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1. Introduction

This paper presents a preliminary description of the particle $g^w$ in Mehweb, a language of the Dargwa branch of the East Caucasian family.\(^3\) The following examples illustrate the use of this marker in a verbal clause (1) and in an equative clause (2):

\[(1) \quad \text{ʔudidi-li} \quad \text{harkʷ-} \quad \text{ar-χ-} \quad \text{uwe} \quad g^w\]
under.EL-ATR river-ERG PV-bring.IPFV-CVB.IPFV ASRT

‘The river carries away the lower one!’
(corpus, Molla Rasbaddin goes to the market place: 1.11)

\[(2) \quad \text{hel} \quad \text{čudu} \quad g^w \quad \text{di-la}\]
this chudu ASRT LOBL-GEN

‘This pie is mine.’

The function of $g^w$ is not obvious. Etymologically, this particle is likely to originate from the imperative of the verb ‘see’. Magometov (1982: 128) translated $g^w$ by the Russian particles ved’ and že, whose semantics is by no means clear. The speakers often suggest that $g^w$ is frequent in disputes and emphasizes a claim (“подчёркивает утверждение”). Given this, I will tentatively label it an assertive marker. Further research is needed for an exhaustive description of the rules that govern its use. What I will argue are the following two specific points:

(i) $g^w$ is a copula,
(ii) the position of $g^w$ does not necessarily depend on the position of the predicate or of the focus.

The latter makes $g^w$ look quite peculiar against the background of what we know about copulas in many East Caucasian languages and in Dargwa languages in particular.

The issue of copula-ness is addressed in Section 2. In Section 3, I discuss the use of the marker in verbal predications and describe syntactic restrictions on its position. Section 4 describes the use of $g^w$ in non-verbal predications. The last section presents conclusions.

2. Assertive marker as a copula

Many East Caucasian languages have elements that are often described as copulas or predicative markers, i.e. as markers which are normally added to some lexical material in order to form complete predications (finite, unless these copulas themselves take a subordinate form).\(^4\) Although their individual morphological and syntactic properties may vary, these elements are clearly distinguishable from verbs. There are typically several predicative markers in a single language: for example, many languages have dedicated predicative markers used in questions in addition to those used in simple declaratives.

\(^3\) The general sources on the grammar of Mehweb include Magometov 1982 and Khajdakov 1985. This paper is based on the sentences elicited by the author during the HSE field trip in May 2016 and, to a smaller extent, on the corpus of Mehweb texts recorded by the members of the HSE Mehweb project. Most elicited examples have been checked with no less than two speakers. Note that the principles of glossing generally follow the rules accepted for the HSE Mehweb project, which is why the morphological analysis proposed here may differ from the analysis followed by the author in other papers.

\(^4\) Some important studies addressing the behaviour of predicative markers in East Caucasian (especially with respect to their interaction with focus) include Harris (2000; 2002) on Udi, Kazenin (2002) on Lak, Sumbatova (2011) and Sumbatova and Lander (2014) on Tanti Dargwa. Forker (2013) discusses question particles which typically represent a kind of predicative markers in these languages. Testelec (1998), Kalinina and Sumbatova (2007) and Belyaev and Forker (2016) describe the influence of the position of some predicative markers on the overall clause structure.
Predicative markers appear both in verbal and non-verbal predications. Below I will illustrate their use with a few examples from Udi, a language belonging to the Lezgic branch of the East Caucasian family, thus being only distantly related to Mehweb.5

Predicative markers in Udi are highly grammaticalized and now commonly described as clitics (Harris 2000, 2002). They include personal markers which usually show agreement with the subject (either the intransitive subject or the transitive agent) and the question marker, which only appears in the interrogative contexts and is not discussed here (but see Harris 1992). The following examples illustrate the use of the 1st person plural personal marker ꞊jan in a non-verbal predication (3) and in verbal predications (4)-(5):6

(3) jan=al t.e χalg-aun mand-i χalg=jan
    we=ADD that nation-ABL remain-AOR(PTCP) nation=1PL
    ‘We are the nation that continue (lit. remain from) that nation.’

(4) me äš-urχo lap mat mand-e=jan
    this affair-PL(DAT) very surprised remain-PERF=1PL
    ‘We really remained surprised at these facts.’

(5) pajiz-e dirij-a-jan kaš-e
    autumn-DAT vegetable.garden-DAT=1PL dig-LV:PRS
    ‘In autumn, we dig in the vegetable garden.’

