Possessive Marking: Dependent and Non-dependent marking

Anton Buzanov

May 9, 2024

1 Introduction

This thesis is dedicated to possessive constructions. Within this study, possessive constructions are defined as comprising two noun phrases: the possessor and the possessum. Their primary function is to convey possessive relationships, which are broadly interpreted. Among these relationships, ownership stands out as the most common.

To illustrate these concepts, several examples of possessive constructions are provided in (1). These examples are to clarify the core focus of the study. Furthermore, they highlight the ways in which possessive relationships can be marked within noun phrases. For instance, while the Russian example indicates possession solely through the genitive case on the dependent, the Even example employs a possessive suffix on the head to convey the possessive relationship.

(1) a. Russian (Indo-European)

dom-øotc-a
house-NOM.SG

'father's house'

b. Even (Tungusic)

etiken   ǯu-n
old.man   house-POSS.3SG

'old man's house'

Various types of possessive constructions can be identified. For instance, in Russian, there exists another construction primarily used to express possessive relationships, as detailed in (2). Forms such as *mam-in-a* are commonly referred to as "possessive adjectives" (*pritjažateľnye prilagateľnye* in Russian). This terminology suggests that possessors in these constructions behave more like adjectives than proper nouns. They inflect in oblique cases as adjectives and cannot be modified by other adjectives.

Constructions where either the possessor or the possessum deviates from typical noun behavior were excluded from the analysis. This exclusion criterion is relevant primarily in languages with a clear distinction between nouns and adjectives. The focus of this study remains exclusively on the interaction between noun phrases.

(2) Russian (Indo-European)

mam-in-a kniga
mother-POSS.ADJ-NOM.SG.F book
'mother's book'

The distinction between alienable and inalienable possession (Nichols 1988; Alexiadou 2003) is not the central focus of this thesis. Both types of constructions are treated with equal importance.

The primary objective of this study is to develop a typology for possessive marking across various language types. Specifically, the focus lies on morphosyntactic patterns such as the locus of marking, obligatoriness, and agreement.

The thesis is structured as follows:

Chapter 2 provides an overview of previous approaches to describing possessive constructions. Chapter ?? identifies the shortcomings in these approaches and presents sporadic data that highlights the missed important generalizations. In this chapter, I introduce my own classification system for languages based on how they express possessive relations.

Chapter ?? presents data from various languages to support the plausibility of my classification system over previous ones. Within this chapter, I highlight the differences between dependent and non-dependent marking within noun phrases.

Chapter ?? articulates the asymmetries between dependent and non-dependent possessive marking that I identified during my study.

Finally, Chapter ?? draws conclusions based on the findings presented in the preceding chapters.

2 Previous Studies

Possessive constructions have been described extensively for individual languages (references), as well as in cross-linguistic studies (references). However, it is noteworthy that most cross-linguistic investigations have focused primarily on alienability, existential, or locative possessives, or solely on possessive constructions marked on the dependent (references).

2.1 Locus of Marking in Possessive Noun Phrases

The literature on the locus of marking, particularly as discussed by Nichols (1986) and later scholars, provides perhaps the most neutral typology of possessive noun phrases. Nichols (1986: 57) argues that the locus of marking does not signify any distinction in the syntactic relation, which remains consistent across different marking patterns.

Based on the specific locus of marking within possessive noun phrases, languages can be distinctly categorized into several groups (Nichols & Bickel 2013; Van Rijn 2016a;b; Lander & Nichols 2020).

The types of possessive marking within a possessive noun phrase, as distinguished by Nichols & Bickel (2013), along with the respective numbers of languages for each type in brackets, are as follows.

1. Head marking (78)

2. Dependent marking (98)

3. Double marking (22)

4. No marking (32)

5. Other (6)

However, this classification seems problematic for several reasons. A later revision of this categorization was presented in Lander & Nichols (2020). In this revised classification, Lander & Nichols (2020) introduced D- and C-marking, corresponding to dependent marking and anywhere-but-dependent marking. This distinction enables the classification of various cases initially placed in the *Other* category.

To better understand the labels employed by Nichols & Bickel (2013), and where necessary, incorporating insights from Lander & Nichols (2020), I will describe their meanings.

