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Abstract: Azeri, the second largest language in Iran—with 15–20 million speakers—is a Turkic language. This study examines the effect of Persian on Azeri morphosyntax, which is becoming persified, as predicted in such situations of long-term language contact involving a politically-dominant language (Myers-Scotton 1993). This study aims at investigating two types of causatives in Azeri: native morphological and borrowed syntactic. The analysis of the data—by conducting a field study with five older, less educated and monolingual in Azeri and five younger, higher educated and bilingual in Azeri and Persian in Tabriz, Iran—revealed that all participants accepted both native and borrowed constructions depending on the context. The degree of penetration of Persian into Azeri is seen by the fact that even monolingual Azeri speakers use the borrowed variant. In addition, I have found that the social factors—age and education—have no decisive role in the choice of variant.

1 Introduction

Iran is a diverse country, with people of many religious and ethnic backgrounds who speak different languages as their first language. Persian is the dominant language and native speakers of Persian often do not learn a minority language. However, most speakers of minority languages in Iran also speak Persian to some degree. Persian serves as a lingua franca in Iran, and most publications and mass media are in this language. There are only limited publications or broadcasting programs in the other relatively popular languages of Iran, such as Azeri and Kurdish. In some societies, people use one language in their families, local communities, and work, but another language for education and official business. This is the situation in Iran: the only official language of Iran is Persian, and it is the only language used for education, including in Azeri-speaking areas. Many educated Azeris are totally fluent in both Azeri and Persian. Bilingual speakers are comfortable in both languages, and often engage in code-mixing when speaking to each other.

Azeri is a Turkic language, but it is strongly influenced by Persian, an Indo-European language. Azeri, with approximately 15–20 million speakers, has more speakers than any other non-Persian language in Iran (Crystal 2010). Most Azeri speakers inhabit the four provinces in the northwestern part of Iran. Each province has its own dialect—the Ardabil dialect in Ardabil province, the Tabriz dialect in East Azerbaijan province, the Urmia dialect in West Azerbaijan province and the Zanjan dialect in Zanjan province. The dialects are mutually intelligible, although they are distinguished by phonological and lexical criteria (Dehghani 2000). I am a native speaker of Azeri, born and raised in Tabriz, capital of East Azerbaijan province in northwestern Iran.

Given the dominance of Persian, and the long period of intensive contact, Azeri speakers differ in their fluency in Persian, ranging from monolinguals to fully functional bilinguals. People from the older generation who have little or no education are not able to read, write or speak Persian fluently. However, those who have higher education, which includes most of the younger generation, can read, write and speak Persian fluently. The reason is that they have been in
contact with Persian for many years, they read academic publications in Persian, and of course, many of the educated people need to write academic texts.

Borrowing is not limited to lexical items. Myers-Scotton (1993) states that when two languages that are not genetically related share a geographical location, and there is a high degree of bilingualism or multilingualism, grammatical features of the dominant language may be adopted by the minority language. Since, Persian is the only official language in Iran it has political and cultural dominance over Azeri. This is exactly the sort of situation where one would expect the structure of a language to be influenced by another language, even if it is typologically dissimilar. Erfani (2012) explored this issue for a variety of morphosyntactic constructions in Azeri and found that several show signs of persification.

The main objective of this paper is to examine patterns of language variation among Azeri speakers in their use of causative constructions in order to determine the degree of influence of Persian on Azeri structure. To do this, I designed a study to investigate Azeri causative constructions, collecting data from a variety of Azeri speakers. Section 2 gives an introduction to causative in Azeri as compared to Turkish and Persian. Section 3 describes the field study detailing the methodology. Section 4 analyses the data and discusses the results in terms of two sociolinguistic factors—the age and level of education of the speaker. Finally, section 5 summarizes the results of this study and discusses what it reveals for the future of the Azeri language.

2 Causative construction

In this section, I discuss the causative construction. Both syntactic and semantic considerations come into play when discussing the typology of causatives. Comrie (1981) categorises causative constructions from lexical through morphological to syntactic (or analytic). Azeri, as well as Turkish and Persian, has all three types of causatives.

