States and Events Workshop, GLOW38, Paris, 18 April 2015

Dmitry Gerasimov*, Peter Arkadiev**

*Institute of Linguistic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, dm.gerasimov@gmail.com **Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences / Russian State University for the Humanities / Sholokhov Moscow State University for the Humanities, Moscow, peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

Two types of derived states in Bzhedug Adyghe

1. Bzhedug Adyghe

Bzhedug dialect < Adyghe (West Circassian) < Circassian < North-West Caucasian (Abkhaz-Adyghe) < North-Caucasian phylum

Our Bzhedug data comes mainly the fieldwork materials collected during field-trips to the village of Wochepshiy in July 2014. Many observations presented herein are also true for other Circassian varieties, at least for Temirgoy Adyghe (studied extensively in 2004–2006 and 2010) and Besleney Kabardian (2011–2013).

Important typological features:

very little distinction between nouns, adjectives and verbs (Lander & Testelets 2006);
 polysynthesis: pronominal affixes expressing all arguments of the verb (S, A, P as well as various indirect objects such as recipient, benefactive, and even location, cf. e.g. Smeets 1992) and a rich system of affixes marking aspectual, temporal and modal meanings (Smeets 1984; Korotkova & Lander 2010; Lander & Letuchiy 2010; Arkadiev & Letuchiy 2011)

Besleney Kabardian

 s∂-q∂-zer-a-x^w∂-č er∂-m∂-tet∂-č ∂-ž '-a-r lsg.ABS-DIR-REL.FCT-3PL.IO-BEN-LOC-NEG-tic-ELAT-RE-PST-ABS 'that they could not untie me'

> double-marking, i.e. presence of both head and dependent marking;

> ergativity in both head- and dependent-marking (Smeets 1992, Letuchiy 2012), coupled with an impoverished case system comprising only Absolutive (-r, marks S (2a) and P (2b)) and Oblique (-m, marks A (2b), all types of indirect objects (2b), and adnominal possessors (2c); NB personal pronouns, proper names and non-specific nouns normally lack overt case marking, see (Testelec 2014).

- (2) a. $\xi' ale r = \emptyset^{1} me \xi \partial_{ge}$. boy-ABS 3.ABS-DYN-Sleep 'The boy is sleeping.'
 - b. $\xi'ale-m$ psase-m $tx \partial \lambda r$ Ø-r-j-e-t ∂ . boy-obl girl-obl book-ABS 3sG.ABS-3sG.O-DAT-3sG.A-DYN-give 'The boy is giving the book to the girl.'
 - c. *çəfə-m* Ø*-jə-wəne* man-obl 3sc.pr.poss-house 'the man's house'

> a rich system of morphological marking of clausal subordination including various types of nominalizations, relativized predicates, and converbs.

> a rich system of auxiliary verb constructions marking aspectual and modal meanings in addition to and sometimes on par with suffixes.

2. The structure of the Circassian verbal complex

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

				pref	ĩxes	hoto		32.6	e ichiekuit	root		suf	fixes	-
argument structure zone			· ·	re-stei lemen			st	em	1	end	ings			
-10	-9	-8	-7	-6	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
absolutive	directional	subordinators	applicatives	dative	ergative	jussive	dynamicity	negation	causative	root	directionals, transitivity	propositional operators	absolutive plural	subordinators, force

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

3. Tense marking in Bzhedug

"Primary" tense:

	Present	Past	Future	
		Preterite	Imperfect	(+2)
Bzhedug Adyghe	unmarked ~ dynamic pre-	$-se \sim -s$ (word-finally)	- <i>təse</i> ~ - <i>təs</i> (word-finally)	-t
Temirgoy/Standard Adyghe	fix (-3)		$-\check{s}'t\partial B e \sim -\check{s}'t\partial B^2$ (word-finally)	-š 't

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

(3a) traktor-əm čəg^wə-r ə-z ^wa-<u>к</u> tractor-ові. land-льв Звб.екс-plough-pst

(3b) weś 'xə-r qəš 'xə-ze traktor-əm ξ əg "və-r $a-\hat{z}$ " $e-\underline{tas}$ rain-ABS rain-SIM tractor-OBL land-ABS $3s_{G,ERG}$ -plough-IPF 'During the rain, the tractor was ploughing the field.'

