

ASSIDUE

Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt

Nr. 8

Possession in Hocąk (Winnebago)

Problems for a prototype approach

Johannes Helmbrecht

November 2003

ISSN 1612-0612

Erfurt

**Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft
der Universität**

Impressum:

Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt

Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft

Philosophische Fakultät

Universität

D - 99105 Erfurt

Herausgeber:

Prof. Dr. Christian Lehmann

© bei den Autoren

ISSN 1612-0612

Contents:

1. Introduction	4
1.1 Seiler's prototype approach to possession	6
1.2 Typological evidence and predictions	8
1.3 A brief typology of possessive constructions	9
1.4 Goals and method of the survey	11
2. Attributive possession in Hocank	12
3. Nominalized possessive clauses	15
3.1 With a lexical human possessor.....	15
3.2 With a pronominal possessor.....	18
4. Predicative Possession in Hocank	23
5. Indirect participation.....	25
5.1 Benefactive applicative.....	26
5.2 A non-actor is possessor of undergoer	28
5.3 Reflexive possession.....	31
6. Summary and conclusions	34
7. References	37

1. Introduction

Possession is a functional domain of language. Probably all languages have conventionalized means to express possessive relations between a person, called the possessor, and his or her belongings, the possessum. Possession subsumes the specific relations a possessor may have to his possessum within his or her bio-cultural sphere. It is the relation of a human being to his kinsmen, body parts, his material belongings, and his cultural and intellectual products (cf. Seiler 1988:82). It is difficult to find one general and unifying notion of possession that allows subsuming all possessive constructions language-internally as well as cross-linguistically. The reason is that the properties of the possessor and/ or the possessum may vary significantly resulting in very different types of possession.

The possessor is most frequently a highly individuated human being occupying a high position on the empathy hierarchy, highly topical (pronominal and nominal) third persons, and speech act participants such as first and second person (singular) pronouns. Sometimes, however, languages also allow entities that are very low on the empathy hierarchy - e.g. inanimate objects - in the same possessive constructions functioning as possessors. These are then part-whole relationships such as English

- E 1 (a) *the leaves of the tree*
 (b) *the wheels of the car*

that represent a type of possession that is not really compatible with the standard ontological notion of possession as ownership as it is prevailing in western societies and cultures.

The same can be observed with regard to different properties of the possessum. A kinsman such as father cannot be possessed in the same way as a head, a bicycle or an emotional property or state such as sadness, cf. the examples in E 2a-d.

- E 2 (a) *my father*
 (b) *my head*
 (c) *my sadness*
 (d) *my bicycle*

Kinship relations, and particularly ascending kin relations are given from birth, the possessor has no influence or control over it. The same holds for the possession of body parts and to a

lesser extent with regard to feelings and other mental states that are rather experienced than controlled by the possessor. Otherwise, control is an almost defining property of possession in the sense of ownership. The possessive construction in E 2d comes close to this concept of ownership in a legal sense which includes full control of the possessor over the possessum. But even here differences are possible. The possession of the bicycle for instance can be only temporary (a kind of borrowed ownership) or may be permanent. These different types of possession are treated equally in English employing the same construction with a possessive pronoun (possessor) and a noun (possessum). Other languages have different construction for these types of possession. It will be shown below that Hocak has three different constructions for E 2a-d.

Cognitive approaches to possession tried to deal with this variety of possessive relations in two different ways. One way is to assume that possession is a cluster of different cognitive concepts including ownership, kinship and part-whole relations etc. (cf. Langacker 1993), the other way is to assume a common prototype notion explaining the different types of possessive relations in terms of closeness and deviation from this prototype. The later approach is more ambitious, because the various concepts of possession are not merely listed as such, but they are also integrated in a theory of this functional domain. This approach was developed by Seiler (1983, 1988; see also Lehmann 1998). Another advantage of the prototype approach à la Seiler is that it makes predictions about markedness properties of possessive constructions in specific languages that are testable. Since this is the most elaborate typological approach of possession up to date it is chosen here to serve as the theoretical background for the description of possession in Hocak.

The object language of this survey is Hocak a language of the Mississippi Valley branch of the Siouan family still spoken by around 200 members of the Hocak tribe in Wisconsin. Another denomination of this tribe is Winnebago, a name traditionally used in the relevant anthropological and linguistic literature. Hocak is the self-denomination of the Wisconsin tribe therefore this name will be used throughout this paper

The goals of the present survey are twofold. First of all, a detailed account of the expressions of possession in Hocak will be given. This survey will later on serve as a part of the grammatical description of Hocak. The second goal is to evaluate the predictions of the prototype approach with regard to the relevant data from Hocak. It will be shown that the Hocak case causes several problems with regard to this approach. Solutions and alternative views that fit better the Hocak data will be sought at the end of this survey (cf. §6). In the

following subsections of this chapter (§1.1-§1.2), a brief summary of Seiler's prototype approach will be given together with the typological predictions in terms of markedness relations that follow from that approach. Subsection (§1.3) gives a summary of different types of possessive constructions found in the languages showing that there are different structural levels or domains where possession is expressed. Attributive possession is mainly expressed within the limits of the noun phrase. Predicative possession is expressed on the clause level. Two cases can be distinguished here. The possessor and possessum are participants of the clause and the possessive relation between them is predicated by the main verb of the clause, or the possessive relation between the participants of the clause is of secondary character treating the possessor as an indirect participant of the clause. The latter includes what is termed external possession marking (cf. Payne & Barshi 1999). This typology provides the structure for the presentation of the possessive constructions in Hocak in the subsequent chapters §§2-5. In subsection §1.4, the goals of the survey are made more explicit and some remarks on the source of the data and the method are made.

1.1 Seiler's prototype approach to possession

Possession is a binary and asymmetric relation between two entities, the possessor and the possessum. The possessum is a part of the bio-cultural sphere of the possessor and belongs to the possessor. The prototype notion of possession is solely dependent on the prototypical properties of the possessor and the possessum. There is no separate relator between them that creates the relation or designates the nature of the relation. The relevant parameter for the prototypicality of the possessor is the empathy hierarchy (cf. Lehmann 1998:4), i.e. the prototypical possessor is EGO (speech act participants in general), less prototypical possessors are human beings and inanimate objects further below the empathy hierarchy. The prototypical possessum are relational nouns that have an inherent semantic argument position for the possessor. Nouns such as kinship terms, body-part terms, and local nouns imply inherently a relation to a possessor. They establish such a relation to begin with. The noun *father* contains the relation «father of someone», the noun *head* implies the relation «head of someone», and the noun *top* implies the local relation «top of something». The prototype notion of possession is summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Prototypical possessive relation

		POSSESSIVE RELATIONS	
		POSSESSOR---	---POSSESSUM
Prototype	EGO--- SAP---	---kinship ---body-parts ---local nouns	Relational Nouns
Deviation from Prototype	Non-SAP Human Animate Object Substance Location Proposition	Human Animate Object Substance Proposition	Absolute Nouns

Absolute nouns, i.e. non-relational noun, are not able to establish a possessive relation by themselves, there is no inherent necessity in animate and inanimate entities such as bird, tree, stone, or car to be possessed by someone. The relation between a possessor and a possessum in these cases has to be established by additional means, grammatical forms that indicate (or lexical forms that predicate) the possessive relation. It is particularly the movement from a prototypical possessum (relational nouns) to a non-relational, absolute noun as possessum, where the property of control comes into play. If the possessor is high on the empathy hierarchy, and the possessum deviant from the prototype, i.e. a non-relational noun, then a high degree of control between possessor and possessum can be observed. In short, if the possessor (e.g. EGO) owns a house, a car, a bag, a book, etc. he or she controls this possessive relation, because he or she has control over the possessum. Control means that the possessor is responsible for and has the ability to obtain such objects, to keep such object, to use and manipulate such objects, and to give away such objects, i. e. to terminate this possessive relationship (see also Hagège 1993:93ff; Lehmann 1998:6). Hence, established possession subsumes our general notion of ownership.

