

The East Slavic ‘HAVE’: between the *be*- and *have*-patterning?

Andrii Danylenko
Pace University (New York)
adanylenko@pace.edu

1. Introduction (Meillet, Bally, Kuryłowicz, Vendryes, Ginneken, Mrázek)

Common assumptions:

- Gk. ἔχω, Lat. *habeō*, Goth. *haba*, Lith. *turiù*, Sl. *imamъ* (< **jimami*) and the like could have entered the grammar of late dialectal areas of IE (Meillet 1923)
- Such verbs stem from transitive verbs with the general meaning ‘hold, grasp’ (Isačenko 1974)
- All modern European languages are polarized into two groups, *have*- and *be*-languages

have-languages

English
German
Dutch
French
Czech
Slovak
Serbian/Croatian
Slovene
Lithuanian, etc.

transitional languages

Polish
Ukrainian
Belarusian

be-languages

Finnish
Estonian
Hungarian

Russian

(Isačenko 1974; Justus 1999a, 1999b)

- Among the Slavic languages, Russian is the only solid *be*-language
Justus (1999a, 77) argued that the older *be*-type predicate of possession is “still found in Sanskrit and Russian”:

(1) a. R *u* (at) *menja* (I-gen.) *est*’ (is) *mašina* (car-nom.)
‘I have a car’

b. L *mihi* (I-dat) *est* ‘to me is’

- From the early 18th c. onward under the influence of German and French, *imět*’ ‘have’ penetrates into the language of the Russian élite in numerous phraseologisms and is firmly established in literary Russian by the end of the 18th c. The verb penetrated into Russian vernacular one century later

čestъ iměju ‘I have the honor’

iměetъ izrjadnoe položenie ‘[the room] has an excellent situation’

iměetъ xorošij vidъ ‘look good’

(*Grammatica Russica* by Michael Groening, 1750, cited in Isačenko 1974)

My major claims would be the following:

- East Slavic demonstrates a much more complicated situation
- Russian can hardly be treated as a solid *be*-language
 - ✓ dialectally and historically, the language shows a competing *have*-possessive patterning
- Ukrainian (along with Belarusian) is not a transitional but rather a typologically split system demonstrating concurrently both *be*- and *have*- patterning
 - ✓ the above split is historically attested in literary Ukrainian(s) and its dialects
- All the eastern Slavic languages are characterized by a split system, though operational to a different extent in each of them

2. Reconciling possessive patterns in (East) Slavic

Czech and Slovak are the focus central European Slavic languages which are affected, according to Kurzová (1999, 503), by the Standard Average European generalization of the finite nominative-accusative sentence, distinguishable in the typologically innovative West European (WE) languages

Thus, the alleged archaic status of Russian poses several immediate questions:

- How can one reconcile the *be*-patterning as a peripheral phenomenon with the focus CE Slavic languages?
 - What is the transitional vector of Ukrainian/Belarusian purportedly influenced by Polish and Russian?
- 2) a. U *ja* (I) *maju* (have-pres. 1 sg) *mašynu* (car-acc.)
b. U *u* (at) *mene* (I-gen.) *je* (is) *mašina* (car-nom.)
'I have a car'
- 3) a. P *mam* (have-pres. 1 sg) *samochód* (car-acc.)
'I have a car'
b. P *u* (at) *jednego* (I-gen.) *był* *długi* *muszkiet* (-nom.)
'one has a long musket' (Ivanov 1989, 169)
- How can we explain different generalization of the sentence type in more archaic Slavic languages as compared with the WE languages?

