

akup

ARBEITEN DES KÖLNER UNIVERSALIEN - PROJEKTS

Nr. 42

Hansjakob Seiler

POSSESSION

as an Operational Dimension of Language

October 1981

Herausgeber der Reihe:

Prof. Dr. Hansjakob Seiler

Universalienprojekt

Institut für Sprachwissenschaft

Universität

D-5000 Köln 41

© bei den Autoren

Ernst Risch

zum siebzigsten Geburtstag
gewidmet

9. Oktober 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Theses and hypotheses	6
3. Conceptual aspects of POSSESSION	11
4. Model theoretical aspects and terminology	13
5. Structures and scales	19
5.1. Two separate lexical classes of POSSESSUM nouns?	19
5.2. POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM in juxtaposition	23
5.2.1. A Model case	23
5.2.2. POSSESSOR noun vs. POSSESSOR pronoun	28
5.2.3. Pronominal elements	29
5.2.3.1. "POSSESSOR deletion"	30
5.2.3.2. "POSSESSOR obligatory"	32
5.2.3.3. "Alienable" vs. "inalienable" pronouns	32
5.2.3.4. Personal possessives and object pronouns	35
5.2.3.5. Personal hierarchy scale	36
5.2.4. Nouns in construct state vs. nouns in absolute state	41
5.2.5. POSSESSOR a common noun vs. POSSESSOR a proper noun	43
5.2.6. Word group vs. compound	45
5.2.7. Word group vs. POSSESSOR adjective	50
5.3. Connectives	56
5.4. Possessive classifiers	59
5.5. Case marking	64
5.5.1. Genitive and dative	65
5.5.2. POSSESSOR and direct object	75
5.5.3. Double case	79
5.5.4. Instrumental	82
5.5.5. Concluding remarks about case marking	83

5.6. Predication	86
5.6.1. Word order	87
5.6.2. Location	88
5.6.3. Existence	91
5.6.4. Directionality	93
5.6.5. Definiteness	96
5.6.6. Verbs of POSSESSION	98
5.6.6.1. What is a verb of POSSESSION?	98
5.6.6.2. Evidence for the scalar ordering of verbs of POSSESSION	102
5.6.6.3. Modes for establishing a possessive relation	104
5.6.6.4. Weakening vs. strengthening the establishing force: two opposite pulls	107
5.7. The markings of inherence	109
5.7.1. Different kinds of inherence	109
5.7.2. Inherence is unmarked with regard to establishing marked	111
5.7.3. Inherence means: POSSESSUM points back to POSSESSOR	111
5.7.4. Other inherence markings	113
6. Operational programs and functions	114
6.1. Systematizing the scales	114
6.2. The techniques	120
6.3. The turning point	123
6.4. Parallelisms	124
6.5. Transitional zones	126
6.6. Inferred operational programs	127
6.7. Inferred functions	129
6.8. Typology	133
6.9. Diachrony and explanation	135
6.10. Assimilation and accomodation	137
FOOTNOTES	140
REFERENCES	142

1. Introduction

POSSESSION is fundamental in human life, and it is fundamental in human language. There are conceptual or notional or cognitive aspects of POSSESSION and there are linguistic aspects of POSSESSION. It seems possible to reach an agreement as far as these statements go. It is less easy to agree on the status of POSSESSION in cognition and in language respectively, as well as on their mutual interdependence.

The linguist cannot base himself on a solid body of knowledge or doctrines on what POSSESSION is, established by either philosophy or epistemology or cognitive psychology and related sciences. Paradoxically, it often appears that the practitioners of the sciences just mentioned resort to language, hoping that linguistic phenomena will help them to better understand the complexity of POSSESSION.

As to research within linguistics proper, it is safe to say that the notion of POSSESSION is far from clear. The linguistic phenomena labeled "possessive" are there, ready for inspection and for classification - recognizable even for the layman. Nevertheless, possessivity is one of the phenomena least understood.¹ It is sometimes denied a linguistic status altogether.² Studies on possessive constructions - either synchronic or diachronic, either within particular languages or comparative and general - are numerous.³ It is impossible to review them in any detail here. What characterizes many of these studies is reductionism. Re-

ductionistic attempts at explaining POSSESSION are doomed to failure. The phenomena are reduced to a notional category: "possession". But evidently, my father, my sister, my nose, my spit, my pants, my car, my job, my word are "possessions" of very different sorts. In how far can I say at all, in English, that I possess my father, or my nose, or my job? Yet, the constructions of possessive pronoun plus possessed noun seem to be all alike. The differences, however, are both notional and formal: While I can say, without any further comment, that I have a car, I cannot do the same with I have a nose. An undifferentiated notion of "possession" does not help us to account for these differences. It is true that a differentiation into "inalienable" vs. "alienable" possession has been proposed at least as early as in L. Lévy-Bruhl's famous study on the expression of possession in the Melanesian languages (1914:96 ff.). Yet the distinction cannot be reduced to a categorial one: Within one and the same language, a possessive relation to one and the same object (e.g. a kinsman) can be represented as either "inalienable" or "alienable"; and different languages are not likely to make the distinction between "inalienable" and "alienable" in the same way. Thus, the distinction needs to be revised and rephrased in more appropriate terms.

The other favorite way of coping with the variety and variability of phenomena of POSSESSION, consists of reducing them to formal-semantic categories. Transformational grammar

has made us believe that all possessive constructions are to be derived from a deep structure configuration with 'to have' or that 'to have' is a mere indicator of possession and has no place in the deep structure (Bach 1967:462 ff.). Both contentions are equally untenable as has already been shown (Seiler 1973a:231 ff.; Boeder 1980:212) and as will again appear in the present study. When "inalienable" possession began to be integrated into generative studies (Fillmore 1968:61 ff.) "inalienable" constructions were assigned to a deep-structural "Dative". While it is true that the dative case - or, for that matter, a "Dative role" - may contribute to representing "inalienable" POSSESSION under certain conditions as formulated below (5.5.1.), it is by no means legitimate to reduce all of "inalienability" to a dative of whatsoever status. This would be grossly violating the facts. There are many ways of expressing "inalienable" vs. "alienable" POSSESSION - e.g. pronominal affixes - that have nothing to do with a "Dative". Also, the dative sometimes indicates the less intimate possession (see 5.5.1.). It has furthermore been proposed (Lyons 1967; E. Clark 1978: 85 ff.) that possessive constructions should be derived from or treated as a subvariety of locational expressions. I shall return to these contentions below (5.6.2.), in order to show that they are untenable. There are certain affinities between possessive and locational expressions, but also some marked differences, which must not be overlooked.

We are thus left with a complex and variegated body of phenomena centering around POSSESSION which cannot be reduced to any particular notional or formal-semantic categories. From a one-sidedly categorial point of view the phenomena may, at times, appear to be quite paradoxical. Thus, one way of signalling "inalienability" is to make the expression of the POSSESSOR obligatory - in the form of a possessive affix (5.2.3.2.); another way, the complete opposite, is to delete the expression of POSSESSOR (5.2.3.1.). In my earlier paper on possessivity (Seiler 1973:248) I have shown that, while in one particular language (Modern Standard German) those nouns that are "inalienably" possessed cannot, in principle, be "alienably" possessed, in another language (Cahuilla, Uto-Aztecan) those nouns that are "inalienably" possessed, and only those, can also be "alienably" possessed. An adequate theory of POSSESSION must be able to resolve these apparent paradoxes.

One of the most difficult problems consists in delimiting the domain of POSSESSION. This appears with painful clarity in R. Ultan's valuable "typology of substantival possession" (1978:11 ff.). From the title, we expect that only adnominal constructions be considered. However, in a sort of appendix, verbs of possession, type 'to have', are considered as well - and quite rightly so. But what would then be the common denominator of both? In Ultan's presentation, the domain is yet considerably enlarged in the following other

directions: Mass constructions, collective constructions, proper nouns, comparative. No doubt, there are affinities between POSSESSION and all these; but where are the limits? Or what, then, is POSSESSION proper? Ultan states (l.c., 22 ff.) that "in all cases possessor and possessee class markers are secondary and redundant, often irrelevant in terms of possessive function". We may wonder, then, what are the truly relevant parameters, in other words: How does POSSESSION work in language?

In this study I want to show, above all, that the linguistic expression of POSSESSION is not a given but represents a problem to be solved by the human mind. We must recognize from the outset that linguistic POSSESSION presupposes conceptual or notional POSSESSION, and I shall say more about the latter in Chapter 3. Certain varieties of linguistic structures in the particular languages are united by the fact that they serve the common purpose of expressing notional POSSESSION. But this cannot be their sole common denominator. How would we otherwise be able to recognize, to understand, to learn and to translate a particular linguistic structure as representing POSSESSION? There must be a properly linguistic common denominator, an invariant, that makes this possible. The invariant must be present both within a particular language and in cross-language comparison. What is the nature of such an invariant? As I intend to show, it consists in operational programs and functional principles corresponding to the pur-

pose of expressing notional POSSESSION. The structures of possessivity which we find in the languages of the world represent the traces of these operations, and from the traces it becomes possible to reconstruct stepwise the operations and functions.

2. Theses and hypotheses

I shall formulate these in the following points:

- 1) Linguistic POSSESSION consists of the representation of a 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. It is normally the topic and, as such, normally comes first in the construction. Substance B, called the POSSESSUM, is either [+ animate] or [- animate]. It prototypically includes reference to the relationship as a whole and to the POSSESSOR in particular. It is normally the comment and, as such, follows the POSSESSOR.
- 2) 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. In a more extended view, it is the relationship between parts and whole of an organism. The complex bio-cultural feature may serve as one criterion to delimit POSSESSION from other

relationships, in particular from VALENCE and from LOCATION. VALENCE is the relationship between an action or process or state and its participants. It does not show any limitations to the bio-cultural sphere. The number of participants can range from zero to three or four, whereas POSSESSION is a strictly binary relation. In VALENCE the relationship is mediated by a relator, the predicate or verb; in POSSESSION the relationship is not necessarily mediated by means of a relator. LOCATION, like POSSESSION, is a binary relation. But, unlike the latter, it is always mediated by a relator, and it always includes a "centrum deicticum" (see C. Lehmann 1981:9), i.e. "the standpoint which the speaker takes within the sentence" (Lehmann, l.c.).

- 3) Syntactically speaking, POSSESSION is a relation between nominal and nominal, which is not mediated by a verb. Predication, specifically a verb of possession, does contribute to the expression of POSSESSION - but only to the extent that such a predication or such a verb refers to the particular mode of the possessive relationship and to nothing else. This we shall consider to be an instance of reference from the code to the code, thus, of metalinguistic predication (see 5.6.6.1.). Selectional restrictions obtain, not between verb and noun, but between noun and noun. However, this is not a categorial but a gradient difference between substantival POSSESSION and verbal VA-

LENCE (see 5.6.6.1.). The limits between POSSESSION and VALENCE are to be sought at the point on the scale where verb-noun selectional restrictions begin to dominate over noun-noun selectional restrictions. The critical limit appears, e.g., in the case of adnominal constructions involving abstract nouns ("transitivity and possession", see 5.5.5.). As to LOCATION, selectional restrictions are neither strictly inter-nominal, nor strictly nominal-verbal, but are governed rather by the "centrum deicticum".

- 4) The structures serving the expression of POSSESSION both within a particular language and in cross-linguistic comparison can be arranged in an overall scale, which we shall call a dimension. It is a scale of increasing explicitation of the possessive relationship. Each step or position on the scale is prototypically represented by a particular syntactic construction, but it cannot be reduced to that sole construction. Instead, each step is represented by a number or sub-scales. Each sub-scale, in turn, is constituted by successive structures, arranged in a continuum.
- 5) the meanings corresponding to the structures constituting the scales - both the overall scale and the sub-scales - show covariation; i.e. as we progress from one structure to another along the scale, their meaning varies. But the covarying meanings show common denominators.
- 6) There are two common denominators, which we shall call functional principles, pervading all the scales: inherent

POSSESSION vs. established POSSESSION. Inherent POSSESSION means that the possessive relationship is inherently given in one of the two terms involved, viz. the POSSESSUM: The POSSESSUM contains reference to the POSSESSOR. Semantically, this kind of representation implies more intimate POSSESSION: Prototypically, of 'self' to his kinsmen, his body parts, etc. To the extent that such a POSSESSION is represented as being less inherently given, less intimate, it is established by explicit means, which are, in principle, means of predication. The two functional principles are thus converse.

- 7) They complement each other in the sense that they are copresent in all the structures contributing to the expression of POSSESSION, and in the sense that they are the functional constituents of the scales.
- 8) The more explicit, more predicate-like expressions are marked vis-à-vis to the less explicit, more inherent-like expressions. On the other hand, the latter are more grammaticalized, more morphologically expressed, while the former are more syntactically expressed and less grammaticalized.
- 9) The scales are to be interpreted as operational programs. Speakers and hearers construct linguistic expressions of POSSESSION along the lines prescribed by the program.

What are in principle, the means for testing these hypotheses? A powerful tool is constituted, as I think, by the notions of scale and functional common denominator. A given structure of a given language is to be integrated into a scale of POSSESSION under two conditions: 1. It must express the notion or concept of POSSESSION. 2. It must not create any discontinuities in scales that are already established; in other words, it must show commonalities with the immediately neighboring steps on the scale. The two criteria supplement each other where one alone might be inconclusive. To cite an example: Connectives are a position on the scale of the dimension (5.3.); the position is intermediate between juxtaposition (5.2.) and possessive classifiers (5.4.). The so-called *Izāfa* in Modern Persian is an instance of a connective. It is an element appended to the determinatum of determinative syntagms that translate such notions as 'house of the father', 'chicken's egg', but also such notions as 'white dog', 'the fifth day': Only the former expressions may be assigned to the dimension of POSSESSION.

A criterion related to the two criteria just mentioned is markedness and substitutability: Within the limits as set by the notion of POSSESSION and by the continuity of the scales, an unmarked expression or structure may be substituted for a marked one, whereas the reverse would not be possible.

Can the scales be recognized within one particular

language, or is it necessary to use a comparative approach, considering as many languages as possible? Since we claim that the scales are to be interpreted as operational programs followed by the speakers and hearers of particular languages, it must be the case that these programs be recognizable and learnable language-internally. However, the more diversified languages we include into our considerations, the more varieties of possessive expression we shall get to know; and accordingly, our scales will become more "fine-grained" and, by that very fact, will gain in consistence.

3. Conceptual aspects of POSSESSION

Above (Chapter 1), I stated that linguistic POSSESSION presupposes conceptual POSSESSION. The impossibility of defining the relation of POSSESSION with its two terms of POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM purely in terms of linguistic form becomes apparent in such phrasings as the one found in R. Ultan's study (1978:13): "By 'substantial possessive constructions' I refer to the general class of attributive constructions in which the head represents a possessee (or possessed item) and the pronominal or nominal attribute represents the possessor of the possessee". The assumption of a tertium comparationis⁴ of conceptual or noetic POSSESSION seems indispensable for any linguistic consideration of that topic, lest we become victims of circularity. In order to make it also clear graphically that possessive expressions in language

always reflect a conceptual relation of POSSESSION including a POSSESSOR and a POSSESSUM, I shall represent these terms in capital letters.

This is, of course, not enough. If conceptual POSSESSION is the indispensable tertium comparationis for comparing and describing possessive constructions in the various languages, we should like to know what this conceptual relation is like and how it can be described. Different levels can be chosen for such descriptions. One is certainly logic, in particular relational logic or relational theory.⁵ A distinction is made here between internal or quasi-relations and external or true relations (Wittgenstein).

It seems that this is reflected in our linguistically based distinction between inherent vs. established relation. An external relation between two terms, A and A', is presented where there is a "third", an "in-between", which is neither A nor A'. The "third" is more than a mere "separation" (van den Boom), it is a distance and is to be treated in spatial terms (R. Thom), possibly a distance or space that can be measured. An internal relation is presented where there is not a "third", not a distance or space between A and A'. One major problem seems to be that of how to conceive a relation between A and A' when there is no "third", no relator that establishes this relation. Thus, if we want to formalize the idea that 'x is y's father' and we write $R(x,y)$, where $R = \text{FATHER}$, we write an extra symbol, R, for

which there is no extra linguistic element, since 'x' and 'father' are coreferent (van den Boom). It seems to me, and will appear from the subsequent chapters, that an internal relation is possible where 'x' itself has a status comparable to a predicate opening a place for an argument, as in our example where 'x' coreferent with 'father' opens a place for 'y', i.e. the person, whose father x is; and this, in turn, is possible where x and y are in an intimate relationship that is given or can be taken for granted beforehand. The linguistic evidence points to a mental operation of bi-directional or reversible character (see 6.10.): In one sense, intimate POSSESSION is taken as a starting point, and less intimate relations of POSSESSION are handled by creating a "third", a special relator, in principle a predicative structure; in the reverse sense, predicative structures are interpreted, and used, as if they referred to intimate POSSESSION.

4. Model theoretical aspects and terminology

An outline of the model of UNITYP is presented in my introductory paper (Seiler 1981:1-9) to the volume on Apprehension (Seiler, ed. 1981). In this chapter I shall limit myself to a few indications, mostly relating to terminology.

In our UNITYP model we strive to reach maximal isomorphism between linguistic description and the phenomena themselves: If it is true, as we contend, that the common denomi-

nator of linguistic POSSESSION consists in a process of construction or in an operation carried out by the human mind, and if it is furthermore true that the relevant structures which we find in the languages represent the traces of such an operation, it must be possible to reconstruct the operational process from the traces. The constructive, as well as the reconstructive process, must be considered both from an inductive and from a deductive point of view. In language communication the deductive point of view is associated predominantly with the point of view of the sender or speaker: He sets out from notional or conceptual POSSESSION, for this is what he wants to express. But, of course, he must also know the operational strategies that will ultimately lead to coding possessive structures. The inductive point of view is primarily associated with the receiver or hearer: He sets out from the possessive structures which he considers to be the traces left by the mental operation relating to POSSESSION; and he reconstructs that operation. But, of course, he must also know that there is conceptual POSSESSION.

Both processes of construction and reconstruction are not simple and not immediate. Instead, they are carried out stepwise and on several levels of hierarchy. The step-by-step procedures leave their traces in the scales which we can observe; and the levels of hierarchy are reflected in the fact that we can observe sub-scales within the scales.

Three major classes of notions are to be distinguished in our model: Observables, operational programs, and functions. Each one is interpretable in two ways, according to the two-fold aspects mentioned in the above: inductive vs. deductive. Observables consist of structures and scales. In the inductive view they constitute the basis for the reconstructive process, in the deductive view, they represent the output or traces of the constructive process. Operational programs are, inductively speaking, the dynamic interpretation of the scales; deductively speaking, they indicate what a speaker or participant in language communication must do in order to pass from one structure to another, in other words: what he must do in order to construct or select expressions of POSSESSION. The functions also receive a double interpretation: Deductively, they represent the problem to be solved - in our case this is to express notional POSSESSION. Inductively, they represent the common denominator of the meanings of the structures, covarying as we pass from one structure to another.

There are three hierarchical levels of operational programs: The dimension, corresponding to the overall program, in our case the overall program of POSSESSION; the techniques, corresponding to subprograms of the dimension, in our case, e.g., the technique of case marking (5.5.); and the prime-programs, corresponding to subprograms of a technique, in our case, e.g., the prime-program of "POSSESSOR deletion" (5.2.3.1.).

The different levels of operational programs show corresponding functions which differ in the width of their scope. But we do invariantly find a bundle of two converse functions complementing each other. They are, respectively, inherent possessive relation vs. established possessive relation.

Observables and observation are not limited to the lowest level, i.e. the morpho-syntactic structures and their scales. Just as we can base our observation on the prime-programs and their functions to see how they constitute a technique, we can take the techniques and their functions as a new starting base to see how they form a dimension.

It follows from the above that, within our model, POSSESSION is not coextensive with syntax or morphosyntax, nor with semantics. Rather it encompasses all levels of linguistic analysis: The word, the sentence, the text, and the situation. This does not mean that, e.g., semantic vs. syntactic aspects of POSSESSION become indistinguishable. Quite to the contrary. To cite just one example: The notion of a turning point within the dimension (6.3.) is apt to precisely delimitate two morpho-syntactic domains, viz. phrasal vs. sentential POSSESSION.

