TYPOLOGIES OF LITERARY GRAMMAR: MEDIEVAL SLAVIC AND OTTOMAN TURKISH

Andrew Dombrowski

University of Chicago

1.   Introduction

Scholars have disagreed about the origin of the Dative Absolute (DA) construction in Slavic since at least the end of the 19th century. The main locus for disagreement is the degree to which the Greek genitive absolute construction influenced the Slavic DA. One viewpoint is that the DA existed in Common Slavic (Miklosich 1883), while other scholars have argued that the DA in Old Church Slavonic (OCS) originated as a calque of the Greek genitive absolute (Belorussov 1899), which may have been facilitated by certain preexisting structural factors in Slavic (see the review in Corin 1995).

This debate cannot be considered to have been conclusively resolved. It has become common for descriptive studies of the DA to mention the history of the debate without explicitly taking sides (Worth 1994: 29–30, Corin 1995: 255–258, Kurešević 2006: 39, Györfi 2007: 49–51), or even in some cases not mentioning the debate at all (Živov 2008). While this is reasonable given the time scale of the debate, agnosticism about the origins of the DA considerably complicates any attempt to draw theoretical conclusions from descriptive studies on the DA. If one accepts the hypothesis that the DA is primarily the result of Greek influence in Slavic, then descriptive studies on the DA are about the ways in which literary languages adapt borrowings absent in the literary language, and therefore, such studies fall broadly under the rubric of contact linguistics. If, contrastingly, one accepts the proposal that the DA was present natively in Common Slavic, then descriptive studies of the DA have to do with language–internal diachronic syntax.

In this paper, I first provide an overview of the history of the DA in Slavic, with a particular focus on its evolution in post–OCS South Slavic and on later textual and dialectal evidence that may be interpreted as remnants of the DA. The origin debate is revisited in light of this evidence, and I argue that the origin debate ultimately depends upon broader assumptions about the behavior of foreign constructions that are borrowed into literary languages but are not present in the corresponding spoken languages. I further argue that evaluating these assumptions requires looking beyond medieval Slavic, and introduce the Persian *izafet* construction in Ottoman Turkish as a first point for comparison. I show that the behavior and diachronic trajectory of the DA in medieval Slavic are fundamentally distinct from the Persian *izafet* in Ottoman Turkish, and evaluate the ramifications of this comparison for the origin debate.

2.   The Diachronic Path of the Slavic DA

2.1.   Background Information

The DA in the earliest written attestations of Slavic (OCS and early East Slavic) can be described as the use of a participial construction marked by dative case to indicate semantic subordination to the main clause. Semantically, the DA indicates various kinds of attendant

circumstances, especially but not exclusively temporal sequentiality. Especially in OCS, there is a strong tendency for subject of the participial clause to be distinct from the subject of a matrix clause. This restriction parallels that found in other Indo-European languages with absolute constructions. An representative example from OCS is given below. Here and elsewhere, the absolute clause is underlined in examples.

> (1) *s ъ šed ъ šju že emu s ъ gory v ъ slĕd ъ ego idǫ narodi mnodzi* (Zogr., Matt 8:1)
> 'When he descended from the mountain, many people followed him.'

2.2.   Formal Evolution of the Slavic DA

Post-OCS, formal restrictions on DA constructions such as the prohibition of identical subjects and the tendency to prepose the participial clause are loosened. Examples given below illustrate this tendency in Middle Serbian (example (2)) and Old Russian (example (3)).

> (2) *mladencu emu suštu dvoe kr ъ štenie prie i paky priemšu emu svety aggel ъ sky obraz ъ*
>   (Kurešević 2006: 52)
>   'When he was young, he was christened twice, and again when he had taken on his
>   holy angelic appearance.'

> (3) *Kievi že prišedšju v svoi gorod Kiev, tu i skonča život svoi.* (Worth 1994: 29)
>   'When Kyj came to his city Kiev, there he ended his life.'

