

## Reconstructing Proto-Syntax: The Case of West Caucasian.

V.A. Chirikba  
(Leiden University).<sup>1</sup>

The West Caucasian (WC), or Abkhazo-Adyghean languages, represent the western branch of the North Caucasian linguistic family<sup>2</sup> and are five in number: Abkhaz and Abaza (the Abkhazian subgroup), Adyghe and Kabardian (the Circassian subgroup), and Ubykh. Their traditional habitat is the Western Caucasus, where they are still spoken, with the exception of the now extinct Ubykh. Large numbers of WC speakers are to be found also in Turkey and in some Middle Eastern countries, to where their ancestors came after fleeing the Russian-Caucasian war in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The WC languages are notorious amongst phonologists for their large consonantal inventories (up to 80 phonemes in Ubykh) and minimally developed vocalism (two or three phonemic vowels); the salient features in morphology include a weakly developed nominal system (4 cases in Circassian, two in Ubykh, none in Abkhaz), a highly developed verbal system (the verbal form is capable of coding up to 5 arguments), extreme verbal prefixation (a dozen or so fixed prefixal slots), and the ergative/absolutive realised via the contrasting ordering of agreement markers.

As to the word order parameters, the modern WC languages are characterized, on the one hand, by a relatively free word order and, on the other hand, by the rigidly fixed order of the cross-referencing, prefixed agreement markers. The preferred or neutral word order in all WC languages is SOV, as exemplified by the phrase ‘The boy sees a book’:

(1)  
Sh Ad *čʲaLe-m*      *txəλ-er*      *ø-j-e-lexʷə*  
boy-ERG      book-ABS      it-he-DYN:PRES-see (Smeets 1984: 95).

(2)  
Ub *a-məzə-n*      *a-txəλ-ø*      *ø-(ə)-bje-n*  
ART-boy-ERG      ART-book-ABS      it-he-see-DYN:PRES (Dumézil 1931: 21).

(3)  
Abx *a-čʲikʷən*      *a-šʷqʷə*      *ø-jə-ba-wa-jtʷ*  
ART-boy      ART-book      it-he-see-DYN:PRES-FIN

The neutral SOV word order is preferred irrespective of the lexical-grammatical properties (*viz.* transitivity/intransitivity) of the main predicate. In contrast, the arrangement of agreement markers depends directly on the transitivity of the verb, determining either the absolutive or the ergative agreement. Circ and Ub express the absolutive/ergative alignment both by NP marking and verbal agreement, whilst Abx, which does not have nominal cases, employs only cross-referencing.

---

<sup>1</sup>I thank Prof. B.G. Hewitt and Dr. L. Kulikov for valuable comments and suggestions.

<sup>2</sup>The other branch is Nakh-Dagestanian or East-Caucasian.

The correlation between the order of main actants and the order of their verbal indices is demonstrated by the following scheme:

*Scheme 1.*

	Word order	vs.	Order of agreement markers
(a) Intransitive/Absolutive:	S – (IO) – V		S-(IO-)V
(b) Transitive/Ergative:	A – (IO –) O – V		O-(IO-)A-V

The absolutive agreement is characterized by the direct concord of agreement markers with their referents (called by Allen 1966: 155 ‘leapfrog concord’), whilst for the ergative agreement the order of the agreement markers is reversed (Allen’s ‘mirror concord’).

There is no doubt that this scheme, where the neutral word order follows a “subject-first” principle, reflects the situation typical for the late stage of the Proto-West Caucasian (i.e. Common West Caucasian) level. But what can be said of the earlier stages of WC morpho-syntax in the light of the theory of PWC’s analytical/isolating past?<sup>3</sup> It has been put forward by Yakovlev & Ašxamaf (1941: 23) that historically “the Adyghe predicate-verb represents in fact a whole sentence fused into one word. This fusion involved monosyllabic amorphous words/roots...”. The same idea was repeated by Yakovlev (2006: 152) in relation to the Abx verb-form, which “was originally a whole sentence, fused into one word – a predicate”. This is reminiscent of Givón’s (1971) famous aphorism about today’s morphology being yesterday’s syntax.