As to the traditional terms of "inalienable" vs. "alienable", I have retained them, but put them into quotation marks in order to indicate that the rationale for the distinction cannot be sought in morpho-syntactic categories - "inalienable nouns" vs. "alienable nouns" - nor in certain syntactic con-

structions - "inalienable" vs. "alienable" constructions - although the latter concept is closer to the truth than the former. Rather, the rationale must be sought in the two functional principles of inherence vs. established relation, and in the corresponding operational programs.

There is a categorial distinction of morpho-syntactic import, which we do want to consider: The one between a relational vs. an absolute noun. A relational noun opens a position for another nominal in a way comparable to a verb that opens positions or places for arguments. Thus father, head, name, etc. are relational nouns in English in the sense that a father is always someone's father, etc. Absolute nouns, like the English house, rock, etc. do not have this property.

A word is in order on our notion of language universals. Is POSSESSION a universal of language? We have made it clear in the foregoing that we want to differentiate between conceptual POSSESSION and linguistic POSSESSION, and that the latter presupposes the former; and that the deductive process begins with conceptual POSSESSION and ends up with linguistic structures, while the inductive process begins with linguistic structures and ends up with reconstructed operational programs and corresponding functions. In the sense that conceptual POSSESSION is presupposed for the expressions of POSSESSION in all languages, it is undoubtedly universal.

What, then, is the status of operational programs and

corresponding functions which we reconstruct? In accordance with our view on the bi-directional nature of both linguistic research and the communication process itself, we must recognize the difference in status between conceptual POSSESSION on one side, and operational programs and corresponding functions on the other. The latter are invariants, where invariance is necessarily linked to its complement, viz. variation, and invariance reaches as far as the assignment of variants goes. An operational program like the dimension of POSSESSION integrates - at least ideally - material from all languages and represents an invariant for all these languages, thus, an invariant of language. In the traditional sense, it would probably be called universal. But, let it be stated again, it is of a different status as compared with the universal mentioned above. The techniques as operational subprograms show invariance, both as programs and in their corresponding functions, but they are not universal in the sense of "occurring in all the languages of the world." The ordered set of techniques assembled in a dimension constitutes a pool from which each particular language makes its own selection (Stachowiak 1981:14). Linguistic and conceptual POSSESSION are linked to one another by the notion of function, i.e. by the two converse functional principles of inherent vs. established POSSESSION.

5. Structures and scales

5.1. Two separate lexical classes of POSSESSUM nouns?

It is still customary in grammars to speak of "inalienable nouns" vs. "alienable nouns" as if the difference could be reduced to that between two distinct classes of the lexicon. U. Mosel (1980) rightly criticizes grammarians of Austronesian languages for doing just that. As a matter of fact, many of these nouns occur both in "inalienable" and in "alienable" constructions; consequently, the difference must be described in terms of constructions in which these nouns enter.

It is true that certain semantic classes prototypically appear in "inalienable" or, as we prefer to say, inherent POSSESSION. Names of kinship and of body parts, above all, enter an inherent relationship of POSSESSION. This may be invariably true for all languages. But even within this class, there may be gradience as to the degree of inherence (the "intimacy" of the relationship). U. Mosel (1981a) gives evidence from Tolai (Austronesian), where some body parts are optionally possessed and never take the derelational suffix. These "non-relational" body part terms characteristically denote body parts that are often found separated, e.g. gap 'blood', kian 'egg', ur 'bone'. A well-known example is shown by the following squish in English (L.B. Anderson 1974:1 ff.):

(1) The barber cut

- (i) me on the cheek ?me on the ear *me in the hair
(ii) me on my cheek ?me on my ear *me in my hair
(iii) \emptyset \emptyset my cheek \emptyset \emptyset my ear \emptyset \emptyset my hair

The gradual decrease of intimacy in the relationship between self and the cheek, the ear, and (the) hair, respectively, is reflected by decreasing acceptability of constructions of these lexical items with personal pronoun plus article or personal pronoun plus possessive pronoun.

Besides body part nouns, we find kin terms as an important semantic class connected with inherence of the possessive relation. Although this is found in a great many languages of widely diverging structure, it is not invariably the case that kin terms and body part terms are treated in the same manner with regard to inherence. In comparing two Austronesian languages of the "nuclear Micronesian language group", Kusaiean and Woleaian, U. Mosel (1980) observes the use of an inalienable possessive phrase to express the bodypart-person relationship in both languages, while kinship is expressed by an alienable possessive phrase in Kusaie, but by an inalienable possessive phrase in Woleai.

In ways comparable to body part phraseology we find gradient scales of intimacy in the relationship between self and kinsman. The scales undoubtedly reflect the difference between necessary and optional relationships in the bi-cultural kinship system. Thus, in German, the use of words

for 'father', 'mother', 'grand-father', in short, for ascending relationship, yields uncommon utterances in constructions with 'to have' and 'to be', whereas this is not the case for kin in the descending or collateral direction:

(2) (i) (?) Ich habe einen Vater, eine Mutter, etc.

(ii) Ich habe eine Schwester, einen Sohn, etc.

As we shall see below, 'to have' is a means of establishing a relationship, and this means is used precisely when the POSSESSUM is not inherently - or less inherently - relational. The difference between (2)(i) and (ii) reflects the fact that every human has kin in the direct ascending, but not necessarily in the descending or collateral direction. But again, there is no necessity that languages always reflect the situation of the biological grid. I have shown (Seiler 1973:204 ff.; forthcoming) that there are languages where precisely the inherently relational nouns like kin terms - and only these - occur both in inherent and in establishing constructions.

Other semantic groupings of "inalienable" or inherently relational nouns include: social relationships ('leader', 'friend', 'partner', 'name', 'dwelling', etc.); implements of material culture ('bow', 'arrow', 'bed', 'clothes', etc.); part-whole relationships ('trunk', 'branches, roots of a tree', 'legs of a table', etc.); spatial orientation ('right side', 'left side', 'top', 'front', etc.); agent-action and object-action ('John's return', 'John's imprisonment', etc.).

As mentioned earlier (chapter 2) there are good reasons for distinguishing between the relations of possession, of location, and of verbal valence, inspite of important zones of overlapping. This would still leave us with five or six semantic groups of nouns which are generally recognized, though not invariably, as being possessed in the inherent manner. It is perhaps possible to arrange them on a ranking scale of intimacy, where 'kinship' would be first, in the majority of languages, followed by body parts, and then by the other groups. The "sphère personnelle", as C. Bally (1962) has termed it, where intimacy and solidarity obtains between POSSESSUM and POSSESSOR, varies in extension from one language to another, and also within one language in the course of its history. And it is certainly true, as Bally (l.c. 69) states, that the domain of solidarity shrinks in direct proportion with the opening up of communicative channels and the multiplication of social contacts, because we are increasingly inclined to envisage from the other's point of view what in former times used to be looked at from the angle of EGO. This is probably the reason why lexical groupings of inherently relational vs. non-relational nouns can most easily be detected in indigenous languages and earlier attested stages of languages. But, as we shall now widen our scope from lexical semantic phenomena to morphology and syntax, we shall find that there are actually two opposing forces at work: One is constantly 'pulling back',

as it were, toward the point of view of EGO and its tendency to anchor relationships as EGO-inherent. The other force also constantly pushes toward making a relationship explicit and all-pervading by showing how it is being established.

In each of the techniques to be described below both forces leave their traces, but in different proportions. This is most clearly evidenced by gradient scales that can be detected within the various techniques.

5.2. POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM in juxtaposition

5.2.1. A model case

An illustration of what has just been stated, and at the same time a clear demonstration of the dimensional - and that means operational - character of POSSESSION can be seen in G. Manessy's description of the "genitive" relation in some Mandé languages of West Africa (Manessy 1964:467 ff.). By genitive relation he means "le rapport établi entre deux noms ou pronoms dont l'un, le déterminant, réduit l'extension du contenu de l'autre, le déterminé, et en précise la compréhension" (l.c. 467). It is thus a broad, semanto-syntactic definition of the genitive and not one based on the properties of a particular case form (on the latter see below, 5.5.1.). The essential findings can be summarized as follows:

Kpelle: If there is no particular need for specifying

thus

(6) (i) Pepe po tay le village de Pepe

(ii) Pepe ye pèlè la (une?) maison de Pepe

This kind of circumlocution seems to be on its way toward grammaticalization. The semantic content of wɔ, pɔ, and ye seems to be vague, and pɔ and ye in particular seem to be interchangeable under certain conditions. The meaning seems reduced to simply indicate the "caractère 'médiat'" of the "genitive" relation.

Mende: The distinction between an unmarked syntagm as against a marked one is more pronounced and rigorous than in Kpelle, and it seems to render quite constantly the difference between an "immediate" vs. a "mediated" relationship.

An immediate relationship is represented by mere juxtaposition of the two nominals accompanied by a modification of the initial consonant of the second term, which characterizes the syntagm as such and is not specific for possession.

(7) (i) nùmú gbàkíi le bras (kpàkí) de quelqu'un (nùmú)

(ii) nyàhà gbówéi la cheville (kpówó) de femme (nyàhá)

This kind of construction is obligatory for the combination of possessive pronoun and a noun designating a body part, a spatial relation, a consanguineal kinsman, or "le possesseur (tì) de quelque chose" (471). The domain of words that can appear in this construction seems to be considerably reduced, as compared with the situation of Kpelle.

A mediated relationship is characterized by modification

of the tone pattern of the second term, which apart from certain exceptions, necessarily receives a low tone

(8) nùmú gbákíí la branche (kpàkí) de quelqu'un (nùmú)

Of course consonantic alternation operates here as well.

With regard to these two kinds of relationship the nouns of Mende fall into two distinct classes:

(a) those which can appear as second terms of both a mediated and an immediate relationship: body parts, spatial relations, certain kin terms

(b) those which are never found in a mediated relationship with their determinant.

It appears that in this opposition between (a) and (b), the latter class is marked vis-à-vis the former, at least on the content side, and that the unmarked pole tends to receive not only a constant characteristic on the formal side (absence of lenition) but also a special meaning representing the opposite of (b): R. Jakobson's law of special meaning of the unmarked term (1931/1971:15). And while in Kpelle the construction of immediate relationship, devoid of this special meaning, represents the general form of relation between nominals, it represents a special case in Mende. It is easy to see the dynamics that appears from the comparison between the two languages, a dynamics which can and must receive an historical interpretation as given by Manessy.

Bandi represents a further step in this direction. A clearly delimited class of "possessions inaliénables" emerges

with drastically reduced membership: nouns designating living beings or objects strictly defined with reference to EGO: consanguineal kinship, in particular "à respect": 'friend', 'pal', 'property'. The formal mark of immediate relationship is the "suture ouverte" between the two words which prohibits initial consonant lenition of the second term:

(9) ní kɛɣɛ mon père

In all other cases, lenition operates whenever it can:

(1) ní vɛlɛ̀ ma maison

Both classes have their formal marks, one (mediated) positive, the other (immediate) negative. In this context, a final remark regarding mediated, "alienable", relationship: While in Kpelle a lexico-semantic, circumlocutional technique is used, the respective procedure in Bandi shows a rigidly grammaticalized expression - which seems to be desemantized accordingly. Other languages of this group show intermediate steps. One may speculate on the further course that historical development might take vis-à-vis this linguistic problem and within this language family: If many nouns designating concepts which "naturally" contract immediate relationships fall into the "mediated" class, the language might eventually end up again in a state comparable to that of Kpelle, showing a large and only weakly differentiated class including relationships of both kinds. The need for specifying the nature of the relationship might then arise again, and an analogous process will be started.

Indications for cyclicity of inherent vs. establishing process will be found in some of the analyses of the various techniques that follow.

5.2.2. POSSESSOR noun vs. POSSESSOR pronoun

The prototype structure within the technique of juxtaposition shows a POSSESSOR represented by a person-differentiated pronoun (personal or possessive) and a POSSESSUM represented by a noun, and such a construction is predominantly "inalienable". More specifically still, the pronoun is in the first person, thus coreferent with EGO. This is the most intimate, most immediate relation - that which is inherent in the POSSESSUM. Evidence for this will be shown below (5.2.3.). Here we are concerned with POSSESSOR pronouns in general, as compared to POSSESSOR nouns. The two are commonly lumped together, thus

(11) his brother like John's brother

(12) his house like John's house

That the two are treated differently is shown, e.g., in Tigak, a Melanesian language spoken in New Ireland, Papua New Guinea (Beaumont 1979, apud Mosel 1980):

(13) (i) na tiga - na his brother

 ART brother - his

 (ii) na tiga - na i Gamsa the brother of Gamsa

 ART brother - his POSS.M Gamsa

(14) (i) Ka - na lui his house
POSS.M - his house

(ii) tang lui te Makeo the house of Makeo
ART house POSS.M Makeo

The formal evidence seems to suggest that 'his brother' is the most immediate relationship, one that need not be specified any further. In contradistinction, 'brother of Gamsa', where POSSESSOR is represented by a noun, more precisely, a proper noun (see on this 5.2.4.) necessitates the mediation of a possessive marker (POSS.M) i. So does the "alienable possessive phrase" (Mosel) corresponding to 'his house', but the possessive marker carries the pronominal suffix. Thus, (13)(ii) and (14)(i) seem to be somewhat on a par as to mediacy vs. immediacy. Finally in (14)(ii) 'the house of Makeo', no pronominal suffix may appear, the possessive alone mediates between the two nouns. This looks like a scale of intimacy or immediateness with 'his brother' at one end, and 'the house of Makeo' at the other.

5.2.3. Pronominal elements

A great variety of forms appear in the languages of the world. An overview of a segment thereof, the Melanesian languages, made accessible by M. Žurinskaja (1977:194 ff.), conveys some ideas of what is possible. As indicators of POSSESSOR we find independent personal pronouns or affixation of personal pronouns, sometimes contrasting with each other. When they do,

- (18) (i) η-k -óogy' émikōno lit. I washed hands = I washed my hands
I-P₃ -wash hands
- (ii) ? η-k -óogy' émikōno yaηge = I washed my (detached) hands
I-P₃ -wash hands my
- (iii) η-k -óogy' émótoká yaηge = I washed my car
I-P₃ -wash car my
- (iv) η-k -óogy' émótoká = I washed the/a car
I-P₃ -wash car
- (v) η-ka -bón' émikōno = I saw (the) hands
I-P₃ -saw hands

Clearly, "possessor deletion" is linked to certain conditions, which, following Hyman, we might summarize as follows: "POSSESSOR deletion" depends on

- (19) (i) the nature of the possessed noun: body part, organic part/whole, (kin term)
- (ii) the nature of the verb: verbs, where POSSESSOR is at the same time experiencer: washing, breaking, etc.
- (iii) the nature of the POSSESSOR: personal hierarchy
1st > 2nd > 3rd human > 3rd animal > 3rd inanimate

The same conditions hold for another phenomenon, called "possessor promotion" by Hyman. It is the type exemplified by French

- (20) Il m'a cassé le bras lit. he broke to me the arm =
he me broke the arm he broke my arm

We shall briefly revert to it below (5.5.2.). It appears that the two phenomena are closely linked to one another or may even be collapsed into one.

5.2.3.2. "POSSESSOR obligatory"

The "mirror image" phenomenon to "possessor deletion" is obligatoriness of POSSESSOR, and it is wide-spread, too. It occurs where inherent possession is involved, and is often highlighted as the decisive criterion for "inalienable possession". Such a statement, originating from a one-sidedly categorial view, need to be relativized. Obligatoriness of POSSESSOR is certainly a salient but not a necessary indicator of inherence. A problem arises when a nominal concept like 'father', 'hand', etc. ought to be referred to "in absoluto". Various solutions are found, e.g. a special "derelationizing" or absolute suffix (see below 5.2.4.), or an affix marking an unspecified POSSESSOR.

5.2.3.3. "Alienable" vs. "inalienable" pronouns

Many American Indian languages show the well-known phenomenon that 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 "inalienable" nature, the other for nouns denoting "alienable" POSSESSION. Tunica, a Gulf language shows the following two series (Haas 1940:37 f.):

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

The "alienable" forms are made from the "inalienable" forms by the addition of an element -hk- which, according to a regular morphophonemic rule, appears as -k- after prefixes ending in -n-. The "inalienable" prefixes are used with two sets of bound stems, namely possessed noun stems (kin terms, body-part terms, clothing, naming, etc.) and static verb stems (emotional, mental states, etc.); These stems in turn may not occur without these prefixes, e.g.:

(22) ʔo'siku his father < ʔu- + -e'si father + -ku MS suff.

(23) wiwa'na you want < wi- + -wa'na to want

The alienable prefixes are used with free stems. They denote possession with noun stems and objectivity with active verb stems, e.g.

(24) ʔuhkʔi'yutʔeku his hog < ʔuhk- + ʔi'yutʔε hog + -ku

(25) ʔihkʔε'hʔuhki he kicked me < ʔihk- + ʔε'hʔuhki he kicked

What is of interest here, besides obligatory union of the "inalienable" series and appropriate stems, is the fact that "inalienability" is systematically linked to stativity - and,

as a consequence, "inalienable" prefixes are correlated with subject prefixes of intransitive verbs -, while "alienability" is linked to activity - and, as a consequence, "alienable" prefixes are correlated with object prefixes of transitive verbs. The "inalienable" - stative correlation reappears under various disguises in many languages, and it seems to have precedence in Tunica. We shall see (below 5.2.3.4.) that under different conditions other languages correlate possessive - and particularly "inalienable" - prefixes with object prefixes of the transitive verb, not with subject prefixes. What is furthermore interesting in the Tunica examples and reappears in widely differing languages is the fact that the "alienable" expression - the "alienable" prefix in this case - is a derived form, and thus morphologically more complex than the "inalienable" expression. In fact, the two relate to one another as marked ("alienable") vs. unmarked ("inalienable").

The situation of pronominal classification in American Indian languages is not as simple as the Tunica examples might suggest. An overview can be gained from E. Sapir's brilliant review (1917:86-90) of C.C. Uhlenbeck's monograph of the "identifying character of the possessive inflection in languages of North America" (1917). The combined evidence of such languages as Takelma, Yuki, Pomo, Mutsun, Nootka, and Chinookan, seems to suggest that the criterion for pronominal differentiation rather consists in personal relation on the one hand, and "true possession" on the other.

"Thus, MY FATHER is not one who is owned by me, but rather one who stands to me in a certain relation; moreover, he may be someone else's father at the same time, so that MY FATHER has no inherently exclusive value. On the other hand, MY ARM, like MY HAT, indicates actual and exclusive possession."

(l.c. 88)

Sapir then proposes the following three fundamental types of classification of possessive pronouns in American Indian languages:

1. All nouns treated alike (Yana, Southern Paiute);
2. Relationship (kin) terms contrasted with other nouns (Takelma).
3. Possessed nouns classified into inseparable (comprising chiefly body-parts and terms of relationship) and separable (Chimariko, Tunica).

Later on, while examining different techniques of expressing the possessive relation we shall find that kin terms can be classed together with body-part, part-whole, and implement terms as "inalienable" or "inseparable" according to general criteria, but that kin terms still have a special status according to special criteria.

5.2.3.4. Personal possessives and object pronouns

Where, as is often the case, possessive pronouns are related to the pronominal affixes of the verb, they agree in form, not with the subject, but, on the whole, with the object form. There are exceptions to this under specific conditions, as seen in the case of Tunica, above 5.2.3.3.; another excep-

tion we shall find for Cahuilla, 5.2.3.5. But the majority of cases show identity or near-identity between possessive and object pronoun. This cannot be viewed as coincidental and calls for an explanation. The phenomenon must be looked at in connection with case marking (below 5.5.2.). Relevant facts drawn from Tlingit, Haida, Tsimshian, Chinook, Chimariko, Maidu, Yuki, Pomo, Muskogean, and Siouan are presented in C.C. Uhlenbeck's monograph (1917).

