The Development of Predicative Possession in Slavic Languages

Jasmina Grković-Major

1. Introduction

Possession is among the universal concepts which are hard to define explicitly, since they are inherently vague.[1] The semantic dispersion of possessive language structures from the prototypical possession (ownership) to the abstract one, including both attributive and predicative patterning, indicates that this is an extremely fuzzy category.[2] In a great number of possessive constructions the semantic of possession is interwoven with some other meaning as concomitant or even dominant,[3] which creates difficulties in defining the concept. R. Mrazek, for example, divides the concept into possession in the narrow sense and possession in a wide sense, where the very moment of possession is weakened and irrelevant,[4] while A. V. Isačenko argues that only the rela-

---

1 Bernd Heine, *Possession: Cognitive Sources, Forces and Grammaticalization* (Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 1; Leon Stassen, *Predicative Possession* (Oxford University Press, 2009), p. 10.

2 Milorad Radovanović, *Uvod u fazi lingvistiku* (Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, 2009), p. 55.

3 Predrag Piper et al., *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika. Prosta rečenica* (red., Milka Ivić) (Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik–Beogradska knjiga–Matica srpska, 2005), p. 681.

4 Roman Mrazek, *Sravnitel'nyi sintaksis slavianskikh literaturnykh iazykov. Iskhodnye struktury prostogo predlozheniia* (Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně, 1990), p. 44.

tion of "ownership" deserves the label "possessive".[5] However, no matter what the proposed subtypes of this cognitive domain are, they all have a common conceptual core. This core, following H. Seiler, would be a relationship pattern: "linguistic possession consists of the relationship between a substance and another substance".[6] The concept of possession is linguistically encoded in different ways, but they are all founded on event schemas derived from the more concrete domains of basic physical experiences: Action, Location, Accompaniment and Existence.[7]

The goal of this paper is to generally present the development of predicative possession in Slavic languages. We start from the inherited Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Slavic structures and then follow their development in the early history of Slavic. The aim is also to investigate the internal language causes and mechanisms of the change, as well as the possible role of language contacts in the process.

2. Proto-Indo-European Predicative Possession

The canonical model for predicative possession in early Proto-Indo-European[8] was the existential *mihi est*-construction, in accordance with

---

5 Alexander V. Isačenko, "On 'Have' and 'Be' Languages (A Typological Sketch)," in Michael S. Flier, ed. *Slavic Forum: Essays in Linguistics and Literature* (The Hague–Paris: Mouton, 1974), p. 65. For a further review of various approaches to possession and its subtypes see: Heine, *Possession*, pp. 2–44.

6 Hansjakob Seiler, "Possessivity, Subject and Object," *Studies in Language* 7:1 (1983), p. 90. Possession as a relational concept is later accepted by several authors. Cf. Brigitte Bauer, *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European: The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French* (Berlin–New York, 2000), p. 155; Michael Herslund, Irène Baron, "Introduction: Dimensions of Possession," in Michael Herslund, Irène Baron, eds. *Dimensions of Possession* (Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 2; Philip Baldi, Pierluigi Cuzzolin, "Towards a New Historical Syntax of Latin," in Claude Moussy, ed. *De lingua latina novae questionae* (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), p. 203; William B. McGregor, "Introduction," in William B. McGregor, ed. *The Expression of Possession* (The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009), p. 1.

7 Heine, *Possession*, p. 45.

8 Subtypes of possession are not considered here since old Indo-European

its original active type.[9] The predication consists of a lexical verb 'be' ('exist'), a possessum in the nominative and the possessor in the dative:

(1) NOM (possessum) + *estĭ + DAT (possessor)
    X   exists   for Y   → 'Y has X'

The dative exhibits its invariant semantics: the notion toward which the action or the state expressed by the verb is directed.[10] The recipi-

---

languages do not offer enough data for reconstructing their varied syntactic encoding, for example, whether there was a structural difference between alienable and inalienable possession. Possible traces of an earlier distinction could be seen, according to T. V. Gamkrelidze and Viach. Vs. Ivanov, in the system of Hittite pronominal possessive constructions (T. V. Gamkrelidze, Viach. Vs. Ivanov, *Indoevropeiskii iazyk i indoevropeitsy* I–II (Tbilisi: Izdatel'stvo Tbilisskogo universiteta, 1984), pp. 289–291). Besides that, Ph. Baldi argues that inalienable possession in Proto-Indo-European was rendered by *bahuvrīhi* compounds (Philip Baldi, "Some Observations on Inalienable Possession in Hittite and Indo-European," in Lea Sawicki, Donna Shalev, eds. *Donum grammaticum. Studies in Latin and Celtic Linguistics in Honour of Hannah Rosén* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), p. 32).

