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The canonical inverse

“a type of transitive person marking system presenting three essential characteristics”:

• role-neutrality of person markers;
• ambiguity resolution by means of obligatory dedicated markers (direct and inverse);
• no valency/transitivity change.
The canonical inverse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agent</th>
<th>patient</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3prox</th>
<th>3obv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>INV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3prox</td>
<td>INV</td>
<td>INV</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3obv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>INV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The canonical inverse

The **referential hierarchy** (Silverstein 1976, DeLancey 1981, Zúñiga 2006 etc.):

SAP > 3proximate > 3obviative

SAP > 3rd person pronoun > human > animate > inanimate

A>P: direct marking

P>A: inverse marking
The canonical inverse

Plains Cree (Algonquian, Canada; Zúñiga 2006: 76)

a. *ni-sēkih-ā-w*
   1-frighten-DIR-3
   ‘I frighten him.’

b. *ni-sēkih-ikw-w*
   1-frighten-INV-3
   ‘He frightens me.’
The canonical inverse

Plains Cree (Algonquian, Canada; Zúñiga 2006: 76)

a. \textit{ni-sēkih-ā-w}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 1-frighten-DIR-3
   \end{itemize}
   ‘I frighten him.’ role neutrality

b. \textit{ni-sēkih-ikw-w}
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 1-frighten-INV-3
   \end{itemize}
   ‘He frightens \textit{me}.’ of person markers
The canonical inverse

Plains Cree (Algonquian, Canada; Zúñiga 2006: 76)

a. \textit{ni-sēkih-ā-w}  
   1-frighten-DIR-3  
   ‘I frighten \textit{him}.’  
   role neutrality

b. \textit{ni-sēkih-ikw-w}  
   1-frighten-INV-3  
   ‘\textit{He} frightens \textit{me}.’  
   of person markers
The canonical inverse

Plains Cree (Algonquian, Canada; Zúñiga 2006: 76)

a. *ni-sēkih-ā*-w
   1-frighten-**DIR**-3
   ‘I frighten him.’ direct 1>3

b. *ni-sēkih-*ikw*-w
   1-frighten-**INV**-3
   ‘He frightens me.’ inverse 3>1
I present a case from Circassian (Northwest Caucasian) languages which can be considered a highly non-canonical instance of inverse.
The canonical inverse

I present a case from **Circassian** (Northwest Caucasian) languages which can be considered a highly non-canonical instance of inverse.

I argue that the Circassian (more precisely, Kabardian) non-canonical inverse has been borrowed by Abaza, another NWC language.
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The Northwest Caucasian languages

- West Circassian (a.k.a Adyghe):
  - ca. 100 thousand speakers
  - Russian republic of Adygeya and Krasnodarsky Kray
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- West Circassian (a.k.a Adyghe):
  - ca. 100 thousand speakers
  - Russian republic of Adygeya and Krasnodarsky Kray
- Kabardian:
  - more than 500 thousand speakers
  - Russian republics of Adygeya, Karachay-Cherkesia and Kabardino-Balkaria
The Northwest Caucasian languages

• West Circassian (a.k.a Adyghe):
  – ca. 100 thousand speakers
  – Russian republic of Adygheya and Krasnodarsky Kray

• Kabardian:
  – more than 500 thousand speakers
  – Russian republics of Adygheya, Karachay-Cherkesia and Kabardino-Balkaria

• Abaza:
  – ca. 35 thousand people
  – several compact districts in Karachay-Cherkesia
The Northwest Caucasian languages

- rich consonantism and poor vocalism
- polysynthesis
- morphological ergativity:
  - both indexing and flagging in Circassian;
  - only indexing in Abaza;
- very little distinction between major parts of speech

The Northwest Caucasian languages

The general West Caucasian verbal template (Arkadiev & Lander to appear):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prefixes</th>
<th>root</th>
<th>suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>argument structure zone</td>
<td>pre-stem elements</td>
<td>stem ((\Sigma))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolutive</td>
<td>subordinators</td>
<td>aspectual, modal and evaluative operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>applicatives and indirect objects</td>
<td>ergative</td>
<td>temporal operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preradical negation</td>
<td>suffixal negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>causative</td>
<td>illocutionary operators or subordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>may be complex</td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources of data

• Examples from Temirgoy and Bzhedugh dialects of West Circassian and Besleney and Kuban dialects of Kabardian elicited during fieldtrips to the Republic of Adygheya in 2004-2016.

• A small corpus of oral narratives (mainly for Besleney Kabardian).

• Annotated published texts in Standard West Circassian and grammars for Standard Kabardian.

