Gianguido Manzelli
University of Pavia, Italy; gianguido.manzelli@unipv.it

Predicative possession and a possible contact-induced phenomenon among Finnic and East Slavic languages: having a headache between the Baltic Sea and the sources of the Volga River

Predicative possession is a much studied topic but much must still be done if one takes into account the extension of this kind of predication to certain semantic areas such as experiential constructions. This paper has the modest ambition to explore the possibility of using the expression of having a headache in Finnic and East Slavic languages as an interesting piece of evidence to be seriously considered as regards the vexed question of the origin of the adessive-like possessor in Russian.

Key-words: predicative possession, experiential constructions, Finnic languages, East Slavic languages, language contact.

1. Introduction[1]

The inspiration for this article were two papers by Ilya A. Seržant (Seržant & Bjarnadóttir 2014; Seržant 2015) where the Baltic, Russian and Finnic experiential expressions for having a headache or something similar played a key role. I am not concerned here with the morphology of verbal forms, brilliantly analyzed in the aforementioned papers, i.e. the presence of an "unexpected" **-o-* grade in the verbal base and a stative marker **-ē-* in Baltic and Slavic (Lithuanian *sk-a-ud-ė-ti* 'ache', Latvian *s-ā-p-ē-t* 'idem', Russian *b-o-l'-e-t* 'idem', Seržant & Bjarnadóttir 2014: 221–235; Seržant 2015: 332, footnote 5, 334). Rather I am interested in the Experiencer expressed by an "adessive-like PP [Prepositional Phrase]" (Seržant 2015: 328) as in Russian **у меня** болит голова / *u menjá bolít golová* 'I have a headache' compared with the adessive case of Estonian *mul valutab pea* 'idem' and Finnish *minulla särkee pää* 'idem' (Seržant 2015: 333), i.e. with the same structure used in the standard predicative possession, cf. Russian **у меня** (есть) новый дом / *u menjá (est') nóvyj dom* 'I have (got) a new house' and Estonian *mul on uus maja* 'idem' and Finnish *minulla on uusi talo* 'idem'. While Seržant and Bjarnadóttir have focused their attention on the dative (DAT) constructions which one finds in the Baltic languages such as Lithuanian and Latvian and in one Finnic language such as Livonian[2],

---

[2] "Livonian, in turn, has a dative case in *-n* in its Curonian dialect (historically stemming from the genitive and essive) and a second dative in *-l* in the Salis dialect representing a merger of the former adessive and allative case […] Morphologically different cases that are inherently linked to the semantic domain of dative case will be

spoken in the Courland peninsula in days gone by[3], my aim was and is to enlarge the frame and collect more data from all the sources available to me. My first step was a paper written in Italian I presented during a meeting of Slavists ("Linguistica slava 6") on the island of Procida (Gulf of Naples) in 2016 (Manzelli 2017). In the title of that paper I contrasted Russian *u menjá bolít golová* 'I have a headache' with Bulgarian *bolí me glaváta* 'idem' because all the South and West Slavic languages have an Experiencer in the accusative, unlike Russian, Belorussian (Belarusian) and Ukrainian (Belorussian admits also a dative Experiencer, Ukrainian admits both a dative and an accusative Experiencer as in Middle Russian, see, for Ukrainian, Seržant & Bjarnadóttir 2014: 231). I considered this fact a good starting point to scrutinize the old issue[4] of whether the adessive-like prepositional phrase for the possessor in East Slavic predicative possession is due to a Finno-Ugric (more precisely: Finnic / Baltic-Finnic / Balto-Finnic)[5] influence or vice versa[6]. Whereas Seržant took into account the Baltic (Lithuanian and Latvian) and the East Slavic languages (Old Russian, Middle Russian, Modern Russian, and Ukrainian)[7] and three Finnic languages (Livonian, Estonian and Finnish), I extended my research to more minor Finnic languages, such as Votian or Votic, Ingrian[8], Karelian Proper (North Karelian and South Karelian, the latter also around Tver), Olonets/Aunus Karelian or Livvi (between Lake Ladoga and Lake Onega, towards Lake Ladoga), Ludic Karelian (between Lake Ladoga and Lake Onega, towards Lake Onega) and Veps or Vepsian (in the area south of Lake Ladoga, Lake Onega and Lake Beloye)[9]. In this paper I have had to sacrifice my ambition to include more languages (such as other Finno-Ugric languages, more Indo-European groups such as the Germanic group as well as the Indo-Iranian macro-group – represented by Romani and Ossetic –, and finally, the Turkic languages of the Volga-Kama region), i.e. the languages spoken (or once spoken) in the huge area stretching from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea.

referred to in this chapter as DAT in order to highlight the structural correspondences across these languages and leave aside the morphological discrepancies." (Seržant 2015: 327). One could argue about the definition of Salis Livonian *-l* as a second dative because it preserved the *-l* element meaning 'next to', cf., e.g. Finnish adessive *-lla/-llä*, allative *-lle* [lleʔ], and ablative *-lta/-ltä*, clearly exhibiting the sequence of two suffixes, thus adessive *-lla/-llä* is the outcome of *-l- + -na/-nä* essive or generic locative as in *kotona* (*koto-na*) 'at home' (see, e.g., Judakin 1997: 42) etc. As for the problem of a datival genitive in old Finnish (16th c. CE) see Inaba (2015) and section 6.

[3] The last speaker of Livonian (with Livonian as L1), Grizelda Kristin (Latvian Kristina), née Berthholde, died in Canada in 2013 at the age of 103. Her cousin Viktor Berthold (Latvian Viktors Bertholds) had already died in Courland (Kurzeme) in 2009. The other Livonian variety mentioned by Seržant (2015: 327, 328), the Salis (Latvian Salaca) dialect was still spoken by 22 persons at the mouth of the river Salis in 1846 (Décsy 1965: 77). That variety perhaps disappeared in the 1860s, see Winkler & Pajusalu (2009) and Grünthal (2015).

[4] The issue was debated in the 1960s by Veenker (1967), Décsy (1967), and Kiparsky (1969), and mentioned as a highly controversial question in the volume specifically devoted to contact linguistics by Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 238–246), see also, for the lack of a verb 'have' in the Baltic *Sprachbund*, Thomason (2001: 110).

[5] English also *Fennic languages*, German *ostseefinnische Sprachen*, Russian прибалтийско-финские языки / *pribaltíjsko-fínskie jazykí*, Hungarian *balti finn nyelvek*, Finnish *itämerensuomalaiset kielet*, Estonian *läänemeresoome keeled*.

[6] Winkler (2003: 205) and Honti (2007: 29) are very skeptical about the connection between the Russian adessive-like PP and the Finnic adessive as a contact-induced phenomenon but they do not exclude the possibility of a Russian influence on the Finnic languages!

[7] As regards "dative-like marked experiencers in a subject-like position" Seržant (2015: 325) makes mention of Scandinavia, (Low) German, Polish and Belarusian.

[8] Though pertaining to two different Finnic subgroups, Votian (Votic) is a southern or western Finnic language while Ingrian is a northern or eastern Finnic language, both are or, better, were spoken in Ingria (Swedish *Ingermanland*, Estonian *Ingeri*, Finnish *Inkeri*, Russian Ижора / *Ižóra*), the region between Estonia and Saint Petersburg.

[9] The first document written in a Finnic language (probably a form of Karelian), dating back to 1240–1260 ca., was found among the birch bark letters discovered in old Novgorod (*grámota* 292), see Xelimskij (2000b: 342–344).

2. The historical framework

Roman, Byzantine, Persian and Arabic sources give us only scanty details as regards what happened in the first millenium CE in the area of the Volga basin. More detailed, but starting only from the 9th century, is the so-called Russian Primary Chronicle (known in Russian as Повесть временных лет / *Póvest' vremennýx let* 'Tale of past / bygone years', earlier as Несторова летопись / *Néstorova létopis'* 'Nestor's Chronicle'). Actually, we do not have the original copy but only later compilations such as the *Laurentian Chronicle* written by the monk Lavrentij in 1377 and the *Hypatian Chronicle* (end of the 1420s). However, as for the ethnic makeup of eastern Europe, the Russian chronicles provide a lot of interesting and valuable information. A good example is the following passage (*Hypatian Chronicle* 1908: col. 4r):

> Въ Афетовї же части сѣдить Русь. Чюдь. и вси ꙗзыцѣ Мерꙗ Мурома. Всь. Мордва. Заволочьскаꙗ Чюдь. Пермь. Печера. Ꙗмь. Югра. Литва. Зимигола. Корсь. Сѣтьгола. Либь. Лꙗховѣ же и Пруси. и Чюдь присѣдꙗть к морю Вꙗрꙗскому.

Transliteration (my italics):

> V" Afetovï že časti sědit' Rus'. *Čjud'*. i vsi językě *Merę Muroma. Vs'.* Mordva. Zavoločʹska *Čjud'. Perm'.* Pečera. *Jęm'. Jugra.* Litva. Zimigola. Kors'. Sěťgola, *Lib'.* Lęxově že i Prusi. i *Čjud'.* prisědęt' k morju Vęręskomu.

English translation (based on the *Laurentian Chronicle*,[10] Finno-Ugric names in italic characters):

> In the share of Japheth lies Rus', *Chud'*, and all the gentiles: *Merya, Muroma, Ves', Mordva, Chud'* beyond the portages, *Perm'*, Pechera, *Yam', Ugra*, Litva, Zimegola, Kors', Let'gola and *Liv'*. The Lyakhs, the Prussians, and *Chud'* border on the Varangian Sea[11].

Leaving aside for the moment the ethnic interpretation of *Rus'* '(Old) Russians', in this passage most of the ethnonyms and place names are Finno-Ugric, such as *Čjud'*, Chud[12], probably here both Ingrians and Votes, *Merę* (i.e. Merja), Merya or Merians, an extinct ethnos living in the area of Moscow[13], *Murom*, Muromá, another extinct ethnic group living in the Oka basin, *Vs'*, Ves, i.e. Veps or Vepsians[14], *Mordva*, i.e. Mordvins (today speakers of Erzya and Moksha), *Perm'*, Finno-Ugric place name (etymologically connected with the Permian linguistic group now represented by three official languages: Komi or Komi-Zyrian, Permyak

---

[10] Even though the *Laurentian Chronicle* is the oldest extant manuscript, it is less detailed and sometimes more corrupted than the later *Hypatian Chronicle*. It seems to me that Cross & Sherbowitz-Wetzor (1953) took into account the Hypatian variants because they have *Liv'* for the Livonians, but the Laurentian version has Любь (*Ljub'*) instead of Либь (*Lib'*).

