

1. Introduction

The Great Caucasus range is famous for its linguistic diversity, and perhaps most deservedly so in its Eastern corner, a region covering Southern Daghestan and the North of Azerbaijan. Three linguistic families meet there: East-Caucasian, with at least thirty languages; Turkic, represented by Azerbaijani and Kumyk; and Indo-European, with Tati, (like Persian) a South-West-Iranian Indo-European language. This diversity makes the region an open laboratory for the study of language-contact: genetically related languages will diverge according to which unrelated languages they are in contact with, while genetically unrelated languages will, after some period of bilingualism, show convergence phenomena in their typological features. It is well-known, for instance, that Azerbaijani, although very close genetically to Turkey Turkish, shows features in its syntax which can be ascribed to the influence of Persian as a prestige language in the area. Conversely, although Tati dialects share the overwhelming majority of their lexical items with Persian (more than 80 % of Tati words have Persian cognates), they show a considerable number of idiosyncratic typological features in their syntax, which, along with a new phonological system and a very different TAM system, set them apart as a separate language, comprizing several “dialects” that are unintelligible to speakers of Persian.

Most Tati varieties are poorly documented, and no comprehensive overall description of the language is available. Northern varieties are mostly spoken by Jewish communities in Southern Daghestan and cities of the Northern Caucasus, while the Southern varieties are spoken in the Republic of Azerbaijan, mostly by Muslim communities. Tati has thus been in intimate contact for a long time with Azerbaijani, and also with various Caucasian languages. According to Grjunberg (1963) Tati is a string of dialects extending from the Apsheron peninsula as far as the town of Nalchik in Kabardino-Balkharia. But in fact, the easternmost varieties spoken by Jewish communities in Groznyj, Nalchik and Mozdok appear to be part of the Kaitag dialect, spoken just North of Derbent.² In the Old town of Derbent itself, the Tati speaking population is Jewish, while Tati speaking villages surrounding Derbent, like Djalgan of Nügedi, are Muslim today. In Azerbaijan, Tati is the language of many thousands of

Muslim inhabitants of the Quba, Ismaili, Apsheron districts and other adjacent regions. Jewish Tati-speaking communities are flourishing in Quba, but moribund in Oghuz (formerly Vartashen). While variation between adjacent dialects may allow intercomprehension, Tat speakers from the Apsheron peninsula near Baku (all Muslim) cannot understand even the written version of a text in the ‘dialect’ spoken by the Jewish community of Derbent in Daghestan. Northern (Derbent Jewish) Tati is rather well documented³ (though there is still no comprehensive grammar of the language), but other varieties like the one here called “Apsheron Tati”, which is spoken near Baku, are much more in need of investigation. This paper is intended as a contribution to the description of this dialect.

Relative clauses in Tati dialects have not been studied in the scanty literature available on this language. This paper is thus the first publication concerned with this issue, dealing with just one strategy, “head-internal”, found in one variety of Azerbaijan at least.

Five strategies for the formation of relative clauses can be identified across Tati dialects:

- the participial strategy, found in all varieties, has been inherited from middle Iranian, but has witnessed a remarkable extension due to its prevalence in surrounding Turkic and Caucasian languages;
- the relative pronoun strategy, commonly found in the written language of the Jewish dialect in Daghestan, due to code-copying of Russian RCs;
- the ‘pluralised-finite’ form strategy found in at least two independent dialects, Lahic and Derbent⁴;
- the correlative strategy, in which the head is expressed by means of an interrogative form and the main clause contains a resumptive element;
- the head-internal strategy (a subtype of the preceding type), found, as far as I know, only in the Apsheron dialect, places the head inside the relative clause and may have no resumptive element in the main clause. This last type constitutes the topic of this paper.

There is no evidence of a Persian-type relativization strategy (i.e. a finite postposed relative clause, cf. Section 2.2) in any dialect of Tati, nor in Azerbaijani. In the latter language as well as in Apsheron Tati, relative clauses are of two types, with some complementarity and overlap: ‘participial’ vs. ‘head-internal’ (or ‘correlative’). In the following, we will describe

these types and examine the criteria for their distribution. As an instance of relevant discrepancies between dialects, the type of head-internal relative clauses under analysis in this paper seems to be a feature specific to this Apsheron dialect, which was not recognized as a valid strategy by Tati speakers in Daghestan. I have not yet been able to test other Southern dialects.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides an overview of the participle strategy in Azerbaijani and Apsheron Tati. Section 3 ('Non-participial relative clauses') presents the head-internal strategy in Azerbaijani and Apsheron Tati. Section 4 summarizes the results.

2. Participial relative clauses

2.1. Participial RCs in Azerbaijani

The participle strategy is dominant⁵ in the great majority of Turkic languages. Standard Azerbaijani, like Turkish, makes use of mainly two types of participles to relativize either subjects or other functions: (i) the *–(y)An* participle (glossed 'SUBJPART') is used to relativize subjects with no past-time reference; (ii) the participle in *–mİş* (glossed 'PERFPART') also has S/A (subject) orientation like the one in *–(y)An*, but it is used with past time reference (cf. [1]).

(1) Azerbaijani

sən-in qardaş-in-ı dö-yən / döy-müş
 2-GEN brother-POS2-ACC beat-SUBJPART beat-PERFPART

adam bu kənd-dən deyil.
 person this village-ABL NEG COP3

'The person who beats / has beaten up your brother is not from this village.' (fn)

In order to relativise other positions than subject in a participial clause, Azerbaijani, like Turkish, mostly makes use of the *DIQ*-participle (cf. [2]–[4]).

- (2) *sən-in qardaş-in-in döy-düy-ü adam bu deyil.*
 2-GEN brother-POS2-GEN beat-NONSUBJPART-POS3 person this NEG COP3
 ‘The person your brother has beaten up is not this one.’ (fn)

- (3) *mən-i istə-yən oğlan qoy-duğ-um şərt-ə*
 1-ACC want-SUBJPART boy put-NONSUBJPART-POS1 condition-DAT
əməl et-məlidir.
 practice do-DEB3

The boy who wants [to have] me must fulfill the condition I put.

