НАСКОЛЬКО НЕЗАВИСИМЫМ МОЖЕТ БЫТЬ ЗАВИСИМОСТНОЕ МАРКИРОВАНИЕ?

© 2018   **Ю. А. Ландер, А. С. Вьюнова**[*]

Падежные показатели, маркеры нефинитных глагольных форм и адлоги нередко представляются в качестве маркеров синтаксической зависимости. В статье на материале кабардино-черкесского языка демонстрируется, что подобные показатели вовсе не всегда маркируют синтаксические отношения, поскольку обозначаемые ими группы могут сами выступать в качестве сказуемого. При этом, по-видимому, возможность таких конструкций коррелирует с тем, насколько для группы естественно выступать в качестве семантического сирконстанта.

Ключевые слова: зависимостное маркирование, падежное маркирование, адлоги, конвербы, псевдоклефты, актанты, сирконстанты.

HOW INDEPENDENT CAN DEPENDENT MARKING BE?

Yury Lander, Anastasia S. Vyunova

This paper argues that cases, adpositions, and converbal markers need not function as markers of syntactic dependency. It is shown that in Kabardian (West Caucasian), the constituents headed by converbs and postpositions as well as case-marked NPs can appear as independent syntactic predicates, although this may correlate with the degree to which they function as semantic adjuncts: the more adjunct-like a phrase is, the easier it may constitute a syntactic predicate.

Keywords: dependent marking, case marking, adpositions, converbs, pseudoclefts, argument-adjunct distinction.

INTRODUCTION[1]

Most syntactic theories rely upon the idea of asymmetric syntactic relations which can be expressed by dedicated morphosyntactic means, applied usually on either the syntactic head (head marking) or on its dependent (dependent marking) [Nichols, 1986; 1992]. Yet, the apparent marking of syntactic relations sometimes appears to be an epiphenomenon of other functions. For example, argument indexing on the predicate, which is often described as head marking, may directly refer to semantic arguments rather than express relations with external syntactic arguments among others [Kibrik, 2011, p. 98ff]. In this paper, we show that the apparent dependent marking does not always mark syntactic relations either.

The synthetic means of dependent marking which we consider include, for example, case marking and converbal marking of clausal subordination. The same functions, however, may be

* Юрий Александрович ЛАНДЕР, кандидат филологических наук, научный сотрудник Института востоковедения РАН, доцент НИУ «Высшая школа экономики», Москва; yulander@yandex.ru

Yury LANDER, PhD (Philology), Research Fellow, Institute of Oriental Studies RAS; Docent, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow; yulander@yandex.ru

Анастасия Сергеевна ВЬЮНОВА, НИУ «Высшая школа экономики», Нижний Новгород; anastasia.vyunova@gmail.com

Anastasia S. VYUNOVA, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Nizhny Novgorod; anastasia.vyunova@gmail.com

encoded analytically. For example, adpositions often behave similar to case markers and in some languages even constitute paradigms described as case marking [Blake, 2001, p. 9–12]: one of the most well-known examples of such languages is Japanese [Shalyapina, 1986]. Since adpositions constitute separate syntactic nodes, describing them as means of dependent marking is debatable, but it may be justified under the assumption of the phrasal nature of dependents (see, e.g., [Gladkij, 1982]), with markers potentially adjoining to phrases rather than words. Indeed, in recent typological literature, we find the term 'flagging', which is used to cover both case marking and adpositions (see [Haspelmath, in print] for a discussion of this concept). Note, however, that if we take the alleged dependent marking to characterize not only nominal dependents but also, for example, clausal subordination, we need a concept broader than flagging. Hence below we will speak simply of 'dependent marking' but assume that it includes both synthetic and analytical means (and probably also various intermediate categories).

