Volitional moods in conditional and concessive subordinate clauses.

Descriptive linguistics have cumulated various evidence that volitional moods (i.e. all moods that include reference to the speaker’s wish, including 2nd person imperative, 3rd person imperative, 1st person plural imperatives, optatives, forms used in various wishings and curses) are apt to occur in subordinate clauses in conditional, concessive-conditional and concessive constructions. V.S. Khrakovskij [1: 48] quotes uses of the imperative in conditional protasis; M. Haspelmath and E. König consider optatives used in concessive-conditional protasis [2: 592]; there is a huge literature on the use of English imperative for expressing condition, see e.g. [3: 340]. A number of explanations have been put forth in order to account for this usage of imperative and optative forms. A closer look at the data proves, however, that the distribution of these forms in different relevant constructions is anything but clear. Most often, typologists do not go into detailed analysis of each form, referring to them by general cover-all terms like “imperative” (indiscriminately for 1st, 2nd and 3rd person imperatives) or “optative” (without specifying the type of the optative or even using it implicitly for all non 2nd person imperatives).

An overview of the imperative typology by A. Aikhenvald [4: 25] says simply that: “Imperatives in dependent clauses have a concessive or conditional meaning in a number of languages of Eurasia”.

A deeper analysis suggests that by no means all imperative and optative forms may be used in any concessive/conditional protasis. Caucasian languages, abounding with volitional moods, provide rich data for investigation. This study is based on our data from Agul, Archi, Bagvalal and some other Caucasian languages, as well as on the data from several languages outside the area, for the sake of comparison. The following four types of constructions have been considered.

a. Conditionals with counter-factual protasis (Had he come on time, we wouldn’t be late),
b. Conditional with hypothetic protasis (If he comes on time, we won’t be late),
c. Concessive conditionals (Even if he comes on time, we’ll be late all the same),
d. Concessive proper (Even though he came on time, we were late in the end).

In this way, the use of volitionals has been considered in relation to two distinct parameters: (1) conditional vs. concessive protasis and (2) the degree of protasis factivity.

The first parameter proved to be relevant for the 3rd person imperative. In all the languages of the sample it is widely used in concessive constructions of both types (concessive conditional and concessive proper), but never in conditionals proper (exs (3) and (4)).

The second parameter proved to be relevant for the 2nd person “classic” imperative. This form is widely used in hypothetic protasis (constructions b and c) but never in factive protasis (construction d) and is non typical of counter-factual protasis (construction a).
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Build (your) house with your own hands – then you become (its) real master.

Even if he graduates from three more institutes, he won’t get any employment all the same.

Even if I (you, he) drank (a lot), (so what) - I (you, he) got up early anyway.