ESSES AND HABERES IN SLAVIC BE- AND HAVE-LANGUAGES (PART 2)[1]

Jungwon Chung
Yonsei University, South Korea

Данная статья посвящена рассмотрению особенностей славянских *иметь* и *быть*, и сравнению их лексических и грамматических функций в русском, польском, чешском, болгарском и сербско-хорватском языках. Работа состоит из двух частей и в первой части были проанализированы славянские *иметь*. А во второй части, прежде всего, рассматривается, как славянские *быть* функционируют. Все славянские локативные и связочные предложения содержат *быть*, но не все экзистенциальные предложения в нем нуждаются. Славянские *быть* также функционируют как вспомогательные в прошедшем и будущем временах, в условном наклонении и в эвиденциальности. Кроме того, восточнославянские *быть* выражают и посессивное отношение. Славянские *иметь* и *есть,* проанализированные в данной двухчастной статье, показывают, что лексические и грамматические функции польского *иметь* и *быть* более похожи на другие западно- и южнославянские, чем на восточнославянские языки, и следовательно классификация славянских языков Исаченко на языки-*быть* и языки-*иметь* должна быть пересмотрена.

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 BCS. With Part 1 having discussed Slavic *haberes,* Part 2 explores, first of all, how Slavic *esses* serve as a content and function word. All Slavic locative and copular sentences contain *esse*, but not all existential sentences do. Slavic *esses* also function as an auxiliary in the past and future tenses, conditional mood, and evidentiality. Additionally, the East Slavic *esses* refer to possessive relations. The Slavic *haberes* and *esses* analyzed in Part 1 and Part 2 reveal that the Polish *habere* and *esse*'s lexical and grammatical functions are rather similar to those of other West and South Slavic *haberes* and *esses*, and Isačenko's classification of Slavic languages into *be*-languages and *have*-languages should be reconsidered.

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

3. Slavic *esses*

Most Slavic existential and locative sentences contain *esse*. At first glance, Slavic existential and locative sentences seem to be very similar, but on a closer view, it becomes clear that they have different phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic, and pragmatic characteristics.

---

[1] Статията е продължение от *Съпоставително езикознание* XLIV, 2019, бр. 4, 25–40.

Phonologically, the phrasal accent falls on the existential verb, while it does not fall on the locative verb, but mostly on the adverbials or sometimes on the subject.

Slavic locative sentences generally start with a definite subject, while existential sentences start with adverbials, as in (34) and (35). These typical word orders are not a compulsory rule or a sine qua non condition for a sentence distinction, but this pragmatic factor plays a crucial role in the written text, especially in Polish and Czech, which do not have any other criteria for this distinction in positive constructions.

(34)   a.Ru. Книга __ на полке. - Книга не __ на полке.

        b.Pl. Książka <u>jest</u> na półce. - Książka nie <u>jest</u> na półce.

        c. Cz. Kniha <u>je</u> na polici. - Kniha <u>není</u> na polici.

        d. BCS. Knjiga <u>je</u> na polici. - Knjiga <u>nije</u> na polici.

        e. Bl. Книга**та** <u>е</u> на рафта. - Книга**та** не <u>е</u> на рафта.

           'The book is on the shelf. - The book isn't on the shelf.'

(35)   a.Ru. На полке <u>есть</u> книга. - На полке <u>нет</u> книги $_{gen.}$.

        b.Pl. Na półce <u>jest</u> książka. - Na półce <u>nie ma</u> książki $_{gen.}$.

        c.Cz. Na polici <u>je</u> kniha. - Na polici <u>není</u> knihy $_{gen.}$ / <u>není</u> kniha $_{nom.}$

        d. BCS. Na polici <u>ima</u> knjiga. - Na polici <u>nema</u> knjige $_{gen.}$

        e. Bl. На рафта <u>има</u> книга. - На рафта <u>няма</u> книга.

           'There is a book on the shelf. - There isn't a book on the shelf.'

Slavic existential sentences have a morphological peculiarity: the genitive case is assigned to a non-existent subject in Russian, Polish, Czech[2], and BCS[3] negative existentials. The Bulgarian definiteness marker also distinguishes two sentence types. The posterior definite article is usually attached to the (non-)located subject, but not to the (non-)existent subject. The Russian present existential and locative sentences differ syntactically with their explicit and zero *esses*, respectively.

The Bulgarian, BCS, and Polish existential and locative sentences can be lexically differentiated[4]. As is shown in (34d-e) and (35d-e), the Bulgarian and BCS present locative sentences contain a conjugated *esse,* while the existentials – an impersonal *habere*[5]. The Polish negative present existentials in (35b) also contain habere. These lexical markers are the most important factor to identify a sentence type. For instance, the Bulgarian sentence (36)

---

[2] The modern Czech negative sentences rarely have a genitive object, which sounds bookish, sometimes even archaic (Karlík et al. 1995: 414).

[3] The BCS positive existentials' plural and mass nouns also are generally genitive.

[4] English, French, and German also have a lexical unit to mark the existential sentence, such as *there, il y a,* and *es gibt*.

