Possessive Constructions in Languages of West Indonesia: NP Incorporation vs. DP Separation

Yury A. Lander, Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow

1. Introduction

This paper is about non-pronominal possessive constructions in languages of West Indonesia[1]. The constructions under discussion in these languages are sometimes thought to be relatively simple. For example, Arakin (1965) and Asmah Hj. Omar (1974) described them almost exclusively in terms of right-branchness. Still, different types of possessive constructions can be found[2].

Juxtaposition type is the simplest. Here the possessor phrase is juxtaposed to the possessum, as in (1)[3].

(1) Iban (Asmah Hj. Omar 1981: 201)
mənadiʔ ʔinday ʔaku
sibling mother 1Sg
'sibling of my mother'

Prepositional type. The possessor is introduced by some possessive preposition (example (2)) which is generally a reflex of the Proto-Austronesian genitive marker **ni* (Blust 1974)[4]. Due to the reasons discussed below such prepositions are sometimes presumed to be articles (see, for example, Donohue 1999).

(2) Toba-Batak (Nababan 1966: 85)
làppak ni bùkku ni si píttOr
cover POS book POS ART Pittor
'the cover of Pittor's book'

Clitic type. The possessor phrase is mirrored with a pronominal clitic (perhaps, agreement marker) adjoined to the possessum nominal (phrase?) (example (3)). These clitics, which exist in all of the languages discussed here with the exception of Iban, are typical for pronominal possessive constructions, where the use of a free pronominal possessor is always non-obligatory (anyway, pronominal possessives do not constitute the focus of this paper).

(3) Muna (van den Berg 1989: 86)
daoa -no Raha
market -3Sg[5] Raha
'the market of Raha'

Actually, it is rather common to observe two types of possessives in one language (example (4)), although, to the best of my knowledge, non-pronominal constructions of clitic type do not coexist with those of prepositional type in any of the languages under discussion[6].

(4) Lampung (Walker 1976: 10, 20)

a. *Tanggay -ni lemaong -hina* tajom-tajom.
claw -3 tiger -DEM sharp:RDP
'The claws of the tiger are very sharp.'

b. Lemaong -sa nganiq *daging binatang lain.*
tiger -DET ACT:eat flesh animal other
'Tigers eat the flesh of other animals.'

The question addressed in this paper is what governs the distribution of different possessive types, or in other words, which factors determine the choice of a certain possessive construction in each concrete case. As a starting point, I take the distinction between type-restricting and token-restricting attributes (Lander, in preparation) introduced in Section 2. It is hypothesized that this distinction is directly reflected in the syntax of possessives in the languages discussed here, although presumably it is not the only factor determining the variation between different possessive types. In Section 3 I propose two syntactic mechanisms that allow us to differentiate between type-restricting and token-restricting possessives. A few possible counterarguments to the proposal about the distinction between possessive types and its syntactic reflection are discussed in Section 4. Section 5 discusses some implications of the theory proposed for pronominal clitics in the languages under discussion. The last section contains concluding remarks.

2. Type-restricting vs. token-restricting possessives

In a paper in preparation I suggest a typology of attributes, dividing them into type-restricting, token-restricting and non-restricting[7], and further, argue that this distinction is directly reflected in the surface structure of NPs in several Indonesian languages. Leaving aside non-restrictive attributes[8], the other two types are different in what they restrict semantically. In particular, while type-restricting attributes form complex predicates with head nouns, token-restricting attributes restrict extensions of these predicates. This is why they are not likely to be used in such generic statements as (5a), where the relative clause must be token-restricting. As one can see from (5b), different possessives display the same effect.

(5) Indonesian

a. Orang (*yang) pandai adalah jenis orang juga.
person REL clever COP kind person too
'Clever people/*People who are clever are also a subkind of people.'

b. Rumah batu /*Umar adalah jenis rumah juga.
house stone Umar COP kind house too
'Stone/*Umar's houses are also a subkind of houses.'

I further argue that type-restricting (such as *batu* 'stone' in (5a)) and token-restricting (e.g., *Umar* (5b)) possessives are different in their syntactic types: type-restricting possessives are (non-referential property-denoting) NPs while token-restricting possessives are in fact (referential individual-denoting) DPs (cf. Munn 1995)[9], and although they do not necessarily differ in their surface internal syntax in Indonesian, they do differ as to their syntactic distribution. Specifically, I suggest that the two rules (6) work in Indonesian:

(6) Among attributes within Indonesian NP:
a. the hierarchy *Type-restricting* > *Token-restricting* > *Non-restricting* is relevant in that the higher an attribute is on this hierarchy, the closer it is to the head;
b. if two attributes, one of which is a nominal, belong to the same position on the hierarchy (6a), then a dependent nominal comes closer to the head.