Both parameters, the empathy hierarchy for possessors, and the distinction between relational vs. non-relational nouns for possessa, are countercurrent to some degree. The higher the possessor is on the empathy hierarchy, the more he or she is assigned control. But if the possessum is high on the relationality scale of nouns, the more this control is reduced. The possession of kinship nouns (in particular ascending blood relations) and body-part nouns (in particular organs and essential parts for surviving) cannot be controlled because these nouns determine (inherently) the nature of the relation (cf. Lehmann 1998:7).

The distinction between inherent and established possession (cf. Seiler 1983:5) is reminiscent to and largely coincides with the traditional distinction between inalienable vs. alienable nouns¹. Alienable nouns usually constitute the open class of this distinction. Alienable nouns comprise possessed animate and inanimate objects that the possessor can control in the above sense. Inalienable nouns are usually the smaller mostly closed class of nouns that comprise kinship terms, body part terms, and local nouns. A finer semantic distinction that occurs here with regard to kinship relations is the distinction between necessary vs. optional relationship, e.g. ascending (mother) vs. descending (son) kinship relations. Body parts may be extended to physical and mental states such as strength and fear (cf. Lichtenberk 1985:105), or to parts of other items such as branch and handle. In addition, nominalizations with a verbal noun as possessum such as «his singing» may belong to the group of inalienable possessive constructions.

However, Seiler made it clear that the distinction between alienable and inalienable nouns cannot be a categorical distinction in a strict sense, because nouns in a specific language may sometimes be used in both constructions of alienable and inalienable possession, and because there is a broad variation among languages with regard to which nouns count as alienable and which ones as inalienable (cf. Seiler 1988:80; see also Chappell & McGregor 1996).

1.2 Typological evidence and predictions

Empirical evidence for the prototype approach to possession is found in markedness relations between different possessive constructions language internally as well as cross-linguistically. There are two central claims with regard to markedness that are associated with this approach. The first one is that the closer a possessive construction is semantically to the prototypical possession in the above sense, the less it is marked. And the other way round: the more a possessive construction in a language deviates from the prototype notion of possession the more marked it is. This means that inherent possession correlates with un-markedness, and established possession with markedness. This claim is supposed to be valid cross-linguistically, i.e. in comparison of possessive constructions in different languages, as well as language internally, comparing alternative possessive constructions in a single language. If

¹ This distinction was first introduced by Lévy-Bruhl (1914) with respect to the expression of possession in Austronesian languages.

there are two alternative possessive constructions in a language, one closer to the prototype, i.e. reserved for more inherent possessive relations than the other, the one for inherent possession is less marked (structurally) than the other. The reason is that possessive constructions with relational nouns as possessa do not need to indicate the nature of the relation by additional grammatical forms, since this relation is inherent in the lexical items.

The second claim is related to the first. The prototypical possessive relation is not marked at all. The construction that corresponds best to the prototypical possession from an iconic point of view is the juxtaposition of two nominals with a personal pronoun (speech act participant) as the possessor and a relational noun as possessum. The fact that many languages utilize indeed this type of construction for the expression of inalienable possession counts as evidence for the assumption of the prototype in Figure 1 rather than another prototype notion such as the notion of ownership.

The predictions of the Seilerian prototype approach for possessive constructions in Hocak are the following.

- a) Constructions expressing inherent possession, i.e. with inalienable nouns as possessa are less marked than alienable possessive construction (established possession). This holds for different types of possessive constructions (different techniques) such as juxtaposition, constructions with connectives, case marking, and possessive verbs, and for constructions on different syntactic levels such as the noun phrase and the clause.
- b) The second prediction associated with the first is that if possession is expressed by juxtaposition, it is reserved (not necessarily exclusively) for inalienable possession. There is an iconic relationship between the semantic type of possession and the markedness of the constructions

1.3 A brief typology of possessive constructions

There are two functional and structural domains where possession is expressed. One is reference within the structural limits of the noun phrase; the other is predication with its structural counterpart of the clause. Within the latter two possibilities have to be distinguished, possession may be predicated by means of a possessive verb with the possessor as a directly involved participant of the clause, or the possessor is only indirectly involved, while the possessum is directly affected by the situation predicated by the verb. All three types of possessive constructions will be illustrated briefly.

There are several types of attributive possession that can be observed in European languages. The most important are summarized in Figure 2 below. One of the most important differences between the last two types, genitive attribute and prepositional attribute, is that the former has the possessor as the attribute of the head noun (possessum), while in the latter the possessum is an attribute to the head noun (possessor). All types given in Figure 2 may be used either for inherent or for established possession.

Figure 2: Attributive possession

Construction type	Structure	Example
Juxtaposition	Noun ₁ Noun ₂ Possessor-Possessum	German: <i>das Regierungsauto</i> «the car of the government»
	Possessive Pronoun Noun Possessor-Possessum	German: <i>mein Auto</i> «my car»
Genitive attribute	Noun ₁ -GEN Noun ₂ Possessor Possessum	English: <i>Peter's car</i>
Prepositional attribute	Noun ₂ PREP Noun ₁ Possessum Possessor	English: <i>the car of the government</i>
	Noun ₂ PREP Noun ₁ Possessum Possessor	English: <i>the man with the red hat</i>

With regard to predicative possession there are in principal two types of possessive verbs. One predicates the possession to the possessor with the possessor as the subject and the possessum as the object of the clause. The other ascribes the possessum to the possessor shifting the possessor in a less central syntactic position as direct object, oblique object, local adjunct, etc. (cf. Heine 1997:29), cf. Figure 3.

Figure 3: Predicative possession

Construction type	Structure	Example
HAVE-type	Subject have Direct Object Possessor Possessum	English: <i>He/ John/ father has a car.</i>
BELONG TO-type	Subject belong to Direct Object/ Oblique/ Local Adjunct Possessum Possessor	English: <i>The car belongs to him/ John/ father</i>

The data for the survey are taken from already published (e.g. Lipkind 1945, White Eagle 1988) or unpublished (e.g. Susman 1943, Zeps 1994) sources as well as from my own field notes.

2. Attributive possession in Hocak

Hocak has no possessive pronouns comparable to English *my, your, his, her, etc.*, no nominal case marking in general, and no genitive case marker in particular. In addition, there are no connectives or linkers, i.e. grammatical forms that indicate a possessive relation between two nominals. The only way to express a possessive relation between two nominals in a noun phrase in a narrow sense is juxtaposition. Such a construction has a rigidly fixed order of elements. The determinans, i.e. the modifying noun always precedes the determinatum, i.e. the head noun of the construction (cf. upper part of Figure 4). The position of the determinans can only be filled with a noun. Elements of other syntactic categories have to follow the head noun (cf. Helmbrecht 2002). However, the juxtaposition of two nominals in Hocak does not only express possessive relations, but also part-whole relations, spatial relations, and specification of a particular nominal concept. The various functions of this construction are summarized in Figure 4 (lower part).

Figure 4: Juxtaposition of two nominals and their functions in Hocak²

Construction	[Noun ₁ Noun ₂ DET] [Determinans Determinatum] [Modifying Noun Head Noun Determiner]
Functions	Possessor Possessum
	Part-Whole Relation
	Spatial Relation
	Classification, Specification of a Nominal Concept

The expression of a possessive relation by means of juxtaposition is restricted to cases where the possessor and the possessum are lexical nominals. If the possessor is a pronoun (a pronominal affix) of no matter what person category, another construction has to be used

² The following abbreviations for the grammatical glosses are used: DET = determiner, DEF = definite article, INDEF = indefinite article, PN = proper name, DECL = declarative, 1, 2, 3, = first, second, and third person, SG = singular, PL = plural, INCL = inclusive, EXCL = exclusive, A = actor, U = undergoer, BEN = benefactive, TR = transitive, INTR = intransitive, APPL.SUPESS = locative applicative superessive, REFL.POSS = reflexive possession, SAP = speech act participants, ST = part of stem.

obligatorily (see §3.2 below). The possessum on the other hand cannot be a pronoun in Hocak, there are no expressions like French *le mien, la mienne* «mine». The following series of examples show that neither the empathy hierarchy – except with regard the pronoun/noun distinction – nor the distinction between relational vs. non-relational nouns have any effect on the expression of attributive possession in Hocak. E 4 is an attributive possessive relation with a proper name as possessor and a kinship term as possessum. The relation is inherent and inalienable. The definite article is required.