9 Gamkrelidze, Ivanov, *Indoevopeiskii iazyk*, p. 288; on Pre-Indo-European as an active language see also: Winfred P. Lehmann, *Pre-Indo-European*, Journal of Indo-European Studies. Monograph Number Forty-One (Washington: Institute for the Study of Man, 2002); John Hewson, Vit Bubenik, *From Case to Adposition* (Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2006), pp. 277–280. This approach is based on Klimov's contentive typology (G. A. Klimov, *Printsipy kontensivnoi tipologii* (Moskva: Nauka, 1963)), which is discussed in detail by Johanna Nichols (*Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time* (Chicago–London: The University of Chicago Press, 1999)). Taking a different typological approach, she also writes that her arguments "do not disprove Gamkrelidze and Ivanov's claim that Proto-Indo-European was active in Klimov's sense; indeed, the lexical and semantic information they adduce is strongly suggestive of the active conceptual cast as Klimov defines it" (Nichols, *Linguistic Diversity*, p. 272). Although the active status of Proto-Indo-European is not generally recognized, we find this hypothesis convincing.

10 Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor, *Spisi iz istorijske lingvistike* (Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, 2007), p. 65.

ent/benefactive role of the dative in the construction promoted it to the role of possessor, since the semantics of these categories is closely connected.[11] This Goal Schema is a subtype of the Existential Schema, attested in different language families. All old Indo-European languages give testimony to the existence of the *mihi est*-construction, reflecting different stages in its development.[12] It is noteworthy to mention that it was long preserved in the Baltic languages,[13] the Indo-European branch diachronically closest to Slavic.

As an active language, Early Proto-Indo-European (Pre-Indo-European) had no category of syntactic transitivity (Subject-Object relation), which is the central characteristic of nominative (accusative) languages, and no verb 'have'. The verb developed in the daughter languages, as witnessed by the fact that its lexical exponents in them are different. Besides, Indo-European languages make a distinction between the concepts 'have' and 'possess'.[14] Although these two notions are quite close, 'possess', often derived from 'rule over', was probably originally restricted to prototypical possession. An example is Lat. *possidere*, a juridical term first used for property. This distinction reveals that 'have' could have had a different function.

The history of the verb 'have' in Indo-European languages is more complex than it seems. It is derived from the root 'hold, grasp', as usually indicated. But what has often escaped notice is that it was not originally a transitive verb. The Greek ἔχω, for example, appears both in absolute and transitive constructions, meaning: a. 'be (in state *x*)', e.g. κότον ἔ. 'be angry', καλῶς ἔ. 'be well', ἡδέως ἔ. 'be nice', and b.

---

11 Cf. Frantisek, Lichtenberk, "The Possessive-Benefactive Connection," *Oceanic Linguistics* 41:2 (2002), p. 440; Steven Pinker, *The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature* (New York: Penguin, 2007), p. 64.

12 Bauer, *Archaic Syntax*, pp. 198–223.

13 William R. Schmalstieg, *A Lithuanian Historical Syntax* (Columbus: Slavica, 1988), pp. 229–230.

14 Carl Darling Buck, *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages* (Chicago–London: The University of Chicago Press, 1949), pp. 740–742.

'hold' > 'have' (with the accusative).[15] The Latin *habeo* is also attested in both meanings: a. 'be (in state *x*)', e.g. *h. amorem* 'love', *h. spem* 'hope', *h. fidem* 'believe, have faith', and b. 'hold' > 'have' (with the accusative).[16] In both cases we can observe the traces of the older, Proto-Indo-European system with absolute verbs, no syntactic transitivity and no government.

3. Early Slavic Predicative Possession[17]

3-1. Old Church Slavonic

Old Church Slavonic, the first Slavic literary language, was created in the Late Proto-Slavic (Common Slavic) period. Although it exhibited some specific South Slavic syntactic features, it preserved the late Common Slavic syntactic structure well, with the exception of hypotactic constructions.[18] Besides its impact on the frequency of some models, the Greek influence was mostly restricted to the domains for which the Slavic system still did not develop its own syntactic means.[19]

The *mihi est*-construction is preserved in Old Church Slavonic both for prototypical (a) and abstract possession (b):[20]

15 Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor, "Kognitivni aspekti razvoja tranzitivnosti," in Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor, Milorad Radovanović, eds. *Teorija dijahronijske lingvistike i proučavanje slovenskih jezika* (Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 2010), p. 46.

16 Alfred Ernout, Antoine Meillet, *Dictionnaire etymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1951), p. 511.

17 Early Slavic development is exemplified by Old Church Slavonic, Old Russian, Old Serbian and Old Czech data. Besides representing three branches of Slavic, they have a rich corpus of medieval documents.

18 Jaroslav Bauer, *Syntactica slavica. Vybrané práce ze slovanské skladby* (Brno: Universita J. E. Purkyně, 1972), pp. 71–72.

19 Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor, "Ka rekonstrukciji praslovenske sintakse," *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* 73 (2008), p. 75.

20 The following sources were used: Mar. = *Codex Marianus glagoliticus*, ed. Vatroslav Jagić (Graz Akademische Druck–U. Verlagsanstalt, 1960); Supr. = *Codex Suprasliensis* I–II, ed. S. Severjanov (Graz: Akademische Druck–U. Verlagsanstalt, 1956); Zogr. = *Quattor evangeliorum Codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus*, ed. Vatroslav Jagić (Graz: Akademische

(2) a. аште бѫдетъ етероу чл҃вкоу р҃ овець Mar. Mt 18:12

'if a man has a hundred sheep'

b. мьнѣ оубо жѣланиѥ ѥстъ възвратити сѧ Supr. 203, 24–25[21]

'I have a wish [my wish is] to go back'

The syntactic-semantic features of the verb *iměti* were close to the abovementioned Greek ἔχω and Latin *habeo*. Derived from the root 'hold' (*jьměti* < PIE *em-*), it was a typical stative verb, as shown by its infinitive formant *ě* < *ē*, which appeared in 'have' in some other Indo-European languages as well.[22] Since this category of stative verbs corresponded to the inactive series of Proto-Indo-European verbs with "middle" semantics,[23] *jьměti* originally denoted the state of the (first) actant.