Note that predicative markers may attach not only to the lexical predicate (4) but also to the focused element (5). This can be viewed as a kind of competition for acquiring head properties between the semantic head (the predicate) and the most relevant element of the clause (i.e. focus).7

In Dargwa languages, predicative markers are less grammaticalized than in Udi. In particular, they show some properties of autonomous words. Many such markers readily constitute autonomous expressions (such as ‘yes’ or ‘no’). Some of them may take attributive and adverbial morphology and hence are akin to content words.

The primary Mehweb predicative marker is the copula le-CL, with a “class” (i.e. gender) marker controlled by the absolutive argument. Its use in non-verbal predications is shown in (6)-(7), while its use in verbal predications is illustrated in (8)-(9).

(6) (corpus, A blind judge: 1.11)
    sača ha-la ahin, di-la le-b
    calf you.sg.OBL-GEN COP.NEG I.OBL-GEN COP-N
    ‘The calf is not yours, (it) is mine.’

(7) (corpus, The Story of Akula Ali, 1.21)
    arci-ze-b le-b-re ha-la daʰ-la surat
    money-INTER-N(ESS) COP-N-PST you.sg.OBL-GEN face-GEN picture
    ‘On the coin (lit., money), there was a picture of your face.’

---

5 Here I omit some important details of the Udi system, including the existence of a series of dative clitics and a more verb-like copula-like element used in existential, possessive, and identificational clauses, which also takes a predicative marker.
6 The Udi examples are from the corpus of text in the Nizh dialect of Udi collected by Dmitry Ganenkov, Timur Maisak and the author.
7 See Lander 2009 for some discussion of competition between semantically obligatory elements and the most relevant elements for the head properties.
Like in Udi, the Mehweb predicative marker in verbal clauses may follow either the verb or the focused constituent. However, unlike in Udi, the Mehweb copula requires that a verb be in a non-finite form (a participle, the neutral converb, or the infinitive), while finite verb forms do not combine with the predicative marker. In fact, combinations of a copula and a lexical verb look like periphrastic forms, although the issue of monoclausality of these constructions may be tricky.\(^8\)

Turning to the assertive marker \(g'\alpha\), it can be shown that it has the distribution of a copula. There are two pieces of evidence for this. First, similarly to \(le-\mathbf{CL}\), the assertive marker cannot appear in clauses that contain finite verb forms (10).

\[\text{(10)}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & do'\text{-ni} & \text{ar-b-ik-ib} & \quad (\ast g'\alpha) \\
& \text{snow} & \text{PV-N-fall.PFV-PST} & \text{ASRT} \\
& \text{‘The snow fell.’} \\
\text{b. } & mator & b-u\text{-z-an} & \quad (\ast g'\alpha). \\
& \text{engine} & \text{N-work.PFV-PRS} & \text{ASRT} \\
& \text{‘The engine is working.’}
\end{align*}\]

Second, the assertive marker cannot combine with a copula (11a-b), unless the latter does not appear in a non-finite form, as in (11c). If we assume that \(g'\alpha\) is a copula, this is explained: a clause cannot contain two copulas.

\[\text{(11)}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & dag & \text{it} & \text{derbenti-ze-la} & \quad w-ak'-'i-le & \quad \text{le-w} & (\ast g'\alpha). \\
& \text{yesterday} & \text{that} & \text{Derbent-INTER-EL} & \text{m-come.PFV-PST-CVB} & \text{COP-M} & \text{ASRT} \\
\text{b. } & dag & \text{it} & \text{derbenti-ze-la} & \quad w-ak'-'i-le & \quad g'\alpha & (\ast \text{le-w}) \\
& \text{yesterday} & \text{that} & \text{Derbent-INTER-EL} & \text{M-come.PFV-PST-CVB} & \text{ASRT} & \text{COP-M} \\
\text{c. } & dag & \text{it} & \text{derbenti-ze-la} & \quad w-ak'-'i-le & \quad \text{le-w-le} & \quad g'\alpha \\
& \text{yesterday} & \text{that} & \text{Derbent-INTER-EL} & \text{M-come.PFV-PST-CVB} & \text{COP-M-CVB} & \text{ASRT} \\
& \text{‘Yesterday he came from Derbent.’}
\end{align*}\]

It is worth mentioning, however, that \(g'\alpha\) differs from \(le-\mathbf{CL}\) in that it does not take any morphology.

