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Overview: This paper provides an account for the distribution of the so-called cislocative marker -q"- in Shapsug Adyghe (North West Caucasian, Russia / Turkey) which acts as an inverse as well as a PCC marker. We show that the phenomenon challenges functional approaches to PCC effects, as it violates alignment of salience hierarchies. Seemingly reverse PCC configuration are marked by the cislocative in ditransitives, while the cislocative in transitive structures acts as a canonical inverse marker. Data comes from elicitation with 3 native speakers of Shabsug Adyghe as well as an online survey with 36 participants. We argue for an underlying DO-over-IO ditransitive structure, which makes the cislocative sensitive to syntactic hierarchy instead of semantic roles.

Puzzle: In ditransitive constructions (give verbs, causatives and benefactives) in Shapsug Adyghe, the marker -q"- appears if the indirect object (recipient in (2)) outranks the direct object (patient) on the person hierarchy (Silverstein 1976), which is the case in (2-b), (2-c), and (2-d), while it is absent otherwise. With monotransitive verbs, however, the cislocative marker occurs if the direct object outranks the subject, as in (1-b), (1-d), and (1-e).

(1) a. Se wo wɔ̃-sɔ̃-letɔ. 1SG 2SG 2SG-1SG-see ‘I see you.’
   WA:1, IA:2, X CIS
b. Wo se sɔ̃-q"-wo-le-ta. 2SG 1SG 1SG-CIS-2SG-see ‘You see me.’
   WA:2, IA:1, X CIS
c. Se Hasan-ə sɔ̃-le-ta. 1SG Hasan-ABS 1SG-see ‘I see Hasan.’
   WA:1, IA:3, X CIS
d. Wo Hasan-ə wɔ̃-le-ta. 2SG Hasan-ABS 2SG-see ‘You see Hasan.’
   WA:2, IA:3, X CIS
e. Hasan-əm se sɔ̃-q"-le-ta. Hasan-obl 1SG 1SG-CIS-see ‘Hasan sees me.’
   WA:3, IA:1, X CIS
   WA:3, IA:2, X CIS

Salience scales, as in (3), are usually argued to align in unmarked scenarios, i.e. additional markers are added only when one argument lower on the argument scales outranks another argument on the person scale (Aissen 1999; Haspelmath 2004). This what we find in the transitive pattern in (1). Crucially, in ditransitives the cislocative occurs in unmarked scenarios, where recipient outranks patient. In other words: a reverse PCC effect. We thus tie the cislocative distribution to syntactic structure, not bi-roles.

(3) a. AGENT > RECIPIENT > PATIENT / THEME (Grimshaw 1990; Van Valin 1990; Givón 2001)
   b. 1 > 2 > 3 (Silverstein 1976; Aissen 1999)

Against IO-over-DO: We provide independent evidence against 3 structures which have been proposed for IO-over-DO cross-linguistically. We conclude that ditransitives in Adyghe merge DOs over IOs, providing the right set-up for the PCC data above.

   (Marantz 1993; Brueening 2001)
   (Pykkänen 2008)
c. [vP SU [v [PP IO [P DO Fhave ] ] vcause ] ]
According to Pylkkänen (2008), low applicatives in (4-b) imply transfer of possession and a direct relation between the indirect object and the direct object. Thus, they should not occur with statives (no transfer) or unergatives (no direct object). This is not true for Adyghe, see (5) and (6).

(5) Hasan-ər wə-ʃə-la= Legislative
Hasan-ABS 2SG-BEN-work
‘Hasan works for you.’

(6) Hasan-əm ʃə=qə A-r Ali-ʃəm (ʃə=gə) fə=r-ər
Hasan-OBL bag-ABS Ali-OBL for BEN-3SG-hold
‘Hasan is holding the bag for Ali.’

Harley (1997, 2002) assumes that there is real having-relation between patient and recipient, thus the structure in (4-c). Thus, the recipient should be existent and receiving (Oehrle 1976; Harley 2002). These predictions are not borne out in Adyghe, see (7).

Finally, an argument that serves against all three structures in (4) is an asymmetry in reflexive binding. DOs can bind IOs but not vice versa, shown in (8).

(7) a. Ali-ʃəm ji-fə=ja= Legislative pasta=fə=r-ʃə=r
Ali-OBL POSS-wife cake BEN-3SG-buy-PST
‘Ali bought a cake for his wife (but he is actually not married.)’

b. Ali-ʃəm ji-fə=ja= pasta=fə=r-ʃə=r
Ali-OBL POSS-wife cake BEN-3SG-buy-PST
‘Ali bought a cake for his wife (but he gave it to his mother.’

Amongst DO-over-IO structures that have been proposed, we argue for (10-a) over (10-b), based on the fact that one can nominalize ditransitive structures (11), which should not permitted for zero P heads (Bruening 2001, 2010).

(8) Se Bilal-ər jə= Legislative ʃə= Legislative ə-ʃə= Legislative ʒə
I Bilal-ABS self-ABS 3SG-1SG-give= Legislative ʒə
‘I gave Bilal to himself.’

(9) Se Bilal-əm, jə= Legislative ʃə= Legislative ə-ʃə= Legislative ʒə
I Bilal-OBL self refl-1SG-give= Legislative ʒə
‘I gave himself to Bilal.’

Implementation: We adopt the Cyclic Agree approach by Béjar & Rezac (2009) with a fully articulated probe [u-3-2-1], where the Φ-feature bundle is organized into subsets and probes downward first. Thus, 1PS can value the probe fully, whereas 3PS would lead the probe to enter a second Agree cycle as [u-2-1] probing upwards. Whenever the probe is fully valued in the first cycle, an additional probe is inserted to agree with the remaining argument. The cislocative reflects this added probe morphologically, see (12).

(10) a. [v PS] [v’ [v ʃə= Legislative IO V ] v ]
    b. [v PS] [v’ [v ʃə= Legislative IO Ploc ] vcause ]

(11) Ali-ʃəm j-ənə ɡufy= Legislative ʃə= Legislative ʃə=fə= Legislative
Ali-OBL POSS-mother gift 3SG-give-INF? 1SG-want-PST
‘I wanted/asked Ali’s gift-giving to his mother.’

We analyze the person markers, attached to the verbs in (2) and (1) as clitics; suggestive evidence comes from their phonologically reduced forms, compared to the full-fledged pronominal counterparts. While transitive structures place the [u-3-2-1] probe with v, ditransitive structures place the probe with V. No interaction is predicted with the subject in ditransitives since they are merged in spec, vP and therefore outside the cyclic expansion possibilities of V.