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1. Introduction
Northwest Caucasian (NWC) languages, like North Caucasian languages in general, are believed to lack passive constructions (cf. Klimov & Alekseev 1980: 33; Siewierska 2013). I will present empirical evidence admittedly showing different stages of the development of passive-like constructions on the basis of resultative constructions and revealing non-trivial parallels to similar developments in better-known European languages.

Some classic definitions and observations:
- Resultative (Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988: 6): “verb forms that express a state implying a previous event”.
- Objective (P-oriented) resultative (ibid.: 9): resultative where “the underlying subject of the state ... in co-referential with the underlying object of the preceding action”.
- Passive (ibid.: 17): “verb forms which indicate that the surface subject does not encode the agent ... the passive involves a change in diathesis, but no change in denotational meaning; thus, by passive only the actional passive and not the statal passive is meant, using traditional terminology”.
- “[T]he resultative from transitive verbs typically expresses a state of the patient of the latter which usually surfaces as subject in a resultative construction ... This results in an intersection of the properties of resultative and passive” (ibid.).

2. Northwest Caucasian (Abkhaz-Adyghe) languages
One of the three indigenous language families of the Caucasus. Three branches:
- Abkhaz-Abaza
- Ubykh (extinct)
In this talk:
- Temirgoy and Bzhedugh dialects of West Circassian
- Kuban dialect of Kabardian
- Tapanta dialect of Abaza

The data have been collected during field-trips jointly organized by the Russian State University for the Humanities and Higher School of Economics in 2014 (Bzhedugh, village Vočepšij, Adygheya), 2015–2016 (Kuban, village Blečepsin, Adygheya) and 2017–2018 (Tapanta, village Inžič-Čukun, Karachay-Cherkessia); Temirgoy data mostly courtesy of Irina Bagirokova (Moscow). Financial support of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (grant # 17-04-00444) is gratefully acknowledged.

Major typological features (see Hewitt 2005, Arkadiev & Lander forthcoming):
- Very little distinction between major word classes (Lander & Testelets 2006).
- Polysynthesis (Lander & Testelets 2017 on West Circassian): pronominal affixes expressing all arguments of the verb (S, A, P as well as various indirect objects such as recipient, benefactive, and even location, cf. Smeets 1992 on Circassian and O’Herin 2002 on Abaza)
and a rich system of affixes marking aspectual, temporal and modal meanings (cf. Korotkova & Lander 2010 on Circassian). By contrast, case marking (rather impoverished) is attested only in Circassian and Ubykh.

Table 1. The general schema of the NWC verbal complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument Structure Zone</th>
<th>Pre-stem Elements</th>
<th>Stem (Σ)</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Subordinators</td>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEMIRGOY WEST CIRCASSIAN (textual example)
2SG.ABS-DIR-LOC-REC.IO-LOC-NEG-go-RE-ADV
’so that you don’t retreat before him’

ABAZA (textual example)
(2) [j-i-ʃa-də]A-[rš-pəsa-wa]C-[ta]B
3PL.ABS-DIR-3PL.ERG-NEG-shame-IPF-ADV
‘(they) not causing them disgrace’

Rich system of valency increasing operations, including causative and a large set of applicatives: benefactive, malefactive, many locatives etc. By contrast, valency decreasing operations are few (Lander & Letuchi 2017 on West Circassian).

Ergativity primarily manifested in head marking distinguishing between absolutive vs. oblique/ergative series of pronominal prefixes occupying distinct slots in the template shown in Table 1 (Kumakhov & Vamling 2009 on Circassian, O’Herin 2002 on Abaza).