(*Səhrli nağıllar*,⁶ *şahzadə Bəndali*)

- (4) *alma-nı zəhərlə-yən o-nun inan-dığ-ı vəzir idi*
 apple-ACC poison-SUBJ ANAPH-GEN trust-NONSUBJ-POS3 vizier COP.PST3
 The one who had poisoned the apple was the minister in whom he had trust.
 (SN, *Quru kəllə*)

In (4), the constituent relativised is a dative argument, which is required by the verb *inanmaq* ‘believe’. When relativising a dative argument corresponding to the Recipient (the third argument of a three-place verb), this position may be occupied in the relative clause by a pronoun marked for the corresponding case (*ona* in [5]).⁷

- (5) *pişiyin (ona) siçan ver-diyi uşağ-a bax*
 cat.GEN DIST-DAT mouse give-NONSUBJPART.POS3 child-DAT look.IMP
 ‘Look at the child to whom the cat has given a mouse!’ (fn)

Possessors can also be relativized. As a rule, a cataphoric possessive suffix appears on the possessum within the relative clause in this case, pointing to the postposed head noun as the possessor. This is not rare, sometimes found instead of Recipient relativising constructions, as in (6):

- (6) *ata-sı-nın (ona) paltar al-dığ-ı qız sevin-ir.*
 father-POS3-GEN DIST-DAT dress take-NONSUBJ-POS3 girl rejoice-PRS3
 ‘The girl whose father has bought a dress for her is happy.’ (fn)

If the possessum functions as a subject in the RC, the subject-oriented participles are used (cf. [7]); otherwise a participle in *-DIQ-* is employed (cf. [8]):

- (7) *ata-sı öl-müş / öl-ən oğlan ağla-yır.*
 father-POS3 die-PERFPART die-SUBJPART boy cry-PRS3
 ‘The boy whose father has died / is dying, is crying.’ (fn)

- (8) *tilsim-i-ni sındır-dığ-ın otaq səmt-i-ndə ged-əcək-sən*
 curse-POS3-ACC break-NONSUBJ-POS2 room direction-POS3-LOC go-FUT-2
 ‘You will go in the direction of the room whose curse you have broken.’
 (SN, Ayğır Həsən)

The participial strategy is dominant in Azerbaijani because the *DIQ*-participle takes (possessive) indexation of the subject within the relative clause, a feature which is of considerable help in recovering the other function relativised. By contrast, Indo-european participles do not bear such personal indexes, and they are usually specialized and restricted to the relativisation of subject and direct object functions.

Headless participial relative clauses are much less frequent than headed ones, even for the relativization of subjects (unlike in Turkish, where this is very frequent). One example could be observed in (4) above. Usually headless participial relatives are in the plural form (cf. [9]), or based on a passive verb, as in (10):

(9) *gel-ən-lər*

come-SUBJPART-PL

‘the arriving ones’ (fn)

(10) *de-yil-ən-ə*

gör-ə

say-PASS-SUBJPART-DAT see-CV

‘according to what is said’ (fn)

Note that in current Azerbaijani (not influenced by Turkish) *DIQ*-participles may head only relatively short RCs, as in (11) and (12):

(11) *axtar-dığ-ım-ı*

tap-muş-am

look_for-NONSUBJPART-1-ACC find-PERF-1

‘I found what I was looking for.’ (SN, *Tapdıq*)

(12) *biz-im bugün kerosin adlandır-dığ-ımız neft-dir*

1PL-GEN today kerosene call-NONSUBJ-POS-1PL oil-COP3

‘What we call today ,kerosene’ is just oil.’

(Fərid Ələkbərov, *Şair Mikayıl Müşfiq*, Azerbaijan International jurnalı, 2002)

2.2. Participial vs. finite strategies in Persian

In Persian, relative clauses using the participial strategy are always short, postposed to their head, linked by an *ezafe* as in any other complex NP, and restricted to relativizing the subject of intransitive verbs (cf. [13]) and the object of transitive verbs (cf. [14]; in the latter case, the subject cannot be expressed). Such constructions are not much different from NPs with adjectives.

- (13) Persian
nâme-ye rasi-de az Tehrân
 letter-EZ arrive-PERFPART from Teheran
 ‘a letter arrived from Tehran’ (fn)

- (14) *sag-e kotak za-de*
 dog-EZ kick beat-PERFPART
 ‘a beaten dog’ (fn)

The dominant RC-forming strategy in Persian is a postposed finite clause introduced by the general subordinator *ki*. The antecedent noun takes a suffix *-i*, which is often considered to be a variant of the *ezafe* found in other noun-complementing (adjectival, genitival) constructions.⁸ If the subject-position is relativized, there is a gap in the relative clause:

- (15) *zan-i [ke Ø tanhâ yek gusfand dâş-t]*
 woman-EZ REL (NOM) alone one sheep have-PST
 ‘a woman who had only one sheep’ (fn)

- (16) *sag-i [ke mardom-râ gaz migir-ad] be-u*
 dog-DEF REL people-ACC biting PRS.strike-3 DAT-3

ostoxân nade!
 bone PROH.give

‘Do not give a bone to the dog which bites people.’ (fn)

This gapping strategy is also common with relativized objects, the gapped function being easily inferable from the presence of an unmarked nominative argument. (cf. [17]).

(17) *gusfand-i ke gorg bor-d*
 sheep-DEF REL wolf(NOM) carry-PST3
 ‘The sheep which the wolf has taken away.’ (fn)

Other, oblique syntactic positions of the head-noun are occupied by a resumptive pronoun or clitic inside the relative clause (u in [18] and -s in [19]).

(18) *sag-i [ke be-u ostoxân midim] u-râ nakuf!*
 dog- DEF REL DAT-DIST bone PRS.give.1PL 3-ACC PROH.beat
 ‘Do not beat the dog to which we give a bone.’ (fn)

(19) *zan-i [ke gorg gusfand-eş bor-d]*
 woman-DEF REL wolf(NOM) sheep-POS3 carry-PST3
 ‘the woman whose sheep a wolf had taken away’ (fn)

Note that this strategy for forming restrictive relative clauses is probably derived from an ‘adjoined relative clause’ type⁹ in which *ke* is used as a general linker and no affix is found to mark definiteness on the head-noun, and in which a resumptive pronoun (including one functioning as a direct object) is grammatical, though always optional (cf. [20]).

(20) *zan yek gusfand dâşt*
 woman one sheep have.PST3

ke (ân-râ) gorg (az-u) bor-d
REL (DIST-ACC) wolf (ABL-3) carry-PST3

‘The woman had a sheep, which a wolf took away.’ (fn)

2.3. The participial strategy in Tati

All Tati dialects make use of the participial suffix inherited from (old) Persian -ta-ka- (derived of Indo-European *-to-), with the two allomorphs *-de* (after consonant-stems) and *-re*

(after vowel-stems), hereafter subsumed under *-De*. However, Apsheron Tati,¹⁰ which has been in contact with Azerbaijani for many centuries, makes much wider use of participles than Persian. We will first describe how Apsheron Tati uses the inherited participle without the orientation constraint usually associated with the related forms in other Indo-European languages, and second, how the rather restricted Persian agent noun forms ending in *-degor* has become a productive participle formation.

2.3.1. The inherited participial strategy in Tati

In contrast to Persian, the participial strategy is dominant in Apsheron Tati, certainly as an imitation of the surrounding Azerbaijani. The relative clause headed by such *De*-participles continues to behave like its Indo-European counterparts in that it permits relativisation of intransitive subjects (cf. [21]) and direct objects, but also transitive subjects and some oblique positions in any factual – either past or non-past – context.

(21) Apsheron Tati

e-piyer-i men-de ye-to baq doşd
 ABL-father-POS3 remain-PART one garden have.PST3
 ‘He had a garden which remained from his father.’ (fn)

The exact temporal interpretation of such participles depends on the context (cf. [22]/present and [23]/past).

