Gréte Dalmi, Jacek Witkoś, and Piotr Cegłowski, eds. *Approaches to Predicative Possession: The View from Slavic and Finno-Ugric*. London/New York/Oxford/New Delhi/Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic, 2020. viii + 228 pp. ISBN 978-1-3500-6246-7 (hardback), 978-1-3500-6249-8 (online), 978-1-3500-6247-4 (epdf)

Reviewed by Ljuba Veselinova

It is widely acknowledged that possession is a universal domain in the sense that all known human languages have conventionalized expressions for it, such as (1) and (2) below (cf. Heine 1997: 2). Like most abstract notions, the domain of possession defies a generally accepted definition. Yet, as pointed out by Stassen (2009: 10–11), most linguists and laymen would agree that the expressions in (1) and (2) illustrate cases of "real"/prototypical possession, while intuitions and views would differ on whether sentences such as (3–6) would count as examples of possession.

(1) Tom has a car.
(2) his car
(3) Frank has a sister.
(4) A spider has six legs.
(5) Mandy has a basket on her lap.
(6) Bill has the flu.

The domain of possession has been construed in terms of judicial ownership, belonging, and spatial proximity. Perhaps one of the most accepted analyses sees possession as a relation between two entities, a POSSESSOR and a POSSESSEE (Langacker 1991; Stassen 2009; Heine 1997). There are authors, such as Miller and Johnson-Laird (1976), who see possession as a social construct; this understanding has been subject to debate. A number of scholars (Seiler 1973; Hagège 1993; Heine 1997; Evans 1995; Stassen 2009, among others) bring up the aspect of CONTROL[1] in the relation POSSESSOR-POSSESSEE. That is, in the prototypical case, the POSSESSOR controls the relation over the POSSESSEE. This, in turn, entails that a prototypical POSSESSOR is a high-ranking animate, usu-

[1] The semantic parameter of control is not to be confused with the syntactic notion of control used in generative grammar.

ally a human, and a prototypical POSSESSEE is an inanimate object, as is the case in the predication shown in (1). Analyses of kinship relations, as well as encodings of body parts versus the body they belong to, as in (3) and (4), bring out aspects of durability and part-whole relations that contribute to the semantic complexity of the domain of possession. Thus, POSSESSEES that can be detached from the POSSESSOR without any physical/other kind of damage instantiate *alienable possession*, while POSSESSEES whose detachment leads to permanent destruction, for instance, the removal of one's legs, are examples of *inalienable possession*. This distinction is marked to varying degrees in different languages. It is barely noticeable, or even completely absent, in many languages of Europe; the native/indigenous languages of the American continents are frequent examples of systematic marking of alienable vs. inalienable possession. The conceptual link between LOCATION, EXISTENCE, and POSSESSION has been discussed in numerous publications, Lyons 1967 being one of the seminal articles. Based on the semantic parameters of CONTROL, ALIENABILITY, and SPATIAL PROXIMITY, Stassen (2009) offers a distinction between four types of possession: alienable, inalienable, temporary, and abstract.

As indicated by examples (1) and (2) on the previous page, possession can be encoded by means of an entire predication or by modifying a nominal. These two strategies are used in different contexts. It has been demonstrated that they have different discourse functions and obviously completely different structural characteristics. This, in turn, has led many scholars to focus either on predicative or adnominal possession, and two almost completely separate bodies of literature have evolved over time. In work dedicated to predicative possession, issues that have received a lot of attention include the semantic composition of the domain, as well as the structural properties of the strategies employed for its encoding.

This edited volume, *Approaches to Predicative Possession: The View from Slavic and Finno-Ugric*, is the offspring of a panel on predicative possession, part of the meeting of the British Association for Slavonic and Eastern European Studies (BASEEES), held at Cambridge in March 2017. The book includes an introduction by Gréte Dalmi, nine chapters, and a conclusion by the editors. The introduction sets the scene by presenting the languages under study: two East[2] Slavic languages (Russian and Belarusian) and one West Slavic (Polish). The Uralic family is represented by five branches: Hungarian; Finnic by Finnish; Mari by Meadow Mari; Permian by Komi-Permyak and Udmurt; and finally, the Samoyedic branch by Selkup.

There is a brief overview of theoretical approaches to predicative possession. Some functionally oriented work is mentioned (e.g., Stassen 2009), but the general orientation is clearly towards formal linguistics.

[2] The classification used here is from Glottolog (https://glottolog.org/).

Parameters considered relevant for the analysis of predicative possession include the use of verbs such as HAVE and BE, as well as negation and definiteness. The verbs HAVE and BE surface in various ways in East and West Slavic languages, especially those that have been in close contact with Uralic varieties. Following a generative perspective, they are considered derivationally related. After an overview of previous formally oriented work on possessive predications, the chapters of the book are summarized one by one. For an edited volume that claims to bring together different approaches to predicative possession, as a reader and reviewer, I would have liked to see a discussion of possible working definition(s) of predicative possession as opposed to other kinds of possession.

In chapter 2, "Genitive of Negation (GoN) in Polish Possessive and Existential Sentences: A Testing Tool for Case Overwriting, Case Projections and Derivational Phases", Jacek Witkoś uses GoN as a basis for discussing the viability of several syntactic theories that account for case assignment. The author starts by presenting relevant data from Polish. Specifically, direct objects are marked accusative in affirmative sentences, but under negation, their case changes to genitive, as shown in (7) below.[3]

(7) a. Maria czyta gazet-ę. (Polish)
Maria reads newspaper-ACC
'Maria is reading a newspaper.'

b. Maria nie czyta gazet-y.
Maria NEG read newspaper-GEN
'Maria is not reading a newspaper.'[4]

In a similar fashion, GoN is assigned to the possessee in predications of possession, as in (8) below.

(8) a. Maria ma gazet-ę. (Polish)
Maria has newspaper-ACC
'Maria has a newspaper.'

[3] The following abbreviations are used throughout the paper: ACC = accusative; ADE = adessive; ADJVZ = adjectivizer; ADV = adverbial; AOR = aorist; DAT = dative; DU = dual; EP = epenthetic; EXIST = existential; GEN = genitive; INE = inessive; INF = infinitive; M = masculine; N = neuter; NEG = negation; NOM = nominative; PAR = partitive; PAST = past tense; PL = plural; PRS = present tense; SG = singular.

[4] Unless otherwise specified, all examples come from the relevant chapter under review. Formatting of glosses in this review follows the formatting found in the reviewed book and thus departs from the JSL stylesheet.

(8) b. Maria nie ma gazet-y.
Maria NEG have newspaper-GEN
'Maria does not have a newspaper.'

GoN occurs when negation scopes over the entire predication, but is not observed with constituent negation. Furthermore, change of object case marking to genitive is not observed in predications with a dative object (beneficiary), nor with most predications with a prepositional/indirect object. However, there are contexts when indirect object too can be assigned GoN; cf. (11) below.

The author observes that GoN appears with the nominal argument of locative-existential constructions in Polish, dubbed "subject" by him.[5]

(9) a. Na stole jest piwo. (Polish)
on table is beer.NOM
'There is beer on the table.'

b. Na stole nie ma *piwo /piw-a.
on table NEG have.3SG beer.NOM beer-GEN
'There is no beer on the table.'

Witkoś also points out that GoN applies "long distance", that is, with complements of embedded constructions, as shown in (10) below. In addition, GoN can be applied to both indirect and direct objects when the indirect object is marked by the accusative case in the positive predication, as in (11).

(10) a. Maria$_i$ kazała Jan-owi$_j$ [PRO$_j$ czytać listy]. (Polish)
Maria.NOM told Jan-DAT read.INF letters.ACC
'Maria told Jan to read letters.'

b. Maria$_i$ nie kazała Jan-owi$_j$ [PRO$_j$ czytać *list-y/
Maria.NOM NEG told Jan-DAT read.INF *letters-ACC
list-ów].
letters-GEN
'Maria did not tell Jan to read letters.'

(11) a. Maria nauczyła Basi-ę czytać cyrylic-ę. (Polish)
Maria.NOM taught Basia-ACC read.INF Cyrillic.script-ACC
'Maria taught Basia to read the Russian alphabet.'

[5] While this is not immediately relevant for the author's inquiry, I find the use of the term "subject" surprising given that there is a vast amount of work on existential predications which shows that nominal arguments in existential predications are the least prototypical subjects and are better referred to as "pivots".

(11) b. Maria nie nauczyła Bas-i czytać cyrylic-y.
Maria.nom neg taught Basia-gen read.inf Cyrillic.script-gen
'Maria did not teach Basia to read the Russian alphabet.'

