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1. Introduction

This paper purports to inquire into the interrelation and interaction between possessive structures on the one hand and verb-subject vs. verb-object structures on the other.¹ The inquiry will be carried out on different levels of analysis: morphological, syntactic, and semantic. Beyond that, a certain amount of conceptual apparatus seems to be indispensable. This pertains to the deductive aspect of our research and cannot be arrived at in a purely inductive way. This does not mean that such concepts are without empirical correlates. But concepts do have a different status as compared with empirical generalizations. Following the practice adopted in my monograph on POSSESSION (Seiler 1981), I'll represent in capital letters the concepts which are the basis and starting point of our empirical research.

I assume (Seiler 1981:6) that linguistic POSSESSION consists of the relationship between a substance and another substance. Substance A, called the POSSESSOR, is prototypically [+animate], more specifically [+human], and still more specifically [+EGO] or close to the speaker. Substance B, called the POSSESSUM, is either [+animate] or [-animate]. It prototypically includes reference to the relationship as a whole and to the POSSESSUM in particular.
Semantically, the domain of POSSESSION can be defined as bio-cultural. It is the relationship between a human being and his kinsmen, his body parts, his material belongings, his cultural and intellectual products. Syntactically speaking, POSSESSION is a relation between nominal and nominal. If a verb intervenes between the two, its only purpose is to make explicit the particular mode of the possessive relationship. Selectional restrictions obtain, not between verb and noun, but between noun and noun.

As for the verb structures mentioned, which, for brevity's sake I shall call VALENCE, some similar scheme on different levels - conceptual, semantic, syntactic - would be needed. I am not in a position to offer this here. For our purpose it seems sufficient to assume that VALENCE is the relationship between an ACTION or PROCESS or STATE and its PARTICIPANTS. The latter appear in different roles, among which the AGENT and the PATIENT are most prominent. But we will also have to reckon with such further roles as the GOAL, the EXPERIENCER, and the INACTIVE. The syntactic categories of subject, object, transitive, intransitive, among others, serve to represent these roles.

The basic question is whether POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM are on the same level as the roles of VALENCE, two additional roles as it were. My research on POSSESSION has shown (Seiler 1981:7 ff.) that this is not the case, that there is a difference in principle between POSSESSION and VALENCE. However, there are multiple interactions between the two domains, and these interactions shall constitute the object
of the following inquiry. It is hoped that this will contribute to a better understanding both of POSSESSION and of VALENCE.

1. In many languages of the world we find affinities or even identities in form and in meaning between pronominal elements in a possessive function on the one hand, and personal pronominal elements in subject and/or in object function on the other hand. This holds for free as well as for bound forms. In a monograph on the identifying character of the possessive inflection in languages of North America, C.C. Uhlenbeck (1917) has called renewed attention to the well-known fact that in many American Indian languages the possessive pronouns, generally affixed to the noun, occur in two more or less morphologically distinct series - one for nouns, possession of which is of an inseparable nature, the other for nouns denoting separable possession. He has further pointed out that where, as is generally the case, the possessive pronouns are related to the pronominal affixes of the verb, they agree in form, not with the subjective or "energetic", but, on the whole, with the objective or "casus inertiae" or "inactivus". Evidence for this important fact is adduced from a number of Amerindian languages, although Uhlenbeck has not endeavoured to give a more detailed account of the situation in any one of these languages, nor a more systematic comparison among them. In chapter 2 I shall try to contribute to the fulfillment of this task. In a brilliant review of C.C. Uhlenbeck's monograph, E. Sapir (1917) confirmed Uhlenbeck's findings as far as the data
are concerned, but he criticized his psychological interpretation of these facts - in particular the claim for greater primitiveness of the possessive affixes of inseparable nouns and the claim for the identifying character of these affixes.

2. Possessor-to-object promotion and possessor-to-subject promotion are syntactic phenomena which appear most clearly in the comparison of different languages: the POSSESSOR that appears in the form of a possessive pronoun in language A appears as the object of the transitive verb in language B, while the POSSESSUM that appears as the object in language A appears as a secondary or oblique object or even a prepositional phrase in language B. We have a clear case of syntactic connections between possessivity on the one hand, object and subject marking on the other.

3. Possessive nominalizations - type the fear of the enemy - can take either a subject interpretation ('the enemy fears X'), or an object interpretation ('X fears the enemy'). This is a problem with many facets; but undoubtedly it is a further syntactic case of possessive-subjective vs. possessive-objective affinities.

In the following pages these three domains will be studied, and their interconnections will be pointed out. The problems which are common to these domains can be formulated in the following three questions to which we shall try to find an answer at the end of this study:

1. What is the rationale behind the affinities between possessive and objective on the one hand, between possessive
and subjective on the other?

2. Why is there fluctuation between possessive-objective and possessive-subjective connections as evidenced, e.g., by the subject-or-object interpretation of possessive nominalizations?

3. Why are possessive-objective affinities altogether predominant over possessive-subjective affinities (as evidenced in the pronominal system and in the interpretation of possessive nominalizations)?

2. Affinities in the pronominal system

2.1. The problem and the sample

The problem has several facets. One is to describe the affinities for a particular given language: Are the affinities with subject or with object pronouns? What is the degree of affinity? Another aspect is the comparison among languages in view of their respective pronominal affinities. A third one consists in finding a rationale, and a fourth in discovering structural correlates of such affinities - which might lead on to typological considerations.

As stated before, the affinities can be found in many languages of widely differing genetic affiliation. In order to provide for a certain comparability of the data and thus for more interesting results, I propose in the sections of this chapter to concentrate on materials drawn from North American Indian languages. Quite a few of them, in addition to differentiating between a subject and an object pronominal series, show two more or less distinct series of pos-
sessive pronouns: one for so-called "inalienable", the other for "alienable" POSSESSION - for reasons expounded in my monograph (Seiler 1981:8 ff.) I prefer the terms (and concepts) of inherent vs. established POSSESSION. Given this further differentiation of possessive pronominal elements we can increase our chances of pinpointing the nature of the affinities with subject and/or object pronominal elements.

