akup

ARBEITEN DES KÖLNER UNIVERSALIEN - PROJEKTS

Nr. 43

Hansjakob Seiler

Possessivity, Subject and Object

August 1982

CONTENTS

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 con-
tribute 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 per-
sonal 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 inter-
pretation of these facts - in particular the claim for
greater primitiveness of the possessive affixes of insepa-
rable 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 POS-
SESSOR 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. pos-
sessive-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 for-
mulated 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, Southeastern 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 affin-
ities, and on the other hand all the systems with predomi-
nant 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 ele-
ments):

(1)		SUBJ	OBJ	DAT	POSS
Sg.	1	ho'o	hom	homan	hom
	2	t'o'o	t'om	t'oman	t'om
	3	——	——	an	an
Du.	1	hon	ho'na	ho'nan	ho'na
	2	t'on	t'o'na	t'o'nan	t'o'na
	3	a·tci	a·tcia	a·tcinaiyan	a·tcia
Pl.	1	hon	ho'na	ho'na·wan	ho'na·wan
	2	t'on	t'o'na	t'o'na·wan	t'o'na·wan
	3	——	——	a·wan	a·wan

Provided that it is legitimate to subsume DAT and OBJ under

a common denominator "object", we get nearly complete iden-
tity. 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 there-
fore must be treated accordingly in our relative quantifi-
cation. 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 -ga (Masset -$^{\varepsilon}$a).
In the Masset dialect this suffix is used only rarely. We find
the noun either without suffix or with the suffix -gia. 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.

(2)

	SUBJ	OBJ	inal.POSS	al.POSS
1	?a	wít	wí	wítbaq
2	ma	tí	tí ~ tít	títbaq
3 m.non-displ. unm.	?úyi	?úyil	?úyit	?úyitbaq
3 m.non-displ. near	míyi	míl	míyit	míyitbaq
3 m.non-displ. far	?íyi	?íyil	?íyit	?íyitbaq
3 m.displ.	yíwi	yíwil	yíwit	yíwitbaq
3 f.non-displ. unm.	?ómed	?ómdil	?ómdit	?ómditbaq
3 f.non-displ. near	mémed	mémdil	mémdit	mémditbaq
3 f.displ.	yímed	yímdil	yímdit	yímditbaq

(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 al. 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 "in-
alienable" 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:

(3)

		POSS			OBJ	SUBJ		
		Property	Body	Relatives	I	II	III
Sg.	1	mitá	ma	mi	ma	wa	mn	ma
	2	nitá	ni	ni	ni	ya	n	ni
	3	ta	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
Pl. incl.	1	ųkíta	ų	ųkí	ųk	ųk	ų	ų
excl.		ųkíta..pi	ų..pi	ųkí..pi	ųk..pi	ųk..pi	ų..pi	ų..pi
	2	nitá..pi	ni..pi	ni..pi	ni..pi	ya..pi	n..pi	ni..pi
	3	ta..pi	∅..pi	∅..pi	wicá	∅..pi	∅..pi	∅..pi

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 identi-
cal 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 exclu-
sively, 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 (ϕi-), while the forms in the 1st singular are wi- for "inalienable" POSS and a^n-, 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	—	$\left\{\begin{array}{c} a \\ du \\ Ac \end{array}\right\}$	du
	3rd refl.	—	c	Ac
Pl.	1st	tu	ha	ha
	2nd	yị̄	yị̄	yị̄
	3rd		$\left\{\begin{array}{c} a \\ (hAs) \\ hAsdu \end{array}\right\}$	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 EX-
PERIENCER 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-(ō-,n-,a-)	-t-, -g-
Indefinite	q-	—	—

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 ob-
ject (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 - wɑpm - ɑ   I see him
         I - see - DIRECT

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

It is the contrast between the theme suffixes -ɑ 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 in-
version, 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 pos-
sessor 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 PA-
   TIENT (GOAL) are not differentiated in the personal ele-
   ments but rather by means of the devices of obviation
   and inversion.

2. One and the same hierarchy is relevant both for posses-
   sive and for verb structure; but the two differ in that
   only verb forms show inversion.