**3. Verbal predications**

Just like the copula \(le-\mathbf{CL}\), the assertive marker need not follow the verb but can appear after focused elements:

\[\text{(12)}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & nu'\text{-a-jni} & \quad g'\alpha & \quad kulubi-s & \quad \text{remont} & \quad \text{b-aq'-'i-le} \\
& \text{we-ERG} & \text{ASRT} & \text{club-DAT} & \text{renovation} & \text{N-do.PFV-PST-CVB} \\
& \text{‘It was us who made the renovation for the club.’}
\end{align*}\]

\(^8\) See Sumbatova and Lander 2014 for a detailed discussion of this issue in Tanti Dargwa, another Dargwa variety.
b. *nuša-j-ni kulub-i-s gʷa remont b-aq'-i-le
   we-OBL-ERG club-OBL-DAT ASRT renovation N-do.PF-PST-CVB
   ‘It was the club for which we made the renovation.’

I will distinguish between the wide scope use of *gʷa, where it has a scope over the whole sentence or over the predicate and follows this predicate, and the narrow scope use of *gʷa, where it should follow exactly the focused phrase. In verbal clauses, the wide scope *gʷa is found with the neutral converb (13) and with the infinitive (14)-(15) but not with the participle (cf. the infelicitous (16) with (19) below):

(13) (corpus, Widow)
qʷe b-iq'-uwe gʷa, hu ha-k-i-le ha-w?-iša
vow N-do.IPV-CVB.IPV ASRT you.sg NEG-bring.PFV-PST-CVB NEG-M.be-FUT.1/2
‘I swear I will take you as a wife.’

(14) (corpus, Widow)
ca dus-li qul-šu w-at-ul-le gʷa
one year-ERG house.LOC-M(ESS) M-put.IPV-PTCP-ADVZ M.work.IPV-INF ASRT
‘The one who will lose will work as a servant for the one who will win, for one year.’

(15) had hete hunt'a-l qul-šu w'iš-'es gʷa
you.sg.DAT there(LAT) red-ATR house-PL-AD(LAT) M.go.IPV-INF ASRT
‘You should go there, to the red houses.’

(16) *musa-ni poˤroˤm b-oˤrʔ-aq-ib-i gʷa
Musa-ERG glass N-break.PFV-CAUS-ATR ASRT
‘Musa broke the glass.’

If the assertive marker follows a constituent other than the predicate, the choice of the verb form is less restricted. In particular, in this construction not only the converbal form (17) and the infinitive (18) but also the participial form (19) are allowed:

(17) mahmudi-ni gʷa b-ilt'-uwe heš surat
Mahmud-ERG ASRT N-take.out.IPV-CVB.IPV that picture
‘It was Mahmud who is drawing that picture.’

(18) rasuj-ni gʷa nu k-es
Rasul.OBL-ERG ASRT I bring.PFV-INF
‘It is Rasul who will bring me here.’

(19) musa-ni gʷa poˤroˤm b-oˤrʔ-aq-ib-i
Musa-ERG ASRT glass N-break.PFV-CAUS-ATR
‘It was Musa who broke the glass.’

In the examples (17)-(19) we observe the assertive copula following focused NPs. (20)-(22) demonstrate that *gʷa may follow other kinds of constituents, such as adverbs and embedded clauses:

---

9 Presumably, the assertive marker should combine with the participle where it functions as the head of the nominal predicate in a nominal clause. However, I lack relevant examples.
assertive marker cannot immediately follow postpositional objects; rather, it should occur after the
postpositional phrase.

(23) a. *heč’ dubur-li-če gʷa aqu-r dirigʷ xa? that mountain-OBL-SUP(LAT) ASRT up-NPL(ESS) cloud appear
d-uḥ-ub-le NPL-become.PVF-AOR-CVB
b. heč’ dubur-li-če aqu-r gʷa dirigʷ xa? that mountain-OBL-SUPER over-NPL(ESS) ASRT cloud appear
d-uḥ-ub-le NPL-become.PVF-AOR-CVB ‘It is over that mountain that the cloud appeared.’