A number of authors, such as Abdokov (1981: 57, 83) and Kumaxov (1989: 339), have suggested that agreement markers, as well as other verbal prefixes, which form in their entirety an impressive edifice of the WC verbal complex, derive from originally independent words. They also point out that the relative order of prefixed actant markers can indicate the old word order within the PWC sentence. According to Abdokov (1981: 60), the line of evolution was as follows: when the WC languages lost inflection and the grammatical classes concord (in a similar way as happened, e.g. in the related EC Lezgi language), all syntactic relations (subject-object, etc.) had to be expressed analytically by separate lexemes, which later, having been carried along by the polysynthesis drive, were incorporated into the verbal form, while preserving the very same order they were assigned relatively to the verb when they were still autonomous units.

Indeed, even a quick look at PWC 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>d</sup> person personal pronouns and the corresponding agreement markers is sufficient to persuade one of their genetic interconnection:

---

<sup>3</sup>There is strong evidence in favour of the theory that the modern polysynthetic agglutinative structure of WC is the result of a radical evolution from an entirely different system, which was by its main parameters analytical or isolating. This latter system, in its turn, was the result of an evolution from a moderately agglutinative system of the EC type, cf. Chirikba (Forthcoming).

Personal pronouns	Agreement markers	
* <i>sa</i>	* <i>sə-</i>	‘I, me’
* <i>wa</i>	* <i>wə-</i>	‘thou’
* <i>śwa</i>	* <i>śwə-</i>	‘you’

It is obvious that agreement markers are historically nothing other than incorporated personal (and deictic – in the case of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person) pronouns,<sup>4</sup> though formally, having the vocalization *-ə*, they coincide rather with possessive markers (which have, of course, the same pronominal origin) than with independent personal pronouns, which end in *-a*; see Dixon (1995: 219, fn 7) on cross-linguistic evidence for the usual connection between cross-referencing pronominal series on verbs and possessive markers on nouns.

From this we come necessarily to the conclusion that the (in)transitivity parameter, which determines the choice of either absolutive or ergative strategy, had to be expressed in the period preceding PWC solely by the relative order of clausal constituents<sup>5</sup>. The S(IO)V word order would thus reflect the intransitive clause, and the OAV word order – the transitive clause. In the light of both internal and typological considerations, the line of the evolution of the word order in WC would be as follows.

1. In the Pre-PWC (i.e. analytical) period, the ergativity was expressed by the contrastive constituent order only:

- |                          |             |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| (a) Intransitive clause: | S–(IO)–V    |
| (b) Transitive clause:   | O–(IO–)–A–V |

2. After the incorporation of personal pronouns into the verbal form and turning them into agreement markers, a mirror concord between the latter and the constituent order was established:

*Scheme 2.*

	Word order	vs.	Order of agreement markers
(a) Intransitive clause:	S – (IO) – V		S-(IO-)V
(b) Transitive clause:	O– (IO –) – A– V		O-(IO-)A-V

3. Finally, as plausibly suggested by Kumaxov (1989: 339), in the transitive clause a diachronic shift took place from the constituent order OAV to AOV, which is characteristic of modern WC languages. This shift can be explained by the redundancy of

---

<sup>4</sup>In a similar way, the history of French agreement markers shows how Latin independent deictic pronoun *ille* became transformed into a clitic personal pronoun *il* ‘he, it’ (*Il est danseur*), and further, in modern non-standard French, into an agreement marker: *Ma femme il est venue*, where *il* is bound to the verb and does not express gender (cited from Hopper & Traugott 1993: 17).

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Yakovlev 1930: 33; Abdokov 1981: 83.

the double expression of the ergative principle both by constituent order and by the pronominal cross-referencing. As a result, we arrive at a mirror concord between the clausal arguments and the cross-referencing markers in the transitive clause and the ‘leap-frog’ concord in the intransitive clause (cf. the Scheme 1 above).

Though this line of reasoning presents quite a plausible scenario of the historical development of WC syntactic structure, in accordance with the evolution of its structural type – from agglutinating and moderately synthetic to isolating and then cyclically again to agglutinative and polysynthetic, the question arises as to the validity of the traditional approach to such concepts as transitivity/intransitivity and, subsequently, ergative/absolutive patterning in the analysis of the language type presented by earlier (isolating) stages of PWC.

