2. The structure of the Circassian verbal complex

Neither templatic, nor layered morphology, but an intricate interaction of both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prefixes</th>
<th>root</th>
<th>suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>argument structure zone</td>
<td>pre-stem elements</td>
<td>stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolute</td>
<td>directional</td>
<td>substantives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many cases the order of morphemes reflects their relative scope, in particular in the slots -8 (subordinators) and -7 (applicatives) and +2 (transitory operators), see Korotkova & Lander 2010, though the overall morphological structure involves complex and opaque interactions between elements in different slots, cf. (Arkadiev & Letuchy 2011, Letuchy 2014).

3. Tense marking in Bzhedug

"Primary" tense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past (≠)</th>
<th>Future (≠)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bzhedug Adyge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preterite</td>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmarked</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>-ae ~ -ar (word-finally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynamic pre-fix (~)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Temeningoy/Standard Adyge | | |
| Preterite | Imperfect |
| -3 tense ~ -3 tare (word-finally) | -3 ? |

Past: perfective (single bounded event) vs. imperfective (durative or habitual)

(a) traktor-am əkgə-r r ədə-gə-r traktor-am land-iss 3sg.masc-plough-iss

"The tractor ploughed the field."

(b) wel-3a-r qalə-3a-ze traktor-am əkgə-r ədə-gə-ənəm raim-iss raam-iss 3sg.masc-plough-br

"During the rain, the tractor was ploughing the field."

With stative verbs, normally only the Preterite is used, regardless of aspect.

(4) mveitingə səegə-r ətə-a-r here road 3sg.masc-stand-iss

"There was a road here."

Preterite is also employed as a "retrospective shift" (Plugan & van der Auwera 2006) marker combining with past and future markers and inducing interpretations such as distant past, annulled result or irregular:

(a) p-ko-w-uzelə ədə-gə-ənəm 2sg.o-o-twin 2sg.o-to DRT-ego-pst

"Your brother has come to visit you [he's waiting]."

(b) p-ko-w-uzelə ədə-gə-ənəm 2sg.o-o-twin 2sg.o-to DRT-ego-pst

"Your brother had come to visit you [you were not present, so he left]."

The Adyge verb is historically a combination of the stative verb ətə- 'to stand' with the past tense marker.

The same is true for other varieties of Adyge (Korotkova 2009; Arkadiev 2014), while Kabardian uses imperfective to mark retrospective shift (Soma 2012).
Attached to future forms, the retrospective shift marker yields irrealis or counterfactual meanings (a cross-linguistically common phenomenon, cf. Laditdou 1990).

Below we will focus on some non-trivial uses of the Circassian Preterite which do not seem to naturally follow from its general past/perfective uses, but rather involving reference to a derived state caused by the event denoted by the verb root and holding at the topic time.

4. Past as resultative

4.1. Resultative proper

The Preterite suffix can be used to form resultative predicates from telic verbs, which differ from the normal past tense uses in that transitive verbs lack the ergative agent prefix (6a,b); with intransitive bases the uses are not formally differentiated (8b). Syntactically, Resultative forms behave like adjectives, i.e. occur as static predicates (6b, 7c 8b), or as postpositional modifiers in NPs (6c, 8c).

(6) a. te pmum'lve le-r d-retu'eg (perfective past)
   we quickly meat-AMG ITEAT-cook-PST
   'We fried the meat quickly.'

b. le-r retu'eg
   meat cook-AMG
   'The meat is fried'

c. le-retu'eg
   meat-cook-AMG
   'fried meat'

The bearer of the derived state is always the Absolutive argument of the verb, which is especially easy to notice in case of verbs that have both transitive and intransitive alternates:

(7) a. te-tsu'a-r j'we
   book-AMG read-PST
   'The book is read' (from transitive j'we 'to read')

b. *te-tsu'a-r je-k'we
   book-AMG eat read-PST
   Expected 'je-a' (from intransitive je-k'we 'to read')

c. ma c'ale-r je-j'al-le ded
   this boy-AMG eat sit-PST very
   'This boy is well-read'

(8) a. vjma-r ja-ja-s
   wine-AMG loc-drink-PST
   'The wine is drunk.' (from transitive ja-a-s 'to drink')

b. ja-r je-j'al-a
   man-AMG eat drink-PST
   'The man is drunk.'
   'The man had a drink.' (from intransitive je-j'al-a 'to drink')

c. ja-jal*a
   man eat drink-AMG
   'a drunk man'

In resultatives, the Preterite suffix does not have past time reference:

- resultative predicates denote situations simultaneous to the speech time or narrative line, as can be seen from their interaction with adverbials, cf. (9);
- for non-present reference, resultative predicates attach tense markers, cf. (10).

