



**HAL**  
open science

## Direct/Inverse Systems

Guillaume Jacques, Anton Antonov

► **To cite this version:**

Guillaume Jacques, Anton Antonov. Direct/Inverse Systems. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2014, 8, pp.301 - 318. 10.1111/lnc3.12079 . hal-01386706

**HAL Id: hal-01386706**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01386706>**

Submitted on 24 Oct 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Direct/inverse systems<sup>\*</sup>

Guillaume JACQUES, Anton ANTONOV  
CNRS-INALCO-EHESS, CRLAO

## 1 Introduction

1 The term ‘inverse’ has been used in the typological literature to designate a considerable variety of  
2 phenomena, which have been analyzed in several distinct frameworks. Direct-inverse systems are  
3 attested in a number of endangered languages spoken in the Americas (Algonquian, Mapudungun,  
4 Sahaptian etc) and the Himalayas (Sino-Tibetan).

5 The aim of this article is to provide an overview of direct/inverse systems in a perspective as free  
6 as possible from framework-specific assumptions, using the most recent data and adopting both a  
7 typological and a historical perspective. It is divided into four sections.

8 First, we propose a definition of the canonical direct/inverse system, and introduce the concepts  
9 of *proximate/obviative* and *referential hierarchies*.

10 Second, we present examples of attested direct/inverse systems in the world’s languages by sub-  
11 dividing them into two main categories: near-canonical and highly non-canonical, and additionally  
12 discussing systems with hierarchical agreement but without direction (direct/inverse) marking.

13 Third, we evaluate to what extent direct/inverse systems are correlated with other typological  
14 features.

15 Fourth, we apply a panchronic perspective on direct/inverse systems, studying their attested  
16 origin and their evolution, and how the diachronic pathways can help understand the present data.

## 17 2 Basic definition

18 Before defining the canonical direct/inverse system, we need to introduce some of the terminology  
19 used by typologists to describe systems which index two arguments.<sup>1</sup> It is customary to represent  
20 these systems using semantic maps in tabular format as in Table 1, where rows indicate agent and  
21 columns patient. The different transitive configurations are symbolically represented by using an  
22 arrow, with the agent on its left and the patient on its right, both abbreviated as 1, 2, 3 for first,

---

<sup>\*</sup>We would like to thank Sonia Cristofaro, Lynn Drapeau, Ives Goddard, Katharina Haude, Enrique Palancar, Géraldine Walther and two anonymous reviewers for useful comments on earlier versions of this article. We are responsible for any remaining errors. This research was funded by the HimalCo project (ANR-12-CORP-0006) and is related to the research strand LR-4.11 ‘Automatic paradigm generation and language description’ of the Labex EFL (funded by the ANR/CGI).

<sup>1</sup>Indexation systems involving three arguments exist, but are rarer and will not be considered in this section.

23 second and third person respectively. The first and second persons are called SPEECH ACT PARTICI-  
 24 PANTS (SAP). In the case of third person arguments 3 indicates *proximate* and 3' *obviative* referents  
 25 (2.2). In intransitive forms, by contrast, the abbreviation refers to the sole argument of the verb.  
 26 They are systematically included for reference.

27 The cells corresponding to the 1→1 and 2→2 configurations are semantically reflexive and are  
 28 thus filled in grey, since in most languages they tend to be expressed by an intransitive construction<sup>2</sup>.  
 29 The 3→3 cell, on the other hand, is not since the corresponding configuration is not necessarily  
 30 reflexive.

Table 1: The three domains of the transitive paradigm

|      | 1   | 2   | 3   |
|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 1    | 1→1 | 1→2 | 1→3 |
| 2    | 2→1 | 2→2 | 2→3 |
| 3    | 3→1 | 3→2 | 3→3 |
| INTR | 1   | 2   | 3   |

31 This table does not represent number, clusivity and obviation, but more complex paradigms  
 32 including these features will be studied below.

33 As will become clear in the course of this article, it is convenient to separate the transitive  
 34 paradigm into three DOMAINS (Zúniga 2006, 47-54), represented in Table 1 by different colours.  
 35 First, the LOCAL domain (in blue) comprises the forms 1→2 and 2→1, where both arguments are  
 36 SAPs. Second, the NON-LOCAL domain (in red) refers to the cases where both arguments are third  
 37 person. Third, the MIXED domain (in green) includes all the forms with a SAP argument and a  
 38 third person (1→3, 2→3, 3→1, 3→2).

## 39 2.1 The canonical direct/inverse system

40 Given the diversity of direct/inverse systems in the world's languages, canonical typology (Corbett,  
 41 2007) seems to be a useful tool for accurately describing them by accounting for their deviation from  
 42 the canon. The canonical direct/inverse system could then be defined as a type of transitive person  
 43 marking system presenting three essential characteristics.

44 First, in such a system all person-number markers are neutral with regard to syntactic roles (S,  
 45 A and O).<sup>3</sup>

46 Second, the ambiguity which this entails (especially in mixed scenarios) is resolved by way of  
 47 obligatory (and mutually exclusive) markers, called *direct* (in the case of 1→2, SAP→3, 3→3') and  
 48 *inverse* (in the case of 2→1, 3→SAP and 3'→3), respectively. These markers do not appear on  
 49 intransitive verbs. This property is generally described in terms of *referential hierarchies* (see section  
 50 2.3).

<sup>2</sup>The same applies, in languages with clusivity (a distinction between first person inclusive vs exclusive) to the com-  
 bination of first inclusive and second person.

<sup>3</sup>See Haspelmath (2011) for a discussion of the terms S (only argument of an intransitive verb), A (more agent-like  
 argument of a transitive verb) and O (more patient-like argument of a transitive verb) . In terms of Bickel et al. (in press,  
 9)'s approach, all persons *trigger agreement* in all three syntactic roles.

51 Third, inverse verb forms unlike verb forms in a passive construction, do not undergo valency  
 52 changes (the verb does not become intransitive when an inverse marker is added), and the arguments  
 53 keep the same syntactic properties (such as case marking and pivot accessibility) as in the direct  
 54 construction.

55 Table 2 illustrates the canonical system, for which we have taken  $1 > 2 > 3 > 3'$  as the canonical  
 56 person hierarchy. We can observe the perfectly symmetrical distribution of direct and inverse forms,  
 57 along an axis running from the upper left side to the bottom right side of the table. Direct forms  
 58 appear in orange and inverse ones in green.

Table 2: The canonical direct/inverse system

|      | 1   | 2   | 3    | 3'   |
|------|-----|-----|------|------|
| 1    |     | 1→2 | 1→3  |      |
| 2    | 2→1 |     | 2→3  |      |
| 3    | 3→1 | 3→2 |      | 3→3' |
| 3'   |     |     | 3'→3 |      |
| INTR | 1   | 2   | 3    |      |

59 No language exactly attests the pattern in Table 2, although Rgyalrong languages (Sino-Tibetan,  
 60 Sichuan, China) are among the closest to it.<sup>4</sup>

61 The status of the local and non-local domains varies considerably across languages, but in most  
 62 languages with near-canonical systems inverse and/or direct markers can also be found in these  
 63 domains.

64 In the local domain, all possibilities but one appear to be attested:  $2 \rightarrow 1$  receives the inverse  
 65 marker (as in Situ Rgyalrong), both  $2 \rightarrow 1$  and  $1 \rightarrow 2$  receive the inverse marker (as in Mapudungun,  
 66 a language isolate of Chile), or else  $1 \rightarrow 2$  and  $2 \rightarrow 1$  are expressed by special forms unrelated to either  
 67 the direct or the inverse ones (as in Algonquian). Another possibility is that the use of direct/inverse  
 68 markers in the local domain can depend on the particular person-number combination involved (as  
 69 in Kiranti languages). The one possibility not attested to the best of our knowledge is one where  
 70  $1 \rightarrow 2$  would receive inverse marking whereas  $2 \rightarrow 1$  would be marked as direct.

