

Slavic “Quirky Subject” Constructions with \bar{e} -Statives: Origin and Development

Jasmina Grković-Major

Abstract: This paper discusses the origin and development of constructions with \bar{e} -statives denoting sensation, emotion, perception, and cognition, which exhibit traces of non-nominative alignment in the history of Slavic languages. Patterns where the experiencer is encoded by the accusative or dative case were inherited from an earlier semantically aligned system, whose relics are found in other Indo-European languages as well. These structures have been subjected to various syntactic, morphological, and semantic changes in the history of Slavic, leading to the establishment of transitive constructions and thus the strengthening of syntactic alignment. The analysis shows that the pace of this process and the types of changes that \bar{e} -stative constructions underwent were determined by the level of the participant’s volitivity and control.

1. Introduction¹

Constructions in Indo-European (IE) languages whose alignment differs from the canonical nominative alignment of late PIE have presented a great challenge for the past 150 years. As already pointed out by Delbrück (1900: 23–37), they fall into three categories: denoting (a) weather conditions, (b) experiences, and (c) modality. Although such structures vary, their common features are the following: (a) the verb is in the 3sg, and (b) the affected or experiencing person, if specified, is expressed by an oblique morphological case, most often accusative or dative. Being aberrant from the canonical structures with nominative subjects, these constructions instigated a fruitful discussion on subject types (“logical”, “psychological”, “grammatical”) already in the epoch of *Junggrammatiker* (Graffi 2001: 73–109). The authors, who considered the subject to be strictly a grammatical category, called these structures “subjectless” (Miklosich 1883).

¹ The glosses adhere to the Leipzig Glossing Rules, with the additional abbreviations AOR ‘aorist’; CONJ ‘conjunction’; IMPF ‘imperfect’; PART ‘particle’. Another abbreviation used in this paper is OCS ‘Old Church Slavonic’.

Further investigations, which included genetically unrelated languages, led to the question of whether the subject is a universal category present in the grammar of every natural language, as, for example, proposed by Keenan in 1976. However, a year later Foley and van Valin (1977) stated that “subject is not a valid theoretical construct (universal) in linguistic theory”, and that the idea of the subject-predicate dichotomy as elemental was brought to us through traditional logic and grammatical traditions since the Greeks. They based their claims on the analysis of three languages typologically different from IE systems. Especially interesting in this respect was Lakhota, an active-stative language, which they claim does not appear to have any clause-level referential structure, being a semantic-role dominated language. This is in accordance with a proposition given earlier by Klimov (1983: 106–07) in the framework of his contentive typology. He states that the nominative language type is characterized by a specific sentence type, determined by a transitivity feature, where, on the morphological level, the nominative and the accusative case have a clear “subject and object orientation” (see also Klimov 1972). Following Klimov, Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 271–76) argued that transitivity is the semantic basis both for nominative (“accusative”) and ergative languages, while the active-stative ones do not have this feature at all. Similarly, Desnickaja (1951: 143) stated that “transitivity and intransitivity in their mutual opposition are historical categories, and their role and significance in a lexical-semantic system as well as in the grammatical system of a given language may not be viewed as primarily given or stable”. Within a different theoretical framework, Hale (1983: 25) stated that there are languages in which lexical structure is configured differently from phrase structure. Recently we also encounter the term “semantic alignment”, describing “the phenomenon whereby basic alignment property of a language can best be described by appealing to semantic factors, rather than syntactic ones” (Donohue 2008: 24). What is common in all these explanations is that there are languages that have only semantic valency.²

The first one to observe such a typological profile of early Proto-Indo-European (PIE) was Meillet (1908: 321–30). He argued that PIE was a system with autonomous sentence elements, where a word was self-sufficient to indicate its role in the discourse, with no “governing” of one word by another. Morphological cases were used depending on the intended meaning, expressing semantic roles, and there was no verb valency.³ The basic principles of syntactic structuring were apposition and agreement, connecting semantically

² While *syntactic valency* refers to a number of arguments in a clause, *semantic valency* of a verb refers to “the number of the semantic roles associated with it” (van Valin 2003: 92). Cf. Payne 2007: 169–70.

³ For the function of the nominative case, Meillet (1908: 308) used the term “subject”, but for him it was a *topic*: “Le nominatif indique de quoi il est question dans la phrase,

related elements. Subsequently, a number of linguists elaborated the idea that PIE was a non-nominative, semantically aligned language, and that syntactic changes of PIE and its daughter languages are the result of typological transformation leading to the creation of syntactic alignment, caused by the rise of transitivity (see Burridge 1993; Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995; Krys'ko 1997; Bauer 2000; Lehmann 2002; Hewson and Bubenik 2006; Grković-Major 2007, 2010a; Barðdal and Eythórsson 2009; Luraghi 2010a; Pooth et al. 2019).

In the older stages of IE languages, we see a number of “syntactic archaisms” revealing this earlier typological profile: the so-called “absolute” verbs with no transitivity feature (Desnickaja 1984: 148) and only semantic valency, impersonal and absolute constructions (Bauer 2000), free word order, discontinuous constituents, null anaphora (Ponti and Luraghi 2018), etc. These syntactic archaisms are abundantly represented in the old Slavic languages as well (Grković-Major 2007, 2010a, 2011, 2012; Pavlović 2011). In the course of time, some of them disappeared, being replaced by new structures; some were reanalyzed; and some took up a marginal place in the system. However, some “syntactic residues” survived, and being non-canonical, formally marked structures, they became both semantically and functionally marked (cf. Havránek 1958: 79–80).

Among such syntactic archaisms in the Slavic languages are structures wherein the first participant is encoded by an oblique case. Their typology in contemporary systems is well described (Mrazek 1990). In this paper, we will focus on the origin and development of Proto-Slavic constructions with experiential \bar{e} -statives (infinitives in *-ěti*).

