, these constructions were not considered in this paper since East Caucasian languages have no straightforward criteria for distinguishing

direct and indirect speech and it is often impossible to classify specific contexts as subordinate imperatives or reported imperative utterances (Ex. (3) in Appendix 1).

I propose that those East Caucasian languages which are not exposed to the influence of Azerbaijanian do not use forms of volitional moods in any of the diagnostic constructions.

In the next section, I will give a brief overview of imperative / optative forms for each language of the sample in respect of their uses in purpose and wish-complement clauses.

3. Languages which use volitional forms both in purpose clauses and in wish-complement clauses.

Only two languages from the sample were attested to use volitional forms in all diagnostic contexts: Azerbaijanian and Kryz.

3.1. Azerbaijanian

In this paper, the data of the Azerbaijanian variety spoken in the village Maraga (Tabasaranskij rajon) is considered. The village is surrounded by Tabassaran-settlements, but, according to Ajaz Abdulzhelilov (an expert who comes from Maraga), most villagers do not speak Tabassaran.

The Maraga dialect of Azerbaijanian has a full set of imperative forms, as is typical for the Turkic languages.

1SG	*git-im*	‘let me go!’	1PL	*git-ek*	‘let us go!’
2SG	*git*	‘go!’	2PL	*git-ün / git-üz*	‘go!’ (you-PL)
3SG/PL		*git-sün*	‘let him / her/ them go!’		

Imperative forms are used in the different-subject purpose clauses and different-subject wish-complement clauses (I have no information about same-subject clauses). The subordinate predicate comes with a complementizer *dije* which originates from the converb of the verb ‘to say’. The form of imperative depends on the person of the subject of the subordinate clause.

(13) Maraga Azerbaijanian, imperatives in different subject purpose clauses (personal fieldnotes)

(a) *ana-m* ***juxla-jum*** *dije* *oxu-j-ur*
mother **sleep-IMP.ISG** COMPL sing-PRS-IIISG
‘Mother sings to make me fall asleep’.

(b) *ana* *balas-ɨ* ***juxla-sun*** *dije* *oxu-j-ur*
mother child-III **sleep-JUSS** COMPL sing-PRS-IIISG
‘Mother sings to make the baby fall asleep’.

Imperatives are also used in the complements of the verbs of wish.

(14) Maraga Azerbaijanian, imperatives in different subject wish complement clauses (personal fieldnotes)

(a) *ana-m* *mən* ***juxla-jum*** *dije* *iste-jedu*
mother-ISG I **sleep-IMP.ISG** COMPL sing-PRS.IIISG
'Mother sings to make the baby fall asleep'.

(b) *ana* *balas-ɨ* ***juxla-sun*** *dije* *iste-jedu*
mother child-III **sleep-JUSS** COMPL sing-PRS.IIISG
'Mother sings to make the baby fall asleep'.

3.2. Kryz

Kryz belongs to the Lezgic group of the East Caucasian family. Kryz villages are located in Azerbaijan, and the level of Azerbaijanian influence on Kryz is very high (Authier, 2009; Authier, 2010). All speakers of Kryz are bilingual in Azerbaijanian; moreover, the younger generation often does not speak Kryz at all.

3.2.1. Volitional forms in Kryz

Kryz has a set of volitional forms specific for different persons (Authier, 2009).

(15) Kryz, 2nd person imperative

q'irša-k *ča-b-ha* *buluš a* ***sa-b-zin (ay) !***
mud-SUB PV-F-stain.PF(PART) dress **PV-F-wash.IMP(A.GEN.HPL)**
'Wash the dress stained with mud.' (Authier, 2009, p. 149)

Hortative (referred to as "exhortative" in Authier, 2009) is used to invite the addressee to carry out certain action together with the speaker.

(16) Kryz, Hortative

q'u-ndu-r *an* *ya* *ğil.i-ğar* ***ya-da-ha-day !***
two-H-ERG ADD IPL.INCL.GEN leg-SUPEL **PV-NEG-take.off-HORT2**
'Let us not take our shoes off, both of us.' (Authier, 2009, p. 275)

There is another Hortative form which is used with reference to the 1st person singular and 1st person plural exclusive and conveys the intention to perform an action.

(17) Kryz, Hortative

zin / jin *sulaxay-a* *rix-iz* ***yi-xh-dam / yi-p-dam !***
ISG / IPL.EXCL left-ATTR road-DAT **PV-go-HORT1 / PV-HPL.go-HORT1**
'I/we will take the left road.' (Authier, 2009, p. 274)

Jussive ("votive" in terms of Authier) is used to express an indirect command (this form is also sometimes referred to as 3rd person imperative).

(18) Kryz, Jussive

va *i-nkan-i* *pul* ***tu-ğa-tir !***
IISG.GEN PV-IPF.remain-PART money **PV-carry-JUSS**
'Make/let him bring back the rest of your money.' (Authier, 2009, p. 274)

Kryz also has an optative, which is available in all persons and is used to express blessings and curses, on the one hand, and indirect commands, on the other.