The generalization of the nominative-accusative sentence type, as evidenced in the WE languages, would imply the emergence of the verb 'have' of possession. And, conversely, a predominance of the flexional principle in Slavic, which has remained "loyal to the Indo-European spirit" (Meillet 1924, 12), would strongly suggest a perpetuation of *be*-constructions like the Russian, with the preposition *u* 'by, at' added at a later date to denote an agent, demoted from its topic position

Methods:

Historical and socio-linguistic methods with elements of typological profiling

3. The New Slavic Perfect.

A new, “possessive” perfect (Mathesius 1925) in Czech, Slovak, Bulgarian, Macedonian (Koneski 1967, 203-04) and, though mostly colloquially, in Lower and Upper Sorbian (Faßke and Michalk 1981, 227), Polish (Mrázek 1973, 180-81), and, though sporadically, in Southwest Ukrainian:

- 4) a. Cz *máme* *zaseto*
have-pres. 1 pl. sow-PPP nom. sg. n.
‘we have sown’
- b. Cz *máme* *pole* *zaseto*
have-pres. 1 pl. field-acc. sg. n. sow-PPP nom. sg. n.
‘we have sown the field’

The Slavic languages, with the exception of East Slavic, must have first developed ‘have’ as a transitive main verb of possession, which subsequently evolved a perfect auxiliary use

4. Typological evidence from Romance

The process of *grammaticalization* of ‘have’ in the WE languages was essentially the same for the periphrastic perfect and the future form.

- o To use the notions of prospective and retrospective aspects in Romance, Fleischman (1983, 195) presented the archetypal perfect function (retrospective present) in Latin as evolving in the direction of the past, just as the prospective complex constructions have evolved in the direction of futures
- o Constructions with *habere* ‘have’ turning into a temporal auxiliary might have emerged from earlier Latin constructions of *habere* + OBJECT, with a *predicativum* referring to its property (Pinkster 1987, 193)

4.1. Perfect formations

In the case of perfect formations, the *predicativum* marks a property of the object that is due to a former action or process in which it was involved:

- 5) L *epistulas* (letter-acc. pl.) *lectas* (read-PPP acc.pl.) *habeo* (have-1 sg.)
‘I have read letters’

Viewed prospectively, the *predicativum*, fulfilled by a gerundive, represents a property to be acquired by the object in the future as in the following example:

- 6) L *epistulas* (letters-acc.) *legendas* (read-ger. acc. pl.) *habeo* (have-1 sg.)
‘I have letters to read’ or ‘I have to read letters’ (see Bauer 2000, 255–57)

The spreading of what Benveniste dubbed ‘pseudo-transitivity’ might have triggered:

- the extension of the infinitive in the PC with the future time reference
- the emergence of the infinitive formation with the modality of obligation evolving gradually into the future marker as observed in transition from ‘I have to sing’ to ‘I will sing’ for *L cantare habeo* (Kuryłowicz 1931, 452; Danylenko 2006, 199)

It is not clear if the so-called Action Schema involving an agent, a patient, and some action or activity might have provoked the appearance of ‘have’:

X takes Y > X has, owns Y (Heine 1997, 47)

- The verb ‘have’ as a stative formation in *-ē-* could hardly have derived from ‘take’ inasmuch as the *-ē-* would have created the syntactically transitive stative ‘have’ (in Bauer’s terms) from an intransitive ‘hold’ by one minute step in transitivity increase (Benveniste 1966, 196-98, 207)
- The meaning of ‘take’, in view of an equal number of participants in the relational structure, is thus higher than ‘have’ on a transitivity scale because its object is affected (Justus 1999a)

5. Historical evidence from Baltic

Baltic falls into two major linguistic areas in the distribution of the *be-* and *have-* constructions

BE Latvian, a highly inflectional, though a more innovative language than Lithuanian, has retained into the present time the ancient dative of possession of the type:

- 7) *La man* (I-dat. sg.) *ir* (is) *nams* (house-nom. sg.)
‘I have a house’ (Fennell and Gelsen 1980, 18; Endzelin 1922, 427)

More importantly, the use of the verb *turēt* in the possessive meaning proper is also represented in this language, though mostly dialectally and by scanty examples (Mühlenbach 1929-1932, 270)

