Nina Dobrushina

State University Higher School of Economics

Contact-induced usages of volitive moods in East Caucasian languages[1]

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to test a hypothesis of the influence of Azerbaijani on East Caucasian languages. It was noticed that most (if not all) Turkic languages widely use forms of imperatives and / or optatives for the main predicate of subordinate clauses of certain types, in particular purpose clauses and complement clauses of verbs of wish. I suppose that some East Caucasian languages had acquired these constructions under the influence of Azerbaijani. To support this hypothesis, I will consider the data of 13 East Caucasian languages and one Turkic language spoken in Dagestan.

The structure of the article is as follows. Section 2 provides a preliminary discussion of Turkic Dagestanian contacts (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 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, while Section 5 lists the languages which do not use volitional forms in subordinate clauses. Section 6 summarizes the discussion.

2.1. *Turkic Dagestanian contacts*

According to the 2002 census, Turkic peoples constitute 20 percent of the population of Dagestan, while the speakers of East Caucasian languages are almost 75 %. Turkic languages Azerbaijani, Kumyk and Nogaj are dominant in certain areas of Dagestan. V. Chirikba suggests that the following languages of Daghestan are exposed to the influence of Azeri: Lezgi, north Tabasaran, Kryz, Budukh, Khinalug, South Avar, Rutul, Tsakhur, Udi [Chirikba 2008: 70]. With reference to [Ibragimov 1991: 51], V. Chirikba says that "The peoples of South-Dagestan used Azerbaijani for communication not only with Azerbaijanis, but also among themselves and with the speakers of Tat" (Chirikba 2008: 73). Nowadays, being bilingual in Azerbaijani is reported for speakers of many East Caucasian languages, both in Dagestan and Azerbaijan.

The contact situation affected both parties: while Turkic languages of Dagestan are reported to acquire certain features of East Caucasian, East Caucasian adopted lexicon and constructions from Turkic. However, until now contact-induced similarities were primarily studied on the lexical level.

2.2. *Overview of the languages*

Several factors influenced choosing languages for this study.

First, I avoided using data from 'standard' languages. Though certain phenomena in standard languages may have developed under the influence of other languages, it could hardly be proved, because the standard language is not unambiguously associated with any particular area and neighbourhood and is shielded from changes by dictionaries and standard grammars. Therefore, the main source of information were the data from dialectal varieties of the explored languages, which were obtained by interviewing the speakers, using electronic corpora, and consulting language experts.

The second sampling criterion was genetic and areal diversity. As it is not easy to distinguish between the genetically inherited structural features and the features acquired through contact, it was important to cover languages which belong to the same genetic unit but have different neighbors. For instance, most dialects of Aghul, Kryz, Lezgian, Tabasaran, Tsakhur, and Udi are both genetically closely related and exposed to the influence of Azerbaijani. It would be hard to tell whether a certain structural feature is common due to their genetic affinity or to the contacts with Azerbaijani. The evidence from Archi, the Lezgic language which is located in central Daghestan and surrounded by Lak and Avar is of special importance. Another language crucial for the research was Akhvakh. This language belongs to the Avar-Andic group located in the eastern part of Daghestan, and thus are not exposed to the influence of Turkic languages. However, the Axaxdərə dialect of Akhvakh, studied by Denis Creissels, is spoken in Azerbaijan. The speakers of Axaxdərə Akhvakh had moved to Azerbaijan in the beginning of the 19th century and are thus bilingual in Azerbaijani only for the last hundred years. According to Denis Creissels, this variety of Akhvakh is still very close to the dialect spoken in the Axvaxskij Rajon of Daghestan.

Another sampling factor was availability of the required data.

The resulting sample includes 14 languages.

family	group	area, village	language
East Caucasian	Avar-Andic	Azerbaijan, Axaxdərə	Akhvakh
		Western Dagestan, Kvanada	Bagvalal
	Tsezic	Western Dagestan, Bezhta	Bezhta
		Eastern Dagestan, Khwarshi	Khwarshi
	Lezgic	Southern Dagestan, Huppuq'	Agul
		Central Dagestan, Archi	Archi
		Azerbaijan, Kryz	Kryz
		Southern Dagestan, Nizhnij Yarak	Tabassaran
		Southern Dagestan, Mishlesh	Tsakhur
		Azerbaijan, Nidzh	Udi

	Dargi	Central Dagestan, Icari	Icari
	Lak	Central Dagestan, Shalib	Lak
	Nakh		Chechen
Turkic	Oguz	Southern Dagestan, Maraga	Azerbaijani