(19) Kryz, 1st person Optative

rix *ya-r-t'-i-n-kar* ***iši*** *zin !*
road.F PV-IPF-cut-PART-H-SUBEL **be.OPT** 1
'I will be a burglar (call me a burglar) (if I ever put my hands on the sheep!)'
(Authier, 2009, p. 274)

(20) Kryz, 2nd person Optative

vun *ya-har-a* *xhi-ci* ***q'ay-i !***
2SG PV-flay-AG be-SEQ **die-OPT**
'I wish they flay you alive!' (Authier, 2009, p. 274)

(21) Kryz, 3rd person Optative

ya *girt-anda* *icin-a* *xayirl u* *yiğ-ri* ***ğ-t-i !***
2PL.GEN all-HPL.GEN face-IN blessed day-PL **PV-N.emerge-OPT**
'Let all the days end (lit. dawn) just as favorable to you all!' (Authier, 2009, p. 273)

According to Authier, the optative is semantically very close to the Jussive ("votive"); the main difference is that the Jussive is not used to express blessings and curses. The function common for Jussive and Optative is indirect command:

(22) Kryz, Jussive and Optative

y-u-ghun, *sas* *ar,* ***ʕa-b-xhir-i*** *uca,*
PV-F-go.IMP voice do.IMP **PV-HPL-come-OPT** here

ts'e ***ʕa-ğva-tir !***
ʕ

goat **PV-bring.F-JUSS**
'Go and call them, let them come here, and let them bring the goat.' (Authier, 2009, p. 273)

Kryz volitional forms are given in Table 3.

Imperative	Hortative 1	Hortative 2	Jussive	Optative
yiqr-ay 'grasp!'	*yiqir-dam* 'let me / us. excl. grasp'	*yiqir-day* 'let us grasp'	*yiqir-tir* 'let him grasp'	*yíqr-i* 'may he grasp'

Table 3. Volitional forms of the verb 'to grasp' (Kryz).

3.2.2. Kryz Volitional forms in subordinate clauses

Kryz 2nd person imperative is not reported to be used in purpose clauses. The most frequent forms in purpose clauses are Hortatives and Optatives. They are introduced by the conjunction *ki*. The conjunction *ki* is likely to be borrowed from Azerbaijanian (originally it comes from Persian and has spread among many languages of Anatolia and the Caucasus, see Johanson, 1998; Haig, 2001).

(23) Kryz, Hortative in purpose clauses: same subject, 1st person

dah *ha-b-gun-cib-jin* *ki* *jina-ğ*
quick PV-HPL-run-AOR.HPL-IPL.EXCL COMPL 1PL.EXCL.self-SUPER

halava ***ği-xha-dam***
r
clothes **PV-dress-HORT1**
'We ran fast to put our clothes on.' (Authier, 2009, p. 299)

(24) Kryz, Optative in purpose clause: different subject, 3rd person

t'ut'- *hu-rt-re* *ki* *furi* *Rahat* ***a-xr-i***
ri
fly-PL PV-chase-PRS COMPL man Calm **PV-sleep-OPT**
'He chases away the flies so that the man sleeps calmly.' (Authier, 2009, p. 300)

There are also examples of the Jussive used in purpose clause. This construction is called a "Turkic pattern" by Authier[7], since the subordinate predicate is combined with a converb of the verb "to say' (cf. Azerbaijanian complementizer *dije* in the Section 3.1).

(25) Kryz, Jussive in purpose clause

[7] "Sur le modèle de la tournure azérie avec diye 'en disant', on peut avoir une cause à un mode fini suivi du séquentiel de 'dire'" – Authier, 2009, p. 335.

ç'aba ***da-b-xha-tir*** *li-p-ci* *u-cbar* *ğa-b-xhir-cib*
wet **NEG-HPL-be-JUSS** PV-say-SEQ III-HPL PV-HPL-come-AOR.HPL
'Not to get wet, they came back inside.' (Authier, 2009, p. 336)

The Optative is also used in different-subject wish complement clauses introduced by the conjunction *ki*.

(26) Kryz, Optative in different wish complement clause

umay-iz *i-ka-c* *ki* *gada-r* *riş* ***ğva-yn-i***
mother-DAT PV-want-AOR.N COMPL boy-ERG girl **PV.F-take-OPT**
'Mother wants the boy to marry the girl.' (Authier, 2009, p. 304)

Same-subject clauses usually have infinitives, but Optative and Hortative with the conjunction *ki* occur as well:

(27) Kryz, Optative and Hortative in different wish complement clause

(a) *za* *şidr-iz* *i-ka-de-d* *ki* *ø*
1SG.GEN sister-DAT PV-want-NEG.PFCT-N COMPL ø(ABS)
lu *fura-z* ***yi-p-i***
this man-DAT **PV-F.go-OPT**
'My sister doesn't want to marry this man.' (Authier, 2009, p. 303)

(b) *za-s* *i-ka-ca* *ki* *Ø* *cur-a* *kum-a* ***yi-xh-dam***
I-DAT PV-want-PFT COMPL Ø(ABS) other-ATTR village-IN **PV-go-HORT1**
'I want to go away to some other village.' (Authier, 2009, p. 303)

Kryz is the only East Caucasian language in our sample which uses volitional forms in all types of subordinate clauses which were taken as diagnostic.

