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

Common assumptions:

- Gk. ἔχω, Lat. habeō, Goth. haba, Lith. turiū, Sl. imamь (< *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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>have-languages</th>
<th>transitional languages</th>
<th>be-languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian/Croatian</td>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Isačenko 1974; Justus 1999a, 1999b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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

  čestь iměju ‘I have the honor’
  iměetь izrjadnoe položenie ‘[the room] has an excellent situation’
  imětь xorošij vidь ‘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) mašyna (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 muszkięt (-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
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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  mâmę  zaseť  have-pres. 1 pl. sow-PPP nom. sg. n.  ‘we have sown’

   b. Cz  mâmę  pole  zaseť  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.

- 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
- 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.)  habeō (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-gerv. acc. pl.)  habeō (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’:

\[
X \text{ takes } Y > X \text{ has, owns } Y \quad \text{(Heine 1997, 47)}
\]

- 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 then 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) *drēba* (tremble-pres. 3 sg) *raņkos* (hands-nom.)
   ‘mother’s hands tremble’ (Ambrazas 1997, 626)

   b. Li *aš* (I) *turiu* (have-pres. 1 sg.) *brolį* (brother-acc. m.)
   ‘I have a brother’ (Ivanov 1989, 173)
A rare Lithuanian construction of \( \text{pàs} \) ‘at, to’ followed by the accusative to refer to the possessor

9) \( \text{Li \ pàs kùpčiu} \) (merchant-acc. sg. m.) \( \text{yrà} \) (is) \( \text{duktē} \) (daughter-nom. sg. f.)

‘the merchant has a daughter’ (Fraenkel 1929, 84; see Danylenko 2005)

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

10) \( \text{R u nas} \) (we-gen.) \( \text{posejano} \) (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 \( \text{*em-} \) (Meillet 1924, 203):

1. \( \text{*jēti : *jimq} \) ‘take’ (determined imperfective) later replaced by numerous prefixed perfectives like OCS \( \text{vùn-ēti : vùn-īmq} \) ‘cavere’ (cf. Vaillant 1966, 194)
2. \( \text{*jimati : *jemljq} \) ‘take’ (indetermined imperfective) which would not take any prefixes
3. \( \text{*jimēti : *jimami} \) ‘hold, own, have’ (imperfective)

R \( \text{vzjat’ : voz’mu} \) ‘take’ (prft) \( \sim \) \( \text{brat’ : beru} \) ‘take’ (imprft)
R \( \text{vzjat’ : voz’mu} \) ‘take’ (prft) \( \sim \) \( \text{imet’ : imeju} \) ‘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, \( \text{*jimēti : *jimami} \) (due to morphological leveling) tended to be replaced by the present in \(-ēq\) (Vaillant 1966, 450)

the imperative stem in \(-ē-\): OCS \( \text{imēi}, \text{Cz mēj}, \text{Pol. miej} \) (2 sg)

6.1. Current distribution

- The archaic (athematic) (van Wijk 1929):
  
  Slov \( \text{imēti} : \text{imam} \)
  Cz \( \text{mīti} : \text{mám} \)
  P \( \text{mīć : mām} \)
  USo \( \text{mēć : mām} \)
  LSo \( \text{mēś : mām} \)

- Russian dialects had steadily followed the new pattern with \(-ē-\):
  
  MoR \( \text{imet’ : imeju} \)
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):

\[
\begin{align*}
P \text{imač} \text{ ‘take, catch’ vs. mieć ‘have’} \\
\text{Plb jāimq vs. met} \\
\text{LSo jimaś vs. LSo měš} \\
\text{USo jimač vs. měć} \\
\text{Slk imat’ vs. mat’} \\
\text{Cz jimati vs. miti}
\end{align*}
\]

\( maty \) 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 \( *jimq \) and \( *jimati \) (see paradigms without duals in (10):

11) OR \( iměti ‘have’ \) OR \( jati ‘take’ \)

\[
\begin{align*}
1 \text{ sg imamь} & \quad \text{pl imamь} & \quad \text{imu imetь} \\
2 \text{ sg imasi} & \quad \text{pl imate} & \quad \text{imeš imete} \\
3 \text{ sg imatь} & \quad \text{pl imatь} & \quad \text{imetь imutь}
\end{align*}
\]

MoU ‘have’ MoU jati (in agglutination only with synthetic future forms)

\[
\begin{align*}
1 \text{ sg maju} & \quad \text{pl. majemo} & \quad -\text{mu} -\text{memo} \\
2 \text{ sg maješ} & \quad \text{pl. majemo} & \quad -\text{meš} -\text{mete} \\
3 \text{ sg maje} & \quad \text{pl. majut’} & \quad -\text{me} -\text{mut’}
\end{align*}
\]

7. \( iměti \) in Old Church Slavonic and East Slavic

Constructions with \( iměti \) in OCS texts are largely loan translations from Greek constructions with \( \varepsilon\chi\varepsilon\nu \). However, all phraseological units of \( iměti \) cited in \textit{Lexicon linguae palaeoslavicae} (LLP), differ structurally from their Greek counterparts:

12) OCS \( zavistь \) (envy-acc. sg. f.) \( imějоštimmū \) (have-PrAP dat. pl. m.)