(9) a. mefe-d'me'm u're-m pc-e
   door-night-AMG open-PST
   'At noon, they opened the door.'

b. mefe-d'me'm pce
   door-night-AMG open-PST
   'At noon, the door was open.' [the act of opening occurred before noon]

c. pce
   door-AMG open-PST
   'The door is open.'

d. wa-qe-zo-ke'-je
   door-AMG open close-AMG
   'When I came, the door was open.'

e. wa-qe-zo-mo-ma
   close-AMG open-PMG
   'When you come, the door will be open.'

f. sa-qe-zo-je
   door-AMG open-AMG
   'Whenever you came, the door would always be open.'

Morphologically the Resultative forms behave like genuine stative predicates:

- under negation, they do not attach the dynamic suffix -e(-e) characteristic of dynamic verbs:

(11) a. c'ale-r c'afe-je-a-e
    boy-AMG sleep AMG-AVSC
    'The boy is not sleeping any more.'

b. pc-e
    open-PST
    'The door is not open any more.'

- however, similar to some static predicates, Resultatives can be combined with markers of dynamicity (-e(-e) in dependent clauses, e- in matrix clauses), receiving a non-episodic (e.g. habitual) reading:

(12) a. 'ja-je-pu'mu' meye-ma
    floor-AMG RELATE-wash-PST-AMG
    'Mom said that the floor is cleaned.'

b. mefe-xe-m sa'-je-pu'mu' meye-ma
    floor-AMG loc-wash-PST-AMG
    'I know that on Saturdays the floor is cleaned.'

(13) a. twa-zo-a
    store-AMG open-PST
    'The store is open (now).'

b. twa-zo-a thwame-fe-ma
    store-AMG open-PST
    'The store is open even on Sundays.'

- like regular stative predicates, Resultatives can not receive the repetitive prefix -e(-e), unless in the scope of negation, cf. (14) vs. (10) and (11b):
Overall, Resultatives build by means of the Preterite suffix -ʁ(e) behave strikingly similar to English or German stative passives (Kratzer 2000, inter alia). It yet remains to be checked systematically whether there is a consistent differentiation of target and resultative readings (but see the next section). Combinability with various adverbials and operators is a matter of considerable micro-variation, but many speakers readily allow clearly agent-oriented adverbials. It seems that speakers differ as to how much of the structure is present when the stativizer is attached. We suggest that the resultative use of -ʁ(e) is a vestige of a previous state of the language system: ʁ(e) underwent evolution along the standart path from (resultative) perfect to preterite (Gerasimov & Arkadiev 2014). An unexpected parallel from Russian: adjectives like ustalyj 'tired', tuxlyj 'rotten', etc. that descend from perfective participles and contain a formant cognate to the modern Past tense marker -l (Maslov 1987). An unexpected parallel from the history of Japanese: the main Preterite marker -ta has evolved from perfect; in Modern Japanese, stative readings of -ta are still available in relative clauses, while in Late Late Middle Japanese, they were licit in main clauses as well (Ogihara & Fukushima 2015).

4.2. Continuative

The Continuative is formed by a manner relativizer zere- and has a meaning roughly equivalent to that of English aspectual 'still', presupposing that certain eventuality was true at some moment of time preceding the topic time and asserting that this same eventuality is true at the topic time. This former has a number of non-trivial morphosyntactic properties that betray its non-finite origins (Gerasimov & Arkadiev 2008), but we are not going to dwell on them here.

(15) č’ale-r zere-čəj
boy-ABS REL.MNR-sleep
‘The boy is still sleeping.’

(16) weš’x qa-zer-je-š’x
rain DIR-REL.MNR-rain
‘It is still raining.’

(17) č’ale-m pjasmə zer-ja-tx
boy-OBL letter REL.MNR-3SG.GERG-write
‘The boy is still writing the letter.’

When Continuative zere- is combined with Preterite, the continuative interpretation is retained; since zere- has a wider scope over -ʁ(e), the latter is interpreted as resultative, denoting a state that arose as a result of the situation described by the predicate that took place prior to topic time, and that holds at the topic time (probably contrary to expectations):

(18) č’ale-r zere-čəja-ʁ
boy-ABS REL.MNR-sleep-PST
‘The boy is still asleep.’
Note that the forms like those in (18-22) are not combinations of the Continuative with the Resultative discussed in 4.1: they retain ergative prefix (21-22) and are not confined to telic predicates (18-20). Atelic predicates in this context are often coerced into achievements denoting entry into a state or activity (18-19); in this case it is such state or activity that falls under the scope of zere-, so Continuative forms with or without the Preterite marker turn out virtually synonymous. A different scenario, however, is illustrated in (20), where the target state of the event “it rained” is referred to.