3.3. Azerbaijanian and Kryz: summary

Table 4 represents the usage of Azerbaijanian and Kryz volitional forms in subordinate clauses.

	volitional forms	*different subject wish-complements*	*same subject wish-complements*	*different subject purpose clause*	*same subject purpose clause*	*complementizer*
Maraga Azerbaijanian	Imperative	?	?	?	?	*dije* (< say.CVB)
	Hortative	+	?	+	?	*dije* (< say.CVB)
	Jussive	+	?	+	?	*dije* (< say.CVB)
Kryz	Hortative		+		+	*ki*

	Jussive				+	*li-p-ci* PV-say-SEQ
	Optative	+	+	+		*ki*
	Jussive			+	+	*ki*

Table 4. Azerbaijanian and Kryz volitional forms in subordinate clauses

4. Languages which use volitional forms in purpose clauses.

Akhvakh, Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur and Udi use forms of volitional moods in purpose clauses, but don't use them in wish-complement clauses.

4.1. Volitional forms in Akhvakh, Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur and Udi.

The forms of volitional moods in Akhvakh, Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur, and Udi are presented in Table 5. The empty cell in the table does not mean that the language has no means of expressing the category; in most cases, it signifies that the category is not expressed by a dedicated form. For example, Tsakhur uses Potential mood to expresses Hortative meaning (e.g. Dobrushina, 1999, p. 285), and the Potential is widely used in purpose clauses. These constructions however were not considered in this paper since it is hard to tell whether the subordinate usage is motivated by its hortative or potential meanings.

The functional difference between Optative and Jussive was discussed in Section 2.4. To put it briefly, the Optative is available in all persons and numbers, while the Jussive is compatible with 3rd person participants only. As one can conclude from this table, most languages combine Optative and Jussive meanings in one morphological form. The exception is Tsakhur which has two distinct forms for Optative and Jussive.

	Imperative (available in 2nd person)	*Hortative (available in 1st person plural)*	*Jussive (available in 3rd person only)*	*Optative (available in 1/2/3 persons)*
Akhvakh	*ƛ'ib-a* dance-IMP 'dance!'			*ƛ'ib-aƛ'a* dance.IMP-OPT 'let him dance'
Aghul	*q'-e* do-IMP 'do!'			*q'u-raj* do.PF-OPT 'let him do'
Tabassaran	*urž* bake.IMP 'bake!'		*urž-ri* bake-JUSS 'let her bake'	
Tsakhur	*qil-e* 4.give-IMP 'give!'		*qil-e-ǯe* 4.give-IMP-JUSS 'let him give'	*ix-e-na* become-IMP-OPT 'may he become'
Udi	*bak-a* be-IMP 'be!'	*bak-en* be-HORT 'let's be!'	*bak-e-qːa-n* be-PF-JUSS-3SG 'let him be'	

Table 5. Dedicated volitional forms in Akhvakh, Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur and Udi.

4.2. Volitional forms of Akhvakh, Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur and Udi in purpose-clauses.

All these languages use volitional forms in purpose clauses.

Optative purpose clauses are one of the most frequently occurring types of purpose clauses in Aghul. The Optative is used both in different-subject and same-subject clauses. It can be combined with the subordinator *puna* which originates from the perfective converb of the verb 'to say'.

(28) **Aghul**, same-subject purpose clause

wert:elüta-as *darman=na* *fatta-ji* *hage*
helicopter-(IN)EL medicine=ADD APUD.EL.let.IPF-PST DEM

čin=na a-j, ilan-ar **k'i-raj** pu-na,
we.EXCL=ADD IN.be-CVB snake-PL **kill.PF-OPT** say.PF-CVB

ǯil-ari-ʔ *a-je* *neχčir* ***k'i-raj*** *pu-na*
earth-PL-IN IN.be-PART animal **kill.PF-OPT** say.PF-CVB

'And they were throwing poison down from helicopters, when we were there **to extinguish snakes**, **to extinguish parasites** (lit. animals) in those places.'

(29) **Aghul**, different-subject purpose clause

čaraw ***d-ušu-raj*** *pu-na,* *mal* ***d-ušu-raj***
a
ram **NEG-go.PF-OPT** say.PF-CVB cow **NEG-go.PF-OPT**

pu-na *fi* *q'a-je-f-e,* *gümbet* *aq'a-je-f-e*
say.PF-CVB what do.IPF-PART-S-COP tombstone do.IPF-PART-S-COP

če-t:-ari, *setk:a* *jarha-je-f-e* *če-t:-ari*
our.EXCL-S-PL.ERG netting beat.IPF-PART-A-COP our.EXCL-S-PL.ERG

'For the sheep not to enter, for the cattle not to enter, our people do that, they build a monument and surround it with a net.'

There are no reliable examples with the 2nd person imperative in purpose clauses in Aghul.

Udi Jussive clitic is widely used in purpose clauses. In these constructions, Jussive is usually combined with loan subordinator *ki* (ex. (31)), or, more rarely, *pi* (ex. (32)). The latter can be traced back to the perfective converb of the verb 'to say'.

(30) **Udi**, Jussive in a same-subject purpose clause

χašil χašil p-sun ta=ne=sa=ki
hashil hashil say-MSD go=3SG=PRS=COMP

iz ejeχun ***ma=q:a=n*** *č:er-i*
self.GE memory.ABL **PRH=JUSS=3SG** go_out-AOR
N

'He walks and keeps saying "khashil", "khashil" (the name of a dish), **in order not to forget**.'

