Peter Arkadiev*

Non-canonical inverse in Circassian languages

https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2019-0028

Abstract: This paper discusses a typologically peculiar inverse-like construction found in the polysynthetic ergative Circassian languages of the Northwest-Caucasian family. These languages possess a cislocative verbal prefix, which, in addition to marking the spatial meaning of speaker-orientation, systematically occurs in polyvalent verbs when the object outranks the subject on the person hierarchy. The inverse-like use of the cislocative in Circassian differs from the "canonical" direct-inverse system in that, first, it is fully redundant since the person-role linking is achieved by means of the person markers themselves and, second, it does not occur in the basic transitive construction, featuring instead in configurations involving an indirect object both in ditransitive and bivalent intransitive verbs. It is argued that the typologically outstanding properties of the Circassian inverse-like marking can be naturally explained by its diachronic origin.

Keywords: Circassian languages, direct-inverse systems, typological rarities

1 Introduction

Typologically rare phenomena in the world's languages often come about as "aberrant" constellations of well-known and recurrent individual features, each of which has its own motivation. Moreover, many a rare phenomenon is but a particular deviation from a certain "prototype" otherwise showing cross-linguistically well-represented properties. Documenting such typological "outliers" and finding the functional and diachronic motivations behind their existence and development not only broadens the horizons of linguistic typology by enriching our knowledge of the possibilities attested in the languages of the world, but also enhances the linguists' understanding of the workings of better-known phenomena and their underpinnings. (On typological rarities and

***Corresponding author: Peter Arkadiev,** Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Leninskiy avenue 32A, 119334, Moscow, Russia; Russian State University for the Humanities, Miusskaya square 6, 125993, Moscow, Russia, E-mail: alpgurev@gmail.com.

their diachronic explanations see, *inter alia*, Harris 2008, Wohlgemuth and Cysouw 2010, Grossman et al. 2018).

In this paper I will discuss one such exceptional phenomenon which I consider quite instructive, i.e. the inverse-like construction in polysynthetic ergative Circassian languages, a branch of the Northwest Caucasian (Abkhaz-Adyghean) family. I will show that the Circassian construction in question, on the one hand, fits squarely into the typological prototype of inverse by being sensitive to the relative ranking of the participants of bivalent predicates on the person hierarchy, but, on the other hand, significantly deviates from the "canon" of inverse as defined by Jacques and Antonov (2014) by being almost fully redundant and insensitive to morphosyntactic transitivity. I will also put forward a hypothesis regarding the diachronic origins of the Circassian inverse-like construction explaining its peculiar behavior and will point out parallels to it in the neighboring languages.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 I will discuss the properties of the "canonical" inverse as attested e.g. in Algonquian languages. In Section 3 I will lay out the most important features of the Circassian languages. In Section 4 I will describe the Circassian inverse-like construction, and in Section 5 I will offer a typological and theoretical discussion.

2 The canonical inverse

The terms "inverse", or, more precisely, "direct-inverse" refer to systems of marking of core participants of bivalent predicates where the grammatical or semantic roles of these participants are encoded indirectly by special markers indicating whether the ranking of roles (e.g. Agent > Patient) is aligned with the (language-specific) person hierarchy (e.g. 1 > 2 > 3), see Comrie (1980); Givón (1994); Zúñiga (2006, 2014); Zavala (2007); Jacques and Antonov (2014). In this paper, I will take as a point of departure the definition of the "canonical" direct-inverse system by Jacques and Antonov (2014: 302–303), which clearly delineates the properties of the indisputable cases without claiming that those phenomena which deviate from the "canon" cannot be subsumed under the term (see Corbett 2005 and Brown et al. 2013 for the framework of "canonical typology"). According to Jacques and Antonov (2014: 302–303), "[t]he canonical direct/inverse system [can] be defined as a type of transitive person marking system presenting three essential characteristics":

1) Role-neutrality of person markers, i.e. no distinction in form or position of verbal person-number markers according to the grammatical roles S, A and P.
2) The ensuing ambiguity is resolved by means of obligatory mutually exclusive markers called **direct** and **inverse**, whose distribution is determined by the relative ranking of A and P on the person hierarchy, as shown in Table 1; such markers do not appear on intransitive verbs.
3) Direct and inverse verb forms do not differ in valency or transitivity, unlike the difference between active and passive voice constructions.

Table 1 schematizes the distribution of the direct and inverse markings in the canonical system. The reflexive cells are shaded as irrelevant for the discussion. "3prox" and "3obv" refer to the so-called proximate (≈ more topical) and obviative (≈ less topical) third-person participants. Following Zúñiga (2006), it is useful to distinguish between **local** (1→2 and 2→1), **non-local** (3prox→3obv and 3obv→3prox) and **mixed** (1→3, 2→3 and 3→2, 3→1) domains of the transitive paradigm. It is in the mixed domain where direct/inverse marking manifests itself most clearly, the other domains often showing special behavior.

Table 1: The canonical direct-inverse system.

Agent \ Patient	1	2	3prox	3obv
1		DIR	DIR	DIR
2	INV		DIR	DIR
3prox	INV	INV		DIR
3obv	INV	INV	INV	
intransitive	1	2	3	

As is clear, direct/inverse marking is regulated by the so-called referential hierarchies, well-known in the literature since Silverstein (1976) and DeLancey (1981), hence the related but not coextensive term "hierarchical alignment" (Nichols 1992: 66; Witzlack-Makarevich et al. 2016). One of the clearest examples of an almost canonical direct-inverse system comes from Algonquian languages, consider example (1) from Plains Cree. Here the person markers *ni-* '1st person' and *-w* '3rd person' are completely insensitive to grammatical roles, the latter being indicated by the dedicated direct (*-ā*) and inverse (*-ikw*) suffixes, whose function is to track the mapping between person features and roles.

(1) Plains Cree (Algonquian, Canada)
[Zúñiga 2006: 76, quoting Dahlstrom 1986: 69–70]
a. *ni-sēkih-**ā**-w*
1-frighten-DIR-3
'I frighten him' (direct)
b. *ni-sēkih-**ikw**-w* > *nisēkihik*
1-frighten-INV-3
'He frightens me' (inverse)

The actual direct-inverse systems attested in the languages of the world differ along such parameters as the exact shape of the language-specific referential hierarchy, the degree to which the person markers are insensitive to grammatical roles, or the morphological makeup of the direct and inverse markers themselves (e.g. many languages lack overt direct markers, as e.g. Japhug Rgyalrong, see Jacques 2010). The Circassian construction that I will discuss in this paper is highly non-canonical because, as I will show, the inverse marker does not disambiguate the person-role associations, which are clearly indicated by the morphological template, and thus is redundant (and in some cases also optional) and, moreover, occurs primarily in configurations involving indirect objects rather than transitive agents and patients. Nonetheless, the Circassian inverse-like construction bears the hallmarks of the canonical inverse, i.e. sensitivity to the relative position of arguments on the person-hierarchy.

3 The major features of Circassian languages

Circassian languages are a group of dialects belonging to the Northwest Caucasian family also comprising Abaza, Abkhaz and the extinct Ubykh (on the family, see Hewitt 2005; Arkadiev and Lander forthcoming). Circassian varieties are usually classified into West Circassian (also known as Adyghe) and East Circassian (Kabardian) languages each having its own written standard. Circassians live in compact areas in the western part of the Russian North Caucasus covering several patches of their original homeland interspersed by settlements of speakers of other languages, mostly Russian, as well as in the diaspora in the Middle East, mostly in Turkey. The standard varieties developed during the Soviet period now enjoy a *de jure* official status in the Russian republics of Adygheya, Kabardino-Balkaria and Karachaevo-Cherkessia. *De facto*, however, the major and often the only language used in official situations is Russian, with the Circassian languages and especially

the extant local dialects limited to colloquial use in rural settings and to events specifically related to traditional culture. All adult speakers of Circassian languages (according to the official census of 2010, there are about 117,500 speakers of West Circassian and about 515,700 speakers of Kabardian), in Russia are bilingual in Russian. Nevertheless, these varieties, being still actively spoken by adults and transmitted to children, are not considered endangered in the strict sense of the word.

