

THE SYNTAX OF COMPLEMENTATION IN ABKHAZ

GEORGE HEWITT

University of London

A. *Vital Statistics*

Abkhaz belongs to the small North West Caucasian family, whose other two members are Circassian and Ubykh (extinct since 1992). Fewer than 100,000 Abkhazians are centred on the historical homeland of Abkhazia, a *de facto* independent state in northwest Transcaucasia since the war with Georgia in 1992-93. Here the language retains the literary status awarded by the early Soviets, which means that there is teaching of/in Abkhaz in initial classes in Abkhaz language schools before the shift to Russian, publication, and broadcasting, but Russian is the main *lingua franca*, and younger generations generally speak more/better Russian than Abkhaz, though in the villages, the situation is healthier. Roughly the same applies to the most divergent dialect, Abaza, with around 30,000 speakers and separate alphabet from standard Abkhaz, in Russia's north Caucasian province of Karachay-Cherkessia. The majority Abkhazian population, anecdotally numbering up to 500,000, has since the late 19th century been found in Turkey, where no official language teaching has taken place during the lifetime of the Republic; younger generations are more fluent in Turkish, if not exclusively so. The language must be regarded as endangered, certainly in Turkey and probably in the Caucasus also.

According to the last Soviet census of 1989, 102,938 Abkhazians lived in the USSR, of whom 95,853 resided in Georgia, the majority of 93,267 within the then *Abkhazian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic*, the demographic data for which were:

Main Population of Abkhazia (1979 & 1989)

	1979	1989	1979	1989
Whole Population	486,082	525,061	100.0%	100.0%
Abkhazians	83,097	93,267	17.1%	17.8%
'Georgians'	213,322	239,872	43.9%	45.7%
Armenians	73,350	76,541	15.1%	14.6%
Russians	79,730	74,913	16.4%	14.2%
Greeks	13,642	14,664	2.8%	2.8%

B. *Typological Profile*

The whole N.W. Caucasian family is synthetic and agglutinative, though verbs can, and often do, reach extreme levels of polysyntheticity. The language is head-marking and morphologically ergative; there is only the occasional indication of ergative syntax.

Consonantal Phonemes						
p	b	p'			m	w
		(f)	f	v		
t	d	t'			n	r
t ^w	d ^w	t' ^w				
ts	dz	ts'	s	z		
tɕ ^w	dʒ ^w	tɕ' ^w				
tʃ	dʒ	tʃ'	ʃ	ʒ		
			ʃ ^w	ʒ ^w		
tʂ	dʒ̥	tʂ'	ʂ	ʒ̥		
					l	
						j
						ɟ
k	g	k'				
k ^j	g ^j	k' ^j				
k ^w	g ^w	k' ^w				
		q'	χ	ɣ		
		q' ^j	χ ^j	ɣ ^j		
		q' ^w	χ ^w	ɣ ^w		
		(?)	h			
			h ^w			

Vowels = open /a/ vs close /ə/ (the phonemic status of [a:] is open to debate).

Abkhaz, unlike the sisters, has no case-marking for the verb's main arguments. Nouns are heads of NPs and distinguish singular from plural; the pronominal agreement-affixes, of which there are 3 sets (or Columns, which function thus: Column I encodes the S/O; Column II, which is virtually identical with the verb-external prefixes used to mark the possessor on the possessed N or the postpositional object on postpositions, encodes the indirect/oblique object; Column III encodes the A), follow the same patterns as independent pronouns, except that the Column II and Column III sets also distinguish human male from non-human in the 3rd person singular in addition to the gender-distinction of the 2nd & 3rd person independent pronouns and of the Column I set. These affixes allow us to identify the verb's arguments, and I use subscripts to help with the identification of cross-referencing for 3rd person non-human entities.

Independent Personal Pronouns

		SINGULAR	PLURAL
1st person		sa('ra)	ħa('ra)
2nd person	(Hum Masc; Non-Hum; indefinite)	wa('ra)	ʃ ^w a('ra)
2nd person	(Hum Fem)	ba('ra)	ʃ ^w a('ra)
3rd person	(Hum Masc; Non-Hum)	ja('ra)	da('ra)
3rd person	(Hum Fem)	la('ra)	da('ra)

Pronominal Possessive Prefixes

		SINGULAR	PLURAL
1st person		s(ə)	ħ(a)
2nd person	(Hum Masc; Non-Hum; indefinite)	w(ə)	ʃ ^w (ə)
2nd person	(Hum Fem)	b(ə)	ʃ ^w (ə)
3rd person	(Hum male)	j(ə)	r(ə)
3rd person	(Hum Fem)	l(ə)	r(ə)
3rd person	(Non-Hum)	a	r(ə)

Pronominal Agreement-affixes in the Verb¹

	<i>Singular</i>			<i>Plural</i>		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
1st	s-	s-	s-(/z-)	ħ-	ħ-	ħ-(/a:-)
2nd Masc/N-Hum	w-	w-	w-	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -(/ʒ ^w -)
2nd Fem	b-	b-	b-	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -	ʃ ^w -(/ʒ ^w -)
3rd Masc Hum	d-	j-	j-	j-	r-(/d-)	r-(/d-)
3rd Fem Hum	d-	l-	l-	j-	r-(/d-)	r-(/d-)
3rd N-Hum	j-/ø-	a-/ø-	(n)a-	j-	r-(/d-)	r-(/d-)

When immediately preceded by its referent, Column I /j-/ drops; under relativization any of the Column I affixes is replaced by /j(ə)-/. Under relativization any of the Col II or III affixes is replaced by /z(ə)-/.

Apart from the pronominal prefixes just listed, verbs (or verbal complexes, in the phrase of the late Sidney Allen) shew tense, mood and, to a certain degree, aspect. One needs to note the following three oppositions: 1. Transitive vs Intransitive verbs (indicated by the presence of a Column III A-marking affix for the former and the absence of such for the latter), though there are some ambi-transitives of both the S = O and S = A variety; 2. Dynamic vs Stative verbs, the latter typically possess a different and more restricted set of primary tense-endings, though it is possible to produce secondarily virtually a full set of tenses by inserting a derivative suffix + the regular Dynamic endings, as exemplified below—whilst there is no Active-Passive distinction as

¹To save space the schwa that may, depending on the stress-patterning, accompany all consonant-initial affixes is not indicated.

such, note this Stative resultative passive vs active Dynamic correlation:

1. jə.q'a.'ts'a.w.p'
 X.Prev.do.Stat.Fin(=Pres)
 'X is/has been done'

⇐

- jə.q'a.s.'ts'a.ø.jt'
 X.Prev.I.do.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I did X'

3. Finite vs Non-finite forms—though it is something of an exaggeration, a sentence will typically contain only one finite form, which means that subordinate 'clauses' (if defined, according to traditional grammatical terminology, as a sequence of words containing a finite verb) largely do not exist, the appropriate non-finite tense-form fulfilling the function, with or without (depending on the construction) an appropriate affix to mark the role it is performing. The morphological distinction between the Finite and Non-finite forms is more developed in Abkhaz than in the sister-languages, where a sure marker of Non-finite status is the presence of pre-radical negation, but in Abkhaz the negative marker /-m-/ or /-m/ sometimes stands pre-radically in Finite forms and suffixally in Non-finite forms, depending on the tense, as exemplified in the examples of Finite vs Non-finite (positive and negative) for Dynamic and Stative basic tense-forms set out below—the Finite forms (of the root /-gəla-/ 'stand up; be standing') are presented with 1st person singular subject, whilst, to shew the morphological changes involved in shifting to the Non-finite forms, the equivalent relativized forms have been chosen;² as regards the marking of arguments, it is only in relativized forms that there is any difference between finites and non-finites:

² This shift to the equivalent relativised forms was preferred for purposes of exemplification because these relativised Non-finites are entirely natural free-standing forms in the language. To have left the 1st person singular Column I S-marker in place would have produced mostly artificial forms, for, whilst the Present /s.'gəla.wa/ '(I) standing' is natural in some constructions, the Imperfect /s.'gəla.wa.z/ is not, though this latter is the base-form for the /s.an.'gəla.wa.z/ 'when I was standing up', with the temporal subordinating conjunctive (perhaps converbal?) prefix inserted in the pre-radical complex.

Finite vs Non-finite Indicative Tense-forms

Dynamic Group I Tenses

	'stand up'		'not stand up'	
	Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
Pres[ent]	s.'gəla.wa.(j)t'	jə.'gəla.wa	s.'gəla.wa.m	'jə.m.gəla.wa
Aor[ist]	s.'gəla.əjt'	jə.'gəla.ə	sə.m.'gəla.əjt'	'jə.m.gəla.ə
Fut[ure] I	s.'gəla.p'	jə.'gəla.ra/ə	s.'gəla.rə.m	'jə.m.gəla.ra/ə
Fut[ure] II	s.'gəla.ʂt'	jə.'gəla.ʂa	s.'gəla.ʂa.m	'jə.m.gəla.ʂa
Perf[ect]	s.'gəla.χ'a.jt'	jə.'gəla.χ'a.w = jə.'gəla.χ'a.(ts) /jə.'gəla.ts	sə.m.'gəla.ts.(t')	'jə.m.gəla.χ'a.w = 'jə.m.gəla.χ'a.(ts) /'jə.m.gəla.ts

Dynamic Group II Tenses

	Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
Imperf[ect]	s.'gəla.wa.n	jə.'gəla.wa.z	s.'gəla.wa.mə.z.t'	'jə.m.gəla.wa.z
Past Indef[inite] ³	s.'gəla.ə.n	jə.'gəla.ə.z	sə.m.'gəla.ə.z.t'	'jə.m.gəla.ə.z
Condit[ional] I	s.'gəla.rə.n	jə.'gəla.rə.z	s.'gəla.rə.mə.z.t'	'jə.m.gəla.rə.z
Condit[ional] II	s.'gəla.ʂa.n	jə.'gəla.ʂa.z	s.'gəla.ʂa.mə.z.t'	'jə.m.gəla.ʂa.z
Plup[erfect]	s.'gəla.χ'a.n	jə.'gəla.χ'a.z /jə.'gəla.tsə.z	sə.m.'gəla.tsə.z.t'	'jə.m.gəla.χ'a.(tsə.)z /'jə.m.gəla.tsə.z

Basic Stative Pattern

	'be standing'		'not be standing'	
	Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
Pres[ent]	s.'gəla.w.p'	jə.'gəla.w	s.'gəla.m	jə.'gəla.m
Past	s.'gəla.n	jə.'gəla.z	s.'gəla.mə.z.t'	jə.'gəla.mə.z
[Perf[ect]	—	jə.'gəla.ts	—	'jə.m.gəla.ts]

The 'missing' tenses can be formed for Statives, as indicated below:

Derived Stative Pattern

	Finite	Non-finite	Finite	Non-finite
Def[inite] Fut[ure]	s.'gəla.z.a.wa.jt'	jə.'gəla.z.a.wa	s.'gəla.z.a.wa.m	jə.'gəla.m.z.a.wa
Fut[ure] I	s.'gəla.z.a.p'	jə.'gəla.z.a.ra	s.'gəla.z.a.ra.m	jə.'gəla.m.z.a.ra
Fut[ure] II	s.'gəla.z.a.ʂt'	jə.'gəla.z.a.ʂa	s.'gəla.z.a.ʂa.m	jə.'gəla.m.z.a.ʂa
Condit[ional] I	s.'gəla.z.a.rə.n	jə.'gəla.z.a.rə.z	s.'gəla.z.a.rə.mə.z.t'	jə.'gəla.m.z.a.rə.z

There is no Finite vs Non-finite opposition for the Imperative, Evidential (though, intriguingly, questions *are* possible on Evidentials, and questions are built on non-finite bases), Subjunctive and Optative moods, forms which do not concern us here. The verb heads the predicate; when relativized, it can modify an NP; when nominalized, it can head an NP.

³ This is included here because, formally speaking, it fits the same pattern as the other Group II tenses. However, in terms of usage, a Finite Past Indefinite cannot 'make a sentence'; it has to be followed by another past tense Finite verb for the sentence to be well-formed, and so its meaning is 'X VERBed AND...'.

C. *Further Grammatical Preliminaries*

Constituent-order is: A-IO-O-V or S-IO-V. Statements contain a Finite verb, whilst all types of questions utilise the Non-finite form of the appropriate tense with relevant affixes in the verbal complex. The equivalents of subordinate clauses similarly involve the use of Non-finite forms, possibly with relative affix replacing the appropriate agreement-prefix, or with a conjunctive (?converbal) prefix or suffix. There is a verbal noun in /-ra/ for Dynamics vs /-z.ɑ:ra/ for Statives, though for some Statives such a form has an artificial flavour. There are also the so-called 'Absolutes' (which can be thought of as correlating sometimes with an English participle, sometimes with a verbal noun), formed from the Present, Aorist and Perfect Non-finite forms for Dynamics and from the verb-stem for Statives by suffixation of /-nə/, the formant typical of adverbs. Of these the Dynamic Past Absolute is the commonest, for it is widely used in clause-chaining, the Column III A-marking affix being omitted in such contexts, e.g.

