1. Introduction

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

(1)  
   a. HAVE — Sally: NOM has book: ACC ‘S has a book’
   c. TAKE — Sally: NOM takes Tommy: DAT book: ACC ‘S takes a book from T’

In East Slavic, however, HAVE is normally expressed instead as existence in a location, roughly paraphrasable in English as At Sally there is a book. This construction of HAVE avoids attributing an active role to the possessor, thus undermining the notion that loss of possession might be actively experienced and preventing the parallel construction of GIVE and TAKE.
In East Slavic, therefore, TAKE is expressed as a syntactic variant of HAVE (existence in a location), and is not parallel to GIVE. The paraphrases of HAVE, GIVE, and TAKE for East Slavic are given in (2).

(2) a. HAVE — at Sally:GEN [is] book:NOM ‘S has a book’
   c. TAKE — Sally:NOM takes at Tommy:GEN book:ACC ‘S takes a book from T’

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

2. An overview of GIVE, HAVE, and TAKE

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

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

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

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

The combination of close parallels and clashing contrasts between GIVE and TAKE motivates the mapping of structures associated with GIVE to expressions of TAKE, but this is not the only logical solution available. As suggested above, TAKE can also take advantage of structures associated with HAVE. Slavic has realized both alternatives, but, as is so often the case with languages, the distinction is not entirely black and
white. Most Slavic languages clearly prefer one alternative over the other, yet there are situations where both strategies are employed to various degrees. The choice is partially determined by how HAVE is expressed, i.e. whether possessors are conceived of as agents of possession or as mere locations of possession. In West and South Slavic, HAVE is expressed by means of a transitive verb: the possessor is a nominative subject, the verb agrees with it, and the possessed object is an accusative direct object, as in (3).

Czech

(3) Petr má novou peněženku.
Peter:NOM has new wallet:ACC
‘Peter has a new wallet.’

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

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

Russian

(4) У Петра новый бумажник.
at Peter:GEN [is] new wallet:NOM
‘Peter has a new wallet.’

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

Table 1. Synonyms for GIVE and TAKE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GIVE</th>
<th>TAKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘offer’</td>
<td>‘steal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘serve’</td>
<td>‘seize’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘give as a present’</td>
<td>‘swipe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘deliver’</td>
<td>‘appropriate’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

3. TAKE as a parallel to GIVE

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

It is often observed (cf. Andersen 1989) that antonyms bear a special relationship to each other, one that transcends simple opposition. In order for words to be antonyms, or indeed, to be related in their meaning, they
must make reference either to a more abstract concept embracing the scale
the antonyms represent, or to another concept which relates them by chance. It is not uncommon in the etymological history of words to find
that different languages have developed opposing meanings from the same
source, thus realizing over the diachronic dimension the synchronic relations
ships that antonyms have in a given language. The English word black
derives from the same root as French blanc and Russian belyi, both of
which mean ‘white’, namely from Proto-Indo-European *bʰh₂a- ‘shine, burn.’
Here the concept of ‘fire’ by chance unites the incandescent light it pro-
duces, generally perceived as white, and the charred remains blackened by
flames. Another notorious example within Slavic are the etymologically
identical Russian čerstvij ‘stale’ and Czech čerstvý ‘fresh’, both of which
reflect Proto-Indo-European *kr-, the source of English hard, a meaning
closer to that of the original Proto-Indo-European than either of the Slavic
reflexes. Both Russian and Czech have abstracted the original meaning of
firmness as an index of relative age, but they have done so in different
domains of food. Whereas the Russians (or their ancestors) have applied
this concept to bread, which hardens as it ages, the Czechs have based their
observations on fruits and vegetables which show the opposite correlation
since they go soft as they rot. One more example is of even more recent
provenience, the meaning of Russian and Czech pitomec, which in both
languages transparently refers to ‘the one who is fed’, being related to the
root pit- ‘feed.’ In Russian, however, it means ‘alumnus, graduate’, whereas
in Czech it means ‘fool’ — a pair of apparent opposites. Again, however,
the difference in meaning is due to the domain in which it was realized.
Russians have applied this word to the abstract domain of intellectual nour-
ishment, whereas Czechs use it metaphorically to refer to humans who
exhibit the characteristics of domesticated livestock, demonstrably less cun-
ning than their cousins who must find their food in the wild.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. GIVE and TAKE in parallel constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. HAVE and TAKE in parallel constructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKE =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;HAVE&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Both HAVE and TAKE here describe transitive actions, the latter optionally expressing also the source of the object. Indeed, it is fruitful to paraphrase TAKE as ATTAIN “HAVE”, since this highlights the parallel.