2.2.3.2. <u>Alienable possessive = object of dynamic verbs,</u>
         <u>inalienable possessive = subject of static verbs</u>

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 ex-
press 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 "in-
alienable" 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):

(8)		Singular	Dual and Plural	
1		ʔi-, ʔihk-	ʔi-n-, ʔink-	
2 masc.		wi-, wihk-	wi-n-, wink-	
2 fem.	{	hi-, hihk-	{ hi-n-, hink-	
		he-, hehk-	he-n-, henk-	
3 masc.		ʔu-, ʔuhk-	ʔu-n-, ʔunk-	Dual
			si-, sihk-	Plural
3 fem.		ti-, tihk-	si-n-, sink-	

Examples for "inalienable" are:

(9) ʔoˈsiku   his father   < ʔu   - eˈsi - ku
                                  3.SG.M. - father - M.SG.

(10) wiwaˈna   you want   < wi   - waˈna
                                  2.PL.M.SUBJ. - want

Examples for "alienable" are:

(11) ʔuhkʔiˈyutʔɛku   his hog   < ʔuhk - ʔiˈyutʔɛ- ku

                                      3.SG.M. - hog   - M.SG.

(12) ʔihkʔɛˈhʔuhki   he kicked me < ʔihk   - ʔɛˈh -.ʔuhki

                                        1.SG.OBJ. - kick - AUX:he was

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 estab-
lished 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 semel-
factive paradigm (Haas 1941:47):

(13)   SG   DU   PL

    1   -ni   -ʔiˈna   -ʔiˈti

    2M   -ʔi   -wiˈna   -wiˈti

    2F   -ʔa   -hiˈna   -heˈna   -hiˈti   -heˈti

    3M   -wi   -ʔuˈna   -ta

    3F   -ti   -siˈna   -siˈti

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.
ir + ri + ur (Parks 1976:216):

(14) witi   - ta   - t   - ir - ri   - ur   - wa:waktik - ∅
      PROCLIT - INDIC - 1.SG.SUBJ - SUBJ.POSS - OBJ.POSS - talk to   - SUBORD

      >wititatirihwa:waktit = 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 (-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 -ur-
alone, which is identical to the -ur- in the combination
ir + ri + ur marking subject possession. An example for
POSSESSOR ≠ subject is (Parks, l.c. 219):

(15) ta - t   - a   - ur   - ku:tik - ∅   - a   - ru:sa
      IND - 1.SG.SUBJ - 2.SG.OBJ - OBJ.POSS - kill   - SUBORD - 2.SG - horse
                                                                 OBJ

      >tatuhku:tit aru:sa = I killed your horse

Again, the verb shows an element (-a-) that agrees with the
POSSESSUM noun. The final subordination sign (∅) 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 - ∅
     DEM - 1.SG.OBJ - OBJ.POSS - die   - SUBORD

       tikuhrurahac = 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   - ∅
     DEM - INDEF - SUBJ.POSS - OBJ.POSS - come - into - 1.PL.INCL - SUBORD

     tiku:raku: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. <u>Both subject and object are represented in the</u>

<u>possessive element</u>

If in a language like Eskimo possessive affixes repre-
sent an amalgam of elements which are, in principle, identi-
cal 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 con-
veniently 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 absolu-
   tively 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 the the POSSESSOR.
5. There is identity between the endings of possessed abso-
   lutive nouns and the indicative endings of the transitive
   verbs which combine subject (3rd, 1st, and 2nd person)
   and object (3rd person). However, the remaining transi-
   tive 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 absolute 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 ele-
ments 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 pos-
sessive 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: ¨ -Iitc, tche
    INTER: tcɑ
    SUBJ: tc
    COND: titc
    IMP: ɑx^{u}
    VOC: tcɑ-Ii (m.), dɑ-Ii (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 posses-
sive elements. The forms for 2nd person singular, e.g., are,
respectively:

(19) -qɑlɑwo, -tilɑwo, -swo (l.c. 233)