(22) *rous-de seg dendu ne-bzeren*
 bark-PART dog tooth NEG-EVT.strike.3
 ‘A dog who barks does not bite.’ (fn)

(23) *rous-de seg kuf-de bü*
 bark-PART dog beat-PART be.PST.3
 ‘The dog who barked was beaten.’ (fn)

When the direct object is relativised, the subject can be omitted, as in (24).

- (24) *nug voçi-re gendüm-yo*
 new collect-PART corn-PL
 ‘the corn newly reaped’ (fn)

If, however the subject is expressed in the RC, it remains in the nominative case (a feature sometimes found in informal spoken Azerbaijani as well), and an attributive marker is usually added to the participle ending (in (25), but not in (26)):

- (25) [*imu kuf-de-yi*] *seg*
 1PL.NOM beat-PART-ATTR dog
 ‘the dog which we have beaten’ (fn)

- (26) *merd-i üsde-re xune be-xoş zen ne-ma-ren.*
 man-POS3 buy-PART house DAT-pleasure woman NEG-come-PRS3
 ‘The house that her husband has bought does not please his wife.’ (fn)

This construction with an overt subject within the relative clause is the one normally found when the position relativised is the Recipient of a ditransitive verb (cf. [27]).

- (27) *imu sugum de-re-yi seg*
 1PL bone give-PART-ATTR dog
 ‘the dog to whom we gave a bone’ (fn)

Note that the attributive ending should be carefully distinguished from the third person possessive suffix (a morphological borrowing from Azerbaijani), which appears in those RCs where the head-noun is a possessor, as in (28).

- (28) *imu guş-yeyi-re keş-re-yi seg*
 we ears-PL.POS3-ACC pull-PART-ATTR dog
 ‘the dog whose ears we pull(-ed)’ (fn)

If the head of the RC is a noun expressing space (cf. [29]) or time (cf. [30]), a syntactic gap in the RC is not leading to similar ambiguities. Its probable function being obvious and easily recoverable, the Tati *De*-participle can be used in very much the same way as the *DIQ*-participle of Azerbaijani (cf. Section 2.1):

(29) *be xisi-re cege ure tike-tike enci-r-ünd,*
 DAT sleep-PART place DIST-ACC piece-piece cut-PST3PL
 ‘at the place where he was sleeping, they cut him to pieces’ (fn)

(30) *ser-e na-re saat xo ber-d u-re.*
 head-ACC put-PART hour sleep carry-PST3 DIST-ACC
 ‘As soon as he put his head down, sleep took him.’ (fn)

The use of the participial strategy in attributive relative clauses is thus not restricted to the relativization of the single argument of intransitives and the Patient of transitives. This strategy allows the relativization of most syntactic positions, including that of a transitive subject: this is an innovation, and a major deviant feature from the inherent S/P orientation of the corresponding Persian participle.

2.3.2. Voice neutrality of the S/P oriented participle in Tati

Since Tati, unlike Azerbaijani, has only one participial attributive verb-form, the participial strategy alone cannot disambiguate between object and subject relativization by way of the inherent ‘orientation’ of the participle employed. The *De*-participle had an inherited, ergatively patterned orientation, permitting relativisation of intransitive subjects and direct objects, while for the relativisation of an agent another participle, lost in Tati, was used. Nevertheless, the once S/P oriented participle is also used in agentive function.

In some idiomatic expressions (e.g. [31] and [32]), the object cannot be marked for the definite-accusative case and the predicate is not prototypically transitive:

(31) *dünya di-re adam-yo*
 world see-PART person-PL
 ‘people who have seen the world’ (fn)

(32) *Molla yeto xob-e şir de-re go doş-de-s.*
 Molla one good-ATR milk give-PART cow have-PERF-3
 ‘Mulla had a cow giving good milk.’ (= ‘good milk-giving cow’) (fn)

However, relativised subjects can have a definite object (accusative-marked) in the participial RC:

(33) *şir-e xar-de nozu ez-i xune nisdü.*
 milk-ACC eat-PART cat ABL-PROX house NEG COP3
 ‘The cat who has drunk the milk is not from this house.’ (fn)

Participial RCs may also relativise possessors of possessa with subject function in the RC (cf. [34]), as well as possessors of nominals with non-subject function (cf. [35]).

(34) *piyer-i müir-de gede herey ze-ren.*
 father-POS3 die-PART boy shout strike-PRS3
 ‘The boy whose father has died is crying.’ (fn)

(35) *xuniyi-re tü di-re kile e-mü xuvar-mü-nü.*
 house.POS3-ACC 2 see-PART girl ABL-1 sister-1-COP3
 ‘The girl whose house you see is my sister.’ (fn)

‘Voice neutral participles’ are also found in neighbouring East-Caucasian languages with ergative case-marking (cf. for instance Authier 2009 for Kryz, spoken in Azerbaijan where it neighbours with the main Tati speaking area). However, unlike these languages, Tati has no ergative marking of core arguments, retaining as it does Indo-European nominative-accusative alignment. This is sufficient to disambiguate Agent and Patient roles, one of these being usually expressed and duely flagged within the relative clause.

2.3.3. Headless participial RCs in Tati

Headless RCs are only rarely derived from attributive participial constructions in Apsheron Tati. In some instances the participle can be nominalized if it relativises a direct object. In this case, the subject is treated as the possessor of a possessive NP in which the participle is the possessum, and as such marked by the ezâfe suffix¹¹ (this seems to be the most probable origin of the attributive suffix illustrated above, although the syntactic reordering is difficult to explain):

- (36) *di-re-yi şumu des-yo-mü nistü*
see-PART-EZ you arm-PL-POS1 NEG.COP.3
'What you see are not my arms.' (fn)

Unlike in Azerbaijani, Tati participles relativizing oblique positions cannot be nominalized: a generic head-noun is added, like *zen* 'woman' in the translation of the Azerbaidjani example in (37), which is given in (38).

- (37) Azerbaijani
sən-in danış-dığ-in mən-im ana-m ol-ub.
2-GEN talk-NONSUBJPART-POS2 1-GEN mother-POS1 be-PERF3
'The woman you were talking to was my mother.'
(SN, Tapdıq)

- (38) Apsheron Tati
tü hadi sax-de-yi zən ə-mü moy-mü bi-res
2 talk do-PERFPART-EZ woman ABL-1 mother-POS1 be-PERF.3
'The woman you were talking to was my mother.' (fn)

If the position relativized is the one of a subject (intransitive or transitive/Agent), or the possessor of the RC's subject, either a derived form in *-gar* (cf. [39a]) or a generic noun (cf. [39b]) or has to be used, or both (cf. [40]).

- (39) a. *burvar-tü-ne küş-degar ez-i di nisdü.*
 brother-POS2-ACC kill-PARTSUBST ABL-PROX village NEG COP3
 b. *küş-de adam*
 kill-PART person

‘The one / person who killed your brother is not from this village.’ (fn)

- (40) *burvar-tü-ne küş-de-gar adam¹² di-imu nisdü.*
 brother-POS2-ACC kill-PARTSUBST person village-1PL NEG COP3

‘The one who killed your brother is not a person from this village.’ (fn)

Further examples of *gar*-participles are given in (41)–(43). Note that this form is also found in Persian, where it derives *nomina agentis*.

