

GIVE, HAVE, and TAKE in Slavic

Laura A. Janda

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

1. Introduction

In the Slavic languages the GIVE, HAVE, and TAKE verbs (verbs of possession and exchange) have informed and influenced one another in terms of their semantic and syntactic expressions. The etymologically related verbs for HAVE and TAKE have undergone very different historical developments in various parts of the Slavic world. The construction of HAVE has played a crucial role in determining whether or not TAKE will be patterned after GIVE. In most of Slavic (the West and South Slavic languages) HAVE is expressed in active constructions, just as in English *Sally has a book*. The construction of HAVE as a transitive verb facilitates a parallel between GIVE and TAKE (as achievement vs. loss of an object by an active participant). Thus the expressions of HAVE, GIVE and TAKE in West and South Slavic could be paraphrased as in (1).

- (1) a. HAVE — Sally:NOM has book:ACC 'S has a book'
- b. GIVE — Sally:NOM gives Tommy:DAT book:ACC 'S gives T a book'
- c. TAKE — Sally:NOM takes Tommy:DAT book:ACC 'S takes a book from T'

In East Slavic, however, HAVE is normally expressed instead as existence in a location, roughly paraphrasable in English as *At Sally there is a book*. This construction of HAVE avoids attributing an active role to the possessor, thus undermining the notion that loss of possession might be actively experienced and preventing the parallel construction of GIVE and TAKE.

This is an offprint from:

John Newman (ed.)
The Linguistics of Giving
John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam/Philadelphia
1998

(Published as Vol. 36 of the series
TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES IN LANGUAGE, ISSN 0167-7373)

ISBN 90 272 2933 3 (hb.) / 90 272 2934 1 (pb.) (European)
1-55619-647-4 (hb.) / 1-55619-648-2 (pb.) (U.S.)

© Copyright 1998 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

In East Slavic, therefore, TAKE is expressed as a syntactic variant of HAVE (existence in a location), and is not parallel to GIVE. The paraphrases of HAVE, GIVE, and TAKE for East Slavic are given in (2).

- (2) a. HAVE — at Sally:GEN [is] book:NOM 'S has a book'
 b. GIVE — Sally:NOM gives Tommy:DAT book:ACC 'S gives T a book'
 c. TAKE — Sally:NOM takes at Tommy:GEN book:ACC 'S takes a book from T'

The syntactic and semantic profiles of Slavic GIVE, HAVE, and TAKE verbs will be examined below, as well as the factors that contribute to the variety of interactions we observe among them.

2. An overview of GIVE, HAVE, and TAKE

It appears that the semantic and syntactic expression of TAKE was variable in Slavic, and that, in a sense, there were two possibilities, one that took advantage of the opposition between TAKE and GIVE, and the other based upon a similar relationship between TAKE and HAVE. Late Common Slavic had two verbs that are glossed as 'take', *brati* and *ęti*, both of which are continued in most modern Slavic languages (although *ęti* reflexes generally require a prefix), and even form a suppletive imperfective/perfective "pair" in several languages (cf. Czech *brát/vzít*, Russian *brat'/vzjat'*).¹ The first verb, *brati*, is descended from the Proto-Indo-European **bher-* usually glossed as 'bear, carry', and thus makes reference to transferal or movement of an object, an important ingredient of GIVE, the prototypical "three-place" verb.² The second verb, *ęti*, shares a root with *imęti* 'have' (the two verbs differed only in their suffixes). At the time of Late Common Slavic the genetic relationship between *ęti* and *imęti* was still transparent (their conjugations were similar and in one form, the third person plural *imęti* 'they take/have', the paradigms even overlapped), but phonological and morphological changes have since made the link quite obscure. Suffice it to say at this point that there is considerable precedence for relating the concepts of TAKE, GIVE, and HAVE, with TAKE alternatively construed either as the inverse of GIVE or as assumption of/removal from possession (HAVING).

Thus the etymologies of the Slavic words for TAKE betray semantic relationships between TAKE and both GIVE (via the third concept transferal) and HAVE (where TAKE is a change of state verb referring to the state coded by HAVE). Oddly enough these relationships are borne out in the semantic and syntactic structures of the modern languages.