2.1.1 Head marking

In these examples the possessed noun (the head) agrees in person and number with the possessor noun, the most common pattern for head-marked noun phrases. Agreement in gender is also fairly common. A few languages have a non-agreeing marker on the head noun. In Fijian, a possessive affix -i marks possessed nouns; that it does not vary for person or number of the possessor. (Nichols & Bickel 2013)

(3) a. Acoma (Keresan; Miller 1965: 177 from Nichols & Bickel 2013)

s'adyúm'ə   gâam'a
1SG.brother 3SG.house

'my brother's house' (lit. 'my-brother his-house')

b. Fijian (Austronesian; Dixon 1988: 36 from Nichols & Bickel 2013)

a   liga-i   'eirau
ART hand-POSS 1DU.EXC

'our hand(s)'

In the examples (3), the possessed entity receives a distinctive marker that serves to signify (i) its role as the possessed item and/or (ii) φ-features, encompassing person, number, and gender, of the possessor. If this marker indicates both (i) and (ii), it is recognized as the equivalent of agreement between a verb and its argument, albeit occurring within the nominal domain. In the framework of Lander & Nichols (2020), the representation of features related to the possessed entity is termed *indexation* in contrast to *registration*.

Notably, the possessor in this context remains morphologically unmarked.

While Nichols & Bickel (2013) categorizes non-agreeing markers, they do not delve into the specific characteristics of these markers, aiming instead to group them together with agreeing markers.

2.1.2 Dependent marking

In the following examples from Chechen (Nakh-Daghestanian), the possessor noun is in the genitive case. (Nichols & Bickel 2013)

(4)   Chechen (Nichols & Bickel 2013)

    a.   loem-an   k'orni
         lion-GEN baby.animal

         'lion cub', 'lion's cub' (lit. 'of-lion cub')

    b.   mashien-an maax
         car-GEN   price

         'the price of a car' (lit. 'of-car price')

In (4), only the possessor is marked with a special marker, while the possessum is marked with an externally governed case.

2.1.3   Double marking

Nichols & Bickel (2013) does not provide specific commentary on double-marking constructions. Essentially, these constructions involve a combination of the two preceding types, where both the possessor and the possessum are marked with distinctive indicators that signify (i) their respective roles and/or (ii) the features of the other (5).

(5)   Southern Sierra Miwok (Miwok-Costanoan; Broadbent 1964: 133)

    cuku-ŋ   hu:ki-ʔ-hy:
    dog-GEN tail-3SG

    'dog's tail' (lit. 'of-dog its-tail')

In example (5), both the genitive marker on the possessor and the possessive suffix on the possessum are present.

2.1.4   No marking

No special comments are made on no-marking constructions.

(6)   Asmat (Asmat family; Voorhoeve 1965: 136, 133 from Nichols & Bickel 2013

    no   cem
    1SG house

    'my house' (lit. 'I house' or 'me house')

Here, the possessor and the possessum are morphologically unmarked.

2.1.5   Key Principles of Nichols & Bickel (2013) Typology

In their classification, Nichols & Bickel (2013) select one construction per language, aiming for minimal restrictions within that construction. Nichols & Bickel (2013) explicitly excludes constructions from their classification that do not permit overtly expressed possessors.

Furthermore, they assert that morphologically unmarked possessors exhibit distinct behavior compared to their marked counterparts. Their focus is solely on an open-class set of possessors, excluding consideration of personal pronouns.

Lander & Nichols (2020), building on the work of others, exploit the concepts of *registration* and *indexation*. While Nichols & Bickel (2013) does not explicitly address these concepts in their typology, for their purposes, it remains inconsequential.

2.2 Registration and Indexation

Another significant aspect that I will address is the distinction between indexation and registration (Nichols 1992). Indexing markers reflect certain φ-features of another part of the construction, while registering markers simply indicate the presence of another part. Originally, this notion aimed to differentiate between two types of head-marking possessive constructions. However, Lander & Nichols (2020) extend this perspective to encompass dependent marking as well.

Similar concepts, albeit under different names, have been discussed by several other authors (Creissels 2017, Plank 1995).

