

# Possession in Koiari

*Tom Dutton*

*The Australian National University*

## 1 Introduction

Koiari is a small Papuan language spoken inland of Port Moresby in southern Papua New Guinea. It is unusual amongst Papuan languages in having a number of structural features not found in other such languages. One of those is the ways that 'possession' is expressed in the language.<sup>1</sup> It is the purpose of this paper to describe those and to relate them to the typology of 'possession' in a selection of other Papuan languages.

Before doing that, however, it is necessary to comment briefly on the concept of 'possession' and the descriptive position adopted for this paper.

## 2 The Concept of 'Possession'

"POSSESSION is" as Seiler (1983:3) points out in his detailed survey, "fundamental in human life, and it is fundamental in human language." Yet the concept is far from clear and is not easily delimited. The problem is that, on the one hand, although a construction may be labelled 'possessive' it may not express true possession (i.e. ownership, whether inherent or acquired) at all, or, on the other, may have nothing formally in common with ones that do. Put another way round, even though expressions may be structurally similar they may be 'possessives' of very different sorts semantically, as, for example, those encompassed by such expressions in English as 'my father, my friend, my hand, my house, my work, and my departure' or 'that sister or mine, the branch of the tree, the streets of the town, the assassination of the king, the city of Port Moresby'.<sup>2</sup>

Theoretical linguistics offers no solution to the problem of definition. There was a time when all or certain categories of possessive constructions were claimed to be derivable from

<sup>1</sup> Possessive has so far not received much attention in the literature on Papuan languages. See Foley's (1986) survey, for example.

<sup>2</sup> The disparity between structural similarity and semantic variability can easily be demonstrated by considering the transformational possibilities of each. For example,

?I have a father. > He is my father. > \*The father is mine.

I have a friend. > He is my friend. > \*The friend is mine.

I have a book. > It is my book. > The book is mine.

\*I have a departure. > ?It is my departure. > \*The departure is mine.

- 9) a. *Da kaia-ve* (or *kaia-he*) *keare-va mioro!*  
 my knife-POSS big-one bring  
 'Bring my big knife!'
- b. *da vov-e komasika-va* 'my insolent brother'  
 my brother-POSS insolent-one
- c. *da vanimeni-ve berikuku-va* 'my firm friend'  
 my friend-POSS strong-one
- d. *da oro homo-ve toroka-va* 'my stiff hair'  
 my head hair-POSS strong-one

This structure is obligatory for inherently possessed nouns (such as kinship nouns and body part nouns) but optional for other nouns which are more commonly possessed in the second way. In this option the PM is not marked for possession as in the basic structure. Instead a possessive marker *-ve* appears on the following adjective. In other words the possessive marker acts like an enclitic which attaches to the last word in the phrase, as in (10).

- 10) a. *da koko vami-ve* 'my young rooster'  
 my fowl male-POSS
- b. *da benisolo dubuka-ve* 'my black pencil'  
 my pencil black-POSS

Note, however, that this possessive suffix shift rule does not apply if demonstratives (as in (11a)), numerals (as in (11b)) or intensifiers (as in (11c)) follow the adjective.

- 11) a. *no hedu-ve eke* 'that story of ours'  
 our talk-POSS that
- b. *Da vam-uhe-re abuti yabe otinua.*  
 my child-PL-<> two they went  
 'Two of my children went.'
- c. *Da kaia dai-ve maiteka mava-vahe bokoravanu.*  
 my knife handle-POSS good true-<> broke  
 'The handle of my very good knife is broken.'

3.1.2.3 *Nominal clauses.* In Koiari the possessive structure is also used for PRs that are derived from clauses by nominalisation. As a result they can be quite complicated.

- 12) a. *Sebure Murumu Anahadabu maiovo detu-te kinyare*  
 Sebure Murumu Anahadabu girl stomach-with made.NOM  
*kota-he*  
 court-POSS  
 ‘Sebure Murumu’s court about making the Anahadabu girl pregnant’
- b. *Oko-re PNGBC banika-va sekuriti ata-ta moni bokoiha*  
 this-<> PNGBC bank-at security person-and money break.for  
*otiniyare ata-ta voinau varaharaigare hedu-ve-re ma*  
 go.NOM person-and suddenly fight.NOM talk-POSS-<> COMP  
*okoe vehitevoinu.*  
 here finished  
 ‘This is the end of my story about the sudden fight between PNG BC bank security officers and robbers.’
- c. *hove ata Modea Dumo yavisovahare vurivuri-ve*  
 dead person Modea Dumo goodbye.do.NOM prayer-POSS  
 ‘the dead person, Modea Dumo’s funeral service’

In these expressions the PR may be linked to the PM by the personal pronouns *ahu* and *yabu* as in recursive possessive phrases discussed above.