As for the ergativity being expressed exclusively by the constituent order, Dixon (1995: 50, 52) remarks that he is not aware of any ergative language in which constituent order is the only or major mark of core syntactic functions (despite some evidence from Tolai, Austronesian, Papuan) and that “since constituent order fulfils a wide variety of pragmatic as well as grammatical functions, we should hesitate to characterize a language as ‘ergative’ on the basis of constituent order alone”. As to the transitivity parameters, in the absence of formal morphology, which would characterize the analytical Pre-PWC system, transitivity itself becomes an elusive concept. Cf., for instance, such typically isolating language as Classical Chinese, where the intuitive classification of verbs like *shā* ‘to kill’ and *lái* ‘to come’ as “transitive” vs. “intransitive” is compromised by the fact that both can take objects; moreover, even nouns can be used as “transitive” verbs under certain circumstances (cf. Norman 1988: 91).

A possible indication of the older situation might be seen in the presence in WC languages of a group of *labile* (or *ambitransitive*) verbs, which, depending on the context, can be used either transitively or intransitively, cf. CCirc \**k’we* ‘to go’ (*itr.*) vs. \**k’wə* ‘to go a distance’ (*tr.*); the vowels *e/ə* serve to distinguish intransitive vs. transitive variants; Abx *pa-ra* ‘to knit (in general)’, and ‘to knit X’. Though all Caucasian languages, and of course many non-Caucasian ones, have such classes of verbs, in WC they could theoretically well be a relic of that distant epoch, when verbs, void of any inflection, lacked the lexical meaning of ‘(in)transitivity’ and could be used both with and without the direct object.<sup>6</sup>

The presence of an unexpectedly great number of labile verbs in such classical ergative languages as WC, where transitivity plays a crucial role in the overall structuring of the verbal complex pivotal for the entire grammar, suggests that the transitivity parameter was not always such an all-pervasive principle and that some other principles could have been in place at earlier stages of PWC. But what could be the alternative organizing principle then, responsible for the structuring of inflection-less words into clauses?

One of the possible hypotheses would be that in archaic WC topic prominence could have served as an organizing principle for the syntactic ordering of clausal constituents, which would resemble the situation in Chinese (but also in such other topic-

---

<sup>6</sup>Klimov&Alekseev (1980: 51) also regard the group of labile verbs as archaic and as relics of the former active typology of WC, replaced later by the ergative one, with its importance on the transitive/intransitive dichotomy. Note that in WC labile verbs do not form a close group, which is seen from the fact that they incorporated also later loans, cf. Abx *a-wanta-ra* ‘ironing’/‘to iron X’, from Tu *ütü* ‘iron’.

prominent languages as Japanese or Tagalog). There are in fact some data coming from Circ which some could regard as supporting the topicality hypothesis. Thus, Circ, parallel to the preferred AOV constituent order, in some variants of the ergative construction requires the OAV order (the examples are from Kab):

(4) constituent order AOV & cross-referencing order O-A-V

(4a) *λ'ə-m*            *dəɣ<sup>w</sup>əzə-r*            *ə-jə-theL-a-ś*  
 man-ERG        wolf-ABS            it-he-smother-PRF-CONF  
 'The man strangled the wolf'.

(4b) *śak<sup>w</sup>e-m*        *śəhə-r*            *ə-jə-wəč'-a-ś*  
 hunter-ERG    deer-ABS            it-he-kill-PRF-CONF  
 'The hunter killed the deer'.

(5) OAV & O-A-V

(5a) *λ'ə-r*            *psə-m*            *ə-jə-theL-a-ś*  
 man-ABS        water-ERG        him-it-smother-PRF-CONF  
 'The man was drowned (by the water)'.

(5b) *c'əx<sup>w</sup>əbzə-r*    *śəbLe-m*        *ə-jə-wəč'-a-ś*  
 woman-ABS    lightning-ERG    her-it-kill-PRF-CONF  
 'The woman was killed by the lightning'.

Analyzing cases in (4) and (5) (I added the example in (4b) for the sake of symmetry), Kumaxov (1989: 336-339) draws attention to the fact that the constituent order in (5a) and (5b) coincides with the arrangement of agreement markers within the ergative construction – obviously in violation of the standard “mirror” concord principle between the clausal constituents and the agreement markers (cf. Scheme 1 above). Kumaxov emphasizes that in (4) and (5) we are dealing with a neutral word order, which has more expressive alternative variants (4 – OAV, VOA, AVO; 5 – AOV, VOA, AVO). He explains the difference in the ordering of the constituents in (4) vs. (5) by the action of the pragmatic factor: in (4) the theme is the Agent, whereas in (5) the theme is the Object. However, it remains unclear, what exactly are the criteria, which are responsible for the different treatment of patients in the examples (4a) and (4b), as opposed to (5a) and (5b).