2. IE Constructions with Accusative and Dative Experiencers

Constructions with impersonal verbs and accusative or dative experiencers are well known from various IE languages (e.g., Bauer 2000: 93–145; Barðdal and Eythórsson 2009; Grković-Major 2012; Matasović 2013). This is a restricted set of verbs, mostly denoting unpleasant, negative experiences, both physical and emotional, such as Hittite *istarak-*, *irmaliya-*, *armaniya-* ‘be(come) ill’, *arsana*, *arsaniya-* ‘envy’, *kistanziya-* ‘be hungry’, etc. (Luraghi 2010b); Latin *paenitet*_{3SG} ‘regret’, *miseret*_{3SG} ‘be sorry’, *piget*_{3SG} ‘bother’, etc. (Matasović 2013); Lithuanian *gelti* ‘ache’, *skaudėti*, *sopėti* ‘hurt’, *niežėti* ‘itch’, etc. (Piccini 2008); and Old English *grisan* ‘fear’, *hreowsian* ‘trauern’ [‘mourn’], *yfelian* ‘suffer’, *tweogan* ‘doubt’ (Pishwa 1999), etc. We will illustrate them with well-known examples from Latin:

le ‘sujet’’. Much later, Lehmann (1976) argued that early PIE was a topic-prominent language.

- (1) a. me pudet
 I_{ACC} be.ashamed_{3SG.PRS}
 ‘I am ashamed’
- b. mihi dolet
 I_{DAT} be.in.pain_{3SG.PRS}
 ‘I ache’

While the encoding of the experiencer may vary, the common feature is a verb in the 3sg. As noted by Benveniste (1966: 227–36), 3rd person, as opposed to 1st and 2nd, is not a “person”. This is reflected in the fact that the form of the PIE 3sg *-m* conjugation differs from the 1sg and 2sg, which have endings of pronominal provenance. The original status of the 3sg can be clearly seen in meteorological verbs with null valency⁴ (Delbrück 1900: 23–24), probably belonging to the oldest chronological layer of impersonals (cf. Savčenko 1974: 333). They refer to the existence of natural phenomena, which, as Wackernagel (2009: 154) stated, “could be represented in this simple form without any thought of a subject”. He also points to the “strange” archaic use of the “indefinite” 3sg in early Latin legal phraseology, e.g., *si in ius uocat* ‘if (one man) calls (another) to court’, in the “Laws of the Twelve Tables” (5th c. BC) and the analogous Greek examples, claiming that “the agreement must be based on common inheritance, and this linguistic feature must be something very ancient” (Wackernagel 2009: 149–51). This brings us to the conclusion that 3sg initially just denoted a process.

The accusative experiencer seems to be older than the dative one (Delbrück 1900: 33). The morphological reconstruction of PIE cases, first given by Popov in 1879–81 (Popov 2012; see Kryś’ko 1990, Danylenko 2016),⁵ speaks in favor of this assumption; a form called “proto-accusative”, which subsequently gave the accusative case, was the first general oblique “case” in early PIE. A semantically diffuse form, expressing all kinds of circumstances under which an action or state took place, it generally meant “in reference to *x*”. Its residues in the form of *accusativus relationis* are present in many old IE languages (Ernout and Thomas 1953; Whitney 2004; Fraenkel 1928; Kryś’ko 1997; Grković-Major 2007, 2010b). Ernout and Thomas (1953: 19) considered it to be an appositive “autonomous determination” not governed by the verb. See, for example, (2):

⁴ Even Paul (1970: 131), who insisted that every IE sentence must have a subject and a predicate, admits that such sentences are truly subjectless. For more details about the origin of IE constructions with “meteorological verbs”, see Grković-Major 2013.

⁵ Popov’s reconstruction of IE morphological cases was later accepted and developed by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 233–52) within the active-stative typology of early PIE.

- (2) timeo Danaos (Latin)
 fear_{1SG.PRS} Greeks_{ACC}
 'I fear *in reference to* Greeks' > 'I fear Greeks'

Accordingly, impersonal constructions with the accusative experiencer may be interpreted as follows:

- (3) me pudet (Latin)
 I_{ACC} be.ashamed_{3SG.PRS}
 'in reference to me there is shaming' > 'I am ashamed'

With the rise of the dative case in PIE, originally restricted to the category [+animate] or personified notions (Kuryłowicz 1964: 191, 196), the dative, as the "recipient case", started entering constructions with experiencer verbs. Its competition with the older accusative is seen in the daughter languages (1).

These patterns were subjected to various changes in Indo-European languages. They could be replaced by nominative alignment constructions in different ways and at a different pace, even within the same subgroup of languages. The history of the Romance languages shows that the majority of impersonal emotion verbs shifted to a personal conjugation (Bauer 2000: 129). Old English had approximately 40 impersonal verbs, some of them having both dative and accusative experiencers, e.g., *maetan* 'dream' (Bauer 2000: 132), but in the Middle English period they were being replaced by agent-like experiencers (Pishwa 1999: 132). On the other hand, the process has been slower in German, which offers, according to von Seeffranz-Montag (1981: 536), "a slow motion picture of syntactic change in progress", with a tendency to replace them with dummy subject constructions.

3. Slavic Constructions with \bar{e} -Statives

Proto-Slavic (PS) had a number of \bar{e} -statives denoting physical, emotional, and mental states.⁶ Their infinitives (*-ěti*) are built with the PIE suffix $*\bar{e}$ (< $*eH1$) (see Yakubovich 2014), which was used in Balto-Slavic to form intransitive aorists (Meillet 1934: 244).⁷ In the development of the IE verbal systems, the same suffix was used to form different categories expressing a state or a "situ-

⁶ On verbs in *-ěti*, see Vaillant 1966: 377–405.

⁷ The present tense of the primary statives was in $e/i > i$ ($*mbnēti$ _{1INF}, $mbniši$ _{2SG.PRS} 'think'), while the present tense of denominals was in $(\bar{e})je$ ($*cělēti$ _{1INF}, $cělěješi$ _{2SG.PRS} 'heal'). Some of them have "anomalous" presents, such as $*xotēti$ _{1INF}, $xošteši$ _{2SG.PRS} 'want, wish', where the old form is preserved only in the 3PL *xotętъ*, while the rest of the present paradigm represents the old optative (Vaillant 1966: 403).

ation" (Beekes 1995: 230). According to Ivanov (1981: 221), PS \bar{e} -statives present a transformation of the inactive series of PIE verbs with "centripetal" semantics".⁸ In comparison to the *-mī* paradigm, this series was originally "defective", having only the 3sg. In other words, it was "structurally impersonal, without paradigmatic oppositions for person" (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995: 257).