• Elicited and textual examples from the Tapanda dialect of Abaza as spoken in the village of Inzhich-Chukun (Abazinsky district, Karachay-Cherkesia) collected during fieldtrips in 2017-2019.
Verbal person marking

Polypersonalism:

• up to four (or even five) participants can be expressed by means of person-number(-gender) prefixes;

• facilitated by a rich system of semantically specialized applicative prefixes.
Verbal person marking

Polypersonalism:
• pronominal prefixes come in the order
  Absolutive - Indirect Object(s) - Ergative
Verbal person marking

Polypersonalism:

- pronominal prefixes come in the order
  \textbf{Absoluteve - Indirect Object(s) - Ergative}
Verbal person marking

Polypersonalism:

- pronominal prefixes come in the order **Abs**olute - Indirect Object(s) - **Erg**ative

- In Abaza, all prefixes are normally overt;
- In Circassian, 3\textsuperscript{rd} person absolutive and some 3\textsuperscript{rd} person indirect object prefixes are null.
Verbal person marking

- Polypersonalism in Kabardian (Besleney dialect, textual example):

\[\emptyset-t-x^w-a-r-j\empty -ke-\hat{s}-a\]

3.ABS-1PL.IO-BEN-3PL.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-CAUS-do-PST

‘He had them make it for us.’

ABS - absolutive                  DAT - dative applicative
BEN - benefactive                 ERG - ergative
CAUS - causative                  IO - indirect object
Verbal person marking

• Polypersonalism in Kabardian (Besleney dialect, textual example):

∅-t-χʷ-a-r-jə-κε-ṣ-a
3.ABS-1PL.IO-BEN-3PL.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-CAUS-do-PST

‘He had them make it for us.’

ABS - absolutive            DAT - dative applicative
BEN - benefactive           ERG - ergative
CAUS - causative            IO - indirect object
Verbal person marking

• Polypersonalism in Abaza (textual example)

\[ j-\hat{s}\omega-z-j-\acute{a}-s-h^{w}-p \]

3SG.N.ABS-2PL.IO-BEN-3SG.M.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-say-NPST.DCL

‘I will tell this to him about you.’

ABS - absolutive  ERG - ergative
BEN - beneactive  IO - indirect object
DAT - dative applicative  M - masculine
DCL - declarative  N - non-human
Verbal person marking

• Polypersonalism in Abaza (textual example)

\[ j-\dot{s}ə-z-j-á-s-h^{w}-p \]

3SG.N.ABS-2PL.IO-BEN-3SG.M.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-
say-NPST.DCL

‘I will tell this to him about you.’

ABS - absolutive
BEN - benefactive
DAT - dative applicative
DCL - declarative

ERG - ergative
IO - indirect object
M - masculine
N - non-human
Verbal person marking

• Two types of polyvalent verbs:
  – transitive (Erg, Abs)
  – intransitive (Abs, IO)

• Ditransitive verbs take Erg, IO and Abs.

Verbal person marking

• Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):
  sə-b-ew-h transitive
  1SG.ABS-2SG.ERG-PRS-carry
  ‘You (sg) are carrying me.’
Verbal person marking

• Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):

\[ sə-b-ew-h \]

transitive

1SG.ABS-2SG.ERG-PRS-carry

‘You (sg) are carrying me.’
Verbal person marking

• Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):
  
  \textbf{sə-b-ew-h} \hspace{2cm} \text{transitive} \\
  1SG.ABS-2SG.ERG-PRS-carry
  
  ‘You (sg) are carrying \textbf{me}.’

  
  \textbf{s-j-e-ẑ-a-ŝ} \hspace{2cm} \text{intransitive} \\
  1SG.ABS-3SG.IO-DAT-wait-PST-DCL
  
  ‘I waited for him/her.’
Verbal person marking

• Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):

\[ sə-b-ew-h \] transitive
\[ 1\text{SG.ABS}-2\text{SG.ERG}-\text{PRS-carry} \]
‘You (sg) are carrying me.’

\[ s-j-e-ẑ-a-ŝ \] intransitive
\[ 1\text{SG.ABS}-3\text{SG.IO}-\text{DAT-wait-PST-DCL} \]
‘I waited for him/her.’
Verbal person marking

- Abaza (elicited)
  \[ wə-l-bá-ṭ \]
  \[ 2\text{SG.M.ABS}-3\text{SG.F.ERG-see}(\text{AOR})-\text{DCL} \]
  ‘She saw you (man).’

AOR - aorist (perfective past)  F - feminine
Verbal person marking

• Abaza (elicited)

\[ wə-l-bá-ṭ \]  transitive

2SG.M.ABS-3SG.F.ERG-see(AOR)-DCL

‘She saw you (man).’

AOR - aorist (perfective past)  F - feminine
Verbal person marking

• Abaza (elicited)

\[ \text{wə}-l-βá-ṭ } \quad \text{transitive} \\
\text{2SG.M.ABS-3SG.F.ERG-see(AOR)-DCL} \\
\text{‘She saw you (man).’} \\
\text{hə-j-pšó-ṭ } \quad \text{intransitive} \\
\text{1PL.ABS-3SG.M.IO-look(AOR)-DCL} \\
\text{‘We looked at him.’} \\

\text{AOR - aorist (perfective past) } \quad \text{F - feminine}
Verbal person marking

- Abaza (elicited)

  \[ \text{wə-l-bá-ṭ} \] transitive
  2SG.M.ABS-3SG.F.ERG-see(AOR)-DCL
  ‘She saw you (man).’

  \[ \text{hə-j-pšá-ṭ} \] intransitive
  1PL.ABS-3SG.M.IO-look(AOR)-DCL
  ‘We looked at him.’