The following language families and individual languages have been considered: Algonquian (Potowatomi, Delaware); Siouan (Assiniboine, Mandan, Dakota, Ponca); Caddoan (Pawnee); Gulf (Tunica); Tonkawa; Chimakuan (Quileute); Penutian (Zuni, Coos, Takelma); Uto-Aztecan (Tetelcingo Nahuatl, Huasteca Nahuatl, Nahuatl, Cahuilla); Hokan (Chumash, South-eastern Pomo); Chinook; Na-dene (Haida, Tlingit).

2.2. Measuring the similarities?

The simplest procedure one might think of would be a bare count of the identical phonemes of the respective forms. This might eventually yield a continuum of increasing or decreasing similarities between possessive and subject pronominal elements and/or a continuum of increasing or decreasing similarities between possessive and object pronominal elements. This, however, is not what we are looking for. We are looking for a scale with a number of relevant successive stages. A relative quantification seems thus to be more appropriate: We certainly want to highlight the extreme systems, viz. complete identity between possessive and ob-
ject pronominal elements vs. complete identity between possessive and subject pronominal elements. Furthermore we want to know the "middle" cases, where, for one reason or the other, neither of the two possible affinities is predominant. And we want to lump together on the one hand all the systems with predominant possessive - object affinities, and on the other hand all the systems with predominant possessive - subject affinities. This will give us a scale with altogether five points: two extremes and three intermediate stages.

2.2.1. Identity of possessive and object pronominal elements

A fairly clear case is presented by Zuni (Bunzel 1935: 499 ff.). The pronominal elements may be charted as follows (SUBJ = subject pronominal elements, OBJ = object pronominal elements, DAT = dative, POSS = possessive pronominal elements):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>DAT</th>
<th>POSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg. 1</td>
<td>ho'o</td>
<td>hom</td>
<td>homan</td>
<td>hom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>t'o'o</td>
<td>t'om</td>
<td>t'oman</td>
<td>t'om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>an</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du. 1</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>ho'na</td>
<td>ho'nan</td>
<td>ho'na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>t'on</td>
<td>t'o'na</td>
<td>t'o'nan</td>
<td>t'o'na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a·tcia</td>
<td>a·tcia</td>
<td>a·tcinaiyan</td>
<td>a·tcia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 1</td>
<td>hon</td>
<td>ho'na</td>
<td>ho'na·wan</td>
<td>ho'na·wan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>t'on</td>
<td>t'o'na</td>
<td>t'o'na·wan</td>
<td>t'o'na·wan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>a·wan</td>
<td>a·wan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provided that it is legitimate to subsume DAT and OBJ under
a common denominator "object", we get nearly complete identity. The 1st and 2nd plur. of POSS includes the OBJ forms, enlarged by an element -wan or -awan. Note that the dual and the plural forms are identical in SUBJ in the 1st and 2nd persons, and so are the corresponding forms in OBJ—a fact which would diminish the weight of the respective affinities with POSS in an absolute count and which therefore must be treated accordingly in our relative quantification. Also, the SUBJ and OBJ forms are on the whole not too different from one another. In particular, the dual and plural OBJ forms seem to result from enlargements of the corresponding SUBJ forms. The most telling instances of a POSS/OBJ identity contrasting with a POSS/SUBJ dissimilarity are found in the 1st and 2nd persons of the singular. Thus it appears that with regard to our problem of identities or affinities the plural (including the dual) carries a different weight (i.e. a lesser weight) than the singular, and again that the first two persons carry more weight than the third. A comparable situation will repeatedly be found in the next stages of our survey.

A clear case of an overall POSS/OBJ similarity or even identity is represented by Haida (Swanton 1911a:256 ff.). Possession of an object by a person other than the subject (i.e. non-reflexive possession) is expressed by the objective pronoun preceding the noun, and by the suffix -gα (Masset -eα). In the Masset dialect this suffix is used only rarely. We find the noun either without suffix or with the suffix -gio. The forms thus described express "inalienable" (kin) relationship.
Transferable ("alienable") possession is expressed by a combination of both object element and suffixal element which, combined, either precede or follow the noun. At the same time the noun takes the suffix -i.

A further candidate for identity or near identity between POSS and OBJ is presented in Southeastern Pomo (Moshinsky 1974:99 ff.). We may content ourselves with charting the singular forms (al. = alienable, inal. = inalienable):

The plural is inconclusive insofar as, apart from final consonants (which are different in SUBJ, OBJ and POSS), the formal similarities between POSS and OBJ equal those between POSS and SUBJ.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & \text{SUBJ} & \text{OBJ} & \text{inal.POSS} & \text{al.POSS} \\
2 & \text{m. non-displ.} & \text{mít} & \text{tí} & \text{títbaq} \\
3 & \text{m. non-displ.} & \text{míyi} & \text{mí} & \text{miyitbaq} \\
3 & \text{f. non-displ.} & \text{miyed} & \text{miyedil} & \text{miyeditbaq} \\
(m. = masculine, f. = feminine, non-displ. = non-displaced, displ. = displaced)
The system distinguishes between an inalienable and an alienable possessive series. Yet the two series are related to one another inasmuch as ali. POSS equals inal.POSS plus an element -baq. This is in accordance with the general principle that "alienable" or rather established POSSESSION shows longer and more complex forms, which serve the purpose of making the relationship between POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM more explicit as compared to "inalienable", inherent POSSESSION (Seiler 1981: 111). The 3rd person, in addition to the m./f. contrast, shows a number of additional distinctions. But this whole set of forms is inconclusive with regard to our problem, because the forms are kept distinct by their final consonants only and are otherwise identical or near-identical. What we are left with, then, is the 1st and 2nd person singular. Here the identities or near-identities are definitely between inal. POSS and OBJ, while SUBJ is widely divergent. Once more it appears that the 1st and 2nd person singular are crucial for the recognition of POSS/OBJ, or more precisely, inal. POSS/OBJ affinities. Ultimately, the comparison of all the forms boils down not to identity but to predominant inal. POSS/OBJ affinity. The case might therefore just as well be classed under the next section.

