Slavic Possessive Genitives and Adjectives from the Historical Point of View

Ranko Matasović

1. Introduction

Slavic languages generally have two constructions for nominal possession, namely the possessive genitive construction and the possessive adjective construction.[1] Both are found already in OCS, and, to various extents, in the history of all Slavic languages. They are illustrated by OCS examples (1) and (2).

––––––––––––––––––

1 The possessive dative construction (e.g. Bulg. *žena mu* 'his wife,' lit. wife he.dat.sg) and the prepositional possessive construction (e.g. Mac. *glaven grad na provincijata* 'the capital of the province,' lit. capital city of province.def) are probably a dialectal development in the South Eastern branch of the Slavic languages. They are also found in the "Balkanized" East Štokavian and Torlak dialects of Serbian, where they are attributable to the Balkan adstratum. For a different opinion see Radmilo Marojević, "O rekonstrukciji praslovenskog sistema posesivnih kategorija i posesivnih izvedenica," *Južnoslovenski filolog* 43 (1987), pp. 17–40. Likewise, the possessive construction with the preposition *otъ* + genitive, common in pre-19th century Croatian, is the result of the influence of Romance syntax (cf. the Italian possessive construction with the preposition *di* 'of'). Lana Hudeček, *Izricanje posvojnosti u hrvatskom jeziku do polovice 19. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 2006). These constructions will not be discussed here.

(1) *dux-ъ*   *otьc-a*   *vaš-ego*
     spirit-Nom.sg   father-Gen.sg.   your(pl.)-Gen.sg.
     "The spirit of your father"

(2) *tekton-ov-ъ*   *syn-ъ*
     carpenter-poss.-Nom.sg.m.   son-Nom.sg.
     "Son of a carpenter"

However, already in OCS, the use of the possessive adjective is somewhat limited with respect to the use of the possessive genitive. Firstly, possessive adjectives are built exclusively from nouns denoting humans, and, in some languages, animals, i.e., they are derived from nouns denoting potential possessors. They cannot be derived from nouns denoting inanimates, e.g. in Croatian there is no possessive adjective *kamenov derived from *kamen* 'stone.' Secondly, possessive adjectives cannot be used when the possessor is in the plural, because the possessive adjective cannot express the plurality of the possessor (only the plurality of the possessed noun is expressed through agreement). Thus, in all modern Slavic languages, "sons of the fathers" must be expressed by putting the noun "father" in the possessive genitive, as in Croatian *sinovi otaca* (lit. son.Nom.pl. father.gen.pl.). However, OCS had the suffix *-ьskъ* used for deriving possessive adjectives denoting plural possessors (although its function was not exclusively possessive).[2] Thus, while *Božii* means 'god's' (singular possessor), *božьskъ* means 'of the gods' (plural possessor), and while *otьčь* is 'father's,' *otьčьskъ* is 'of the fathers.'[3] It is not unlikely that the function of the suffix *–ьskъ* in OCS is inherited from Proto-Slavic.

Many languages further restrict the use of possessive adjectives, but these restrictions often do not hold for the early forms of Slavic and they should not be posited for Proto-Slavic. For example, in most Slavic languages, possessive adjectives cannot be modified by other nouns. In

---

2 Cf. André Vaillant, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, t. IV. La formation des noms* (Paris: Klinksieck, 1974), p. 449.

3 The cognate suffix *–ski* has the same function in early Croatian. Hudeček, *Izricanje posvojnosti*, p. 37.

such cases, possessors must be expressed by possessive genitives, and this is the norm already in OCS[4]:

  (3) *sil-oją   xristos-ov-oją   i   arxangela   Rafail-a*
     (Su. 231.7)
     power-Instr.sg. Christ-poss.-Instr.sg. and archangel-Gen.sg. Raphael-Gen.sg.
     "by the power of Christ and of the Archangel Raphael"

However, we shall see below that this restriction does not hold in Old Russian and in parts of the West Slavic area, so that it appears probable that it is not inherited from Proto-Slavic.