The data for this paper comes from the varieties of both West and East Circassian spoken in the Republic of Adygheya in Russian Federation, i.e. the Standard West Circassian largely based on the Temirgoy dialect and two closely related Kabardian dialects, Besleney and Kuban. All these varieties were subject to fieldwork by a team of researchers including the author in 2004–2016. The material includes elicited as well as textual examples. Below, I will present the features of Circassian languages most relevant for the present discussion, i.e. polysynthesis, ergativity and valency classes.

The most notable and pervasive property of the grammar of Circassian and Northwest Caucasian languages in general is polysynthesis, understood as the tendency to express most syntactic and semantic information by means of productively formed morphologically complex words, primarily verbs (see Lander and Testelets 2017; Arkadiev and Lander forthcoming). Verbal forms in Circassian include the expression of as much as four participants, as well as of valency-change, spatial configuration, negation, modality, tense-aspect and subordination by means of both prefixes and suffixes, see Smeets (1984, 1992); Korotkova and Lander (2010); Arkadiev and Letuchiy (2011). Table 2 presents the schematic template of the Circassian verbal complex, glossing over some minor points of cross-dialectal variation.

Table 2: The Circassian verbal complex.

Prefixes									Root			Suffixes		
Argument structure zone						Pre-stem elements			Stem				Endings	
−10	−9	−8	−7	−6	−5	−4	−3	−2	−1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4
absolutive	deictic markers	subordinators	applicatives	dative	ergative	jussive	dynamicity	negation	causative	root	directionals, transitivity	event operators	plural	subordinators, force

Circassian languages exhibit ergativity in both head- and dependent marking (see Smeets 1992; Kumakhov and Vamling 2009; Letuchiy 2012). In head marking, ergativity is manifested in the difference between the absolutive (slot –10) and ergative (slot –5) series of verbal pronominal prefixes. In dependent marking, Circassian languages possess a poor case system comprising just two grammatical case markers, i.e. the absolutive, marking the intransitive S and the transitive P, and the oblique, which, besides marking the transitive A, also flags various indirect objects, e.g. the recipient as well as nominal possessors and even certain adjuncts not cross-referenced in the predicate. In addition to ergative and absolutive arguments, Circassian verbs cross-reference one or several indirect objects. These are always introduced by applicative prefixes appearing in slots –7 and –6 and preceded by person-number prefixes. Applicatives comprise benefactive, malefactive, comitative and many locatives (Paris 1995; Letuchiy 2009a). For this study, the most important applicative is the so-called "dative", which does not have a specialized meaning and is used to formally introduce indirect objects selected by the verbal stem, such as the recipient argument of the verb 'give'.

Table 3 presents the person-number prefixes for all three types of arguments; as can be seen, the three sets largely overlap, but are not identical, and, as I will show below, the roles of the participants are unequivocally indicated by the position of the cross-referencing prefixes in the verbal template.

Table 3: Circassian person-number prefixes.

	West Circassian			Kabardian		
	ABS	**IO**	**ERG**	**ABS**	**IO**	**ERG**
1SG	*sə-*	*s-/z-*		*sə-*	*s-/z-*	
1PL	*tə-*	*t-/d-*		*də-*	*d-/t-*	
2SG	*wə-*	*w-/p-/b-*		*wə-*	*w-/p-/b-*	
2PL	*ŝʷə-*	*ŝʷ-/ẑʷ-*		*fə-*	*f-/v-*	
3SG	∅	*jə-/ə-*		∅		*jə-*
3PL	∅	*a-*		∅	*(j)a-*	

Transitivity is a morphosyntactic feature of verbs in Circassian reflected in the kind of cross-referencing prefixes they take. Importantly, polyvalent verbs can be both transitive and intransitive, and, as will be shown in Section 4, the Circassian inverse-like construction applies to transitive and intransitive polyvalent verbs alike. Transitive verbs have an A and a P argument. The A is case-

marked by the oblique case and is cross-referenced with a special class of prefixes occupying the slot (–5) close to the verbal stem. The P is encoded as the absolutive and is cross-referenced in the leftmost position of the verb form, see example (2).

(2) Besleney Kabardian (elicited)
a. ***wə-s***-*леʁʷ-a*
2SG.ABS-1SG.ERG-see-PST
'I saw you'
b. ***w-jə***-*леʁʷ-a*
2SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-see-PST
'S/he saw you'
c. *pŝaše-**m*** *ç'ale-**r*** *Ø-**jə***-*леʁʷ-a*
girl-OBL boy-ABS 3ABS-3SG.ERG-see-PST
'The girl saw the boy'

Bivalent intransitive verbs have an absolutive S which is cross-referenced in the leftmost position of the verb with the set of prefixes identical to the set cross-referencing the P of transitive verbs, and an indirect object (IO). The IO is introduced either by one of the numerous specific applicative prefixes or by the semantically underspecified dative applicative prefix *(j)e- ~ r-* (this prefix exhibits complex morphophonologically conditioned allomorphy and in some cases is not overtly realized at all). All applicative prefixes together with the pronominal prefixes immediately preceding them occur in slots intermediate between those of the absolutive and the ergative arguments, see example (3).

(3) West Circassian (textual examples)
a. ***sə-p-fe***-*gʷəmeç'ə-n* *faje*
1SG.ABS-2SG.IO-BEN-worry-POT must
'I must worry about you (SG)'
b. ***ŝʷə***-*qə-**s-a***-*ž!*
2PL.ABS-CISL-1SG.IO-DAT-wait(IMP)
'You (PL) wait for me!'
c. *č'əle-r* *zeweɬ-**me*** *Ø-**ja***-*ža-ʁ*
village-ABS warrior-OBL.PL 3ABS-3PL.IO+DAT-wait-PST
'The village waited for the warriors'

The class of two-argument intransitive verbs in Circassian languages is large and heterogeneous. Here belong verbs denoting physical activity ('hit', 'bite', 'drink',

'kiss' etc.) as well as cognition, speech, or perception ('read/learn', 'look at', 'scold', 'talk to', 'smell', 'think about' etc.). With most bivalent intransitive verbs, the absolutive S argument is more agentive than the oblique IO.

There is also a class of trivalent transitive (ditransitive) verbs, which in addition to an ergative A and an absolutive P have an indirect object. With such verbs as 'give', 'sell' or 'say' the IO is introduced by the dative applicative, see example (4a), but specialized applicatives also freely attach to transitive verbs, see example (4b) with the benefactive.

(4) West Circassian (textual examples)
a. *jəzən* *qə-**s-e**-ŝʷ-t-jə*
permission(ABS) CISL-1SG.IO-DAT-2PL.ERG-give(IMP)-ADD
'(You all) give me permission to …'
b. *qə-**p-fe**-s-šečə-š't*
CISL-2SG.IO-BEN-1SG.ERG-weigh-FUT
'I'll weigh it for you (SG)'

Circassian languages possess an elaborate system of marking spatial relations by means of verbal morphology, including directional suffixes, locative prefixes forming part of the applicative set, and deictic prefixes occupying the slot −9 immediately after the absolutive person markers. The most widely used deictic prefix is the cislocative *qV-* or *q̇V* (the quality of the vowel, as in most other prefixes, depends on the morphophonological context; the glottalized consonant occurs in Kabardian while the plain one in West Circassian). It is one of the most frequently occurring morphemes in the Circassian languages[1], and is fairly polyfunctional, with different uses spanning the entire derivation~inflection continuum and sometimes lexicalized. The basic meaning of *qV-* is 'hither', i.e. orientation towards the deictic center, in the simplest case towards the speaker, as shown in examples (5a,b).

(5) Temirgoy West Circassian (elicited)
a. *če* *pλe*
run(IMP) look(IMP)
'Run (away)!' 'Look there!'
b. ***qa**-če* ***qa**-pλe*
CISL-run(IMP) CISL-look(IMP)
'Run here!' 'Look here!'

1 A random narrative from the small corpus of Besleney Kabardian contains 7 occurrences of the cislocative out of the total of 120 wordforms (58,3 items per thousand).

Apart from encoding the deictic spatial meaning, the Circassian cislocative is used in many polyvalent verbal forms, including those shown in examples (3b) and (4) above, serving as a quasi-inverse marker to be discussed in detail in the next session.