Kumaxov remarks that in the ergative construction the diachronic theme or topic could also be the logical subject, as observed in the construction OAV in the examples (4) and (5) above. This returns us, of course, to the much-debated discussion over whether or not the patient possesses high topicality in ergative languages. In his paper devoted to this issue, Tsunoda (1986), analysing examples from both ergative and accusative languages, argues that the agent, irrespective of the alignment type, is universally more topical than the patient. However, if the pronominal agreement markers in WC languages indeed reflect the old word order, which seems strongly to be the case, then we shall have to admit that in the Pre-PWC transitive clause it was the patient, rather

than the agent, which enjoyed higher topicality status, by occupying the privileged first position in the sentence.

I agree with Kumaxov concerning the original ‘ergative’ OAV constituent order in PWC. As to the modern Circ examples adduced in (4) and (5), it is possible, however, to explain their OAV order by the animacy hierarchy factor: a man, even being a notional and grammatical patient, and exercising a zero level of control, still occupies a higher position in the animacy hierarchy than an inanimate entity affecting it, such as the river or the lightning. This seems to be a pan-West Caucasian pattern: in Ad, as my fieldwork proves, the situation is exactly the same as in the Kab examples given by Kumaxov, and the same is repeated in Abx, where in the sentence with inanimate Agent and human Patient the preferred order is the placement of the Patient in the initial position:

(6) constituent order AOV & cross-referencing order O-A-V

(6a) *A-waj<sup>wə</sup> a-k<sup>wə</sup>əž<sup>ma</sup> ø-jə-š<sup>ə</sup>-ø-jt’.*  
 ART-man ART-wolf it-he-kill-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 ‘The man killed the wolf’.

(6b) *A-k<sup>wə</sup>əž<sup>ma</sup> a-waj<sup>wə</sup> d-a-š<sup>ə</sup>-ø-jt’.*  
 ART-wolf ART-man him-it-kill-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 ‘The wolf killed the man’.

(7) OAV & O-A-V

(7a) *A-waj<sup>wə</sup> a-ʒə d-a-gə-ø-jt’.*  
 ART-man ART-water him-it-take-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 ‘The man was drowned (by the water)’.

(7b) *A-ph<sup>wəs</sup> a-c’la d-a-š<sup>ə</sup>-ø-jt’.*<sup>7</sup>  
 ART-woman ART-tree her-it-kill-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 ‘The woman was killed by the tree’.

(7c) *A-ph<sup>wəs</sup> a-mac<sup>wəs</sup> d-a-š<sup>ə</sup>-ø-jt’.*  
 ART-woman ART-lightning her-it-kill-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 ‘The woman was killed by the lightning’.

(7d) *A-waj<sup>wə</sup> a-maš<sup>ə</sup>na d-a-š<sup>ə</sup>-ø-jt’.*  
 ART-man ART-car her-it-kill-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 ‘The car killed a man’.

---

<sup>7</sup>The constituent order will be different if ‘the tree’ is the focus:

*A-c’la a-ph<sup>wəs</sup> jə-lə-k<sup>wə</sup>-ha-n d-a-š<sup>ə</sup>-ø-jt’.*  
 ART-tree ART-woman it-her-top-fall-PIDF her-it-kill-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 ‘The tree fell and killed a woman’.

- (7e) *A-waj<sup>wə</sup> a-t'ok' d-a-šə-ø-jt'*  
 ART-man ART-current her-it-kill-AOR-DYN:FIN  
 'The electric current killed a man'.

It is thus the animacy hierarchy that can explain the violation of the otherwise standard subject-first constituent order in both Circ and Abx; note that even in these cases the canonical 'ergative' case marking and the O-A-V mirror concord of the agreement markers in (4), (5) (in Circ), and (6), (7) (in Abx) are being maintained.

But can it be that either topicality or animacy factors, as in the examples adduced above, be used to explain the OAV order in the Pre-PWC ergative construction? The problem is, the OAV patterning of agreement markers in the ergative construction is universal and tolerates no exceptions: *any* patient marker occupies the left-most position (reflecting the older sententially initial position), and *any* agent marker – the right-most/verbal root-immediate position, irrespective of their referents' topicality or animacy status.