Finally, some Slavic languages impose further restrictions on the use of possessive adjectives. In Russian, their use is nowadays restricted to nouns denoting close relatives, e.g. *séstrin* 'sister's,' *synóvyj* 'son's,' as well as to hypocoristic forms of personal names (e.g. *Sašin* 'Sasha's,' *Volodin* 'Volodya's,' etc.). Similar restrictions hold in Polish, but it can be shown that these are the result of independent development. Both in Old Russian and in Old Polish, possessive adjectives can be used with all singular human possessors, just like in OCS.[5]

This paper discusses the historical sources of the two Slavic possessive constructions and the problem of their mutual relationship. In the next section, we shall first look at the morphological and syntactic properties of possessive adjectives. There follows a discussion of the origin of Slavic possessive suffixes in Section 3, and in Section 4 we establish some syntactic correspondences between the use of possessive adjectives in Slavic and in other IE languages. Finally, Section 5 offers some tentative conclusions.

2. Morphological and Syntactic Properties of Possessive Adjectives

At first sight, possessive adjectives do not differ from other adjectives in the Slavic languages. They agree with the noun they modify

---

4 Horace Lunt, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1974), p. 147.

5 Stanisław Rospond, *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego* (Warszawa: PWN, 1971); Viktor I. Borkovskii & Petr S. Kuznetsov, *Istoricheskaia grammatika russkogo iazyka* (Moscow: URSS, 2006).

in gender, number, and case. This is illustrated in examples (4) and (5) from Croatian:

(4) *velik-a*   *oč-ev-a*   *kuć-a*
    large-Nsg.f.   father-poss.-Nsg.f.   house-Nsg.(f.)
    "father's large house"

(5) *velik-e*   *oč-ev-e*   *kuć-e*
    large-Gen.sg.f.   father-poss.-Gen.sg.f.   house-Gen.sg.(f.)
    "of the father's large house"

However, Slavic possessive adjectives are atypical adjectives lacking at least two adjectival morphological properties: a) they do not have the opposition between definite and indefinite forms. For example, Croat. *čovjekov* 'man's, of the man' cannot be made definite by adding the ending *–i*, like the ordinary adjective *crven* 'red,' which has the definite form *crveni*. b) The possessive adjectives do not form the comparative and the superlative degree, unlike the majority of other Slavic adjectives (e.g. Croat. comparative *crveniji* 'redder' and superlative *najcrveniji* 'the reddest').

Finally, in OCS, ORuss., and in all attested periods of Croatian, the possessive adjectives can be derived from *all* nouns with human referents. For such nouns, the possessive adjectives have actually become a part of their inflectional paradigm.[6]

The syntactic properties of possessive adjectives also set them apart from ordinary adjectives. In several respects, possessive adjectives show noun-like properties. For example, in Croatian, they may be co-referent with the unexpressed subject of the following clause, as in (6):

(6) *Očeva*   *kuća* *je stara, pa će*   *ju uskoro popraviti.*
    Father's(Adj.) house is old, so will   it soon   repair(inf.)
    "Father's house is old, so he will soon repair it"

Similarly, in Old Russian we find examples such as (7), where the anaphoric pronoun (*ego*) is co-referent with the noun from which the possessive adjective (*Jakunъ*) is derived:

---

6 Nikolai S. Trubetzkoy, *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik* (Graz & Wien: Hermann Böhlaus, 1968), p. 188.

(7) *id-oša   na dvor-ъ   Jakun-ь   i rozgrabi-ša   i*
go-3pl.Aor. to court-Acc.sg. Jakun-poss.Acc.sg. and take-3sg.Aor. and
žen-u   ego ja-ša
wife-Acc.sg.   his take-3pl.Aor.
"They went to the court of Jakun, and they took (it) and they captured his (=Jakun's) wife"

Moreover, in Slovak and Upper Lusatian, and in the earlier periods of other languages, possessive adjectives can be relativized, which means that they can be heads of relative phrases. This is illustrated in (8), from Upper Lusatian, and in (9), from 19th century Serbian[7]:

(8) *Słyšetaj... Wićazowy   hłós,   kotryž   je zastupił*
hear(2du.pres.) W.(poss.Nom.sg.m) voice(Nsg.m) who(Nom.sg.m) went away(Nom.sg.m)
"You hear the voice of Wićaz, who went away"