Most data discussed below come from Kabardian, a language which together with West Circassian (also known as Adyghe) constitutes the Circassian branch of the West (or Northwest) Caucasian family. We primarily use data from the Kuban dialect of Kabardian. This dialect, which is briefly described in [Kumakhov, 1969], differs from Standard Kabardian (for the latter, see [Abitov et al., 1957; Bagov et al., 1970; Colarusso, 1992; 2006; Kumakhov, 2006]). Yet we do not claim that Standard Kabardian is not the same as concerns the aspects discussed here. Our choice is motivated exclusively by the fact that we carried out more field work on Kuban Kabardian than on the dialects closer to Standard Kabardian.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 1 presents information on the basic kinds of marking (cross-reference, cases, and postpositions) in Kabardian. Sections 2 and 3 discuss postpositions and case markers in Kabardian respectively. The last section contains conclusions and discussion of the Kabardian facts against general background.

1. MARKING CLAUSAL ARGUMENTS AND NPs IN KABARDIAN

Kabardian is an ergative polysynthetic language which expresses arguments within the predicate by means of cross-reference, as in (1):[2]

(1)   daska-m   sə-ġə-Ø-d-jə-š'-a
        blackboard-OBL   1SG.ABS-DIR-3SG.IO-LOC-3SG.ERG-lead-PST
        'He led me to the blackboard.'

Cross-reference involves not only the absolutive and ergative arguments but also indirect objects. The latter are introduced by means of applicative markers, including benefactive, malefactive, comitative, possessive and plenty of locative preverbs. In (1), for example, the locative preverb introduces the (null) 3rd person singular indirect object cross-reference (the same participant is described by the oblique NP). Note, further, that all kinds of cross-reference markers can appear on non-verbal predicates, and this suggests that no null copula should be postulated for Kabardian.

NPs in Kabardian can be marked for case. Most descriptions assume that there are four cases, namely:[3]

- absolutive, which marks NPs describing intransitive subjects and transitive undergoers;
- oblique, which marks NPs cross-referenced elsewhere, including transitive actors, indirect objects, possessors and postpositional objects, but also NPs referring to the location and time, which need not – but coud – be cross-referenced;
- instrumental;
- adverbial/predicative.

The adverbial and instrumental cases differ from the core cases in many respects. In particular, they also mark clausal subordination, which makes the case status of these affixes

---

[2] All the examples are from the Kuban dialect unless stated otherwise.
[3] The descriptions of Kabardian differ in labelling the cases. The labels given here are used, for example, in [Colarusso, 1992; 2006], with the exception of the adverbial case, which is called 'predicative' in these grammars.

somewhat doubtful. The following example demonstrates the use of the core cases (absolute and oblique) in a transitive clause:

(2) **a-bə.m**   **haṩe-xe-r**   jə-ʁe-š'xe-ne
     that-OBL   guest-PL-ABS   3SG.ERG-CAUS-eat-FUT
     'S/he will feed the guests.'

The markers of the core cases almost never appear on pronouns, typically do not appear on proper names and often do not appear on possessed NPs and on non-specific NPs (cf. [Kumakhov, Vamling, Kumakhova, 1996; Kumakhov, Vamling, 2009] *inter alia*).

The participants of a situation can also be described by NPs introduced by postpositions. In such patterns the NP either is marked by the oblique case and occasionally cross-referenced on the postposition or remains unmarked. Some examples are given in (3) and (4).

(3) djekanə-m   **dje**   sə-ḳʷ-a
     dean-OBL   at   1SG.ABS-go-PST
     'I went to the dean.'

(4) š'ə-ʔe-q̇əm   s-jə-bze   **ja-pe**   z-ʁe-ḳʷe-n.
     LOC-be-NEG   1SG.IO-POSS-language   3PL.IO+POSS-before   1SG.ERG-CAUS-go-MOD
     'There is nothing that I would place (lit. let go) before my language.'

In the following sections we will first discuss marking by postpositions and then turn to case marking.

2. POSTPOSITIONAL PHRASES USED INDEPENDENTLY

While grammars of Kabardian normally distinguish a single class of postpositions, as we did above, this class is heterogeneous. We distinguish between (at least) two types of postpositions.

Type A postpositions can head postpositional phrases. They are used as predicates and hence cannot be considered a means of dependent marking proper. An example of such use is given in (5) (note the tense suffix on the postposition):

(5) a   txəλə-r   we   **ŝha.č'e-t**
     that   book-ABS   you.SG   for-IPF
     'That book was for you.'