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

(4) $mwe\check{z}'e$ $w^{*}eg^{*}a$ $\check{s}'a-ta-w$ here road LOC-stand-PST 'There was a road here...'

Preterite is also employed as a "retrospective shift" (Plungian & van der Auwera 2006) marker combining with past and future markers and inducing interpretations such as distant past, annuled result or irrealis³:

(5a)	p-šə	w-adəž'	qe-ķ ^w a-в
	2sg.pr-brother	2sg-to	DIR-go-PST
	'Your brother h	as come to v	isit you [he's waiting].'

(5b) *p-šə w-adəž' qe-k^we-ua-u* 2sg.pr-brother 2sg-to Dir-go-pst-pst

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

¹ Henceforth we will not mark and gloss zero morphemes.

^{&#}x27;The tractor ploughed the field.'

 $^{^2}$ The Adyghe imperfective is historically a combination of the stative verb $\dot{s}'\partial t$ 'to stand' with the past tense marker.

³The same is true of other varieties of Adyghe (Korotkova 2009; Arkadiev 2014), while Kabardian uses Imperfective to mark retrospective shift (Somin 2012).

Attached to future forms, the retrospective shift marker yields irrealis or counterfactual meanings (a cross-linguistically common phenomenon, cf. latridou 2000).

> 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 stative predicates (6b, 7c 8b), or as postpositional modifiers in NPs (6c, 8c).

(6)	a.	<i>te psənč'ew</i> we quickly 'We fried the meat o	<i>le-r</i> meat-лвя juickly.'	d-веž'а-<u>в</u> lpl.erg-cook-pst	(perfective past)
	b.	<i>le-r Bež'a-<u>Ke</u> meat cook-RES 'The meat is fried'</i>			(resultative)
	c.	<i>le=uež'a-<u>ue</u></i> meat=cook-res 'fried meat'			(resultative)
The	beare	of the derived state is	s always the Ab	solutive argument	of the verb, which is espe-

cially easy to notice in case of verbs that have both transitive and intransitive alternates:

- (7) a. tx∂λ∂-r ž'∂-ue book-ABS read-PST
 'The book is read' (from transitive ž'∂n 'to read')
 - b. *txəλə-r je-ǯ'a-κ
 book-ABS DAT-read:AP-PST
 Expected '=4a' (from intransitive jeǯ'en 'to read')
 - c. *mə č'ale-r je-ž'a-ĸe ded* this boy-ʌBS DAT-read:AP-PST very 'This boy is well-read'
- (8) a. vjəno-r jə-s^wə-κ wine-ABS LOC-drink-PST
 'The wine is drunk.' (from transitive jəs^wən 'to drink')
 - b. $\lambda \partial r$ $je \hat{s}^w \partial s^w$ man-ABS DAT-drink:AP-PST 'The man is drunk.' 'The man had a drink.' (from intransitive $je\hat{s}^w en$ 'ПИТБ')
 - c. $\lambda \partial = je \hat{s}^{*}a B$ man=DAT-drink:AP-PST '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).

(9a)	<i>mefe-š ^{vh}ež 'ав^we-m</i> day-noon-овь 'At noon, they opened	<i>pče-r</i> door-ABS the door.'	<i>qә-?^w-а-хә-в</i> dir-loc-3pl.erg-оре	2N-PST
(9b)	<i>mefe-š ^{'h}ež 'ав^we-m</i> day-noon-овь 'At noon, the door was	<i>pče-r</i> door-авs	?"-x	ed before noon]
(10a)	<i>pče-r ?^w∂-x∂-</i> door-ABS LOC-ope 'The door is open.'			
(10b)	<i>sə-qə-z-e-k^we-m</i> lsg.abs-dir-rel.temp-dyn-go 'When I came, the doc			
(10c)	<i>wə-qə-zə-k^we-ğ'e</i> 2sg.abs-dir-rel.temp-go-ins 'When you come, the	door-ABS	?"	
(10d)		k ^w a- <i>ке-т-jә</i> dīr-go-pst-cond-add the door would al	<i>pče-r</i> door-ABS ways be open.'	?""-x-2- <u>BC-12B</u> LOC-OPEN-PST-IPF
Morpho	logically the Resultative for	orms behave like g	genuine stative p	redicates:
> under	negation, they do not atta	ch the dynamic su	ffix -r(e) charac	teristic of dynamic verbs:
(11a)	č'ale-r čaje	-ž'a-r-enh		

(11a)	ç'ale-r	čəje-ž'ə- r -ep"
	boy-abs	sleep-re-dyn-neg
	'The boy is r	not sleeping any more.'