- (41) *ay mü-ne xas-degar-yo!*
 Oh 1-ACC want-SUBJPART-PL

‘Oh, you who love me!’ (fn)

- (42) *be-möçüd bi-regar-yo hamme xis-ren*
 DAT-mosque be-SUBJPART-PL all sleep-PRS.3

‘All those who are in the mosque are sleeping.’ (fn)

- (43) *mür-degar, des-i xurd bi-regar*
 die-SUBJPART hand-POS3 broken be-SUBJPART

‘deads, people whose hand was cut.’ (fn)

3. Non-participial RCs

Non-participial strategies for forming relative clauses are a largely neglected aspect of the syntax of Turkic languages, due to the fascination exerted by their participial strategies on linguists accustomed to finite strategies typical of European languages. They certainly deserve

more attention, especially when they are shared by non-Turkic languages in contact with Turkic ones, and when they are of such a rare type as head-internal RCs. But before turning to the description of head-internal RCs, let's first consider another non participial strategy, namely the correlative one, which is found mostly with conditional verb forms.

3.1. Non-participial strategies in Azerbaijani

Non participial relative clauses are almost never mentioned in grammars, including those published in Azerbaijan. This is why examples had to be collected in a corpus of published texts, and focus on those that were most easily identifiable, i.e. ones containing the interrogative word *hansı* 'which'.

3.1.1. Headless non-participial RCs

Azerbaijani has sentence-initial headless relative clauses in which an interrogative pronoun correlates with a resumptive element in the main clause, as illustrated in (44).

(44) Azerbaijani

kim düşmən maşın-ı-nı saxla-yır-muş,
who enemy car-POS3-ACC stop-PRS-PSTEVID

o maşın ol-urmuş həmin yaraqlı-nın
DIST car be-PRS-PSTEVID FOC.PROX fighter-GEN

‘(He) who would stop an enemy’s car, would keep this car.’

(S. Əhmədli *ömiür Urası*, 2000)

Such correlative clauses are translatable into Tati (cf. [45]). However, this type of relative clause appears to be rare.

(45) Apsheron Tati

ki mošin dišmən-ə m-poyən-d-ü, həmin mošin birebü əz-u.
 who car enemy-ACC EVT-stop-PST-3 **FOC.PROX** car be-PERF.3 **ABL-DIST**
 = (44)

3.1.2. Head-internal non-participial RCs

In a sub-type of non-participial RCs, the interrogative word functions as a **specifier** ('which') of the head-noun, which appears inside the RC. This strategy is available for the relativization of *any* syntactic **function**, **which is reflected** on the embedded head noun by a case suffix. This sub-type is rather common, especially in oral informal speech. Such constructions are stigmatized by purists as “*ərməni budaq cümləsi*”, that is “Armenian subordinate clauses”, and as such not **mentioned** in reference grammars and schoolbooks, but examples are easily elicited and can also be found in published texts by classic authors.

Relativising Goals, Recipients and Possessors, which is rather rare with the participial strategy, is **very** straightforward if one employs a non-participial strategy which flags the relativised function on the head itself, very much in the same way as in European-type RCs using a relative pronoun flagged by cases or adpositions. Thus, in cases in which relativising the possessor or an adjunct function would render the sentence awkward, the head-internal strategy may be used for more clarity, though usually with conditional modality. The internal head(s) is/are marked for the required cases. A resumptive pronoun (or a generic noun) in the matrix clause establishes a correlation (cf. [46]–[48]).

(46) *hansı iş-ə əl at-ır-am, o-nu qadağan elə-yir.*

Tableau mis en forme

which work-DAT hand throw-PRS-1 **DIST-ACC** forbidden do-PRS
 ‘Whatever work I take on, he forbids it.’ (*Azərbaycan nağılları, Pinəci ilə şah Abbas*)

- (47) *hansı çox-du, o-ndan siz yapış-in iki-əl-li.*
 which much-COP **DIST-ABL** 2PL catch-IMP.PL two-hand-WITH
 ‘Take the one which is heavier with both hands.’ (SN, *Daş üzük*)

- (48) *ayağ-in-ı hansı ilan gəl-di qoy o-nun üst-ü-nə.*
 foot-POS2-ACC which snake come put.IMP **3-gen** on-POS3-DAT
 ‘Put your foot on the (first) snake which will come.’ (SN, *Daş üzük*)

In (49) and (50), the head-internal construction could not be matched by an equivalent participial construction, which means that the finite construction fills a functional gap that emerges only at the lower end of the accessibility scale:

- (49) *hansı qız-in ayağ-ı-na ol-sa gərək*
 which girl-GEN foot-POS3-DAT be-HYP.3 DEBPTCL

həmin gözəl-i al-a-m.
 FOC.**PROX** beauty-ACC take-OPT-1

‘I have to marry the girl whose foot it goes to.’ (SN, *Ibrahim*)

- (50) *hansı padşah-la dava elə-sə-m, o-nun torpağ-ı-nı*
 which king-WITH war do-HYP-1 **DIST-GEN** earth-POS3-ACC

torba ilə daşı-mağ-a güc-üm çat-ar
 bag with carry-INF-DAT strength-POS1 reach-EVT.3

‘Whichever king I make war with, I have the power to carry his earth away in a bag.’
 (*Azərbaycan nağılları, Keçəl*)

If the internal head has subject (cf. [51]) or object (cf. [52]) function in the matrix clause, it is usually gapped, and this also happens with other functions in ‘loose’ spoken style (cf. [53] and [54]) or in the language used in theater plays or opera *libretti* (cf. [55] and [56]):

- (51) *kağız-ı hansı div-ə göstər-sə-n, Ø sən-i apar-acaq*
 letter-ACC which demon-DAT show-HYP-2 (NOM) 2-ACC carry-FUT.3
 ‘The first devil you will show the letter to, will carry you.’ (fn)

- (52) *Hansı at xoş-u-na gəl-ir, öz-ün*
 which horse pleasure-POS3-DAT come-PRS3 REFL-2

Ø seç Ø min get!
 (ACC) choose.IMP (DAT) mount.IMP go.IMP

‘Which horse you like (lit. “pleases you”), (which) is good, choose (it), mount (on it), and go!’ (fn)

- (53) *Hansı ölkə-yə istə-yir-sən, Ø ged-ə-k.*
 which country-DAT want-PRS-2 (DAT) go-OPT-1PL
 ‘Let’s go to whichever country you wish.’ (fn)

- (54) *Biz-im hansı-muz-ın əl-i-nə pul düş-sə-ydi*
 1PL-GEN which-1PL-GEN hand-POS3-DAT money fall-HYP-PST

bazar-dan Ø ulduz al-ar-dı.
 market-ABL (COM) star take-EVT-PST

‘Any of us could buy stars (= distinctions) from the bazar with whatever money might land in his hand.’ (M. İbrahimbəyov, *Püstə Ağacı*, contemporary)

- (55) *hansı bəy-in qız-ı-nı istə-sə-n ged-im Ø*
 which lord-GEN girl-POS3-ACC want-HYP-2 go-IMP1 (ACC)

sən-ə al-ım.
 2-DAT take-IMP1

‘Which lord’s daughter you ever may wish, I’ll go and fetch her for you.’