2. zɑ'gǝ ø.q'a.s.'ts'a.ø.jt'
 all it.Prev.I.do.Past.Fin
 'I did everything/it all'

⇒

- zɑ'gǝ ø.q'a.ts'a.ø.'nə s.'dʷə.kʷ.la.ø.jt'
 all it.Prev.do.Past.Abs I.field.on.go.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'Having done everything, I took off'

An alternative to the Past Absolute in this context is the Past Indefinite:

3. zɑ'gǝ ø.q'a.s.'ts'a.ø.n s.'dʷə.kʷ.la.ø.jt'
 all it.Prev.I.do.Past.Fin(=P/I) I.field.on.go.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I did everything and took off'

cf. the Stative Absolute, which is formally parallel to the Dynamic Past Absolute by virtue of suffixing /-nə/ to the verbal root:

4. ɑ.'la ø.'sə.ma.w.p'
 the.dog it.I.have.Stat.Fin(=Pres)⁴
 'I have a dog'

⇒

- ɑ.'la ø.'sə.ma.nə s.'dʷə.kʷ.la.ø.jt'
 the.dog it.I.have.Abs(-Stat) I.field.on.go.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I took off with = having the dog'

⁴ The verb 'have' is a bivalent intransitive (Stative) verb in Abkhaz, such that 'I have X' is historically literally 'X is (in) my hand/possession'.

D. *Complement Clauses*

Unless one is speaking of cases where the direct speech construction (viz. Finite verb + speech-particle /h^wa/) stands where a complement is expected, one could say that *sensu stricto* there are no complement clauses, as the relevant sequences contain no Finite verb. So, I shall use the neutral term ‘complement’, leaving readers to make whatever distinctions take their fancy; the relevant sequences are placed between chevrons. The following types of complement are attested:

1. Extended direct speech construction. The speech-particle, which at first glance looks like the root of the verb ‘say’, is actually the Past Absolute of this verb minus the typical suffix /-nə/; being a transitive verb, no Column III agent-prefix is present, and the Column I 3rd person Non-Human prefix is missing because it is immediately preceded by its referent, namely the original direct quote. This sequence plus the speech-particle functions as a unitary argument (viz. noun-complement) of the introductory main verb, as indicated by the absence of the Column I 3rd person Non-Human prefix on this verb when it immediately follows the complement, as it normally does. The examples to hand (5-15) have the complement functioning principally as either S or O; additionally, examples for it functioning as A and indirect/oblique object are attested, whilst in two cases below the complement is linked by means of a possessive prefix to a noun that is integral to the VP, and in a further two cases, there is no morphological linkage to any other element in the sentence, and in these last two instances the complement-status is questionable. In O-function consider:

5. wə-j j(.)aj(.)'ta(.)ts'(.).wa a.q'a(.)ts'a(.)r(.).ba.'k^wa
 that.one transitive the.verb.Pl
 k'av'k'az.t^wə(.)j a.bəz(.)f^wa.'k^wa r.q'(.).nə
 Caucasus.pertaining the.language.Pl them.in
 jə.p'a'ssiv(.)t^w'k^wa.w.p' h^wa
 they.passive.Pl.Stat.Fin(-Pres) Sp-Part_i
 ø.jə.pχ'adza.'wa.jt'
 it_i.he.judge.Dyn.Fin(-Pres)

‘He [Schuchardt] considers that the transitive verbs in the Caucasian languages are passives’

Here, the main verb could stand before the complement to give /wə-j jə.j.pχ'adza.'wa.jt'.../.

As an example of this construction in S-function, though it is not the preferred construction for expressing the notion ‘recall’, see:

6. <a.p'h^wəs də.tsa.'χⁱa.jt' h^wa> s.χ.a.'tʂ'ə
 the.woman she.go.Perf.Fin Sp-Part_i my.head.it.in
 j.a:(.j.ə.[j]t'
 it_i.come.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I recalled (= it came into my head) that the woman had already gone'

(N.B. the Perfect is used here and not the Pluperfect /də.tsa.'χⁱa.n/, suggesting that the link with *oratio recta* is not entirely broken, as the original thought was 'she has already gone'). There is a colloquialism for 'think' where this construction is obligatory, though the relevant sequence cannot here be demonstrated to be an argument of the introductory verb, and thus perhaps not a complement at all, for this latter is the copular root /-q'a-/ with the thinker as its only argument, e.g.

7. <wə.s za: j.a:.'wa.jt' /
 that.Adv early they.come.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 j.a:.'wa.n h^wa>
 they.come.Dyn.Fin(=Imperf) Sp-Part(=that)
 'sə.q'a.mə.z(.)t'
 I.be.not.Past(=Stat.Past)

'I was not [of the opinion] that they would come so early'

where we note that either the Present or Imperfect is possible, even when speaking of an event completed prior to the moment this sentence is uttered. The possibility of using the Imperfect here indicates that the construction has developed into something other than simple *oratio recta*, for the original thought would have had the Present (used as a definite Future). Another colloquialism to express the notion 'think' is a phrase that is literally 'X's heart brings <Y>' = 'X thinks <Y>', and this alternative can replace the copula in the previous example to produce:

8. <wə.s za: j.a:.'wa.jt' /
 that.Adv early they.come.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 j.a:.'wa.n h^wa> s.g^wə
 they.come.Dyn.Fin(=Imperf) Sp-Part(=that)_i my.heart
 'j.a:na.ga.wa.mə.z(.)t'
 it_i.hither.it.carry.Dyn.not.Fin(=Imperf)

'I was not thinking that they would come so early'

The other example to hand of a free-standing complement, if it is relevant to include this, is for the expression 'deny', though the presence of the negative in the clause perhaps suggests there is more of *oratio recta* in this construction:

9. $\langle j\dot{a}.u\dot{e}za \quad a.u'n\dot{e} \quad 'd\dot{e}.q'a.m\dot{e}.z(.)t'$
 his.friend the.house (s)he.be.not.Past(=Stat.Past)
 $\dot{h}^w\alpha$ map' $\emptyset.j\dot{e}.k'.wa.jt'$
 Sp-Part(=that) no_i $it_i.he.seize.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)$

'He denies that his friend was at home (lit. He seizes 'no', saying his friend was not at home)'

In A-function we have:

10. $\langle wa(.)'ra \quad a'ra \quad w.a.: \emptyset.jt'$
 you-Masc here you-Masc.come.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 $\dot{h}^w\alpha$ $a'g'.a.ts'a.na.k'.wa.m$
 Sp-Part(=that); nothing. it_i .under. it_i .hold.Dyn.Neg(=Pres)
 '(The fact) that you have come here means nothing'

As oblique object consider:

11. $\langle d\dot{e}.ps.'wa.jt' \quad \dot{h}^w\alpha.'g\dot{e}$
 (s)he.die.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part(=that);.even
 $s.a.z.'x'a.ps.wa.m$
 I. it_i .for.Prev.look.Dyn.not(=Fin.Pres)

'I am not paying attention to even (the fact) that (s)he is dying'

With / $[a.]a.\dot{s}s.'ra$ / 'complain' the complement seems at first glance to be rather functioning as simple indirect object to the verb, but in fact it is dependent on the indirect object-marking prefix /- a -/, which might incline one to argue that we should see it as an oblique (rather than indirect) object:

12. $\langle a.'k'las \quad a.'t\dot{s}'\dot{e} \quad d.a.: [a.]q^w\dot{e}.m.ts'. 'dza.\emptyset.k^w'a$
 the.class it.in (s)he.Prev.it.off.not.leave.Emph.Past.Neg-Abs
 $d\dot{e}.'t\dot{e}^w\alpha\dot{z}^w\alpha.wa.jt'$ $\dot{h}^w\alpha$
 (s)he.talk.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part(=that);
 $s.[a.]a.\dot{s}s.'wa.jt'$
 I. it_i .to.complain-of.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

'I am complaining that (s)he talks incessantly in class'

For 'convince X of <Y>' (literally 'make X take the heartness/belief of <Y>') and 'hope' (literally 'have the hope <Y>'), the complement is linked to the respective nouns by means of the 3rd person singular Non-human possessive prefix on the noun, which means that they are not strictly complements of course, e.g.

13. $\langle 'a.sas.t\dot{e}^w\alpha \quad 'j\dot{e}.r.las.n\dot{e} \quad j.a.: 'wa.jt' \quad /$
 the.guest.Pl it.Caus.quick.Adv they.come.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 $j.a.: 'wa.n \quad \dot{h}^w\alpha$
 they.come.Dyn.Fin(=Imperf) Sp-Part(=that);

a.g^w.ra ø.d.sə.r.'gə.øjt'
 its_i.heart.Abstj it_j.them.I.Caus.take.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I convinced them that the guests would soon come'

As listed in Hewitt (1987: 244) the aforementioned construction is attested:

(a) as factive subject (= S/A) with:

/a.χ.a.'tʃ'ə [a.]'a:(.)j.ra / '⟨X⟩ comes to Y's mind' = 'Y recalls ⟨X⟩'

/a.'g^wə 'a.la.z.a.ra / '⟨X⟩ is in Y's heart' = 'Y regrets ⟨X⟩'

/int'ε'ɾes.s 'a.ma.z.a.ra / '⟨X⟩ is in the possession of Y as an interest' = 'Y is interested in ⟨X⟩'

/'a.ts'a.k'.ra / '⟨X⟩ holds Y under itself' = 'X means Y'

/[a.]'a:n.k'ə.la.ra / '⟨X⟩ restrains Y'

(b) as factive object (= O) with:

/a.'dər.ra / 'know'

[An interesting unsolicited example, reminiscent of Ancient Greek's or Latin's accusative and infinitive construction was encountered in a recently published collection of works by The Father of Abkhaz Literature, Dmitry Gulia (Dərməjt' G^wələja), in Bghazh^wba & Zyx^wba (2003: 336). The example, with inconsequential adaptation, reads thus:

14. <'a.ts^wg'a.ra ø.z.wə.ø.z a.'w[a].a:
 the.bad.ness it.who.do.Past.N/F(=P/I) the.person.Pl
 rə.pʃ.a:.'ra ħ^wa 'jə.j.dərə.ø.z
 their.find.Suff.Masd Sp-Part whom.he.know.Past.N/F(=P/I)
 də.r.'ta.t^w'a.ø.jt'
 he.them.in.sit.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'He settled down among those whom he recognized (to be likely)
 to find the wrong-doers'

However, consultants felt that the Masdar here is preferably replaced by the finite Present or Future I (viz. /ø.rə.pʃ.a:.'wa.jt' / or /ø.rə.p'ʃ.a:p' / respectively) to produce the basic construction here being reviewed, albeit with what could be analysed as raising of the embedded A to O in the introductory verb.]

/'a.dʒa.fə.ra / 'find ⟨X⟩ amazing' = 'be amazed at ⟨X⟩'

/[a.]'aj(.).l.k'.a.ra / 'understand, learn'

/a.fə.k^wə.r.ɛ^wg^wa.'ra / 'confirm'

/a.r.ba.'ra / 'shew'

(c) as factive indirect object with:

/[a.]a.ʃʃ.'ra / 'complain'

(d) as factive oblique object with:

/a.z.'χ'a.pʃ.ra / 'pay attention to'

(e) as non-factive subject (= S) with:

/a.'tɛwɑ 'a.lɑ.fwɑ.ra/ '⟨X⟩ falls into Y's skin' = 'Y feels ⟨X⟩'

/[a.]ɑ(.)ħɑ.'ra/ 'hear' [N.B. one could treat this verb synchronically as transitive, but the open vowel that seems to have merged with the original consonant-initial root was probably in origin an indirect object marker governing a Column II indirect object affix, such that the Column I affix correlated with an original intransitive subject. This is why I have categorized the verb as one taking a subject-complement.]

(f) as non-factive object (= O) with:

/a.χ.ɑ.'tʂ'ə [a.]'ɑ:.m.gɑ.ra/ 'not to fetch ⟨X⟩ into one's head' = 'not to imagine ⟨X⟩'

/a.χɑ.ts'a.'ra/ 'believe'

/a.fɑ.kwə.r.'gəla.ra/ 'decide'

/a.r.ts'a.'ra/ 'teach'

/a.'gʷ.ɑ:.nɑ.gɑ.ra/ 'X's heart brings ⟨Y⟩' = 'X thinks ⟨Y⟩'

/[a.]'ɑ:.nɑ.gɑ.ra/ 'mean'

Verba dicendi in general such as /a.ħwɑ.'ra/ 'say'

/'ɑ.lɑ.gɑ.ra/ 'begin' (see below for a discussion of this verb)

(g) as non-factive indirect object with:

/'ɑ.pχ'ɑ.ra/ 'read'

(g') as non-factive oblique object with:

/ɑ.z.'χwəts.ra/ 'think about', as in:

jə.q'ɑ.z.ts'a.'rə.da

ħwɑ

it/them.Prev.who.do.FutI(-N/F).who?

Sp-Part

s.ɑ.z.'χwəts.wɑjt'

I.it.for.think.Dyn.Fin(-Pres)

'I am thinking about who should do it/them'

(h) as free-standing structure with:

/'ɑ.qɑ.z.ɑ:.ra/ 'be [of the opinion ⟨X⟩] = think ⟨X⟩'

/mɑp'ɑ.k'.'ra/ 'seize no [to ⟨X⟩] = deny ⟨X⟩' (but see below under construction 4 for a peculiarity here)

(i) as structure linked via possessive prefix to a N with:

/ɑ.gʷ.'ra ɑ.r.gɑ.'ra/ 'cause X to take the heartness/belief of ⟨Y⟩ = convince X of ⟨Y⟩'

/ɑ.'gʷə.ɛ.ra 'ɑ.mɑ.z.ɑ:.ra/ 'have hope of ⟨X⟩ = hope ⟨X⟩'

/ɑ.'gʷ(.)ɑ:(.)nɑ(.)gɑ(.)ra/ 'thought, supposition', as in:

15. <də.j.'pɑ.w.p' ħwɑ ɑ.'gʷ(.)ɑ:(.)nɑ(.)gɑ(.)ra

he.his.son.Stat.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part(=that); its;thought;

mɑp' ø.ɑ.'tɛwə.j.k'.wɑjt'

no_k itk.itj.from.he.seize.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

‘He denies the supposition that he is his son’ [See below for the non-*oratio recta* construction with this variant for ‘deny’]

2. The second construction, which is perhaps the commonest of all the variants, inserts the pre-radical affix /-aχ^j(ə)-/, which may be translated here as ‘that’, into the appropriate non-finite verb-form in the slot where such prefixes are accommodated—see the table of non-finite forms for the endings of the various tense-forms. No changes of course affect the cross-referencing for the verb’s own arguments. The affix’s basic function seems to mark sentential relative ‘where’, as in:

16. f^w.aχ^j.tsa.'wa /
 you(-Pl).where.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 f^w.aχ^j.tsa.'wa.z
 you(-Pl).where.go.Dyn.N/F(=Imperf)
 (a.'təp) ø.'f^wa.r(.)ta.w.p'
 the.place it.fear.place.Stat.Fin(=Pres)
 ‘(The place) where you are/were going is dangerous’

This postulated basic usage is confirmed by its association with the interrogative prefix to give:

17. f^w.a.'ba.tsa.wa /
 you(-Pl).where.Qu.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 f^w.a.'ba.tsa.wa.z⁵
 you(-Pl).where.Qu.go.Dyn.N/F(=Imperf)
 ‘Where are/were you going?’