[11] Cross & Sherbowitz-Wetzor (1953: 52). A Czech translation of the same passage by Karel Jaromír Erben (published in 1867 and in second edition in 1954) is found in Blažek et al. (2011: 206): "V Jafetově pak části sedí Rusi, **Čudi** a tito národové: **Mera**, **Muroma**, **Vesi**, **Mordva**, Závlačská Čuď, **Permi**, Pečera, **Jami**, **Ugra**, Litva, Ziměgola, Krsi, Letigola, **Livi**; Lechové pak a Prusi. **Čudové** přísedí k moři Varažskému" (authors' bold).

[12] According to Kallio (2015: 91–93, footnotes 15–16) the popular derivation of Russian Чудь / *Čud'* from Gothic þiuda 'people' must be abandoned in favour of a Norse origin (Runic Swedish þiuþ, Old Norse þióð 'people') and even a chain like the following one could be conceived: East Norse *þjūð > Chud *cuuti 'people' > Russian Чудь / *Čud'* 'Chud'.

[13] According to Tkačenko (2007: 56–58, 115, 122 and 283–284) the name of Moskva River (Russian Москва-река / *Moskvá-reká*), hence the name of Moscow (Москва / *Moskvá*), is due to Merja *moska or *moskâ or *mosko 'hemp', cf. Erzya мушко / *muško* 'idem', Moksha мушка / *muška* 'fibre; bundle of hemp fibres', Mari муш / *muš* 'hemp, bundle of hemp fibres'.

[14] Notice that also the Vepsian language was called in Russian чудский / *čúdskij* up to the October Revolution, see the first Vepsian glossary by Uspenskij (1913).

and Udmurt), *Jęm'*, place name, probably Finnish *Häme* (Tavastia)[15]. *Jugra*, ancestors of Hungarians, Mansi (Voguls) and Khanty (Ostyaks), the latter now living only beyond the Urals along the Ob River, and *Lib'*, Livonians, ancient inhabitants of Latvia (see section 1.). The other ethnonyms regard mainly the Baltic group, *Litva* (Lithuanians), *Zimigola* (Semgallians), *Kors'* (Curonians), *Sět'gola* (uncorrect initial consonant *S* for *L* of Lettigallians or Latgalians), *Prusi* (extinct Baltic Prussians), while *Lęxově*, Lyakhs, are the ancestors of the Poles. The Varangian Sea[16] is the Baltic Sea named after the North Germanic people of the Varangians (Varyags, Vikings), ancestors of the Swedes.

As for the origin of the name *Rus'* a simple sentence in the Primary Chonicle (*Hypatian Chronicle* 1908: col. 9v) is telling:

и бѣша оу него Словѣни. и В(а)рѧзи. и прочии прозвашасѧ Русью.

Transliteration:

i běša ou nego Slověni. i V(a)ręzi. i pročii prozvašasę Rus'ju.

English translation (based on the *Laurentian Chronicle*):

The *Slavs, Varangians, and others* who accompanied him, *were called Rus'*. (Cross & Sherbowitz-Wetzor 1953: 61).

The real meaning of *Rus'* is much debated by historians, see, for instance, Duczko (2004), Lind (2006), Plokhy (2006) and Puzanov (2007). Unfortunately, sometimes historians are not able to distinguish *Finnic* as a linguistic group from *Finnish*, a language belonging to the group of the same name. On the Finnic side it is sure that Finnish *Ruotsi* and Estonian *Rootsi* mean 'Sweden', but Ingrian distinguishes *rōtsi* 'Lutheran' from *rōtsa* 'Russian (person)', while Karelian *ruottši* means both 'Finn' and 'Lutheran' and Ludic *ruotš* has a gamut of meanings including 'Lutheran', 'Finland' and 'Sweden', and so on (see SSA III: 108 where the etymon is Old Swedish *rōþs-*)[17]. The name for Russia is in Finnish *Venäjä*, in dialects *Venät*, *Venäh* and *Ven(n)ää*, cf. Estonian *vene* 'Russian (person)' and *Venemaa* 'Russia', from Germanic **weneđ-*, already attested in Tacitus (*Venethi*), see SSA III: 426, and Bjornflaten (2006: 73), i.e. a widespread Indo-European ethnonym, still surviving in place names such as *Venezia* 'Venice' in Italy and *Vendée* in France[18].

The confusion between the ethnic groups can also be seen in the name given to the Votes, cf. Finnish *vatja*, Votic *vad'ja*, Estonian *vadja* 'Votian language'. If Jorma Koivulehto is right in hypothesizing **vakja* from Baltic **vākịā* 'lännessä oleva maa [a land lying in the West]' (SSA III: 418), the Finnic words correspond to Latvian *Vācija* and Lithuanian *Vókia* 'Germany', whereas according to Fraenkel (1965: II, 1272, s.v. *Vókia* 'Deutschland'), Finnish *Vuojola* and Estonian *Oju-* or *Ojamaa* 'Gotland (island)' come from the same Baltic root. In this regard place names are a very important clue to earlier ethnic and linguistic situations or to the results of foreign

---

[15] Finnish *Häme* corresponds to Lappish (Sami) *sabme* 'lappalainen, lapin kieli [Lapp, Lappish language]' but a Baltic source is unlikely (SSA I: 207). Archaeology and historical information can demonstrate that most of Finland was originally a Sami territory.

[16] Cf. Arabic بحر ورنك *baḥr Warank* 'Baltic Sea' in the Iranian polymath al-Bīrūnī (973–1050 CE), see, e.g., Pinto (2016: 28).

[17] A well-informed and innovative approach to the origin of *Rus'*, compared with Byzantine Greek Ῥῶς / *Rhôs* and Semitic (Arabic, Syriac) forms etc., is found in Danylenko (2004) but the question is still open. Roberge (2010: 420) mentions for *rus* only Finnish *Ruotsi* 'Sweden' and Old Norse *róðr* 'rowing'.

[18] The name of *Veneti* has been particularly studied by Italian linguists such as Giacomo Devoto (1897–1974), Giovan Battista Pellegrini (1921–2007), and Aldo Luigi Prosdocimi (1941–2016), see Ramat (2005).

influence. The old capital of Finland carries the name of *Turku* (Swedish *Åbo*), a fine example of Slavic influence because of Old Russian търгъ / *tŭrgŭ* 'market' > Modern Russian торг / *torg* 'barter' (Vasmer 1958: III, 123–124, s.v. то́рг), cf. the Finnish common noun *turku* 'market place' (a sophisticated and poetic word, Papp 1978: 882)[19]. What is remarkable is the Finnish preservation as *u* [u] of Slavic *jerŭ*, i.e. *ŭ (Cyrillic ъ), both strong (> Russian *o*) and weak (> Russian zero) as in common nouns such as Finnish *lusikka* 'spoon' from Old Russian лъжька / *lŭžĭka* > Modern Russian ложка / *lóžka* 'idem'[20] with loss of weak *jerĭ*, i.e. *ĭ (Cyrillic ь) –, while strong *jerĭ* became *e* in Russian –. Its counterpart is the Russian river name *Msta* (tributary of Lake Ilmen, Novgorod Oblast) from *Mŭsta* < Finnic *musta* (Finnish *musta*, Estonian *must*) 'black' (Vasmer 1955: II, 168, s.v. Мста; Xelimskij 2000a: 330)[21].

In this historical context it is worth mentioning the figure of Alexander Yaroslavich Nevsky – Russian Александр Ярославич Невский / Aleksándr Jaroslávič Névskij (1221–1263) –, Prince of Novgorod, Grand Prince of Kiev and Grand Prince of Vladimir. He gained his Finnic sobriquet Невский / *Névskij* thanks to his victory against a Swedish invasion in the Neva battle (1240) at the confluence of the rivers Izhora and Neva. Izhora (Old Russian Ижера / *Ižera*) was at the same time the name of a river and that of the Finnic population (Ingrians) who supported the young Prince Alexander, while Swedes counted on auxiliary troops recruited among Tavastians (i.e. the inhabitants of Häme in Finland). The Russian nickname *Névskij* is based on the name of the famous river (Russian Нева / *Nevá*) now crossing Saint Petersburg: its etymology is clearly Finnic[22], cf. Finnish *neva* 'open treeless marsh; river' and Karelian *neva* 'water, body of water (lake, river, sea)', see SSA II: 215. Two years later Prince Alexander defeated the German (and Danish) Livonian Knights who were supported by Chud (i.e. Estonian) infantry in the Battle on the Ice (1242), on Lake Peipus, actually, on the lake named Lämmijärv in Estonian ('warm lake' – Russian Тёплое озеро / *Tëploe ózero* – between Lake Peipsi – Russian Чудское озеро / *Čudskóe ózero* – and Lake Pskov): also on that occasion Prince Alexander could count on the help of Finnic troops in the service of the Republic of Novgorod[23].

3. Predicative possession

From a typological point of view the reference text for possession is now Heine (1997) who has distinguished 8 cognitive schemata on the basis of a 100 language sample. At least 3–4 schemata conform to the possessive constructions which can be found in the area under scrutiny: (1) the Action Schema, namely "X takes Y" with X possessor and Y possessee (Heine 1997: 47–50), in other words the use of a *have*-verb like Russian иметь / *imét'* 'to have'; (2) the Location Schema, "Y is located at X" (Heine 1997: 50–53), cf. Russian у / *u* + GEN of the possessor; (3) the Goal Schema, "Y exists for/to X" (Heine 1997: 59–61)[24] when the possessor is in a DAT form, cf.

---

[19] SSA III: 335; Bjornflaten (2006: 63); Kallio (2006: 155).

[20] SSA II: 113; Xelimskij (2000a: 330); Kallio (2006: 155); Koivulehto (2006: 180), Dolgorukova (2015: 7, 9, 12, 13, 18, 23. 41).

[21] In 2015 the fourth volume of Субстратная топонимия Русского Севера / *Substratnaja toponimija Russkogo Severa* (Substratal toponymy of North Russia) edited by A. K. Matveev (1926–2010) appeared posthumous (Matveev 2015). The previous volumes were published in Ekaterinburg in 2001, 2004 e 2007. See also Saarikivi (2006).

[22] For other opinions see Kallio (2015: 89–90, footnote 12).

[23] As for Alexander Nevsky see Pašuto (1995).