Further, the assertive marker cannot be embedded in an NP. In particular, it cannot occur immediately after an adjectival attribute (24), an attributive demonstrative (25) and a quantifier (26) when they precede the head noun:

(24) a. *hunt’a-l gʷa burqā-li-če-r karr-ube red-ATR ASRT roof-OBL-SUPER-NPL(ESS) stone-PL
b. hunt’a-l burqā-li-če-r gʷa karr-ube red-ATR roof-OBL-SUPER-NPL(ESS) ASRT stone-PL ‘There are stones on the RED roof.’

(25) a. *heš gʷa wʷet’i-če-r d-agil inc-be d-uṛh-uwe that ASRT tree-SUPER-NPL(ESS) NPL-much apple-PL NPL-become.IPVF-CVB.IPVF
b. heš wʷet’i-če-r gʷa d-agil inc-be d-uṛh-uwe that tree-OBL-SUPER-NPL(ESS) ASRT NPL-much apple-PL NPL-become.IPVF-CVB.IPVF ‘There are many apples growing on THAT tree.’

(26) a. *har-il gʷa urši-li-s midal g-i-le each-ATR ASRT boy-OBL-DAT medal give.PVF-AOR-CVB
b. har-il urši-li-s gʷa midal g-i-le each-ATR boy-OBL-DAT ASRT medal give.PVF-AOR-CVB ‘He gave a medal to EACH boy.’

I hypothesize that these restrictions hold for the neutral copula as well, but I lack the necessary data.
One natural way to focus an attribute is to place the assertive copula after the whole NP. Alternatively, one can split the description of a participant into two NPs with a semantic attribute being nominalized and taking its own case marker. Since the semantic attribute itself constitutes a complete NP in this construction, it becomes possible to place \( g^a \) immediately after it (27). Notably, for absolutive NPs this may result in the illusion of the embedment of the assertive marker in an NP (28), but this is likely to be a consequence of the fact that absolutive NPs do not receive overt case marking, so the two adjoined absolutive NPs may look as a single phrase.

(27) \( \text{hunt'a-j-će-r} \quad g^a \quad \text{burj'a-li-će-r} \quad \text{sars-ube} \)
\begin{align*}
\text{red-OBL-SUPER-NPL(ESS) ASRT roof-OBL-SUPER-NPL(ESS) stone-PL}
\end{align*}

‘There are stones on the RED roof.’

(Lit., ‘There are stones on the red one, on the roof.’)

(28) \( b-\text{urq'-il} \quad g^a \quad \text{bartbisu} \quad \text{izi-ni} \quad \text{ha-s':i-le} \)
\begin{align*}
\text{N-old-ATR ASRT carpet that-ERG NEG-take.PFV-AOR-CVB}
\end{align*}

‘He did not buy the OLD carpet.’

Further, \( g^a \) cannot occur within syntactic islands. For example, it cannot be embedded in a coordination construction (29) or in a converbal clause (30).

(29) \( *r\text{asuj-ni=}\text{ra} \quad g^a \quad \text{nu-ni=}\text{ra} \quad \text{past'an} \quad b-\text{er-u-le} \)
\begin{align*}
\text{Rasul.OBL-ERG=ADD ASRT I-ERG=ADD vegetable.garden N-dig.PFV-AOR-CVB}
\end{align*}

‘RASUL and I digged the vegetable garden.’

(30) a. \( *b-\text{urq'-il} \quad \text{bartbisu} \quad g^a \quad b-ic-i-le, \)
\begin{align*}
\text{N-old-ATR carpet ASRT N-sell.PFV-AOR-CVB}
\end{align*}

b. \( b-\text{urq'-il} \quad \text{bartbisu} \quad b-ic-i-le \quad g^a, \)
\begin{align*}
\text{N-old-ATR carpet N-sell.PFV-PST-CVB ASRT}
\end{align*}

‘After selling THE OLD CARPET, he got much money.’

Unlike most Dargwa varieties, Mehweb has developed a biabsolutive construction\(^ {11} \). In this construction, a transitive verb appears as a converb and requires a copula but the actor appears in the absolutive, same as the undergoer. This construction is possible with \( g^a \) (31a-b), yet the assertive copula cannot occur between the P-argument and the converb (31c).\(^ {12} \) This contrasts the biabsolutive construction with a simple combination of the converb with a copula and suggests that this pattern contains an embedded converbal clause which is an island, at least with respect to \( g^a \):

(31) a. \( \text{musa} \quad \text{kaš} \quad d-\text{uk-uwe} \quad g^a \)
\begin{align*}
\text{Musa kasha NPL-eat.PFV-CVB.PFV ASRT}
\end{align*}

‘Musa is eating kasha.’