Phrases headed by Type B postpositions at first seem reluctant to serve as predicates and normally demand a verb (6). One could suggest that these postpositions indeed mark syntactic dependency and hence require the presence of a head.

(6) a.   d-jə-meq̇ʷə-r   nav'es   bəde-m   **jə-ṩaʁə-m**   ŝ-e-λ
          1PL.IO-POSS-hay-ABS   canopy   solid-OBL   POSS-under-OBL   LOC-DYN-lie
     b.   *d-jə-meq̇ʷə-r   nav'es   bəde-m   **jə-ṩaʁ**
          1PL.IO-POSS-hay-ABS   canopy   solid-OBL   POSS-under
          'Our hay is under the solid canopy.'

On a closer inspection we find that Type B postpositions show much nominal behavior. Words belonging to this class may take case markers and possessive morphology (7). Phrases headed by some Type B postpositions can be further modified relative clauses (8). All of this is impossible for Type A postpositions.

(7) **wəne**   **ʔʷəpe-m**   roze-xe-r   q̇ə-ŝ-ew-č'
     house   in.front-OBL   rose-PL-ABS   DIR-LOC-DYN-grow
     jə-ṩəbaʁ   məʔerəse   ž'əg-xe-r   q̇ə-ŝ-ew-č'
     POSS-behind   apple   tree-PL-ABS   DIR-LOC-DYN-grow
     'Roses grow in front of the house, and apple trees grow behind it.'

(8)   aχš'e   ŝə-d-ʁe.ṗ§ḳʷ   š'xəʔen
       money   LOC-1PL.ERG-hide   blanket
       §aʁə-m   konvjertə-r   ŝe-λ.he
       under-OBL   envelope-ABS   LOC-put(IMP)
       'Put the envelope under the blanket where we hide money.'

There is, however, a feature that distinguishes Type B postpositions from nouns. In Kabardian, an unmarked common noun is normally non-specific, both at the clause level and within an NP[4]. When an unmarked nominal is found with a postposition, however, it can be specific. This can be illustrated by the ability of an NP to serve as the antecedent for anaphora, as in (7) above, where a null object of the postposition *jə.ʕəbaʁ* 'behind it' serves as anaphor, while *wəne* 'house' serves as its antecedent.

The examples just given suggest that Type B postpositions have reference to some spatial domain and do not establish a syntactic relation between a verbal head and its relation. In fact, in both (7) and (8) the relevant spatial domains appear as indirect objects introduced by locative applicatives in the verb, and it is these indirect objects that appear as phrases headed by Type B postpositions. Yet, if such phrases describe spatial domains and not just individuals whose location is specified, their use as predicates should be felicitous with subjects which also refer to location. This prediction is borne out, as demonstrated in (9), where the subject is represented by a headless relative clause referring to the location of a situation:

(9)   d-jə-meꝗʷə-r   z-də-ꝗʷe-λə-r   nav'es   bəde-m   **jə-§aʁ**
       1PL.IO-POSS-hay-ABS   REL.IO-LOC-LOC-lie-ABS   canopy   solid-OBL   POSS-under
       'The hay is under a solid canopy.'

Thus, we find that neither type of postposition can be considered a marker of syntactic dependency, even though some of them require very specific contexts to function as predicates themselves.[5]

3. CASE-MARKED NPs USED INDEPENDENTLY

Example, provided (9) above, represents a construction, which allows almost any part of the proposition to be conveyed by the syntactic predicate of the clause. If speakers focus on something, they may construct a pseudocleft, i.e. a non-verbal predication, where the focused part constitutes the matrix predicate and the subject is represented by a (normally headless) subordinate clause, describing the event and relativizing on the focused argument.[6]

There are two patterns of this kind. If the focused part is specific, as in (10), it takes the absolute case (if needed) and the copula-like element, which usually appears as =*ra*.[7] Otherwise, no copula appears, as in (11)–(12). In what follows, we will be mainly interested in the second pattern.