71 In the non-local domain, some languages with a direct/inverse system present a further contrast  
 72 between *proximate* and *obviative* referents (see 2.2 for more details). In such cases, the inverse marker  
 73 appears in the  $3' \rightarrow 3$  and the direct marker in the  $3 \rightarrow 3'$  configuration and the same direction markers  
 74 are shared between the mixed and non-local domains.

## 75 2.2 Proximate / obviative

76 Algonquian languages have grammaticalized a distinction between two types of third person refer-  
 77 ents. These are generally designated as *proximate* (3) and *obviative* (3'). This distinction is re-  
 78 dundantly marked on both nouns and all verb forms, including transitive and intransitive ones (see  
 79 3.1.2). In addition, the proximate / obviative status of the arguments determines the presence of  
 80 direct or inverse marking on transitive verbs: in non-local scenarios, when the A is proximate and

<sup>4</sup>Direct/inverse systems are often illustrated with data from Algonquian languages, but they generally lack di-  
 rect/inverse marking in the local domain, and are thus farther removed from the canon than Rgyalrong languages.

81 the O is obviative, the direct form is used, whereas in the case when the A is obviative and the O  
 82 is proximate, the inverse form is required. In example 1, the verb is in the direct form, as the A  
 83 is proximate and hence unmarked while the O is obviative (marked with the *-a* suffix), whereas in  
 84 example 2, the converse is true.

85 (1) *mihcet nipah-êw mistanask mostosw-a*  
 many kill-3→3' badger buffalo-OBV  
 86 'Badger (3) has killed many buffalo (3).'

87 (2) *sêkih-ik nâpêw atimw-a*  
 scare-INV man dog-OBV  
 88 The dog scares the man. (Wolfart, 1973, 25)

89 In the mixed domain, the proximate / obviative status of the third person referent is also indi-  
 90 cated on the verb (see Table 4).

91 No language outside of Algonquian displays a system in which the proximate / obviative dis-  
 92 tinction is marked on nouns, on intransitive verbs and in the mixed domain. Yet, for the purpose of  
 93 typological comparison, we find it legitimate to use the terms 'proximate' and 'obviative' to describe  
 94 systems which distinguish two third person referents in the non-local domain only by means of  
 95 direct / inverse marking on the verb form.

96 Indeed, in most languages with direct/inverse systems, unlike Algonquian, the presence of direct  
 97 or inverse markers on the verb is the only clue to the proximate or obviative status of a particular  
 98 argument in non-local scenarios. In example 3 from Japhug Rgyalrong for instance, the absence of  
 99 inverse marker on the verb indicates a direct form, which implies that the A (the maid) is proximate  
 100 while the O (the rooster) is obviative. Inverse marking here would indicate the opposite scenario (A  
 101 obviative and O proximate) without changing the syntactic roles.

102 (3) *ɛʃoʋ nuu ku kumpyaphu nuu pɣ-sat*  
 servant TOP ERG rooster TOP EVD-kill  
 103 'The maid killed the Rooster.' (Japhug, Aesop adaptation "The old woman and the maid")

104 As is the case in Japhug, in languages with direct-inverse contrast in the non-local domain, the  
 105 choice of proximate or obviative status for a particular referent (and thus the use of an inverse or a  
 106 direct form) is guided by both semantics (relative animacy of the agent and patient) and pragmatics  
 107 (the relative topicality or saliency of the two referents).

### 108 2.3 Referential hierarchies

109 Some authors have proposed to apply the (pre-existing) concept of *referential hierarchies* in order to  
 110 provide a unified account of the use of direct/inverse markers in all three domains, including the  
 111 question of how the proximate or obviative status of the referents is determined.

112 Since DeLancey (1981a, 644), direct/inverse systems are often described in terms of the *Empathy*  
 113 *Hierarchy* presented in (4):<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup>For an overview of referential or *prominence* hierarchies, see Lockwood and Macauley (2012). These hierarchies,

114 (4) SAP > third person pronoun > human > animate > natural forces > inanimate

115 The distribution of direct and inverse markers can then be captured by the following rule:

116 (5) If the patient is higher on the hierarchy than the agent, the verb receives inverse marking;  
117 conversely, if the agent is higher on the hierarchy than the patient (or if both are equal),  
118 the verb receives direct marking.

119 In DeLancey’s view, the Empathy Hierarchy in (4) is motivated by several factors.

120 First, the ranking SAP → 3 is due to an ‘inherent natural attention flow’, whereby discourse  
121 participants (first or second person) are the ‘natural starting point’ of most utterances. Second, the  
122 ranking within the third persons is explained by the concept of *empathy*, hence the name of the  
123 proposed hierarchy: ‘speakers, being animate and humans, are more likely to empathize with (i.e.  
124 take the viewpoint of) human beings than animals, and of animals than inanimates.

125 The hierarchy in (4) is a general model which has to be adapted to each language to correctly  
126 predict the attested forms, and some variation can be observed even between closely related lan-  
127 guages.

128 A detailed investigation of hierarchies in direct/inverse systems is beyond the scope of this paper  
129 (see Zúñiga 2006 for more detail). Overall, the two rankings SAP > 3 and animate > inanimate  
130 appear to be relatively robust, and can even be considered definitional of direct/inverse systems  
131 within a theoretical framework using referential hierarchies.<sup>6</sup>

132 Additionally, direct/inverse systems are considered by some authors as a special case of *hierarchi-*  
133 *cal alignment* (Nichols 1992), a type distinct from accusative, ergative, active or tripartite alignment.  
134 Following Siewierska (1998, 10), hierarchical alignment can be defined as an alignment type where  
135 “the treatment of the A and O is dependent on their relative ranking on the referential and/or  
136 ontological hierarchies”.

### 137 3 Attested systems

138 This section will present three types of hierarchical systems: near-canonical direct/inverse sys-  
139 tems, highly non-canonical direct/inverse systems and hierarchical systems without direction (di-  
140 rect/inverse) markers.

#### 141 3.1 Near-canonical direct/inverse systems

##### 142 3.1.1 Rgyalrong languages

143 The direct/inverse systems of Rgyalrong languages have been described in several studies (DeLancey  
144 1981b on Situ, Sun and Shidanluo 2002 on Tshobdun, Jacques 2010 on Japhug and ? on Zbu).

initially proposed in order to account for particular splits in case patterns (see Silverstein 1976), have also been used to explain a variety of other phenomena, including the distribution of direct and inverse markers and slot accessibility. However, it is not always possible to account for all phenomena within a given language by positing a single hierarchy, as Zúñiga 2006 has shown. In Cree for instance, no less than four distinct hierarchies are needed to explain direct/inverse marking and the allocation of person markers to the correct slot.

<sup>6</sup>Hierarchies involving 3 > SAP may govern slot accessibility, as in the case of slots 5-7 in Cree which follow the hierarchy 1PL > 1INCL/2PL > 3 animate > SAP.SG > 3 inanimate, Zúñiga 2006, 86. This type of hierarchy has however never been described for direct/inverse morphemes.

145 These languages index not only the person but also the number of the two arguments in the verbal  
 146 morphology, and the resulting paradigm is more complex than the pattern shown in Table 2.

147 In 6, the verb has a direct form, and the inverse is blocked, as the A is SAP while the O is third  
 148 person. On the other hand, 7 illustrates the compulsory use of the inverse marker when the agent  
 149 is third person and the patient SAP.

150 (6) *ŋóʔ kə akúʔ tə-xśâŋ*  
 I ERG that AOR-hit:1SG  
 151 I hit him/her.

152 (7) *rəçór vəjéʔ kə-lə nəjéʔ tə-tə-wə-xśâv*  
 yesterday 3SG one-time you AOR-2-INV-hit  
 153 (S)he hit you once yesterday.