An interesting picture is presented by the interaction of the Continuative with adverbs of duration. With unmarked Present, the latter always induce habitual interpretation (23):

(23a) č'ale-m səhatə-naqʷe pjəsme  j-e-txə
boy-OBL hour-half letter 3SG.ERG-DYN-write
‘It (usually) takes the boy half an hour to write a letter.’

(23b) pšaše-r səhat-ja-ble  me-čəje
girl-ABS hour-LNK-seven DYN-sleep
‘The girl (usually) sleeps for 7 hours.’

The Continuative falls under the scope of a temporal adverbial:

(24a) č'ale-m səhatə-naqʷe pjəsme  zer-ja-tx
boy-OBL hour-half letter REL.MNR-3SG.ERG-write
‘The boy has been writing a letter for half an hour already.’

(24b) pšaše-r səhat-ja-ble zere-čəaj
girl-ABS hour-LNK-seven REL.MNR-sleep
‘The girl has been sleeping for seven hours already.’

With forms marked with Preterite -ʁ(e), adverbs of duration are interpreted as falling under the scope of resultative and, consequently, under the scope of continuative, returning a non-trivial interpretation of the kind ‘there holds a state that arose due to eventuality described by the predicate continuing for the duration of time indicated by the adverbial’; the eventuality itself does not hold at the topic time (25):

(25a) č'ale-m səhatə-naqʷe pjəsme  zer-ja-txə-ʁ
boy-OBL hour-half letter REL.MNR-3SG.ERG-write-PST
‘The boy had been writing a letter for half an hour, and now is not writing any more.’

(25b) č'ale-r səhat-ja-ble zere-čəajə-ʁ
boy-ABS hour-LNK-seven REL.MNR-sleep-PST
‘The boy had slept for seven hours, and now is not asleep.’

So, within the scope of Continuative, Preterite is interpreted as some kind of (unspecified) derived state.
4.3. Continuative in temporal clauses

As has been shown in (Gerasimov & Arkadiev 2007, 2009; Arkadiev 2009), the interpretation of temporal adverbial clauses with converbs containing the above-discussed zere- prefix crucially depends on actional properties of the verb. Zere-forms of atelic predicates denote unbounded events/states that are in effect when the eventuality expressed by the main verb takes place ('while P, Q'; 26), while with telic predicates similar constructions denote immediate precedence of a 'bounded event' (as soon as P, Q'; 27).

(26) č’ale-r krasnadar zere-ŋʷə-ř-ew p’jæme q-j-e-txə
boy-ABS Krasnodar REL-MNR-LOC-be-ADV letter DIR-3SG.ERG-DYN-writte
‘While staying in Krasnodar, the boy is writing a letter.’

(27) se wərama-m zə-qə-zere-řje-h-ew weš’xə-r q-je-š’xə-ʁ
I street-OBL 1SG.ABS-Dir-REL-MNR-LOC-go.out-ADV rain-ABS DIR-DAT-rain-PST
‘As soon as I went outside, it started raining.’

Similar construction with converbial suffix zere- can only denote simultaneity, and select predicates that can denote unbounded situations:

(28) weš’x qə-zere-je-š’xə-ze čəje-gʷ
rain DIR-REL.MNR-DIR-rain-PST-SIM sleep(mp)-OUM
‘While it is still raining, have some sleep.’

When the Preterite suffix is introduced into zere-converb, the interpretation shifts to the simultaneous one, cf. (29), which suggests that the Preterite form in this construction is interpreted as stative, just like independent Continuative:

(29) weš’x qə-zere-je-š’xə-ke-ze xate-m ta-de-žʷ-ka-h
rain DIR-REL.MNR-DIR-rain-PST-SIM garden-OBL 1PL.ABS-LOC-2PL.ERG-caus-go.out(mp)
‘While the rain is over and haven’t started again, let's go out into the garden.’

Bzhedug speakers prefer -ze in cases when -v(e) is introduced; some of them even reject forms containing the more ambiguous -ew:

(30) ?ʔa-zəre-ŋʷə-a-ʁ-ew/"qə-zere-ŋʷə-ke-ze ta-de-žʷ-ke-gʷəš’ŋə?
DIR-REL.MNR-GO-PST-ADV/…-SIM 1PL.ABS-LOC-2PL.ERG-caus-talk(mp)
‘While he is still here, let's talk to him.’