In a related vein, Duguine (2008) explore this distinction in various languages. They demonstrate that possessors triggering agreement can be pro-dropped and extracted, whereas possessors that do not trigger agreement cannot.

Although these concepts are mentioned by various authors within different frameworks, as far as I am aware, there is no unified account or set of generalizations based on the nature of a marker.

3 Problems with Nichols & Bickel (2013) Typology

Given my exclusive familiarity with the possessive construction typology presented by Nichols & Bickel (2013), I will compare my observations directly to this framework to enrich its scope. It's worth noting that my study does not concern itself with semantics or alienability, rendering typologies based on these factors irrelevant to my research.

I contend that the assertions made by Nichols & Bickel (2013) are erroneous. Firstly, there is no necessity to exclude constructions lacking an overt possessor; in fact, their inclusion is essential for establishing a comprehensive typology of locus marking. Secondly, the postulation of a distinction between morphologically marked possessors, such as those bearing the genitive case, and morphologically unmarked genitives is unnecessary.

3.1 Null Possessors

I argue that what is called by Nichols & Bickel (2013); Lander & Nichols (2020) a head-marking strategy is not a proper head-marking strategy but rather a double marking one.

The ideal example of head marking is that presented in (7).

(7) Mongolian (Mongolic) from Janhunen (2012)

    a. (*min-ii) duu-men'
        1SG-GEN   younger.brother-POSS.1

        'my younger brother'

b. min-ii   eej(-*men')
   1SG-GEN mother-POSS.1

   'my mother'

In (7), the simultaneous use of both genitive and possessive marking is precluded. This limitation can be elucidated by tracing the grammaticalization trajectory of possessive markers, originally post-posed clitics derived from personal pronouns. In the current state, these markers are fully integrated phonologically, displaying no distinguishing features from regular affixes in Mongolian (Janhunen 2012: 137).

Example (7a) exemplifies the perfect head-marking pattern, since there is no dependent to be marked. Conversely, example (7b) illustrates the ideal dependent-marking pattern.

According to the classification by Nichols & Bickel (2013), Mongolian is placed in the category of languages exhibiting dependent marking in possessive phrases. This is due to the fact that Nichols & Bickel (2013) exclude constructions without overtly expressed possessors. However, it is evident to me that Mongolian must differ in this aspect from languages like Russian.

3.2 Unmarked vs Marked Possessors

Classic instances of head-marking possessors include those in (3) or the one referenced in (8). In such examples, the possessor remains morphologically unmarked.

(8) Hungarian adapted from Szabolcsi (1981: 263)

   az én kar-ja-i-m
   the I arm-POSS-PL-1SG

   'my arms'

Now, I want to draw the attention to the data of Even (Tungusic) cited in (??).

(9) Even (Tungusic), field data

   a. bi   əm-ni-wu
      I.NOM come-PST-1SG

      'I came.'

   b. min   ǯu-wu
      I.OBL house-POSS.1SG

      'my house'

   c. etiken   əm-ni-n
      old.man come-PST-3SG

      'The old man came.'

   d. etiken   ǯu-n
      old.man house-POSS.3SG

      'old man's house'

These examples bear resemblance to Hungarian in that ordinary nouns do not exhibit special genitive marking. However, a distinction arises between Even and Hungarian concerning possessive

forms with pronouns. Notably, Even demonstrates a distinction from Hungarian by featuring distinct possessive forms for pronouns.

While it may initially seem that Nichols & Bickel (2013) exclusively focus on constructions with nominal possessors, Evenki, which is related to and behaves similarly to Even in this particular aspect, is categorized as a *Double marking* language while Hungarian is categorized as a *Head-marking* one. The primary rationale for this classification appears to be the presence of special possessive pronouns in Evenki. In the possessor position, both Evenki and Even employ an oblique stem, aligning with the direct stem for nouns and diverging from it for pronouns.

Indeed, when considering only nouns, Hungarian and Evenki appear similar, as both languages employ morphologically unmarked forms for possessors. However, despite this similarity, they are classified differently. An additional factor contributing to this discrepancy could be the presence of an obsolete genitive marker that occasionally appears on possessors in Evenki. This historical remnant might influence the classification of Evenki, leading to its categorization distinct from Hungarian despite their superficial similarity in possessive marking.