154 The presence or absence of the inverse prefix in 3→3 forms (in other words, the 3'→3 vs 3→3'  
 155 contrast) can be predicted by the following rules (Sun and Shidanluo 2002, Jacques 2010):

- 156 1. When the agent is animate and the patient inanimate, the inverse is blocked.
- 157 2. When the agent is inanimate and the patient animate, the inverse is required.

158 There is a strong, though not absolute, tendency for the inverse to appear when the agent  
 159 is non-human animate and the patient human. When both arguments are human, there is no  
 160 absolute constraint blocking or requiring the use of the inverse. 3'→3 forms with inverse marking  
 161 are relatively rare in comparison with direct 3→3' ones, and are used when the patient is markedly  
 162 more topical than the agent.

163 Table 3 presents the non-past paradigm of a dialect of Zbu Rgyalrong. The symbols  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\Sigma_3$   
 164 represent different stem forms (stem 1 and stem 3, respectively). Stem 3 only occurs in a subset of  
 165 direct forms, i. e. those where the patient is third person and the agent is singular ([123]SG→3('))  
 166 and could thus be considered as a non-canonical direct marker.

Table 3: Zbu Rgyalrong transitive paradigm (data adapted from ?)

|      | 1SG  | 1DU                                       | 1PL                                      | 2SG                            | 2DU  | 2PL                                      | 3SG                              | 3DU                                | 3PL                              | 3'                     |
|------|--|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1SG  |  |   |  | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1$           | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ndzə$           | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ŋə$           | $\Sigma_3\text{-}\eta$           | $\Sigma_3\text{-}\eta\text{-}ndzə$ | $\Sigma_3\text{-}\eta\text{-}ŋə$ |                        |
| 1DU  |  |   |  |                                |  |  | $\Sigma_1\text{-}tçə$            |                                    |                                  |                        |
| 1PL  |  |   |  |                                |  |  | $\Sigma_1\text{-}jə$             |                                    |                                  |                        |
| 2SG  | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}\eta$             |   |  |                                |  |  | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_3$             |                                    |                                  |                        |
| 2DU  | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}\eta\text{-}ndzə$ | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}tçə$ | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}jə$ |                                |  |  | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ndzə$ |                                    |                                  |                        |
| 2PL  | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}\eta\text{-}ŋə$   |   |  |                                |  |  | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ŋə$   |                                    |                                  |                        |
| 3SG  | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}\eta$                       |   |  | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1$ | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ndzə$ | $tə\text{-}wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ŋə$ |                                  |                                    |                                  | $\Sigma_3$             |
| 3DU  | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}\eta\text{-}ndzə$           | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}tçə$           | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}jə$           |                                |  |  |                                  |                                    |                                  | $\Sigma_1\text{-}ndzə$ |
| 3PL  | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}\eta\text{-}ŋə$             |   |  |                                |  |  |                                  |                                    |                                  | $\Sigma_1\text{-}ŋə$   |
| 3'   |  |   |  |                                |  |  | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1$             | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ndzə$   | $wə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ŋə$   |                        |
| INTR | $\Sigma_1\text{-}\eta$                                 | $\Sigma_1\text{-}tçə$                     | $\Sigma_1\text{-}jə$                     | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1$           | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ndzə$           | $tə\text{-}\Sigma_1\text{-}ŋə$           | $\Sigma_1$                       | $\Sigma_1\text{-}ndzə$             | $\Sigma_1\text{-}ŋə$             |                        |

167 In this paradigm, considering only the mixed and non-local forms and leaving aside stem al-  
 168 ternations ( $\Sigma_1$  vs  $\Sigma_3$ ), there is perfect symmetry between direct and inverse forms, which are dis-  
 169 tinguished only by the presence or absence of the inverse prefix  $wə\text{-}$ . Mixed and non-local direct  
 170 forms are identical to the corresponding intransitive forms except for the stem alternations. Only

171 1→2 forms are distinct from all the rest, with a synchronically opaque portmanteau *tə-* 1→2 prefix  
172 (if the system was perfectly symmetrical, 1→2 forms such as *\*tə-Σ<sub>1</sub>-ŋ* would be expected).

173 To account for the Zbu Rgyalrong data presented above, the following hierarchy has to be  
174 posited:

175 (8) 1 > 2 > 3 animate proximate > 3 animate obviative > 3 inanimate

176 Applying rule 5 to the hierarchy in (8) predicts the occurrence of the inverse in 2→1, 3→SAP and  
177 3'→3 forms, and its absence in 1→2, SAP→3 and 3→3'. Here proximate/obviative (or topical/non-  
178 topical) is more relevant than human/non-human as listed in the original formulation of the hier-  
179 archy in (4).

180 Describing Japhug Rgyalrong data in this framework would require a different hierarchy (Jacques  
181 2012b):

182 (9) SAP > 3 animate proximate > 3 animate obviative > 3 inanimate > generic human

183 In Japhug, there is no inverse in 2→1 forms, while it appears with a generic human agent  
184 (disregarding the animacy of the patient).

185 Zbu Rgyalrong also allows us to illustrate the ways in which inverse marking can be shown to  
186 differ from passive marking. Indeed, the Zbu prefix *wə-* cannot be analyzed as a passive marker for  
187 several reasons.

188 First, it is obvious that the verb still remains transitive even in inverse forms, since especially in  
189 2/3 →1SG the number markers *-ndzə* (dual) or *-jə* (plural) are suffixed to the first person *-ŋ* and  
190 since in all 2→1 forms both the second person *tə-* prefix and the first person *-ŋ*, *-tə* or *-jə* suffixes  
191 are present. Given the fact that both the agent and the patient are indexed, one can deduce that the  
192 inverse *wə-* has no intransitivizing effect.

193 Second, the addition of the inverse prefix has no effect on case marking: third person agents  
194 still receive ergative case, as illustrated by example (10) from ?.

195 (10) *tʂɛɕi skutsɛʔ kə tə-wə-xʂəv ki*  
Bkrashis stone ERG AOR-INV-hit NON.VISUAL

196 'A stone hit bKrashis.' (The stone falls from the mountain, for example)

197 Third, the inverse prefix *wə-* is not a derivation contrary to the passive construction in this  
198 language: the semantics of inverse forms are always predictable from that of the base forms, un-  
199 like derivation prefixes in Rgyalrong languages (including passive, anticausative, antipassive etc, see  
200 Jacques 2012b) which present many irregularities.

201 Few direct/inverse systems are as symmetrical as the one attested in Zbu Rgyalrong, and in fact  
202 these systems present tremendous diversity across languages. Partially opaque inverse systems will  
203 be studied in more detail in 3.2.

### 204 3.1.2 Algonquian languages

205 Algonquian languages differ from Rgyalrong and all other languages with direct/inverse (apart from  
206 Kutenai) in that the proximate/obviative distinction is largely independent of direction marking on  
207 the verb.

208 In Algonquian languages, all animate nouns are marked for proximate and obviative and all  
 209 animate third person referents have a clear status as proximate or obviative in a given sentence. No  
 210 such distinction is found in the case of SAP (SAPs are never obviative) nor in the case of inanimate  
 211 nouns in most of these languages. Furthermore, the singular/plural distinction is neutralized in  
 212 obviative forms (except in some Central Algonquian languages such as Fox and Miami-Illinois) or  
 213 else there is no contrast between proximate and obviative in the plural (as in Blackfoot). In a single  
 214 sentence, at most one argument can be proximate, but it is also possible to find sentences with only  
 215 obviative arguments.

216 Table 4 (adapted from Wolfart, 1973) illustrates an example of a transitive animate paradigm  
 217 (the verb *wâpam*– “see”) and an intransitive animate one with *pimipahtâ*– “run”. The direct markers  
 218 are –â– or –ê– and the inverse marker is –ik(o). Please note that the proximate/obviative distinction  
 219 is also marked on intransitive verbs.