- 13) *Tamati orovoniyare-re ahu hedu-ve*  
 Tamati came.NOM-<> his talk-POSS  
 ‘the story about Tamati’s coming’

In many languages when verb phrases or entire clauses are nominalised, the resultant noun phrase is often formally a possessive construction. Thus in English there are phrases like ‘the dog’s barking’ and ‘the burning of the house’ which are derived from ‘the dog barked’ and ‘(they) burned the house’ respectively. In the first of these phrases the genitive phrase refers to the underlying subject of the source sentence; in the second, to the object. As a result they are often referred to as subjective and objective topic possessives.

In Koiari the translation equivalents of these possessive constructions are unmarked, as in (14).

- 14) a. *Da adahe kurukuvahare-re bokoravanu.*  
 my on.top.of.it write.NOM-<> broke  
 ‘My pencil’ (lit. ‘writing on top thing’) broke. (< *kurukuvahanu* ‘write’)
- b. *Da yaga atahare-re komara-ho.*  
 my house cover.NOM-<> no.good-<>  
 ‘My covering of the roof (lit. ‘house’) is no good.’

In these the verbs *kuruku-* and *ataha-* have been nominalised but are not marked as being possessed. They are to be distinguished from the possessive forms of certain verb bases which are marked in the usual way by the suffix *-ve*.

- 15) a. *ahu edo-ve* 'his vomiting' (< *edova-* '(to) vomit')
- b. *ahu akisi-ve* 'his sneezing' (< *akisiva-* '(to) sneeze')
- c. *ahu ariho-ve* 'his yawning' (< *arihova-* '(to) yawn')

### 3.2 Predicative Constructions

In these the PR occurs in the comment or predicate slot of equative clauses of form 'X is/was mine/yours, his...' and the PM in the topic or subject slot. The PR has suffixes attached to it that are different in form from those that occur on PMs in attributive possessive phrases. These suffixes are of two forms, *-ye* and *-yete*,<sup>16</sup> the latter of which is thought to be an emphatic or contrastive form of the other, as in (16).

- 16) a. *Eke-re da-ye-ro.* 'That's mine.'  
 that-<> I-POSS-<>
- b. *Eke-re a-yete-bene. Da-yete-ro.*  
 that-<> you-POSS-not I-POSS-<>  
 'That's not YOURS; it's MINE.'

These same suffixes also mark human nouns in predicate position.

- 17) *Eke-re Vuiena-ye-ro.* 'That's Vuiena's.'  
 that-<> Vuiena-POSS-<>

## 4 Other Types of Possession

### 4.1 Partitive Possessives

In these constructions there is a close or intimate relationship between a part and the whole of which it is part. In them the PR corresponds to the whole and the PM to the part. In Koiari this relationship is marked by special suffixes as illustrated in (18-22).

<sup>16</sup> So far it has not been possible to positively confirm the suggestion that the *-yete* form is a contrastive one; informants say there is no difference between them. It is to be noted also that the *-te* in *-yete* is the same form that is used in causative constructions but there is no obvious semantic connection.

- 18) *-ga*  
*idi taha-ga* 'fruit'  
 tree fruit-PART
- 19) *-ha*  
*yaga bokita-ha* 'the back of the house'  
 house end-PART
- 20) *-ka ~ -kava*<sup>17</sup>
- a. *idi umu-ka(va)* 'stump, root'  
 tree base-PART
- b. *vadu kina-kava* 'taro tops'  
 taro head-PART
- c. *oho ada gobi-kava* (also *oho ada gobiva*)  
 pig hand fist-PART 'pig's hoof' (or 'pig's trotter')
- 21) *-ra*
- a. *mobo-ra* 'husband'  
 husband-PART
- b. *maba-ra* 'wife'  
 wife-PART
- 22) *-va*
- a. *ada nekota-va* 'elbow'  
 hand joint-PART
- b. *ugumu taha-ga* 'kidney'  
 ? ball.like.organ-PART

Of these *-ka* and *-va* are the most common;<sup>18</sup> *-ga*, *-ha* and *-ra* are rare and limited to the items given.

When partitive possessive phrases are possessed the possessive suffix *-ve* (or *-he* for some speakers in Kailakinumu) is added to the PM in the normal way.

- 23) a. *da oho ada gobika-(v)e* (or *gobi-ve*) 'my pig trotter'  
 b. *da kaia daika-ve* 'the handle of my knife'

Unlike other languages Koiari uses both possessive pronouns and partitive possessive forms for expressing relationships between PRs and parts of the body and kinship nouns, e.g. *ahu mame* > *mamaka* 'his father'; *Ege veu-ka-(va)he dadavege...* 'And his piss made a noise like "da da da da" and...' (lit. 'and piss-PART-◇ da.da.did.and...'). The partitive possessive forms are more commonly used in discourse, however, where they are used as short forms

<sup>17</sup> Note that there is some variation between sections (or clans) in Kailakinumu between partitive *-ka* and *-va*.

<sup>18</sup> Note, however, that not all *-ka*'s and *-va*'s indicate a partitive relation; some are the accidental final syllables of words, e.g. *beduka* 'message', *maiteka* 'good', *hava* 'betel nut'.

forms to refer back to participants that have been introduced previously. They cannot be used, however, to express possession of body parts by a personal name in contrast to kin terms. cf. *Dumo (ahu) ada-ke* (\**Dumo ada-ka*). 'Dumo's hand' and *Eva maba-ra(va)* 'Eva's wife'.