The structure can be used alone or in association with the postposition /a.'zə/ ‘for it’ in the sense of ‘because’, which can lead to some lack of transparency when it comes to precise syntactic analysis; consider the following variations:

18. a.'k'las a.'tʃ'ə d.a:.[a.]q^w'ə.m.ts'.'dza.ø.k^w'a
 the.class it.in (s)he.Prev.it.off.not.leave.Emph.Past.Neg-Abs
 d.aχ^j.'tə^waʒ^wa.wa (a.'zə)
 (s)he.that.talk.Dyn(=N/F-Pres) it.for
 s.[a.]a.ʃʃ.'wa.jt'
 I.?it.to.complain.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

or

19. <a.'k'las a.'tʃ'ə d.a:.[a.]q^w'ə.m.ts'.'dza.ø.k^w'a
 the.class it.in (s)he.Prev.it.off.not.leave.Emph.Past.Neg-Abs
 d.aχ^j.'tə^waʒ^wa.wa
 (s)he.that.talk.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 s.a.'z.[a.]a.ʃʃ.wa.jt'
 I.it.for.?it.to.complain.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

⁵ Where /-a.ba-/ ← */-aχ^j.ba-/.

whereas without the postposition the likelihood is that this affix will be absent, which suggests that the complement is in S-function, though the possibility of retaining the affix raises questions about the overall status of the complement, e.g.

26. <a.tɛlɛ'fon b.a'χl.a.sə.θ.z> (a.'zə)
 the.phone you(-Fem).that_i.it.hit.Past.N/F(=P/I) it_i.for
 (jə.)tə'bə.w.p'
 ?it_i.thanks.Stat.Fin(=Pres)

'Thanks for phoning'

As listed in Hewitt (1987: 242-43) this construction is attested:

(a) as factive subject (= S/A) with:

/a.k'r.a.ts'a.k'.ra/ 'hold much under itself = be important'

/wama.'ʃw'a 'a.q'a.z.a.ra/ 'be as a surprise'

/a.t'ra'gjadəja.z.a.ra/ 'be a tragedy'

/a.g'wə.ʃ'tə.χ.ga.ra/ 'be exciting'

/a.ʃa.'ʃw'a.la.ra/ 'fall into the blood of X = benefit X'

/a.z.χa.'ra/ 'suffice'

/a.r.'g'wəq'.ra/ 'upset, torment'

/a.g'wə.pχa.'ra/ 'be warming to X's heart = please X/X likes <Y>'

/a.g'wə.'ra a.r.ga.'ra/ 'convince'

/a.ʃ'tə.χ.ra/ 'elevate'

/a.χ'wə.ra/ 'be helpful to'

/a.r.'g'wə.(.)r(.)'ɸ'a.ra/ 'make joyful'

/a.r.ʃanχa.ra/ 'cause surprise to'

/a.'g'wə a.p.ʒ'w'a.'ra/ 'shatter the heart of X = anger X'

/int'ɛ'rəs.s 'a.m.a.z.a.ra/ 'be in the possession of X as an interest =

X is interested in'

/a.'χara.ra/ 'be the fault of'

/[a.]'aj(.)ts'a.r.χa.ra/ 'cause to slow down'

/a.'g'wə 'a.q'a.ts'a.ra/ 'make the heart of X = cause X to rejoice'

/a.ts'a.k'.ra/ 'mean'

/a.pər'χa(.)ga.ra/ 'hinder'

/a.n.'k'ə.la.ra/ 'restrain'

/[a.]'a:ga.ra/ 'bring = mean'

/a.r.ʒ'w'a.'ra/ 'make vomit'

/a.r.q'a.ts'a.ra/ 'cause to do'

/a.χ.qi'a.'ra/ 'result from'

/jə.tə'bə.w.p'/ 'thanks' (being governed by the postposition /-zə/

'for' as alternative)

(b) as factive object (= O) alternating with a variant governed by the postposition /-zə/ 'for' with:

- /'a.d.nəḥ^wa.la.ra/ 'congratulate on'
 /a.dʒa.ʃa.'ra/ 'be amazed at'
- (c) as factive indirect/oblique object with:
 /[a.]a.ʃʃ.'ra/ 'complain about' (with alternative governed by the
 postposition /-zə/ 'for')
 /a.z.'χ'a.pʃ.ra/ 'pay attention to' (with alternative governed by the
 postposition /-zə/ 'for')
 /a.'tɛ^wə.pχaʃa.ra/ 'feel shame at'
- (d) as factive free-standing complement alternating with a variant gov-
 erned by the postposition /-zə/ 'for' with the verbs:
 /'a.pχaʃa.ra/ 'feel shame at'
 /'a.ts'a.ʃəts.ra/ 'envy X for <Y>'
- (e) as non-factive subject (= S) with:
 /a.'nə.pʃ.ra/ '<X> appears on Y'
 /a.'jaʃa.z.a.:ra/ 'be true'
 /a.'jaʃa.m.z.a.:ra/ 'be false'
 /a.m'tsə.z.a.:ra/ 'be a lie'
 /a.g^w.'ʉa(.)ra.(m.)z.a.:ra/ '(not) to be doubtful'
- (f) as non-factive oblique object with:
 /map' a.tɛ^w.k'.ra/ 'deny', as in:
27. <d.αχ'ə.j.'pa.w> map'
 he.that_i.his.son.Stat(=N/F-Pres) no_j
 ø.a.'tɛ^wə.j.k'.wa.jt'
 it_i.it_i.from.he.seize.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'He denies that he is his son'

which is an admittedly less happy alternative to the final example of-
 fered above to illustrate construction-type 1 (viz. 15).

3. Construction three inserts the pre-radical affix /-ʃ(ə)-/, which may
 be translated here as 'that', into the appropriate non-finite verb-form
 in the same slot as we saw with the previous conjunctive prefix—
 again see the table of non-finite forms for the endings of the various
 tense-forms. As is to be expected, no changes of course affect the cross-
 referencing for the verb's own arguments. The affix's basic function
 seems to mark a sentential expression for 'how', as in:

28. jə.ʃ.'s.a.ʃ^w.ḥ^wa.ø.z ([a.]qj(.)pʃ)
 it.how.me.to.you(-Pl).say.Past.N/F(=P/I) it.like
 jə.q'a.s.'ts'a.ø.jt'
 it.Prev.I.do.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I did it as you told me'

This interpretation is confirmed by the coupling of this prefix with the same interrogative element as seen earlier to produce questions of manner, such as:

29. $f^w\text{ə.}\xi.\text{'pa.q'}.a.w$
 you(-Pl).how.Qu.be.Stat(=N/F-Pres)
 'How are you?'
 30. $j\text{ə.}\xi.\text{'pa.q'}.a.f^w\text{.ts'}.a.\text{ø}.z$
 it/them.how.Qu.Prev.you(-Pl).do/make.Past.N/F(=P/I)
 'How did you do/make it/them?'

Examples of usage suggest that this type of complement is more common in non-subject roles, whether factive or non-factive. I have no example of this construction-type in A-function. To illustrate it in S-function we have:

31. $\langle ab'ra \text{ ts'əp}\chi \quad f^w.\text{'}\xi\text{ə.q'}.a.z \rangle$
 here last-year you(-Pl).that;.be.N/F(=Stat-Past)
 $\text{ø}.s.\text{'}\chi a.\text{stə.}\text{ø}.jt'$
 it;.me.Prev.forget.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I forgot that you were/had been here last year'

In O-function consider:

32. $j\text{ə}.m\text{y}a(.p(.))\text{'g}a(.)\text{f}a \quad \langle d.z\text{ə}.p\chi^j a.\text{'}wa \rangle$
 his.behaviour he.what.read.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 $\text{ø}.\xi.a.j(.)\text{'l}ə.j.k'.a.wa \rangle$
 it.that;.Prev.he.understand.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 $\text{ø}.\text{h}a.na.r.ba.\text{'}wa.jt'$
 it;.us.it.Caus.see.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'His behaviour shews us that he understands what he reads'

or

33. $\langle s.\text{'}y\text{ə}za \quad \text{'}a.z^w\text{lar} \quad d\text{ə}.\xi.\text{'}r\text{ə}.l\text{a}.g\text{ə}l\text{a}.z \rangle$
 my.friend the.people he.that;.them.in.stand.N/F(=Stat-Past)
 $\text{ø}.\text{'}g^w a.s.ta.\text{ø}.jt'$
 it;.Prev.I.notice.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I noticed that my friend was standing among the people'

Compare this with an example in Bagrat Dzhnashia's 1954 Abkhaz-Georgian Dictionary:

34. $s.\text{'}y\text{ə}za \text{'}a.z^w\text{lar} \quad d.a\chi^j.\text{'}r\text{ə}.l\text{a}.g\text{ə}l\text{a}.z$
 he.where.them.in.stand.N/F(=Stat-Past)
 $d.\text{'}g^w a.s.ta.\text{ø}.jt'$
 him.Prev.I.notice.Past.Fin(=Aor)

which might at first glance be thought to mean the same with change of conjunctive particle and raising of the lower subject into O-func-

's.a.pχ^ja.wa.n

I.itj.read.Dyn.Fin(=Imperf)

'I was reading that the guests would soon come'⁸

As listed in Hewitt (1987: 243-44) this construction is attested:

(a) as factive subject (= S) with:

/a.χ.a.'tʂ'ə [a.]'a:(.)j.ra/ '⟨X⟩ comes to Y's head = Y recalls ⟨X⟩'

/a.'χa.ʂt.ra/ '⟨X⟩ ?slips out of Y's head = Y forgets ⟨X⟩'

/a.'g^wa(.)la.f^wa.ra/ '⟨X⟩ falls into Y's heart = Y remembers ⟨X⟩'

/[a.]a(.)ħa.'ra/ 'hear' (see above for why this is treated as an intransitive verb)

(b) as factive object (= O) with:

/a.'dər.ra/ 'know'

/a.ba.'ra/ 'see'

/a.r.ba.'ra/ 'cause to see = shew'

/[a.]'aj(.)l.k'.a:.ra/ 'understand, learn'

/a.f^a.k^wə.r.ɛ^wɛ^wa.'ra/ 'confirm'

/a.'g^wa.ta.ra/ 'notice'

(c) as non-factive subject (= S) with:

/a.'nə.pʂ.ra/ 'appear on'

/a.g^w.'ʉa(.)ra.(m.)z.a:.ra/ '(not) to be doubtful'

/a.'tɛ^wa 'a.la.f^wa.ra/ '⟨X⟩ falls into Y's skin = Y feels ⟨X⟩'

/a.'tɛ^wa a.'nə.z.a:.ra/ '⟨X⟩ is on Y's skin = Y senses ⟨X⟩'

(d) as non-factive object (= O) with:

/a.χa.ts'a.'ra/ 'believe'

/a.ɥ.'ra/ 'write'

/a.f^a.k^wə.r.'gəla.ra/ 'decide'

/a.r.ts'a.'ra/ 'teach'

/a.'g^wə [a.]'a.na.ga.ra/ 'think'

(e) as dependent on the instrumental postposition /-la/ 'by' with:

/a.g^w.'ra a.r.ga.'ra/ 'convince'

/a.'g^wə.ɛ.ra 'a.ma.z.a:.ra/ 'have the hope that'

/[a.]'aʒ^wa 'a.ta.ra/ 'give the word to X that ⟨Y⟩ = promise X that ⟨Y⟩'

/map' a.k'.ra/ 'deny'

(f) as oblique object with:

⁸ Cf. the function of the speech-particle in:

j.aħ ^w .'tɛ ^w a	ø.əɣ ^l .a.'ga.ø.z	ħ ^w a	a(.)k'.g ^ə
his.sister.Pl	them.where.it.take.Past.N/F(=P/I)	?about	one.even
ø.jə.z.'dər.dza.wa.m			
it.he.Pot.know.Emph.Dyn.not(=Pres)			
'He knows nothing about where it [the cloud] took his sisters'			

/map' a.tɛ^w.k'.ra/ 'deny'

/'a.k^w.f^wa.ra/ 'light upon, realise'

4. The fourth construction is a conflation of 1 and 3 with a non-finite verb-form containing /ɣ-/ followed by the speech-particle /h^wa/. The privileges of occurrence for this construction seem to be those contexts where constructions I (finite verb + /h^wa/) and 3 (non-finite verb containing /ɣ-/) are free variants. However, /h^wa/ seems only to accompany /ɣ-/ when the tense of the embedded non-finite verb is that of the (possibly putative) original statement/thought, i.e. when the construction is what I have called the 'semi'-indirect mode of speech-reporting (see Hewitt & Crisp 1986), e.g.