3.3   Solutions

I believe that aforementioned problems with classification of Mongolian, Hungarian and Evenki straightforwardly follows from wrong assumptions made by Nichols & Bickel (2013).

I contend that classifying languages or constructions as a whole is an inaccurate approach. A more effective method involves employing a bottom-up strategy, initially categorizing markers as either C- or D-marking (Lander & Nichols 2020), and subsequently classifying a language as a collection of pairs of these markers. For instance, in this framework, Russian would be characterized as a language featuring several D-markers, such as GEN and possessive forms of (pro)nouns, while lacking any C-markers. This approach resembles the earlier concept of a dependent-marking language but offers a more flexible and nuanced classification.

In my second argument, I posit that treating languages with unmarked possessors differently from those with marked possessors a priori is an inaccurate approach. It is crucial to distinguish between zero marking and the absence of marking. The concept of the locus of marking presupposes the existence of a head and a dependent, with some form of relationship between the two. I propose that in languages featuring a grammaticalized case system, the possessor is indeed marked, but the marker itself is represented by zero.

This perspective might be seen as controversial, yet several arguments support this viewpoint. Consider languages like Even and Evenki, where a position is marked with the genitive, but only for personal pronouns. In such instances, it is reasonable to assume that for nouns, marking is also present, albeit in the form of zero. Moreover, adpositions in Even and Evenki also governs this unmarked form.

In the second argument, consider languages with declension classes where certain classes exhibit a coincidence between the nominative and genitive forms, as seen in Latin with *avis* meaning 'bird.NOM / bird.GEN'. In such cases, determining whether these forms are marked or unmarked becomes ambiguous. On the one hand, the nominative is typically considered an unmarked case, even though it is morphologically marked. From a paradigmatic perspective, it might be more appropriate to label these forms as marked with the genitive rather than with the nominative.

In a language where nouns lack dedicated genitive forms and the form coinciding with the nominative is employed in possessor contexts, this shared nominative/genitive form is morphologically

unmarked. This observation supports the idea of unmarked case. Essentially, it is a matter of cross-linguistic variation which form must be used as a default nominal dependent.

We must consider morphologically unmarked possessors in languages that have cases to be an instance of head-marking / double-marking strategy. In the same way, we consider unmakred nominative with agreeing verb to present double-marking strategy at the clause level.

3.4 Summary

4 Hypotheses

4.1 Non-possessive meanings

4.1.1 Formulation

Possessive suffixes more often develop non-possessive meanings, such as marking topic.

4.1.2 Pipeline

5 Sampling for Variety

To comprehend the nature and potential diversity of possessive constructions, particularly in the context of head and dependent marking interaction, constructing a variety sample is essential. The aim of a variety sample is to capture a broad spectrum of linguistic patterns with minimal effort, as outlined by Miestamo et al. (2016) following Rijkhoff et al. 1993.

Another approach to sampling is probability sampling, which allows for statistical generalizations based on language data. However, as discussed in the literature on language sampling, achieving a completely unrelated or independent sample is practically unattainable. In any large language sample, there are bound to be relationships among languages, whether they are genetic, areal, cultural, or otherwise interconnected.

To understand if there is a tendency to express something in a particular way, it is impractical to examine all languages of the world for several reasons. First, it is practically impossible given the large number of languages. Second, such a comprehensive survey would not necessarily yield accurate conclusions. Dryer (1989) illustrated this point through a thought experiment. Imagine a hypothetical world consisting of 1000 languages, categorized as follows:

- · 900 languages originate from a single language family.

- · The remaining 100 languages originate from ten different families.

Now, suppose in this world, the majority of languages (900 out of 1000 originating from a single family) exhibit SVO word order, while the remaining 100 languages demonstrate SOV word order. Despite observing a prevalence of SVO word order, we cannot conclusively state that there is an overall tendency towards SVO word order across languages. This observation is likely influenced by genealogical bias, where the high occurrence of SVO word order in the majority of languages can be attributed to

their shared linguistic ancestry within the same family. Therefore, drawing generalizations about linguistic tendencies requires careful consideration of language relationships to avoid misleading interpretations based solely on observed patterns in a diverse linguistic landscape.