Several theoretical accounts are considered. The first one brings up the work of Błaszczak, and ultimately also of Borschev and Partee (2002), and posits two different types of locative constructions. Following the terminology adopted in this article and cited work, they are referred to as the existential locative, (12a), and agentive locative, (12b).

(12) a. Ivana ne bylo v komnate. (Russian)
Ivan.gen neg was.3sg.n in room
'There was no trace of Ivan in the room.'

b. Ivan ne byl v komnate.
Ivan.nom neg was.3sg.m in room
'Ivan was not in the room.

GoN applies in existential locatives but not in agentive locatives. This is accounted for by their different perspectival centers, as suggested by Borschev and Partee (2002), and also by different underlying representations for these constructions, following Błaszczak (2001, 2008, 2010).

(13) Adaptation of Błaszczak's (2008, 2010) analysis of possessive constructions, locative existentials, and agentive locatives

a. Transitive possessive

$[_{\text{NegP}}$ Neg $[_{\text{vP}}$ NP$_{AGENT}$ (possessor) $[_{\text{v}}$ v $[_{\text{VP}}$ V NP$_{THEME}$]]]]

b. Locative existential

$[_{\text{NegP}}$ Neg $[_{\text{vP}}$ PP$_{LOC}$ $[_{\text{v'}}$ v $[_{\text{VP}}$ V NP$_{THEME}$]]]]

c. GoN: Neg > v > NP

d. "Agentive" locative

$[_{\text{NegP}}$ Neg $[_{\text{vP}}$ NP$_{AGENT}$ $[_{\text{v'}}$ v $[_{\text{VP}}$ V PP$_{LOC}$]]]]

As indicated in (13a–c), in possessive sentences as well as in locative existentials, the thematic NP falls under the c-command of NEG/v', while in (13d), it does not, since it is no longer the theme NP but rather the agent NP.

The next framework considered by Witkoś is Pesetsky's (2013) theory of case overwriting. After a rather esoteric introduction to this model, Witkoś concludes that Pesetsky's approach can be used to account for core cases of GoN, but not for long-distance GoN as in (11).

Witkoś moves on to nanosyntax as another alternative to investigate in the quest to account for GoN. Via its mingling of morphology and syntax, as well as by its perspective on case as a functional projection, this framework is said to provide the means "to derive various case patterns" and to allow "for the movement of NP within the set of case projections" (p. 25). However, similar to Pesetsky's (2013) theory, the nanosyntactic approach is not found satisfactory with regard to providing an account for long-distance GoN. Witkoś appears to suggest that an operation such as Agree, as outlined in Chomsky's (2000, 2001) work, can be further exploited when looking to account for GoN in all its complexities.

The chapter is theoretically grounded; it definitely represents a solid piece of work as far as testing a set of data against different formal models. However, it has to be said too that this section is rather esoteric and might be challenging for non-specialists in these frameworks.

Chapter 3, "Extraction of Possessive NP-Complements and the Structure of the Nominal Domain in Polish", is authored by Piotr Cegłowski. The focus of the chapter is achieving a formal analysis of nominal phrase complements, including adnominal possessives, as illustrated by data in (14).

(14) Jeszcze w szkole średniej, jak sam (Polish)
already in school high as (he) himself

wspominał, [$_{NP2}$ węgierskich pisarzy]$_i$ czytywał [$_{NP1}$ książki *t*]
recalled Hungarian writers (he) read books

(z przyjemnością).
with pleasure

'Already in high school, as he himself recalls, he used to read the books of Hungarian writers with pleasure.'

The author strives to achieve a representation of the domain that would both cover its formal properties and also model its comprehension. To this end, Cegłowski conducted an online survey with 183 native speakers. In an online questionnaire, participants were asked to rate sentences according to grammaticality. The sentences they were given covered various types of extraction constructions: Left-Branching Extraction of adjectives, demonstratives, wh-complements, NP-complements—including extraction of possessive/genitive NP complements, as in (14) above—extraction across numerals, and more complex kinds of extraction. They rated the sentences on a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 is least grammatical/ungrammatical and 5 is definitely grammatical. The collected data were analyzed by rigorous statistical procedures. After analyzing previous parsimonious accounts (e.g., Bošković 2008), and also based on the statistical analysis of his own data, Cegłowski argues that accounts presented so far do not capture the complexity of the domain adequately. He

suggests instead a refined representation, still based in minimalism but also taking into account discourse factors such as topicality and focus as well as various collocations, such as those with demonstratives, numerals, and relative clauses, (15).

(15) Underlying representation of NP-complements in Polish

$[_{DP}$ D $[_{TopP}$ Top $[_{FocP}$ Foc $[_{AgrP}$ DemP $[_{AgrP}$ Agr $[_{QP}$ NumP $[_{QP}$ F_Q $[_{NP}$ (wh/AP) $[_{NP}$ N]]]]]]]]]

Thus, while theoretically grounded, Cegłowski's account also provides solid empirical evidence and analysis, thus opening the problem to further studies.

The study is undeniably very interesting and meritorious. I do, however, have a couple points of criticism.

Methodology and data collection. It would have been beneficial for further replications of the study to see the questionnaire in its entirety. Furthermore, the reader is left wondering about the stratification of the participants. Apart from the fact that they are all native speakers of Polish, we know nothing about relevant sociological variables such as age, gender, education, and occupation. There is no information either about the way(s) participants were recruited for the study.

Relation to the topic of the volume. It is not clear how this topic is relevant for predicative possession. An explicit motivation would have contributed to the cohesion of the volume.

In chapter 4, Olga Kagan, building on previous work (e.g., Francez 2007), lays out the characteristics of existential predications with a special focus on the nominal in them, typically dubbed "pivot" in the relevant literature. Similar to many other scholars, Kagan points out that the nominal in existential predications tends to be indefinite and can appear together with indefinite articles, numerals, and indefinite quantifiers such as *some*. Following Milsark (1974), Kagan refers to nominals acceptable in existential predications as *weak,* and the ones that are unacceptable as *strong*. Essentially, this amounts to stating that definite nominals are generally not welcome in existential sentences.

The contrast between weak and strong nominals in existential sentences has been referred to as the Definiteness Effect. The manifestation and justification for the Definiteness Effect in Russian existential and possessive predications is the subject matter of Kagan's article. Specifically, she notes that affirmative and negative existential sentences differ in Russian with regard to this parameter. In Russian affirmative existential sentences, the nominals are

typically weak; strong ones are generally not admitted, as demonstrated by the data in (16).[6]

(16) a. V zale est' vrač. (Russian)
in hall be doctor.NOM.SG
'There is a doctor in the hall.'

b. V zale est' stul'ja.
in hall be chair.NOM.PL
'There are chairs in the hall.'

c. *V zale est' ètot vrač.
in hall be this.NOM.SG doctor.NOM.SG
'There is this doctor in the hall.'

d. *V zale est' pjat' iz ètix studentov.
in hall be five.NOM of these students
'There are five of these students in the hall.'

However, in Kagan's view, the Definiteness Effect is highly limited in negative existential sentences since along with weak nominals, there are also a number of occurrences of strong ones, that is, NPs with a definite reading are fully possible, as in (17).

(17) a. V zale net vrača. (Russian)
in hall NEG.be doctor.GEN.SG
'There is no doctor in the hall.'

b. V zale net stul'ev.
in hall NEG.be chair.GEN.PL
'There are no chairs in the hall.'

c. V zale ne bylo pjati vračej.
in hall NEG was five.GEN doctor.GEN.PL
'There weren't five doctors in the hall.' (NEG > 5)
Or: 'Five doctors were not in the hall.' (5 > NEG)

d. Ètogo vrača net v zale.
this.GEN.SG doctor.GEN.SG NEG.be in hall
'This doctor is not in the hall.'

[6] The third lines of the ungrammatical Russian examples in (16c–d) are quoted directly as they appear in Kagan's chapter.

(17) e. Dimy /ego net doma.
Dima.GEN he.GEN NEG.be at.home
'Dima/He is not at home.'

Kagan starts her analysis by pointing out that the nominative case of the pivots in the affirmative existential predications has to be replaced by genitive of negation in the negative ones. She notes too that GoN alternates with the accusative marking the direct object in transitive sentences and also subjects of unaccusative intransitive sentences, (18) and (19).

(18) a. Anna ne kupila knigi. (Russian)
Anna NEG bought books.ACC.PL
'Anna didn't buy (the) books.'

b. Anna ne kupila knig.
Anna NEG bought book.GEN.PL
'Anna didn't buy (any) books.'