As Newman (1996) has amply demonstrated, GIVE is at once both simple and complex. It is simple because it is a basic concept motivated by universal human experience. It is complex because it involves three participants (one of which may be omitted if recoverable from context, but none of which may be altogether absent³), and involves prototypical expectations across a variety of domains: spatio-temporal (physical transferal of an object from one person's hands to another's), control (subject relinquishes control of object to RECIPIENT), force-dynamics (object moves from subject to RECIPIENT), and human interest (RECIPIENT is advantaged by this event; cf. Newman 1996:33-54). Most constructions with three participants using other verbs can be shown to be motivated as extensions of GIVE.⁴

Aside from synonyms of GIVE and their extensions, the next closest concept is the antonym TAKE, which, in its prototypical sense, also involves the passing of an object from one person to another. Yet TAKE differs from GIVE in several important respects, as Newman (1996:42) points out: (a) the force-dynamics is reversed (object moves toward subject rather than away); (b) the subject acts both as energy source (agent) and as energy sink (RECIPIENT); (c) the role of the GIVER ("takee") is less important; that participant may be omitted. We could add to this a contrast in the domain of human interests: the RECIPIENT is advantaged in GIVE, but the "takee" is disadvantaged in TAKE (actually, both can be true in some sense for both scenarios, but GIVE highlights advantage to the third participant, whereas TAKE highlights disadvantage). This contrast is brought into relief when we examine common synonyms for GIVE and TAKE, as in Table 1.

The combination of close parallels and clashing contrasts between GIVE and TAKE motivates the mapping of structures associated with GIVE to expressions of TAKE, but this is not the only logical solution available. As suggested above, TAKE can also take advantage of structures associated with HAVE. Slavic has realized both alternatives, but, as is so often the case with languages, the distinction is not entirely black and

Table 1. *Synonyms for GIVE and TAKE*

GIVE	TAKE
'offer'	'steal'
'serve'	'seize'
'give as a present'	'swipe'
'deliver'	'appropriate' ⁵

white. Most Slavic languages clearly prefer one alternative over the other, yet there are situations where both strategies are employed to various degrees. The choice is partially determined by how HAVE is expressed, i.e. whether possessors are conceived of as agents of possession or as mere locations of possession. In West and South Slavic, HAVE is expressed by means of a transitive verb: the possessor is a nominative subject, the verb agrees with it, and the possessed object is an accusative direct object, as in (3).

Czech

- (3) *Petr má novou peněženku.*
 Peter:NOM has new wallet:ACC
 'Peter has a new wallet.'

Here the possessor appears in the role of the active participant, the agent of possession.

In East Slavic, however, the possessor is conceived of as the location or landmark of a state pertaining to the object in a construction that consists of the preposition *u* 'at' + possessor:GEN + verb 'be' (optional and usually omitted) + possessed object, which functions as the grammatical subject, as in (4).

Russian

- (4) *U Petra novyj bumažnik.*
 at Peter:GEN [is] new wallet:NOM
 'Peter has a new wallet.'⁶

The division of Slavic languages into "have-languages" (West and South Slavic) and "be-languages" (East Slavic) has long been clear, but its probable origin has only recently been probed, and the impact of this division on the syntax of TAKE has not been widely recognized. The Late

Common Slavic verb *iměti* 'have' was paradigmatically a marginal item, belonging to a class of only five athematic (i.e. conjugated without a theme vowel) verbs (the other four were *byti* 'be', *ěsti* 'eat', *věděti* 'know', and *dati* 'give'). At the close of the Common Slavic era VjV sequences in thematic verbs contracted to yield long \bar{V} in West and South Slavic, giving thematic verbs a stem shape similar to the athematics. At this point the uniform pattern of the athematics was simpler and more distinctive than that of the contracted thematics. In about the fourteenth century a reevaluation of verbal stem types promoted *iměti* 'have' to the role of paradigmatic prototype for vast sectors of the verbal lexicon and this once marginalized conjugation type became highly productive. In East Slavic, however, contraction did not take place; *iměti* 'have' and the other athematic verbs remained marginalized and eventually assimilated to thematic paradigms, without ever experiencing the prototypical status they gained in West and South Slavic. In the case of *iměti* 'have' (and for some languages *věděti* 'know'), paradigmatic lack of prominence compromised semantic prominence as well, contributing to the development of an expression for HAVE that treats possession as location in East Slavic.⁷ In East Slavic TAKE cannot be constructed like GIVE, but instead derives its construction from that of HAVE, where the possessor acts as the locus of the existence of the object rather than as a transitive agent.