In lexical causatives, the causative form is lexically distinct from the corresponding intransitive verb, e.g. English kill vs. die. Lexical causatives occur in Azeri (1), Turkish (2) and Persian (2), as seen by contrasting the intransitive verbs below with their transitive counterparts; however only a few verbs have lexical causatives in each language.

(1) **Azeri**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical item</th>
<th>Syntactic item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>getmax</td>
<td>aparmax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to go’</td>
<td>‘to take’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xarap olmax</td>
<td>xarap elämmax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to be destroyed’</td>
<td>‘to destroy’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) **Turkish**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical item</th>
<th>Syntactic item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>görmek</td>
<td>göstermek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to see’</td>
<td>‘to show’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harap olmak</td>
<td>harap etmek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘to be destroyed’</td>
<td>‘to destroy’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the morphological causative, a causative verb can be created from a non-causative or causative verb by attaching an affix.

(4) ye ‘eat’ ye-dir ‘feed’ (Turkish & Azeri)
(5) ye-dir ‘feed’ ye-dir-t ‘cause to feed’ (Turkish & Azeri)

In syntactic causatives, the notion of cause and effect is distributed between two predicates, as in these English examples:

(6) I caused John to go.
(7) I brought it about that John went.

The next sections describe the morphological and syntactic causative construction in Azeri followed by the constructions in Turkish and Persian.

2.1 Morphological causative

In Azeri the morphological causative, the suffix -dir or -(I)t (with allomorphs varying phonologically due to vowel harmony) is affixed to the verb stem to form a causative verb. In a causative based on an intransitive verb, the causer, e.g. Ali in 0, occurs in subject position in the causative clause, and the cause, e.g. uşax ‘kid’ in 0, occurs in direct object position and is marked with accusative case.

(8) Azeri
a. uşax yat-dı
   kid-NOM sleep-PST.3SG
   ‘The kid slept.’

b. Ali uşağ-r yat-ıt-dı
   Ali-NOM kid-ACC sleep-CAUS-PST.3SG
   ‘Ali made the kid sleep.’

In a causative based on a transitive verb, the causer, e.g. män ‘I’ in 0, occurs in subject position, the direct object, kitab-ı ‘book-ACC’ in 0, remains unchanged in its position and the cause, qız-a ‘girl-DAT’ in 0, occurs in indirect object position, with dative case.
According to Comrie’s (1989: 191) case hierarchy, the causee is assigned the leftmost available position in the hierarchy: subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique object. Since the direct object position is already occupied in a causative based on a transitive verb, the causee occupies the indirect object position.

To form a causative clause with a verb with a direct object and one or more indirect object, the causer is added as a new subject. Since the direct object position is already occupied, the causee must move to the indirect object position; but this position is also already occupied and two NPs cannot occupy the indirect object position in the same clause. Thus, based on Comrie’s (1989) case hierarchy, the causee can be presented as an oblique object using other case suffixes—locative 0, benefactive (11), instrumental (12) (Dehghani 2000: 234)—or a postposition tarafından ‘by’ (13) (Lee 2008: 125):

(10) Azeri

kişi ät-i qässab-a tükan-da käs-dir-di
man-NOM flesh-ACC butcher-DAT store-LOC cut-CAUS-PST.3SG
‘The man made the butcher cut the flesh in the store.’

(11) (män) kitab-ı Ali-yä gardaş-im üçün oxu-t-dum
(I-NOM) book-ACC Ali-DAT brother-POSS.1SG for read-CAUS-PST.1SG
‘I made Ali read the book for my brother.’

(12) qız tablo-nu naqqäş-a qäläm-inän çäk-dir-di
girl-NOM picture-ACC artist-DAT pen-INST draw-CAUS-PST.3SG
‘The girl made the artist draw the picture with the pen.’

(13) Häsän kişi-yä namä-ni ata-m tarafından yaz-dir-di
Häsän-NOM man-DAT letter-ACC father-POSS.1SG by write-CAUS-PST.3SG
‘Hasan made my father write the man a letter.’