Table 2. Absolutive vs. ergative personal prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abazsa</th>
<th>West Circassian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>2SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(a)-</td>
<td>w(a)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(a)-/ʒ-</td>
<td>w(a)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>3SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M w(a)-, F b(a)-</td>
<td>H d(a)-, N j(a)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w(a)-, F b(a)-/p-</td>
<td>M j(a)-, F l(a)-, N na-/a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>1PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H d(a)-, N j(a)-/∅</td>
<td>h(a)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j(a)-/a-</td>
<td>j(a)-/a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>2PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h(a)-</td>
<td>š(a)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h(a)-/ʃ-</td>
<td>š(a)-/ʒ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>3PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š(a)-/ə-</td>
<td>r(a)-/d(a)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>3PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j(a)-/∅</td>
<td>r(a)-/d(a)-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABAZA (textual examples)
(3) a. h-bzása-d
1PL.ABS-live(AOR)-DCL
‘We lived.’

b. awáʔa ḥə-ca-da-ɾ-ça-χ-nás
there 1PL.ABS-LOC-3PL.ERG-CAUS-lie-RE-PURP
‘so that they bury us there’

c. á-sabaj-kʷə-g’əj bzəj ḥa-ʃ-b-ʃj-t
DEF-child-PL-ADD good 3PL.ABS-1PL.ERG-see-PRS-DCL
‘We love children.’
Circassian languages also manifest ergativity in their case systems comprising the Absolute (-r, marks intransitive S (4a) and transitive P (4b)) and the Oblique (-m with allomorphs, marks transitive A (4b) and all types of indirect objects (4b)).

KUBAN KABARDIAN (elicited)
(4) a. ṣale-r  me-ž’ej
   boy-ABS  DYN-sleep
   ‘The boy is sleeping.’

b. ṣale-m  pšaše-m  tɔwɔla-r  ja-r-jə-t-a
   boy-OBL  girl-OBL  book-ABS  3SG.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-give-PST
   ‘The boy gave the book to the girl.’

Both branches also have polyfunctional Instrumental cases marking a variety of non-cross-referenced elements (see Serdobolskaya 2011 on West Circassian):

ABAZA (textual example)
(5) taba = daw-kʷa-la  ja-h-róɔə-n
   pan = big-PL-INS  3SG.N.ABS-1PL.ERG-fry-PST.DCL
   ‘We fried it in big pans.’

TEMRIGOY WEST CIRCASSIAN (textual example)
(6) ja-taŋɛ̆-ja  ja-meʔʷ-ja  taŋən-re  doše-re-čɛ xe-ke-x
   POSS-helmet-ADD  POSS-shield-ADD  silver-COORD  gold-COORD-INS  paint-RES-PL
   ‘Both his helmet and shield were decorated with gold and silver.’

➢ The normal way of backgrounding the agent of the event is by means of a generic or non-referential 3rd person plural:

BZHEDUGH WEST CIRCASSIAN (elicited)
(7) pʰš’mafe q-əʔʷa-ʁ t-jə-wəne svjet-er  zere-x-a-ke-na-ke-r
   Pshimafe  DIR-3SG.ERG-say-PST  1PL.IO-POSS-house  light-ABS  REL.FCT-LOC-3PL.ERG-be.lit-PST-ABS
   ‘Pshimafe said that light was turned on in our house (lit. that they turned on).’

ABAZA (textual example)
(8) osmán  d-an-ps-g’əj  jará  awáʔa  dɔ-ča-r-čax-t
   Osman  3SG.H.ABS-REL.TEMP-die-ADD  he  there  3SG.H.ABS-LOC-3PL.ERG-bury(AOR)-DCL
   ‘When Osman died, he was also buried there (lit. they buried him there).’

➢ A complex tense-aspect system with a morphological distinction between static and dynamic verbs (most evident in Abkhaz-Abaza), and perfective and imperfective past tenses. See Kljagina 2018 for a recent comprehensive overview.