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 Azerbaijani influence, it is essential to have information about the contacts of these languages with Azerbaijani. However, the notion of language contact is not absolutely straightforward. The patterns of contact with Azerbaijani in Dagestan are quite diverse. For example, all speakers of Kryz, according to Gilles Authier, are bilingual, children are more fluent in Azerbaidjani then in Kryz, and the language situation is on the verge of shifting to Azerbaijani. The situation with Huppuq' dialect of Aghul is also a contact situation. However, only a part of speakers of Huppuq' Aghul have a knowledge of Azerbaijani. Therefore, Kryz and Aghul are both contacting with Azerbaijani, but the level of contact exposure is different, and the expected influence of Azerbaijani on the structure of these languages is expected to be different, too.

Another problem with establishing the situation of contact is that the language situation is constantly changing. For example, the communication with Azerbaijanis was more important for the Aghuls in the beginning than in the end of the 20th. Thus, if we choose the contemporary language situation of Huppuq' Aghul as the only starting point, we may come to the false conclusion that the level of contact between Huppuq' Aghul and Azerbaijani is very low. The opposite case is that of Axaxdərə Akhvakh. Though all speakers of this idiom are now bilingual in Azerbaijani, it is a recent situation. The Akhvakhs moved to Azerbaijan in the beginning of the 20th century and are thus exposed to the influence of Azerbaijani for about one hundred years, while the speakers of the Mishlesh dialect of Tsakhur have been contacting with Azerbaijani as long as it is possible to trace back.

However, presently there is no way to account for the situations of contact in sufficient detail, because no information is available for most of idioms considered in this paper. For this reason, I adopted the following methodology. In order to view the situation for a longer period and still base upon reliable information, I made an attempt to obtain the data on multilingualism in the studied areas not only at the time of writing the paper, but also as far back as it can be observed from the today evidences of the language community. It seems, that the most remote time which can be witnessed nowadays is the beginning of the 20th century, since the 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 contacting with the languages of my sample.

language (village)	*other languages spoken by the villagers in the beginning of the 20th century*	*other languages spoken by the villagers in the beginning of the 21st century*
Akhvakh	Avar	Azerbaijani

(Axaxdərə)		
Bagvalal (Kvanada)	Avar	Avar, Russian
Bezhta (Bezhta)	Avar, Georgian	Avar, Russian
Khwarshi (Khwarshi)	Avar, Georgian	Avar, Russian
Agul (Huppuq')	Lezgian, Azerbaijani	Lezgian, Russian, Azerbaijani
Archi (Archib)	Lak, Avar	Avar, Russian
Kryz (Alik)	Azerbaijani	Azerbaijani
Tabassaran (Nizhnij Yarak)	Azerbaijani	Russian, Azerbaijani
Tsakhur (Mishlesh)	Azerbaijani	Azerbaijani, Russian
Udi (Nidzh)	Azerbaijani, Russian	Azerbaijani, Russian
Icari (Icari)	local Dargwa dialects	Standard Dargwa, Russian
Lak (Shalib)	standard Lak	Russian
Chechen	Ingush	Russian
Azerbaijani (Maraga)	standard Azerbaijani	Russian, standard Azerbaijani

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

2.4. *Overview of volitional forms*

There is considerable amount of confusion concerning the categories and naming of volitional moods. Several attempts have been made quite recently to define the main notions in the domain of volitional modality (Palmer 2001, Ammann and van der Auwera 2004, van der Auwera & al. 2004, König & Siemund 2007, Timberlake 2007). However, as several different terms are still used for the same functional item, I will explicitly define the verbal categories which will be discussed in this paper.

I will focus on morphologically specialized forms of volitional moods. While many languages have some ways to express the 2nd person imperative, it is less common to have dedicated morphology for the expression of 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). However, most of Turkic languages use distinct morphological forms for each of these functions. East Caucasian languages often have no dedicated form for 1st person plural and 3rd person imperatives. If these meanings are expressed by means of other moods, I did not include them into discussion, since there is no way to understand which of the meanings of the given polysemous form triggers its usage in subordinate clause.

Thus, I have been considering the following morphologically specialized forms with volitional meaning in the languages of the sample.

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.

(1) Aghul, 2nd person imperative

sa   meʕni   q'-e   sara   čun   ʔu.ji=ra
one   song   **do-IMP**   sara   you   two(ERG)=&
Please, sing a song together.