The partitive construction is also used for calling relatives at a distance, e.g. *Ine-ka!* 'Mother (where are you?)!';<sup>19</sup> in recursive possessive phrases (as already noted); with personal names as shown in (24); and for expressing general (in contrast to particular) reference as shown in (25).

- 24) a. *Betty Modea mae-kava* 'Betty Modea's daughter'  
 Betty Modea daughter-PART
- b. *Eva maba-rava erume mae-kava misuka-va*  
 Eva wife-PART and daughter-PART small-one  
 'Geua Eva's wife and small daughter Geua'
- c. *Sarayori maba-ra vore* 'Sarayori and his wife'  
 Sarayori wife-PART with
- 25) a. *Imi vate bauva!*  
 sugar.cane skin take.off  
 'Peel the sugarcane!' (lit. 'take away sugarcane skin')
- b. *ua de* 'flour' (in contrast to *ua deka* 'grub's behind')  
 grub shit
- c. *idi hana* 'leaves, paper' (in contrast to *idi hanaka* 'a leaf of the tree')  
 tree leaf

Partitive forms are **not** used in Koiari as they are in many other languages for expressing proper name genitives (that is, those corresponding to phrases in English such as 'the city of Port Moresby'), as shown in (26); the relationship of a unit or quantity to its total mass, as shown in (27); that of an object to its source material, as shown in (28); or that of a member to its class, as shown in (29).

- 26) *Depo yaga* 'Depo village/the village of Depo'
- 27) a. *Finchafen yabu ina baigi-ve abuti*  
 Finschhafen their sweet.potato bag-POSS two  
 'the Finschafeners' two bags of sweet potato'
- b. *vadu bahu katen abuti* 'two cartons of bread'  
 taro food carton two
- 28) *idi maua* 'wooden box'  
 tree box

<sup>19</sup> These forms may be shortened by leaving off the partitive marker as one gets more pleading or desperate, e.g. *Ine!* 'Mother (where, oh where are you?!)'

- 29) a. *vih*i *idi-vare* *idi* *be-ro*.  
*vih*i tree- $\diamond$  tree a- $\diamond$   
 'A *vih*i is a kind of tree.'
- b. *Da* *ada-ke-re* *da* *ahatan-e* *be-ro*.  
 my arm-POSS- $\diamond$  my body-POSS a- $\diamond$   
 'My arm is part of my body.'

Instead these expressions take the form of compounds or of an adjective phrase (as in the last case in which *be* follows the head noun).

#### 4.2 Locatives

Linguists have long noted (Clark 1978:85-126) that locative expressions are in a systematic relation with possessive ones in many languages, if not 'universally' (Seiler 1983:56). Some (Lyons 1967) have even suggested that existential and possessive constructions are derived from the same source.

In Koiari location is indicated by postpositions, a goodly number of which are derived from body parts or parts of other objects like houses and plants which have recognisable parts.<sup>20</sup> There are two types. The first is a structure in which the locative marker *-va* (or, in a number of established cases, *-he*) is used with the possessive form of a body part or part of an object, as, for example, in (30).

- |        |                             |                               |
|--------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 30) a. | <i>dehi-e-va</i>            | 'at the foot of'              |
|        | side-POSS-at                |                               |
| b.     | <i>uhu-ke-va</i>            | 'during'                      |
|        | inside-POSS-at              |                               |
| c.     | <i>gadiva-ne-he</i>         | 'behind'                      |
|        | back-POSS-at                |                               |
| d.     | <i>vohe-ke-he</i>           | 'in front of'                 |
|        | chest-POSS-at               |                               |
| e.     | <i>numuta dehieva</i>       | 'at the foot of the mountain' |
| f.     | <i>ahu nivare uhukevage</i> | 'while crying'                |
| g.     | <i>da guramare uhukeva</i>  | 'while I was sitting'         |
| h.     | 15.05.91 <i>uhukevage</i>   | 'during 15 May 1991'          |

<sup>20</sup> See Bowden (1992) for a study of locationals in a subset of Austronesian languages. In these languages parts of houses figure prominently as the basis for locatives:

In Oceania, the house is clearly seen as the most salient object other than the human form in relation to which location should be specified in general. It is also the most important object that one might want to say whether or not something or someone is inside of or outside of. (p.56)

Alternatively the partitive form may be used (except when the PR is a personal pronoun when the normal possessive construction is used), as in (31).

- 31) a. *Orovi da gadiva-ne-he gurama!*  
 come.and I back-POSS-at sit  
 'Come and sit behind me! (lit. 'at my back')'  
 b. *Vadibe-vane eke yaga bokita-ha-va-geno?*  
 what-<>.Q that house back-PART-at-<>.Q  
 'What's that at the back of the house?'

In the second structure for marking location by postpositions, a short form of a body part or part of an object is used in combination with the locative postposition *-va* (or *-he* in certain established cases).

