

ESSES AND HABERES IN SLAVIC BE- AND HAVE-LANGUAGES (PART 1)¹

Jungwon Chung
Yonsei University, South Korea

Статья посвящена особенностям славянских глаголов *иметь* и *быть*, чьи лексические и грамматические функции сопоставляются в русском, польском, чешском, болгарском и сербскохорватском языках. Работа состоит из двух частей. В первой части рассматриваются вопросы функционирования славянских *иметь*. В польском, чешском, болгарском и сербскохорватском языках глаголы *иметь* отличаются высокой частотностью и широким употреблением. Они выражают possessive отношение как в узком, так и в широком смысле и выполняют важные грамматические функции, такие как экзистенциальная, модальная и вспомогательная (для образования перфекта). Употребление русского глагола *иметь* ограничено устойчивыми словосочетаниями, определенными синтаксическими конструкциями и стилями, причем этот глагол не выполняет никакой грамматической функции.

This two-part article examines the characteristics and peculiarities of the Slavic *haberes* and *esses*, comparing their lexical and grammatical functions, especially in Russian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BSC. Part 1 of the article explores, above all, how these Slavic *haberes* serve as a content and function word. The Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BCS *haberes* are used very widely and frequently. Their *haberes* refer to possessive relations in both narrow and wide senses and have significant grammatical functions, such as an existential sentence marker, a modal verb, and a perfect tense auxiliary. On the other hand, the Russian *habere* is more restricted to idiomatic expressions, specific styles and syntactic constructions, and does not have any grammatical function.

Keywords: Slavic, have, be, language classification, be-language, have-language

1. Slavic *be-* and *have-*languages

The Indo-European *esse* and *habere* are considered to be basic words, embracing a wide range of lexical meanings and grammatical functions as a hypernym of semantically more complicated words. These two basic verbs are closely related to each other and can describe the same situation: if a certain object is located in a certain place, i.e. A IS at B, the place contains the object in its domain, i.e. B HAS A.

Discussing the correlation of *esse* and *habere*, Benveniste (1966: 196) asserts that the Indo-European *esse*-based possessive construction had been

¹ I would like to express my gratitude to Juliia Arkhipova, Nargiza Azimova, Marzena Zgirska, Milvia Gulešić Machata, the anonymous reviewers and editors.

used before the *habere*-based one emerged, and the latter gradually took the former's place. In old Slavic languages, the newly appeared *habere* possessive construction also kept substituting the older *esse* type². Consequently, all contemporary Slavic languages with a national language status have a possessive construction with *habere*, but not all of them have one with *esse* (Chung 2018: 567).

Previously, the East Slavic possessive construction was not an exception to this general trend. The Ukrainian and Belarusian *haberes* expanded their sphere more or less under the Polish influence (Isačenko 1974: 73), though this tendency has been reversed in relatively recent times. The Modern Ukrainian and Belarusian possessive sentences with *esse* started to prosper again presumably under the Russian influence, and this revived construction has constantly impinged on the existing *habere*'s realm (Вячорка / Vjačorka 2015). At the present, both possessive constructions are equally accepted in these languages, and Ukrainian and Belarusian are in a transitional stage between *be*-languages and *have*-languages, as Isačenko (1974: 44) properly pointed out.

Old Russian texts testify that the Russian *habere* also penetrated into the written language to a considerable extent by the end of the 18th century (Isačenko 1974: 50-51). However, the Russian *habere*-based possessive sentences may not have been strong enough to take over the *esse*-based ones or *esse* may have gained strength to expand its sphere under the influence of geographically contiguous Uralic languages (Лермит / Lermi 1973, Thomason & Kaufman 1988:246, Вячорка / Vjačorka 2015, etc.). Whatever the reason might be, *esse* is presently the dominant verbal constituent of Russian possessive constructions, while *habere* is strictly restricted to formal and literary styles or certain idiomatic expressions. Thus, Russian unquestionably belongs to the *be*-language group.

The West and South Slavic languages predominantly employ *habere* to represent possessive relations and can be classified as *have*-languages. As for Polish, which Isačenko (1974: 44) categorizes as transitional, it also acts rather like a *have*-language, and I cannot find any reason to describe it as being in a shifting stage between *be*- and *have*-languages. In this regard, I argued against the claim that the relatively low barrier for a zero *esse* may endow Polish with a peripheral status as a *have*-language (Chung 2018).

This two-part article compares the use and functions of Slavic *haberes* and *esses*, especially in Russian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BSC, discovers which characteristics are peculiar to the Slavic *haberes* and *esses*, and decides which of their characteristics are relevant to the distinction between Slavic *have*- and *be*-languages. Though I cannot examine all Slavic languages in

² Isačenko (1974: 50–51) asserts that Slavic languages borrowed their *habere* construction from Greek, while Mladenova (Младенова 2018: 34) suggests that Slavic *habere* constructions spontaneously appeared due to the sematic relatedness of *esse* and *habere*.

detail, I will take more than one of East, West, and South Slavic examples into consideration, and I am sure that focusing on these five languages will not hinder us from grasping overall characteristics of the Slavic *esses* and *haberes*.

In Part 1, I will start, above all, with the characteristics and peculiarities of the Russian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BSC *haberes*.

2. Slavic *haberes*

As a content word, Slavic *haberes* refer to inalienable and alienable possessive relations, i.e. ownership, part-whole relation, kinship, social relationship, permanent, constant or temporary attributes, states, events, etc.

The Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BCS *haberes* are the only way to express more prototypical anthropocentric possessive relations, such as ownership, part-whole relation, kinship, social relationship, temporary event, etc. All sentences in (1), (2), and (3) do not have an *esse*-based equivalent.