[5] The past and future BCS existentials bear *esse*.

with the word order typical of an existential is a locative sentence[6], for its predicate is *esse*.[7]

> (36) Bl. В куфара <u>са</u> парите (нали знаеш!), затова го мъкна_{1st.sg.} със себе си. (Иванова / Ivanova 2002: 17)
>
> 'It is the money that is in the suitcase (you know!), so I carry it(=the suitcase) with me.'

Yet, this does not mean that there is no restriction on rearranging Bulgarian locative and existential sentences. The Bulgarian existential *habere* hardly comes after the subject, and the locative *esse* comes after adverbials only if the subject occupies the whole place. For instance, (37a) sounds unnatural because it is not usual that a room contains only one table without any other things in it. Its modified sentence (37b) becomes appropriate because a room corner is small enough to be occupied by a single table[8].

> (37) a. Bl. ?В стаята <u>е</u> бюрото. 'It is the table that is in the room.' (Иванова / Ivanova 2002: 16)
>
> b. Bl. В ъгъла на стаята <u>е</u> бюрото. 'It is the table that is on the corner of the room.'

All Slavic *esses* function as a copula that links a grammatical or semantic subject with a predicate noun, adjective, participle, or adverbial.

When the copula *esse*[9] accompanies a predicate noun in Russian, Polish, Czech, and BCS, the noun takes nominative or instrumental. In principle, Slavic predicate nominatives should indicate the given state's permanency and predicate instrumentals – its temporality, but in practice, this semantic difference has been somewhat tarnished. To wit, the Polish predicate noun should be instrumental in all tenses[10]. The Russian predicate noun is also mostly

---

[6] Generally, the locative sentences with this word order are stylistically marked, i.e. archaic, poetic or ironic. (Korytkowska 1974: 208)

[7] This kind of reversed locative sentence fulfills an identifying function. Especially, if the subject does not have an article, the sentence fulfills a classifying and characterizing function, introducing a directly perceived object into the discourse. For instance while, (a) refers to a storm's existence, (b) identifies and depicts a storm observed by the speaker (Градинарова / Gradinarova 2005: 68, 72).

(a) В морето <u>има</u> буря. 'There is a storm at sea.'

(b) Навън <u>е</u> буря. 'There is a storm outside.'

[8] As a reviewer pointed out, (37a) can be interpreted as (b)'s reversed sentence with a preposed focus though (b) is a more neutral variant as an answer to the question (a).

(a) – Къде е бюрото? 'Where is the desk?'

(b) – Бюрото е в стаята. 'The desk is in the room.'

[9] The Russian present copula *esse* must be zero before predicate adjectives (of short and long forms), predicate participles and predicative adverbials, and it is predominantly zero before predicate nouns (Chung 2018).

[10] If the Russian, Polish, Czech, and BCS copula sentences begin with demonstrative pronouns, only the nominative predicate is acceptable.

(a) Ru. Это __ / <u>был</u> / <u>будет</u> студент _{nom}.

instrumental, unless it is in the present tense. Both variants coexist in Czech copula sentences of all tenses, but nominative is stylistically neutral, whereas instrumental is used "in an intellectualized discourse" (Karlík et al. 1995: 404). The BCS nominative predicate is also unmarked: the present predicate nouns cannot be instrumental, and the past and future predicate instrumentals are rare and stylistically marked. Thus, Czech and BCS prefer an uninflected nominative predicate over a synthetic oblique case, and this shows that they are more analytic than Polish and Russian.

(38) a. Ru. Он __ студент $_{nom}$. –Он <u>был</u> студентом $_{instr}$. –Он <u>будет</u> студентом $_{instr}$.
b. Pl. (On) <u>jest</u> studentem $_{instr}$. – (On) <u>był</u> studentem $_{instr}$. – (On) <u>będzie</u> studentem $_{instr}$.
c. Cz. (On) <u>je</u> student $_{nom}$ [/studentem $_{instr}$]- (On) <u>byl</u> student $_{nom}$[/studentem $_{instr}$]-
(On) <u>bude</u> student $_{nom}$ [/studentem $_{instr}$]
d. BCS. (On) <u>je</u> student $_{nom}$ - (On) <u>je bio</u> student $_{nom}$ [/studentom $_{instr}$]- (On) <u>će biti</u>
student $_{nom}$.[/studentom $_{instr}$].
e. Bl. (Той) <u>е</u> студент. - (Той) <u>беше</u> студент. – (Той) <u>ще бъде</u> студент.
'He is a college student. –He was a college student. – He will be a college student.'

When the Slavic copula *esse* accompanies a predicate adjective and passive past participle (henceforeth, PPP), Polish, BCS, and Bulgarian adjectives (39b, 39d, 39e) and PPPs (40b, 40d, 40e) have the same endings both in predicative and attributive uses. On the other hand, Czech adjectives and PPPs have different endings[11], and the PPPs, which do not decline, are restricted to the predicative position[12]. Therefore, the Czech PPPs are realized only with the help of the copula *být*. Likewise, Russian adjective and PPP short forms limited to the predicative function always need an overt or covert copula *быть*.