4 The inverse-like uses of the Circassian cislocative

That the cislocative prefix is used in certain constellations of person values of participants of polyvalent predicates has been noted in the literature on Circassian languages, see e.g. Kumakhov (1971: 253–254) and especially Testelets (1989), where the affinity of this pattern to direct-inverse systems is explicitly mentioned. However, until recently, no systematic analysis of the distribution of the cislocative has been proposed. The only fairly comprehensive description of the inverse-like use of the cislocative is offered in Lomize (2013) for Besleney Kabardian couched in the framework of Zúñiga (2006). I complement the results of this paper by textual data from the same variety as well as by the data from West Circassian and Kuban Kabardian. It should be said that the three varieties show no significant differences with respect to the phenomenon in question.

The most convenient environment to observe the inverse-like distribution of the Circassian cislocative is the ditransitive verbs 'give' and 'say' with different combinations of person values of the agent and the recipient. Let us first consider the mixed domain, i.e. situations where one of the participants is 1st or 2nd person and the other is 3rd person. When the agent is 1st or 2nd person and the recipient is 3rd person, the cislocative prefix is not used, cf. elicited examples in (6) and textual examples in (7).

(6) Besleney Kabardian (elicited): mixed domain, direct scenario
a. *jə-z-ew-t*
[3SG.IO]DAT-1SG.ERG-DYN-give
'I give it to him/her'
b. *jə-b-ew-t*
[3SG.IO]DAT-2SG.ERG-DYN-give
'You (SG) give it to him/her'

(7) West Circassian (textual examples): mixed domain, direct scenario
a. *ʎ̣ə-m ə-nəbž' qə-tje-z-ʁa-fe-re-m*
man-OBL POSS-age CISL-LOC-REL.ERG-CAUS-fall-DYN-OBL

s-jə-pŝaŝe ***je-s-tə-š'ət***
1SG.IO-POSS-girl [3SG.IO]DAT-1SG.ERG-give-FUT
'I shall give my daughter to the one who guesses the man's age'

b. *jeṭane ç̣əfə-me* ***jə-p-tə*** *zə-χʷə-č̣'e*
then man-OBL.PL 3PL.IO+DAT-2SG.ERG-give TEMP-AUX-INS
'Then when you give it to the people …'

By contrast, when the agent is 3rd person and the recipient 1st or 2nd person, the use of the cislocative is obligatory, as shown by the elicited examples in (8) and textual examples in (9).

(8) Besleney Kabardian (elicited): mixed domain, inverse scenario

a. ***q̇ə****-z-j-e-t (*s-j-e-t)*
*(CISL-)1SG.IO-3SG.ERG-DYN-give
'S/he gives it to me'

b. ***q̇ə****-w-j-e-t (*w-j-e-t)*
*(CISL-)2SG.IO-3SG.ERG-DYN-give
'S/he gives it to you (SG)'

(9) West Circassian (Bible translation, adyghe.web-corpora.net): mixed domain, inverse scenario

a. *s-jə-təž'ən* ***qə-s-ɑ-tə-ž'ə-ʁ***
1SG.IO-POSS-silver CISL-1SG.IO-3PL.ERG-give-RE-PST
'They gave me back my silver' [Gen., 42:28]

b. *ŝʷ-je-λeʔʷ-jə,* *the-m* ***qə-ŝʷ-jə-tə-š'ət***
2PL.ABS-DAT-ask(IMP)-ADD god-OBL CISL-2PL.IO-3SG.ERG-give-FUT
'Ask, and God will give it to you' [Mt., 7:7]

If we now consider the local domain, we find that with a 1st person agent and a 2nd person recipient the cislocative is optional, as shown in (10a) and (11), while with a 2nd person agent and a 1st person recipient it is obligatory, see examples (10b) and (12).

(10) Besleney Kabardian (elicited): local domain, direct and inverse scenarios

a. *(****q̇ə****-)wə-z-ew-t*
(CISL-)2SG.IO-1SG.ERG-DYN-give
'I give it to you (SG)'

b. ***q̇ə**-zə-b-ew-t (*sə-b-ew-t)*
*(CISL-)1SG.IO-2SG.ERG-DYN-give
'You (SG) give it to me'

(11) West Circassian (textual examples): local domain, direct scenario
a. *depqə-m-jə qə-pə-s-xə-nə-ŝ*
wall-OBL-ADD CISL-LOC-1SG.ERG-take-POT-CNV
qə-w-e-s-tə-n
CISL-2SG.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-POT
'I will take it from the wall and give to you'
b. *səd–fedjəz* ***w-e-s-tə-me***
what–like 2SG.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-COND
sə-b-ʁe-χ^{w}ə-ž'ə-š't?
1SG.ABS-2SG.ERG-CAUS-become-RE-FUT
'What should I give you (SG) so that you heal me?' (lit. If what I give you you will heal me?)

(12) Besleney Kabardian (textual example): local domain, inverse scenario
sət–x^{w}ede few mə ***q̇ə-z-e-f-t-a-r?***
what–like honey this CISL-1SG.IO-DAT-2PL.ERG-give-PST-ABS
'What kind of honey did you (PL) give me?'

Finally, in the non-local scenario with both the agent and the recipient of the 3rd person, the use of the cislocative seems to correlate with their relative discourse prominence, i.e. something similar to the distinction between a "proximate" and "obviative" 3rd person (for a preliminary experimental analysis see Lomize 2013: 224–229; see also Kuvshinova 2015 for similar observations regarding Bzhedugh West Circassian). Somewhat simplifying, when the recipient is more topical than the agent, the cislocative prefix tends to be used, while in the reverse situation it is usually absent, see the minimal pair in (13). Note that this context is the only one where the cislocative can actually disambiguate the person-role mapping.

(13) West Circassian (elicited)
a. *a-r ç̣'ele-g^{w}ere-m* ***qə-r-jə-tə-ʁ.***
DEM-ABS guy-some-OBL CISL-[3SG.IO]DAT-3SG.ERG-give-PST
[How did she get this book?] 'Some guy gave it to her.'
b. *a-r ç̣'ele-g^{w}ere-m* ***r-jə-tə-ʁ.***
DEM-ABS guy-some-OBL [3SG.IO]DAT-3SG.ERG-give-PST
[What did she do with the book?] 'She gave it to some guy.'

The analysis of texts confirms this intuition, consider example (14) from a literary rendition of a Nart saga, also presenting an almost minimal pair. In (14a), the recipient, Werzemedzh, is the highly topical protagonist of the whole story, while the agent is the Narts, who were not mentioned in the preceding stretch of the text; here, the cislocative prefix is used on the verb 'give'. By contrast, in (14b), the protagonist is the agent while the Narts are the recipients, and the cislocative prefix is absent.

(14) West Circassian (textual example)
a. *werzemež'-ə* *sena-bʒe-r*
Werzemedzh-OBL wine-horn-ABS
qə-zə-r-a-tə-m,
CISL-TEMP-(3SG.IO)DAT-3PL.ERG-give-OBL
b. *nart-me* ***a-r-jə-ʔʷa-ʁ***.
Nart-OBL.PL 3PL.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-say-PST
'When they gave him the horn with wine, Werzemedzh told the Narts.'

Likewise, in the West Circassian translation of the New Testament, most occurrences of the verb 'give' with Jesus as the agent lack the cislocative prefix, as in example (15a), and most of those with Jesus as the recipient have it, as example (15b). Examples not following this pattern are those where Jesus is locally not the most prominent discourse participant, as e.g. in (16), where the current topic is the Magi bringing gifts to newborn Jesus.

(15) West Circassian (textual examples, adyghe.web-corpora.net)
a. *jəswəs ...* *a-xe-me* *ž'ənepçe-ʔaje-xe-r* *çəf-me*
Jesus DEM-PL-OBL.PL devil-evil-PL-ABS man-OBL.PL
a-x-a-fə-n-x-ew *tjetəʁʷe*
3PL.IO-LOC-3PL.ERG-drive-POT-PL-ADV power
a-r-jə-tə-ʁ.
3PL.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-give-PL
'Jesus ... gave them authority to drive out impure spirits.' [Mt., 10:1]
b. *a-xe-me* *peʁʷeč'* ***qə-r-a-tə-ŝʷə-ʁ-ep***.
DEM-PL-OBL.PL answer CISL-[3SG.IO]DAT-3PL.ERG-give-HBL-PST-NEG
'And they could not give Him the answer.' [Lk., 14:6]

(16) *tən-x-ew* *dəŝ-jə,* *laden-jə,* *smjərn-jə* *sabəjə-m*
gift-PL-ADV gold-ADD incense-ADD myrrh-ADD child-OBL

r-a-tə-ʁe-x.
[3SG.IO]DAT-3PL.ERG-give-PST-PL
'They gave the child gifts of gold, incense and myrrh.' [Mt., 2:11]

The data presented above show that the distribution of the cislocative prefix is sensitive to the alignment of person values with the roles of agent and recipient of ditransitive verbs. Surprisingly, the same distribution is observed with bivalent intransitive verbs. Here the cislocative is sensitive to the person values of the absolutive and the indirect object. In the mixed domain, when the absolutive is 1st or 2nd person and the indirect object 3rd person, the cislocative is not used, as shown in example (17). In reverse situations, i.e. when the absolutive is 3rd person and the indirect object is 1st or 2nd person, the cislocative is obligatory, just as with ditransitive verbs, see example (18).