Hortative will below refer to forms used to express 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 2001a), and inclusive imperative (Dobrushina & Goussev 2005).

(2) Udi, Hortative

uk-sun   čur-un-sa,   za-χun   ta-ʁ-en
eat-MSD   want-2SG-PRS   I-ABL   **go-LV.FUT-HORT**
You want to eat – come along with me.

Jussive will be used to refer to the form which 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. This category is also referred to as Exhortative (Ammann & van der Auwera 2004), and 3rd person imperative (Xrakovskij 2001a).

(3) Tsakhur, Jussive

zaʔatexnik'-ē=d   *či-s*   *āʔid-in*   *ǯawab*
zootechnician-ERG-COH.4   self.4.OBL-DAT   deserving-A   word.4

qil-e-ǯe
4.give-IMP-JUSS
'Let the zootechnician give an appropriate answer to that.' (Kibrik 1999: 833)

Optative is a category which is rarely expressed by a specialised morphological form in European languages. However, it is very widespread in the languages of the Caucasus. 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 Dagestan, 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, though there are languages in the sample which have the Optative in the 2nd person only (Chechen).

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 will refer to this form as Optative.

(4) Aghul, Optative / Jussive

waʔ, *c'a-f-ṫawa,* *wun* *bag̥* **xu-raj,** **čurqu-raj**
no give.IPF-A-COP:NEG you сторона **become.PF-JUSS** **burst.open.PF-OPT**
No, I won't give it, go to hell (lit. let your side burst open)!

(5) Agul, Optative / Jussive

mi *ʁa-a,* *alajš* *xä-s,* **alajši-raj**
DEMM(ERG) say.IPF-PRS visit(IMP) we.INCL-DAT **visit.PF-OPT**
She says, (tell her to) come to us, (let her) pay us a visit.

2.5. *Subordinate usage of volitional forms in Turkic languages*

Most of Turkic languages have a full paradigm of imperative forms. This is a clear genetic feature of Turkic languages, common to languages which had no areal contacts during last 6-7 centuries at least, like Khakas (Northern Turkic, spoken in Siberia), Mishar Tatar (Eastern Turkic, spoken in Tatarstan) or Azerbaijani (Southern Turkic, spoken in southern 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.

For instance, Khakas (Northern Turkic, spoken in Siberia) has morphologically distinct imperative forms for 1/2/3 persons.

1sg	*al-ym*	'let me take'	1pl	*al-aŋ*	'let us take!'
2sg	*al*	'take!'	2pl		'take (you-pl)!'
3sg	*al-zin*	'let him take'	3pl	*al-zin-nar*	'let them take!

These Khakas forms can be used in purpose clauses and in complement clauses of the verbs of wishing.

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

ižem *ta:brax* *uz-im* *tip* *kniga* *xyr-še*
mother quickly **fall.asleep-IMP1SG** COMPL book read-PRS
Mom reads to fall asleep quickly.

(7) Khakas, Jussive imperative in purpose clause

ižem *sin-i* *ta:brax* *uzu-zun* *tip* *kniga* *xyr-še*
mother you-ACC quickly fall.asleep-IMP3 COMPL book read-PRS
Mom reads to make you falls asleep quickly

(8) Khakas, Jussive in wish complement clause

Ajdo *ipši-zi-n* *to:ɣys* *ta:p* **al-zyn** *tip* *saɣyn-še*
Ajdo wife-3SG-ACC job find **take-IMP3** COMPL want-PRS
Ajdo wants his wife to find a job

(9)

abam *Ajdo-ne* *ib-zer* **ajlan-zyn** *tip* *sur-dyr-še*
father Ajdo house-? **come.back-IMP3** COMPL ask-CAUS-PRS

Father demands that Ajdo comes home.

I gave an example from Khakas to show that the phenomenon I am going to deal with in this paper is typical for Turkic languages irrespective of their geographical localization. To the best of my knowledge, imperatives are also used in purpose and complement clauses in Turkish, Tatar, Balkar, Altaj and other languages of Turkic family.

While the rich system of imperative forms is typical to (almost) all Turkic languages, some of them also have morphological optatives. What is important for this study, Turkic optatives also tend to be used in subordinate clauses. For instance, Karachay-Balkar (Western Turkic) has a morphologically distinct Optative which is used to express the wish of the speaker.

(10) Karachay-Balkar Optative (1/ 2 /3 person)
*ders   terkiraq **bošal-ʁa   edi***
lesson   soon   **finish-OPT**   AUX
I wish this lesson be over!