HAVE Lithuanian, a solid inflectional language, preserves the dative of possession and shows a strong inclination toward using the verb *turėti* ‘have’ in the possessive meaning (see Danylenko 2001)

- 8) a. *Li Motinai* (mother-dat) *drėba* (tremble-pres. 3 sg) *rañkos* (hands-nom.)
‘mother’s hands tremble’ (Ambrazas 1997, 626)
- b. *Li aš* (I) *turiu* (have-pres. 1 sg.) *broli* (brother-acc. m.)
‘I have a brother’ (Ivanov 1989, 173)

A rare Lithuanian construction of *pàs* ‘at, to’ followed by the accusative to refer to the possessor

- 9) Li *pàs kùpčiū* (merchant-acc. sg. m.) *yrà* (is) *duktė* (daughter-nom. sg. f.)
‘the merchant has a daughter’ (Fraenkel 1929, 84; see Danylenko 2005)

The above construction is a borrowing from the Russian *be*-construction, with specifically possessive constructions with *u* ‘at’ plus the genitive case in the northern and some western central Russian dialects:

- 10) R *u nas* (we-gen.) *posejano* (sow-PPP nom. sg. n.)
‘we have sown’ (see Kuz’mina 1993, 131-33)

Called *possessive resultative* (Danylenko 2005), the above construction is a mirror-image reflection of the new perfect in some western Slavic languages

6. Modern reflexes of Slavic ‘have’

From the Slavic root **em-* (Meillet 1924, 203):

1. **jēti* : **jimQ* ‘take’ (determined imperfective) later replaced by numerous prefixed perfectives like OCS *vŭn-ęti* : *vŭn-ŭmQ* ‘cavere’ (cf. Vaillant 1966, 194)
2. **jimati* : **jemljQ* ‘take’ (indetermined imperfective) which would not take any prefixes
3. **jiměti* : **jimami* ‘hold, own, have’ (imperfective)

R *vzjat’* : *voz’mu* ‘take’ (prft) ~ *brat’* : *beru* ‘take’ (imprft)

R *vzjat’* : *voz’mu* ‘take’ (prft) ~ *imet’* : *imeju* ‘have’ (imprft)

The latter two belong to one root, thereby maintaining the basic IE opposition between ‘take’ and ‘have’, expandable by aspectual nuances not encountered in the WE languages

As a Slavic innovation, **jiměti* : **jimami* (due to morphological leveling) tended to be replaced by the present in *-ějQ* (Vaillant 1966, 450)

the imperative stem in *-ě-*: OCS *iměi*, Cz *měj*, Pol. *miej* (2 sg)

6.1. Current distribution

- The archaic (athematic) (van Wijk 1929):
Slov *iměti* : *imam*
Cz *míti* : *mám*
P *mieć* : *mam*
USo *měć* : *mam*
LSo *měš* : *mam*
- Russian dialects had steadily followed the new pattern with *-ě-*:
MoR *imet’* : *imeju*

- West Slavic preserved the initial *i* in historical reflexes of **jimati* and in **jiměti* this sound followed subsequently the line of development of the *jers* in weak positions (Shevelov 1965, 441):

P *imać* ‘take, catch’ vs. *mieć* ‘have’

Plb *jáimq* vs. *met*

LSo *jimaś* vs. LSo *měś*

USo *jimać* vs. *měć*

Slk *imat’* vs. *mat’*

Cz *jimati* vs. *míti*

- *maty* in Ukrainian and *mec’* ‘have’ in Belarusian (14th-15th cc.) as a result of partial overlapping of the imperfectives *iměti* ‘have’ and *imati* ‘take’ and in the latter, of the verbs **jimō* and **jimati* (see paradigms without duals in (10):

| | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 11) | OR <i>iměti</i> ‘have’ | | OR <i>jati</i> ‘take’ |
| | 1 sg <i>imamъ</i> | pl <i>imamъ</i> | <i>imu imemъ</i> |
| | 2 sg <i>imaši</i> | pl <i>imate</i> | <i>imeši imete</i> |
| | 3 sg <i>imatъ</i> | pl <i>imutъ</i> | <i>imetъ imutъ</i> |
| | MoU ‘have’ | | MoU <i>jati</i> (in agglutination only with synthetic future forms) |
| | 1 sg <i>maju</i> | pl. <i>majemo</i> | <i>-mu -memo</i> |
| | 2 sg <i>maješ</i> | pl. <i>majemo</i> | <i>-meš -mete</i> |
| | 3 sg <i>maje</i> | pl. <i>majut’</i> | <i>-me -mut’</i> |

7. *Iměti* in Old Church Slavonic and East Slavic

Constructions with *iměti* in OCS texts are largely loan translations from Greek constructions with ἔχειν. However, all phraseological units of *iměti* cited in *Lexicon linguae palaeoslavicae* (LLP), differ structurally from their Greek counterparts:

- 12) OCS *zavistī* (envy-acc. sg. f.) *imějōštīimŭ* (have-PrAP dat. pl. m.)
 ‘τῶν φθονουμένων’ (Supr. 403:5)

OCS *bolezni* (sickness-acc. pl. f.) *iměje* (have-PrAP nom. sg. m.)
 ‘ἀλγυνόμενος’ (Supr. 335:13)

OCS *ne* (not) *imy* (have-PrAP nom. sg. m.) *very* (trust-gen. sg. f.)
 ‘θραυμάζων’ (Supr. 224:12)

The latter unit is obviously Slavic proper (MoU *jnjaty vry* ‘trust’). Similar old constructions, inherited in all likelihood from late Common Slavic, were well integrated in the vernacular(s)

OCS Luke as compared with the Czech and Bulgarian translations (Přikrylová 1998):

- 1) constructions with the verb ‘have’, both in the OCS *Vorlage* and in its translations
- 2) constructions with *iměti*, only in the OCS text
- 3) constructions with the verb ‘have’, attested only in the translations
- 4) the use of the verb ‘have’ either in Czech or Bulgarian translation

The use of *iměti* in OCS, as well as its development from a purely possessive meaning to manifold grammatical (modal, temporal) functions in Czech and Bulgarian, should be conceived as internally motivated

Old Novgorodian examples:

- 13) ONovg *citŭ* (what-acc.) *do mĭnŭ* (to me) *zŭla* (offence-gen.sg.) *imeeši* (have-pres. 2 sg.)
‘what offence do you have to me?’ (Letter A7, no 752, ca 1080-1100)
- 14) ONovg *ne* (not) *imamŭ* (have-pres. 1 sg.) *vŭlosti* (goods-gen. sg. f.)
‘I do not have any worldly goods [except you]’ (Letter 503) (Zaliznjak 1995, 229, 262)

The development of the verb ‘have’, attested already in Old East Slavic records, should be conceived of qualitatively, rather than quantitatively. The verb ‘have’, though tending to give way under influence of the construction *u menja jest*’ did not vanish either in the standard language or in the vernacular. This verb proves to have gone through a re-distribution and, as a result, narrowed its functions (Safarewiczowa 1964)

8. Grammaticalization of ‘have’ in Old Church Slavonic

Parameters of grammaticalization:

- extension (or context generalization): use in new contexts suggests new meaning
- desemanticization (or ‘semantic bleaching’), i.e., loss in meaning content
- decategorialization, i.e., loss in morphosyntactic properties characteristic of lexical or other less grammaticalized forms
- erosion (or ‘phonetic reduction’), i.e., loss in phonetics substance (Andersen; Heine, Kuteva)

Paraphrases of the type:

imamŭ (1 sg.) (*iměti*) ‘have’ + inf.

xoštŭ (1 sg.) (*xotěti/xŭtěti*) ‘want, will’ + inf. (Večerka 1993, 175)