(17) Kuban Kabardian (textual examples): mixed domain, direct scenario
a. ***d-a-d-ew-ʔepeq̇^{w}*** *vitiran-xe-m*
1PL.ABS-3PL.IO-COM-DYN-help veteran-PL-OBL
'We help the veterans'
b. *žʼeʁ^{w}eʁ^{w}-psaλe-xe-m we* ***w-ja-deʔ^{w}-əw-rjə***
envy-word-PL-OBL 2SG 2SG.ABS-3PL.IO+DAT-listen-ADV-ADD
'You (SG) have listened to the envious words and …'

(18) Kuban Kabardian (textual examples): mixed domain, inverse scenario
a. *wərəs-l̥ə-r … k^{w}edre* ***q̇ə-z-e-wəp̣ŝ-a***
Russian-man-ABS much CISL-1SG.IO-DAT-ask-PST
'The Russian man … asked me a lot'
b. ***q̇ə-zer-w-e-mə-psaλe-r*** *s-çəx^{w}-əw-re …*
CISL-SBD-2SG.IO-DAT-speak-ABS 1SG.ERG-know-ADV-CNV
'I know that he does not speak with you (SG)'

In the local domain, the cislocative is obligatory when the absolutive is 2nd person and the indirect object 1st person, as in example (19a), and optional with the 1st person absolutive and the 2nd person indirect object[2], see examples (19b) and (19c).

2 In the eastern dialects of Kabardian as well as in the standard variety the vestigial translocative prefix *nV-* occurs in the 1>2 contexts, cf. *sə-**n**-w-ew-ŝe* 1SG.ABS-**TRAL**-2SG.IO-DYN-wait 'I am waiting for you' (Kumakhov 2006: 177). This marker is not used in the dialects of Kabardian discussed here.

(19) Besleney Kabardian (textual examples): local domain
a. *wə-**ɻ̇ə**-z-de-ʔepəɻ̇^{w}ə-n*
2SG.ABS-CISL-1SG.IO-COM-help-POT
'You (SG) will help me'
b. *sə-b-de-ʔepəɻ̇^{w}ə-ne-ɻ̇əm*
1SG.ABS-2SG.IO-COM-help-FUT-NEG
'I won't help you (SG)'
c. *sə-**ɻ̇ə**-f-x^{w}-ew-λaʔ^{w}e*
1SG.ABS-CISL-2PL.IO-BEN-DYN-ask
'I ask you (PL)'

In the non-local domain the use or non-use of the cislocative prefix with bivalent intransitive verbs is apparently conditioned by the relative discourse prominence of the absolutive and the indirect object. Thus, in example (20a) with the cislocative, the absolutive is the protagonist's wife who was not mentioned in the preceding stretch of discourse, while the indirect object is the highly activated protagonist. By contrast, in (20b) with the same lexical verb the protagonist is encoded as the absolutive while the indirect object is less activated, and here the cislocative is absent.

(20) West Circassian (textual examples): non-local domain
a. *werzemeʒ'* *wəne-m* *qə-z-j-e-haž'ə-m*,
Werzemedzh house-OBL CISL-TEMP-LOC-DYN-return-OBL
setenaje ***q-je-wəpčə-ʁ***.
Setenay CISL-[3SG.IO]DAT-ask-PST
'When Werzemedzh came home Setenay asked him.'
b. *amdeχan* *jə-λəẑ* *č'erə-h-jə ...* ***je-wəpčə-ʁ***.
Amdekhan POSS-old.man LOC-go.in-ADD DAT-ask-PST
'Amdekhan went to her old husband ... and asked him.'

So far we have seen that the distribution of the Circassian cislocative is sensitive to the relative position on the person hierarchy of the indirect object and the agent of transitive verbs or the absolutive of intransitive verbs: when the indirect object outranks the more agentive participant the cislocative appears, in other cases it is either optional or not used at all. The relevant person hierarchy is shown in (21) and the distribution of the cislocative is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: The distribution of the Circassian cislocative.

IO / ABS/ERG	1	2	3prox	3obv
1		±CISL	−CISL	−CISL
2	+CISL		−CISL	−CISL
3prox	+CISL	+CISL		−CISL
3obv	+CISL	+CISL	+CISL	

The person hierarchy relevant for Circassian

(21) 1 > 2 > 3prox > 3obv

The distribution in Table 4 almost perfectly fits into the distribution of the "canonical" inverse shown in Table 1 above. However, the reader is surely wondering whether the Circassian cislocative is used with monotransitive verbs when the absolutive patient outranks the ergative agent on the person hierarchy. The answer to this question is, surprisingly, negative. Apart from those cases where the occurrence of the cislocative is conditioned by some other factors, such as spatial or aspectual semantics or lexical requirements of the verb, the relative position of the agent and patient of monotransitive verbs on the person hierarchy is irrelevant to its use. This is most clearly seen in examples in (22), where the cislocative is lacking in those configurations where it is obligatory with bivalent intransitive and ditransitive verbs, i.e. with the 3rd person agent and the 1st or 2nd person patient (22a,b), and with the 2nd person agent and the 1st person patient (22c).

(22) Besleney Kabardian (textual examples)

a. *s-jə-ʔape* *jə-wəbəd* ***s-jə-š'e-rjə*** …
1SG.IO-POSS-hand 3SG.ERG-seize 1SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-lead-ADD
'She seized my hand and led me …'

b. *mə ɕəḳə-m* ***wə-jə-ʁe-l̩e-ne-qəm***
this little-OBL 2SG.ABS-3SG.ERG-CAUS-die-FUT-NEG
'These little things won't kill you'

c. *ǯ'eš'ə-m rjen-wə* ***sə-b-ʁe-žej-a-q̇əm-jə***
night-OBL whole-ADV 1SG.ABS-2SG.ERG-CAUS-sleep-PST-NEG-ADD
'You (SG) did not let me sleep for the whole night'

Likewise, the use of the cislocative with ditransitive verbs is only sensitive to the person value of the indirect object (recipient), and not to that of the absolutive

(theme), as evidenced, *inter alia*, by the extensive verbal paradigms presented in such reference grammars as Rogava and Kerasheva (1966: 159–160) for West Circassian or Kumakhov (2006: 196–198) for Kabardian. Consider also textual examples in (23) and (24) showing the verb 'give' with 1st and 2nd person absolutive arguments in combination with 2nd and 3rd person ergative arguments without the cislocative.

(23) West Circassian (textual examples)
qebertaj-ew ***sə-z-e-p-tə-re-m***
Kabardian-ADV 1SG.ABS-REL.IO-DAT-2SG.ERG-give-DYN-OBL
ja-gʷəš'əʔe *ŝʷewə-ps*
3PL.IO+POSS-word honey-water
'The Kabardians whom you give me (in marriage), their words are like sweet water'

(24) *sjənegʷegʷ-xe-m* ***ŝʷ-a-r-a-tə-š't*** [Lk. 21:12, adyghe.web-corpora.net]
synagogue-PL-OBL 2PL.ABS-3PL.IO-DAT-3PL.ERG-give-FUT
'They will deliver you (PL) to synagogues'

To summarize so far, the Circassian cislocative is similar to the canonical inverse in some respects and crucially differs from it in others, perhaps most notably in not being used in monotransitive verbs, which clearly constitute the canonical environment for the occurrence of direct/inverse systems.

Before turning to the typological interpretation of the peculiarities of the Circassian inverse-like construction in the next section, I would like to point out that this usage pattern of the cislocative prefix has apparently been copied into Tapanta Abaza, a Northwest Caucasian variety of the Abkhaz-Abaza branch spoken in the Karachay-Cherkess Republic in prolonged contact with varieties of Kabardian distinct from but closely related to those discussed here. The brief exposition below is based on the fieldwork data collected in the village Inzhich-Chukun in 2017 and 2018.