39. <'a.q^w.a.q'a h.rə.ft.'wa.jt' h^wa /
 Sukhum.to us.they.send.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part;
 h.'ɣə.rə.ft.wa.z
 us.that;they.send.Dyn.N/F(=Imperf)
 (*h^wa) / h.'ɣə.rə.ft.wa
 Sp-Part us.that.they.send.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 (h^wa) > ø.z.'dər.wa.n
 Sp-Part; it;I.know.Dyn.Fin(=Imperf)

'I knew that they would send us to Sukhum'

which may be uttered even after the journey has already been completed (i.e. it is not essential that the journey still lie in the future at the moment of discourse).

We have already seen that, when the expression for 'deny' contains the relational particle /-tɛ^w/ 'from' in the main verb, /ɣ-/ can simply replace /aɣⁱ-, illustrated above, as in:

40. <d.ɣə.j.'pa.w> map'
 he.that.his.son.Stat(=N/F-Pres); no;
 ø.a.'tɛ^wə.j.k'.wa.jt'
 it;it;from.he.seize.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

'He denies that he is his son'

We also saw that, if the main verb lacks the relational particle, the complement can be governed by the instrumental postpositional phrase /'a.la/ 'by it', to give:

41. jə.'uəzə a.u'nə d.'ɣə.q'a.w> 'a.la
 his.friend the.house (s)he.that;be.Stat(=N/F-Pres) it;by
 map' ø.jə.k'.wa.jt'
 no it.he.seize.Dyn.Fin.(=Pres)
 'He denies that his friend is at home'

The mixed fourth construction is also possible (as indeed is construction 1) in this context, but the closeness to *oratio recta* is betrayed by the presence of the negative marker within the subordinate verb, viz.

42. $\text{ʃə.}^{\text{h}}\text{qəza}$ $\text{a.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʎnə}$ $\text{d.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʃə.q}^{\text{h}}\text{a.m}$ /
 his.friend the.house (s)he.that.be.not(=Stat-N/F-Pres)
 $\text{d}^{\text{h}}\text{ə.q}^{\text{h}}\text{a.m}$ $\text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a}$ $\text{m}^{\text{h}}\text{ap}^{\text{h}}$
 (s)he.be.not(=Stat-Fin-Pres) Sp-Part no
 $\text{ø.jə.k}^{\text{h}}\text{.}^{\text{h}}\text{wa.jt}^{\text{h}}$
 it.he.seize.Dyn.Fin.(=Pres)

And one can even replace the sequence $/\text{d.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʃə.q}^{\text{h}}\text{a.m } \text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a}/$ with $/\text{d.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʃə.q}^{\text{h}}\text{a.m } \text{a.la}/$!

The close association between this conflated construction and *oratio recta* is illustrated differently in the following example from the folktale ‘The Birth of Abrsk’yl’:

43. $\text{tʃ}^{\text{h}}\text{a}^{\text{h}}(\text{.)t}^{\text{h}}\text{a}^{\text{h}}(\text{.)}^{\text{h}}\text{a.nə}$ $\text{jə.q}^{\text{h}}\text{a.l.}^{\text{h}}\text{ts}^{\text{h}}\text{a.}^{\text{h}}\text{ø.jt}^{\text{h}}$ $\text{χats}^{\text{h}}\text{a}$
 vow.Adv it_i.Prev.she.made.Past.Fin(=Aor) man
 $\text{s.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʃə.m.tsa.ra}$ $\text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a}$
 I.that.not.go.FutI(=N/F) Sp-Part_i
 ‘She vowed that she would not marry’

where there is no shift in the 1st person singular subjecthood of the verb expressing the vow. Interestingly, one can introduce this (?expected) shift to 3rd person singular $/\text{χats}^{\text{h}}\text{a } \text{d.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʃə.m.tsa.ra } \text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a}/$ without any change of meaning; also possible is the direct quote with speech-particle (= $/\text{χats}^{\text{h}}\text{a } \text{s.tsa.}^{\text{h}}\text{rə.m } \text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a}/$ ‘I shall not marry, saying’) as well as the fully embedded indirect quotation (= $/\text{χats}^{\text{h}}\text{a } \text{d.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʃə.m.tsa.rə.z}/$ ‘..that she would not marry’), without speech-particle.

For ‘threaten’ we have:

44. $\text{wa}^{\text{h}}\text{tə}^{\text{h}}\text{wə}$ $\text{a.}^{\text{h}}\text{wal}$ $\text{a.l.}^{\text{h}}\text{χ.ra.}[\text{a.}]^{\text{h}}\text{zə}$
 tomorrow the.debt its.Prev.collect.Masd.it.for
 $\text{h.a.}^{\text{h}}\text{wa.jt}^{\text{h}}$ $\text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a}$
 we.come.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part
 $\text{jə.}^{\text{h}}\text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a.k}^{\text{h}}\text{.makarə.}^{\text{h}}\text{ø.jt}^{\text{h}}$
 they.us.on.threaten.Past.Fin(=Aor)

=

45. $\text{wa}^{\text{h}}\text{tə}^{\text{h}}\text{wə}$ $\text{a.}^{\text{h}}\text{wal}$ $\text{a.l.}^{\text{h}}\text{χ.ra.}[\text{a.}]^{\text{h}}\text{zə}$
 tomorrow the.debt its.Prev.collect.Masd.it.for
 $\text{jə.}^{\text{h}}\text{ʃ.a.}^{\text{h}}\text{wa}$ $\text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a}$
 they.that.come.Dyn(=N/F-Pres) Sp-Part
 $\text{jə.}^{\text{h}}\text{h}^{\text{h}}\text{a.k}^{\text{h}}\text{.makarə.}^{\text{h}}\text{ø.jt}^{\text{h}}$
 they.us.on.threaten.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 ‘They threatened to come the next day to collect the debt’

- [a.]'a(.)k'w'ə.z.f'w'a > [a.]'a(.)k'w'ə.n
 it.be.N/F(=Stat.Past).as-if_i it_i.be.Fin(=Stat-Past)
 jə.'sə.q'a.z
 it.how.be.N/F(=Stat-Past)

'At other times, as if it was an old nag was how it was' (talk is of a magical horse that can change its appearance)

In O-function there is:

51. <də.tsa.'wa.f'w'a / də.tsa.'wa.z.f'w'a
 (s)he.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).as-if_i (s)he.go.Dyn.N/F(=Imperf).as-if_i
 ø.a'nə.r.ba.ø
 it_i.when.they.see.Past(=N/F-Aor)

'When they saw that (s)he looked as if (s)he was about to leave...'

We note the choice of tense in both the above examples: Past to fit the context of the speech-act, Present to reflect what was relevant at the time of the event itself. No examples are to hand of this structure in A-function.

Also employed to mark uncertainty is *oratio recta* with speech-particle, as in:

52. <<gə(.)χa.'k'w'a.k' ø.'jə.ma.w.p' h'w'a >
 error.Pl.a them.he.have.Stat.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part(=that);
 wə.'g'wə 'j.a.na.ga.ø.r(.)t'w' >
 your(-Masc).heart_j it_i.Prev.it_j.bring.Past(=N/F-Aor).Res_k
 ([a.]aj(.)pə) 'jə.q'a.w.p'
 it_k.like it.be.Stat.Fin(=Pres)

'It is such that one would suppose he has/might have some errors'

or

53. <a'rəj dʒa'ra r.χə
 this_i anywhere their.head_j
 j.a.'də.r.χ'w'a.wa.jt' h'w'a >
 it_i.it_j.they.Caus.help.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part(=that)_k
 ø.sə.z.'dər.wa.m'⁹
 it_k.I.Pot.know.Dyn.not(=Fin-Pres)

'I do not know that/whether they use this anywhere'

6. There are at least six verbs (predicates) with which another construction can be used. The verbs are: /a.'dər.ra/ 'know', /[a.]a(.)h'a.'ra/ 'hear', /a.ba.'ra/ 'see', /a.'g'w'a.la.f'w'a.ra/ 'remember', /'a.pχ'a.ra/ 'read', and /a.f'qə a.k'.ra/ 'smell'. The sixth type of complement is the

⁹In Hewitt (1987:241) this example was wrongly presented with the positive form /ø.z.'dər.wa.jt'/ in place of the negative correctly given here.

appropriate Absolute for the verb in question: Dynamic verbs have the three Absolutes (Present in /-wa.nə/, Past in /-nə/, Perfect in /-χ'a.nə/), whilst Statives have just the one (in /-nə/). The Present Absolute can drop the ending /-nə/, leaving the Non-finite Present in its place¹⁰. With a non-past introductory verb, the Present Absolute can have present, future or imperfective past reference, whilst the Past Absolute refers to the simple past, and the Perfect Absolute parallels the English Perfect:

54. <a.həs'k'ən ø.'pəj.q'a.wa /
 the.grass it.Prev.he.cut.Dyn(=N/F-Pres);
 ø.'pəj.q'a.wa.nə / ø.'pəj.q'a.ø.nə¹¹ /
 it.Prev.he.cut.Dyn.Abs(-Pres); it.Prev.he.cut.Past.Abs;
 ø.'pəj.q'a.χ'a.nə> ø.s.α(.)hə.'wa.jt'
 it.Prev.he.cut.Perf.Abs; it;I.hear.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'I hear that he is cutting/will cut/was cutting/has (already) cut
 the grass'

cf. the temporal references when the introductory verb is past:

55. <a.həs'k'ən ø.'pəj.q'a.wa /
 the.grass it.Prev.he.cut.Dyn(=N/F-Pres);
 ø.'pəj.q'a.wa.nə / ø.'pəj.q'a.ø.nə /
 it.Prev.he.cut.Dyn.Abs(-Pres); it.Prev.he.cut.Past.Abs;
 ø.'pəj.q'a.χ'a.nə> ø.s.α(.)hə.ø.jt'
 it.Prev.he.cut.Perf.Abs; it;I.hear.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'I heard that he was cutting/would cut/had (already) cut the
 grass'

If this construction is used with 'know' and 'hear', the speech-particle /h^wa/ can optionally be added at the end of the complement; a parallel association of the speech-particle with 'see' seems awkward, even if it is not absolutely excluded. Examples:

56. <s.'təzə də.tsa.'wa / də.tsa.wa.'nə
 my.friend (s)he.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres) (s)he.go.Dyn.Abs(-Pres)
 (?h^wa)> ø.z.ba.ø.jt'
 Sp-Part(=that); it;I.sec.Past.Fin(=Aor)

¹⁰ Since the two forms I call the Present Absolute and the Non-finite Present are regularly interchangeable, one might wonder whether it is necessary to set up two different grammatical categories as opposed to operating with allomorphs of just a single entity. However, the Present Absolute seems questionable as complement for 'begin' and impossible in contexts where the non-finite Present indicates that one action is in progress at the same time as another:

a.kal'pad.k^wa ø.l.pa.wa wa də.'t^wa.w.p'
 the.sock.Pl them.she.knit.Dyn(=N/F-Pres) there she.sit.Stat.Fin(=Pres)

'She is sitting there, knitting socks'

¹¹ Note the alternative forms of the negative Past Absolute: /ø.'pəj.m.q'a.ø.nə/ vs /ø.'pəj.m.q'a.ø.k^wα(())n/.

'I saw that my friend was going'

57. *s.'qəza d.χats'a.'bzəja.nə (h^wa)›*
 my.friend he.man.good.Abs(=Stat) Sp-Part(=that);
ø.z.'dər.wa.jt'
 it; I.know.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

'I know that my friend is a good man'

Note the following variant for this last expression:

58. *s.'qəza d.χats'a.'bzəja.nə (h^wa)›*
 my.friend; he.man.good.Abs(=Stat) Sp-Part(=that)
də.z.'dər.wa.jt'
 him; I.know.Dyn.Fin (=Pres)

with apparent raising of embedded subject (= S) to matrix object (= O) slot. We find a similar alternative for the last but one example, to give:

59. *s.'qəza də.tsa.'wa / də.tsa.wa.'nə*
 my.friend; (s)he.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres) (s)he.go.Dyn.Abs(-Pres)
 (*h^wa)› də.z.'ba.ø.jt'
 Sp-Part(=that) him/her; I.see.Past.Fin(=Aor)

where we note that the speech-particle is definitely inadmissible. If one considers that the Absolute ending /-nə/ is an alternative to /-s/ as the Adverbial (or Transformative or Predicative) case-marker (being also the standard marker for adverbs), as witnessed by such examples as:

60. *s.'qəza ga'dza.s/gadza.'nə d.sə.pχ'adza.'wa.jt'*
 my.friend; fool.Adv him/her; I.deem.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'I regard my friend as a fool'

and

- 60'. *a.p'h^wəs [a.]'a^wa ø.l.h^wa.wa.'nə*
 the.woman the.song it.she.say.Dyn.Abs(-Pres)
də.s.g^wa.pχa.'wa.jt'
 she.me.Prev.please.Dyn.Fin (=Pres)

'I like the woman(?s) singing (of) the song' (where only non-finite Present seems to be excluded)

perhaps the examples with an embedded argument seemingly raised to O-position of the introductory verb originally had a non-raised argument as their O-nominal accompanied by the Present Absolute (or Non-finite Present) signalling either the contemporaneous nature of the verbal activity with the action of the introductory verb or the predicative function illustrated in the last example quoted. If so, translations such as the following might get closest to the original force, namely: 'I saw my friend going', and 'I know my friend as/to be a

good man'. True complement-function could perhaps still be in the process of developing from these putative original structures. It would surely be reasonable to propose on the basis of the range of usage seen above (to say nothing of supportive evidence from purpose-expressions, as described in Hewitt 1987: 37-43 & 246-51) that speech-particle /h^wa/ is in the process of developing into a general complementiser but that such a reinterpretation has not been fully carried through—this would help to account for both its awkwardness and/or unsuitability with a verb like 'see' in the example above and the restriction when it accompanies a non-finite verb containing /s-/ that the tense of the non-finite form has to be that of the original putative speech/thought.