[24] Russian **u menja** *mašina* 'I have a car' is mentioned in Heine & Kuteva (2005: 230) but not in connection with Finnish.

the Russian experiential expression **мне** холодно / ***mne*** (1SG.DAT) *xólodno* 'I'm cold'[25] or, better, for concrete possession, Latvian ***man*** (1SG.DAT) *ir jauna māja* 'I have a new house' (litt.: 'to.me is new house'). The substantial volume (830 pages) by Stassen (2009) is specifically devoted to predicative possession (with indefinite possessee) on the basis of a sample of 420 languages. Stassen halves Heine's schemata reducing them to 4 (Locational Possessive, With-Possessive, Topic Possessive, Have-Possessive) and in the Locational Possessive he brings together both static cases such as locative, adessive and inessive, and dynamic cases corresponding to dative and allative (Stassen 2009: 48–54), in other words including Heine's Goal Schema. But I argue that the distinction between ADESS and DAT (merged by Leon Stassen and by Ilya A. Seržant as well) is crucial as regards the predicative possession in Finnic and Russian[26].

4. Predicative possession in the Slavic languages

A typological discussion about predicative possession in Slavic languages as regards the relationship between *be*-verbs and *have*-verbs was initiated by Isačenko (1974)[27]. All Slavic languages possess the modern forms of Proto-Slavic **jĭmĕti* (**jьmĕti*, Trubačev 1981: VIII, 226–227; Derksen 2008: 211–212) 'to have' (originally 'to take, to hold'), but in Russian the use of иметь / *imét'* is limited to abstract possession (Timberlake 1993: 875; Timberlake 2004: 311–312), and "is also a useful alternative to locative possessives under special syntactic conditions where the latter option is impossible, e.g. imperative sentences and infinitives embedded under volitional and modal verbs" (Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli 2001: 676). Thus, Old Russian имѣти / *imĕti* 'to have' has become Modern Russian иметь / *imét'*, Belorussian мець / *mec'* (Mayo 1993: 934–935) and Ukrainian мати / *máty* (Shevelov 1993: 987–988), but a sentence expressing concrete possession as Russian **я имею** новый дом / ***ja im*́*ju*** *nóvyj dom* 'I have a new house' is unusual in respect of **у меня** (есть) новый дом / ***u menjá (est') nóvyj dom***, while in Belorussian **я маю** новы дом / ***ja máju*** *nóvy dom* and in Ukrainian **я маю** новий будинок / ***ja máju*** *novýj budýnok* are just as acceptable as Belorussian **у мяне** (ёсць) новы дом / ***u mjané (ёsc') nóvy dom*** and Ukrainian **у мене** є новий будинок / ***u méne*** *je novýj budýnok*[28], respectively[29]. In a paper of hers McAnallen (2009: 133) mentions the three constructions for expressing predicative possession: (1) Old Church Slavonic (OCS) *imĕti*, Czech *mit*, Polish *mieć* etc. 'to have', (2) *u* + GEN and (3) DAT. As for *u* + GEN McAnallen gives four examples, one in OCS,

---

[25] Romanian ***mi-e frig*** 'I'm cold' is a perfect equivalent to Russian (with Romanian *mi* 1SG.DAT), while Italian ***ho*** *freddo*, French ***j'ai*** *froid*, Catalan ***tinc*** *fred*, Spanish ***tengo*** *frío*, Galician ***teño*** *frío* exhibit the *have*-strategy and Portuguese *estou* ***com*** *frio* (litt.: 'I stay **with** cold') has a comitative solution. This kind of expressions were studied by our misfortunate colleague Regina Pustet (1963–2013) in a paper devoted to the syntax of temperature predications (Pustet 2015).

[26] The adessive construction in Russian is mentioned by Stassen (2009: 8, 51, 282), together with or independently from the similar Finnish and Estonian constructions (Stassen 2009: 39, 51, 129, 297).

[27] See Dingley (1995); Danylenko (2002); Clancy (2010).

[28] In Ukrainian the original distinction between the prepositions **у** / *u* ("adessive", from Proto-Indo-European **au*) and **в** / *v* ("inessive/illative", from IE **n̥*) got lost already in the 14th-15th c. (Slyn'ko 1980: 243), cf. **в Ольги** немає грошей / *v Ól'hy nemáje grošéj* 'Ol'ha has no money', as in **в мене** є… / *v méne je* …'I have …' (Pugh & Press 2005: 111), beside **у мене** є брат / *u méne je brát* (Zahnitko 2001: 276) 'I have a brother'.

[29] Notice that the Ukrainian short existential є / *je* 'there is' is pratically compulsory. In Belorussian the rules connected with the conditions for the presence or absence of the existential ёсць / *ёsc'* are quite complicated according to Krivickij et al. (1978: 314–317). As for the conditions of omission or not of the existential есть / *est'* in Russian see Isačenko (1974: 56–58) and Timberlake (2004: 313–315).

one in Old Czech and two in Old Russian (one from the Primary Chronicle – therefore not in pure Russian – and the other from a Novgorodian birch-bark letter). I think that the most interesting example is a passage in OCS from Matthew 18:12 ("if a man owns a hundred sheep") where for the possessor *Codex Assemanianus* (Glagolitic, 11th c.) has *u* + GEN in *ou etera čl(ově)ka*, but *Codex Marianus* (Glagolitic, beginning of the 11th c.) has a possessive DAT: *eterou čl(ově)kou* (McAnallen 2009: 133 and footnote 3). However, Vaillant (1977: 126, § 1342) considered *u etera člověka* a locative noun phrase, and he translated the sentence into French in this way: "s'il y a chez quelque homme 100 brebis" (but see Grgović-Major 2011: 43, footnote 32), cf.[30]:

аще	бѫдетъ	оу	етера	чл͞ка	р̃·	овець
ašte	*bǫdetŭ*	*ou*	*etera*	*čl(ově)ka*	*.r̃.*	*ovecĭ*
if	be.PRF-3SG	at	certain-GEN	man-GEN	100	sheep-GEN.PL

'if a man owns a hundred sheep'

Grgović-Major (2011: 47) gives an example of *u* + genitive in Old Serbian "but it was a peripheral predicative possession patterning"[31]. Julia McAnallen has collected more data in her PhD dissertation (134 pages), discussing the issue of internal development vs. language contact for the expression of predicative possession and dealing with details (e.g. verb agreement or animacy) which are here disregarded (see data in many languages, not only in Finnic, Baltic and all the Slavic languages, in McAnallen 2011: 128–134). Stern (2011) has dealt with language contact in the East and the Northeast of Europe: starting from Veenker (1967) he mentions seven structural features which can be due to a Finnic influence on East Slavic, including the adessive construction for the expression of possessivity, cf. Russian ***u menja*** *knig-a* (book-NOM) and Finnish ***minulla*** *on kirja* 'I have a book' (Stern 2011: 382, bold is mine). Stern (ibidem) compares and contrasts Russian with Ukrainian, which allows a broader use of a *have*-verb, thus, Ukrainian exhibits ***u mene*** *knyh-a* (book-NOM) alongside ***ja ma-ju*** (have-1SG.PRS) *knih-u* (book-ACC). In another dissertation and in a forthcoming article of his the young Thai scholar Chingduang Yurayong has focussed on hypotheses concerning the origin of the possessive predication of the type with adessive-like possessor in Russian (scrutinizing the birch bark documents found in Novgorod), wondering whether (1) it is an original Slavic construction (as in Isačenko 1974), or (2) it is due to a Finnic substratum (as in Veenker 1967 and Kiparsky 1969), or (3) a contact-induced change according to the "Refrigerator Theory" (Finnish *jääkaappiteoria*, Yurayong 2013: 27), cf.:

> Dingley (1995) applies to this question Gunnar Jacobsson's *Refrigerator Theory* (Germ. *Kühlschranktheorie*). This concept of contact-induced change means certain language features have been preserved or literally "frozen" in a safe cold place, that is, in neighbouring languages. According to Dingley — and later also McAnallen (2009) and Grković-Major (2011) — the original Proto-Slavic PredP [= Predicative Possession] looked similar to Modern Russian at least until 6th century. Then, East Slavs who encountered Finno-Ugric people took along with them the old construction, which happened to be similar to that in Finno-Ugric languages. On the eastern side of the Baltic Sea, the original construction was safely protected from the innovation of multifunctional *habeo*-verb, which took place in the nuclear Europe and in which the other Slavic sister languages have participated. As a result in those Slavic languages, the original locative PredP was replaced by the *habeo*-verb, which has become the primary choice today. (Yurayong, forthcoming, ms. p. 5)

---

[30] Reading of the Old Cyrillic script (transliterated from Glagolitic) and glossing are mine. The same sentence is mentioned in Latin transcription by McAnallen (2011: 4).

[31] Browne (1993: 370) claims that in Serbo-Croatian *u* + GEN with the meaning of 'in the possession of' "is now rare" (even with a locational value), cf. ***u lȁži*** *su krȁtke nȍge* (proverb), litt.: 'a lie has short legs' (i.e. 'the truth eventually comes out') and ***u Mȉlicē*** *(su) dȕge trȅpavice* (folk poetry) 'Milica has long eyelashes'.

According to Timberlake (2014: 1680) the first evidence of *u* + GEN to express concrete possession is found in Novgorodian Russian, cf. **у кого** конѣ / ***u kogo** koně* […] 'some people have horses […]' (*grámota* 242), whereas the *have*-verb (i.e. имееши / *imeeši*, 2SG.PRS 'you have') seems to be used only once in a text partially influenced by Church Slavonic (*grámota* 752)[32]. The Russian *u* + GEN construction could be of "West Finnic" origin but Timberlake (2014: 1681) is puzzled by its widespread diffusion, not only in the northern Russian dialects, but in the southern dialects as well, and in the literary language. In the same volume Haarmann (2014: 1196–1197) considers it likely that the *u* + GEN possessive construction is the outcome of a Finno-Ugric substratum in a social framework of extensive bilingualism. Finally, a balanced judgement about this issue is found in Mazzitelli (2015), a monograph devoted to predicative possession in Belarusian (Belorussian) and Lithuanian where the question of the origin of the East Slavic adessive possessor is taken into account.