It is doubtful, therefore, that topicality or the animacy hierarchy could have played a role in the structuring of the Pre-PWC word order. It seems that in the (near) absence of nominal and verbal morphology in the presumably basically isolating Pre-PWC, the ergative principle, supposedly inherited by Pre-PWC from its ancestor language, simply did not have any other possibility of expression (except probably for ablaut or tone distinctions) than by contrastive word order (representing thus cross-linguistically a rare example of an ergative language expressing ergativity by constituent order alone, see Dixon's remark above).

The main syntactic configurations were thus as follows:

1. intransitive clause:  $S_{\text{nom}} (IO_{\text{obl}}) V$   
 2. transitive clause:  $O_{\text{abs}} (IO_{\text{obl}}) A_{\text{erg}} V$

Even in modern WC languages in certain cases contrastive word order can serve as the sole means of expressing the core grammatical relations. In Abx this happens when both the agent and the patient belong to the same nominal class: if the agreement markers are the same for both agent and patient, the distinguishing role is taken over by the constituent order, and in this case the word-initial position must necessarily be occupied by the agent. The same is even truer of Circ, which does not have gender distinctions:

- (8) Ad a. *pśaśe-m čʲaLe-r ə-lex<sup>wə</sup>-x*  
 girl-ERG boy-ABS 3SG-see-PAST  
 'The girl saw the boy'.
- b. *čʲaLe-m pśaśe-r ə-lex<sup>wə</sup>-x*  
 boy-ERG girl-ABS 3SG-see-PAST  
 'The boy saw the girl'.

Interestingly, in riddles, proverbs and similar genres, Circ optionally permits the zero marking of ergative and absolutive on core NPs (if they are indefinite), the word order remaining thus the only means to distinguish between the NPs, cf.:

- (9) Kab    žem    λaq<sup>w</sup>    šk'e    ø-jə-wəč<sup>ʔ</sup>ə-r.q'a.m  
          cow   leg    calf    it-it-kill-NEG  
          'Cow-leg does not kill the calf' (Gezadze 1979: 126).

However, all these Abx and Circ cases do not disturb the general principle, according to which the main grammatical roles are expressed by cross-referencing, and the constituent order in most cases plays no significant role. But the situation in Pre-PWC, in which both verb and noun apparently lacked inflection, was quite different. The mere need to express the ergative/absolutive alignment, i.e. purely grammatical considerations, could have overridden the seemingly universal higher topicality status of the agent, raising the patient, for the sake of the grammatical contrast/foregrounding, to the privileged sentence-initial position.<sup>8</sup>

We have thus in the history of WC languages a diachronic shift from a purely syntactic marking of ergativity – by contrastive constituent order alone<sup>9</sup> – to its purely morphological expression by pronominal prefixation alone, which is still observed in Abx, whereas Circ and Ub developed also nominal inflection. The appearance of the latter is of later chronological periods; the fact that case markers in Circ do not coincide materially with those in Ub testifies to their independent development in both languages. And, as examples above show, in certain cases the expression of the ergative *vs.* nominative alignment by purely syntactic means (i.e. by word order) in certain cases is still observed in modern WC languages.

When later, during the early PWC period, personal pronouns were incorporated into the verbal form and started to express syntactic relations,<sup>10</sup> the need to use contrastive word order, which in the case of the transitive clause violated the higher topicality status of the agent, became redundant.<sup>11</sup> This stimulated the shift of the order in the transitive clause from OAV to AOV, now perfectly in line with the (natural) high topicality status of the agent. However, even if the constituent order has changed, the principle of the contrasting arrangement of the prefixed agreement markers, which reflects the older word order, is still being preserved.

<sup>8</sup>It should be mentioned here that Abdokov (1981: 57), on the contrary, spoke about the relative closeness to the verb as being the privileged position in Pre-PWC; from this it would follow that in the OAV word order it is S/A, close to the predicate, which is in the privileged, or higher hierarchical position, rather than O; if we accept this, it would imply, as observed by B.G. Hewitt (p.c.), rather a nominative-accusative configuration of pre-PWC (by virtue of closeness of S and A to the verb).