Note in passing that the example 'I know that my friend is a good man' can have non-human or human direct object for 'know' if the direct speech construction is employed but only a non-human object if the construction is /s-/ + non-finite verb, viz.:

61. <s.'ʏəzə d.χats'a.'bzəjə.w.p' (h^wa)>
 my.friend; he.man.good.Stat.Fin(=Pres) Sp-Part(=that);
 ø.z.'dər.wəjt' / də.z.'dər.wəjt'
 it;I.know.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) him;I.know.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'I know that my friend is a good man ? ⇐ for the good man that
 people say he is'

or

62. <s.'ʏəzə də.ʃ.χats'a.'bzəjə.w (*h^wa)>
 my.friend he.that;man.good.Stat(=N/F-Pres) Sp-Part(=that)
 ø.z.'dər.wəjt' / *də.z.'dər.wəjt'
 it;I.know.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) him.I.know.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'I know that my friend is a good man'

where we observe that not only to be excluded is a main verb with human O but also the presence of the speech-particle. This is perhaps unexpected in view of the acceptability of this item in an entirely parallel context illustrated by example 39 (= 'I knew that they would send us to Sukhum') and which seems to indicate that the appearance of this item depends on a subtle interplay of such factors as the nature of the introductory verb, the semantics of the embedded structure, and the relationship between them.

Another context in which the (Present) Non-finite fulfils the role of complement is with the verb /'a.lə.gə.ra/ 'begin', the complement serving syntactically as oblique object of the verb, which is a bivalent

67. <a.r.ts'a.u.'tɛʷa 'bzəjɑ.kʷɑ
 the.Caus.learn.person.Pl good.Pl
 jə.ħɑ.də.r.ts'a.'wɑ
 X.us.they.Caus.learn.Dyn(=N/F-Pres);
 (?)'ħ.a.lɑ.gɑ.ø.jt' /
 we.it_i.Prev.began.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'j.a.lɑ.gɑ.ø.jt'
 they.it_i.Prev.begin.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'ʔWe began being taught by the good teachers/The good teach-
 ers began teaching us'

Substitution of the Present Absolute for the Non-finite Present to mark the complement of 'begin' seems to be unacceptable:

68. <*d.'χʷəts.wɑ.nə> 'd.a.lɑ.gɑ.ø.jt'
 (s)he.think.Dyn.Abs(-Pres)_i (s)he.it_i.Prev.begin.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 '(S)he began thinking'

The non-finite form of the appropriate tense is the only construction found with the verb 'suppose', e.g.

69. <a.daw.'tɛʷa jə.nə.w.r.'tɛʷ'a.ø.z
 the.ogre.Pl whom.Prev.you(-Masc).Caus.perish.Past.N/F(=P/I)
 rə.f'ɥə mə'k'ɑnɑ jə.ɥ'nə.ts'.χ'a.w>
 their.smell yet it.house-from.pass.Perf.N/F_i
 ø.'dʒə.w.ʃɑ.wɑ.mɑ
 it_i.Prev.you(-Masc).suppose.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).Qu
 'Do you suppose that the stench of the ogres you slew has as yet
 left the house?'

7. Abkhaz makes wide use of its verbal noun, which partly corresponds to the infinitive and partly to the gerund in English, in complement-function. The masdar ends in /-ra/; as a noun, it will always begin with the article /ɑ-/ 'the', unless this is replaced by the appropriate possessive pronominal prefix (viz. essentially a Column II affix), which will correlate with the S-nominal for an intransitive verb but with the O-nominal for a transitive, another manifestation (as indeed in English) of ergative syntax. Occasionally one finds two such prefixes accommodated side by side within the one masdar, as in:

70. lə.p'ħɑ ɑ.gʷəl'ʃɑp l.ɑ.tɛʷ.gɑ.rɑ.[ɑ.]'zə
 her.daughter_i; the.dragon_j; her_i;it_j.from.take.Masd.it.for
 ɑj(.)'ħɑ k'ər ø.zə.l.'ʃɑ.ø.z
 more something it.who.Prev.be-able.Past.N/F(=P/I)
 'the one who was better able to do something for getting her
 daughter away from the dragon'

Given these marking-restrictions, it is natural that the masdar can serve as verb in a complement where the subject is shared between matrix and embedded verbs and where the embedded sequence is relatively simple in terms of its argument-structure. And so, alternatives for the first two examples for construction 6 (63-64) would be:

71. <a.'χwəts.ra> 'd.a.la.ga.ø.jt'
 Art.think.Masd_i (s)he.it_i.Prev.begin.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 '(S)he began to think'

and

72. <a(.)'dzʷ(.)a(.)dzʷ(.)a(.)la> a.'tʃən əj(.)d(.)'hʷa(.)la
 one-by-one the.osier bunch
 a.p.tɛʷ'a.'ra 'j.a.la.ga.ø.jt'
 its.Prev.snap.Masd_i they.it_i.Prev.begin.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'They began to snap the osier-bunch(es) one by one'

The masdar is in S-function with the bivalent intransitive verb meaning 'forget', viz.:

73. <a.tsa.'ra> ø.s.'χa.ʃtə.ø.jt'
 Art.go.Masd_i it_i.I.Prev.forget.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I forgot to go'

Coupled with the parallel bivalent intransitive verb meaning 'remember', the masdar with specified possessor-subject corresponds to the English gerund 'X's going', specifically implying that it is the details and not the fact of the going that is being indicated, viz.:

74. <s.'yəza> 'aqʷ'a.q'a jə.tsa.'ra
 my.friend Sukhum.to his.go.Masd_i
 ø.s.'gʷa.la.fʷa.wa.jt'
 it_i.my.heart.into.fall.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

'I remember my friend's going to Sukhum'

But the use of the simple masdar (i.e. without any possessor-subject specified) could NOT be used as a translation-equivalent of English 'I remembered to go', which would be translated by a non-finite form containing the conjunctive particle /s-/ , viz.:

75. <sə.ʃ.tsa.'ra> / sə.ʃ.'tsa.ʃa>
 I.that.go.N/F(=FutI)_i I.that.go.N/F(=FutII)_i
 ø.s.'gʷa.la.fʷa.ø.jt'
 it_i.my.heart.into.fall.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I remembered that I had to go'

where the nuance of obligation comes from the selection of either the Future I or Future II non-finite form¹². These non-finite Futures could replace the masdar in example 73 meaning ‘I forgot to go’.

An example of the masdar in A-function would be:

76. ⟨l.a.:rə⟩ a(.)k'r.a.ts'a.na.k'.wa.jt'
her.come.Masd; something.it;under.it;seize.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
‘Her coming is very significant’

The verb ‘finish, stop’ in Abkhaz is morphologically identical to the verb ‘begin’ except that the preverbal component is in its zero-grade (as opposed to the a-grade for ‘begin’)—the a-grade is associated with illative/allative movement (‘into/upto’), whereas the zero/reduced-grade signifies elative/ablative motion (‘away from/out of’), concrete directional nuances which ideally suit the semantics of beginning and finishing, respectively. The masdar is, of course, possible with the verb ‘finish’, e.g.

77. ⟨a.ɥ'nə a.r.'gəla.ra⟩
the.house its.Caus.stand.Masd;
'j.a.l.ga.ə.jt'
they.it;Prev.end.Past.Fin(=Aor)

‘They finished building the house’

And just as the Non-finite Present is an alternative complement-structure with ‘begin’, so the Past Absolute (minus, if the verb is transitive, the Column III agent-affix coreferential with the introductory verb’s subject = S-nominal) provides an alternative construction for ‘finish’—in fact, the Absolute ending /-nə/ may be omitted, though in this case for transitive verbs we are not left with the Non-finite Aorist, as the column III agent-affix would have to be present to produce this form, e.g.

78. ⟨a.ɥ'nə ø.r.'gəla.ə(nə)⟩
the.house it.Caus.stand.Past.Abs;
'j.a.l.ga.ə.jt'
they.it;Prev.end.Past.Fin(=Aor)

‘They finished building the house’

Indeed, the Non-finite Present can even be used as complement to ‘finish’, so that another (though less common) alternative would be:

- 78'. ⟨a.ɥ'nə ø.r.'gəla.wə⟩
the.house it.Caus.stand.Dyn(=N/F-Pres);

¹² Also possible would be the non-finite copula (sc. containing the particle /s-/) in association with either the Purposive in /-r(ə)ts/ or the Future Absolute of the lexical verb. Here these alternatives would give: /s.tsa.ə.r(ə)ts s.'sə.q'a.z ø.s.'g'w.a.la.j'w.a.ə.jt'/ and /s.tsa.ra.nə s.'sə.q'a.z ø.s.'g'w.a.la.j'w.a.ə.jt'/, respectively.

'j.a.l.ga.ø.jt'
 they.it_i.Prev.end.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'They finished building the house'

And, just as clause-chaining in the past permits either the Past Absolute or the Past Indefinite to be used, so here the Past Indefinite can replace the Past Absolute:

79. (ə)a.ŋ'nə ø.də.r.'gəla.ø.n(s)
 the.house it.they.Caus.stand.Past.Fin(=P/I)_(i)
 'j.a.l.ga.ø.jt'
 they.it_(i).Prev.end.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'They built the house and finished = finished building the house'

In fact, both the constructions of 78 and 79 must in origin be verb-serializations. The verb 'try' is another where the masdar can serve as complement, e.g.

80. sa(.)'ra <za'g'ə jə.'bzəja.nə 'a.q'a.ts'a.ra>
 I everything it.good.Adv its.Prev.do.Masd_i
 s.tʃ.a.'zə.s.k'.wa.jt'
 my.self.it_i.for.I.seize.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'I try to do everything well'

But unlike English (and like Georgian) there is no necessity for the subject of the lower verb to be coreferential with that of the introductory verb, such that /'a.q'a.ts'a.ra/ 'its doing' (with objective O-possessor) in the last example could be replaced by /'a.q'a.la.ra/ 'its happening' (with subjective S-possessor) for an overall meaning of 'I try [to see to it] that everything is done well'.

The verb 'want' in Abkhaz is a bivalent intransitive Stative verb, and, where the person experiencing the desire (viz. the logical subject) is identical with the subject (= A/S) of the embedded verb, the masdar can be used, as long as there is no more than an O-argument, with this O marked possessively, e.g.

81. <'a.p'x'a.ra / a'ra 'a.q'a.z(.)a:ra>
 its.read.Masd_i here Art.be.Ext.Masd_i
 ø.s.ta'χə.w.p' / ø.s.ta'χə.n
 it_i.I.want.Stat.Fin(=Pres) it_i.I.want.Fin(=Stat-Past)
 'I want/wanted to read it/to be here'

This verb-form with invariant non-human 3rd person singular Column II affix provides Abkhaz (as does the equivalent form in the South Caucasian languages) with its modal expression for 'it is necessary'. The complement is expressed again by the masdar, as long as only a possessively marked S or O argument is present, e.g.

82. <l.a.ga.'ra / s.tsɑ.'ra> ø.a.ta'χə.w.p' /
 her.Prev.bring.Masd_i my.go.Masd_i it_i.it.want.Stat.Fin(=Pres)
 ø.a.ta'χə.n
 it_i.it.want.Fin(=Stat-Past)

'Fetching her/My going is/was necessary'

The semantics of both 'try' and 'want' suggest intention or purpose, and this can be made explicit in Abkhaz by selecting the eighth construction we now need to examine.

8. Abkhaz has two forms that I call Purposive, one in /-ra(.)zə/ the other in /-r(.)ts/ (with dialectal variant /-ra(.)tsə/—for Statives /-z(.)a(:).ra(.)zə/ and /-z(.)a(:).r(.)ts/ would be the endings; cf. the root-expansion in the tables above for the derived Stative forms). In Dynamic verbs the protasis-form with future reference ends in /-r/, seemingly added to the Non-finite Aorist, whilst for Statives the basic protasis-form ends in /-z(.)a(:).r/, such that it seems to be possible to analyse these Purposives as protasis-form + either /-ts/ or /-a.zə/ 'it.for'¹³. But the lengthened vowel in the Stative root-expansion is a problem. Meanwhile, we note that an alternative to example 80 is:

83. sa(.)'ra <za'gə jə.'bzəja.nə
 I everything it.good.Adv
 ø.q'a.s.'ts'a.ø.r(.)ts /
 it.Prev.I.do.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp_i

(?)ø.q'a.s.ts'a.ø.r(?)a(.)'zə
 it.Prev.I.do.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp_i
 s.tʃ.a.'zə.s.k'.wa.jt'
 my.self.it_i.for.I.seize.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 'I try to do everything well'

It is perhaps the presence in the verb of the sequence /-a.zə-/ which renders the use of the Purposive ending in this same sequence slightly infelicitous. Substitution of /ø.q'a.'la.ø.r(.)ts/ or /(?)ø.q'a.la.ø.r(?)a(.)'zə/ 'that X happen' produces an alternative for the meaning 'I try [to see to it] that everything is done well'.

This construction is natural for verbs like /'a.dzb(a).ra/ 'decide', /wal.s'a.k'.ts'a.ra/ 'lay <X> upon Y as an obligation', and /'a.h'a.ra/ 'request', e.g.