(b) Pl. To (<u>jest</u>) / <u>był</u> / <u>będzie</u> student $_{nom}$.
(c) Cz. To <u>je</u> / <u>byl</u> / <u>bude</u> student $_{nom}$.
(d) BCS. Ovo <u>je</u> / <u>je bio</u> / <u>će biti</u> student $_{nom}$.
(e) Bl. Това <u>е</u> / <u>беше</u> / <u>ще бъде</u> студент.
'This is / was / will be a college student.'

[11] The endings of Czech nominative adjectives and PPPs are as follows.

	Singular			Plural		
	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
Adjectives	-ý/-í	-á/-í	-é/-í	-í	-é/-í	-á/-í
PPPs	-	-a	-o	-i	-y	-a

[12] The PPPs with an adjective ending are also found in spoken Czech but only in a predicative position (Karlík et al. 1995: 324, 525-526).

34

(39) a. Ru. Он __ умный $_{long}$ / умён $_{short}$.
     b. Pl. (On) <u>jest</u> mądry.
     c. Cz. (On) <u>je</u> moudrý$_{long}$.
     d. BCS. (On) je pametan.
     e. Bl. (Той) <u>е</u> умен.
        'He is smart.'

(40) a. Ru. Он __ убит$_{short}$.
     b. Pl. (On) <u>jest</u> zabity.
     c. Cz. (On) <u>je</u> zabit$_{short}$.
     d. BCS. (On) <u>je</u> ubijen.
     e. Bl. (Той) <u>е</u> убит.
        'He is killed.'

Some Slavic copula sentences with predicate adjectives can have a synonymous *habere* sentence with a semantically related abstract noun (see also (6a-e) in Part 1). However, two relevant constructions can differ in meaning and use. For example, Slavic *esse* constructions in (41) refer to a physiological state of hunger, which is semantically more basic, while the Polish, BCS, and Bulgarian *habere* constructions in (41b, d, e) refer to, inter alia, a psychological need or a desire, which must have been semantically derived from the more primitive physical hunger. This secondary meaning requires an additional syntactic complement referring to the emotion target, and the BCS, Bulgarian, and Polish *habere* sentences should have the prepositions *za* 'for', *за* 'for', and a bare genitive case, respectively (eg. *imati glad za znanjem* / *имам глад за знание* / *mieć głód wiedzy*). In Czech, both variants in (41c) are actively used, and its *habere* is an unmarked means to express physiological hunger[13]. On the contrary, the Russian adjective copular sentence does not have an appropriate *habere* or *esse* possessive constructions.

(41) a. Ru. Он __ голоден. – ??? У него <u>(есть)</u> голод./ ??? Он <u>имеет</u> голод.
     b. Pl. (On) jest głodny. – ? (On) ma głód.
     c. Cz. (On) je hladový. – (On) má hlad.
     d. BCS. (On) je gladan. – ?(On) ima glad.
     e. Bl. (Той) е гладен. – ? (Той) има глад.
        'He is hungry. – He has (a) hunger.'

The Slavic copula *esse* also links a null expletive subject with an adverbial or nominal predicate that denotes an ambient, physical, physiological or emotional state. Slavic copula *esse*s here in principle take the singular neuter form[14], and the

---

[13] The Czech *habere* sentence requires *po* 'up to' to specify the emotion target but still can be felicitous without them if they represent physical hunger.

[14] Some Slavic impersonal structures consist of nouns. Modern Czech grammar allows them two subject-verb agreement patterns: the copula can agree with the noun itself, and at the same time, it can

subject of the state should be dative. The Russian present copula should be zero[15], and the Polish present copula also can be zero.

(42) a. Ru. Ему$_{dat.}$ ___ грустно.
  b. Pl. (Jest) mu$_{dat.}$ smutno.
  c. Cz. Je mu$_{dat.}$ smutno.
  d. BCS. Tužno mu$_{dat}$ je.
  e. Bl. Тъжно му$_{dat.}$ е.
    'He feels sad (lit. (it) is sad to him).'

(43) a. Ru. Темно ___.
  b. Pl. (Jest) ciemno.
  c. Cz. Je tma[16].
  d. BCS. Mračno je.
  e. Bl. Тъмно е.
    'It is dark.'

Some Slavic impersonal sentences with predicative adverbs have a semantically correspondent *habere*-based personal sentence. Compare (43) with (44). The Bulgarian *habere* sentence (44e), unlike its *esse* sentence (43e), rather describes the subject's dark inner state. The Polish, Czech, and BCS *habere* constructions (44b-d) also refer to a metaphorical darkness, such as the subject's dark state of mind, negative social, political, economic situations, etc. but they still can depict the exterior ambient atmosphere, just as (43b-d). The Russian *habere* sentence in (44a) sounds unnatural, but its *esse*-based possessive counterpart can describe the metaphoric darkness as well as the actual absence of light.

(44) a. Ru. ??? Мы имеем темноту / мрак. – У нас ___ темнота / мрак.
  b. Pl. (My) mamy ciemność / mrok.
  c. Cz. (My) máme tmu.
  d. BCS. (Mi) imamo mrak / tamu (u sebi).
  e. Bl. (Ние) имаме тъмнина (в себе си).
    'We have darkness.'