(11b) *pče-r* ?*v∂-x∂-ĸe-ž`-ep^h* door-ABS LOC-OPEN-PST-RE-NEG 'The door is not open any more .'

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

(12a)	<i>ž'exaŝ^we-r</i> floor-авs 'Mom said t	<i>zere-thač'ə-se-r</i> REL.FCT-wash-PST-ABS nat the floor is cleaned.'		<i>mame</i> Mom	<i>q-ә-?^wа-в</i> dir-3sg.erg-say-pst
(12b)	<i>š^hembet^h</i> saturday	<i>mafe-xe-m</i> day-pL-овL	<i>zere-thačið-ве-<u>re</u>-r</i> rel.fct-wash-pst-dyn-abs		
	<i>se s-e-şe</i> я lsg.erg-dyw 'l know that	-know on Saturdays	the floor is c	leaned.'	
(13a)	<i>twəč'anə-r</i> store-ABS 'The store is	?" <i>ә-хә-в</i> Loc-open- open (now)'.			
		545			

(13b) *twəč'anə-r thewəmafe-xe-m-jə ?ⁿ-e-xə-u* store-ABS sunday-PL-OBL-ADD LOC-DYN-OPEN-PST 'The store is open even on Sundays.'

> like regular stative predicates, Resultatives can not receive the repetitive prefix -z'a, unless in the scope of negation, cf. (14) vs. (10) and (11b):

(14)

* $p\check{c}e$ -r ?^w ∂ - $x\partial$ -ue- $\check{z}'(\partial)$ door-ABS LOC-open-PST-RE Intended: 'The door is once again open.'

> Overall, Resultatives build by means of the Preterite suffix $-\mu(e)$ 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).

 \succ 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 -B(e) is a vestige of a previous state of the language system: B(e) underwent evolution along the standard 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).

• (Ogihara & Fukushima 2015) base their argumentation on the idea that stative -ta lost the ability to combine with tense operators and so can not appear in tensed clauses. Stative $-\mu(e)$, as we have seen earlier, combine freely with tense markers. Could this be a parameter of cross-linguistic variation?

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-čaj* boy-ABS REL.MNR-sleep 'The boy is still sleeping.'
- (16) *weš'x qə-zer-je-š'x* rain dir-rel.mnr-rain 'It is still raining.'

(17) *č'ale-m pjəsme zer-jə-tx* boy-obl letter REL.MNR-3sg.ERG-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 $-\mathbf{E}(e)$, 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
boy-ABSzere-čаја-в
REL.MNR-sleep-PST'The boy is still asleep.'

- (19) č'ale-r zere-ž'eg^w∂-в
 boy-ABS REL.MNR-play-PST
 'The boy is still playing (as he started).'
- (20) weš'x qə-zer-je-š'xə-b rain dir-rel.mnr-dat-rain-pst 'It is still wet (after the rain).'
- (21)tjeljefon=nomjerə-r
phone=number-ABSqə-zer-a-ь^wetə-ž'ә-ь
DIR-REL.MNR-3PL.erg-найти-RE-PST'The phone number is still not lost again (after they have found it).'
- (22) *č'ale-m pjəsme zer-jə-txə-u* boy-obl letter rel.MNR-3sg.erg-write-pst 'The boy still has his letter written.'

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-nəq ^w e	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.'							
(22h)	nêgêo n	schat is bla	ma čaja					

(230)	psase-r	sənat-jə-ble	те-сәје
	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-nəq ^w e	pjəsme	zer-jə-tx				
	boy-obl	hour-half	letter	REL.MNR-3SG.ERG-write				
	'The boy has been writing a letter for half an hour already.'							
(24b)	pŝaŝe-r	səhat-jə-ble	zere-čəj					
	girl-abs	hour-lnk-seven	REL.MNR-sleep)				

'The girl has been sleeping for seven hours already.'