Old Church Slavonic had other verbs from the same root *em-*: pf. *jęti*, praes. *imǫ* 'seize, grasp', and impf. *imati*, praes. *jeml'ǫ* 'seize, grasp, gather', e.g. *jemъše že dělatele raby ego* Mar. Mt 21: 35 'but the tenants seized his slaves'. Although they had the same root, they were semantically distinct from *iměti*.

In Old Church Slavonic *iměti* had two basic meanings:

a) in the constructions with the accusative of abstract nouns it was clearly a stative verb; the state was denoted by the adverbial accusative:

Druck–U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954); SS = *Staroslavianskii slovar', po rukopisiam IX–X vekov*, red. R. M. Tseitlin, R. Vecherka, Ė. Blagova (Moskva: Russkii iazyk, 1994).

21 Such structures are usually defined as impersonal, cf. K. I. Khodova, *Padezhi s predlogami v staroslavianskom iazyke. Opyt semanticheskoi sistemy* (Moskva: Nauka, 1971), pp. 234–254. However, R. Večerka states that we cannot be sure if the nouns in such structures were already adverbialized, leaving two possible transformations for the perfect tense: **nǫžda bě* → 1. **nǫžda jestъ byla*; 2. **nǫžda jestъ bylo* /?/ (Radoslav Večerka, *Altkirchenslavische* (*altbulgarische*) *Syntax* III: *Die Satztypen: Der einfache Satz* (Freiburg: Weiher Verlag, 1996), pp. 240–241). Old Church Slavonic had both *mihi est-* and *habeo-*constructions with abstract nouns: *nǫžda mi jestъ* : *nǫždǫ imatь* (SS, p. 387).

22 Eva Havlová, ed. *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského* (Praha: Academia, 1989–), 4, p. 242.

23 Viach. Vs. Ivanov, *Slavianskii, baltiiskii i rannebalkanskii glagol. Indoevropeiskie istoki* (Moskva: Nauka, 1981), p. 176.

(3) миръ имѣите междю собоѭ Zogr. Mr 9:50.[24]
  'be at peace with each other'

This is also testified to by other similar phrases, which were in the later history of Slavic languages replaced by verbs denoting states.[25] A comparison with the Greek text reveals that these were original Slavic constructions, where the semantics of *iměti* was close to that of 'be', e.g.:

(4) вѣрѫ имѣти "believe"   – πιστεύειν (active voice)
  болѣзнн имѣти "be sick" – ἀλγύνεσθαι (middle voice)
  печаль имѣти "be sad"   – περίλυπον (adj.) εἶναι ('be') (SS: 260)

b) in the constructions with the accusative of concrete nouns it expressed predicative possession:

(5) лнсн ѣзвнны имѫтъ Mar. Lk 9:58
  'foxes have dens'

Old Church Slavonic texts show the beginning of change in the syntactic-semantic status of *iměti*, as well as the competition between *habeo x* and *mihi est x*. For example, in all the codices the Greek *mihi est*-construction is translated with *iměti* in Lk 9:13: [26]

(6) не нмамъ съде важше пѧтн хлѣбъ
  οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ ἄρτοι πέντε
  'we have no more than five loaves'

───────────────

24 In SS (260) the function of *iměti* in such cases is defined in the following way: "s sushch., oboznachajushchim deistvie, sostoianie ili svoistvo, v kachestve nepolnoznachnogo glagola."

25 SS: 260. This can be exemplified by comparing Old Church Slavonic and modern Bulgarian and Czech translations of the New Testament: OCS *imatъ chvalǫ* – Blg. *šte blagodari* – Cz. *děkuje* Lk 17:9; OCS *ne iměachǫ imъ very* – Blg. *ne gi vjarvacha* – Cz. *nevěřili jim* Lk 24:11 etc. (Milena Přikrylová, "Sémantika konstrukcí se slovesem *mít* ve staroslověnských biblických textech a vývoj těchto konstrukcí do češtiny a bulharštiny," *Slavia* 67:1–2 (1998), p. 69).

26 K. Mirchev, "Predlog *u* v posessivnoi funktsii v istorii bolgarskogo iazyka," *Issledovaniia po slavianskomu iazykoznaniiu. Sbornik v chest'shestidesiatiletiia professora S. B. Bernshteina* (Moskva: Nauka, 1971), p. 80.

