THE PECULIAR RESULTATIVE IN ADYGHE

AND WHAT IT CAN TELL ABOUT ASPECTUAL COMPOSITION IN THE LANGUAGE

Peter M. Arkadiev,
Institute for Slavic Studies,
Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow
alpgurev@gmail.com, peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

Dmitry V. Gerasimov,
Institute for Linguistic Studies,
Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg
dm.gerasimov@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Adyghe (West Circassian) < Circassian < North-West Caucasian, Russian Federation

Typological features of interest:
♣ (almost) no distinction between nouns and verbs (Lander & Testelets 2006);
♣ highly polysynthetic verb morphology (pronominal affixes expressing all syntactic arguments of the predicate, rich system of valency increasing operations);
♣ ergativity in both dependent marking (case on NPs) and head marking (pronominal affixes on verbs);
♣ rich system of locational preverbs;
♣ clausal syntax highly dependent on information structure (Sumbatova 2005);
♣ complex mechanisms of clause combining and sentential complementation (cf. Gerasimov 2004; 2006a,b; cf. also Kumakhov & Vamling 1998 for the closely related Kabardian).

The data comes mainly from the fieldwork materials collected during field-trips to village Hakurino-habl, Republic Adygeya, organized by the Russian State University for Humanities in 2003–2006. Most of the examples cited in the talk were obtained through elicitation; however, in most cases informants were asked to describe a speech situation in which the utterance in question would be appropriate.

There were some informants who rejected the resultative construction altogether. It may be the case that the construction in question is dialectally limited. The question of the exact area within the Adyghe dialectal continuum to which our findings are applicable is, however, beyond the scope of the current presentation.

2. The “Resultative construction”

Adyghe possesses a rather peculiar construction that, to our knowledge, up to date has never been described in any published works on the language. It is formed by means of a prefix zere- attached to a finite verb form and expresses meaning that at the first approximation can be characterized as “resultative”:

(1) pče-r  jəřjə  zere-?wəhe-κ
     door-ABS still OPEN-PST
     ‘The door is still opened’.

The construction in question has the following morphosyntactic properties:
♣ formed by attaching the zere- prefix;
♣ can not attach case markers (like various nominalizations do);
♣ attaches tense-aspect-modality suffixes (1, 3);
♣ in the Present the last vowel of the base is omitted (2);
♣ in other respects has the same phonological shape as the corresponding finite form;
♣ negation is marked using the mo- prefix (i.e., characteristic of non-finite forms, see Lander & Sumbatova 2007 for details)(2);
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(2) qe-γaw-oe-xe-r sabjo-me zer-a-mo-š
DIR-become-PST-ABS child-PL.OBL ZERE-3PL-NEG-know
‘Children still don’t know what happened.’

(3) tɔ-qɔ-γaw-e-ʃɔ-œ-me sabaj-xe-r žəɾjɔ zere-čəje-š’tə-x
1PL-DIR-come-RFC-COND child-PL-ABS still ZERE-sleep-IRR-PL
‘When we come back the children will still be sleeping’

3. The semantics of the construction in question

1 Compositional semantics

Closer examination, however, reveals that the meaning of the construction in question can not be characterized as simply resultative. Resultative interpretation arises from the combination of the actional properties of the predicate, the temporal/aspectual semantics of the Preterite marker -R(e), and the semantics of the zere- prefix proper.

(4) a. mo šeʃəje-xe-r č’anə-ʃ
this knife-PL-ABS sharp-PST
‘These knives were sharp’.
b. mo šeʃəje-xe-r zere-č’anə-x
this knife-PL-ABS ZERE-sharp-PST
‘These knives are still sharp’.
c. mo šeʃəje-xe-r zere-č’anə-ʃ
this knife-PL-ABS ZERE-sharp-PST
‘These knives are still sharp (= as sharp as they were then)’.

2 Bi-situational nature

While the zere- construction is apparently mono-clausal, it obligatorily refers to two distinct situations. Use of this construction implies that both the Speaker and the Addressee share the knowledge that at some moment of time prior to the reference time a situation S described by the predicate took place. The construction is used to inform the Addressee that some situation S’ in effect at the reference time, the exact character of S’ being left to the Addressee’s interpretation. Being in a sense a derivate of S, situation S’ can be reconstructed on the basis of the character of S, its actional properties, and various discourse-pragmatic considerations available to the Addressee.