We will survey enough languages to give us an idea of the geographical distribution of concepts of TAKE in Slavic: Russian, Ukrainian (East Slavic); Czech, Polish, Slovak (West Slavic); Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian (South Slavic).⁸

3. TAKE as a parallel to GIVE

What is an antonym? Is TAKE an antonym of GIVE or of HAVE, and how is this expressed syntactically? The Slavic languages have woven these three concepts into the fabrics of their grammars in various ways, as we shall see below. But before we turn to these alternate solutions, let us take up the first question concerning the nature of antonyms.

It is often observed (cf. Andersen 1989) that antonyms bear a special relationship to each other, one that transcends simple opposition. In order for words to be antonyms, or indeed, to be related in their meaning, they

must make reference either to a more abstract concept embracing the scale the antonyms represent, or to another concept which relates them by chance. It is not uncommon in the etymological history of words to find that different languages have developed opposing meanings from the same source, thus realizing over the diachronic dimension the synchronic relationships that antonyms have in a given language. The English word *black* derives from the same root as French *blanc* and Russian *belyj*, both of which mean 'white', namely from Proto-Indo-European **bhā-* 'shine, burn.' Here the concept of 'fire' by chance unites the incandescent light it produces, generally perceived as white, and the charred remains blackened by flames. Another notorious example within Slavic are the etymologically identical Russian *čerstyj* 'stale' and Czech *čerstvý* 'fresh', both of which reflect Proto-Indo-European **kr-*, the source of English *hard*, a meaning closer to that of the original Proto-Indo-European than either of the Slavic reflexes. Both Russian and Czech have abstracted the original meaning of firmness as an index of relative age, but they have done so in different domains of food. Whereas the Russians (or their ancestors) have applied this concept to bread, which hardens as it ages, the Czechs have based their observations on fruits and vegetables which show the opposite correlation since they go soft as they rot. One more example is of even more recent provenience, the meaning of Russian and Czech *pitomec*, which in both languages transparently refers to 'the one who is fed', being related to the root *pit-* 'feed.' In Russian, however, it means 'alumnus, graduate', whereas in Czech it means 'fool' — a pair of apparent opposites. Again, however, the difference in meaning is due to the domain in which it was realized. Russians have applied this word to the abstract domain of intellectual nourishment, whereas Czechs use it metaphorically to refer to humans who exhibit the characteristics of domesticated livestock, demonstrably less cunning than their cousins who must find their food in the wild.

Like 'fire' in the case of *black*, *belyj*, and food/feeding in the cases of *čerstyj*, *čerstvý* and *pitomec*, an oblique experiencer presents a domain that can yield opposite interpretations. The oblique experiencer may serve as either the goal of object transfer (in the case of GIVE) or as the source of object transfer (in the case of TAKE). The antonymical roles of goal and source allow TAKE to be conceived of as an antonym and therefore variant

Table 2. GIVE and TAKE in parallel constructions

GIVE	Subject	Object	Oblique
	Agent	Patient	Experiencer/Goal
TAKE	Subject	Object	Oblique
	Agent	Patient	Experiencer/Source

of GIVE, where both involve the transfer of an object by an agent. The parallel constructions of TAKE and GIVE can be diagrammed as in Table 2, where the first row of the description refers to grammatical roles (realized by means of cases and/or prepositions) and the second row refers to semantic roles.⁹

The only mismatch, highlighted in the table, involves the opposites Goal and Source. In languages where this parallel is exploited syntactically and TAKE uses the GIVE construction, the one non-correspondence is usually ignored by the grammar (though it retains some force in the domain of human interest: GIVE is associated with benefit, whereas TAKE is associated with harm). The West and South Slavic languages permit the construction of TAKE as GIVE, marked by the following case structure (also known as the indirect object construction): *Nominative Agent, Accusative Patient, Dative Experiencer* (the order of these items is variable, since they are clearly marked by cases, and in some of the Slavic languages a pronoun in the nominative case can be dropped).