5. Predicative possession in the Finno-Ugric (Uralic) languages

As for predicative possession the members of the Uralic language family are predominantly *be*-languages with some amazing exceptions (i.e. the Siberian Ugric and Samoyedic languages). Adnominal (attributive) and predicative possession in Uralic languages are especially dealt with by Kangas-Minn (1984), Winkler (2003), Kozmács (2006), and Honti (2007), briefly by Abondolo (1997: 33) and Laakso (2011: 194–195)[33]. As already mentioned above (section 1, footnote 6) as regards the relationship between Russian *u* + GEN and Finnic ADESS (Finnish *-lla/-llä*) both Winkler (2003: 205) and Honti (2007: 29) are sceptical, though they do not exclude a possible Russian influence on the Finnic languages. In the case of inanimate possessors Finnish opts for the inessive case, cf. ***autossa*** (INESS) *on neljä pyörää* 'the car has four wheels' (Karlsson 1999: 69), whereas Estonian admits the adessive case also with inanimate possessors, e.g. ***autol*** (ADESS) *on neli ratast* 'the car has four wheels' (Erelt 2003: 94). However, Yurayong (forthcoming, ms. pp. 8–9) points out that an inanimate noun, for example institution, may obtain possessive function in the adessive, but location in the inessive (Table 1, glosses by the author):

Table 1

Finnish

*Suome**lla***	*on*	*hyvä*	*koulutusjärjestelmä*
Finland.ADESS	be.3SG	good	educational_system

'Finland (as a state) has a good educational system.'

vs.

*Suome**ssa***	*on*	*hyvä*	*koulutusjärjestelmä*.
Finland.INESS	be.3SG	good	educational_system

'In Finland there is a good educational system.'

Aet Lees has made an interesting analysis (based mainly on Biblical texts) comparing case alternations in 5 Finnic languages (Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Livonian and Vepsian), see possessive clauses and experiential clauses (with examples for hunger and thirst) in Lees (2015: 361–373, 373–375).

---

[32] The Novgorodian document (*grámota*) number 242 is found in the D25 section in Zaliznjak (2004: 673–674), therefore it is a late document (from the 1420s), while the love letter in *grámota* 752 (A11 section) dates back to 1080–1100 or to 1100–1140 (Zaliznjak 2004: 249–254). Yurayong (2013) gives reliable statistics concerning the distribution of ADESS, *have*-verb and DAT possessive constructions in Novgorodian Russian.

[33] For in-depth reflections about language contact situations involving Finno-Ugric see Laakso (2010).

6. Dative in Finnish?

In my paper (Manzelli 2017: 194, footnote 11) I touched upon the question whether an experiential construction such as Finnish *minun* on *jano*[34] 'I'm thirsty' really corresponds to the Genitive Schema, "X's Y exists" (Heine 1997: 58–59), just because *minun* has the same form as the genitive of *minä* (1SG) 'I' as in *minun* talo*ni* 'my house (litt.: of-me house-my)'. The existence of the Finnish expression ***Jumalan*** *kiitos* 'thanks (*kiitos*) God (*Jumala*)' casts doubt as to whether -*n* is a real GEN[35]. On that occasion I mentioned only the English version of Hakulinen (1961: 68–69), but here much more can be said. In his Finnish grammar Bubrix (1955: 13) wondered about the meaning of expressions such as ***minun*** *on kiire* = Russian я спешу / *ja spešú* 'I'm in a hurry' – quoted also by Inaba (2015: 232) – without mentioning the synonymous Finnish ***minulla*** *on kiire* (Lehtinen 1962: 122), which is a perfect predicative possessive sentence in Finnish (cf. Italian ***ho*** *fretta* – a *have*-verb expression – vs. French *je* ***suis*** *pressé* – a *be*-verb expression where *be* is a copula –'I'm in a hurry'). Bubrix (1955: 14) also mentions a sentence in the language of Finnish poetry where -*n* is equivalent to allative -*lle*, Finnish *anna kättä* ***käyvän miehen*** = Russian дай руку **идущему человеку** / *daj rúku* ***idúščemu čelovéku*** 'give a hand **to the walking man**', in Standard Finnish *anna kättä* ***käyvälle miehelle*** (*miehe-lle* is the allative case of *mies* 'man'). This topic has recently been dealt with in a substantial book of 413 pages written in Finnish by the Japanese researcher Nobofumi Inaba, *Suomen datiivigenitiivin juuret vertailevan menetelmän valossa* (The roots of the Finnish datival genitive in the light of the comparative method). Inaba (2015: 26–43) takes into consideration four possibile hypotheses for the origin of the anomalous Finnish -*n* on the basis of the previous literature: (1) a genitive-instructive connective; (2) a derivational suffix for adjectives; (3) an apocopated locative; (4) a lative. Inaba does not only deal with the Finnish datival genitive but also with similar cases in Livonian, South Saami (Lappish), Mordvinian and Mari, and Swedish. The real origin of the Finnish datival genitive -*n* is not relevant for our purpose, what is impressive is the old Finnish (16th c.) rendering of a famous Biblical sentence (i.e. Matthew 22:21):

Greek	Ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος **Καίσαρι** καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ **τῷ Θεῷ**
	*Apódote oûn tà Kaísaros **Kaísari** kai tà toû Theoû tôi **Theôi***
Latin	*Reddite quae sunt Caesaris **Caesari** et quae sunt Dei **Deo***
English	*Render **unto Caesar** the things that are Caesar's, and **unto God** the things that are God's*
Russian	итак отдавайте кесарево **кесарю**, а Божие **Богу**
	*iták otdavájte késarevo **késarju**, a Bóžie **Bógu***

translated into Finnish by Mikael Agricola (*Se Wsi Testamenti* 'The New Testament', 1543, published in 1548) in this way[36]:

Finnish   *Andaca **Keisarin** mite **Keisarin** tule / ia **JVMALAN** mite **JVMALAN** tule*[37]

---

[34] In this case Estonian exhibits the use of adessive: ***mul*** *on janu* ≠ Finnish ***minun*** *on jano* (Alvre 1993: 60).

[35] I could have been misled by my mother tongue because the equivalent to Finnish ***Jumalan*** *kiitos* is in Italian *grazie* ***a Dio*** (litt.: 'thanks **to God**'), i.e. giving rise to a DAT interpretation, but cf. also the Hungarian translation *hála* ***Istennek*** (*Isten-nek* DAT of *Isten* 'God') in Papp (1978: 268). Moreover, the Finno-Ugric ACC marker *-m* has become -*n* in Finnish, i.e. perfectly identical to the GEN marker -*n* (hence the definition of genitive-accusative used by some linguists for Finnish -*n* as a case marker). However, Nobofumi Inaba (see below in this section) gives ***Jumalalle*** *kiitos* (*Jumala-lle*: allative of *Jumala* 'God') as an equivalent to ***Jumalan*** *kiitos* (Inaba 2015: 34).

[36] Mark (12:17) in Inaba (2015: 358 (128)).

[37] All the forms in old Finnish are datival genitives because the counterpart of the verb *antaa* 'to give' is the verb *tulla* 'to come' (*mite* ***Keisarin*** *tule* = litt.: 'what **to Caesar** comes').

whereas in a Finnish translation published in 1992 one finds:

Finnish   *Antakaa siis* **keisarille**, *mikä keisarin on, ja* **Jumalalle**, *mikä Jumalan on*[38]

Thus, it seems to me that for experiential constructions such as Finnish *minun on nälkä* 'I'm hungry' there exists the possibility that the present day genitive could have originally been the "datival genitive" studied by Inaba (2015). This impression is strengthened by the fact that Finnish has a construction such as *minun tulee nälkä* 'megéhezem, megéheztem [I get hungry, I got hungry]' (Papp 1978: 475) with *tulee* 3SG(PRS) of *tulla* 'to come', a motion verb which seems to be constructed with a DAT (cf. Italian *mi viene fame* and Albanian *më vjen uri* 'I get hungry', with *venire* 'to come' and *vij* 'idem', respectively[39]) instead of a GEN, cf. the corresponding use of ALLAT in Kven (Kainu), the Finnish dialect spoken in Norway, as in *Liisale tuli kylmä* (Söderholm 2017: 133) 'Liisa got cold', alongside the ADESS in *minula oon vilu* (Söderholm 2017: 447) 'I'm cold'[40]. Thus, the sentence *minun on kiire* 'I'm in a hurry' could be considered the antecedent to Finnish *minulla on kiire* 'idem', cf. Estonian *mul on kiire* 'idem' (Alvre 1993: 60), expressions which formally are based on the structure of the standard predicative possession.

7. Having a headache (and other experiential feelings)

Having a headache is an experiential situation, an experience of pain. In the semantic role of Experiencer is an animate being (mainly human) whereas in the case investigated the Stimulus is frequently omitted (because obvious or insignificant or obscure), i.e. the Stimulus is something causing the head or a different body part to ache. Languages express experiential situations in different ways, and the same language may change the structure of the sentence to express a painful feeling (or a feeling in general) in the course of time, as happened in Russian.

8. Having a headache in the Slavic languages

Proto-Slavic **bol'ěti* (Trubačev 1975: II, 187–189) or **bolěti* (Derksen 2008: 51) 'to ache'[41] was a verb that required an ACC Experiencer, an archaic syntactic feature of Indo-European origin (cf. Latin *mē pudet* 'I feel ashamed'[42]). All the Slavic languages (except Modern Russian and, possibly, Belorussian) preserve this ancient construction, cf. Table 2[43]:

---

[38] Matthew (22:21) in Xramcova (2012: 26).

[39] Both Italian *mi* and Albanian *më* are DAT forms of 1SG personal pronouns, cf. Fedriani, Manzelli & Ramat (2013: 401).

[40] For 'I'm cold' cf. Finnish *minulla on kylmä* (Papp 1978: 562) or *minun on kylmä* (Papp 1978: 322) and Estonian *mul on külm* (Saagpakk 1992: 389).

[41] As for the etymology of Proto-Slavic **bolěti* see also Javorskaja (2009: 413–417). In Russian болеть / *bolét'* has two different paradigms, a full-fledged inflected form (3SG болеет / *boléet*) 'to be ill' (practically unknown to Belorussian and Ukrainian) – cf. Russian я болею гриппом / *ja boléju grípom* 'I have the flu' – and an impersonal form (3SG болит / *bolít*) 'to ache, hurt', shared with all the Slavic languages, including Belorussian and Ukrainian.

[42] See, e.g., Chiara Fedriani in Fedriani & Manzelli (2014: 73–78).

[43] References omitted for the main Slavic languages. Jakuškina (2009: 135) mentions Czech, Slovak, Polish, Slovene, Serbo-Croatian, Macedonian and Bulgarian (главата **ме** боли / *glaváta* **me** *bolí*); Javorskaja (2009: 415) has the same examples.