Modality of *imamŭ* was difficult to distinguish from the temporal meaning proper in most of the contexts:

- 15) OCS *to kako imamŭ* (have-pres. 1 sg.) *razuměti* (understand-impf)
‘how have I to understand that’ (*καὶ πῶς ἔχομεν γινῶναι*)

(Večerka 1993, 179)

Not influenced by Greek, the future time reference seems to be exemplified by a well-known paraphrase with a non-finite lexical verb as found in the Ostromir Gospel of 1056-57:

- 16) OCS *vьsa jeliko imaaši prodaždь i razdai ništiimъ*
all much have-pres. 2sg sell-impr 2sg and give-impr 2sg poor-dat. pl.
iměti imaaši sьkrovišče na n/e/b/e/se (EO, 111a, 77b)
have-inf have:to-pres. 2sg. treasure-acc.sg.n. on haven-loc. sg. n.
πάντα ὅσα ἔχεις πώλησον καὶ διάδος πτωχοῖς,
καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῶ.
‘sell that thou hast, and give to the poor’ (Mt 19:21)

9. Grammaticalization of ‘have’ in East Slavic

The paraphrases based on the de-modal extension of *iměti* ‘have’ were attested in all the East Slavic languages (Křížková 1960, 116-20)

In Middle Russian, that type was stylistically marked (Church Slavonic and bookish)
In Ruthenian (Middle Ukrainian and Belarusian), this type was commonplace, competing with other (indigenous) constructions based on various de-modal and de-phasal extensions

9.1. De-modal extensions of *iměti/maty* ‘have’ in Ukrainian/Belarusian

Independent paraphrases commonly attested in various registers and genres:

- 17) MUkr. *ne maju toho rušyty* (Charter of 1347)
not have:to-pres. 1sg. that-acc.gen. m. violate
‘I must not violate that [bill of sale]’

No future tense categorization due to incomplete grammaticalization

9.2. De-phasal extensions of *iměti* ‘have’ in East Slavic

- East Slavic paraphrases with the inceptive phasal perfective *jati* ‘take’, not found in West and South Slavic, cf. *-čati* ‘begin’ (*načati, počati, učati*) which came into use somewhat later
- In some Russian territories the auxiliary *jati* followed by an infinitive of the main verb was commonly used in reference to the future till the sixteenth century and is sporadically attested in some modern dialects (Křížková 1960, 128-29). The competing formation *budu* + INF prevailed in literary Russian from the early sixteenth century

- o Attested in southern Belarusian in parallel use with *budu* (fut.1 sg.) + INF:

18) Be dial. *icimu* from *ici* + *(i)mu*
 ‘I will go’ go-inf. take:fut. 1 sg

9.3. De-phasal extensions of *iměti/maty* ‘have’ in Ukrainian

The de-phasal construction with *jati* ‘take’ was used in Ukrainian (and Belarusian) from the 14th c. onward, concurrently with the PF *budu* + INF (Bevzenko *et al.* 1978)
 These two imperfective futures are considered today stylistic variants in some textbooks and grammars

Morphonological and semantic overlapping of the verbs *iměti* ‘have’ and *imati/jati* ‘take’ is found in the homonymic *imutʹ* (2 pl.) from both *iměti* and *jati*:

19) MUkr. *a u kotoromʹ torhu imutʹ ix*
 and in which-loc. sg. Market-loc. sg. m. have/take-pres. 3 pl. them
kupiti tamʹ imutʹ dati [...] po četyry hroši (15th c.)
 buy-inf.prf. there have:to-pres. 3 pl.give-inf.prf. by four *grosh*-dat. sg. m
 ‘And in which market they will buy them [horses], they have to/will pay four *groshes*’