\(^{11} \) Biabsolutive (binominative) constructions are quite widespread in the East Caucasian family, but are not typical for the Dargwa branch, where they have been previously only reported for Itsari Dargwa (Sumbatova and Mutalov 2003). See Forker (2012) and Gagliardi et al. (2014) for surveys of some properties of this kind of constructions as well as for a discussion of their diversity and possible analyzes.

\(^{12} \) The same set of facts is observed for the simple copula \( le-\text{CL} \).
b. musa gʷa kaš d-uk-uwe
   Musa ASRT kasha NPL-eat.IPFV-CVB.IPFV
   ‘It is Musa who is eating kasha.’

c. *musa kaš gʷa d-uk-uwe
   Musa kasha ASRT NPL-eat.IPFV-CVB.IPFV
   Intended ‘It is kasha that Musa is eating.’

With clausal complements, the situation is less obvious: some (but by no means all) speakers allow positioning gʷa within a clausal complement (32)-(33).

(32) %it kaltuška gʷa d-elʔ-eš d-aʔ-i-le
    that potato ASRT NPL-seed.IPFV-INF NPL-start.PFV-PST-CVB
    ‘She started to plant potatoes.’

(33) %heš kʷiha gʷa b-eqʷ-es ahmadi-ni di-ze
    that ram ASRT N-cut. PFV-INF Ahmad-ERG LOBL-INTER(LAT)
    hari b-aqʿ-i-le
    request N-do.PFV-AOR-CVB
    ‘Ahmed asked me to cut this ram.’

While the placement of gʷa after a constituent other than the predicate usually indicates the focus shift, even in this case it does not need to follow the constituents that are (likely to be) focused. Consider the following example:

(34) χadižati-ni=ra heš kung gʷa b-elec-u-we
    Khadizhat-ERG=ADD that book ASRT N-read.PFV-AOR-CVB
    ‘Even Khadizhat has read that book.’

In (34) one can hypothesize that the focused constituent is the ergative NP, since it is marked with the additive clitic meaning ‘even’, but the assertive copula follows the absolutive argument. These examples suggest that focus is possibly not the only factor which determines the position of gʷa. More generally, we can conclude that in verbal clauses the grammatical position of gʷa should be determined neither by the predicate nor by focus.

4. Non-verbal predications

Non-verbal predications include existential clauses and non-existential clauses with non-verbal predicates (nouns, adjectives, numerals, demonstratives, etc.). In Mehweb, the latter allow the absence of a copula while the former normally do not. The assertive copula may appear in both types.

(35)-(36) show examples of the use of gʷa in existential predications that assert the existence of entities or events described by an NP. Note that, in Mehweb, this type includes possessive predication (37).

---

13 An important exception is the use of NPs denoting events, which allow the absence of copula, as in (i):

(i) išbari meħʷe bеʁ today in.Mehweb-N(ESS) wedding
    ‘There is wedding in Mehweb today.’
There is a museum in Gunib!

‘There is wedding in Mehweb today!’

‘Patimat has a cow!’

The assertive copula may also be found in clauses emphasizing the existence of the already known entities (sometimes in combination with the converbal form of the copula; cf. (38)) or describing the location of the already known entities (39):

‘Mehweb does exist!’

‘Musa is in Gunib.’

(40)-(41) show examples of the use of gʷa in clearly non-existential predications.

The house which Rasul built is that one.

At least if the assertive marker follows the demonstrative, their combination may be embedded within the alleged subject phrase. In (42) the phrase haš  gʷa ‘that is’ is embedded within the relative clause construction ‘the house which Rasul built’.

The house that Rasul built is that one.’

Negative non-verbal predications in Mehweb contain a dedicated negative copula. If gʷa is needed, this copula appears in a converbal form:

‘He is not a teacher!’
For equative clauses, determining what is the predicate may be a complex issue because of the formal similarity between the subject and the nominal predicate. However, one can find indirect evidence for the predicate status of one of the noun phrases based on various semantic and syntactic tests. By using these tests, it is also possible to show that, like in verbal predications, here, too, the assertive marker does not have to immediately follow the syntactic predicate.