(6) djɔrektεr-œ-əm ze’γaw-εœ’-er ze’rjəkežə-ʃ
director-OBL meet-ABS ZERE-begin-PST
‘Having open the meeting, the director still hasn’t finished it’
If the predicate is atelic, S is perceived as not having reached its final endpoint at the reference time and so S’ is merely a continuation of S (2-4). If the predicate is telic, S’ is taken to be a post-final state of S (i.e. the situation that emerges after the final endpoint of S is reached; 1, 5-6).

Note that in the “telic” case the identity of S’ is rather arbitrary and dependent on pragmatic factors, preceding discourse, etc. Naturally, different states may be regarded as post-final states of the same situation. Two informants, when presented with (7), readily gave back two quite different translations:

(7) šaκw-em məʃe-r zer-jɔ-wəœ’-ə-ʃ
hunter-OBL bear-ABS ZERE-3SG-kill-PST
‘After the hunter has killed that bear, he doesn’t kill bears any more’.
‘After the hunter has killed the bear, that bear doesn’t trouble us any more’.
Apparently, (7) states that some resulting state of certain event already known to the Addressee (namely, the hunter having killed the bear) is in effect; what this resulting state actually is is left to the Addressee. Therefore the Adyghe “resultative” exhibits somewhat paradoxical nature: it is used to refer to some situation (S’), but it doesn’t mention it; another situation (S), already known to the speech act participants is mentioned instead.

Looks like an overwhelming triumph of economy over iconicity.

Interaction with tense-aspect markers (and temporal adverbials)

As has already been mentioned in 2, the zere-construction is able to attach various tense-aspect suffixes. It is worth noting, however, that while Present, Imperfective and Future/Irrealis markers have scope over the “derivative” situation (S’), the Preterite suffix $\text{R(e)}$ modifies the “initial” situation (S):

\begin{align}
(8) & \quad \text{a. } \text{zaboj-xe-r } \text{zere-$\text{g'egwe}$-x} \\
& \quad \text{child-PL-abs } \text{ZERE-play-PL} \\
& \quad \text{‘The kids are still playing’.} \\
& \quad \text{b. } \text{zaboj-xe-r } \text{zere-$\text{g'egwe}$-ke-x} \\
& \quad \text{child-PL-ABS } \text{ZERE-play-PST-PL} \\
& \quad \text{‘The kids, after they have played, are not playing anymore’.} \\
& \quad \text{c. } \text{zaboj-xe-r } \text{zere-$\text{g'egwe}$-st'ek}'e-x} \\
& \quad \text{child-PL-ABS } \text{ZERE-play-IPF-PL} \\
& \quad \text{‘[The kids were playing at some moment; when we called on them later] the kids were still playing’.}
\end{align}

This notable difference in semantic behaviour can shed some light on the relations between scopes of different tense-aspect markers in Adyghe.

Cf. also example (9), where the combination of Preterite and Irrealis has scope over the initial situation, and (10), where the simulative suffix -$\text{Iwe}$ allows both interpretations:

\begin{align}
(9) & \quad \text{hazret } ə$\text{she} \text{ zere-$\text{ache}$-x} \\
& \quad \text{Hazret } 3 \text{ SG-head } \text{ZERE-ache-PST-IRR} \\
& \quad \text{‘Perhaps Hazret still has a headache’ (=it is known that she had at some point)} \\
& \quad \text{*‘It is still possible that Hazret has a headache’ (=she still displays the same symptoms).} \\
(10) & \quad ɕ'ale-m psha'se-r $\text{zere-$\text{3sg}$-see-SML} \\
& \quad \text{boy-OBL girl-ABS good ZERE-3SG-see-SML} \\
& \quad \text{‘It seems that the boy is still in love with the girl’.} \\
& \quad \text{‘It still seems that the boy is in love with the girl’.}
\end{align}

As for the interaction with temporal adverbials, almost no data is available, due to the fact that such constructions would be rather unnatural with respect to pragmatics. We have a few examples, however, to which our informants provided, with some hesitations and without much enthusiasm, translations implying that zere- has a scope over temporal adverbials:

\begin{align}
(11) & \quad ɕ'ale-m taqjEq-$\text{jw}$-t$\text{g}$-e' $\text{zere-$\text{jw}$-x}$ \\
& \quad \text{boy-OBL minute-INF-2-INS fence-ABS ZERE-3SG-paint-PST} \\
& \quad \text{‘The fence is still standing [badly painted] after the boy has painted it in two minutes’.}
\end{align}

More investigation is needed, however, as various other factors may be in effect here.