Table 3. Abaza core tense system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Static</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>-p ~ b</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>g’-...-m</td>
<td>g’-...-mə-ʃ-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>-əj-ʃ</td>
<td>-t ~ -d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>g’-...-wa-m</td>
<td>g’-...-m-ʃ-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Circassian core tense systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.Circassian</td>
<td>unmarked ~ -ne ~ -ʃ (word-finally)</td>
<td>-(ʃ)’təne</td>
<td>-(ʃ)’t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuban</td>
<td>dynamic prefix</td>
<td>-a ~ -ne (stem-internally)</td>
<td>-te ~ -t (word-finally)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The NWC resultatives

In both Circassian and Abaza resultatives are static predicates derived from dynamic verbs and lacking the ergative agent prefix. In Circassian, resultatives are furnished with the perfective past suffix (9b), in Abaza they do not have specific markers at all (10b).

BZHEDUGH (elicited)
(9) a. te psənč’-ew l-er d-neżə-ne
   we quick-ADV meat-ABS 1PL.ERG-CAUS-roast-PST
   ‘We quickly roasted the meat.’

b. l-er neżə-ne
   meat-ABS CAUS-roast-RES
   ‘The meat is roasted.’

ABAZA (elicited)
(10) a. a-phʷə́spa á-š j-ʕa-l-ṭə́-d
    DEF-girl DEF-door 3 SG.N.ABS-DIR-3SG.F.ERG-open(AOR)-DCL
    ‘The girl opened the door.’

b. á-š j-ṭə-b
    DEF-door 3 SG.N.ABS-open(RES)-NPST.DCL
    ‘The door is opened.’

In Circassian, resultatives can be formed from intransitive verbs, in which case they are not formally differentiated from the perfective past (Preterite) (11). In Abaza, only transitive verbs form resultatives. Syntactically, resultatives behave like adjectives, i.e. occur as incorporated postnominal modifiers in NPs (11b), or as stative predicates (9b, 10b).

KUBAN (elicited)
(11) a. λə-xe-r vino je-f-a-xe
    man-PL-ABS wine DAT-drink-PST-PL
    ‘The men drank wine.’

b. cəxʷ=je-f-a=dəde qʷ-e-ḳʷ-a
    man=DAT-drink-RES=very DIR-go-PST
    ‘A very drunk man came.’

NB Due to the lack of dedicated morphology, it is virtually impossible to automatically extract resultatives from any kind of corpora, therefore most of the examples in the following are elicited.

In the Circassian resultatives, the Preterite suffix does not have past time reference:
– resultatives denote situations simultaneous to the speech time (12):

BZHEDUGH (elicited)
(12) pče-r ʔʷə-xə-ʁ
    door-ABS LOC-open-RES
    ‘The door is open (now).’

– for non-present reference, resultative predicates take regular tense markers (13)–(14):

BZHEDUGH (elicited)
(13) sa-qə-z-e-kʷe-m pče ʔʷə-xə-ʁə-ne
    1SG.ABS-DIR-REL.TEMP-DYN-go-OBL door LOC-open-RES-PST
    ‘When I came, the door was opened.’

KUBAN (elicited)
(14) wə-qə-ʂə-kʷesə-č’e bə’e-r ʔʷə-xə-ʁə-ne
    2SG.ABS-DIR-REL.TEMP-go-RE-INS door-ABS LOC-open-RES-FUT
    ‘When you come, the door will be opened.’
Resultative predicates may attach aspectual and modal affixes, which in Circassian come after the Preterite suffix (15), (16a), thus showing it to be a part of the derived stem, in contrast to the regular perfective past (16b).

**BZHEDUGH (elicited): refactive**

(15) \( \text{pće-} \text{r}_n\text{-xə-} \text{be-} \text{ʔʷə-xə-} \text{ʁe-} \text{ʔe-} \text{pʰ} \)

\( \text{door-ABS} \ \text{LOC-open-PST-RE-NEG} \)

‘The door is no longer opened.’