84. s.'bə.h'a.wa.jt'
 I.you(-Fem).request.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)

¹³ Or should it be /-ra.[a.]zə/? See the discussion later in the article.

b.'sə.tsχrɑ:ø.r(.)ts /
 you(-Fem).me.help.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp
 b.'sə.tsχrɑ:ø.r(?)ɑ(.)zə
 you(-Fem).me.help.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp
 'I ask you to help me'

The 'complement' here is free-standing, in that there is no possibility of having an agreement-affix coreferential with it in the verbal complex, and thus it is not a true complement but rather an indirect command. For 'decide' there is an affixal slot for reference to the complement, and in addition to the Purposive allomorphs the complement can be indicated by the Future Absolute, thus:

85. 'ɑ.tʃ'k'ən <'ɑʃəz də.'tsɑ.ø.r(.)ts /
 the.boy morning he.go.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp
 də.'tsɑ.ø.r(?)ɑ(.)zə / də.'tsɑ.ra.'nəɣ_i
 he.go.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp he.go.FutI.Abs
 ø.jə.dz'bə.ø.jt'
 it_i.he.decide.Past.Fin(=Aor)

'The boy decided to go in the morning'

[N.B. the optionality of the Col I affix when the Col III affix takes a different shape: <s.'tsɑ.ø.r(.)ts> (jə.)sə.dz'bə.ø.jt' 'I decided to go']

Since one begins a verbal action with an intention to carry it out, it is not surprising that this construction is also found with this predicate, as in:

86. <ɑ(.)'dzʷ(.)ɑ(.)dzʷ(.)ɑ(.)la a.'tʃ'ən əj(.)d(.)'h'wɑ(.)la
 one-by-one the.osier bunch
 ø.'pə.r.tɛ'w'ɑ.ø.r(.)ts /
 it.Prev.they.snap.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp_i
 ø.'pə.r.tɛ'w'ɑ.ø.r(?)ɑ(.)zə
 it.Prev.they.snap.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp_i
 'j.ɑ.lɑ.gɑ.ø.jt'
 they.it_i.Prev.begin.Past.Fin(=Aor)

'They began to snap the osier-bunch(es) one by one'

To complete the picture for constructions allowed with 'begin', we have the following example of *oratio recta*:

87. <ɑ(.)'dzʷ(.)ɑ(.)dzʷ(.)ɑ(.)la a.'tʃ'ən əj(.)d(.)'h'wɑ(.)la
 one-by-one the.osier bunch
 ø.'p.ɑh̄.tɛ'w'ɑ.wɑ.jt'
 it.Prev.we.snap.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 h'wɑ <'j.ɑ.lɑ.gɑ.ø.jt'
 Sp-Part_i they.it_i.Prev.begin.Past.Fin(=Aor)

‘They began to snap the osier-bunch(es) one by one ⇐ They began, “We shall snap the osier-bunch(es) one by one,” saying’

Naturally, both the Purposive allomorphs are used to express adverbial clauses of purpose, and they stand alongside each other in:

88. d.'wə.ħ^wa.wa.jt' ‹'a.dzb.tə^wa
 (s)he.you(-Masc).urge.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) the.judge.Pl
 wə.χ'şəu ø.na.'rə.la.ts'a.ø.nə,
 your(-Masc).intelligence it.Prev.them.among.put.Past.Abs
 a.'wəs ø.'wə.r.lasə.ø.r(.)ts,
 the.case it.you(-Masc).Caus.hurry.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp
 a.'k'aba ø.zə.k^w.na.ga.'wa
 the.shirt it.whom.on.it.take.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 də.d.wə.r.ba.ø.r(?)a(.)'zə
 him.them.you(-Masc).Caus.sec.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp
 ‘(S)he urges you to lend your intelligence to the judges and, in order to hurry the case along, to shew them the one to whom the shirt belongs’

As this sentence stands, one can insert /a.'zə/ ‘it.for’ after the first Purposive to underline its role as an expression of purpose. Since both these allomorphs function to mark complements and expressions of purpose, the endings can be switched and the meaning will remain the same, for the context determines that the earlier Purposive must be the marker of purpose; if the endings are switched in this way, no insertion of /a.'zə/ ‘it.for’ is possible in the purpose-expression itself.

The complement of ‘want’ can be expressed by the Purposive in /-r(.)ts/ *alone* even where the ‘wanter’ and the embedded subject are identical, and this Purposive is one of the obligatory choices both when that identity does not obtain and when the embedded verb has more than the single argument that can be expressed possessively on the Masdar, e.g.

89. ‹'s.a.pχ'a.ø.r(.)ts / a'ra 'sə.q'a.z(.)a.r(.)ts /
 I.it.read.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp_i here I.be.Ext.Purp_i
 a.'tə^wa ø.'lə.s.ta.ø.r(.)ts /
 the.apple it.her.I.give.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp_i
 d.a:j.'ga.ø.r(.)ts
 him/her.Prev.he.bring.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp_i
 ø.s.ta'χə.w.p' / ø.s.ta'χə.n
 it_i.I.want.Stat.Fin(=Pres) it_i.I.want.Fin(=Stat-Past)
 ‘I want/wanted to read it/to be here/to give her the apple/him to bring him/her’

But this does not exhaust the possibilities for the marking of the complement with 'want', and this other construction is examined under (9).

But before that we have to note another (tentative) alternation between Purposive in /-r(.)ts/ and a different Absolute. The Future Absolute in /-ra.nə/ (or more speculatively the Purposive in /-r(.)ts/) followed by the copular root /-q'a/ gives the meaning 'intend', though the sequence is obviously not a direct argument of the copula; an alternative to this is Purposive in /-r(.)ts/ or /-r(?)a(.)zə/ coupled with the verb-phrase /-gʷə jə.ə.'ta.w.p'/ 'be in X's heart', where the complement is in S-function:

90. <'s.a.pxʲa.ra.nə / ?'s.a.pxʲa.ə.r(.)ts / s.tsa.ra.'nə /
 I.it.read.FutI.Abs I.it.read.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp I.go.FutI.Abs
 ?s.tsa.ə.r(.)ts> 'sə.q'a.w.p' /
 I.go.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp I.be.Stat.Fin(=Pres)
 'sə.q'a.n
 I.be.Fin(=Stat-Past)

or

91. <'s.a.pxʲa.ə.r(.)ts/'s.a.pxʲa.ə.r(?)a(.)zə/s.tsa.ə.r(.)ts/s.tsa.ə.r(?)a(.)'zə>
 'sə.q'a.w.p/'sə.q'a.n
 'I intend(ed) to read (it)/go'

The Future Absolute combined with the copula provides the means of saying 'X is destined/due/sure to VERB', and the ending of the Absolute is again omissible, e.g.

92. də.w.'pə.la.ra[nə] 'də.q'a.w.p'
 (s)he.you(-Masc).Prev.meet.Fut.Abs (s)he.be.Stat.Fin(-Pres)
 'X is sure to meet you'¹⁴

9. Protasis-forms in Abkhaz add /-(z(.)a)r/ to the appropriate (non-finite) stem. Where the Purposive is used with 'want', the equivalent protasis-form is also allowed, e.g.

93. <'s.a.pxʲa.ə.r / a'ra 'sə.q'a.za.r / a.'təʷ'a
 I.it.read.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i here I.be.Ext.if_i the.apple
 ə.'lə.s.ta.ə.r /
 it.her.I.give.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i
 d.ɑ:j.'gə.ə.r>
 him/her.Prev.he.bring.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i

¹⁴ Coreference here is between the S-nominals of the two verbs, but the coreference can be between the copular subject and the oblique object of the Absolute, viz. /də.w.'pə.la.ra[nə] 'wə.q'a.w.p'/, which is most easily capturable in English by resorting to the passive 'you are sure to be met by X'.

$\emptyset.s.ta'\chi\emptyset.w.p'$ / $\emptyset.s.ta'\chi\emptyset.n$
it_i.I.want.Stat.Fin(=Pres) *it_i.I.want.Fin(=Stat-Past)*
 'I want/wanted to read it/to be here/to give her the apple/him
 to bring him/her'

And to express obligation/necessity when the embedding contains more than the S or O nominal that can be marked possessively on a Masdar, one combines the appropriate protasis-form with one of the copular roots /-a-/ in the non-negated Present or /-a(.)k^w-/¹⁵ in the negated Present or Past in general, e.g.

94. $\langle's.a.p\chi'a.\emptyset.r$ / $s.tsa.\emptyset.r$ / $a'ra$
I.it.read.Past(-N/F-Aor).if_i *I.go.Past(-N/F-Aor).if_i* *here*
 $'s\emptyset.q'a.z(.)a.r$ / $a.'t\emptyset^w'a$ $\emptyset.'l\emptyset.s.ta.\emptyset.r$ /
I.be.Ext.if_i *the.apple* *it.her.I.give.Past(=N/F-Aor).if*
 $d.a:j.'ga.\emptyset.r\rangle$
him/her.Prev.he.bring.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i
 $[a.]'a.w.p'$ // $[a.]'a(.)k^w'\emptyset.n$
it_i.be.Stat.Fin(-Pres) *it_i.be.Fin(-Stat-Past)*

'I have to read it/to go/to be here/to give her the apple/He has
 to fetch him/her//I should have read it/have gone/have been
 here/have given her the apple/He should have fetched him/her'

Examples with Present- and Perfect-based protasis-forms coupled with a negated copula would be:

95. $\langle s.tsa.'wa.z(.)a(.)r\rangle$ $[a.]'a(.)k^w'\emptyset.m$ /
I.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).if_i *it_i.be.not(=Stat-Pres)*
 $[a.]'a(.)k^w'.m\emptyset.z(.)t'$
it_i.be.not.Fin(=Stat-Past)
 'I should not be/have been going'
 $\langle s.tsa.'\chi'a.z(.)a(.)r\rangle$ $[a.]'a(.)k^w'\emptyset.m$ /
I.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).if_i *it_i.be.not(=Stat-Pres)*
 $[a.]'a(.)k^w'\emptyset.m\emptyset.z(.)t'$
it_i.be.not.Fin(=Stat-Past)

'I should not already be/have been gone'

Note the parallelism between 'want' and the modal 'be able', also a bi-valent intransitive with the person possessed of the capacity functioning as oblique object to the preverb, in terms of the interplay between Masdar and protasis-form, on the one hand, and between personal and impersonal forms of the introductory verb, on the other:

¹⁵ Both these roots are peculiar in that their sole S-marking prefix is selected not from the Column I but from the Column II set.

96. <a'rəj 'a.q'a.ts'a.ra>
 this its.Prev.do.Masd_i
 ø.z.la.'sə.l.ʂa.wa.j
 it_i.which.by.I.Prev.be-able.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).what?
 'How am I able to do this?'
 <ʂə.'s.a.f^w.h^wa.ø.r>
 it.me.to.you(-Pl).say.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i
 ø.'a.lə.m.ʂa.wa.j
 it_i.it.Prev.not.be-able.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).Qu
 'Is it [with dummy Col. II affix in Abkhaz] not possible for you to tell me?'

An alternative for the modal 'may; be possible' is the verb for 'happen' conjoined with the appropriate protasis-form as its complement, e.g.

97. <də.'tsa.ø.r / də.tsa.'wa.z(.)a(.)r /
 (s)he.go.Past(=N/F-Aor).if (s)he.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).if
 də.tsa.'x'a.z(.)a(.)r
 (s)he.go.Perf(=N/F).if
 'a.mɥa 'də.ø.k^w.z(.)a(.)r / də.'tsa.ø.z(.)a(.)r>
 the.road (s)he.it.on(=Stat-Pres).if (s)he.go.Past(=N/F-Aor).if
 ø.q'a.la.'wa.jt'
 it_i.Prev.happen.Dyn.Fin(=Pres)
 '(S)he may go/be going (= about to go)/have gone/be *en route*/maybe (s)he went'

As complement to /'a.q'a.la.ra/ in its basic notion of 'become' the non-finite Present or Present Absolute or the Resultative, formed by /-r(.)t^w/ (dialectally /-ra(.)t^wə /) replacing the Purposive endings, is found, with or without the postpositional phrase /[a.]aj(.)pʂ/ 'like it':

98. <sə.l.ba.'wa('nə)
 me.she.see.Dyn(-N/F-Pres)(.Abs)
 s.l.a(.)hə.'wa('nə) /
 me.she.hear.Dyn(-N/F-Pres)(.Abs)
 sə.l.'ba.ø.r(.)t^w s.l.a(.)hə.ø.r(.)t^w
 me.she.see.Past(-N/F-Aor).Res me.she.hear.Past(-N/F-Aor).Res
 ([a.]aj(.)pʂ) > də.q'a.la.'wa.z(.)a(.)r
 it.like she.Prev.become.Dyn(-N/F-Pres).if
 ø.z.ba.p'
 it.I.see.Fut1-Fin
 'I shall see then whether she is going to become the sort to look after (and) listen to me'

99. $\langle \text{d.t}\epsilon^w\text{a.}\emptyset.\text{l.}'\text{t}^w\text{ə.m.k}^w\text{a}(\text{.})\text{n} \rangle$ ¹⁶
 her.skin.it.her.belong.not(=Stat-N/F-Pres).Abs-Neg
 ($[\text{a.}]qj(\text{.})p\text{ʃ}$) $\langle \text{d.q}'\text{a.}'\text{l}\text{a.}\emptyset.j\text{t}' \rangle$
 it.like she.Prev.become.Past.Fin(-Aor)
 'She became pregnant'

In the case of the next example the two possible types of complement illustrated in 98 and 99 for this verb-root seem somewhat confused:

100. $\langle \text{w}\text{a}(\text{.})\text{u} \rangle$ $\langle \text{d.b}\text{ə.m.b}\text{a.}\emptyset.\text{n}\text{ə} \rangle$ /
 human him.you(-Fem).not.see.Past.Abs
 $\langle \text{d.b}\text{ə.m.}'\text{b}\text{a.}\emptyset.\text{k}^w\text{a} \rangle$
 him.you(-Fem).not.see.Past.Neg-Abs;
 ($[\text{a.}]qj(\text{.})p\text{ʃ}$) $\langle \emptyset.q'\text{a.l}\text{a.}'\text{r}\text{ə.m}\text{ə.z}(\text{.})\text{t}' \rangle$ /
 it.like it_i.Prev.happen.FutI.not.Fin
 $\langle \text{b.q}'\text{a.l}\text{a.}'\text{r}\text{ə.m}\text{ə.z}(\text{.})\text{t}' \rangle$
 you(-Fem).Prev.happen.FutI.not.Fin
 'It would have been impossible for you not to see/have seen anyone'

for the protasis-form seems impossible as substitute for the Past Absolute here.