AOR - aorist (perfective past) F - feminine
Verbal person marking

- Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):
  \( \emptyset-f-e-s-t-a-\hat{s} \)  
ditransitive
  3.ABS-2PL.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-PST-DCL
  ‘I gave it to you (pl).’
Verbal person marking

• Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):

\[ \emptyset f-e-s-t-a-\hat{s} \] 
ditransitive

3.ABS-2PL.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-PST-DCL

‘I gave it to you (pl).’
Verbal person marking

• Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):

\[ \emptyset-f-e-s-t-a-\dot{s} \] \hspace{2cm} \text{ditransitive}
3.ABS-2PL.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-PST-DCL

‘I gave it to you (pl).’

• Abaza (elicited):

\[ j-\dot{s}\dot{\alpha}-s-t-\dot{t} \] \hspace{2cm} \text{ditransitive}
3SG.N.ABS-2PL.IO-1SG.ERG-give(AOR)-DCL

‘I gave it to you (pl.)’
Verbal person marking

• Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):

\(\emptyset-f-e-s-t-a-\hat{s}\) \hspace{2cm} ditransitive
3.ABS-2PL.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-PST-DCL

'I gave it to you (pl.).'

• Abaza (elicited):

\(j-\hat{s}\acute{a}-s-t-\hat{t}\) \hspace{2cm} ditransitive
3SG.N.ABS-2PL.IO-1SG.ERG-give(AOR)-DCL

'I gave it to you (pl.).'
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Deictic prefixes

- All Northwest Caucasian languages have complex systems of spatial marking in the verb.
- Among the various meanings expressed are the deictic ‘hither, towards the speaker’ (**cislocative**) and ‘thither, from the speaker’ (**translocative**).
Deictic prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic Type</th>
<th>Circassian</th>
<th>Abaza</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cislocative</td>
<td>$q(V)$-, $q(V)$-</td>
<td>$\xi(a)$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translocative</td>
<td>$n(V)$-</td>
<td>$n(a)$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deictic prefixes

• In Circassian, deictic prefixes occupy the slot immediately following the Absolutive.
Deictic prefixes

• In Circassian, deictic prefixes occupy the slot immediately following the Absolutive.
• In Abaza, deictic prefixes normally occur closer to the stem, after the applicative complexes.
Deictic prefixes

• Kabardian (Besleney dialect, textual example):

\[ \text{wə-ʔə-če-h-a} \quad \text{wəne-m} \]

2SG.ABS-CISL-LOC-go.in-PST      house-OBL

‘You came into the house.’

CISL - cislocative
LOC - locative applicative
OBL - oblique case
Deictic prefixes

• Kabardian (Besleney dialect, textual example):

\[ wə-\text{̣ə̣}-če-h-a \quad wəne-m \]

2SG.ABS-\textbf{CISL}-LOC-go.in-PST house-OBL

‘You came into the house.’

CISL - cislocative
LOC - locative applicative
OBL - oblique case
Deictic prefixes

• Abaza (textual example):
  čə-r-zə-na-hə-r-χa-rnəs
  RFL.ABS-3PL.IO-BEN-TRAL-1PL.ERG-CAUS-turn-PURP
  ‘for us to turn ourselves towards them’

PURP - purposive
RFL - reflexive
TRAL - translocative
Deictic prefixes

- Abaza (textual example):

  čə-r-ʒə-na-hə-r-χa-rənəs
  RFL.ABS-3PL.IO-BEN-TRAL-1PL.ERG-CAUS-turn-PURP

  ‘for us to turn ourselves towards them’

PURP - purposive
RFL - reflexive
TRAL - translocative
The Circassian cislocative

- $qe- \sim qa- \sim q(ə)-$ (the vowel depends on the morphophonological environment);
- one of the most frequently occurring morphemes in the Circassian languages;
- fairly polyfunctional with different uses spanning the entire “derivation $\sim$ inflection” continuum.
The Circassian cislocative

• The basic meaning: orientation towards the deictic center (origo), in the simplest case towards the speaker.

West Circassian:
če ‘run (away)!’ vs. qa-če ‘run here!’
ğλe ‘look (there)’ vs. qa-ğλe ‘look here!’
The Circassian cislocative

• The cislocative is much more frequent and productive than the translocative in Circassian.

• In fact, West Circassian as well as the western dialects of Kabardian do not seem to use the translocative apart from some lexicalized combinations.
Deictic prefixes in person paradigms

• Circassian languages have integrated the deictic prefixes into their person paradigms of polyvalent verbs with indirect objects in a fashion reminiscent of inverse marking.

Deictic prefixes in person paradigms

• The **cislocative** is used whenever the indirect object is higher than the ergative or absolutive subject on the person hierarchy $1 > 2 > 3$, or when a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person IO is more topical than a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person subject.