(Ü. Hacıbəyov, *Arşın Mal Alan*, 1913)

- (56) *kənd-lər-in hansı-nda əylən-ibdir, Ø gəl-ər çıx-ar.*
 village-PL-GEN which-LOC have_fun-PERF (ABL) come-EVT.3 come_out-EVT.3
 ‘Whichever village he may be [hiding] enjoying a good time, he will reappear and come out of it.’ (M. F. Axundov, *Sərgüzəşti mərdi xəsis* or *Hacı Qara*, 1852)

3.1.3. Conditional RCs in Azerbaijani

The other case in which the use of a finite strategy instead of a participial one is common is when it is strongly motivated by the necessity to express non-factual modality in the RC. Usually the Azerbaijani subordinate verb-form is a conditional form (‘HYP’ in [57]-[60]):

- (57) *hansı söz lazım-ıydı-sa, o söz-ü də de-di.*
 which word necessary-COPPST.3-HYP DIST word-ACC FOC say-PST.3
 ‘He would pronounce the necessary words.’ (Elçin, *Toyuğun diri qalması*, 1987)

(58) *hansı-nız mən-im əmr-im-dən çıx-sa, o-nu öldür-əcəy-əm.*
 which-POS-2PL 1-GEN order-POS1-ABL go_out-HYP DIST-ACC kill-FUT-1
 ‘Whoever of you goes against my order, I’ll kill him.’ (SN, *Ayğır Həsən*)

(59) *kim hansı oğlan-ı istə-yir-sə, alma-nı o-na at-sın.*
 who which boy-ACC want-PRS-HYP apple-ACC DIST-DAT throw-OPT
 ‘Which boy she wishes, let her throw the apple to him.’ (fn)

(60) *sən-ə hansı gözəl-i de-sə-n Ø al-ar-əm.*
 2-DAT which beauty-ACC say-HYP-2 (ACC) take-EVT-1
 ‘I shall take for you whichever beautiful (girl) you say.’ (fn)

The fact that such conditional relative clauses imply topicalisation is a well-known phenomenon across languages;¹³ in Azerbaijani, the focus of the hypothesis can additionally be moved away from the verb onto one of his arguments by cliticising to it a conditional copula (cf. [61]).

(61) *hansı xatirə-lər-i-sə yad-ı-na*
 which memory-PL-COP3-HYP mind-POS3-DAT

sal-ıb baş-ı-nı yellə-di.
 let-PERF head-POS3-ACC shake-PST

‘He shook his head, remembering some memories.’ (Anar, *Dantenin Yubileyi*, 1988)

3.1.4. Multiple-head RCs in Azerbaijani

A case in which the use of the finite, non-participial strategy employing interrogative pronouns appears to be obligatory in the written norm is when two syntactic positions are relativized in the same RC. In one instance (cf. [62]), the interrogative word *hansı* ‘which’ was found to bear on (logically) two internal heads:

- (62) *hansı uşağ-ın baş-ı üst-ü-nə bu üç pəri gəl-sə-ydi,*
 which child-GEN head-POS3 on-POS3-DAT THIS three fairy come-HYP-PST
bir-i öp-ər-di o-nu, bir-i bəxşeyiş ver-ər-di Ø
 one-POS3 kiss-EVT-PST **DIST-ACC** one-POS3 present give-EVT-PST (DAT)
 ‘[Of] these three fairies who would come upon the head of the (lit. which) child, one would give him a kiss, one would give him a present.’ (Ə. Cəfərzadə, *Üç öpüş*, 1982)

However, usually *hansı* is repeated (cf. [63] and [64]), or used jointly with an interrogative pronoun, as in (65) and (66).

- (63) *Hansı ev-ə hansı döyüşçü birinci gir-di, həmin ev*
 which house-DAT which wrestler first enter-PST FOC.**PROX** house
bütün əşya-sı ilə ol-ur-muş o-nun.
 all furniture-POS3 with be-EVT-PST.EVID DIST-GEN
 ‘Which house which wrestler first entered, all the furniture of this house would be his.’
 (Sabir Əhmədli, *Omür urası*, 2000)

- (64) *hər bir kəs hansı məzhəb-dən hansı*
 every one person which sect-ABL which
məzhəb-ə istə-sə keç-ə bil-sin.
 sect-DAT want-HYP pass-DAT can-OPT
 ‘Let everyone have the possibility to abide by the faith he wishes.’ (**fn**)

(65) *kim-i hansı nömrə-ni ver-ir həmin palto-nu da al-ır.*
 who-POS3 which number-ACC give-PRS this_very coat-ACC FOC take-PRS
 ‘which number one gives gets the [corresponding] coat’ (Anar, *Asqılıqda işləyən qadının söhbəti*, 1988)

(66) *harada hansı ticarət müəssəs-i-ndə qara parça var-sa,*
 where which business plant-POS3-LOC black fabric exist-HYP
yığıl-sın.
 requisition-PASS-OPT

‘Whereever, in whichever business black fabric will be available, let it be requisitioned.’
 (Sabir Əhmədli, *Qara bayraqlar*, 2003)

3.2. Use of *ki* in Azerbaijani head-internal RCs

The particle *ki* is almost never used in Azerbaijani finite relative clauses, at least in written texts. We found only two instances in a corpus of some 2000 pages, and they are typically descriptive, not restrictive RCs, as in (67) and (68):

(67) *iç-ə-k həmin o məhəbbət körpü-sü-nün sağlığı-ı-na,*
 drink-OPT-1PL FOC.PROX DIST love bridge-POS3-GEN health-POS3-DAT

hansı-nın ki, bir uc-u bu dam-da-dır, bir uc-u
 which-GEN **ki** one end-POS3 PROX roof-LOC-COP3 one end-POS3

o dam-da oğlan ev-i-ynən qız ev-i-nin
DIST roof-LOC boy house-POS3-WITH girl house-POS3-GEN

ara-sı-nda!..
 interval-POS3-LOC

‘Let’s drink to this bridge of love, [I mean] whose one end is on one of the roofs, the other end on the other roof, between the house of the groom and the roof of the bride.’
(S. Qədirzadə, *Bənövşə*, 1969)

(68) *əlifba-mız* (hansı *ki*, *Türk* #*əlifba-sı-na*
alphabet-POS-1PL which **ki** Turk alphabet-POS3-DAT

yaxın idi) *dəyişdir-il-di*.
close COPPST change-PASS-PST

‘Our alphabet (which was close to the Turkish alphabet) was changed.’ (F. Ələkbərov, *Əlyazmalar İnstitutu Azərbaycanda erkən əlifbalar*, Azerbaijan International jurnalı, 2000)

The preceding examples should be considered derivatives of the *hansı* construction without *ki*, but they seem to have moved one step forward in the direction of forming European-type relative pronouns. This is not directly comparable with the use of *ki* in Tati head-internal restrictive relative clauses.