5.2.3.5. Personal hierarchy scale

In languages where a POSSESSOR personal pronoun is affixed to the POSSESSUM, we find that the different persons do not behave in the same way with regard to "inalienable" vs. "alienable" constructions. I have described in detail a salient case for Cahuilla, a Uto-Aztecan language of Southern California (Seiler 1980a and forthcoming) and shall here only briefly summarize the findings:

I have studied kinship expressions featuring two pronominal elements, one representing the POSSESSOR, the other being coreferent with the POSSESSUM - the kin term -, i.e. translation equivalents of such English expressions as she is my niece, I am her niece, etc. There are altogether seven combinations possible from the point of view of "natural" logic (i.e. excluding such unnatural combinations as 'I am my niece', 'thou art thy niece'): she - my, thou - my, she - thy, she - her, I - her, I - thy, thou - her. From the point of view of English all these combinations seem to be parallel. However, the Ca-

huilla evidence shows us, that they must be distributed over two gradient scales and that the relation between the scales is not one of parallelism but rather one of inversion. The reason for this is presented by two widely differing types of expression distributed over two scales in a manner to be described presently. The two types can be exemplified as follows:

(26) ʔet - ne - nési thou (art) my niece

 P₂ - P₁ - niece
 2SG 1SG

P₁ prefixes occur both with nouns and with verbs; with nouns they mark the POSSESSOR, with verbs the actor. P₂ prefixes occur with nouns only, and their function is to indicate what I (Seiler 1977:256) have called logical or higher predication and what, in languages like English, we would translate by using the copula 'is'; in (15) this pronominal prefix is coreferential with the entity indicated by the stem, thus thou and niece are coreferential in thou art my niece. Any noun can be viewed as being virtually construed with a prefix P₂. The second type is:

(27) pe - y - nési - k (a)(t) she is one who is related

 O - P₂ - niece - OR.REL to her, the niece
 3SG 3SG

We have an object prefix here (3rd sing.), followed by a subject prefix (3rd sing.), followed by the element for niece, followed by a suffix -k or -kat and other variants. This suffix is a nominalizer and a relativizer, and it carries the function of oriented relationship, by which I mean that

a relationship is being established by showing that it has a point of departure (the subject, she) and a goal (the object, her, coreferential with the kin term niece) toward which the relation extends. In short, (26) represents an inherent expression, (27) an establishing one, and the latter establishes the relationship by starting "from the other end", as it were, i.e. from the pronoun referring to the reciprocal term (aunt). We shall revert to this type once more when discussing directionality of establishing expressions (below 5.6.4.). For our present purpose it may suffice to say that the speakers chose among the two types according to the following scheme:

(28)	POSSESSOR	POSSESSUM	Expression Type	POSSESSOR	POSSESSUM	Expression Type
	my	① ③	she almost excl. Inher.	her	③ ①	I only Establ.
	my	① ②	thou mostly Inher.	thy	② ①	I preferably Establ.
	thy	② ③	she preferably Inher.	her	③ ②	thou mostly Establ.
	her	③ ③	she Inher. and Establ.			

The meaning of the combinations can be read off by going from right to left, e.g. first line left side she is my niece. Plural is not under consideration here. Person is additionally symbolized by number to make the distance between them more salient. The informants either volunteered or accepted or rejected an expression type for a given combination. We see

from the chart that exclusive, or near-exclusive use of one vs. the other type coincides with the maximal distance between the persons (two digits). We find a scale of decreasing exclusivity or increasing tolerance for the other of the two respective types as the distance between the persons becomes smaller. When both are third person, both expression types are acceptable. There is compelling evidence, not to be reproduced here, that the POSSESSOR in possessive constructions and the ACTOR in transitive verb constructions behave in an exactly parallel way, and so do the POSSESSUM and the GOAL of the respective constructions. And the two types of expression - inherent vs. establishing - appear in the verbal domain as well, in exactly comparable shape. The following generalization can then be derived from what has been outlined above: The constraints in the choice for one or the other expression type are correlated with a scale or hierarchy of proximity with regard to the speaker. The direct type is chosen when the person of the POSSESSOR is nearer to the speaker than to the person of the POSSESSUM. This is the "natural", the expected instance. It has to be chosen when the POSSESSOR is identical with the speaker, i.e. 1st person. The inverse type is chosen when the person of the POSSESSUM is nearer to the speaker than the person of the POSSESSOR. It has to be chosen when the POSSESSUM is identical with the speaker, i.e. 1st person. When both persons are third, the Cahuilla has the choice of presenting either

the POSSESSOR or the POSSESSUM as being nearer to him and of respectively "obviating", as it were, or backgrounding, either the POSSESSUM or the POSSESSOR. Exactly parallel procedures are applied to AGENT and GOAL of transitive verbs, where it is the expected or "natural" thing that the AGENT's person be nearer to the speaker, eventually identical with him, and the GOAL more removed, but where an inverse relation can also be represented, in which latter case an establishing expression has to be chosen.

The lesson to be learned from this description is the following: Even though it was said at the beginning of section 5.2.2. that the prototype structure within the technique of juxtaposition shows a POSSESSOR represented by a person-differentiated pronoun and a POSSESSUM represented by a noun, and that the construction is predominantly "inalienable", this need not be so under all circumstances. Once more, a categorical statement will have to be replaced by a scalar one, and by one of converseness: The inherent relationship represented by POSSESSOR 1st person vs. POSSESSUM 3rd has its necessary complement in the established relationship represented by POSSESSUM 1st person vs. POSSESSOR 3rd, and vice versa, with intermediate stages. The squish or scale is reversible. And since it reflects actual speaker's behavior - i.e. constraints on choices - one may very well be entitled to speak of an operational program: a sub-program within the dimension of possession which is the superordinate program.

5.2.4. Nouns in construct state vs. nouns in absolute state

In some language families POSSESSUM nouns show a typical correlation of complementarity between, on the one side, the obligatory affixation of personal (possessive) elements to a noun combined with the compulsory absence of a certain suffix, and, on the other hand, the absence of personal affixes combined with the obligatory presence of this very suffix. Uto-Aztecan is a well-known example and I have described the situation for Cahuilla both from the morphosyntactic and from the semantic and functional point of view (Seiler 1977:64 ff.). Within the Austronesian language super-stock Tolai very clearly shows the same kind of correlation, and it has been described by U. Mosel (1981a). Semitic languages with their correlation between status constructus and status absolutus must be cited here, too, although the morpho-syntactic evidence is not straight-forward.

As for Cahuilla, I have distinguished between the morpho-syntactic states of certain classes of nouns, one called construct, the other absolute. The construct state is characterized by the obligatory presence of personal prefixes of the series P_1 (identical with the personal subject prefixes of the finite verb) and the compulsory absence of the absolute suffix. The absolute state is characterized by the obligatory presence of this very suffix - which appears as /t/, /š/, /l/, or /l̃/ - and by the compulsory absence of the personal P_1 prefix. Examples are:

- (29) (i) ne - húya my arrow
PERS.PREF - arrow
1SG
- (ii) húya - l the arrow, anybody's or nobody's
arrow - ABS.SUFF arrow
- (30) (i) hé - puŷ his eye
PERS.PRON - eye
3SG
- (ii) púĉ - iĩ the eye, anybody's or nobody's
eye - ABS.SUFF eye, seed(s)

Specialization in meaning, as shown in (30)(ii), is a typically concomitant feature of absolutivization (see Seiler, l.c.: 67, 337). The primary effect of absolutivization is to annul the relationship of intimacy or inherence, a process which we might call de-relationization (cf. Seiler 1973:201; Clasen 1981:39 f.). Sometimes de-relationization is applied in order to utilize such a form in a more complex expression which explicitly establishes the relationship:

- (31) húya - l ne - méxan'a lit.: the arrow,
arrow - ABS.SUFF PERS.PREF - thing viz. my thing

It is an apositional construction of the absolute, de-relationized form as in (29)(ii) plus the construct state of the general possessive classifier 'thing' (see below 5.4.). The meaning resulting from this combination is 'my arrow', thus comparable to that of (29)(i), but with a notable difference: Only a man utilizes the form as in (29)(i), while a woman would have to choose (31). The reason is obvious and has been

explicitly paraphrased by informants: The man fabricates arrows, not the woman; his relation to the arrow is intimate, the woman's relation to the arrow has to be established, if the need arises. An exactly reverse situation is shown for the word for 'basket'.

The complementarity between the two forms is a particularly telling testimony to the systematic correlation between the expressions of inherent vs. established relationship within one and the same language. However, not for all relational nouns of Cahuilla do we find the alternation of the two expressions. A gradient scale can be observed: Most readily and almost freely the alternation occurs in implement terms (as in (29)); less so in body part expressions; and still less in kin terms. But for the latter, a different kind of correlation between inherence and establishing holds, as described in section 5.2.3. above. For Tolai, U. Mosel (l.c.) reports that kin terms must be obligatorily possessed or combined with the derelational suffix, while some body parts may be optionally possessed and never take the derelational suffix.

5.2.5. POSSESSOR a common noun vs. POSSESSOR a proper noun

Examples of possessive noun-plus-noun constructions are almost invariably of the type proper noun-plus-common noun, i.e. John's arm, John's book. We shall presently see that this is not by accident, and that proper nouns should not be con-

followed by pronominal suffix of the POSSESSOR corresponding to (32)(i), pronominal suffix 3SG of the POSSESSOR plus proper noun corresponding to (32)(ii), and possessive marker plus common noun corresponding to (32)(iii). Thus, again, a gradient situation. The comparison between (32) and (33) shows very clearly that "inalienability" vs. "alienability", or, as I prefer to say, inherence vs. establishing, are not contradictory but contrary principles: They do not exclude each-other, but they operate conjointly, albeit in differing proportions: The structures in (32) are predominantly "inalienable" by virtue of the direct combination of affixes with the POSSESSUM noun; but a gradient scale of "inalienability" is brought about by the nature of these affixes (personal pronouns vs. possessive marker) and by the presence vs. absence of a following noun. The structures in (33) are predominantly "alienable" by virtue of the possessive classifier mediating between the POSSESSUM noun and the affixes; but a gradient scale of "inalienability" is brought about by, again, the nature of the affixes and the nouns following.

5.2.6. Word group vs. compound

The findings of the preceding section are matched by some statements by P. Kay and K. Zimmer (1976:29 ff.) regarding the semantics of compounds and genitives in English. The notion of "genitive" is, again, to be taken in the broad sense roughly equivalent to a determinative N-N syntagm.

The authors claim (p. 32) that "all and only proper nouns - since they designate individuals - should occur as modifiers in genitive constructions", and that "all and only common nouns should occur as modifiers in compounds". Their examples are:

(34) (i) Ethel's gait

(ii) * $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{an} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right\}$ Ethel-gait

(35) (i) $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right\}$ bicycle-wrench

(ii) * $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right\}$ bicycle's wrench

(iii) * $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right\}$ wrench of $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{a} \\ \text{the} \end{array} \right\}$ bicycle

The authors state that

"common nouns ordinarily designate classes (as against individuals or relations). One may narrow the meaning of a class-designating expression to one that designates a subclass of the original class, a 'smaller' class so to speak, or one may narrow the meaning of a class-designating expression to one designating an individual that is a member of the original class. It appears that the prototypic use of nominal compounds is to narrow the semantic coverage of the head noun to a smaller class while the prototypic use of the genitive construction is to narrow the meaning of a class expression to an individual that is a member of the original class."

There are many exceptions, but, as the authors rightly state, they are of such a nature as to rather reinforce the idea that the claims are correct: In

(36) a Wittgenstein argument

a compound with a proper noun as first member, the name is

really being used not to designate the individual but a class of things associated with that individual. Another major class of exceptions is presented by such examples as

- (37) (i) a baby's toe
(ii) a woman's husband
(iii) a skier's goggles etc.

We find body part and kin terms, articles of clothing and the like as second terms in these compounds in short, nominal concepts - "inalienable" nouns - that are commonly found in an intimate, indissoluble relation with a particular (usually human) individual. "Inalienable", inherent relationships are as a rule, individualized, "alienable", non-inherent relationships may be of a more generalized quality. It is thus the "inalienability" of the second member of the N-N construction that conveys the status of individuality to the first, which, by itself, would be a class term.

From all this we learn that the proper noun is the more "natural" partner in an inherent relationship, as compared to the common noun.

At least a brief note must be devoted to the so-called possessive or bahuvrihi compound. Here is a very short list of examples taken from Sanskrit⁶, where this type of compounds has been productive for a long period (examples from Kielhorn 1965 [= 1888]:213 ff.).

- (38) (i) dīrgha - bāhu - one who has long arms
long - arm
- (ii) catur - mukha - one who has four faces (=Brahma)
four - face
- (iii) pra - parna - (tree) leaves of which have
off - leaf fallen off
- (iv) a - putra - one who has no son
not - son
- (v) devadatta - nāman - one with name D.
D. - name
- (vi) citra - gu - one who has colourful cows
colourful - cow
- (vii) bahu - vrihi - (land) that has much rice
much - rice

The peculiarity of these compounds lies in the fact that their meaning cannot be explained as a result from the mere juxtaposition of its constituent parts. This distinguishes them from other compound types, notably from the so-called determinative compounds.

Consider the minimal pair

- (39) (i) á - hasta - (a) non-hand
not - hand
- (ii) a - hastá - one who has no hand, handless
not - hand

The examples are from vedic texts where accentuations attested, and it constitutes the sole difference. Now, E. Benveniste (1967/1974) has very convincingly analyzed the meaning of bahuvrihis as resulting from the contraction of two propositions that are "logiquement antérieures": one, a

predication of quality or the like: 'the arm is long'; the other, a predication of attribution: 'long arm is (X)'s' or '(X) has long arm'. The link between the two would be constituted by the possessive pronoun son, his, which, however is not expressed; or by the existential predicate être à or avoir, to have, also not expressed. This latter function, the attributive, may in some languages be represented by adjectival suffixes, such as -ig in German, -äug-ig (including ablaut variation) in blau-äug-ig, English blue-eye-d, etc. This is, however, an optional device, compare Rot-bart, red-breast, etc.

What remains unexplained is the question of how the "two planes", which Benveniste rightly claims for the bahuvrihis, can be accounted for systematically. Neither the mere accent shift as in (39), nor the adjective endings as in blau-äug-ig, nor any other comparable devices would suffice - compare mehl-ig 'floury', which is "uniplanaire", not "biplanaire" like blau-äug-ig. It seems that one point of fact is still missing in the course of argumentation, and that it can be supplied by the observation that the second member of bahuvrihis are predominantly "inalienable nouns".⁷ Looking at the short list in (38) - but also looking at more extensive ones - the observation seems to be essentially confirmed. Of course, one might object that vrihi- 'rice' in bahu-vrihi 'having much rice' does not seem to be particularly "inalienable". But typically in the texts, the

compound is used with reference to land - for which it is certainly true that, in the respective cultural environment, it contracts an intimate relationship with rice that grows on it. A similar remark may hold for cows in (38)(vi). Special subclasses are constituted by compounds with prepositions (38)(iii) and negation elements (iv) as first member, but I must leave accounting for them to a later occasion. As we already know, we cannot reckon with a rigidly delimited class of "inalienable" vs. "alienable" nouns, but must, instead, take gradience into account. Accordingly, we shall encounter zones of transition where the status of bahuvrihi becomes blurred.

Nevertheless, it is safe to say that "inalienable" or inherent nouns as second members represent the core of bahuvrihis, and that it is this very quality of inherence that stands in a systematic relationship with both possessive pronouns and with attribution ("être à", "avoir") and that accounts for the "second plane", that of attribution.

5.2.7. Word groups vs. POSSESSOR adjective

In his famous article "Genetiv und Adjektiv" J. Wackernagel (1908:125 ff.) has claimed that in the IE proto-language the adnominal genitive was of very limited use and that possessive relations were preferably expressed by representing the POSSESSOR in adjectivized form. An exception was constituted by pronouns, i.e. demonstratives, relatives, and perso-

nal pronouns. On the other hand, Wackernagel claims the adverbial genitive constituted a productive device in the proto-language, which then began to disappear in the course of history. In the modern tongues, e.g. Modern Standard German, it is nearly lacking. The archaic distribution is still faithfully reflected in Ancient Greek; not only in Homeric formulas do we find POSSESSOR adjectives, especially in patronymics like

(40) Telamōn - ios Aías the Telamonian Ajax; Ajax, Telamon's (son)
Telamon - ADJ Ajax

but throughout Ancient Greek, not only in Aeolic but in the other dialects as well. POSSESSUM may also be represented by a common noun:

(41) Hērākleios Herculean, Hercules's

in construction with

- (i) bíē strength (this combination being the most frequent)
- (ii) āthlos struggle
- (iii) bélē missile
- (iv) démnia bed
- (v) thálamos bedroom
- (vi) xúmмуakhos companion

etc. (see Wackernagel, l.c. 137 ff.)

The POSSESSOR, however, is most always represented by a personal name.

The question that interests us most at this moment is this: Why should adjectivization be such a favored device in

expressing POSSESSION? Obviously, inherence is involved, specifically: inherence with regard to a personal noun. This latter fact is, perhaps, not sufficiently stressed in Wackernagel's essay. Judging from the POSSESSUM nouns given in (41), we may surmise that different degrees of intimacy or inherence of the relation are involved. What, then, does adjectivization have to do with degrees of inherence?

In his monograph "Inhärenz und Etablierung", Clasen (1981:29 ff.) has observed for Modern Standard German that certain nouns denoting states and properties of a human are combinable with haben: Angst, Pech, Lust, Glück, Hunger, Wut, while others are not: Fleiss, Intelligenz, Schönheit, Reichtum. He states that the latter are in a systematic relationship with antonymous adjectives like fleißig - faul, intelligent - dumm, schön - häßlich, reich - arm, while nouns of the former group are not so correlated. He says that incompatibility with haben is an indicator for inherence, and that for the respective nouns: Fleiss, Intelligenz, Schönheit, Reichtum the entire scale between the antonyms is inherent, not just the corresponding quality adjective.

This needs to be explicated somewhat further. In an article entitled "Some remarks on antonymy", M. Ljung (1974:74 ff.) has shown that adjectives derived from "inalienable nouns" form "the same kind of semantic triplets as antonymous adjectives". For English antonyms like long/short, long is positive, short negative. The negative member

is normally marked; but the positive member can be either marked or unmarked. This can be shown, e.g., in how-questions:

(42) (i) How óld is your brother?

*How yóung is your brother?

(ii) Hów old is your brother?

Hów young is your brother?

In (i), old is unmarked, it simply means 'having age' in the sense of 'having relative age'. The negative member of the pair cannot be unmarked; hence (i) is not well-formed with young. In (ii) the presupposition holds that the speaker knows that your brother is old - which in turn means that he is older with regard to a certain norm for age. This is the marked use for old. And the negative member is marked per se; hence the well-formedness of the corresponding construction. Instead of a triplet, as the author would have it, we are rather confronted with a whole scale, implying two poles, one marked, the other unmarked, and intermediate stages represented by relativity with regard to a variable norm.

Turning now to "inalienable" nouns in English, the author observes that they normally permit adjective formation under precisely the circumstances that the alienable nouns do not. "Inalienable" nouns must normally be modified if adjectives are to be formed from them, and the suffix chosen is mostly -ed: three-legged, long-haired, box-shaped, feeble-minded, etc. "Alienable" nouns may serve as bases for adjectives with meanings that can be paraphrased as 'having', 'posses-

sing', 'full of': stony 'having stones on it', snowy 'covered with snow', angry 'full of anger'. The bases must not be modified if adjectivization is to result: *many-stony, *white-snowy are unacceptable. The suffixes used in adjectives formed on the bases of "alienable" nouns are -y, -ous, -ful, -ic, but not -ed.

Adjectivization of "inalienable" nouns thus follows the pattern 'Modifier + "Inalienable" noun + -ed'. But sometimes it happens that "inalienable" nouns do adjectivize by using the same means as the "alienable" ones, i.e. by adding an adjectival suffix other than -ed. When this happens, the meaning of the resulting adjective differs in a uniform way from that of an adjective formed on an "alienable" stem: The adjectives then express deviation from a norm. Thus, leggy does not mean merely "possessing legs", but rather 'having remarkable legs', fleshy means 'having more flesh than normal', etc. The author proposes the following proportions:

- (43) (i) negative thin : marked fleshy
or: fleshless
= negative short : marked long
- (ii) unmarked long : unmarked white-fleshed
= marked long : marked fleshy
(above norm) (above norm)

Discussing further supporting evidence, the author points out that -less suffixed to "alienable" nouns carried meanings like 'having less N than normal': Thus, shape-less does not mean simply 'lacking shape', but often 'having less shape

than normal', while house-less does mean 'lacking a house'.