• The **translocative** is used in $1>2$ combinations in (eastern) Kabardian.
Locutors vs. non-locutors

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

a. ʒə-ʒ-o-t
   (3.ABS)3SG.IO-1SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘I give it to him/her.’  1>3

b. qə-ʒ-j-e-t
   (3.ABS)CISL-1SG.IO-3SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘S/he gives it to me.’  3>1
Locutors vs. non-locutors

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

a. $jə$-$z$-$o$-$t$
   (3.ABS)3SG.IO-1SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘I give it to him/her.’   1>3

b. $qə$-$z$-$j$-$e$-$t$
   (3.ABS)CISL-1SG.IO-3SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘S/he gives it to me.’   3>1
Locutors vs. non-locutors

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

a. jə-b-o-t
   (3.ABS)3SG.IO-2SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘You give it to him/her.’ 2>3

b. qə-w-j-e-t
   (3.ABS)CISL-2SG.IO-3SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘S/he gives it to you.’ 3>2
Locutors vs. non-locutors

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

a. ʒə-b-o-t
   (3.ABS)3SG.IO-2SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘You give it to him/her.’ 2>3

b. ʔə-w-j-e-t
   (3.ABS)CISL-2SG.IO-3SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘S/he gives it to you.’ 3>2
Locutors only

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

a. (qə-)wa-z-o-t
   (3.ABS)CISL-2SG.IO-1SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘I give it to you.’ 1>2

b.  qə-zə-b-o-t
   (3.ABS)CISL-1SG.IO-2SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘You give it to me.’ 2>1
Locutors only

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

a. (qə-)wə-z-o-t
   (3.ABS)(CISL)-2SG.IO-1SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘I give it to you.’ 1>2

b. qə-zə-b-o-t
   (3.ABS)CISL-1SG.IO-2SG.ERG-DYN-give
   ‘You give it to me.’ 2>1
3rd person only

Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited):

a. \( \text{a-r č’ele-gʷere-m qə-r-jə-tə-κ.} \)
   DEM-ABS guy-some-OBL (3.ABS)CISL-
   3SG.IO-3SG.ERG-give-PST

   [How did she get this book?]
   ‘Some guy gave it to her.’

b. \( \text{a-r č’ele-gʷere-m r-jə-tə-κ.} \)
   DEM-ABS guy-some-OBL (3.ABS)3SG.IO-
   3SG.ERG-give-PST

   [What did she do with the book?]
   ‘She gave it to some guy.’
3rd person only

Temirgoy Adyghe (elicited):

a.  a-r  č’ele-gʷere-m  qə-r-jə-tə-κ.
    DEM-ABS  guy-some-OBL  (3.ABS)CISL-3SG.IO-3SG.ERG-give-PST

[How did she get this book?]  
‘Some guy gave it to her.’ (obv>prox)

b.  a-r  č’ele-gʷere-m  r-jə-tə-κ.
    DEM-ABS  guy-some-OBL  (3.ABS)3SG.IO-3SG.ERG-give-PST

[What did she do with the book?]  
‘She gave it to some guy.’ (prox>obv)
3rd person only

• The labels “proximate” and “obviative” stand for not yet fully understood relations between 3rd person referents in discourse, having to do with differential activation / topicality / protagonistishood etc., see Lomize (2013) on Besleney Kabardian and Kuvshinova (2015) on Bzhedugh Adyghe.
Deictic prefixes in person paradigms: West Circassian & western Kabardian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3prox</th>
<th>3obv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(CISL)</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3prox</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3obv</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Is it an inverse?

• Inverse markers in the languages of the world are sensitive precisely to the relative prominence of subjects and objects in polyvalent constructions (Zúñiga 2006; Jacques & Antonov 2014).

• The affinity of the Circassian cislocative to inverse markers has been pointed out already in Testelec (1989).
Is it an inverse?

• The diachronic development of cislocative markers into inverse markers is well-documented in various languages (Jacques & Antonov 2014: 312).
Is it an inverse?

Hakhun Tangsa (Sino-Tibetan, India; Boro 2017: 342)

dɔ̂ a kómí i-tʰɤʔ nɤ̂ mi?
however 1SG-over LOC person

mɤ̂-tʰə a-dûŋɤ r-a
CLF-one NMLZ-big come CISL.NON.PST-3

‘However, a person greater than me will come.’ (cislocative)
Is it an inverse?

Hakhun Tangsa (Sino-Tibetan, India; Boro 2017: 342)

\[ \text{nuʔrûm kómó} \quad \eta à \quad ný \quad mì \]

2PL ERG 1SG LOC ADD

\[ \eta à \ r-\text{a} \]

say INV.NON.PST-3

‘You will also tell me.’ (inverse)
Is it an inverse?