    Takelma (Penutian) (Sapir 1922) shows possessive suf-
fixes 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-posi-
tives 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 f.; 126 f.) have pronominal elements on the verb
agreeing with the subject, the object, or both. These sub-
ject markers are mostly prefixes. There is reason to be-
lieve that the subject markers are innovative. Object pre-
fixes are more widespread, and it may be possible to recon-
struct 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 f.;
81 f.) or Huasteca Nahuatl (Beller and Beller 1979:240;
269 f.) 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:

(20)   SG   DUAL   PLURAL

  1   k-   k-iš-   k-iy-

  2   p-   p-iš-   p-iy-

  3   s-   s-iš-   s-iy-

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
                $\left\{ -iyuw \right\}$

  2   -in   -švš

  3   -us ~ -∅   -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   ʔe-   ʔe-   ʔe-

    3   he-   ∅-   ∅-   pe-

PL 1   čem-   čem-   čeme-

    2   ʔem-   ʔem-   ʔeme-

    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 pos-
sessive 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) Ø   - ne   - nési   she is my niece,

      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) ʔet   - ne   - nési   thou art my niece,

      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 ana-
lysis 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) ŋ-ka-hénd' ómwáán' ómukôno

I-P$_3$-break child   arm

Lit. I broke the child the arm = I broke the child's arm

(29) (?) ŋ-ka-hénd' ómukono gw'ómwáana

I-P$_3$-break arm   of child

I broke the (detached) arm of the child

(30) ŋ-ka-hénd' éŋkoni y'ómwáana

I-P$_3$-break stick of child

I broke the stick of the child

(31) *ŋ-ka-hénd' ómwáán' éŋkoni

I-P$_3$-break child   stick

(lit. I broke the child the stick)

(32) omwáán' a -ka-hénd -w' ómukôno

child   he-P$_3$-break-PASS arm

lit. the child was broken the arm
   = the child's arm was broken

(33) ŋ-ka-mu -hénd' ómukôno

I-P$_3$-him-break arm

lit. I broke him arm = I broke his arm

As (32) shows, the POSSESSOR (of the <u>child's arm</u>) 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 him-
self 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 ŋ -aa-sháásh' ómútwe
      child   PR-he-ache   head

    lit. the child is aching the head
       = the child has a headache

(35) (??) omutwe gw'ómwaána ni-gu-shaash-a

        head   of child   PR-it-ache

        the head of the child is aching

(36) omwaána n -aa-núúk' ómukôno

    child   PR-he-smell arm

    lit. the child smells (with respect to) the hand

      = the hand of the child smells

(37) omukono gw'ómwaána gú-ka-gw-a

    arm   of child   it-P$_3$-fall

    the arm of the child fell

POSSESSOR promotion must take place if POSSESSOR is EX-PERIENCER ('arm smell' vs. 'arm fall' implies that POSSESSOR 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 POSSESSOR in Pawnee (2.2.3.3.), but with a few notable differences:

1. In Pawnee POSSESSOR is marked for subject only if POS-SESSOR 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 differ-
ent. Possessor-as-subject marking in constructions with in-
transitive 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 determi-
native constructions type N_1N_2, where N_1 is nominalized,
typically an "abstract noun", derived either from a transi-
tive or an intransitive verb, and N_2, 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 N_1 "abstract noun" takes more
than one determiner according to the number of argument
places opened by the underlying finite verb. The interpre-
tation 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 N_1N_2 construction, where N_1 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 inter-
pretation 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 ambi-
guities, 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 ambiguitiy 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 nominali-
zations). 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 POS-
SESSUM 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 pro-
nominal 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 grammati-
calization, i.e. in cohesion and obligatoriness between
the two nominal constituents. Two converse functional prin-
ciples 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 interpre-
tation 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 identi-
fying (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

[1]This 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.

REFERENCES

Andrade, M.J. 1933. "Quileute." Extract from Handbook of American Indian Languages, Vol. III. New York: Columbia University Press. 145-292.