My conclusion from the above is that possessive adjectivization is a subprogram within the juxtaposing technique, and that the functional correlate is a scale of normalcy of inherence which is, in languages like English, paralleled by the scale of normalcy represented by antonymous adjectives.

This holds for adjectivization of the POSSESSUM. How about adjectivization of the POSSESSOR with which we were concerned at the beginning of this section? I think it is a complementary procedure or subprogram. Being linked to POSSESSOR proper names it is concerned with degrees of intimacy or inherence. This can still be seen in languages like English from a comparison between POSSESSOR adjective and POSSESSOR genitive constructions:

(44) (i) The Jakobsonian features

(ii) Jakobson's features

(i) leaves room for a scalar interpretation, the features being more or less those devised by Jakobson himself or by others in a more or less Jakobsonian way; (ii) can only refer to the features as proposed by Jakobson himself. It seems likely that the patronymic adjectives of the ancient Indo-European languages as exemplified above by Ancient Greek must have yielded some such scalar interpretation, that 'the Telamonian' or 'the Herculean', etc., could have implied a more or less direct descendant from Telamon or Hercules. It

is also likely that this procedure had its correspondence in the social organization of the sib or lineage. An indication for this can be seen in the fact that in the system of Roman personal names the adjectivizing -ius marks the "gens", the family relationship. In the complete and official formula the "gentilicium" is preceded by the person's "praenomen" and followed by the father's "praenomen", the latter being followed by the "cognomen", thus:

(45)	M.	Tullius M.	f.	Cicero	= Marcus, the Tullian,
		Marcus Tullius Marci	filius	Cicero	son of Marcus, Cicero
	PRAE.	GENT.	FATH.PRAE.	son	COGN.

For many "gentilicia" it can be shown that they are derived from original "praenomina", thus: Tullius 'the Tullian', from Tullus, originally a "praenomen".

5.3. Connectives

Under the title "Izafe und Verwandtes", B. Clasen in his monograph (1981:12 f.) has compared several means of expressing connection between POSSESSUM and POSSESSOR in different languages, and he has found that some of them were predominately determinative while others were predominantly predicative in nature. Thus, it seems appropriate to localize the technique of using connectives in an intermediate position on the continuum between the predominantly determinative structures studied in 5.2. and the increasingly predicative structures to be studied in the sections 5.4. ff.

Connective particles are a prominent feature in many Austronesian languages (see Foley 1980:171-199). The manifold uses of the element na connecting two nouns within a noun phrase in Tolai have been extensively described by U. Mosel (1981a:9 ff.). In these $N_1 C N_2$ constructions the modifying noun N_2 determines the head noun N_1 in a rather un-specific way. Within the domain of possession $N_1 C N_2$ phrases, according to Mosel's analysis compete as a third type with "alienable" possessive phrases and "inalienable" possessive phrases. Examples:

"Alienable"

(50) a pal ka -i ra tutana the house of the man
ART house CLFR-POSS.M ART man

"Inalienable"

(51) a bala i ra tutana the belly of the man
ART belly POSS.M. ART man

"Compound" noun phrases ($N_1 C N_2$ phrases):

(52) (i) a mapi na davai the leaf/leaves of the/a tree
ART leaf C tree

(ii) a bala na pal the interior of the house
ART interior C house
(belly)

The difference between $N_1 C N_2$ possessive phrases and the other possessive types is exemplified and explained by Mosel (1981) as follows:

(53) a bul ka -i ra lulai the child of the chief
ART child CLFR-POSS.M ART chief

This "alienable" possessive construction identifies the reference of the child by specifying whose daughter or son it is.

(54) a bul na luluai the chief's child
 ART child C chief

This "compound" noun phrase characterizes the child as being a chief's child with all the properties of a child of this status, i.e. it determines the concept.

The difference ties in with some of the contrasts studied in the preceding sections, viz. that between word group and compound (5.2.6.) and that between word group and POSSESSOR/POSSESSUM adjectives (5.2.7.).

5.4. Possessive classifiers

The technique is found primarily, if not exclusively, in Oceanic languages on the one hand and in Amerindian on the other. Comparing it with the connectives, this technique can be generally characterized as representing a somewhat more explicit specification of the relation between POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM. It thus represents a first step towards increasing the establishing principle. It brings together reference to properties of the POSSESSOR and to properties of the POSSESSUM, in ways that will be briefly characterized for a few languages.

Rennellese, a Polynesian language spoken in the Polynesian Outlier islands as described by S.H. Elbert (1965/66: 16 ff.) has 127 elements which the author calls possessives.

They are morphologically complex. With regard to the POSSESSUM, they indicate whether it is singular or plural, whether it is one or some of one or of more than one, whether it is of an ephemeral or permanent character. As to the POSSESSOR, they indicate person and number and a contrast exclusive/inclusive in the first person dual and plural; and they indicate benefactivity. Examples:

- (55) (i) t -o -ku hage my house (the only one)
P'UM-PERM-1 SG house
ONE P'OR
- (ii) t hage o'-o -ku my house (the speaker has other
P'UM house PERM -1 SG houses, too)
ONE OTHER
- (iii) naa hage o-'o-ku my house (the speaker has many other
P'UM house PERM-1 SG houses)
MORE MANY
- (56) (i) t -a -ku tama'ahine my (a-class) daughter
P'UM-EPHEM-1 SG daughter
ONE
- (ii) t -o -ku hosa my (o-class) son
P'UM-PERM-1 SG son
ONE

(P'UM = POSSESSUM, P'OR = POSSESSOR)

a-class vs. o-class distinguish between ephemeral or changeable vs. permanent POSSESSION. Male members of EGO's patrilineal descent group are in the o-class, but females are in the a-class; upon marriage they live elsewhere. A nuance of temporality also pervades the a-class. Flora or fauna terms belonging to an individual as in a garden or being caught (e.g. a fish) are a, but the same words associated with a place are o. Some are mostly o and take a only if handled. Names

of artifacts are predominantly a, names of body parts or diseases predominantly o. The t-set indicating a singular possessed object (as in (55) and (56) alternates with a zero set indicating a plural possessed object, and with an m-set indicating 'for, for the use or benefit of, in behalf of'.

A great number of contrasts can be expressed within this system. The classifying element comprises morphological characterization of both the POSSESSOR and the POSSESSUM. Number is a differential characteristic for both, person for the POSSESSOR, set membership for the POSSESSUM ('a member of two', 'a member of many'), and permanence vs. ephemerality, also for the POSSESSUM. These represent the actual class difference, which reminds us of the distinction between "inalienable" vs. "alienable". It looks as if these class marks were the nucleus to which all the other differentiating elements are appended as satellites - in a way which prefigures the auxiliaries or "logical predicates", type English to have, which are to follow on our continuum - and in the course of language evolution. Certainly not by accident do languages with possessive classifiers lack special auxiliaries for 'to have'. And certainly not by accident does the meaning of 'to have' - in those languages where such verbs occur - oscillate between transience: 'to seize, to grab', and permanence: 'to be in the state of "having"'.

Possessive classifiers of very different sort are found in such Austronesian languages as Puluwat, Woleai, Kusaie,

The "thing" word proves to be a real classifier (for inanimate items), because other classifiers contrast with it. The differentiation is particularly developed in the realm of trees, plants, and their edible fruits:

- | | | | | |
|------|----------------------|-------|------------|---------------------------|
| (60) | ne-kí'iw | -ʔa | méñikiš | my claim, the mesquite |
| | my-waiting:for-ABSTR | | mesquite | beans |
| | i.e. claim | | beans | |
| (61) | ne-ʔáy | -ʔa | méñikiš | my (fresh) mesquite means |
| | my-plucking-ABSTR | | mesquite | (on the tree) |
| | | | beans | |
| (62) | ne-čí | -ʔa | méñikiš | my mesquite beans (picked |
| | my-picking up-ABSTR | | mesquite | from the ground) |
| | | | beans | |
| (63) | ne-wés | -ʔa | sandíya | my watermelon |
| | my-planting-ABSTR | | watermelon | |
| (64) | ne-ʔaš | ʔáwal | | my dog |
| | my-pet | dog | | |

The classification is either inherent - as in (64) - or temporary (60)-(62). In this latter case it goes beyond mere classification: it adds information about certain aspects under which the POSSESSUM is considered, and, by virtue of this, is of predicative nature.

This classification system combines features pertaining to the inherence principle with features pertaining to the establishing principle. Inherence is represented by the use of an "inalienable" noun which, as such, may also occur outside classifying constructions. Establishing is represented by the appositional construction and by the predicative nature of the classification.

A final remark regarding the relationship between possessive and numeral classification: In some of the Austronesian languages possessive and numeral classification co-exist, but are largely independent from one another. Many languages, e.g. Chinese, show numeral classification only.

5.5. Case marking

It is natural to study the effects of case marking with regard to POSSESSION in languages with a fairly well developed case system. For this purpose, a consideration of ancient Indo-European languages will be preferred here.

Cases are means of expression that always contract some relation with the predicate or main verb. There is no exclusively adnominal case. This is true even for the genitive. Insofar as case forms contribute to the expression of POSSESSION, it is always by intermediacy of the verb. The ties between the case form and the verb may be stronger or weaker on a gradient scale. If they are strong, the case form will contribute little to the marking of POSSESSION. If they are weak, the contribution may be more important. The gradient strength of the bonds between a case form and the main verb - which is a subject to be treated in a study on valence and must be simply assumed here - is only one of the reflexes of the gradient strength of the ties between actants and the verb, or, semantically speaking, between the roles and the predicate. Such a scale, once established, will serve as an important

tool for negatively delimiting the field of POSSESSION, more precisely, for indicating the extent to which we are confronted with a N-N-relation that is possessive.

5.5.1. Genitive and dative

According to Roman Jakobson's pioneering interpretation (1971 [=1936]:37 ff.), the genitive form is marked for quantification, i.e., it focuses upon the extent to which the entity takes part in the message, by implying that the extent is not total. As was mentioned above (5.2.7.), the genitive does and did have adverbial uses. One, inherited from Indo-European and quite archaic, is the occurrence with the copula or in a nominal sentence (see Watkins 1967:2193):

(65) Faliscan

eko	kaisiosio	I belong to Caesius
I (am)	Caesius-GEN	

(66) Old Irish

(i) is	aí	it is his', it belongs to him
	COPULA PRON.GEN	

(ii) táith	-i	he has it
	EXIST.VERB-DAT.PRON	

(67) Latin

(i) liber est	Marc-i	the book belongs to Mark
book	COPULA Mark-GEN	

(ii) liber est	Marc-o	Mark has a/the book
book	COPULA Mark-DAT	

Old Irish shows that the genitive goes together with the co-

pula, and the dative with the existential verb, and this must have been the distribution in the proto-language. In Latin and most modern IE languages the distinction between copula and existential verb was given up. As Watkins (l.c.) showed, the genitive + copula construction marks the more intimate and constant relationship of belonging or ownership, while the dative + existential verb construction marks the less intimate, and more accidental relationship of POSSESSION: One may possess something without owning it.

However, as a consequence of its general function as indicated above - limited extent of participation in the assertion - the genitive seems to be predestinated for being a predominantly adnominal case. And since POSSESSION is basically a noun-noun-relation, it follows that the genitive is the typical possessive case. But then, it is also the case that it is unmarked with regard to the differentiation between inherence vs. non-inherence of the relation, thus:

(68) (i) Marc-i pater Mark's father

like

(ii) Marc-i liber Mark's book

In fact, the N-N_g-relation may become very unspecific. As a consequence, a tendency to relate the case to a verb may become operative. In my earlier paper on possessivity (Seidler 1973:199 f.) I described the following situation of a genitive syntagm in Modern Standard German:

(69) Karls Haus Karl's house

besides the well-known and almost obvious interpretation of
(69) (i) house which Karl has or owns
may receive any of an almost infinite number of interpretations, such as:

- (ii) (a) house where K. lives or used to live
 - (b) house which K. likes
 - (c) house where K. goes to have a drink on Friday evenings
 - (d) house K. thinks he is going to build in five years
- etc. etc.

The important observation to be made here is that verbs are always involved in these interpretations. They are not actually asserted but "presupposed", as I put it in my 1973 paper, or rather evoked, as P. Kay and K. Zimmer describe a comparable situation for English (1976:30 ff.). I presume the phenomenon occurs in many languages with genitives. And I proposed (1973:202) that, to the extent that a relation between a genitive and such verbs becomes instrumental for the interpretation of the utterance, the phenomenon - in spite of the presence of the genitive - not be subsumed under possessivity. The same multiple ambiguity obtains for possessive pronoun-N-syntagms, thus:

- (70) his house
- (i) house which he has or owns
 - (ii) (a) house where he lives or used to live
- etc.

Next to the genitive, the dative also shows a certain predisposition for adnominal uses. According to R. Jakobson (l.c. 45 ff.), the dative, like the instrumental, indicates a peripheral role with regard to the assertion or predication; it is a "Randkasus" within the "Stellungskorrelation"; it is marked vis-à-vis the instrumental within this same correlation, the dative positively specifying peripherality, the instrumental leaving this unspecified. As Jakobson points out (p. 46 f.), the notion of periphery presupposes the notion of a center, of a central content in the assertion which is being modified by the peripheral case. Such a central content need not even be stated explicitly, it may be implied by the dative:

(71) Latin

Diīs	Manibus	to the divine spirits
divine-DAT.PL	spirit-DAT.PL	

as inscription on a monument implies its being dedicated to the divine spirits. On the other hand, the dative, according to Jakobson (l.c. 45) is in a "Bezugskorrelation" with the accusative, and this correlation has to do with the question whether the object designated by the noun is affected or is unaffected by the action or process expressed by the predicate. The accusative is the marked, the dative the unmarked member in this correlation. For this reason the dative object is less intimately connected with the predicate than the accusative. Thus, we find that the dative shows less intimate connection with the predicate (verb) for two reasons:

1. in its quality of the marked member in the "Stellungs-

korrelation" signalling peripheral status; 2. in its quality of the unmarked member in the "Bezugskorrelation", signalling unaffectedness.

This, all in all, makes it very plausible that the dative should have a prominent role in expressing POSSESSION. To a lesser extent the instrumental and the locative enter as concurring means (see below 5.5.4. and 5.6.2), and this also follows from their general function as defined by Jakobson.

It is now very important to take into account the conditions under which the dative appears in possessive constructions, and its interplay with the genitive in similar constructions.

As W. Havers in his thorough study of the "dativus sympathicus" (1911) has shown, the dative in the ancient Indo-European languages appears with overwhelming frequency with the pronouns of the first and second person:

(72) Vedic (RV X 28, 2)

yṓ me kuksī́ sutāsomah pṛṇā́ti
REL PERS.PR belly-ACC having-pressed-the Soma fills
1st DAT.SG

= who has pressed the Soma and fills (with it) my (me-DAT) belly

(73) Vedic (RV I 164, 33)

dyā́ur me pitā́ janitā́
heaven (is) PERS.PR father (and) producer
1st DAT.SG

= heaven is my (me-DAT) father and producer

Scanning Havers' collection of examples it becomes evident that what is involved here is EGO (and TU) on the one hand,

and its most intimate relationships with parts of the body, kinsmen, spouse, etc. The situation is entirely parallel for Ancient Greek, Latin, and the other Indo-European languages. A confirmation comes from observations about the interaction between the genitive and the dative in possessive constructions: While the dative predominates in the first and second person, the genitive or the possessive pronoun appears in the third:

(74) Iliad 22.388

óphr' àn ... moi phíla goúnat' orōréi
so that MOD PERS.PR own knees he impel
1st SG.DAT

= in order for him to impel my (me-DAT) own knees

(75) Iliad 5.563

toũ d'ōtrunen ménos Arēs
DEM.PR spurred courage Ares
3rd SG.GEN

= Ares spurred his (his-GEN) courage

And while the dative predominates with the pronoun, the genitive appears as soon as a noun is involved. Consider the change within the same utterance in

(76) Odyssey 10.484

thūmōs dé moi éssutai édē ed' állōn hetārōn
spirit PART PERS.PR becomes and PART other-GEN.PL fellows-GEN.PL
1st SG.DAT incited

=my (me-DAT) spirit becomes incited and that of the other fellows (GEN)

(77) Plautus

(i) Epidicus 466

mihi concubina quae sit
PERS.PR concubine who is
1st SG.DAT

= who is concubine to me, who is my concubine

(ii) Miles 362

eri concubina haec quidem
lord-GEN concubine this PART

= this (is) the concubine of our lord

Personal nouns are more likely to show the dative while common nouns show the genitive.

What we find, then, is the squish of inherence in the relationship between EGO, or, more generally, between the individual and the things most closely associated with him. And the dative acts as a positive, marked means for expressing inherence; it acts as a means of relationalization.

The role of the dative as a relationizer appears even more clearly in contrasting constructions such as these (some examples are from Clasen 1981:39 f.):

(78) (i) Ich habe mir das Bein gebrochen

je me suis cassé la jambe

I broke my leg

(ii) ? Ich habe mein Bein gebrochen

? J'ai cassé ma jambe

The utterances in (ii) have a dubious status in both languages. If they can be assigned an interpretation it will imply that

(80) (i) Ich habe mir die Hose zerrissen

(ii) Ich habe meine Hose zerrissen

(81) (i) Ich habe mir den Stuhl kaputtgemacht/repariert

(ii) Ich habe meinen Stuhl kaputtgemacht/repariert

In both (80) (ii) and (81) (ii) the possessive pronoun contracts only one syntactic relation, the adnominal one (meine Hose, meinen Stuhl). (81) (i) shows a dative which is basically adverbial and would be classed as either "benefactive" or "adversive" depending on the respective larger context. It does not contract a relationship with the noun Stuhl (a possessive relationship, that is), for the example may equally well admit the interpretation that I wrecked someone else's chair. However, in (80) (i) the dative does contract a twofold relationship, just as do the datives in (78) (i), viz. one of inherent possession vis-à-vis the noun - Hose 'pants' being treated here almost as a body part - and one with the verb which indicates that the agent is at the same time the experiencer. The accuracy of this last statement is evidenced by the fact that the reflexive form of the personal pronoun must appear where there is a contrast between reflexive and non-reflexive, i.e. in the 3rd person:

(82) Er hat sich die Hose zerrissen

Once more it should be stressed that the dative, here, is neither "benefactive" nor "adversive". A parallel can be seen in Amharic (Allan 1975/6:303) where in comparable contexts "inalienable possession" is additionally characterized

by the absence of both the "adversive" particle -b- and the "benefactive" particle -l-, which do appear in "alienable" possession:

(83) (i) †su sisay-in †gr-u -n mätta -w
he Sisay-OBJ leg-his-OBJ he:hit-him
= he hit Sisay's leg

(ii) yā-sisay-in mākina mätta -ba -t
of-Sisay-OBJ car he:hit-ADVERS-it
= he hit Sisay's car (to Sisay's disadvantage)

It should furthermore be stressed that one part of the relevant contexts with relationizing datives is characterized by verbs denoting a (predominantly negative) action upon the possessed noun (mostly, but not uniquely, body parts) and that means upon the self: hitting, breaking, taking away, etc. And that another important part is characterized by reflexivity of the action. In the Ancient Indo-European languages this is appropriately expressed by the middle voice:

(84) Ancient Greek

nízomai (tās) kheĩras = "je me lave les mains"
wash-1SG.MED (ART) hands-ACC

(85) Od. 10.484

thūmōs dé moi ēssutai = my spirit becomes incited"
spirit PART PERS.PR becomes
1SG.DAT incited

After all, it seems that the relationality of the constructions studied is not so much due to the dative itself rather than to a convergence of several features; among them, the twofold relationship contracted by the case form is probably

the most important; it is supplemented by the self-reflexivity of the action and/or the character of the action particularly affecting one's self.