Tapanta Abaza has a cislocative prefix *ʕa-*, which, in addition to the spatial uses similar to those of the Circassian *qV-*, is frequently, though apparently not obligatorily, used in inverse combinations of person values of participants of ditransitive and bivalent intransitive verbs under conditions very similar to its Circassian cognate. Consider examples (25a) and (25b) showing the use of the cislocative with ditransitive verbs and (26a) with bivalent intransitive verbs when the subject is 3rd person and the indirect object 1st or 2nd person. Examples (25c) and (26b), by contrast, show that when the subject outranks the indirect object on the person hierarchy, the cislocative is not used.

(25) Tapanta Abaza (textual examples)

a. *ẑ-zaʒə-ḳ ...* *nana-rʕa* *r-pnə*
cow-one-INDF granny-ASPL 3PL.IO-at
j-ʕa-hə-r-tə-n
3SG.N.ABS-CISL-1PL.IO-3PL.ERG-give-PST
'At granny's they gave us a cow'

b. *awəj* *bzəj-ta* *w-ʔa-ʕa-h^{w}ə-z* *a-qaz*
that good-ADV 2SG.M.ABS-REL.LOC-CISL-dance-PST.NFIN 3SG.N.IO-for
j-ʕa-wə-r-t-ṭ
3SG.N.ABS-CISL-2SG.M.IO-3PL.ERG-give(AOR)-DCL
'They gave it (the money) to you because you had danced well'

c. *a-televizor* *jə-z-ga-z-g'əj*
DEF-tv.set REL.ABS-1SG.ERG-bring-PST.NFIN-ADD
rə-s-ta-ṭ
3PL.IO-1SG.ERG-give(AOR)-DCL
'I gave them the TV-set I had brought'

(26) a. *jara* *awasa-bərg* ***d-ʕa-sə-z-ç'ʕa-ṭ***
he thus-just 3SG.H.ABS-CISL-1SG.IO-BEN-ask(AOR)-DCL
'He asked me thus'

b. *s-a-pšə-n*
1SG.ABS-3SG.N.IO-look-PST
'I looked at it'

My hypothesis that the use of the Tapanta Abaza cislocative just exemplified results from contact influence of Kabardian, i.e. is an instance of pattern-borrowing (Matras and Sakel 2007), is based on the following observations. First, the inverse-like use of the cislocative prefix in Abaza is less systematic than in Circassian; in particular, in elicited examples with inverse scenarios native speakers almost always allow to drop the cislocative even though in narratives it is used more consistently; cf. the observation by Heine (2012: 132) that "replica categories are generally less grammaticalized than the corresponding model categories". Second, while the inverse-like use of the cislocative prefix is reflected in all reference and standard grammars of both Circassian languages, reference grammars of Abaza, by contrast, do not mention it in their discussion of person-marking with polyvalent verbs, cf. e.g. Genko (1955: 145, 170); Tabulova (1976: 124–132); O'Herin (2002: 58–59). The most detailed description of the distribution of the Abaza cislocative to date is found in Allen (1956: 164–169), who argues for a deictic basis of its uses. Third, the inverse function of the cislocative is conspicuously absent from

Abkhaz (as evidenced both by native speakers' intuitions and by reference grammars, cf. Hewitt 1979: 212–216), the closest relative of Abaza spoken on the other side of the Great Caucasian Range and outside of the Circassian influence. Finally, Abaza has been in close contact with Circassian languages for several centuries and almost all speakers of Abaza in Russia are bilingual in local varieties of Kabardian, which has resulted in a considerable number of loanwords and morpholexical calques and even some borrowed affixes as well. Therefore, it is fairly plausible that it is Kabardian that has been the source of the inverse-like uses of the cislocative prefix in Tapanta Abaza.

5 Discussion and conclusions

As has already been mentioned above, the inverse-like character of the Circassian cislocative has been pointed out already in Testelets (1989). In this section I will discuss the place of Circassian in the typology of direct-inverse systems, taking as a starting point the definition of the canonical direct-inverse system from Jacques and Antonov (2014). Let me briefly remind the main features of the canonical inverse:

(27) The canonical inverse:
- a. applies to transitive verbs;
- b. is obligatory;
- c. serves to disambiguate the person-role mapping;
- d. follows the person hierarchy as shown in Table 1 above;
- e. does not involve valency change;
- f. verbal person markers are role-neutral.

The Circassian cislocative only matches the properties (27d), (27e), and to some extent (27b) (on the issue of obligatoriness see below). The main rationale of the "normal" direct-inverse marking, i.e. disambiguation of the mapping between person values and grammatical roles in morphological systems where person markers do not signal these roles, crucially does not apply to Circassian. Indeed, as has been shown above, the role information is unequivocally encoded by the form and especially position of person prefixes in the morphological template of the Circassian verb, so the need to disambiguate the roles of participants by any extra means potentially arises only in the non-local domain. Therefore, the inverse-like use of the Circassian cislocative prefix is mostly redundant and only adds to the complexity of the polysynthetic morphology, apparently not serving any clear function.

Given this redundancy, it is no surprise that in some cases the cislocative is actually optional even in clearly "inverse" combinations of participants. This is

often the case in verbal forms containing the benefactive applicative (on the benefactive in Circassian see Letuchiy 2009a); it is easy to find almost minimal pairs like (28a,b), which not only contain the same verb and the same combination of participants, but also come from one and the same speaker.

(28) Besleney Kabardian (textual examples)
a. *few-č'e* ***q̇ə-s-xʷe-f-ŝə-ž'!***
honey-new CISL-1SG.IO-BEN-2PL.ERG-do-RE(IMP)
'Make me new honey!'
b. *kaše* ***s-xʷe-p-ŝə-ne.***
porridge 1SG.IO-BEN-2SG.ERG-do-FUT
'You will make me porridge.'

Likewise, the cislocative is optional in causatives from monotransitive verbs, which encode their arguments identically to ditransitive verbs (with the causee, the original agent, being expressed as the indirect object), but show specific syntax, see Letuchiy (2009b, 2015). This is again shown in an almost minimal pair in (29).

(29) West Circassian (textual examples)
a. *zə-par-jə* ***w-jə-mə-ʁe-ɬeʁʷə-ž'-ew***
one-none-ADD 2SG.IO-3SG.ERG-NEG-CAUS-see-RE-ADV
'(He) not letting you see anything …'
b. *ʁʷegʷə-terez* ***qə-t-jə-ʁe-ɬeʁʷə-ʁ-ew***
road-correct CISL-1PL.IO-3SG.ERG-CAUS-see-PST-ADV
'(He) having shown us the right road …'

The second and no less dramatic deviation of the Circassian cislocative from the canonical inverse is its distribution across valency classes of verbs. While canonical direct-inverse systems pertain to transitive verbs with an agent and a patient, it is exactly this verb class where the Circassian cislocative is not used, being completely insensitive to the relative position of the transitive agent and patient on the person hierarchy. Instead, the cislocative is sensitive to the mutual ranking of the indirect object and the subject, the latter term covering the ergative agent of (di)transitive verbs and the more agentive absolutive argument of bivalent intransitive verbs. 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 where the ditransitive recipient is encoded identically to the monotransitive patient (the so-called "primary object", see Dryer 1986), as in Itonama, see example (30).

(30) Itonama (isolate, Bolivia) [Crevels 2010: 685, 693]
a. *sih-**k'i**-ma-doh-ne* *upa'u*
1PL.EX-INV-hand-bite-ASP dog
'The dog bit us on the hand' (monotransitive)
b. *wase'wa* *sih-**k'i**-makï* *pïlata*
yesterday 1PL.EX-INV-give silver
'Yesterday they gave us money' (ditransitive)

However, Circassian languages show consistent indirective alignment with the role of indirect object clearly distinct from that of the absolutive. In those languages that combine indirective encoding of ditransitive constructions and a direct-inverse system, the latter is not sensitive to the role of indirect object (cf. e.g. Japhug Rgyalrong, Jacques 2010: 144–145). And anyway the use of inverse marking with bivalent intransitive verbs is apparently not known in typology – perhaps because such verbs rarely figure in typological studies in the first place.