(10)   [thamad-əw   x-a-ʒ-a-r]   [mwe   çəxʷə-r.a]₍FOC₎
       leader-ADV   LOC-3PL.ERG-throw-PST-ABS   this   person-ABS+COP
       'Who was elected the chair is this person.'

---

[4] In West Circassian a noun and most of its modifiers including non-specific nominals constitute the so-called nominal complex, which has many properties of a single word (see [Lander, 2017] for details). In Kabardian nominal complexes arguably have been demorphologicised and lost many such properties, although they still retain some traces of this pattern.

[5] Some descriptions of Kabardian (e.g., [Bagov, 1970, p. 201]) distinguish between postpositions that function exclusively as grammatical markers and postpositions that have not yet lost their derivational relations to other parts of speech (most commonly to nouns and verbs), thus representing an interim category. Although related, this classification is still different from ours, because the second class also includes postpositions that originate from verbs and hence can function as predicates.

[6] Kabardian allows relativization not only of the core arguments, but also of various peripheral participants as well as relativization based on more abstract parameters such as time, manner, reason, etc.

[7] The full form of this element is *ara*, where the initial pronominal *a-* 'that' (usually used in anaphoric contexts). Moreover, there is evidence that the final *-a* in =*ra* may formally behave as the past suffix; see [Arkadiev, 2017].

(11) [mə ʁʷembə-m jə-sə-r] [məŝe-š'xʷe]_FOC
    this burrow-OBL LOC-sit-ABS bear-AUG
    'In this burrow, there is a bear.' (Lit., 'Who is in this burrow is a bear.')

(12) [mə txəλə-r zə-tx-a-r] [a-bə.m jə-q̇ʷeš']_FOC
    this book-ABS REL.ERG-write-PST-ABS that-OBL POSS-brother
    'Who wrote this book was a brother of his.'

As demonstrated by (11)–(12), if the focused argument is ergative or absolutive, the focused part does not bear any case marker in this construction. The predicate in this construction may also be constituted by an adverbial clause, however, such as by a conditional clause (13) or a purpose clause (14), or even by a simple adverbial (15). We are not aware of any evidence for a null (copula) predicate in such examples. Hence it seems that the conditional and the adverbial suffixes in this pattern do not signal the dependency relation between a constituent and some higher element. Rather they only indicate the semantic contribution of the expression in the proposition. The same holds for NPs marked with the instrumental and adverbial "cases" (16)–(17), which suggests that they need not mark the syntactic dependency.

(13) [se sə-q̇ə-ŝə-b-de-ḳʷe-ne-r] [labe ʒ'abe-m de-ž'-je-me]_FOC
    I 1SG.ABS-DIR-LOC-2SG.IO-COM-go-FUT-ABS Laba mountain-OBL LOC-start-UP-COND
    Lit., 'When I will marry you is if (the river) Laba will start flowing up the mountain.'

(14) [se sə-zə-xʷ-je-te-r] [krasnodar mjedə-m
    I 1SG.ABS-REL.IO-BEN-want-IPF-ABS Krasnodar medical.institute-OBL
    sə-ḳʷe-n-əw]_FOC
    1SG.ABS-go-MOD-ADV
    'What I wanted was to enter the medical institute.'

(15) [se sə-ze-rə-ž'e-r] [psənče-ʔje-we]_FOC, [a-r ze-rə-ž'e-r]
    I 1SG.ABS-REL.IO-MNR-run-ABS fast-INT-ADV that-ABS REL.IO-MNR-run-ABS
    [xʷem-əw]_FOC
    slow-ADV
    'I drive fast, he drives slowly.'
    Lit., 'The way I drive is fast, the way he drives is slow.'

(16) [mew tjetradə-m wə-ze-rə-de-txe-n xʷ-je-r]
    this exercise.book-OBL 2SG.ABS-REL.IO-INSTR-LOC-write-MOD BEN-must-ABS
    [ruč'ke ŝχʷanṭe-m-č'e]_FOC
    pen blue-OBL-INS
    'You must write with the blue pen in this exercise-book.'
    Lit., 'With what you must write in this exercise-book is with the blue pen.'