A note on negation

As has already been mentioned in 2, the zere-construction attaches the negative prefix -$m'\alpha$, which is traditionally connected to non-finite forms. A few examples where the “finite” negative suffix -$\alpha$ is attached have also been recorded.

Further investigation in this direction is required. Since, as has been shown in (Lander & Sumbatova 2007), the distribution of -$m'\alpha$- and -$\alpha$- is motivated not by finite/non-finite distinction, but rather by the semantic scope of negation, it may be the case that the two operators negate different components of the bi-situational structure expressed by the zere-construction.
4. A cognate biclausal construction

General basics
Another construction with the same prefix exists in Adyghe, which seems to be directly related semantically. It is a biclausal construction in which the head of the subordinate clause is marked by both the prefix *zere-* and the adverbial suffix *-Ew*. The meaning expressed is again crucially dependent on the telicity of the predicate: with atelic predicates the construction in question denotes simultaneity of events, while with atelic predicates it denotes immediate precedence of the event denoted by the subordinate clause:

(12) a. ***b’ale-r zere-soma3'-ew, škWel-m kO-a-ke.***

   *The boy, still being ill, went to school. || *The boy went to school as soon he became ill.***

b. ***sakw-e-m pšaše-r šw-a zere-jo-lægæy-ew q-a-s’a-k.***

   *The hunter married the girl as soon as he fell in love with her || *still being in love with her.*

This latter use of the *zere-* *-Ew* has been briefly mentioned in (Rogava & Kerasheva 1966: 117) and (Zekokh 2002). Some informants tend to further interpret the simultaneity of events in the “atelic” use as concession, e.g., giving to (12) the translation ‘Although the boy was still ill, he went to school’.

Most informants suggest a paraphrase of this construction using an auxiliary:

(13a) a. ***č’ale-m č’ewe-r zere-jo-kal-al-ew, wešw a q-je-xa-β.***

   *Just as the boy finished painting the fence, it started to hail. || *While the boy was still painting the fence, it started to hail.*

b. ***č’ale-m č’ewe-r zere-jo-kalak-ke-ew mjet-ew wešw a q-je-xa-β.***

   *While the boy was still painting the fence, it started to hail.*

Interaction with tense-aspect markers
There are not enough data yet to draw any firm conclusions. Some informants altogether reject introduction of tense-aspect markers in the position before *-Ew*. Yet those examples that are available suggest that semantic effects similar to those observed with respect to the “resultative” construction are present:

(14)  ***b’ale-m č’ewe-r zere-jo-kala-k-ew, zero-dax-ew š’ö-t***

   *The fence has been standing so beautiful since the very time the boy have painted it.*

Constraints on relativization and wh-extraction
Adyghe is notable for allowing extraction from most types of subordinate clauses, including most adverbiacl clauses, without displaying any island effects (15a-b). Extraction out from the *zere-* *-Ew* construction is, however, impossible (16 b).

(15a) a. ***mašW-e-m asłan je-p ele-z, jo-ayš’æle šw-a-towæ-β-β.***

   *While Aslan was watching the fire, his purse was stolen.*

b. ***sɔdø-m asłan z-je-p ele-z, jo-ayš’æle šw-a-towæ-β-β-a***

   *While Aslan was watching what, was his purse stolen?*

(16a) a. ***mašW-e-m asłan zer-je-p ele-ew jo-ayš’æle šw-a-towæ-β-β.***

   *Just as Aslan has taken a look at the fire, his purse was stolen.*

b. ****sɔdø-m asłan zer-je-p ele-ew jo-ayš’æle šw-a-towæ-β-β-a***

   *Just as Aslan has taken a look at what, was his purse stolen?*
5. Actionality in Adyghe

- Non-aprioristic typologically-oriented theory of actionality (Tatevosov 2002):
  - **universal actional meanings**: state (S), process (P), multiplicative process (M), entry-into-a-state (ES), entry-into-a-process (EP), quantum-of-a-multiplicative-process (Q);
  - **actional characteristic** of a tense-aspect form: the set of actional meanings a tense-aspect form of a given verb may have;
  - **empirical procedure** for the discovery of actional classes in a particular language:
    - two verbal lexemes belong to one actional class iff their combinations with tense-aspect morphemes representing the universal aspectual viewpoints (perfective and imperfective) show identical actional characteristics;
  - **cross-linguistic actional classes**: classes which recur in different languages; NB the set of cross-linguistic actional classes does not coincide with the set of classes proposed for English by Vendler (1967).