(31) **Udi**, Jussive in a different-subject purpose clause

ko-t:-o görä=l Šo q:ejra z t:oraj-in
DEM-NO-DAT according=ADD DEM+NA other bag-GEN

boš he-t:-u ***ma=q:a=n*** ***k:ac:-ec-i*** *pi,*
inside what-NO-DAT **PRH=JUSS=3SG** **dice-LV-AOR** COMPL

t:änk:it all=jan=st:a :
basket wicker=1PL=LV+PRS

'So, **in order for it not to get creased** in some kind of bag, we weave a "tankit" (a sort of basket).'

An example of purposive use of the Hortative is attested in Udi corpus. However, since it has no subordinator, the construction can be as well interpreted as a juxtaposition of two independent clauses: *Call our daughter-in-law. Let us see her.*

(32) **Udi**, Hortative in the different-subject purpose clause

be bin-a k:al-p-a=nan, jan=al ***ak:-en š***
our daughter.in.law-DAT call-LV-IMP=2PL we=ADD **see-HORT**

'Call our daughter-in-law, so that we can see her.'

Tsakhur also has Jussive purpose clauses. Purpose clauses are introduced by a complementizer *wɨ*, which functions as a quotative particle (e.g. Kalinina & Chumakina, 1999, p. 548). When used in adverbial clauses, it can be interpreted as conveying causal or purposive meaning. As Kalinina and Chumakina indicate, Jussive purpose clauses can only be different-subject: "The semantics of the form suggests that the central participant of the main clause is not co-referent to the main participant of the subordinate clause". This claim about the connection between the semantics of Jussive and its restriction to different-subject purpose clauses is however not

supported by the data of other languages (see examples (36) and (35) from Tabassaran below).

(33) **Tsakhur** (Kalinina, Chumakina, 1999, 549)

haˤmmaše	aliƙ̄-aʔ-as	ɨƙ̄an	čura
always	4.mix-4.do-POT	4.need.IPF	meat.4

g<im>ojxan-ǯe-wɨ
<PRH>burn-JUSS-COMPL
'One has to stir the meat all the time for it not to burn (to ashes)'.

Jussive purpose clauses in Tabassaran are also accompanied by a complementizer *k'uri* which is based on the converb of the verb 'to say'.

(34) **Tabassaran**, different-subject purpose clause (personal fieldnotes)

dadaji	*maʔli*	*ap'ura,*	*baj*	***ax-ri***	*k'uri*
mother	song	do	boy	**sleep-JUSS**	saying

'Mother sings a song to make the boy fall asleep.'

(35) **Tabassaran**, same-subject purpose clause (personal fieldnotes)

dadaji	*uč*	***ax-ri***	*k'uri*	*Kitab*	*urxura*
mother	self	**sleep-JUSS**	saying	Book	read

'Mother reads to (help herself to) fall asleep.'

According to Denis Creissels, Akhvakh purpose clauses almost exclusively have infinitive predicates. However, the Optative is also found, though this pattern is rather rare:

(36) **Akhvakh** (Denis Creissels, p.c.)

(a)	*b-eλ-a*	*ha-be*	*di-ge*	*taχi-ge*	***ĩk'aλ-aƛ'a***
	N-let-IMP	DEM-N	1SG.OBL-ESS	pocket-ESS	**grow.up-OPT**

qe,	*čili*	*r-ižw-ide,*	*b-oƛ-ide*	*q'oq'odiro,*
then	tooth.PL	NPL-grow-IPFV.NPL	N-become-IPFV.N	saw

qe	*o-x-uwa*	*du-λaje*
then	N-give-POT.N	2SG.OBL-AFF

'Leave it (the knife) in my pocket so that it may grow up, its teeth will grow, it will become a saw, then I will give it to you'.

(b *č'ib-e qedo miƛ'aradi-le- eƛ'-iri, ušt q'alda ĩk'aλ-a*

) , *ga* *i*
sow-CVBN after seed.PL-ONPL-LAT tell-IRR 2PL quickly grow-IMP

de-ne *ĩč'ila* *haga* *w-oq'-eλi* *di-λa* *ʕeče* ***harigw-aƛ'a***
1SG-ABS again here.LAT M-come-POST 1SG.OBL-AFF apple **see-OPT**
'After sowing he told the seeds: "Grow quickly, so that when I come again I can see apples!"

4.3. Volitional forms of Akhvakh, Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur and Udi in purpose-clauses: summary

The survey of the five languages where volitional forms are attested in purpose clauses gives grounds to the following observations.

Optatives and / or Jussives are used in purpose clauses in all these languages, Hortative is used only in Udi.

The languages differ as to which (co)reference constraints are typical for the purpose clauses with a volitional form. The grammar of Tsakhur indicates that Jussive purpose clauses can be different-subject only. All other languages have no restrictions on participants coreference in Jussive / Optative purpose clause. Not enough is known about the purpose usage of Aghul Imperative and Udi Hortative. In all examples that are available there is no coreference.

In most instances of Optative / Jussive purpose clauses the subordinate clause is introduced by a complementizer. The complementizer often originates from the converb of a speech verb (Aghul *puna*, Udi *pi*, Tabassaran *k'uri*) thus resembling Azerbaijanian complementizer *dije*. The usage of the complementizer of this type can also be due to the Turkic influence. In Udi, even more frequent is the Azerbaijanian subordinator *ki* (cf. the usage of *ki* in Kryz – 3.2.2). Tsakhur introduces the purposive Jussive by a quotative particle *wɨ* which is widely used in complement clauses.