(19) a. Otvet ne prišel.
answer.NOM.SG NEG arrived.M
'The answer did not arrive.'

b. Otveta ne prišlo.
answer.GEN.SG NEG arrived.N
'No answer arrived.'

Kagan states that the arguments marked by the genitive case are known to be indefinite, non-specific, and non-referential. However, there are also definite and specific nominals that can be marked genitive under certain circumstances. For instance, Kagan claims that the nominal in (19b) can be given a specific reading, despite the fact that it is marked by the genitive case. She provides a formal semantic account for this state of affairs. Specifically, she builds on McNally 1998, as well as Borschev and Partee 2002 and Partee and Borschev 2004. These scholars argue that negative existential sentences contain property-denoting predicates in that they systematically entail the non-existence of an entity at a certain location. Furthermore, Kagan points out that two semantic properties have been suggested to characterize objects that appear in GoN: property-type denotation and absence of existential commitment. In her view, definite nominals marked by GoN undergo a shift to the property type. For example, in (17e) the nominal *Dima* comes to denote a specific property, e.g., the property of being the individual Dima, rather than the token/individual Dima. That is, Kagan applies an intensional rather than a denotational approach to meaning, thus following Borschev and Partee (2002) and likewise

Zimmermann (1993: 10–11). This shift to property type is observed with all definite NPs that are marked by GoN; when the NP has undergone the shift, the verb undergoes a shift too. For instance, consider the verb in (19b), which shows no agreement with the subject and appears in neuter rather than masculine gender. Eventually, Kagan turns to predications of possession, which are encoded by the existential construction in Russian. After laying out the basic facts of Russian predications of possession, Kagan turns to the Definiteness Effect. She postulates that definite possessees in Russian can only be interpreted as referring to the property type and not to a specific token, (20).

(20) a. U menja est' èta kniga. (Russian)
at me be this.NOM.SG book.NOM.SG
'I have this book.'

b. U menja net ètoj knigi.
at me NEG.be this.GEN.SG book.GEN.SG
'I don't have this book.'

In the statement in (20a), *èta kniga* 'this book' can only refer to the whole set of particular copies of a given book. In other words, a reading whereby the sentence means that the speaker owns a specific physical object is not possible. One wonders, then, how ownership of a specific object is encoded in Russian.

There are two possible readings under negation in (20b): one where the possession of a specific property type is negated; another where the physical location of a specific token is negated, e.g., 'this book is not at me/with me'. Kagan concludes that GoN facilitates the shift to property-type interpretation. The Definiteness Effect, i.e., the ban on definite NPs, is eliminated in negative existentials; however, the Definiteness Effect remains valid in negated possessive predications. This remains a thorny issue for the author and she leaves it to future research. The semantic analysis offered here is a valuable example of viewing language facts in a specific theoretical framework.

As indicated in Kagan's conclusions, she considers the Definiteness Effect in existential and possessive sentences to be a crucial factor for their distinction on several levels. These include crosslinguistic contrast, e.g., differences between existential and possessive sentences in Russian and in English. The Definiteness Effect is also an important diagnostic for the intralinguistic differentiation of these sentence types. Specifically, Kagan maintains that it is valid only to a limited degree in Russian negative existential sentences; conversely, the Definiteness Effect leads to several semantic shifts in BE-possessive sentences in Russian, such as the change to property type rather than token type for definite pivots, or to locative rather than possessive reading if a definite pivot is interpreted as a token.

Egor Tsedryk presents a very informative overview of Belarusian predicative possessive constructions. Belarusian is unique among the languages studied in the book in using be or have, in different constructions, to encode predicative possession.

(21) a. U Hanny ësc' kvatèra. (Belarusian)
at Hanna.gen be.exist apartment.nom
'Hanna has an apartment.'

b. Hanna mae kvatèru.
Hanna.nom have.3sg apartment.acc
'Hanna has an apartment.'

The article consists of two parts: (i) data presentation and (ii) theoretical modeling. In the first, the different encodings of predicative possession in Belarusian are analyzed in terms of the verbal item used in them, e.g., either be or have, the functional load associated with each construction, and their potential to encode prototypical possession/ownership. Other parameters considered in the descriptive part of the article relate to the encoding and interpretation of the possessee, e.g., the Definiteness Effect and GoN. In the second part, Tsedryk views the presented data within the minimalist framework and offers a theoretical account for the observed facts.

Essentially, Tsedryk makes a distinction between three different ways of encoding predicative possession in Belarusian and dubs them according to the verb item used: (i) existential be as in (22a); (ii) copular be as in (23a); and (iii) have-construction as in (21b), (22b), and (23b).

(22) a. U Heli ësc' dačka i syn. (Belarusian)
at Helja.gen be.exist daughter.nom and son.nom
'Helja has a daughter and a son.'

b. Helja mae dačku i syna.
Helja.nom has daughter.acc and son.acc
'Helja has a daughter and a son.'

(23) a. U Hanny *ësc' / Ø pryhožyja vočy.
at Hanna.gen be.exist be.cop.prs [beautiful eyes].nom
'Hanna has beautiful eyes.'

b. Hanna mae pryhožyja vočy.
Hanna.nom has [beautiful eyes].acc
'Hanna has beautiful eyes.'

Tsedryk finds the existential and copular BE-constructions to be in complementary distribution, as their functions never overlap. Specifically, the existential BE-construction encodes kinship and abstract possession, while the copular BE-construction is used for body parts, inanimate part-whole relations, diseases, and psychological conditions. HAVE-constructions alternate with existential BE for both of its uses, kinship and abstract possession; they alternate with copular BE-constructions to express body parts and inanimate part-whole relations. However, HAVE-constructions are not used for the encoding of states such as diseases, e.g., 'he has the flu', or psychological states. I would have liked to see some discussion on their frequency. Likewise, what determines the choice of one over the other in the cases when they overlap for specific functions? Is there any evidence that one is preferred in particular contexts?

Following Tham's (2006: 138) analysis of English *have*-possessives, Tsedryk considers both the HAVE-construction and the existential BE-construction to be underspecified in their lexical representation for encoding prototypical ownership. In his view, this is motivated by the fact that the sense of permanent possession can be easily cancelled with all of these constructions, and they can come to express temporary possession or availability instead. Generally, I find this to be a strange approach to multiple uses as it appears to exclude polysemy, e.g., a lexical item or a construction may express either permanent or temporary possession, with any particular interpretation being contingent on context.

Tsedryk does contend that Belarusian speakers associate HAVE with prototypical ownership and that indefiniteness of the possessee, or, in fact, the "existential closure of the possessee" (p. 87), is a decisive factor for interpreting the construction as designating permanent or temporary possession. This brings us to the Definiteness Effect in these constructions. Permanent possession is encoded by them when the possessee has a type reading, whereas the ownership is more likely to be conceived of as temporary when the possessee has a token reading.

As regards GoN, Tsedryk observes that similar to Russian, accusative case marking is used to designate a specific entity that is presupposed and salient in the discourse, while the genitive tends to be used for non-specific or generic possessees. In addition, GoN is described as mandatory for the BE-existential, as well as for the HAVE-construction. It is not observed in the BE-copular constructions, which, in Tsedryk's view, is due to the fact that an existential operator is not present in them. However, he also observed that the lack of an overt verbal form in the present tense makes the sentential negator indistinguishable from constituent negation.

Generally, as regards the negation of predicative possession, I am surprised that the focus has been restricted only to GoN. Belarusian offers very interesting data as regards lexicalization of negative existence, specifically,

that the negative existential *njama*—a transparent univerbation between the negator *ne* and *(i)ma* 'have$_{3SG.PRS}$'—is restricted to the negative existential construction. However, the construction with the verb *mec'* 'have' is negated by the standard negator *ne*. This fact is only shown by a couple of examples, without any further discussion.

(24) a. U mjane njama hètaj knihi/ (Belarusian)
at me.GEN not.be.EXIST [this book].GEN
*hètaja kniha.
[this book].NOM
'I don't have this (kind of) book.'

b. Ja ne maju hètaj knihi.
I.NOM NEG have.1SG [this book].GEN
'I don't have this (kind of) book.'

After a concise summary of the descriptive part, Tsedryk turns to discussing possession from a theoretical perspective. He starts off with an overview of Langacker's (1993, 2009) definition of possession and then a deft presentation of functionally oriented authors such as Heine (1997) and Stassen (2009). However, his focus is clearly on providing a minimalist-based account of the Belarusian facts. Unlike such authors as Freeze (1992) and Kayne (1993), he concludes that HAVE is not a result of incorporating a locative P into BE. In Tsedryk's view, HAVE represents a transitivized form of a spatiotemporal root √AT, whose logical form is realized as a free variable of individual type e in the denotation of the clause. This variable can be either existentially closed or contextually bound. Tsedryk correlates this with two set-theoretic possibilities postulated in Langacker's definition of possession, namely, possession as inclusion into a domain or into a class of potential targets. The two set-theoretic possibilities are distributed between two derivational options: one that features an existential phrase of type <e, t> (intersection of two sets) and another of type e (inclusion of a set). These two scenarios lead, in Tsedryk's view, to the BE-existential and BE-copular constructions. The two co-exist in strictly complementary distribution, with consistent allomorphy.