PS monovalent verbs denoting physical states (*stojati* 'stand', *běžati* 'run away', *sěděti* 'sit', *ležati* 'lie', etc.) became intransitives already in OCS (4a). Semantically bivalent statives (**dbržati* 'hold', *vbrtěti* 'turn around', etc.) developed syntactically transitive constructions, with nominative subjects and accusative objects (4b):

- (4) a. ideže stoěste nodzě ego
 where stand_{3DU.AOR} feet_{NOM.DU} he_{GEN.SG}
 'where his feet stood' (OCS; *PsSin* 131.7)
- b. drǣžaaχφ i
 hold.back_{3PL.IMPF} he_{ACC}
 'they held him back' (OCS; *Mar* Lk 4:42)

On the other hand, statives denoting sensations, emotions, perception, and cognition do not always exhibit nominative alignment and have kept the accusative or dative experiencers throughout the history of Slavic.

3.1. Sensation and Emotion Verbs

Sensation and emotion verbs are analyzed together since the division between physical and emotional states is historically fuzzy. Emotion designations are the result of metaphorical and metonymical changes of words denoting concrete states, actions, and activities causing emotions or caused by emotions.⁹ Some \bar{e} -statives had undergone semantic shifts by the time of the first written records (e.g., OCS *skbrběti* 'be sad, worry, hurt' < 'be sharp, cut'; Petleva 1988–90: 52), but some of them were still polysemous, meaning both sensation and emotion (e.g., OCS *bolěti* 'be in pain physically, be in pain emotionally').

Verbs denoting negative sensations or emotions marked [-volitive] and [-control], such as PS **bolěti* 'be in pain, be sick, hurt' or **svbrběti* 'itch' (see

⁸ The PIE "semantically centripetal subject-version forms naturally became the means for marking intransitive semantics" (Gamkrelidze and Ivanov 1995: 292).

⁹ The first study dealing with the semantic sources of the words for emotions in (some) Indo-European languages was Kurath 1921, followed by Buck's 1949 comprehensive "dictionary of ideas".

- (7) a. ašte čeloveku bolit serce
 if man_{DAT} hurt_{3SG.PRS} heart_{NOM}
 ‘if a man’s heart hurts’ (Old Russian; SK)
- b. hlava mu boli
 head_{NOM} he_{DAT} hurt_{3SG.PRS}
 ‘he has a headache’ (Old Czech; Gebauer 2007: 386)
- c. ili ti e zabolěla glava
 or you_{DAT} AUX begin.to.hurt_{3SG.PTCP.PRF} head_{NOM}
 ‘or you got a headache’ (Old Serbian; PTP 71a)

Taking into account comparative IE data, we might presume that the affected body part was originally expressed by *accusativous relationis* (see Desnickaja 1984: 89–199).¹² The replacement of the accusative (8a) by the nominative (8b) is seen in the history of Lithuanian:

- (8) a. mane visą skauda
 I_{ACC} all_{ACC} hurts
 ‘I am aching all over’ (older Lithuanian; Piccini 2008: 445)
- b. man viskas skauda
 I_{DAT} all_{NOM} hurts
 ‘I am aching all over’ (Lithuanian; Piccini 2008: 445)

In some contemporary Slavic languages, such constructions are still impersonal, with no agreement between the nominative and the verb:

- (9) boljalo go zăb (Bulgarian)
 hurt_{PTCP.PRF.N} he_{ACC} tooth_{NOM.M}
 ‘he apparently had a toothache’

In others it has further developed into a structure where the nominative controls the agreement:

- (10) bolela me je glava (Serbian)
 hurt_{PTCP.PRF.F} I_{ACC} AUX head_{NOM.F}
 ‘I had a headache’

¹² Its trace in Slavic impersonal constructions is Russian *mne golovu bol’no*, while in personal constructions it was replaced by the instrumental case (see Gadolina 1958: 209–12).

Although it has a formal nominative subject (*glava*) and an accusative object (*me*), this is a pseudo-transitive, "quirky" construction, since the nominative denotes a stimulus, the accusative the experiencer, and the predicate (*boleti*) is intransitive.¹³

Eventually within the scheme of nominative alignment, the meaning of the predicate was reinterpreted as 'cause pain/restlessness' (see *RSANU* 2: 49; *SSKJ*). This change was supported by the fact that statives in *-ěti* shared the present *-i-* stem with the productive class of factitives in *-iti*, such as PS **gubiti* 'kill', **staviti* 'put', and **umoriti* 'kill'.¹⁴ The reinterpretation of sensation predicates as causatives led to the introduction of verbs that originally signified actions causing unpleasant sensations. The experiencer became an object, with no specification of a subject:

- (11) a. *menja znobit* (Russian)
 I_{ACC} shiver_{3SG.PRS}
 'I shiver'
- b. *bode me* (Slovenian)
 pierce_{3SG.PRS} I_{ACC}
 'it is piercing me'
- c. *guši me*¹⁵ (Serbian)
 choke_{3SG.PRS} I_{ACC}
 'it is choking me'

Since emotions, unlike sensations, imply evaluation as a conscious mental activity, their experiencer has a certain degree of control, depending on the type of emotion and level of the volitivity feature. This semantic class of verbs gradually developed nominative subjects.

Negative emotion verbs with low or no volitivity and control features, such as **bojati se* 'be afraid' and **styděti se* 'be ashamed', were transformed

¹³ Sentences such as Serbian **Petar_{NOM} boli_{3SG} Jovana_{ACC}*, with the intended meaning that Petar causes Jovan pain, are not acceptable at all. The construction was gradually generalized by including other nouns denoting stimuli: *Petra_{ACC} boli_{3SG} istina_{ACC}* 'Petar is hurt by the truth'. See Grković-Major 2012.

¹⁴ Although their present tense originally differed in accentuation, the two paradigms eventually were unified (Vaillant 1966: 437–38).