(9) *Ovaj je antihristov,   za kojega   čuste,   da će doći*
this is Antichrist.(poss.Nom.sg) about who.Acc.sg. you.heard(Aor.) that will come.inf.
"This one belongs to Antichrist, about whom you heard that he would come"

Finally, in at least some languages, it appears as if the possessive adjectives may be modified by attributes, or, rather, the nouns from which possessive adjectives are formed can be modified by attributes. This is possible in Slovak[8] and Upper Lusatian,[9] in Old Russian,[10] and in Old Czech.[11] The example (10) is from Upper Lusatian, (11) is from Old Russian, and (12) is from Old Czech:

---

7 Tomislav Maretić, *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (Kugli: Zagreb, 1899), p. 460. In the contemporary language such examples would sound slightly unnatural.

8 Greville Corbett, "The Morphology/Syntax Interface: Evidence from Possessive Adjectives in Slavonic," *Language* 63 (1987), pp. 315–416.

9 Helmut Fasske, *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart: Morphologie* (Bautzen: VEB Domowina Verlag, 1981), pp. 382–383.

10 Pavel Ia. Chernykh, *Istoricheskaia grammatika russkogo iazyka* (Moscow: Ministerstvo prosveshcheniia RSFSR, 1962), p. 315.

11 Sergei S. Skorvid, "O sintaksicheskikh svoistvakh pritiazhatel'nykh prilagatel'nykh v drevnecheshskom iazyke," *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta*, Seriia 9. Filologiia 4 (1981), p. 49.

(10) *moj-eho*   *muž-ow-a*   *sotr-a*
     my-Gen.sg.m.   husband-poss.-Nom.sg.f.   sister-Nom.sg.
     "My husband's sister"

(11) *Ivor-ъ,*   *sol-ъ*   *Igor-ev-ъ,*   *velik-ogo*   *knjaz-ja*
     I.-Nom.sg. emissary-Nom.sg. I.-poss.-Nom.sg.m. great-Gen.sg. duke-Gen.sg.
     russk-ogo
     Russian-Gen.sg.
     "The emissary of Igor, the great Russian duke"

(12) *prv-ého*   *král-ov-a*   *syn-a*
     first-Gen.sg.m   king-poss.-Gen.sg.   son-Gen.sg.
     "of the son of the first king"

There is no evidence that these syntactic peculiarities of possessive adjectives are in any way secondary, i.e. that they developed during the history of the individual Slavic languages. Although some are attested in only a few languages, they are found in the earliest documents of these languages, and, apparently, in several dialects. Moreover, as we shall see below, there are indications that these syntactic features represent archaisms, inherited from Proto-Slavic, and, perhaps, Proto-Indo-European.

3. The Origin of the Suffixes Deriving Possessive Adjectives

In order to see whether Slavic possessive adjectives are inherited from Balto-Slavic and, perhaps, Proto-Indo-European, we should examine the history of the suffixes with which they are formed. We find four possessive suffixes in Slavic, two of which became very productive in the historical period, while one seems to be an archaism.[12]

The suffix *–ov-* (*-ev-* after *j and the palatal consonants) forms possessive adjectives from masculine nouns, e.g. Croat. *kralj-ev* 'king's,'

---

12 See also Maria Brodowska-Honowska, "Staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskie przymiotniki o sufiksie -ovъ na tle porownawczym," *Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego* 9, Filologia 2 (Kraków, 1956), pp. 205–222; Maria Brodowska-Honowska, *Słowotwórstwo przymiotnika w języku staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskim* (Kraków: PWN, 1960); Marojević, "O rekonstrukciji praslovenskog sistema."

sin-ov 'son's.' This suffix does not appear to have any parallels in Baltic, nor in other Indo-European languages. Its origin is quite unclear, but it was very productive in (Late) Proto-Slavic and in the individual Slavic languages. It probably originated in thematic adjectives built from u-stems, on the model of, e.g., OCS *synovъ* 'son's' < *suHnow-o-* 'pertaining to son' (from *suHnus* 'son' > OCS *synъ*). This is quite a regular way of forming adjectives, inherited from PIE, and with clear parallels in Baltic.[13] The original function of this suffix was not in building specifically possessive adjectives. It was rather used for deriving general, qualitative adjectives, and this can still be seen in such forms as Croat. *bukov* 'made of beech-wood' (OCS *buky*, Croat. *bükva* 'beech'). In Polish, this suffix probably never specialized in the possessive function, while remaining fairly productive in the derivation of qualitative adjectives, cf. Pol. *papierowy* 'made of paper,' *dniowy* 'daily,' etc.[14]