(11)
*zaš   **tap-xy   edi-ŋ***
boy   **deliver-OPT   AUX-2SG**
I wish you have a boy!

This form also occurs in purpose clauses

(12) Karachay-Balkar Optative in purpose clauses
*men   **zuqla-ʁy   edi-m**   dep   oquj-ma*
I   sleep-OPT **AUX-1SG**   COMPL   read-1SG
I am reading to (help myself to) fall asleep

(13)
*men säbi **zuqla-ʁy   edi**   dep   oquj-ma*
I   child **sleep-OPT AUX** COMPL   read-1SG
I am reading to make the child to fall asleep

(14)

men	*aša-ʁy*	*edi-m*	*dep*	*kak*	*et-e-me*
I	**eat-OPT**	**AUX-1SG**	COMPL	porridge	make-PRS-1SG

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. As I will try to show in this paper, this phenomenon is reported in those East Caucasian languages that are in close contact with Azerbaijani.

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

The following types of subordinate constructions were chosen as 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, Turkic imperatives and optatives are widely used in the complement clauses of manipulation verbs (*to ask, to request, to order*) (ex. (15) and (16)). However, these constructions were not considered in this paper since East Caucasian languages do not have straightforward criteria for distinguishing direct and indirect speech and it is thus often impossible to classify specific contexts as subordinate imperatives or reported imperative utterances (quotations).

(15) Karachaj-Balkar, imperative in complement clause

men	*sen*	*artxa*	**qait**	*dep*	*telej-me*
I	you	back	**come.IMP**	COMPL	ask-1SG

I ask you to come back.

(16) Udi

čoʁ-on	*č:apːₑ=e=b-sa*	*q:ɨzil-χo,*	*micːik: vič-a=l*
wife-ERG	hide=3SG=LV-PRS	gold-PL(ABS/DAT)	small.brother-DAT=ADD

zom=e=b-sa=ki	*ma=ta-a,*	**beš=q:a=n**	*baj-i,*
teach=3SG=LV-PRS=COMP	PROH=give(-LV)-IMP	**our=JUSS=2/3SG**	be-AOR

jan	*šo-tː-oχun*	*döjlätːtːu*	**bak-en**
we	DIST-NO-ABL	rich	**be-HORT**

The wife hid the gold and egged on the younger brother – don't give it away, let it belong to us, let us be rich with this (gold).

(17) Archi

to-w-mu	*zon*	*žu-ɬːu*	*ɬːʷa*
that-1-OBL(ERG)	I(NOM)	self.OBL-COMIT	together

cili-ši	*č'ebaː-r*
Azerbaijan-ALL	go.1.IMP-REP

He tells me, let's go to Azerbaijan together (with him).

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

For each language of the sample I will give a brief overview of imperative / optative forms which have been tested and indicate whether they are used in purpose and wish-complement clauses or not.

2.7. *Sources of the data for the research*.
The examples were collected from the corpora where available. Grammars and elicitations served as additional sources.

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

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

3.1. Azerbaijani
In this paper, the data of Azerbaijani spoken in the village Maraga (Tabasaranskij rajon) will be considered. According to Ajaz Abduldzhalilov, native speaker of this dialect, most villagers do not speak Tabassaran (even though Tabassaran people are the closest neighbours.

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

git-im	'let me go!'	*git-ek*	'let us go!'
git	'go!'	*git-ün / git-üz*	'go!' (you-PL)
git-sü	'let him go!'		

Imperative forms are widely used in same-subject and different-subject purpose clauses. The subordinate predicate comes with a complementizer *dije* which originates from the converb of the verb 'to say'.

Maraga Azerbaidjani, imperatives in purpose clauses

(18) same subject purpose clause
*mama **juxla-su** dije uxijedü*
mother **sleep-IMP3** COMPL sing
Mom sings to fall asleep

(19) different subject purpose clauses
*mama ušaq-y **juxla-su** dije uxijedü*
mother child-3 **sleep-IMP3** COMPL sing
Mom sings to make the baby fall asleep

(20)
*mama **juxla-jum** dije uxijedü*
mother **sleep-IMP1** COMPL sing
Mom sings to make me fall asleep

(21)

mama **juxla** *dije* *uxijedii*
mother **sleep.IMP** COMPL sing
Mom sings to make you fall asleep

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

(22) Maraga Azerbaidjani, imperatives in wish complement clauses

u *eve* **gäl-sü** *dije* *istejede-m*
he house **come-IMP3** COMPL want-1SG
I want him to come home

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

3.2.1. Volitional forms in Kryz
 Kryz has a set of heterogeneous volitional forms specific to different persons (Authier, in print).
 Below is an example of 2nd person imperative:

(23)
q'irša-k *ča-b-ha* *buluša* **sa-b-zin (ay)** !
mud-SUB PV-F-stain.PF(PART) dress **PV-F-wash.IMP(AGHPL)**
 Wash the dress stained with mud.