Dryer (1989) and Bickel (2008), among others, proposed methods for creating a probability sample in linguistic studies. Dryer (1989) introduced the concept of "genus" to mitigate genealogical bias. A genus refers to a grouping of languages with a time depth not exceeding 3,500 to 4,000 years (Dryer 1989). These genera are considered sufficiently independent to be included in the sample. Another criterion for independence is the distant geographic location of languages. Dryer (1989) argues that so-called Macro-Areas (Africa, Eurasia, Australia + New Guinea, North America, South America) are independent from each other in terms of linguistic properties. The main idea is to assign values to all genera (allowing for multiple values since languages within a genus can exhibit different behaviors) and then create a table similar to Table 1.

	Africa	Eurasia	Australia-NG	North America	South America	Total
SOV	22	26	19	26	18	111
SVO	21	19	6	6	5	57

Table 1: Word order in different genera across Macroareas

Next, Dryer (1989) determines the prevalence of SOV or SVO word order within each Macroarea. Modeling this scenario as a binomial distribution, he suggests that there is a tendency towards SOV, reasoning that the probability of SVO "winning" five times (with a probability of 0.5 for each outcome) is less than 0.05 ($0.5^5 = 0.03125$), indicating a statistically significant preference for SOV word order.

Certainly, I can revise that. Here's an alternative wording:

While the methodology involving genera and macroareas may raise questions, the concepts have been employed in other studies dedicated to language sampling. Miestamo et al. (2016) proposed a method for creating a variety sample based on genera and macroareas, following the framework established by Dryer (1989) regarding the relative independence of genera and macroareas. In variety sampling, complete independence is not mandatory. Miestamo et al. (2016) divided the world into six macroareas, with a distinct categorization for Australia and New Guinea. The Genus-Macroarea method involves selecting languages from a macroarea in proportion to the number of genera within that macroarea, aiming to achieve a representative and diverse sample of languages across different geographic and genetic classifications.

5.1

6 Other questions

- How do possessive markers undergo grammaticalization? (Нужно почитать джоанну)

- Regarding the relative order of case and possessive markers: Dékány?

- Is there a relationship between the markedness of the nominative form and the relative order of case and possessive markers?

- Do marking strategies at the clause level, especially considering pro drop, correlate with strategies within NP? Verification of Nichols' observations.

- Do markers on the dependent reflect registration while markers on the head reflect indexing (or do they exhibit no preference)? What does this imply about the "universal" structure of NP?

- Are there any significant asymmetries between verbal agreement and nominal agreement? I'm aware of one epiphenomenal difference. It's difficult to find instances where Agreement failure elicits default agreement, as often occurs with sentential subjects in many languages. It's challenging to imagine a scenario where a non-nominalized clause could occupy the possessor's position.

7 Possessive Systems

7.1 Bystraja Even

Northern Tungusic < Tungusic

Word order: SOV, Pr Ps

Nominal affix order: stem-AL-Number-Case-Poss

Nominal possessive markers can be categorized into two subsets: personal and reflexive. Personal possessive markers indicate specific person values, including first (inclusive and exclusive in plural), second, and third persons. Reflexive possessive markers, as discussed by Buzanov (2022), are employed when there is co-reference between the possessor of a noun and the subject of the entire clause. While reflexive possessive markers are used with possessors of any person value, they do not differentiate between different person values. Both personal and reflexive markers distinguish between two number values: singular and plural. The paradigm for these markers is illustrated in Table (2).

Table 2: Possessive markers in Even

(a) Personal possessive suffixes

POSS	morpheme
1SG	-wu
2SG	-š(i)
3SG	-n(i)
1PL.INC	-t(i)
1PL.EXC	-wun
2PL	-šan
3PL	-tan

(b) Reflexive possessive suffixes

POSS.REFL	morpheme
SG	-i/-ji/-mi/-bi
PL	-wur

Another way of expressing possessive relations in Even is through the possessive form of a (pro)noun. Both personal pronouns and the reflexive pronoun in Even have distinct possessive forms, which I will refer to as the genitive form. These forms can be utilized within possessive constructions alongside the corresponding possessive suffixes detailed in Table (2), or within postpositional phrases, which should be analyzed as possessive phrases.