---

take a neuter singular form typical of Slavic impersonal sentences (Karlík et al. 1995: 394). On the other hand, Modern Russian grammar accepts only a neuter singular variant.
  (a) Cz. Slunce zapadlo a v lese bylo/byla tma.
    'The sun had set, and it was dark in the woods.'
  (b) Ru. Вам одеваться было/*была лень. (Цветаева)
    'You were too lazy to get dressed.'
  [15] Refer to Градинарова (Gradinarov 2002, 2004) for correlations between Russian impersonal sentences and other relevant constructions.
  [16] Overt expletive subjects are also found in Colloquial Czech when the subject can be pragmatically emphasized (Franks 1995: 314-315).
  (a) Cz. (V)ono je tma. 'It is dark.'

Slavic languages have many idiomatic expressions based on the copula *esse*, including telling the time, date, day of the week, month, year, century, etc. Aside from more generally used *esse*-based ones, Polish and Czech have additional *habere*-based time expressions, while Russian, BCS, and Bulgarian do not.

(45) a. Ru. Сколько сейчас __ времени? – ???Сколько времени мы <u>имеем</u> сейчас?
   -?Сколько сейчас у нас __ времени?
   b. Pl. Która godzina (<u>jest</u>) teraz? – Którą (my) <u>mamy</u> teraz godzinę?
   c. Cz. Kolik <u>je</u> teď hodin?   – Kolik (my) <u>máme</u> teď hodin?
   d. BCS. Koliko <u>je</u> sati sada?   –?Koliko sati sada (mi) imamo?
   e. Bl. Колко <u>е</u> час<u>ът</u> сега?   –?Колко часа сега (ние) <u>имаме</u>?
       'What time is it now? – What time do we have now? '

The BCS and Bulgarian *habere* sentences and the Russian *esse*-based possessive equivalent in (45) become appropriate only when they mean "How much time do we have?".

Additionally, Slavic *esses* serve as an auxiliary. The Russian, Czech, and Polish imperfective future forms consist of the conjugated *esse* future auxiliary and the main verb infinitive or *l*-participle[17]. The BCS analytic imperfective future II (*futur drugi*) come only after the conjunctions *dok* 'while', *ako* 'if'[18], and *kada* 'when'.[19]

(46) a. Pl. (Ja) <u>będę</u> **czytać / czytał(a)** książki.
       b. Cz. (Já) <u>budu</u> **číst** knihy.
       c. Ru. Я <u>буду</u> **читать** книги.
       'I will read books.'
       d. BCS. Dok (ja) <u>budem</u> **čitao** knjige, što ćeš (ti) raditi? 'What are you going to do, while I will be reading books?'

The Czech past[20], the BCS perfect[21,] and the Bulgarian present perfect need a present auxiliary *esse* containing grammatical information about the subject the null form of which is unmarked. The Polish past verb has a person-marked

---

[17] In Russian and Czech, the imperfective future's main verb should be an infinitive, in Polish – either an infinitive or *l*-participle, and in the BCS future II - an *l*-participle.

[18] The *esse*-based imperfective future tense form can also appear in the BCS *li*-conditional.
   (a) BCS. Budem **li** (ja) čitao knjige, što ćeš (ti) raditi? 'If I read books, what are you going to do?'

[19] The BCS future I (*futur prvi*) and the Bulgarian future tense contain the specific markers *ću* and *ще* derived from the verbs meaning 'to want'.
   (a) BCS. (Ja) **ću čitati** knjige.
   (b) Bg. (Аз) **ще чета** книги.
       'I will read books.'

[20] In Czech, only the first and second person past verbs contain the auxiliary *esse*.

[21] BCS has four types of past tense forms but only the perfect is used on a daily basis. The aorist, imperfect, and pluperfect are generally used in the literature and sound rather archaic.

ending, historically derived from *esse* and is more synthetic than those of other West and South Slavic languages[22].

(47) a.Cz. (Já) <u>jsem</u> **přečetla** tuto knihu.
    b .BCS. (Ja) <u>sam</u> **pročitala** ovu knjigu.
    c.Bg. (Аз) <u>съм</u> **прочела** тази книга. 'I have read this book (and I know it).'
    d. Pl. (Ja) **przeczytał**<u>am</u> tę książkę.
        'I read this book.'

The *esse* is also an auxiliary of the Bulgarian and BCS pluperfect and the Bulgarian future perfect. The pluperfect refers to an act that happened before another past act, and the future perfect - an act that will take place before another future act. In Bulgarian, the past perfect consists of the imperfect *esse* and the main verb's *l*-participle, and the future perfect consists of the future marker ще, the present *esse*, and the main verb's *l*-participle. The BCS pluperfect restricted to written language is made by adding an active perfect participle to the perfect or imperfect *esse,* both of which are also stylistically marked.