As concerns possessives, the rules in (6) predict that type-restricting possessives must be adjacent to the head of a NP. This fact will become important below.

Now, turning to the other languages under discussion — where two types of possessives (one of which is juxtaposition) coexist — we find that what is expressed by adjacent possessors in Indonesian is expressed here in the same way. For example, as Ogloblin (1986) describes the situation in Madurese, dependent nouns in such phrases as (7) cannot be separated from their heads; and similar notes may be found in respect to other languages discussed here.

(7) Madurese (Ogloblin 1986: 127)
a. mano' tasè'
bird sea
'sea bird'
b. buku ghàmbhàr
book picture
'book with pictures'

One can make then the following hypothesis:

(8) The distribution of the unmarked (juxtaposition) and marked (prepositional or clitic) possessive constructions depends on the type of a possessor: if the latter is type-restricting, juxtaposition is chosen; otherwise, the marked possessive construction is used.

This hypothesis will be elaborated and improved in the subsequent sections.

3. NP incorporation vs. DP separation

(Obligatory) adjacency is often regarded as a reflection of incorporation or at least as a phenomenon which is closely related to incorporation. Indeed, there are several pieces of evidence supporting the view that type-restricting possessors are in fact incorporated into their heads.

The first argument for such a representation is that type-restricting possessives are often lexicalized and form compounds (or complex words, following the terminology of Alieva 1998), while lexicalization is often taken to be a consequence or even a cause of incorporation (Mithun 1984). Examples are numerous (9), and many of them can be contrasted with token-restricting possessives (10):

(9) a. Iban (Asmah Hj. Omar 1981: 194)
dagiən capi
meat cattle
'beef'

b. Madurese (Ogloblin 1986: 127)
tokang kaju
maker wood
'carpenter'

c. Buginese (Sirk 1975: 49)
tappam matua
product father.in.law
'one who will be father-in-law'

d. Wolio (Anceaux 1952: 41)
qinci mantoa
tooth dog
'eye-tooth'

(10) a. Buginese (Sirk 1975: 49)
tappán -na matuá -e
product -3 father.in.law -DET
'the father-in-law's product'

b. Wolio (Anceaux 1952: 41)
qinci -na mantoa
tooth -3 dog
'a dog's tooth'

Some authors (e.g., Alieva 1998) take it for granted that one direct reflection of lexicalization of such sequences as Indonesian *ruangan konsert* 'concert hall' (lit. 'hall concert') is that the pronominal possessive clitic is added in these cases to the second part of a presumable compound: for instance,

ruangan konsert-nya 'his/her/its/their concert hall'. I have doubts, however, that this can be empirical evidence for lexicalization, given the apparent productivity and compositionality of such examples. Still, the fact that pronominal clitics, which may be considered as agreement markers, are often placed after type-restricting possessors is striking and presents another piece of evidence for the incorporation hypothesis[10].

Finally, the very notion of type-restriction is consistent with the theory of semantic incorporation elaborated by Chung & Ladusaw (2001 ms.), who argue that incorporated nominals only restrict predicates rather than saturate their arguments.

It should be noted that none of these arguments is sufficient for the claim that type-restricting attributes are incorporated, and in fact, all of them are theory-dependent[11]. Still, in the absence of counterarguments I assume that something like incorporation does occur here.

Now, turning to token-restricting marked possessors, they differ from type-restricting ones in all of these respects. They are normally not lexicalized[12] and follow pronominal clitics (where there are clitic type possessive constructions) (11-13).

(11) Wolio (Anceaux 1952: 40)
bulu -na pani -na
feather -3 wing -3
'the feathers of his wings'

(12) Madurese (Ogloblin 1986: 95)
bengko -na Hosèn
house -3 Hosen
'Hosen's house'

(13) Lampung (Walker 1976: 18)
bapaq -ni Ahmat
father -3 Ahmat
'Ahmat's father'

Finally, they are by definition not type-restricting. In fact, it can be proposed that unlike type-restricting possessors, token-restricting possessors saturate arguments of possessum nouns (cf. Barker 1995; Partee & Borschev 2000). And I would like to argue that that is why they do tend to be marked.