The suffix *–in-* builds possessive adjectives from feminine nouns and from the masculine ā-stem nouns, e.g. Croat. *žen-in* 'woman's,' *slug-in* 'servant's' (from *sluga* f. 'servant'). In OCS this suffix also builds possessive adjectives from i-stems and from nt-stems, e.g. OCS *zvĕrinъ* 'of the beast' (from the i-stem *zvĕrь*) and *osьlętinъ* 'of a young donkey' (from the neuter nt-stem *osьlę* 'donkey'). A similar, but less productive possessive suffix is *-ьnь* (eg. OCS *otьnь* 'father's,' ORuss. *družьnь* 'friend's'). The origin of these suffixes is quite unclear. In Baltic and in other IE languages, we find the suffix *-in-* which is ussed to form qualitative adjectives, e.g. Lith. *auks-in-is* 'golden' (from *auksas* 'gold'), Lat. *eburnus* < *ebur-in-os* 'of ivory' (from *ebur* 'ivory'), Gr. *anthinós* '(made) of flowers' (from *ánthos* 'flower'). This may be compared with the Slavic suffix *-ьnь*, which may be derivable from *-in-yo-*. The Slavic suffix *-in-* could have been formed by ablaut (with the lengthened grade) and compared to Lith. *–íena-* in *kárviena* 'beef' (from *kárvė* 'cow'), *kiaulíenas* 'pork' (from *kiaulė* 'pig').[15] If this is correct, the PIE

---

13 Jānis Endzelīns, *Comparative Phonology and Morphology of the Baltic Languages* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971); Panas Skardžius, *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba* (Vilnius: Lietuvos Mokslų Akademija, 1941).

14 Rospond, *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*, p. 217.

15 Cf. Skardžius, *Lietuvių kalbos žodžių daryba*, p. 288.

and the Balto-Slavic function of the suffix was not to indicate possession, but rather to derive qualitative adjectives from nouns.

Finally, the suffix *-i-/-jь- < *-yo- is chiefly found in early Slavic dialects. In Croatian, it only remains in a few relict forms, such as *božji* 'god's' (from *bog* 'god'). In OCS this is the most productive of all the possessive suffixes.[16] Moreover, this is the only possessive suffix that has exact correspondences outside Slavic. In Greek, we find the Aeolic suffix –*io-* in Homeric formulas such as *bíē Hērakleíē* 'the might of Heracles.' It is attested already in Mycaenean, cf. *e-te-wo-ke-re-we-i-jo* (= *Etewoklewehiyos* 'son of Etewoklewēs,' PY An 654.7). In Latin, the cognate suffix is found in possessive adjectives in –*ius*, e.g. in Vergil's *Aeneia nutrix* 'the nurse of Aeneas' (Aeneis VII 1).[17] With some nouns, the suffix –*ius* is in competition with the other suffixes, sometimes with slightly different shades of meaning. Thus, Lat. *patrius* (with –*ius* < *-iHo-) usually occurs with the abstract nouns such as *potestas* 'power,' and its meaning vacillates between 'father's' and 'fatherly'; the possessive meaning is more often expressed by the adjective *paternus* < *pater-in-o-*, or by the possessive genitive.[18]

It is very likely that the same suffix was used to form possessive pronouns, as in OCS *mojь* 'my,' *tvojь* 'your,' *svojь* 'one's own.' The comparison with Lat. *meus, tuus* shows that we should reconstruct PIE *$h_1$me-iHo-s, *tewos*, and that the suffix –iHo- was generalized in Balto-Slavic (cf. also OPr. *mais, twais, swais*, which correspond exactly to the OCS forms). In Slavic, the stem *mo-* in *mojь* has the vowel –*o-* by analogy with the 2nd person, where it is regular.