The properties of the Circassian cislocative are in fact quite remote from the canonical inverse as defined by Jacques & Antonov (2014).
Redundancy

• The Circassian cislocative is in most cases **redundant**, because the mapping between person features and grammatical roles is fully indicated by the position of cross-referencing prefixes (apart from the combinations of several 3rd person arguments).
Redundancy

• In many cases the use of the cislocative with “inverse” mappings of persons and roles is optional, e.g. with the benefactive applicative.
Redundancy

Besleney Kabardian (textual examples)

few–č’e  ŷə-s-xʷe-f-Ŝə-ž’!
honey-new  CISL-1SG.IO-BEN-2PL.ERG-make-RE
‘Make me new honey!’

kaše  s-xʷe-p-Ŝə-ne.
porridge  1SG.IO-BEN-2SG.ERG-make-FUT
‘You will make porridge for me.’
Redundancy

Besleney Kabardian (textual examples)

few–č’e   qə-s-xʷe-f-ṣə-ž’!
honey-new   CISL-1SG.IO-BEN-2PL.ERG-make-RE
‘Make me new honey!’ (2>1 +cisl)

kaše   __s-xʷe-p-ṣə-ne.
porridge  1SG.IO-BEN-2SG.ERG-make-FUT
‘You will make porridge for me.’ (2>1 –cisl)
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Even more importantly, the canonical inverse is a hallmark of highly transitive verbs or constructions:
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Even more importantly, the canonical inverse is a hallmark of highly transitive verbs or constructions:

• However, in Circassian the cislocative is always **optional** with transitive verbs with an ergative A and an absolutive P.
Relation to (in)transitivity

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

$s-\lambda e\beta^w-a$  I saw him/her 1 > 3 – CISL
Relation to (in)transitivity

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

s-\(\lambda e\kappa^w\)-a  
I saw him/her  1 \(>\) 3 – CīSL

wə-s-\(\lambda e\kappa^w\)-a  
I saw you  1 \(>\) 2 – CīSL
Relation to (in)transitivity

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

\( s\text{-}λεβ^{w}\text{-}a \) I saw him/her \( 1 > 3 \) –CISL

\( ω\text{-}s\text{-}λεβ^{w}\text{-}a \) I saw you \( 1 > 2 \) –CISL

\( s\text{-}p\text{-}λεβ^{w}\text{-}a \) You saw me \( 2 > 1 \) –CISL
Relation to (in)transitivity

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

\(s-\text{leb}^w-a\) I saw him/her \(1 > 3\) – CISL

\(w\theta-s-\text{leb}^w-a\) I saw you \(1 > 2\) – CISL

\(s\theta-p-\text{leb}^w-a\) You saw me \(2 > 1\) – CISL

\(s-j\theta-\text{leb}^w-a\) S/he saw me \(3 > 1\) – CISL
Relation to (in)transitivity

- By contrast, the cislocative prefix is **obligatory** with the “inverse” combination of subject (S/A) and **indirect object** — with ditransitive and intransitive verbs alike.
Relation to (in)transitivity

Besleney Kabardian (elicited)

a. \((\check{\text{qə}}-)jə-z-o-t\)
   \((3.\text{ABS})3\text{SG.IO-1SG.ERG-DYN-give}\)
   ‘I give it to him/her.’ \(1>3\) –CISL

b. \((\check{\text{qə}}-)z-j-e-t\)
   \((3.\text{ABS})\text{CISL-1SG.IO-3SG.ERG-DYN-give}\)
   ‘S/he gives it to me.’ \(3>1\) +CISL
Relation to (in)transitivity

Standard Adyghe (Kumakhov 1971: 294)

a.  
   \textit{s-j-e-že}  
   \text{1SG.ABS-3SG.IO-DYN-wait}  
   ‘I am waiting for him/her.’ 1>3 –CISL

b.  
   *\textit{(qə-)}s-e-že  
   \text{(3SG.ABS)CISL-1SG.IO-DYN-wait}  
   ‘S/he is waiting for me.’ 3>1 +CISL
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Besides that, in the eastern varieties of Kabardian and in the standard language, the **translocative** prefix *n(V)*- is often used in some 1→2 combinations.
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Standard Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):

  sə-n-w-ew-že

  1SG.ABS-TRAL-2SG.IO-PRS-wait

  ‘I am waiting for you.’ 1>2
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Standard Kabardian (Kumakhov ed. 2006):

\textit{sə-n-w-ew-ẑe}

\begin{align*}
1\text{SG.ABS-TRAL-2SG.IO-PRS-wait} \\
\text{‘I am waiting for you.’} \quad 1\!>\!2
\end{align*}
Deictic prefixes in person paradigms: Standard (eastern) Kabardian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subject</th>
<th>object</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3prox</th>
<th>3obv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>TRAL</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3prox</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3obv</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td>CISL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Cross-linguistically, inverse markers can be sensitive to the relation between the Agent and the Recipient of ditransitive verbs (Malchukov et al. 2010: 44–45), but in such languages ditransitive verbs show secundative alignment (R=P).
Relation to (in)transitivity

- Itonama (isolate, Bolivia; Crevels 2010: 685, 693):

\[ \text{sih-}k’i\text{-ma-doh-ne upa’u} \]
1PL.EX-INV-hand-bite-ASP dog

‘The dog bit us on the hand.’ (monotrans.)
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Itonama (isolate, Bolivia; Crevels 2010: 685, 693):

\[ \text{sih-}k’i\text{-ma-doh-ne} \quad \text{upa’u} \]
\[ 1\text{PL.EX-INV-hand-bite-ASP} \quad \text{dog} \]