On the other hand, while in Mt 5:46 the Greek sentence with ἔχω is rendered with *iměti* in all the codices, presbyter Cosma cited it as a *mihi est*-construction which, according to K. Mirčev, proves that there were also translations in which ἔχω was rendered as *mihi est*:[27]

(7) кал вам мьзда естъ
τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε
'what reward do you have'

The competition of the two patternings was the result of the development of syntactic transitivity, a process which is well testified to by the Old Church Slavonic data.[28] In this process, stative verbs with the formant *ě* were removed in several ways: by giving reflexives (e.g. *bojati sę*), by being replaced by the newly formed category of reflexive causatives (e.g. *icělěti – icěliti sę*), or by being reanalyzed as syntactically transitive (e.g. *chotěti*). *Iměti* was subjected to the last process.

The third patterning for predicative possession was based on Locative schema, with the possessum in the nominative and the possessor expressed by *u* + genitive:

(8) Nom (possessum) + **jestь* + *u* + Gen (possessor)
X   exists   (from >) at Y   → 'Y has X'

The preposition **u* is of Proto-Indo-European origin (< **au*) and its primary function was ablative.[29] The Location schema was derived from the Source schema, thus the semantics "the existence of a notion in the sphere of another notion".[30] The prepositional phrase *u* + genitive was polyfunctional, its locational, ablative, agentive or possessive meaning being derived contextually, depending on the meaning of both the predicate and the noun in the nominative.[31] The possessive interpretation was

27 Ibid.

28 Grković-Mejdžor, *Spisi iz istorijske lingvistike*, pp. 77–97.

29 František Kopečný, *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků. Slova grammatičká a zájmena. sv. 2: Předložky. Koncové partikulé* (Praha: Academia, 1973), p. 258.

30 Milka Ivić, "Sistem predloških konstrukcija u srpskohrvatskom jeziku," *Južnoslovenski filolog* XXII (1957–58), p. 145.

31 Khodova, *Padezhi s predlogami*, pp. 46–48, 176–177.

rare, but it occurred for both prototypical (a) and abstract possession (b):

(9) a. аще бѫдетъ оу етера чл҃ка ҏ҃· овець Mt 18:12[32]
'if a man has a hundred sheep'

b. оу тебе естъ дръжава Euch. 64a7 (SS: 718).
'you have the power'

3-2. Old Russian

The *mihi est*-construction with relational nouns is confirmed in Russian chronicles:[33]

(10) *...Мстислава иже бѣ ѥму ѿ наложницѣ* (Lavr. 91f.)[34]
'...Mstislav, which he had from the mistress'

But in juridical documents its usage was narrowed to abstract possession early on, denoting the state of possessor:

(11) *то вины ѥмоу в томь нѣтоуть* (*Russkaia pravda*)[35]
'and he is not guilty for that'

Although A. B. Pravdin argues that this patterning was possible in the later period only in the higher literary functional styles (citing examples form Smotricky's *Grammar* from the 17th century),[36] it is also found in juridical documents from the same century, in *Uloženie* by the emperor Aleksej Mihajlovič (1649).[37]

---

32 This example from the Codex Assemaius is cited in: André Vaillant, *Grammaire compare des langues slaves*, *V: La syntaxe* (Paris: Éditions Klinckieck, 1977), p. 126 as having spatial semantics ("auprès de, chez"), while Mirchev ("Predlog *u* v posessivnoi funktsii," p. 81) gives it as the most credible case of *u* + genitive-possession in Old Church Slavonic.

33 A. B. Pravdin, "Datel'nyi priglagol'nyi v staroslavianskom i drevnerusskom iazykakh," *Uchenye zapiski Instituta slavianovedeniia* XIII (1956), p. 73.

34 *Lavrent'evskaia letopis'* (http://litopys.org.ua).

35 V. I. Borkovskii, *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskii sintaksis vostochnoslavianskikh iazykov. Tipy prostogo predlozheniia* (Moskva: Nauka, 1968), p. 114.

36 Pravdin, "Datel'nyi priglagol'nyi," p. 81.

37 See: Borkovskii, *Sravnitel'no-istoricheskii sintaksis,* p. 115.

The status of the *habeo*-structure in the early period was similar to its function in Old Church Slavonic. In the Old Novgorodian dialect it is found exceptionally. Besides in the monastic letter № 503 and fragment № 886, it occurs only twice, in № 752, and A. A. Zaliznjak, in his comments on this letter, states that the use of verb *iměti* was bookish:[38]

(12) цьть до мьнь зъла нмеешн
    "why are you angry with me?"

In Sl RJa[39] all examples with *iměti* are from the high-style Church Slavonic documents or chronicles. But there is a difference: while in the religious literature the verb was used for prototypical possession, in the chronicles it occurred exclusively in phraseological units in combination with an abstract noun: *ljubovъ* 'love', *mirъ* 'peace', *otvět* 'answer', *postъ* 'fasting', *čestь* 'honor', etc.[40] Having in mind that chronicles represent the 'the lower norm', in which Russian Church Slavonic was brought closer to the spoken language by introducing vernacular elements,[41] it is hard to say to which stratum these phraseological units belong. However, there is a striking similarity with Old Church Slavonic constructions of the same kind.