5.5.2. POSSESSOR and direct object

At this point, it is appropriate to return to the phenomenon of "possessor promotion" mentioned earlier (5.2.3.) and described in detail by L. Hyman (1977) for Haya, and found in most, if not all, other Bantu languages. According to Hyman's presentation, a POSSESSOR is "promoted" into a direct object, if the verb is transitive, and he is "promoted" into subject position, if the verb is intransitive. Examples:

(86) η-ka-hénd' ómwáán' ómukôno

I-P₃-break child arm

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

(87) (?) η-ka-hénd' ómukono gw'ómwáana

I-P₃-break arm of child

I broke the (detached) arm of the child

(88) η-ka-hénd' éηkoni y'ómwáana

I-P₃-break stick of child

I broke the stick of the child

(89) *η-ka-hénd' ómáán' éηkoni

I-P₃-break child stick

(lit. I broke the child the stick)

(90) omwáán' a -ka-hénd -w' ómukôno

child he-P₃-break-PASS arm

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

(91) η-ka-mu -hënd' ômukône

I-P₃-him-break arm

lit. I broke him arm = I broke his arm

As (90) 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" - compare to egocentricity scale presented for Cahuilla in 5.2.3.5.), 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 proposition.

The role of experiencer is also decisive in subject promotion:

- (92) omwáána η -aa-sháásh' ómútwe
child PR-he-ache head
lit. the child is aching the head = the child has a headache
- (93) (??) omutwe gw'ómwáána ni-gu-sháash-a
head of child PR-it-ache
the head of the child is aching
- (94) omwáána n-aa-núúk' ómukôno
child PR-he-smell arm
lit. the child smells (with respect to) the hand
= the hand of the child smells
- (95) omukono gw'ómwáána gú-ka-gw-a
arm of child it-P₃-fall
the arm of the child fell

POSSESSOR promotion must take place if POSSESSOR is experienter ('arm smell' vs. 'arm fall' implies that POSSESSOR is involved as a whole), and if the other conditions are fulfilled as well.

We conclude from all this that there must be a common denominator between, on the one hand, the relation "experienter finds part of self affected" and, on the other hand "POSS-ESSUM of POSSESSOR". The common denominator has to do with the contrast between inherent vs. established POSSESSION, and also between stative, self-reflexive, given POSSESSION and active, acquired possession. We have already encountered the relevance of the stative vs. agentive contrast for the "inalienable" vs. "alienable" pronominal distinction (5.2.3.3.).

5.5.3. Double case

Theoretically we might expect that in an inherent possessive relationship of part/whole (body part, etc.) the POSSESSOR - instead of the POSSESSUM - might appear in any case that is required (or governed) by the main verb.¹⁰ The expectation is fulfilled in many languages. Quite frequently, POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM appear in the same case, a phenomenon called double case by some grammarians. As a subvariety we find that POSSESSUM is "demoted" to the position of either a prepositional locative phrase or a genitive phrase.

The classical languages - but others as well - show the well-known construction kath' hólōn kaí katà méros, 'of whole and part'. It is represented by marking part and whole by identical case forms. They may be dative as in

(100) Iliad 1.150

pōs tís toi próphrōn épesin peithētai
how one PERS.PR readily words-DAT.PL obey-3SG.SUBJ.MED
2SG.DAT

= how should one readily obey you, viz. your words?

How should one ... obey your words?

Or they may be accusative as in

(101) Od. 19.356

hē se pōdas nípsei
she PERS.PR feet-ACC wash-FUT
2SG.ACC 3SG

= she will wash you, viz. the feet; she will wash your feet

Both of the identical case forms relate to the main verb, but certainly not in the same manner. In accordance with the gener-

al principle that "each case relationship occurs only once in a simple sentence" (Fillmore 1968:21), it appears that the personal pronouns contract a twofold relationship - in a way comparable to the twofold relationship of the datives considered above: with the main verb on the one hand, and, by virtue of case identity, with the possessed noun on the other. The procedure works with nouns denoting parts of the body but also cultural products intimately connected with the self, like 'words' (ex. 100); furthermore with part-whole relationships in general; but generally not with kin terms. It would surprise me to find a language where a kin term would be so construed. This us a further instance where the treatment of kin terms departs from the treatment of the other relational nouns (see above 5.2.3.).

There are two other kinds of construction which I consider to be subvarieties of double case constructions, although there is not really an identity of case forms. One is by using a locative - i.e. that case form which, like the genitive, does not specify whether an object is affected by the action (see Jakobson l.c. 58 f.). The construction is readily exemplified by English:

(102) (i) Mary pinched John on the nose

(ii) Mary pinched John's nose

(103) (i) *Mary pinched John on the dog

(ii) Mary pinched John's dog

The construction in English is limited to body part nouns.

The other kind - as might be predicted from its general function - is represented by the (prepositional) genitive of the possessed noun. It is the French construction, made famous by H. Frei's article showing it in its title (1939: 185-192):

(104) Sylvie est jolie des yeux

Frei calls it "le type converse" and contrasts it with the "tour direct" as documented in

(105) (i) Sylvie a de jolis yeux

(ii) Les yeux de Sylvie sont jolis

In Ancient Greek the contrast is implemented as follows:

"accusativus limitationis" a procedure which is very close to double case marking - for the converse type:

(106) (i) Homeric

pódas ōkús
feet-ACC.PL swift

= swift with regard to (his) feet (frequent epithet
of Achilles)

(ii) Homeric

pod -ōk̄ -ēs
feet-swift-DERIV.SUFF.SG.MASC

swift-footed (also epithet of Achilles)

for the direct type:

(107) Homeric

ōkú -pous a bahuvrihi compound: swift-footed
swift-foot

One condition for the appearance of the converse type, as stated by Frei (l.c. 188) is, that POSSESSUM and POSSESSOR -

which Frei calls "les deux sujets logiques" - are of one and the same substance. Hence the deviant status of
(108) belle de gants, noire de chaussure, etc.

The condition does permit, however, such relations other than body part as

(109) un rideau passé de ton, une table abîmée du coin, etc.

Moral qualities of self are also permitted as in

(110) libre de moeurs, froid de parole, etc.

5.5.4. Instrumental

Like the dative, the instrumental functions as a "Randkasus" (Jakobson l.c. 45 f.) indicating a peripheral position of the respective noun with regard to the utterance. Moreover the instrumental marks a supplementary predication of the type "and X is there, too" (see Coseriu 1970:218, Seidler 1975:215 ff.). Accordingly, we shall interpret such constructions as

(111) See the man with the hat

by over-paraphrasing it as

(112) See the man - and a hat is there, too.

In

(113) See the man with the head

the constraints imposed by inherence relations become apparent once more: The utterance, lest it be deviant, forces the interpretation of "the man with the head that is beyond the norm in some sense", "with an abnormally shaped head" or the like.

It is the same kind of interpretation which we already encountered in adjectives of the type fleshy, leggy, etc. (see 5.2.6.). A determiner is almost indispensable in these instances, and the supplementary predication concerns rather the determiner than the determined noun.

5.5.5. Concluding remarks about case marking

Case marking proves to have shown a Janus-like nature. It is the zone of transition from adnominal or determinative or N-N-relations to adverbial or predicative or N-V-relations.

From case marking, two paths can in principle be traced in the program. One leads straight toward full verbs and the phenomena connected with "transitivity and possession" (see Allen 1964:337 ff.). The facts are manifold and have received a great deal of attention. As a reminder, I shall just cite the Armenian example from E. Benveniste's well-known study on the transitive perfect (1952:52 ff.):

(114) (i) nora ē gorcea (z-gorc)
 PRON. be:AUX make-PTC (OBJ-work)
 3SG.GEN/DAT

"eius est factum (operam)"
= he has made (the work)

(ii) nora ē handerj
 PRON. be:AUX garment
 3SG.GEN/DAT

"eius est vestimentum"
= he has a dress

Typically, the genitive (or dative - in Armenian the two coincide except in the pronominal inflection -) represents the agent of the transitive verb, as in (i); and the same genitive (dative) represents the POSSESSOR, as in (ii). One may then, with regard to construction (i), speak of a "possessor of an act" (Seiler 1973:836 ff.). It is a predominantly establishing procedure of POSSESSION where the agent is credited with an act. The expression is clearly predicative; it is the type of "mihi est N" and "habeo N" to be discussed below (5.6.). Beyond that, it does not add any new feature to the spectrum or dimension of POSSESSION. An interesting question, which has not yet been properly raised, let alone been answered, is to know why languages in the course of their history should, again and again, replace simple perfect forms by such periphrastic constructions and why a function like the transitive perfect should be represented as being "the possessor of an act". This, however, is a problem to be solved within the framework of the dimension of valence.

It is certainly important to note that possessive constructions within the system of verbal valence are always linked to specific conditions - like the expression of the perfect of transitive verbs mentioned above - and that they are by no means all-pervading. In a yet unpublished paper M. Ostrowski (1981) has pointed out that the often claimed parallelism in Circassian between POSSESSOR-

POSSESSUM configurations and noun-verb constructions disappears as soon as POSSESSOR first and second persons are being considered; and as soon as the predicate complex is enlarged by additional specifications.

In short, the path that leads from case marking towards transitive (and intransitive) verb constructions is a connecting path between possessivity and valence. We shall not consider it any further here.

The other path, which properly continues the squish or dimension of POSSESSION, leads on to increasingly predicative constructions and eventually ends up with special verbs. These constructions and special verbs serve the unique purpose of establishing the possessive relation by explicating the particular mode or angle under which the relation is to be considered. But also with regard to such a continuation, case marking in general, and the dative in particular, functions as a zone of transition; It combines the features of peripherality ("Randkasus") with regard to the main assertion and the feature of interest or participation with regard to the established relation. It can therefore be used equally well for the purpose of explicating a more inherent relationship (cf. ex. (78) (i) and (79) (ii)), or for establishing a (less inherent) relationship (cf. ex. (67) (ii)). In a comparable sense the genitive is seen to be involved either in the expression of a more inherent relationship (ex. (67) (i)), or, on the contrary, in the expression of a less inherent one (ex. (78) (ii)).¹¹

5.6. Predication

All of the techniques studied thus far have been found to include prime-programs based on scales of greater or lesser inherence or intimacy of the possessive relation. And the "alienable" constructions corresponding to the lesser inherent relationships usually included some predicative element: an element (or elements) which is apt to be understood as asserting something about the manner in which the lesser inherent relation between POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM ought to be established. The techniques and prime-programs studied last involve elements like case forms which are intimately linked to predication. We now move on to true, i.e. syntactic, predication of possessivity. This constitutes a real turning point in our dimension, for it is a point where several things change concurrently. It is essentially the change from determinative to predicative syntagms.

Several features are involved here, most of them concurring and intimately linked to one another in the respective constructions. They all contribute to making assertions about the manners of establishing a possessive relation. We shall successively highlight the following aspects:

1. Word order;
2. Location;
3. Existence;
4. Directionality of establishing;
5. Definiteness;
6. Verbs mark the terminal point of our dimension.

5.6.1. Word order

This feature has been studied by E. Clark (1978:91f.) in connection with most of the other features just mentioned. In her sample of some 30 languages she finds that the great majority shows POSSESSOR-POSSESSUM as one or the only possible word-order, and that this resembles the order "Loc-Nom" predominant in existential constructions (type: there is a book on the table). Word order appears to vary predictably with the definiteness of the subject nominal in existential and locative construction.

It must be added that in possessive constructions, POSSESSOR is normally the topic and POSSESSUM the comment, and that there is a strong tendency for the topic to precede the comment.

It must furthermore be added that pronominally possessed constructions - with possessive pronouns or adjectives rather than pronominal affixes - may not show the same constituent order as nominally possessed constructions (Ulan 1978:24). When this happens the pronominally possessed order is always POSSESSOR - POSSESSUM as opposed to POSSESSUM - POSSESSOR for the corresponding nominally possessed order. This means that pronominal possession shows the expected or dominant constituent order as against nominal POSSESSION. And this, in turn, can be explained within our dimensional framework: Pronominal POSSESSION is basically linked to inherence of the relation, which is, after all, the unmarked prototypic case of POSSESSION.

5.6.2. Location

It has long been recognized¹² that locative expressions are in a systematic relationship with possessive ones in many languages - if not "universally". It has also been argued (E. Clark l.c.) that "the possessor on the two possessive constructions [viz. 1. Tom has a book, 2. The book is Tom's, H.S.] is simply an animate place. The object possessed is located in space just as the object designed in existential or locative sentences. In possessive constructions, the place happens to be an animate being, such that a [+ Animate] Loc becomes a Pr." An even stronger claim holds (Lyons 1967) that both the existential and the possessive constructions are derived (synchronically, diachronically and even ontogenetically) from the same source, namely the locative.

Such a claim, however, will hardly stand up against the facts, as a glance especially at indigenous languages with a richly developed possessive system will easily show. In her paper on possessive constructions in African languages, M. Reh et al. (1981) distinguish, among other things, between socially determined inherence (kin terms), partitive inherence (part/whole), and localizing inherence (orientation in space). In spite of some formal overlappings, especially in pronoun-noun-syntagms, the syntactic behavior of locative phrases differs in certain definite ways from that of both kin and

part/whole expressions. It is true that in the languages studied, the "POSSESSUM" in localizing constructions is quite often represented by words identical with, or derived from, body part terms, as, e.g. in Ewe megbé 1. 'back', 2. 'back part', 3. 'behind'; tá 1. 'head', 2. 'upper part', 3. 'above'. But such expressions when used in the spatial locative sense, notoriously differ as to their constructional properties from both body part and other part/whole expressions. As Reh et al. have shown (l.c.), Ewe local expressions show an alienable construction and thereby differ markedly from both kin terms and body part terms.

It is true that in the constructive process of establishing a possessive relation many languages make use of local expressions. But this is not the same thing as saying that POSSESSION can be reduced to, or derived from, location. In fact, as we now see, locative expressions are just one of several means of establishing a relationship - and as such they notoriously tend to drift away from local expressions that truly serve the purpose of indicating location. An example often reiterated in order to substantiate the "location hypothesis" is the Russian construction u A (est') B:

(115) U Péti est' mašina Peter has a car

In a refreshingly critical essay A. Isačenko (1974) has pointed out the true state of affairs: he compares (115) with the following sentences:

5.6.3 Existence

We are often told (E. Clark 1978:89; Lyons 1967:390ff.) that for an object to be (i.e. to exist) normally means that it is to be found somewhere in space, and that one should therefore expect concepts of existence to be expressed in locative terms in natural languages. Although this sounds plausible and is indeed the case in many languages, the connection between expressions of existence and expressions of location is by no means a necessary one.

Cahuilla (Uto-Aztecan) has several possibilities of expressing existence and thereby of establishing a possessive relation. One is the "logical predicate" (see 5.6.6.)

(118) mī - yax - wen (it) is somehow, (it) exists
INTERR-so - DUR
INDEF

where an interrogative or indefinite (according to context) prefix is attached to a verb stem of little semantic content basically meaning 'to be in some way'. The construction establishing a relation with a body part is as follows:

(119) wikikmāl-em hem -wākʔa miyaxwen
bird-PL PERS.PR-wing exists
3.PL

= (the) birds have wings

Another verb which may be used as "logical predicate" in order

to establish a possessive relation with a kin term is

(120) híw -qal (it) is living, (it) exists
 live-DUR

in constructions as

(121) né? né -pas Ø -híw -qal
 I PERS.PR-older brother PERS.PR-live-DUR
 1SG 3SG

= I have a brother

A third verb is qál 'to be placed (somewhere)', 'to exist',
in

(122) né? ne-cípatmal qál
 I my-basket placed
 = I have a basket

and it serves to establish a possessive relation with a human
POSSESSOR and a cultural implement as POSSESSUM.

Only the third expression is connected with locality,
the other two are patently non-local. But all three represent
verbs of existence to indicate a possessive relation. The re-
lation is established not solely by means of these "logical
predicates" but also by what I shall call subject dissocia-
tion (5.6.4.). All nouns involved are in the construct state
and thus obligatorily possessed. But this does not keep them
from appearing in constructions that predominantly serve to
represent the establishing principle.

5.6.4. Directionality

By this term I wish to refer to a procedure whereby the possessive relation is being established by choosing one of the terms as point of departure, and the other as the target or goal. Some languages prefer the direction from POSSESSOR to POSSESSUM ("A is POSSESSOR of B"), others the direction from POSSESSUM to POSSESSOR ("B is POSSESSUM of A"), and still others show constructions corresponding to either direction, with differing meaning correlates. Typological studies will have to elucidate the conditions for such choices. In an unpublished UNITYP progress report, M. Ostrowski (August 1981) has examined the question for three Uralic languages, namely Zyrjan, Vogul and Yurak. Among several different dialects of Vogul he found one (Tavda-Vogul) with exclusively POSSESSUM-POSSESSOR directionality, some others (North-Vogul, South-East Vogul) with exclusively POSSESSOR-POSSESSUM, and still others (Pelym-Vogul, South-West Vogul) with both directionalities.

Cahuilla (see Seiler forthcoming) uses a suffix denoting oriented relationship in a complex expression discussed earlier in this paper (5.2.3.), which is repeated here for convenience:

(123) = (27) pe -y -nési -k(a) (t)

O -P -niece-OR.REL

3SG 3SG

= She is one who is related to her, the niece

This amounts to saying: 'she is her aunt' - without mentioning the term 'aunt'. In fact the expression is used when the 'aunt' is deceased, i.e. when it is no longer legitimate to refer to her directly. What is of primary interest here is that in such a case the natural, expected directionality, namely POSSESSOR \longrightarrow POSSESSUM ('her - aunt') is inverted by virtue of the reciprocal nature of most kin terms. The POSSESSOR, then, is "demoted" into the role of a POSSESSUM ('niece') and made coreferential with an object marker pe-, while the original POSSESSUM is "promoted" into the role of POSSESSOR and made coreferential with a P₂-subject marker -y- which has the function of marking a dissociated subject. Such a dissociated subject, then, is taken as the starting point (originally the POSSESSUM), and the suffix -k(a)(t) indicates how the relation extends to the goal/object (originally the POSSESSOR). That P₂ marks a dissociated subject can also be seen from such non-possessive expressions as

(124) né? hen-táxliswet

I I -Indian-HABIT.PERFORMER

=I (am) one who is an Indian; I (am) an Indian

where né? marks the independent pronoun 1st singular, and hen- is a P₂ subject prefix 1st singular, the corresponding third person being -y-. We thus have a double subject.

The same dissociation technique with double subject appeared in the existential construction studied above (5.6.3.):

- (125) = (121) né[?] né -pas Ø -híw -gal
I P₁ -older brother he-live-DUR
1SG
= I have a brother

In discussing a closely related construction in Luiseño, S. Steele (1977:114ff.) defines the problem of explaining this kind of double subject. The following sentences from her data deserve close attention:

- (126) noo=p no-paa[?]aš [?]awq = I have a brother
I =CLIT my-brother is

- (127) noo=n no-paa[?]aš [?]awq = I have a brother
I =1SG my-brother is
CLIT

- (128) no-paa[?]aš [?]awq = my brother is there
my-brother is

We can see the effect of the double or dissociated subject technique: without it, namely in (128) we don't get a possessive sentence. In (127) we seem to have a triple reference to the 1st person (identical with the POSSESSOR). Steele is certainly right in linking the phenomena with topicalization. Within the framework of our dimension and the two principles, inherent vs. establishing, I might add this: The double subject technique consists in dissociating from the POSSESSOR an extra subject for the purpose of taking it as the point of departure for establishing a relationship, which otherwise - "by nature" - would be inherent,

since kin terms and implement terms are involved. Some such consideration might also bring the solution to the much debated question of double subjects in such languages as Japanese with its hackneyed example

(129) zoo wa hana ga nagai = the elephant has a long
 elephant wa nose ga long nose

literally: "As to the elephant, (to wit) (by) his nose, long
(is)"¹³

Certainly not by accident do we find a body part term involved here. The purpose seems to be similar to the one mentioned above for the two Uto-Aztecan languages: a relation of possession presented as being established, which otherwise would be inherently given. But one last remark needs to be added: Establishing expressions such as (129) seem to have at least as much to do with the predication ('long') as with relating the two terms ('elephant' and 'nose').

This would mean that the example also needs to be considered under the aspect of "Double case" (5.5.3. above).

5.6.5. Definiteness

A different manner of establishing a possessive relationship by moving from a point of departure toward a goal consists in utilizing textual features such as 'given' vs. 'new' or 'identifiable' vs. 'not identifiable' or 'definite' vs. 'indefinite'. Languages with definite and indefinite articles

like German or English show the following distribution:

- (130) (i) I have a book (i') I have the book
(ii) The book belongs to me (ii') A book belongs to me
(iii) The book is mine (iii') A book is mine

The primed sentences are only acceptable under quite restricted conditions. Clasen (1981:17) presents the following text configurations for German haben 'to have' vs. gehören 'to belong' with regard to the contrast between the definite and the indefinite article:

- (131) (i) Ich habe ein Buch. Das Buch ist spannend.
(ii) Da sitzt ein Mann. Der Mann hat ein Buch.