With forms marked with Preterite $-\mathbf{E}(e)$, adverbials of duration are interpreted as falling under the scope of resultative and, consequently, under the scope of continuative, returning a nontrivial 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-nəq ^w e	pjəsme	zer-jə-txə-к		
	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					
(25b)	č'ale-r	səhat-jə-ble	zere-	čәја-в		
	boy-abs	R-sleep-PST				
	'The boy had slept fo	r seven hours, ar	nd now is not	t 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*- prefixcrucially 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'al	e-r kra	asnadare	zere-š 'ʰə-ʔ-ew	pjəsme	q-j-e-txə			
	boy-		isnodar	REL.MNR-LOC-be-ADV	letter	dir-3sg.erg-dyn-wrtite			
	'While staying in Krasnodar, the boy is writing a letter.'								
(27)	se	wəramə-m	sə-qə-zere	-t ^h je-h-ew	weš 'xə-r	q-je-š'хә-ь			
	Ι	street-obl	1sg.abs-dir-f	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 *ze*- can only denote simultaneity, and select predicates that can denote unbounded situations:

(28)	weš 'x	qə-zer-je-š'xə-ze	čəje-g ^w
	rain	DIR-REL.MNR-DAT-ИДТИ.О.ДОЖДС-SIM	sleep(IMP)-DUM
	'While it		

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	qә-zer-je-š'хә-ве-ze	xate-m	tə-de-ź ^w -ва-h
	rain	DIR-REL.MNR-DAT-rain-PST-SIM	garden-obl	1pl.abs-loc-2pl.erg-caus-go.out(imp)
	'While th	e rain is over and haven't st	arted again, let's	go out into the garden.'

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

(30) ^{???}*qə-zere-kwa-u-ew /^{0k}qə-zere-kwa-u-ze* Dir-rel.mnr-go-pst-adv/...-sim

tә-de-ź^w-*ве-g*^wðš '^ha? 1pl.abs-com-2pl.erg-caus-talk(імр)

'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'	jә-š 'әвәn-xe-r		zere-b-ĸe-bəλə-ĸe-ze,	
	you	that-OBL	POSS-clothes-PL-AF	BS	REL.MNR-2SG.ERG-CAUS-hide(INTR)-PST-CNV	
	a-r	mwe-ž'e	?ʷə-č಼ 'ə-ž 'ə-n	λejə-t	$-ep^h$	
	that-ABS	this-INS	LOC-exit-re-pot	be.able	-FUT-NEG	
	'While you keep his clothes hidden, he can't leave.'					
	that-ABS	this-INS	<i>₽ʷә-čָ`ә-ž`ә-n</i> Loc- exit -re-pot	<i>λejə-t</i> be.able	- <i>ep^h</i> -FUT-NEG	

(31b)	a-š'	jə-š'əsən-xe-r	zere-se-bəλə-se-ze,			
	that-OBL POSS-clothes-PL-AB		rel.mnr-caus-hide(intr)-pst-cnv			
	a-r	mwe-ž'e	?™ə-č'ə-ž'ə-n	λejə-t-ep ^h		
	that-ABS	this-INS	LOC-exit-re-pot	be.able-FUT-NEG		
	'While his clothes are hidden, he can't leave.'					

(32a) doske-m $q \partial -zere-tr-j\partial -tx-a-e-ze$ board-obl dir-rel.MNR-loc-3sg.erg-write-lat-caus-cnv $je-kwa-\lambda e-r-j\partial$ $je-\check{z}'$ dat-go-dir-cnv-add dat-read(IMP)'While his writing is still on the blackboard, go and read.' (32b) doske-m zere-tje-tx-a-we-zeboard-obl dir-rel.MNR-loc-write-lat-CAUS-CNV $je-kwa-\lambda e-r-ja$ $je-\tilde{z}'$ DAT-go-DIR-CNV-ADD dat-read(IMP)'While it is still written on the blackboard, go and read.'