E 4 *Petergá hi»abrá*
 |*Peter-gá hi»ak- rá*
 P.- PN father-DEF
 «Peter»s father»

The possessive relation in E 5a is a part-whole relationship with a human possessor and a body part term as possessum. The possessive relation is inherent and inalienable. The same holds for the examples in E 5b-c. The whole possessive noun phrase needs to be specified by a determiner, i.e. the definite article, a demonstrative pronoun, or the indefinite article. The determiner in this position controls the reference of the whole expression. If there is a definite article following the possessor (cf. E 5b), then it is the possession of a specific definite possessor. If the indefinite article follows the possessor (E 5c), it is the possession of an indefinite or unspecific possessor.

E 5 a) *hinúk hisja-rá*
 woman face- DEF
 «The woman»s face»
 b) *hinuk-rá hisja-rá*
 woman-DEF face- DEF
 «The face of the (specific) woman»
 c) *hinuk-ízal hisja-ra*
 woman-INDEF face- DEF
 «The face of a woman»

The possessive relations in E 6 and E 7 are alienable. Both contain non-relational nouns as possessa. The possessor in E 6 is a human being (proper name), the possessum is a (domestic) animal. In E 7, the possessum is an inanimate object.

E 6 *Petergá sùukrá*
/Peter-ga sùuk-ral
 Peter- PN dog- DEF
 «Peter»s dog»

E 7 *John-ga hiratí-ra*
 J. -PN car- DEF
 «John»s car»

The possessive relation in E 8 includes a body part term as possessum (inseparable, inalienable) with a non-human possessor. The example in E 9 represents a part-whole relation with an inanimate object as possessor and an inanimate object as possessum (separable, alienable). Both possessors in E 8 and E 9 can be interpreted either as specific or as generic.

E 8 *wijúk huu-rá*
 cat leg-DEF
 «The leg(s) of the/a cat»

E 9 *wazàtíre hogis-rá*
 car circular.part-DEF
 «The wheel(s) of a/the car»

The type of construction employed for the expression of possession in the preceding examples is also used for the expression of spatial relations. There are numerous local nouns such as *coowé* «front part», *nabké* «back part», *rook* «inside», *híhák* «top, surface», and so on which are used to express the specific local relation of an object vis-à-vis the local region of another object. The local nouns are the possessum in these constructions. They designate the local region of the possessor. The possessor functions as the reference point of the localization, it represents the object with regard to which another one is localized, cf. the examples in E 10a-c. The clitic *=eja* «there» is a local adverb frequently used in these constructions, others are also possible.

- E 10 (a) *sùukrá hirarúti coowéja «aksàhal*
/sùuk-rá hirarúti coowé=eja «ak- sàhal
 dog- DEF car front.of-there be.lying-DECL
 The dog is (in a lying position) in front of the car.
- (b) *sùukrá hirarúti híhákeja jeenal*
/sùuk-rá hirarúti híhák= eja jee- nal
 dog- DEF car on.top.of=there be.standing-DECL
 The dog is (in a standing position) on the top of the car.

- (c) *sùukrá hīrarúti rookéja naksàhal*
l sùuk-rá hīrarúti rook= éja nak- sàhal
 dog-DEF car inside.of=there be.sitting-DECL
 The dog is (in a sitting position) inside of the car.

The constructions in E 4 to

E 10 are structurally equivalent. The possessor precedes the possessum independent of the semantic class of the possessor or the relationality of the possessum. From the point of view of markedness theory, all these constructions are equipollent, i.e. equally marked. The predictions of the prototype approach are not reflected in these data. Relational nouns (kinship nouns, body part nouns, local nouns) with an inherent argument slot for the possessor are possessed structurally in the same way as non-relational nouns. The same type of juxtaposition can also be used on the level of word formation in order to create new nominal concepts. The preceding modifying noun specifies the following noun in order to create a more specific nominal concept. It is a classifying technique; cf. the examples in E 11a-c.

- E 11 (a) *nab+há*
 tree-skin
 «bark»
 (b) *nab+áp*
 tree-leaf
 «tree-leaves/ leaf(s) of a tree»
 (c) *waminák huu*
 chair leg
 «chair-legs/ legs of a chair»

3. Nominalized possessive clauses

3.1 With a lexical human possessor

The juxtaposition of two nouns is a general construction type to express possession and other binary relations. There are, however, alternative possessive constructions especially for possessive relations with kinship terms, domestic (pet) animals, and other animate and inanimate nouns as possessa and lexical human possessors. The alternative constructions are nominalized variants of possessive predications employing different possessive verbs for different types of possessa. The nominalized possessive clauses appear in the same syntactic position as juxtaposed nouns, i.e. in a noun phrase position. This is the reason why they are not subsumed under attributive possession in §2. These nominalized possessive clauses rather

represent a transition from attributive to predicative possession. The general structure of the alternative possessive constructions is given in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Structure of nominalized possessive clauses

[POSSESSOR_i POSSESSUM_j PRO_j-PRO_i-Verb of possession-DET]

If the possessor is a lexical human noun, this construction type competes with the juxtaposition dealt with in the preceding section. If the possessor is a speech act participant or a third person, the construction in Figure 5 is the only possible construction on the level of the noun phrase. In this case, the verb of possession is pronominally inflected for the person category of the possessor. If the possessum is a multitude of entities, the verb of possession exhibits another marker, a third plural undergoer marker, to indicate the plurality of the possessum. This means, person and number of the possessor and the possessum are cross-referenced in the verb of possession utilizing the two different series of pronominal prefixes, the actor series for the possessor and the undergoer series for the possessum (see below §3.2).

The alternative construction of

E 7 (see above) is given in E 12. The verb *hanil* «to own» is a regular (lexical) transitive verb employed for the possession of alienable entities such as inanimate objects, artifacts, animals, and so on. It is restricted to human possessors. Part-whole relations with inanimate possessors are never expressed with this construction. In order to compare the structural properties of both constructions, see the clauses in E 13a-b.

E 12 *John-gá hiratí hanil rá*
 J.- PN car own-DEF
 «John»s car»

E 13 (a) *John-gá hiratí-ra hacáa- nal*
 J.- PN car- DEF 1SG.see-DECL
 «I see John»s car.»
 (b) *John-gá hiratí hanil rá hacáa- nal*
 J.- PN car own-DEF 1SG.see-DECL
 «I see John»s car.»

The example clause in E 13a contains a juxtaposition of two nominals, the example clause in E 13b contains the nominalized clause with *hanil* «to own». Both clauses have the same translation, but speakers indicate that they prefer the nominalized variant over the juxtaposed variant. The same constructional pairs exist for possessive constructions with kinship terms and pet animals (domestic animals), cf. the examples in E 14a-b and

E 15a-b. The a) clauses represent the juxtaposition construction (they are repeated here for convenience), the b) clauses represent the nominalized alternative construction. In all cases, the nominalized constructions are preferred by speakers.