- (1) a.Pl. (Ona)³ ma samochód.
b.Cz. (Ona) má auto.
c.BCS. (Ona) ima auto.
d. Bl. (Тя) има кола.
,She has a car.'
- (2) a.Pl. (Oni) maja dzieci.
b.Cz. (Oni) mají děti.
c. BCS. (Oni) imaju djecu.
d. Bl. (Те) имаг деца.
'They have children.'
- (3) a.Pl. Dziś (ja) mam zajęcia.
b.Cz. Dneska (já) mám vyučování.
c.BCS. Danas (ja) imam nastave.
d.Bl. Днес (аз) имам занятия.
'I have classes today.'

If an adjective modifier is added to the possessed noun, the Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BCS *habere* sentences can have synonymous *esse* counterparts, as (4) and (5) illustrate. These sentence pairs, however, are not completely identical. Above all, they differ in topics: the *habere* sentences are taking about the possessor, while their *esse*-based equivalents are about the possessed. Additionally, the possessed that is a grammatical subject of *esse* sentences is definite, which is marked out by the Bulgarian posterior definite articles (see *-me* (pl.) in (4d) and *-ят* (sing. masc.) in (5d)), while *habere*'s possessed

³ The parentheses in the illustrated sentences denote a preferred zero form including *pro-drop*.

object is indefinite. It is also noteworthy that, in (4), the *habere* sentences are preferred to describe a given body part's permanent attribute.

- (4) a. Pl. (On) ma niebieskie oczy. – Jego oczy są niebieskie.
 b. Cz. (On) má modré oči. – Jeho oči jsou modré.
 c. BCS. (On) ima plave oči. – Njegove oči su plave.
 d. Bl. (Той) има сини очи. – Неговите очи са сини.
 ‘He has blue eyes. – His eyes are blue.’
- (5) a. Pl. (On) ma mądrego przyjaciela. – Jego przyjaciel jest mądry.
 b. Cz. (On) má chytrého přítele. – Jeho přítel je chytrý.
 c. BCS. (On) ima pametnog prijatelja. – Njegov prijatelj je pametan.
 d. Bl. (Той) има умен приятел. – Приятелят му е умен.
 ‘He has a smart friend. – His friend is smart.’

Slavic *haberes* can render peripheral possessive relations, such as possessing an abstract quality. The *habere* sentence with an abstract noun complement is rather a secondary means to refer to the subject's personal qualities, which are generally described in an *esse* sentence with a predicate adjective. Therefore, the given Polish, Czech, BCS, and Bulgarian *habere* constructions are less frequent in use than their *esse* counterparts, and generally, not all abstract nouns can be *habere*'s complement⁴.

- (6) a. Pl. (On) ma mądrość Salomona. – (On) jest mądry jak Salomon.
 b. Cz. (On) má moudrost Šalamounovu. – (On) je moudrý jako Šalamoun.
 c. BCS. (On) ima mudrost Salomonovu. – (On) je mudar kao Salomon.
 d. Bl. (Той) има мъдростта на Соломон. – (Той) е мъдър като Соломон.
 ‘He has the wisdom of Solomon. – He is as wise as Solomon.’

The Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BCS *haberes* also can indicate non-anthropocentric possessive relations. Some of these peripheral possessive constructions with an inanimate subject sound natural, but others do not, as the Slavic *habere* sentences in (7) and (8) illustrate. The *habere* sentences of (7) differ from those of (8) in that their possessive relations last longer, and their possessed is more difficult to separate from their possessor. In other words, the Slavic *habere*'s subject and object in (7a-d) represent a part-whole relation, while those in (8a-d) do not represent a possessive relation even in the widest sense and should be replaced by a corresponding existential sentence⁵.

⁴ (a) and (b) illustrate that certain abstract nouns are inappropriate or less appropriate as a Polish *habere*'s complement (Lempp 1986: 36-48). (b) becomes appropriate, if the nouns accompany modifiers, as in (6a).

(a) Pl. *(On) ma nachalność/próżność. ‘He has impudence/vanity.’

(b) Pl. ? (On) ma mądrość/ślepotę/chorobę. ‘He has wisdom/blindness/illness.’

(c) Pl. (On) ma śmiałość/przyszłość. ‘He has courage/ a future.’

⁵ The Bulgarian and BCS present existential sentences contain *habere*.

- (7) a. Pl. Pokój ma okno. – W pokoju jest okno.
 b. Cz. Místnost má okno. – V místnosti je okno.
 c. BCS. Soba ima prozor. – U sobi ima prozor.
 d. Bl. Стаята има прозорец. – В стаята има прозорец.
 ‘The room has a window. – There is a window in the room.’

- (8) a. Pl. ??*Garaż ma samochód. – W garażu jest samochód.
 b. Cz. ??*Garáž má auto. – V garáži je auto.
 c. BCS. ??*Garaža ima auto. – U garaži ima auta.
 d. Bl. ??*Гараж има кола. – В гаража има кола.
 ‘The garage has a car. – There is a car in the garage.’

On the other hand, Russian, as an authentic Slavic *be*-language, does not have a preference for a *habere*-based possessive construction⁶.