¹⁵ For more examples, see Mrazek 1990: 95–96. The affected body part can be specified with different prepositional phrases, which is a language-specific feature (Běličová and Uhlířova 1996: 57).

into reflexives expressing “middle”, “centripetal” semantics already in PS.¹⁶ In this way, they developed “internal transitivity”, with the accusative (object) **se* being coreferential with the subject:

- (12) *azъ esmъ ne boite se*
 I am NEG be.afraid_{2SG.IMP} REFL
 ‘it is me, do not be afraid’ (OCS; *Mar* Mt 14:27)

Negative emotion verbs exhibiting volitivity and control became intransitives. In the following example, OCS *trъpěti* ‘suffer’ expresses not only that a subject will suffer but that he is willing to do so. This further caused its semantic shift into ‘endure’:

- (13) *trъpljo do kon’ca*
 suffer/endure_{1SG.PRS} until end
 ‘I will (suffer >) endure until the end’ (OCS; *SS*: 705)

A difference between a negative sensation and a negative emotion can be seen in the polysemous verb *bolěti*. If it meant ‘be in pain, hurt physically’, the experiencer was, as shown earlier, patient-like, but if it meant ‘be in pain, hurt emotionally’, it had an agent-like experiencer:¹⁷

- (14) *dětištъ plačetъ i mati bolitъ*
 child cries and mother_{NOM} hurt_{3SG.PRS}
 ‘the child is crying and the mother is hurting (in emotional pain)’
 (OCS; *Supr* 312.8–9)

Changes in the constructions with negative emotion verbs were gradual and depended on their semantics. For example, PS **mbrzěti* ‘be loathsome, repellent’ is found in OCS only in the 3rd person with the dative experiencer:

- (15) *vesъ denъ slovesa moě mřъžěaxo imъ*
 all day words my be.loathsome_{3PL.IMP} they_{DAT}
 ‘my words were loathsome to them all day long’ (OCS; *PsSin* 55.6)

¹⁶ Reflexive verbs developed in IE languages lacking middle voice as a grammatical category (Večerka 1993: 130). Both categories express the same “centripetal” semantics. Cf. Shenker 1988.

¹⁷ This is in accordance with Seržant’s (2013: 305) conclusions that “there is a change in meaning concomitantly with the change from the original oblique case-marking into the nominative one”.

Old Slavic languages had not only the dative but also the accusative experiencer (see Dal' 1881: 326; *VW*; *StStp*: 233; *RJA* 7: 100–01), which points to the common PS origin of such patterns. They have been subjected to various language-specific changes, both syntactic and semantic. In the history of Serbian and Croatian, the original meaning 'be loathsome, repellent' is preserved with the non-nominative experiencers:

- (16) a. taj te dar sad mrzi
 this_{NOM} you_{ACC} gift_{NOM} now be.loathsome_{3SG.PRS}
 'that gift is loathsome to you' > 'you do not like that gift'
 (older Serbian and Croatian; *RJA* 7: 100–01)¹⁸
- b. Bogu to mnogo mrzi
 God_{DAT} this_{NOM} very.much be.loathsome_{3SG.PRS}
 'that is loathsome to God' > 'God does not like it'
 (older Serbian and Croatian; *RJA* 7: 100–01)¹⁹

The dative pattern was lost, while the accusative one is kept with the infinitive or the *da*-clause complement in contemporary Serbian and Croatian,²⁰ denoting a feeling of not wanting to do something. Its preservation was probably supported by the generalization of the type (11):

- (17) a. mrzi me pisati loše kritike (Croatian)
 be.loathsome_{3SG.PRS} I_{ACC} write_{INF} bad reviews_{ACC}
 'I do not feel like writing bad reviews'
- b. mrzi me da učim (Serbian)
 be.loathsome_{3SG.PRS} I_{ACC} COMP study_{1SG.PRS}
 'I do not feel like studying'

On the other hand, the verb also developed a transitive construction, accompanied by its semantic change into 'hate':

- (18) mrzim da učim (Serbian)
 hate_{1SG.PRS} COMP study_{1SG.PRS}
 'I hate to study.'

¹⁸ The example is from the works of M. Nelješковиć, a 16th-century writer from Dubrovnik (see *RJA* 6: 947).

¹⁹ The example is from a Croatian Glagolitic book, *Korizmenjak* (1508) (see *RJA* 6: 943).

²⁰ They are present today in both standards, although in different ratio (see the Serbian web corpus, <http://nlp.ffzg.hr/resources/corpora/srwac/>, and Croatian web corpus, <http://nlp.ffzg.hr/resources/corpora/hrwac/>).

Positive emotion statives are found in two kinds of constructions from the earliest records. When meaning ‘want’, which presumes volitivity and control,²¹ PS **hotěti/hotěti* ‘want, wish’ gradually developed transitive syntax with agent-like experiencers. However, the traces of semantic alignment are still found in the history of the Slavic languages; a patient is (rarely) attested in the genitive, mostly with abstract nouns (see *SDrJa* 3: 1381; *RJA* 3: 663–64), but often with the dative, which was dominant in OCS:

- (19) a. emuže ašte xošteši damь ti
 what_{DAT.SG} PART want_{2SG.PRS} give_{1SG.PRS} you_{DAT}
 ‘whatever you want I will give to you’ (OCS; *Mar* Mr 6:22)
- b. zlěmь dinarem ne htě grьci
 bad dinars_{DAT} NEG want_{3PL.PRS} Greeks
 ‘the Greeks do not want bad dinars’ (Old Serbian; *PP*: 43)
- c. ne tolma xotja pobědě
 NEG only want_{PTCP.NOM.SG} victory_{DAT}
 ‘not only wanting victory’ (Old Russian; Pravdin 1956: 72)
- d. jakému chceš, panno, muži
 which_{DAT.SG} want_{2SG.PRS} maiden_{VOC} husband_{DAT.SG}
 ‘which husband do you want, maiden?’
 (Old Czech; Gebauer 2007: 378)

On the other hand, the semantics of ‘wish’ (volitivity and no control) was expressed by the reflexive 3SG and a dative experiencer. The reflexive marks the “centripetal” predicate force, compatible with the recipient status of the experiencer. We find this type of construction already in OCS, but also in the old Slavic languages:

- (20) a. poslušati se jemu xošetě zapovedii
 obey_{INF} REFL he_{DAT} wish_{3SG.PRS} commandments_{GEN.PL}
 n<e>b<e>сѣнухъ
 divine
 ‘he wishes to obey the heavenly commandments’
 (OCS; *SSJa* 4: 785)²²

²¹ Wanting, as a simple intentional state (*MIT*: 132), implies a degree of control of the first participant, insofar as intentions presume cognitive processes.