2.2.2. Similarities possessive/object predominant over similarities possessive/subject

A widespread pattern shows similarities between possessive and object pronominal elements in the 1st and 2nd person singular while subject, object, and possessive elements tend
to be identical in the 3rd singular and throughout the plural. Where possessivity is represented by two different series ("inalienable" vs. "alienable"), the form of the "inalienable" is closest to the object form. This pattern is represented in most Siouan languages for which Assiniboine (Levin 1964:27 ff.) may stand as an example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>POSS</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg. 1</td>
<td>mitá</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nitá</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>ϕ</td>
<td>ϕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. incl.</td>
<td>ϕíta</td>
<td>ϕí</td>
<td>ϕí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excl.</td>
<td>ϕíta..pi</td>
<td>ϕí..pi</td>
<td>ϕí..pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>nitá..pi</td>
<td>ni..pi</td>
<td>ni..pi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ta..pi</td>
<td>ϕ..pi</td>
<td>ϕ..pi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possessivity shows three partly distinct series for property ("alienable"), body parts and kinship ("inalienable"), where the "alienable" is characterized by the additional element -ta. 1st and 2nd person singular object elements are identical with the corresponding POSS body-part elements. Subject pronominal elements also come in three series (Levin 1964:31 ff.), and only the first is clearly distinct from OBJ and hence also from POSS; the class of verbal themes taking this series of affixes seems to predominantly, though not exclusively, comprise action verbs. While class II seems to be constituted on purely formal grounds (stems beginning in yu-, ya-), class III affixes are said to join "neuter and
adjective verb stems" (Levin, l.c. 33): 'I am good', 'you are suffering', 'you are dead', etc. In the first two persons of the singular they are identical to OBJ and hence to POSS, and this is certainly not coincidental: Neuter and adjective verb stems of the sort indicated take an EXPERIENCER or INACTIVUS rather than an AGENT, and the formal identity with OBJ as well as the dissimilarity to SUBJ are thus plausible. From the 3rd persons singular onwards throughout the plural we find regular correspondence or even identity among the forms of all series pertaining to a particular person.

Dakota and Mandan exhibit very similar systems. Ponca (Boas and Swanton 1911:914) deviates in showing identity between "inalienable" POSS and OBJ in the 2nd person singular only (gi-), while the forms in the 1st singular are wi- for "inalienable" POSS and un, a- for OBJ and SUBJ respectively.

A situation different from the Siouan is found in Tlingit (Swanton 1911b:170). The subjective, objective, and possessive series are as follows:

(4) SUBJ OBJ POSS

Sg. 1st x, xa xAt Ax
2nd i i i
3rd — {a du} du
     {Ac}
3rd refl. — c Ac
Pl. 1st tu ha ha
2nd yī yī yī
3rd {(hAs) hAsdu}
The clearest OBJ/POSS against SUBJ/POSS identities are in the 3rd persons (singular and plural) and in the 1st and 2nd person plural. This is in some sense the mirror image of the Siouan system.

For Chinook, the following three series of affixes are reported (Boas 1911:580 f.): transitive, intransitive, and possessive. The series show formal near-identity in the 1st and 2nd persons. Only the 3rd persons are conclusive in that possessive here goes mostly with intransitive, from which we may conclude that POSSESSOR in the 3rd person is equated with the subject of an intransitive verb, i.e. with EXPERIENCER or INACTIVUS:

(5) | Transitive | Intransitive | Possessive |
---|---|---|---|
1st person | n- | n- | -tcE-, -gE- |
Exclusive dual | nt- | nt- | -nt- |
Exclusive plural | ntc- | ntc- | -ntc- |
Inclusive dual | tx- | tx- | -tx- |
Inclusive plural | lx- | lx- | -lx- |
2nd person sg. | m- | m- | -m- |
2nd person dual | mt- | mt- | -mt- |
2nd person plural | mc- | mc- | -mc- |
3rd person sg., masc. | tc- | i- | -i- |
3rd person sg., fem. | g- | a- | -tca-, -ga- |
3rd person sg., nt. | L- | L- | -L- |
3rd person dual | c- | c-, ct- | -ct- |
3rd person plural | t- | t-(δ-, n-, a-) | -t-, -g- |
Indefinite | q- | | |

- 13 -
2.2.3. Similarities possessive-object equal similarities possessive-subject

No preponderance of either possessive-object or possessive-subject similarities can be found in languages of different genetic affiliation, and this for different structural reasons: 1. In languages with inverse verb inflection (e.g. Algonquian), there may be one single set of personal pronominal affixes, which, in and of themselves, give no indication of whether they function as subject or object markers. 2. In some languages (e.g. Tunica), there is an equal apportionment between alienable possessive = object markers of dynamic verbs and inalienable possessive = subject markers of stative verbs. 3. In still other languages (e.g. Pawnee), there is an equal apportionment between subjective personal = possessor elements, where the possessor is the subject of the sentence, and objective personal = possessive elements, where the possessor is not the subject of the sentence. 4. Finally, in some languages possessive affixes, like affixes of transitive verbs, represent a combination or an amalgam of both subject and object elements. A brief exemplification and discussion of these four types follows.

2.2.3.1. Inverse verb inflection

The relevant phenomena are perhaps most familiar from Algonquian languages. A convenient example would be the situation in Potowatomi as described by Hockett (1966: 59 ff.). The system builds upon a hierarchy of naturalness, distinguishing entities that are most likely to function as
subject (AGENT) from those most likely to function as object (PATIENT, GOAL) of a transitive verb. The essential criterium is nearness to EGO (the speaker), where speaker and addressee range foremost. Within the 3rd person there is an animacy hierarchy, where humans are more animate than animals, the latter more animate than inanimate objects. These distinctions are implemented by a contrast between proximate vs. obviative (occasionally further differentiated into lesser and further obviative) forms.

One and the same set of personal pronominal affixes is used in subject and object and possessive marking. In the verb a personal prefix ne-, e.g., gives no indication in and of itself as to whether it functions as subject or object marker (Hockett, l.c. 65-66):

(6) (i) n - wapm - a
    I see him
    I - see - DIRECT

(ii) n - wapm - uk
    he sees me
    I - see - INVERSE

It is the contrast between the theme suffixes -a DIRECT vs. -uk INVERSE which codes the proximity hierarchy between 1st and 3rd person: -uk INVERSE codes the less natural, less expected situation where the AGENT is the further referent, that is, more remote from the speaker.