The idea is that the marking of possessors is intended (at least partly) to resolve the ambiguity arising in such cases as (14):

(14) Indonesian
a. rumah orang ini
house person DEM
'this person's house' or 'this house for persons'[13]
b. kawan Salim
comrade Salim
'Salim's comrade' or 'comrade Salim'

As is shown in (14), in a language where the juxtaposition strategy prevails, in the absence of other attributes, case markers and preposing obligatory used determiners, it is impossible to distinguish between token-restricting DP possessors on the one hand, and caseless type-restricting NPs on the other hand. At the same time, possessive markers can resolve this ambiguity[14]. This is in fact true even in Indonesian where the marking strategy is not favoured and perhaps, is used under the influence of Javanese (Alieva et al. 1972: 235):

(15) Indonesian (Alieva et al. 1972: 235)

kawan	-nya	Salim
comrade	-3	Salim

'Salim's comrade'

Thus, generally possessive markers are required in order to show that a possessor phrase is token-restricting. Theoretically, this aim can be achieved either by making explicit the DP status of a possessor or by demonstrating that it is not caseless, both possibilities being seemingly equal[15]. But how can this be put into practice? Here we can recall the types of possessives observed in the beginning.

The first way, which is realized, for example, in Tondano (16) and Tukang Besi (17), is to mark both the DP status and the case by a special preposition. Since this possessive marker already shows that a phrase is a DP, it is not surprising to see that other means for marking the DP status cannot coexist with it, hence the label "article" which is used sometimes in respect to these prepositions.

(16) Tondano (Sneddon 1975: 118)[16]

m-	bale	ne	tuama
DET	house	POS:Pl	man

'the men's house(s)'

(17) Tukang Besi (Donohue 1999: 344)

te	ana	nu	raja	iso
CORE	child	POS	king	DEM

'the King's son'

The second way, namely the use of pronominal clitics or agreement markers, is somewhat more complicated. First, recall that in almost all the languages discussed here the use of these clitics does not require the use of overt possessors. This means in particular that even where these clitics can be used as agreement markers, they need not be coreferenced with dependent nominals — due to the pro-drop nature of these languages. Hence, dependent nominals can be interpreted as type-restricting, and this is an unfortunate result. The solution presented in the languages with clitic type possessives is to fix the position of clitics with respect to token-restricting possessors, placing them immediately before these phrases, as in (18):

(18) Lampung (Walker 1976: 18)

Hadat	pekon	asal	-ni	bapaq	-ni	kajong	-ku	pagun	kuat.
custom	village	origin	-3	father	-3	spouse	-1Sg	still	strong

'The traditions of the native village of my wife's father are still strong.'

As a result, the possessive clitics assign case to token-restricting possessives and at the same time can at least sometimes mark them as DPs providing an explicit reference to their left boundaries (hence the term "DP separation"). Not surprisingly, after that possessor phrases need not be marked as DPs. Indeed, in languages which have preposing articles, these are usually absent where phrases are used as token-restricting possessors. This is the case, for example, in Wolio and in Muna. Interestingly, however, both these languages do not prohibit articles in token-restricting possessor phrases (19-20) but rather only tend not to use them, so the incompatibility of possessive clitics and articles is not a structural phenomenon.

(19) Wolio (Anceaux 1952: 40)

o	kapepuua	-na	o	kariaa
ART	beginning	-3	ART	feast

'the beginning of the FEAST'

(20) Muna (van den Berg 1989: 106)

ina	-ndo	o	anahi	-hi
mother	-3Pl	ART	child	-Pl

'the mother of the children'

At the same time, these clitics function as agreement exponents, hence the material located between them and their heads turns out to be incorporated. Thus, NP incorporation and DP separation seem to be mirror images of each other, that is, one complements another.

However, in languages with possessives of prepositional type, incorporation (in our sense, that is, framing of the postnominal material with an agreement marker) is not obligatory. And this is what we find in Tondano:

(21) Tondano (Sneddon 1975: 120)

m-	pasar	-ea	səraʔ
DET-	market	-3Pl	fish

'their fish market'

Similar to incorporated nominals, *səraʔ* 'fish' must be adjacent to the head in (21), still the pronominal clitic may be inserted between them. Since the status of this clitic is unclear, in particular, it is not apparent whether it constitutes a separate lexical item, scholars may choose whether to consider the dependent nominal in (21) as incorporated or not. What is important here, however, is that this "internal" position of a clitic is possible at least partly due to the fact that Tondano does have a possessive preposition.

