S Berkeley Linguistics Society

Alienability, Inalienability and Nominal Classification Author(s): Hilary Chappell and William McGregor Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1989), pp. 24-36

Please see "How to cite" in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via <u>eLanguage</u>, the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

ALIENABILITY, INALIENABILITY AND NOMINAL CLASSIFICATION

Hilary Chappell and William McGregor La Trobe University

1. INTRODUCTION

We have two main, closely related, purposes in writing this paper. Firstly, we attempt to account for the fact that inalienability in many languages is formally marked in the same way as nominal classification, frequently referred to in the literature by 'compounding'. Both construction types are typically zero marked. Alienability, by contrast, seems to be always formally distinct from classification, and is normally realized by overt morphological marking, typically on the dependent constituent. And secondly, we wish to argue that formal identity notwithstanding, inalienability must be regarded as grammatically and semantically distinct from classification.

As to the first point, we suggest that it correlates with two important variables: (i) the degree of referentiality or individuation of the modifying noun; and (ii) the conceptual distance (q.v. Haiman 1985) between the referents of the head and dependent noun. These features are iconically represented by the formal characteristics, of (a) status as independent phrases or words, and (b) overt, mediating morphological marking respectively. Two implicational scales are proposed which account for the facts represented in our sample of languages. These scales relate degree of referentiality and conceptual distance to the grammatical phenomena of alienable possession, inalienability and nominal classification in such a way that the greater values of referentiality and conceptual distance correlate with alienable possession while the lesser values correspond to inalienability and classification.

Our second point is a suggestion that in languages which do not distinguish formally between inalienability and classification, the distinction is nevertheless present but covert (Whorf 1956). This appears to hold in the languages of our sample, and we present some arguments which may have cross-linguistic validity.

Our argument is organized as follows. Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 define and exemplify each of the three main types of relationship under investigation, respectively alienability, inalienability and classification. These sections form the main body of the paper, presenting a cross-linguistic analysis with data from a corpus of 20 languages from 15 different language families. These are Sino-Tibetan (Mandarin Chinese, Burmese); Austronesian (Manam, Tolai, Paamese); Altaic (Turkish, Mongolian); Africa (Ewe (Tano-Congo), Acholi (West Nilotic), Kpelle (Mande, Niger-Congo)); Australia (Gooniyandi (Bunuban), Nyulnyul (Nyulnyulan), Yidin and Jaru (Pama-Nyungan)); Papua New Guinea (Fore (East Central Highlands), Maisin (of uncertain family membership), Amele (Gum)); America (Imbabura Quechua (Quechuan), Tzutujil (Mayan)), Kiowa (Kiowa-Tanoan)); and Indo-European (English). Section 3 elucidates the connection between inalienability and classification, and presents an overview of the data by means of two implicational hierarchies. We conclude (in section 4) with a brief summary which attempts to show the wider relevance of our arguments and findings.

2. SEMANTIC AND SYNTACTIC DESCRIPTION

2.1. Alienability

Alienability is realized by various construction types which we will refer to collectively as genitives. In many languages, the genitive construction is the morphologically and syntactically marked member of the three types of relationship, and has the possessor realized by an NP which

is separated from the possessed constituent by an overt linking marker. This may be either attached to the possessor NP (e.g. English, Gooniyandi, Mandarin Chinese and Jaru), be attached to a possessive classifier (Austronesian languages), or may constitute a separate word (e.g. Nyulnyul, Ewe and Acholi). Less frequently, the marker occurs as a morpheme bound to the possessed constituent (e.g. Kiowa and Tzutujil).

The common pattern of morpho-syntactic separation iconically reflects, we suggest, the 'alienable' semantic relation of non-inherent association between the referents of the two nominal constituents, a relationship established solely through the construction itself, and not necessarily through any real world circumstances (Kay & Zimmer 1976:29). We put this forward as a first approximation to the core meaning of the genitive.