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

**Czech**

(5) **Hana** dala **Petrovi** dárek.

Hana:NOM gave Peter:DAT gift:ACC

‘Hana gave Peter a gift.’

(6) **Zloděj** vzal **Petrovi** peněženku.

thief:NOM took Peter:DAT wallet:ACC

‘The thief took Peter’s wallet.’ (lit. ‘... took wallet from Peter.’)

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

(7) **Zloděj** vzal **Petrovi** moji peněženku.

thief:NOM took Peter:DAT my wallet:ACC

‘The thief took my wallet from Peter.’

(8) **Studenti** mi vzali všechny moje knihy.

students:NOM me:DAT took all my books:ACC

‘The students took all my books from me.’

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

---

**Slovak**

(9) \( \text{Daj mi to!} \)

you give me:DAT it:ACC

‘Give it to me!’

(10) \( \text{Ukradli mi dátžnik.} \)

stole me:DAT umbrella:ACC

‘They stole [my] umbrella from me.’

---

**Polish**

(11) \( \text{Mary daje pudełko siostrze.} \)

Mary:NOM gives box:ACC sister:DAT

‘Mary gives a box to her sister.’

(12) \( \text{Zabrała mi syna.} \)

took me:DAT son:ACC

‘[She] took [my] son from me.’

---

**Macedonian**

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

(13) \( \text{Mu ja dadov knjigata.} \)

him:DAT her:ACC gave book:the

‘I gave him the book.’

(14) \( \text{(Toj) mi go ukrade casovnik.} \)

(be:NOM) me:DAT him:ACC stole watch:the

‘He stole the watch from me.’

Although the prototypical TAKE expression involves a dative indirect object in these languages, it is possible to construe TAKE differently, highlighting instead the fact that the “takee” is the source (rather than the experiencer) of the transferal of the object, and this is done with a prepositional phrase rather than the indirect object. Here is an example from Czech, where the source is identified in (15a) by the preposition od ‘from’ governing the genitive case, but in (15b) by a dative pronoun:
(15) a. Ani pes by od  
not even dog:NOM would:AUX from  
něho kůrku chleba nevzal.  
him:GEN crust:ACC bread:GEN not took  
‘Not even a dog would take a crust of bread from him.’  
b. Ani pes by mu  
not even dog:NOM would:AUX him:DAT  
kůrku chleba nevzal.  
crust:ACC bread:GEN not took  
‘Not even a dog would take away his crust of bread.’

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

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

(16) Molim, dajte mi pět maraka.  
please you give me:DAT five:ACC stamps:GEN  
‘Please, give me five stamps.’

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

(17) Uzeo je novac od nje.  
took AUX money:ACC from her:GEN  
‘He took money from her.’

(18) Uzeo joj je novac.  
took her:DAT AUX money:ACC  
‘He took her money.’

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

4. TAKE as a parallel to HAVE

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

Table 4. East Slavic HAVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAVE</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Locus of possession</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. East Slavic TAKE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAKE</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“HAVE”</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Locus of possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTAIN</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENER/SOURCE</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>EXPERIENER/SOURCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The normal construction for TAKE in East Slavic capitalizes on the semantic parallels available in HAVE, but chooses to suppress the mismatch between locus of possession and experiencer in favor of the former (semantically close to the concept of source). This construction can be illustrated with the examples in (19) and (20).

**Russian**

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

(20) Ja vidibral v xlopciv hrosi.
I: NOM took at boys: GEN money: ACC
'I took the money from the boys.'

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

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

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

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

---

5. Discussion

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

**Czech**

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

**Russian**

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

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

There is clearly nothing in the semantics of the dative case (which by itself bears no more semantic freight than ‘experience’) that would prevent
Table 6. Czech and Russian verbs denoting ‘harm’ used with dative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vadit</td>
<td>‘bother’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>škodit</td>
<td>mekat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ublížovat</td>
<td>‘hurt’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>izmenjat’</td>
<td>‘betray’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>překážet</td>
<td>‘hinder’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nadoedat’</td>
<td>‘get on nerves of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mstít</td>
<td>‘take revenge on’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dosázdat’</td>
<td>‘annoy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>naskučit’</td>
<td>‘bore’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ostočeret’</td>
<td>‘repel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oprotivet’</td>
<td>‘repel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opostylet’</td>
<td>‘be hateful’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(26) Voz’mi zontik!
you take umbrella:ACC
‘Take the/an umbrella!’

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

Notes

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