In addition, Azeri allows two morphological causative suffixes on the same verb:

(14) Azeri

a. qapı-nı aç-dir-dim
door-ACC open-CAUS-PST.1SG
‘I had the door opened.’
b. qapı-nı aç-dr-t-dım
   door-ACC open-CAUS-CAUS-PST.1SG
   ‘I had the door opened.’ / ‘I had someone open the door.’

c. qapı-nı kişi-yä aç-dr-t-dım
   door-ACC man-DAT open-CAUS-CAUS-PST.1SG
   ‘I had the man open the door.’ / ‘I had the door opened.’

A transitive verb with two causative suffixes often has the same meaning as its single causative counterpart, though a double causative meaning is also possible.

The Azeri morphological causative corresponds to the Turkish morphological causative. The morphological causative, which are the most productive strategy for forming causatives in Turkish, are formed with two main causative suffixes -DIr and -t (Aissen 1979, Kornfilt 1997, Aygen 2003, Göksel and Kerslake 2005). In a causative formed on an intransitive verb, the causee appears in the accusative case and the causer takes the subject position:

(15) **Turkish**
   a. çocuk koş-tu
      kid-NOM run-PST.3SG
      ‘The kid ran.’
   
   b. (sen) çocuk-u koş-dur-dun
       (You.2SG) kid-ACC run-CAUS-PST.2SG
       ‘You made the kid run.’

   In a causative formed on a transitive verb, the causee is marked with dative case and the direct object is marked with accusative case:

(16) **Turkish**
   a. oglu-m kitab-ı oku-du
      boy-POSS.1SG book-ACC read-PST.3SG
      ‘My son read the book.’
   
   b. (ben) oglu-m-a kitab-ı oku-t-tum
      (I-NOM) boy-POSS.1SG-DAT book-ACC read-CAUS-PST.1SG
      ‘I made my son read the book.’

   Causatives formed on ditransitive verbs—verbs with both a direct object and an indirect object—are parallel to causatives formed on transitive verbs. Since the direct and indirect object positions are already occupied and marked with accusative and dative case respectively, the causee appears as an oblique, marked with dative case:

(17) **Turkish**
   a. Ali kitab-ı çanta-ya koy-du
      ‘Ali put the book in the bag.’
b. (ben) Ali-ye kitab-ı çanta-ya koy-dur-dum
   ‘I caused Ali to put the pen into the bag.’

In Turkish, multiple causatives are possible though rare.\(^1\) They are formed by adding a causative suffix to a stem which already has a causative suffix (Kornfilt 1997, Göksel and Kerslake 2005):

(18) **Turkish**

a. resim-im-i çek-tir-dim
   picture-POSS.1SG-ACC draw-CAUS-PST.1SG
   ‘I had my picture drawn.’

b. resim-im-i (ressam-a) çek-tir-t-tim
   picture-POSS.1SG-ACC (painter-DAT) draw-CAUS-CAUS-PST.1SG
   ‘I got the painter to draw my picture.’

Persian also has a morphological causative. The suffix –ân is affixed to the stem of a few intransitive or transitive verbs to form a causative verb:

(19) **Persian**

a. Ali xand-id
   Ali-NOM smile-PST.3SG
   ‘Ali smiled.’

b. (man) Ali-râ xand-ân-dam
   (I-NOM) Ali-OM smile-CAUS-PST.1SG
   ‘I caused Ali to smile.’

(20) a. kudak xâb-id
    baby-NOM sleep-PST.3SG
    ‘The baby slept.’

b. mâdar kudak-râ xâb-ân-d
   mother-NOM baby-OM sleep-CAUS-PST.3SG
   ‘The mother caused the baby to sleep.’

(21) a. (man) gaza xor-dam
    (I-NOM) food eat-PST.3SG
    ‘I ate food.’