Table 4: Plains Cree present paradigms. TA *wâpam*– “see” and IA *pimipahtâ*– “run” (Wolfart, 1973)

|      |                       | P                         |                        |                       |                         |                        |                     |                      |                       |
|------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| A    |                       | 1SG                       | 1PI                    | 1PE                   | 2SG                     | 2PL                    | 3SG                 | 3PL                  | 3'                    |
| 1SG  |                       |                           |                        |                       | <i>kiwâpamitin</i>      | <i>kiwâpamitinâwâw</i> | <i>niwâpamâw</i>    | <i>niwâpamâwak</i>   | <i>niwâpamimâwa</i>   |
| 1PI  |                       |                           |                        |                       |                         |                        | <i>kiwâpamânaw</i>  | <i>kiwâpamânawak</i> | <i>kiwâpamimânawa</i> |
| 1PE  |                       |                           |                        |                       | <i>kiwâpamitinân</i>    |                        | <i>niwâpamânân</i>  | <i>niwâpamânânak</i> | <i>niwâpamimânâna</i> |
| 2SG  | <i>kiwâpamin</i>      |                           |                        |                       |                         |                        | <i>kiwâpamâw</i>    | <i>kiwâpamâwak</i>   | <i>kiwâpamimâwa</i>   |
| 2PL  | <i>kiwâpaminâwâw</i>  |                           | <i>kiwâpaminân</i>     |                       |                         |                        | <i>kiwâpamâwâw</i>  | <i>kiwâpamâwâwak</i> | <i>kiwâpamimâwâwa</i> |
| 3SG  | <i>niwâpamik</i>      | <i>kiwâpamikonaw</i>      | <i>niwâpamikonân</i>   | <i>kiwâpamik</i>      | <i>kiwâpamikowâw</i>    |                        |                     |                      | <i>wâpam(im)êw</i>    |
| 3PL  | <i>niwâpamikwak</i>   | <i>kiwâpamikonawak</i>    | <i>niwâpamikonânak</i> | <i>kiwâpamikwak</i>   | <i>kiwâpamikowâwak</i>  |                        |                     |                      | <i>wâpam(im)êwak</i>  |
| 3'   | <i>niwâpamikoyiwa</i> | <i>kiwâpamikonawa</i>     | <i>niwâpamikonâna</i>  | <i>kiwâpamikoyiwa</i> | <i>kiwâpamikowâwa</i>   | <i>wâpamik</i>         | <i>wâpamikwak</i>   |                      | <i>wâpamêyiwa</i>     |
| INTR | <i>nipimipahtân</i>   | <i>kipimipahtâ(nâ)naw</i> | <i>nipimipahtânân</i>  | <i>kipimipahtân</i>   | <i>kipimipahtânâwâw</i> | <i>pimipahtâw</i>      | <i>pimipahtâwak</i> |                      | <i>pimipahtâyiwa</i>  |

220 On transitive verbs, the proximate/obviative appears in the mixed domain: there are different  
 221 forms for SAP ↔ 3 PROX and SAP ↔ 3 OBV. In the non-local domain, three configurations with  
 222 direct and inverse marking are observed: 3 → 3', 3' → 3 and 3' → 3'. While the first two are attested in  
 223 other languages with direct/inverse systems, the third one is only found in Algonquian. Here, 3' → 3'  
 224 (as in the form *wâpam-êyiwa* ‘he<sub>obv</sub> sees him<sub>obv</sub>’) is the so-called *further obviative* form, which is  
 225 often abbreviated as 3' → 3". Example 11 illustrates this form with the verb *nipah*– ‘to kill’.

- 226 (11) *pêyak piko nipah-êyiwa o-mis-a wâposw-a*  
 227 one just kill-3' → 3' 3POSS-older<sub>s</sub>ister-OBV rabbit-OBV  
 228 ‘His sister had killed but one rabbit.’ (Wolfart, 1996, p. 401)

228 Such a form illustrates the fact that a given sentence can have any number of obviative arguments.  
 229 Thus, a configuration with two obviative arguments does not imply reflexivization.

230 The morphosyntactic marking of the proximate/obviative distinction presents some noteworthy  
 231 differences with other languages with direct/inverse such as Rgyalrong.

232 First, in Algonquian, we observe a tripartite distinction between proximate animate, obviative  
 233 animate and inanimate referents. Indeed, the empathy hierarchy for Cree would be the following:<sup>7</sup>

- 234 (12) SAP > animate proximate > animate obviative > inanimate

<sup>7</sup>It is generally considered that the second person outranks the first person (2 > 1) in Algonquian languages, but this refers to a distinct hierarchy related to the slot accessibility of person prefixes, not the distribution of direct and inverse forms. Concerning obviative inanimates, see a recent study by Muehlbauer (2012).

235 Second, the proximate/obviative distinction in Rgyalrong is only present in  $3 \rightarrow 3'$  and  $3' \rightarrow 3$  verb  
 236 forms, while in Algonquian it is also redundantly marked on nouns, intransitive verbs and transitive  
 237 mixed forms.

238 Third, in Algonquian languages, the possessee of a SAP possessor can be either proximate  
 239 or obviative, but the possessee of a third person proximate referent must be obviative. Thus, in  
 240 example 13, where the possessee ('John's dog') is the agent and the possessor ('John') is the patient,  
 241 the inverse suffix *-ik* is required, since the former ('John's dog') is automatically obviative.

242 (13) *Cân o-têm-a kî-mâkwam-ik*  
 John 3SG.POSS-dog-OBV PST-bite-INV  
 243 John<sub>prox</sub>'s dog<sub>obv</sub> bit him<sub>prox</sub>. (Wolfart 1973, 25)

244 Although a similar constraint has been described in other language families such as Mayan  
 245 (see Aissen 1997), no such phenomenon is attested in other languages with direct/inverse in non-  
 246 local forms, such as Rgyalrong languages, for instance (see Jacques 2010, 141-2), and is thus not a  
 247 universal property of proximate/obviative marking.

248 This comparison of Rgyalrong and Algonquian shows that while the proximate/obviative dis-  
 249 tinction may appear to be a subset of the direct/inverse in non-local forms, the two phenomena are  
 250 fundamentally different and only intersect in the  $3 \rightarrow 3'$  and  $3' \rightarrow 3$  configurations. Nearly all lan-  
 251 guages whose direct/inverse system includes the non-local domain behave like Rgyalrong languages.  
 252 The only exceptions we are aware of are Algonquian and Kutenai, but even the latter has a much  
 253 simpler system than Algonquian. This also confirms the fact that the Algonquian direct/inverse  
 254 system, while undeniably the first to have been properly described, is by no means representative.

### 255 3.2 Highly non-canonical direct/inverse systems

256 Highly non-canonical inverse systems comprise two main types: systems with the direct/inverse  
 257 contrast present in the local or non-local domains but not in the mixed domain, or systems where  
 258 the direct or inverse markers are polyfunctional. For lack of space, we will only illustrate the second  
 259 case, using data from Khaling, a Kiranti language of Nepal (Jacques et al. 2012).<sup>8</sup>

260 As can be seen in Table 5, Khaling has a prefix *?i-* which appears in the second person forms of  
 261 intransitive verbs as well as in the following transitive configurations:  $2 \rightarrow 1$ ,  $3 \rightarrow 1$ ,  $3 \rightarrow 2$  and  $2 \rightarrow 3$ .  
 262 Additionally, it appears in  $1DU/PL \rightarrow 2$  forms which are not shown in that table. Khaling has no  
 263 contrast between 3 and 3'.

Table 5: Khaling verbal system (singular forms only)

|      | 1                       | 2                     | 3             |
|------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| 1    |                         | $\Sigma-n\varepsilon$ | $\Sigma-u$    |
| 2    | $?i-\Sigma-\eta\lambda$ |                       | $?i-\Sigma-u$ |
| 3    | $?i-\Sigma-\eta\lambda$ | $?i-\Sigma$           | $\Sigma-u$    |
| INTR | $\Sigma-\eta\lambda$    | $?i-\Sigma$           | $\Sigma$      |

<sup>8</sup>The first case is represented by languages with proximate/obviative marking only in the non-local domain (Kutenai, Navajo) and languages with inverse only in local forms such as Nez Percé.