Although they appear to be the marked member of the set from a grammatical point of view, genitives are semantically unmarked, and encode a broad range of specific interpretations, which are contextualizations of the above mentioned core meaning (cf. Kay & Zimmer 1976, who mention many of the senses, without attempting to relate them as contextualizations of a single core meaning). The specific senses include, among others, temporary ownership, voluntary association, all kinds of transitory possession and the use and disposal of objects. For example, the English genitive, Harriet's red nose, apart from referring to a part of Harriet's face, could also refer to the plastic nose she bought for a masquerade (and hence is owner of), the paper one she was given to play 'pin the nose on the clown' with (a case of transient possession), or the one she drew herself and cut out to give away to a child (where Harriet is the fabricator). Similarly the English expression my bus need not only refer to a bus exclusively in the speaker's possession, that is, one s/he bought and owns, but also to the bus s/he catches every day to work and by extension, to any bus on the habitual route. It may even refer to the bus a person ought to take to reach their destination, including, for example, the bus just missed:

(1) That's your bus pulling out right now.

Thus the genitive does not express strict 'ownership' or 'possession', but rather a freely-made association between two referents (q.v. also Welmers 1973:212). The possibilities just described for English are also available interpretations for genitive constructions in many other unrelated languages. In Tolai, for example, Mosel (1984:36) describes the common denominator of the alienable possessive construction coded by the possessive classifier -ka as being an 'active voluntary or controlling relationship such as temporary ownership' which 'implies acquisition and the possibility of disposal, or as personal relationships other than kinship' which 'presuppose selection'. For example, 'wife' (alienable) as opposed to 'brother' (inalienable) and 'adopted child' (alienable) versus 'own child by birth' (inalienable) in Tolai:⁴

(2) Possessive classifier Pronominal Possessor Possessed N (alienable)

kau -gu vavina / mumum

poss⁵ -my woman / adopted:child

'my wife / adopted children'

(3) Possessed N Pronominal Possessor (inalienable)

ura / natu -gu
brother / son -my
'my brother / son'

The genitive construction typically contains two referential NPs, both of which permit modification by means of, for example, adjectives, determiners, demonstratives, numeral classifiers

and adverbials. (The particulars vary from language to language.) For example, in Mandarin Chinese,

(4)	Possessor NP			GEN	Possessed N
	zhèi	zuo	miào	de	qiáng
	this	CL	temple	GEN	wall
	'the v	valls of			

(5) jiù shèhuì de hèn duō fēngsú old society GEN very many custom 'very many customs of the old society'.

Before leaving this topic, it is worth mentioning that some languages, notably many from the Austronesian family, manifest a formal distinction between different types of alienability. Paamese, spoken on Vanuatu, is such a language, distinguishing four types of alienability, depending on the choice of possessive classifier — see Crowley (1982:219). These possessive classifiers distinguish according to the purpose or use of the alienable 'possession'. (Note, however, that they are all instances of alienability, as distinct from inalienability, which does not employ a possessive classifier — see below.)

(6)	Possessed N	Possessive Classifier	-Pronominal Possessor		
	ani	ā	-k	'my green coconut for eating'	
	ani	ma	-k	'my green coconut for drinking'	
	ani	<i>3</i> 2	-k	'green coconut growing on my land'	
	ani	ona	-k	'my green coconut used for any purpose' (e.g. as door stopper, weapon)	

2.2 Inalienable constructions

Nominal constructions expressing inalienability represent a halfway house between genitives and nominal classification. Cross-linguistically, it has been found that inalienable nominal constructions are of two main types: (a) In many languages they are zero-marked (cf. Haiman 1985, Hopper & Thompson 1985, Seiler 1983, Fox 1981; Chappell & McGregor (in prep.)), the nominal referring to the possessor being juxtaposed to the nominal referring to the possessed, without the intervention of morphological markers. Languages of this type include: Jaru, Yidip, Mandarin Chinese, Acholi, and Ewe. (b) An equally frequent pattern is for the inalienably possessed item to be marked by a bound morpheme, normally a pronominal cross-referencing the possessor. Languages of this type include Paamese, Nyulnyul, Manam, and many Amerindian languages (see Nichols 1988). In terms of Nichols' parameters, then, inalienability is associated with head marking or non-marking, whilst alienability (as we have seen) is typically associated with dependent marking.