3.2.1. The head-internal strategy in Tati

The presence of an attributive participial form capable of relativising subjects, objects and most oblique positions in Tati is doubled by the non-participial, head-internal strategy. It can be headed by a pronoun in initial position (cf. [69]), or by a NP made up of the head-noun preceded by the adjective *kitam* meaning ‘which’ (cf. [70]).

(69) *ki* *ki* *burvar-tü-ne* *küş-de-s*,
who(NOM) KI brother-POS2-ACC kill-**PERF**-3

adam *di-imu* *nisdü*.
person village-1PL NEG COP3

‘The one who killed your brother is not a person from this village.’ (**fn**)

(70) *kitam* *adam* *ki* *burvar-tü-ne* *küş-de-s*

which person KI brother-POS2-ACC kill-PERF-3

ez-i di nisdü.
ABL-PROX village NEG COP3

‘The person who killed your brother is not a person from this village.’ (fn)

As in Azerbaijani, the main asset of this strategy is the finiteness of the verb form employed, which allows for a switch in tense and mood categories (cf. [71]).

(71) *kitam adam ki burvar-tü-ne kuf-den*
which person KI brother-POS2-ACC beat-PRS3

ez-i di nisdü.
ABL-PROX village NEG COP3

‘The person who is beating up your brother is not a person from this village.’ (fn)

Tati usually adds the particle *ki* after the head-noun marked for its syntactic function and before the verb (cf. [70] and [71] above). The matrix clause may contain a resumptive pronoun, in which case we are dealing with a correlative construction, as in (72).

(72) [*kitam seg ki dendu bzeren*] *bo-u sugum medi !*
which dog KI tooth EVT.strike.3 DAT-DIST bone PROH.give

‘Do not give a bone to the dog which bites.’ (fn)

Most frequently, however, and systematically if the antecedent head has subject function in the matrix clause, the latter contains a gap (cf. [73] and [74]):

(73) *kitam nozu ki şir-e xar-de-s, ez-i xune nisdü.*
 which cat KI milk-ACC eat-PERF-3 ABL-PROX house NEG-COP3
 ‘The cat who has drunk the milk is not from this house.’ (fn)

(74) *kitam xune-re (ki) merd üsde-re-s (...)*
 which house KI man buy-PERF-3
 ‘The house that her husband has bought (does not please his wife).’ (fn)

In some instances, a shared argument other than the head noun is repeated (e.g. *xune* ‘house’ in [75]).

(75) *kitam merd ki xune üsde-re-s, xune-re*
 which man KI house buy-PERF-3 house-ACC

be-zen xaşden volen-den.
 DAT-woman SELF show-PRS3

‘The husband who has bought a house shows it to his wife.’ (fn)

Possessors can be relativised, whether or not their possessa are subjects in the relative clause (cf. [75] for a subject possessum and [76] for a non-subject possessum).

(75) *e-kitam gede ki piyer-i mür-de-s herey ze-ren.*
 ABL which boy KI father-POS3 die-PERF-3 shout strike-PRS3
 ‘The boy whose father has died is crying.’ (fn)

(76) *e-kitam kile ki xuniyi-re di-rini e-mü xuvar-mü-nü*
 ABL-which girl KI house see-PRS2 ABL-1 sister-POS1-COP3
 ‘The girl whose house you see is my sister.’ (fn)

If the head-noun is the possessor of an argument of the matrix clause (e.g. *seg* ‘dog’ and *guşyeyi* ‘ear’ in [77]), it appears in the case corresponding to its function in the RC, and is cross-referenced by a possessive suffix on the possessum in the matrix clause:

- (77) [*kitam seg ki rousden*] *guş-yeyi-re me-keş !*
 which dog KI bark-PRS.3 ears-PL.POS3-ACC PROH-pull
 ‘The dog which barks, do not pull his ears!’ (fn)

As can be seen in (77), in such head-internal relative clauses *ki* is used not as a linker morpheme, like in Persian, but as a marker of focus on the preceding word, head of the RC. Without this particle the clause takes an indefinite, more general meaning, thus compensating for the absence of a conditional form (cf. [78] and [79]):

- (78) *kitam seg rousden...*
 which dog bark-PRS.3
 ‘Whichever dog barks...’ (fn)

- (79) *be-kitam kar des şen-dunum, be-u qadeşe na-ren.*
 DAT-which work hand throw-PRS.1 DAT-DIST interdiction put-PRS.3
 ‘Whatever work I take on, he forbids it.’ (fn)

The strategy illustrated above is used whenever the head-noun is highly topical and has to be preposed to the RC, a feature quite systematically associated with the semantic role of (transitive) Agent, and the fronting movement involved by this strategy is a way to mark the head of the RC as a topic. It is, however, not restricted to filling any functional gap left by the disappearance of the Indo-European active participle, since it is also found in relative clauses in which the syntactic position of transitive subject may be relativised.

3.2.2. Pragmatic and (non factual) modal motivation

Grammatically, the question-word using strategy may be called a “primary strategy”, since it allows for the relativization of all syntactic positions including subjects, but pragmatically, it is not dominant and highly marked for an additional value:

The use of the head-internal strategy allows speakers to

- topicalize the head and the function relativized;
- express non-factual modality in the relative clause.

Non-factual modality is expressed on the verb, usually in the ‘eventual’¹⁴ form; recall that the particle *ki* is always omitted in this case:

(80) *be-kitam ölke m-yo tii-ne, b-re-m.*
DAT-which country EVT-come.3 you-ACC SUBJ-go-1PL
‘Let’s go to whatever country you want.’ (fn)

(81) *e-kitam beg kiliyi-re m-xas-di*
ABL-which lord girl.POS3-ACC EVT-want-PST-2

bu-ra-m xas-d-um bere-tü.
SUBJ-go-1 ask-PST-1 for-2

‘Whichever lord’s daughter you wish I will ask for you.’ (fn)

3.2.3. Restrictions on the participial strategy

Three-place predicates give rise to rather heavy participial clauses, and even if the relativised position is that of a subject, the participial construction is accepted as grammatically correct when it is suggested to informants, but the translation first given by our informant uses the head-internal equivalent construction (cf. [82]).