- E 14 (a) *Petergá sùukrá*
/Peter-ga sùuk-ral
 Peter- PN dog- DEF
 «Peter»s dog»
- (b) *Peterga sùuk niñhíra*
/Peter-ga sùuk niñhí- ral
 Peter-PN dog own.pet-DEF
 «Peter»s dog»
- E 15 (a) *Petergá hi»abrá*
/Peter-gá hi»ac- rá
 P.- PN father-DEF
 «Peter»s father»
- (b) *Peterga hi»ác hii- ra*
/Peter-ga hi»ác hii- ral
 P.- PN father make.kin -DEF
 «Peter»s father»

The verbs of possession that are used in the b) clauses are restricted in their usage. The verb =*hii* «X makes Y a kin» can only be used with kinship terms or with terms designating close friends. This verb is homophonous with the causative auxiliary =*hii* «to cause». There are reasons to believe that both verbs are historically cognate, and that they should be considered as different usages of one verb rather than homonyms. The main reason for this analysis is that the causative verb =*hii* has an irregular personal inflection, and the possessive verb =*hii* shows exactly the same irregularities. A literal translation of E 15b is then «the one Peter makes (his) father». The three possessive verbs used in nominalized possessive clauses are summarized in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Verbs of possession in Hocak

Possessor	Possessum	Verbs of possession
Lexical human possessor or Pronominal (SAP) possessor	Kinship (including close social relations such as friendship)	<i>=híí</i>
	Pet animals (usually domestic animals such as dog, cat, horse, etc.)	<i>níhí</i>
	Inanimate objects (including body parts)	<i>haníl</i>

The possessive verb *níhí* is used only with pet animals. Usually, pet animals are domesticated animals such as cats and dogs etc. The boundaries of this class are not clear cut. Historically, *níhí* is presumably a combination of **níl* «to live, living thing» which does not occur independently in Hocak and the causative auxiliary *=híí*. This verb shows the same inflectional irregularities as the causative verb *=híí*.

All three verbs form the same type of possessive construction with lexical human possessors (and pronominal possessors, see §3.2 below). There is no difference between them with regard to structural markedness. But they are definitely more marked than the corresponding juxtaposition constructions. That the nominalized constructions are preferred over the juxtaposed constructions makes the situation even worse for the prototype approach, because it is the relational nouns as possessa that have a preferred alternative construction that belongs to the type of a more established possessive construction. The fact that there are alternative possessive constructions for kinship terms (inalienable possession) confirms the particularity of this class of nouns. On the other hand, there are alternative constructions for pet (domestic) animals and inanimate object including body parts too, and they are structurally not more marked than the kinship possessions.

3.2 With a pronominal possessor

As was indicated in the preceding section, verbs of possession have to be used in nominalized constructions in case that the possessor is a speech act participant or third person, i.e. expressed by a pronominal affix. No alternative constructions do exist for this case. The paradigm of possessive forms with a kinship term as possessum is given in Figure 7. The paradigms for the possession of pet (domestic) animals and inanimate object are with a pronominal possessor are given in Figure 8 and Figure 9.

Figure 7: Possessive paradigm for kinship terms

Possessor	Possessum	Translation
Person category	Rel. Noun : <i>hicuwíl</i>	«aunt (father»s sister)»
1SG	<i>hicuwílhaará</i>	«my aunt»
2SG	<i>hicuwílraagá</i>	«your aunt»
3SG	<i>hicuwílhiirá</i>	«his aunt»
1DU.INCL	<i>hicuwílhihirá</i>	«my and your aunt»
1PL.INCL	<i>hicuwílhihiwíra</i>	«our aunt»
1PL.EXCL	<i>hicuwílhaawíra</i>	«our aunt»
2PL	<i>hicuwílraawíga</i>	«your aunt»
3PL	<i>hicuwílhiíre</i>	«their aunt»

Figure 8: Possessive paradigm for pet (domestic) animals.

Possessor	Possessum	Translation
Person category	Noun: <i>sùuk</i>	«dog»
1SG	<i>sùuk niñháara</i>	«my dog»
2SG	<i>sùuk niñháara /-ga</i>	«your dog»
3SG	<i>sùuk niñhíra</i>	«his dog»
1DU.INCL	<i>sùuk niñhira</i>	«our dog»
1PL.INCL	<i>sùuk niñhávira</i>	«our dog»
1PL.EXCL	<i>sùuk niñhiwira</i>	«our dog»
2PL	<i>sùuk niñhávira/-ga</i>	«your dog»
3PL	<i>sùuk niñhíre</i>	«their dog»

Figure 9: Possessive paradigm for inanimate object.

Possessor	Possessum	Translation
Person category	Non-Rel. Noun: <i>wazàtíre</i>	«car»
1SG	<i>wazàtíre haaníhal</i>	«my car»
2SG	<i>wazàtíre hasihíhal</i>	«your car»
3SG	<i>wazàtíre haníhal</i>	«his car»
1DU.INCL	<i>wazàtíre hiñhíhal</i>	«our car»
1PL.INCL	<i>wazàtíre hiñhíwihal</i>	«our car»
1PL.EXCL	<i>wazàtíre haaníwihal</i>	«our car»
2PL	<i>wazàtíre hasihíwihal</i>	«your car»
3PL	<i>wazàtíre haníthera</i>	«their car»

If the possessum is a plurality of individuals, the verb of possession is always marked for that, cf. the example in E 16 for the possession of a kinsman. The same holds for all three verbs of possession.

E 16 *hícuwíl wahaará*
hícuwíl wa- haa- rá
 aunt 3PL.U-1SG.A.make.kin-DEF
 «my aunts»

Note that the personal inflection of the verb of kinship possession =*hii* is identical in form with the causative verb =*hii*. The kinship term *hícuwíl* «aunt (father)s sister» has a variant form that is used for address purposes, *cuwíl* «(my) aunt!». These address forms of kinship terms often simply lacking the initial syllable *hi-* cannot occur in a possessive construction as exemplified in Figure 7. This seems to be a general rule. Further examples are given in E 17a-c. The reason for this restriction seems to be that the usage of address terms usually implies the kinship relation designated by the kinship address term and EGO, the speaker. Since the possessor can easily be inferred in such a communicative situation, there is no need to specify it.

E 17 (a) *hinúl* «older sister»
nuhúl «older sister (address term)»
 **nuhúlhaara* «my older sister»
 (b) *kuhúga* «first son»
kuhúl «first son (address term)»
 **kuhúlhaara* «my first son»
 (c) *heenaga* «second son»
heenal «second son (address term)»
 **heenalhaara* «my second son»

There is another kind of variation in the paradigm of kinship possession that may be rooted in the mutual knowledge of the interlocutors. The common determiner in possessive constructions with a kinship term is the definite article *ra*. However, in the second person singular and plural the determiner is *ga*, a deictic element also used for the indication of proper names. Lipkind claims that *ga* has to be used exclusively in these instances (cf. Lipkind 1945:31), but Hocak speakers gave me forms that show that there is actually a choice between *-ra* and *-ga* in the second person and in the first person inclusive dual form³; *-ga* is ungrammatical in all other person categories. Phil Mike indicated to me that this choice has to do with the mutual knowledge of the kinsman by both interlocutors. The definite article is used, if the speaker does not know the kinsman (assuming that the hearer knows his or her kinsmen), but *ga* is used when both interlocutors know the person talked about (which is

³ I am particularly grateful to Henning Garvin helping me to collect the relevant forms here.

more naturally the case if the speaker talks about the kinsman of the hearer). This could also explain why *ga* is not allowed, if the possessum is plural.

The demonstrative suffix *ga* is also used with the address forms of kinship terms indicating the first person as possessor. Lipkind (1945:31) says that all kin terms with initial *hi-* take *haará* «my» in the first person, the few ones without it take solely *ga* instead; the reason is that the shorter forms are terms of address while the *hi-* forms are terms for reference. E.g. the form *culwíl* is the address term corresponding to *hiculwíl* «aunt», hence the 1SG possessive form is *culwílga* which translates literally «that aunt» implying that everybody knows that she is the aunt of the speaker (EGO), it is a kind of reduced form of speaking, the address term implies that the person so addressed has the kin relation designated by the term toward the speaker. It is an effect of the Empathy hierarchy. Shared background knowledge of the possessor plays an important role here (cf. also Heine 1997:26f). This can also be interpreted as an instance where the inherent relationality of kin terms leads to a structural reduction of the expression of possession confirming the prediction of the prototype approach.