9. 4. Distribution of the de-phasal reflexes: clitic vs. affix

- The next round in the grammaticalization process was heralded by the postposition of the auxiliary that had been used as a free form till the 15th c.
- Appearance of the postverbal auxiliary with clitic properties (Franks and King 2000, 196-7) in the 16th c.
- The auxiliary clitic is used in the so-called synthetic (de-inceptive) future today either
 - autonomously in Southwest Ukrainian
 - a) *pysaty* (write) *mu* (take-fut. 1 sg.) VClitic
 - b) *mu* (take-fut. 1 sg.) *pysaty* (write) CliticV
 ‘I shall write’
 - or being agglutinated with the infinitive in Southeast (standard) Ukrainian
pysatymu (write-inf:take-fut. 1 sg.) Verb+Affix?
 ‘I shall write’

9.5. The Ukrainian synthetic future vs. the Serbian future

The word > inflected clitic > suffix grammaticalization for Serbian/Croatian (Andersen 2008: 27):

- 20) Serb *hoć-u pisati* > *pisati*=*hć-u* fut. > *piša=ć-u* fut. 1sg.
‘I want to write’ > ‘I will/shall write’
- Ukrainian exhibits a limited morphological and morphosyntactic univerbation. With the auxiliary-turned-clitic in Southwest Ukrainian, the process of grammaticalization stopped short of transforming the auxiliary clitic into a true affix in Southeast Ukrainian
 - Both *měti* : *mamъ* ‘have’ (MoUkr. *maty* ‘have’ and ‘have to’) and *jati* : *mu* ‘take’ underwent phonetic erosion long before the emergence of the synthetic future. Erosion ultimately strengthened the desemantization of the said two verbs in Ukrainian
- 21) a. U *ja maju* (have-pres. 1sg.) *budynok* (house-acc. sg. m.)
‘I have a house’
- b. U *ja maju* (have:to-pres. 1sg.) *bihty* (run-inf.imprf.)
‘I have to hurry up’

10. The East Slavic resultative

Is Russian a solid *be*-language?

- 22) a. R dial. *u* (at) *nego* (he-gen.) *ujexano* (PPP 3 sg. n.)
‘he has left’
- b. R dial. *u* (at) *nego* (he-gen.) *pole* (field-nom./acc. sg. n.) *zasejano* (sow-PPP 3 sg. n.)
‘he has sown the field’

Similar constructions are found in Belarusian and Ukrainian:

- 23) a. U dial. *u* (at) *nas* (we-gen) *vyorano* (sow-PPP 3 sg. n.)
‘we have ploughed’
- b. U dial. *u* (at) *nas* (we-gen) *pole* (field-acc. sg. n.) *vyorano* (sow-PPP 3 sg. n.)
‘we have ploughed the field’

Russian dialectal constructions with *u* plus the genitive which refer to an agent-salient participant downgraded to a possessor, are innovations (19th to 20th c). They are also found in the dialects adjacent to those which demonstrate *i*-less forms of the possessive verb ‘have’ (Kuz’mina 1993,136, map 7)

All the East Slavic languages demonstrate *two types* of possessive patterning based on an active and stative relational structures, whence *the new West/South Slavic perfect* vs. *the East Slavic resultative*

11. Possessive patterning in East Slavic

The two possessive patternings are to be explained sociolinguistically (cf. Du Bois 1987):

- 1) The *be*-oriented patterning is likely to be realized in spoken discourse with a large amount of active background information, whence, for example, the use of constructions with *byt'* 'be' and the prepositional phrase *u* plus the genitive case in the Russian, and partly in Ukrainian and Belarusian vernaculars, as well as the emergence of the Russian resultative in isolated and small linguistic communities in the North at the turn of the 20th c.
- 2) The *have*-patterning is highly predictable in non-spoken (written) discourse, which implies communication in a large community with much less shared background information, whence the bookish use of *iměti* in the history of literary East Slavic languages.