In both (a) and (b) the morphological marking is iconic to the semantic relationship of 'inherence' being encoded. In type (a) there is a lack of any 'morpho-syntactic mediation' between the two nominals (q.v. Mosel 1984, Seiler 1983), whilst in type (b) a single word refers to the two referent entities.

Inalienability covers a variety of semantic fields, which vary from language to language. However, in almost all languages which have a distinct inalienable construction, this encodes at least the body-part to whole relation and/or kinterms (see Nichols 1988). For example:

(7) Yidin:

jaja ngumbar wungul gambil child face carpet:snake tail 'child's face' 'carpet snake's tail'

(8) Paamese:

ah 73-n v Tvi-n brain-3sg cheek-3sg 'his/her brain' 'his/her cheek'

In some languages, the inalienable relationship may also be extended to parts of inanimate entities. Acholi is such a language:

(9) Animates

wang dako pyen lagwa eye/face woman skin zebra 'woman's eyes/face' 'zebra's skin'

(10) Inanimates

 wen
 agwata
 pok
 lemun

 handle
 calabash:scoop
 skin
 orange

 'handle of a calabash scoop'
 'skin of an orange'

However, more frequently, it seems that the part-whole relation for inanimates is treated as classification (q.v. section 2.3).

Other semantic fields frequently covered by inalienability include exuviae such as blood, sweat and tears; aspects of the personality including emotions; forms of personal representation such as terms for soul, reputation and name; and concepts involving images of the person such as footprints, shadow, photograph, story or song. (Inalienability in most languages covers only a subset of this range.) Some examples are:

(11) Manam

taburí -gu fear -1sg 'my fear'

(12) Nyulnyul

 nga
 -marraj
 nga
 -lawirl
 nga
 -ginbal

 1sg
 -shadow
 1sg
 -name
 1sg
 -appearance

 'my shadow, my reflection'
 'my name'
 'my appearance'

(13) Paamese

ve -n footprint -3sg 'his/her footprints'

Finally, in many languages, important cultural concepts and objects of value can or must be encoded by an inalienable construction when being related to a second noun (see Bally 1926; Chappell & McGregor (eds.) in prep.). Examples of this category would be traditional items of clothing and terms for 'home', including the place where one sleeps:

(14) Manam

tamóata málo -ø man breech:clout -3sg:ad 'the man's breech clout' (but only when he is wearing it)

(15) Paamese

vuli -nsleeping:place -3sghis/her regular sleeping place/hole'

Hence, we choose not to define the inalienable relation in terms of 'a part of (the whole)'. Our research (e.g. Chappell & McGregor 1988, Chappell 1986, McGregor 1985) has shown clearly that the inalienable relationship is more centrally concerned with the idea of two entities being inextricably linked than the part-whole relation — clearly footprints, souls and clothing are not parts of a person in the normal sense of that word, and on the other hand, in many languages (e.g. Nyulnyul), terms for hair and fingernails are not treated as inalienables, even though they are physically parts of the body. By this we mean that one thing is so closely related to another as to be 'inseparable' from it in a particular referent context, in regard to a particular referent event or process. We do not mean that one of the items cannot be detached from the other. The noteworthy feature of the inalienable construction is that it does not encode ownership nor establish any kind of voluntary or transitory association between the two nouns, but rather expresses a closely bound relationship.

In nominal constructions encoding inalienability, it seems to be the case that both nouns are referential in nature — that is, they refer to particular entities, rather than generically to classes of entities. As we have already suggested, inalienability represents a point midway between alienability and classification. Although both nouns are referential, in many languages the head noun referring to the inalienable possession may not permit modification without recourse to other morphological strategies, if at all. (This is particularly clear in the case of clause-level coding of inalienability, for example, dative constructions in French and German where the body part may only be marked by the definite article and not by any adjectives — see Wierzbicka 1979.) Consider the following examples from Mandarin: The first example, (16), with an inalienable construction, is well-formed syntactically with a pronominal possessor and possessed noun in apposition (see Chappell 1988). Upon adjectival modification of $u\bar{u}'$ leg', a construction with the genitive marker de must be used as in (17), otherwise an ungrammatical sentence results (18):

Hence the two nominals of inalienable constructions do not have an equal pragmatic status as they do in the genitive and in this respect behave more like classificatory constructions.