\(^1\)Göksel and Kerslake (2005) mention that verbs with three causative suffixes are possible, but the third suffix serves only to place emphasis on the event and does not affect the argument structure of the clause.
However, the Persian morphological causative, unlike the morphological causative in Azeri and Turkish, is not productive. To form a double causative in Persian requires concatenation of a morphological and syntactic causative, as in:

(22) **Persian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ali</th>
<th>baʔes šo-d</th>
<th>[(ke) (man) qaza-râ be kudak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ali-NOM</td>
<td>cause</td>
<td>become.PST.3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xor-ân-dam]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat-caus-pst.1sg]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Ali caused me to feed the baby.’

The morphological causative occurs as an embedded clause in the syntactic causative, which I turn to in the following section.

### 2.2 Syntactic causative

As mentioned above, the morphological causative in Persian is not productive, but is limited to a few verbs. The productive strategy for forming causatives in Persian is a syntactic construction formed with the light verb baʔes šodan ‘to cause’. The light verb functions as a main verb and the auxiliary verb šodan ‘become’ is inflected for subject agreement and tense. The light verb (the cause) is followed by a complement clause (the effect) introduced by the complementizer *ke* ‘that’:

(23) **Persian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>(man) sib-râ xor-dam</th>
<th>(I-NOM) apple-OM eat-PST.1SG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I ate the apple.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasan caused me to eat the apple.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The syntactic causative construction in Azeri is borrowed from Persian. In this construction, the light verb construction using baʔes olimax ‘to cause’ is followed by the complement clause with the complementizer *ki* ‘that’:

(24) **Azeri**

a. ușax kitab-ı oxu-du| kid-NOM book-ACC read-PST.3SG|
|‘The kid read the book.’|
b. (män) baʔıs ol-dum [(ki) uşax kitab-i oxu-du]
   (I-NOM) cause be-PST.1SG [(COMP) kid book-ACC read-PST.3SG]
   ‘I caused the kid to read the book.’

The light verb baʔıs olmax is borrowed from Persian light verb baʔes şodan ‘to cause’. Light verb constructions in many languages often show language mixing: a borrowed noun is compounded with a native verb (Myers-Scotton 2002). We see this in the case of Azeri light verbs—the Persian noun baʔıs ‘cause’ is compounded with the Azeri verb olmax ‘become’. In this structure, which is borrowed from Persian, the complement clause is introduced by the complementizer ki ‘that’. Unlike other noun clauses, which can be placed either before or after the main clause, complement clauses with ki obligatorily follow the main clause:

(25) Azeri
   (män) baʔıs ol-dum [(ki) qız namä-ni oxu-du]
   (I-NOM) cause be-PST.1SG [(COMP) girl letter-ACC read-PST.3SG]
   ‘I caused the girl to read the letter.’

There is also a syntactic causative in Turkish, formed with a light verb construction using sebep or neden meaning ‘cause’ and the light verb olmak ‘become’ (Dede 1986: 49, Kornfilt 2012, personal conversation):

(26) Turkish
   a. inek öl-dü
cow die-PST.3SG
   ‘The cow died.’

   b. Ali [ineğ-in ölüm-ü]-na sebep ol-du
   Ali [cow-GEN death-POSS.3SG]-DAT cause be-PST.3SG
   ‘Ali caused the cow to die.’

(27) a. şoför ol-du
driver die-PST.3SG
   ‘the driver died.’

   b. kaza [şoför-ün ölüm-ü]-ne neden ol-du.
   accident [driver-GEN death-POSS.3SG]-DAT cause be-PST.3SG
   ‘The accident caused the driver to die’.

This construction follows the basic SOV order: the nominalized phrase, marked with dative case, precedes the main verb. The subject of the nominalized phrase is a possessor in the genitive case.

3 Methodology

In order to investigate the morphosyntax of Azeri and the influence that Persian has on it, I travelled to Tabriz, Iran, to conduct a field study. This project is a qualitative/quantitative study designed to compare Azeri as spoken by the younger and older generations. This field research involved ten participants divided into two groups. The participants in the older generation (aged
65+) were mostly monolingual in Azeri and the participants in the younger generation (aged 20–35) were mostly bilingual in Azeri and Persian. They can be further sub-divided by their level of education (basic education or higher education). The interviews were recorded with a high quality digital voice recorder (Olympus WS 801). The participants were each involved in a 30–45 minute free conversation in an informal setting in a quiet room at the participant’s home. Selected data through acceptability judgment task and comparative judgment task were transcribed and translated and these formed the basis of my dataset.