The use of the dative indirect object construction allows the grammar to capitalize on another parallel, that between HAVE and TAKE, shown in

Table 3. HAVE and TAKE in parallel constructions

HAVE	Subject Agent	Object Patient	
TAKE = ATTAIN "HAVE"	Subject Agent	Object Patient	Oblique Experiencer/Source

Table 3. Both HAVE and TAKE here describe transitive actions, the latter optionally expressing also the source of the object. Indeed, it is fruitful to paraphrase TAKE as ATTAIN "HAVE", since this highlights the parallel.

The indirect object type of TAKE construction is best instantiated in Czech and Slovak, where this is the only neutral way to construct TAKE, and the case system is well-maintained. Here are some examples:

Czech

- (5) *Hana dala Petrovi dárek.*
 Hana:NOM gave Peter:DAT gift:ACC
 'Hana gave Peter a gift.'

- (6) *Zloděj vzal Petrovi peněženku.*
 thief:NOM took Peter:DAT wallet:ACC
 'The thief took Peter's wallet.' (lit. '... took wallet from Peter.')

The datives in TAKE expressions such as (6) are often termed "datives of possession" in the literature, but their function is actually distinct from that of all other possessives. If no other possessive is present in the expression, it is assumed that the dative experiencer of the loss is also the possessor. However, true possessives referring both to the experiencer and to another possessor can be used along with the dative; if the dative's role were truly possession, the expressions in (7) and (8) would be ungrammatical, since two possessives cannot modify a single noun phrase in Czech. These examples prove that the semantic force of the dative is to identify the person (or thing) *from whom* something was taken, not *whose* something was taken:

- (7) *Zloděj vzal Petrovi moji peněženku.*
 thief:NOM took Peter:DAT my wallet:ACC
 'The thief took my wallet from Peter.'
- (8) *Studenti mi vzali všechny moje knihy.*
 students:NOM me:DAT took all my books:ACC
 'The students took all my books from me.'

The situation is the same in Slovak and nearly so in Polish, as the examples (9)-(12) attest.

Slovak

- (9) *Daj mi to!*
 you give me:DAT it:ACC
 'Give it to me!'
- (10) *Ukradli mi dáždnik.*
 stole me:DAT umbrella:ACC
 'They stole [my] umbrella from me.'

Polish

- (11) *Mary daje pudełko siostrze.*
 Mary:NOM gives box:ACC sister:DAT
 'Mary gives a box to her sister.'
- (12) *Zabrała mi syna.*
 took me:DAT son:ACC
 '[She] took [my] son from me.'

Macedonian

Macedonian generally lacks case marking on nouns and adjectives, but compensates for this by inserting the appropriate pronominal form to refer to some non-nominative noun phrases.¹⁰ Thus in indirect object constructions the direct object (cf. *knigata* 'book:the' in (13)) is also realized as a pronoun (*ja* 'her:ACC'). Both GIVE and TAKE have this construction:

- (13) *Mu ja dadov knjigata.*
 him:DAT her:ACC gave book:the
 'I gave him the book.'
- (14) *(Toj) mi go ukrade časovnikot.*
 (he:NOM) me:DAT him:ACC stole watch:the
 'He stole the watch from me.'

Although the prototypical TAKE expression involves a dative indirect object in these languages, it is possible to construe TAKE differently, highlighting instead the fact that the "takee" is the source (rather than the experiencer) of the transferal of the object, and this is done with a prepositional phrase rather than the indirect object. Here is an example from Czech, where the source is identified in (15a) by the preposition *od* 'from' governing the genitive case, but in (15b) by a dative pronoun:

- (15) a. *Ani pes by od*
 not even dog:NOM would:AUX from
něho kůrku chleba nevzal.
 him:GEN crust:ACC bread:GEN not took
 'Not even a dog would take a crust of bread from *him*.'
- b. *Ani pes by mu*
 not even dog:NOM would:AUX him:DAT
kůrku chleba nevzal.
 crust:ACC bread:GEN not took
 'Not even a dog would take away his crust of bread.'