(82) *be-ayol muş de-re nozu-re girind*
DAT-child mouse give-PART cat-ACC catch.IMPPL
‘Catch the cat which has given a mouse to the child!’ (fn)

(83) *kitam nozu ki be-ayol muş de-re-s, u-re girind.*
which cat KI DAT-child mouse give-PERF-3 DIST-ACC catch.IMPPL

= (82)

In other cases, the motivation for choosing this strategy was the categorical inability of the Tati *De*-participle to relativise functions lower down on the accessibility (or ‘Keenan-Comrie’) scale. The participial strategy was rejected, and the head-internal one was judged the only possibility. The functions concerned are those of

- a Recipient marked by the dative-directive pro-clitic *be-* (cf. [84]);
- a Beneficiary introduced by the preposition *bere* ‘for’ (cf. [85]);
- animate argument of a verb “take” marked with the ablative proclitic (cf. [86]);
- comitative with preposition *boş* (cf. [87]);
- and possessor of a noun which is not subject of the RC (cf. [88]).

(84) *be-kitam ayol ki nozu muş de-re-s, be-u deş.*
DAT-which child KI cat mouse give-PERF-3 DAT-DIST look.IMP
‘Look at the child to whom the cat has given a mouse!’

(85) *bere kitam kile ki piyer-i nüg-e lupke üsde-re-s*
for which girl KI father-POS3 new-ATTR dress buy-PERF-3

be-u deş.
DAT-DIST look.IMP

‘Look at the girl for whom her / whose father has bought a new dress.’ (fn)

(86) *e-kitam nozu ki ayol muş üsde-re-s, u-re girind.*
ABL-which cat KI child mouse take-PERF-3 DIST-ACC catch.IMP
‘Catch the cat from whom the child has received (=taken) a mouse!’ (fn)

(87) *boş kitam parşah davo s-um, ez-u xak-i-re*
 WITH which king fight do.SUBJ-1 ABL-DIST earth-POS3-ACC

be turbi es bere keşi-ren avar-den zür-mü m-ras-ü,
 DAT-bag.EZ horse FOR pull-INF carry-INF strength-POS1 EVT-reach-3

‘Whichever king I make war with, I have the power to carry his earth away in a bag.’ (example translated from Azerbaijani)

(88) *e-kitam eyol ki mumser-i-re pare sax-dem*
 ABL-which child KI hair-POS3-ACC cut do-PERF-1PL

‘The child whose hair we cut / have cut.’ (fn)

In some interesting cases (e.g. [89]), the markers of the two different syntactic relations (possessum and Patient argument) can scramble (the e- genitive proclitic goes with the possessive suffix in the main clause, while the –e accusative enclitic is governed by the main verb):

(89) [*e-kitam seg-e ki guşye-yi-re keş-ren-im*] *mo-kuf!*
 of-which dog-ACC KI ears-POS3-ACC pull-PRS-1-PL PROH-beat
 (lit.) ‘The dog whose ears we pull, do not beat it!’ (fn)

3.2.4. Double relativisation

In the case of double relativisation, the head-internal strategy has to be used in Tati. The double RCs provided above from our Azerbaijani corpus can be translated into Tati with a parallel construction:

- (90) *ki-re e-kitam gede xoş ma-ren,*
 who-ACC ABL-which boy well come-PRS3

sib-e be-u b-şən-ü
 apple-ACC DAT-DIST SUBJ-throw-3

‘Which boy pleases to whom’, let her throw the apple to him.’ (fn)

- (91) *her şexs e-kitam mezheb be-kitam mezheb*
 each person ABL-which religion DAT-which religion

xas-d-ü tan-ü güdoş-den.
 want-PST-3 can.SUBJ-3 pass-INF

‘Let everyone have the possibility to abide by the faith he wishes.’

4. Conclusion

It is well known that relativizing strategies can be copied, from one language to another, even across linguistic families. For instance, all Kashkay dialects of Southern Iran, though genetically South-West Turkic like Azerbaijani,¹⁵ have lost most of the preposed participial strategies typical of the Turkic family and have replaced it with the strategy found in surrounding – and genetically unrelated – Persian, which involves a general subordinating morpheme *ki* and a pronominal anaphora for all relativized positions other than subject and object. This seems not to have happened in Northern Azerbaijani dialects. Indeed Persian and standard Azerbaijani use two very different strategies to form relative clauses. In Northern Azerbaijan, it is rather the Iranian language Tati that has extended the use of participles under the influence of the dominant Azerbaijani language.

The greater capacity of Turkic participles to clarify syntactic roles within the RC certainly accounts for the fact that, unlike Indo-European languages, most Turkic languages have not developed finite relative clause strategies, and when such finite RC occur, they are clearly a

result of language contact. Apart from the case of Kashkay mentioned in the introduction, Gagauz and Balkan varieties of Turkish have also copied RC from surrounding Slavic languages.¹⁶ And Azerbaijani has a finite RC-forming strategy, in which the relative clause contains the head noun, is headed by a finite verb-form, and precedes the matrix clause. While not very widely used, it can be found in all sorts of Azerbaijani texts, as the examples given above have shown.

In both the Azerbaijani and Tati head-internal relative clause constructions, the relative clause 1) is preposed to the matrix clause, 2) has its domain noun embedded and marked for its case / function in the relative clause; and 3) the latter is preceded by an inflected interrogative pronoun ('which'). It is the matrix clause which has either zero anaphora (if the head-noun inside it is subject, transitive or not, or object) or a resumptive pronoun marked for case (for functions other than subject or object). I believed at first that this new head-internal strategy had been copied by Azerbaijani from Tati, because in the past, in all likelihood, Tati, not Azerbaijani, was the dominant language, and the emergence of a new strategy may have been motivated, in Tati only, by the disappearance of the active participle and the need for a new strategy to relativize transitive subjects. But Tati participles have lost their original (Indo-European) S/P or "passive" orientation, and they are now used to relativise transitive subjects as well as other functions. This may have resulted from the influence of East-Caucasian ergative dependent-marking languages with non-oriented participles, but such a development would be far-fetched for the Apsheron dialect we have dealt with, which has not been in contact with any language other than Azerbaijani. Azerbaijani does have, along with the two complementarily oriented participles in -(y)*An* (S/A or 'agentive') and *-DIQ-* (non agentive), a perfect participle in *-mİş* (S/P or 'patientive'): all these options to relativise syntactic roles are conflated in the syntactic behaviour of the only participle of Tati. Only the lowest syntactic function on the accessibility scale prompted the other strategy as the only grammatically correct choice.

Finally, one may assume that instances of similar constructions in neighbouring languages represent an areal syntactic feature. The same relative construction is found in Northern Taleshi (another Iranian languages spoken in the Southern part of Azerbaijan and across the border in Iran, but not closely related with Caucasian Tat dialects):

(92) [kom maktabli ve bāl gırda bı-kā.] av mukāfat ba-ste

which schoolchild much point collection MOD-make.OPT 3 prize FUT-take
 '[Whichever schoolchild collects most points], he will receive a prize.'

cf. the corresponding question:

(93) kom maktabi ve bâl gırda ba-kârde?
which schoolchild much point collection FUT-make

'Which schoolchild will collect most points?'

(94) [ba çiki sıxân bî-mând-o,] bî-zın, hagigi peyğambar av e
to whose word MOD-stay-OPT MOD-know genuine prophet 3 3COP

'[At whosoever word (the sea) stays still,] know that he is the genuine prophet.'

cf.