From the data presented in this section it is evident that the empathy hierarchy plays a significant role in the expression of possession. If the possessor is high on this hierarchy i.e. a SAP or third person, no matter whether the possessum is relational or not, the nominalized construction has to be used instead of the juxtaposition. The predictions of the prototype approach would be in this case that the constructions with a possessor high on the empathy hierarchy, i.e. constructions that are closer to the prototype notion of possession, should be structurally less marked than the construction with a possessor low on the hierarchy. Exactly the reverse is the case. The possessive constructions presented in this section are all structurally more marked than the juxtaposition constructions. They are constructions that belong rather to the established types of possessive construction than to inherent ones. This holds in particular for possessa that are kinship nouns, pet (domestic) animal nouns, and body parts. It holds also for inanimate possessa, but they have never been hypothesized to be relational nouns. The data presented so far indicate that <the relationality of noun does not play a role in the expression of possession in Hocak.

There is an important constructional similarity between kinship possession and localization. The causative auxiliary =*hii* that is used for possession of kinship is also used for the localization of an object with regard to another object employing local nouns for this purpose. The local constructions with =*hii* «make» are illustrated in E 18 and E 19. The structure is as follows: =*hii* is the verb of a subordinated clause together with a local noun

figuring as undergoer and possessum, respectively, and the actor as possessor. This subordinated clause predicates the local position of the argument in the matrix clause, cf. Figure 10. The examples in E 18 and E 19 illustrate this construction. The difference between them is that the former has a lexical nominal as actor/ possessor of =*hii* while the latter has a pronominal actor/ possessor.

Figure 10: Structure of localization by means of =*hii*.

M A T R I X			C L A U S E		
Object to be localized	S U B O R D I N A T E C L A U S E			= <i>hii</i>	Predicate Verb of Being
	Actor	Undergoer			
	Possessor	Possessum			
	Reference point for localization (always human)	Local relational noun (local region of possessor)			

E 18 *sùukrá Billgá naáké hieja jeenal*
Isùuk-rá Bill-gá naáké hii= eja jee- nal
 dog-DEF Bill-PN back.part make=there be.standing-DECL
 «The dog is (standing position) behind Bill»
 (lit. «The dog is (standing) where Bill makes the back»)

E 19 *sùukrá naáké haaeja jeenal*
Isùuk-rá naáké haa= eja jee- nal
 dog-DEF back.part 1SG.A.make=there be.standing-DECL
 «The dog is (standing position) behind me»
 (lit. «The dog is (standing) where I make the back»).

The parallel between kinship possession and possession of local nouns, i.e. localization is another piece of evidence that the predictions of the Seilerian prototype approach are not reflected in the Hocak data. According to Seiler, local nouns like kinship nouns are relational nouns with a inherent semantic argument slot for a possessor. It is these nouns that do not need relation establishing grammatical means. However, in Hocak it seems to be the other way round. It is precisely this relational classes of nouns that need constructions for established possession in Hocak.

4. Predicative Possession in Hocak

The verbs of possession listed in Figure 6 above and described in the preceding sections are the principal means to predicate possession in Hocak. Their meaning/ function is exactly the same, whether they are used as predicates in possessive clauses or in nominalized clauses. The structural difference is that there is no nominalizing determiner such as a definite article, or a demonstrative pronoun at the end of the construction. Instead, a declarative suffix or another sentence final suffix is required in this position. The whole clause is not subordinated to another clause. Cf. the general pattern in Figure 11. The BELONG TO-type of possessive predications (cf. Figure 3 in §1.3 above) does not exist in Hocak.

Figure 11: Structure of possessive clauses

[POSSESSOR_i POSSESSUM_j PRO_j-PRO_i-Verb of possession-DECL]

Some examples will illustrate the structure of a predication of possession employing the three verbs of possession. In E 20a-b, possession is expressed with the verb *hanıl* «to own» for the possession of inanimate (alienable) objects, and non-pet (non-domestic) animals. E 21a-b contains possessive predications with the verb for pet (domestic) animals, and E 22a-b shows predicative possession with kinship terms. All a) clauses have lexical possessors; all b) clauses have pronominal possessors. It is obvious that they are structurally exactly parallel. They differ from the nominalized possessive clauses in chapter §3 in several respects. First, the verbs have a declarative suffix or some other sentence-final suffix instead of the nominalizing determiner; secondly they can be modified more freely with regard to tense, mode and aspect, while this is not possible with the nominalized counterparts. And thirdly, the possessum in the predications is much more flexible with regard to determination and modification than the possessum in the nominalized possessive clause, e.g. the possessum in the predication can have the indefinite article, the one in the nominalized possessive clause not.

- E 20 (a) *Billgá wazàtíreizàhaníthal*
/Bill-gá wazàtíre-izàl hanít nàl
 Bill- PN car- INDEF own-DECL
 «Bill has/ owns a car.»
- (b) *wazàtíreizàhaaníthà*
/wazàtíre-izàl ha- ha- níf nàl
 car- INDEF ST-1SG.A-own-DECL
 «I have/ own a car»
- E 21 (a) *Billgá wijukízàlníthíinal*
/Bill-gá wijuk-ízàl níthí- nàl
 Bill-PN cat- INDEF own.pet-DECL
 «Bill has a cat.»
- (b) *wijukízàlnítháanal*
/wijuk-ízàl nítháa- nàl
 cat- INDEF own.pet.1SG.A-DECL
 «I have/ own a cat.»
- E 22 (a) *Billgá hisuk- ízàl hii- nal*
 Bill-PN younger.brother-INDEF make.kin-DECL
 «Bill has a younger brother.»
- (b) *hisuk- ízàl haa- nal*
 younger.brother-INDEF 1SG.A.make.kin-DECL
 «I have a younger brother.»

Other types of possessive predication such as «X is my Kin» or «This is my Kin, Pet, etc.» are formed in Hocak with very similar constructions; cf. the examples in E 23, E 24, and E 25.

- E 23 *Billgá hi»ác haána*
/Bill-gá hi»ác haá- nàl
 Bill-PN father 1SG.make.kin-DECL
 «Bill is my father» (lit. «I make Bill (my) father»)
- E 24 *Te»é hi»ác haá- nal*
 DEM.PROX father 1SG.A.have.kin-DECL
 «This is my father.»
- E 25 *te»é hicakóro haá- nal*
 DEM.PROX friend 1SG.A.have.kin-DECL
 «This is my friend»

Finally, there is at least one kinship verb⁴ in Hocak that predicates the type of kinship relation instead of predicating possession as such with certain selectional restrictions. This type of possessive construction is very different from the ones dealt with up to this point. The kinship verb is *kíihúp* «be sibling (including cousins)» and *kiikíhup* «be siblings to each other», compare the examples in E 26a-b. No verb of possession is used in these cases.

- E 26 (a) *heenaga kunuḡá* «*ee kíihúpsàhal*
lheenatga kunuḡá «*ee kíihúp- sàhal*
 second.son-PN first.son-PN that.one be.sibling-DECL
 «Heenaga is a brother to Kunuḡa.» (White Eagle 1988:62)
- (b) *hakíihupwiíhal*
lha-kíihup-wiínal
 1A-be.siblings-PL-DECL
 «We are cousins.» (White Eagle 1988:61)

The Hocak data illustrating the predication of possession do not reflect the predicted asymmetries with regard to the hypothesized prototype of possession. The usage of the three verbs of possession is mutual exclusive which leads to a classification of possible possessa: kinship nouns, pet (domestic) animals, and the rest. The rest includes body parts, inanimate objects, artifacts, but not local nouns. Part-whole relations cannot be predicated by *=hii*, *haní* and *níihí* too, because they do not allow non-human possessors. The constructions with these three verbs of possession are strictly parallel; there is no markedness relation observable among them that are iconically in line with the closeness or deviation from the prototype.

5. Indirect participation

There are two different types of secondary possession marking, i.e. external possession, in Hocak. One is based on a systematic polysemy of a benefactive application (cf. §5.1 and 5.2 below), the other one may be termed reflexive possession (cf. §5.3). Both types of external possession marking have in common that the possessive relations between two participants in the clause are in a way secondary, mostly because one of the participants is only an indirect participant (cf. Lehmann et al. 2000). The possessive relations are not predicated by means of verbs of possession. The participants of the relevant clauses are primarily participants of the

⁴ Kinship terms are verbs in some Australian and North American Indian languages (cf. Evans 2000)

action predicated by the main verb. It is hypothesized that external possession is restricted to relational nouns such as kinship terms and body part nouns, cf. Seiler (1988:91) and Lehmann (1998:10). The prototype approach would predict for these construction types that a) possessive relations close to the prototype are more easily expressed by external possession, and that b) possessive relations close to the prototype are less marked in external possession constructions than possessive relations deviant from the prototype. Both types of external possession in Hocak will be introduced and discussed in the subsequent section in particular with regard to these predictions.