In Modern Russian, *иметь* ‘to have’ matches mostly with abstract nouns (e.g. *честь* ‘honor’, *способность* ‘ability’, *талант* ‘talent’, *счастье* ‘happiness’, *вес* ‘weight’, *авторитет* ‘authority’, *репутация* ‘reputation’, *отношение* ‘relation’, *влияние* ‘influence’, *возможность* ‘possibility’, *понятие* ‘concept’, *терпение* ‘patience’, etc.), some concrete nouns (e.g. *деньги* ‘money’, *дом* ‘house’, *машина* ‘car’, *друзья* ‘friends’, etc.), and measure nouns (e.g. *длина* ‘length’, *ширина* ‘width’, *глубина* ‘depth’, etc.) (Isačenko 1974: 51–52).

The Russian *habere* is also necessary in some specific syntactic structures, such as infinitives, imperatives, participles, and adverbial participles (Safarewiczowa 1964: 9).

(9) a. Ru. Надо иметь благорасположение к пассажиру, а кой-кого даже и провезти бесплатно. (Паустовский) ‘One should have a good will for the passenger, even letting him pass for free.’

b. Ru. Через его руки проходили части механизма, не имевшие названия. (Панова)
 ‘The parts of the mechanism that had no name were passing through his hands.’

c. Ru. Ты ведешь арьергардные бои, имея на плечах неразбитого противника. (А. Толстой.) ‘You lead a rearguard action, having the defeated enemy on your shoulders.’

d. Ru. погоди, имей терпение. (Гончаров) ‘Wait, have patience.’

Except for these restricted cases, it is generally better to replace the Russian *habere* with the overt or covert *esse*, accompanied by “*y* + gen.” or locative adverbials.

⁶ Other Slavic languages also have an *esse*-based possessive construction (Иванов / Ivanov 1989: 168–169, Kuna 2012: 56–57), but this construction is very uncommon in these languages.

(a) Cz. Je i u nás dokonce Kreml. ‘We even have Kremlin. (lit. By us is even Kremlin)’

(b) Pl. U jednego był długi muszkiet. ‘One of them had a long musket. (lit. By one was a long musket)’

(c) BCS. U nje su crne oči i crne kose. ‘She has black eyes and black hair. (lit. By her are black eyes and black hair.)’

In the Russian equivalents to (1)-(5), the *esse* sentences sound more natural, more “Russian”, and more neutral in style, while the *habere* sentences are inappropriate, unnatural or restricted to official or literary styles. Russians tend to regard these *habere* variants as awkward sentences uttered by non-native speakers of Russian.

- (1) e. Ru. Она имеет машину. – У неё есть машина.
‘She has a car. – lit. By her is⁷ a car.’
- (2) e. Ru. ?Они имеют детей. -У них есть дети.
‘They have children. – lit. By them are children.’
- (3) e. Ru. *?Сегодня я имею занятия - Сегодня у меня ⁸ занятия.
‘Today I have lessons. lit. Today by me (are) lessons’
- (4) e. Ru. ?Он имеет голубые глаза.-У него голубые глаза⁹.
‘He has blue eyes. – lit. By him (are) blue eyes.’
- (5) e. Ru. ?Он имеет умного друга.- У него (есть) умный друг.
‘He has a clever friend. – lit. By him is a clever friend.’

When the subject possesses an abstract quality, the Russian *habere* sentence sounds more natural than in (2e-5e) and often can substitute its corresponding *esse* sentence (Dulewiczowa 1981: 103). However, this does not mean that *иметь* ‘to have’ is favored over *быть* ‘to be’ or *обладать*, i.e. another possessive verb preferred to describe personal qualities in formal or literary style. On the other hand, the possessive *esse* variant with “y + gen.” here, e.g. (6f), is employed less than the copular *esse* with a predicative adjective, e.g. (6g), for an adjective fits better to an abstract feature description than a noun.

⁷ I added a literal translation to the Russian *esse* possessive sentences to make it clearer that the unmarked Russian possessive contains *esse*.

⁸ The Russian present *esse* possessive sentences can contain a zero *esse*, and in this article, I mark the obligatory zero *esses* (i.e. the “zero lexes” in the terms of Mel’čuk (Мельчук 1995:179)) with an underlined blank (). The Slavic zero *esses* were discussed in more detail in another article (Chung 2018).

⁹ If you change this body-part sentence’s word order, its meaning also slightly changes. For example, the typical possessive sentence (a) talks about Masha while the copular sentence (b) – about her eyes. On the other hand, (c) does not sound natural because the bare genitive without the proposition *y* is not suitable for describing an inalienable body part’s permanent state (Мельчук / Mel’čuk 1995: 141, 159-161).

(a) Ru. У **Маши**_{gen.} были голубые глаза. ‘Masha had blue eyes. (lit. By Masha were blue eyes)’

(b) Ru. Глаза у **Маши**_{gen.} были голубые. ‘Masha’s eyes were blue. (lit. The eyes at Masha were blue)’

(c) Ru. ?Глаза **Маши**_{gen.} были голубые. ‘Masha’s eyes were blue. (lit. The eyes of Masha were blue)’

(6) e. Ru. Он имеет мудрость Соломона./Он обладает мудростью Соломона. ‘He has the wisdom of Solomon.’

f. Ru. У него есть мудрость Соломона. ‘lit. By him is the wisdom of Solomon’

g. Ru. Он мудр, как Соломон. ‘He (is) as wise as Solomon.’

The Russian *habere* construction can contain an inanimate subject in formal and literary styles, only if the subject and the object make a part-whole relation, as in (7e), although still the *habere* sentence is not favored over its *esse* counterpart. It should be also noted that the appropriate *esse* construction here begins with locative adverbials, inasmuch as the Russian “y + gen.” possessive construction generally does not allow an inanimate possessor¹⁰.

(7) e. Ru. ? Комната имеет окно. - *У комнаты есть окно. – В комнате есть окно.
‘The room has a window. – There is a window in the room.’