Table 2

Bulgarian	*bolí*	**me**	*glaváta* / боли **ме** главата
Macedonian	**me**	*bóli*	*glávata* / **ме** боли главата
BCS[44]	*bòlī*	*me*	*gláva* / боли **ме** глава
Slovene	*gláva*	*me*	*bolí* — *bolí **me** gláva*
Czech	*hlava*	*mě*	*bolí* — *bolí **mě** hlava*
Slovak	*bolí*	**ma**	*hlava*
Rusyn	**méne**	*bolýt'*	*holová*[45]
Upper Sorbian	**mje**	*hłowa*	*boli*[46]
Polish	*boli*	**mnie**	*głowa*[47]
Kashubian	**ḿe**	*głova*	*boli*[48]

Alongside this old structure the West and South Slavic languages can use the *have*-strategy as in Standard Average European, cf., e.g., Czech ***mám*** *bolesti hlavy* 'I have a headache' (Seržant 2015: 341), and Slovene ***imám*** *glavoból* 'I have a headache' (Pirnat-Greenberg 2012: 213). Ilya A. Seržant in Seržant & Bjarnadóttir (2014: 229–233) has shown the evolution of the cases required by the verb for 'to ache' from Middle Russian (with an ACC Experiencer) to Modern Russian (with an ADESS Experiencer). Krys'ko (2006: 118–119) offers the following examples from Middle Russian to Early Modern Russian: охъ охъ голова **мя** болить / *ox" ox" golova **mja*** (ACC) *bolit'* (15th c.) 'ouch! ow! my head hurts', много **ми** болить д̄ша / *mnogo bo **mi*** (DAT) *bolit' d(ou)ša* 'indeed my soul is aching very much', and аще **у кого** болить зоубъ / *ašče **u kogo*** (ADESS-like PP) *bolit' zoub"* 'if someone has a toothache'. Miklosich (1868–1874: 383), among a lot of examples, gives "kleinrussisch" ("Little Russian", i.e. a variety of Ukrainian) *hołovka **mja*** (ACC) *bołyt*. An ACC-Experiencer is still admitted in Ukrainian, cf. **мене** болить голова / ***mené** bolýt' holová* (Javorskaja 2009: 415), or **тебе** болять зуби / ***tebé** bolját' zúby* (Zimovec 2009: 67) 'my teeth ache'[49]. Moreover, Belorussian, Ukrainian, and Baltic Russian admit the use of a DAT-Experiencer, cf. Belorussian **мне** баліць галава / ***mné*** (DAT) *balíc' halavá* (Koščanka et al. 2010: 81) 'I have a headache', Ukrainian **мені** болить голова / ***mení** bolýt' holová* (Zimovec 2009: 67)[50] 'I have a headache', cf. Ukrainian *bolila **meni*** (DAT) *holova* 'I've got headaches' (Seržant & Bjarnadóttir 2014: 231), and Baltic Russian ***mne*** (DAT) *galava balit* 'I have a head-ache' (Čekmonas 2001: 121). Finally, for expressing a headache, Modern Russian admits only the predicative possession with the Experiencer in "adessive state", a construction which exists also in Belorussian and in Ukrainian as an alternative strategy (Table 3):

[44] BCS = Bosnian-Croatian-(Montenegrin)-Serbian.

[45] Transcarpathian Rusyn for 'I have a headache' (Magocsi 1979: 71).

[46] Bjarnat Rewerk in Budanowa (1990: 67, s.v. *boleć*): Upper Sorbian is spoken in Upper Lusatia (Oberlausitz in German), which is part of Saxony (Germany).

[47] Polish *mnie* could be a DAT because *mnie* is simultaneously GEN, DAT (= *mi*), and ACC (= *mię*), but it is suffi-cient to take into account a 3SG.M personal pronoun to remove any doubt that the Experiencer is an ACC: *boli **go** głowa* 'he has a headache'.

[48] Kashubian (Cassubian) is a member of the Lechitic subgroup of West Slavic alongside Polish and Silesian. It is spoken in the present Pomeranian Voivodeship (capital Gdańsk) in Poland. Kashubian data from Sychta (1967: I, 55, s.v. *bolec*; 326–327, s.v. *głova*).

[49] As for Ukrainian Zimovec (2009: 67) mentions also **моя** голова болить / ***mojá** holová bolýt'* which corre-sponds exactly to English ***my*** *head aches*.

[50] According to Javorskaja (2009: 415, footnote 4) the use of DAT in Ukrainian as an alternative construction to express having a headache could be due to a Germanic influence (Yiddish or German).

Table 3

Russian	**у меня** болит голова / ***u menjá*** *bolít golová*
Belorussian	**у мяне** балиць галава / ***u mjané*** *balíc' halavá*
Ukrainian	**у мене** болить голова / ***u méne*** *bolýt' holová*
	'I have a headache'

9. Having a headache in the Finnic languages

All the Finnic languages, except Livonian, use the predicative possession pattern (with possessor bearing the ADESS suffix) to express a headache or other physical pains (Table 4)[51]:

Table 4

Livonian (Kettunen 1938: 468, in simplified transcription)

mi'n	*ambõd*	*va'llõbõd*
1SG.DAT	tooth-PL	hurt-PL.PRS

(German:) 'mir schmerzen die zähne' ('my teeth hurt')

Estonian
mul *valutab pea* (NOM)   (Seržant 2015: 333)
mul *on peavalu* (NOM)   (Alvre 1993: 344)[52]

Võro
mul *käsi* (NOM) *halt'*   (Käsi & Neetar 2011:70)[53]
'my hand hurted'

Votian
milla *vaivattaap pää* (NOM)   (Adler et al. 2012: 1455)
mill *vaivattaap päätä* (PART)   (Adler et al. 2012: 352)[54]

Ingrian
miul *pakottaa hampahia* (PL-PART)   (Nirvi 1971: 371b)[55]
'my teeth hurt'
miul *kivistaa kurraa kättä* (PART)   (Laanest 1997: 74)
'my left hand hurts'

---

[51] Except in the case of Livonian the sentences have no interlinear glosses in order to save space and only the noun for 'head' or for another body part is followed by the case abbreviation in brackets. The meaning is 'I have a headache' except when differently translated.

[52] Alternative expressions in Estonian are *mu* ('my') *pää* (= *pea*) *valutab* (Saagpakk 1992:1060, s.v. *valutama*) and *pää on haige* 'I have a headache' (Saagpakk 1992: 696, s.v. *pää*), litt.: 'head is ill' (without Experiencer).

[53] Võro or South Estonian (Vastseliina dialect) ***mul*** *käsi halt'* means 'at-me hand (*käsi*) hurted', with *halt'* = *halut'*, imperfect of *halutam(m)a* = North Estonian *valutama* 'to hurt'. Inge Käsi collected the data, Helmi Neetar edited them.

[54] NOM of 'head' in western Votian of Itšäpäivä (Adler et al. 2012: 1455, s.v. *vaivattaassa*), cf. PART in eastern Votian of Luuditsa ***mill*** *vaivattaap päätä* (Adler et al. 2012: 352, s.v. *kaihota*) and eastern Votian of Liivtšülä ***mil*** *vaivatap päätä* (Adler et al. 2012: 728, s.v. *miä*).

[55] See *paɢottā* in central Ingrian of Metsäkülä in the Soikkola peninsula (Russian Сойкино / *Sójkino*) in simplified script. I am grateful to Manuel Barbera (university of Turin) for his kind help on this point. The following example from Laanest (1997: 74, s.v. *kivistaaɢ*) is in the eastern Ingrian of Hevaha (Russian Коваши / *Kovaší* or Коваш / *Kováš*).

Finnish
minulla *särkee pää* (NOM)   (Seržant 2015: 333)

Karelian Proper
miula *piätä* (PART) *kivistäy*   (Karlova 2011: 102)
miula *on piä* (NOM) *kipie*   (Karlova 2011: 102)

Livvi Karelian
minul *kivistäy piädy* (PART)   (Filippova 2009: 51)[56]

Ludic Karelian
millai *oŋ kibed vatš* (NOM)   (Kujola 1944: 128a, 239b)[57]
'my stomach hurts'

Vepsian
minai *kibištab pän* (ACC)   (Brodskij 2008b: 97)[58]

As highlighted, all of the Finnic languages except Livonian have the Experiencer in the adessive case, notwithstanding the fact that the formal differences could make someone suspect it is not always as glossed (for instance, Vepsian *minai* is an adessive form vs. *minei* which is the dative form of the first person singular of the personal pronoun). Actually, Finnish presents a lot of alternative expressions, not only with the Experiencer in the adessive case. Finnish is closer to English *I have a headache* when it employs *päänsärky* 'headache', a nominal compound word with *pää-n* 'head-GEN' + *särky* 'pain', instead of using the verb *särkeä* 'to ache', 3SG *särkee* 'it hurts'. The sore body part (the head) can bear a possessive suffix (*-ni* 1SG 'my'), possibly reinforced by the GEN of the personal pronoun (*minu-n* 1SG-GEN 'of me'), almost always in the partitive case (*-tA*), i.e. *pää-tä* 'head-PART', and *pää-tä-ni* 'head-PART-POSS1.SG'. Moreover, there is a series of synonymous verbs for 'to ache, to hurt' (and also *olla kipeä* 'to be sore'), cf. Finnish ***minulla*** *särkee pää* (NOM), ***minulla*** *särkee päätä* (Seržant 2015: 333), (colloquial:) ***mulla*** *särkee pää* (NOM), ***minulla*** *on päänsärkyä* (PART), ***minulla*** *särkee päätä* (PART), ***minun*** (1SG-GEN) *päätä* (PART) *särkee*, *päätäni* (PART-POSS.1SG) *särkee*, *päätäni* (PART-POSS.1SG) *kivistää*, *päätäni* (PART-POSS.1SG) *pakottaa*, *päätäni* (PART-POSS.1SG) *porottaa*, ***minun*** (1SG-GEN) *päätäni* (PART-POSS.1SG) *särkee*, *päätäni* (PART-POSS.1SG) *on kipeä*[59]. As for the use of cases in Finnish Sulkala & Karjalainen (1992: 178) report an interesting couple of examples in the semantic area of pain: Finnish *pojan* (GEN) *käsi on kipeä* 'the boy's hand [*käsi*] is sore' vs. ***pojalla*** (ADESS) *on käsi kipeä* 'the boy has a sore hand' (*poja-n* is the genitive case and *poja-lla* the adessive case of *poika* 'boy'). In her study of case marking in Estonian and Lithuanian Birute Klaas took into account also German, Finnish and Russian as regards experiential clauses expressing cold, heat, merriness and well being. As for having a headache Klaas (1997: 58–59) added Estonian *ema* (GEN) *pea* (NOM) *valutab* 'mother's head is aching', thus implicitly introducing the concept of inalienable possession, but this kind of clause does not belong to the

---

[56] Cf. (without Experiencer) Livvi *keroi* (NOM) *on kibei* = Russian горло болит / *górlo bolít* (Bojko & Markianova 2011: 32, s.v. *болеть* 2) 'throat hurts' (litt.: 'throat is sore (ADJ)' in Livvi vs. *piän* (ACC) *kivistäy* = Russian голова болит / *golová bolít* (Bojko & Markianova 2011: 70, s.v. *голова*) 'head hurts'.