The genitive stem is not only used for possessive forms but also to derive other case forms of pronouns, as illustrated in Table (3). Unlike pronouns, nouns do not have special genitive forms. Nouns

pronoun	NOM	GEN	DAT
1SG	bi	min	min-du
2SG	i	in	in-du
3SG	noŋa-n '(s)he-POSS.3SG'	noŋa-n	noŋan-du-n '(s)he-DAT-POSS.3SG'
1PL.INC	mut	mut	mut-tu
1PL.EXC	bu	mun	mun-du
2PL	u	un	un-du
3PL	noŋa-r-tan '(s)he-PL-POSS.3PL'	noŋa-r-tan	noŋa-r-du-tan '(s)he-PL-DAT-POSS.3PL'

Table 3: Personal pronouns in Even

in the possessor position remain morphologically unmarked, much like their appearance in subject positions. Third-person pronouns exhibit noun-like behavior, evident in their morphological structure, which includes distinct non-suppletive exponents for number and possessive marking.

The first-person inclusive pronoun *mut* also displays similar forms in both subject and possessor positions, which is unexpected.

It is important to note that while possessive suffixes are obligatory, these genitive forms are optional (see 10).

(10)   min   žu-wu
       I.OBL   house-POSS.1SG

       'my house'

In Even, compounds are absent. Instead, compound-like structures are conveyed through possessive phrases, exemplified in (**??**).

(11)   munnukan   təwtə-n
       hare   berry-POSS.3SG

       'cranberry' (lit. 'hare's berry')

Summary on Even

In Even, there are markers that appear on the head of possessive phrases, along with the genitive form of (pro)nouns, which is an instance of dependent marking.

While dependent marking is optional, head marking is obligatory and resemble agreement, occurring even with non-referential possessors.

7.2   Kildin Saami

Saami < Uralic

Word order: SVO, Pr Ps

Nominal affix order: stem-OmnPl-Case+Number-Poss

According to the possessive paradigms presented in Kuruch et al. (1985) and Kert (1971), there are three distinct possible person values as illustrated in Tables (4) and (5). These scholars do not mention any variance between speakers. However, Rießler (2022) notes that "Kildin Saami has lost the regular possessive inflection of nouns. Remnants of the former possessive inflection are only found occasionally with kinship nouns".

Case	SG possessor, SG possessum			PL possessor, SG possessum		
	1 person	2 person	3 person	1 person	2 person	3 person
Nominative	-a[m] -an	-at	-es'	-a[m] / -an	-ant	-edes'
Genitive	-an	-at	-es'	-an / -edan	-edant	-edes'
Accusative	-an	-at	-es'	-e(t)dan	-edant	-edes'
Essive	-jan	-jant	-jas'	-jedan	-jedant	-jedes'
Inessive-Elative	-san	-sant	-esan	-esan	-esant	-eses'
Dative-Illative	-(ja)san	-(je)sant	-jes'	-jedan	-jedant	-jedas'

Table 4: Part of Possessive Paradigm of Kildin Saami

Case	SG possessor, PL possessum			PL possessor, PL possessum		
	1 person	2 person	3 person	1 person	2 person	3 person
Nominative	-a[m] -an	-ant	-edes'	-edan	-edant	-edes'
Genitive	-edan	-edant	-edes'	-edan	-edant	-edes'
Accusative	-edan	-edant	-edes'	-edan	-edant	-edes'
Essive	-edan	-jedant	-jedes'	-jedan	-jedant	-jedes'
Inessive-Elative	-esan	-esant	-eses't'	-esan	-esan	-eses't'
Dative-Illative	-ejdan	-jedant	-jedas	-jedan	-jedant	-jedas

Table 5: Part of Possessive Paradigm of Kildin Saami

In my view, the assertion made by Rießler (2022) is not entirely accurate. While it is true that the possessive declension is nearly extinct for nouns (as is the case in other Saami languages), it had been grammaticalized in reflexives and reciprocals prior to its loss. Therefore, possessive markers are obligatory in these structures, as demonstrated in example (12).