2.3 Classification

Classification refers to the phenomenon whereby the dependent nominal indicates the type of entity that is being referred to by the head nominal. That is, it is the embodiment of the type-token relation within the nominal phrase. Nearly all of the languages in our example used apposition, that is, simple juxtaposition of two nouns as the mode of realization of compounding:⁶

(19)	Imbabura Quechua	<u>Amele</u>	<u>Maisin</u>	
	yura uma	na ahul	taru foyang	
	tree head	tree coconut	dog tail	
	'treetop'	'coconut tree'	'dog's tail'	

In all of the languages of our sample the head nominal and dependent classifier occur next to one another, with the classifier almost always preceding the head nominal. Amele is the only exception: as the above example shows, the head typically occurs first. It should be noted that there is a grammatical difference between classification on the one hand and genitives and inalienable constructions on the other. It is that the classifier may not be realized by a pronominal. Both classifier and head must be filled by substantives. In the genitive and inalienable constructions, the dependent role may be discharged by a pronominal.

There are many different ways in which classification contextualizes in particular instances, including generic-specific, function-form, use-item, status-holder, slot-filler, and role-occupant (cf. Halliday 1985:115). Most of these senses occur in nominal classification both across languages and within individual languages. The first relation, generic-specific, is the one almost always found encoded by classification. For instance, in Gooniyandi:

(20) girili mandaadda tree Leichhardt:tree 'Leichhardt tree'

In classification there is only one referential noun, the head noun; the other acts as its dependent, specifying the class or type to which the head noun belongs, and is thus not referential. Compare, for example, the following two examples from Manam:

(21) bóesa moarépi
Boesa sweet:potato
'Boesa sweet potato' (i.e. a variety of sweet potato — regardless of whether or not they are grown on Boesa Island)

(22) boésa níu né -di
Boesa coconut gen:poss 3pl
'Boesa coconuts' (i.e. coconuts of the Boesa people, coconuts that grow on Boesa)

Similarly, in Turkish:

(23) *çoban* -*in kiz* -*i* (Genitive) shepherd -3sg:GEN girl -3sg:GEN 'the shepherd's daughter'

vs:

(24) *çoban kız -ı* (Classification) shepherd girl -3sg:GEN 'the shepherd girl'

It seems to hold as a cross-linguistic generalization that no material may come between the classifying and head noun to further modify the head noun. In this way classification contrasts grammatically with the genitive construction in many languages. In Turkish, genitives (Lewis's 'definite *izafet'* 1967) may be modified but compounds do not permit any material to intervene between the two nouns.

- (25) Possessor N -Gen. Possessed N -3sg Gen.

 Istanbul -'un tarihî cami -ler -i

 Istanbul -3sg:GEN historic mosque 3PL -3sg:GEN

 'the historic mosques of Istanbul'
- (27) *İstanbul tarihî cami-ler-i

And in Ewe, if either of the nouns is modified, the genitive construction with $\emptyset e$ must be used, as shown by the following examples:

- (28) gbo fo goat leg 'goat leg'
- (29) gbo vé vê má *(Φe) a-jò ngénge lá goat smelly DEM poss. leg broken DEF 'the smelly goat's broken leg'

These facts iconically reflect both the close relation between the two nouns and the lower degree of referentiality of the classifying noun.