(48) a. Bg. (Аз) помня, че като ученик (аз) <u>бях</u> **чел** някакъв фантастичен роман.
    'I remember that as a student I had read some fantastic novel.
    b. Bg. (Аз) **ще** <u>съм</u> **прочел** 10 страници до края на седмицата. 'I will have read 10 pages by the end of the week'.
    c. BCS. (On) je uradio sve kako <u>bejaše</u>$_{3rd.sg.}$ **isplanirao**/kako <u>je</u>$_{3rd.sg.}$ **bio isplanirao**.
        'He did everything as he had planned'

The Slavic conditional mood also needs an *esse* auxiliary. The BCS, Bulgarian, and Czech conditionals consist of the currently valid or invalid aorist *esse* and the main verb's *l*-participle. The Russian and Polish conditional mood's auxiliary derived from *esse* is attached to the past verb or the subject in an analytic and synthetic way, respectively.

(49) a.Cz. (Já) <u>bych</u> **četl** mnoho knih, kdy<u>bych</u> **měl** (já) čas na to.
    b.BCS. Kad (ja) <u>bih</u> **imao** vremena za to, (ja) <u>bih</u> **čitao** mnogo knjiga[23].
    c.Bg. (Аз) <u>бих</u> **прочел** много книги, ако **имах**$_{1st.sg.}$ време за това.
    d.Ru. Я <u>бы</u> **прочитал** много книг, если <u>бы</u> у меня **было** время
    e. Pl. (Ja) **czytał**<u>bym</u> wiele książek, gdy<u>bym</u>$_{1st.sg.}$ **miał** na to czas.
        'I would read many books if I had time for that'.

---

[22] The Russian past tense forms do not have a person marker.
    (a) Ru. Я/ты/она **прочитала** эту книгу. 'I/you/she read this book.'
[23] The BCS imperfective conditional can refer to a past iterative act, and other Slavic languages do not have this usage. (Čilaš-Mikulić et als. 2015: 146-147)
    (a) BCS. Posla <u>bi</u> uvijek **bilo** i previše. 'There was always too much to do '

Additionally, the Bulgarian and Macedonian *esse*s convey an evidential interpretation that the utterance is not based on the speaker's direct observation, but on his/her inference or someone else's report.

(50) a. Bg. Може би той не <u>е</u> **чел** достатъчно добре конституцията. 'Maybe he did not read the Constitution well enough.'

b. Bg. Така, в бързината той го <u>бил</u> **подписал**, но ø$_{\text{3rd.sg.pron.}}$ не го <u>бил</u> **прочел**. 'I have been told that he had signed it in a hurry, but he had not read it (, but I doubt it)'.

Besides these functions, the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian *esse*s can constitute the possessive sentence, as was mentioned in Part I.

Thus, Slavic *esse*s have some idiosyncratic characteristics. All Slavic locative and copular sentences contain *esse*, but not all existential sentences do. Slavic *esse*s also function as an auxiliary in the past and future tenses, conditional mood, and evidentiality. It is worth noting that, though Russian is the only authentic Slavic *be*-language, its *esse* does not have any additional grammatical functions, except for the functions fulfilled by other Slavic *habere*s examined in Part I.

4. Conditions for Slavic *be*- and *have*-languages

We have examined main functions of Slavic *habere*s and *esse*s in the previous sections and now let us think over the Slavic *be*- and *have*-language classification. Taking the analyzed Slavic *esse*s and *habere*s' distribution into consideration, I would say that Russian is a *be*-language, while Polish, Czech, BCS, and Bulgarian are *have*-languages.

However, Isačenko (1974: 44) classifies Polish as a Slavic language in a transitional stage between *be*- and *have*-languages. He does not give any ground for this classification, and we, on his behalf, can make the hypothesis that Polish shares some specific characteristics with Russian, the authentic Slavic *be*-language, but not with other West and South Slavic *have*-languages. There are at least three characteristics that Russian has in common with Polish.

First, the frequent Polish present zero copula can be related to its alleged peripheral *have*-language status, as Clancy (2010: 92) suggests. However, no cause and effect relationship between these two characteristics has been found (Chung 2018). First, many Indo-European *have*-languages contain a zero *esse* (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 246). Considering that the copula does not have a specific lexical meaning, and the locative *esse* is informatively insignificant, it is understandable why many *have*-languages allow a zero *esse*. Second, the zero *esse* is not usual in all *be*-languages. For instance, the Finnish, Korean, and Japanese unmarked possessive constructions contain *esse*[24] but cannot

---

[24] The Finnish, Korean, and Japanese possessive constructions are as follows.

drop it without any adequate context. Therefore, its zero copula's relatively wide range use cannot be a ground for the assertion that Polish is closer to *be*-languages than other West and South Slavic languages.

Second, Polish and Russian are less analytic than Czech, BCS, and Bulgarian, as was mentioned above. Bulgarian and Macedonian have almost lost their case system, and their syntactic relations are expressed by word orders and prepositions. BCS has a more simplified case system[25] and a more fixed word order than most West and East Slavic languages. Modern Czech is also undergoing an analyticization process: prepositions are added to bare oblique cases and more and more oblique case forms are replaced with nominative and accusative in a colloquial style (Sussex & Cubberley 2006: 560). Polish and Russian are not an exception to this trend, but their analyticization processes are not as widespread or systematic as in Czech. However, I do not know any causal relationship between analytic languages and *have*-languages. For example, Chinese is a highly analytic language, but its possessive construction contains *esse*. German is more synthetic than English, but the former apparently has more *habere* constructions than the latter. Being more analytic does not necessarily mean being a *have*-language. Likewise, being more synthetic does not mean being a *be*-language, either. Therefore, this cannot alienate Polish from *have*-languages.