We reconstruct the PIE form of the suffix as *-iHo-, with the laryngeal, because its Vedic reflex, the suffix –*ya-*, scans disyllabically (i.e. as –*iya-*) in possessive adjectives such as *ján(i)ya-* 'of the people,' *viś(i)ya-* 'of the village.'[19] It is quite probable that this suffix, PIE *-iHo-, rep-

16 Trubetzkoy, *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik*, p. 190.

17 Cf. Manu Leumann & Johann B. Hofmann, *Lateinische Grammatik, Bd. 2, Syntax* (München: Beck, 1928), pp. 392–393.

18 Einar Löfstedt, *Syntactica, Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins,* I (Lund: Gleerup, 1928), p. 99.

19 Thomas Burrow, *The Sanskrit Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), p. 185. Note, however, that the suffix –*iya-* is not used to build exclu-

resents the thematization of the original *-iH-, which is attested as the genitive singular ending –ī of thematic stems in Latin (e.g. *lupī* 'of the wolf'), Celtic (Ogam Irish *MAQI* 'of the son'), Tocharian, and Venetic.[20] There are independent reasons to believe that this form in –ī < *-iH was originally a possessive adjective, which became incorporated into the nominal paradigm of some IE languages.[21]

Thus, at least one of the Slavic suffixes used in possessive adjective formation is of PIE origin. The system of possessive adjective formation was renewed in Slavic with the slow demise of the suffix *-jь < *-iHo- and the introduction of the new suffixes (especially the very productive suffix *-ovъ/-evъ), but its core is of PIE origin. The fact that true possessive adjectives do not exist in Baltic does not contradict this claim. The Baltic languages could easily have lost the category, perhaps under the influence of the Uralic substrate and adstrate, because Uralic languages also lack possessive adjectives.[22] In the next section we shall see that some of the archaic syntactic constructions with Slavic possessive adjectives have parallels in other IE languages, so that they are also probably inherited.

4. Syntactic Parallels in the Use of Possessive Adjectives in Other Indo-European Languages

In early Latin, possessive adjectives can be modified by attributes, including possessive pronouns, as in the example (13); this is somewhat parallel to the Slavic examples (10–12) above:

---

sively possessive adjectives in Vedic; rather, in some examples it has relational meaning, e.g. *ráthiya-* 'relating to a chariot' (cf. *rátha-* 'chariot'), *udaníya-* 'watery' (cf. *udán-* 'water').

20 Cf. Toch.A *Mahiśvari,* G.sg. of the proper name *Mahiśvar.* Some linguists reconstruct this ending also in Proto-Albanian, cf. Alb. *et* 'father's,' which may be derived from *attī. G. Klingenschmitt, "Die lateinische Nominalflexion," in Oswald Panagl & Thomas Krisch, ed., *Lateinisch und Indogermanisch* (Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 1992), pp. 98–104.

21 Ranko Matasović, *Gender in Indo-European* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2004).

22 Daniel Abondolo, ed., *The Uralic Languages* (London: Routledge, 1997).

(13) *sed me-am   es-se eri-l-em   concubin-am   cens-ui*
but my-Acc.pl.f. be-inf. master-poss.-Acc.sg. concubine-Acc.sg. think-1sg.perf.
"But I thought it was the concubine of my master" (Plautus, *Miles Gloriosus* 49)

Similar consctrucions are attested in Hieroglyphic Luwian[23]:

(14) *ta$_4$-ma-sá-n   LAND-n-sá-a-n   CHILD-n-n*
all.Acc.sg.   land-poss.-Acc.sg.   child-Acc.sg.
"The child of all the lands" (Kargamis a 15 B4)

Similarly, in Greek, there are examples where the possessive adjective is modified by an attribute in the genitive[24]:

(15) *Gorge-í-ē   kephal-ḗ   dein-oîo   pelṓr-ou*
Gorgon-poss.-Nom.sg.f. head-Nom.sg. terrible-Gen.sg.n. monster-Gen.sg.
"The head of the Gorgon, of the terrible monster" (Homer, The Iliad, E 741)

These syntactic parallels from other IE languages give us reason to believe that the construction with the possessive adjective in Slavic is inherited from PIE. Moreover, it appears that possessive adjectives could be modified by attributes already in PIE, that is, that at least some of their noun-like syntactic properties in Slavic are inherited from the proto-language.