5.1 Benefactive applicative

Hocak has a very productive benefactive applicative *gi-* that increases the argument frame of the verb by one. Semantically, the new argument is sometimes a sympathicus (cf. Lehmann et al. 2000:12ff), i.e. a participant which is indirectly affected by the event designated by the verb. Such an indirect participant is often expressed by what has been termed traditionally *dativus ethicus*. Since there is no case marking in Hocak, this term would be inappropriate. Examples of a sympathicus participant introduced by the benefactive application are given in E 27 and E 28. Most often, the newly introduced participant has a benefactive relation to the state of affairs designated by the verb; cf. the examples in E 29 and E 30.

E 27 Sympatheticus interpretation of the *gi-* argument
hicawĩłgi- t'ě 'widower, (lit. his wife died to him and he was affected by that)'
 wife- BEN-die

E 28 Sympatheticus interpretation of the *gi-* argument
 (a) *hiksă* 'to laugh, to smile'
 (b) *gihiksă* 'to laugh at so.'
 (c) *hagiiksăana* 'I laughed at him'
lha- gi- hiksă- nă
 1SG.A-BEN-laugh- DECL

There are two meaning nuances of the benefactive role in Hocak. Dependent on the semantics of the verb and the discourse context, the action designated by the verb can be interpreted as being instigated in favor of (or 'in behalf of') the benefactive participant or as being instigated

instead of the benefactive participant⁵. Accordingly, the derived form in E 29a could also be glossed 'to cry instead of someone' which is pragmatically unlikely in this case. There are, however, verbs such as *gimahíl* 'to walk for someone' which are more likely to be interpreted as 'to walk instead of someone'. Pronominal marking of the arguments is with the exception of the 3pl *ire* always prefixal. The benefactive argument is cross-referenced by a pronominal prefix of the undergoer series morphologically preceding the *gi-* formative, cf. E 29b.⁶

E 29 *gi-* with intransitive active verb

- (a) *gigăk* 'to cry for someone'
 (b) *hiġigăgireenâ* 'they cried for me'
hiġ gi- găk- ire- nâ
 1SG.U-BEN-cry- 3PL.A-DECL

The *gi-* derivation is possible with intransitive active (cf. E 29) and with transitive verbs (cf. E 30). Transitive verbs with *gi-* become three place verbs with the actor (actor series of pronominal affixes) and the benefactive (undergoer series of pronominal affixes) usually marked pronominally. The patient is third person singular in the overwhelming number of cases and hence remains zero. However, it is in principle possible to elicit forms with three pronouns, if the patient is a speech act participant showing that a preference for either primary object marking or secondary object marking (cf. Dryer 1986) is not grammaticalized in Hocak.

E 30 *gi-* with transitive verbs

- (a) *harukôs* 'to hold sth.'
 (b) *hagirúkos* 'to hold sth. for someone'
 (c) *maġġhírojihalhanigítukossâhal*
Imaġġhírojihal ha- niġ gi- tukos- sâhal
 hammer- DEF ST-1->2- BEN-1SG.A.hold-DECL
 'I hold the hammer for you.'

The argument structure of the benefactive derivations with intransitive active and transitive verbs is schematically summarized in Figure 12.

⁵ Both meaning nuances are formally distinguished in Lakhóta. There are two different so-called dative series of pronouns, the first one meaning 'on behalf of' the second one meaning 'instead of', cf. Boas & Deloria 1941:87; Helmbrecht 1998:169-174.

Figure 12: The basic argument structure of benefactive derivations I.

ACTOR	BENEFACTIVE/ SYMPATHETICUS		Verb _(intransitive)
ACTOR	PATIENT	BENEFACTIVE	Verb _(transitive)

However, the derivation with *gi-* is systematically ambiguous in Hocak in that the benefactive participant can be interpreted in most cases as the possessor of the patient. This type of external possessor marking is most obvious with intransitive inactive verbs which will therefore be treated below, but is present in other verb classes too.

5.2 A non-actor is possessor of undergoer

The type of external possession marking to be described here is mostly given preference in discourse over possessive constructions of the nominalized possessive clause type (cf. §3). The benefactive argument introduced in the argument frame of the verb can be systematically interpreted as the possessor of the undergoer, i.e. either possessor of the undergoer of the intransitive (inactive) verb or the possessor of the undergoer of the transitive verb. The first possibility is illustrated in E 31a-c, where the intransitive inactive verb *sisřé* is derived by the benefactive applicative *gi-*. The resulting verb can have two interpretations, in the first one 'sth. is broken for him' the added argument is interpreted as being affected by the breaking, in the second one, the benefactive argument is interpreted as the possessor of the undergoer 'his is broken'.

E 31 *gi*-derivation with intransitive inactive verbs

- (a) *sisřé* 'to break, to be broken'
 (b) *gisisřé* 'sth. is broken for him'/ 'his is broken'
 (c) *wazàłrera gi-sisřéenal* «His car is broken»
lwazàłre-ra gi- sisřé- nal
 car- DEF BEN-broken-DECL

The benefactive applicative derives verbs that have two undergoer arguments. The first and primary undergoer is the «car» in E 31c. It is not cross-referenced on the verb, because it is a

⁶ Information of the morphological structure of the Hocak verb, in particular with regard to the position of the pronominal affixes in relation to the other affixes can be found in Susman (1943:104-110), and Helmbrecht (in

3SG noun phrase. If it were plural, it would get a marker on the verb. The second undergoer is the benefactive argument. This undergoer is only indirectly affected by the event designated by the verb. It is usually interpreted as the possessor of the primary undergoer. The same constructions are possible also with body parts as possessum. Kinship terms are not possible in this example for semantic/ pragmatic reasons, but in other verbs they are.

With transitive verbs, two interpretations are systematically available. The added argument is either the benefactive of the action, or the possessor of the patient of the action. This is illustrated in E 32a-c. The action is conducted in favor of the benefactive who in turn may be taken as the possessor of the patient.

E 32 *gi*-derivation with transitive verbs

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------------------------|------------|--|
| (a) | <i>hi'é</i> | | | | 'to find sth.' | | |
| (b) | <i>higi'é</i> | | | | 'to find sth. for someone' | | |
| (c) | <i>wazàtíre-ra</i> | <i>hi</i> | <i>hił</i> | <i>gi-</i> | <i>'e-</i> | <i>nàł</i> | 'he found the car for me'/ 'he found my car' |
| | car- | DEF | ST-1SG.U | BEN | find | DECL | |

The systematic interpretation of the benefactive as possessor is, however, not possible with *gi*-derivations of intransitive active verbs. Here, only the benefactive meaning is available, cf. the example in E 33a-c. If the possessor of the 'younger brother' is someone else *haara* 'my kin' has to be inflected for another person category. If *haara* 'my kin' is dropped in E 33c the translation would be 'the younger brother cried for me'. The argument introduced by *gi*- cannot be interpreted as possessor.

E 33 *gi*-derivation with intransitive active verbs

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|------------|-------------|---|
| (a) | <i>găak</i> | | | | | 'to cry' |
| (b) | <i>gigăk</i> | | | | | 'to cry for someone, to yell for someone' |
| (c) | <i>hiisúk</i> | <i>haará</i> | <i>higigăksàhal</i> | | | 'my younger brother cried for me' |
| | <i>hiisúk</i> | <i>haará</i> | <i>hił</i> | <i>gi-</i> | <i>găk-</i> | <i>sàhal</i> |
| | younger.brother | my | 1sg.U | Ben | cry | Decl |

The possibilities of external possessor marking by means of the benefactive applicative *gi*- are summarized in Figure 13.

Figure 13: The argument structure of benefactive derivations II.