I have no data on whether the usage of a complementizer in purpose clauses is obligatory or not. The syntactic function of these complementizers is not always clear either. While Kryz and Udi conjunction *ki* is clearly subordinative, and Tsakhur *wɨ* is also argued to mark subordination (Lutikova, Bonch-Osmolovskaja, 1999, p. 487), it is less obvious with Aghul *puna*, Udi *pi* and Tabassaran *k'uri.* These three forms are commonly used as converbs of the verb *say*. For example, when being used as a finite, Udi *pi* has the personal ending *-ne* (e.g. Maisak, 2008, p. 113). Cf. examples (38) and (38):

(37) Udi

(a) *p-i* *čːer-i* *ta=ne=sa*
say-AOR go_out-AOR go=3SG=PRS
'Having said (this), he leaves.'

(b) *agronom-en* *mo-tːo-* *ak-i* ***p-i=ne***
agronomist PROX-NO-DAT see-AOR **say-AOR=3SG**

‘The agronomist who saw that said…’

Thus, Aghul, Udi and Tabassaran Optative / Jussive purpose clauses are introduced by connectors which are also used as the forms of the verb ‘to say’ - *puna*, *pi* and *k’uri* respectively. For this reason, these cases can be considered as an earlier stage of the grammaticalisation process than the case of Kryz and Udi purpose clauses with *ki* and Tsakhur with the quotative marker *wɨ*, which both have no functions except those of connectors.

The only language which does not use any complementizer-like marker with purposive Jussive is Akhvakh.

Purpose clause patterns in these five languages are given in Table 6.

	volitional forms used in purpose clauses	*different subject purpose clause*	*same subject purpose clause*	*complementizer*
Aghul	Optative	+	+	*pu-na* (say.PF-CVB)
Udi	Jussive	+	+	*ki* *p-i* (say.PF-CVB)
	Hortative	+	?	-
Tsakhur	Jussive	+	-	*wɨ* (quotative particle)
Tabassaran	Jussive	+	+	*k’uri* (say.CVB)
Akhvakh	Optative	+	?	-

Table 6. Volitional forms of Akhvakh, Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur and Udi used in purpose-clauses

5. East Caucasian languages which do not use imperative / optative forms in subordinate clauses

Six languages from our sample do not use imperative / optative forms in any subordinate clauses (Dobrushina, 1999; Dobrushina, 2001; Mutalov, 2002; Sumbatova, Mutalov, 2003; Khalilova 2009). Dedicated volitional forms which were checked for their ability to be used in subordinate clauses are presented in Appendix 2.

6. Discussion and conclusions

The hypothesis that Imperative – Optative usages in subordinate clauses are induced by contacts with Azerbaijanian was verified by the data from twelve East

Caucasian languages and one Turkic language spoken in Daghestan. Based on four diagnostic constructions, the languages have been classified into three types.

Two languages from the sample, Maraga Azerbaijanian and Kryz, use volitional forms in both purpose clauses and wish-complement clauses. According to Authier, the Optative and other forms of volitional moods are the main means of forming purpose clauses and wish-complement clauses in Kryz.

The languages of the second group (Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur, Udi, and Axaxdərə Akhvakh) use volitional forms only in purpose clauses. However, the extent to which such constructions are typical for these languages varies. Volitional forms in purpose clauses are highly typical for Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur, and Udi, but they are reported to be infrequent in Axaxdərə Akhvakh. There is another important fact which puts Akhvakh aside: Akhvakh Optative purpose clauses have no complementizer of any kind, being juxtaposed to the main clause.

The rest of the languages (Bagvalal, Bezhta, Khwarshi, Archi, Icari, and Lak) do not use Imperative – Optative forms in any kind of subordinate clauses.

This grouping of languages correlates with the background of contact with Azerbaijanian.

The Kryz-speaking village is located in Azerbaijan, and Kryz is exposed to the influence of Azerbaijanian as far back as can be traced. All Kryz speaking people are bilingual, and the situation is on the verge of shifting to Azerbaijanian. It is not surprising that the patterns observed in Kryz show the highest degree of structural similarity with Azerbaijanian.

Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur, and Udi speakers are also bilingual in Azerbaijanian, but the level of bilingualism in terms of the number of bilingual speakers is lower. The features shared by these languages could also have been explained by their genetic affinity, since all these languages belong to the Lezgic group of East Caucasian. There are, however, two pieces of evidence against the genetic origin of this feature.

First is another Lezgic language, Archi, which is located in Central Daghestan and has no contact with Lezgic languages. The Archi people had a very low level of contact with Azerbaijan (about 20% of the population born before 1919 had some command of Azerbaijanian), and Archi does not use volitional forms in subordinate clauses. Nevertheless, the case of Archi cannot serve as definitive proof of the contact origin of the phenomenon, because the absence of the phenomenon can be due to many various factors (for example, the contact with other languages which could have influenced Archi).

Axaxdərə Akhvakh is another argument for the contact origin of the phenomenon. Akhvakh belongs to the Avar-Andic group. Other representatives of the group (Bagvalal in my sample) are spoken in Central Daghestan. Axaxdərə Akhvakh is spoken by people who moved to Azerbaijan at the beginning of the 20th century. They have been exposed to the influence of Azerbaijanian only for about one hundred years, and the language, according to Creissels (p.c.), does not display traces of vast Azerbaijanian influence. My research shows that there are several examples of the "Azerbaijanian type" subordinate constructions in Axaxdərə variety of Akhvakh.