²² This example is from a 13th-century Russian Church Slavonic text whose archetype was translated from Latin in Bohemia. The angle brackets in the example indicate letters that are omitted in the original manuscript.

- (20) b. němajú oprava kako b-i-mъ se htělo
 not.have_{3PL.PRS} things CONJ AUX-they_{DAT} REFL wish_{PTCP.PRF}
 ‘they do not have as many things as they wish’
 (Old Serbian; PP 286)
- c. mne s nim rostatísja ne xočetsja
 I_{DAT} with him part_{INF.REFL} NEG wish_{3SG.PRS.REFL}
 ‘I do not wish to part with him’
 (Old Russian; Borkovskij 1968: 139)
- d. zachtělo se mi masa
 wish_{PTCP.PRF} REFL I_{DAT} meat_{GEN.SG}
 ‘I wished for meat’
 (Old Czech; Gebauer 2007: 13)

As the transitive agent-like type was grammaticalized, the “quirky” reflexive pattern was reinterpreted into ‘*x* feels like’ and extended to incorporate other verb classes in all three branches of Slavic (Borkovskij 1968: 137–43; Georgieva 1969: 74–75; Grković-Major 2004: 198). Today this modal construction is productive in South and East Slavic (Běličová and Uhlířová 1996: 60), denoting a recipient-like experiencer situation. Ivić (1973: 86) distinguishes two basic types—the first one marked [+volitive] (21a), the second [–volitive] (21b)—while Mitkovska (2019: 283) thoroughly analyzes a continuum of the “various modal nuances from necessity and urge through need, craving, desire, inclination to determination” in South Slavic:

- (21) a. ide mi se u bioskop
 go_{3SG.PRS} I_{DAT} REFL in movies
 ‘I feel like going to the movies’ (Serbo-Croatian; Ivić 1973: 86)
- b. kija mi se
 sneeze_{3SG.PRS} I_{DAT} REFL
 ‘I have an urge to sneeze’ (Serbo-Croatian; Ivić 1973: 86)

3.2. Perception and Cognition Verbs

Perception and cognition verbs are analyzed together because they historically constitute a continuum: physical perception evolves into “mental perception” (‘see’ > ‘know’, ‘listen’ > ‘obey’).²³

²³ Due to the general closeness of these two domains, Talmy (2003: 139) postulates a cognitive domain of “ception, which encompasses the traditional notions of ‘perception’ and ‘conception’”.

These predicates are found in two types of constructions, which mark different degrees of their experiencer's volitivity and control. On the one hand, they gradually developed transitive syntax with agent-like experiencers. But still in the oldest records we see traces of semantic alignment. In OCS, as well as in the early Slavic languages, there is a competition in formalizing the second participant, which could be expressed by different cases. For example, with *slyšati* 'listen' it could be denoted by genitive (source), dative (goal), or even by *accusativus relationis* (22); and with *mьněti* 'think', by the double accusative²⁴ (23):

- (22) *ioanъ že slyšavъ vъ ožilišti děla °xva*
 John PART hear_{PTCP.PST} in prison deeds_{ACC} Christ's
 'when John heard in prison about the deeds of the Christ'
 (OCS; *Mar* Mt 11:2)

- (23) *vy bo běšni sošte ny*
 you_{NOM} PART insane_{NOM.PL} be_{PTCP.PRS.NOM.PL} we_{ACC}
cělomōdrgьnyę běšeny mьnite
 wise_{ACC.PL} insane_{ACC.PL} think_{2PL.PRS}
 'you, being insane, think that we, who are wise, are insane'
 (OCS; *Supr* 116.6)

At the same time, the process of establishing transitive syntax with the accusative object (24) or complement clause (25) was underway:

- (24) *da bō slyšali slovo °bžie*
 CONJ AUX listen_{PTCP.PRF} word_{ACC.SG} God's
 'in order to listen to God's word'
 (OCS; *Mar* Lk 5:1)

- (25) *ne mnite ěko pridъ razoriti zakona*
 NEG think_{2PL.PRS} COMP come_{1SG.AOR} abolish_{INF} law_{GEN.SG}
 'do not think that I have come to abolish the Law'
 (OCS; *Mar* Mt 5:17)

The second type of construction found in the old Slavic languages denotes lower control of the first participant. It consists of a reflexive 3sg and a dative

²⁴ The double accusative with perception, cognition, and communicative verbs is a syntactic archaism, replaced by complement clauses in the history of Indo-European languages (Ambrazas 1990: 148–49).

experiencer. Among perception verbs it is found only with the non-volitive *viděti* 'see',²⁵ when a person is not sure what s/he perceives:

- (26) a. mně sja vidit
 I_{DAT} REFL see_{3SG.PRS}
 'it seems to me' (Old Ukrainian; Borkovskij 1968: 141)
- b. vidí mi se
 see_{3SG.PRS} I_{DAT} REFL
 'it seems to me' (Old Czech; Kosek 2012: 10)
- c. ako vi se vidi
 if you_{DAT} REFL see_{3SG.PRS}
 'if it seems to you' (Old Serbian; PP 800)

The identical pattern, with the same semantics, is found with *mněti* in OCS and Old West and South Slavic:²⁶

- (27) a. čto ti se mñitъ
 what you_{DAT} REFL think_{3SG.PRS}
 'how does it seem to you?' (OCS; *Mar* Mt 17:25)
- b. mnyeffe mi se, bych stál na břěže
 think_{3SG.IMPF} I_{DAT} REFL AUX stand_{PTCP.PRF} on shore
 'it seemed to me that I stood on the shore' (Old Czech; VW)
- c. mněše mu se da je Ancilešъ ubijenъ
 think_{3SG.IMPF} he_{DAT} REFL COMP AUX Achilles killed
 'it seemed to him that Achilles was killed' (Old Serbian; T: 58–59)

This type of construction with perception and cognition \bar{e} -statives is today almost completely lost and is found only in some dialects (*BER* 4: 191).