3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ALIENABILITY, INALIENABILITY AND CLASSIFICATION

We now attempt to account for the close connection between classification and inalienability. Restricting attention to the part-whole subtype, the whole naturally contextualizes as a generic, the part as a specific, at least in those circumstances in which the whole is not specific and identifiable. In other words, given the inalienable possessor as a nominal with non-specific reference, it is at the same time a good candidate for indicating the type of thing that the part is, in contrast to parts of other wholes. Indeed, when it comes to inanimates, and lesser animates, the fact that these are treated as non-individuated (or less individuated than human beings) in many circumstances means that they are good candidates for classifiers of their parts, as shown by the examples from Yidin:

- (30) wungul gambil
 carpet:snake tail
 'carpet snake's tail' (inalienable)
- (31) minya gangu:l animal wallaby 'wallaby' (classifier + noun)
- (32) minya wungul gambil animal carpet:snake tail 'carpet snake's tail' (classifier + inalienable construction)

It is perhaps worth remarking here that it is the fact that the relation is of the part-whole type, rather than the fact that the relation is one of inalienability that makes it suitable for interpretation as classification. We have seen that inalienability needs to be defined in terms of inextricable linkage.

In sharp contrast to this, alienable possessors do not in general suit either the general semantic description of type, or any of the more specific descriptions associated with type, given the fact

that they are high on the scale of referentiality. Thus, it is not surprising that cross-linguistically, alienable possession is rarely treated formally in the same way as classification; nor do alienable possessions frequently function as classifiers.

A number of other analyses have noted a connection between inalienability and classification (e.g. Seiler 1983, Ameka 1988, Reh, Heine & Lamberti 1981), although few attempt an explanation. All agree that they are subtypes of a general type; the disagreement concerns the nature of the general type. For example, Ameka (1988), using Wierzbicka's framework of natural language semantics (1978, 1982), shows how both of these relations in Ewe share some, but not all, components of meaning. (Cf. also Evans 1988.)

Hierarchy 1: Constituent status

Semantic relation		Means of coding	Construction type
alienable		2 phrases	e.g. NP
			NPpossessor Npossessed the girl's computer
inalienable	r e f e r e n	1 phrase	NP N_1 N_2 N_1 N_2 N_1 N_2 N_1 N_2 N_1 N_2 N_1 N_2
	t i a l i	juxtaposed nominals	N N Steam train
	У	lexical compound	NP N ₁ -N ₂ I I moonlight
classification		single lexeme	NP N - blackbird

Our findings may be summarized in terms of two implicational hierarchies which associate alienability, inalienability and classification with constituent status on the one hand and morphological marking on the other. According to these scales, if one of these relations is realized formally by a certain construction, then no semantic relations below it on the hierarchy may be realized by a construction that is higher than the first construction. Likewise, if a particular

construction encodes a semantic relation of a certain type, then no construction below it will encode a semantic relation higher on the scale than the first construction. (For convenience our hierarchies have been rotated from the horizontal to the vertical.)

Remarks on hierarchy 1:

- (1) Words and constituents have been ordered here for convenience of representation only; there is no suggestion that this corresponds to their typical order in any particular language.
- (2) It is difficult to distinguish between N_1 - N_2 constructions involving classification that constitute compounds and those which constitute single lexemes, and even to distinguish these from constructions which do not form compounds or lexemes. Moreover, the criteria are likely to differ from language to language. These differences are not important to our present purposes, as we are concerned with the relationship encoded of classification.

semantic relation		morphological marking			example languages
		Dependent	Marker	Head	
alienable	с о п с	NP	{PossPro PossMarker }	N	Nyulnyul (al)
	e p t	NP	PossClassifier + ProAffix	N	Paamese (al)
	u a l	{NP PossPro}	+ Oblique marker	N	English, Gooniyandi (al, inal) Yidiny (al)
inalienable	d i	N	ProAffix +	N	Paamese (inal)
	s t		ProAffix +	N	Nyulnyul (inal)
classification	a n c e	N-ø		N-ø	Yidiny (inal, class) English, Gooniyandi (class) Chinese

Hierarchy 2: Morphological marking

Remarks on hierarchy 2:

- (1) Hierarchy 2 shows only the predominant realizations of the different formal possibilities for each language; to indicate all the possibilities would be confusing.
- (2) It might be objected that since this hierarchy involves both morphological information and information of word/constituent boundaries, hierarchy 1 and hierarchy 2 could be combined into a single hierarchy. However, to do this would miss the point that it is necessary to include information on where the bound morpheme (if any) occurs, and so it is not possible to strictly separate morphological form from morphological syntax. And to confuse the two would fail to bring to light significant generalizations. Note, in this connection, that the final line of the hierarchy, N-ø N-ø does not distinguish among the various word-boundary possibilities for this information, see hierarchy 1.
- (3) The genitive, as the semantically unmarked construction, often allows substitution of semantic categories found below it on the continuum. That is, categories typically encoded by the

inalienable or classifying constructions may sometimes also be encoded by the genitive, with a concomitant change of meaning. For example, in some languages with the alienable/inalienable distinction, (some) parts of the body and some other items typically treated as inalienable may be encoded by the genitive instead of the inalienable construction. For instance, this obtains in both Yidin (Dixon 1976) and Jaru (Tsunoda 1981), for parts of the human being — though not for inanimates. In such circumstances we hypothesize that the body part is conceived of as an individuated entity in its own right or as physically separate from the body. This may happen, for instance, in detailed descriptions of a person's appearance, in metaphor, epithets and avoidance language, or even in the case of reference to physically separated parts of the body (cf. Bally 1926). Consider two examples from Paamese:

```
(33) Ametemau, avu!
eye:extent grandmother (free form)
'What big eyes you have, grandmother!'
(34) Asa, ao?!
```

what, penis (free form)

'What is it, prick?!' (cf. $\bar{o}n$ 'his penis (inal)')

On the other hand, terms which occur in the genitive are not normally able to occur in the inalienable construction (see also Seiler 1983). Nor are they usually able to occur in classification — except when the genitive relation is also marked.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have discussed the connection between classification and inalienability in a number of different languages, from diverse genetic families; we attempted to account for this connection by means of a pair of implicational scales relating to the two variables of formal separateness of the nominals as phrases or words, which we suggest to be iconic of the degree of referentiality of the nominals; and secondly, morphological marking, which we suggest reflects the proximity or otherwise of the connection between the nominals. On both counts inalienability is closer to classification than is alienable possession.

We have also suggested that while these three types of relationship are not always formally distinct at the level of the phrase, there is convincing support cross-linguistically for treating the relationships of inalienability and classification as in fact different, indeed both semantically and grammatically different, and thus instances of covert categories. It is possible also that inalienability should be distinguished from alienability in all languages, whether or not there is a formal contrast. We have not had the space to explore this possibility here — but see e.g. Kay & Zimmer (1976:34) for suggestive comments in this direction.

To conclude the paper, we draw attention to the wider significance of our findings. The formal similarity between inalienability and classification we have been investigating within the noun phrase finds interesting parallels elsewhere. For instance, according to Welmers (1973:279), the formal distinction between alienable and inalienable in some of the Mande languages (Niger-Congo), generally non-noun class languages, is isomorphic to the use of noun classes in the Bantu language family, particularly with respect to the opposition of noun classes containing kinship terms versus all others. For example, the marker for alienable genitive constructions in many Mande languages is claimed by Welmers to be cognate to the noun class marker for classes other than those including kin terms in Bantu languages. More interestingly, there are languages which incorporate nominals into the verbal complex, in which inalienable possessions are treated in the

same way as generic-specific classifiers. For example, consider the following two Mayali examples (from Evans 1988):

- (35) ka -yaw -karrm -e al -daluk 3minA+3minO -baby -have -PAST ClassII -female 'She has a baby girl'
- (36) ngan -karre+mok -bukka -ng
 3minA+1minO -calf+sore -show -PastPerfective
 'He showed me his sore calf.'

Clearly, our hypotheses account for this formal collapse.