4. Supporting counterarguments

There are further two pieces of evidence against our hypothesis (8). First of all, the distribution of the marking types sometimes does not follow this rule, so that token-restricting possessors may be unmarked. What we see is that this distribution generally follows predictions made by Nichols (1988: 581), who suggests that the higher a possessor is in definiteness, animacy and related "topicality" hierarchies, the more likely it is overtly marked as possessor. For example, in Tondano we find that a possessive preposition (the form of which is, in turn, determined by the number of a possessor) is used only with animate possessors (which do not accept the determiner) and not with other possible token-restricting possessors. Interestingly, this has only slight influence on the theory proposed above — in fact, DP possessors in Tondano are separated, although only by means of inserting a determiner[17]. Thus, DP separation does turn out to be required here — and it is only the very possessive marking that follows other rules than those suggested in (8). The example (22a) demonstrates two stacked possessives, of which the first is inanimate and the second is animate. Interestingly, now, apart from these determiners, occasionally inanimate possessors are also accompanied by possessive clitics (as in (22b)) — presumably reflecting the assignment of a case.

(22) Tondano (Sneddon 1975: 118, 119)

a.	muri	m-	bale	ni	mantic
	back	DET-	house	POS:Sg	Mantik

'the back of Mantik's house'

b.	naʔe	-na	n-	tamporok
	foot	-3Sg	DET-	Tamporok

'the foot of (Mount) Tamporok'

Nevertheless, there do exist languages where DP separation does not occur (at least overtly) always. Thus, there are languages where possessive markers can be omitted in some instances. For example, in Muna possessors that are interpreted as animate can be introduced without a clitic (23)[18], and the same holds seemingly for all possessor phrases in Toba-Batak (24):

(23) Muna (van den Berg 1989: 88)

bhai	-hi	karambau	Kainsedodo
friend	-Pl	buffalo	Kainsedodo

'buffalo Kainsedodo's friends'

(24) Toba-Batak (Nababan 1966: 46)

tàrup	(ni)	jábu
roof	POS	house

'roof of a house'

These examples presumably cannot be captured semantically — at least until we have information on their actual occurrences in texts. Nevertheless, I believe that the problem can be solved pragmatically through the well-known economy principle. Thus, I suggest that DP marking really may be optional where the category of a possessor phrase is recoverable (as is the case when a possessor is very likely to be definite/specific — as in Muna) or where it does not matter at all whether a possessor is type- or token-restricting[19]. It is important, however, that when a possessor phrase can be ambiguous, the absence of marking cannot be obligatory, but remains optional — if it is allowed at all. And judging from grammars, this is the fact.

To conclude this section, none of the presented counterexamples contradicts the idea of DP separation, although both of them require reformulation of our hypothesis (8) as (25):

(25) The distribution of the unmarked (juxtaposition) and marked possessive constructions depends on the type of a possessor: if the ambiguity between type-restricting and token-restricting possessive functions arises, juxtaposition is chosen for type-restricting possessor, while the marked construction is chosen for token-restricting possessor.

5. Some puzzles of possessive clitics

This section, completing the core of the paper, is intended to relate the operation of DP separation as described above to two puzzles posed by 3rd person possessive clitics, namely to some perturbations of these markers and their particular place in the development of languages of West Indonesia[20]. In addition, I will move to the East of the Brandes line and show how a certain feature of Oceanic languages may be inferred from what was suggested above.

The first puzzle posed by 3rd person clitics concerns languages where these clitics are the only clitics remaining from the rich Proto-Austronesian system described, for example, by Dyen (1974). Such a situation, which is found, for instance, in Madurese (example (26)), is actually quite surprising if we take into consideration another generalization from Nichols (1988), according to which 1st and 2nd person possessors are more likely to be head-marked than 3rd person possessors[21].

(26) Madurese (Ogloblin 1986: 108, 130)

a. parao bulà
boat 1Sg
'my boat'

b. lengngen -na sang kalambhi
sleeve -3 my[22] jacket
'sleeve of my jacket'

The theory outlined above, however, makes it possible to explain this violation of Nichols's observation. If 3rd person clitics are actually needed in order to underlie the DP category of a possessor, then they must be required even where locutor possessors (which referential status cannot be doubted) are to be expressed with free forms.