264 The prefix *ʔi-* can be described as appearing in all forms involving the second person (except  
 265 1SG→2) and in all inverse forms. It is thus a conflation of a second person marker and an inverse  
 266 marker, which has little synchronic functional motivation and cannot be described in terms of a  
 267 hierarchy, even though a historical explanation seems possible (see section 5.2). We could gloss the  
 268 Khaling prefix as 2/INV, but it would be misleading to refer to it as an inverse marker.

269 Prefixes with a distribution nearly identical to that of Khaling *ʔi-* are found in related languages  
 270 such as Dumi, Trung and Rawang (van Driem 1993).

### 271 3.3 Hierarchical agreement without direction marking

272 Hierarchical systems without direct/inverse marking can be illustrated with data from Icarl Dargwa  
 273 (Nakh-Daghestanian, Sumbatova and Mutalov 2003).

274 This language illustrates the fact that the access to inflectional slots may be described in terms  
 275 of an indexability hierarchy. There are two clitics (= *di* ‘2s’ and = *da* ‘1, 2p’) which mark person  
 276 in several TAM forms, such as the preterite. Second person arguments are always indexed on the  
 277 verb irrespective of their grammatical role (S, A, or O). On the other hand, 1st person arguments  
 278 are indexed only if there is no 2nd person involved (see 14 vs 15)

279 (14) *du-l u uc-ib=di* 1>2  
 1SG-ERG 2SG(ABS) catch.M.PFV-PRET=2SG  
 280 I caught you.

281 (15) *du-l Murad uc-ib=da* 1>3  
 1SG-ERG M. catch.M.PFV-PRET=1SG  
 282 I caught Murad.

283 Finally, when there are no SAP arguments, none of these clitics is used. In other words, person  
 284 indexability is only determined by the hierarchy 2 > 1 > 3, not by grammatical roles (see Table 6  
 285 with the verb *uc-* “to catch” in the preterit form *-ib*).

Table 6: Icarl Dargwa person markers in the preterite

|   | 1               | 2               | 3               |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 1 |                 | <i>uc-ib=di</i> | <i>uc-ib=da</i> |
| 2 | <i>uc-ib=di</i> |                 | <i>uc-ib=di</i> |
| 3 | <i>uc-ib=da</i> | <i>uc-ib=di</i> | <i>uc-ib</i>    |

286 The paradigm in Table 6 is the prime example of a hierarchical system without a direction  
 287 marker.

288 However, this simple picture looks different when TAM categories derived from the thematic  
 289 stem are taken into account (Sumbatova and Mutalov, 2003, 81-82, 99).

290 The choice of the thematic vowel follows the hierarchy SAP > non-SAP. Thus, *-i-* shows that  
 291 the AGENT is higher on the hierarchy than the PATIENT, *-u-* that this is not the case, i.e. *-i-* is used  
 292 if the AGENT is SAP and the patient isn’t, and *-u-* in all other cases (including intransitive forms,

293 except with 3 person subjects where *-ar-/-an-* is used instead). Person markers in the thematic TAM  
 294 categories cross-reference only SAP: we have *-d* ‘1st person (SG/PL)’ and *-ĭ/-ĭa* ‘2nd person (SG/PL)’,  
 295 the 3rd person being unmarked (cf. Table 7).

Table 7: Icari Dargwa Potential Present verb paradigm

| A \ P | P                | 1              | 2s               | 2p               | 3                |
|-------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1     |                  |                | <i>urc-u-ĭ</i>   | <i>urc-u-ĭ-a</i> | <i>urc-i-d</i>   |
| 2s    | <i>urc-u-ĭ</i>   |                |                  |                  | <i>urc-i-ĭ</i>   |
| 2p    | <i>urc-u-ĭ-a</i> |                |                  |                  | <i>urc-i-ĭ-a</i> |
| 3     | <i>urc-u-d</i>   | <i>urc-u-ĭ</i> | <i>urc-u-ĭ-a</i> | <i>urc-u</i>     |                  |

296 Although pure hierarchical systems without any direct or inverse marker are well attested,<sup>9</sup> it  
 297 is possible that many languages with hierarchical alignment appearing to lack direction markers  
 298 may reveal restricted direct or inverse marking in some areas of their grammar, like Icari Dargwa.  
 299 In particular, Tangut (Sino-Tibetan; extinct) is generally presented as having a verbal agreement  
 300 system very close to that of Dargi in Table 6 (the only significant difference being that in Tangut in  
 301 local forms the verb agrees with the patient, thus 2→1 receives the first person marker instead of  
 302 the second person marker as in Dargi, cf Kepping 1981). However, it has more recently been shown  
 303 that Tangut consistently distinguishes SAP.SG→3 and 3→SAP.SG by stem alternation in the direct  
 304 forms (Jacques 2009).

#### 305 4 Typological perspectives

306 An important question concerning direct/inverse systems is to what extent this typological feature  
 307 is correlated with other features. Klaiman (1992, 1991, 165-169) has proposed a correlation with  
 308 head-markedness and configurationality, which was indeed observed in most of the languages in  
 309 her sample.

310 More than twenty years after Klaiman’s work, it seems unlikely that direct/inverse could be  
 311 correlated with any other feature (or set of features) in particular. Table 8 presents data from  
 312 Zbu (?), Cree (Wolfart 1973), Sahaptin (Rude 1997, Zúñiga 2006), Navajo (Willie 2000), Dargwa  
 313 (Sumbatova and Mutalov 2003), Movima (Haude 2009) and Mapudungun (Zúñiga 2006).

314 This table indicates whether the inverse in these languages appears in the local, non-local or  
 315 mixed domains, as well as the presence or absence of other typologically relevant features such  
 316 as head-markedness, discontinuous constituents, case marking, polypersonal marking on the verb,  
 317 incorporation, and strong noun-verb distinction.

318 These data show that languages with direct/inverse systems, though mainly head-marking and  
 319 polysynthetic (i.e. having noun incorporation and polypersonal marking), need not be so. It is  
 320 important to note that non-configurationality, if understood as allowing discontinuous constituents,  
 321 is likewise rare among such languages.

<sup>9</sup>The Tupi-Guarani family provides many examples of such systems (see for instance Rose 2009).

Table 8: Direct/inverse and other typological features

| Family             | Language   | Head-marking | Discontinuous constituents | Non-local | Mixed | Local | Case       | Noun / Verb     | Incorporation | Polypersonal marking on the verb |
|--------------------|------------|--------------|----------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------------|
| Rgyalrongic (ST)   | Zbu        | x            |                            | x         | x     | x     | ergative   | strong          | x             | x                                |
| Algonquian (Algic) | Cree       | x            | x                          |           | x     | x     | obviative  | strong          | x             | x                                |
| Sahaptian          | Sahaptin   | x            | x                          | x         |       | x     | tripartite | strong          |               |                                  |
| Athabaskan         | Navajo     | x            |                            | x         |       |       |            | strong          |               | x                                |
| Nakh-Daghestanian  | Dargwa     |              |                            | x         | x     | x     | ergative   | strong          |               |                                  |
| Isolate            | Movima     |              |                            | x         | x     | x     |            | omnipredicative | x             |                                  |
| Isolate            | Mapudungun | x            |                            | x         | x     | x     |            | strong          | x             | x                                |

322 Given the limited number of languages with direct/inverse systems, it may prove difficult to  
 323 ascertain whether the presence of such a system in a given language could be correlated with the  
 324 presence or absence of other features. Indeed, even if we surveyed all such languages, the result-  
 325 ing sample would still be too limited to provide any statistically significant results, especially if  
 326 all languages of a particular subgroup (Algonquian or Rgyalrong, for instance) are counted as one  
 327 token.