Furthermore, some nominal-incorporating languages permit the incorporation of secondary predicates (Nichols 1978) or attributes which are central to the referent process, as well as inalienables. This is the case in Rembarrnga (see McKay 1975):

- (37) par -tumu -mirri -ya
 3min.IMPL+3min.A -small:of:back -spear -PAST:PUNCT
 'He speared him in the small of the back.' (McKay 1975:299)
- (38) kalij -ø -ma pantu yærra -turra -ra -ø others -NOM -ma here 1.aug.S -alive -ra -PRES 'Others of us are still (getting around) alive.' (McKay 1975:292)

This suggests the possibility of further extension of our hypotheses to include not just classification, but also attribution, thus accounting for the fact that some languages (e.g. Ungarinyin and Wunambal (Northern Kimberley, Australia) use the same set of prefixes to mark inalienables as are used to mark carriers of certain attributes. For example, compare gurr-ornarr 'your bones' and gurr-arnerr 'you (pl) are great' in Ungarinyin (Rumsey 1982:43, 54).

NOTES

- 1 We use the terms 'possessor', 'possessed' and 'possession' merely as convenient labels as opposed to Ultan (1978), Seiler (1983) and Nichols (1988), amongst others, who regard the label as indicating some general aspect of meaning, shared by the constructions they investigate. Although we use these terms as labels, the purely semantic notion of 'possession' is regarded in this paper as being expressed by the genitive construction see section 2.1.
- ² Seiler (1983) also uses the construct of a continuum. The scope of his analysis is broader than ours in that it treats, for example, verbs of having and existence amongst a wide range of morphological and syntactic means for expressing 'possession'. Consequently, a markedly different continuum to ours representing 'the dimension of possession' is set up. Note also that in Seiler (1983) inalienability and alienability are subsumed under the rubric 'possession' as two possible points on this scale. In our analysis, 'possession' is a semantic feature restricted to encoding by genitive constructions which refers to a non-inherent, often temporary relationship between the two referents see section 2.1 for a more detailed discussion. Haiman (1985:103) also proposes a scale of linguistic distance corresponding to the conceptual distance between notions represented.
- ³ The data and examples are obtained from the reference grammars and articles listed below.
- ⁴ Mosel points out (1984:34) that 'the bride is bought by the relatives of the bridegroom and becomes the property of the man' and that upon divorce, 'the family of the woman has to pay back the bride price'. Note that the terms for both 'husband' and 'spouse' are also treated as alienables.
- ⁵ The following abbreviations are used: A = subject of transitive clause; al = alienable; ART = article; aug = augmented; class/CLF = classifier; GEN = genitive; IMPL = implicated; inal = inalienable; INC = inceptive aspect marker; min = minimal; N = noun;) = object of transitive clause; PL = plural; pro = pronoun; poss = possessive; S = subject of intransitive clause; and sg = singular.

⁶ We will mainly consider the type of classification represented by compounds formed by a double nominal in this analysis with some reference to other types of classification encoded by means of noun class markers or by nominal incorporation

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Liú Míngchén (from Beijing, PR China) and Mehmet Çelik (from Konya, Turkey), both postgraduate students at La Trobe University, for acting as consultants on Mandarin Chinese and Turkish respectively. We also express our gratitude to Felix Ameka, Edith Bavin, Terry Crowley and Nicholas Evans for use of data from their papers presented at the workshop on Body Parts in Grammar at the annual conference of the Australian Linguistics Society in 1988.