Tsedryk acknowledges the possibility that there might be a diachronic account for the use of alternative encodings of predicative possession in Belarusian. He is correct inasmuch as such alternation between BE- and HAVE-constructions existed in Old Church Slavonic. A detailed investigation of this issue is still in demand. Another direction for future research is a comparative perspective that takes into account variation within all East Slavonic languages, specifically Ukrainian, as a similar alternation between BE- and HAVE-constructions is observed in that language as well. It would be interesting to

find out how their distribution patterns and whether it is similar or different from what we have seen for Belarusian.

As in the chapters by Witkoś and Kagan, a discussion of data sources and data collection procedure is entirely missing in Tsedryk's chapter. As a data-oriented linguist, I find such discussions indispensable. They would have been enlightening even for more theoretically minded readers.

As already stated, the account presented for the Belarusian data is clearly grounded in minimalist syntax. However, the author demonstrates openness to several frameworks and alternative approaches, which is highly commendable. In addition, the detailed description of Belarusian data makes this chapter a welcome contribution to scholarship on an understudied language.

In chapter 6, Maria Vilkuna presents an analysis of expressions of predicative possession in Finnish, setting it within the framework of Construction Grammar. One of the most common ways to encode predicative possession in Finnish uses a construction modeled on the existential clause. As shown in (25b) below, in the possessive clause, the possessor is encoded by the locative constituent and the possessee by the NP which corresponds to the pivot in an existential clause.

(25) Existential (ExCl)

a. Sohva-lla/Anna-n syli-ssä on koira. (Finnish)
sofa-ADE Anna-GEN lap-INE be.3SG dog
'There is a dog on the sofa/in Anna's lap.'

Possessive (PossCl)

b. Anna-lla on koira /koir-i-a /raha-a.
Anna-ADE be.3SG dog.NOM dog-PL-PAR money-PAR
'Anna has a dog/dogs/money.'

Locative (LocCl)

c. Koira on sohva-lla/Anna-n syli-ssä.
dog be.3SG sofa-ADE Anna-GEN lap-INE
'The dog is on the sofa/in Anna's lap.'

Transitive

d. Anna hala-a koira-a.
Anna hug.3SG dog-PAR
'Anna is hugging a/the dog.'

After a theoretical overview in which she points out broad differences and commonalities between four different construction types—possessive (25b), existential (25a), locative, and transitive—Vilkuna proceeds with a detailed

constructional analysis of the predication labeled by her PossCl, as in (25b). She does point out that the domain of predicative possession can be encoded in other ways as well, specifically, by verbs such as *omistaa* 'own' to express legal possession, *omata* 'possess', used mainly in participial constructions, *kuulua* 'belong', as well as by copular clauses with the possessor in genitive case, e.g., 'The dog is Anna's'. However, the predication dubbed PossCl here is "the basic, unmarked construction" that encodes not only prototypical possession, but also relations which the author considers outside such prototypical possession, such as part-whole relations.

Vilkuna suggests that the Existential Clause serves as an overarching schema on which the Possessive Clause is modeled. Following Hakulinen et al. (2004: §893), she identifies the properties of the core ExCl as follows: (i) a constituent order which typically includes a locative, a verb, and an entity/existent labeled E, that is, LOC V E; (ii) the function of the ExCl is to introduce a new referent into the discourse; (iii) case marking of E in the affirmative clause is partitive when cumulative (non-bounded) reference is targeted; in other instances, E/pivot is marked nominative; (iv) case marking of E under negation is normally partitive; (v) there is no agreement between the verb and E; and (vi) the verb used in the construction is normally *olla* 'be'. Vilkuna notes that there are deviations from each of these properties; the more they accumulate, the further the distance from the core Existential Clause.

The Possessive Clause, while building on ExCl, emerges as a distinct clause type with its own characteristics that depart in several ways from the ones just listed for ExCl. Specifically, features that appear exclusive to the PossCl include case marking of the possessor, the choice of verb, and case marking of the possessee.

For instance, as indicated in (25a), there are different options for the case marking of the locative phrase in an Existential Clause. Conversely, the only possible case for marking the possessor in the Possessive Clause is the adessive. However, Vilkuna points out that adessive marking on a topical constituent should not be taken as the sole indicator of a possessive construction. Rather, adessive-marked animate participants are strong candidates for this position even outside the Possessive Clause (cf. p. 124).

The invariant form used in the Possessive Clause is by definition a form of the verb *olla* 'be'. Vilkuna points out that this preference is a mark of specialization of the Possessive Clause and likewise of its stative character. In endnote 15, she does mention two other possible verbs for the Possessive Clause: *riittää* 'be enough' to express notable quantity of the possessee or *puuttua* 'lack' as a lexical way of negating possession. Both of these are quite restricted in use and still stative. Thus, the verbs used in the Possessive Clause contrast with the Existential Clause, which admits dynamic verbs such as *tulla* 'come' or *ilmestyä* 'appear' and can thus express change.

The marking of the possessee, especially under negation, is one of the features that most clearly distinguish the Possessive Clause from the Existential Clause. The author shows quite convincingly that the choice of case for the pivot/possessee is governed by ontological and discourse-pragmatic factors such as specific vs. generic interpretation, alienable vs. inalienable possession, quantification, and also by the scope of negation. For instance, the partitive marking of the possessee, which is normally expected under negation, can be replaced by nominative, (26).

(26) Minu-lla ei ole punainen mekko/ (Finnish)
I-ADE NEG.VERB.3SG be red.NOM dress.NOM
punais-ta mekko-a.
red-PAR dress-PAR
'I don't have a red dress.'

In (26) above, the nominative is suitable when the speaker is talking about the color of the dress she is wearing on a specific occasion, while the partitive marking is expected when she describes the contents of her wardrobe and the fact that she does not own a red dress in general. Nominative marking is also possible in affirmative sentences when those indicate part-whole relations or abstract possession, as in (27).

(27) a. Rakennukse-ssa on iso-t ikkuna-t. (Finnish)
building-INE be.3SG big-PL window-PL
'The building has big windows.'

b. Rakennukse-lla on kiinnostava historia.
building-ADE be.3SG interesting history
'The building has an interesting history.'

Vilkuna notes that apart from indicating inalienable possession, the use of the nominative case for the possessee is not common; however, the limits of its use remain evasive. Another context that clearly triggers its use is when the possessor group shares identical possessions, and this is indicated by the modifier *sama* 'same', as in (28).

(28) Laps-i-lla ei ole sama isä. (Finnish)
child-PL-ADE NEG.VERB.3SG be same father
'The children do not have the same father.'

Generally, the partitive contributes to asserting or denying the existence of the possessee in a general manner. A possessee-marked nominative singles

it out as a specific instance or in possessive predications with an essentially characterizing function, regardless of polarity.

(29) a. Mei-llä on hyvät tuotteet ja (Finnish)
we-ade be.3sg good.pl product.pl and
tyytyväiset asiakkaat.
satisfied.pl customer.pl
'We have good products and satisfied customers.'

b. Mei-llä ei ole huono maku/suuret-t tulo-t/
we-ade neg.verb.3sg be bad taste big-pl income-pl
läheise-t väli-t /mukava-t olosuhtee-t.
close-pl relation-pl comfortable-pl circumstance-pl
'We don't have bad taste/a big income/a close relationship/ comfortable circumstances.'

Vilkuna appears to consider predications such as those in (29) as slight departures from the core Possessive Clause. However, it is worth noting that casting characteristics as a possessive relation but encoding them by a construction that deviates from the one used for prototypical possession is observed with other languages in this book, for instance, with the be-copular construction in Belarusian, which is the only one used for the encoding of states.

Vilkuna wraps up her article with a general summary of her findings. She points out that while the Possessive and the Existential Clause clearly share many features and the Existential Clause is demonstrably the overarching schema, the Possessive Clause emerges as a clause type in its own right. This is based on features outlined above, but also on the semantic properties of its constituents. Specifically, the possessor is the dominant element in the PossCl since it shows properties such as (i) binding of a reflexive element; (ii) being typically animate; and (iii) determining the interpretation of the possessee when the latter is exhaustively construed. The referents of the possessee tend to be controllable entities that are often introduced as personal attributes of the possessor. Finally, the encoding of abstract possession indicates that the PossCl is a productive construction on its own.