(12) a. nizan   ujjn-av   kaan'n'c' kaan'n'c'-*(es')
         women   see-NPST.3PL   friend   friend-POSS3

         'The women see each other.'

b. paṛ'ṛ'š'a oaffk iž'-*(es')
   boy   scolds self-POSS3

   'The boy scolds himself.'

Given that reflexives and reciprocals cannot be formed without the use of possessive morphology, yet possessive morphology is not commonly employed in the language, it is understandable that this presents an intriguing area of study.

Conventional possessive forms are infrequent and only appear sporadically. Nevertheless, these sporadic instances align with the diversity found in reflexive pronoun formation.

Speakers of Kildin Saami may be classified into two distinct groups based on the number of person values they differentiate in the possessive declension. One group of speakers differentiates between all three values, while the other group distinguishes only between two. In the latter group, first and second person values are always combined and expressed using a single marker, which consistently appears as -*ant*, the ex-marker for second person. This differentiation is illustrated in (13), with different colors representing each group of speakers.

(13) a. munn iž'-an/-ant   šobbš-a
        I   self-POSS1/POSS1_2 love-NPST1SG

        'I like myself.'

     b. toonn soagg-ex   kul'   iiӡ-s'-ant/ant
        you.SG catch-PST.2SG fish.ACC self-POSS2/POSS1_2

        'Did you fish for yourself?'

In Kildin Saami, speakers have different preferences regarding which nouns can take possessive suffixes. However, they generally adhere to a hierarchy: kinship terms > domestic animals > certain household items. This hierarchy implies that all speakers allow possessive markers on (some) kinship terms. If a speaker allows possessive marking on certain household items, they typically also allow possessive markers on certain domestic animals. Nouns that do not fit into these categories are less likely to be found with possessive markers.

In Kildin Saami, there is a set of possessive markers that are dependent-marked, known as possessive pronouns. These pronouns have largely replaced possessive suffixes in usage. Speakers of Kildin Saami prefer using these possessive pronouns, with possessive suffixes being rarely employed, except in cases involving reflexives and reciprocals as mentioned earlier.

Summary on Kildin Saami

Kildin Saami has the preference for dependent marked possessive markers, specifically possessive pronouns, over possessive suffixes. These possessive pronouns have largely replace the use of possessive suffixes. Speakers of Kildin Saami commonly use possessive pronouns to indicate possession, with possessive suffixes reserved for specific contexts such as reflexives and reciprocals.

Furthermore, Kildin Saami speakers exhibit a hierarchical pattern in determining which nouns can take possessive markers. This hierarchy prioritizes certain categories of nouns, such as kinship terms, domestic animals, and household items, for possessive marking. Nouns falling outside these categories are less likely to be marked with possessive suffixes or pronouns, and when they are, it occurs sporadically. Concluding, possessive suffixes in Kildin Saami are not obligatory while possessive pro-

nouns are obligatory.

7.3   Marind

Marindic < Anim

In Marind, possessive relation can be expressed by two different strategies: a postpositional phrase headed by *en* expressing the possessor (14), and juxtaposition of the possessor and possessum (15).

According to ([Olsson 2021](): 158), *en* is dependent marking since it forms a constituent with a possessum.

(14)   amay   en   yay   en   pula
       ancestor POSS   uncle   POSS   taboo.spot

       'grandpa's uncle's taboo spot'

(15)   nok   onos   ɣa   k-a-Ø   ehe,   oɣ   ɣakna
       1   cousin   real aprs.ntrl-3sg-be.npst   prox:I   2sg   husband's.elder.bro:2sg

       k-a-Ø
       aprs.ntrl-3sg-be.npst

       'This is my cousin, your brother-in-law.'

According to [Olsson (2021)](), the postpositional phrase with *en* in Marind has no restrictions on the type of ownership expressed and can convey associative meanings. This construction is flexible in its use and allows for a broad range of possessive relationships to be expressed.

In Marind, many kinship terms have special forms marked with possessive prefixes that are identical to the Undergoer prefixes. While these special marked forms can be used along with the *en* construction, it is not obligatory to do so. Simply using the *en* phrase is sufficient to express possessive relation.