For the modal notion 'probably' the Future I of the verbal stem consisting of the combination of the 'be'-copular root $/-\text{a}(\text{.})\text{k}^w-/$ and the 'become'-copular root $/-\text{x}\text{a}-/$ is used in association with a protasis-form:

101. $\langle \text{d}\text{ə.tsa.}'\text{w}\text{a.z}(\text{.})\text{a}(\text{.})\text{r} \rangle$ / $\langle \text{d}\text{ə.tsa.}'\text{x}\text{a.z}(\text{.})\text{a}(\text{.})\text{r} \rangle$ / $\langle \text{a.m}\text{q}\text{a} \rangle$
 (s)he.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).if (s)he.go.Perf(=N/F).if the.road
 $\langle \text{d}\text{ə.}\emptyset.\text{k}^w.\text{z}(\text{.})\text{a}(\text{.})\text{r} \rangle$ / $\langle \text{d}\text{ə.}'\text{ts}\text{a.}\emptyset.\text{z}(\text{.})\text{a}(\text{.})\text{r} \rangle$
 (s)he.it.on(=Stat-Pres).if (s)he.go.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i
 $[\text{a.}]'\text{a}(\text{.})\text{k}^w.\text{x}\text{a.p}'$
 it_i.be.become.FutI-Fin
 '(S)he is probably going (= will be going)/has probably gone/is probably *en route*/probably went'

If 'probably' is to be linked to an imperfective action in the past, either this same form of the main verb or its Conditional I variant combines with a protasis-form marked by the compound suffix $/-z(\text{.})t(\text{.})g^j\text{ə}/$:

102. $\langle \text{j}\text{ə.}'\text{w}\text{əs} \rangle$ $\langle \text{d.}\text{a.}'\text{t}\text{ʃ}'\text{ə.z}(\text{.})\text{t}(\text{.})\text{g}^j\text{ə} \rangle$ / $\langle \text{a.}'\text{w}\text{əs} \rangle$
 his.work he.it.in(=Stat).if_i the.work
 $\langle \emptyset.j\text{ə.}'\text{w.}[\text{w}]\text{a.z}(\text{.})\text{t}(\text{.})\text{g}^j\text{ə} \rangle$
 it.he.do.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).if_i

¹⁶ The nominal root meaning 'skin' can be substituted by $/-\text{b}\text{a}\text{q}-/$ 'bone' for the same meaning.

[a.]'a(.)k^w.χa.p' / [a.]'a(.)k^w.χa.rə.n
 it_i.be.become.FutI-Fin it_i.be.become.FutI.Fin(=ConditI)
 'He was probably engaged in his business/working'

The verb /a.w.'ra/ 'do' with a complement represented by a protasis-form provides a method of expressing the notion 'allow', and if both introductory and embedded verbs contain the negative, another method of expressing obligation results, e.g.

103. <jə.na(.)tε^wa dzə 'χj^wq^wa.k'
 his.finger water cold.a
 ø.'n[a.]a.k^w.t^wa.ø.r.g^jə>
 it.Prev.it.on.spill.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i.even
 j.an jə.l.'w.[w]a.mə.z(.)t'
 his.mother it_i.she.do.Dyn.not.Fin(=Imperf)
 'His mother used not even to let a drop of cold water spill on his finger'
104. <a(.)k' ø.'sə.f^wə.m.ta.ø.r>
 one it.me.you(-Pl).not.give.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i
 ø.f^wə.m.'w.[w]a.z(.)a(.)r
 it_i.you(-Pl).not.do.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).if
 wəb'rəj f^w.t_ʃə ø.sə.f^w.t
 that your(-Pl).horse it.me.you(-Pl).give(=Imper)
 'If you cannot not give = must give me something, give me that horse of yours'
105. <[j.]'jə.rə.m.ta.ø.r>
 it.him.they.not.give.Past(=N/F-Aor).if_i
 ø.a.m.'wə.ø.jt'
 it_i.it.not.do.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'It was not possible for them not to give = They had to give it to him'

where we note that the introductory verb is impersonal with dummy 3rd person non-human Column III agent-affix.

It is even possible to find examples of a protasis-form seemingly fulfilling the role of (here object-)complement to a non-modal main verb:

- 105'.<s.a₃^wə(.)m'ta(.)t_ʃ(.)χa 'bzəja.ra.k' s.'pəjps.za(.)r>
 my-old.age good.Abst.a I.destiny.if(=Stat)_i
 ø.z.'dər.χ.wa.da
 it_i.who.know.again.Dyn(=Fin-Pres).who?
 'Who can claim to know if (= that) in my old age I would find a happy destiny?!'

10. Mention has already been made of the Resultative as means of expressing the complement to /'a.q'a.la.ra/ 'become'. This grammatical form can also express the complement in causative expressions. In general Abkhaz causatives are formed by the synthetic morphological process of inserting the causative morph /-r-/ immediately before the root (or, for some verbs, before the preverb), which naturally results in an increase to the valency of the causativized verb. However, unlike Circassian, Abkhaz has an aversion to verb-forms with more than three persons indicated (though quadripersonal verbs can be found). If the non-causativized verb is tripersonal, then Abkhaz uses /'a.q'a.ts'a.ra/ 'make' or /'a.r.q'a.ts'a.ra/ 'cause to make' as matrix verb and places the embedded verb in its Resultative form. The postpositional phrase /[a.]qj(.)pʂ/ 'it.like' is optional. Whether or not this postpositional phrase appears, the O-functioning 3rd person singular non-human Column I affix of the introductory/main verb may be present or omitted. This again raises an interesting query about the status of the material preceding it: if we are dealing with a noun-complement in O-function, it should correlate with this Column I affix, which should thus drop, as it is immediately preceded by its referent; the fact that the affix may be retained suggests that the structure may be more akin to: 'X made/caused Y to make it (the situation?!)' (such that Y VERB'. In other words, we may be dealing with what originally was a free-standing complement with dummy-affix in the verb, though the option of dropping the Column I affix suggests a drawing of the embedded clause more closely within the verb's ambit, specifically as its O-nominal, e.g.

106. 'a.taḥmada 'jə.tʃ'kʷən.təʷa r.an a.'ḥamta
 the.old-man his.son.Pl their.mother the.present
 ø.'lə.r.ta.ø.r(.)tʷ' ([a.]qj(.)pʂ)
 it.her.they.give.Past(=N/F-Aor).Res it.like
 ø/jə.q'a.j.'ts'a.ø.jt' /
 it.Prev.he.make.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 ø/jə.'də.j.r.q'a.ts'a.ø.jt'
 it.them.he.Caus.Prev.make.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'The old man got his sons to give their mother a present'

The notion 'forbid' seems to be most naturally rendered by using the negated, causativized form of the lexical verb, e.g.

107. də.d.s.mə.r.'ʃə.ø.jt'
 him/her.them.I.not.Caus.kill.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 'I did not let them kill him/her = I forbade them to kill him/her'

The verb ‘hinder’ preferably takes just the Masdar as its O-argument, though for complements with more complex internal structure one can use the *negated* Resultative (plus postpositional phrase /*[a.]aj(.)pɕ/* ‘like it’) or either form of the Purposive with an expanded predicate, such that ‘He hindered their sending me there’ literally comes out as ‘They hindered my business such that they did NOT send me there’, rendering the second part of 108 a result-clause rather than a true complement, e.g.

108. <wa.[a.a]χʲ s.tsa.'ra> ø.aj(.)'ts'a.r.qʲ'a.ø.jt'
 there.it.to my.go.Masdj it_i.Prev.they.hinder.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 ‘They hindered my going there’
 wa.[a.a]χʲ sər.mə.ʃtə.ø.r(.)tʷ [a.]aj(.)pɕ /
 there.it.to me.they.not.send.Past(=N/F-Aor) it.like
 sər.mə.ʃtə.ø.r(.)ts /
 me.they.not.send.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp
 sər.mə.ʃtə.ø.r(?)a(.)'zə s.wəɕ
 me.they.not.send.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp my.business
 ø.aj(.)'ts'a.j.qʲ'a.ø.jt'
 it.Prev.he.hinder.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 ‘He hindered their sending me there’

11. One might finally mention the role of (sentential) relatives or protasis-forms as equivalents to indirect questions, e.g.

109. <b.əχʲ.tsa.'wa> /
 you(-Fem).where.go.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 bə.z.'tsa.ø.z /
 you(-Fem).why.go.Past.N/F(=P/I)
 b.'ɕə.q'a.w / də.tsa.'χʲ'a.z(.)a(.)r>
 you(-Fem).how.be.Stat(=N/F-Pres) (s)he.go.Perf(=N/F).if
 ø.s.a.hʷ
 it.me.to.say(=Imper)
 ‘Tell me where you are going/why you went/how you are/if X
 has already gone’

or

110. <s.əχʲ.tsa.'wa.z> d.'s.a.z.ts'a:ø.jt'¹⁷
 I.where.go.Dyn.N/F(=Imperf) (s)he.me.it.for.ask.Past.Fin(=Aor)

¹⁷ *Oratio recta* is possible to give /wa.'ba.tsa.wa hʷa d.'s.a.z.ts'a:ø.jt'/ ‘(S)he asked me: “Where are you going?”’. Note the differentiation if the speech-particle is used with a non-finite form containing the sentential relative marker of place: with Non-finite Present /s.əχʲ.tsa.'wa hʷa d.'s.a.z.ts'a:ø.jt'/ ‘(S)he asked me where I was going’ we have a form where the direct question was ‘Where are you going?’, but with Non-finite Imperfect /s.əχʲ.tsa.'wa.z hʷa d.'s.a.z.ts'a:ø.jt'/ ‘(S)he asked me where I had been going’ we have a form where the direct question was ‘Where were you going?’

115. <χ'dzə ø.r.'gə.ø.rts>.[a.]a.w.p'
 name it.they.take.Past(=N/F-Aor).Purp.it.be.Stat.Fin(=Pres)
 <a.'χa.te^wa ø.'zə.j.wa>
 the.man.Pl they.why.be-born.Dyn(=N/F-Pres)
 'It is in order that they earn a reputation why=that men are born'

12. The complement with verbs of fearing may take one of five forms, all with /h^wa/: appropriate protasis-form, appropriate finite tense, the 'agitated' interrogative of the relevant tense, the negated Optative, the negated Subjunctive:

116. <(a) də.'psə.ø.r h^wa
 (s)he.die.Past(=N/F-Aor).if Sp-Part
 (b) də.ps.'wa.jt' h^wa
 Fin-Pres
 (c) də.ps.'rə.w/ma.f h^wa
 (s)he.die.FutI-NF.Qu.Ag
 (d) də.m.'psə.ø.nda(().z) h^wa
 (s)he.not.died.Past(=N/F-Aor).Opt
 (e) də.m.'ps.ø.α:(.jt' h^wa>
 (s)he.not.die.Past(=N/F-Aor).Subj
 s.f^wa.wa.jt' / s.f^wa.wa.n
 I.fear.Dyn.Fin(=Pres) Fin-Imperf
 'I am/was afraid that (s)he will/would die'

From the change of person in:

- 117 <jə.lə.z.'pə.m.ɬsə.ø.r h^wa>
 X.she.Pot.Prev.not.break.Past(=N/F-Aor).if Sp-Part
 d.f^wa.wa.n
 she.fear.Dyn.Fin(=Imperf)
 'She was afraid that she would not be able to break X'

it is clear that /h^wa/ must be functioning as a conjunction at some level of analysis, though /jə.sə.z.'pə.m.ɬsə.ø.r/, with 1st person (demoted because of the presence of the potential affix) agent, is also possible.

Compare the construction with the expression for 'have a suspicion':

118. <a.mts ø.jə.'h^wa.ø.r / ø.jə.'h^wa.'wa.z(().)a(().r /
 the.lie it.he.say.Past(=N/F-Aor).if it.he.say.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).if
 ø.jə.'h^wa.ø.z(().)a(().r h^wa> g^wə(().)'ɬa(().)ra.s
 it.he.say.Past(=N/F-Aor).if Sp-Part_i suspicion.as
 jə.'sə.ma.w.p'
 it_i.I.have.Stat.Fin(=Pres)

'I have a suspicion/suspect that he (a) will lie, (b) is lying/was lying/is going to lie, (c) lied'

Distribution and Origins

Wide use is made of the construction for the direct reporting of speech not only in Abkhaz but in a number of Caucasian languages. As we have seen, this option is available with, to use the traditional designation, *verba dicendi et sentiendi*, but it is not limited to verbs falling within this category. If the role of the speech-particle is shifting to that of complementiser, we could have at least a part-explanation for this extension, and indeed there are indications from elsewhere in the language (e.g. purpose-expressions—see Hewitt 1987: 39/42) that such a change is in progress, and parallel shifts have been attested in other languages.