 The form referred to as "exhortatif" in Authier (in preparation) (more common terms for this form are hortative, inclusive imperative, 1st person plural imperative) is used to invite the addressee to carry out certain action together with the speaker.

(24) Hortative ("exhortatif")
q'u-ndu-r *an* *ya* *ǧil.i-ǧar* **ya-da-ha-day** !
two-H-E AN 4i.G leg-SUPEL **PV-Neg-take.off-HORT2**
 Let us not take our shoes off, both of us.

 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.
(25)
zin / jin *sulaxay-a* *rix-iz* **yi-xh-dam / yi-p-dam** !
1 / 4[e] left-a road-D **PV-go-HORT1 / PV-HPL.go-HORT1**
 I/we will take the left road.

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

(26) Jussive ("votif")

va i-nkan-i   pul   tu-ğa-tir !
2.G PV-IPF.remain-PART money **PV-carry-JUSS**
 'Make/let him bring back the rest of your money.'

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.

Optative (blessings and curses)
(27) 1st person
rix   ya-r-t'-i-n-kar   iši   zin !
road.F PV-IPF-cut-PART-SUBEL **be.OPT** 1
 'I will be a burglar (call me a burglar) (if I ever put my hands on the sheep!)'

(28) 2nd person
vun ya-har-a   xhi-ci   q'ay-i !
2   PV-flay-A be-SEQ **die-OPT**
'I wish they flay you alive!'

(29) 3rd person
ya girt-anda   icin-a   xayirlu yiğ-ri   ği-t-i !
5.G all-HPLG   face-IN blessed day-PL **PV-N.emerge-OPT**
 'Let all the days end (lit. dawn) just as favorable to you all!'

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

(30)
y-u-ghun,   sas   ar,   ˤa-b-xhir-i   uca,   ts'eˤ   ˤa-ğva-tir !
PV-F-go.IMP   voice do.IMP **PV-HPL-come-OPT** here   goat   **PV-bring.F-JUSS**
'Go and call them, let them come here, and let them bring the goat.'

    Kryz volitional forms are given in Table #.

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

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

3.2.2. *Kryz Hortative, Jussive and Optative in polypredicative constructions*
Kryz 2nd person imperative is not reported to be used in purpose clauses. The most frequent forms in purpose complement clauses are Hortatives and Optatives. When used in purpose clauses, these forms are introduced by the conjunction *ki*, an Azerbaijani loan.

(31) Hortative in purpose clauses: same subject, 1st person
dah   ha-b-gun-cib-jin   ki jina-ğ   halavar ği-xha-dam

quick PV-HPL-run-AOR.HPL-4e   KI   4eSELF-SUPER   clothes   **PV-dress-HORT1**
We ran fast to put our clothes on.

(32) Optative in purpose clause: different subject, 3rd person
t'ut'-ri   hu-rt-re   ki   furi   rahat   a-xr-i
fly-PL   PV-chase-PRS   KI   man   calm   **PV-sleep-OPT**
He chases away the flies so that the man sleeps calmly.

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

(33)
ç'aba   da-b-xha-tir   li-p-ci   u-cbar   ğa-b-xhir-cib
wet   **Neg-HPL-be-VOT**   PV-say-SEQ   3-HPL   PV-HPL-come-AOR.HPL
Not to soil themselves, they came back inside.

When used in wish-complements, the Optative is typical for different-subject clauses (the conjunction *ki* is used).

(34)
umay-iz   i-ka-c   ki   gada-r   riş   ğva-yn-i
mother-D   PV-want-AOR.N   KI   boy-E   girl   **PV.F-take-OPT**
Mother wants the boy to marry the girl.

Same-subject clauses usually have infinitives, however optative and hortative with the conjunction *ki* occur as well.

(35)
za   şidr-iz   i-ka-de-d   ki   ø   lu   fura-z   yi-p-i
1.G   sister-D   PV-want-NEGPFCT-N   KI   ø(ABS)   this   man-D   **PV-F.go-OPT**
  'My sister doesn't want to marry this men.'