ο Aspectual classes in Adyghe

Aspectual classes were determined on the basis of the actional meanings of (Progressive) Present and Preterite forms of predicates from a representative sample, see Table 1 (Arkadiev 2006a, b).

### Table 1. Actional classes in Adyghe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Actional characteristic of the Present</th>
<th>Actional characteristic of the Preterite</th>
<th>Number of predicates</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>'to lie', 'to live'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Inceptive-Stative</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>'to know', 'to see'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Inceptive-Stative</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ES,S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>'to sleep'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processual</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>'to play', 'to write'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Ingressive-Processual</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>EP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>'to go', 'to fly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Multiplicative</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>'to shout', 'to spit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak Multiplicative</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Q,M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>'cough'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punctual</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>'to throw', 'to explode'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong Telic</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>'to die', 'to give', 'to dig'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Stative**:
  1. a. rasul ə-ššë me-wəžə. Rasul 3SG.POSS-head DYN-ache ‘Rasul has headache.’
  2. b. rasul ə-ššë wəžə-ke. Rasul 3SG.POSS-head ache-PST ‘Rasul had headache (for some time).’

- **Strong Inceptive-Stative**:
  1. a. č’ale-m pšaše-r ⱥə j-e-əle-əxə. boy-OBL girl-ABS good 3SG.A-DYN-see ‘The boy loves the girl.’
  2. b. č’ale-m pšaše-r ⱥə ə-ələxə-wə-kə. boy-OBL girl-ABS good 3SG.A-DYN-see-PST ‘The boy fell in love with the girl || loved the girl (for some time).’

- **Weak Inceptive-Stative**:
  1. a. č’ale-r me-çəje. boy-ABS DYN-sleep ‘The boy is sleeping.’
  2. b. č’ale-r čəja-ke. boy-ABS sleep-PST ‘The boy slept (for some time) || fell asleep.’

All actional classes observed in Adyghe are cross-linguistic actional classes.

The fact that the ‘weak’ (actionally ambivalent) predicates are almost absent in Adyghe is typologically peculiar (but see next section).
Two cross-linguistic types of temporal adverbials:

♣ adverbials of temporal duration: `səhatnaq`e ‘for half an hour’, `taqjaq`a`e ‘for two minutes’ etc.;


Adverbials of temporal extent more or less freely combine with all predicates whose Preterite has an ‘entry-into’ actional meaning, viz. with Strong Inceptive-Stative, Weak Inceptive-Stative, Strong Ingressive-Processual, Strong Multiplicative, Punctual, and Strong Telic. They never combine with Stative predicates and are usually not felicitous with Processual predicates.

Adverbials of temporal duration freely combine with atelic predicates, i.e., those whose Preterite allows durational interpretation: Stative, Weak Inceptive-Stative, Processual, and Weak Multiplicative.

However, adverbials of temporal duration no less freely combine with those predicates whose Preterite in isolation does not allow durational reading, viz. Strong Inceptive-Stative (20a), Strong Ingressive-Processual (20b), Strong Multiplicative (20c) and some Strong Telic (20d) predicates:

(20) a. `ç`ale-m pəase-r jəles-jə-tfe əә ə-λәekwә-κ.
   boy-OBL girl-ABS year-INF-five good 3SG.A-see-PST
   ‘The boy was in love with the girl for five years.’

b. samoljwetә-r səhat-ja-tәә krasnwedәr bәә-әә.
   airplane-ABS hour-INF-two Krasnodәr fly-PST
   ‘The airplane flew in the direction of Krasnodar for two hours.’

c. çəәm-m çәә-r taqjaq-ja-ʃ`e ә-ke-ssәә-κ.
   man-OBL tree-ABS minute-INF-three 3SG.A-CAUS-shake-PST
   ‘The man shook the tree for three minutes.’

d. mәә-r mef-jә-tfe ʃkәә-әә.
   ice-ABS day-INF-five melt-PST
   ‘The ice melted for five days.’

e. *txamate-m taqjaq-ja-ʃ`e ze` duәә-әә-әә-әә-r r-jo-ke-ʃ`a-κ.
   director-OBL minute-INF-three meeting-ABS 3SG.IO-3SG.A-CAUS-begin-PST
   ‘*The director opened the meeting for three minutes (i.e. he tried to open the meeting for three minutes, but failed, e.g. because the people were too loud.’