Possessive constructions do not show markings of inversion, but they do show the proximate - obviative contrast. If the possessed noun is animate, then a non-1st or -2nd animate possessor and the possessed noun must be located
at different points on the proximity- or obviation scale; and it is a general principle in Algonquian that the possessor in such cases is 'closer' than the possessed entity. Thus we have

(7) W - os' - un > ?os'un his father
3rd.SG. - father - OBV

with possessor proximate and possessed obviative.

The important points to be noted here are:
1. The roles of POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM, of AGENT and PATIENT (GOAL) are not differentiated in the personal elements but rather by means of the devices of obviation and inversion.
2. One and the same hierarchy is relevant both for possessive and for verb structure; but the two differ in that only verb forms show inversion.

2.2.3.2. Alienable possessive = object of dynamic verbs, inalienable possessive = subject of static verbs

Tunica, a Gulf language (Haas 1941) shows a radical distinction between prefixation and suffixation of person markers. The distinction is correlated with the distinction between static and dynamic (or "active", as they are termed by Haas, l.c. 59) verbs. All transitive verbs are dynamic, but also some of the intransitive verbs. Static verbs express emotional, mental, and physical states and possessivity. The correlation between static vs. dynamic and prefixation vs. suffixation of person markers is as follows: Subject mar-
kers of dynamic verbs, no matter whether transitive or in-transitive, are suffixed. Subject markers of static verbs and object markers of dynamic verbs are prefixed, whereby the former are drawn from the "inalienable" series, the latter from the "alienable" series. This means that "inalienable" prefixes are used with two sets of bound stems, namely so-called "possessed" noun stems (kin terms, body-part terms, clothing, naming) and static verb stems; and that "alienable" prefixes are used with two sets of free stems namely noun stems and active verb stems. The sets of prefixes are as follows (Haas 1941:37):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Dual and Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>?i-, ?ihk-</td>
<td>?i-n-, ?ink-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 masc.</td>
<td>wi-, wihk-</td>
<td>wi-n-, wink-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 fem.</td>
<td>hi-, hihk-</td>
<td>hi-n-, hink-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he-, hehk-</td>
<td>he-n-, henk-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 masc.</td>
<td>?u-, ?uhk-</td>
<td>?u-n-, ?unk-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 fem.</td>
<td>ti-, tihk-</td>
<td>si-, sihk-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples for "inalienable" are:

(9) ?o'siku his father < ?u - e'si - ku
    3.SG.M. - father - M.SG.

(10) wiwa'na you want < wi - wa'na
     2.PL.M.SUBJ. - want

Examples for "alienable" are:
We note that the "alienable" and "inalienable" prefixes are not totally different: The former are clearly derived from the latter by the addition of an element -hk- which appears as -k- after prefixes in -n-. This is again in accordance with our tenet that "alienable" or rather established POSSESSION is formally more explicit and thus more complex (see 2.2.1.).

For the purpose of comparison we reproduce here the set of subject suffixes of dynamic verbs in their semifactive paradigm (Haas 1941:47):

```
(13) SG   DU   PL
1   -ni   -?i'na  -?i'ti
2M  -?i   -wi'na  -wi'ti
2F  -?a   -hi'na  -he'na  -hi'ti  -he'ti
3M  -wi   -?u'na  -ta
3F  -ti   -si'na  -si'ti
```

No similarity can be detected between the singular set and the corresponding prefixes, either "alienable" or "in- alienable". However, the dual forms appear to be related to the dual inalienable prefixes except that the dual element used here is the suffix -na. And the plural forms (except -ta) are constructed like the dual forms except that the dual suffix -na is replaced by a plural suffix -ti.
The identity of "inalienable" possessive markers and subject markers of static verbs is plausible: Both kinds of relationship indicate the state of the subject. What may cause surprise at first sight is the identification of "alienable" possessive and object markers of dynamic verbs. We must respect the fact that the POSSESSOR of non-intimate, acquired POSSESSION is definitely not represented like an AGENT but rather like an EXPERIENCER (or INACTIVUS). Hence our conclusion: With regard to the dichotomy subject ~ AGENT vs. object ~ EXPERIENCER (or INACTIVUS), both "inalienable" and "alienable" POSSESSORS are on the same side, viz. the EXPERIENCER's (or INACTIVUS'), if we assume that "state of the subject" is closer to EXPERIENCER/INACTIVUS than to AGENT.

2.2.3.3. POSSESSOR is/is not the subject of the sentence

In Pawnee, a Caddoan language (Parks 1976:212 ff.) regular POSSESSION is formally differentiated according to whether POSSESSOR is the subject of the sentence or is not the subject of the sentence, in which latter case it may contract an object relation or still another syntactic relation. The very complex verb forms contain indications of the persons of subject and object as well as special possessive markers for subject and/or object POSSESSOR.

Within subject possession a distinction is made between "simple ownership" and "physical possession" which roughly corresponds to non-intimate, established vs. intimate, inherent possession (see Seiler 1981:8 ff.). The
latter is expressed by a sequence of three morphemes, viz. 
\( \text{ir} + \text{ri} + \text{ur} \) (Parks 1976:216):

\[
(14) \text{witi} - \text{ta} - \text{t} - \text{ir} - \text{ri} - \text{ur} - \text{wa:waktit} - \emptyset \\
\text{PROCLIT} - \text{INDIC} - \text{1.SG.SUBJ} - \text{SUBJ.POSS} - \text{OBJ.POSS} - \text{talk to} - \text{SUBORD}
\]

\[>\text{witi:tirihwa:waktit} = \text{I talked to my (child)}\]

The actual POSSESSUM noun ('child') is not expressed in this example, but the important thing is that the verb form has to show an element (-\text{ur}-) that agrees with it, and that the POSSESSOR (1st SG) is at the same time the subject of the sentence.