The second puzzle is related to the neutralization of the number opposition within 3rd person clitics. Specifically, 3rd person singular clitics have superseded 3rd person plural clitics in all clitic type languages under discussion except for Muna, where, however, the number neutralization has already come into play (27). Thus, according to van den Berg (1989), in Muna the suffix *-ndo*, which originally functioned as a plural agreement morpheme (27a), denotes the plurality of either the possessor or the possessum (partly depending on the presence of other plural markers) in constructions with non-pronominal possessors (27b-c), while the suffix *-no*, which is a descendant of the 3rd person singular agreement morpheme, is now neutral with respect to number (27d):

(27) Muna (van den Berg 1989: 86, 87)

a. galu -ndo andoa
field -3Pl 3Pl
'THEIR field'

b. boku -hi -ndo muri (-hi)
book -Pl -3Pl pupil (-Pl)
'the books of the pupils'

c. motoro -ndo bhai -ku
motorbike -3Pl friend -1Sg
'the motorbikes of my friend(s)'

d. boku -no muri -hi
book -3Sg pupil -Pl
'the book(s) of the pupils'

Now, if we accept the view (presented in the previous sections) that 3rd person clitics do turn into purely syntactic markers of the DP possessor and of its boundaries, we can expect some semantic bleaching of the possessive morphemes accompanying their turning into construct morphemes or even pure possessive markers. I suggest that we consider the number neutralization as exactly such bleaching. This is supported by the fact that in the languages of prepositional type discussed here the neutralization in 3rd person clitics did not occur.

Finally, let me turn to East Indonesia and Oceania where we commonly find a specificity marker *na* (see Crowley 1985 for details). Its analogues are, perhaps, found in Formosan languages (Ülo Sirk, p.c.), and one can also relate *na* to the Tondano common noun determiner which is represented by a series of nasals, thus giving a possible variant *n-* (see examples above). Given the extremely prominent role of nasals in Austronesian grammars, it is difficult to make a precise hypothesis about the origin of the Proto-Oceanic specific marker. Still, I would like to mention another possible variant, namely that this specificity marker *na* may be related to the 3rd person singular clitic *-na* (as it is found

exactly near the Brandes line), since the latter in fact — as I tried to argue above — could be considered as a marker of the boundary of a specific DP.

6. Conclusion

Summing up, in this paper I proposed that the distribution of dependent nominals in languages of West Indonesia may be described in terms of two processes, namely incorporation of type-restricting NPs and separation of token-restricting DPs. I suggested, further, that the separation function of possessive pronominal clitics may shed light on certain puzzles posed by these clitics. Nevertheless, such a representation of possessives in the languages considered here gives rise to some more general questions.

First, if NP incorporation is simply a mirror of DP separation, do we need to postulate both phenomena? If not, then which of them must we choose and how will we derive the properties of one from the properties of another? These questions appear immediately when we accept the structural view on these phenomena.

Second, can we regard NP incorporation and DP separation as synchronic processes, or must we view them as some diachronic ordering resulted in base-generated structures? Note that once we choose the diachronic perspective, we have to accept that the resulted structures are only optional and hence need not be recognized by Universal Grammar. However, if we think about these processes as synchronic, we should look at similar phenomena in other languages or at features of the discussed languages which make these processes possible.

The answers to these questions will certainly require a number of assumptions, however, and it is not my aim here to evaluate different assumptions.

Endnotes

* I am grateful to the organizers of AFLA 9 for their hospitality, to the audience of the conference for interesting discussion (not only during the sessions), and to Wayles Brown for useful comments and correcting my English. This material is based upon work supported in part by the National Science Foundation under grant No. BCS-9905748 to Barbara H. Partee and Vladimir Borschev. All errors are, of course, my own.

[1] Languages and sources used here are: Buginese (Sirk 1975); Iban (Asmah Hj. Omar 1981); Indonesian (Alieva et al. 1972; Alieva 1998; the author's data); Lampung (Walker 1976); Madurese (Ogloblin 1986); Muna (van den Berg 1989); Toba-Batak (Nababan 1966); Tondano (Sneddon 1975); Tukang Besi (Donohue 1999); Wolio (Anceaux 1952). In spite of the fact that these languages do not form a close genetic unit, they do show some structural similarity — at least in some features which can be attributed to the common Indonesian type (Alieva 1998). These features (whose concrete realizations can vary, however) concern

mainly word order and verb morphology, although the facts observed below testify that some generalizations may also be found in the domain of the noun phrase.