4 Data Analysis

Over the last forty years, language variation theorists have developed a methodology for applying sociolinguistic analysis to the variation found in the phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic structure of a language. Labov (1972) defines a linguistic variable as simply “two ways of saying the same thing.” Tagliamonte (2006: 70) refines this notion, saying that the variants should not result from performance anomalies, but be linguistically well-formed. Furthermore, the frequency of variation should be robust: both variants must occur with sufficient frequency. A variationist approach to linguistic analysis can then look for factors that elucidate the systematic distribution of the variants. Ferguson (1959), Calteaux (1994), Thomason and Kaufman (1998) and Thomason (2003) are among those to discuss the effect of social factors in language contact. When speakers of different languages live in close contact, their languages influence each other, but they do so in piece-meal fashion, leading to complexities in the synchronic language structure and differences among speakers. Variations that gain popularity can gradually lead to loss of a variant and result in language change.

It was my impression based on introspection that both variants are used frequently in everyday speech. My goal was to use pairs of sample sentences as in example (28a,b) to find out if speakers had a preference for the native or the borrowed variant, and if they had a preference, what factors conditioned their choice.

In the investigation of the causative construction by the younger and older groups, all participants compared the paired causative sentences and expressed their opinion about their acceptability. All participants answered that both constructions are acceptable and that they could use either structure, depending on the context. They stated that besides the grammatical differences, there are also semantic differences between the two types of causatives. For instance, the following examples illustrate a pair of morphological and syntactic causatives from my sample list:

(28) a. (män) uṣağ-a paltar gey-dir-dim
   (I-NOM) kid-DAT cloths put-CAUS-PS.1SG
   ‘I got the kid dressed’

   b. (män) baʔis ol-dum [(ki) uṣax paltar gey-di]
   (I-NOM) cause be-PST.1SG [(COMP) kid cloths put-PST.1SG]
   ‘I caused the kid to get dressed.’

Participant 3, who is an older, educated speaker, expressed that the choice between the morphological versus syntactic causative depends on the context. In example (28), the causer is the agent who performs the act of dressing whereas in the syntactic causative, as in examples (29) and (28), the causer may or may not be the person who actually dresses the child. One
interpretation involves indirect causation, i.e. the causer asked someone else to help the kid to get dressed, as in (29):

(29) (män) baʔis ol-dum [(ki) ușax paltar gey-di]
(I-NOM) cause be-PST.1SG [(COMP) kid cloths put-PST.3SG]
‘I asked someone to help the kid to get dressed.’ (Participant 3: 2012)

In another example from my sample sentences, the impression of participant 6, a young, educated speaker, was slightly different.

(30) bu ev-i Ali-yä düzāt-dir-dim
this house-ACC Ali-DAT build-CAUS-PST.1SG
‘I got Ali to build this house.’ / ‘I had this house built for Ali.’

Participant 6 expressed that the above morphological causative is also ambiguous. He stated that sentence (30) means ‘I got Ali to build the house’, where Ali in the dative case denotes the person who has built the house, or it can also mean ‘I had this house built for Ali’. The latter meaning is also unambiguously expressed with the benefactive üçün:

(31) bu ev-i Ali üçün düzāt-dir-dim
this house-ACC Ali for build-CAUS-PST.1SG
‘I had this house built for Ali.’

Comparing the morphological causative in example (30) with the syntactic causative in example (32), this participant said that example (32) unambiguously means that Ali built the house and furthermore entails that I used a degree of force to make him do it.

(32) (män) baʔis ol-dum [(ki) Ali bu ev-i düzāt-dí]
(I-NOM) cause be-PST.1SG [(COMP) Ali this house-ACC build-PST.3SG]
‘I forced Ali to build the house.’ (Participant 6: 2012)

Furthermore, participant 4, who is an older and less educated speaker, offered his opinion about causatives like the following:

(33) a. (män) şorba-nı uşağ-a ye-dirt-dim
(I-NOM) soup-ACC kid- DAT eat-CAUS-PST.1SG
‘I made the kid eat the soup.’ / ‘I fed the kid.’

b. (män) baʔis ol-dum [(ki) ușax şorba-NECT ye-dí]
(I-NOM) cause be-PST.1SG [(COMP) kid soup-ACC eat-PST.3SG]
‘I caused the kid to eat the soup.’

