Adyghe (Circassian, Northwest Caucasian) possesses a rich system of non-finite verbal forms used to code sentential complements. Traditional grammar divides this set of forms into a number of categories under the standard labels such as “masdar”, “participle”, “converb”, etc. It can easily be shown however, that morphologically all these non-finite forms fit into a single paradigm, being able to attach both Case and TAM-markers at the same time. Thus, the segment -new, traditionally referred to as “supine ending” is clearly analyzable as a combination of the Future Tense marker -n- and the Adverbial Case marker -ew. No special transcategorial morphemes are used to indicate the non-finite status of complement verbs, save for the zere- prefix that marks complements of factive predicates. So, in general the morphological structure of the (intransitive) complement verb corresponds to the following scheme: (Pers) + (-zere-) + Stem + (Case) + (TAM). Contrary to [Noonan 1985]’s assumption, Adyghe seems to lack the sentential-like strategy of complementation, except conditional and concessive forms used in “if-clause” complements. There are some peripheral cases when complement predicates do not inflect for Case (in Adyghe only nouns with defined reference take overt Case markers, the same mutatis mutandis applies to sentential complements), and so their finite/non-finite status is somewhat problematic. Such cases will be treated in more detail at the presentation.

The co-occurrence of TAM markers with Case endings (the latter being assigned by the matrix predicate) is especially interesting, if we take into account that basic inflectional categories in Adyghe, such as Case and TAM, are oriented to sentential functions (such as argument and predicate) rather than to parts of speech (such as noun and verb). Thus, a TAM marker can be easily attached to a NP used in the predicate position.

With respect to co-reference relations, Adyghe shows a great variability: both Subject and Object “Control” can be Forward or Backward. It is notable that one and the same predicate can participate in Forward and Backward “Control”. It is not clear what actually determines the choice between forward and backward strategies; since in both types of constructions there are cases when the reference of the silent participant can’t be identified unambiguously, it may depend on whether the speaker considers the situational semantics of the higher or the lower predication more important.

It is still not quite clear whether Adyghean complements are syntactically true complements and not complement-like adverbial clauses (hence we take the word “Control” in quotes). If they are, than the pattern described in the preceding passage will be of great value for the typology of control structures. Anyway, the syntactic relation between matrix and embedded predication and, therefore, the nature of the silent argument remains problematic. Further investigation concerning selectional restrictions, behaviour of negative markers and various modifiers is required to give a final answer to the question. Some evidence pro and contra will be presented in the paper.