- (132) (i) Dort liegt ein Buch. Das Buch gehört mir.
(ii) Das Buch gehört einem Mann. Der Mann liest nur Krimis.

Note that gehören is also compatible with a definite POSSESSOR:

- (iii) Das Buch gehört dem Mann. Der Mann liest nur Krimis.

The following tetrachoric tables (somewhat deviant from Clasen's l. c. 18) might be set up:

(133)

	<u>haben</u>		<u>gehören</u>	
	POSSESSOR	POSSESSUM	POSSESSOR	POSSESSUM
Definite	+	-	+	+
Indefinite	-	+	+	-

Gehören with its distribution of articles proves to be dominant for POSSESSOR while POSSESSUM is recessive. With haben it is not the exact reverse; neither the POSSESSOR

nor the POSSESSUM is dominant. It is thus unmarked as compared to gehören. But as the textual configurations in (131) and (132) show, haben is used when the POSSESSOR has been previously mentioned, thus definite, i.e. when it is the point of departure wherefrom we move on to the POSSESSUM, and gehören is used, when the POSSESSUM is chosen as the point of departure whence we move on to the POSSESSOR.

5.6.6. Verbs of POSSESSION

5.6.6.1. What is a verb of POSSESSION?

Many languages show more than one verb of POSSESSION: translation equivalents of the copula, of 'to be', 'to have', 'to belong', 'to grasp', etc. Neither the number of such elements nor the choice among them is accidental; but the rationale still remains to be discovered.

Some of these elements are formally characterized by representing a rather marginal status within the verbal system of the respective languages. The so-called copula, for one, is often represented by zero, especially in the present tense, e.g. in Russian. The existential verb and the equational 'to be' are most often defective as compared to the paradigms of 'full verbs'. For equivalents of 'to have' this also holds, but to a lesser degree. As we then proceed to the equivalents of 'belonging', 'holding', 'seizing', 'grasping', we increasingly find verbs of full status. There is thus a scale here

of increasing or decreasing status as a full verb.

A second characteristic or parameter concerns selectional restrictions. In some previous publications (Seiler 1977:256ff.) I have introduced the notion of logical predicates, as contrasted with that of semantic predicates. Semantic predicates, usually represented by full verbs, are characterized by certain definite selectional restrictions. Thus, a two-place predicate like to beat normally requires an agent argument that is [+animate]. The above mentioned "auxiliaries", on the other hand, do not show any such restrictions. Thus, the logical predicate EXISTS, or the logical predicate APPLIES (surfacing as the copula or as 'to be') can take any kind of argument. For any conceivable argument it may be asserted that it APPLIES to something, or that it EXISTS. A further characteristic of the logical predicates consists in asserting truth (or falsity) and conformity, whereas semantic predicates cannot assert their own truth. The function of logical predicates is thus basically metalinguistic. Note that logical predicates may be one place, as in EXISTS (x), or two place, as in APPLIES (x, y).

Now, as pointed out by Clasen (1981:23), the distinction between logical and semantic predicates is not a categorial one, but of gradient nature. And the scale, grosso modo, runs parallel to the one established above and concerning "auxiliaries" vs. "full verbs". Thus, selectional restrictions become increasingly stronger as we move on from 'to be' to 'to

have' and to 'hold, seize, grasp', etc. Their metalinguistic character decreases in the same proportion.

If logical predicates exert a very low selectional restriction with regard to the noun(s), this does not mean that no selectional restrictions occur in these expressions.

Clasen (1981:22) has advanced the hypothesis that in such cases the restrictive force emanates from one of the nouns and extends to the other noun. Hence

(134) Judy is a waitress

is acceptable, but

(135) *The house is a waitress

(136) *The waitress is a house

are deviant. Clasen has further hypothesized that the selective force extending from a verb to a noun is in inverse proportion to the selective force extending from a noun to a noun. This remains to be tested in detail. But if the hypothesis is correct, it will enable us to advance the following further hypothesis: If the selective force emanating from the verb - a logical predicate in principle - is low, and the restrictions are between noun and noun, we are presented with a predominantly inherent possessive relation. This is borne out by the cases studied under 5.6.3. (existence) and 5.6.4. (directionality), especially by the double subject constructions. It is also borne out by the so-called possessive substantives (see Ultan 1978:27f.), type

(137) (i) x is John's

(ii) x is mine, yours, his

Preferably pronominal forms (usually 1st and second person) and proper nouns or designations of persons are admitted as POSSESSORS, not, e.g., inanimate nouns as in

(138) *The garden is the house's

It is the intimate POSSESSION of self or person.

The more the verb approaches the status of a full verb and the more it exerts its own selectional restriction with regard to the two nouns, the less inherent is their relationship. This is in accordance with our basic tenet that a possessive relationship which is not inherently given, tends to be established by more or less explicit means.

Not any verb will qualify as a verb of possession. The series 'have' - 'hold' - 'seize' - 'grab' cannot be prolonged indefinitely. It has been stated (Givón 1976:175) that 'hold', 'seize', or 'grab' can become a verb of POSSESSION because it entails 'have'. Yet

(139) The man finds a ring

also entails that he has it, but 'find' will hardly qualify as a verb of POSSESSION. From this we conclude that for a verb to qualify for a verb of POSSESSION it must imply a certain amount of metalinguistic potential. This means that what it asserts or predicates must primarily or predominantly refer to the mode of the relationship between the two nominals.

This prompts us to make the following statement regarding

the relationship between possessive expressions within the noun phrase, and possessive expressions within the sentence: There is no doubt that in the various languages the two differ in certain ways. But a common denominator also clearly emerges: In both cases the relation is basically one between nominal and nominal - or, semantically speaking, between substance and substance. Within the noun phrase the relation is, in principle, posited. Within the verb phrase it is, in principle, predicated. But as we have seen throughout this study, the distinction is not categorial but gradient.

5.6.6.2. Evidence for the scalar ordering of verbs of POSSESSION

In the preceding section we have posited a scalar ordering of possessive verbs with regard to their status as auxiliaries vs. full verbs, as logical vs. semantic predicates, as contributing to the expression of inherent vs. established relation of POSSESSION. This can be tested by showing the interaction between those verbs and POSSESSUM nouns: The more a verb contributes to establishing a possessive relation, the less it is compatible with POSSESSUM nouns that predominantly occur in "inalienable" constructions. A comparison between the German verbs haben 'to have', besitzen 'to possess', gehören 'to belong', and such POSSESSUM nouns as Vater 'father', Sohn 'son', Kopf 'head', Haar 'hair', Intelligenz 'intelli-

gence', Hose 'pants', Haus 'house' may bear this out:

(140) (compare Clasen 1981:19 ff.)

	Vater	Sohn	Kopf	Haar	Intelligenz	Hose	Haus
haben	-	+	+	+	+	+	+
besitzen	-	-	?	+	+	+	+
gehören	-	-	-	-	-	+	+

The scalar ordering of verbs of possession can also be demonstrated by showing that they are increasingly specialized and restricted as to context. Thus, the verb to have in English, haben in German, basically an auxiliary with little semantic content, is widely usable in various contexts, and it is multibly ambiguous itself.

It is widely usable: This does not only appear from collocations exemplified in (140), but also from the fact that to have, haben, and comparable verbs in other languages again and again show the tendency of being attracted by a main verb: This is the switch that leads to the integration of to have in the verbal paradigm as a marker of aspect and, ultimately, of tense. These are the well known cases of reanalysis (Ramat 1981), as in French

- (141) (i) J'ai une lettre écrite I have a written letter
 (ii) J'ai écrit une lettre I have written a letter

Such reanalyses do not occur with verbs like possess or belong. In this propensity for being attracted by the main verb, to have behaves in a way quite analogous to the one pointed out above for the genitive (5.5.1.).

To have is vague or multiply ambiguous: This has been pointed out by Seliverstova (1977:23) and Boeder (1980:212).

Thus, a sentence like

(142) I have a son

might be interpreted in several different ways, such as

(143) (i) I have a son I am proud of

(ii) I have a son who gives me headache

(iii) I have a son to take care of

etc.

These are interpretations that are not actually asserted but may be evoked by an utterance such as (142). The multiple interpretability results from the unspecific character of to have. It is never found with possess or belong. The case is strikingly parallel to the multiple interpretability of genitives, type Karl's house studied above 5.5.1. There too it proved to be a result of unspecificity. We are thus presented with two independent cases of parallelism between genitive and to have, which may be advocated to support the following claim:

The role of the genitive case marking within the possessive noun phrase corresponds to the role of to have within the possessive sentence.

5.6.6.3. Modes of establishing a possessive relation

Specific verbs of POSSESSION, type possess, belong,

or hold, seize, grab serve the purpose of explicating the mode in which the possessive relation is to be established. I shall content myself with pointing out some features recurring in various languages without going into greater detail:

[Contact], a feature already encountered, is probably present in have, but absent, e.g. in belong.

[Directionality] is present in belong but unspecified for in have.

[Result] specifies POSSESSION as resulting from developments which previously took place. It is probably present in hold.

[Control] indicates whether or not POSSESSOR has control over POSSESSUM, probably present in possess, hold.

[Title] specifies whether or not POSSESSOR is entitled to POSSESSUM; it introduces a modal component, visible, e.g., in the German gehören 'to belong to', when used in such expressions as

(144) Kleine Kinder gehören ins Bett.

Little children ought to be in bed.

These features may be represented not actually by the verbs themselves but by special particles. A case in point is Bambara as described by C. S. Bird (1972): Three particles, fê, bolo, and kùn presuppose a [+human] POSSESSOR and a [+concrete] POSSESSUM. All three assert that POSSESSOR has [+control] over POSSESSUM. In addition, fê asserts that

POSSESSOR is [+entitled] to POSSESSUM. kùn asserts [+existential] or, as I should rather call it, [+contact] with POSSESSOR at the moment of speaking. It furthermore presupposes [+location].

A particularly rich system of 'to have' verbs is found in Kartvelian (South Caucasian). A first account and systematization has been given by W. Boeder (1980:207ff.), who is preparing an extensive monograph. I am therefore limiting myself to enumerating some of the features as described by Boeder. Ancient Georgian had several verbs 'to have', one of them rather unspecified; another one seems to actually mean 'it follows me' or 'I carry with me' [+control], where POSSESSUM is represented by a [+animate] and non-relational noun; still another one means "(bei) mir steht" (with version vowel -i-) or "auf mir steht" (with version vowel -a-); The former is used with POSSESSUMs like houses, trees, land property etc., the latter with (external) body parts (including 'belly' and 'mouth'); yet another verb means "(bei) mir liegt" (-i-), used with 'power', 'possessions', or "auf mir liegt". Svan and Mingrelian show verbs of having with such features as [control] [result], and classificatory ones such as [human], [animate], [alive] etc. The classificatory character can be clearly seen in the following example from Mingrelian (Boeder, l. c.:212):

- (144) (i) bati p̄uns I have a (living) goose
goose have:I
- (ii) sadilo baṭi miyudu I had a (dead) goose
eat:ADV goose had:I for lunch

From this survey we may conclude the following:

Verbs of POSSESSION show differentiations that indicate the mode of establishing a possessive relation. The differentiations parallel exactly the ones found earlier in the domain of non-sentential POSSESSION. In both domains we found: subprograms of classification (cf. 5.4.), of location and directionality (cf. 5.5.) , of contact and control (cf. 5.5.). One may thus say that non-sentential and sentential possessive expressions show homologous subprograms of establishing a possessive relation.

5.6.6.4. Weakening vs. strengthening the establishing force: two opposite pulls

Why is it that more than one verb of having seem to be necessary in so many different languages? And why does it notoriously happen that in the course of time a verb originally meaning 'to seize', 'grasp' or 'hold', thus a dynamic verb for the most part, turns into a stative verb 'to have'? And that in the course of time a construction like mihi est domus 'to me is a house' is

being replaced by another construction habeo domum

'I have a house' in so many languages?

Two opposite pulls seem to be constantly at work: One is toward explicating the mode in which a possessive relation is to be established that is not inherently given. This is done by providing formal counterparts to the various features (location, direction, result, contact, control, temporality, title, etc.), partly incorporated into the verbs themselves. The other pull is toward the pole of inherence of the possessive relation, which is the unmarked pole. A weakening of the special establishing features - which often means a weakening of the special meaning of the verb itself, is the result. The expression admits "inalienable" nouns whose POSSESSOR is 'self'. The middle voice, "diathèse interne" according to Benveniste (1950), prevails, as does the perfect, describing the state of the subject, as in Sanskrit ī́ṣe 'to be master, dispose of', 'to control', Avestan ise etc.; or stative derivatives like the ones in -ē-, as in Old High German habēn 'to have' when compared to Latin cap-io 'to seize', or in Slavonic imēti 'to have' when compared to Gothic niman 'to take' (cf. Boeder 1980a), all emphasizing the state of the subject. The process is probably self-repeating, since both forces continue to exert their attraction. Mihi est domus 'to me is a house' - note the dative and its role as an indicator of intimacy (5.5.1.) - is

to habeo domum 'I have a house' as OHG habēn 'to have' is to Lat. capio 'to seize'.

In conclusion we might say this:

Inherence vs. establishing are not two disjunct categories but rather two opposing forces ever present in the domain of POSSESSION. They are equally present in possessive noun phrases - see our model case 5.2.1. - and in possessive sentences.

5.7. The markings of inherence

5.7.1. Different kinds of inherence

We have seen that both from a semantic and formal point of view different manifestations of the principle of inherence appear in the various languages. The notion of 'inalienability' - apart from its one-sidedly categorical character - proves to be under-differentiated in this respect.

From a notional point of view it is plausible that the relationship to one's kin should be different from the relationship to one's body part or to one's mental manifestations. In fact, the expressions of kin relationships proved to differ in several ways from the relational expressions: A special series of possessive affixes (5.2.3.3.), non-accessibility to POSSESSOR promotion (5.5.2.) and verbal attraction (5.5.3.). This does not

preclude all these relationships from being treated alike in certain respects and in certain languages.

It is difficult to substantiate a scale or continuum of bondedness between POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM for such semantic classes as kin terms, body-part terms, part/whole relationships, cultural manifestations ('word', 'thought', 'character', 'name', etc.), cultural implements ('weapon', 'basket', etc.). Yet, broadly speaking, such gradience in the strength of inherence seems indeed to be the case. Kin terms and/or body part terms seem to range on top, albeit for different reasons. Part/whole seems to be a derivative or echo of body part, and thus of weaker bondedness. Cultural manifestations seem to be more strongly inherent than cultural implements. Local inherence is excluded from the considerations of this paper; but if it were included it would range rather high. M. Reh et al. (1981) consider three kinds of inherent relationship: "socially determined" (kin), "localizing", and "partitive" (mainly body part). They seem to imply each other in that order in African languages: If in such a language only one kind is expressed by an "inalienable" construction, it is kin; if two kinds of inherent relationships are expressed, they are kin and localizing; if three kinds, they are kin, localizing, and body part. For each combination one can find several African languages as examples. An exception is represented by Dizi, an Ethiopian language, where local and body part are represented by "inalienable" constructions, but not kin terms. A comparable deviance for kin terms was found by

U. Mosel (1980) for Kusaie as opposed to other Austronesian languages.

5.7.2. Inherence is unmarked with regard to establishing marked

t This is generally confirmed by the data. Expressions manifesting the establishing principle ("alienable") were found to be longer, more complex, more explicit, both formally and semantically. Very rarely does one find exceptions to this - and they certainly deserve careful attention as to the context in which they appear. Reh et al (l.c.) have found one for Dizi (see above 5.7.1.) where "inalienable" is marked by a genitive particle which is absent in "alienable".

The general rule just formulated needs to be restated in operational terms:

Inherence is posited (as a point of departure)
while establishing is construed (by means that are
basically predicative).

This implies that inherence is not altogether without a mark, or in other terms: Inherence must be recognizable as the "ground", upon which establishing is construed as the "figure".

5.7.3. Inherence means: POSSESSUM points back to POSSESSOR

This seems to be the common denominator of most inherent markings. It is certainly manifest in the obligatoriness of

POSSESSOR pronominal or nominal overt representation. It is underlined by special pronominal affixes for inherent possession (with, eventually, subdivisions according to different inherent classes). POSSESSUM referring back to POSSESSOR is furthermore manifested in "egocentricity", i.e. the particular personal hierarchy (1st 2nd 3rd) found in the distribution between inherent and establishing kin expression in Cahuilla (5.2.3.5.) and which we found again in the accessibility to "POSSESSOR promotion" (5.5.2.) and verbal attraction (5.5.3.). A further manifestation of the same principle is self-reflexivity, i.e. the formal distinction for identity or non-identity with the subject (of the sentence) referent. Latin suus vs. eius exemplifies this phenomenon. If it be accepted that POSSESSOR is the "natural" topic and POSSESSUM is the "natural" comment, inherent POSSESSION is characterized by the comment referring back to the topic. This is the rationale underlying the phenomenon that in inherent possession, POSSESSOR is at the same time subject (agent) and experiencer of "verba afficiendi" (5.5.2.). In other contexts the verb is stative (OHG habēn), is in the middle voice (Sanskrit īṣe 'to possess, control') and in the perfect (cf. the so-called preterito-present Goth. aih, aigum 'to have, to own'), all indicating the state of the subject (5.6.6.4.).

5.7.4. Other inherence markings

Inherence is sometimes posited by lexical means. A noun glossed 'property, owned' is added in apposition to the POSSESSUM. This is reported for Malay, Khari, etc. (Ultan 1978:15).

A notable case is presented by Ancient Greek p^hilos 'friend, closely related, own', extensively studied by H. Rosén (1959:264 ff.) and by E. Benveniste (1969:335 ff.). Rosén has pointed out the indubitable fact that p^hilos is used in Homer for marking inherent POSSESSION (body-part, kin, personal belongings), while Benveniste has stressed the fact that the general meaning of p^hilos expresses more than "un simple possessif". It seems to me that both views can be reconciled, considering that an element with a very precise meaning is just what is needed in order to emphasize the inherent character of the possessive relation.

6. Operational programs and functions

In our comparative analysis of the data pertaining to POSSESSION we have had the opportunity, again and again, to point out observational facts which cannot be fitted into the ordinary frame-work of structural descriptions. Comparing the different structures of possessive expressions with each other, and applying, among others, the criterion of similarity and dissimilarity, we saw it fit to speak of scales, of zones of transition, of a turning point, and of parallelisms or homologies between the zones that are separated from one another by the turning point. What we have found calls for an interpretation and for further inferences. Our interpretation and inferences will be to the effect that the observables just mentioned are the traces of a process of construction, and that the linguistic expressions of POSSESSION are not a given - ex nihilo - but rather the result of such a constructional process which took place and endlessly takes place in the human mind. In order to make this acceptable we need to systematize our findings somewhat further.

6.1. Systematizing the scales

The following scale may be set up to cover the entire domain of POSSESSION:

(A)

					w.o.		
					loc.		
N N	N conn N	N class N	N case N	N exist. N	dir.	N V N	
					def.		

[Here conn stands for connective, class for classifier, w.o. for word order, loc. for location, exist. for existence, dir. for directionality, and def. for definiteness.]

It is a scale of increasing explication: The nature or mode of the possessive relationship is made increasingly explicit, and the means of explicitation are increasingly those of predication. It is thus a scale of increasing predicativity. By using the term predicativity - instead of predication - I have in mind a kind of measure; one pole of it being represented by syntactic predication, or full predication, or verbal predication; the other pole being represented by a lexical class: The "inalienable nouns", and by a grammaticalized syntagm of the Type N N. The scale, then, is one of increasing syntacticization of predicativity; and predicativity is an indicator for the amount of information that is conveyed regarding the mode of the possessive relationship. Predicativity thus has a formal aspect, syntacticization, and a functional aspect: what is being said about the mode of POSSESSION?