Third, the Polish *habere* is less grammaticalized as a function word than its South Slavic counterparts.[26] The Polish existential has *habere* only in the negative present, whereas the BCS present existential also has *habere* in the affirmative present, and the Bulgarian and Macedonian existentials have *habere* in all tenses both in affirmative and negative constructions. However, I would point out that in the other West Slavic languages, such as Czech and Slovak, and in another South Slavic, i.e. in Slovene, existential sentences do not have *habere* in any tenses. If Polish were a peripheral *have*-language because of its existential *habere*'s underdevelopment, not only Czech, Slovak, and Slovene, but also English, German, Italian, etc. would be a marginal *have*-language. Therefore, the given argument provided to support Isačenko's assertion only raises questions about its reliability.

Thus, I do not know any convincing theoretical grounds or evidence to support the assertion that Polish is in the transitional stage between *be*- and *have*-languages. Now let us find grounds to bolster its counterargument.

(a) Fn. minulla on paketti. '(lit. me-to is package' (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 246)

(b) Kr. Na-ege sopo-ga iss-ta/*Ø. (lit. me-to package is)

(c) Jp. Watashi-ni kodzutsumi-ga aru/*Ø. (lit. me-to package is)

'I have a package.'

[25] In BCS, the nominal singular dative and locative are identical. The plural nouns and adjectives have only four distinct case forms, because dative, locative, and instrumental are identical, and so are nominative and vocative.

[26] A Korean slavist raised this argument to support Isačenko's claim in a personal conversation.

The most important criteria for *be-* and *have-*languages should be the use and functions of *habere* and *esse* themselves. From what has been examined in Part 1 and 2, it is clear that the biggest difference among the Russian, Polish, Czech, BCS, and Bulgarian *haberes* and *esses* is that the unmarked Russian possessive sentence contains *esse* and the Russian *habere* is rarely used. Polish differs from Russian in that its *habere* is essential to possessive relations and is actively used as a content and function word.

Polish also differs from Isačenko's other transitional languages in preference for *habere* and *esse*. The *esse* possessive construction has predominance in Belarusian, there is no general preference for *habere* or *esse* in Ukrainian,[27] and the *habere* possessive construction predominates in Polish (Chinkarouk 2008: 192). Typical Belarusian and Ukrainian overt and covert *esses* are substituted only by the Polish *habere,* as (51) and (52) illustrate.

(51)   a. Bel. У мяне ёсьць кніжка калгасьніка. (Вячорка /Vjačorka 2015) 'lit. By me is a kolkhoz worker's notebook.'
       b. Pl. (Ja) mam książeczkę pracy.
           'I have a Kolkhoz worker's notebook.'
(52)   a. Uk. У нього __ карі очі. (Ukrajins'ka mova 2004: 509) 'lit. By him (are) brown eyes.'
       b. Pl. (On) ma brązowe oczy.
           'He has brown eyes.'

On the other hand, it is hard to find any notable peculiarities of the Polish *habere* and *esse* not shared by other Slavic *have-*languages, among others, Czech, BCS, and Bulgarian. The Polish *habere* is not less frequent than other Slavic *haberes,* and its *esse* is not more widespread than other Slavic *esse*s.

I should admit that West Slavic *habere*s are less grammaticalized than the Bulgarian, Macedonian, and BCS *habere*s, but they are constantly expanding the sphere as a function word, as was pointed out in Part I. The Polish and Czech *habere's* new grammatical functions are even in a more developed stage than Bulgarian and BCS equivalents. Their *habere's* modal meanings are diverse, and the *habere*-based perfect tense is a rather widespread phenomenon.

Moreover, the range of the West Slavic *haberes* as a content word is much wider than their South Slavic equivalents, and West Slavic possessive *habere*s often correspond to South Slavic copular *esse*s.

The West Slavic *habere*'s peculiarity stands out, especially when it refers to a transient state, which is a peripheral possessive relation and is not described with *habere* in many *have-*languages. If you compare the original texts from Anton Chekhov's "A Boring Story" with their translated texts in (53) and (54),

---

[27] The Ukrainian possessive sentence preferences are regionally marked: the *esse* variant is prevalent in the east and the *habere* variant - in the west (Chinkarouk 2008: 192).

it becomes obvious that the Russian and Bulgarian *esses* correspond to the Polish *haberes*[28]. The Russian sentences contain a zero *esse* copula and the translated Bulgarian texts - an explicit *esse* copula, while the corresponding Polish translations have a possessive *habere*[29].