(17) [kamjenš'jək-əw]_FOC [ze-rə-laẑe-r]
    mason-ADV REL.IO-MNR-work-ABS
    'He works as a mason.'
    Lit., 'As a mason is what he works as.'

The core cases demonstrate a more complex picture. If a focused NP is overtly marked by the absolutive suffix, it is treated as specific and hence requires the copula. However, oblique NPs may occasionally function as predicates without the copula. We will show this by examples of the indirect object, introduced by the applicative prefix ŝə- within the verb. The principal function of ŝə- is the introduction of a location (without specifying the details of the spatial relation). It may also introduce arguments of some verbs and in the relative clause construction it may make the temporal location ('when') an argument of the verb.

In (18) and (19) what is relativized within the first part of the pseudocleft are the location and the time, introduced by this prefix, and the predicate is an oblique NP. Yet, in (20) where the relativized argument introduced by ŝə- is the indirect object of the verb 'be a part of', an oblique-marked NP can not serve as the predicate.

(18) [futbol   də-z-ŝ-je-pλə-r]   [ŝəbə-m]_{FOC}
     football   1PL.ABS-REL.IO-LOC-DAT-look-ABS   outdoors-OBL
     Lit. 'Where we are watching football is outdoors.'

(19) [zə-ŝə-s-š'e-ne-r]   [vtornikə-m]_{FOC}
     REL.IO-LOC-1SG.ERG-carry-FUT-ABS   Tuesday-OBL
     Lit. 'When I will carry (him) is on Tuesday.'

(20) *[a-r   zə-ŝə-ŝə-r]   [xʷeʒ   de-s-xe-m]_{FOC}
     that-ABS   REL.IO-LOC-be.part-ABS   Khodz   LOC-sit-PL-OBL
     Expected: 'Of whom he is one of is of the inhabitants lit., those who sit in) of Khodz.'

We propose that whether a phrase may function as the predicate of a pseudocleft construction depends on how adjunct-like it is: more adjunct-like elements such as expressions of location, time and manner appear as predicates more easily.[8] Even then, we need to explain the appearance of phrases with the alleged dependent marking in the predicate position.

The most natural explanation is related to the fact that adjuncts are more autonomous, as their semantic contribution is normally determined by themselves rather than by the modified element. Presumably, it is for this reason that expressions which usually serve as adjuncts may function as autonomous focused predicates. Yet this would suggest that the morphosyntactic marking of adjuncts need not reflect the syntactic structure but only the semantic composition.

DISCUSSION

To sum up, we have seen that in Kabardian many phrases, traditionally regarded as bearing dependent marking, can appear as independent predicates. Moreover, this may correlate to the degree to which they can contribute to the semantics of the clause autonomously: more adjunct-like phrases serve as clausal predicates more easily. But then, why can we not say that in other syntactic patterns the alleged dependent marking has the same semantic function rather than reflecting syntactic dependencies?[9]

The idea that the main function of case marking may be not syntactic but semantic was in fact proposed for early Indo-European, as discussed by S. Luraghi [Luraghi, 2010, p. 221], who also cites A. Meillet and J. Vendryes's suggestion [Meillet, Vendryes, 1924, p. 522] that the Proto-Indo-European case was not governed by the verb but was determined semantically. Curiously, when discussing these matters these authors were concerned with the expression of the core participants, i.e. the phrases which are expected to be less adjunct-like and hence more associated with the verb. Their proposal seemingly was that even for the patient the accusative case served as a marker of a patientive semantic role and not of any grammatical relation. At first glance, this seems to be true for modern languages as well. Consider the Russian example (21), where in the bolded phrases the

---

[8] Since they can appear as arguments of the predicate (at least in the relative construction where the predicate should contain a relativizer), we cannot simply consider them adjuncts as opposed to arguments. The distinction between arguments and adjuncts may be gradual, however (cf. [Vater, 1978; Somers, 1984; Forker, 2014] for general considerations and [Lander, 2015] for specific considerations concerning West Circassian). Alternatively, it may be that cross-reference on a predicate need not necessarily reflect its argument structure, which may find typological parallels in the opposition between registration and promotion of adjunct participants in some languages of Mesoamerica [Hernández-Green, 2016]. Then the most adjunct-like participants can still be considered adjuncts, but we will have to distinguish between registering and promoting uses of "applicative" prefixes like ŝə-.