**KUBAN (elicited): habilitive**

(16) a. \( \text{ş'eš-} \text{ê'e-} \text{bže-r}_n\text{-xə-} \text{ʁe-} \text{e-} \text{fə-ne} \)

\( \text{night-INS} \ \text{door-ABS} \ \text{LOC-open-RES-HBL-FUT} \)

‘The door can stay opened at night.’

b. \( \text{ṣale-m} \text{bže-r}_n\text{-xə-} \text{ʁe-fə} / \text{ʔw-jə-xə-} \text{ʁe-fə} \)

\( \text{boy-} \text{ERG} \ \text{door-ABS} \ \text{LOC-3SG.ERG-open-HBL-PST} / \text{*-PST-HBL} \)

‘The boy managed to open the door.’

4. From resultative to passive I: via direct extension

Since a canonical resultative denotes a state, it suppresses the agentive and dynamic components of the basic situation, which is manifested by the incompatibility of the resultative with expressions whose interpretation depends on such components. This distinguishes the resultative from the (actional) passive, cf. English examples in (17):

**ENGLISH**

(17) a. *The door has been closed quickly / on purpose.* (passive)

b. *The door is closed (*quickly / on purpose).* (resultative)

However, the native speakers of Bzhedugh, Kuban and Abaza allow the resultative to combine with a variety of expressions referring to the dynamic phases of the situation:

**Table 5. Adverbial modification of resultatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Bzhedugh</th>
<th>Kuban</th>
<th>Abaza</th>
<th>Temirgoy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'last year'</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (18)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in X time</td>
<td>yes (19)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'quickly'</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (20)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instrument</td>
<td>yes (21)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>yes (22)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes (23)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agent-oriented</td>
<td>yes (24)</td>
<td>no (25)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demoted agent</td>
<td>yes (26)</td>
<td>no (28)</td>
<td>yes (27)</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABAZA (elicited)**

(18) \( \text{arūj} \ \text{sə́ra} \ \text{cəpχ}_x \ \text{ja-x}^\text{ná-b} \)

\( \text{DEM} \ \text{cupboard} \ \text{last.year} \ \text{3SG.N.ABS-1PL.ERG-buy(RES)-DCL} \)

‘This cupboard was (lit. is) bought last year.’

**BZHEDUGH (elicited)**

(19) \( \text{pis'm-e} \ \text{minut} = \text{pšək}^\text{wət} \text{fə-} \text{ʔe-} \text{txə-} \text{ʁa-} \text{ʁe} \)

\( \text{letter-ABS} \ \text{minute=fifteen-INS} \ \text{write-RES-PST} \)

‘The letter was written in fifteen minutes.’

**KUBAN (elicited)**

(20) \( \text{pis'm-o} \ \text{psaŋč-əw} \ \text{tx-a} \)

\( \text{letter-ABS} \ \text{quick-ADV} \ \text{write-RES} \)

‘The letter was (lit. is) written quickly.’
The door was opened by means of this key.

This book was written for the sake of money.

This book was written by a famous writer.

The keys have been (lit. are) found by some guy.

Our house was built by our father.

This book was written (lit. they had written) in order to get a lot of money.

Someone (lit. they) secretly wrote swearwords on the blackboard.
Abaza (elicited)

(31) a-tʃə́ r-bla-t/*bla-p
  DEF-house 3PL.ERG-burn(AOR)-DCL/*burn(RES)-NPST.DCL
  a-straxɔ́fka ʃa-ró-r-t-ra ą-qaz-la
  DEF-insurance DIR-3PL.IO-3PL.ERG-give-MSD 3SG.N.IO-sake-INS

‘The house has been burnt (lit. they burnt the house) in order to collect insurance.’

5. From resultative to passive II: via inceptive in Abaza

In addition to the passive-like uses of the plain resultative not always accepted by the native speakers, Abaza features a construction for which the diagnostic contexts listed above are accepted more unanimously, viz. the inceptive derived from the resultative by the suffix -χa and yielding a “secondary” dynamic predicate still lacking the agent prefix:

ABAZA (elicited)

(32) a. a-š arkə́-b
  DEF-door close(RES)-NPST.DCL
  ‘The door is closed.’

b. a-š ark-χá-d
  DEF-door close(RES)-INC(AOR)-DCL
  ‘The door became closed.’