The hypothesis that possessive adjectives in Indo-European represent an older construction for expressing possession than possessive genitives was proposed long ago by Wackernagel,[25] and it has been repeated many times since.[26] This may well be correct, but we should not

---

23 Anna Morpurgo-Davies, "Thessalian Patronymic Adjectives," *Glotta* 46 (1968), p. 98.

24 Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, Bd. I–IV (München: Beck, 1939–1971), II, p. 177.

25 Jakob Wackernagel, "Genetiv und Adjektiv," in *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à F. de Saussure* (Paris, 1908), pp. 125–152.

26 Cf., e.g., Hermann Hirt, *Indogermanische Grammatik, Teil VI: Syntax 1* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1934), p. 109; Antoine Meillet, *Le slave commun* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1934), p. 465; Calvert Watkins, "Remarks on the Genitive," in *To Honor Roman Jakobson III* (The Hague: Mouton, 1967), pp. 2191–2198;

jump to conclusions. It is important to note that the genitive can express possession in all early Indo-European languages, and it is difficult not to conclude that this function should be attributed to the genitive in PIE. Indeed, we have seen above that the only suffix for the formation of possessive adjectives that has certain PIE origin, the suffix *-iHo-, in all likelihood represents a thematization of an earlier form in *-iH, which is preserved as a thematic genitive case ending in some Indo-European languages. Whether this morpheme was originally a case ending, or a derivational marker of possession, preserved from a period when adjectives were still uninflected in PIE, is unknown at present, and it is perhaps unknowable. To conclude, then, the two constructions (the possessive genitives and adjectives) may have co-existed in the proto-language, or they may have been used to express different kinds of possession (one may have been reserved for alienable possession, and the other for inalienable possession).[27]

5. Conclusions

In all modern Slavic languages, with the partial exception of Slovak and Lusatian, the use of possessive adjectives is syntactically rather restricted. In some languages, and especially in Russian, the use of the possessive genitive has all but replaced the use of possessive adjectives. However, we have adduced examples from the earlier periods of various Slavic languages, including Russian, which show that many of the restrictions on the use of possessive adjectives did not apply in Proto-Slavic. We have also shown that at least one Proto-Slavic suffix used in

---

David Huntley, "The Distribution of the Denominative Adjective and the Adnominal Genitive in Old Church Slavonic," in Jacek Fisiak, ed., *Historical Syntax* (Berlin: Mouton, 1984), pp. 217–236; Radmilo Marojević, *Posesivne kategorije u ruskom jeziku (u svome istorijskom razvitku i danas)* (Beograd: Filološki fakultet Beogradskog univerziteta, 1983), pp. 8–9.

27 It was noted already by Leumann that family relationships were usually expressed with possessive adjectives in Early Latin, and family relationships are a prototypical example of inalienable possession. Leumann & Hofmann, *Lateinische Grammatik* Leumann, p. 393.

the formation of possessive adjectives is of PIE origin, and that in some early Indo-European languages possessive adjectives were also freely modified by attributes. This, then, suggests the conclusion that such uses of possessive adjectives represent archaisms, which may go back to Proto-Indo-European. However, this conclusion does not necessarily imply that the use of possessive adjectives is chronologically earlier than the use of possessive genitives in PIE itself.

Abbreviations

Alb. = Albanian
Bulg. = Bulgarian
Croat. = Croatian
Gr. = Greek
Lat. = Latin.
Lith. = Lithuanian
Mac. = Macedonian
O- = Old-
OCS = Old Church Slavonic
OPr. = Old Prussian
PIE = Proto-Indo-European
Pol. = Russian
Russ. = Russian
Su. = Codex Suprasliensis
Toch.A = Tocharian A

Glosses

Aor. = aorist
def. = definite article
du. = dual
Gen. = Genitive
inf. = infinitive
Inst. = Instrumental
Nom. = Nominative
perf. = perfect
pl. = plural
poss. = possessive
sg. = singular