(36)
za-s   i-ka-ca   ki   Ø   cur-a   kum-a   yi-xh-dam
I-DAT   PV-want-PFCT   KI   Ø(ABS)   other-a   village-IN   **PV-go-HORTI**
'I want to go away to some other village.'

Thus, Kryz is the only East Caucasian language in our sample which uses imperative / optative forms in all types of subordinate clauses we are considering. The usage of volitional moods in purpose and complement clauses is also the dominant pattern of subordinate clauses in this language.

3.3. Azerbaijani and Kryz: summary
Table 4 represents the usage of Azerbaijani 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
Azerbaijani	Imperative			+	-	*dije* (< say.CONV)
	Hortative			+	-	*dije* (< say.CONV)
	Jussive	+		+	+	*dije* (< say.CONV)
Kryz	Hortative		(+)		+	*ki* (loan from Azerbaidjani)
	Jussive				+	*li-p-ci* PV-say-{
	Optative	+	(+)	+		*ki*
	Jussive			+	+	*ki*

Table 4. Azerbaijani 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.

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

The forms of volitional moods which were controlled for their ability to be used in subordinate clauses 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 simply means that it is not expressed by a dedicated form. For example, Tsakhur uses Potential mood to express Hortative meaning (e.g. Dobrushina 1999: 285). Though Potential is widely used in Tsakhur purpose clauses, I did not consider these constructions since it is hard to decide whether this usage is motivated by its hortative or potential meanings.

The functional difference between the forms called Optative and the forms called 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 of the languages have one form of volitional mood which combines Optative and Jussive meanings. The exception is Tsakhur which distinguishes them.

	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	*ƛib-a* dance-IMP 'dance!'			*ƛib-aƛa* 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'	

13

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-q:a-n be-PF-JUSS-2/3SG '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 wish-complement clauses.*
   Neither Optative nor Jussive are used in wish-complement clauses in any of these languages.

4.3. *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 occuring types of purpose clauses in Aghul. The Optative is used both in different-subject and same-subject clauses. It can be combined with the conjunction *puna* which originates from the perfective converb of the verb 'to say'.

(37) Aghul, same-subject purpose clause

wert:elüta-as   darman=na   fatt.a-ji   ha-ge
helicopter-(IN)ELAT   medicine=&   {APUD-ELAT}let.IPF-PST   ha-DEMG

*čin=na   a-j,   ilan-ar   **k'i-raj**   pu-na,*
МЫ:EXCL=&   {IN}-be-CONV   snake-PL   **kill.PF-OPT**   say.PF-CONV

*žil-ari-ʔ   a-je   neχčir   **k'i-raj**   pu-na*
earth-PL-IN   {IN}-be-PART   animal   **kill.PF-OPT**   say.PF-CONV
And they were throwing poison down from helicopters, when we were there to extinguish snakes, to extinguish parasites (lit. animals) in those places .

(38) Aghul, different-subject purpose clause
*čarawa   **d-ušu-raj**   pu-na,   mal   **d-ušu-raj***
ram   **NEG-go.PF-OPT**   say.PF-CONV   cow   **NEG-go.PF-OPT**

pu-na   fi   q'a-je-f-e,   gümbet   aq'a-je-f-e
say.PF-CONV   what   do.IPF-PART2-A-COP   tombstone   do.IPF-PART2-A-COP

če-t:-ari,   setk:a   jarħa-je-f-e   če-t:-ari

14

our.EXCL-A-PL(ERG)   net   beat.IPF-PART2-A-COP   our.EXCL-A-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.

Less frequent but still possible is the usage of the 2nd person imperative in purpose clauses.

(39) Aghul, 2nd person imperative in purpose clause

i	*čin*	*gi-s*	**ʁuzar-q'-e**	*pu-na*
and	we.EXCL	DEMG-DAT	**stop-do-IMP**	say.PF-CONV

χil	*ʁadu-guna,*	*gi*	*ča-s*	*ʁuzar-q'u-ndawa*
hand	raise.PF-TEMP	DEMG(ERG)	we.EXCL-DAT	stop-do.PF-PFT:NEG

And when we raised hand to stop him, he did not stop to (pick) us up.

Udi Jussive clitic is widely used in purpose clauses. In these constructions, Jussive usually combines with conjunction *ki* (ex. (40)), which is a loan from Azerbaijani, or, more rarely, *pi* (ex. (41)). The latter comes back to the perfective converb of the verb 'to say'.