- 32) a. *neme-he* 'amongst, between, in the middle of' (*neme* 'middle')  
 b. *deri-he* 'underneath' (*deri* 'back underneath part of house')  
 c. *deri-va* 'at the back of, behind' (*deri* 'back underneath part of house')  
 d. *uhu-va* 'in, inside' (*uhuka* 'inside')  
 e. *vohe-va* 'in front of' (*voheka* 'front of torso')<sup>21</sup>  
 f. *gigi-va* 'beside' (*gigika* 'side')

Note that these constructions have some formal similarities with possessive constructions but they are not employed to express possessive relationships.

#### 4.3 POSS Raising

POSS (or possessive) raising or promotion is the name used for constructions in which the subject and indirect object in a transitive clause refer to the experiencer of an action and the object is a body part. In these constructions the indirect object usually is in the dative case in languages which have that case, such as is exemplified by German *Ich wasche mir die Hunde* 'I'm washing (or I wash) my hands' (lit. 'I wash to me the hands'). In such expressions (which are restricted to certain types of nouns and verbs) there is no actual possessive phrase but the subject and indirect object correspond to the PR. In Koiari POSS raising is achieved by either using partitive possessive forms for the PM (as in *Yabu adaka ruruvahanua*. 'They

<sup>21</sup> Another kind of locative construction which does not appear on the surface to contain a genitive is what Ulan (1978:30) calls CHEZ constructions. These are constructions which are usually composed of a locative element and a possessive element but no head PM, such as in English 'at John's' or in French *chez moi* where the words for 'house, home, place' are missing. There are no such constructions in Koiari. One has a choice of indicating possession or not. When possession is not indicated one will say *Yaga-uhu-va-ge da otima*. for 'I'm going home' (lit. village/house-into-<> I go)-yaga means both 'house' and 'village' in Koiari). When possession is indicated one will say *Da yag-e-he-ge da otima* (lit. my village/house-POSS-to-<> I go).



shook hands.’) – there is no dative case in Koiari—or unpossessed forms of those (i.e. ones without the partitive suffix). They translate roughly as ‘the X’ rather than ‘my/your/his etc. X’,<sup>22</sup> as shown in (33).

- 33) a. *Ada ketova!* ‘Wash your hands!’  
 hand wash  
 b. *Kina daihama!* ‘Don’t bump your head!’  
 head bump.NEG  
 c. *Ahu vahi-va beteinu.* ‘She put it on her (own) leg.’  
 she leg-LOC put.it.on  
 d. *Mama-ka-he moe-ka utihege moe-ka-he ura vehite...*  
 father-PART-<> son-PART wake.him.up son-PART-<> want not  
 ‘The father woke his son up and he (the son) didn’t want to...’

However, this does not mean to say that the normal possessive construction is prohibited. It simply means that when used it is superfluous (as in *Da ohere ahu ada gobive bokovanu*. ‘My pig broke its trotter.’) and not the most elegant way of expressing the idea.

Sometimes reference to a body part is not required at all, the semantics of the verb making it clear, e.g. *matuhunu* means ‘put something on a particular part of the body’ so that if one is referring to a hat then one automatically knows that this goes on the head. Similarly with *agedahunu* which means ‘carry something on one’s shoulder’.

#### 4.4 HAVE

Another construction in Koiari in which no actual possessive phrase occurs is that corresponding to that of ‘have’ in English. In Koiari this kind of possession is indicated by using an equational sentence in which the topic or subject represents the PR and the comment or predicate is expressed in the form of a postpositional phrase using the comitative postposition *vore* ‘with’ with the PM. Such sentences are typically translatable as ‘someone has something’.<sup>23</sup> Iconically they express a more distant relationship than ‘have’ (as ‘own’ or ‘possess’) does in English. This is because culturally one does not ‘own’ anything in Koiari; one is merely the temporary controller or guardian of an object.

- 34) a. *Ahu-ne masisi vore-geno?*  
 he-Q<> matches with-Q<>  
 ‘Has he got any matches?’ (lit. ‘is he with matches?’)

<sup>22</sup> There are cases, however, where the phonotactics of Koiari require the normal possessive form, as in, *Da ubio-ge da kina-ke-re i ʔi daivamu*. ‘I bumped myself on the head.’ (lit. ‘I self-<> I head-POSS-<> I bump’) for example.

<sup>23</sup> Cross-linguistically this is the lesser used of two types (according to Ultan 1978:37). In the other, less common type the PR is the predicate (commonly marked as dative or benefactive) and the PM the subject (lit. PM PR-to/for).