(95) [ba çiki sıxân ba-mânde?
to whose word FUT-stay-OPT

'At whose word will (the sea) stay still?'

But in Northern Taleshi, when this strategy is used, the relative clause is most commonly of the headless kind:

(96) [ba tı ıstı âvlod çiç bî-ka,] bî-zın,
to 2 2.POS child what MOD-do.SUBJ.2 MOD-know

ba-vinde ısta âvlod-on-ku ay-an
FUT-see REFL child-PL-from 3-FOC

'[What your child does to you,] know that he will see it also from his own children.'

cf. ba tı ıstı âvlod çiç bakârde? 'What will your child do to you?'

Correlative relative clauses made up of an indirect parametric question are also found in a non Turkic, non Iranian language of Azerbaijan, as exemplified by Haspelmath (1993):

(97) vuj k'anik akat-ay-t'a,
[who:ABS below come-AORPART-CND]

hada viçi-n q'uşun-ar q'uluqh çugwa-da
that(ERG) self-GEN troop-PL back pull-FUT

'Whoever is defeated shall withdraw his troops.'

(98) Hinal yif xha-yi-t'a,
[whereon night become-AORPART-CND]

hanal am yal jağ-un patal aq:waz-zava,
thereon he [rest hit-MSD] for stop-ipf

‘Wherever the night falls, there he stops to rest.’

And in Lezgian also, when the interrogative word is the determiner hi ‘which’, the full NP may be repeated in the main clause.

(99) Abur hi gaf.uni-z talug’ ya-t’a,
[they which word-DAT belonging COP-CND]

ha gaf.uni-n k’anikaj ts’ar çug-u.
that word-GEN below line draw-IPF

‘Whichever word they belong to, draw a line below that word.’

Such correlative relative clauses with the verb in the indicative are found in the proverbs:

(100) (Q’el hi kas.di ne-da, hada yad qhwa-da.
[salt which man(ERG) eat-FUT] that(ERG) water drink-FUT

‘Whoever eats salt will drink water.’

Haspelmath further states that “This construction is more usual in the neighboring languages Budukh and Kryz”, referring to Boguslavskaja 1981, to which should now be added Authier (2009) on Kryz. This is enough to show that the correlative constructions are not restricted to the Apsheron peninsula, or a merely sociolectal feature of the outskirts of Baku. I think that they are rather a fashionable stylistic pattern: the last two examples from Lezgian are typical ready-made sentences, easily borrowed in multilingual environments.

However, it should be emphasized that in Tati and Azerbaijani, the head-internal subtype has extended its domain for discursive purposes. Since a case marker signals the relativized function (contrary to most previously described head-internal relative clauses), they may well be found to relativize any syntactic functions of the well-know accessibility scale, but they are most widely used for Agents (transitive subjects), dative and possessor functions, which are naturally most topical, because (while certainly most relative clauses belong to the presupposed part of a sentence) Azerbaijani and Tati head-internal RCs entail outright topicalization. They signal high topicality of the head noun and the subsequent matrix clause is in focus.

Abbreviations

1	1st person
2	2nd person
3	3rd person
<u>ABL</u>	<u>ablative</u>
<u>ATTR</u>	<u>attributive marker</u>
<u>CND</u>	<u>conditional</u>
DIST	distal anaphora
PROX	proximal anaphora
CAUS	causative
DAT	dative
EVT	eventual mood
EZ	ezâfe
GEN	genitive
<u>HORT</u>	<u>hortative</u>
<u>HYP</u>	<u>hypothetic</u>
IMP	imperative
INF	infinitive
LOC	locative
<u>MSD</u>	<u>masdar</u>
NEG	negation
OPT	optative
PASS	passive
PL	plural
PERF	perfect
PRS	present
PROH	prohibitive
<u>PART</u>	<u>participle</u>
<u>REL</u>	<u>relator</u>
SUBJ	subjunctive

References

Izgiyaeva, E.

2005 *Tatsko-Russkij slovar'*, Maxachkala

Authier, G.

2009 *Grammaire kryz*, Paris

in preparation *Le judéo-tat, langue iranienne des Juifs du Daghestan*

Keenan, E. & Comrie, B.

1977 Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.63-99.

Haiman, J.

1978 *Conditionals are topics* In *Language*, 54, 3, 564-89

Gorçu T.

2008 *Səhrli nağıllar*, Baku

Grjunberg A. L.

1963 Grünberg, A. 1963. Jazyk severoazerbajdzhanskix tatov. Moskva: Nauka

Hale, K.

1976 *The adjoined relative clause in Australia*, In *Grammatical categories in Australian Languages*, ed. by Dixon R., Canberra

Haspelmath, M.

1993 *A Grammar of Lezgian*, Mouton, Berlin

Lazard, G.

1975 *La catégorie de l'éventuel* In *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à E. Benveniste*, Paris, Peeters. p. 347-358.

Matras Y. & Tufan, S.

2008 Contact-induced change in Macedonian Turkish. In: *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Edited by Yaron Matras and Jeanette Sakel. Mouton, Berlin

Samvelian, P.

2006 L'enclitique *-i* introducteur de relative en persan : déterminant, allomorphe de l'*ezâfe* ou autre chose encore ? , *Studia Iranica* 34/2, 7-34.

Schachter, P.

1973 *Focus and relativization* In *Language* 49, 19-46.

¹ The data for this article are either drawn from Azerbaijani published texts, most of them available on the internet (reference after each example) or from data collected by myself (field notes). Field trips were funded by the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique and the Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales. I wish to thank my main informant Mrs Naiba Mammadova for sharing with me her knowledge of such a rare language as Tati, and Mr Elvin Abbabeyli for the Azerbaijani elicited examples. I am also indebted to V. Gast for improving my English and to him and G. Lazard for valuable remarks.

² cf. [Izgiyaeva](#) 2003.

³ Original literary works, translations, primers, and a newspapers have been published in Derbent from the early 20's.

⁴ cf. Authier, in preparation.

⁵ cf. Comrie & Keenan 1977.

⁶ Hereafter SN.

⁷ This would be totally incorrect in standard Turkish.

⁸ For a different opinion, see Samvelian 2008???

⁹ cf. Hale

¹⁰ The name Tati is sometimes applied (especially by Yarshater and Stilo) to residual North-West Iranian languages of Southern (Iranian) Azerbaijan; we choose to stick to the European tradition and will call Tati only the language spoken in the North-Caucasus and the North-Eastern Part of the Republic of Azerbaijan.

¹¹ Note that the ezâfe is found in Tati only on words ending with a vowel.

¹² Recall that there is no ezafe on words ending with a consonant !

¹³ See of course Haiman 1978.

¹⁴ cf. Lazard 1975

¹⁵ There is an almost perfect mutual intelligibility between Azerbaijani and Kashkai speakers. I tested this personally by submitting recordings to both audiences. Northern Azerbaijani people understand in fact better Kashkai than 'Stambuli' Turkish.

¹⁶ cf. Matras & Tufan 2007