Under this twofold aspect, predicativity serves as an important criterion for testing the adequacy of the ordering of the positions - the techniques, as we call them - along the continuum (A). What we find, when looking at (A) and when keeping in mind our analyses of the preceding chapter, is this:

- (B) Each technique on the continuum shows more syntacticization as compared to the technique immediately preceding - when moving from left to right.

In the juxtaposing technique (5.2.) no special syntactic

means indicate the nature of the possessive relationship. Instead, morphological classes serve as indicators: noun vs. pronoun, obligatoriness of pronouns, different classes of pronouns, nouns construct vs. nouns absolute, common vs. proper noun, word group vs. compound or vs. adjective. "Connectives" (5.3.) introduces a yet undifferentiated means by which to connect POSSESSOR with POSSESSUM. "Classifier" (5.4.) adds specifications relating both to properties of POSSESSUM and properties of POSSESSOR. "Case marking" (5.5.) indicates the syntactic ties of both POSSESSOR and POSSESSUM with the sentence and thereby further explicates the syntactic ties between the two terms of the possessive relationship themselves. Predication (5.6.), finally, introduces a whole array of syntactic means explicating the mode of construction of a possessive relationship: They range from word order to location, predication of existence, directionality topic/comment, and finally to verbs of possession.

So much for the formal aspects of predicativity. For the functional aspects the following regularity may be proposed:

- (C) The amount of information conveyed regarding the mode of the possessive relationship increases steadily from N N to N V N.

As a measure to substantiate this claim I propose the number of contrasts that are possible within each of the techniques. The number is smallest, without any doubt, in juxtaposition;

it is highest in possessive sentences, where the verb provides for multiple contrasts of person, number, tense, aspect, mode. And many languages have more than one verb of possession. The number of contrasts is intermediate, e.g., in "possessive classifiers", depending on the number of classifiers which may vary from one language to another. An extreme case was found in Rennellese (5.4.), where the number of possible contrasts may well exceed that in possessive predication. It was pointed out (l.c.), that such languages, certainly not by accident, lack any special verb of possession, albeit they may show possessive sentences (formed by means of logical predicates).

Apart from the predicativity, there is yet another aspect under which the continuum or scale in (A) may be considered: markedness. On the basis of our previous analyses the following regularity might be proposed:

- (D) Each stage or technique on the scale is more marked as compared with the stage immediately preceding - when moving from left to right.

There is probably an equivalence between (D) on the one hand, and (B) and (C) on the other. The correctness of (D) can be easily tested when looking at the analyses of chapter 5. One way of testing consists in substitutability: We expect that members of the continuum that are less marked can be substituted for members more marked, while the reverse would not hold. This we found right from the start, in our model

case (5.2.1.), where Kpelle shows simple juxtaposition of the two nominals when no particular need for specifying the relationship between them arises, and where both inherent relationships - marked by obligatoriness of the pronoun - and non-inherent ones are so expressed. It is further substantiated by the fact that expressions of inherent possessive relationship - e.g. POSSESSOR pronoun vs. POSSESSOR noun, nouns in construct state vs. nouns in absolute state - were found to be in systematic, mostly paradigmatic, relation with expressions establishing a possessive relationship, while the reverse does not always hold: Compare, e.g., the relation between construct and absolute state in Cahuilla nouns (5.2.4.): For most construct forms there is a corresponding absolute one, but many absolute forms lack a corresponding construct one.

A third way of looking at the scale in (A) is grammaticalization. This concept as proposed by C. Lehmann (1980 and 1982) implies that expressions grouped together under a common functional denominator form a scale: increasing grammaticalization is characterized on the formal side by an increase in the obligatoriness of constituent parts of the construction, in the propensity of the constituent elements to form closed sets (paradigms) and to form constructions of lower morphological, constituent levels. On the semantic side it is characterized by the propensity of the constituent parts to become semantically empty, by the lack of variation, and

by the limitation of contrasts. The other direction on the scale, decreasing grammaticalization, is characterized by the converse properties: constituent parts less obligatory, less prone to form paradigms, constructions of higher, syntactic, level: semantically they show autonomous meanings, more variation and more contrasts. Applying such a concept to the continuum in (A) we might propose the following:

(E) The continuum (A) represents a scale of grammaticalization, beginning with least grammaticalized constructions and ending up with highly grammaticalized structures on the phrase or even on the word level.

This statement is not equivalent to (B) - (C) or (D), for the directionality is converse: Whereas markedness (or predicativity) is defined on the basis of the less marked, i.e. the structures on the left hand side of the scale, grammaticalization is defined by using the less grammaticalized structures, i.e. those to the right, as a basis. This is again confirmed by our analyses in chapter 5. Thus indications of location, existence, directionality, and definiteness are more grammaticalized than sentential constructions with a possessive verb, and are less grammaticalized than the "grammatical" cases dative and genitive. Connectives like the *Izāfa* are more grammaticalized as compared with possessive classifiers and less grammaticalized than possessive prefixes, possessive compounds and possessive adjectives.

The foregoing statements (B) - (E) may be subsumed under the following generalized regularity statement:

(F) The scale in (A) is established by a gradual increase in predicativity, and, concurrently, a gradual increase in markedness. It is furthermore established by a gradual increase in grammaticalization. The term "increase" implies that the scale is directional. It is not uni-directional but bi-directional or reversible; predicativity and markedness on the one hand, and grammaticalization on the other, progress in opposite directions. The ranking or ordering of the techniques on the scale is thus doubly justified. The functional correlates of this ranking are, respectively, greater or lesser intimacy of the possessive relation, or, in other terms: inherent vs. established relation. The term of dimension is used to subsume the foregoing regularities.

6.2. The techniques

The theoretical and empirical status of the notion of technique as compared to the notion of dimension needs further clarification. How are we justified in separating the various positions on (A) from one another? - which seems to be a prerequisite for making statements about their forming a continuum or scale. This problem, of course, concerns the

theory of the dimensional-operational approach as a whole. It must be solved within a framework that compares several such dimensions with each other. For our present purpose, i.e. the elucidation of the dimension of POSSESSION, the following two thumbnail statements must suffice:

(G) A technique is prototypically represented by a particular morpho-syntactic category; the contribution of that category to the overall function can be tested independently of the other categories involved in signalling that function;

and

(H) A technique is constituted by one or several continua or scales of structures; the range of phenomena covered by these scales is smaller - both intensionally and extensionally - than the total range covered by the dimension.

With regard to (G) the situation is rather clear in "Connectives" (5.3.), "Possessive classifiers" (5.4.), and "Case marking" (5.5.), where each of these morpho-syntactic categories represents the focal instance of that particular technique, and where each is represented in contrasts that show its particular contribution to signifying the function of POSSESSION. "Juxtaposition" also represents a relatively clear situation: We may think of the relational noun, belonging to the "inalienable class", as representing the focal instance of that technique. Doubts may be cast on the

delimitation of the two techniques to the far right on the linear continuum in (A): They are presented as two in the formula but they are treated together under the corresponding section (5.6.) on "Predication". It seems that more relevant data and more empirical research would be needed here. To cite just one concrete example, definiteness: To the extent that we succeed in a particular language to demonstrate the interaction between definiteness (e.g. definite vs. indefinite article) and possessivity under conditions ceteris paribus, i.e. independent of the possessive verb, would we be justified in considering definiteness as a technique of its own. Analogous remarks apply to word order, location, existence, and directionality.

With regard to (H) - a technique constituted by one or several scales - our analyses allow us to state the following:

- (I) All the positions on (A) are characterized by one or several scales. The structures on those scales show co-varying meanings, the common denominators of which are, respectively, greater or lesser intimacy of the possessive relation.

For convenience's sake let us just evoke the situation of "juxtaposition" (5.2.). "Juxtaposition" proved to be the unmarked pole and to indicate intimacy or inherence of the possessive relationship with regard to a number of scales: the personal hierarchy scale, the POSSESSOR pronoun vs.

POSSESSOR noun scale, the POSSESSOR proper noun vs. POSSESSOR common noun scale, etc.

What we discover about the techniques is this: They show morphosyntactic categories as focal instances, but they cannot be reduced to those categories. Instead, they are constituted by scales, the functional correlates of which - inherent vs. established relation - are analogous to the two functional correlates of the entire dimension. None of the above mentioned scales, however, covers the range of the entire dimension. The scales constituting a technique are thus scales within an overall scale - that of the dimension. The dynamic interpretation of this state of affairs - to which we shall proceed presently - states that techniques are subprograms within an overall program, called a dimension.

6.3. The turning point

That the sequence of techniques in (A) constitutes a continuum or a scale is evidenced by the regularities as ultimately formulated in (F). However, there is a certain point in the continuum where, instead of a smooth transition, we find a rather dynamic change: It is the change from determinative syntagms constituting a noun phrase to predicative syntagms constituting a sentence. Does this contradict the idea of a continuum? Quite to the contrary, it forms a constituent part of it.¹⁴ The turning point divides the continuum into two syntactically defined subparts: determinative

syntagms vs. predicative syntagms. But the continuum as a whole, the dimension, is not defined syntactically. Its framework is functional, which means that it constitutes a program to serve the purpose of expressing POSSESSION. As such it integrates linguistic properties of all levels: Semantic, syntactic, morphological, and lexical. It enables us to delimitate the syntactic aspects - precisely by the concept of turning point; and the morphological aspects - precisely by the concept of grammaticalization; and the semantic aspects - precisely by the concept of a scale and co-varying meanings.

Stating that the turning point is a constituent feature of this dimension - as it is a constituent feature of every operational dimension of language - implies the claim that a distinction between phrasal and sentential possessive expressions belongs to the invariants that hold for all languages. However, this is not tantamount to claiming that every language must show a verb of possession.

6.4. Parallelisms

Further justification for positing a turning point comes from the numerous parallelisms which we were able to point out in chapter 5: A certain phenomenon, assigned to a particular position or technique to the left of the turning point was found to be exactly parallel to a phenomenon assigned to a corresponding position to the right of the

turning point. For convenience's sake I shall recall the following instances:

1. Verbs of possession show differentiations that indicate the mode of establishing a possessive relation. The differentiations are parallel to the ones found in the domain of non-sentential possession. In both domains we found: subprograms of classification, of location and directionality, of contact and control (see summary at end of 5.6.6.3.).
2. The role of the verb to have among the verbs of POSSESSION was found to be parallel to the role of the genitive among the case markings in the following two independent respects:
 - (a) both show an inclination toward being attracted by the main verb. For the genitive, these are the phenomena connected with "transitivity and possession" - type "eius est factum (operam)" vs. "eius est vestimentum" (5.5.5., ex. (114)). For the verb to have, these are the phenomena connected with the so-called periphrastic forms of the verb - type "habeo factum (operam)" vs. "habeo vestimentum" (5.6.6.2.).
 - (b) Both genitive and to have evoke in their constructions a multitude of possible interpretations not found with other case forms or other verbs of POSSESSION (see 5.5.1. and 5.6.6.2.).

The motivation for both (a) and (b) phenomena seems to me to be the same: Both are due to the unmarked, unspecified status

which the genitive has within the case forms, and which to have has within the verbs of POSSESSION. It is thus legitimate to say - with regard to the dimension of POSSESSION - that the role of the genitive case marking within the noun phrase corresponds to the role of to have within the possessive sentence.

6.5. Transitional zones

The dimension is structured by the turning point and by the parallelisms as pointed out in the forgoing section. It is also structured by a few zones of transition which were pointed out in chapter 5. I recall the following: Genitive and dative were found to represent a zone of transition from predominantly adnominal to predominantly adverbial relations. The dative in particular, combining such features as peripherality ("Randkasus") and participation or interest of the subject, proved to be equally usable for indicating a more inherent, a more intimate possessive relationship, or, on the contrary, for establishing a less intimate possessive relationship (5.5.5.).

It also appeared that connectives (5.3.) form a transitional zone between implicit and explicit possessive relationship.

6.6. Inferred operational programs

We are now ready for interpreting the systematizations presented so far. Scales of different hierarchical levels, a turning point, parallelisms between corresponding positions on the scale, and zones of transition are all observable - and hitherto badly neglected - facts relevant to the expression of POSSESSION. They all transcend the narrow framework of a category-oriented "thing-grammar" as represented, e.g. by categorial grammar, case grammar, or the various subspecies of generative transformational grammar. On the other hand, they necessitate the construction of a framework of wider scope, one that integrates all the structures and categories encountered in the course of this study, without being coextensive with them.

Our interpretation of the facts just mentioned is dynamic: It states that POSSESSION, linguistically speaking, is not a category but an operational program - with subprograms - and a corresponding cluster of functions.

Regarding operational programs, our inference is to the effect that the multifarious and seemingly widely diverging aspects of POSSESSION can be linguistically expressed because there is a pathway to be followed by the mind, a pathway that shows a starting point, a continuity of steps, zones of transition, a turning point, and correspondances, also eventual side-paths or paths connecting with other pathways. Since we do find starting points - the unmarked categories -,

continuity of steps - the scales -, and all the rest in the observable facts, our interpretation as operational programs seems the only one possible.

The facts even allow us to go farther than that. We found that the overall scale of the dimension shows directionality, and that it is bi-directional. For the dynamic interpretation this means that two converse or opposite forces are constantly at work in the process of constructing expressions of POSSESSION: One takes inherent possession as the starting point and strives to establish the possessive relation by ever more syntacticized (regularity (B)), more predicative (regularity (C)), and more marked means (regularity (D)). The other force or tendency starts out from maximally explicit and syntacticized structures and works toward ever more grammaticalized, obligatory, morphological means of expression (regularity (E)).

We are now also ready for pointing out the invariances in the linguistic domain of POSSESSION. To ask: What are the universal categories of possession? is certainly asking the wrong question. For none of the categories encountered in this domain can we be absolutely certain of finding it in all the languages of the world. The continuum in (A) presents in sequence a number of positions which we call techniques. I do not mean to say that these techniques are present in every language: Clearly, this is not the case; the majority of languages, e.g., do not show a technique of possessive classifiers. Nor do I mean to say that it is a complete ré-

pertoire of techniques found in the languages of the world. I may have overlooked some. If such a technique should turn up, some day, and if it is a genuine technique of POSSESSION, I can be certain that it will fit into the continuum in (A) without creating any discontinuities. It may be said, however, that (A) constitutes a representative pool of techniques from which each language makes its own selection (see Stachowiak 1981:14).

The true invariants of linguistic POSSESSION are operational ones. They are constituted by the regularities as formulated under (B) - (I). They must be supplemented by functional considerations.

6.7. Inferred functions

I propose the following regularities as resulting from our analyses and systematization:

- (J) POSSESSION is a relation between substance and substance; in syntactic terms this means a relation between nominal and nominal, representing, respectively, the POSSESSOR and the POSSESSUM.

This does not exclude the possibility of verbs being involved in or contributing to the expression of POSSESSION. In a normal utterance, nominals or noun phrases contract relations not only amongst themselves, but also with the main verb. With regard to the latter, we have seen that, if the language is a case language, the cases involved signal

relations that are peripherally or marginally adverbial, but predominantly adnominal (5.5.5.). If a possessive relation is predicated by means of a verb of possession, its predicative potential must include a metalinguistic component; that is to say that it must be able to relate to the mode of the relationship between the two nominals (5.6.6.1.).

(K) The relation of POSSESSION is constituted by the two complementary functional principles of "inherent relation" (also called intimate relation) vs. "established relation". The two principles are not contradictory but complement each other in every possessive expression.

We have seen that the two functional principles are copresent not only in the overall program of the dimension but also in the subprograms that constitute the different techniques. The traditional exclusive categorization into "inalienable" or "alienable" possession must be given up in favour of our functional - operational framework which enables us to recognize two converse principles complementing each other. We have applied the terms of "ground" vs. "figure" to the principle of "inherence" vs. "establishing" respectively (5.7.2.). This can be interpreted in two ways according to the bi-directionality of our operational programs: (a) in the sense of regularities (C) and (D), where establishing is achieved by predicativity and markedness; (b) in the sense of regularity (E), where the "figure" refers back to the

"ground". This will be further explicated in the two regularities to follow.

(L) From "egocentricity" to "establishing". This can be explained by stating the following instructions based on our operational programs (dimension and techniques): "Assume that POSSESSOR is a (human) individual, ideally that it equals EGO. Assume further that POSSESSUM is either a person or a thing intimately connected with EGO, thus a kinsman, a body part, etc. If both assumptions are optimally fulfilled, a minimum of semantic and morpho-syntactic apparatus is needed. If one or the other or both assumptions are fulfilled less than optimally, start introducing material in the sense of predicativity and markedness. If one or the other or both assumptions are fulfilled more than minimally, you may still have the operation of either introducing or not introducing such material."

This accounts not only for the personal hierarchy scale (4.2.3.5.), but also for POSSESSOR pronoun ranging before POSSESSOR noun (5.2.2.), POSSESSOR proper noun before POSSESSOR common noun (5.2.5.), word group before compound (5.2.6.) and before POSSESSOR adjective (5.2.7.), and all the techniques subsequent to juxtaposition; furthermore for kin terms and/or body parts ranging before other part/whole relationship and before material belongings.

(M) From "establishing" to "self-reflexivity". This relates to the inverse direction in the operational

programs and can be explicated in terms of the following instructions: "Assume that a given possessive expression, no matter how much marked and how predicative, relates to EGO and to intimate possession. Use it accordingly. You may underline this by introducing features that point to the participation of 'self', e.g. middle voice, the state of 'self', e.g. stative verbs, the interest of 'self', e.g. dative case or self-reflexivity" (see 5.7.3. and 5.6.6.4.).

It is easy to see that, while (L) is stated from the point of view of the sender or speaker, (M) represents the receiver's or hearer's point of view. It is also plausible that the antinomy between the two may create a functional and structural imbalance which must then, eventually, be resolved by re-applying (L). This would account for the cyclicities which we occasionally found in our analyses (5.2.1., 5.6.6.4.).

(N) POSSESSOR topic to POSSESSUM comment. This can again be explicated in terms of the following instructions: "Take POSSESSOR as the starting point, as the given, the topic; take POSSESSUM as the comment. This is most readily achieved, i.e. with the least effort of morpho-syntactic machinery, when a POSSESSUM is so chosen as to refer back to POSSESSOR, i.e. when POSSESSUM is an "inalienable" noun" (see 5.1.).

(O) From POSSESSUM topic to POSSESSOR comment. This

would correspond to the following instructions: "Take POSSESSUM as the topic, and POSSESSOR as the comment. This will in any event involve more cost in morpho-syntactic apparatus than the reverse strategy in (N), because the normal and expected distribution is that of POSSESSOR topic and POSSESSUM comment. It can best be done by indicating that POSSESSOR refers back to POSSESSUM, i.e. by 'POSSESSOR interested' (dative, 5.5.1.; middle voice, 5.6.6.4.), 'POSSESSOR in a state' (stative verbs, 5.6.6.2.), 'POSSESSOR reflexive' (reflexive pronoun, 5.7.3.).

6.8. Typology

The regularities and instructions or strategies as formulated in the above may account for the "phenomenology of POSSESSION". This means that they explicate the functions involved and indicate what kinds of expression serve the functional purposes, how the expressions are related to one another, and, generally, why they are the way they are.

The formulas (A) through to (O) will not be sufficient to justify the particular choice that a speaker of a particular language makes in order to express a particular mode of POSSESSION. We are not (yet) able to write a computer program that gives us the desired possessive expression for any particular language of the world. But, jokes aside, there is one essential component to increase accountability that

has not been considered so far, and that will not be considered extensively in this study: typology. Typology in my view (see Seiler 1979), uncovers the operational programs accounting for the ways in which a group of languages - and, as a limiting case, a particular language - makes its choice among the possibilities as systematized in the dimensions and techniques. It has to uncover "preferred connections" (see Skaličková 1969) in the first place. Thus considering our dimension as represented in (A), a typological study should answer questions such as these: What are the conditions for the emergence of verbs of POSSESSION in general, and of certain verbs of POSSESSION in particular? Or what are the conditions for the appearance of possessive classifiers? Or of possessive cases? Or for the appearance of special inherence markers?¹⁵ Clearly, in order to find answers to these questions, we would have to go beyond the limits of the dimension of POSSESSION. For, evidently, a language can only develop possessive cases when it shows cases otherwise. This is thus a separate perspective and a separate direction of research, which must be undertaken in order to complement our phenomenological approach. It can be undertaken, as I think, much better than before on the basis of our dimensional work and the discovery of invariants.