REFERENCES

- Ameka, F. 1988. Body parts in Ewe grammar. To appear in H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.) (in prep).
- Bally, Ch. 1926. L'expression des idées de sphères personnelles et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes. In Fankhauser & J.Jud (eds.), Festschrift Louis Gauchat. Aarau: H.R. Sauerländer:68-78.
- Bavin, E. 1988. Body part constructions in Acholi. To appear in H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.)
- Chappell, H. 1986. The passive of bodily effect in Chinese. Studies in Language 10.2:271-296.
- Chappell, H. 1988. Inalienability in Mandarin Chinese: Double subject and discontinuous double object constructions. To appear in H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.) (in prep.)
- Chappell, H. & W. McGregor. 1988. Body parts in grammar. To be revised as introduction for H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.) (in prep).
- Chappell, H. & W. McGregor (eds.). In prep. The grammar of inalienability.
- Cole, P. 1985. Imbabura Quechua. London: Croom Helm.
- Crowley, T. 1982. The Paamese Language of Vanuatu. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics B-87.
- Crowley, T. 1988. Body part constructions and part-whole constructions in Paamese grammar. To appear in H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.).
- Dayley, J. 1985. Tzutujil Grammar. Berkeley: UC Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W.1977. A grammar of Yidin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Evans, N. 1988. The syntax and semantics of body part incorporation. To appear in H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.)
- Fox, B. 1981. Body part syntax: Towards a universal characterization. Studies in Language 5:323-342.
- Haiman, J. 1985. Natural syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Arnold.
- Hopper, P.J. & S.A. Thompson. 1985. The iconicity of the universal categories 'noun' and 'verb'. In J. Haiman (ed.) *Iconicity in Syntax*. Amsterdam: Benjamins: 151-183.
- Kay, P. & Zimmer, K. 1976. On the semantics of compounds and genitives in English. Sixth California Linguistics Association Conference Proceedings, 29-35.
- Lewis, G.L. 1967. Turkish Grammar. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Li, C.N. & S. A. Thompson. 1981. Mandarin Chinese. A Functional Reference Grammar. Berkeley: UC Press.
- Lichtenberk, F. 1983. A Grammar of Manam. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication No. 18. University of Hawaii Press.

- McGregor, W. 1985. Body parts in Kuniyanti clause grammar. Australian Journal of Linguistics 5:209-232.
- McGregor, W. 1988. Nominal prefixing in Nyulnyul. To appear in H. Chappell & W. McGregor (eds.).
- McKay, G. 1975. Rembarnga: a Language of Central Arnhem Land. Ph.D thesis, Australian National University.
- Mosel, U. 1984. Tolai Syntax and its Historical Development. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics B-92.
- Nichols, J. 1978. Secondary predicates. *BLS* 4:114-127. Nichols, J. 1988. On alienable and inalienable possession. In Shipley, W. (ed.), *In honor of Mary*
- Haas: from the Haas Festival Conference on Native American Linguistics. Berlin: Mouton-De Gruyter. 557-609.
- Okell, J. 1969. A Reference Grammar of Colloquial Burmese. London: Oxford UP. Poppe, N. 1970. Mongolian Language Handbook. Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Reh, M., B. Heine & M. Lamberti. 1981. Inhärenz in Possessivkonstruktionen afrikanischer Sprachen. Cologne: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft. UNITYP paper.
- Roberts, J. 1987. Amele. London: Croom Helm.

Verlag.

- Ross, M. 1984. Maisin: A Preliminary Sketch. Papers in New Guinea Linguistics No. 23.1-82.
- Canberra: Pacific Linguistics A-69.
 Rumsey, A. 1982. An Intra-sentence Grammar of Ungarinjin North-Western Australia. Canberra:
- Pacific Linguistics B-86.
- Scott, G. 1978. The Fore Language of Papua New Guinea. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics B-47. Seiler, H. 1983. Possession as an Operational Dimension of Language. Tübingen: Gunter Narr
- Seiler, H. 1985. Language, Object and Order. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Swift, L. 1963. A Reference Grammar of Modern Turkish. Bloomington: Indiana UP.
- Tiee, H. 1986. A Reference Grammar of Chinese Sentences. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Tsunoda, T. 1981. *The Djaru language of Kimberley, Western Australia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics B-78.
- Ultan, R. 1978. Toward a typology of substantival possession. In J. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of Human Language*. v.4:12-49. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Watkins, L.J. 1984. A Grammar of Kiowa. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Welmers, W. 1973. African Language Structures. Berkeley: UC Press.
- Whorf, B. 1956. Language, Thought and Reality. Selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf,
- J.B.Carrol (ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1978. Semantic Primitives. Frankfurt: Athenäum.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1979. Ethno-syntax and the philosophy of grammar. Studies in Language 3.3:313-383.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1982, Lingua Mentalis. Sydney: Academic Press.