12. Conclusions

- The history of Russian shows a gradual penetration of the verb 'have' into its linguistic system under the influence of information flow in discourse within a particular linguistic community. This wholly indigenous process could have brought about a historic redistribution of *be*- and *have*-constructions, the former being preserved in the vernacular (spoken discourse) and the latter being mostly used in the literary language (written discourse)
- Taken geographically, the Russian language falls conspicuously into two complementary dialectal zones, which may be roughly labeled Northern and Southern Russian. The former zone displays a strong inclination toward a syntactic patterning on the basis of 'be', while the latter zone is characterized by a haphazard distribution of both *be*- and *have*-constructions
- Southern Russian, however, demonstrates sporadically some morphonological (the rise of *i*-less forms like *mec'* : *maju*) and morphosyntactic features proper to Ukrainian and Belarusian which display almost a parallel use of the two possessive patternings. Ukrainian is characterized by a split in possessive patterning, with the use of predominantly *be*-constructions in the east under a possible influence from modern Russian literary norms, and with the prevailing use of *have*-constructions in the west, provoked by Polish traditions
- Generally, East Slavic appears typologically heterogeneous with regard to possessive patterning. One can speak of a twofold split linguistic system which (dialectally or discourse-pragmatically) may exhibit either *be*- or *have*-patterning

References

- Andersen, Henning. 2006. 'Periphrastic futures in Slavic. Divergence and convergence'. In Eksell, Kerstin & Thora Vinther (eds.). *Change in Verbal Systems. Issues in Explanation*. Bern: Peter Lang, 9-45.
- Andersen, Henning. 2008. Grammaticalization in a speaker-oriented theory of change. In: Eythórsson, Thórhallur (ed.). *Grammatical Change and Linguistic Theory. The Rosendal papers*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 11-44.
- Bauer, Brigitte. 2000. *Archaic Syntax in Indo-European. The Spread of Transitivity in Latin and French*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1966. "Être" et "avoir" dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. In: Benveniste, Émile. *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Paris: Gallimard, 187-07 [reprint of 1960].
- Bevzenko, S. P. et al. 1978. *Istorija ukrajins'koji movy. Morfolohija*. Kyiv: Naukova dumka.
- Danylenko, Andrii. 2002. The East Slavic 'have': revising a developmental scenario. In: Jones-Bley, K. et al. (eds.). *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference. Los Angeles, November 9-10, 2001*. Washington, D.C., 105-27 (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series. 44).
- Danylenko, Andrii. 2003. *Predykaty, vidminly i diatezy v ukrajins'kij movi: istoryčnyj i typolohičnyj aspekty*. Xarkiv: Oko.
- Danylenko, Andrii. 2005. Is there any possessive perfect in North Russian? *Word* 56 (3), 347-79.
- Danylenko, Andrii. 2006. *Slavica et Islamica. Ukrainian in Context*. München: Otto Sagner Verlag.
- Dingley, John. 1995. *Iměti* in the Laurentian redaction of the Primary Chronicle. In: *The Language and Verse of Russia: In Honor of Dean S. Worth on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Henrik Birnbaum and Michael S. Flier (eds.). Moscow: Vostočnaya Literatura Publishers, 80-87.
- Du Bois, John W. 1987. The discourse basis of ergativity. *Language* 63: 805-55.
- Endzelin, Janis. 1922. *Lettische Grammatik*. Rīga: A. Gulbis.
- Faßke, Helmut and Siegfried Michalk. 1980. *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Morphologie*. Leipzig: VEB Domowina-Verlag.
- Fennell, Trevor G. and Henry Gelsen. 1980. *A Grammar of Modern Latvian*. Vol. 1. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1983. From pragmatics to grammar. *Lingua* 60, 183–214.
- Franks, Steven and Tracy Golloway King. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fraenkel, Ernst. 1929. *Syntax der litauischen Postpositionen und Präpositionen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession. Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2006. *The Changing Languages of Europe*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press
- Isačenko, Alexander V. 1974. On 'have' and 'be' languages (a typological sketch). In: *Slavic Forum: Essays in Linguistics and Literature*, Michael S. Flier (ed.). The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 43-77.
- Ivanov Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič et al. (eds.). 1989. *Kategorija posessivnosti v slavjanskix i balkanskix jazykax*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Justus, Carol F. 1999a. The Arrival of Italic and Germanic 'have' in late Indo-European. In: *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, 1998* (= Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 32), Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angella Della Volpe, and Miriam Robbins Dexter. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 77-94.