#### 328 4.1 Extension of the concept of direct/inverse

329 As defined in section 2 and even taking into account highly non-canonical inverse systems, di-  
 330 rect/inverse systems represent a very restricted phenomenon only attested in a minority of languages.  
 331 Givón (1994) has proposed to extend this term to a broader set of phenomena.

332 Givón (1994, 9) defines the inverse as a type of de-transitive voice where ‘the patient is more  
 333 topical than the agent but the agent retains considerable topicality’, unlike the passive where the  
 334 agent is extremely non-topical (demoted or suppressed). He strictly distinguishes between *pragmatic*  
 335 inverse (the optional use of the inverse to indicate that the agent is more topical than the patient)  
 336 and *semantic* inverse (the obligatory use of the inverse conditioned by the relative ranking of the  
 337 agent and patient on a particular referential hierarchy).

338 Under this view, inverse constructions are not limited to hierarchical systems, but the concept  
 339 can be extended to describe topic fronting, a phenomenon he designates as *word-order* inverse. This  
 340 extension of the concept of direct/inverse, while it has some merits in terms of cross-linguistic  
 341 comparison, may run into difficulties when analysing the syntax of languages with a near-canonical  
 342 direct/inverse system, as those languages also have topic fronting and right extraposition, and topic  
 343 fronting of the patient is not always correlated with the use of the inverse.

344 Regardless of terminological preferences, Givonian text counts (in particular of *referential distance*  
 345 and *topic persistence*, Givón 1994, 10) have provided an easily reproducible and insightful basis on  
 346 which to build a cross-linguistic study of direct/inverse systems. It has been successfully applied to  
 347 various languages with direct/inverse, such as Kutenai (Dryer 1994) and Japhug Rgyalrong (Jacques  
 348 2010).

## 349 5 Diachronic perspective

350 Recent work such as Cristofaro (2013) has called into question the functional validity of referential  
 351 hierarchies as an explanatory tool to account for the existence of direct/inverse systems. Instead,

352 it suggests that the structure of direct/inverse systems might be better explained by taking into  
353 account the diachronic origin of these markers.

354 In this section, we provide a panchronic overview of direct and inverse markers: their origins  
355 from and their development into other markers. Still, this type of research is fraught with difficulties  
356 for two main reasons. First, most languages with direct/inverse marking (such as Movima, Kutenai,  
357 Mapudungun) are isolates and thus cannot be easily studied in a diachronic perspective. Second,  
358 since there are no languages with a near-canonical inverse with a written tradition predating the  
359 seventeenth century (when Wampanoag was first put to writing by John Eliot), the data presented  
360 here are reconstructions obtained by using the comparative method, and may be subject to revision  
361 in the future.

## 362 5.1 Origins of inverse marking

363 The best attested origin of inverse markers is from an earlier cislocative. Two additional sources  
364 (an earlier passive or a third person marker) have been identified, but examples are fewer and more  
365 difficult to interpret.

### 366 5.1.1 Cislocative

367 The term ‘cislocative’ is used to refer to markers expressing a motion towards the speaker, both  
368 directional (*‘verb hither’*) and associated motion (*‘come to verb’*) ones.<sup>10</sup>

369 The inverse marker in Nez Percé (Sahaptian) used in local scenarios with second person acting  
370 on first person has grammaticalized from an earlier cislocative marker, reconstructed for Proto-  
371 Sahaptian as \*-im (Rude, 1997, 122).

372 (16) *héxn-e*  
see-PST  
373 I saw you.

374 (17) *hexn-ím-e*  
see-CIS-PST  
375 You saw me.

376 Interestingly, this marker has also grammaticalized into the ergative case suffix which appears  
377 on the non-SAP agent in mixed scenarios in cases where one would expect inverse marking on the  
378 verb (Rude, 1997, 121-2).

379 (18) *hi-héxn-e*            *háama-nm*  
3S/A→SAP-see-PST man-ERG  
380 The man saw me/you. (NEZ PERCÉ)

381 This grammaticalization path is also attested in Sino-Tibetan. DeLancey (2013, 13-14) reports  
382 that in several Kuki-Chin languages a verb meaning ‘to come’ (reconstructed for Proto-Kuki-Chin  
383 as \*huŋ by VanBik 2009, 191) has grammaticalized to a varying degree in different languages into a

---

<sup>10</sup>On the grammaticalization of associated motion markers from motion verbs, see Jacques (2013).

384 cislocative ‘hither’ prefix on motion verbs. Interestingly, in some Northern and Central languages,  
 385 it has developed the additional function of optionally marking some transitive or ditransitive con-  
 386 figurations involving a 1st person patient as in Bawm (example 19) or 1st or 2nd person patient, as  
 387 in Sizang (example 20).

388 (19) *ka pâ nih hâi hawng ka pêk*  
 1SG father ERG cup CIS 1SG give  
 389 My father gives me the cup. (Reichle 1981, 147-149, cited in DeLancey 2013, 14)

390 (20) *naŋmá: k-oy né: tú: hî:*  
 you 1SG-CIS eat will FIN  
 391 I will eat you. (Stern 1984, 48, cited in DeLancey 2013, 13)

392 Even if we are not dealing with a fully grammaticalized direct/inverse system, the process towards  
 393 its shaping is well under way.

394 Similar developments which have not (as yet) reached the same target, are also attested in the  
 395 unrelated languages Shasta (Shastan, extinct), the Northern Iroquoian languages Cayuga, Tuscarora  
 396 and Mohawk (Mithun, 1996), but also in Modern Japanese (Shibatani, 2003, 2006; Koga and Otori,  
 397 2008) and Kabardian (Kumakhov and Vamling, 2006, 68ff). In all of these languages a cislocative  
 398 has evolved, or is currently evolving, into a first person patient or a portmanteau 2 → 1 marker.

399 As for the grammaticalization path involved, it need not have been the same in all of the lan-  
 400 guages concerned. Based on data from Japanese (Japonic) and Circassian (NW Caucasian) and the  
 401 following tentative grammaticalization pathway could be proposed:

402 (21) COME → CISLOCATIVE *associated motion* *directional* → (‘sudden action’)? → INVERSE

403 Indeed, apart from their incipient use as a marker of grammatical relations in mixed scenarios,  
 404 cislocative markers in these two languages have independently developed a secondary meaning of  
 405 ‘sudden action’, a semantic extension not attested in the other languages of the sample. Therefore,  
 406 the pathway proposed in (21) may not be applicable to other languages where the inverse originated  
 407 from an earlier cislocative marker and so further research is needed.

### 408 5.1.2 Passive

409 A second grammaticalization pathway from passive to inverse has been proposed by several authors,  
 410 the most prominent of whom is Givón (1994).

411 This pathway could perhaps be attested in the case of Algonquian. At present, there is no  
 412 consensus on the origin of the inverse marker (used in the independent order) which has been  
 413 reconstructed for Proto-Algonquian as \*-ekw (Bloomfield, 1946, 98, Goddard, 1979, 89).

414 Goddard (1974) pointed out a possible Wiyot cognate, but the data is too fragmentary to draw  
 415 any firm conclusions. Yurok, the only other relative of Algonquian, has a passive suffix *-oy* (Robins  
 416 1958, 56-8) which presents affinities with inverse marking: it is required in some 3→SAP forms and  
 417 blocked in SAP→3. However, this passive suffix is not relatable to Algonquian \*-ekw by known  
 418 phonetic laws (A. Garrett, p.c.).