(8) e. Ru. *Гараж имеет машину. *У гаража есть машина. – В гараже есть машина.
‘The garage has a car. – There is a car in the garage.’

The Russian *иметь* sounds natural and neutral when it describes an ownership, as in (1e), i.e. a constant possessive relation not restricted to a specific space or time. To wit, you can say both (10a) and (10b) when Ivan had a car, but you cannot say (10a) if he did not own a car. For the same reason, you cannot add an adverbial denoting the object’s temporary location to the *иметь* sentence (11b).

(10) a. Ru. Вчера Иван имел машину. (Harves & Kayne 2012: 123, footnote 4)

b. Ru. Вчера у Ивана была машина.

‘Yesterday Ivan had a car.’

(11) a. Ru. У Ивана есть своя машина (у родителей/ в гараже).(Chvany 1975: 100)
‘Ivan has a car of his own (at his parents’/in the garage).’

b. Ru. Иван имеет свою машину (*у родителей/ *в гараже).

‘Ivan has own car (at his parents’/in the garage).’

Unlike the Russian *habere* stuck in the possessive relation in a narrow sense, the Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BCS *haberes* expand their semantic horizons beyond the core sense of ownership and can even encroach on other verbs’ semantic boundaries.

¹⁰ A reviewer pointed out that the “y + gen.” construction sometimes contains an inanimate possessor, as in (a). I assume that the inanimate object is personified here and this makes “y + gen.” sound natural. These kinds of sentences need further discussion.

(a) Ru. У этой старинной вещи (есть) своя история. ‘This old stuff has its own story/history (lit. By this old stuff (is) its own story/history)’

For instance, the Polish *mieć*, the Czech *mít*, and the Bulgarian *имам* can be read as ‘to consider, to regard’¹¹. Not only the Russian *habere* but also its possessive *esse* do not have this interpretation.

- (12) a.Pl. (Ja) mam cię za geniusza. ‘I consider you as a genius.’ (Lempp 1986: xiv)
b.Cz. (Oni) mają ho za blázna. ‘They take him for a crazy person.’ (Clancy 2010: 239)
c. Bl. (Аз) ИМАМ го за верен човек. ‘I regard him as trustworthy.’

In addition, the Polish, Czech, BCS, and Bulgarian *haberes* can mean ‘to wear’. In Russian, only the *esse* possessive construction holds this meaning.

- (13) a. Pl. (Ona) ma na sobie piękną suknię. (lit. She has a beautiful dress on herself.)
b.Cz. (Ona) má na sobě krásné šaty. (lit. She has a beautiful dress on herself.)
c. BCS. (Ona) ima na sebi lijepu halinu. (lit. She has a beautiful dress on herself.)
d Bl. (Тя) има красива рокля. (lit. She has a beautiful dress)
e. Ru. У неё __ красивое платье. (lit. By her (is) a beautiful dress.)
‘She wears a beautiful dress.’

The Polish, Bulgarian, Czech, and BCS age expressions can contain *habere*. Bulgarian, Czech, and BCS additionally have an *esse*-based age expression, which is a marked marginal variant in Bulgarian and BCS¹² but is a more frequently used unmarked variant in Czech. Polish does not have an *esse*-based age expression, while the Russian age expression can only have an impersonal *esse*, accompanied by a dative subject.

- (14) Pl. (Ja) mam 20 lat. (lit. I have 20 years.)
BCS. (Ja) imam 20 godina (lit. I have 20 years.)- (Ja) sam u 20. godini. (lit. I am at 20 years.)
Bl. (Аз) ИМАМ 20 години. (lit. I have 20 years.) – (Аз) СЪМ на 20 години. (lit. I am at 20 years.)
Cz. Je mi 20 let. (lit. To me (it) is 20 years.)- (Já) mám 20 let. (lit. I have 20 years.)
Ru. Мне __ 20 лет. (lit. To me (it) (is) 20 years.)
‘I am 20 years old.’

Furthermore, Slavic *haberes* can serve as a function word that is undergoing a grammaticalization or has already completed it.

Some Slavic existential sentences contain *habere*, although existence is one of the most basic references of *esse* in many languages¹³. The Bulgarian

¹¹ The BCS *habere* can bear this meaning in some regions.

(a) BCS. (Vi) ne možete ih imati za zlo. ‘You cannot consider them as a bad thing.’

¹² The BCS and Bulgarian *esse* variants can be read as ‘I turned 20 / I have reached 20 years old’.

¹³ This is not peculiar to Slavic languages. The French, Spanish, and Portuguese existential sentences also contain *habere*: fr. *il y a* ‘(lit.) it there has’, sp. *hay* ‘(it) has’, port. *tem* ‘(it) has’.

and Macedonian positive *има-* and negative *няма-* (Bl) and *нема-* (Mc) are the only means to indicate an object's existence and non-existence in all tenses¹⁴.

(15) a. Bl. Има мляко в хладилника. - Няма мляко в хладилника.

b. Mc. Има млеко во ладилникот. - Нема млеко во ладилникот.

'There is/isn't milk in the refrigerator. (lit. (It) has/doesn't have milk in the refrigerator).'

The BCS negative and affirmative existential sentences generally contain *habere* in the present tense¹⁵. The BCS present existential *esse* also is possible but very marginal¹⁶(Birtić 2001: 9-10), while the past and future existential sentences only contain *esse*.

(16) BCS. U hladnjaku ima mlijeka_{gen}. - U hladnjaku nema mlijeka_{gen}.

'There is / isn't milk in the refrigerator. (lit. (It) has / doesn't have milk in the refrigerator).'