Object possession is characterized by the element -\text{ur}- alone, which is identical to the -\text{ur}- in the combination \( \text{ir} + \text{ri} + \text{ur} \) marking subject possession. An example for POSSESSOR \( \neq \) subject is (Parks, l.c. 219):

\[
(15) \text{ta} - \text{t} - \text{a} - \text{ur} - \text{ku:tik} - \emptyset - \text{a} - \text{ru:sao} \\
\text{IND} - \text{1.SG.SUBJ} - \text{2.SG.OBJ} - \text{OBJ.POSS} - \text{kill} - \text{SUBORD} - \text{2.SG} - \text{horse OBJ}
\]

\[>\text{tauhku:tito:ru:sao} = \text{I killed your horse}\]

Again, the verb shows an element (-\text{a}-) that agrees with the POSSESSUM noun. The final subordination sign (\( \emptyset \)) seems to be due to the fact that the example (as well as the previous and the following ones) is taken from a larger context. There seems to be some sort of an "object promotion" here (see below, chap. 3) in that the POSSESSOR, who is not the subject of the sentence, is "promoted", as it were, into the syntactic status of an object. Thus, a more literal
translation would have to be something like 'I killed you - your horse'. This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the two following examples (Parks, l.c. 219):

(16) ti - ku - ur - hurahac - ø
    DEM - 1.SG.OBJ - OBJ.POSS - die - SUBORD
    tikuhurahac = I lost my (e.g., friend through death)

This is the translation given by Parks. But a more literal translation would be 'me died someone'. If the person of the subject ('someone') is not specified in the verb, it is a 3rd person.

(17) ti - ku - ir - ur - rak - hu:k - a - ø
    DEM - INDEF - SUBJ.POSS - OBJ.POSS - come - into - 1.PL.INCL - SUBORD
    tikuraku:ka = he came into ours
    literally: 'he came into (something) of us' viz. 'into our house'

What is the rationale for this difference in treatment of a POSSESSOR being the subject and a POSSESSOR not being the subject of the sentence, in which latter case he is treated like an object? It seems reasonable to assume that if somebody else acts on a POSSESSOR's POSSESSUM, this is linguistically represented as if the acting were on the POSSESSOR himself, hence POSSESSOR = object. Would the complementary argument hold as well: If POSSESSOR acts on his own POSSESSUM, is he, linguistically speaking, not an object ~ PATIENT but rather a subject ~ AGENT, or perhaps a subject ~ EXPERIENCER?
2.2.3.4. Both subject and object are represented in the possessive element

If in a language like Eskimo possessive affixes represent an amalgam of elements which are, in principle, identical with subject and object elements of a transitive verb, this represents, of course, a special case of our overall problem. The relevant data for Yup'ik Eskimo are most conveniently displayed in the grammar by I. Reed et al. (1977). As a detailed discussion would go far beyond the limits of this paper, I must content myself with a few statements:

1. In all possessive endings both the POSSESSOR and the POSSESSUM are formally represented in the amalgam.

2. The POSSESSUM appears in the absolute form in absolutely possessed nouns as the subject of intransitive verbs or as the object of transitive verbs; it appears in the relative (ergative) in relatively possessed nouns as the subject of transitive verbs. There are thus two possessive paradigms.

3. In both paradigms the elements representing the POSSESSOR show affinities with the subject element of intransitive verbs.

4. In both paradigms the POSSESSUM segment precedes the segment corresponding to the POSSESSOR.

5. There is identity between the endings of possessed absolute nouns and the indicative endings of the transitive verbs which combine subject (3rd, 1st, and 2nd person) and object (3rd person). However, the remaining transitive indicative endings, where the object is in a person
other than the 3rd show a different internal structure. Here the subject segment precedes the object segment, while in the possessed absolutive and transitive endings with the object in the 3rd person it is the object (corresponding to the POSSESSUM) which precedes the subject (corresponding to the POSSESSOR).

2.2.4. Similarities possessive/subject predominant over similarities possessive/object

Quileute (Chimakuan) (Andrade 1933:216 f.) shows one series of postpositive and one of free morphemes for the expression of possessive relation. The affixed possessives establish a relation between the nouns to which they are appended and the POSSESSOR; the latter being represented by the suffix itself or by the suffix and the noun which follows the possessive word. The possessive suffixes of the 3rd person are formed by appending the subjective pronouns to the element -ya. To this general 3rd person suffix subjective pronouns are added that specify whether the POSSESSOR is the subject of the sentence or not. As to the subject elements proper, there are about six different forms, the use of which is, on the whole, determined by modal functions. Accordingly, four of the main series have been named after the modes with which they are associated, viz. indicative, interrogative, subjunctive, and imperative. Some of these forms are free morphemes, others are suffixed. A comparison of these various subject series with the corresponding possessive affixes reveals - apart from the 3rd person, which,
as already mentioned, does contain the subjective element - a certain amount of similarity. Thus, the subject markers for 2nd person singular are (Andrade, l.c. 204):

(18) IND: -(l)tc, tche
INTER: tca
SUBJ: tc
COND: titc
IMP: axu
VOC: tca-li (m.), da-li (f.)

The corresponding possessive 'thy' is -tc (l.c. 216).

Objective suffixes also occur in different shapes, which can be defined by reference to the verbal classifiers. For our purposes, it may suffice that all of the forms are totally different from both the subjective and the possessive elements. The forms for 2nd person singular, e.g., are, respectively:

(19) -qalawo, -tilawo, -swo (l.c. 233)

Takelma (Penutian) (Sapir 1922) shows possessive suffixes appended to the noun. Altogether four distinct though genetically related series of possessive pronominal affixes have been found, of which three are used to express "simple ownership" of the noun modified; the fourth is used with nouns preceded by prepositives and with local adverbial stems. The former set includes a special scheme for most terms of relationship, and two other schemes for the great mass of nouns that seem to be fundamentally identical and to have become differentiated for phonetic reasons. None of
these four pronominal schemes is identical with either the objective or any of the subjective series found in the verb, though the pronominal forms used with pre-positives are very nearly coincident with the subjective forms found in the future of class II intransitives.

Quite a number of Uto-Aztecan languages (Langacker 1977:86 ff.; 126 ff.) have pronominal elements on the verb agreeing with the subject, the object, or both. These subject markers are mostly prefixes. There is reason to believe that the subject markers are innovative. Object prefixes are more widespread, and it may be possible to reconstruct object proclitics to the verb for Proto-Uto-Aztecan. Because of their different origins, subject and object markers in Uto-Aztecan show considerable diversity in their properties. Looking at the prefix series of some particular languages such as Tetelcingo Nahuatl (Tuggy 1979:59 ff.; 81 ff.) or Huasteca Nahuatl (Beller and Beller 1979:240; 269 ff.) we find that possessives resemble the subject slightly more than the object prefixes.