The origin of *habeo*-patterning in Russian has different interpretations. A. B. Isačenko argues that *iměti* was not used in the vernacular, and that "under the influence of German and French, *imět'* penetrates into the language of the Russian educated elite in numerous phraseologisms and is firmly established in the literary language by the end of the 18th century".[42] On the other hand, A. Danylenko states that "the verb 'have', though tending to give way under the influence of the construction *u menja est'* did not vanish either in the standard language or in the

---

38 A. A. Zalizniak, *Drevnenovgorodskii dialekt* (Moskva: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2004), pp. 249, 252.

39 *Slovar' russkogo iazyka XI–XVII vv.* 6 (Moskva: Nauka, 1979), p. 229.

40 Cf. Isačenko, "On 'Have' and 'Be' Languages," p. 50.

41 M. L. Remneva, *Istoriia russkogo literaturnogo iazyka* (Moskva: MGU, 1995), pp. 365–366.

42 Isačenko, "On 'Have' and 'Be' Languages," p. 51.

vernacular".[43] Keeping in mind that stative constructions with *iměti* and abstract nouns were originally Slavic, as a part of the Common Slavic heritage, we are prone to think that this was a vernacular feature, creating fertile soil for calquing French and German phraseologisms in the later period.

The existential construction based on the Location schema was dominant from the earliest documents, replacing the *mihi est*-model:

(13) *бѣ бо у него с͞нвъ в҃i* (Lavr. 42f.)
      'he had twelve sons'

As in Old Church Slavonic, *u* + genitive was polyfunctional and it remained as such from the time of the birchbark documents[44] to contemporary Russian.[45]

3-3. Old Serbian[46]

In the oldest vernacular (juridical) documents from the 12th and 13th centuries, the *mihi est*-construction, just like in Old Russian, occurred only if the possessum was an abstract notion: *sila* 'force', *nepravьda* 'unjustice', *zakonь* 'law', *zledь* 'injury', *milostь* 'mercy', etc.:

---

43 Andrii Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica: Ukrainian in Context* (München: Otto Sagner Verlag, 2006), p. 210.

44 See: Zalizniak, *Drevnenovgorodskii dialekt*, pp. 284, 379, 397 etc.

45 R. Mrázek, J. Brym, "Sémantika a funkce ruského genitivu s předložkou 'u'," *Sborník prací filosofické fakulty brněnské university (J. E. Purkyně)* A10: 11 (1962), pp. 99–118.

46 A detailed analysis of the development of predicative possession in Old Serbian is given in: Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor, "Razvoj predikativne posesije u starosrpskom," Međunarodni simpozijum *Gramatika i leksika u slovenskim jezicima*, Novi Sad–Beograd, 14–16. September 2010. (forthcoming). The corpus, defined already by Fr. Miklosich (*Monumenta serbica. Spectantia historiam Serbiae Bosnae Ragusii*, Graz: Akademische Druck–U. Verlagsanstalt, 1964, reprint), consists of vernacular documents (charters and letters) written in Dubrovnik, Bosnia, Hum and Raška.

(14) како нцль є биль законь прѣге za тон SPP 140.29 [47]
'as they had the law for that before'

By the 15th century the model was reanalyzed and the dative was re-interpreted as a recipient or a possessive dative. This is indicated by the presence of relational and concrete nouns in the position of the former possessum, as well as by the structural re-patterning of the construction. This was done in several ways, e.g. by the change of word order, which brought the former possessum and the possessor into juxtaposition:

(15) а сада никога инога ние ближнега синовца [Ø, *nije*] кнеzȣ браилȣ него юраіа сина брата браилова богише SPP 749.25–26
'and now there is no closer nephew to/of the duke Brailo than Juraj the son of Brailo's brother Bogiša'

In the earliest period a noun in the *habeo*-construction in most cases was abstract as well: *věra* 'faith', *gněvъ* 'anger', *ljubъvъ* 'love', *mirъ* 'peace', *obětъ* 'promise', *prijatelьstvo* 'friendship', etc.:

(16) мы ȣ томь нѣмамо гнѣва SPP 32.5
'we are not angry about that'

The examples correspond to the Old Church Slavonic phrases with *iměti,* and in a number of cases the phrases in the two languages are identical: OCS *verǫ iměti* – OS *iměti věru* 'have faith, believe'; OCS *mirъ iměti* – OS *iměti mirъ* 'be at peace'; OCS *pečalь iměti* – OS *iměti pečalь* 'be sad, worried'. The situation is parallel to Old Russian as well.

The first example with a pronoun referring to a relational noun occurred in the 13th century:

(17) и все твое люди кое ицашь или кое ȣчьнешь ицати SPP 26. 9–10
'and all your men which you have or which you will have'

The systemic withdrawal of the stative verbs with the formant *ě*, together with the analogy *imatь : imati*, led to the morphological blending of the verbs *iměti* and *imati* in Old Serbian, as seen in the example (17). This meant also the transformation of its semantics, which now included

---

47 SPP = Ljub. Stojanović, *Stare srpske povelje i pisma*, I/1–2 (Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda XIX) (Beograd, 1929, 1934).

the meaning 'seize, grasp' (Action schema). It must have been an additional impulse for the transitivization of the *habeo* structures.