The Polish, Ukrainian, and Belarusian present existential sentences also contain *habere* but only in the negative construction. All positive existential sentences and negative past and future existential sentences should contain *esse*.

(17) a. Pl. W lodówce nie ma mleka_{gen}.

b. Uk. В холодильнику немає молока_{gen}.

c. Bel. У халадзільніку няма малака_{gen}.

'There isn't milk in the refrigerator. (lit. (It) doesn't have milk in the refrigerator).'

Moreover, Slavic *haberes* can function as a tense marker. The Bulgarian and Macedonian grammatical markers for the negative future tense *няма да* (Bl), *нема да* (Mc) 'will not' and the negative future in the past *нямаше да* (Bl), *немаше да* (Mc) 'would not' contain *habere*.

(18) a. Bl. Няма да гледам_{1st.sg.} този филм.

'I am not going to watch this film.'

b. Bl. Ако ме нямаше мене Земята, нямаше как да поникнат цветята.

'If there wasn't me, the Earth, there would be no way for the flowers to grow.'

¹⁴ The Macedonian existential can contain *esse* if it follows *може да* 'can' (Maksimowska et als. 1981: 149), and the same holds for the Bulgarian existential.

(a) Mc. (Секој/тој) камен може да биде во (секоја/таа) вода. 'A (every/the) stone can be in (every / the) water.'

¹⁵ The BCS negative present existential sentences always have a genitive object, but the options are more complicated in the affirmative: a plural noun tends to take genitive, a countable singular noun – nominative and an uncountable noun can take either genitive or nominative. However, in practice, BCS present existential sentences predominantly contain a genitive object, and the data in a research even show that only 8 out of the 744 BCS *ima* existential sentences have a nominative object (Birtić 2001: 11, Kuna 2012: 59).

¹⁶ Most BCS speakers say (a) and only some Croatian speakers take the option (b), too (Birtić 2001: 10).

(a) BCS. Na stolu ima knjiga_{nom.sing.}. 'There is a book on the desk.'

(b) BCS. Na stolu je knjiga_{nom.sing.}.

Slavic *haberes*, like many other Indo-European counterparts, represent modality. For instance, the Polish *mieć* expresses necessity, intention, presumption, futurity, etc. or implicates a reported, unwitnessed speech (Świdarska-Koneczna 1930, Topolińska 1968: 427–429, Koseska-Toszewa 1983, Lempp 1988: 61–85).

(19) a. Pl. (Ty) masz **pójść** do domu! ‘You have to go home’ (Lempp 1988: 68)

b. Pl. (Ty) myślisz o podróży i o Spinozie....Ale mój drogi, (ty) miałeś przecież **mówić** o Amsterdamie. ‘You are thinking about the trip and Spinoza. But my dear, you wanted to talk about Amsterdam.’ (Lempp 1988: 74)

c. Pl. Wojtek ma się z nią **spotkać** o piątej. ‘Wojtek will meet her at five’ (Lempp 1988: 79)

d. Pl. Jan miał **wyjechać** z Warszawy. ‘Jan supposedly has left Warsaw’ (Lempp 1988: 65)

The Czech *mát*, the BCS *imati*, and the Bulgarian *умам* also function as a modal auxiliary. The Czech *habere*’s modal interpretations include deontic and epistemic necessities, epistemic possibility, and conditional.

(20) a. Cz. (Ty) máš **být** doma v sedm. (Clancy 2010: 215) ‘You are supposed to be home at seven.’

b. Cz. Má to **být** pěkný film. ‘It must be a beautiful film’

d. Cz. Zítra má **být** hezky. ‘It can be nice tomorrow.’

c. Cz. (Ty) Měl jsi tu **být** včas, (ty) byl bys to viděl. ‘If you had been here on time, you would have seen it.’

The BCS *habere*’s modal meanings are, among others, necessity and desire.

(21) a. BCS. (Ti) imaš to **uraditi**. ‘You must do it.’

b. BCS. Što (vi) imate **reći**? ‘What do you want to say?’

Unlike other Slavic languages where modal *haberes* are widely used and their primary modal meaning is necessity¹⁷, the Bulgarian *habere*’s modal usage is limited to colloquial language, and its most prominent modal meaning is futurity though the deontic modality interpretation is not excluded.

(22) Bl. Има да плаче_{3rd.pres.} за изгубените пари. ‘He/she is going to cry over lost money.’

Bulgarian has a negative future marker *няма да* meaning literally ‘it does not have that P’, and this can make Bulgarian speakers treat *умам да* ‘lit. have that’ as a positive counterpart of *няма да*, although they already have the positive future tense marker *ще*. The Bulgarian modal *habere* has personal and impersonal variants. The personal modal *habere* carries a futurity interpretation

¹⁷ The Ukrainian *habere* also represents deontic and epistemic necessities.

(a) Uk. Що ми маємо робити? ‘What do we have to do?’

(b) Uk. Обід мав бути далеко пізніше. ‘The lunch must have been a little bit later.’

and at the same time a slight nuance of deontic modality, while the impersonal one reveals the speaker's strong emotion about a future event, sometimes even making an utterance a threat (Младенова / Mladenova 2013: 7-8).

- (23) a. Вл. (Аз) Имам да уча_{1st.sg.}. 'I am going to study' (Младенова/Mladenova 2013: 8).
 b. Вл. Има да стават и други събития. 'Other things will happen.'

Macedonian also has a similar, but more grammaticalized future modal *habere*. The Macedonian personal modal *habere* expresses a weaker obligation, while its impersonal variant, which has a wider distribution, reveals commissive, debitative and epistemic modalities¹⁸, marking futurity (Friedman 2001: 41, Mitkovska & Bužarovska 2014: 203-214).