Jacques and Antonov (2014: 308–310) discuss several deviations from their established canon, but from their exposition it appears that this domain remains seriously underinvestigated. If the major properties of their canonical definition are taken as typological variables, one may envisage a number of deviations summarized in Table 5.

Table 5: Deviations from canonical inverse.

Property	Deviation	Example
limited to transitive verbs	attested with intransitive verbs	Circassian
person marking role-neutral	person marking not role-neutral	Circassian
obligatory direct and inverse marking	optional marking	Circassian (in some cases)
both direct and inverse marking overt	null direct marking null inverse marking	Rgyalrongic, Circassian Tangut[3]
used mainly in the mixed domain	not used in the mixed domain	Kutenai, Nez Percé[4]
direct and inverse forms both transitive	inverse forms intransitive	Straits Salish[5]

3 Gong (2017: 31–33).
4 Jacques and Antonov (2014: 316, fn. 8).
5 Jelinek and Demers (1983).

I believe that the peculiar "non-canonical" behavior of the Circassian inverse-like construction can be explained diachronically. The development of cislocative markers into inverse markers is well-documented in various languages (Jacques and Antonov 2014: 312–313), such as Nez Percé (Sahaptian) or Kuki-Chin (Sino-Tibetan). For example, in Hakhun Tangsa, a Kuki-Chin language of Northeast India, the same series of postverbal markers hosting person cross-reference affixes are used to encode cislocative with verbs such as 'come', as in example (31a), and appear in inverse combinations of person values with polyvalent verbs, as in example (31b). Note that in Hakhun Tangsa the inverse is, strictly speaking, also redundant, since independent personal pronouns encode grammatical relations by means of an ergative-absolutive case system.

(31) Hakhun Tangsa (Sino-Tibetan, India)

a. *dɤ̂ a kə́mî i-tʰɤʔ nɤ́ miʔ mɤ̂-tʰə a-dûŋ vɤ̀*
however 1SG-over LOC person CLF-one NMLZ-big come
r-a
CISL.NON.PST-3
'However, a person greater than me will come' [Boro 2017: 342]

b. *ŋà həniîrûm kə́mə́ rikheʔ* ***r-ɤ***
1SG 3PL ERG kill INV.NON.PST-1SG
'They will kill me' [Boro 2017: 404]

Most importantly, in ditransitive constructions the cislocative in Hakhun Tangsa is sensitive to the person value of the recipient argument, which triggers agreement on the postverbal marker, but, when expressed by an overt pronoun, retains dative case marking, see example (32).

(32) Hakhun Tangsa (Sino-Tibetan, India) [Boro 2017: 343]
ŋà hə càm mêtʰeʔ ʒó kuʔ ***r-ɤ***
1SG DAT rice little extra give INV.NON.PST-1SG
'Bring me some more rice'

It seems very plausible that examples like (32) have served as bridging contexts between the cislocative and the inverse uses of the relevant marker, since with transfer verbs with first person recipients these functions effectively coincide. Likewise, the extension of the cislocative prefix in Circassian to inverse person-role configurations must have naturally occurred 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 first or second person object. The latter type of situations, such as contact, speech or perception, are normally encoded as bivalent

intransitives in Circassian, hence the use of the cislocative with such verbs naturally falls out of its original spatial semantics. Given that the grammatical function of indirect object receives consistent special marking in Circassian and is never encoded in the same way as the absolutive P of transitive verbs, it is natural that the latter does not get involved with the inverse-like system since there is no basis for a putative analogical extension of the cislocative from ditransitive or bivalent intransitive constructions to monotransitive ones.

It should also be noted that similar patterning of 'hither' and 'thither' markers is also attested in some languages geographically close to Circassian, such as Georgian and Ossetic, though in these languages it is much less widespread. Thus, in Georgian there are two productive deictic spatial prefixes, the cislocative *mo-* 'hither' and the translocative *mi-* 'thither', cf. their spatial uses in example (33).

(33) Georgian (Kartvelian, Georgia) [Vogt 1971: 173]
a. ***mo****-di-s*
CISL-go-PRS.3SG.SBJ
'S/he is coming'
b. ***mi****-di-s*
TRAL-go-PRS.3SG.SBJ
'S/he is going'

The same prefixes are used with certain verbs denoting literal or metaphorical transfer such as 'give', 'sell' or 'address', all of which have an indirect object indexed on the verb. The cislocative *mo-* is used when the indirect object is 1st or 2nd person, while the translocative *mi-* occurs with 3rd person indirect objects. This is illustrated in examples (34) and (35). Note that while 'give' is a ditransitive verb in Georgian, 'address' is a bivalent intransitive; this difference, however, is not reflected in the verbal morphology.

(34) Georgian [Vogt 1971: 173]
a. ***mo****-m-ec-i*
CISL-1SG.OBJ-give-AOR.1/2SBJ
'You (SG) gave it to me'
b. ***mi****-v-ec-i*
TRAL-1.SBJ-give-AOR.1/2SBJ
'I gave it to him/her'

(35) a. ***mo****-g-mart-a*
CISL-2.OBJ-address-AOR.3SG.SBJ
'S/he addressed you (SG)'
b. ***mi-****v-mart-e*
TRAL-1.SBJ-address-AOR.1/2SBJ
'I addressed him/her'

The verbal indexing system of Georgian follows a complex partly hierarchical pattern involving both prefixes and suffixes; third person objects are normally not indexed. However, like in Circassian, the verbal person markers indicate the roles of arguments by themselves, and the deictic prefixes are fully redundant. Besides that, the use pattern of deictic prefixes illustrated in examples (34) and (35) is limited to several verbs with indirect objects in Georgian and does not extend to monotransitive verbs.

A similar pattern is reported for Ossetic, which, like Georgian, has a deictic opposition in its spatial verbal prefixes (see e.g. Abaev 1964: 76–79; Thordarson 2009: 67–68). With verbs denoting displacement, the prefix *a-* indicates that motion is directed out of an enclosure and from the speaker, as in example (36a), while the prefix *ærba-* denotes the direction into an enclosure and towards the speaker, as in example (36b). The same prefixes are claimed to be sensitive to the relative position of the agent and the recipient of some transfer verbs on the person hierarchy, see example (37) showing this for the verb 'send'. It is unclear what the extent of this pattern is in Ossetic.[6]

(36) Ossetic (Indo-European > Iranian; North Caucasus)
[Thordarson 2009: 67, 68]
a. ***a****-cə-d-i*
TRAL-go-PST-3SG
'S/he went out (from the speaker)'
b. ***ærba****-cə-d-i*
CISL-go-PST-3SG
'S/he came in (towards the speaker)'

(37) a. *æz* ***a****-rvəs-t-on* *wəm-æn* *činəg*
1SG:NOM TRAL-send-PST-1SG he-DAT book
'I sent him the book'

6 Moreover, David Erschler (p.c.) suggests that Thordarson's data may be inaccurate. This issue requires further investigation.

b. *wəy* ***ærba****-rvəs-t-a* *mæn-æn* *činəg*
he:NOM CISL-send-PST-3SG 1SG-DAT book
'He sent me the book'

The pattern of usage of deictic prefixes in Ossetic illustrated in example (37) is even farther from the "canonical" inverse than the Circassian one since Ossetic only indexes subject (S/A) arguments on the verb and uses free case-marked pronouns or noun phrases for other participants. Still, it can corroborate the diachronic scenario proposed above.

Finally, similar patterns are observed in Japanese, where exist two constructions whose properties are reminiscent of those discussed here and both of which, notably, employ markers with clearly deictic semantics (Shibatani 2003; Koga and Ohori 2008[7]). The first construction employs ditransitive verbs meaning 'give', either as lexical verbs or as members of the periphrastic benefactive construction where the 'give'-verbs are added to the converb form of the lexical verb and introduce a benefactive indirect object marked with the dative case (Shibatani 1996). Crucially, the choice among the various 'give'-verbs is in both cases regulated by the relative ranking of the agent of the event and the recipient/beneficiary on the "empathy hierarchy" (abstracting away from the orthogonal dimension of asymmetric social relations between them): in particular, if the agent is first person and the recipient/beneficiary second or third person, the verbs *yaru* or *ageru* are employed, as in (38a) and (39a), whereas in the reverse situation the verbs *kureru* and *kudasaru* have to be used, see (38b) and (39b). Examples in (38) illustrate the lexical use of these verbs and examples in (39) show them as members of the benefactive construction.