Again, Continuative converbs 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) $q \partial$ -zere- k^{w} -ew $t \partial$ -de- \hat{z}^{w} -&ee- $g^{w}\partial \check{s}'^{h}a?$ DIR-REL.MNR-gO-PST-ADV 1PL.ABS-COM-2PL.ERG-CAUS-talk(IMP) '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 converbs are underspecified, their exact denotation being largely determined by context/pragmatics:

(29') weš'x qə-zer-je-š'xə-we-ze xate-m tə-de-ẑ^w-wa-h
rain DIR-REL.MNR-DAT-rain-PST-SIM garden-OBL 1PL.ABS-LOC-2PL.ERG-CAUS-gO.OUt(IMP)
'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 *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)	look.imp	<i>skoree,</i> quicker uick, while the	while	they.turi		YF)	svet. light
(34)	while	Masha vyshla M. went.ou Masha was awa	t(pvf)	Ι	called	nil	Dashe. D.
(35)	while on ch he rea	I allowed(PVF) ital pochtu id correspo	I.	use kazhdy every	/j	my den'. day	komp'juterom, PC

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 stat ive passives;

 \triangleright 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?);

 \succ 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":

 \succ show no lexical restrictions;

 \succ 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).

Abbreviations

A – agent; ABS – absolutive; ADV – adverbial; BEN – benefactive; COND – conditional; COORD – coordination; DAT – dative; DEM – demonstrative; DIR – directive preverb; DYN – dynamic preverb; ELAT – elative; ERG – ergative; FCT – factive; FUT – future; IMD – immediative; INC – inceptive; INS – instrumental; INT – intensive; IO – indirect object; IPF – imperfective; LOC – locative preverb; MNR – manner; NEG – negation; OBL – oblique; PL – plural; POSS – possession; PR – possessor; POT – potential; PST – preterite; QUOT – quotative; RE – repetitive; REL – relativization; RES – resultative; S – intransitive subject; SG – singular; TEMP – temporal relation.

References

- Arkadiev P.M. (2009). Lexical and compositional factos in the aspectual system of Adyghe // L. Hogeweg, H. de Hoop, A. Malchukov (eds.), *Cross-Linguistic Semantics of Tense, Aspect and Modality*. (Linguistik Aktuell 148) Amsterdam—Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 55–82.
- Arkadiev P.M. (2014). Sistema form pljuskvamperfekta v šapsugskom dialekte adygejskogo jazyka [System of pluperfect forms in the Shapsugh dialect of Adyghe] // Voprosy jazykoznanija 4, 46–65.
- Arkadiev P.M., D.V. Gerasimov (2009). From instrument to manner to tense-aspect: A diachronic scenario from Adyghe. Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Meeting of Societas Linguistica Europaea, Lisbon, 9–12 September 2009.
- Arkadiev P.M., A.B. Letuchiy (2011). Prefixes and suffixes in the Adyghe polysynthetic wordform: Types of interaction // V. S. Tomelleri, M. Topadze, A. Lukianowicz (eds.), *Languages and Cultures in the Caucasus*. München, Berlin: Otto Sagner, 495–514.
- Baglini R.(2012). The scalar source of stative passives // Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 16. Cambridge, MA, 2012.
- Baglini R.(2013). Deriving target and resultant states // R. E. Santana-LaBarge (ed.). Proceedings of the 31st Annual Meeting of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics. Somerville, MA, 2013.
- Gerasimov D.V., P.M. Arkadiev (2007). A peculiar resultative in Adyghe and what it can tell about aspectual composition in the language. Paper presented at the *Conference on the Languages of the Caucasus*, Leipzig, 7–9 December 2007.
- Gerasimov D.V., P.M. Arkadiev (2014). Peculiar of past time reference in Circassian. Paper presented at the *Chronos XI* conference, Pisa, 16-18 June 2014.
- Hewitt B.G. (ed.) (1989). The Indigenous Languages of the Caucasus, Vol. 2. The North West Caucasian Languages. Delmar, NY: Caravan.
- Iatridou S. (2000). The grammatical ingredients of counterfactuality. Linguistic Inquiry 31/2, 231-270.
- Kennedy C. (1999). Projecting the Adjective: The Syntax and Semantics of Gradability and Comparison. New York: Garland.
- Kennedy C. (2010). The Composition of Incremental Change // Proceedings of 12th International Symposium on Chinese languages and linguistics, Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Kennedy C., B. Levine (2008). Measure of change: The adjectival core of degree achievements // Adjectives and adverbs: Syntax, semantics, and discourse, 156–182.
- Kennedy C., L. MacNally (2005). Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates // Language 81, 345–381.
- Korotkova N.A. (2009). "Prošloe" i "sverxprošloe" v adygejskom jazyke ["Past" and "superpast" in Adyghe] // Testelec (ed.) 2009, 262–286.
- Korotkova N.A., Yu.A. Lander (2010). Deriving suffix ordering in polysynthesis: Evidence from Adyghe // Morphology 20, 299–319.
- Kratzer A. (2000). Building statives // L. J. Conathan et al. (eds.). *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*. Berkeley
- Korotkova N.A. (2009). "Prošloe" i "sverxprošloe" v adygejskom jazyke ["Past" and "superpast" in Adyghe]. In: Testelec (ed.) 2009, 262–286.
- Lander Yu.A., A.B. Letuchiy (2010). Kinds of recursion in Adyghe morphology // H. van der Hulst (ed.), *Recursion and Human Language*. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter, 263–284.
- Lander Yu.A., Ya.G. Testelets (2006). Nouniness and specificity: Circassian and Wakashan. Paper presented at the conference *Universals and Particulars in Parts-of-Speech Systems*, Amsterdam.
- Letuchiy A.B. (2012). Ergativity in the Adyghe system of valency-changing derivations // G. Authier, K. Haude (eds.), *Ergativity, Valency and Voice*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 323–354.
- Letuchiy A.B. (2014). The causative derivation and ordering of morphosyntactic operations in Adyghe. Ms.