This suffix is used to derive dynamic verbs from nominals (Tabulova 1976: 104–105):

(33) awát zəmʕʷá j-ʃ’arda.ĉa-χá-ṭ
  DEM.PL all 3 PL.ABS-too.many-INC-DCL
  ‘They became too numerous.’ (textual example)

My consultants, regardless of whether they accept the passive-like uses of the plain resultative, tend to allow the inceptive in contexts referring to the dynamic aspects of the situation (34)–(35), including the reference to the agent (36)–(37):

ABAZA (elicited)

(34) a-həjsáp sahat=bža-ḳ-la j-č’pa-χá-d/%j-č’pá-b
  DEF-problem hour=half-ADNUM-INS 3SG.N.ABS-do(RES)-INC(AOR)-DCL/%3SG.N.ABS-do(RES)-NPST.DCL
  ‘The problem was solved in half an hour.’

(35) a-saɮám.ʃʔa lasə́-ta j-ʕʷ-χa-d/*j-ʕʷə-b
  DEF-letter quick-ADV 3SG.N.ABS-write(RES)-INC(AOR)-DCL/*3SG.N.ABS-write(RES)-NPST.DCL
  ‘The letter was written quickly.’

(36) á-maĉa-kʷa a-sabə́j-kʷa-la j-ʒʒə-χá-d/%j-ʒʒə-b
  DEF-dish-PL DEF-child-PL-INS 3PL.ABS-wash(RES)-INC(AOR)-DCL/%3PL.ABS-wash(RES)-NPST.DCL
  ‘The dishes were washed by the children.’

(37) arőj a-tʃə́ z-la-č’pa-χá-da?
  DEF-house REL.IO-INS-do(RES)-INC(AOR)-QH
  ‘Who built this house? (lit. by whom was this house built?)’

6. Discussion

The two paths of development from the objective resultative (“statal passive”) to actional passive outlined above for NWC, i.e. the extension of the resultative proper and the “dynamicization” of the resultative by an inceptive operator, find immediate parallels in European languages such as German, Baltic and Slavic (see Nedjalkov 1988, 2017, Wiemer 2004, Wiemer & Giger 2005).
Thus, in Russian and Lithuanian constructions with the auxiliary ‘be’ and the passive past participle are systematically ambiguous between resultative and actional passive (see e.g. Knjazev 1988 on Russian, Gēniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988 on Lithuanian):

**Russian**

(38) a. **Dverʹ by-l-a otkry-t-a dolg-o.**
   door(NOM.SG) be-PST-F.SG open-PST.PP-F.SG long-ADV
   ‘The door was open for a long time.’

b. **Dverʹ by-l-a otkry-t-a bystr-o.**
   door(NOM.SG) be-PST-F.SG open-PST.PP-F.SG fast-ADV
   ‘The door was opened quickly.’

**Lithuanian** (Gēniušienė & Nedjalkov 1988: 373, glossing added)

(39) **Dur-ys buv-o už.rakin-t-os, bet aš ne-žin-au,**
   door-NOM.PL be-PST.3 lock-PST.PP-NOM.PL.F but 1SG.NOM NEG-know.PRS-1SG
   when 3-NOM.PL.F get-PST.3 lock-PST.PP-NOM.PL.F
   ‘The door was locked (resultative), but I don’t know when it got locked (passive).’

By contrast, in Polish, Latvian and German the distinction between resultative and actional passive is formally marked by the choice of the stative vs. inceptive auxiliary:

**German** (Nedjalkov 1988: 424)

(40) a. **Gestern noch war dort ein Schild angebracht.**
   ‘Yesterday, a signboard was attached there still.’

b. **Gestern noch wurde dort ein Schild angebracht.**
   ‘Yesterday yet someone attached a signboard there.’