Beeler, M.S. 1976. "Barbareño Chumash Grammar: A Farrago." In: Langdon, M. and S. Silver (eds.) 1976. Hokan Studies. Papers from the First Conference on Hokan Languages held in San Diego, California, April 23-25, 1970. [= Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, 181.] The Hague: Mouton. 251-269.

Beller, R. and P. Beller 1979. "Huasteca Nahuatl." In: Langacker, R.W. (ed.) 1979. 199-306.

Boas, F. (ed.) 1911. Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part I. [= Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40,1.] Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Boas, F. (ed.) 1922. Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 2. [= Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40,2.] Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Boas, F. 1911. "Chinook." In: Boas, F. (ed.) 1911. 559-678.

Boas, F. and E. Deloria 1941. Dakota Grammar. [= Vol. 23, 2nd memoir of Memoirs of the National Academy of Sciences.] Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Reprinted 1979, Vermillion: Dakota Press.).

Boas, F. and J.R. Swanton 1911. "Siouan. Dakota (Teton and Santee Dialects) with remarks on the Ponca and Winnebago." In: Boas, F. (ed.) 1911. 875-965.

Bunzel, R.M. 1935. "Zuni." Extract from Handbook of American Indian Languages, Vol. IV. New York: Columbia University Press. 385-515.

Frachtenberg, L.J. 1922. "Coos." In: Boas, F. (ed.) 1922. 297-429.

Haas, M.R. 1941. "Tunica." Extract from Handbook of American Indian Languages, Vol. IV. New York: J.J. Augustin. 1-143.

Hockett, Ch.F. 1966. "What Algonquian is really like."
  IJAL 32.59-73.

Hoijer, H. 1933. "Tonkawa." Extract from Handbook of American
  Indian Languages, Vol. III. New York: Columbia University
  Press. 1-148.

Hyman, L.M. 1977. "Syntax of body parts." In: Byarushengo,
  E.R. and A. Duranti and L.M. Hyman (eds.) 1977. Haya
  Grammatical Structure. [= Southern California Occasional
  Papers in Linguistics, 6.] 99-118.

Jacobs, R.A. 1975. Syntactic Change. A Cupan (Uto-Aztecan)
  Case Study. [= University of California Publications in
  Linguistics, 79.] Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University
  of California Press.

Kennard, E. 1936-38. "Mandan Grammar." IJAL 9.1-43.

Langacker, R.W. 1977. Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar, Vol. 1:
  An Overview of Uto-Aztecan Grammar. [= Summer Institute of
  Linguistics Publications in Linguistics, 56.] Dallas:
  Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Langacker, R.W. (ed.) 1979. Studies in Uto-Aztecan Grammar,
  Vol. 2: Modern Aztec Grammatical Sketches. [= Summer Insti-
  tute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics, 56,2.]
  Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University
  of Texas.

Lehmann, Ch. 1982. "Ergative traits in Latin." Paper read at
  the Colloquium "Akkusativischer, ergativischer und akti-
  vischer Sprachbau", Hannover, Jan. 15-17, 1982. (Prelimi-
  nary version). Mimeo.

Levin, N.B. 1964. The Assiniboine Language. [= IJAL Publica-
  tion 32.] Bloomington: Indiana University.

Mey, J. 1970. "Possessive and Transitive in Eskimo." Journal
  of Linguistics 6.47-56.

Moravcsik, E. 1978. "On the limits of subject-object ambi-
    guity tolerance." Papers in Linguistics 11,1-2. 255-259.

Moshinsky, J. 1974. A grammar of Southeastern Pomo. [= Univer-
    sity of California Papers in Linguistics, 72.] Berkeley:
    University of California Press.

Parks, D.R. 1976. A Grammar of Pawnee. New York: Garland
    Publishing, Inc.

Reed, I. and O. Miyaoka and S. Jacobson, et al. 1977.
    Yup'ik Eskimo Grammar. Fairbanks: University of Alaska.

Riggs, S.R. 1893. Dakota Grammar, Texts, and Ethnography.
    [= Contributions to North American Ethnology, 9.]
    Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. (Reprinted
    1977, Marvin: American Indian Culture Research Center.).