‘The dog bit us on the hand.’ (monotrans.)
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Itonama (isolate, Bolivia; Crevels 2010: 685, 693):

\[\text{sih-}k’i\text{-ma-doh-ne upa’u}\]
1PL.EX-INV-hand-bite-ASP dog

‘The dog bit us on the hand.’ (monotrans.)

\[\text{wase’wa sih-k’i-makï pilata}\]
yesterday 1PL.EX-INV-give silver

‘Yesterday they gave us money.’ (ditrans.)
Relation to (in)transitivity

• Itonama (isolate, Bolivia; Crevels 2010: 685, 693):

\[ \text{sih-}k’i\text{-ma-doh-ne upa’u} \]
1PL.EX-INV-hand-bite-ASP dog

‘The dog bit us on the hand.’ (monotrans.)

\[ \text{wase’wa sih-}k’i\text{-maki pilata} \]
yesterday 1PL.EX-INV-give silver

‘Yesterday they gave us money.’ (ditrans.)
Relation to (in)transitivity

But Circassian languages show consistent **indirective** alignment with the role of indirect object clearly distinct from that of the absolutive.
Towards a diachronic explanation

- As mentioned above, the change from cislocative (‘hither’) to inverse is a well-attested historical development (Jacques & Antonov 2014: 312–313).
- Moreover, this development seems to naturally explain the sensitivity of the Circassian “inverse” to the role of the indirect object.
Towards a diachronic explanation

The extension of the cislocative prefix to inverse person-role configurations should occur most naturally in the context of verbs of transfer with first or second person recipients as well as with verbs denoting activities directed at a non-affected object, such as contact, speech or perception, which are encoded as bivalent intransitives in Circassian.
Towards a diachronic explanation

• Cf. partly similar patterning of ‘hither’ and ‘thither’ markers with transfer verbs in geographically close Georgian.
Towards a diachronic explanation

- Georgian (Vogt 1971: 173)
  a. \textit{mi-n-s-\c{c}er-e} \textit{\c{c}eril-i}.
     \begin{tabular}{l}
     TRAL-1.SBJ-3.IO-write-AOR letter-NOM \\
     ‘I wrote him a letter.’
     \end{tabular}
  b. \textit{mo-m-\c{c}er-a} \textit{\c{c}eril-i}.
     \begin{tabular}{l}
     CISL-1SG.IO-write-AOR.3SG.SBJ letter-NOM \\
     ‘He wrote me a letter.’
     \end{tabular}
Towards a diachronic explanation

• Georgian (Vogt 1971: 173)

a. \textit{mi-\textsuperscript{v}s-\textsuperscript{ç}er-\textit{e}} \textit{çeril-i}.
   \textsc{tral}-1.\text{SBJ}-3.\text{IO}-write-\text{AOR} letter-\text{NOM}
   ‘I wrote him a letter.’ \hspace{1cm} (1>3)

b. \textit{mo-\text{m-\textsuperscript{ç}er-\textit{a}}} \textit{çeril-i}.
   \textsc{cisl}-1\text{SG}.\text{IO}-write-\text{AOR}.3\text{SG}.\text{SBJ} letter-\text{NOM}
   ‘He wrote me a letter.’ \hspace{1cm} (3>1)
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Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

• Basically the same pattern is found in the fieldwork data from Abaza, both elicited and textual.
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

- Abaza (elicited):

  \[ j-\text{ʕa-wó-l-t-ṭ} \]

  3SG.N.ABS-CISL-2SG.M.IO-3SG.F.ERG-give(AOR)-DCL

  ‘She gave it to you (man).’       3>2
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

• Abaza (elicited):

  \[ j-ʕa-wá-l-t-t \]

  3SG.N.ABS-CISL-2SG.M.IO-3SG.F.ERG-give(AOR)-DCL

  ‘She gave it to you (man).’ 3>2
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

- Abaza (elicited):

  \[ j-\textit{ʕa}-wó-l-t-ṭ \]
  \[ 3\text{SG.N.ABS-\textbf{CISL}-2\text{SG.M.IO-3\text{SG.F.ERG-give}}(\text{AOR})-DCL} \]
  ‘She gave it to you (man).’ \hspace{1cm} 3\textgreater{}2

  \[ h-na-w-pšó-ṭ \]
  \[ 1\text{PL.ABS-TRAL-2\text{SG.M.IO-look}}(\text{AOR})-DCL \]
  ‘We looked at you (man).’ \hspace{1cm} 1\textgreater{}2
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

• Abaza (elicited):

\[ j-\text{ʕa}-w\dot{\text{á}}-l-t-\text{ṭ} \]
3SG.N.ABS-\text{CISL}-2SG.M.IO-3SG.F.ERG-give(AOR)-DCL

‘She gave it to you (man).’ 3>2

\[ h-\text{na}-w-p\dot{\text{ʃ̃}}-\text{ṭ} \]
1PL.ABS-\text{TRAL}-2SG.M.IO-look(AOR)-DCL