First, if a nominal phrase in an equative clause includes a reflexive bound by the other part of the clause, it is likely that it is a predicate and the reflexive is bound by the subject. Curiously, gʷa need not adjoin such a nominal predicate:

(44) šamil gʷa sune-s-al w-e?
Shamil ASRT SELF.OBL-DAT-EMPH M-boss
‘Shamil is a boss of himself.’

Second, in an equative clause, an expression with a true distributive quantifier arguably should not function as a predicate (Partee 1987; but see Arkadiev and Lander 2013 for counterevidence). Yet, gʷa is possible with the quantified NP:

(45) har insan gʷa sune-s-al uhna-w rasul hamzatow
every person ASRT SELF.OBL-DAT-EMPH M.inside-M(ESS) Rasul Gamaztov
‘Everyone is Rasul Gamaztov (a famous Daghestanian writer) deep inside.’

Finally, if an equative clause contains an adjunct, the assertive copula may follow this adjunct:

(46) anwar mehwe-ja ušk-je-w gʷa učitil
Anwar in.Mehweb-GEN school.OBL-IN-M(ESS) ASRT teacher
‘Anwar is a teacher at the Mehweb school.’

Thus, the assertive marker need not follow the predicate. At the same time, it is not obvious that gʷa always follows the focus. For instance, in the elicited dialog (47), gʷa is attached to the first part of the clause ‘Shamil is a singer’, while its focus is constituted by its second part. Also, in answers to content questions, gʷa is by default attached to the part of the utterance which does not contain new information, as in (48) and (49).

(47) šamil učitil. — ahin! šamil gʷa dalaj uk'-an-či!
Shamil teacher COP.NEG Shamil ASRT song M.say.IPFV-HAB-AG
‘Shamil is a teacher. — No! Shamil is a singer!’

(48) mehʷe-la χʷalajli či-ja? — mehʷe-la χʷalajli gʷa Israpil
in.Mehweb-GEN chief who-INTRG in.Mehweb-GEN chief ASRT Israpil
‘Who is the head of Mehweb? — The head of Mehweb is Israpil.’

(49) israpil i-ja? — israpil gʷa mehʷe-la χʷalajli
Israpil who-INTRG Israpil ASRT Mehweb-GEN chief
‘Who is Israpil? — Israpil is the head of Mehweb.’

Thus, we find that, in non-verbal predications as well as in verbal predications, the assertive copula does not necessarily follow the predicate and the focused element.
5. Conclusion

To sum up, the assertive marker *gʷa* has the distribution of a copula (though lacking non-finite forms which are available for the copula), but its position does not fit into the picture that is usually documented in East Caucasian languages in that it does not need to be linked to the predicate and the focus. At the same time, we observe some constraints on its distribution in complex constructions (in particular, its reluctance to occur in syntactic islands), which may be, however, subject to variation. I conclude that more research is needed both to approach the functions of *gʷa* and to understand the principles that govern its syntactic position.

Further, it seems that our assumed knowledge of the principles regarding other kinds of predicative markers is overestimated. Indeed, while the idea of focus-determined positions of copulas is important for East Caucasian, I am aware of no detailed corpus-based study of the position of predicative markers for any language of the family. Given the fact that during the last years the amount of corpora of East Caucasian languages has been increasing, one may hope that such studies will soon appear.

Moreover, as I emphasized in Section 2, predicative markers may differ in their behavior, both within a single language and cross-linguistically. For East Caucasian, we need a more elaborated intragenetic typology of predicative markers. The present paper is to be considered a contribution to this line of investigation.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>locutive agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablativ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>‘near’ (localization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD</td>
<td>additive particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVZ</td>
<td>adverbializer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>agent nominalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT</td>
<td>anterior converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASRT</td>
<td>assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR</td>
<td>attributivizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVB</td>
<td>general converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>elative (orientation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPH</td>
<td>emphatic (particle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>essive (orientation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine (agreement class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>feminine (additional agreement class, unmarried women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>‘in a substance’ or 'between' (localization)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTJ  interjection
INTRG  interrogative
IPF   imperfect
IPFV  imperfective (verb stem)
LAT   lative (orientation)
LOC   default localization
LV    light verb
M     masculine (agreement class)
N     neuter (agreement class)
NEG   negative
NPL   non-human plural (agreement class)
OBL   oblique (nominal stem)
PERF  perfect
PL    plural
PRS   present
PST   past
PTCP  participle
PV    preverb
SELF  reflexive/logophoric pronoun
SUPER ‘on’ (localization)
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