While presenting a chapter with a strong theoretical grounding in construction grammar, Vilkuna also has a sound empirical basis. In addition to a meticulous and engaging data presentation, she also offers discussions of variation patterns as well as possible frequency effects.

Chapter 7, authored by Gréte Dalmi, offers a formal semantic-syntactic analysis of the argument structure of be-possessives in Hungarian. The author starts off by making a distinction between be-copular and be-existential/possessive predications, shown in (30) on the following page.

(30) BE_{COP} <[$_{SC}$ DP XP]> (where XP = NP/AP/PP/AdvP)

a. A császár Ø bölcs. (Hungarian)
the emperor COP wise
'The emperor is wise.'

BE_{EXIST} <(DP), DP>

b. A kert-ben VAN-NAK virág-ok.
the garden-in be.EXIST-3PL flower-PL
'There are flowers in the garden.'

BE_{POSS} <DP, DP>

c. A császár-nak VAN új ruhá-ja.
the emperor-DAT be.EXIST.3SG new clothes-POSS.3SG
'The emperor has new clothes.'

Dalmi brings up several semantic and syntactic aspects, illustrating them with Russian and Hungarian data. They can be summarized as follows:

(i) Semantic interpretation of the predications listed in (30): Dalmi notes that existential and possessive BE-predications "state the existence of an individual in a given location or relation" (p. 137), thus situating her work as part of a long line of similar scholarship within the generative tradition. BE-copular predications, on the other hand, are described as denoting a property of the subject; in addition, the copula is said to bear a number of grammatical functions, such as tense, mood, aspect, and person-number-gender agreement. The implication here appears to be that the BE-existential and BE-possessive do not have such functions, which in turn is puzzling to me. The only feature it typically does not have is indexation of the properties of the pivot/possessee; however, in both Hungarian and Russian, the existential and possessive item is the one that signals the temporal reference/tense of the clause.

(ii) Definiteness restriction: pivots, or the only argument of the BE-existential/possessive clause, are required to be indefinite or non-specific; such a restriction does not apply for the single argument of a copular predication.

(iii) Quantifier floating is found possible for copular predications but not in existential or possessive predication.

(iv) Clause negation: Dalmi notes that copular predications are negated by the standard negator in both Russian and Hungarian, while a special negative existential verb must be used in existential and possessive predications.

(v) GoN is required in existential and possessive predications but not in copular predications.

(vi) Zero copula in the present tense is mandatory for copular predications but not for existential and possessive predications.

After wrapping up the overview of the features characterizing be-copular and be-existential/possessive predications, Dalmi moves on to a critical review of literature relevant for the analysis of expressions of predicative possession. First, she challenges the tradition stemming from Benveniste's (1966: 197) statement "*avoir* n'est rien autre qu'un *être-à* inverse" (*avoir* is nothing other than inverted *être-à*), whereby have is considered to be an inverted version of be. In support of this, she evokes the differences she outlined between be-copular and be-existential constructions, arguing that the latter pattern with have-constructions, thus be-existential constructions are a distinct construction type from be-copular. In addition, she follows the analyses proposed by Paducheva (2000) and Partee and Borschev (2008), ultimately suggesting that the current ways of analyzing be and have in the generative tradition should be reconsidered. Second, she brings up research (e.g., Szabolcsi 1992, 1994) as well as several other scholars who draw parallels between adnominal and predicative possession in their analyses. This line of thinking establishes a structural analogy between Hungarian possessive constructions and the clausal structure of configurational languages. Specifically, the possessor corresponds to the subject and the possessee to the predicate; the possessor is extracted from the possessive DP in the same way as subjects are extracted from the clause. Dalmi finds this parallelism problematic from a theoretical point of view. For instance, she cites cyclic movement and long operator movement that can move the possessive DP to the left periphery of the sentence in general. However, she points out that the be-possessives diverge from the general pattern since such movement is not possible for the dative possessor, as in (31b) below.

(31) a. [$_{FocP}$ Ki-nek$_i$ [$_{IP}$ mond-tad [$_{DP}$ t_i [$_{CP}$ hogy (Hungarian)
who-dat say-past.2sg that

[$_{IP}$ elvesz-ed [$_{DP}$ t_i a [$_{NP}$ t_i lány-á-t]]]]]]]?
marry-2sg the daughter-poss.3sg-acc

'Whose daughter did you say that you would marry?'

b. *[[$_{FocP}$ PÉTER-NEK$_i$ új ruhája] mond-tad
Peter-dat new clothes.poss.3sg say-past.2sg

[t_i [$_{CP}$ hogy [$_{IP}$ VAN [$_{DP}$ t_i]]]]?
that be.exist

Intended: 'Did you say it was Peter who had new clothes?'

Furthermore, Dalmi notes that a data-oriented perspective offers arguments against the parallelism between adnominal possessives and BE-possessive constructions. This can be demonstrated by the fact that definite possessive adnominal constructions can move to the left periphery of a sentence, while this is not possible with the indefinite possessees of the BE-possessive predications.

Dalmi suggests that possessive BE selects two distinct arguments, which have different thematic roles. For this reason, she concludes that BE-possessives cannot be analyzed on a par with possessive DPs. After performing several syntactic tests to support this claim, she moves on to formulate a more substantive proposal with regard to the argument structure of BE-possessives. Adhering to the thinking of a number of scholars, she suggests that existential BE takes a location and a theme argument, while possessive BE takes an oblique and a theme argument. This makes the VP-internal structure of existential and possessive BE-predicates similar to that of *psych*-predicates, which are dyadic unaccusatives. Typically, both of their arguments are internal to the VP and their subjects are far removed from canonical agentive subjects. Based on binding as well as on facts of agreement, Dalmi contends that the argument structure of existential and possessive BE-predicates in Hungarian resembles that of the 'please'-class of psych-predicates. Consequently, she concludes that the BE-predicates in Hungarian existential and possessive constructions should be considered dyadic unaccusative verbs.

In chapter 8, Alexandra Simonenko offers a formal semantic and syntactic analysis of the encoding of possession in Meadow Mari, a language representing the Mari branch of the Uralic family. In an introduction the author presents some facts about the Mari language and its speakers. They count in the hundreds of thousands and live mainly in the Volga and Uralic regions of the Russian Federation. There is also a presentation of the main encodings of possession in the language, shown in (32).

(32) a. myj-yn aka-m ulo. (Mari)
I-GEN sister-POSS.1SG be.PRS.1SG
'I have a sister.'

b. tide pört myj-yn.
that house I-GEN
'That house is mine.'

Simonenko labels the construction in (32a) an "existential possessive construction" (ExPoss), while the one in (32b) is dubbed a "predicative possessive construction" (PredPoss). I have to say that the latter denomination is somewhat puzzling to me as both constructions predicate possession. The construction in (32b) appears to build on Heine's (1997: 65) Equation Schema, e.g., *X is Y's*

(property); it would have been helpful if the chapter, and generally the book, had broader contextualization in the functionally oriented literature.

After declaring the ExPoss construction the focus of her study, the author lays out the basic differences between the ExPoss and PredPoss constructions. One of the most prominent ones is the definiteness of the possessee, also discussed by a number of authors as the Definiteness Effect. As has been explained in a number of previous chapters, it entails a non-specific or generic possessee in the existential construction as in (32a). In contrast, the possessee in the PredPoss construction (32b) is presupposed and definite.

The basic patterns of ExPoss are presented in §2. Simonenko states that ExPoss consists of a possessor NP marked genitive, a possessee in nominative, and an existential predicate which agrees with the latter in number. That agreement according to number is never really shown; in fact, in all examples, the verb 'be' occurs in 3sg either present or past.

Another important feature of this construction is the use of possessive suffixes, such as *–m* in (32a). It is determined by factors such as partial or total possessive relation. These concepts appear to relate to instantaneous vs. permanent possession. After studying the presentation of corpus data together with elicited data, the reader can formulate an understanding that possessive marking can be skipped when possession is partial/instantaneous, but it has to be used when possession is total/permanent. That contrast is limited to situations set in the present. When ExPoss has a non-present time reference, the use of possessive marking is optional.

Simonenko puts forth the claim that ExPoss sentences pattern with existential sentences in Meadow Mari. She further specifies that possession in these sentences has two loci and two different flavors. First, ExPoss makes an existential assertion that is restricted to a situation in which everything is controlled by the possessor. Second, the possessive marking on the possessee encodes information that applies exclusively to the possessor's situation. Thus, the ExPoss construction may encode either instantaneous control or a more permanent state of possession. These functions are directly related to the presence or absence of possessive marking and also to the temporal reference of the predication.

