Predicative possession beyond HAVE-constructions: towards taking stock of BELONG and OWN across languages

Thomas Stolz & Nataliya Levkovych (University of Bremen)

Ever since the seminal studies by Hansjakob Seiler in the 1970-1980ies possession has developed into one of the favourite topics in linguistic typology. There is as yet a plethora of dedicated publications which focus on different aspects of the grammar of possession. It suffices to mention Heine (1997) as an influential monograph which covers the entire domain of linguistic possession. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2002) gives an account of adnominal possession – an issue investigated more recently also by Haspelmath (2017). Predicative possession is payed attention in several typologically-minded studies. There is e.g. the book-length study by Stassen (2009). Mazzitelli (2015, 2017) inquires into predicative possession in Belarusian and Lithuanian and provides an areal survey for the languages of the Circum-Baltic region. Stassen (2005) traces the geo-linguistic distribution of predicative possessive constructions in the world's languages. Michaelis (2013) looks at the situation in Pidgin and Creole languages. What all of these and many more studies have in common is that they limit the scope of the research to proper HAVE-constructions, i.e. they take account of functional equivalents of sentences like English *Georgina has a new car*.

However, we know from Seiler's work (Seiler 1983) that there are further kinds of predicative possession (other than those of the HAVE-type) which have not been studied in sufficient detail yet. Aikhenvald & Dixon (2013) show that it makes sense to study OWN-constructions more closely without, however, putting forward any typologically valid generalisations as to the relation between HAVE and OWN. A further notion that is repeatedly mentioned in the literature on possession is that of BELONG. Usually BELONG is depicted as the mirror image of HAVE. Some authors like Heine (1997) claim that the opposition HAVE ≠ BELONG is universal and each language has formal means to distinguish the two possessive categories. In contrast there are also voices like Baron & Herslund & Sørensen (2001) who cast doubt upon the tenability of this universal. On the basis of Clark (1978) and Ultan (1978) it seems reasonable to assume that one branch of BELONG-constructions is widely common among the world's languages, namely so called substantival possesstion corresponding to English *The car is hers / Georgina's*. What is still largely unknown is the distribution of BELONG-constructions which involve lexical verbs of possession (like English *The car **belongs** to her / Georgina*).

The talk is intended to convince field linguists and typologists to look beyond HAVE-constructions when they carry out their descriptive linguistic or cross-linguistic projects. If we want to understand the grammar of possession in individual languages as well as cross-linguistically, we need to widen the scope of our research so that OWN-constructions and BELONG-constructions can be adequately integrated into the general picture. In support of this hypothesis we will present and discuss data especially from Mesoamerican and Micronesian languages.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. & Dixon, R.M.W. (eds.). 2013. *Possession and ownership. A cross-linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Baron, Irène & Herslund, Michael & Sørensen, Finn (eds.). 2001. *Dimensions of possession*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Clark, Eve. 1978. Locationals: existential, locative, and possessive constructions. In: Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of human language. Volume 4: Syntax*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 85–126.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2017. Explaining alienability contrasts in adpossessive constructions: predictability vs. iconicity. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 36 (2), 193–231.

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession. Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Mazzitelli, Lidia Federica. 2015. *The expression of predicative possession. A comparative study of Belarusian and Lithuanian*. Berlin, Munich, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mazzitelli, Lidia Federica. 2017. Predicative possession in the languages of the Circum-Baltic area. *Folia Linguistica* 51 (1), 1–60.

Michaelis, Susanne Maria (and the APiCS Consortium). 2013. Predicative possession. In: Susanne Maria Michaelis & Philippe Maurer & Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber (eds.) *The atlas of Pidgin & Creole language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 306–309.

Seiler, Hansjakob. 1983. *Possession as an operational dimension of language*. Tübingen: Narr.

Stassen, Leon. 2005. Predicative possession. In Martin Haspelmath & Matthew Dryer & David Gil & Bernard Comrie (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 474–477.

Stassen, Leon. 2009. *Predicative possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ultan, Russell. 1978. Towards a typology of substantival possession. In Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of human language. Volume 4: Syntax*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 11–50.