(53) a. Ru. Спине моей __ холодно, она точно втягивается вовнутрь [...]
    b. Bl. Студено ми <u>е</u> на гърба, сякаш той хлътва навътре [...]
    c. Pl. Plecy <u>mam</u>$_{1st.sg.}$ zimne, jakby coś je wciągnęło do środka [...]
      'I feel cold in my back, it is as if drawn inwards […]'

(54) a. Ru. Но она не глядит на меня, рука у нее __ холодная, словно чужая.
    b. Bl. Но тя не ме гледа, ръката ѝ <u>е</u> студена, като чужда.
    c. Pl. Ale ona nie patryz na mnie, rękę <u>ma</u>$_{3rd.sg.}$ zimną, jakby nie swoją.
      'But she is not looking at me, her hand is cold as if it were not hers.'

There are other examples showing that the Polish and Czech *haberes* are more actively and widely used as a content word than South Slavic *haberes*. For instance, the Polish and Czech greetings meaning 'how are you' contain *habere*, while the Bulgarian, BCS, and Russian equivalents contain *esse,* just as in English.

(55) a. Pl. Jak (ty) się <u>masz</u>? 'lit. How do you have yourself?'
    b. Cz. Jak se (ty) <u>máš</u>? 'lit. How do you have yourself?'
    c. BCS. Kako <u>si</u> (ti)?
    d. Bl. Как <u>си</u> (ти)?
    e. Ru. Как (у тебя) __ дела? 'lit. How (is) your business?'
      'How are you?'

Additionally, the Polish and Czech *habere* expressions meaning 'to want' are used on a daily basis, while the corresponding Bulgarian, BCS, and Russian constructions are not used as widely or frequently as (56a-b).

(56) a. Pl. (Ja) <u>mam</u> ochotę na kawę.
    b. Cz. (Já) <u>mám</u> chuť na kávu.
    c. BCS. (Ja) <u>imam</u> želju za kavom/kafom.
    d. Bl. (Аз) <u>имам</u> желание за кафе.
    e. Ru. Я <u>имею</u> желание выпить кофе. - У меня __ желание выпить кофе.
      'I feel like a coffee. (lit. I have a desire for coffee)'.

---

[28] The sources of the texts are as follows: Чехов, А.П. 1955. "Скучная история", *Собрание сочинений в 12 томах. Том шестой.* М.; Чехов, А. П. 2004. «Скучна история», *Дамата с кученцето. Повести и разкази.* София,; Czechow, A. 2011. *Nieczekawa historia.* Warszawa.

[29] I have neither its Czech nor BCS translations, but the Czech and BCS equivalents must contain *habere* and *esse*, respectively, considering the *habere* usage, such as (53c) and (54c) is characteristic of West Slavic (Ницолова / Nicolova 1996: 240).

Considering that German also has *haben Lust auf* 'to have desire for', these West Slavic expressions, inter alia, might have come from the contact with other languages. Indeed, the Slavic languages of the regions where German was widely spoken before, have literal equivalents of typical German *habere*-expressions, e.g. *haben gern* 'like (lit. to have gladly)'.

(57)   a. Cz. (Já) <u>mám</u> tě rád.
       b. Slk. (Ja) <u>mám</u> ťa rád.
       c. BCS. (Ja) te <u>imam</u> rad.
       d. Sln. (Jaz) te rad <u>imam</u>.
          'I like you.'

However, the language contact does not necessarily result from geographical proximity of the regions where given languages are spoken or from the direct rule of the region by foreign powers. It rather must have come from a cultural contact between language users. For example, the Polish expression meaning 'to be right' shares its inner form with the French *avoir raison* 'lit. to have reason', and the Czech, BCS, and Bulgarian equivalents mean literally 'to have truth', just as the German *haben recht,* though France never shared its border with Poland, and Bulgaria has not been under the rule of German speaking nations.

(58)   a. Pl. (Ty) <u>masz</u> rację.
       b. Cz. (Tý) <u>máš</u> pravdu.
       c. BCS. (Ti) <u>imaš</u> pravo.
       d. Bl. (Ти) <u>имаш</u> право.
          'You are right.'

Thus, the West Slavic countries' geographical contiguity to Germany and Austria, and the historical predominance of German in this region cannot be the only reason for the West Slavic *habere*'s lexical expansion. It is incomprehensible why West Slavic is more "ready" to use *habere* than East and South Slavic, but there must be reasons other than the German influence.

The West Slavic *habere*'s lexical expansions differ from each other. As a content word, the Czech *habere* is generally more widespread than the Polish *habere*. But still Polish has some unique *habere*-expressions. For instance, the Polish *mieć na imię* 'lit. to have as a name' and *mieć nadzieję* 'lit. to have hope' do not have *habere*-based Czech, BCS, Bulgarian, and Russian equivalents, as (59) shows, or their equivalents are not used as widely as the Polish *habere*-expression, as (60) illustrates.

(59) a. Pl. (Ja) <u>mam</u> na imię Anna. 'lit. I have Anna as a name' – (Ja) nazwam się Anna. 'lit. I am called Anna'
   b. Cz. (Já) se jmenuji Anna. 'lit. I am called Anna'
   c. BCS. (Ja) se zovem Anna. 'lit. I am called Anna'
   d. Bl. (Аз) се казвам Анна. 'lit. I am called Anna'
   e. Ru. Меня зовут₃ᵣ𝒹.ₚₗ. Анна. 'lit. They call me Anna'
      'My name is Anna.'