In §3 Simonenko turns to a formal semantic account of the Mari data and the ExPoss construction; her analysis is at times interspersed with parallels to the PredPoss construction. Special attention is paid to the existential predicate, which the author analyzes as introducing existential quantification. The possessive suffixes, on the other hand, introduce a salient relation. In §4, the author uses set-theoretical semantics to account for the fact that the Definiteness Effect obtains in the ExPoss construction but not in the PredPoss construction. After a theoretically grounded reasoning, she points out that the ExPoss construction asserts the existence of an individual controlled by the possessor, while the PredPoss construction presents relational information

about an individual that is already presupposed. This is why, in her view, the Definiteness Effect arises in the ExPoss construction but is absent in the PredPoss construction.

In her conclusions, Simonenko summarizes her analysis of the different components of ExPoss vs. PredPoss constructions. Specifically, she points out that the genitive possessors introduce a relation of control that is simultaneous with the time of the existential predicate; on the other hand, the possessive suffixes introduce a salient relation that is more situation-related, in particular, with the situation of the possessor. The genitive phrase shows flexibility in its functions, which is why it can be used to indicate domain restriction in the ExPoss construction and property in the PredPoss construction.

While the chapter is definitely more theoretically than data-oriented, it still provides an example of consistent and creative theoretical reasoning together with information on two encodings of predicative possession in Western Mari. Further inquiries about their functional distribution can be a good direction for future research.

In chapter 9, Nikolett Gulyás offers an analysis of the encoding of predicative possession in two closely related languages, Komi-Permyak and Udmurt, both from the Permic branch of the Uralic family. Her work presents a good example of a study on microvariation. The author opts for a functional approach to the domain of predicative possession.

After an overview of the sociolinguistic situation and of the morphosyntactic characteristics of Permic languages, Gulyás proceeds to a discussion of her data collection and methodology. The introduction also includes an overview of the standard functional typological literature on predicative possession.

The author proceeds to the classification of the Permic data, which is based on Stassen 2009, 2013. Specifically, both Komi and Udmurt can be demonstrated to adhere to Stassen's (2009, 2013) locative type, i.e., both encode predicative possession by a construction modeled on the existential construction. The author reviews all four predicative possession types suggested by Stassen and concludes that in Permic languages the domain is encoded by Stassen's locative type, shown in (33) and (34), and by a genitive-possessive construction containing a possessor marked by the genitive case and possessee encoded by a demonstrative and a nominal, shown in (35) and (36). The latter constructions are good examples of Heine's (1997: 65) Equation Schema, often rendered by structures such as *Y is X's (property)* > *Y belongs to X*, even though the author does not identify them as such.

(33) Nasta-lön em ńebög. (Komi-Permyak)
Nastya-GEN be.PRS.SG book
'Nastya has a book.'

(34) Ol'ga-len umoj už-ez vań. (Udmurt)
Olga-GEN good work-3SG be.PRS
'Olga has a good job.'

(35) Eta *perna/perna-ys Petra-lön. (Komi-Permyak)
this cross cross-3SG Peter-GEN
'This cross belongs to Peter.'

(36) Ta ly /*ly-ez puny-len. (Udmurt)
this bone bone-3SG dog-GEN
'This bone belongs to the dog.'

Gulyás notes that constructions which reflect the equational schema are not discussed as much in the typological literature as predicative possessives based on locative-existential constructions. In any case, her focus is mainly on the latter, with the purpose of identifying structural and semantic differences in the predication of possession in Komi-Permyak and Udmurt.

As demonstrated in (33) and (34) above, in both languages the predicative possessive construction involves two NPs, a possessor marked by the genitive case and a possessee, the marking of which differs between Komi and Udmurt; the construction also requires a form of the verb 'be'. Gulyás considers the possessee to be the grammatical subject of the clause, most likely because it governs agreement. She points out that even though closely related, Komi and Udmurt exhibit differences in their encoding of predicative possession. In particular, the two languages differ on the following parameters: word order, agreement, possible omission of elements on different levels, negation, and finally, the encoding of alienable vs. inalienable possession or lack thereof.

The pragmatically neutral word orders differ in Komi and Udmurt: SVO for Komi and SOV for Udmurt. Predicative possessive constructions in each language conform to the neutral word order in that language; consequently, it is safe to say that the difference in word order is maintained in the domain of predicative possession.

The most important facts as regards agreement are as follows. An invariant form is used in Udmurt in the present tense; some indexation of the number of the possessee on the existential verb is observed in non-present tenses, notably in the second past tense. In Komi, agreement between the possessee and the existential verb is generally expected; however, it is complicated by quantification. Specifically, no agreement occurs when the possessee is quantified by a numeral. However, if the possessee is quantified by a non-determined quantifier such as 'many', then agreement may occur if the possessee has been marked by plural, which is not obligatory. So both structural and semantic factors appear relevant for agreement.

Komi-Permyak and Udmurt are similar as regards negation of predicative possessive constructions in that in both languages a special negative existential is used in the present tense. This is a very common crosslinguistic tendency (cf. Veselinova 2013 and also Veselinova 2015 specifically for Uralic). I would have expected more detailed comments on the synchronically different negative existential in Komi-Permyak and in Udmurt, on their uses in non-present tenses, as well as the ways in which they pertain to the negative existential cycle (cf. Croft 1991; Veselinova 2014, 2016).

One of the most obvious differences between the two languages is the use of possessive marking on the possessee. It is also relevant for the discussion of possible alienability marking in these languages. As is well known, possessive suffixes are a huge topic in Uralic linguistics. The ones referencing 2nd and 3rd person are considered by some to indicate definiteness, while others analyze them as markers of topicality, emphasis, contrast, or associate relationship. In Komi, possessive suffixes are invariant in form and are used only when the possessee is modified by a demonstrative and refers to body parts, kinship terms, and abstract nouns. Possessive suffixes are not observed in any other instances. This distribution may be used as an argument for the presence of some marking of alienability in Komi-Permyak.

In Udmurt, possessive suffixes are always used, but they can be omitted with abstract nouns. Unlike in Komi-Permyak, possessive suffixes in Udmurt show variation in form that can be contingent on distinctions of alienability. Specifically, the vowel of the suffix is *y* with kinship terms, body parts, and abstract nouns; with all other nouns it is *e*. While Gulyás acknowledges some connection to the domain of alienability, she also notes that the use of suffixes with the vowel *y* is very limited. Consequently, she interprets the occurrence of *y*-possessive suffixes as morphosyntactic variation rather than an indication of a currently valid semantic distinction. Still, she notes that the semantics of predicative and adnominal possession in Permic languages do require further research. On the whole, the chapter offers a very detailed and theoretically informed overview of predicative possessive constructions in two Permic languages. As mentioned above, it is also a good example of a study of microvariation.

Beáta Wagner-Nagy opens chapter 10 with an overview of Selkup, its endangered status, morphosyntactic characteristics, and position among Samoyedic languages, a separate branch within the Uralic family. Selkup varieties are still spoken in southwestern Siberia, along the tributaries of the Yenisei and Ob rivers, in the Yamal-Nenets Autonomous District, and in the Krasnojarskij Krai. The author points out that the language is critically endangered, currently spoken by a handful of elderly people, with no intergenerational transmission. Around two-thirds of the people who identify as Selkup (3,527 according to the latest census) have shifted to Russian.

Wagner-Nagy offers an informative discussion of her data sources. Her study is predominantly based on corpora—the Selkup Language Corpus and INEL Selkup corpus—which together reflect three dialectal groups: northern, central, and southern. The work is grounded in the functional-typological literature. After an informative yet concise overview of pertinent works on the encoding of predicative possession, the author proceeds with her analysis. For her classification of predicative possessive constructions in Selkup, Wagner-Nagy relies mostly on Heine 1997 and 2001.

The article can be said to have two goals. One is to exploit the framework presented in Heine 1997 and 2001 for the analysis of the Selkup data. The other is to examine in detail the constructions Wagner-Nagy considers central for predicative possession in Selkup.

The following can be said as regards the first goal. The author maintains that predicative possession in Selkup is encoded by a Location, as in (37a), and by a Topic Schema, as in (37b); the Genitive Schema is mentioned too, but its use appears very limited—it is illustrated by two variants of a single example, one of which is shown in (37c).