Sapir, E. 1917. "Review of Het identificeerend karakter der
    possessieve flexie in talen van Noord-America by C.C.
    Uhlenbeck." IJAL 1.86-90.

Sapir, E. 1922. "The Takelma Language of South-Western
    Oregon." In: Boas, F. (ed.) 1922. 1-296.

Seiler, H. 1977. Cahuilla Grammar. Banning, CA: Malki
    Museum Press.

Seiler, H. 1981. POSSESSION as an Operational Dimension of
    Language. [= akup (Arbeiten des Kölner Universalien-
    Projekts), 42.] Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft

Swanton, J.R. 1911a. "Haida." In: Boas, F. (ed.) 1911.
    205-282.

Swanton, J.R. 1911b. "Tlingit." In: Boas, F. (ed.) 1911.
    159-204.

Thalbitzer, W. 1911. "Eskimo." In: Boas, F. (ed.) 1911.
    967-1069.

Tuggy, D.H. 1979. "Tetelcingo Nahuatl." In: Langacker, R.W.
    (ed.) 1979. 1-140.

Uhlenbeck, C.C. 1917. Het identificeerend karakter der
    possessieve flexie in talen van Noord-America. Reprinted
    from Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie
    van Wetenschapen. Afdeeling Letterkunde, 5e Reeks, 2e Deel,
    3e Stuck. Amsterdam. 345-371.

Uhlenbeck, C.C. 1938. A Concise Blackfoot Grammar. Based on
    Material from the Southern Peigans. [= Nieuwe Reeks,
    Deel XLI.] Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers
    -Maatschappij.

Whitman, W. 1947. "Descriptive Grammar of Ioway-Oto."
    IJAL 13,4.233-248.

Woodbury, A.C. 1977. "Greenlandic Eskimo, Ergativity, and
    Relational Grammar." In: Cole, P. and J.M. Sadock (eds.)
    1977. Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 8: Grammatical Relations.
    New York: Academic Press. 307-336.

In der Reihe akup erscheinen die Arbeiten des Kölner
Universalienprojekts (DFG-Projekt, Leitung Prof. Dr.
Hansjakob Seiler). Die Nummern 1-15 sind erschienen
als Linguistic Workshop I-III (LW I, LW II, LW III),
München: Fink 1973-75.

1. Seiler, H. 1973, "Das Universalienkonzept", LW I, 6-19.
2. Lehmann, C. 1973, "Wortstellung in Fragesätzen", LW I, 20-53.
3. Ibañez, R. 1973, "Programmatische Skizze: Intonation
   und Frage", LW I, 54-61.
4. Brettschneider, G. 1973, "'Sexus' im Baskischen: Die
   sprachliche Umsetzung einer kognitiven Kategorie",
   LW I, 62-72.
5. Stephany, U. 1973, "Zur Rolle der Wiederholung in der
   sprachlichen Kommunikation zwischen Kind und Erwachsenen",
   LW I, 73-98.
6. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance: Instru-
   mental, Comitative and Collective (With special reference
   to German)", LW II, 2-55.
7. Seiler, H. 1974, "The Principle of Concomitance in
   Uto-Aztecan", LW II, 56-68.
8. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Prinzipien für 'Universal 14'",
   LW II, 69-97.
9. Lehmann, C. 1974, "Isomorphismus im sprachlichen
   Zeichen", LW II, 98-123.
10. Seiler, H. 1975, "Die Prinzipien der deskriptiven und
    der etikettierenden Benennung", LW III, 2-57.
11. van den Boom, H. 1975, "Zum Verhältnis von Logik und
    Grammatik am Beispiel des neuinterpretierten λ-Ope-
    rators", LW III, 58-92.
12. Untermann, J. 1975, "Etymologie und Wortgeschichte",
    LW III, 93-116.
13. Lehmann, C. 1975, "Strategien für Relativsätze",
    LW III, 117-156.
14. Ultan, R. 1975, "Infixes and their origins"
    LW III, 157-205.