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

χašil	*χašil*	*p-sun*	*ta꞊ne꞊sa꞊ki*
hashil	hashil	say-MSD	уходить=3SG=LV.PRS=COMP

iz	*ejeχun*	**ma꞊q:a꞊n**	*č:e-r-i*
one	memory.ABL	**PROH=JUSS=2/3SG**	quit-LV:PST-AOR

He walks and keeps saying "Khashil", "Khashil", in order not to forget.

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

ko-t:-o	*görä꞊l*	*šo*	*q:ejraz*	*t:oraj-in*	*boš*	*he-t:-u*
DIST-NO-DAT	according=ADD	DIST+NA	other	bag-GEN	inside	what-NO-DAT

ma꞊q:a꞊n	*k:ac:-ec-i*	*pi,*	*t:änk:it:*	*aIl꞊jan꞊st:a*
PROH=JUSS=2/3SG	dice-LV:PST-AOR	COMPL	basket	wicker=1PL=LV+PRS

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

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

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

beš bin-a   *k:al-p-a⸗nan,*   *jan⸗al*   **ak:-en**

our   daughter.in.law-DAT   call-LV-IMP=2PL   we=ADD   **see-HORT**

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

    Tsakhur is another language reported to have Jussive purpose clauses. Purpose clauses are introduced by a complementizer *wɨ,* which can also be used as a quotative particle (e.d. Kalinina, Chumakina 1999: 548). When used in adverbial clauses, it can be interpreted as conveying causal or purposive meaning.

    As E. Kalinina and M. 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.

(43) Tsakhur (Kalinina, Chumakina 1999: 549)

haɪmmaše alīk-aʔ-as   *ɨ̄kan*   *čura*   **g<im>ojxan-že-wɨ**

always   4.mix-4.do-POT   4.need.IPF   meet.4   **<PRH>burn-JUSS-COMPL**

'One has to stir the mean 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'.

(44) Tabassaran, different-subject purpose clause

dadaji   *maʔli ap'ura,*   *baj*   **ax-ri**   *k'uri*

mother   song   do   boy   **sleep-JUSS**   saying

Mom sings a song to make the boy fall asleep.

Tabassaran, same-subject purpose clause

dadaji   *učv*   **ax-ri**   *k'uri kitab urxura*

mother   self   **sleep-JUSS**   saying book   read

Mom reads to fall asleep.

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

(45) Akhvakh (Denis Creissels, p.c.)

b-eλ-a   *ha-be*   *di-ge*   *taχi-ge*   **ĩk'aλ-aλ'a**   *qe,*   *čili*   *r-ižw-ide,*

N-let-IMP   DEM-N   1SG$_O$-ESS   pocket-ESS   **grow.up-OPT**   then   tooth$_{PL}$ NPL-grow-IPFV$_{NPL}$

b-oλ-ide   *q'oq'odiro,*   *qe*   *o-x-uwa*   *du-λaje*

N-become-IPFV$_N$ saw   then   N-give-POT$_N$ 2SG$_O$-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'.

(46)

čib-e	qedo,	miχaradi-le-ga	eχ-iri,	ušti	q̇alda	ĭḳaχ-a
sow-CVB$_N$	after	seed.PL-O$_{NPL}$-LAT	tell-IRR	2PL	quickly	grow-IMP

de-ne	ĭčila	haga	w-oq̇-eλi	di-λa	ʕeče	harigw-aλa
1SG-ABS	again	here.LAT	M-come-POST	1SG$_O$-AFF	apple	**see-OPT**

'After sowing he told the seeds: "Grow quickly, so that when I come again I can see apples!"

4.4. *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.

Although Optatives and / or Jussives are used in purpose clauses in all these languages, two languages are found to use another volitional forms as well (2nd person Imperative in Aghul and Hortative in Udi).

The languages differ as to the (co)reference constraints in those purpose clause which can be expressed by a volitional form. The contributors to the grammar of Tsakhur indicate 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 Aghul purpose Imperative and Udi purpose Hortative. In all examples that are available there is no coreference.

In most instances of the 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 Azerbaijani complementizer *dije*. However, in Udi more frequent is the Azerbaijani complementizer *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 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: 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 independently, Udi *pi* has personal ending *-ne* (e.g. Maisak 2008: 113). Cf. example (47) and (48):

(47) Udi

p-i	**č:e-r-i**	ta=ne=sa
say-AOR	quit-LV:PST-AOR	leave=3SG=LV+PRS

Having said, he leaves.