- b. *Ata eke-re beri vore-go.*  
man that-<> strength with-<>  
'That man is strong.' (lit. 'has strength')
- c. *Eke-re tihu vore-go.*  
that-<> mud with-<>  
'That has dirt in it.' (lit. 'that is with mud')
- d. *Gorogo vore-gene a ua?*  
sickness with-Q<> you be  
'Are you sick?' (lit. 'are you with sickness?')
- e. *Detu vore-go. (= Detu vore-ge ahu unu.)*  
stomach with-<>q stomach with-<> she be  
'She's pregnant.' (lit. 'she is with stomach')
- f. *Gomugo vore-ru-ge bebe iyare-ro.*  
dirt with-because-<> NEG drink.NOM-<>  
'It's not drinkable because it's dirty.' (lit. 'because it is with dirt (and) it is not drinkable')

This is the same form as that used for expressing accompaniment in Koiari. However, in that case *vore* is only used with singular nouns or noun phrases; *ruhuta* is used for plural ones. Compare (35a,b) with (35c).

- 35) a. *Taubada vore heduvariheni-ge da orovonu.*  
Taubada with talk.want-<> I came  
'I came to talk with Taubada.'
- b. *Ahu vore-ge da otima.*  
he with-<> I go  
'I'm going with him.'
- c. *Maigo, no nema yabu ruhuta otari!*  
okay we then they with let.us.go  
'Okay, let's go with them then!'

## 5 Conclusion: The Typological Position of Koiari

Given these facts about Koiari the question arises: How do the structures described compare with those of other Papuan languages and other languages of the world typologically? To facilitate making observations about this question with respect to Papuan languages a survey was made of over 20 widely distributed ones throughout Papua New

Guinea and across unrelated (or if related, very distantly related) families.<sup>24</sup> Wherever possible data were collected for a subset of nine features derived from those discussed above and viewed from a Koiari point of view (that is, whether a particular language is the same or different with respect to the feature). These were set out in chart form and the boxes at the intersecting rows and columns filled in from materials obtained from published sources supplemented where necessary by personal communication with linguists working in or knowledgeable about the languages concerned.<sup>25</sup> A sample of the results of this survey are presented in the Appendix. To see how Koiari substantival possessive constructions compare typologically with those in languages in other parts of the world a tenth feature was added to the charts. This feature asks which of Ultan (1978)'s typological categories Koiari and the other Papuan languages surveyed fall into.

Ultan surveyed 75 languages across the world including four Papuan ones (Asmat, Dani, Saker, Sentani). His results show that "the four most common basic types of attributive possessive constructions viewed in terms of possessive feature marking with an arbitrary constituent order of GN [= PR^PM] are, in descending order of frequency of occurrence: **gen-#**, **##**, **#-gen**, and **gen-gen**" (pp.35-36) where **gen** and **#** indicate which of the two constituents PR and PM is morphologically marked for possession and which is not, respectively.<sup>26</sup>

In respect of the possessive constructions described above, Koiari is most similar to its geographically and genetically closest relatives, Koita and Mountain Koiari in the range of features discussed. Of these it is most similar to Koita to which it is most closely related. None of the other three languages in the putative Koiarian family (Barai, Ömie, and Managalasi) shows any marked agreement with Koiari in those features for which there is evidence. Koiari is definitely unusual (as far as its possessive constructions are concerned) amongst Papuan languages in a number of respects.

<sup>24</sup> Besides Koiari the languages concerned were Abelam (Laycock, 1965), 'Abu Arapesh (Nekitel, p.c.), Alambak (Bruce, 1984), Amele (Roberts, 1987, p.c.), Awa (McKaughan & Loving, 1973), Barai (Olson, 1975), Baruya (Lloyd, p.c.), Dani (Bromley, 1981), Fore (Scott, 1978, m.p.c.), Guhu-Samane (Richert, 1975), Imonda (Seiler, 1984, 1985), Kalam (Pawley, 1966, p.c.), Kewa/Kewapi (Franklin, 1971; Yaraepa, p.c.), Koita (Dutton, 1975, own notes), Korafe (Farr, p.c.), Magi (Thomson, 1975), Managalasi (Dutton, own notes), Motuna (Onishi, p.c.), Mountain Koiari (Garland & Garland, 1975), Ömie (Austing & Upia, 1975), Saker (Z'Graggen, 1965), Selepet (McElhanon, 1972), Usan (Reesink, 1987), Yagaria (Renck, 1975), Yareba (Weimer, 1975), Yele (Henderson, 1975), Yimas (Foley, 1991, p.c.), Zia (Kamene, p.c.). The location of these languages in proposed genetic subgroupings of languages in Papua New Guinea are to be found in Wurm & Hattori (1983).

<sup>25</sup> I am especially grateful to the following for supplying relevant information: Sakarepe Kamene, Matayuki Onishi, Apoi Yaraepa, Otto Nekitel, Dick Lloyd, John Roberts and Jim and Cindy Farr.

<sup>26</sup> Ultan (1978) had to make a number of simplifying assumptions to make sense of the multifarious variations found. Two of these were:

a) "in a number of languages the feature of person in pronominal constructions is actually analogous to genitive in nominal constructions" (p. 23);

b) "person serves basically to identify the possessor and almost never denotes possessee, then genitive rather than—or at least in addition to—# might be posited as the nominal analog of person" (p.23).