‘We looked at you (man).’ 1>2
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

- Abaza (textual examples):

  \[ h-an \quad d-\text{ʕ}a-s-\text{ʕ}a-\text{ʕ} \]

  1PL.IO-mother 3SG.H.ABS-CISL-1SG.IO-ask(AOR)-DCL

  ‘My mother asked me.’ 3>1
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

- Abaza (textual examples):

  \[ h-an \quad d-ʕa-s-ʕa-ʕa-t \]

  1PL.IO-mother 3SG.H.ABS-CISL-1SG.IO-ask(AOR)-DCL

  ‘My mother asked me.’ 3\textsuperscript{>}1
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

• Abaza (textual examples):

  *h-an*  
  *d-ʕa-s-cʕa-ṭ*

  1PL.IO-mother  3SG.H.ABS-CISL-1SG.IO-ask(AOR)-DCL

  ‘My mother asked me.’  3>1

  *s-na-wə-ça-pš-əj-ṭ*

  1SG.ABS-TRAL-2SG.M.IO-LOC-look-PRS-DCL

  ‘I look at you (man).’  1>2
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

- Abaza (textual examples):

  *h-an d-ʔa-s-ʕa-ṭ*
  1PL.IO-mother 3SG.H.ABS-CISL-1SG.IO-ask(AOR)-DCL

  ‘My mother asked me.’ 3>1

  *s-na-wə-caa-pš-əj-ṭ*
  1SG.ABS-TRAL-2SG.M.IO-LOC-look-PRS-DCL

  ‘I look at you (man).’ 1>2
Non-canonical inverse in Abaza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>object</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3prox</th>
<th>3obv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>TRAL</td>
<td>⌀</td>
<td>⌀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3prox</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3obv</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
<td>⬝</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A case of pattern borrowing

• Pattern borrowing:
  “re-shaping of language-internal structures” when “it is the patterns of distribution, of grammatical and semantic meaning, and of formal-syntactic arrangement .. that are modeled on an external source” without transfer of phonological substance (Matras & Sakel 2007: 829–830).
A case of pattern borrowing

• The use of the cislocative prefix in person paradigms is a feature common to all Circassian varieties, including those which have never been in close contact with Abaza.

Kumakhov (1971: 253-254), Arkadiev (to appear)
A case of pattern borrowing

• The inverse-like uses of directional prefixes are not attested in Abkhaz, a close relative of Abaza spoken on the other side of the Caucasian range and not in contact with Kabardian.
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abkhaz (elicited):

\[ \text{s-}a\text{š’}a \quad a\text{-}η\ ν\text{ɛ}κ\text{α} \quad a\text{-}γ\text{ɛ}ζ\text{α} \]
1SG.IO-brother  DEF-home  DEF-friend
\[ d\text{-}aa\text{-}j\text{-}ga\text{-}j\text{t} \]
3SG.H.ABS-CISL-3SG.M.ERG-bring(AOR)-DCL

‘My brother brought a friend home.’
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abkhaz (elicited):

\[ s-aš’a \quad a-γηəⱱa \quad a-γəza \]

1SG.IO-brother  DEF-home  DEF-friend

\[ d-aa-j-ga-jṭ \]

3SG.H.ABS-\textcolor{red}{CISL}-3SG.M.ERG-bring(AOR)-DCL

‘My brother brought a friend home.’
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abkhaz (elicited):

\[ s-a\text{'a} \quad d-(\#a\text{a}-)b\text{e}-\chi^w a-p\text{'} a-j\text{t} \]

1SG.IO-brother 3SG.H.ABS-(#CISL)-2SG.F.IO-LOC-look-PRS-DCL

‘My brother is looking after you (woman).’
A case of pattern borrowing

- Abkhaz (elicited):

\( \text{s-} \text{aš’} \text{a} \quad \text{d-(#aα-)} \text{bə-χ}^w \text{a-pš-wa-jṭ} \)

1SG.IO-brother 3SG.H.ABS-(#CISL-)2SG.F.IO-LOC-
look-PRS-DCL

‘My brother is looking after you (woman).’
A case of pattern borrowing

• The quasi-inverse use of the cislocative is recorded in all grammars of West Circassian and Kabardian, while for Abaza this phenomenon is not yet recognized and is conspicuously ignored by existing sources (e.g. Genko 1955, Tabulova 1976, Lomtatidze et. al. 1989, O’Herin 2002).
A case of pattern borrowing

- Abaza has been in close contact with Kabardian for several centuries.
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abaza has been in close contact with Kabardian for several centuries.
• Most speakers of Abaza also know and use Kabardian.
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abaza has been in close contact with Kabardian for several centuries.
• Most speakers of Abaza also know and use Kabardian.
• It is common for Abaza men to marry Kabardian women, who then learn Abaza.
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abaza has been in close contact with Kabardian for several centuries.
• Most speakers of Abaza also know and use Kabardian.
• It is common for Abaza men to marry Kabardian women, who then learn Abaza.
• Abaza has numerous lexical and some morphological borrowings, as well as morphosemantic calques, from Kabardian (Xaratokova 2011).
The Abaza-speaking Inzhich-Chukun

The Kabardian-speaking Khabez
A case of pattern borrowing

• In their inverse-like uses, the Abaza deictic prefixes mirror not only the function, but also the position of their Kabardian models.
A case of pattern borrowing

• In their inverse-like uses, the Abaza deictic prefixes mirror not only the function, but also the position of their Kabardian models.