(60) a. Pl. (Ja) <u>mam</u> taką nadzieję. 'lit. I have such a hope.'
   b. Cz. (Já) doufám v to.
   c. BCS. (Ja) se nadam.
   d. Bl. (Аз) се надявам.
   e. Ru. Я надеюсь (на это).
      'I hope so.'

One can find more such examples revealing that the Polish *habere* is used no less than its other Slavic equivalents.

In conclusion, Polish is rather a *have*-language than a transitional language between *be*- and *have*-languages, and Isačenko's classification of Slavic languages into *be*- and *have*-languages should be reconsidered. There are at least five grounds for this argument. First, the most important criterion for *be*- and *have*-languages should be which verb the possessive construction contains, and the Polish *habere* refers to possessive relations in the narrow and broad sense, while its *esse* does not. Second, the Polish *habere,* both as a content and function word, is used more widely and frequently than East Slavic *haberes,* and no less than other West and South Slavic equivalents, which unarguably belong to *have*-languages. Third, the Polish *habere's* new functions are expected to take root in the system, becoming new grammatical and lexical norms. Fourth, a new linguistic trend showing that the Polish *esse* expands its realm or replaces *habere* is not observed. Fifth, though Polish has relatively lower barrier for present zero *esse* copulas and is more synthetic than other West and South Slavic languages, which makes Polish closer to Russian, those characteristics cannot be a substantial condition for a *be*-language.

REFERENCES

Chinkarouk, Oleg. 2008. Constructions possessives et focalisation en ukrainien contemporain. – *Revue des études slaves*, tome 79, fascicule 1–2, 191–208.

Chung, Jung Won. 2018. The Zero *Esse* in Slavic *Be*- and *Have*-languages. – *The Slavic and East European Journal,* 62(3), 566–589.

Clancy, Steven J. 2010. *The Chain of Being and Having in Slavic*, John Benjamins publishing Company.

Čilaš-Mikulić, Marica and Sanda Lucija Udier, Milvia Gulešić Machata. 2015. *Razgovarajte s nama B2: udžbenik hrvatskog kao drugoga i stranoga jezika*. I izdanje. Zagreb: FFPress.

Franks, Steven. 1995. Null Subject Phenomena, In: *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. NY., Oxford: Oxford University Press. 287–332.

Gradinarova, Alla. 2002. O meste «bezlichnyh» predlozhenij v sisteme yazyka i v sintaksicheskoj teorii. – *Bolgarskaya rusistika*, broy 1, 8–17.

Gradinarova, Alla. 2004. Bespodlezhashchnye konstrukcii s sub"ektom sostoyaniya v dative i ih podlezhashchnye transformy, In: *Dinamika yazykovyh processov: istoriya i sovremennost'. K 75-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya professora Penki Filkovoj. Sbornik nauchnyh trudov*. Sofiya: Heron Pres, 259–273.

Gradinarova, Alla. 2005. Russkie bezglagol'nye bytijnye konstrukcii na fone bolgarskih sootvetstvij, Rusistika 2005. In: *Yazyk. Kommunikaciya. Kul'tura. Sbornik statii v chest na prof. dfn Stefana Dimitrova*. Shumen: Universitetsko izdatelstvo «Ep. K. Preslavski», 65–77.

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.

Ivanova, Elena Ju. 2002. *Ima* i *săm* v bolgarskix bytijnyx predloženijax (v sopostavlenii s russkimi). – *Săpostavitelno ezikoznanie,* XXVII, № 2, 5–23.

Karlík, Petr and Marek Nekula, Zdenka Rusínová. 1995. *Příruční mluvnice češtiny.* Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.

Korytkowska, Małgorzata. 1974. Predykat „ima" wobec „sam" we współczesnym języku bułgarskim. – *Studia z Filologii Polskiej i Słowiańskiej,* XIV, 203–211.

Mel'čhuk, I. A. 1995. *Russkij jazyk v modeli „smysl – tekst".* Moskva-Vena : Škola „Jazyki russkoi kul'tury".

Mladenova, Margarita. 2018. *Semantika na pritezhatelnite glagoli v balgarskiya, cheshkiya i ruskiya ezik.* Sofiya: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski"

Nicolova, Ruselina. 1990. Ekzistencialnite izrečenija s glagolite i v bălgarskija ezik v săpostavka s drugite slavjanski ezici. – *Săpostavitelno ezikoznanie,* XV, № 4–5, 236–242.

Sussex, Roland and Paul Cubberley. 2006. *The Slavic Languages*. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press.

Ukrajins′ka mova: Encyklopedija. 2004. Redkol. Rusanivs′kyj V.M., Taranenko O.O., Zjabljuk M.P. ta in. – 2-he vyd., vypr. i dop., K. : Vyd-vo "Ukrajins′ka encyklopedija" im. M.P.Bažana.

Vjačorka, Vincuk. 2015. „«Ja maju» ci «ŭ mjane ës′c′»? Iznoŭ pra belaruski indyvidualizm i kalektyvizacyju ŭ move", *Radyë Svaboda*, June 4, 2015. http://www.svaboda.org/content/article/27053489.html (accessed 15 January 2020).

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

Джунгвон Чжунг

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.