15. Stephany, U. 1975. "Linguistic and extralinguistic factors in the interpretation of children's early utterances", LW III: 206-233.
16. Ultan, R. 1975. "Descriptivity grading of Finnish body-part terms"
17. Lehmann, C. 1975. "Determination, Bezugsnomen und Pronomen im Relativsatz"
18. Seiler, H. 1975. "Language Universals and Interlinguistic Variation"
19. Holenstein, E. 1975. "Semiotische Philosophie?"
20. Seiler, H. 1976. "Introductory Notes to a Grammar of Cahuilla" (To appear in Linguistic Studies offered to Joseph Greenberg on the occasion of his 60th birthday)
21. Ultan, R. 1976. "Descriptivity in the Domain of Body-Part Terms"
22. Boom, H. van den. 1976. "Bedeutungsexplikation und materiale Implikation"
23. Seiler, H. 1977(a). "The Cologne Project on Language Universals: Questions, Objectives, and Prospects"
    Seiler, H. 1977(b). "Determination: A Functional Dimension for Interlanguage Comparison" (final version of Seiler, H. 1976 "Determination ...", published as <u>akup</u> 23, 1976).
    (To appear in: Papers from the Gummersbach Conference on Language Universals. The Hague: Mouton)
24. Moshinsky, J. 1976. "Measuring Nominal Descriptivity"
25. Seiler, H. (ed.) 1976. "Materials for the DFG International Research Conference on Language Universals"
26. Walter, H. 1976. "Das Problem der Deskriptivität am Beispiel deutscher Verbalderivation"
27. Seiler, H. 1977. "Two Systems of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Labeling and Descriptive" (To appear in the Festschrift for Madison S. Beeler)
28. Holenstein, E. 1977. "Motive der Universalienforschung"
29. Virkkunen, P. 1977. "Zum Ausdruck der notivischen Bestimmtheit im Finnischen. Mit einer Schlußbemerkung zum typologischen Vergleich des Französischen und des Finnischen von Wolfgang Raible".

30. Kölver, Ulrike. 1977. "Nominalization and Lexicalization in Modern Newari".

31. van den Boom, Holger. 1978. "Paradigmenwechsel als Notationswechsel: Saussure - Chomsky".

32. Holenstein, Elmar. 1978. "Von der Hintergehbarkeit der Sprache (und der Erlanger Schule)".

33. Ramat, Paolo. 1978. "Y a-t-il une typologie profonde? (quelques considérations théoriques (et pratiques))".

34. Kölver, Ulrike. 1979. "Syntaktische Untersuchung von Numeralklassifikatoren im Zentralthai".

35. Holenstein, Elmar. 1979. "Zur Begrifflichkeit der Universalienforschung in Linguistik und Anthropologie".

36. Lehmann, Christian. 1979. "Der Relativastz. Typologie seiner Strukturen. Theorie seiner Funktionen. Kompendium seiner Grammatik".

37. Serzisko, Fritz. 1980. "Sprachen mit Zahlklassifikatoren: Analyse und Vergleich".

38. Barron, Roger. 1980. "Das Phänomen klassifikatorischer Verben in nordamerikanischen Indianersprachen: Ein typologischer Versuch".

39. Seiler, Hansjakob. 1980. "Two Types of Cahuilla Kinship Expressions: Inherent and Establishing".

40. Stachowiak, Franz. 1981. "Zum funktional-operationalen Ansatz in der sprachlichen Universalienforschung aus psycholinguistischer Sicht".
    Lehmann, Christian. 1981. "On some current views of the language universal".
    Serzisko, Fritz. 1981. "Gender, noun class and numeral classification: a scale of classificatory techniques".

41. Clasen, Berndt. 1981. "Inhärenz und Etablierung".

42. Seiler Hansjakob. 1981. "POSSESSION as an Operational Dimension of Language".

43. Seiler, Hansjakob. 1982. "Possessivity, Subject and Object".

44. Mosel, Ulrike. 1982. "Possessive constructions in Tolai".

45. Lehmann, Christian. 1982. "Rektion und Syntaktische Relationen".

46. Lehmann, Christian. 1982. "Twenty-four questions on linguistic typology and a collection of anwers".