From the 14th century onward the construction included concrete nouns (*dukatъ* 'golden coin', *zemlja* 'land', *kuća* 'house', *povĕlja* 'charter', etc.), in other words, it now expressed prototypical possession:

(18) нѣмамо дѹка|т|ь ѹ ѡпкинѹ SPP 132.20
    'we have no gold coins in the municipality'

In the 15th century the possessum included abstract nouns whose possessor was not only the recipient (*milostъ* 'mercy'), but a patient as well (*usilostъ* 'violence, force'), which indicates the further extension of *habeo*-predication and the grammaticalization of its subject:

(19) ако би кою годи ѹсилость ѿ кѹда годи дѹбровникь имаю SPP 713.44–45
    'if Dubrovnik would have any kind of violence from wherever'

Old Serbian also had the *u* + genitive construction, but it was a peripheral predicative possession patterning:

(20) а ѹ браила биста два сина радонꙗ и радосавь и двие к꙽ерѣ елача и владислава SPP 48.17
    'and Brailo had two sons, Radonja i Radosav, and two daughters, Jelača and Vladislava'

Like in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian, *u* + genitive was polyfunctional,[48] and many instances are on the border of locative and possessive meaning:

(21) двие ста повелле ѹ бана стефана SPP 76.53
    a. '*Ban* Stefan has two charters' or
    b. 'two charters are at *Ban* Stefan's'

In all the cases the possessor is animate. There is a striking similarity with the 14th century Bulgarian documents, where the possessive interpretation is undoubted only in cases referring to close family rela-

---

48 Slobodan Pavlović, "Genitiv s predlogom *u* i njegovi sintaksički konkurenti u starosrpskim poveljama i pismima," *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* 67 (2005), pp. 65–76.

tions.[49] This points to the conclusion that *u* + genitive was restricted to inalienable and permanent possession, which is also proven by the data from Serbian epic poetry.[50]

3-4. Old Czech

The *mihi est*-construction is attested in Old Czech as well:

(22) *ani mně ani tobě tento mlýn bude*[51]
'neither you nor I will have that mill'

However, because of the Latin influence on Old Czech syntax,[52] especially in translated texts, it is hard to say to what extent this model was present in the vernacular. For example, in Luke in the *Dráždanska Bible* (14th century) 88% of *mihi est* examples correlate with such a construction in the Latin Bible, while in Luke in the *Kralická Bible* 71% correspond to the *mihi est* Greek constructions.[53]

The *habeo*-structure was present from the earliest texts and in the course of time it was replacing the *mihi est*-patterning, even in the translations. This can be illustrated with the following examples from the abovementioned Bible translations. In both cases, the original Latin/Greek text had the existential dative model:[54]

---

49 Mirchev, "Predlog *u* v posessivnoi funktsii," p. 82.

50 Motoki Nomaći, "O prototipu posesivnosti i pitanju neotuđive posesije," in Predrag Piper, ed. *Kognitivnolingvistička proučavanja srpskog jezika* (Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti, 2006), pp. 171–172.

51 Jan Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého, IV: Skladba* (Praha: Academia, 2007), p. 391.

52 In the earliest period "v oblasti syntaktické byla náročná úloha postupné přeměny jazyka mluveného v jazyk literární stimulací syntakticky rozvitou latinou uspíšena" (Dušan Šlosar, Radoslav Večerka, Jan Dvořák, Petr Malčík, *Spisovný jazyk v dějinách české společnosti* (Brno: Host, 2009), p. 43).

53 Julia McAnallen, "Developments in Predicative Possession in the History of Slavic," in Björn Hansen, Jasmina Grković-Major, eds. *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax*: *Gradual Changes in Focus* [Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 74] (München–Berlin–Wien, 2010), p. 134.

54 Ibid., p. 135.

(23) a. *a tej bieše sestra, jménem Maria* Lk 10:39
     b. *A ta měla sestru, jménem Mariji*
     'And she had a sister named Mary'

Old Czech also had a third construction, *u* + genitive:

(24) *oči u ňeho biešta jako denice*[55]
     'he had eyes [his eyes were] like morning stars'

As in other old Slavic languages, *u* + genitive was polyfunctional, its semantics depending on the semantics of the governing verb and the noun in the genitive.[56]

4. Causes and Mechanisms of Predicative Possession Development

4-1. Internal Causes

The basic driving force in major syntactic changes from Indo-European to Slavic was, as well as in other Indo-European languages, a typological change: a drift toward a nominative language type, its core characteristic being syntactic transitivity. It was also a change from a topic-oriented to an agent-oriented language.[57] This drift caused a series of changes,[58] one of them being the loss of *mihi est* predicative possession.

The situation in Old Church Slavonic and early Slavic texts shows that all late Common Slavic dialects still had *mihi est*-patterning. Besides that, they all had a peripherally available structure: *u* + genitive, which by a metaphorical transfer became a means for predicative possession. The loss of the *mihi est*-type in the period of Common Slavic disintegration caused the rise of new models for predicative possession.

---

55 Gebauer, *Historická mluvnice*, p. 495.

56 Ibid., pp. 495–496.

57 Grković-Mejdžor, "Kognitivni aspekti razvoja tranzitivnosti," p. 58.

58 Jasmina Grković-Major, "The Role of Syntactic Transitivity in the Development of Slavic Syntactic Structures," in Björn Hansen, Jasmina Grković-Major, eds. *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax*: *Gradual Changes in Focus* [Wiener Slawistischer Almanach, Sonderband 74] (München–Berlin–Wien, 2010), pp. 63–74.