[57] Ludic dialect of Nuomoil = Naamoila (here in simplified script) translated into Finnish *vatsani on kipeä* ('my belly is sore') by Kujola but litterally the Ludic sentence means 'at-me is sore belly'.

[58] Cf. ***minai*** *pän kibištab* translated into Russian у меня болит голова / *u menjá bolít golová*, but litterally у меня голову болит / *u menjá gólovu bolít* in Brodskij (2008a: 212).

[59] My main source is the Finnish-Hungarian dictionary by Papp (1978: 271, s.v. *kipeä*; 278, s.v. *kivistää*; 520, s.v. *pakottaa*; 583, s.v. *porottaa*; 622, s.v. *pää*; 790, s.v. *särkeä*).

pattern here analyzed because *ema pea* 'mother's head' is a single noun phrase functioning as a subject.

10. Other experiential constructions and the like

Other experiential constructions expressing physical feelings such as 'to be cold' (cf. Finnish *minulla on kylmä* 'I am cold'), or, more generally, predicative expressions of abstract possession, e.g. 'to be in a hurry' (cf. Finnish *minulla on kiire* 'I am in a hurry', translatable into Spanish **tengo** prisa or Catalan **tinc** *pressa*, litt.: 'I have haste') have been seen above (section 6. and footnotes 34 and 40). Finnic and East Slavic have more than one alternative to express feelings such as, e.g., hunger, thirst, cold, heat, and sleepiness. For reasons of space here only examples in Finnish and Russian are shown for just one feeling, 'to be hungry' (Table 5):

Table 5

Finnish

minulla	*on*	*nälkä*	(Papp & Jakab 1985: 183)
1SG-ADESS	be.3SG	hunger	
minun	*on*	*nälkä*	(Papp 1978: 475)
1SG-GEN[60]	be.3SG	hunger	
*ole**n***	*nälissä**ni***		(Papp 1978: 475)
ole-n	näl-i-ssä-ni		
be-1SG	hunger-PL-INESS-POSS.1SG		
*ole**n***	*nälkäinen*		(Papp & Jakab 1985: 183)
be-1SG	hungry		

Russian

я	голоден	
ja	*golóden*	
1SG.NOM	hungry	
я	хочу	есть
ja	*xočú*	*est'*
1SG.NOM	want-1SG	to.eat
мне	хочется	есть
mne	*xóčetsja*	*est'*
1SG.DAT	want-3SG-REFL	to.eat

Table 6 (hopefully, a complete picture) is a synthetic report of the use of cases expressing the Experiencer for five physical feelings (to be hungry etc.) in six Finnic languages and in the East Slavic languages.

It is clear that the East Slavic languages (and Livonian) do not utilize the ADESS-like PP for any of the five physical feelings, in contrast with Estonian (5 times out of 5), Finnish (4 out of 5), Karelian Proper (4 out of 5), and Livvi Karelian (3 out of 5). Vepsian is close to the sister Finnic languages but replaces the adessive case with the allative case in 3 expressions out of 5. For these feelings the extension of the ADESS Experiencer is totally in favour of the Finnic languages whereas the East Slavic languages exhibit a complete absence of ADESS-like PP constructions.

Finally, another example of abstract possession (for a reduced sample of languages), i.e. the expression of age, shows a peculiar situation (table 7).

---

[60] But see section 6. as regards Finnish *-n* as a "datival genitive".

Table 6. Five feelings in Finnic and East Slavic languages

	hungry	thirsty	cold	hot	sleepy
Livonian	NOM	NOM	DAT	DAT	DAT
Estonian	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	**ADESS**
	NOM	NOM	—	—	NOM
Finnish	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	PART
	GEN	GEN	GEN	GEN	—
	NOM	NOM	NOM	—	NOM
Karelian	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	PART
	NOM	PART	—	—	—
Livvi	**ADESS**	NOM	**ADESS**	**ADESS**	NOM
	NOM	PART	—	—	—
Vepsian	NOM	NOM	—	—	PART
	ALLAT	—	ALLAT	ALLAT	—
Russian	NOM	NOM	—	—	NOM
	DAT	DAT	DAT	DAT	DAT
Belorussian	DAT	DAT	DAT	DAT	DAT
	NOM	—	—	—	—
Ukrainian	NOM	NOM	DAT	DAT	NOM

Table 7

Finnish	—	*ole**n***	*kaksikymmentä*	*vuotias*[61]
		be.1SG	20	year-ish
Livvi	***minul***	*on*	*kaksikymmen*	*vuottu*[62]
	1SG-ADESS	be.3SG	20	year-PART
Vepsian	***minei***	*om*	*kaks'kümne*	*vot*[63]
	1SG-DAT	be.3SG	20	year-PART
Russian	**мне**	—	двадцать	лет
	mne	—	*dvádcat'*	*let*
	1SG.DAT	—	20	year.GEN.PL
	'I am twenty years old'			

In this case the possessive construction exhibited by Livvi Karelian is surprising, while Finnish uses an adjectival predication and Vepsian shares a datival subject with Russian.

11. Conclusions

The topic scrutinized, having as its background the problem of the relationship between the Finnic languages and Russian, is by no means a simple issue. I examined the data in order to add one more piece (the expression of having a headache already studied by Ilya A. Seržant from another perspective) to the mosaic of possible correspondences among languages in con-

---

[61] Cf. Alvre (1993: 87).

[62] Filippova (2009: 20).

[63] Cf. Brodskij (2008b: 33).

tact which belong to different language families. A thorough treatment of the subject would require an entire book or more than one volume. Many scholars who dealt with the theme of predicative possession in the aforementioned languages have reached a conclusion I could share, namely that every language has made a contribution to the growth of a "new" kind of expression. How it happened is difficult to discover. A Location Schema to express a possessor is a quite trivial possibility[64], less trivial is the extension of the predicative possession at issue (with the possessor in "adessive state") to experiential constructions. I think that somewhere at some time a speaker began to treat having a headache as a kind of possession, mainly because one's head is an inalienable body part. Was that speaker's L1 Russian or a Finnic language? Or was he/she bilingual? Difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain. Bilingualism and even plurilingualism was and is largely widespread near the Baltic Sea (and the same holds true for the Volga-Kama Basin and the Pontic area). As for Russian we have documents (in Russianized Old Church Slavonic but also in "pure" Novgorodian Russian) dating back to the 11th century CE, while, leaving aside the short "Karelian" birch bark document from Novgorod (13th c.), a real documentation of a Finnic language, namely Finnish, begins with the Lutheran clergyman Mikael Agricola's *ABCkiria* (modern Finnish *ABC-kirja*), a primer printed in 1543. There is a gap of half a millenium between East Slavic and Finnic languages as regards their written documentation, and this is a real handicap for a serious comparison. As was remarked in section 6. Agricola's language in his New Testament (*Se Wsi Testamenti*, 1548) shows important differences in respect of the present-day language as the "datival genitive" studied by Inaba (2015). Some differences could especially affect experiential constructions, which are not well attested in that kind of religious literature. Thus, I think that the adessive possessor in Finnish was less widespread in the 16th century than nowadays (and what about in the first millenium CE?). Such a statement does not solve anything, but it is at least an honest approach to such problems. Research must go on examining more constructions before making a reasonable assessment about the whole question regarding the linguistic relationship between the Finnic and the East Slavic languages.

References

Abondolo, Daniel. 1997. Introduction. In: Abondolo, Daniel (ed.). *The Uralic Languages*. London and New York: Routledge: 1–42.

Adler, Elna, Silja Grünberg, Merle Leppik, Valmen Hallap. 2012. *Vadja keele sõnaraamat*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

Alvre, Paul. 1993. *Soome-eesti vestmik*. Neljäs, täiendatud trükk. Tallinn: Valgus.

Belyayev, Oleg. 2010. Evolution of Case in Ossetic. *Iran and Caucasus* 14: 287–322.

Bjornflaten, Jan Ivar. 2006. Chronologies of the Slavicization of Northern Russia Mirrored by Slavic Loanwords in Finnic and Baltic. In: Nuorluoto (ed.): 50–77.

---

[64] Whoever denies that the Russian adessive-like possessor has something to do with a Finnic interference can rely, e.g., on the scanty evidence of the same structure in South Slavic languages. But one could observe that an adessive solution (with a real adessive case!) is present also in Hungarian, a distant relative of the Finnic languages. However, the Hungarian construction is confined to temporary possession (as for temporary or physical possession, see Stassen 2009: 16–17, 19–26, 45, 63–64, 100, 164, 201, 210, 212, 238, 244, 288, 291, 300, 313, 316, 329, 331–332, 435, 466, 562, 564, 590–591, 596, 621, 635, 660, 721). Cf. Hungarian *nincs most pénz **nálam***, translated into Finnish with ***minulla** ei ole nyt rahaa mukana* (Papp & Jakab 1985: 576) 'at the moment (*most* / *nyt*) I have no money (*pénz* / *rahaa* PART) **with me** (*nálam* ADESS / *minulla* ADESS… *mukana* 'together (here, there)')'. The Hungarian standard predicative possession involves a DAT possessor (left out if the possessor is a non emphatic personal pronoun) + a coreferential possessive suffix, e.g. (*nekem*) *sok pénzem van* (litt.: '(**to-me**) much money-**my** there.is') 'I have/own a lot of money'.

Blažek, Václav, Lucie Hofírková, Michal Kovář. 2011. Rané prameny o národech uralské jazykové rodiny. Early sources on the history of Fenno-Ugric populations. *Linguistica Brunensia* 59(1), 1–2: 189–224.