- (24) a. Мс. Ти имаш да одиш_{2nd.sg.}. 'You have to go.' (Mitkovska & Bužarovska 2014: 194).
 b. Мс. Ти има да одиш_{2nd.sg.}. 'You shall go.' (I order you)

Mitkovska and Bužarovska (2014: 201-202) suggest that the Macedonian modal *haberes* have undergone three stages of grammaticalization. At the first stage, *habere* has its own lexical meaning of possession and a subordinate clause is added to modify the main clause's object. At the second stage, *habere* obtains a modal meaning as a result of reanalysis, still not losing its own lexical meaning and accompanying a nominal object. At the final stage, *habere* loses its own lexical and syntactic characteristics and becomes a modal verb, obtaining the obligatory syntactic valency *да P* 'that P'.

- (25) a. the 1st stage: Мс. (јас) Имам деца да ме гледаат_{3rd.pl.}. 'I have children who will take care of me.' (Mitkovska & Bužarovska 2014: 201-202)
 b. the 2nd stage: Мс. (јас) Имам деца да гледам_{1st.sg.}. 'I have children to take care of.'
 c. the 3rd stage: Мс. (јас) Имам да гледам_{1st.sg.} деца. 'I have to take care of children.'

This hypothesis explains convincingly how the Macedonian and Bulgarian modal *haberes* have been grammaticalized¹⁹ but does not explain the Polish, Czech, and BCS modal *haberes*' grammaticalization, because they cannot undergo the reanalysis of the second stage. To wit, the Polish infinitive cannot

¹⁸ These modal interpretations depend on the person category of the subordinate *да*-clause. If it is the first person, the utterance becomes a promise or a threat. If it is the second person, the addressee's obligation becomes categorical. If it is the third person, the sentence becomes a reported obligation with which the speaker is strongly involved. (Mitkovska & Bužarovska 2014: 203-205)

(a) Мс. Има сите да ве испрочитам_{1st.sg.} кога ќе половажам_{1st.sg.}, ветувам_{1st.sg.}! 'I am going to read you cover to cover when I pass the exams, promise!'

(b) Мс. Има да ја изедеш_{2nd.sg.} салатата и точка. 'You shall eat the salad and that's final.'

(c) Мс. Има да се плаќа за ТВ без пардон. 'The TV tax must be paid no matter what.'

¹⁹ The French inflectional future also seems to have undergone a similar grammaticalization process (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 52-55). So does the English modal *have to*.

modify its preceding noun, and the change process in (26a) is impossible. Instead, Polish has the modifier “*do* + gen. gerund”, but (26b) does not make sense, either, for the modifiers are not identical in two related sentences.

- (26) a. Pl. *(Ja) mam książkę **czytać**. $\neq \rightarrow$ (Ja) mam **czytać** książkę.
 b. Pl. (Ja) mam książkę **do czytania**. $\neq \rightarrow$ (Ja) mam **czytać** książkę.
 ‘I have a book to read – I have to read a book.’

Lempp (1986: 81–85) suggests that the Polish modal *habere* can be an elliptical form of ‘*habere* + a modal noun’. For example, (27a) is supposedly derived from (27b).

- (27) a. Pl. Wczoraj (on) miał **nakarmić** psa dziś. (Lempp 1986: 82-83²⁰)
 ‘Yesterday he was supposed to feed the dog today’
 b. Pl. Wczoraj (on) miał **obowiązek nakarmić** psa dziś.
 ‘Yesterday he had the obligation to feed the dog today’

However, the compound phrase ‘*habere* + a modal noun’ cannot replace all Polish modal *haberes*, as Lempp (1986: 84) points out, and two synonymous constructions differ stylistically: the Polish modal *habere* constructions are less formal than ‘*habere* + a modal noun’.

It is more likely that the Slavic modal *haberes* emerged under the influence of other adjacent languages. Or these modal meanings may have come from the Slavic *habere*’s spontaneous semantic expansion from inside: if you have an action to do, it becomes your obligation, intension, possibility, future act, etc.

The Russian *habere*’s modal function is somewhat archaic as in (28), and contemporary Russian native speakers would hardly use this structure.

- (28) Ru. Через несколько дней было объявлено князю Андрею, что он имеет **явиться** к военному министру. (Tolstoy, “War and peace”) ‘A few days later it was announced to Prince Andrew that he had to go to the Minister of War.’

Instead, the overt and covert *esse* forms can convey deontic modality in Modern Russian but not in a possessive structure with “*y* + gen.”, but in an infinitive sentence with a syntactically optional dative subject²¹.

- (29) a. Ru. Мне __ завтра **уезжать**. ‘I have to leave tomorrow.’
 b. Ru. Мне __ не **сдать** этот экзамен. ‘I cannot pass this exam.’

²⁰ I revised his examples a bit to compare them under the same conditions.

²¹ As a reviewer properly pointed out, Russian infinitive sentences generally require a dative subject, but it is not syntactically obligatory, for sentences without it, e.g. (a) and (b) are still grammatically and semantically complete.

(a) Ru. Здесь _ не пройти. ‘You cannot pass here.’

(b) Ru. Что _ делать? ‘What to do?/ What am I going to do?/ What am I supposed to do?’

If the Polish, Czech, and Bulgarian *haberes* accompany a passive past participle (PPP), the compound predicates are interpreted as a present perfect tense (Topolińska 1968: 429-430, Lempp 1988: 122-133, Clancy 2010: 185-190, Младенова / Mladenova 2013: 7-8). Other Slavic *have*-languages, such as Slovak and Macedonian also have *haberes* of this function, but BCS and Slovenian do not.