The only actional class whose members normally do not combine with durational adverbials is the Punctual class (21a); however, in appropriate contexts recategorization is possible (21b):

   balloon-ABS minute-INF-two DIR-explode-PST
   ‘*The balloon exploded for two minutes.’

b. *æәnawe-xe-r taqjaq-jo-ʃ`e qe-ke-ke-x.
   balloon-PL-ABS minute-INF-two DIR-explode-PST-PL
   ‘The balloons exploded (one after another) for two minutes.’

How to explain the behaviour of the adverbials of temporal duration?

Two possible accounts:

♠ The ‘lexical’ account (cf. Tatevosov 2002 and especially Tatevosov 2005 for Bagwalall, Mari and Tatar): Adyghe ‘Strong’ predicates are in fact ‘Weak’, i.e. inherently actionally ambiguous: their Preterite forms always allow both telic (ES, EP, Q) and atelic (S, P, M) interpretations, but the latter requires special context which is provided precisely by the durational adverbials.

♠ The ‘compositional’ account (cf. Depaetere 1995, Smith 1995, de Swart 1998): Adyghe actional classes are as in Table 1; the actional properties of the predicate may be subject to change when it is combined with adjuncts of various kinds.
5. Aspectual composition in constructions with zere-

Semantic behaviour of the constructions described in sections 2-3 and 4 with respect to aspectual classes provides a strong argument in favour of the "compositional" account. Predicates of ‘Weak’ classes allow both ‘telic’ and ‘atelic’ interpretations when used in these constructions. Predicates of ‘Strong’ classes, however, do not allow ‘atelic’ interpretation, despite the fact that they allow it with durational adverbials.

1 The monoclusal construction with zere-

(22) a. ć’ale-r ĺọja-κ
    boy-ABS sleep-PST
    ‘The boy fell asleep’.
    ‘The boy has taken a sleep’.

b. ć’ale-r zere-ćọja-κ
    boy-ABS ZERE-sleep-PST
    ‘The boy is still sleeping (= after he has fallen asleep)’.
    ‘The boy is no more sleeping (= after he has taken a nap)’.

(23) a. mọla-ɾ 2wọ-κ
    ice-ABS melt-PST
    ‘The ice has melted’.
    ‘*The ice still melts (= as it once did)’

b. mọla-ɾ zere-2wọ-κ
    ice-ABS ZERE-melt-PST
    ‘There’s no more ice (= after it has melted)’.

2 The biclausal construction with zere-...-ew

Strong Inceptive-Stative predicates do not allow atelic interpretation of the zere-...-ew form (12b); however, the Weak Inpective-Stative predicate ěọjen ‘to sleep’, does allow the atelic interpretation, cf. (24a), (24b) and (24c):

    boy-ABS SBD-sleep-CNV dream 3SG.A-see-PST
    ‘As soon as the boy fell asleep, he saw a dream.’

b. ć’ale-r zere-ćej-ew, qarọwọ-m qọ-xe-γ’ọ-ẹ-κ.
    boy-ABS SBD-sleep-CNV strength-OBL DIR-LOC-become-PST
    ‘As soon as the boy had slept (for a while), he acquired strength.’

c. ć’ale-r zere-ćej-ew, wọne-m r-a-xọ-κ.
    boy-ABS SBD-sleep-CNV house-OBL 3 SG.IO-3SG.A-carry-PST
    ‘While the boy was still sleeping, they carried him out of the house.’

Those Telic predicates which allow atelic interpretation with durational adverbials, do not allow it in the zere-...-ew construction, cf. (28a) and (28b):

(25) a. ć’ale-m ć’ewọ-r sahat-n’ọqwe ẹ-ιẹla-κ.
    boy-OBL fence-ABS hour-half 3 SG.A-paint-PST
    ‘The boy has been painting the fence for half an hour.’

b. ć’ale-m ć’ewọ-r zer-ị-ka1-ew, wešwọ q-je-xọ-κ.
    boy-OBL fence-ABS SBD-3SG.A-paint-CNV hail DIR-LOC-come.down-PST
    ‘Just as the boy finished painting the fence, it started to hail. || *While the boy was still painting the fence, it started to hail.’

The non-finite zere-...-ew forms preserve the independently established distinction between the Strong and Weak Inceptive-stative predicates, but fail to reveal any contrast between those Telic predicates which co-occur with the durational adverbials and those which do not.
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