It appears that these two sentences encode the "same" hypothetical physical event (transfer of bread from man to dog), and indeed they form a syntactic minimal pair. However, the concepts communicated are strikingly different. (15b) focuses on how the man will experience the loss, whereas (15a) specifically avoids such a focus. The man in (15a) is so wicked or deceitful that even a dog will shun him. By contrast the man in (15b) is so pitiful and wretched that even a dog will feel sorry for him and not want to harm him by taking his food.

Serbo-Croatian

The competition between these two alternative constructions (indirect object vs. prepositional phrase) is rather evenly matched in Serbo-Croatian. The dative appears in prototypical indirect object constructions with GIVE as in (16).

- (16) *Molim, dajte mi pet maraka.*
 please you give me:DAT five:ACC stamps:GEN
 'Please, give me five stamps.'

but the number of TAKE verbs that admit a dative indirect object is very limited, consisting of only three examples: *uzeti* 'take', *oteti* 'take away', and *ugrabiti* 'seize'. There are furthermore usage restrictions on TAKE verbs. The dative generally appears only with the past tense of *oteti* and *ugrabiti*; and *uzeti* can also take the prepositional phrase *od* 'from' + GEN, in which case it connotes 'borrow' rather than 'take (permanently)'. The following examples demonstrate the variation between the dative and the *od* + GEN prepositional phrase observed with *uzeti* 'take', as in (17)-(18).

- (17) *Uzeo je novac od nje.*
 took AUX money:ACC from her:GEN
 'He took money from her.'
- (18) *Uzeo joj je novac.*
 took her:DAT AUX money:ACC
 'He took her money.'

To sum up, West and South Slavic languages tend to highlight the "takee's" role as an active experiencer of loss by using an indirect object construction, although it is possible to treat the "takee" as merely the source of the possessed object in a prepositional phrase.

4. TAKE as a parallel to HAVE

In East Slavic, as we have seen in Section 2, HAVE is normally conceived of as presence in a possessor's vicinity. The transferal of possession expressed by TAKE is consequently conceived of as an action on an object in a possessor's vicinity. If HAVE can be diagrammed in East Slavic as in Table 4, then the attainment of HAVE, a transitive concept, should involve the addition of a third entity, which now serves as the subject and agent, and removes the patient (and now object) from the locus of possession (now realized as a source), as in Table 5.

Table 4. *East Slavic HAVE*

HAVE	Object	Oblique
	Patient	Locus of possession

Table 5. *East Slavic TAKE*

ATTAIN	Subject	Object	Oblique
"HAVE"	Agent	Patient	Locus of possession
TAKE	Subject	Object	Oblique
	Agent	Patient	Experiencer/Source

The normal construction for TAKE in East Slavic capitalizes on the semantic parallels available in HAVE, but chooses to suppress the mismatch between locus of possession and experiencer in favor of the former (semantically close to the concept of source). This construction can be illustrated with the examples in (19) and (20).

Russian

- (19) *Slava vzjal u menja zontik.*
 Slava:NOM took at me:GEN umbrella:ACC
 'Slava took [my] umbrella from me.'

Ukrainian

- (20) *Ja vidibrav u xlopciv hroši.*
 I:NOM took at boys:GEN money:ACC
 'I took the money from the boys.'

In (19) (and 20) the patient (*zontik* 'umbrella') and the experiencer/source (*u menja* 'at me:GEN') constitute two separate constituents (cf. alternative word orders such as *U menja Slava vzjal zontik*). In other words, this type of construction could not be paraphrased as *'Slava took the at.me umbrella', where 'at.me' modifies 'umbrella'. On the contrary, there are still three syntactic roles involved in TAKE, even in East Slavic. The indirect object construction cannot be used to express TAKE, and thus a sentence like Russian:

- (21) **On mne vzjal poslednjuju kopejku.*
 he:NOM me:DAT took last kopeck:ACC
 'He took my last kopeck.'

is ungrammatical. The closest we come to this sort of construction is in sentences that describe some sort of strong effect (usually damage or destruction) on the patient rather than actual 'taking', as in Russian:

- (22) *On razbil otcu mašinu.*
 he:NOM smashed up father:DAT car:ACC
 'He smashed up his father's car.' (cf. Levine 1984:494)