Bojko, Taťjana Petrovna, Ljudmila Fedorovna Markianova. 2011. *Bol'šoj russko-karel'skij slovar' (livvikovskoe narečie)*. Petrozavodsk: Verso.

Bricyn, V. M., E. V. Raxilina, T. I. Reznikova, G. M. Javorskaja (eds.). 2009. *Koncept bol' v tipologičeskom osveščenii*. Kyjiv: Vydavnyčyj Dim Dmytra Buraho.

Brodskij, I. V. 2008a. *Samoučitel' vepsskogo jazyka*. Sankt-Peterburg: Sankt-Peterburgskoe vepsskoe obščestvo, Otdel nauki i obrazovanija.

Brodskij, I. V. 2008b. *Russko-vepsskij razgovornik. Venä-vepsläine pagižkirj*. Sankt-Peterburg: Sankt-Peterburgskoe vepsskoe obščestvo, Otdel nauki i obrazovanija.

Browne, Wayles. 1993. Serbo-Croat. In: Comrie & Corbett (eds.): 306–387.

Bubrix, Dmitrij Vladimirovič. 1955. *Istoričeskaja morfologija finskogo jazyka*. Moskva / Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.

Budanowa, Ludmila (chief ed.). 1990. *Słownik Hornjoserbski-němski*. Budyšin: Ludowe nakładnistwo Domowina.

Čekmonas, Valeriy. 2001. Russian varieties in the southeastern Baltic area. In: Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) 2001a: 101–136.

Clancy, Steven J. 2010. *The Chain of* Being *and* Having *in Slavic*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing House.

Comrie, Bernard, Greville G. Corbett (eds.). 1993. *The Slavonic Languages*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cross, Samuel Hazzard, Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (eds.). 1953. *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian Text.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Mediaeval Academy of America.

Dahl, Östen, Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). 2001a. *The Circum-Baltic Languages*. [Volume 1] *Typology and Contact*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Dahl, Östen, Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.). 2001b. *The Circum-Baltic Languages*. Volume 2, *Grammar and Typology*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Danylenko, Andrii. 2002. The East Slavic "HAVE": Revising a Developmental Scenario. In: Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe, Miriam Robbins Dexter (eds.). *Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference, Los Angeles, November 9–10, 2001*: 105–127. Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 44).

Danylenko, Andrii. 2004. The name "Rus'". In search of a new dimension. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 52(1): 1–32.

Décsy, Gyula. 1965. *Einführung in die finnisch-ugrische Sprachwissenschaft*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Décsy, Gyula. 1967. Is there a Finnic substratum in Russian? *Orbis* 16: 150–160.

Derksen, Rick. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Dingley, John. 1995. *Iměti* in the Laurentian redaction of the Primary Chronicle. In: Henrik Birnbaum, Michael S. Flier (eds.). *The Language and Verse of Russia. In Honor of Dean S. Worth on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday. Язык и стих в России* [*Jazyk i stix v Rossii*]. UCLA Slavic studies, new series 2. Moskva: Vostočnaja Literatura RAN: 80–87.

Dolgorukova, Valeria. 2015. *lusikas, lusikka, ložka*: *vene laensõnad eesti ja soome keeles*. Bakalaureusetöö. Juhendajad Raili Pool, Sirje Rammo. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool, Filosoofiateaduskond, Eesti ja üldkeeleteaduse instituut, Eesti keele võõrkeelena osakond.

Duczko, Wladyslaw. 2004. *Viking Rus. Studies in the Presence of Scandinavians in Eastern Europe*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Erelt, Mati. 2003. Syntax. In: Erelt (ed.): 93–129.

Erelt, Mati (ed.). 2003. *Estonian Language*. Tallinn: Estonian Academy Publishers.

Fedriani, Chiara, Gianguido Manzelli, Paolo Ramat. 2013. Gradualness in contact-induced constructional replication. The Abstract Possession construction in the Circum-Mediterranean area. In: Anna Giacalone Ramat, Caterina Mauri, Piera Molinelli (eds.). *Synchrony and Diachrony: A dynamic interface*. Amsterdam / Philadephia: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 391–417.

Fedriani, Chiara, Gianguido Manzelli. 2014. Costruzioni esperienziali con esperiente in accusativo nelle lingue slave meridionali. In: Anna Bonola, Paola Cotta Ramusino, Liana Goletiani (eds.). *Studi italiani di linguistica slava. Strutture, uso e acquisizione*. Firenze: Firenze University Press: 75–94.

Filippova, Jelena. 2009. *Russko-karel'skij razgovornik. Ven'alais-karjalaine paginsanakirju*. Petroskoi: Periodika.

Fraenkel, Ernst. 1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch.* Band II. *Privykėti-žvolgai*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Grković-Major, Jasmina. 2011. The Development of Predicative Possession in Slavic Languages. In: Motoki Nomachi (ed.). *The Grammar of Possessivity in South Slavic Languages. Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*. Sapporo: Slavic Research Center, Hokkaido University: 35–54.

Grünthal, Riho. 2015. Livonian at the crossroads of language contacts. In: Junttila Santeri (ed.). *Baltic Languages and White Nights*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (Uralica Helsingiensia 7): 12–67.

Gutschmidt, Karl (†), Sebastian Kempgen, Tilman Berger, Peter Kosta (eds.). 2014. *Die slavische Sprachen. The Slavic languages*. […]. Band 2 / Volume 2. Berlin / Munich / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Haarmann, Harold. 2014. Finnougrische-slavische Sprachkontakte. In: Gutschmidt et al. (eds.): 1181–1198.

Hakulinen, Lauri. 1961. *The Structure and Development of the Finnish Language*. Translated by John Atkinson. Bloomington: Indiana University / The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co.

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession. Cognitive Sources, Forces, and Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, Bernd, Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language Contact and Grammatical Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hickey, Raymond (ed.). 2010. *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Honti, László. 2007. A birtoklás kifejezésének eszközei az uráli nyelvekben szinkrón és diakrón szempontból. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 104: 7–56.

Hypatian Chronicle. 1908 (available in http://litopys.org.ua/ipatlet/ipat.htm, accessed many times between January 2017–May 2018).

Inaba, Nobofumi. 2015. *Suomen datiivigenitiivin juuret vertailevan menetelmän valossa.* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Sueran Toimituksia 272).

Isačenko, Alexander V. 1974. On 'have' and 'be' languages (a typological sketch). In: Michael S. Flier (ed.). *Slavic Forum. Essays in Linguistics and Literature*. The Hague / Paris: Mouton: 43–77.

Jakuškina, E. I. 2009. Glagoly boli v serbskom i xorvatskom jazykax. In: Bricyn et al. (eds.): 135–153.

Javorskaja, G. M. 2009. K ètimologii praslavjanskogo *bolěti*. In: Bricyn et al. (eds.): 413–417.

Judakin, A. P. 1997. *Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika finno-ugorskix jazykov (stanovlenie sistemy padežej)*. Moskva: Glas.

Kallio, Petri. 2015. The language contact situation in prehistoric Northern Europe. In: Robert Mailhammer, Theo Vennemann gen. Nierfeld, Birgit Anette Olsen (eds.). *The Linguistic Roots of Europe. Origin and Development of European Languages.* Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press (Copenhagen Indo-European Studies 6): 77–102.

Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva. 1984. On the Possessive Constructions in Finno-Ugric. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* 86(1): 118–123.

Karlova, Olga. 2011. *Vienankarjalan alkeiskuršši. Карельский для начинающих* [*Karel'skij dlja načinajuščix*]. Petroskoi: Verso.

Karlsson, Fred. 1999. *Finnish: An Essential Grammar*. London and New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Käsi, Inge, Helmi Neetar. 2011. *Vanapärase võru murde sõnaraamat. Rõuge, Vastseliina, Setu*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Sihtasutus.

Kettunen, Lauri. 1938. *Livisches Wörterbuch mit grammatischer Einleitung*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura (Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae 5).

Kiparsky, Valentin. 1969. *Gibt es ein finno-ugrisches Substrat im Slavischen?* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Koivulehto, Jorma. 2006. Wie alte sind die Kontakte zwischen Finnisch-Ugrisch und Balto-Slavisch? In: Nuorluoto (ed.): 179–196.

Klaas, Birute. 1996. Similarities in Case Marking of Syntactic Relations in Estonian and Lithuanian. In: Mati Erelt (ed.). *Estonian: Typological Studies I*. Tartu: Tartu ülikooli kirjastuse trükikoda: 37–67.

Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria, Bernhard Wälchli. 2001. The Circum-Baltic languages. An areal-typological approach. In: Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.) 2001b: 615–761.

Kortmann, Bernd, Johann van der Auwera (eds.). 2011. *The Languages and Linguistics of Europe. A Comprehensive Guide*. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Koščanka, Uladzimir Aljaksandravič et al. 2010. *English-Belarusian Phrasebook*. Minsk: Artyja Grup.

Kozmács, István. 2006. A birtokosszemélyragozás és a birtokos szerkezetek. In: István Kozmács, Katalin Sipőcz (eds.). *Uralisztika. Uráli nyelvészet*. Budapest: Bölcsészkonzorcium: 41–64.

Krivickij, A. A., A. E. Mixnevič, A. I. Podlužnyj. 1978. *Belorusskij jazyk dlja ne belorusov*. Minsk: Vyšèšaja skola.

Krys'ko, V. B. 2006. *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka. Ob"ekt i perexodnost'*. 2nd edition. Moskva: Azbukovnik.

Kujola, Juho. 1944. *Lyydiläismurteiden sanakirja*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Laakso, Johanna. 2010. Contact and the Finno-Ugric Languages. In: Hickey (ed.): 598–617.

Laakso, Johanna. 2011. The Uralic Languages. In: Kortmann & van der Auwera (eds.): 179–197.

Laanest, Arvo. 1997. *Isuri keele Hevaha murde sõnastik*. Tallinn: Eesti Keele Instituut.

Lees, Aet. 2015. *Case Alternations in Five Finnic Languages. Estonian, Finnish, Karelian, Livonian and Veps*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Lehtinen, Meri. 1963. *Basic Course in Finnish* (supervised and edited by Thomas A. Sebeok). Bloomington: Indiana University / The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co. (Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic series 27).

Lind, John H. 2006. Problems of Ethnicity in the Interpretation of Written Sources on Early Rus'. In: Nuorluoto (ed.): 246–258.

Magocsi, Paul R. 1979. *Let's speak Rusyn. Говорім по-руськы. Hovorim po-rus'kŷ. Transcarpathian edition*. Fairview, New Jersey: Carpatho-Rusyn Research Center.