1) It is unusual in the manner in which it marks possession, viz. in having suffixes not related to pronouns on the heads of possessive phrases. Thus it uses a suffix on the PM in combination with a personal pronoun to indicate personal possession whereas all other Papuan languages (except Koita and Mountain Koiari to which it is most closely related) use either a suffix on the pronominal PR or a connective. This manner of marking possession is striking because Koiari is otherwise typologically similar to all other Papuan languages in word order—all Papuan languages are SOV—and similar to most in the ordering of its constituents representing PR and PM—notably PR<sup>^</sup>PM. This is an order which is most common in languages across the world (Clark 1978:91ff) and is probably explained by the universal tendency for Topics to precede Comments (assuming PR can be equated with Topic and PM with Comment). Furthermore, Koiari is in agreement with other Papuan languages and with Ultan's (1978:24) claim that where the order of pronominal and nominal PR and PMs differ in the same language "the pronominally possessed order is always GN [Genitive Noun] as opposed to NG for the corresponding nominally possessed order." This implies that worldwide the pronominal order is the dominant order.

2) There is no change in the form of the pronominal PR in Koiari in contrast to the majority of other Papuan languages surveyed where it has some suffix attached (in many cases *na*) or a connective that may or may not be attached to it.

3) There is no alienable/inalienable distinction in Koiari of the sort commonly found in Austronesian languages,<sup>27</sup> for example, in which different sets of possessive markers correlate with different classes of nouns, e.g. in the Austronesian language Motu spoken in the Port Moresby area neighbouring Koiari territory *tamagu* 'my father' and *lauegu ruma* 'my house' differ in that in the first the possessive marker *-gu* is attached to the noun and in the second it is attached to a connective or classifier *e*. Koiari does, however, like other Papuan languages, have some features of an alienable-inalienable system. Thus there are some nouns which do not generally occur without some possessive marking attached to them. These are nouns which refer to kinship relationships and body parts which are inherently possessed or associated with someone or something. The distinction between these two types is reflected syntactically in adjective phrases in Koiari for example, where adjectives have to take a particular form following an inherently possessed noun but may optionally take a different form following other nouns. In this latter aspect Koiari differs from other Papuan languages with inherent versus non-inherent possessive noun class systems.

4) Koiari has special predicative forms whereas most Papuan languages do not—they use attributive ones. In those cases which do have predicative forms distinct from attributive ones a second suffix is added to the possessive pronoun (as in Abalam where the short form of the possessive suffix *na* is added as *n*) or a totally different form is added to the pronoun (e.g. Barai which adds *-do*).

<sup>27</sup> For further details see Lichtenberk (1985), Mosel (1983) and Pawley & Sayaba (1990) for example.

5) Koiari possessive suffixes are in some ways like enclitics because they may be attached to adjectives in final position in possessive phrases involving non-inherently possessed nouns in which they occur. No other Papuan languages have this feature except for the closely related language of Koita.<sup>28</sup>

6) Koiari has a special suffix to mark part-of-whole constructions. No other Papuan languages of those surveyed (except for Koita and Yagaria (-'a)) seem to have this feature. One advantage of this system is that compounds are easily distinguishable from possessive phrases in Koiari, a situation that does not obtain in many (most?) other Papuan languages.

7) Koiari uses possessive constructions for nominalised clause PRs.

8) Koiari does not use possessive constructions for expressing the following relationships: i) that of a unit or quantity to its total mass, ii) that of an object to its source material, iii) that of a member to its class. Juxtaposition does this task in Koiari and the result is compounding.

9) Typologically Koiari (together with its two closest relatives Koita and Mountain Koiari) differs from the other Papuan languages surveyed in having a #-gen pattern as its only system of marking possession.<sup>29</sup> This puts it in Ultan's third most common category whereas the majority of the world's languages belong to his gen-# category.

## References

- Austing, John and Randolph Upia. 1975. Highlights of Ömie morphology. In Dutton (ed), 513-89.
- Bach, E. 1967. Have and be in English syntax. *Language* 43:462-85.
- Bowden, John. 1992. *Behind the preposition: grammaticalisation of locatives in Oceanic languages*. Pacific Linguistics B-107. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Bromley, Myron H. 1981. *A grammar of the Lower Grand Valley Dani*. Pacific Linguistics C-63. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Bruce, Les, 1984. *The Alamlak language of Papua New Guinea (East Sepik)*. Pacific Linguistics C-81. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Clark, Eve V. 1978. Locational: existential, locative and possessive constructions. In Greenberg (ed), 11-49.
- Dutton, T.E., ed. 1975. *Studies in languages of Central and South-East Papua*. Pacific Linguistics C-29. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Dutton, T.E. 1975. A Koita grammar sketch and vocabulary. In Dutton (ed), 281-412.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In *Universals in linguistic theory*, ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms, 1-88. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

<sup>28</sup> Not included in this claim are languages like 'Abu Arapesh which has a concordial system in which adjectives agree with the head noun and possessive suffixes are repeated on the adjective, e.g. *aulafiye- 'i namif-i* (= house.C I-POSS new.C-POSS) 'my new house' (where C = nominal class marker).