Again, like independent Continuative, converbial forms under discussion are not necessarily Absolutive-oriented and retain ergative prefix of transitive verbs. As a consequence, with transitive predicates, constructions derived from full-fledged verbs (31a, 32a) and constructions derived from Resultatives (31b, 32b) are formally differentiated:

(31a) we a-š’ jə-š’zək-ən-xe-r zere-b-ve-hələ-ke-ze,
you that-OBL POSS-clothes-PL-ABS REL-MNR-2SG.ERG-caus-hide(INTR)-PST-CNV
a-r mwe-ʒ’e Pə-č’ə-z’ə-n əje-t-ep⁷
that-ABS this-INS loc-exit-re-POT be.able-fut-NEG
‘While you keep his clothes hidden, he can’t leave.’

(31b) a-š’ jə-š’zək-ən-xe-r zere-b-ve-hələ-ke-ze,
that-OBL POSS-clothes-PL-AB REL-MNR-CAUS-hide(INTR)-PST-CNV
a-r mwe-ʒ’e Pə-č’ə-z’ə-n əje-t-ep⁷
that-ABS this-INS loc-exit-re-POT be.able-fut-NEG
‘While his clothes are hidden, he can’t leave.’

(32a) doske-m qə-zere-trjə-tx-ə-ke-ze
board-OBL DIR-REL.MNR-LOC-3SG.ERG-write-LAT-caus-CNV
je-ŋ’k’a-šə-e-r-ja je-ʒ’
DAT-GO-DIR-CNV-ADD DAT-read(mp)
‘While his writing is still on the blackboard, go and read.’
Again, Continuative conversbs make reference to some kind of derived states. That it is the Preterite that is responsible for stative interpretation, can easily be seen from contrast with similar forms lacking this suffix, cf. (33) vs. (30).

(33) \( qə-zere-kʷ-ew \) \( tə-de-žʷ-še-gʷəš'ʰə? \)
    \( \text{DIR-REL.MNR-GO-PST-ADV} \) \( 1\text{PL.ABS}-2\text{PL.ERG}-\text{CAUS-talk(mpl)} \)
    ‘As soon as he comes, let's talk to him.’

And similar to the case of main clause Continuatives, the states referred to in Continuative conversbs are underspecified, their exact denotation being largely determined by context/pragmatics:

(29') \( \text{weš'x } qə-zer-je-š'xə-ʁe-ze } xate-m \) \( tə-de-žʷ-ka-h \)
    \( \text{DIR-REL.MNR-DAT-rain-PST-SIM} \) \( \text{garden-OBL} \) \( 1\text{PL.ABS}-2\text{PL.ERG}-\text{CAUS-go.out(mpl)} \)
    ‘While the rain is over and haven't started again, let's go out into the garden.’
    ‘While it is cool and fresh after the rain, let's go out into the garden.’

An unexpected parallel from colloquial Russian: combinations of temporal conjunction \( \text{poka 'while'} \) with perfective verbs, yielding the interpretation that “action/situation \( P \) is simultaneous with the perfect state of the event \( Q \)” (Paducheva 2014).

(33) \( \text{Smotri skoree, poka vkljuchili svet.} \)
    \( \text{look.imp quicker while they.turned.on(pvf)} \) \( \text{light} \)
    ‘Look quick, while the light is on.’

(34) \( \text{Poka Masha vyshla, Ivan pozvonil Dashe.} \)
    \( \text{while M. went.out(pvf)} \) \( \text{I called D.} \)
    ‘While Masha was away, Ivan called Dasha.’

(35) \( \text{Poka ja razreshil Ivanu pol'zovat'sja moin komp'juterom,} \)
    \( \text{while I allowed(pvf)} \) \( \text{I. use my PC} \)
    \( \text{on chital pochtu kazhdyj den'}. \)
    \( \text{he read correspondence every day} \)
    ‘While Ivan had my permission to use my PC, he used to check his e-mails every day.’

5. Summary and questions

“Resultative states”:

➢ semantically similar to target/resultant states introduced by English or German stative passives;
➢ obligatorily ascribed to the Absolutive, and lack Ergative inflection, yet are to some variable extent compatible with Agent-oriented components of meaning (a problem for Kratzer 1996; 2000?);
➢ constrained by lexical semantics considerations: generally restricted to change of state and incremental theme predicates, which point to a scalar change analysis along the lines of (Baglini 2012; 2013).

“Continuative states”:

➢ show no lexical restrictions;
➢ not ascribed to any particular individual, semantically underspecified, largely inferred from context;
➢ and yet reversible – do not quite fit into target/resultant state distinction of (Parsons 1900).
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