- Maslov Yu. (1987). Perfektnost' [Perfectivity] // Teorija funkcionalnoj grammatiki. Vvedenije. Aspektualnost. Vremennaja lokalizovannost'. Taksis. [The theory of functional grammar. Introduction. Aspect. Temporal localization. Relative tense]. Leningrad: Nauka, 195–209.
- Michaelis L.A. (1996). On the use and meaning of already // Linguistics and Philosophy 19, 477-502.

Michaelis L.A. (2004). Type shifting in Construction Grammar: an integrated approach to aspectual coercion // *Cognitive Linguistics* 15, 1–67.

Nishiyama A., J.-P. Koenig. What is a perfect state? // Language 86.

Ogihara T., Fukushima T. (2015). Semantic properties of the so-called past tense morpheme in Late Late Middle Japanese // Journal of East Asian Linguistics 24, 75–112.

Paducheva E. (2014). Klassifikatsiya Maslova/Vendlera i ee netrivialnyje primenenia [The Maslov/Vendler classification of predicates and its non-trivial applications] // Paper presented at the international conference Academic Legacy and Further Development of Ideas of Yuri Maslov, St. Petersburg, 20-22 November.

Parsons T. (1990). Events in the Semantics of English. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Plungian V.A., J. van der Auwera (2006). Towards a typology of discontinuous past marking // Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 59/4, 317–349.
- Rogava G.V., Z.I. Keraševa (1966). *Grammatika adygejskogo jazyka [A Grammar of Adyghe]*. Krasnodar, Majkop: Krasnodarskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.
- Smeets R. (1984). Studies in West Circassian Phonology and Morphology. Leiden: Hakuchi.
- Smeets R. (1992). On valencies, actants and actant coding in Circassian // B.G. Hewitt (ed.), *Caucasian Perspectives*. München, Newcastle: LINCOM Europa, 98–144.
- Somin A.A. (2012). Vid, vremja i modal'nost' glagola v besleneevskom dialekte kabardino-čerkesskogo jazyka [Verbal aspect, tense and modality on the Besleney dialect of Kabardian]. MA thesis, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow.

de Swart H. (1998). Aspect shift and coercion // Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 16/2, 347-385.

Testelec Ja.G. (ed.) (2009). Aspekty polisintetizma: Ocherki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka [Aspects of Polysynthesis: Studies in Adyghe Grammar]. Moscow: RSUH.