The majority of Slavic languages gradually developed a transitive *habeo*-structure.[59] The mechanisms of its development can be followed in Old Serbian texts, which are representative because they encompass vernacular texts from a period of four centuries. The rise of *habeo*-possessive predication went through a typical grammaticalization path: it was subjected to *contextual extension* (more frequent usage and usage in new contexts).[60] The process had several phases, the last one being the one in which the subject obtained the semantic roles of a recipient and then a patient, which indicates its full grammaticalization.[61]

On the other hand, the *mihi est*-model was subjected to *contextual restriction* from the oldest Slavic texts. While in the mid-9th century (Old Church Slavonic) it was used for prototypical possession, by the 12th century it was limited to abstract possession (Old Serbian).[62] By the 15th century this patterning was reanalyzed, i.e. the dative was reinterpreted as benefactive/malefactive or as a means of attributive possession. The analysis revealed that *mihi est* was retreating from the center to the periphery of the domain of possession, until it became reanalyzed.

The phases in the development of the two patterings could be presented in the following way:

a) *habeo*-construction (contextual extension > grammaticalization)
    a. "middle" semantics (actant-experiencer)
    b. prototypical possession (ownership)
    c. prototypical possession + possessor-recipient
    d. prototypical possession + possessor-recipient + possessor-patient
b) *mihi est*-construction (contextual restriction > reanalysis)
    a. prototypical possession (ownership) + possessor-experiencer
    b. possessor-recipient + possessor-patient
    c. reanalysis

59 In some of them, as in Serbian, *mihi est* is preserved as a marginal or emphatic syntactic means (Grković-Mejdžor, *Spisi iz istorijske lingvistike*, p. 29).

60 Bernd Heine, Tania Kuteva, *The Changing Languages of Europe* (Oxford: University Press, 2006), p. 58.

61 The syntactic roles of subject and object are fully grammaticalized once they can both have different semantic roles.

62 The same process is attested to in the history of Latin: in the period between early and late Latin the possessum in the *mihi est* structure was restricted to abstract nouns (Bauer, *Archaic Syntax*, p. 181).

Why was *mihi est* replaced exactly by *have*-predication? Syntactic change can be understood in the light of prototypes: the new structure has to be from the same conceptual domain as the old one since they both encode the same semantics.[63] Here we recall E. Benveniste's observation on the nature of 'have'. Giving the example of French *avoir*, he argues that it has a transitive construction but that *avoir* is a stative verb, nothing else but *être-à* "inverted".[64] A similar explanation is later given by A. V. Isačenko: 'be' is 'have' minus transitivity.[65] The two verbs are semantically similar, which is also witnessed by the crossovers of their semantic maps in Slavic languages today.[66] Both *mihi est-* and *habeo*-possessive predications are stative, relational patterns. So it is not by chance that *mihi est x* was replaced by *iměti x,* an originally stative verb in most Slavic languages.

4-2. External Causes: Language Contact

The internal typological change in Slavic languages was supported by language contacts, as seen in the distribution of predicative possession structures in Slavic. South and West Slavic languages have the *habeo*-construction, with *u* + genitive as an archaic or peripheral structure in some regions.[67] Russian has a dominant Location schema, while 'have'

---

63 Grković-Mejdžor, *Spisi iz istorijske lingvistike*, p. 71.

64 Emil Benvenist, *Problemi opšte lingvistike* (Beograd: Nolit, 1975), p. 153.

65 Isačenko, "On 'Have' and 'Be' Languages," p. 60.

66 R. Mrázek and J. Brym comment the semantic relation between 'be' and 'have' in the following way: "slovesa *býti* a *míti* vyjadřují totiž velmi obecně lexikální významy" (Mrázek, Brym, "Sémantika a funkce ruského genitivu," p. 100). A detailed presentation of the semantic maps of the two verbs is given in: Steven J. Clancy, "Semantic Maps for BE and HAVE in Slavic," *Glossos* 1 (2001), pp. 1–14 (http:// seelrc. org/glossos/).

67 In standard Serbian, for example (Piper et al., *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika*, p. 694), while in western Serbian dialects it still exists in a restricted domain (Dragoljub Petrović, *O govoru Zmijanja* (Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1973), p. 133). In some parts of Slavdom this prepositional phrase was entirely lost, as in Slovene and practically in the Sorbian languages (Kopečný, *Etymologický slovník*, p. 257–262).

is generally used for abstract possession and in phraseologisms, in other words, it is used "for the expression of purely abstract non-specific concepts",[68] rarely colloquially for concrete possession. Ukrainian and Belorussian have almost a parallel use of the two possessive patternings.[69] Thus in the domain of predicative possession only (standard) Russian remained a *be*-language,[70] while 'have' did not spread beyond its original domain. The usage of the *habeo*-model for encoding peripheral, abstract possession in Russian is a Common Slavic heritage, and its preservation in standard Russian was supported by French and German influences.