He stated that in the morphological causative, the causer feeds the kid, but in the syntactic causative the causer may exert some force on the causee. Therefore, in his impression, the light verb baʔis olmax ‘to cause’ in the syntactic causative might mean ‘to force someone to do something’:
Thus, we see that the two types of causatives have different semantics. This semantic distinction is often characterized as a difference between direct and indirect causation (Shibatani 1975). According to the notion of iconicity (Haiman 1980, Givón 1980, DeLancey 1984), morphological causatives express a stronger degree of direct causation than their syntactic counterparts. As described by Whaley (1997: 193), when the causer exerts a direct influence on the causee, the causation is direct, as in the English causative kill. When the causer starts a chain of events in motion that then affects the causee, then the causation is indirect, as in the English cause to die. Comrie (1985: 333) also states that in the morphological causative the relation between the causer and the causee is more direct than in the syntactic causative. Therefore, where a language allows both morphological and syntactic causatives, the morphological causative expresses more direct causation.

Turkish morphological versus syntactic causatives also differ with respect to their meaning where morphological causatives seem to reflect more direct causation and the syntactic (or clausal syntactic) tends to express more indirect causation (Kornfilt 2012, personal conversation). Dabir-Moghaddam (1982: 34) also argues that there is a semantic difference between morphological and syntactic causatives in Persian, as well. In the former, the causer is involved in the action, but in the latter, the causer may not be involved directly in the action. Therefore, in the morphological causative, the causer forces the causee to do something, while there is no implication of the use of force by the causer in syntactic causative.

5 Conclusion

To sum up, all three languages have both morphological and syntactic causatives, but the level of productivity differs among them. In Azeri and Turkish, the morphological causative strategy is productive, but in Persian it is not productive. Although all three languages have syntactic causatives, they are not all constructed in the same fashion. To form the syntactic causative, Turkish follows the basic SOV order; the light verb sebep olmak ‘to cause’ or neden olmak ‘to cause’ appears as a main verb at the end of the sentence. However, the Azeri syntactic causative mimics the Persian syntactic causative: the light verb baʔıs olmax ‘to cause’ appears as a main verb followed by a complement clause with complementizer ki ‘that’. The following summarizes the strategies used to form causative in three languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morphological Causative</th>
<th>Turkish: SOV</th>
<th>Azeri: SOV</th>
<th>Persian: SOV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-DIr or -t</td>
<td>[S][clause] sebep lmak</td>
<td>[S] [baʔıs olmax] ki [complement clause]</td>
<td>[S][baʔes şodan] ke [complement clause]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Causative</td>
<td>[S][clause] sebep lmak</td>
<td>[S] [baʔıs olmax] ki [complement clause]</td>
<td>[S][baʔes şodan] ke [complement clause]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, we have seen that in Azeri the two causatives express different meanings. The morphological causative formed on the Turkic pattern expresses direct causation and the Persian-style syntactic causative expresses indirect causation. This follows a general cross-linguistic tendency toward iconicity. In a morphological causative the distance between the verb stem and
its affix is shorter than the distance between two separate verbs in a syntactic causative. Therefore, the morphological causative expresses more direct causation than syntactic causatives.

It became readily apparent during my field study that the two types of Azeri causatives did not actually represent variants. All speakers used both types, but for different meanings. It is important to note, however, that the persification of the Azeri syntactic causative is so well-established in Azeri that even monolinguals have a two-type system now, differing from Turkish, where the morphological causative are the norm. We can also point out that younger Azeri speakers also still maintain a productive morphological causative, unlike Persian where the morphological causative is non-productive. Thus, we see that Azeri has a system that combines elements of the Turkic and Persian causatives.
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