5. Discussion

The above data yield a significant syntactic isogloss in Slavic: TAKE has an indirect object construction in West and South Slavic, but uses a prepositional phrase expressing location in East Slavic. In West and South Slavic a possessor is construed as an agent and appears as the nominative subject of a transitive verb. This construal facilitates the identification of the "takee" (the agent of HAVE prior to object transfer) as an experiencer equivalent to the RECIPIENT of GIVE. Here the actual subject (in the nominative case) of HAVE is clearly correlated with the potential subjects (in the dative case), i.e. the experiencers of both GIVE and TAKE.¹¹ In East Slavic the construal of possessors as passive locations prevents this identification. One might wonder whether there are not other factors at work here. Could it be that the dative case has a different range of meanings and is just not as suited to the expression of loss as to the expression of gain in East Slavic? A look at independent evidence indicates that this is not the case. The dative case is unrestricted in marking the experiencer of both benefit and harm in all areas of Slavic. Where damage is involved (as in (22) above), both Czech and Russian can mark the experiencer with the dative, as the following examples show:

Czech

- (23) *Kdo mi šlápl na rajčata?*
 who:NOM me:DAT stepped on tomatoes:ACC
 'Who stepped on [my] tomatoes [this impacted on me]?'

Russian

- (24) *Kto mne nastupil na pomidory?*
 who:NOM me:DAT stepped on tomatoes:ACC
 'Who stepped on [my] tomatoes [this impacted on me]?'¹²

Grammatically (23) and (24) are identical and both utterances highlight the loss experienced by the possessor. Both languages also use dative government with verbs denoting harm, and indeed, this kind of verbal government is more prevalent in Russian than in Czech, as can be seen in Table 6.

There is clearly nothing in the semantics of the dative case (which by itself bears no more semantic freight than 'experience') that would prevent

Table 6. Czech and Russian verbs denoting 'harm' used with dative

Czech		Russian	
<i>vadit</i>	'bother'	<i>mešat'</i>	'bother, hinder'
<i>škodit</i>	'harm'	<i>vredit'</i>	'harm, hurt'
<i>ublížovat</i>	'hurt'	<i>izmenjat'</i>	'betray'
<i>překážet</i>	'hinder'	<i>nadoedat'</i>	'get on nerves of'
<i>mstit</i>	'take revenge on'	<i>mstit'</i>	'take revenge on'
<i>nesedět</i>	'annoy'	<i>dosaždat'</i>	'annoy'
		<i>naskučit'</i>	'bore'
		<i>ostočertet'</i>	'repel'
		<i>oprotivet'</i>	'repel'
		<i>opostylet'</i>	'be hateful'

it from signaling loss in East Slavic. Instead it is the presumption of possession on the part of the "takee", combined with the fact that possessors are in East Slavic mere locations (a historical result of the marginal paradigm of *iměti* 'have') that prevents construal of TAKE as harm, parallel to the benefit of GIVE.

Continuing the discussion on the basis of Czech and Russian data, we can also observe that whereas TAKE is exclusively a two-place verb in Russian, it is most usually a three-place verb in Czech, even when the "takee" is not expressed (either by omission or because there is none, as in (25)). Thus, although it is possible to simply 'take an umbrella' (25a), it is more normal to highlight the fact that this action will advantage the subject by using the dative reflexive pronoun *si* (25b). Here the dative entity experiences a benefit directly parallel to that produced by GIVE:

- (25) a. *Vezmi deštník!*
 you take umbrella:ACC
 'Take the/an umbrella!'
- b. *Vezmi si deštník!*
 you take REFL:DAT umbrella:ACC
 'Take the/an/your umbrella [for your benefit]!'

(25a) is a neutral statement, and could be used even in a context where it is clear that the umbrella is not going to be used by the hearer, such as when moving from one home to another. In (25b), however, the speaker is

asserting that the hearer will (probably) need to use the umbrella; the semantic import of the dative pronoun *si* is suggested by the gloss 'for your benefit'. Russian, which does not permit the "takee" to be expressed as an indirect object experiencer, also does not allow this status to be conferred on the "taker", so there is no Russian equivalent to (25b), and Russian allows only (26).

- (26) *Voz'mi zontik!*
 you take umbrella:ACC
 'Take the/an umbrella!'