[9] This may hold not only for constructions where a marker specifies the semantic function, but also for constructions where the semantic function is default for a given phrase (as is the case for location and time). In other words, theoretically, a marker may merely indicate that the speaker assigns a given phrase a default semantic function.

specific verbs need not be reconstructed, as the meaning is clear from the context, so it seems that the semantics of the situation of hitting is conveyed exclusively by case marking here.

(21)   (…) *70 % фраз будут следующего содержания: "**А я его…**", "**А он меня…**", "**А мы его…**", "А он промазал…", "**А я ему прямо в ногу…**"*

Lit., 'Seventy percent of expressions will have the following content: "**I … him**", "**He… me**", "**We … him**", "He missed…', "**I … him straight in his foot.**"

Still, it is by no means obvious that such case-marked phrases are necessarily interpreted similarly to adjuncts. The problem is that taken independently of the context they do not have any default meaning. Rather it seems that the default semantics (if any) could be provided here by a *combination* of factors, which presumably suggests a situation which can be described as highly transitive in P. J. Hopper and S. A. Thompson's terms [Hopper, Thompson, 1980]. Even then, since these expressions cannot be described as resulting from ellipsis of the predicate, the core cases (nominative and accusative) cannot be considered dependent-marking means here.

We conclude that what is usually described as dependent marking does not necessarily function as such, though there may be different reasons for this: primary function of a marker may be the expression of the semantic contribution of a phrase, or a marker may just participate as one of many elements that mark a given construction. Yet this does not imply that we should reject case markers, adpositions, and similar means to have a strictly syntactic function of marking a kind of syntactic dependency. The presence of such a syntactic function may depend on the extent to which a given construction has been grammaticalized. Nevertheless, we definitely need a theoretical approach which will be able to take into account various uses of the alleged means of dependent marking, including those where their primary function is not syntactic at all.

Abbreviations used in glosses

ABS – absolutive	INSTR – instrumental applicative
ADV – adverbial	IO – indirect object
AUG – augmentative	IPF – imperfective
BEN – benefactive	LOC – locative
CAUS – causative	MNR – manner applicative
COP – copula	MOD – modal
DIR – directive	NEG – negation
DYN – dynamic	OBL – oblique
ERG – ergative	POSS – possessive
FOC – focus	PL – plural
FUT – future	PST – past
IMP – imperfect	REL – relative
INS – instrumental case	SG – singular

Литература / References

Abitov M. L., Balkarov B. H., Desheriev Ju. D., Rogava G. V., Èl'berdov H. U., Kardanov B. M., Kuasheva T. H. (eds.). *Grammatika kabardino-cherkesskogo literaturnogo iazyka.* Moscow, 1957 [Абитов М. Л., Балкаров Б. Х., Дешериев Ю. Д., Рогава Г. В., Эльбердов Х. У., Карданов Б. М., Куашева Т. Х. (ред.). *Грамматика кабардино-черкесского литературного языка.* М., 1957].

Arkadiev P. M. Morfosintaksis fokusnoi sviazki v besleneevskom dialekte kabardino-cherkesskogo iazyka // *Vestnik RGGU. Ser. "Istoriia. Filologiia. Kul'turologiia. Vostokovedenie".* 2017. 11(32). Pp. 9–23 [Аркадьев П. М. Морфосинтаксис фокусной связки в бесленеевском диалекте кабардино-черкесского языка // *Вестник РГГУ. Серия «История. Филология. Культурология. Востоковедение».* 2017. № 11(32). С. 9–23].

Bagov P. M., Balkarov B. H., Kuasheva T. H., Kumakhov M. A., Rogava G. V. (eds.). *Grammatika kabardino-cherkesskogo literaturnogo iazyka.* Moscow, 1970 [Багов П. М., Балкаров Б. Х., Куашева Т. Х., Кумахов М. А., Рогава Г. В. (ред.). *Грамматика кабардино-черкесского литературного языка.* М., 1970].