<sup>29</sup> A number of other Papuan languages have this pattern in their inherently versus non-inherently possessed systems, e.g. Amele has *ija-na cudun* 'my place' (non-inherently possessed) versus *ija cudu-ni* 'my place' (inherently possessed) (lit. 1SG place-POSS.1SG) (Roberts, p.c.).

- Foley, William A. 1986. *The Papuan languages of New Guinea*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foley, William A. 1991. *The Yimas language of New Guinea*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Franklin, Karl J. 1971. *A grammar of Kewa, New Guinea*. Pacific Linguistics C-16. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Garland, Roger and Susan Garland. 1975. A grammar sketch of Mountain Koiari. In Dutton (ed.), 413-69.
- Greenberg, Joseph H., ed. *Universals of human language*, vol. 4: *Syntax*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Henderson, J.E. 1975. Yeletnye, the language of Rossel Island. In Dutton (ed), 817-34.
- Laycock, D.C. 1965. *The Ndu language family (Sepik District, New Guinea)*. Pacific Linguistics C-1. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1985. Possessive constructions in Oceanic languages and in Proto-Oceanic. In xxx, ed. by Pawley and Carrington, 93-140. Pacific Linguistics C-88. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Lyons, John, 1967. A note on possessive, existential and locative sentences. *Foundations of Language* 3:390-96.
- McElhanon, K.A. 1972. *Selepet grammar: Part 1: From root to phrase*. Pacific Linguistics B-21. Canberra: Australian National University.
- McKaughan, Howard, ed. 1973. *The languages of the Eastern Family of the East New Guinea Highlands Stock*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- McKaughan, Howard and Aretta Loving. 1973. Possessive prefixes occurring with inalienable Awa nouns. In McKaughan (ed.), 31-35.
- Mosel, Ulrike. 1983. *Adnominal and predicative possessive constructions in Melanesian languages*. Kuln [*Arbeiten des Kulner Universalien-Projekts, Nr 50*].
- Olson, Mike. 1975. Barai grammar highlights. In Dutton (ed.), 471-512.
- Pawley, Andrew K. 1966. *The structure of Kalam: a grammar of a New Guinea Highlands language*. PhD dissertation, University of Auckland.
- Pawley, Andrew and Timoci Sayaba. 1990. Possessive-marking in Wayan, a western Fijian language: noun class or relational system? In *Pacific Island languages: essays in honour of G.B. Milner*, ed. by Jeremy H. C. S. Davidson, 147-72. London: University of London and Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- Reesink, Ger P. 1967. *Structures and their functions in Usan, a Papuan language of Papua New Guinea*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Renck, G.L. 1975. *A grammar of Yagaria*. Pacific Linguistics B-40. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Richert, Ernst L. 1975. Sentence structure of Guhu-Samane. In Dutton (ed.), 771-815.
- Roberts, John. 1987. *Amele*. London: Croom Helm.
- Scott, G. 1978. The Fore language of Papua New Guinea. Pacific Linguistics B-47. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Seiler, Hansjakob. 1983. *Possession as an operational dimension of language*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Seiler, W. 1984. Imonda part-of-whole marking. In xxx, 273-83. Pacific Linguistics A-69. Canberra: Australian National University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Imonda, a Papuan language*. Pacific Linguistics B-93. Canberra: Australian National University.

- Thomson, N.P. 1975. Magi phonology and grammar—fifty years afterwards. In Dutton (ed.), 599-666.
- Ultan, Russell, 1978. Toward a typology of substantival possession. In Greenberg (ed.), 11-49.
- Weimer, Harry and Natalie Weimer. 1975. A short sketch of Yareba grammar. In Dutton (ed.), 667-729.
- Wurm, S.A. and Shiro Hattori. 1981. *Language atlas of the Pacific area*. Pacific Linguistics C-66. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Z'Graggen, J.A. 1965. Possessor-possessed relationships in the Saker language, North-East New Guinea. *Oceanic Linguistics* 4:119-26.

Presented 18 September 1992  
Revised 26 February 1993

Department of Linguistics  
Research School of Pacific Studies  
The Australian National University  
GPO Box 4  
Canberra, ACT 2601  
AUSTRALIA