The relationship between TAKE and GIVE or HAVE is not merely one of antonymy. These relationships are motivated by shared abstract concepts such as transferal and existence at a location. We may conclude with the following observations. Slavic data suggest that TAKE is certainly not as basic a concept as GIVE or HAVE. Instead, TAKE is manifested as an extension or variant of GIVE or HAVE. All Slavic languages express GIVE the same way, with the experiencer as a dative indirect object. As previous research has shown (Janda 1993; Smith 1985; Bachman 1980), the basic meaning of the dative case is "potential subjecthood", i.e. potential to serve as the agent of a further action, which is why the dative is the ideal vehicle for expressing the role of the experiencer.¹³ The prototypical agent and/or dative entity is a human being, with animals and animate objects progressively less felicitous and hence rarer in the dative case (as shown by Greenberg 1974). Slavic languages are not united, however, in their construction of HAVE, which is expressed with an active agent of a transitive verb in West and South Slavic, but as mere existence at a location (which might or might not be human or animate) in East Slavic. In West and South Slavic, where both HAVE and GIVE imply that the possessor is a sentient being capable of reacting (the actual subject of HAVE and a potential subject in the GIVE construction), the TAKE construction likewise tends to capitalize on these (mainly human) qualities of the third participant. But in East Slavic, where the HAVE construction contains no implications about the animacy of the possessor, TAKE construes the possessor as nothing more than a passive location with no particular qualities, be they human or not. There is apparently not enough support in the semantic and syntactic systems of the East Slavic languages to realize the parallels between TAKE and GIVE. Language is indeed a system *ou tout se tient* — phonological

shape (e.g. in the case of the athematic stems) can contribute to or detract from the viability of lexical items and their syntactic constructions and further, semantic construals and syntactic constructions appear to form "communities" that can mutually support one another. TAKE depends on both GIVE and HAVE for its expression.

Notes

1. See discussion of these verbs in Townsend and Janda (1996:216, 239).
2. Compare Buck's (1949/1988) entries for TAKE (733-734) and CARRY (707-708).
3. In Newman's examples, such as *We give to the Red Cross* and *I like to give presents* the missing patient and RECIPIENT are clearly *money* and *people*, respectively.
4. This is certainly true for Slavic and some other European languages, cf. Janda (1993).
5. This is a sampling of glosses of synonymous verbs in Czech. All GIVE verbs are constructed exactly like 'give' and all TAKE verbs have the same construction as well, cf. Janda (1993:560).
6. East Slavic languages do have transitive verbs meaning 'have', 'possess', and the like, but the prototypical construction for expressing this relationship is the one cited in (2). All others are marked and of low frequency.
7. The fate of the athematic verbal paradigm in Slavic is examined in great detail in chapter 2 of Janda (1996).
8. The only major Slavic languages missing from this list are Belarusian (which behaves like Russian and Ukrainian) and Bulgarian (which is similar to Macedonian). For convenience, we will use the traditional name "Serbo-Croatian" to refer to the linguistic entity which may be variously termed Serbian, Croatian, and Croato-Serbian.
9. Both the grammatical roles and the semantic roles referred to in this article are admittedly ad-hoc. The former are inspired by the grammatical options available in Slavic languages, and the latter are inspired by the semantic domains identified by Newman (1996).
10. Pronouns are inserted for definite direct objects and for all indirect objects. Moreover, specific direct objects can trigger this phenomenon as well.
11. As indicated below, potential subjecthood is a core meaning of the dative case, as argued by Janda (1993), Smith (1985), and Bachman (1980).
12. Levine (1984) provides a good discussion of this phenomenon in Russian.

13. The sources cited have demonstrated the dative's expression of potential subjecthood only in Slavic and Germanic languages. However, the core meaning of the dative does not appear to be very language-specific, and this may well be valid for other languages or even for languages in general.