[2] I regard possessive constructions (here) as a semantically unmarked combination of two nominals forming one nominal constituent, including therefore cases of, say, "material phrases" — such as Madurese *ettong bessè* 'metal cask' (lit. 'cask metal'; Ogloblin 1986: 126). Although the latter are often not considered possessive constructions, one cannot ignore the fact that they are marked (or unmarked) in the same way as possessives in a number of languages including English (cp. *a ring of gold*). On the other hand, I would certainly not like to count as possessives such cases as Madurese *orang paraowan* 'boatman', where the dependent is a derived verbal (here formed with the suffix *-an*; Ogloblin 1986: 95).

[3] Abbreviations in glosses: ACT — active voice, ART — article, COP — copula, CORE — core case, DEM — demonstrative, DET — determiner, NOM — nominative, OBJ — object (agreement), Pl — plural, POS — possessive marker, RDP — reduplication, REL — relative clause marker, Sg — singular; numbers denote persons.

[4] There are also a few innovative adnominal possessive constructions which I do not discuss here. These include, for example, constructions with *punya* 'have', *bagi* 'for', *dari* 'from' in Indonesian.

[5] The glossing of *-no* as 3Sg possessive clitic is a simplification, since it can be used sometimes with plural possessors (see van den Berg 1989: 86 where *-no* is glossed as POS); see section 5 for the discussion of the number neutralization in 3rd person pronominal possessives.

[6] One possible counterexample, namely Tondano, is discussed in Section 4.

[7] This distinction is, in fact, reminiscent of the well-known restrictive vs. non-restrictive distinction on the one hand and a whole family of such oppositions as reference-modifying vs. referent-modifying adjectives (Bolinger 1967), anchoring vs. non-anchoring possessives (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002), and even stage-level vs. individual-level predicates (Carlson 1980 et passim) on the other.

[8] This is not to say that non-restricting possessives are impossible (an example is *my John*); their use is highly marginal, however, and in many cases is limited to conventional formulae.

[9] When distinguishing between NP and DP here, I mean that only phrases which are considered DP can contain various determiners, such as demonstratives, prenominal numerative complexes etc.

[10] Actually, some patterns with these clitics are definitely similar to the classical instances of incorporation. Thus, according to Donohue (1999: 343-344), in Tukang Besi "possessive suffixes" are added to the head in nominative phrases (i) but follow any adjectival modifiers in other cases (ii):

(i)	Ku-	'ita	-'e	na	honda	-'u	to'oge.
	1Sg-	see	-3OBJ	NOM	motorbike	-2Sg	big

'I see your big motorbike.'

(ii)	Ku-	‘ita	te	honda	to’oge	-‘u
	1Sg-	see	CORE	motorbike	big	-2Sg

‘I can see your big motorbike.’

This phenomenon has a parallel in Chukchi, a typical incorporating language, where noun modifiers are obligatorily incorporated in some oblique cases.

[11] For example, the argument concerning the distribution of clitics depends on whether we consider them to be agreement markers. At the same time, whether we consider them as such hardly depends on whether we think of type-restricting attributes as incorporated.

[12] Surely, they can be lexicalized when accidental properties they assign to tokens are rethought to be non-accidental. Still, their percentage in the lists of compounds presented in grammars is insignificant.

[13] David Gil (p.c.) pointed out that the phrase (14a) can also mean ‘that one’s person’s house’ with the demonstrative *ini* interpreted as an independent DP.

[14] The insertion of possessive markers in order to resolve possible ambiguities in juxtapositional structures seems to be a common feature of South-East Asian languages. It is widespread, for example, in Vietnamese.

[15] Here I assume that a noinal phrase is a DP iff it is not caseless (cf. Longobardi 1994).

[16] What I gloss as determiner in Tondano examples is interpreted as a “class marker” by Sneddon, although it is clearly used as a specifier in many cases; see also fn. 15. This fact will be relevant later.

[17] Note that Sneddon treats various allomorphs of this determiner (“class marker” in his terms; see fn. 14) as allomorphs of some possessive marker which are only homonymic to those of the determiner.

[18] Another example cited by van den Berg (1989: 88) is (i). Here, however, the possessor includes a personal article and furthermore is reduplicated, which suggests that the whole phrase is likely to be understood as a proper name (van den Berg 1989: 80), and hence a DP.