## Appendix: Comparative Chart

	Koita (Dutton 1975)	Koiari	Mountain Koiari (Garlands 1975)
1. What is the structure of:			
a) pronom POSS: my father	PR^PM-Ce	PR^PM-Ce	PR^PM-vc/cabc*
my house	PR^PM-Ce	PR^PM-Ce	PR^PM-ve/cabe
b) nom POSS: X's father	PR^PM-Ce/ka	PR^PM-Ce/ka	PR^PM
X's house	PR^his/their^PM-Ce	PR^his/their^PM-Ce	
2. Does PR have a special form if it is			
(a) a pronoun?	No, except <i>da</i> > <i>di</i> , <i>no</i> > <i>ni</i>	No: same as subj. & obj	No: same as subj & obj
(b) a N?	No	No	No
3. Is POSS indicated by suffix on PM?	Yes: 6 rare + 1 common (-ve)	Yes: 6 rare + 1 common (-ve)	Yes, but only for 3rd person (optionally) -ve (SG), -eabe (PL)
4. If Q3 is 'yes' does language have PL for classes of N?	Yes: kin (- <i>uhu</i> )	Yes: kin (- <i>uhu</i> , <i>uhe</i> , ( <i>uhere</i> ))	Yes: - <i>uhu</i> ( <i>ve/eabe</i> )
5. If Q3 is 'yes' does POSS suffix shift when ADJ added?	Yes	Yes	No
6. Does the language have predicative POSS forms?	Yes: - <i>ye</i>	Yes: - <i>yel</i> - <i>yete</i> < <i>rE</i> >	?
7. Does the language have partitive forms different from normal POSS suffixes?	Yes: - <i>ka</i>	Yes: - <i>ka</i>	No: PR- <i>e</i> + PM
8. Are LOCs formed from body/house parts + postpositions?	Body parts in partitive form + - <i>he</i> 'at'	Body parts/house parts a) root + - <i>va</i> , - <i>he</i> 'at' b) POSS form + - <i>he</i>	? - ?unmarked
9. How is HAVE expressed?	PM- <i>te</i> + BE	PM- <i>vore</i> + BE	?
10. Which of Ultan's classes does the language fall into?	#-gen	#-gen	#-gen

\* 1 and 2 are free forms; 3 may be suffixed optionally.



	Barai (Olson 1975)	Ömie (Austing & Upia 1975)	Managalasi (Dutton, fieldnotes)
1. What is the structure of:			
a) pronom POSS: my father my house	PM-SG/PL^PR-one	PR-(e)si^PM	PR-uni^PMPM^PR
b) nom POSS: X's father X's house	? PR^C(SG/PL)^PM PR^C(SG/PL)^PM	PR^PM ? PR-his^PM	
2. Does PR have a special form if it is (a) a pronoun?	Yes: PRN-one	Yes: PRN-(e)si	Yes: PRN-uni
(b) a N?	No: Uses DEM- <i>aduol</i> <i>afuo</i> as connective	No: Uses he (= 3PRN) <i>-si/are</i> as connective	?
3. Is POSS indicated by suffix on PM?	Yes: on kin Ns = PRN	No (on terminators)	?
4. If Q3 is 'yes' does language have PL for classes of N?	Yes: <i>-ki</i> (SG), <i>-rafa</i> (PL)	N/A	?
5. If Q3 is 'yes' does POSS suffix shift when ADJ added?	No	N/A	?
6. Does the language have predicative POSS forms?	Yes: <i>-do</i>	?	?
7. Does the language have partitive forms different from normal POSS suffixes?	?	?	?
8. Are LOCs formed from body/house parts + postpositions?	?	?	?
9. How is HAVE expressed?			
10. Which of Ultan's classes does the language fall into?	? gen-#	PM- 'e' ('with') + BE gen-#	? gen-#

	Zia (Kamenc, p.c.)	Kewa (Franklin 1971, Yarapca, p.c.)	'Abu Arapesh (Nekitel, p.c.)
1. What is the structure of:			
a) pronom POSS: my father my house	PM^PR- <i>na</i> PM^PR- <i>na</i>	PR- <i>na</i> ^PM PR- <i>na</i> ^PM	PM^PR- <i>'i</i> PM^PR- <i>'i</i>
b) nom POSS: X's father X's house	PR- <i>nalra</i> ^PM	PR- <i>na</i> ^PM	PM^PR- <i>'ilri</i>
2. Does PR have a special form if it is (a) a pronoun? (b) a N?	Yes (PRN- <i>na</i> ) Yes (N- <i>nalra</i> )	Yes (PRN- <i>na</i> ) Yes (N- <i>na</i> )	Yes (PRN- <i>'i</i> ) Yes (N- <i>ilri</i> )
3. Is POSS indicated by suffix on PM?	No	No	No
4. If Q3 is 'yca' does language have PL for classes of N?	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. If Q3 is 'yca' does POSS suffix shift when ADJ added?	N/A	N/A	N/A
6. Does the language have predicative POSS forms?	No (same as attributive form)	No (same as attributive form)	No (similar to attribu- tive form (PRN- <i>'ilri</i> ))
7. Does the language have partitive forms different from normal POSS suffixes?	No (No marker; just juxtaposition (PR^PM))	No (uses PR(- <i>na</i> )^PM)	No (PM^PR- <i>'i</i> )
8. Are LOCs formed from body/house parts + postpositions?	Yes (Body part root + <i>-nalra</i> )	Yes (PR- <i>na</i> ^PM-LOC)	No (LOC- <i>ma</i> ^PR)
9. How is HAVE expressed?	Verbally (POSSP + <i>pasa</i> 'have, own'); no 'with'	Verbally (POSSP+hold/ keep/look after); no 'with'	Verbally (POSSP+put/ hold/carry); no 'with'
10. Which of Ultan's classes does the language fall into?	gcn-#	gcn-#	gcn-#