- Justus, Carol F. 1999b. Indo-European 'have': a Grammatical Etymology. In: *Language Change and Typological Variation: in honor of Winfred P. Lehmann's 83rd birthday*. Vol. 2, (= Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph 31), C. J. Justus and Edgar C. Polomé (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 613-41.
- Koneski, Blaže. 1967. *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.
- Křížková, Helena. 1960. *Vývoj opisného futura v jazycích slovanských, zvláště v ruštině*. Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství (Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis. Fakultas Philosophica 4. Philologica 11).
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. 1931. Les temps composés du roman. *Prace filologiczne* 15 (2):448-53.
- Kurzová, Helena. 1999. Syntax in the Indo-European Morphosyntactic Type. In: *Language Change and Typological Variation: in honor of Winfred P. Lehmann's 83rd birthday*. Vol. 2, (= Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph 31), C. J. Justus and Edgar C. Polomé (eds.). Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man, 501-520.
- Kuz'mina, Irina Borisovna. 1993. *Sintaksis russkix govorov v lingvogeografičeskom aspekte*. Moscow: Nauka.
- LLP = Kutz, J. (ed.). 1958-1977. *Slovník jazyka staroslovenského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae*, 4 vols. Praha: Academia.
- Mathesius, Vilém. 1925. Slovesné časy typu perfektního v hovorové češtině. *Naše řeč* 9 (7):200-02.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1923. Le développement du verbe 'avoir'. In *Antidōron. Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres am 11. Dezember 1923 gewidmet von Schülern, Freunden und Kollegen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 9-13.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1924. *Le slave commun*. Paris: Champion.
- Mrázek, Roman. 1973. Funkční distribuce habere a esse v slovanské vete. In: *Československé přednášky pro VII. mezinárodní sjezd slavistů ve Varšavě. Lingvistika*. Praha: Akademia, 175-180.
- Ostr. (Vostokov, Aleksandr Xristoforovič, ed.). 1843. *Ostromirovo Èvangelie 1056-57 goda*. St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaja Akademiya nauk.
- Pinkster, Harm. 1987. 'The strategy and chronology of the development of future and perfect tense auxiliaries in Latin'. In: Haris, Martin and Paolo Ramat (eds.). *Historical developments of auxiliaries*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 193-223.
- Příkrylová, Milena. 1998. Sémantika konstrukcí se slovesem *mít* ve staroslovenských biblických textech a vývoj těchto konstrukcí do češtiny a bulharištiny. *Slavia* 67 (1-2): 67-72.
- Rouveret, Alain (ed.). 1998. "*Être*" et "*avoir*". *Syntax, sémantique, typologie*. Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.
- Safarewiczowa, Halina. 1964. *Oboczność я имею i у меня есть w języku rosyjskim dziś i dawnej* (= Polska Akademia Nauk – Oddział w Krakowie. Prace komisji językoznawstwa 3). Wrocław: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich.
- Shevelov, George, Y. 1965. *A Prehistory of Slavic: The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Shevelov, George Y. 1979. *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Vaillant, André. 1966. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Vol. 3: *Le verbe*. Paris: C. Klincksieck.
- Večerka, Radoslav. 1993. *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax*. Vol. 2: *Die innere Satzstruktur*. Freiburg im Breisgau: U.W. Weiher.
- Wijk, van N. 1929. Zu den Verbaldubletten auf *-ajō, -ati; -ějō, -ěti*. *Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie* 6:70-74.
- Zaliznjak, Andrej Anatol'jevič. 1995. *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. Moscow: Nauka.