As I have pointed out (1987: 249), the Abkhaz Absolutes are akin to the participles in Indo-European languages, and their ability to mark noun-complements with a restricted range of verbs is reminiscent of the appearance of the participles in a similar function in Ancient Greek. And interestingly, it was essentially verbs of perception, such as the relevant verbs in Abkhaz, that required the participial construction in Greek. The optional presence of the speech-particle with some of these Absolute-taking verbs is strictly as unwarranted as its similar presence after a non-finite verb-form incorporating the prefix /ʒ-/ , for in neither case is the actual form of any original statement or thought reprised. Ancient Greek too allowed an optional accompaniment to the participial complement-function, and this was the element ὡς, which in origin was the relative adverb of manner ‘in what way, how’ but which came to be one of the classical language’s complementisers for introducing indirect quotation as an alternative to ὅτι ‘that’. Of this coupling Goodwin (1966: 365) states: ‘The participle in indirect discourse may be preceded by ὡς, which implies that the thought of the participle is expressed as that of the leading subject, or as that of some person prominent in the sentence... When this is already implied in the context, as it often is, ὡς adds only emphasis to the expression. Thus

[119.] ἴσθι ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα means

know that this is so

but

[120.] ἴσθι ὡς ταῦτα οὕτως¹⁸ ἔχοντα means

know that (as you may assume) this is so, i.e. be assured that this is so.’

¹⁸ This adverb is missing from Goodwin’s original.

The explanation for the possible presence of the Abkhaz speech-particle alongside the Absolute, on the one hand, and a non-finite verb incorporating the prefix /ʃ-/ , on the other, might be similarly to underline the complement role of the constructions in question, though the link to *oratio recta* is not entirely lost with the latter construction, where the tense has to be that of the putative original statement/thought when the speech-particle is present.

Regarding the two conjunctive particles, as we have seen the basic meaning of /ʃ-/ is 'how', whilst that of /αχⁱ-/ is 'where'. The development from 'how' to 'that' can be deemed straightforward—in English 'how' can substitute for 'that' with no change of meaning (e.g. 'He told us how/that he had rung earlier and how/that there had been no answer'). However, the path of development of complementiser functions for the sentential locative is less clear. Nor is it easy to determine the criteria by which the two infixes are differentiated when functioning as complementisers. As stressed above, the sentential locative tends to predominate in subject-complements, /ʃ-/ in object-complements. As the particles have at least two meanings each, perhaps each predominates in contexts where the non-complementiser sense of the other particle would be so strong as to render it incapable of fulfilling the complementiser-role in that context. This still does not explain how the particle /ʃ-/ can be tolerated with those verbs where it may be interpreted as either 'that' or 'how'. But this is by no means peculiar to Abkhaz, for we have just seen an exact parallel in English, and the same applies to *wie* 'how, as' as possible substitute for *dass* 'that' in German, and, as just observed, Ancient Greek ὡς 'how' developed complementiser-functions alongside its manner-role. Closer to home for Abkhaz, one can point to a parallel development from 'how' to 'how/that' for /mutʃə/ in the South Caucasian language Mingrelian, which has for centuries been immediate neighbour to Abkhaz. As Mingrelian has the general complementiser /nam(u/ə)da/, parallel to Georgian /rə(m)/, which might be thought to render the supposed secondary sense of 'that' redundant for /mutʃə/, it is not impossible that we have here a case of Abkhaz influencing Mingrelian. We also need to note that in Abkhaz's sister-languages the particles of 'manner' (viz. Ubykh /d(.ʁ)ɑ-/ , Circassian /zə/ɑ(.rə)ɑ-/) are also used in complementiser-functions, e.g.

121. d(.ʁ)ɑ.w.lɑ.'tə.ø.j

how.you.Prev.be.Stat(=Pres).Qu

'How are you?'

[Ubykh—Vogt 1963: 113]

122. d(.(Ɂ))a.w.bja.nə.n
 as.you.sec.Dyn(=N/F-Pres).Obl
 'As you see' [Ubykh—Vogt 1963: 113]
123. ⟨sə(.)'Ɂ^wa d(.(Ɂ))a.sə.'wə.t^w⟩ ø.'wə.s.q'a.q'a
 I that_i.I.your.father(=Stat-N/F-Pres) it_i.you.I.say.Aor-Fin
 'I told you that I was/am your father' [Ubykh—Vogt 1963: 113]
124. ⟨ø.qə.za(.)ra.t.f.jə.mə.ɛ'ə.Ɂa.m⟩
 it.Prev.how/as_i.us.for.he.not.make.Aor(=N/F).Obl
 ø.fa(.)ɛ'ə(.)ga
 it_i.because
 'since he had not made it for us'
 [Shapsugh Circassian—Smeets 1984:255]
125. ⟨ø.za(.)ra.k^wa:Ɂa.r⟩ ø.s.a.ɛ'ə.ø
 X.that_i.go.Aor(=N/F).Absol it_i.I.Dyn.know.Pres(=Fin)
 'I know that X has gone'
 [Shapsugh Circassian—Smeets 1984: 255]

where the former example equates to an Abkhaz form containing /Ɂⁱ-, the latter two to forms containing /Ɂ-/.
 where the first example in Ubykh equates to an Abkhaz form containing /Ɂ.pə-/, the latter two to forms containing /Ɂ-/.
 where the former example equates to an Abkhaz form containing /αɁⁱ-, the latter to one containing /Ɂ-/—this Circassian particle is not used for direct questions of manner. Note that the Circassian complementiser/manner-particle mirrors those of Abkhaz by virtue of standing inside the verbal complex, whilst that of Ubykh stands first in the complex.

The etymology of the particles in Ubykh and Circassian is pretty transparent (Dumézil 1975: 205): the first component is the Column II (or III) relative-affix in the respective language, whilst for the second component in Ubykh Dumézil refers to the postposition /-Ɂa/ 'in, from' (though one could perhaps think more in terms of the homonymous intraverbal particle indicating an indirect object, just as in Abkhaz /-a-/ fulfils this role with some verbs, such as in /jə.'s.a.l.ħ^wa.ø.jt'/ 'she told me X'), and in Circassian Dumézil points to the suffix in /mɑ:fa.ra/ 'by day', and so the original meaning will have been something like 'in relation to which; by which'. But no such breakdown is feasible for the Abkhaz particle. If one is looking for a conjunctive particle in Abkhaz which derives from the parallel relative marker, it is the one indicating reason, for /-z-/ 'why' pretty obviously derives from /-z.zə-/ 'which.for = for which'. In the northern Bzyp dialect the conjunctive particle of manner is usually /ɛ-/, though the voiced counterpart /z-/ is possible, and this is the same

element as is used with the meaning ‘why’; the benefactive postposition ‘for’ is also represented in Bzyp by this same alveolo-palatal /-zə/, and so some connection cannot be excluded between standard Abkhaz /ʃ-/ and the Bzyp sequence /-z.zə-/, though the devoicing would need to be explained, as would the reason why the alveolar /s-/, which would be expected from simplification and devoicing, has become a retroflex.

When it comes to the use of the Masdar (Infinitive), Purposive, Resultative, and protases in /-(z(.)a(.))r/, we can begin by observing that, apart from such uses of the Masdar as in the Abkhaz equivalent of ‘Their coming surprised me’, these forms share the semantic feature of (usually) not signifying a factual event but rather an intention or goal—in other words, they are either typically, in the case of the Masdar, or obligatorily, in the case of the others, *irrealis*. The answer as to why this feature is present lies in the morphology, as first noticed in her analysis of these forms by the doyenne of Abkhaz studies, Ketevan Lomtadze, in 1948. Recall that the Masdar ends in /-ra/, the Purposive in /-r(.)ts/ (dialectally /-ra(.)tsə/) or /-r(.)a(.)zə/, protasis-forms in /-(z(.)a(.))r(?)a/, and the Resultative in /-r(.)tʷ/ (dialectal variant in /-ra(.)tʷə/); to these we should also add the Future Absolute in /-ra(.)nə/. The common element is /-ra/, and a glance at the list of tense-forms, specifically the non-finite forms, presented at the start of this paper reveals that the Non-finite Future I ends in this self-same formant, and *irrealis* and futurity are natural partners. The close bond between Infinitive and Future I is paralleled by the corresponding forms in Circassian (both ending in /-n/). The ending /-zə/ derives from the benefactive postposition ‘for’, the element /-tʷə-/ is the root of the verb ‘belong’ and also serves as the formant of the gerundive ‘that which is to be VERBed’, /-nə/ is the ending of adverbs and an alternative to /-s/ as the Adverbial case-desinence. Which leaves the formant /-ts/. On the basis of such dialectal forms as:

126. də.jʃə.rəs

də.tsa.əjtʰ

him/her.he.kill.FutI(=N/F).Adv he.go.Past.Fin(=Aor)

‘He went to kill him/her’ (= standard /də.jʃə.r(.)ts də.tsa.əjtʰ/)

from the Ashkharywa dialect of Abaza, Lomtadze proposed that standard /-ts/ derives from the Adverbial case-ending /-s/, which would make Purposives in /-r(.)ts/ (dialectally /-ra(.)tsə/) and Future Absolutes in /-ra(.)nə/ simple allomorphs. And it follows from this wholly persuasive analysis that, historically at least, we are not dealing with composite suffixes added to the Non-finite Aorist, as proposed above for the synchronic analysis of Purposive and Resultative forms

as well as basic protases in /-r/ alone—one can hardly argue, however, that those in /-z(.)ɑ(.)r/ derive so straightforwardly from the Future I.

That grammatical forms deriving from a future tense with the concomitant semantics of *irrealis* should end up being employed to mark complements which themselves are non-factual and/or *irrealis* and/or point to some sort of goal is no surprise. This statement includes the infinitival usage of the form in /-ra/. Since the same form serves as the verbal noun, it is equally unsurprising to find it used in such factual contexts as: A-function for the predicate ‘cause joy’:

127. *ʃjə.tsa.'ra* *s.ɑ.r.'gʷə(.)r(.)ʃʷɑ.ø.jt'*
 his.go.Masd; me.it;.Caus.rejoice.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 ‘His going made me joyful’

S-function for the predicate ‘not to be good’:

128. *ʃjə.tsa.'ra* *ø.tʃɑj.m*
 his.go.Masd; it;.good.not(=Stat-Pres)
 ‘His going is not good’

and O-function for the predicate ‘notice’:

129. *ʃjə.tsa.'ra* *ø.'gʷɑ.s.ta.ø.jt'*
 his.go.Masd; it;.Prev.I.notice.Past.Fin(=Aor)
 ‘I noticed his going’

Despite lacking complement clauses *sensu stricto*, Abkhaz ironically has a wealth of constructions that build translation-equivalents. It is, thus, perhaps only to be expected that the language would distribute, albeit with some overlaps and extensions that serve to obscure the precise factors behind the selection of this or that option, its constructions according to the different nuances associated with the different contexts of: *verba dicendi et sentiendi* vs others; factive vs non-factive; subject vs object-complements; sense-perception; desire; necessity; possibility; probability; etc... Where there is no precise predicate-equivalent, as in the case of ‘forbid X from VERBing’, Abkhaz utilizes its resources and turns the expression on its head to say ‘not to allow X to VERB’, whilst for ‘hinder’ the actual outcome of the verbal action is reflected in the language by the choice of a negated expression of purpose or result.

It is hoped that the detailed analysis presented above will lead to a deeper appreciation of Abkhaz syntax, an area of grammar not widely explored for North Caucasian languages, and contribute to increasing interest in the typology of complementation.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abs	Absolute	N/F	Non-Finite
Absol	Absolutive	Neg	Negative
Abst	Abstract	Non-Hum/	
Adv	Adverb(ial)	N-Hum	Non-Human
Ag	Agitated	Obl	Oblique
Aor	Aorist	Opt	Optative
Art	Article	P/I	Past Indefinite
Caus	Causative	Perf	Perfect
Condit	Conditional	Pl	Plural
Def	Definite	Plup	Pluperfect
Dyn	Dynamic	Pot	Potential
Emph	Emphatic	Pres	Present
Ext	Extension	Prev	Preverb
Fem	Feminine	Proh	Prohibition
Fin	Finite	Purp	Purposive
Fut	Future	Qu	Question
Hum	Human	Res	Resultative
Imper	Imperative	Sp-Part	Speech-particle
Imperf	Imperfect	Stat	Stative
Indef	Indefinite	Subj	Subjunctive
Masc	Masculine	Suff	Suffix
Masd	Masdar		

REFERENCES

- Bghazh^wba, X^w. S., Zyx^wba, S. L. (2003), *Dərməjt' G^wləja* [Dmitry Gulia], Aq^wa: Alaşara.
- Dumézil, G. (1975), *Le Verbe Oubykh: Etudes Descriptives et Comparatives*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Goodwin, W. W. (1966), *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, London: Macmillan.
- Hewitt, B. G., Crisp, S. (1986), "Speech-reporting in the Caucasus", F. Coulmas (ed.) *Trends in Linguistics: Studies & Monographs 31. Direct and Indirect Speech*: 121-143, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hewitt, B. G. (1987), *The Typology of Subordination in Georgian and Abkhaz*, Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Lomtadidze, K. (1948), "e.ts' 'mizan-p'irobiti k'ilos' ts'armoebisatvis apxazur dialekt'ebshi'" [On the formation of the so-called 'purpose-conditional mood' in the Abkhaz dialects], *Iberul-k'avk'asiuri enat-metsniereba, II* [Ibero-Caucasian Linguistics, II]: 17-29.
- Vogt, H. (1963), *Dictionnaire de la Langue Oubykh*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