(48)

*agronom-en   mo-t̸-o   ak-i   **p-i̸=ne***

agronomist   PROX-NO-DAT   see-AOR   **say-AOR=3SG**

The agronomist who saw that said…

Since Aghul *puna*, Udi *pi* and Tabassaran *k'uri* are widely used as forms of the verb 'to say', these cases can be considered as an earlier stage of grammaticalisation process than the case of Kryz and Udi constructions with *ki* and Tsakhur constructions with the quotative marker *wi̸*. Optative / Jussive purpose clauses are marked as subordinate in these languages, though the marker is not yet fully specialized for the expression of subordination.

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 the Table 6.

	volitional forms used in purpose clauses	*different subject purpose clause*	*same subject purpose clause*	*complementizer*
Aghul	Optative	+	+	*pun-a* (say.PF-CONV)
	Imperative	+	?	*pun-a* (say.PF-CONV)
Udi	Jussive	+	+	*ki* (loan from Azerbaijani) *p-i* (say.PF-CONV)
	Hortative	+	?	-
Tsakhur	Jussive	+	-	*wi̸* (quotative particle)
Tabassaran	Jussive	+	+	*k'uri* (say.CONV)
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**

Seven languages from our sample do not use imperative / optative forms in any subordinate clauses.

The table below shows dedicated volitional forms which were controlled for their ability to be used in subordinate clauses.

	Imperative	*Hortative*	*Jussive*	*Optative*	*Optative*

	(available in 2nd person)	(available in 1st person plural)	(available in 3rd person only)	(available in 1/2/3 persons)	(available in 2 person)
Bagvalal	w-uɫu M-become.IMP 'become!'			w-uɫu-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 N-catch-IMP 'catch !'		b-uc-ik:a N-catch-JUSS 'let him catch!'	b-uc-ab N-catch-OPT 'may he catch!'	
Lak	nasu go.IMP 'go away!		nasu-ča go.IMP-JUSS 'let him go!	uč'an-naw come-OPT 'may he come!'	
Chechen	dʕa-ɣuo away-go.IMPsimp 'Go away!'		d-a-it-a II-make-CAUS- 'let her make!'	lo-ħāra die-PERF.OPT1 'may he die'	lielajo-jla carry-OPT2 'may you carry'

Table 7. Dedicated volitional forms in Bagvalal, Bezhta, Khwarshi, Archi, Icari, Lak, Chechen.

6. Discussion and conclusions.

The hypothesis of the Imperative – Optative usages in subordinate clauses as induced by contacts with Azerbaijani was verified on data from 13 languages of East Caucasian and one Turkic language. As a result of the analysis of volitional forms in subordinate clauses, the languages have been classified into three classes.

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

The second group of languages uses volitional forms in purpose clauses only: Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur, Udi, and Akhvakh. However, the extent to which such use of volitional forms is typical for these languages varies. While Imperative – Optative forms in purpose clauses are highly typical for Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur and Udi, they are reported to be infrequent in Akhvakh. There is another important fact: 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, Lak, and Chechen) do not use Imperative – Optative forms in any kind of subordinate clauses.

How does all this correlate with linguistic contacts with Azerbaijani?

The Kryz-speaking village is located in Azerbaijan, and Kryz is exposed to the influence of Azerbaijani as far back as can be traced. It is thus not amazing that the patterns observed in Kryz show the highest degree of structural similarity with Azerbaijani.

Aghul, Tabassaran, Tsakhur, and Udi speakers are also bilingual in Azerbaijani. The features shared by these languages can also be explained by their genetic affinity, since all these languages belong to the Lezgic group of the East Caucasian. However, another Lezgic language of our sample, Archi, does not use volitional forms in the subordinate clauses.

Akhvakh is of special interest for this research, since the speakers of the studied idiom moved to Azerbaijan only recently. They are exposed to the influence of Azerbaijani only for about two hundred years, and the language, according to Denis Creissels, does not show traces of vast Azerbaijani influence. The research shows that this idiom is probably developing the subordinate constructions of the "Azerbaijani type".

Seven languages which do not use volitional forms in subordinate clauses (Bagvalal, Bezhta, Khwarshi, Archi, Icari, Lak, and Chechen) had never had systematic contacts with Azerbaijani. Since these languages represent six different genetic groups of Nakh-Daghestanian family (Avar-Andic, Tsezic, Dargi, Lak, and Nakh), it is quite unlikely that the usage of volitional forms in purpose and in wish-complement clauses in Lezgic languages and Akhvakh is a structural feature inherited from the East Caucasian.