In a loose kind of terminology it is often talked about "the typology of POSSESSION" (see, e.g. Ultan 1978, Fillmore 1968). It seems to me that what is involved here is, for

the most part, a phenomenological, "universalistic" interest, and not typology as outlined in the above. The two must be distinguished from one another; only then can we see how they complement each other.

6.9. Diachrony and explanation

(P) Language change works along the sequence of steps in the scales. This is a striking confirmation of our contention that the scales are to be interpreted as operational programs, and that speakers and listeners construct linguistic expressions of POSSESSION along the lines of the program.

In accordance with the bi-directional nature of the dimension we expect forces of change to work in two directions: in the direction toward establishing the possessive relationship by using ever more explicit means [predicativity (C), markedness (D), from egocentricity to establishing (L)]; and in the converse direction of "retreating" toward inherence of the possessive relationship [grammaticalization (E), from establishing to self-reflexivity (M)]. A clear case was found in the continuum of verbs of POSSESSION (5.6.6.4.). Replacing in Latin mihi est domus 'to me is a house' by habeo domum 'I have a house' is resorting to more explicit means for establishing the possessive relation. They are more explicit, because, amongst other things, habeo is person-differentiated (see Boeder 1980a) and shows object government. On the other

hand, the development of originally dynamic verbs meaning 'to seize', 'to take', 'to grasp' toward stative verbs and "mere indicators of POSSESSION" occurring in the middle voice and/or in the perfect tense is a "retreat" toward inherence and participation or interest of the subject/POSSESSOR. It is also certainly not by accident that most verbs of POSSESSION are intimately connected with body parts, thus with 'self': 'take', 'hold', 'seize', 'grasp' with the HAND, German besitzen with the BEHIND, etc.

Many more phenomena of POSSESSION can be explained historically on the basis of our operational framework. It suffices to go through Ultan's repertoire of features in his "typology" (1978): He states (l.c., 26) that less intimate POSSESSION is most often represented by free forms, more intimate POSSESSION by bound forms. This can be generalized further by saying that expressions of inherent POSSESSION are less complex than expressions of established POSSESSION. It is in accordance with the principles of predicativity (C) and markedness (D). Furthermore it is stated (l.c., 23) that the structure gen-∅ [for POSSESSOR-POSSESSUM] "would clearly emerge as the dominant basic type for all substantival possessive constructions". This would imply that, in order to be recognizable as POSSESSOR, a nominal needs to have a special mark, no matter whether it appears in inherent or in established POSSESSION; a POSSESSUM, however, does not need a special mark when it appears in in-

herent POSSESSION; it may even imply a POSSESSOR. We have found "POSSESSOR deletion" (5.2.3.1.) but no "POSSESSUM deletion". There may be ellipsis of the POSSESSUM, as in John's for John's house or John's object (previously mentioned). But ellipsis and deletion are not the same.

An important feature is represented by the affinities between personal possessives and object pronoun forms of the verb (Ultan, l.c., 29), discussed above (5.5.2.) and compared with affinities between possessives and subject pronoun forms of the verb. What seems to be a contradiction, can be resolved in the light of our two complementary functional principles of inherence vs. establishing and of our two converse strategies called "from egocentricity to establishing" (L), and "from establishing to self-reflexivity" (M): Active, acquired POSSESSION needs to be represented in the establishing way, and it requires a POSSESSOR ~ agent ~ subject who does the acquiring. In stative, inherent POSSESSION the POSSESSOR is not an agent, hence not a subject, but rather an experiencer, hence an object.

6.10. Assimilation and accomodation

Would it be possible, on the basis of our observations, inferences, regularity and strategy statements proposed thus far, to account for the operations of the human mind necessary to represent the relationship of POSSESSION by linguistic means? The following is a first attempt at devising an

appropriate formula and it is of rather symbolic value, intended to indicate the direction in which we were heading; no doubt much further empirical and theoretical, also interdisciplinary, work will be necessary in order to arrive at a conclusive formulation.

(Q) With regard to the task of expressing POSSESSION by means of language two forces or "pulls", formulated as strategies, were found to be constantly at work, counterbalancing each other, as it were: 1. The "pull" from inherent possessive relationship ("egocentricity") toward establishing a possessive relation (L).

It implies that EGO creates new structures in order to accommodate to the realities of the outside world, in particular to accommodate relationships to things and persons which are outside his "sphère personnelle", and which he therefore cannot take for granted. This is the realistic approach, and it may be called accommodation.

2. The inverse "pull" going from established to inherent relationship and to "self-reflexivity" (M) implies that EGO assimilates expressions for relationships that are outside his "sphère personnelle" to his known "schemata" for inherent, intimate POSSESSION. This is the autistic approach, and it may be called assimilation.

This comes as close as one may wish to J. Piaget's concepts

of accomodation and assimilation, as the two converse forces constituting the adaption of an organism with regard to its environment.¹⁶ For Piaget, the two forces are found to mutually dominate or be dominated in the early stages of the mental development of the child, thus creating imbalance. Only when these two forces acquire their full directionality, and, at the same time, their full "equilibration", the processes become reversible; and only when reversibility is achieved can we speak of a true mental operation.

The time seems to have come to understand linguistic structures as representing the traces of linguistic operations, and the latter as being closely akin to other mental operations.

FOOTNOTES

¹The situation is curiously analogous to the situation of the word as a linguistic unit (see Seiler 1962, 1962a).

²See H. Weinrich (1969).

³A rich bibliography can be found in M.A. Žurinskaja's study of the nominal possessive constructions and the problem of inalienable possessivity (1977:194-258). More bibliographical material is presented in two other contributions of the same, relevant volume on "categories of existence and possession in language", edited by V.N. Jarceva (1977): E.M. Vol'f (144-193) and O.N. Seliverstova (5-77).

⁴On this notion see K. Heger's theoretical contributions as expounded, e.g., in his paper on valence (1966:138 ff.).

⁵For the following I am indebted to H. van den Boom who delivered an unpublished UNITYP progress report on July 17, 1981.

⁶For Ancient Greek compare the relevant presentation in Risch (1974:182 ff.).

⁷For English this has been stated categorially by Ljung (1974:82), who points out that there are no bahuvrihi compounds *smallhouse, *redbook, *bigcar to refer to people with small houses, red books or big cars, since houses, books, and cars are not normally considered to be "inalienably possessed".

⁸A rich and well-ordered display is found in Lentz (1958:209 ff.).

⁹On the general context of N-i N constructions see Seiler (1960:118 f.).

¹⁰M. Reh et al., in their article on inherence in possessive constructions in African languages (1981:19) call this, quite appropriately, verbal attraction.

¹¹In an unpublished project paper, A. Biermann (1981) has convincingly pointed out the linking role of the dative within a continuum of Hungarian adnominal and adverbial relations.

¹²See E. Clark (1978:85-126) with ample references.

¹³Cf. the pertinent remarks in Coseriu (1979:41).

¹⁴There is a striking resemblance between our concepts of a continuum including one or several turning points and R. Thom's catastrophe theory (see Thom 1978:79 ff). The analogy cannot be pursued here any further, but will be considered more thoroughly in a later study.

¹⁵A valuable first installment to broach this latter question is due to Reh et al. (1981).

¹⁶See among other publications, his "le jugement et le raisonnement chez l'enfant" (1967), and "La psychologie de l'intelligence", preface of the German translation by H. Aebli (1947), furthermore the glossary in his "Genetic Epistemology" (1970).

REFERENCES

- Allan, Edward Jay. 1975/6. Inalienable possession in some Ethiopian languages. *Afrika und Übersee* 59.4:300-307.
- Allen, W. Sidney. 1964. Transitivity and possession. *Language* 40.3:337-343.
- Anderson, Lloyd B. 1974. The part-whole squish, main- vs. subsidiary predications, and why 'grammatical insertion' is like 'lexical insertion'. *CLS* 10:1-16.
- Bach, E. 1967. Have and be in English syntax. *Language* 43:462-85.
- Bally, Charles. 1926. L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes. F.Fankhauser & J.Jud (eds.), *Festschrift Louis Gauchat*. Aarau: Sauerländer. 68-78.
- Beaumont, C.H. 1979. The Tigak Language of New Ireland. *Pacific Linguistics, Series B - No. 58*. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Benveniste, Emile. 1950. Actif et moyen dans le verbe. *Journal de Psychologie normale et pathologique* 43:121-129.
- Benveniste, Emile. 1952. La construction passive du parfait transitif. *BSL* 48.1:52-62.
- Benveniste, Emile. 1967/1974. Fondements syntaxiques de la composition nominale. *BSL* 62:15-31 (= *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, II. 145-162. Paris: Gallimard).
- Benveniste, Emile. 1969. *philos. Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. 1. Economie, parenté, société. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit. 335-353.
- Biermann, Anna. 1981. Wechselbeziehungen adnominaler und adverbaler Relationen im Ungarischen. Unpublished UNITYP project report. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Bird, Charles S. 1972. The syntax and semantics of possession in Bambara. *Conference on Manding Studies*. SOAS. London: Mimeograph.
- Boas, Franz. 1911. Tsimshian. In: Franz Boas (ed.), *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, Vol. 1:283-422. Washington: Government Printing Office.
- Boeder, Winfried. 1980. 'Haben' in den Kartwelsprachen. In: Lehmann, Christian and Gunter Brettschneider (eds.), *Wege zur Universalienforschung*. *Festschrift für Hansjakob Seiler zum 60. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 207-217.

- Boeder, Winfried. 1980a. Probleme der Geschichte von 'haben'. Preliminary version. Oldenburg: Mimeograph.
- Brockelmann, Carl. 1908/12. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen. Band I: Laut- und Formenlehre. Band II: Syntax. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.
- Clark, Eve V. 1978. Locational: Existential, Locative and Possessive Constructions. In: Greenberg, Joseph H. (ed.). 1978. Universals of Human Language. Vol 4: Syntax. Stanford, Ca.: Stanford University Press. 85-126.
- Clasen, Bernd. 1981. Inhärenz und Etablierung. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (akup 41).
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1970. Semantik, innere Sprachform und Tiefenstruktur. In: Eugenio Coseriu. Sprache. Strukturen und Funktionen. XII Aufsätze. Ed, by Uwe Petersen. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 213-224.
- Coseriu, Eugenio. 1979. Verbinhalt, Aktanten, Diathese. Zur japanischen Ukemi-Bildung. In: Sprache und Sprechen. Festschrift für Eberhard Zwirner zum 80. Geburtstag. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. 35-56.
- Elbert, S.H. 1965/66. The 127 Rennellese possessives. Acta Linguistica Hafniensia IX:16-24.
- Fillmore, Charles F. 1968. The case for case. In: Emmon Bach & Robert T. Harms (eds.), Universals in Linguistic Theory. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston. 1-90.
- Foley, William A. 1980. Toward a universal typology of the noun phrase. Studies in Language 4.2.:171-199.
- Frei, Henri. 1939. Sylvie est jolie des yeux. In: Mélanges de linguistiques offerts à Charles Bally. Ed. by Albert Sechehayé et al. Genève: Georq. 185-194.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement. In: Charles N. Li (ed.), Subject and Topic. New York: Academic Press. 149-188.
- Haas, Mary R. 1940. Tunica. Extract from Handbook of American Indian Languages, vol. IV. New York: J.J. Augustin. 1-143.
- Havers, Wilhelm. 1911. Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indo-germanischen Sprachen. Straßburg: Trübner.
- Heger, Klaus. 1966. Valenz, Diathese und Kasus. ZRPh 82:138-170.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1977. Syntax of body parts. In: E.R. Byarushengo, A. Duranti, Larry M. Hyman (eds.), Haya Grammatical Structure. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 6:99-118.

- Isačenko, Alexander. 1974. On 'have' and 'be' languages.
A typological sketch. *Slavic Forum* 356:43-77.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1931/1971. Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums.
In: Roman Jakobson. *Selected Writings, Vol. II: Word and Language*. 1971:130-147. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1936/1971. Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre.
In: Roman Jakobson. *Selected Writings, Vol. II: Word and Language*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton. 23-71.
- Jarceva, V.N. (ed.). 1977. Kategorii bytija i obladanija v jazyke.
Akademia Nauk SSSR Institut jazykoznanija. Moskva: Nauka.
- Kay, Paul & Karl Zimmer. 1976. On the semantics of compounds and genitives in English. *Sixth California Linguistics Association Conference Proceedings*. San Diego State University. 29-35.
- Kielhorn, Franz. 1888/1965. *Grammatik der Sanskrit Sprache*. Berlin: Dümmler. (reprinted by Steiner, Wiesbaden)
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1968. Observations on French possessives. *Language* 44:51-75.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1972. Possessives in Classical Nahuatl. *IJAL* 38:173-186.
- Lee, Ke-dong. 1975. *Kusaiean Reference Grammar*. PALI Language Texts: Micronesia. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1980. The linguistic operation in language typology and universals research. Paper read at the Symposium on Language Universals, Trier, 10 - 12 march 1980.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1981. Latin cases and preverbs. Unpublished paper. University of Cologne.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1982. Universal and typological aspects of agreement. In: Seiler, H. and F.-J. Stachowiak (eds.). 1982. *Apprehension, Vol. II*. Tübingen: G. Narr. (in print)
- Lentz, Wolfgang. 1958. Das Neupersische. In: B. Spuler & H. Kees (eds.). *Handbuch der Orientalistik, Bd. 4, Abschnitt 1*. Leiden - Köln: Brill.
- Lévy-Bruhl. 1914. L'expression de la possession dans les langues mélanésiennes. *Memoire de la Société de linguistique de Paris*. 1914. t.19, Fasc.2. 96ff.
- Ljung, Magnus. 1974. Some remarks on antonymy. *Language* 50:74-88.
- Lyons, John. 1967. A note on possessive, existential, and locative sentences. *Foundations of Language* 3:390-396.
- Manessy, Gabriel. 1962. La relation génitive dans quelques langues Mandé. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguistics*. Cambridge, Mass. The Hague: Mouton. 467-475.

- Mosel, Ulrike. 1980. A few remarks on possessive phrases in Austronesian languages. Unpublished UNITYP paper. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Mosel, Ulrike. 1981a. Possessive phrases in Tolai. Unpublished UNITYP paper. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Mosel, Ulrike. 1981b. Nominaldetermination im Tolai. Unpublished UNITYP paper. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Ostrowski, Manfred. 1981. Zu Fragen der Possession, der Lokalisation und der Verbvalenz in drei kaukasischen Sprachen (Tscherkessisch, Georgisch und Tabarsaranisch). Unpublished UNITYP paper. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Piaget, J. 1947. La Psychologie de l'Intelligences. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin. [German translation 1971: Psychologie der Intelligenz. Mit einer Einführung von Hans Aebli. Olten, Freiburg: Walter-Verlag.]
- Piaget, J.⁶ 1967. Le jugement et le raisonnement chez l'enfant. Nauchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé. [German translation 1972: Urteil und Denkprozess des Kindes. Sprache und Lernen Band 9. Düsseldorf: Schwann.]
- Piaget, J. 1970. Genetic Epistemology. New York/London: Columbia University Press. [German translation 1973: Einführung in die genetische Erkenntnistheorie. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.]
- Ramat, Paolo. 1981. Ein Beispiel von 'Reanalysis': habere + PPP. Lecture delivered on 16th July 1981. Department of Linguistics, University of Cologne.
- Reh, Mechtild & Bernd Heine & Marcello Lamberti. 1981. Inhärenz in Possessivkonstruktionen afrikanischer Sprachen. Unpublished UNITYP paper. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Risch, Ernst.² 1974. Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter. 182-186.
- Rosén, Hajim B. 1959. Die Ausdrucksform für 'veräußerlichen' und 'unveräußerlichen Besitz' im Frühgriechischen. Das Funktionsfeld von homer. φίλος. *Lingua* 8:264-293.
- Sapir, Edward. 1917. Review of Het identificeerend karakter der possessieve flexie in talen van Nord-America by C.C. Uhlenbeck. *IJAL* 1:86-90.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1960. Relativsatz, Attribut und Apposition. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1962. Zum Verhältnis von Wort und Satz in indogermanischen Sprachen. In: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft. Sonderheft 15. 163-174.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1962a. On defining the word. In: Horace G. Lunt (ed.). 1964. Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists 1962. Den Haag et al.: Mouton. 767-770.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1973. On the semanto-syntactic configuration 'Possessor of an Act'. In: Issues in Linguistics. Papers in Honor of Henry and Renée Kahane. Ed. by Braj Kachru et al. Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 836-853.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1973a. Zum Problem der sprachlichen Possessivität. Folia Linguistica VI, 3/4 1973:231-50.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1975. The principle of concomitance: Instrumental, comitative, and collective. Foundations of Language 12:215-247.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1977. Cahuilla Grammar. Banning, Ca.: Malki Museum Press.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1979. Language Universals Research, Language Typology and Individual Grammar. Papers of the First Meeting of the Working Group on General Typology, Debrecen, June 3rd to 8th 1979 (to appear in Publications of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences).
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1980a. Two types of Cahuilla kinship expressions: inherent and establishing. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (akup 39).
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1981. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen (Apprehension). In: Seiler, H. (ed.). 1981. (in print)
- Seiler, Hansjakob and Ch. Lehmann (eds.). 1981. Apprehension. Das sprachliche Erfassen von Gegenständen. Tübingen: Narr (in pr.)
- Seiler, Hansjakob. forthcoming. Inherent vs. established relation, proximity vs. obviation, and two types of Cahuilla kinship expressions. IJAL 1982. A preliminary version is published under the title Two types of Cahuilla kinship expressions: inherent and establishing. Köln: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (akup 39).
- Seiler, Hansjakob, F.-J. Stachowiak (eds.). 1982. Apprehension, Vol II (in print). Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Seliverstova, O.N. 1977. Semantičeskij analiz existencial'nych i possessivnych konstrukcij v anglijskom jazyke. In: Jarceva, V.N. (ed.). 1977:5-67.

- Skalička, V. 1969. Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Typologie. Tübingen: Romanisches Seminar.
- Stachowiak, F.-J. 1981. Ansätze zur sprachlichen Universalienforschung. Vortrag gehalten an der Rhein.-Westf. Technischen Hochschule Aachen. Abteilung Neurologie. Juni 1981. Manuskript.
- Steele, Susan. 1977. On being possessed. BLS 3:114-131.
- Thom, René. 1978. La double dimension de la grammaire universelle. In: Seiler, H. (ed.). 1978. Language Universals. Papers from the Conference held at Gummersbach/Cologne, Germany, October 3-8 1976. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. 79-87.
- Uhlenbeck, C.C. 1917. Het identificeerend karakter der possessieve flexie in talen van Noord-America. Reprinted from Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afdeling Letterkunde, 5e Reeks, Deel II. Amsterdam. 345-371.
- Ulan, Russell. 1978. Toward a typology of substantival possession. In: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.). Universals of Human Language. Vol 4: Syntax. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 11-50.
- Vol'f, E.M. 1977. Nekotorye osobennosti mestoimennych possessivnykh konstrukcij (ivero-romanskije jazyki). In: Jarceva, V.N. (ed.) 1977:144-193.
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1908. Genetiv und Adjektiv. Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Ferdinand de Saussure. Paris: Champion. 125-152.
- Watkins, Calvert. 1967. Remarks on the genitive. To Honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the occasion of his 70th birthday. The Hague, Paris: Mouton. Vol. III:2191-2198.
- Weinrich, H. 1969. Textlinguistik: Zur Syntax des Artikels in der deutschen Sprache. Jahrbuch für internationale Germanistik 1:1, 73.
- Žurinskaja, M.A. 1977. Immenye possessivnye konstrukcii i problema neottoržimoj prinadležnosti. In: Jarceva V.N. (ed.). 1977: 194-258.

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: Instrumental, 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 -Operators", 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 akup 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 Boon, Holger. 1978. "Paradigmenwechsel als Notationswechsel: Saussure - Chomsky".
32. Hohenstein, Elmar. 1978. "Von der Hintergebarkeit 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. Hohenstein, Elmar. 1979. "Zur Begrifflichkeit der Universalienforschung in der Linguistik und Anthropologie".
36. Lehmann, Christian. 1979. "Der Relativsatz. 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-Josef. 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, Bernd. 1981. "Inhärenz und Etablierung."