**Moods of conditional clauses in East Caucasian languages**

Category: oral

The category of irrealis comprises a wide range of cross-linguistic meanings. Counterfactual and hypothetical conditions, counterfactual situations, wishes, commands, potential situations, low certainty, habitual and negated situations – all these meanings often occur in typological models of the irrealis domain (see, for instance, Elliott 2000). The aim of the present paper is to describe typical ways of expressing this domain in East Caucasian languages. As the domain is vast, the study will focus on conditionals. The following questions are to be answered for the East Caucasian.

- Which forms are typically used in protasis of conditional constructions?
- Which forms are typically used in apodosis of conditional constructions?
- What degrees of irreality are typically distinguished?
- What meanings do these forms have when used outside conditional constructions?
- How do the East Caucasian data fit into the typological background?

Basing on the data from ten languages of the family (Agul, Akhvakh, Archi, Avar, Bagvalal, standard Dargwa, Icari, Khwarshi, Lak, Tsakhur) several observations are made.

First, East Caucasian languages normally use different forms in protasis and apodosis. The difference between languages which use the same vs. different forms in the two clauses of the conditional construction was noted in [Chung & Timberlake 1985: 255]. For instance, Russian has the same mood form for both clauses, expressing the difference between the condition and simple sequence by the presence of conditional conjunction in the dependent clause (1), while Bagwalal uses different morphological forms (2).

Second, East Caucasian languages typically have dedicated morpheme to mark the dependent predicate (protasis). The form of apodosis, on the other hand, is often expressed by combining future and past markers (cf. Archi example (3)). The latter construction, known as Future in the Past, or Counterfactual, is widely used in the languages of the world in counterfactual clauses as well as in independent constructions with counterfactual meaning (cf. Lazard 2006, van Linden & Verstraete 2008).

All East Caucasian languages have a certain means to convey the difference between counterfactual and hypothetical conditions, but they vary in the way they express this difference. Two main patterns are observed. The first is expressing both types of condition by dedicated affixes (Tsakhur). More often the same marker is used in all types of protasises, while the degree or irreality is expressed by the choice of the stem (Agul).

Many irreal forms used in conditional constructions may also be used in independent clauses. There are certain correlations between the conditional usage of an irreal form and the meaning it conveys when used independently. From the East Caucasian data, irreal moods that are used in subordinate conditional clauses in isolation express the speaker’s desire (Khwarshi, ex. (4) and (5)). The forms used in main conditional clauses convey a much wider range of irreal meanings, such as counterfactual situations, potential situations with low certainty, etc. (cf. Bagwalal (2) and (6)). This is also confirmed by typological evidence from outside the family.
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Examples

(1) Russian (Slavonic)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Jesli} & \text{by} & \text{on} & \text{zakončili} & \text{universitet}, & \text{j-emu} \\
\text{if} & \text{SUBJ} & \text{he} & \text{finish-PST.SG.M} & \text{university} & \text{he-SG.M.DAT} \\
\text{by-l-o} & \text{by} & \text{legč-e} & \text{naj-ii} & \text{rabot-u} \\
\text{be-PST-SG.N SUBJ} & \text{easy-COMP} & \text{find-INF} & \text{job-SG.DAT} \\
\end{array}
\]

If he’d have graduated from the university, it would be easier for him to find a job.

(2) Bagwalal (Avar-Andic, Nakh-Daghestanian)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{anwar} & \text{institut-i-la} & \text{s’ajli-bali}, & \text{hō-b} & \text{halti-la} & \text{w-uk’a-s} & \text{w-uk’a} \\
\text{Anvar} & \text{institute-OBL-SUP} & \text{learn-IRR} & \text{good-N} & \text{job-LA} & \text{M-быть-POT-FUT} & \text{M-быть} \\
\text{If Anwar would have studied at the institute, he would now have a good job. [Chumakina 2001: 604]} \\
\end{array}
\]

(3) Archi (Lezgic)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{dāz} & e<2> & \text{χu-li} & \text{d-i-nč’iš} & \text{zari} & \text{jamu-r} & \text{du-kne-na} & \text{t’al} & \text{a-r-u-qi-ši} & \text{e<2>} \\
\text{get} & \text{<2>stay.PF-EVID} & \text{2-be-COND} & \text{I.ERG} & \text{that-2} & \text{2-eat.PF-CVB.AUX} & \text{send} & \text{do-2-PF-POT-CVB.AUX} & \text{<2>AUX} \\
\text{Had I caught her, I’d have her eaten up [Archi Electronic Corpus 09.58]} \\
\end{array}
\]

(4) Khwarshi (Tsezic)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{haq’u} & \text{čago} & \text{b-eč-lo} \\
\text{parents alive} & \text{HPL-be-COND} \\
\text{(I wish) the parents would be alive! (example courtesy Zaira Khalilova)} \\
\end{array}
\]

(5) Khwarshi (Tsezic)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{haq’u} & \text{čago} & \text{b-eč-lo} & \text{izze} & \text{dil} & \text{kumak} & \text{b-ij-a} & \text{b-eč-i} \\
\text{parents alive} & \text{HPL-be-COND} & \text{they.ERG} & \text{I.LAT} & \text{help} & \text{3-do-INF} & \text{3-be-PST.W} \\
\text{If the parents would be alive, they’d help me. (example courtesy Zaira Khalilova)} \\
\end{array}
\]

(6) Bagwalal (Avar-Andic)

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{den} & \text{o-b} & \text{χan-a-s} & \text{b-uk’a}, & \text{hē} & \text{o-ru-r} & \text{χani-b-o} & \text{b-isā} \\
\text{I-ERG} & \text{this-N} & \text{mov-POT-FUT} & \text{N-be} & \text{then} & \text{this-OBL,HPL-ERG} & \text{mow-N-CONV} & \text{N-find} \\
\text{I wanted to mow this field, but it turned out that they mowed it themselves. [Maisak, Tatevosov 2001: 289]} \\
\end{array}
\]