‘\( τῶν \phi\theta\nu\nu\omega\mu\mu\varepsilon\nu\omega \nu \)’ (Supr. 403:5)

OCS \( bolezni \) (sickness-acc. pl. f.) \( imějс \) (have-PrAP nom. sg. m.)

‘\( ἀλγυνόμενος \)’ (Supr. 335:13)

OCS \( ne \) (not) \( imy \) (have-PrAP nom. sg. m.) \( very \) (trust-gen. sg. f.)

‘\( θξυμάζων \)’ (Supr. 224:12)

The latter unit is obviously Slavic proper (MoU \( jnjaty viry ‘trust’ \)). 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 cǐtŭ (what-acc.) do mǐnŭ (to me) zūla (offence-gen.sg.) imeeşi (have-pres. 2 sg.)
   ‘what offence do you have to me?’ (Letter A7, no 752, ca 1080-1100)
14) ONovg ne (not) imamĭ (have-pres. 1 sg.) vūlosti (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 redistribution 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:
imamĭ (1 sg.) (iměti) ‘have’ + inf.
xoštŭ (1 sg.) (xotěti/xytěti) ‘want, will’ + inf. (Večerka 1993, 175)

Modality of imamĭ was difficult to distinguish from the temporal meaning proper in most of the contexts:
15) OCS to kako imamĭ (have-pres. 1 sg.) razuměti (understand-imprf)
   ‘how have I to understand that’ (καὶ πῶς ἔχωμεν γνῶναι)
   (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

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{vvs}a\ \text{jeliko}\ \text{imaa}š\ i\ \text{prodažd}b\ i\ \text{razdai}\ \text{nistiš}m\hfill \\
&\text{all}\ \text{much}\ \text{have-pres.}\ 2\text{sg}\ \text{sell-impr}\ 2\text{sg}\ \text{and}\ \text{give-impr}\ 2\text{sg}\ \text{poor-dat.}\ \text{pl.}\hfill \\
&\text{imě}ti\ \text{imaa}š\ \text{s}j\text{krovišč}e\ \text{na}\ \text{n/e/b/e/se} \ (\text{EO},\ 111a,\ 77b)\hfill \\
&\text{have-inf}\ \text{have:to-pres.}\ 2\text{sg}\ \text{treasure-acc.sg.n.}\ \text{on}\ \text{haven-loc.}\ \text{sg.}\ \text{n.}\hfill \\
&\text{pán}ta\ \oska\ \text{če}zi\ \text{pól}lž\text{son}\ \text{ka}d\ \text{diá}dοc\ \text{πτωχοίς},\hfill \\
&k\text{ai}\ \text{če}zi\ \text{θ}h\text{s}xw\text{r}n\ \text{en}\ \text{s}u\text{ra}x\text{n}y.\hfill \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘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 \text{imě}ti ‘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 \text{imě}ti/\text{maty} ‘have’ in Ukrainian/Belarusian

Independent paraphrases commonly attested in various registers and genres:

17) MUkr.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{ne maju toho rušyty} \ (\text{Charter of 1347})\hfill \\
&\text{not}\ \text{have:to-pres.}\ 1\text{sg.}\ \text{that-acc.gen.}\ \text{m.}\ \text{violate}\hfill \\
&\text{‘I must not violate that [bill of sale]’}\hfill \\
\end{align*}
\]

No future tense categorization due to incomplete grammaticalization

9.2. De-phasal extensions of \text{imě}ti ‘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
9.3. De-phrasal extensions of iměti/maty ‘have’ in Ukrainian

The de-phrasal 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 imutь (2 pl.) from both iměti and jati:

19) MUkr. a u kotoromь torhu imutь ix
    and in which-loc. sg. Market-loc. sg. m. have/take-pres. 3 pl. them
    kupiti tamь imutь 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-phrasal 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=ć-u* fut. > *pisa=ć-u* fut. 1sg.  
‘I want to write’ > ‘I will/shall write’

- Ukrainian exhibits a limited morphonological 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 *imēti* 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.
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