Notably, the juxtaposition strategy of placing the possessor and possessum side by side is not commonly observed with kinship terms in Marind, highlighting a preference for the *en* postpositional phrase when expressing possession involving kinship terms.

Summary on Marind

In Marind, possessive marking involves two distinct sets of markers. The first set utilizes dependent marking with the postposition *en*, which establishes a relationship between the possessor and the possessum within a postpositional phrase. This strategy is versatile and can convey various types of possession and associative meanings.

The second set of markers consists of prefixes occurring on the head of most kinship terms. These special prefixes indicate possession and are closely associated with kinship relationships. The presence of a special prefixed form for a noun implies that the *en* strategy can also be used for possession involving that noun.

However, if there is no special prefixed form available for a noun, speakers of Marind have the option to use either the *en* strategy or simply place the possessor and possessum side by side without any intervening markers. Juxtaposition, in this context, represents a no-marking strategy since Marind lacks case marking.

Glossary

1	first person	GEN	genitive
2	second person	INC	inclusive
3	third person	NOM	nominative
ACC	accusative	NPST	non-past
ADJ	adjective	OBL	oblique
ART	article	PL	plural
DAT	dative	POSS	possessive
DU	dual	PST	past
EXC	exclusive	REFL	reflexive
F	feminine	SG	singular

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 2003. Some notes on the structure of alienable and inalienable possessors. *From NP to DP* 2. 167–188.

Bickel, Balthasar. 2008. A refined sampling procedure for genealogical control. *Language Typology and Universals* 61(3). 221–233.

Broadbent, Sylvia M. 1964. *The southern sierra miwok language*. Vol. 38 (University of California Publications in Linguistics). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dixon, Robert M. W. 1988. *A grammar of boumaa fijian*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1989. Large linguistic areas and language sampling. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language"* 13(2). 257–292.

Duguine, Maia. 2008. Structural case and the typology of possessive constructions. In *Annual meeting of the berkeley linguistics society*, 97–108.

Janhunen, Juha A. 2012. *Mongolian*. Vol. 19. John Benjamins Publishing.

Kert, Georgiy M. 1971. *Saamskij jazyk (kil'dinskij dialekt): fonetika, morfologija, sintaksis.* [*Saami language (Kildin dialect): phonetics, morphology, syntax*]. Leningrad: Nauka.

Kuruch, Rimma D. et al. 1985. *Saamsko-russkij slovar'* [*Saami-Russian dictionary*]. Moscow: Russkij Jazyk.

Lander, Yury & Nichols, Johanna. 2020. Head/dependent marking. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of linguistics*.

Miestamo, Matti & Bakker, Dik & Arppe, Antti. 2016. Sampling for variety. *Linguistic Typology* 20(2). 233–296.

Miller, Wick R. 1965. *Acoma grammar and texts*. Vol. 40 (University of California Publications in Linguistics). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Nichols, Johanna. 1986. Head-marking and dependent-marking grammar. *Language*. 56–119.

Nichols, Johanna. 1988. On alienable and inalienable possession. *In honor of Mary Haas*. 557–609.

Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. University of Chicago Press.

Nichols, Johanna & Bickel, Balthasar. 2013. Locus of Marking in Possessive Noun Phrases. In Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. https://wals.info/chapter/24.

Olsson, Bruno. 2021. *A grammar of coastal marind*. Vol. 87. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.

Rießler, Michael. 2022. Kildin Saami. In *The Oxford Guide to the Uralic Languages*. Oxford University Press.

Rijkhoff, Jan et al. 1993. A method of language sampling. *Studies in Language. International Journal sponsored by the Foundation "Foundations of Language"* 17(1). 169–203.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1981. The possessive construction in hungarian: a configurational category in a non-configurational language. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 31(1/4). 261–289.

Van Rijn, Marlou. 2016a. Locus of marking typology in the possessive np: a new approach. *Folia Linguistica* 50(1). 269–327.

Van Rijn, Marlou. 2016b. The grammaticalization of possessive person marking: A typological approach. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 114(2). 233–276.

Voorhoeve, Clemens L. 1965. *The flamingo bay dialect of the asmat language*. Vol. 46 (Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal, Land en Volkenkunde). The Hague: M. Nijhoff.