<sup>9</sup>Cf. similar conclusions in Gecadze (1967: 165-6; 1971: 57).

<sup>10</sup>Gecadze (1971: 52-55) assumes that originally the WC verb was monopersonal, containing only the subject marker in the intransitive clause and only object marker in the transitive clause, as, for example, in modern Daghestanian languages, and only later the agent marker was also incorporated into the verb-form, thus changing the verbal structure and creating polypersonal verb-forms. She regards the absence of the agent marker in Abx transitive converbs and transitive positive imperatives as vestiges of that epoch.

<sup>11</sup>The role of non-predicate words – substantives, adverbs, etc., has also become significantly diminished. That is why Yakovlev & Ašxamaf (1941: 23-4) labelled all non-predicates in WC as 'additional words', in contrast to the predicates, which they regarded as 'the main' and 'basic' parts of the sentence.



Abbreviations:

A	Agent
ABS	Absolutive
Abx	Abkhaz
Ad	Adyghe
AOR	Aorist
ART	Article
CCirc	Common Circassian
Circ	Circassian
CONF	Confirmative
DYN	Dynamic
EC	East Caucasian
ERG	Ergative
FIN	Finite
IO	Indirect Object
Kab	Kabardian
NEG	Negation
nom	Nominative
NP	Noun phrase
O	Object
obl	Oblique
PIDF	Past Indefinite
PRES	Presence
PRF	Perfect
PWC	Proto-West Caucasian
S	Subject
Sh	Shapsygh
Tu	Turkish
Ub	Ubykh
V	verb
WC	West Caucasian

References:

Abdokov, A.I.

1981 Vvedenie v sravnitel'no-istoričeskiju morfologiju abxazsko-adygskix i naxsko-dagestanskix jazykov [Introduction to the Comparative-Historical Morphology of the Abkhazo-Adyghean and Nakh-Daghestanian Languages]. Nal'čik: Kabardino-Balkarskij Gosudarstvenny universitet.

Allen, W.S.

- 1956 Structure and system in the Abaza verbal complex. In: Transactions of the Philological Society (Hertford), Oxford, p. 127-176.
- Chirikba, V.A.  
Forthcoming. Reconstructing Proto-West Caucasian: From North Caucasian to West Caucasian via “Chinese”?
- Dumézil, G.  
1931 La langues des Oubykhs. CL, t. XXXV, Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Gecadze, I.O.  
1967 K istorii formirovanija ergativnoj konstruksii v abxazskom jazyke [On the History of Formation of the Ergative Construction in Abkhaz]. In: Žirmunskij, V.M. (Ed.). Ergativnaja konstrukcija predloženiya v jazykax različnyx tipov. (Issledovanija i materialy). Leningrad: Nauka, p. 156-167.
- 1979 Očerki po sintaksisu abxazskogo jazyka [Sketches on Abkhaz Syntax]. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Givón, T.  
1971 Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archaeologist’s field trip. – Papers from the 7<sup>th</sup> Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society 7. Chicago, p. 394-495.
- Hopper, P. & Traugott, E.  
1994 Grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klimov, G., Alekseev, M.  
1980 Tipologija kavkazskix jazykov [Typology of the Caucasian Languages]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Kumaxov, M.A.  
1989 Sravnitel’no-istoričeskaja grammatika adygskix (čerkeskix) jazykov [Comparative-Historical Grammar of the Adyghean (Circassian) Languages]. Moskva: Nauka.
- Lightfoot, D.  
1979 Principles of Diachronic Syntax. Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Norman, J.  
1998 Chinese. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smeets, R.  
1984 Studies in West Circassian Phonology and Morphology. Leiden: The Hakuchi Press.
- Tsunoda, T.  
1986 Topicality in ergative and accusative languages. In: Nagoya Working Papers in Linguistics. Vol. 2, University of Nagoya, p. 173-258.
- Yakovlev, N.F.  
1930 Jazyki i narody Kavkaza. Kratkij obzor i klassifikacija [Languages and Peoples of the Caucasus. A Brief Survey and Classification]. Tiflis.  
2006 Grammatika abxazskogo literaturnogo jazyka [Grammar of Literary Abkhaz]. Suxum: Alašara.
- Yakovlev, N.F., Ašxamaf, D.A.  
1941 Grammatika adygejskogo literaturnogo jazyka [Grammar of Literary Adyghe]. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel’stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.