Blake B. J. *Case.* 2nd edition. Cambridge, 2001.

Colarusso J. *A Grammar of the Kabardian Language.* Calgary, 1992.

Colarusso J. *Kabardian (East Circassian).* München, 2006.

Forker D. A canonical approach to the argument/adjunct distinction // *Linguistic Discovery.* 2014. 12(2). Pp. 27–40.

Gladkij A. V. *Sintaksicheskie struktury estestvennogo iazyka v avtomatizirovannyx strukturax obscheniia.* Moscow, 1982. [Гладкий А. В. *Синтаксические структуры естественного языка в автоматизированных структурах общения.* М., 1982].

Haspelmath M. Indexing and flagging, and head and dependent marking // *Te Reo* (in print).

Hernández-Green N. Registration versus applicative constructions in Acazulco Otomi // *International Journal of American Linguistics.* 2016. 82(3). Pp. 353–383.

Hopper P. J., Thompson S. A. Transitivity in grammar and discourse // *Language.* 1980. 56.2. Pp. 251–299.

Kibrik A. A. *Reference in Discourse.* Oxford, 2011.

Kumakhov M. A. (ed.) *Kabardino-cherkesskii iazyk.* 2 vols. Nalchik, 2006. [Кумахов М. А. (ред.) *Кабардино-черкесский язык.* 2 т. Нальчик, 2006.]

Kumakhov M. A. Kubanskij dialekt // Kumakhov M. A. (ed.). *Ocherki kabardino-cherkesskoj dialektologii.* Nalchik, 1969. Pp. 190–248 [Кумахов М. А. Кубанский диалект // Кумахов М. А. (ред.) *Очерки кабардино-черкесской диалектологии.* Нальчик, 1969. С. 190–248].

Kumakhov M., Vamling K. *Circassian Clause Structure.* Malmö, 2009.

Kumakhov M., Vamling K., Kumakhova Z. Ergative case in the Circassian languages // *Lund University, Dept. of Linguistics Working Papers.* 1996. 45. Pp. 93–111.

Lander Yu. Nominal complex in West Circassian: between morphology and syntax // *Studies in Language.* 2017. 41(1). Pp. 76–98.

Lander Yu. A. Aktanty i sirkonstanty v morfologii i v sintaksise adygejskogo jazyka // *Vestnik RGGU. Ser. "Istorija. Filologija. Kul'turologija. Vostokovedenie".* 2015. 1. Pp. 7–31 [Ландер Ю. А. Актанты и сирконстанты в морфологии и в синтаксисе адыгейского языка // *Вестник РГГУ. Сер. «История. Филология. Культурология. Востоковедение».* 2015. № 1. С. 7–31].

Luraghi S. The rise (and possible downfall) of configurationality // Luraghi S., Bubenik V. (eds.). *The Continuum Companion to Historical Linguistics.* London, 2010. Pp. 212–229.

Meillet A., Vendryes J. *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques.* Paris, 1924.

Nichols J. Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar // *Language.* 1986. 62(1). Pp. 56–119.

Nichols J. *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time.* Chicago, 1992.

Shalyapina Z. M. O morfologo-sintaksicheskom statuse nekotoryh iaponskih edinits (v sviazi s obschimi problemami razgranicheniia morfologii i sintaksisa v estestvennom iazyke) // Vardul' I. F. (ed.). *Aktual'nye problemy iaponskogo iazykoznaniia.* Moscow, 1986. Pp. 69–103 [Шаляпина З. М. О морфолого-синтаксическом статусе некоторых японских единиц (в связи с общими проблемами разграничения морфологии и синтаксиса в естественном языке) // Вардуль И. Ф. (ред.). *Актуальные проблемы японского языкознания.* М., 1986. С. 69–103].

Somers H. L. On the validity of the complement–adjunct distinction in valency grammar // *Linguistics.* 1984. 22(4). Pp. 507–530.

Vater H. On the possibility of distinguishing between complements and adjuncts // Abraham W. (ed.). *Valence, semantic case and grammatical relations.* Vol. 1. Amsterdam, 1978. Pp. 21–45.