²⁵ The group of visual (as well as auditory) perception verbs exhibits the opposition [-volitive] : [+volitive], e.g., OCS *viděti* 'see' : *zbrěti*, *glědati*, *sъmotriti*, all 'watch'—i.e., active vs. inactive perception (cf. Verhoeven 2007: 50).

²⁶ This pattern also existed in Old East Slavic but belonged to the higher registers (Borkovskij 1968: 138), which is indicative of its Church Slavonic origin.

4. Conclusions

The syntactic development of PIE and its daughter languages testifies to the gradual establishment of syntactic alignment caused by the rise of transitivity. This is reflected in the changes of PS constructions with \bar{e} -statives denoting negative sensations, emotions, perception, and cognition. The pace of this process and the types of changes the \bar{e} -stative constructions were subjected to were determined by the level of the participant's volitivity and control.

Statives denoting negative bodily sensations, characterized by the features [-volitive] and [-control], exhibit traces of semantic alignment in the history of Slavic: their participant was encoded by the accusative or dative. The accusative pattern was eventually reinterpreted and generalized by including causatives, and being aberrant from the dominant alignment, it became a marked structure, denoting the aberrant status of the participant: a patient-like experiencer. The fact that semantic markedness corresponds to syntactic markedness points to a kind of isomorphism between the two linguistic levels.

Since emotions always include evaluations, experiencers of emotion statives have a certain degree of volitivity and control. However, they evolved differently depending on the level of that degree. If denoting "centripetal" non-volitive negative states, they gave reflexives, becoming "internally transitive" already in PS. In this way, they formalized the double "middle" nature of their agent- and patient-like experiencer. Verbs marked [+volitive] evolved into intransitives with agent-like experiencers from the earliest records. Positive emotion statives marked as [+volitive] eventually gave transitives with agent-like experiencers. Although they have nominative subjects from the earliest written sources on, the process of creating transitive constructions was gradual, since it took time for the accusative objects to be grammaticalized. The same applies to perception and cognition verbs, which also eventually developed transitive syntax with agent-like experiencers.

Non-volitive positive emotion, perception, and cognition statives also had impersonal reflexives with dative-like experiencers (recipients) in the history of Slavic. While the pattern with emotion statives was preserved and then grammaticalized as a modal construction denoting a recipient-like experiencer with other verb classes as well, this possibility no longer exists with perception and cognition verbs. This is because, compared to other semantic classes of experiential statives, their experiencer has the highest control over a situation. This is in accordance with Haspelmath's (2001: 63–64) conclusion that "cognition predicates show the strongest affinity with the agent-like experiencer construction".

Finally, we want to point out that the gradual changes of PS experiencer \bar{e} -stative constructions caused by the rise of transitivity leading to the creation of the syntactically aligned systems encompassed different linguistic levels.

This was a multifaceted process which included morphological and syntactic innovations, followed by semantic reinterpretations and shifts, while semantic shifts could also lead to syntactic changes.

Sources

- [L] (18th c.) *Lekaruša*. Manuscript. National Library of Serbia, sign. RS 79.
- [Mar] (1883/1960) *Codex Marianus glagoliticus*. V. Jagić, ed. Graz: Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt.
- [PP] (1929–34) *Stare srpske povelje i pisma*. Vol. 1. Parts 1–2. Ljubomir Stojanović, ed. Belgrade: SKA. [Zbornik za istoriju, jezik i književnost srpskog naroda, vol. 19, no. 24.]
- [PsSin] (1922) *Sinajskaja psaltyr': Glagoličeskij pamjatnik XI vėka*. Sergěj Sever'-janov, ed. Petrograd: Izdanie Rossijskoj akademii nauk'.
- [PTP] (1763) *Pesmarica Teodora Popovića Dobraševića*. Manuscript. Novi Sad: Library of Matica srpska, sign. BMS: Mk 168.
- [RJA] (1880–1976) *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Vols. 1–24. Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- [RSANU] (1959–) *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog književnog i narodnog jezika SANU*. Vols. 1– . Belgrade: SANU.
- [SDrJa] (1893–1912) *Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkogo jazyka po pis'mennym pamjatnikam*. Vols. 1–3. I. I. Sreznevskij. St. Petersburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- [SK] *Starorusskij korpus*. Available at: http://www.ruscorpora.ru/new/search-mid_rus.html. Last accessed 30 March 2020.
- [StStp] (1963–65) *Słownik staropolski*. Vol. 4. Wrocław: Polska Akademia Nauk.
- [SRJa] (1975–) *Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv*. Vols. 1– . Moscow: Nauka.
- [SS] (1994) *Staroslavjanskij slovar', po rukopisjam X–XI vekov*. R. M. Cejtlin, R. Večerka, and Ě. Blagova, eds. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.
- [SSJa] (1966–97/2006) *Slovar' staroslavjanskogo jazyka*. Vols. 1–4. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta.
- [SSKJ] *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Available at: <http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/sskj.html>. Last accessed 30 March 2020.
- [Supr] (1904) *Suprasl'skaja rukopis'*. Vols. 1–2. Sergěj Sever'janov, ed. St. Petersburg: Izdanie Imperatorskoj akademii nauk.
- [T] (1951) *Eine altserbische Trojasage*. Allan Ringheim. Prague, Upsal: Imprimerie de l'état à Prague.
- [VW] *Vokabulář webový* [online]. Version 0.4.2. Oddělení vývoje jazyka Ústavu pro jazyk český AV ČR. Available at: <http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz>. Last accessed 30 March 2020.