Seven languages, representing five different genetic groups of the East Caucasian family, do not use volitional forms in subordinate clauses (Bagvalal, Bezhta, Khwarshi, Icari, Archi, and Lak). All these languages either had no or scarce contact with Azerbaijanian.

Therefore, it is quite unlikely that the usage of volitional forms in purpose and wish-complement clauses in Lezgic languages and Akhvakh is a structural feature inherited from East Caucasian. A more satisfactory solution is to consider subordinate usages of volitional forms a result of the influence of Azerbaijanian.

One of the main results of the study is the observed correlation between certain social circumstances of language contact and its linguistic consequences. Two factors turn out to be relevant - the ratio of bilingual speakers and the duration of the contact. The linguistic result of the contact is represented as a hierarchy of borrowability. Wish-complement clauses with volitionals only occur where a very strong pressure from Azerbaijanian is present. Volitionals in purpose clauses are borrowed more easily. I tentatively suggest that this corresponds to the typological frequency of these patterns; volitionals in purpose-clauses are more common in the world's languages than volitionals in wish-complements. Although the latter generalization has not yet been demonstrated on a sizable language sample, the typological studies of the imperatives do not mention the usages in wish-complements; while purpose clauses with imperatives are attested (Aikhenvald, 2010, pp. 234-241; Xrakovskij, 2001).

Abbreviations

1	First class
2	Second class
3	Third class
4	Forth class
I	First person
II	Second person
III	Third person
ABL	Ablative
ABS	Absolutive
ADD	Additive
AFF	Affective
AG	Agent
ALL	Allative
AOR	Aorist
APUD	Apudelative
ATTR	Attributivizer
AUX	Auxiliary
CAUS	Causative
COMIT	Comitative
COMPL	Complementiser
COP	Copula
CVB	Converb
DAT	Dative
DEM	Demonstrative
EL	Elative
ERG	Ergative
ESS	Essive
EXCL	Exclusive
F	Feminine

FUT	Future
GEN	Genitive
H	Human
HORT	Hortative
HPL	Human Plural
IMP	Imperative
IN	'Inside' (localization)
INCL	Inclusive
IPF	Imperfective
IRR	Irrealis
JUSS	Jussive
LAT	Lative
LV	Light verb
MSD	Masdar
NA	Nominalization, absolutive
NEG	Negative
NO	Nominalization, oblique
NOM	Nominative
OBL	Oblique stem
OPT	Optative
PART	Participle
PF	Perfective
PL	Plural
POST	POST (localization)
POT	Potential
PRH	Prohibitive
PROX	Proximal demonstrative
PRS	Present
PV	Preverb
REP	Reportative
S	Substantivizer
SEQ	Sequential converb
SG	Singular
SUB	SUB (localization)
SUPEL	Super-elative
SUPER	SUPER (localization)
TEMP	Temporal converb

References

Agazade, N.G. (1967). Sistema glagol'nyh naklonenij v sovremennom azerbajdzhanskom literaturnom jazyke. Baku.

Aikhenvald, A.Y. & Dixon, R.M. Inroduction. In A.Y. Aikhenvald, & R.M. Dixon (Eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics* (pp. 105-133). Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2010). Imperatives and commands. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ammann, A., & van der Auwera, J. (2004). Complementizer-headed main clauses for volitional moods in the languages of South-Eastern Europe: A Balkanism? In O. Tomić (Ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 293-314). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Authier, G. (2009). Grammaire kryz (langue caucasique d'Azerbaïdjan, dialecte d'Alik). Peeters, Leuven-Paris.

Authier, G. (2010). Azeri morphology in Kryz (East Caucasian). *Turkic Languages*, 14, 1-14.

Baskakov, N.A. (1952). Karakalpakskij jazyk. T. II. M.

Berg, Helma van den. (2005). The East Caucasian language family. Lingua, 115(1), 147-190.

Chirikba, V. (2008). *The problem of the Caucasian Sprachbund*. In P. Muysken (Ed.), From Linguistic Areas to Areal Linguistics (pp. 25-94). John Benjamins Publishing.

Clifton, J. M., Clifton, D.A., Kirk, P., Ljokjell, R. (2005). The Sociolinguistic Situation of the Udi in Azerbaijan. J. M. Clifton (Ed.), *Studies in languages of Azerbaijan*, 1, 57-70. Baku, Azerbaijan and St. Petersburg, Russia: Institute of International Relations, Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan and North Eurasian Group, SIL International. http://www.sil.org/silesr/2005/silesr2005-014.pdfhttp://www.sil.org/silesr/2005/silesr2005-014.pdf

Clifton, J. M., Mak, J., Deckinga, G., Lucht, L., & Tiessen, C. (2005). The Sociolinguistic Situation of the Kryz in Azerbaijan. J. M. Clifton (Ed.), *Studies in languages of Azerbaijan*, 1, 57-70. Baku, Azerbaijan and St. Petersburg, Russia: Institute of International Relations, Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan and North Eurasian Group, SIL International http://www.sil.org/silesr/2005/silesr2005-006.pdfhttp://www.sil.org/silesr/2005/silesr2005-006.pdf

Creissels, D. (2009). Participles and finiteness: the case of Akhvakh. Linguistic Discovery, 7 (1), 106-130.