2.2.5. Identity of possessive and subject pronominal elements

For some languages it has been observed that one and the same series of elements express possessor in nouns, subject in verbs. In Chumash (Hokan) (Beeler 1976:255) we find the following series of possessive/subject prefixes:
In contradistinction, the object is expressed by suffixed forms on verbs, and the forms are totally different from the possessive/subjective ones:

(21) SG NON-SG REFL
1 -it {-iyuw}
2 -in -§v§
3 -us ~ -Ø -wun

Cahuilla (Uto-Aztecan) (Seiler 1977:74 f.; 108 f.) shows near-identity between subject and possessive prefixes; but the object prefixes are also quite similar, especially in the singular:

(22) POSS SUB OBJ
SG 1 ne- ne- ne-
2 ?e- ?e- ?e-
3 he- Ø- Ø- pe-
PL 1 čem- čem- čeme-
2 ?em- ?em- ?eme-
3 hem- hem- me-

Possessive prefixes occur with nouns, subject prefixes with verbs. It is important to note that a possessed nominal form
must be analyzed as containing, in addition to the possessive prefix, a prefix of a different series, which occurs with nouns only and which I called $P_2$. It is in the 3rd person, represented by zero, and it refers to the POSSESSUM. The form may assume the value of a predication - with the copula not segmentally represented. Thus:

(23) $\emptyset$ - *ne* - něsí she is my niece,
\hspace{1cm} $P_2$ 3.SG - $P_1$ 1.SG - niece or simply: my niece

Overt forms of $P_2$ appear where the person is a non-3rd:

(24) 'et - *ne* - něsí thou art my niece,
\hspace{1cm} $P_2$ 2.SG - $P_1$ 1.SG - niece or simply: thou - my niece

It is this paradigmatic connection together with the possibility of predicative use which justifies this analysis of possessed noun forms. As to the subject prefixes on verbs there is good reason to believe that in Cahuilla they are recent extensions of POSSESSOR prefixes used originally only in subordinate clauses (Jacobs 1975:25 f.). The verb forms, however, do not take the $P_2$ prefixes.

In the pronominally possessed nouns of Cahuilla there is thus a representative of both POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM, and this situation is reminiscent of that found in Eskimo, although the structural details differ widely.
2.2.6. **Summary**

What have we done? In answer to the question mark of our title in 2.2. we might say that we did not actually measure the similarities, we weighted them. We found that all five assumed points on the similarity continuum are represented by actual language examples. No statistics were attempted. Impressionistically we might say that it is certainly easier to find languages showing possessive-objective similarities as over languages with possessive-subjective similarities. But granted that a more comprehensive sampling would yield some further instances of the latter kind of similarity, this would not decisively alter the picture.

In the languages studied the possessive-objective similarities outweigh the possessive-subjective similarities, because the former are more firmly anchored in systematic connections, which I shall enumerate for convenience:

1. Objective elements are clearly connected with the "inalienable" possessive series as over the "alienable" in languages where two such series are represented. No generalized connection between subjective elements and one or the other of the two series was found. 2. The connections between objective and possessive elements (mostly of the "inalienable" kind) appear most clearly in the 1st and 2nd person of the singular. The 3rd person singular and the entire plural seemed inconclusive in a number of languages because the corresponding possessive, objective, and subjective forms are more or less alike. One language (Tlingit)
showed some sort of a mirror image of this. 3. Objective and possessive elements are most clearly connected when the verb is intransitive or stative. In contrast to this, connections between possessive and subjective elements appear where the verb is transitive, most typically a verb of action. A different apportionment of similarities appears where the verbs show a systematic contrast between static and dynamic (Tunica). Here the subject of the static goes with the "inalienable" possessive, the object of the dynamic with the "alienable" possessive, while subject of the dynamic differs from both in the sense of suffixation vs. prefixation.

We have also encountered a number of languages where - for different structural reasons - no preponderance of either possessor-subject or possessor-object similarities obtain. This is particularly the case where subject/object differentiation is not coded in the pronouns themselves (inverse verb inflection), or where a possessive represents an amalgam of both a subject and an object element (Eskimo).

The interpretation of these results of our weighting must go beyond morphology proper (see chap. 5).

3. Possessor-to-object and possessor-to-subject promotion

Both phenomena manifest a clear affinity between possessivity and the syntactic relations of subject vs. object.
Possessor-to-object promotion can be exemplified by such French examples as

(25) Il m'a cassé le bras  lit. he broke me the arm
    he me has broken the arm  = he broke my arm

(26) Je me suis cassé le bras  lit. I broke myself the arm
    I me am broken the arm  = I broke my arm

Why can we say that the French constructions are manifestations of possessivity? Only because the translation into idiomatic English shows a possessive pronoun? This would certainly not be a sufficient justification. However, it can be shown that the French constructions are constrained in such a way as to fit exactly into the pattern of POSSESSION, more precisely: of inherent POSSESSION. The nouns involved in the constructions are relational nouns, namely body-part terms. Substitution of a non-relational, non-body-part term in (26) would yield an unacceptable

(26)' *Je me suis cassé la tasse

instead of

(27) J'ai cassé ma tasse  I broke my cup

We may then say that in French the POSSESSOR of a relational (body-part) noun appears as or "is promoted to" the (direct) object while he appears in the form of the possessive pronoun in English.
Both possessor-to-object and possessor-to-subject promotion appear systematically in Bantu languages and have been described in detail by L. Hyman (1977) for Haya (see also the discussion in Seiler 1981:75 ff.). I'll content myself with reproducing a few examples, first for possessor-to-object promotion (Hyman, l.c. 101-102):

(28) ƞ-ka-hénd' ómwáán' ómukôno
I-P3-break child arm
Lit. I broke the child the arm = I broke the child's arm

(29) (?) ƞ-ka-hénd' ómukono gw'ómwaana
I-P3-break arm of child
I broke the (detached) arm of the child

(30) ƞ-ka-hénd' éŋkoni y'ómwaana
I-P3-break stick of child
I broke the stick of the child