(37) a. Predicative possessive construction based on the Location Schema

tab-i-stja-n-naːn je:-qa-n neː-t. (Selkup, Middle Ob dialect)
s/he-EP-DU-GEN-ADE be-AOR-3SG daughter-3SG.POSS

'They have a daughter.'

b. Predicative possessive construction based on the Topic Schema

ukkɨr qup 27 kanak-tɨ e-ŋa. (Taz dialect)
one person 27 dog-3SG.POSS be-AOR.3SG

'A man has 27 dogs.'

(Erdélyi 1969: 31/a; cited in Wagner-Nagy's chapter, p. 219)

c. Predicative possessive construction based on the Genitive Schema

Ukkɨr naľa-tɨ ɔːmti-ľ qoː-n…. (Taz dialect)
one daughter-3SG.POSS horn-ADJVZ chief-GEN

'The tsar has a daughter….'

Wagner-Nagy argues against scholars who claim that there is a transitive verb of possession similar to *have*/*habeo* in Selkup that originates from the verb 'keep'. She states that when verbs such as 'hold', 'keep', or 'take' start to be used with kinship terms and inalienables such as body parts, then they can be considered truly grammaticalized as *habeo*-type verbs. Wagner-Nagy also rules out the conjunctional use (i.e., Companion Schema, e.g., *X with Y*) as

a conceptual source for predicative possessive constructions in Selkup. She brings up the fact that such constructions are generally not observed in Uralic languages, so if they were to be acknowledged for Selkup, the language would stand out as an odd one in the family. In addition, she also cites frequency of use, e.g., the fact that constructions of this kind are only marginally used to express possession, and even then only with a handful of lexicalized forms.

As indicated above, two constructions appear most relevant for the encoding of predicative possession in Selkup: (i) those based on the Location Schema and (ii) those based on the Topic Schema. The first group is analyzed in terms of the case marking of the possessor, the use of possessive suffixes on the possessee, word order, and negation. The second group is analyzed in terms of the use of possessive suffixes and word order. The author brings up the fact that predications of possession based on the Topic Schema are mainly encountered under negation but offers no further discussion on this aspect.

In predications based on the Location Schema, we observe dialectal variation as regards the case marking of the possessor. In the central and southern Selkup dialects, this constituent is marked by the genitive case; in the northern dialect, it is part of a postpositional phrase.

The following can be said about possessive predications based on the Location Schema. As indicated by the data in (37a), the predication includes a constituent marked by a locative case that encodes the possessor, a form of the verb 'be', and the possessee. If inalienable, the possessee has to be marked by the possessive suffix. The possessive suffixes indicate the person and number of the possessor.

The issue of inalienability requires further specification. Apparently, the distinction applies to humans only. There are plenty of examples in the article where possessive suffixes are not used with body parts and kinship terms. This is motivated by the fact that these are cases where the parts do not belong to humans, as in (38) below, where *haj* 'eye' is not marked by a possessive suffix when belonging to a crucian (a species of fish).

(38) tudo-n-nan šidi haj e-ja. (Selkup, Vasyugan dialect)
crucian-GEN-ADE two eye be-AOR.3SG
'… the crucian has two eyes.'

Wagner-Nagy points out that the word order of sentences encoding predicative possession is the exact opposite of the one observed in locative statements since in the latter the locational element does not usually occur in initial position. Inverse-locative predications are commonly used for the encoding of existential and potentially also possessive constructions, so this is in line with well-known crosslinguistic tendencies (cf. Creissels 2014, 2019).

The other major way of encoding predicative possession in Selkup is by using constructions based on the Topic Schema, as in (37b) on the previous

page. In these constructions, the possessor appears unmarked in topic position, while the possessee comes in the rheme. Both semantic and syntactic factors appear to govern the use of the possessive suffixes. The data are not entirely clear, but the author seems to think that animacy rather than alienability governs the use of possessive suffixes in this construction. However, if the possessor is omitted, then possessive suffixes are used even with inanimate possessees, (39).

(39) nuŋa-tɨ ɛ-ppa. (Selkup, Vasyugan dialect)
tambourine-3SG.POSS be-PAST.REP.3SG
'He had a tambourine.'

The possessive suffixes index the person and number of the possessor. The person and number of the possessee are indexed on the verb 'be'.

Negation is expressed by a special negative existential in all constructions under discussion, regardless of the conceptual schema they build on. The form of the negative existential varies depending on dialect—*ťangu-/čangu-* in the southern dialect and *čaŋki-* in the northern dialect. In addition, the Russian negative existential *net* is borrowed in the southern dialects. It shows a high degree of integration in the language in that it appears with pertinent morphological marking, such as aorist and person/number marking.

(40) a. taššu-k, miː-nan poː ťaːg-wa. (Middle Ob dialect)
cold-ADV we-DU.ADE tree NEG.EX-AOR.3SG
'It is cold and we do not have wood.'

b. a imaqota qəːli-tɨ čäːŋka. (Taz dialect)
but elderly.woman fish-3SG.POSS NEG.EX.3SG
'But the elderly woman did not have any fish.'

c. tab-nan or-t nʲetu-pa.
s/he-ADE force-3SG.POSS NEG-AOR.3SG
'He had no force.'

The use of special negative existentials, the tendency for them to be borrowed, and finally, the co-existence of several variants conform to a very widespread crosslinguistic tendency (cf. Veselinova 2013 for a typological overview and Veselinova 2015 for Uralic).

Chapter 10 is closed by a summary of the structural characteristics, e.g., case marking of the possessor and word order in the Locative and Topic constructions, together with an overview of their dialectal variation. It would have been helpful to see features such as possessive suffixes as well as ne-

gation presented in the summary table. A substantive part of the article is devoted to them, but they are missing from the table.

I would like to emphasize that chapter 10 offers a very informative overview of the encoding of predicative possession in Selkup, which is not only descriptively adequate but also theoretically well reasoned, with a solid ground in cognitive grammar. At the same time, I cannot help noting that a lot of effort is devoted to discarding the existence of specific conceptual schemas such as the Genitive and the transitive schema whereby a verb such as 'have' is used to encode predicative possession. The data for both of these schemas are highly restricted. On the other hand, the issue of alienability distinctions as well as the factors that condition the use of possessive suffixes remain open-ended. Given that the language is critically endangered, it seems to me that gaining further understanding into this problem is much more important than ruling out the use of conceptual schemas that are clearly marginal in the language.

In a stub entitled Chapter 11, the editors offer a summary of the ideas presented in the book. It is clear that the works collected here reflect an impressive variety of schools in linguistics and likewise very different approaches to predicative possession. Readers can delve into analyses where various components of these constructions are discussed. A topic brought up in several articles is the marking of the possessor and the possessee under affirmation and under negation. A theme that recurs in a variety of interpretations and approaches in the book is the unity and distinction between locatives, existentials, and possessive predications; see, for instance, Kagan (ch. 4) for a set-theoretical semantic approach and Vilkuna (ch. 6) for a perspective from construction grammar. Using formal semantic and syntactic analysis, Dalmi successfully draws parallels between the argument structure of predicative possessive predications in Hungarian and dyadic perception predicates such as 'please'. We also find a wealth of data on the encoding of predicative possession in a number of understudied languages such as Belarusian from the Slavic group and Mari, Komi-Permyak, Udmurt, and Selkup from the Uralic family.

There is no doubt the book has a lot of merit and includes highly commendable work. At the same time, I find its diversity to be also a source of weakness. A unifying red thread that brings the book together is completely missing. There is no effort to work out an outline of the domain of predicative possession that could be the common denominator to all contributing authors.

There is also a certain amount of imbalance in both the theoretical treatments and the data presented for specific languages. The editors point to the lack of theoretical work on most Uralic languages, except Hungarian and Finnish, and express hope that this is a fruitful direction for future research. I would like to add to this a more balanced data set for the languages under discussion. For instance, for Polish and Russian, mainly the nominal components

of the predicative construction are discussed, in terms of their case marking. There is no data on the encoding of the various sub-domains of possession that corresponds to the data presented for most other languages in the book. The datasets included in the book are not really comparable. This is something that can be remedied in a future endeavor.

The treatment of negation in predicative possessive constructions is largely restricted to discussions of the Genitive of Negation. Most languages in the book use a negative existential, which tends to be a special form with identifiable semantic profile and uses (cf. Veselinova 2013). Given that the use of negative existentials reflects a notably widespread crosslinguistic tendency and there are sound reasons to postulate negative existence as a separate semantic domain (cf. Veselinova 2013, 2016), I am surprised the discussion of negation is not contextualized within broader crosslinguistic research.

There are also a number of form-related issues that I list below.