Dench, A. (2001). Descent and diffusion: the complexity of the Pilbara situation. In A.Y. Aikhenvald, & R.M. Dixon (Eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics* (pp. 105-133). Oxford University Press.

Dobrushina, N.R. (1999). Formy imperativnoj serii. In A.E. Kibrik (Ed.), Elementy tsakhurskogo jazyka v tipologicheskom osveschenii (pp. 278 – 285). Moskva, Nasledie.

Dobrushina, N.R. (2001). Formy imperativnoj serii. In A.E. Kibrik (Ed.), Bagvalinskij jazyk. Grammatika, teksty, slovari (pp. 319-333). Moskva: Nasledie.

Dobrushina, N.R. (2007a). Optativ ili imperativ? In E.A. Lutikova, K.I. Kazenin, V.D. Solovjev, & S.G. Tatevosov (Eds.), Misharskij dialekt tatarskogo jazyka. Ocherki po sintaksisu i semantike (pp. 252-266). Kazan': Magarif.

Dobrushina, N.R. (2007b). O semantike odnoj tjurkskoj modal'noj kategorii In E.A. Lutikova, K.I. Kazenin, V.D. Solovjev, & S.G. Tatevosov (Eds.), Misharskij dialekt tatarskogo jazyka. Ocherki po sintaksisu i semantike (pp. 267-285). Kazan': Magarif.

Dobrushina, N. (2011). The Optative domain in East Caucasian languages. In G. Authier & T. Maisak (Eds.), Tense, Aspect, Modality and Finiteness in East Caucasian Languages (pp. 95-130). Bochum: Brockmeyer. Diversitas Linguarum, 30.

Dobrushina, N. (2012). What is the Jussive for? Linguistics, 50 (1), 1–25.

Dyrenkova, N.P. (1941). Grammatika shorskogo jazyka. Moskva-Leningrad.

Ibragimov, M.-R.A. (1991). Jazyki mezhetnicheskogo obshchenija narodov Daghestana v konce XIX – nachale XX. Maxachkala.

Johanson, L. (2006). On the roles of Turkic in the Caucasus area. In A. McMahon, Y. Matras & V. Nigel (Eds.), *Linguistic areas* (pp. 160-181). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Johanson, L. (2013). Selection of Subjunctors in Turkic Non-Finite Complement Clauses. Bilig 67: 73-90.

Field, F. (2005). Long-term effects of CS: Clues to structural borrowing. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 9 (3-4), 341-360.

Haig, G. (2001) Linguistic diffusion in present-day East Anatolia: From top to bottom. In A.Y. Aikhenvald, & R.M. Dixon (Eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics* (pp. 195-224). Oxford University Press.

Harris, A. C., & Campbell, L. (1995). *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective* (Vol. 74). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hewitt, B. G. (1981). Caucasian languages. In B. Comrie (Ed.), Languages of the Soviet Union (196-237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geiger, B., Halasi-Kun, T, Kuipers, A.H., Menges, K.H., (1959). Peoples and Languages of the Caucasus: A Synopsis. Mouton, The Hague.

Johanson, L. (1998). Code-copying in Irano-Turkic. *Language Sciences*, *20*(3), 325-337.

Johanson, L. (2013). *Structural factors in Turkic language contacts*. Routledge.

Johanson, L. (2014). A synopsis of Turkic volitional moods. Turkic languages, 18, 19-53.

Kalinina E.Ju., Chumakina M.Je. (1999). Obstojatel'stvennye predlozhenija. In A.E. Kibrik (Ed.), *Bagvalinskij jazyk. Grammatika, teksty, slovari* (pp. 537-559). Moskva: Nasledie.

Kibrik, A.E., ed. (1999). *Elementy tsahurskogo jazyka v tipologicheskom osveschenii*. Moskva: Nasledie.

Khalilova, Z. (2009). *A grammar of Khwarshi*. Diss. LOT, Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics, Utrecht.

Khanina, O.V. (2007). Konstruktsii s grammatikalisovannym konverbom glagola rechi. In E.A. Lutikova, K.I. Kazenin, V.D. Solovjev, & S.G. Tatevosov (Eds.), Misharskij dialekt tatarskogo jazyka (pp. 126-142). Kazan', Izdatel'stvo Magarif.

König, E., Siemund, P. (2007). Speech act distinctions in grammar. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*. Second edition. Volume I: Clause structure (pp. 276 – 324). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lutikova E.A., Bonch-Osmolovskaja A.A. (2001). Aktantnye predlozhenija. In A.E. Kibrik (Ed.), *Bagvalinskij jazyk. Grammatika, teksty, slovari* (pp. 481-537). Moskva. "Nasledie".

Maisak, T. A. (2008). Glagol'naja paradigma udinskogo jazyka. In M.E. Alekseev, T.A. Maisak, D.E. Ganenkov, & Yu.A. Lander (Eds.), *Udinskij sbornik. Grammatika. Leksika. Istorija jazyka* (pp. 96-161). Moskva: Academia.

Matras, Y., & Sakel, J. (2007). Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in language*, 31(4), 829-865.