(31) *ƞ-ka-hénd' ómwáán' éŋkoni
I-P3-break child stick
(lit. I broke the child the stick)

(32) ómwáán' a -ka-hénd' -w' ómukôno
child he-P3-break-PASS arm
lit. the child was broken the arm = the child's arm was broken

(33) ƞ-ka-mu -hénd' ómukôno
I-P3-him-break arm
lit. I broke him arm = I broke his arm
As (32) shows, the POSSESSOR (of the child's arm) satisfies a criterion for direct object status inasmuch as it is accessible to subjectivization in the passive. It satisfies other conditions as well. The examples altogether show that the following conditions must be fulfilled:

a. the nature of the possessed noun: body part, part-whole
b. the nature of the verb: verbs implying experiencer or affected object rather than verbs of state or sensory verbs
c. the nature of the POSSESSOR: personal hierarchy
   1st > 2nd > 3rd human > 3rd animal > 3rd inanimate

In short, what causes POSSESSOR promotion to object position is a POSSESSOR = EGO or next to it ("egocentricity"), a POSSESSOR who is experiencer and who finds a part of himself affected by an action or process. If the part is affected, the POSSESSOR as a whole is affected. The whole is even more affected than the part, and thus, the part, the POSSESSUM, is "demoted" to a "secondary" or "oblique" object to the verb, perhaps even to a prepositional phrase with zero preposition.

The role of EXPERIENCER is also decisive in subject promotion (Hyman, l.c. 108):

(34) omwáána ą -aa-sháásh’ ą mútwe
    child   PR-he-ache   head
    lit. the child is aching the head = the child has a headache
(35) (??) omutwe gw’ómwáána ni-gu-sháash-a  
head of child PR-it-ache  
the head of the child is aching

(36) omwáána n -aa-núúk’ ómukono  
child PR-he-smell arm  
lit. the child smells (with respect to) the hand  
= the hand of the child smells

(37) omukono gw’ómwáána gú-ka-gw-a  
arm of child it-P3-fall  
the arm of the child fell

POSSSESSOR promotion must take place if POSSSESSOR is EXPERIENCER (‘arm smell’ vs. ‘arm fall’ implies that POSSSESSOR is involved as a whole), and if the other conditions are fulfilled as well.

Possessor-to-object promotion as discussed thus far is reminiscent of the special morphological codings of POSSSESSOR in Pawnee (2.2.3.3.), but with a few notable differences:

1. In Pawnee POSSSESSOR is marked for subject only if POSSSESSOR is not the subject of the sentence (see ex. (15)), while French and Haya do not limit possessor-as-object marking in this way. 2. Pawnee does not restrict possessor-as-object marking to relational nouns, while for French and Haya this constraint is essential.

All in all, what this shows is a certain amount of variation in the affinities between possessivity and the syntactic relations of object and subject. Possessor-as
object marking seems to be widespread under clearly statable constraints. But possessor-as-subject marking in constructions with transitive verbs is also possible, though perhaps less frequent, and the constraints are for the most part different. Possessor-as-subject marking in constructions with intransitive verbs, where it occurs, seems to obey the same or similar constraints as possessor-as-object marking.

4. Subject/object interpretation in possessive nominalizations

This is the problem area indicated by the classical grammatical terms of genitivus subjectivus and genitivus objectivus, respectively. This means that we find determinative constructions type NaN2, where Na is nominalized, typically an "abstract noun", derived either from a transitive or an intransitive verb, and N2, the "genitive" - "genitive" here taken in a broad sense of a determiner - is usually interpreted as representing a POSSESSOR. It is also possible that an Na "abstract noun" takes more than one determiner according to the number of argument places opened by the underlying finite verb. The interpretation of the relationship between determiners and head noun clearly follows the patterns of the relationship between the underlying finite verb and its arguments. Thus, for an NaN2 construction, where Na is derived from a one-place verb the interpretation of the "genitive" is clearly "subjectivus":

(38) John's failure - John failed
Complications arise where \( N_1 \) is derived from a more-than-one-place verb. For one thing, \( N_1 \) cannot take more than one, or two, or three (?) "genitives" - this is language-specific. The remaining determiners - corresponding to the remaining argument places - would have to be represented by prepositional phrases:

(39) John's gift of a watch to Mary - John gave a watch to Mary

In the following I shall confine myself to two-place nominalizations. In English, as in many other languages, it is quite often the case that only one "genitive", corresponding to one argument, appears. The relationship of this \( N_2 \) to \( N_1 \) can then be interpreted either as a subject relation:

(40) John's claim

or as an object relation:

(41) John's election

or as ambivalent between a subject or object relation:

(42) John's killing

The important fact to be retained for the general purpose of this study and for the problems raised in section 1. is that such fluctuations or even ambiguities in the interpretation of the \( N_2 \) "genitive" do occur. To the extent
that such a "genitive" really represents the POSSESSOR, we may say that such a POSSESSOR is linked to subject function in certain instances, and to object function in other instances, and that the speaker and/or hearer may at times vacillate from one to the other in the assignment. Semantically speaking this would mean that POSSESSOR may be linked either to an AGENT, or to a PATIENT (or EXPERIENCER), or to either one. This parallels our findings of chapter 2 regarding pronominal affinities and of chapter 3 regarding syntactic markings of the POSSESSOR. Additional support for the parallelism claimed comes from the fact that within the realm of two-place nominalizations the object interpretation is by and large the more common and natural one as over the subject interpretation. This holds for English as well as for many other languages. And it does parallel our findings of chapters 2 and 3.

The analysis of possessive nominalizations cannot be carried any further within the framework of this paper - although a great number of problems still await their solution.