References

- Andersen, Henning. 1989. "Markedness theory — the first 150 years." In Olga M. Tomić (ed.), *Markedness in synchrony and diachrony*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 11-47.
- Bachman, Ronald David. 1980. "The subject potential of the dative case in Modern Russian." Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Buck, Carl Darling. 1949/1988. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1974. "The relation of frequency to semantic feature in a case language (Russian)." *Working Papers on Language Universals* 16:21-45.
- Janda, Laura A. 1993. "The shape of the indirect object in Central and Eastern Europe." *Slavic and East European Journal* 37:533-563.
- Janda, Laura A. 1996. *Back from the Brink: A Study of How Relic Forms in Languages Serve as Source Material for Analogical Extension*. München: Lincom Europa [*Lincom Studies in Slavic Linguistics* 1].
- Levine, James S. 1984. "On the dative of possession in contemporary Russian." *Slavic and East European Journal* 20:493-501.
- Newman, John. 1996. *Give: A Cognitive Linguistic Study*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter [*Cognitive Linguistics Research* 7].
- Smith, Michael B. 1985. "Event chains, grammatical relations, and the semantics of case in German." *Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 21:388-407.
- Townsend, Charles E. and Laura A. Janda. 1996. *Common and Comparative Slavic: Phonology and Inflection*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.

In the series **TYPOLGICAL STUDIES IN LANGUAGE (TSL)** the following titles have been published thus far:

8. SLOBIN, Dan I. & Karl ZIMMER (eds): *Studies in Turkish Linguistics*. 1986.
9. BYBEE, Joan L.: *Morphology. A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form*. 1985.
10. RANSOM, Evelyn: *Complementation: its Meaning and Forms*. 1986.
11. TOMLIN, Russel S.: *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse. Outcome of a Symposium, Eugene, Oregon, June 1984*. 1987.
12. NEDJALKOV, Vladimir (ed.): *Typology of Resultative Constructions. Translated from the original Russian edition (1983). English translation edited by Bernard Comrie*. 1988.
14. HINDS, John, Shoichi IWASAKI & Senko K. MAYNARD (eds): *Perspectives on Topicalization. The case of Japanese WA*. 1987.
15. AUSTIN, Peter (ed.): *Complex Sentence Constructions in Australian Languages*. 1988.
16. SHIBATANI, Masayoshi (ed.): *Passive and Voice*. 1988.
17. HAMMOND, Michael, Edith A. MORAVCSIK and Jessica WIRTH (eds): *Studies in Syntactic Typology*. 1988.
18. HAIMAN, John & Sandra A. THOMPSON (eds): *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse*. 1988.
19. TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth C. and Bernd HEINE (eds): *Approaches to Grammaticalization, 2 volumes (set)* 1991
20. CROFT, William, Suzanne KEMMER and Keith DENNING (eds): *Studies in Typology and Diachrony. Papers presented to Joseph H. Greenberg on his 75th birthday*. 1990.
21. DOWNING, Pamela, Susan D. LIMA and Michael NOONAN (eds): *The Linguistics of Literacy*. 1992.
22. PAYNE, Doris (ed.): *Pragmatics of Word Order Flexibility*. 1992.
23. KEMMER, Suzanne: *The Middle Voice*. 1993.
24. PERKINS, Revere D.: *Deixis, Grammar, and Culture*. 1992.
25. SVOROU, Soteria: *The Grammar of Space*. 1994.
26. LORD, Carol: *Historical Change in Serial Verb Constructions*. 1993.
27. FOX, Barbara and Paul J. Hopper (eds): *Voice: Form and Function*. 1994.
28. GIVÓN, T. (ed.): *Voice and Inversion*. 1994.
29. KAHREL, Peter and René van den BERG (eds): *Typological Studies in Negation*. 1994.
30. DOWNING, Pamela and Michael NOONAN: *Word Order in Discourse*. 1995.
31. GERNSBACHER, M. A. and T. GIVÓN (eds): *Coherence in Spontaneous Text*. 1995.
32. BYBEE, Joan and Suzanne FLEISCHMAN (eds): *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. 1995.
33. FOX, Barbara (ed.): *Studies in Anaphora*. 1996.
34. GIVÓN, T. (ed.): *Conversation. Cognitive, communicative and social perspectives*. 1997.
35. GIVÓN, T. (ed.): *Grammatical Relations. A functionalist perspective*. 1997.
36. NEWMAN, John (ed.): *The Linguistics of Giving*. 1998.
37. RAMAT, Anna Giacalone and Paul J. HOPPER (eds): *The Limits of Grammaticalization*. n.y.p.

A full list of titles published in this series is available from the publisher.