- Language classification

  Apparently, it has been up to each author to choose the language classification they use. This leads to a number of discrepancies. For instance, the book is entitled *Approaches to Predicative Possession: The View from Slavic and Finno-Ugric*, but in chapter 10, Wagner-Nagy states that Samoyedic languages are not Finno-Ugric.

- Abbreviations and presentation conventions

  - A section on presentation conventions would have been helpful. For example, it is unclear what a question mark in front of a sentence indicates:
    - Is it the case that the sentence is not accepted by all speakers?
    - Or is it that it is downright ungrammatical?
  - The use of asterisks and brackets in examples, as well as pound signs, is never explicated. It should have been, as they are used differently in different schools of linguistics.
  - Each chapter has its own abbreviation list. The introduction does not have any although some abbreviations are used. All this is impractical and makes reading cumbersome. An edited volume should have had a unified list of abbreviations.
  - Generally, it is common practice in crosslinguistic work to adhere to the Leipzig Glossing Rules. This practice is not followed here.
  - In chapter 2, N stands for both neuter gender and for a category

N mainly associated with genitive case in Pesetsky's framework. This is very tasking for the reader.

- Some chapters use abbreviations that are not included in their respective abbreviation lists.

- References
  - Each chapter has its own reference list. This makes looking up references cumbersome. Even if the book is made available as an e-book, an edited volume should still have a unified reference list.
  - Many references have incomplete information, and I had to look them up.

- Proofreading and typesetting
  - There are typos all throughout the book. Some of them are mentioned below:
    - page 11, example (2): 'Maria is not reading a book, but a newspaper' should have been 'Maria is not reading a newspaper, but a book'
    - page 12, example (3b): 'Maria is helping her daughter' should have been 'Maria is not helping her daughter'

    I understand these errors most likely result from copy-and-paste operations, but at the same time, having them at the very opening leaves a bad impression.
    - page 14, example (12): the Cyrillic alphabet is wrongly referred to as the Russian alphabet.
    - page 73: the Russian name *Коля* is transliterated in two different ways in adjacent examples: *Kolia* and *Kolja*. While this is a minor detail, the impression such examples leave is of sloppy proofreading.
    - page 213: there is a reference to §3.2, which does not exist. Eventually, the reader finds out that the intended reference is to §2.2.
- Modern word processors and typesetting systems allow footnotes, so it is not clear why endnotes were chosen.
- It would have been helpful to show the locations of the lesser-known languages, such as, for instance, Meadow Mari, Komi, Udmurt, and Selkup, together with the places where speakers were interviewed.

References

Benveniste, Émile. (1966) "*Être* et *avoir* dans leurs fonctions linguistiques". *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Vol. 1. Paris: Gallimard, 187–207.

Błaszczak, Joanna. (2001) *Covert movement and the genitive of negation in Polish*. Potsdam: Universitätsbibliothek.

————. (2008) "What HAS to BE used? Existential, locative, and possessive sentences in Polish". Andrei Antonenko, John F. Bailyn, and Christina Y. Bethin, eds. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16: The Stony Brook 2006 Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, 31–47.

————. (2010) "A spurious genitive puzzle in Polish". Thomas Hanneforth and Gisbert Fanselow, eds. *Language and logos*. Berlin: Akademieverlag, 17–47. [Studia grammatica, 72.]

Borschev, Vladimir and Barbara H. Partee. (2002) "The Russian Genitive of Negation in existential sentences: The role of theme-rheme structure reconsidered". Eva Hajičová, Petr Sgall, Jiří Hana, and Tomáš Hoskovec, eds. *Prague Linguistic Circle papers / Travaux du cercle linguistique de Prague*. Vol. 4. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 185–250.

Bošković, Željko. (2008) "What will you have, DP or NP?" *NELS 37: Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society* 37: 101–14.

Chomsky, Noam. (2000) "Minimalist inquiries". Roger Martin, David Michaels, Juan Uriagereka, and Samuel J. Keyser, eds. *Step by step: Essays on Minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 89–156.

————. (2001) "Derivation by phase". Michael Kenstowicz, ed. *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.

Creissels, Denis. (2014) "Existential predication in typological perspective". Revised version of a paper presented at the 46th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea, workshop "Space, Time and Existence: Typological, Cognitive and Philosophical Viewpoints", Split, Croatia, 18–21 September 2013. Available at: http://www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-Exist.Pred.pdf

————. (2019) "Inverse-locational predication in typological perspective". *Italian journal of linguistics* 31(2): 38–106.

Croft, William. (1991) "The evolution of negation". *Journal of linguistics* 27(1): 1–39.

Erdélyi, István. (1969) *Selkupisches Wörterverzeichnis: Tas-Dialekt*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Evans, Nicholas D. (1995) *A grammar of Kayardild*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Francez, Itamar. (2007) *Existential propositions*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.

Freeze, Ray. (1992). "Existentials and other locatives". *Language* 68 (3): 553–95.

Hagège, Claude. (1993) *The language builder. cilt.94*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho. (2004) *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen.
Heine, Bernd. (1997) *Possession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
————. (2001) "Ways of explaining possession". Irene Baron, Michael D. Herslund, and Finn Sørensen, eds. *Dimensions of possession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 311–28.
Kayne, Richard S. (1993) "Towards a modular theory of auxiliary selection". *Studia linguistica* 47(1): 3–31.
Langacker, Ronald W. (1991) *Foundations of cognitive grammar.* Vol. 2. *Descriptive application*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
————. (1993) "Reference-point constructions". *Cognitive linguistics* 4(1): 1–38.
————. (2009) *Investigations in cognitive grammar*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Lyons, John. (1967) "A note on possessive, existential and locative sentences". *Foundations of language* 3(4): 390–96.
McNally, Louise. (1998) "Existential sentences without existential quantification". *Linguistics and philosophy* 21(4): 353–92.
Miller, George A. and Philip N. Johnson-Laird. (1976) *Language and perception*. Cambridge/London/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
Milsark, Gary. (1974) *Existential sentences in English*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Paducheva, Elena. (2000) "Definiteness Effect: The case of Russian". Klaus von Heusinger and Urs Egli, eds. *Reference and anaphoric relations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 133–46.
Partee, Barbara H. and Vladimir Borschev. (2004) "The semantics of Russian Genitive of Negation: The nature and role of perspectival structure". Kazuha Watanabe and Robert B. Young, eds. *Proceedings of the 14th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 14)*. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications, 212–34.
————. (2008) "Existential sentences, BE, and the Genitive of Negation in Russian". Ileana Comorovski and Klaus von Heusinger, eds. *Existence: Semantics and syntax*. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 147–90. [Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy, 84.] DOI 10.1007/978-1-4020-6197-4_6.
Pesetsky, David. (2013) *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Seiler, Hansjakob. (1973) "Zum Problem der sprachlichen Possessivität". *Folia linguistica* 6(3–4): 231–50. DOI 10.1515/flin.1973.6.3-4.231.
Stassen, Leon. (2009) *Predicative possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
————. (2013). "Predicative possession". Martin Haspelmath, Matthew Dryer, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie, eds. *World atlas of language structures*. Max

Planck Digital Library. Available at: http://wals.info/feature/117. Last accessed 31 May 2021.

Szabolcsi, Anna. (1992) *A birtokos szerkezet és az egzisztenciális mondat*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

————. (1994) "The Noun Phrase". Ferenc Kiefer and Katalin É. Kiss, eds. *The syntactic structure of Hungarian*. San Diego: Academic Press, 179–274.

Tham, Shiao Wei. (2006) "The definiteness effect in English *have* sentences". Pascal Denis et al., eds. *Proceedings of the 2004 Texas Linguistics Society Conference: Issues at the Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 137–49. Available at: www.lingref.com (document #1512).

Veselinova, Ljuba. (2013) "Negative existentials: A cross-linguistic study". *Italian journal of linguistics: Special issue on existential constructions* 25(1): 107–45.

————. (2014) "The Negative Existential Cycle revisited". *Linguistics* 52(6): 1327–69.

————. (2016) "The Negative Existential Cycle through the lens of comparative data". Elly van Gelderen, ed. *The linguistic cycle continued*. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 139–87.

Veselinova, Ljuba (with Hedvig Skirgård). (2015) "Special negators in the Uralic languages: Synchrony, diachrony and interaction with standard negation". Matti Miestamo, Ann Tamm, and Beáta Wagner-Nagy, eds. *Negation in Uralic languages*. Amsterdam/New York: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 547–99.

Zimmermann, Thomas. (1993) "On the proper treatment of opacity in certain verbs". *Natural language semantics* 1(2): 149–79. DOI 10.1007/BF00372561.

Ljuba Veselinova
Department of Linguistics
Stockholm University
Stockholm, Sweden
ljuba@ling.su.se