• While in the spatial meanings the Abaza deictic prefixes follow the applicatives, in the inverse-like function they precede them.
A case of pattern borrowing

- Abaza (textual examples):
  \[ j-rə-z-ʕá-ʕ-ga-τ \]
  3SG.N.ABS-3PL.IO-BEN-CISL-1PL.ERG-carry(AOR)-DCL
  ‘We brought it to them.’ (deictic)
A case of pattern borrowing

- Abaza (textual examples):
  \[ j-rə-z-ʕá-ʕ-ga-ʕ \]
  3SG.N.ABS-3PL.IO-BEN-CISL-1PL.ERG-carry(AOR)-DCL
  ‘We brought it to them.’ (deictic)
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abaza (textual examples):

\[ j-ra-z-\text{ʕá}-\text{ʕa-ṭ} \]
3SG.N.ABS-3PL.IO-BEN-CISL-1PL.ERG-carry(AOR)-DCL
‘We brought it to them.’ (deictic)

\[ d-\text{ʕa-ra-z-ʕa-ṭ} \]
3SG.H.ABS-CISL-3PL.IO-BEN-ask(AOR)-DCL
‘Then he asked them.’ (inverse-like)
A case of pattern borrowing

• Abaza (textual examples):

\[ j-\text{rə-z-ʕá-ʕa-t} \]
3SG.N.ABS-3PL.IO-BEN-CISL-1PL.ERG-carry(AOR)-DCL
‘We brought it to them.’ (deictic)

\[ d-ʕa-ró-z-ʕa-t \]
3SG.H.ABS-CISL-3PL.IO-BEN-ask(AOR)-DCL
‘Then he asked them.’ (inverse-like)
A case of pattern borrowing

• Kabardian:

| Abs | Deictic, Inverse | Appl | Erg | Root |

• Abaza (reconstructed):

| Abs | Appl | Deictic | Erg | Root |
A case of pattern borrowing

• Kabardian:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{Abs} & \text{Deictic, Inverse} & \text{Appl} & \text{Erg} & \text{Root} \\
\end{array}
\]

• Abaza (reconstructed):

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{Abs} & \text{Appl} & \text{Deictic} & \text{Erg} & \text{Root} \\
\end{array}
\]
A case of pattern borrowing

• Kabardian:

| Abs | Deictic, Inverse | Appl | Erg | Root |

• Abaza (attested):

| Abs | Inverse | Appl | Deictic | Erg | Root |

• Abaza (reconstructed):

| Abs | Appl | Deictic | Erg | Root |
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Conclusions

• The Circassian and Abaza cislocative prefixes share with the “canonical” inverse markers the factors conditioning their occurrence as well as a common diachronic origin.
Conclusions

• However, the “inverse” uses of the Circassian and Abaza cislocative differ from the “canonical” inverse in two important respects:
  – it is almost fully redundant;
  – it is not sensitive to transitivity.
Conclusions

• From the typological point of view, the Circassian/Abaza cislocative is a highly peculiar inverse.

• In the context of predominantly ergative morphosyntax of the NWC languages, the cislocative behaves in a somewhat nominative-accusative fashion (sensitivity to S+A vs. IO).
Conclusions

• Abaza has borrowed a typologically non-trivial inverse-like use of deictic verbal prefixes on the model of Kabardian, its distant relative.
Conclusions

• This case of pattern borrowing is interesting because:
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  – it involves two genealogically related polysynthetic languages with complex templatic morphology;
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• This case of pattern borrowing is interesting because:
  – it involves two genealogically related polysynthetic languages with complex templatic morphology;
  – it shows contact-induced replication of a typological rarity;
Conclusions

• This case of pattern borrowing is interesting because:
  – it involves two genealogically related polysynthetic languages with complex templatic morphology;
  – it shows contact-induced replication of a typological rarity;
  – its result is not just functional extension of an affix but a creation of a new slot in a morphological template as well.
Conclusions

• This case of pattern borrowing is interesting because:
Conclusions

• This case of pattern borrowing is interesting because:
  – it involves complexification on both paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimensions;
Conclusions

• This case of pattern borrowing is interesting because:
  – it involves complexification on both paradigmatic and syntagmatic dimensions;
  – this complexification is “gratuitous”, since as a result of borrowing no functional gap is filled, and neither has the Abaza person marking become more transparent.
stacle ádayalı!
šəzʕʷádaχaṭ!

them fjəkepsew!

ẑəz[..]ádaxaṭ!
Thank you!

them fjəłəpsəw!

šəzʕʷádaχaṭ!
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