Types of clausal possession in Komi-Permyak

In the Komi-Permyak language (Permic, Uralic), the strategies for clausal possession include predicative possession (following the schema 'X has Y') and possessor predication (with the schema 'Y belongs to X'). The aim of the present paper is to provide an overview of the two clause types from the viewpoint of linguistic typology (Stassen 2009). Based on elicited data and a small corpus-based study (Borin et al. 2012), I present morphological, as well as some syntactic and semantic properties of these constructions and finally, I compare both to other clause types. While there are several former sources expansively discussing adnominal possession (cf. Batalova 2002), predicative types of the phenomenon have not received much attention (but see Bartens 2000 for instance).

In predicative possessive clauses, the possessor is marked with the genitive case marker *-lön,* the possessee is often unmarked and the existential verb *em* (or *abu* in negative form) follows the possessor. This encoding resembles the one that can be found in existential sentences. On the other land, possessor predication is a subtype of clauses with nominal predicates. This construction consists of the possessee as the grammatical subject of the clause and the possessor as the predicate marked by the genitive case. As opposed to the predicative possessive type, the possessee here is definite as it is indicated by the overt possessive agreement marker (Px).

Data show that neither the semantic properties of the possessor (animacy for instance) nor the type of the possessive relation (alienable vs. inalienable possession) affect the coding features of the constructions. If the possessive agreement marker is overt in a predicative possessive construction, then the possessee is either focussed and/or modified by a determiner. While the existential verb is always overt in predicative possessive clauses, the copula found in the possessor predication type is omitted in indicative sentences in the present tense. This indicates that in past tense forms, the difference between the two constructions can be found in different word order and in the marking of the possessee.

Keywords: possession, predicative possession, possessor predication, Komi-Permyak.

NIKOLETT F. GULYÁS