References

- Ambrasas, Vitautas. (1990) *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Barðdal, Jóhanna and Thórhallur Eythórsson. (2009) "The origin of the oblique-subject construction: An Indo-European comparison". Vit Bubenik, John Hewson, and Sarah Rose, eds. *Grammatical change in Indo-European languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 179–93.
- Bauer, Brigitte. (2000) *Archaic syntax in Indo-European: The spread of transitivity in Latin and French*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Beekes, Robert S. P. (1995) *Comparative Indo-European linguistics: An introduction*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Běličová, Helena and Ludmila Uhlířová. (1996) *Slovanská věta*. Prague: Euroslavica.
- Benveniste, Émile. (1966) *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. Vol. 1. Paris: Gallimard. [Bibliothèque des sciences humaines.]
- [BER] (1962–) *Bŭlgarski etimologičen rečnik*. Vols. 1–. V. Georgiev, I. Gülbov, J. Zaimov, and S. Ilčev. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Borkovskij, V. I. (1968) *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskij sintaksis vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov: Tipy prostogo predloženiya*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Buck, Carl Darling. (1949) *A dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages*. Chicago, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Burridge, Kate. (1993) *Syntactic change in Germanic: Aspects of language change in Germanic with particular reference to Middle Dutch*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dal', Vladimir. (1881) *Tolkovnyj slovar' živago velikoruskago jazyka*. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg, Moscow.
- Danylenko, Andrii. (2016) "Oleksandr Popov (1855–80) and the reconstruction of Indo-European noun inflection". *Language & history* 59(2): 112–30.
- Delbrück, Berthold. (1900) *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Vol. 3. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- Desnickaja, A. V. (1951) "Iz istorii razvitija kategorii glagol'noj perexodnosti". *Pamjati akademika L. V. Ščerby*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo LGU.
- . (1984) *Sravnitel'noe jazykoznanie i istorija jazykov*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Donohue, Mark. (2008) "Semantic alignment systems: What's what, and what's not". Mark Donohue and Søren Wichmann, eds. *The typology of semantic alignment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 24–75.
- Ernout, Alfred and François Thomas. (1953) *Syntaxe latine*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Foley, William and Robert Van Valin, Jr. (1977) "On the viability of the notion of 'subject' in universal grammar". *Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 293–320.

- Fraenkel, Ernest. (1928) *Syntax der litauischen Kasus*. Kaunas: L.U. humanitarinių mokslų fakulteto leidinys.
- Gadolina, M. A. (1958) "Tvoritel'nyj priimennoj". S. B. Bernštejn, ed. *Tvoritel'nyj padež v slavjanskix jazykax*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 289–312.
- Gamkrelidze, T. V. and V. V. Ivanov. (1995) *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A reconstruction and historical analysis of a proto-language and a proto-culture*. Berlin, New York: De Gruyter.
- Gebauer, Jan. (1929/2007) *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého*. Vol. 4. *Skladba*. Prague: Academia.
- Georgieva, V. L. (1969) "Bezličnye predloženiya po materialam drevnejšix slavjanskix pamjatnikov (osobenno staroslavjanskix)". *Slavia* 38: 63–90.
- Graffi, Giorgio. (2001) *200 Years of syntax: A critical survey*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grković-Major [Mejdžor], Jasmina. (2004) "Impersonalne konstrukcije u starosrpskom jeziku". *Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane* 33(1): 249–61.
- . (2007) "Razvoj sintaksičke tranzitivnosti". *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* 71–72: 417–33.
- . (2010a) "Kognitivni aspekti razvoja tranzitivnosti". Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor and Milorad Radovanović, eds. *Teorija dijahronijske lingvistike i proučavanje slovenskih jezika*. Belgrade: SANU, 43–62.
- . (2010b) "The role of syntactic transitivity in the development of Slavic syntactic structures". Björn Hansen and Jasmina Grković-Major, eds. *Diachronic Slavonic syntax: Gradual changes in focus*. Munich, Berlin, Vienna: Verlag Otto Sagner, 63–74. [Wiener slawistischer Almanach, 74.]
- . (2011) "The development of predicative possession in Slavic languages". Nomachi Motoki, ed. *The grammar of possessivity in South Slavic languages: Synchronic and diachronic perspectives*. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University, 35–54. [Slavic Eurasian Studies, 24.]
- . (2012) "Obrazac srpskog 'boli me glava' kao sintaksički arhaizam". *Glas SANU—Odeljenje jezika i književnosti* 419(28): 43–60.
- . (2013) "Povodom Miklošičeve studije o rečenicama bez subjekta". Jasmina Grković-Mejdžor and Aleksandar Loma, eds. *Miklosichiana bicentennialia: Zbornik u čast dvestote godišnjice rođenja Franca Miklošiča*. Belgrade: SANU, 293–310.
- Hale, Ken. (1983) "Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages". *Natural language & linguistic theory* 1(1): 5–47.
- Haspelmath, Martin. (2001) "Non-canonical marking of core arguments in European languages". Alexandra Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon, and Masayuki Onishi, eds. *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 53–84.
- Havránek, Bohuslav. (1958) "Metodická problematika historickosrovnávacího studia syntaxe slovanských jazyků". *K historickosrovnávacímu studiu slovanských jazyků*. Prague: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, 77–88.