UNDERGOER	BENEFACTIVE POSSESSOR OF UNDERGOER		Verb _(intransitive inactive)
ACTOR	BENEFACTIVE		Verb _(intransitive active)
ACTOR	PATIENT	BENEFACTIVE POSSESSOR OF PATIENT	Verb _(transitive)

The possessor interpretation of the benefactive in the first and the third line of Figure 13 can be blocked by an explicit possessor marking of the undergoer noun phrase, i.e. by means of a nominalized possessor construction (cf. section §3). An example is given in E 34. The 2SG possessor of 'the car' contrasts with the 1SG benefactive in the verb hence the 1SG benefactive can no longer be interpreted as the possessor of the patient noun phrase.

E 34 *wazàtírerera hasihíhalhílgí'eenal*
/wazàtíre-ra hasihíhal hi- híł gí- 'e- nál
 car- DEF your ST-1SG.U-BEN-find-DECL
 'he found your car for me/ *he found my car'

The possessors in such a secondary possessive relation (external possessive construction) are usually high in the empathy hierarchy. They are human beings (all person categories) referred to by means of pronominal affixes, or lexical noun phrases. Inanimate possessors (benefactives) are not possible. The possessum, on the other hand, can be almost everything, from kinship nouns, body parts, human beings, to inanimate objects. Part-whole relations and local relation cannot be expressed with this type of construction. The data presented show that the relationality of nouns does not play a significant role with regard to markedness of these possessive constructions.

The possessive constructions by means of nominalized possessive clauses (see chapter §3) and the type of external possessive marking by means of the benefactive application are to some extent in competition with each other. This can be demonstrated with the clauses in E 35 and E 36. The former one uses the benefactive applicative strategy, the latter the nominalized possessive clause strategy. If speakers have a choice they always prefer the benefactive (*gi-* derivation) strategy.

E 35 *wazàtírerera níłgítuzàanal*
/wazàtíre-ra ní-l gí- tuzàa- nal
 car- DEF 1->2-BEN- I.wash.it- DECL
 'I wash your car' (or 'I wash the car for you')

E 36 *wazàtírerera hasihíhãltuzãanal*
/wazàtíre-ra hasihí-ra tuzãa- nal
 car- DEF you.own.it-DEF I.wash.it-DECL
 'I wash your car'

5.3 Reflexive possession

The second type of external possession in Hocak is marked by the prefixes *kara-/ k-* 'one's own'. The choice between both forms that are functionally equivalent is morphologically determined by the conjugation type of the verb. Verbs that require the second conjugation take *k-*, verbs that require the first conjugation take *kara-*. In both cases the result is a verb of the first conjugation.

The prefix *kara-/ k-* can be used only with transitive verbs. In general, it designates that the transitive actor possesses the transitive undergoer. Since *kara-/ k-* are possible only with transitive verbs they represent a highly reliable test for transitivity (syntactic valence) of verbs in the Hocak lexicon. There are, however, also cases where *kara-/ k-* seems to have itself a transitivizing function, cf. E 37a-b.

E 37 Transitivity function of *kara-/ k-*
 (a) *nabzil* 'to stand, to stand up'
 (b) *nabkára-zil* 'to stand up for his own'

An example of the typical function of *kara-/ k-* is given in E 38a-c. The transitive verb *gígúš* 'to teach someone' changes its meaning to 'to teach one's own' with *kara-/ k-*, cf. E 38b. It is indicated that the undergoer of the transitive verb belongs to the actor. There is almost no restriction with regard to the semantic class of the possessum. Animate and inanimate object can be possessed, body parts, kinship relations and close social relations such as friendship. What has been observed several times in other domains of possessive marking holds also for reflexive possession, the relationality of the possessum does not play a role.

- E 38 A possesses U in transitive verbs: *kara-/k-*
- (a) *gígúš* 'to teach someone, to council someone'
- (b) *karagígúš* 'to teach one's own'
- (c) *niikják waakaragígúšsàhal* 'I taught my children'
- niikják wa- ha- kára- gígúš- sàhal*
 child 3PL.U-1SG.A-REFL.POSS-teach- DECL

The reflexive possession marker *kara-/k-* can be used with plain non-derived transitive verbs, but also with verbs that have received their second argument by way of some derivational processes. If verbs are transitivized by means of one of the instrumental prefixes *kara-/k-* indicates that the patient is possessed by the actor, cf. E 39a-b.

- E 39 (a) *booxúx* 'to break sth. by striking'
- (b) *boo-kára-xux* 'to break his own by striking'

If the verb has received a new (second) argument by means of one of the locative applicatives, *kara-/k-* refers to this newly introduced argument, i.e. it indicates that the actor owns the place with regard to which the action is instigated. An example with the verb *hat'áp* 'to jump on sth.' is given in E 40a-c. The clause in E 40c illustrates that the place (locative) of the action which is the new argument is the possessum of the second person actor.

- E 40 (a) *hat'áp* 'to jump on sth.'
- (b) *hakarát'áp* 'to jump on one's own'
- (c) *waarúcra harakarat'apsàhal*
lwaarúc-ra ha- ra- kára- t'áp- sàhal
 table- DEF APPL.SUPRESS-2SG.A-REFL.POSS-jump-DECL
 You jumped on your table.

Ambiguities and uncertainties about the interpretation of *kara-/k-* arise with ditransitive verbs and verbs that have received a third argument by means of some derivation. Both undergoer arguments are marked on the verb (if they are not 3sg) by pronominal prefixes of the undergoer series. Since there are two pronominal affixes of the same undergoer series, some uncertainty about the correct assignment of the semantic roles patient and recipient to the two undergoer pronouns arise. I assume that in these admittedly extremely rare cases in actual discourse animacy plays the decisive role, i.e. the human participant is assigned the recipient role, since this role is prototypically human, and consequently, the inanimate participant is assigned the patient role, since transitive patients are prototypically inanimate. The same uncertainty extends now to the usage of the reflexive possessor marking

with *kara-/ k-*. The transitive patient may be interpreted as being possessed by the actor as well as the recipient, cf. the examples in E 41a-c. The verb *hok'úl*'to give sth. to someone' has three arguments, the actor, patient and recipient, the latter two are expressed by pronouns of the undergoer series. As was already said it may be uncertain which one of the two undergoer participants is patient and recipient respectively, but this is not a problem here. The semantics of the two undergoer arguments makes it clear that the "candies" are the patient (the object of giving) and the "children" are the recipient. A similar uncertainty holds with regard to *kara-/ k-*, either the patient or the recipient may be interpreted as possessed by the actor.

E 41 *kara-/ k-* in ditransitive verbs

- (a) *hok'úl* 'to give sth. to someone'
- (b) *ho-kara-k'úl* 'to give sth. (his own) to someone (his own)'
- (c) *niłkjágra tanízü kirikíris`wookárák'ulhal*
l niłkják-ra tanízü kirikíris` wa- ho- kára- k'ut nál
 child-DEF sugar striped (=candy) 3PL.U-ST-REFL.POSS-give-DECL
 «He gave the candy to his children.»/
 «He gave his candies to the children.»

The same ambiguity exists also for the verb *hozũ* 'to put sth. in sth.' which has also three arguments. The expressions in E 42b and E 42c are from different Hocak speakers, the former preferred the goal argument (i.e. the container) to be interpreted as possessed, the latter preferred the transitive patient (i.e. the papers) to be interpreted as possessed. A schematic summary of reflexive possessive marking in Hocak is given then in Figure 14.

- E 42 (a) *hozũ* 'to put sth. in sth.'
- (b) *waákarazüuna* 'I put them in my (container)'
l wa- ho- há- kara- zü- nál
 3SG.U-ST-1SG.A-REFL.POSS-put.in-DECL
- (c) *waagáxra waxupáhalwaákarazüuna*
l waagáx-ra waxupál-ra wa- ho- há- kara- zü- nál
 paper- DEF suitcase-DEF 3PL.U-ST-1SG.A-REFL.POSS-put.in-DECL
 «I put my papers in the suitcase.»