For one thing, the assignment of these $N_1N_2$ "genitive" constructions to the domain of POSSESSION cannot be taken for granted in the unreflected manner in which it is usually done. I have discussed the problem at some length in my monograph (Seiler 1981:83) and shall not repeat the discussion here. The outcome was that the "genitive" represents a POSSESSOR - and hence a POSSESSOR-subject or POSSESSOR-object in a restricted sense.
A further problem consists in stating the conditions for the different interpretations and also for the ambiguities, and here we need a lot more detailed inquiries into actual language data rather than the repetition of stereotyped examples of the shooting-of-the-hunters kind. There are different kinds of nominalization that may enter these constructions, and they may have a different effect on the "genitive" interpretation (see Lehmann 1982:7 f.). The nature of the underlying verb has an important role in it, too: ambivalence is likely to occur with action nouns derived from verbs that can take both an animate subject and an animate object. A further prerequisite seems to be that subject and object appear to be equally affected by the action portrayed in the verb: 'love', 'fear', 'killing', 'visiting', 'discovering', etc. It seems that subject/object ambiguity is quite clearly constrained in this realm, and this also sheds some light on the problem of subject/object ambiguity tolerance in finite verbs (see Moravcsik 1978:255 f.).

5. Conclusion

Three questions were raised in the introductory chapter, and we may now try to answer them. The evidence adduced in the preceding chapters concerned facts of morphology (2. Affinities in the pronominal system) and of syntax (3. Possessor-to-object and possessor-to-subject promotion; 4. Subject/object interpretation in possessive nominalizations). The solution of the problems raised can neither
come from morphology alone, nor from syntax alone. Semantics has an important part in it, and, together with the domains just mentioned, it must be integrated into a functional view that takes into account the purposive aspect of the structures involved.

In my monograph on POSSESSION I showed that the different structures pertaining to this domain cannot be reduced to or derived from a particular category - such as, e.g., 'having', or 'dative'. Rather, they can be naturally ordered in a continuum which is bi-directional. In the one direction we find that the structures are ordered according to the amount of predicativity, i.e. the degree to which the relationship between the POSSESSOR and the POSSESSUM is made explicit by ever more complex structures. This ranges from a simple juxtaposition of $N_1$-POSSESSOR and $N_2$-POSSESSUM, where $N_1$ may also be represented by a pronominal element, to the construction type $N_1 \, V \, N_2$, where the relationship between the two nominals representing the two terms of POSSESSION is explicated by special verbs of possession ('have', 'belong', 'possess', etc.) with all their possibilities for contrast. In the reverse direction, i.e. going from $N_1 \, V \, N_2$, we find an increase in grammaticalization, i.e. in cohesion and obligatoriness between the two nominal constituents. Two converse functional principles are correlated with this bi-directional continuum: POSSESSION is either inherent in one of the two terms (kin terms, body-part terms, and the like), or it is not inherent; in that case the relationship has to be estab-
lished by explicit means. In every possessive construction both functional principles are co-present, but in different proportions. The more establishing the structure, the less inherent the relation, and vice-versa. Non-inherent, linguistically established POSSESSION is usually acquired and calls for a POSSESSOR - AGENT that does the acquiring. Inherent, intimate POSSESSION does not need to be acquired. Rather, the POSSESSOR appears as being qualified by his POSSESSUM, or as being EXPERIENCER when something happens to his POSSESSUM. In any case, he is an INACTIVUS - to utilize Uhlenbeck's term (l.c. 367). Prototypically, he is EGO, i.e. 1st person singular, or an entity most closely related to EGO, i.e. 2nd person singular. This is, in short, an outline of what I have called the dimension of POSSESSION. But the dimension, based on the continuum, is not static, it is dynamic. This means that both synchronically and diachronically there are two permanently present pulls in opposite directions. Hence even an acquired POSSESSUM tends to be interpreted as characterizing EGO rather than as the GOAL of an AGENT; and even the relation to an intimate POSSESSUM like a kin tends to be explicitly established. Moreover, the two poles of the dimension are not symmetrical. Rather, inherent, "inalienable" POSSESSION is unmarked with regard to established, "alienable" POSSESSION. Thus, predominantly inherent structures can be substituted for predominantly establishing ones, whereas the reverse is not true.

In order to be able to interpret the observations made in the preceding chapters, we must correlate the morpho-
syntactic categories such as subject, object, possessivity, with semantic-conceptual categories such as AGENT, GOAL, EXPERIENCER, INACTIVUS, POSSESSOR, POSSESSUM. Clearly, the object represents the GOAL or EXPERIENCER or INACTIVUS roles. The subject of transitive verbs may stand for AGENT or EXPERIENCER, the subject of intransitive verbs for EXPERIENCER and INACTIVUS.

Now, the three questions and their answers:

1. What is the rationale behind the affinities between possessive and objective on the one hand, between possessive and subjective on the other? - Affinities of the first kind have inherent POSSESSION as their common denominator. This explains why the objective pronominal series agrees with the "inalienable", not with the "alienable" possessive series in languages where the two are differentiated. It also explains why the affinities objective - possessive appear most clearly in the EGO-proximate 1st and 2nd persons singular. Affinities of the possessive-subjective kind seem to have acquired, establishing POSSESSION as their basis. This would explain the innovative character of these similarities in some of the languages studied.

2. Why is there fluctuation between possessive-objective and possessive-subjective connections as evidenced, e.g., by the subject-or-object interpretation of possessive nominalizations? - This has to do with the dynamics in the dimension of POSSESSION. A possessive structure never uniquely represents either inherent or establishing POSSESSION. This is also the reason why we want to avoid the
terms "inalienable" vs. "alienable", because they suggest a categorial either-or decision. A POSSESSOR is never fully an AGENT-subject nor fully a PATIENT or INACTIVUS -object.

3. Why are possessive-objective affinities altogether predominant over possessive-subjective affinities (as evidenced in the pronominal system and in the interpretation of possessive nominalizations)? - This has to do with the unmarked status of inherent POSSESSION. Without indication to the contrary, POSSESSION relates to EGO and is intimate. The POSSESSOR, then, is not conceived as an AGENT-subject but rather as an INACTIVUS-object.

C.C. Uhlenbeck was right in recognizing the identifying (i.e. with EGO) character of possessive expressions where they show similarities with the objective-INACTIVUS. He was wrong in his psychological interpretation of this fact and in his assumption that possessive pronominal affixes were originally not employed with separable nouns. Sapir was right in criticizing this; but it seems that, in considering the affinities between possessivity and object marking as arbitrary, he underestimated the regularities that obtain between possessive, subjective, and objective markings.
FOOTNOTE

¹This is a revised and expanded version of a paper read at the Conference on "Accusative, ergative, and active language types", held at the University of Hannover, January 15-17, 1982.
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