In the south, in Serbian, some of Croatian, Bulgarian and Macedonian, the influence of Balkan language area was decisive, in which Greek and mostly Romance, situated deep in the Balkans, had a dominant role. The early development of the *habeo*-predication in Old Church Slavonic documents probably reflects the rise of the new patterning in south Macedonian dialects. Saying this, we have in mind that, for example, Thessalonica was a bilingual Greek-Slavic city at the time. On the other hand, the rise of the *habeo*-construction in Serbian was first completed in the documents from the Dubrovnik chancellery, where the Slavic-Romance language contact was continuous, even on the level of code switching.

West Slavic languages, Slovene and Croatian Kajkavian developed the *habeo*-predication due to the German influence. For example, German colonization of the Czech lands (1240–1260) meant not only intense contact with German speakers, but the beginning of Czech-German bilingualism in larger centers as well.[71] The structure spread further to the

---

68 Thomas Stolz et al., *Split Possession: an Areal-Linguistic Study of the Alienability and Related Phenomena in the Languages of Europe* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008), p. 449.

69 Peter Mayo, "Belorussian," in Comrie Bernard, Greville Corbett, eds. *The Slavonic Languages* (London–New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 934–935; George J. Shevelov, "Ukrainian," Comrie, Corbett, eds. *The Slavonic Languages*, pp. 987–988.

70 Its *be*-typology can be seen in some other features as well (Isačenko, "On 'Have' and 'Be' Languages," pp. 43–77).

71 Šlosar et al. *Spisovný jazyk*, p. 46.

east, encompassing Belorussian and Ukrainian dialects. Thus, Ukrainian uses predominantly *have*-constructions in the west and *be*-constructions in the east.[72]

The development of *u* + genitive in east Slavic is attributed to convergent processes in the east Baltic area (Slavic, Baltic and West Finnish).[73] The fact that Northern Russian displays a strong inclination toward a syntactic patterning on the basis of 'be' while Southern Russian is characterized by both *be*- and *have*-constructions[74] is in accordance with this assumption. However, the Sprachbund situation did not create a new structure, it just directed the choice between the possibilities existing in late Common Slavic.

Generally speaking, South Slavic and West Slavic, with a grammaticalized *habeo*-predication as a structural feature of nominative typology, belong today to the so-called *Standard Average European Sprachbund*, with *have*-possession among its salient features.[75] Northern Russian became part of the East Baltic Sprachbund, while the rest of East Slavic, with both *have*- and *be*-patterning, represents "transitional areas between the typologically more consistent core of focal areas of different sprachbünde".[76] This sprachbünde influence resulted in the areal gradience of the two syntactic patterns.

––––––––––––––––––––

72 Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica*, p. 217.

73 Terje Mathiassen, "A Discussion of the Notion 'Sprachbund' and Its Application in the Case of the Languages in the Eastern Baltic Area (Slavic, Baltic, and West Finnish)," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* XXXI/XXXII (= *Slavic Linguistics, Poetics, Cultural History*, eds. Michael S. Flier, Dean S. Worth) (1985), p. 278.

74 Danylenko, *Slavica et Islamica*, p. 217.

75 Cf. Martin Haspelmath, "Non-canonical Marking of Core Arguments in European Languages," in Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, Masayuki Onishi, eds. *Non-canonical Marking of Subject and Object* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001), p. 53.

76 Hans Henrich Hock, "Historical Implications of a Dialectological Approach to Convergence," in Jacek Fisiak, ed. *Historical Dialectology: Regional and Social* (Berlin–New York–Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter, 1998), p. 285.

5. Conclusions

The canonical means for predicative possession in late Proto-Slavic (Common Slavic) was the *mihi est*-construction, inherited from Proto-Indo-European. Its gradual loss, testified to in all Indo-European languages, was due to a typological change of Proto-Indo-European and its daughter languages from an active into a nominative language type. When the internal drift caused the loss of *mihi est*-patterning, the rise of new means for predicative possession was directed by language contact. This contact reinforced one of the possibilities which already existed in Common Slavic as peripheral (*u* + gen.) or potentially available (the verb **jьměti*). From a theoretical point of view this would be an additional exemplification of a change resulting from both language-internal and contact-induced processes.[77]

This research shows that syntactic change is a gradual process. In the course of drift a certain period in which the system is being brought into accordance with the type is needed. This is manifested in the competition and variation between old and new syntactic patterns. The process of the grammaticalization of a new syntactic pattern is concomitant with the withdrawal of the old structure to the periphery of the cognitive domain in question, where it more easily becomes reanalyzed or takes up a marginal place in the system.

---

[77] An interplay of internal and external causes in syntactic change can be seen in the development of the hypotactic *da* in Old Serbian, as explained in: Grković-Mejdžor, *Spisi iz istorijske lingvistike*, pp. 204–230. This mechanism is responsible for changes in other domains as well; see an explanation of the rise of the postposed article in Bulgarian and "double determination" in Scandinavian in: Tania Kuteva, Bernd Heine, "On the Explanatory Value of Grammaticalization," in Jeff Good, ed. *Linguistic Universals and Language Change* (Oxford: University Press, 2008), pp. 215–230.