(38) Japanese [Koga and Ohori 2008: 49–50]
a. *Watashi-wa* *Ken-ni* *booru-o* ***yat-ta***.
I-TOP Ken-DAT ball-ACC give-PST
'I gave the ball to Ken.'
b. *Ken-ga* *watashi-ni* *booru-o* ***kure-ta***.
Ken-NOM I-DAT ball-ACC give-PST
'Ken gave the ball to me.'

(39) a. *Boku-wa* *Ken-ni* *booru-o* ***nage-te*** ***yat-ta***.
I-TOP Ken-DAT ball-ACC throw-CNV give-PST
'I threw the ball to Ken.'

7 I thank Guillaume Jacques for pointing this work out to me.

b. *Ken-wa boku-ni booru-o* ***nage-te kure-ta***.
Ken-TOP I-DAT ball-ACC throw-CNV give-PST
'Ken threw the ball to me (for my benefit).'

Importantly, the Japanese 'give'-verbs are similar to the Caucasian data discussed here in that, first, their use is sensitive to the grammatical role of indirect object and, second, in that the opposition between different 'give'-verbs in Japanese does not have much to do with the disambiguation of role-reference mapping, since in Japanese the latter is achieved by case markers on arguments (at least when these are overt).

The second Japanese construction of relevance to our discussion involves the motion verb *kuru* 'come', which is oriented towards the speaker or the deictic center and in some of its grammaticalized uses is similar to cislocative morphemes of other languages, as opposed to the translocative verb *iku* 'go', denoting motion directed from the deictic center (Shibatani 2003: 259–263). Both of these verbs have a number of semi-grammaticalized uses more or less closely related to their basic meaning (Shibatani 2003: 264–273). In addition to these, Shibatani (2003: 273–279) singles out the use of the verb *kuru* 'come' he calls "inverse". It involves the addition of *kuru* to verbs involving a recipient or goal participant coinciding either with the speaker or with a person in the speaker's sphere. According to Shibatani, in such contexts the use of *kuru* is obligatory. Consider examples (40a) with a 1st person agent and a 3rd person recipient, where *kuru* is illicit, and (40b) with a 3rd person agent and 1st person recipient, where *kuru* is mandatory. Note that there is no parallel "direct" uses of *iku* 'go'.

(40) Japanese [Shibatani 2003: 274]
a. *Boku-wa Hanako-ni tegami-o* ***kai-ta {/*kai-te it-ta}.***
I-TOP Hanako-DAT letter-ACC write-PST/*write-CNV go-PST
'I wrote a letter to Hanako.'
b. *Ken-ga boku-ni tegami-o* ***kai-te ki-ta/*kai-ta.***
Ken-NOM I-DAT letter-ACC write-CNV come-PST/*write-PST
'Ken wrote me a letter.'

Besides that, according to Koga and Ohori (2008), the "inverse" use of *kuru* 'come' occurs not only with goal/recipient-oriented predicates, but also with at least some monotransitive verbs with 1st person patients in the accusative case, see example (41), as well as in cases where the 1st person is not an argument of the verb at all but is either the possessor of an argument, as in (42a), or is merely implied by the construction, as in (42b). In all such cases *kuru* also implies

volitionality of the agent and "focus on an initiation or inception of an event" (Koga and Ohori 2008: 48).

(41) Japanese [Koga and Ohori 2008: 43]
Ken-ga boku-o kyoohaku ***shi-te ki-ta/??shi-ta***.
Ken-NOM I-ACC threat do-CNV come-PST/??do-PST
'Ken threatened me.'

(42) a. *Ken-ga boku-no ashi-o wazato*
Ken-NOM I-GEN foot-ACC deliberately
fun-de ki-ta*/?fun-da*.
step.on-CNV come-PST/?step.on-PST
'Ken intentionally stepped on my foot.' [Koga and Ohori 2008: 47]
b. *Ken-ga nedan-o nibai-ni* ***tsuriage-te ki-ta***.
Ken-NOM price-ACC twice.as.much-DAT raise-CNV come-PST
'Ken doubled the price (on me).' [Koga and Ohori 2008: 43]

The Japanese data shows how deictic distinctions encoded in lexical verbs can give rise to their inverse-like patterning when they come to be used as (semi-) grammaticalized components of periphrastic or serial constructions, and, most importantly, how such deictic verbs are naturally oriented primarily or exclusively towards the role of goal or recipient rather than transitive patient.

To conclude, the Circassian cislocative prefix *qV-* shares with the "canonical" inverse markers some of the crucial factors conditioning its occurrence as well as a common diachronic origin. However, as has been shown above, the inverse-like uses of the Circassian cislocative differ from the "canonical" inverse in two important respects: first, it is almost fully redundant and does not fulfill the disambiguation function; second, it is not sensitive to transitivity and to the role of the transitive patient. Instead, the Circassian cislocative (as well as its areal parallels) is triggered by the role of the indirect object, with transitive and bivalent intransitive verbs alike. In the context of the predominantly ergative morphosyntax of the Circassian languages, the cislocative thus behaves in a somewhat nominative-accusative fashion showing sensitivity to S/A versus IO. Notably, this is not the only grammatical process in Circassian with such behavior, see e.g. Letuchiy (2012) and Arkadiev and Letuchiy (forthcoming). Anyway, by this article I hope to have shown that the typological space of inverse constructions can be supplemented by a highly non-trivial example of Circassian and that many of its peculiarities can be naturally explained if its historical origins are taken into account.

Acknowledgments: This paper is based on talks given at the international conference "Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters" (Moscow, October 2017) and at the 51st Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (Tallinn, August–September 2018). I thank all my consultants for their help and patience and the audiences of the aforementioned conferences as well as Irina Bagirokova, Oleg Belyaev, David Erschler, Eitan Grossman, Guillaume Jacques and Yury Lander, as well as an anonymous reviewer, for their useful feedback. All faults and shortcomings are mine. The research has been supported by the Russian Science Foundation, grant # 17-18-01184.

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3	1st, 2nd, 3rd person
ABS	absolutive
ACC	accusative
ADD	additive
ADV	adverbial
AOR	aorist
ASP	aspect
ASPL	associative plural
AUX	auxiliary verb
BEN	benefactive
CAUS	causative
CISL	cislocative
CLF	classifier
CNV	converb
COM	comitative
COND	conditional
DAT	dative
DCL	declarative
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative
DIR	direct
DYN	dynamic
ERG	ergative
EX	exclusive
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
H	human
HBL	habilitive
IMP	imperative
INDF	indefinite
INS	instrumental

INV	inverse
IO	indirect object
LOC	locative
M	masculine
N	neuter
NEG	negation
NFIN	non-finite
NMLZ	nominalization
NOM	nominative
OBJ	object
OBL	oblique
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
POT	potential
PRS	present
PST	past
RE	refactive
REL	relativizer
SBD	subordinator
SBJ	subject
SG	singular
TEMP	temporal
TOP	topic
TRAL	translocative

References

Abaev, Vasilij I. 1964. *A grammatical sketch of Ossetic*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics.

Allen, W. Sidney. 1956. Structure and system in the Abaza verbal complex. *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 127–176.

Arkadiev, Peter M. & Yury A. Lander. forthcoming. The North-West Caucasian languages. To appear in Maria Polinsky (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of the languages of the Caucasus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arkadiev, Peter M. & Alexander B. Letuchiy. 2011. Prefixes and suffixes in the Adyghe polysynthetic wordform: Types of interaction. In Vittorio S. Tomelleri, Manana Topadze & Anna Lukianowicz (eds.), *Languages and cultures in the Caucasus*, 495–514. München & Berlin: Otto Sagner.

Arkadiev, Peter M. & Alexander B. Letuchiy. forthcoming. Indirect antipassive in Circassian. To appear in Katarzyna Janic & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (eds.), *The multifaceted nature of antipassive*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Boro, Krishna. 2017. *A grammar of Hakhun Tangsa*. PhD dissertation, University of Oregon.