Figure 14: Reflexive possession.

POSSESSOR	POSSESSUM		
ACTOR	UNDERGOER		VERB _(TRANSITIVE)
	PATIENS	GOAL	VERB _(DITRANSITIVE)
	PATIENS	RECIPIENT	VERB _(TRANSITIVE)

The same uncertainties arise in verbs which have an additional benefactive argument, here the transitive patient as well as the benefactive may be interpreted as possessed. All these cases are, however, rare and are rather problematic instances of elicitation than real problems of grammatical structure.

6. Summary and conclusions

The various possessive constructions in Hocak can be divided into two different classes, the ones that require contextual inference in order to be interpreted as indicating a possessive relation, and the ones that explicitly mark possession between two nominals. The juxtaposition and the benefactive applicative belong to the former class of possessive constructions, the verbs of possession (nominalized possessive clauses and predication of possession) and the reflexive possession belong to the latter class, cf. the summary in Figure 15.

Figure 15: Relevance of the prototypical features of possession for possessive constructions

	Juxtaposition	Nominalized possessive clause	Predication of possession	Benefactive applicative	Reflexive possession
Mode of interpretation of possessive relation	Inferential	Symbolic	Symbolic	Inferential	Symbolic
Relationality of Possessum	Not Relevant	Not Relevant (constructions depend on selectional restrictions of the verbs of possession)	Not Relevant (constructions depend on selectional restrictions of the verbs of possession)	Not Relevant	Not Relevant
Possessor»s position on the Empathy Hierarchy	Relevant: - only lexical possessors (no SAP and third person pronouns) - human and inanimate possessors (part-whole relations, spatial relations)	Relevant: - lexical (always cross-reference on verb) and pronominal possessors - only human possessors	Relevant: - lexical (always cross-reference on verb) and pronominal possessors - only human possessors	Relevant: - only human possessors	Relevant: - only human possessors

Seiler»s central hypothesis with regard to possession is that there are certain semantic classes of nouns that are relational in nature. They have an inherent semantic argument slot for a possessor and that»s the reason why they are able to establish a possessive relation to another noun without requiring relation establishing grammatical material (cf. Seiler 1983:12ff, 45ff). Since juxtaposition (see also Seiler 1983:14f) and the benefactive applicative (see particularly the chapter on possessor promotion in Seiler 1983:45f) does not mark possession explicitly, i.e. presuppose inference of the possessive relation, they are to be expected to show some restrictions or other effects with regard to the semantic type of the possessum such as kin terms, and body part terms. This is not the case in Hocak. Relational as well as non-relational noun are allowed as possessa. Juxtaposition in Hocak resembles much more what Seiler said about genitive constructions in Indo-European languages (cf. Seiler 1983:39ff). It is a general construction for many different functions. Possession is only one among these. Another one is the spatial localization of objects. There are no restrictions with

regard to inherent relational and non-relational nouns in juxtapositions expressing possessive relations. In addition, there is no such restrictions observable with respect to the benefactive application.

The other three techniques to express possession have in common that they mark this relation explicitly, either by means of the selectional restrictions of the verbs of possession, or by means of a special possessive marker. Seiler's theory would predict that these constructions are in particular appropriate to express alienable possession, since they are not built upon the inherent relationality of inalienable nouns. This, however, is not the case. The three verbs of possession classify nouns according to kinship nouns, domestic animals nouns, and rest, but this has nothing to do with the relationality of these nouns. Relevant is here only the selectional restriction of the verb of possession. Similarly, the reflexive possessive marker is neutral with respect to the semantic types of the possessum. It can be concluded here too that the distinction between inherently relational vs. non-relational nouns is irrelevant in these constructions too. These observations lead to the conclusion that one part of the prototype notion of possession with regard to the possessum is largely irrelevant in Hocak and that there is no such thing as grammaticalized inherent relational nouns in Hocak. This part of the prototype notion has to be given up for the Hocak data.

The other part of the prototype notion of possession does play a role in possessive constructions in Hocak. The possessor has to be a human being, i.e. a third person pronoun or speech act participant, except for the juxtaposition. Here, lexical possessors of all semantic classes are allowed leading to constructions that no longer express possessive relations. The higher the possessor is on the empathy hierarchy the more control he has over the possessum. The reverse force, the reduction of control of a possessor high on the empathy hierarchy by means of inherent relational possessa such as body parts, and kinship relations, cannot be observed in Hocak. Possession seems to be solely construed along the control parameter in Hocak. Evidence for this hypothesis is provided by the fact that the etymological source for two of the verbs of possession *=hii* «to.make.kin» and *nithí* «to.have.pet/ to.keep.as.pet» is the causative verb *=hii* «X causes Y», a verb that predicated maximal control of one participant over the other. The **causative schema** *=hii* «X causes Y» serves as the conceptual source as well as the source construction for the grammaticalization of kinship possession and domestic (pet) animal possession in Hocak. It should be added to Heine's list of possible event schemas that serve as source for the grammaticalization of the predication of possession in the languages of the world (cf. Heine 1997:47). Further evidence is that the same causative verb

is also used for the expression of local relations in case that the reference point of the localized object is a human being or speech act participant that has control over the spatial reference point e.g. because the local region is a part of his or her body.

7. References

- Baron, I. et al. (eds.) 2001: *Dimensions of possession*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.
- Boas, Franz & Ella Deloria. 1941. *Dakota Grammar*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Chappell, Hilary & William McGregor (eds.) 1996. *The grammar of inalienability: a typological perspective on body part terms and the part-whole relation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1986: „Primary objects, secondary objects, and antitativity.“ *Language Journal of the Linguistic Society of America* 62: 808-845.
- Evans, Nicholas 2000: „Kinship verbs.“ In: Vogel, Petra M. & Comrie, Bernard (eds.), *Approaches to the typology of word classes*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter (EALT, 23); 103-172.
- Hagège, Claude 1993. *The language builder. An essay on the human signature in linguistic morphogenesis*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Heine, Bernd 1997: *Possession. Cognitive sources, forces and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Helmbrecht, Johannes 1998: *Universalität und Vagheit semantischer Funktionen. Untersuchungen zum funktionalen Zusammenhang morphosyntaktischer und kognitiver Kategorien der Sprache*. Unterschleissheim: LINCOM Europa (Edition Linguistik, 26).
- Helmbrecht, Johannes 2002: „Nouns and verbs in Hoca'k“. In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* IJAL 68,1:1-27.
- Helmbrecht, Johannes (in prep.): *A grammar of Hocank*
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1993: „Reference-point constructions.“ *Cognitive Linguistics* 4: 1-38.
- Lehmann, Christian & Yong-Min Shin & Elisabeth Verhoeven 2000: *Direkte und indirekte Partizipation. Zur Typologie der sprachlichen Repraesentation konzeptueller Relationen*. Muenchen: LINCOM
- Lehmann, Christian 1998: *Possession in Yucatec Maya. Structures - functions - typology*. Unterschleissheim: LINCOM Europa (LINCOM Studies in Native American Linguistics, 4).
- Lévy-Bruhl, L. 1914: „L'expression de la possession dans les langues mélanésiennes.“ *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique* 19(2): 96-104.
- Lipkind, William 1945: *Winnebago grammar*. New York; King's Crown Press.
- Payne, Doris L. & Barshi, Immanuel (eds.) 1999: *External possession*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins (Typological Studies in Language, 39).
- Seiler, Hansjakob 1983: *POSSESSION as an operational dimension of language*. Tübingen: G. Narr (LUS, 2).
- Seiler, Hansjakob 2001: „The operational basis of possession.“ Baron, I. et al. (eds.), *Dimensions of possession*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins; 27-40.
- Susman, Amelia 1943: *The accentual system of Winnebago*. New York: Columbia University [Ph.D. dissertation].

White Eagle, Josephine P. 1988. *A lexical study of Winnebago*. Lexicon Project Working Papers 26. Cambridge, MASS.: Centre for Cognitive Science, MIT.

Zeps, Valdis J. 1994. *Dictionary of Winnebago*. Manuscript.