(i)	kalei	(-no)	ando-	a-	ndoke
	banana	(-3Sg)	RDP-	ART-	monkey

‘the monkey’s banana tree’

[19] Note, however, that the same claim may be applied to the Lampung example (18).

[20] As was pointed out to me by John Wolff, a number of phenomena concerning these possessive clitics may be attributed to their grammaticalization into markers of definiteness (see, for example, Ogloblin 1986: 95-97). It should be noted, however, that the latter function of possessive clitics does not coincide with that of European definite articles (cf. Ewing 1995), so the situation can be understood as the extensive use of possessive markers rather than as the use of these exponents as markers of definiteness (see Fraurud 2001 for discussion of similar cases).

[21] In fact, Nichols (1988: 580) cites one exception, namely Tlingit.

[22] Note that Madurese has one possessive pronoun *sang* 'my', which is used on a par with 1st person pronouns (which are mainly pronominal substitutes, however).

References

Alieva, Natalia F. 1998. *Tipologičeskie aspekty indonezijskoj grammatiki*. Moscow: Novoe Tysjačeletie.

Alieva, Natalia F., Vladimir D. Arakin, Alexander K. Ogloblin, Ülo Sirk. 1972. *Grammatika indonezijskogo jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka. [Revised translation into Indonesian: *Bahasa Indonesia: Deskripsi dan Teori*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 1991.]

Anceaux, J.C. 1952. *The Wolio Language. Outline of Grammatical Description and Texts*. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Arakin, Vladimir D. 1965. *Indonezijskie jazyki*. Moscow: Nauka.

Asmah Hj. Omar. 1974. The possessive phrase in the Western Austronesian languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13, 391-407.

Asmah Hj. Omar. 1981. *The Iban Language of Sarawak. A Grammatical Description*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Barker, Chris. 1995. *Possessive Descriptions*. Stanford: CSLI.

Blust, Robert A. 1974. Proto-Austronesian syntax: The first step. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13, 1-15.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication. *Lingua* 18, 1-34.

Carlson, Gregory. 1980. *Reference to Kinds in English*. New York: Garland.

Chung, Sandra & William A. Ladusaw. 2001. *Restriction and Saturation*. Ms.

Crowley, Terry. 1985. Common noun phrase marking in Proto-Oceanic. *Oceanic Linguistics* 24, 135-193.

Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A Grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin etc.: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dyen, Isidore. 1974. The Proto-Austronesian enclitic genitive pronouns. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13, 16-31.

Ewing, Michael C. 1995. Two pathways to identifiability in Cirebon Javanese. *BLS* 21S, 72-82.

Fraurud, Kari. 2001. Possessives with extensive use: A source of definite articles? In I. Baron, M. Herslund, & F. Sørensen (eds.), *Dimensions of Possession*, Amsterdam etc: John Benjamins, 243-267.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2002. Adnominal possession in the European languages: form and function. *STUF* 55 (2), 141-172.

Lander, Yury A. In preparation. Word order, formal marking and the semantics/syntax interface in Indonesian NPs. (Working title.)

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25 (4), 609-665.

Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60 (4), 847-894.

Munn, Alan. 1995. The possessor that stayed close to home. In V. Samiian & J. Schaeffer (eds.), *Proceedings of WECOL* 24, 181-195.

Nababan, P. W. J. 1966. *Toba-Batak, a Grammatical Description*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.

Nichols, Johanna. 1988. On alienable and inalienable possession. In W. Shipley (ed.), *In Honor of Mary Hass: From the Haas Festival Conference on Native American Linguistics*, Berlin etc.: Mouton de Gruyter, 557-609.

Ogloblin, Alexander K. 1986. *Madurskij jazyk i lingvističeskaja tipologija*. Leningrad: LGU.

Partee, Barbara H. & Vladimir Borschev. 2000. Genitives, relational nouns, and the argument-modifier distinction. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 17, 177-201.

Sirk, Ülo. 1975. *Bugijskij jazyk*. Moscow: Nauka. [English translation: *The Buginese Language*. Moscow: Nauka, 1983.]

Sneddon, J. N. 1975. *Tondano Phonology and Grammar*. (*Pacific Linguistics*, B-38.) Canberra: Australian National University.

van den Berg, Rene. 1989. *A Grammar of the Muna Language*. Dordrecht etc.: Foris.

Walker, Dale F. 1976. *A Grammar of the Lampung Language: the Pesisir Dialect of Way Lima*. (*NUSA* 2.) Jakarta.