Mougeon, R., Nadasdi, T., & Rehner, K. (2005). Contact-induced linguistic innovations on the continuum of language use: The case of French in Ontario. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 8*, 99–115.

Musaev, K.M. (1964). Grammatika karaimskogo jazyka. M.
Mutalov, R.O. (2002). *Glagol darginskogo jazyka*. Maxachkala.
Nasilov, D. M., Isxakova, X., Safarov, Nevskaya, I. A. (2001). Imperative sentences in Turkic languages. In V.S. Xrakovskij (Ed.), Typology of imperative sentences (pp. 181-220). Muenchen: Lincom Press.
Nikolaeva, I. (2014). Analyses of the Semantics of Mood. In J. Nuyts & J. van der Auwera (Eds.), The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199591435.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199591435-e-3
Matić, D., & Pakendorf, B. (2013). Non-canonical SAY in Siberia: Areal and genealogical patterns. *Studies in Language, 37*(2), 356-412.
Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. Second edition. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Pavlenko, A. (2006). *Russian as a lingua franca.* Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 26, 78–99.
Pokrovskaja, L.A. (1964). Grammatika gagauzskogo jazyka. M.
Ross, M. (1997). Social networks and kinds of speech-community event. *Archaeology and language*, 1, 209-261.
Russian Census 2010. Retrieved from http://www.perepis-2010.ruhttp://www.perepis-2010.ru/
Schmidtke-Bode, K. (2009). *A typology of purpose clauses* (Vol. 88). John Benjamins Publishing.
Sumbatova, N.R., Mutalov, R.O. (2003). *A Grammar of Icari Dargwa*. München – Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
Thomason, S. & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics.* University of California Press.
Trudgill, P. (1986). *Dialects in contact*. Blackwell.
Tuite, K. (1999). The myth of the Caucasian Sprachbund: the case of ergativity. Lingua, 108 (1), 1-29.
van der Auwera, J., Dobrushina, N., & Goussev, V. (2004). A Semantic Map for Imperative-Hortatives. In D. Willems, T. Colleman, & B. Defrancq (Eds.), *Points of Comparison in Linguistics: from Morphology to Discourse* (pp. 44-66). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Weinreich, Uriel. (1979). Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. Mouton publishers. Berlin. The Hague. New York.
Winford, D. (2013). Social factors in contact languages. In P. Bakker, & Y. Matras. Contact languages: A comprehensive guide (pp. 363-416). Mouton de Gruyter.
Wixman, R. (1980) Language Aspects of Ethnic Patterns and Processes in the North Caucasus. Chicago: University of Chicago.
Xrakovskij, V.S. (ed.). (2001). *Typology of imperative constructions.* München: Lincom.

Appendix 1.

Balkar, imperative in say-complement clause (personal fieldnotes)

men sen artxa ***qait*** *dep telej-me*

I you back **come.IMP** COMPL ask-IISG
'I ask you to come back.'

Udi, hortative in say-complement clause

čoʁ-on *č:ap:=e=b-sa* *q:ɨzɨł-χo,* *mic:ik:vič-a=l*
wife-ERG hide=IISG=LV-PRS gold-PL small brother-DAT=ADD

zom=e=b-sa=ki *ma=ta-a,* ***beš=q:a=n*** *baj-i,*
teach=IISG=LV-PRS=COMP PRH=give-IMP **our=JUSS=IIISG** be-AOR

jan *šo-t:-oχun* *döjlät:t:u* ***bak-en***
we DEM-NO-ABL rich **be-HORT**
'The wife hid the gold and coaxed the younger brother – don't give it away, let it belong to us, let us be rich with this (gold).'

Archi, imperative in reported speech

to-w-mu *zon* *žu-ł:u* *ł:^{w}a*
that-1-ERG I.NOM self.OBL-COMIT together

cili-ši ***č'eba:-r***
Azerbaijan-ALL **go.I.IMP-REP**
'He tells me, let's go to Azerbaijan together (with him).'

Appendix 2

	Imperative (available in 2nd person)	*Hortative (available in 1st person plural)*	*Jussive (available in 3rd person only)*	*Optative (available in 1/2/3 persons)*
Bagvalal	*w-ułu* M-become.IMP 'become!'			*w-ułu-la* M-become.IMP-PERF.OPT 'may he become!'
Bezhta	*b-ow-a* 3-do-IMP 'do!'			*b-ow-ala* 3-do-OPT 'let him do!'
Khwarshi	*ok'-o* 1.go-IMP 'go away!'			*ok'-oλo* 1.go-OPT 'get him go!'
Archi	*a* 4.make.IMP 'make!'		*a-ba* 4.make.IMP-JUSS 'make!'	
Icari	*b-uc-a*		*b-uc-ik:a*	*b-uc-ab*

	N-catch-IMP ‘catch !’		N-catch-JUSS ‘let him catch!’	N-catch-OPT ‘may he catch!’
Lak	nasu go.IMP ‘go away!		nasu-ča go.IMP-JUSS ‘let him go!	učʼan-naw come-OPT ‘may he come!’

Dedicated volitional forms in Bagvalal, Bezhta, Khwarshi, Archi, Icari, Lak. The cell is shaded if there is no specialized form for this category.

Nina Dobrushina
National Research University Higher School of Economics, School of Linguistics, ndobrushina@hse.ru