Manzelli, Gianguido. 2017. Russo *u menjá bolít golová* vs. bulgaro *bolí me glaváta* 'ho mal di testa' e la *vexata quaestio* delle strutture possessive di tipo baltofinnico nello slavo orientale. In: Marina di Filippo, François Esvan (eds.). *Studi di Linguistica Slava*. Volume dedicato a Lucyna Gebert. Napoli: Il Torcoliere-Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale": 191–209.

Matveev, A. K. 2015. *Substratnaja toponimija Russkogo Severa*. IV. *Toponimija merjanskogo tipa*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta.

Mayo, Peter. 1993. Belorussian. In: Comrie & Corbett (eds.): 887–946.

Mazzitelli, Lidia Federica. 2015. *The Expression of Predicative Possession. A Comparative Study of Belarusian and Lithuanian*. Berlin / Munich / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

McAnallen, Julia. 2009. Developments in predicative possession in the history of Slavic. In: Björn Hansen, Jasmina Grković-Major (eds.). *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax. Gradual Changes in Focus*. München / Berlin / Wien: Wiener Slawistischer Almanach: 131–142.

McAnallen, Julia. 2011. *The History of Predicative Possession in Slavic: Internal Development vs. Language Contact*. A dissertation submitted […] for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Berkeley: University of California.

Miklosich, Fr[anz]. 1868–1874. *Vergleichende Syntax der slavischen Sprachen*. Wien: Wilhelm Braunmüller k. k. Hofbuchhändler.

Moravcsik, Gyula. 1983. *Byzantinoturcica*. II. *Sprachreste der Türkvolker in den byzantinischen Quellen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Nirvi, Ruben Erik. 1971. *Inkeroismurteiden sanakirja*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Nuorluoto, Juhani (ed.). 2006. *The Slavicization of the Russian North. Mechanisms and Chronology. Die Slavisierung Nordrusslands. Mechanismen und Chronologie. Славянизация Русского Севера. Механизмы и хронология*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press (Slavica Helsingiensia 27).

Pajusalu, Karl. 2003. Estonian dialects. In: Erelt (ed.): 231–272.

Papp, István. 1978. *Finn-magyar szótár*, harmadik kiadás, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Papp, István, László Jakab. 1985. *Magyar-finn szótár*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Pašuto, Vladmir. 1995. *Aleksandr Nevskij*. New edition. Moskva: Molodaja gvardija.

Pinto, Karen C. 2016. *Medieval Islamic Maps. An Exploration.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pirnat-Greeberg, Marta. 2012. *Colloquial Slovene. The Complete Course for Beginners*. 2nd edition. London / New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Plokhy, Serhii. 2006. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations. Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus.* Cambridge University Press.

Pugh, Stefan M., Ian Press. 2005. *Ukrainian. A Comprehensive Grammar*. London / New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Pustet, Regina. 2015. The syntax of temperature predications. In: Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (ed.). *The Linguistics of Temperature*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company: 889–916.

Puzanov, Viktor Vladimirovič. 2007. *Drevnerusskaja gosudarstvennost': genezis, ėtnokul'turnaja sreda, ideologičeskie konstrukty*. Iževsk: Udmurtskij universitet.

Ramat, Paolo. 2005. Il nome dei "Veneti": considerazioni etno-linguistiche. In: Paolo Ramat. *Pagine linguistiche: scritti di linguistica storica e tipologica*. Roma: GLF editori Laterza: 156–161.

Roberge, Paul. 2010. Contact and the History of Germanic Languages. In: Hickey (ed.): 406–431.

Saagpakk, Paul F. 1992. *Eesti-inglise sõnaraamat. Estonian-English Dictionary*. Tallinn: Koolibri.

Saarikivi, Janne. 2006. *Substrata Uralica. Studies on Finno-Ugrian Substrate in Northern Russian Dialects*. Academic dissertation […]. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Seržant, Ilja A., Valgerður Bjarnadóttir. 2014. Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in *-ē-* in Baltic and Russian. In: Artūras Judžentis, Tatyana Civjan, Maria Zavyalova (eds.). *Balty i Slavjane: peresečenie duxovnyx kul'tur*, Skiriama akademikui Vladimirui Toporovui atminti. Vilnius: Versmė: 218–241.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2015. Dative experiencer constructions as a Circum-Baltic isogloss. In: Peter Arkadiev, Axel Holvoet, Björn Wiemer (eds.). *Contemporary Approaches to Baltic Linguistics*: 325–348. Berlin / Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Shevelov, George Y. 1993. Ukrainian. In: Comrie & Corbett (eds.): 947–998.

Slyn'ko, Ilarion Ilarionovyč. 1980. Syntaksys. In: M. A. Žovtobrjux, O. T. Volox, S. P. Samijlenko, I. I. Slyn'ko. *Istoryčna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy*. Kyjiv: Vyšča škola: 253–308.

Söderholm, Eira. 2017. *Kvensk grammatikk*. Oversatt fra kvensk av Philipp Conzett. [2014. *Kainun kielen grammatikki*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura]. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.

SSA I = Itkonen, Erkki, Ulla-Maija Kulonen (chief eds.) et al. 2001 [1992]. *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja*. 1. *A-K*. 2. Painos. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Kotimaisten Kielten Tutkimuskeskus.

SSA II = Kulonen, Ulla-Maija (chief ed.) et al. 2001 [1995]. *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja*. 2. *L-P*. 2. Painos. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Kotimaisten Kielten Tutkimuskeskus.

SSA III = Kulonen, Ulla-Maija, Satu Tanner (chief eds.) et al. 2000. *Suomen sanojen alkuperä. Etymologinen sanakirja*. 3. *R-Ö*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Kotimaisten Kielten Tutkimuskeskus.

Stasse, Leon. 2009. *Predicative Possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stern, Dieter, 2011. Language contact in the East and Northeast of Europe. In: Kortmann & van der Auwera (eds.): 381–392.

Sulkala, Helena, Marja Karjalainen. 1992. *Finnish*. London / New York: Routledge.

Sychta, Bernard. 1967. *Słownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej*. Tom I. *A-Ǵ*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Krakow: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact*. Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, Sarah G., Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics.* Berkeley / Los Angeles / London: University of California Press.

Timberlake, Alan. 1993. Russian. In: Comrie & Corbett (eds.): 827–886.

Timberlake, Alan. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Timberlake, Alan. 2014. The Simple Sentence. In: Gutschmidt et al. (eds.): II, 1675–1699.

Tkačenko, Orest B. 2007. *Issledovanija po merjanskomu jazyku*. Kostroma: Infopress.

Trubačev, Oleg Nikolaevič. (ed.). 1975. *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*. Vypusk 2 (*bez – *bratrъ). Moskva: Nauka.

Trubačev, Oleg Nikolaevič. (ed.). 1981. *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond*. Vypusk 8 (*xa – *jьvъlga). Moskva: Nauka.

Uspenskij, Pavel. 1913. *Russko-čudskij slovar' s někotorymi grammatičeskimi ukazanijami*. S.-Peterburg: Tipografija V. D. Smirnova.

Vaillant, André. 1977. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. Tome V. *La syntaxe.* Paris: Éditions Klinckieck.

Vasmer, Max. 1955. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Zweiter Band. *L-Ssuda.* Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag.

Vasmer, Max. 1958. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Dritter Band. *Sta-Ÿ*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag.

Veenker, Wolfgang. 1967. *Die Frage des finnougrischen Substrats in der russischen Sprache*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press (Uralic and Altaic Series 82).

Winkler, Eberhard. 2003. Az uráli nyelvek *habeo*-szerkezetének történetéhez. *Folia Uralica Debreceniensia* 10: 195–207.

Winkler, Eberhard, Karl Pajusalu (eds.). 2009. *Salis-livisches Wörterbuch*. Tallinn: Teaduste Akadeemia Kirjastus (Linguistica Uralica. Supplementary series 3).

Xelimskij, Evgenij Arnol'dovič. 2000a. Slavjanskie (novgorodsko-pskovskie) zaimstvovanija v pribaltijsko-finskix jazykax: *-a* i *-u* v refleksax imen mužskogo roda]. In: E. A. Xelimskij. *Komparativistika, uralistika. Lekcii i stat'i*: 330–331. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Xelimskij, Evgenij Arnol'dovič. 2000b. O pribaltijsko-finskom jazykovom materiale v novgorodskix berestjannyx gramotax. In: E. A. Xelimskij. *Komparativistika, uralistika. Lekcii i stat'i*: 338–348. Moskva: Jazyki russkoj kul'tury.

Xramcova, O. A. 2012. *Finsko-russko-finskij slovar' biblejskix frazeologizmov. Raamattuperäisten fraasien suomi-venäjä-suomi sanakirja*. Available online: http://avtor.karelia.ru/elbibl/hramtsova/fin_rus_fraz.pdf, accessed April 2018.

Yurayong, Chingduang. 2013. *Оу мене есть хлѣбъ vs. Minulla on leipä. Omistuslause Novgorodin tuohikirjeissä itämerensuomalaisten substraattikielten näkökulmasta*. Kandidaatiin tutkielma Suomalais-ugrilainen kielentutkimus. Helsinki: Helsingin Yliopisto.

Yurayong, Chingduang. Forth. Predicative possession in the Novgorod birch barks from the perspective of Finnic substrate languages. *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 97.

Zahnitko, A. P. 2001. *Teoretyčna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy. Syntaksys*. Donec'k: DonNU.

Zaliznjak, A. A. 2004. *Drevnenovgorodskij dialekt*. 2nd edition. Moskva: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.

Zimovec, G. V. 2009. Glagoly boli v ukrainskom jazyke. In: Bricyn et al. (eds.): 66–109.

Джангвидо Мандзелли. Предикативные посессивные конструкции как контактно-обусловленное явление в прибалтийско-финских и восточнославянских языках: как болит голова между Балтийским морем и истоками Волги

Несмотря на то, что предикативные посессивные конструкции в целом довольно хорошо исследованы, в этой области еще остается немало вопросов, особенно при изучении того, как они соотносятся с экспериенциальными конструкциями. В настоящей статье на конкретном примере таких конструкций (выражение идеи головной боли в прибалтийско-финских и восточнославянских языках) проводится попытка разрешить «больной» вопрос о происхождении адессивно-посессивной конструкции в русском языке.

Ключевые слова: предикативные посессивные конструкции, экспериенциальные конструкции, прибалтийско-финские языки, восточнославянские языки, языковые контакты.