- Hewson, John and Vit Bubenik. (2006) *From case to adposition: The development of configurational syntax in Indo-European languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ivanov, Vjač. Vs. (1981) *Slavjanskij, baltijskij i rannebalkanskij glagol: Indoevropskie istoki*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Ivić, Milka. (1973) "Problematika modalnih rečenica". Jaroslav Burian, ed. *Otázky slovanské syntaxe*. Vol. 3. *Sborník symposia "Modální výstavba výpovědi v slovanských jazycích"*, Brno 27.–30. září 1971. 1st edition. Brno: Universita J. E. Purkyně, 85–91.
- Keenan, Edward L. (1976) "Towards a universal definition of subject". Charles N. Li, ed. *Subject and topic*. London, New York: Academic Press, 303–34.
- Klimov, G. A. (1972) "K charakteristike jazykov aktivnogo stroja". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4: 3–13.
- . (1983) "On contentive typology". *Lingua e stile* 18(3): 327–41.
- Kosek, Pavel. (2012) "Vývoj slovosledných vlastností auxiliáru préterita ve starší češtině". Kateřina Najbrtová, ed. *Gramatika a korpus 2012: 4. mezinárodní konference*. Hradec Králové: Gaudeamus, Univerzita Hradec Králové, 1–17.
- Krys'ko, V. B. (1990) "Istorija indoevropskogo akkuzativa v 'Sintaksičeskix issledovanijax' A. Popova". *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4: 119–30.
- . (1997) *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka: Ob'jekt i perexodnost'*. Moscow: Indrik.
- Kurath, Hans. (1921) *The semantic sources of the words for the emotions in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and the Germanic languages*. Menasha, WI: George Banta Publishing Company.
- Kuryłowicz, Jerzy. (1964) *The inflectional categories of Indo-European*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Lehmann, Winfred P. (1976) "From topic to subject in Indo-European". Charles N. Li, ed. *Subject and topic*. London, New York: Academic Press, 445–56.
- . (2002) *Pre-Indo-European*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man. [Journal of Indo-European Studies, 41.]
- Luraghi, Silvia. (2010a) "The rise (and possible downfall) of configurationality". Silvia Luraghi and Vit Bubenik, eds. *Continuum companion to historical linguistics*. London, New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, 212–29.
- . (2010b) "Experienter predicates in Hittite". Ronald Kim, Norbert Oettinger, Elisabeth Rieken, and Michael Weiss, eds. *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European studies in honor of H. Craig Melchert on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Ann Arbor, MI; New York: Beech Stave Press, 249–64.
- Matasović, Ranko. (2013) "Latin *paenitet me, miseret me, pudet me* and active clause alignment in Proto-Indo-European". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 118: 93–110.

- Meillet, Antoine. (1908) *Introduction a l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.
- . (1934) *Le slave commun*. Paris: Librairie ancienne Honoré Champion.
- Miklosich, Franz (1868–1874) *Vergleichende Syntax der slavischen Sprachen*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller.
- . (1883) *Subjectlose Sätze*. Vienna: Wilhelm Braumüller.
- [MIT] (1999) *The MIT encyclopedia of the cognitive sciences*. Robert A. Wilson and Frank C. Keil, eds. Cambridge, London: The MIT Press.
- Mitkovska, Liljana. (2019) "Types of modality in South Slavic stative reflexive-dative constructions". *Slověne* 8(2): 260–87.
- Mrazek, Roman. (1990) *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis slavojskix literaturnyx jazykov: Isxodnye struktury prostogo predložénija*. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně.
- Paul, Hermann. (1880/1970) *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Pavlović, Slobodan. (2011) "Elementi nekonfigurativne sintakse u starim slovenskim pismenostima". *Zbornik Matice srpske za slavistiku* 80: 47–62.
- Payne, Thomas E. (2007) *Describing morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Petleva, I. P. (1993) "Ėtimologičeskie zametki po slavjanskoj leksike. XVII". Ž. Ž. Varbot, L. A. Gindin, G. A. Klimov, V. A. Merkulova, V. N. Toporov, and O. N. Trubačev, eds. *Ėtimologija 1988–1990: Sbornik naučnyx trudov*. Moscow: Nauka, 52–57.
- Piccini, Silvia. (2008) "Traces of non-nominative alignment in Lithuanian: The impersonal constructions in Indo-European perspective". *Baltistica* 43(3): 437–61.
- Pishwa, Hanna. (1999) "The case of the 'impersonal' construction in Old English". *Folia linguistica historica* 20(1–2): 129–51.
- Ponti, Edoardo Maria and Silvia Luraghi. (2018) "Non-configurationality in diachrony: Correlations in local and global networks of Ancient Greek and Latin". *Diachronica* 35(3): 367–92.
- Pooth, Roland, Peter Alexander Kerkhof, Leonid Kulikov, and Jóhanna Barðdal. (2019) "The origin of non-canonical case marking of subjects in Proto-Indo-European: Accusative, ergative, or semantic alignment". *Indogermanische Forschungen* 124(1): 245–64.
- Popov, A. V. (2012) *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis imenitel'nogo, zvatel'nogo i vinitel'nogo padežej v sanskrite, drevnegrečeskom, latinskom i drugix jazykax*. Moscow: Li-brokom (reprint).
- Pravdin, A. B. (1956) "Datel'nyj priglagoľnyj v staroslavjanskom i drevnerusskom jazykax". *Učenyje zapiski Instituta slavojanovedénija* 13: 3–120.
- Savčenko, A. N. (1974) *Sravnitel'naja grammatika indoevropskix jazykov*. Moscow: Vysšaja škola.

- Schenker, Alexander M. (1988) "Slavic reflexive and Indo-European middle". Alexander M. Schenker, ed. *American contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists. Linguistics*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, 363–83.
- Seržant, Ilja A. (2013) "Rise of canonical subjecthood". Ilja A. Seržant and Leonid Kulikov, eds. *The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 283–310.
- Talmy, Leonard. (2003) *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Vol. 1. *Concept structuring systems*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Vaillant, André. (1966) *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Vol. 3. *Le verbe*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- van Valin, Robert D., Jr. (2003) *An introduction to syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Večerka, Radoslav. (1993) *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax*. Vol. 2. *Die innere Satzstruktur*. Freiburg: U. W. Weiher.
- Verhoeven, Elisabeth. (2007) *Experiential constructions in Yucatec Maya: A typologically based analysis of a functional domain in a Mayan language*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- von Seeffranz-Montag, Ariane. (1981) "'Subjectless' constructions and syntactic change". Jacek Fisiak, ed. *Historical syntax*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 521–53.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. (2009) David Langslow, ed. *Lectures on syntax, with special reference to Greek, Latin, and Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Whitney, William Dwight. (2004) *Sanskrit grammar (Including both the classical language, and the older dialects, of Veda and Brahmana)*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers Pvt. Ltd. (reprinted from the second edition of 1889).
- Yakubovich, Ilya. (2014) "Reflexes of Indo-European 'ē-Statives' in Old Indic". *Transactions of the Philological Society* 112(3): 386–408.

Jasmina Grković-Major
Department of Serbian Language and Linguistics
Faculty of Philosophy
University of Novi Sad
Novi Sad, Serbia
jgrkovicns@gmail.com