The contemporary Polish, Czech, and Slovak prescriptive grammar only approve of three simple tenses, i.e. present, past and future, but in practice, the speakers of these Slavic languages use an additional perfect tense form. The frequently appearing combination of *habere* and PPP has the same function and structure as other European perfect tenses.

(30) a. Pl. Dziś (ja) mam zarezerwowane te bilety. (Lempp 1988: 130)

‘Today I have reserved the tickets.’

b. Cz. Když (my) nemáme vyřešenou minulost, tak jak (my) chceme řešit přítomnost a budoucnost? (Clancy 2010: 188) ‘If we haven’t solved the past, then how do we want to solve the present and the future?’

c. Sk. S českou televizí (my) máme uzavretú zmluvu o distribúciu jej programov. ‘We have made a contract with Czech Television about the distribution of its programs’

Many researchers believe that Polish, Czech, and Slovak have obtained this new tense as a result of language contact with German, but some argue that these Slavic languages must have “developed the respective function by themselves, and the contact with German was just the trigger for an analogous final grammaticalizing step” (Abraham & Piskorz 2014: 445²²).

In the Bulgarian language, which already has an *esse*-based perfect tense, the *habere*-based perfect tense is a new trend of colloquial style. Geographically contiguous Macedonian has a stylistically unmarked *habere*-based perfect tense (*има-перфект*) as well as an *esse*-based one (*сум-перфект*). The Bulgarian and Macedonian *habere*-perfects are considered to have resulted from language contact with non-Slavic languages spoken in the Balkan Peninsula (Tomić 2010: 140–141).

(31) a. Bl. Тук (ние) го имаме писано/написано. (Младенова/Mladenova 2013: 8).

‘We have written it here.’

b. Mc. (Јас) го имам видено. (Младенова/Mladenova 2013:8).

‘I have seen it/him.’

This new tendency is mostly found in non-standard colloquial language and is not yet perfectly grammaticalized in West Slavic and Bulgarian. The

²² Abraham and Piskorz(2014: 444-445) assert that German and Polish perfect tenses differ from each other, especially, in their epistemic modality, conditional perfect tense, and relation to viewpoint aspect.

Polish *habere*-sentence with a PPP presently has two different readings. If *habere* has a possessive interpretation, as in (32a), the subject has something, whereas if *habere* serves as an auxiliary verb, as in (32b), the subject does not always have something²³. (32b) must have derived from the reanalysis of (32a). I assume that other Slavic perfect tenses also have undergone a similar reanalysis.

- (32) a.Pl. (Ja) mam [**z**gubione banknoty.] ‘I have [lost banknotes]’ (Lempp 1988: 126)
 b.Pl. [(Ja) mam **z**gubione] banknoty. ‘[I have lost] banknotes’

Though the Polish and Czech perfect tenses have not yet been completely grammaticalized, this new usage in colloquial speech shows how *haberes* are constantly expanding their sphere in these languages.

Additionally, in a Russian dialect, the *esse*-based possessive sentence can have a perfect reading (Циммерлинг / Cimmerling 2000:179). However, the Russian perfect tense cannot be a significant linguistic issue, because it is a marginal phenomenon limited to a specific region.

- (33) Ru. [dialect] У него __ уехавши. ‘He has gone.’

In sum, the Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, and BCS *haberes* are used very widely both as a content and function word. Their *haberes* are mostly the only way to render the possessive relation in both narrow and wide senses and have important grammatical functions, such as an existential sentence marker, a modal verb and a perfect tense auxiliary. On the other hand, the Russian *habere* is more restricted to idiomatic expressions, specific styles and syntactic constructions, and its narrow range of use as a content word prevents it from developing a grammatical function, whereas the Russian *esse* plays a significant role not only in a possessive construction, but also in various grammatical functions.

²³ The position of a demonstrative or reflexive modifier gives a clue to disambiguate these two interpretations. If a demonstrative directly precedes a noun, the PPP is bound to the verb *mieć* ‘to have’ as in (b) and (c), and *habere* is read as a present perfect auxiliary. To the contrary, if a demonstrative is located right before a PPP as in (a), the PPP is supposed to modify the posterior noun, and *habere* refers to a possessive relation (Lempp 1988: 127–128).

- (a) Pl. (Ja) mam [tę **z**gubioną chusteczkę]. ‘I have this lost handkerchief’
 (b) Pl. (Ja) mam [tę chusteczkę] **z**gubioną. ‘I have lost this handkerchief’
 (c) Pl. (Ja) mam **z**gubioną [tę chusteczkę]. ‘I have lost this handkerchief’
 (Topolińska 1968:429, Lempp 1988:127–128)