419 Still, [McLean \(2001\)](#) has proposed that the Algonquian inverse suffix *\*-ekw* originated from a  
 420 passive marker whose function was similar to the suffix *-oy* in Yurok. There is some evidence for this  
 421 in modern languages such as Cree and Ojibwe which still have a passive construction distinct from  
 422 the inverse one but sharing with it the *\*-ekw* element. In Ojibwe ([Valentine 2001](#), 689), for instance,  
 423 the passive SAP form is marked by *-igoo*, a compound suffix which could be tentatively analyzed as  
 424 resulting from the fusion of the inverse *-igw* with the intransitive animate verb derivational suffix  
 425 *-aa*.

### 426 5.1.3 Third person

427 In still other languages, we observe a formal similarity between some inverse or direct markers and  
 428 various types of third person markers including agent, patient or possessive affixes.

429 The clearest case is the inverse prefix found in Sino-Tibetan (Rgyalrongic and Kiranti) lan-  
 430 guages. As first noticed by [DeLancey \(1981b\)](#), the Situ Rgyalrong third person possessive prefix  
 431 *wə-* is formally identical to the inverse marker. This is also true of other Rgyalrong languages and  
 432 of some Kiranti languages that have an inverse marker, such as Bantawa (see [Table 9](#), data from ?  
 433 and [Doornenbal 2009](#)).

**Table 9:** Comparison of inverse and third person prefixes in Rgyalrong and Kiranti

|           | language | inverse marker     | third person possessive |
|-----------|----------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Rgyalrong | Situ     | <i>wə-</i>         | <i>wə-</i>              |
|           | Tshobdun | <i>o-</i>          | <i>o-</i>               |
|           | Zbu      | <i>wə-</i>         | <i>wə-</i>              |
| Kiranti   | Bantawa  | <i>i- &lt; *u-</i> | <i>i- &lt; *u-</i>      |

434 The similarity between the two sets of prefixes is striking, and suggests a grammaticalization  
 435 from a third person marker into an inverse marker. While the exact pathway remains unclear and  
 436 thus requires further investigation, it is possible that non-finite verb forms carrying a third person  
 437 possessive prefix were reanalyzed as finite ones. In the case of Sino-Tibetan languages, this scenario  
 438 probably occurred in the ancestor of both Rgyalrongic and Kiranti languages (see [Jacques 2012a](#) and  
 439 [DeLancey 2011](#)).

## 440 5.2 Stability of direct/inverse systems

441 Direct/inverse marking appears to be quite stable in at least one family: Algonquian. The system  
 442 can be reconstructed back to Proto-Algonquian ([Goddard 1979](#), 89) and has been preserved with  
 443 little modification in all daughter languages.

444 However, in Sino-Tibetan, the only other large family where direct/inverse systems are attested,  
 445 near-canonical direct/inverse systems are only present in the Rgyalrong languages described in sec-  
 446 tion 2.1. Other Sino-Tibetan languages show highly non-canonical or even completely opaque  
 447 inverse systems (cf. Kiranti languages described in section 3.2).

448 In this connection, Lavrung ([Huang 2007](#), 69-70, [Lai 2013](#)) shows an interesting evolution  
 449 which might help us understand how such opaque systems develop. A comparison of the data in

450 Table 10 with the Zbu Rgyalrong paradigm in 3 shows that the  $\vartheta$ - prefix neatly corresponds to the  
 451 inverse  $w\vartheta$ - in Zbu and indeed the system we have in Lavrung, though slightly less canonical than  
 452 that of Zbu, is still what we would call a near-canonical inverse system.

Table 10: Lavrung verbal paradigm (singular and plural forms)

|      | 1sg                      | 1pl                  | 2sg                  | 2pl                  | 3                  |
|------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| 1sg  |                          |                      | $\Sigma-n$           | $\Sigma-j$           | $\Sigma-a\eta$     |
| 1pl  |                          |                      |                      |                      | $\Sigma-j$         |
| 2sg  | $\vartheta-\Sigma-a\eta$ | $\vartheta-\Sigma-j$ |                      |                      | $\Sigma-n$         |
| 2pl  |                          |                      |                      |                      | $\Sigma-j$         |
| 3    |                          |                      | $\vartheta-\Sigma-n$ | $\vartheta-\Sigma-j$ | $\vartheta-\Sigma$ |
| INTR | $\Sigma-a\eta$           | $\Sigma-j$           | $\Sigma-n$           | $\Sigma-j$           | $\Sigma$           |

453 Lavrung appears to differ from Zbu mainly in having lost direct inverse contrast in non-local  
 454 forms ( $3 \rightarrow 3'$  and  $3' \rightarrow 3$ ) to the benefit of the inverse form. This evolution appears somewhat  
 455 contrary to *a priori* expectation, given that inverse could be construed as being the marked form,  
 456 and the direct the unmarked form. Lavrung thus represents a first step in the direction of an  
 457 opaque (direct/inverse) system. The prefix  $\vartheta$ - cannot be analyzed synchronically as a third person  
 458 agent marker, since it occurs in  $2 \rightarrow 1$  forms, but it is not a canonical inverse marker anymore either,  
 459 since it also occurs in all  $3 \rightarrow 3$  forms.

460 There is no consensus as to how exactly the opaque systems observed in Kiranti came into exist-  
 461 ence, but a possibility is that they originated from a direct/inverse system similar to that observed in  
 462 Rgyalrong languages, and then underwent a series of changes which thoroughly reshaped the system  
 463 starting with a generalization of the inverse marker in non-local scenarios as in the case of Lavrung.  
 464 This in turn increased morphological opacity up to a point where many individual morphemes (like  
 465 Khaling *?i-*) ceased to have a synchronically straightforward morphosyntactic function.

## 466 6 Conclusion

467 Direct/inverse systems in the narrow sense are a rare type of agreement system, observed mainly in  
 468 languages of the Americas and the greater Himalayan region. Nevertheless, their theoretical impor-  
 469 tance cannot be overestimated. Indeed, they have served as one of the models for the development  
 470 of the concept of *referential hierarchies* and the idea of setting *hierarchical alignment* as a category  
 471 distinct from accusative, ergative, active or tripartite alignment.

472 Direct/inverse systems are attested in extremely endangered languages, and much work is still  
 473 needed for a detailed and meticulous description of such systems. In particular the precise conditions  
 474 for the use of direct and inverse forms in the non-local domain is a topic of research which cannot  
 475 be based on elicitation, but requires extensive work on authentic oral corpora. A finer-grained  
 476 approach to morphosyntactic diversity is necessary, and recent research on Rgyalrongic languages  
 477 for instance has revealed subtle but important differences in the use of the inverse across closely  
 478 related language varieties.