**Latvian** (elicited, Arkadiev & Wiemer, forthcoming, ex. (21))

(41) **Durv-is bij-a aiz.slēg-t-as, bet es ne-zin-u,**
   door-NOM.PL be-PST.3 lock-PST.PP-NOM.PL.F but 1SG.NOM NEG-know.PRS-1SG
   when DEM-NOM.PL.F get-PST.3 lock-PST.PP-NOM.PL.F
   ‘The door was locked, but I don’t know when it got locked.’

**Polish** (elicited, courtesy of Andrzej Żak)

(42) **Okn-o jest wy.bi-t-e, ale nie wie-m,**
   window-NOM.SG be.PRS.3 break-PST.PP-N.SG but NEG know-PRS.1SG
   when become-PST-N.SG break-PST.PP-N.SG
   ‘The window is broken, but I don’t know when it was broken.’

Note that in contexts like this Abaza shows a fully parallel distinction between the resultative and the inceptive:

**Abaza** (elicited)

(43) **a-š ṭa-b, awásá sará j-g'į-sá-z-dor-g-m**
   DEF-door open(RES)-NPST.DCL but 1SG 3SG.N.ABS-NEG.EMP-1SG.IO-POT-know-NEG
   3SG.N.ABS-REL.TEMP-open(RES)-INC(AOR)
   ‘The door is open, but I don’t know when it was opened.’

Unfortunately, I have no examples like (43) for the Circassian varieties, though I suspect that the use of the resultative with reference to the event here would not be acceptable.

Note, however, that at least in German, the resultative with the ‘be’-auxiliary can combine with a variety of event-related modifiers including agent phrases (see Nedjalkov 2017: 157–170, 177–236; Gehrke 2012):
Nach anderthalb Monaten war das erste Kapitel wieder neu geschrieben.


'In one and a half months the first chapter was written anew.'

'This [painting] has been painted by a painter.'

However, it does not seem that the constraints on adverbial modification of the German statal passive proposed by Gehrke (2012) work for the Circassian and Abaza resultatives, though this still remains to be investigated in greater detail.

The extension of the NWC resultative into the passive domain might have to do with the influence from Russian. However, the elicited data available so far is fairly tentative and shows a high degree of inter-speaker variation, and thus should ideally be supplemented by naturalistic data, e.g. from the written registers of standard languages, which may exhibit greater influence from (formal) Russian than spoken vernaculars. However, as said above, the nature of the formal marking of the constructions in question makes their corpus investigation extremely difficult.

Perhaps most notably, this material offers a window into the initial stages of the transition between resultative proper and passive, as well as into the microvariation in this domain, finding interesting parallels in the better-known languages. It also shows the role of optional modifiers in this change, which is manifested mainly in semantics rather than in morphosyntax.

Abbreviations
ABS — absolutive; ADD — additive; ADNUM — adnumeral; ADV — adverbial; AOR — aorist; CAUS — causative; CNV — converb; COORD — coordinator; DAT — dative preverb; DCL — declarative; DEF — definite; DEM — demonstrative; DIR — directional preverb; DYN — dynamic; EMP — emphatic; ERG — ergative; F — feminine; FCT — factive; FUT — future; H — human; HBL — habilitive; INC — inceptive; INDF — indefinite; INS — instrumental; IO — indirect object; IPF — imperfective; LOC — locative; MSD — masdar; N — neuter/non-human; NEG — negation; NOM — nominative; NPST — nonpast; OBL — oblique; PL — plural; POSS — possessive; POT — potential; PP — passive participle; PRS — present; PST — past; PURP — purposive; QH — question with human reference; RE — refactive; REC — reciprocal; REL — relativization; RES — resultative; SG — singular; TEMP — temporal.
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