REFERENCES

- Abraham, Werner and Jadwiga Piskorz. 2014. A Rare Case of Covert Modality: Spoken Polish and the Novel Periphrastic Past with *Mieć* 'have'. – In: Abraham, W. and E. Leiss (eds.). *Modes of Modality: Modality, Typology, and Universal Grammar*. John Benjamins, 409–455.
- Benveniste, Emile. 1966. 'être' et 'avoir' dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. – In: *Problèmes de Linguistique Générale*. tome 1. Gallimard, 187–207.
- Birtić, Matea. 2001. Imati ili biti – Riječ, god. 7., br. 2., 7–14.
- Chung, Jung Won. 2018. The Zero *Esse* in Slavic *Be-* and *Have-*Languages. – *The Slavic and East European Journal*, October, 62(3), 566–589.
- Chvany, Catherine. 1975. *On the Syntax of Be-Sentences in Russian*. Cambridge: MA:Slavica.
- Cimmerling, A.V. 2000. Obladat' i byt' rjodom. – In: *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Jazyki prostranstv*. Moskva: Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury, 179–188.
- Clancy, Steven J. 2010. *The Chain of Being and Having in Slavic*, John Benjamins publishing Company.
- Dulewiczowa, Irena. 1981. Czasowniki *być* i *mieć* w języku polskim i rosyjskim. – *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 14. 91–107.
- Feleszko, Kazimierz. 1974. Dystrybucja macedońskich czasowników e 'być' i има 'mieć'. – *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej*, 13, 125–139.
- Friedman, Victor. 2001. *Macedonian*. SEELRC.
- Harves, Stephanie and Richard Kayne. 2012. Having 'Need' and Needing 'Have'. – *Linguistic Inquiry*, 43, 120–132.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993/2003. *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Isačenko, Alexander V. 1974. On Have and Be languages: A Typological Sketch. – In: Flier, Michael S.(ed.). *Slavic Forum: Essays in Linguistics and Literature*. The Hague: Mouton, 43–77.
- Ivanov, Vjač. Vs. et al. 1989. *Kategorija posessivnosti v slavjanskix i balkanskix jazykax*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Koseska-Toszewa, Violetta. 1983. Konstrukcje z polskim *mieć* i bułgarskim *imam*. – In: *Studia linguistica memoriae Zdislai Stieber dedicata. Materiały z sesji naukowej Warszawa 20–21 X 1981 r.* Wrocław: PAN, 137–143.
- Kuna, Branko. 2012. *Predikatna i vanjska posvojnost u hrvatskome jeziku*. Osijek: Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta J. J. Strossmayera u Osijeku.
- Lempp, Albrecht. 1986. *Mieć. 'to Have' in Modern Polish*. Slavistische Beiträge 204. München: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- Lermit, R. 1973. O razvitii nominativnogo predloženiija v russkom jazyke. – *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, № 2, 58–66.
- Maksimowska, Stojka, Barbara Oczkova, Tone Pretnar, Jovo Rašković. 1981. Egzystencjalne znaczenie czasowników *być* i *mieć* w językach: polskim, macedońskim, serbsko-chorwackim i słoweńskim. – *Studia z filologii polskiej i słowiańskiej*, XX, 141–155.
- Mel'čuk, I. A. 1995. *Russkij jazyk v modeli „smysl – tekst”*. Moskva–Vena: Škola „Jazyki ruskoj kul'tury”.

- Mitkovska, Liljana and Eleni Bužarovska. 2014. Deontic or Epistemic? Habēre as a Modal Marker of Future Certainty in Macedonian. – In: Abraham, W. and E. Leiss (eds.). *Modes of Modality: Modality, Typology, and Universal Grammar*. John Benjamins, 193–218.
- Mladenova, Margarita. 2013. Gramatikalizirani upotrebi na glagolite ot semantičното pole na pritežanieto v slavjanski ezici. – *Šapostavitelno ezikoznanie*. XXXVIII, № 4, 5–12.
- Mladenova, Margarita. 2018. *Semantika na pritezhatelnite glagoli v balgarskiya, cheshkiya i ruskiya ezik*. Sofiya: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“
- Pisarkowa, Krystyna. 1974. Posesywność jako przykład problemu gramatycznego. – *Biuletyn polskiego towarzystwa językoznawczego*, 32/4, 3–17.
- Safarewiczowa, Halina. 1964. Oboczność *я имею* i *у меня есть* w języku rosyjskim dziś i dawnej. – *Prace komisji językoznawstwa*. Nr 3. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków.
- Świdarska-Koneczna, Halina. 1930. Użycie czasownika mieć jako słowa posiłkowego w języku polskim. – *Prace Filologiczne*, tom XV. 263–272.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2010. The Macedonian “Have” and “Be” Perfects. – In: *Grammaticalization in Slavic Languages: From Areal and Typological Perspectives*. Slavic Research Center. Hokkaido University, 123–146.
- Topolińska, Zuzanna. 1968. Miejsce konstrukcji z czasownikiem mieć w polskim systemie werbalnym. – *Slavia Orientalis*, XVII, № 3, 427–431.
- Vjačorka, Vincuk. 2015. „«Ja maju» ci «ŭ mjane ěs'c'»? Iznouŭ pra belaruski indyvidualizm i kalektyvizaciju ŭ move.” *Radyë Svaboda*, June 4, 2015. <http://www.svaboda.org/content/article/27053489.html>.

ГЛАГОЛИТЕ СЪМ И ИМАМ В СЛАВЯНСКИТЕ СЪМ- И ИМАМ-ЕЗИЦИ

Джунгвон Чжун

Университет Йонсей, Сеул

Статията разглежда особеностите на славянските *имам* и *съм*, чиито лексикални и граматични функции се сравняват в руския, полския, чешкия, българския и сърбохърватския език. Изследването се състои от две части. В първата част са разгледани въпросите на функционирането на славянските *имам*. В полския, чешкия, българския и сърбохърватския език глаголите *имам* се отличават с висока честота на употреба и са широко разпространени. Те изразяват посесивно отношение както в тесен, така и в широк смисъл и изпълняват важни граматични функции, като екзистенциална, модална и спомагателна (за образуване на перфект). Употребата на руския глагол *иметь* е ограничена в рамките на устойчиви словосъчетания, определени синтактични конструкции и стилове, при това той не изпълнява граматична функция.