## References

- 479 Aissen, Judith. 1997. On the Syntax of Obviation. *Language* 73, 705–750. 73.4:705–750.
- 480 Bickel, Balthasar, Giorgio Iemmolo, Taras Zakharko, and Alena Witzlack-Makarevich. in press.  
481 Patterns of alignment in verb agreement. In *Languages across boundaries: studies in memory of*  
482 *Anna Siewierska*, ed. Dik Bakker and Martin Haspelmath. Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- 483 Bloomfield, Leonard. 1946. Algonquian. In *Linguistic structures of native America*, ed. Harry Hoijer  
484 and Cornelius Osgood, volume 6 of *Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology*, 85–129. New York:  
485 Wenner-Gren Foundation.
- 486 Corbett, Greville G. 2007. Canonical typology, suppletion and possible words. *Language* 83.1:8–42.
- 487 Cristofaro, Sonia. 2013. The referential hierarchy: reviewing the evidence in diachronic perspective.  
488 In *Languages Across Boundaries*, ed. Dik Bakker and Martin Haspelmath, 69–94. Berlin, New York:  
489 Mouton de Gruyter.
- 490 DeLancey, Scott. 1981a. An interpretation of split ergativity. *Language* 57.3:626–57.
- 491 DeLancey, Scott. 1981b. The category of direction in Tibeto-Burman. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-*  
492 *Burman Area* 6.1:83–101.
- 493 DeLancey, Scott. 2011. Notes on verb agreement prefixes in Tibeto-Burman. *Himalayan Linguistics*  
494 *Journal* 10.1:1–29.
- 495 DeLancey, Scott. 2013. Argument Indexation (Verb Agreement) in Kuki-Chin. URL  
496 [http://www.academia.edu/4155394/Argument\\_Indexation\\_Verb\\_Agreement\\_in\\_](http://www.academia.edu/4155394/Argument_Indexation_Verb_Agreement_in_Kuki-Chin)  
497 [Kuki-Chin](http://www.academia.edu/4155394/Argument_Indexation_Verb_Agreement_in_Kuki-Chin), paper presented at the Workshop on Issues in Kuki-Chin Linguistics at the 46th  
498 International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Dartmouth College,  
499 August 7, 2013.
- 500 Doornenbal, Marius. 2009. A Grammar of Bantawa: Grammar, paradigm tables, glossary and texts  
501 of a Rai language of Eastern Nepal. Doctoral Dissertation, Leiden University.
- 502 van Driem, George. 1993. The Proto-Tibeto-Burman verbal agreement system. *Bulletin of the School*  
503 *of Oriental and African Studies* 61.2:292–334.
- 504 Dryer, Matthew. 1994. The Discourse Function of the Kutenai Inverse. In *Voice and Inversion*, ed.  
505 Talmy Givon, 65–99. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 506 Givón, Talmy. 1994. The pragmatics of de-transitive voice: Functional and typological aspects of  
507 inversion. In *Voice and inversion*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 508 Goddard, Ives. 1974. Remarks on the Algonquian Independent Indicative. *International Journal of*  
509 *American Linguistics* 40.4:317–327.
- 510 Goddard, Ives. 1979. Comparative Algonquian. In *The languages of Native America*, ed. Lyle Camp-  
511 bell and Marianne Mithun, 70–132. Austin: University of Texas Press.

- 513 Haspelmath, Martin. 2011. On S, A, P, T, and R as comparative concepts for alignment typology.  
514 *Linguistic Typology* 15.3:535–567.
- 515 Haude, Katharina. 2009. Hierarchical alignment in Movima. *International Journal of American*  
516 *Linguistics* 75.4:513–532.
- 517 Huang, Bufan. 2007. *Lawurongyu yanjiu* 拉塢戎語研究 (*Study on the Lavrung language*). Beijing:  
518 Minzu chubanshe.
- 519 Jacques, Guillaume. 2009. The Origin of Vowel Alternations in the Tangut Verb. *Language and*  
520 *Linguistics* 10.1:17–28.
- 521 Jacques, Guillaume. 2010. The Inverse in Japhug Rgyalrong. *Language and Linguistics* 11.1:127–157.
- 522 Jacques, Guillaume. 2012a. Agreement morphology: the case of Rgyalrongic and Kiranti. *Language*  
523 *and Linguistics* 13.1:83–116.
- 524 Jacques, Guillaume. 2012b. Argument demotion in Japhug Rgyalrong. In *Ergativity, Valency and*  
525 *Voice*, ed. Katharina Haude and Gilles Authier, 199–226. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- 526 Jacques, Guillaume. 2013. Harmonization and disharmonization of affix ordering and basic word  
527 order. *Linguistic Typology* 17.2:187–217.
- 528 Jacques, Guillaume, Aimée Lahaussais, Boyd Michailovsky, and Dhan Bahadur Rai. 2012. An  
529 overview of Khaling verbal morphology. *Language and linguistics* 13.6:1095–1170.
- 530 Kepping, Ksenija Borisovna. 1981. Agreement in the Tangut verb. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman*  
531 *area* 6.1:39–48.
- 532 Klaiman, M.H. 1991. *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 533 Klaiman, M.H. 1992. Inverse languages. *Lingua* 88.3/4:227–261.
- 534 Koga, Hiroaki, and Toshio Ohori. 2008. Reintroducing inverse constructions in Japanese. In *In-*  
535 *vestigations of the Syntax–Semantics–Pragmatics Interface*, ed. Robert D. Van Valin Jr. Amsterdam:  
536 John Benjamins.
- 537 Kumakhov, Mukhadin, and Karina Vamling. 2006. *Èrgativnost' v čerkesskix jazykax*. Malmo Uni-  
538 versity.
- 539 Lai, Yunfan. 2013. La morphologie affixale du lavrung wobzi. Master's thesis, Université Paris III.
- 540 Lockwood, Hunter T., and Monica Macauley. 2012. Prominence hierarchies. *Language and Lin-*  
541 *guistics Compass* 6.7:431–446.
- 542 McLean, Lisa M. 2001. A passive to inverse reanalysis in Cree. Master's thesis, Univeristy of  
543 Manitoba at Winipeg.
- 544 Mithun, Marianne. 1996. New directions in referentiality. In *Studies in Anaphora*, ed. Barbara Fox,  
545 volume 33 of *Typological Studies in Language*, 413–435. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- 546 Muehlbauer, Jeffrey. 2012. The Relation of Switch-Reference, Animacy, and Obviation in Plains  
547 Cree. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 78.2:203–238.
- 548 Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago  
549 Press.
- 550 Reichle, Verena. 1981. *Bawm language and lore*. Peter Lang.
- 551 Robins, R. H. 1958. *The Yurok Language*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- 552 Rose, Françoise. 2009. A hierarchical indexation system: the example of Emerillon (Teko). In *New  
553 Challenges in Typology*, ed. Patience Epps and Alexander Arkhipov, 63–83. Berlin: Mouton de  
554 Gruyter.
- 555 Rude, Noel. 1997. On the history of nominal case in Sahaptian. *International Journal of American  
556 Linguistics* 63:113–43.
- 557 Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2003. Directional verbs in Japanese. In *Motion, Direction and Location in  
558 Languages: In Honor of Zygmunt Frajzyngier*, ed. Erin Shay and Uwe Seibert, 259–286. John  
559 Benjamins.
- 560 Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2006. On the conceptual framework for voice phenomena. *Linguistics*  
561 44:217–269.
- 562 Siewierska, Anna. 1998. On nominal and verbal person marking. *Linguistic Typology* 2:1–56.
- 563 Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Hierarchy of Features and Ergativity. In *Grammatical Categories in Aus-  
564 tralian Languages*, ed. Robert M.W. Dixon. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- 565 Stern, Theodore. 1984. Sizang (Siyin) Chin texts. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 8:43–58.
- 566 Sumbatova, Nina R., and Rasul O. Mutalov. 2003. *A grammar of Icarl Dargwa*. München: Lincom  
567 Europa.
- 568 Sun, Jackson T.-S., and Shidanluo. 2002. Caodeng Jiarongyu yu rentong dengdi xiangguan de  
569 yufa xianxiang 草登嘉戎語與「認同等第」相關的語法現象 (Empathy Hierarchy in Cao-  
570 deng rGyalrong grammar). *Language and Linguistics* 3.1:79–99.
- 571 Valentine, J. Randolph. 2001. *Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto  
572 Press.
- 573 VanBik, Kenneth. 2009. *Proto-Kuki-Chin*, volume 8 of *STEDT Monograph Series*. university of  
574 California.
- 575 Willie, Mary-Ann. 2000. The Inverse Voice and Possessive yi/bi. *International Journal of American  
576 Linguistics* 66.3:360–382.
- 577 Wolfart, H. Christoph. 1973. Plains Cree: A Grammatical Study. *Transactions of the American  
578 Philosophical Society* 63.5:1–90.

- 579 Wolfart, H. Christoph. 1996. Sketch of Cree, an Algonquian Language. In *Languages*, ed. Ives  
580 Goddard and William C. Sturtevant, volume 17 of *Handbook of North American Indians*, 390–439.  
581 Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- 582 Zúñiga, Fernando. 2006. *Deixis and Alignment - Inverse systems in indigenous languages of the Americas*.  
583 Amsterdam: Benjamins.