Brown, Dunstan, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.). 2013. *Canonical morphology and syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1980. Inverse verb forms in Siberia: Evidence from Chukchee, Koryak and Kamchadal. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 1(1). 61–74.
Corbett, Greville G. 2005. The canonical approach to typology. In Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges & David S. Rood (eds.), *Linguistic diversity and language theories*, 25–49. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Crevels, Mily. 2010. Ditransitives in Itonama. In Andrey Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions. A comparative handbook*, 678–709. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Dahlstrom, Amy Louise. 1986. *Plains Cree morphosyntax*. PhD Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley.
DeLancey, Scott. 1981. An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns. *Language* 57(3). 626–667.
Dryer, Matthew. 1986. Primary objects, secondary objects, and antidative. *Language* 62(4). 808–845.
Genko, Anatoliy N. 1955. *Abazinskij jazyk. Grammatičeskij očerk narečija tapanta*. [The Abaza language. A grammatical sketch of the Tapanta dialect]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
Givón, Talmy. 1994. The pragmatics of de-transitive voice: Functional and typological aspects of inversion. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Voice and inversion*, 3–44. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Gong, Xun. 2017. Verb stems in Tangut and their orthography. *Scripta* 9. 29–48.
Grossman, Eitan, Anton Antonov & Guillaume Jacques. 2018. A cross-linguistic rarity in synchrony and diachrony. Adverbial subordinator prefixes exist. *STUF/Language Typology and Universals* 71(4). 513–538.
Harris, Alice C. 2008. On the explanation of typologically unusual structures. In Jeff Good (ed.), *Linguistic universals and language change*, 54–76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Heine, Bernd. 2012. On polysemy copying and grammaticalization in language contact. In Claudine Chamoreau & Isabelle Léglise (eds.), *Dynamics of contact-induced language change*, 125–166. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
Hewitt, B. George. 1979. *Abkhaz*. Amsterdam: North Holland.
Hewitt, B. George. 2005. North West Caucasian. *Lingua* 119. 91–145.
Jacques, Guillaume. 2010. The inverse in Japhug Rgyalrong. *Language and Linguistics* 11(1). 127–157.
Jacques, Guillaume & Anton Antonov. 2014. Direct-inverse systems. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8. 301–318.
Jelinek, Eloise & Richard A. Demers. 1983. The agent hierarchy and voice in some Coast Salish languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49(2). 167–185.
Koga, Hiroaki & Toshio Ohori. 2008. Reintroducing inverse constructions in Japanese. In Robert D. Van Valin Jr. (ed.), *Investigations of the syntax-semantics-pragmatics interface*, 37–57. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Korotkova, Natalia A. & Yury A. Lander. 2010. Deriving suffix ordering in polysynthesis: Evidence from Adyghe. *Morphology* 20. 299–319.
Kumakhov, Mukhadin A. 1971. *Slovoizmenenie adygskix jazykov* [Inflection in the Circassian languages]. Moscow: Nauka.
Kumakhov, Mukhadin A. (ed.) 2006. *Kabardino-čerkesskij jazyk* [The Kabardian language]. Vol. I. Nalchik: El-Fa.
Kumakhov, Mukhadin A. & Karina Vamling. 2009. *Circassian clause structure*. Malmö: Malmö University.

Kuvshinova, Ekaterina V. 2015. Direktivnyj preverb v "inversivnoj funkcii" v bžedugskom dialekte adygejskogo jazyka [The "inverse" function of the directional preverb in Bzhedugh Adyghe]. *Polevye issledovanija studentov RGGU. Ètnologija, fol'kloristika, lingvistika* [RSUH students' field studies. Ethnology, folkloristics, linguistics]. No. 10, 202–220. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities.

Lander, Yury A. & Yakov G. Testelets. 2017. Adyghe. In Michael Fortescue, Marianne Mithun & Nicholas Evans (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of polysynthesis*, 948–970. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Letuchiy [Letučij], Alexander B. 2009a. Affiksy benefaktiva i malefaktiva: sintaksičeskie osobennosti i krug upotreblenij [Benefactive and malefactive markers: Syntactic peculiarities and range of uses]. In Yakov Testelets (ed.), *Aspekty polisintetizma: Očerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* [Aspects of polysynthesis: Studies in Adyghe grammar], 329–371. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities.

Letuchiy [Letučij], Alexander B. 2009b. Kauzativ, dekauzativ i labil'nost' [Causative, anticausative, and lability]. In Yakov Testelets (ed.), *Aspekty polisintetizma: Očerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* [Aspects of polysynthesis: Studies in Adyghe grammar], 372–428. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities.

Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2012. Ergativity in the Adyghe system of valency-changing derivations. In Gilles Authier & Katharina Haude (eds.), *Ergativity, valency and voice*, 323–354. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Letuchiy, Alexander B. 2015. Scope versus ordering of operations: Causativization and ordering of valency-changing operations in Adyghe. In Stela Manova (ed.), *Affix ordering across languages and frameworks*, 53–81. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lomize, Grigory E. 2013. Inversiv v uljapskom govore kabardino-čerkesskogo jazyka [The inverse in the Ulyap variety of Kabardian]. *Polevye issledovanija studentov RGGU. Ètnologija, fol'kloristika, lingvistika, religiovedenie* [RSUH students' field studies. Ethnology, folkloristics, linguistics, religion studies]. No. 8, 210–233. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities.

Malchukov, Andrey, Bernard Comrie & Martin Haspelmath. 2010. Ditransitive constructions: An overview. In Andrey Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Studies in ditransitive constructions. A comparative handbook*, 1–64. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Matras, Yaron & Jeannete Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31(4). 829–865.

Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press.

O'Herin, Brian. 2002. *Case and agreement in Abaza*. Arlington: SIL International.

Paris, Catherine. 1995. Localisation en tcherkesse: Forme et substance du référent. In André Rousseau (ed.), *Les préverbes dans les langues d'Europe. Introduction à l'étude de la préverbation*, 345–379. Lille: Presses Universitaires de Septentrion.

Rogava, Georgi V. & Zeinab I. Kerasheva. 1966. *Grammatika adygejskogo literaturnogo jazyka* [A grammar of Standard West Circassian]. Krasnodar, Majkop: Adygejskoe knižnoje izdatel'stvo.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1996. Applicatives and benefactives. In Masayoshi Shibatani & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Their form and meaning*, 157–194. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2003. Directional verbs in Japanese. In Erin Shay & Uwe Seibert (eds.), *Motion, direction and location in languages*, 259–286. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of features and ergativity. In R. M. W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*, 112–171. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

Smeets, Rieks. 1984. *Studies in West Circassian phonology and morphology*. Leiden: The Hakuchi Press.

Smeets, Rieks. 1992. On valencies, actants and actant coding in Circassian. In B. George Hewitt (ed.), *Caucasian perspectives*, 98–144. München & Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.

Tabulova, Nuria T. 1976. *Grammatika abazinskogo jazyka. Fonetika i morfologija* [A grammar of Abaza: Phonetics and morphology]. Čerkessk: Karačaevo-Čerkesskoe otdelenie Stavropol'skogo knižnogo izdatel'stva.

Testelets [Testelec], Yakov G. 1989. Kategorija inversiva: opredelenie i opyt tipologii [The category of inverse: Definition and typology]. *Problemy semantičeskoj i sintaksičeskoj tipologii* [Problems of semantic and syntactic typology], 135–146. Moscow: Nauka.

Testelets [Testelec], Yakov G. (ed.). 2009. *Aspekty polisintetizma: Očerki po grammatike adygejskogo jazyka* [Aspects of polysynthesis: Studies in Adyghe grammar]. Moscow: Russian State University for the Humanities.

Thordarson, Fridrik. 2009. *Ossetic grammatical studies*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Vogt, Hans. 1971. *Grammaire de la langue géorgienne*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Witzlack-Makarevich, Alena, Taras Zakharko, Lennart Bierkandt, Fernando Zúñiga & Balthasar Bickel. 2016. Decomposing hierarchical alignment: Co-arguments as conditions on alignment and the limits of referential hierarchies as explanations in verb agreement. *Linguistics* 54(3). 531–561.

Wohlgemuth, Jan & Michael Cysouw (eds.). 2010. *Rethinking universals. How rarities affect linguistic theories*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Zavala, Roberto. 2007. Inversion and obviation in Mesoamerica. In Peter K. Austin & Andrew Simpson (eds.), *Endangered languages*, 267–306. Hamburg: Buske.

Zúñiga, Fernando. 2006. *Deixis and alignment: Inverse systems in indigenous languages of the Americas*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Zúñiga, Fernando. 2014. Inversion, obviation, and animacy in native languages of the Americas: Elements for a cross-linguistic survey. *Anthropological Linguistics*, 56(3/4). 1–22.