Example (2) illustrates both tendencies; the DA clauses have the same subject reference as the finite verb, and they are found both before and after the main clause. Studies of post-OCS South Slavic corpora have revealed a sharp increase in same-subject DAs compared to OCS. In OCS, 5.3% of DAs are same-subject (Stanislav 1933/34: 13). The majority of these examples are from Suprasliensis, i.e., at the end of the OCS period. In her study of a large middle Serbian corpus ranging from the 12th to the 15th centuries, Kurešević (2006: 51) finds that 31.5% of DAs have identical subjects. Leafgren's (2002) study of 10 middle Bulgarian texts from the Tărnovo school has similar findings; in this corpus, 24.1% of DAs are same-subject (Leafgren 2002: 159).

Somewhat later, a tendency emerges for case marking on the participle to break down. In both South Slavic and East Slavic, dative case marking is replaced by an invariant participial form. In Middle Serbian, as in example (4), this is often characteristic of a more popular register.

> (4) *i se plačukje mi se. i se ag(ъ)g(e)l ъ g(ospod ъ)n ъ prĕd(ъ)sta i reče mi* (Kurešević 2006:
>   56)
>   'And lo, when I was crying, an angel of the Lord appeared and said to me...'

Such usage continues in Serbian into the early 18th century, as shown by the following example from the early 18th century author Venclović:

(5) *vidě neku caricu slavnu, sěděći joj na carskom stolu* (Grickat 1972: 105–106)
  'He saw a lovely queen, as she sat on the throne.'

Analogous examples can be found in 16th century western Russian documents (example (6)), although variation in participial morphology suggests that invariant adverbial forms were emerging in East Slavic as early as the 12th century (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963: 446).

(6) *edučy mne čerez toe selo i majučy nekotoruju potrebu do Murashki, stupil ъ by esmi
      do nego v dvor* (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963: 446)
  'when I traveled through that village and needed something from Murashka, I stopped
      by his courtyard'

Only the dative marking on the pronoun in (6) formally distinguishes such constructions from the modern adverbial constructions found in East Slavic.

In OCS it is typical that only one DA clause precedes the main clause. In later medieval Slavic, however, it becomes increasingly common for multiple DA clauses to stack up before a main clause. This is particularly common in chronicles, and such examples can reach considerable complexity. Kurešević (2006: 55) finds examples with as many as five dative referents preceding a matrix clause, and Worth (1994: 30–31) finds examples of similar DA stacking in the Primary Chronicle that do not obviously prepose any matrix clause.

2.3   Semantic Evolution of the Slavic DA

In addition to formal evolution, the DA in Slavic underwent significant semantic shift post–OCS. Temporal antecedence was the most prototypical reading of the DA in OCS, although not the only one. Post–OCS medieval Slavic is marked by an ever–increasing diversity of semantic and pragmatic motivations for the use of DA clauses, to the point that the late medieval Slavic DA is better understood as indicative of general pragmatic backgrounding (Leafgren 2002, Kurešević 2006, Saxarova   2010).

During the post–OCS period, causal readings of the DA become dramatically more prevalent, as indicated by the following Serbian example:

(7) *n ъ nič ъ tože v ъ mogoše uspěti oklevetajuštei jego, bogu pomagajuštu jemu* (Kurešević
      2006: 58)
  'but those that cursed him could not accomplish anything, since God was helping him.'

The non–temporality of the DA is even more noticeable in the Middle Bulgarian usage that has been termed "circumstantial modification" (Leafgren 2002: 156–157). In such examples, DA clauses provide background information relevant for the main clause without any hint of sequentiality or causation.

(8) *Egda ubo prixoždaaše svętitel ъ v ъ grad zovomyi Moskvu, ešte togda malu suštu emu i*

ne mnogu narodnu (Leafgren 2002: 156–157)
'when the saint came to the city called Moscow, which was then still small and not
very well-populated'

(9) _Po mnodzě že vrěmeni Grъčьskomu oskǫ děvšu carstvu i umalenu vъ sěčьsky,_
     Blъgarskomu že i dzělo vъ zveličivšu sę, blagočьstivějšij carъ
Kaloan Blъgarskoe   togda pravěaše sküptro (Leafgren 2002: 156–157)
'The Byzantine Empire having been weakened for a considerable time and diminished
in various ways, and the Bulgarian Empire having greatly expanded, the
honorable Tsar Kaloan commanded the Bulgarian scepter'.

2.3   Possible Remnants of the DA

Some constructions found in modern Slavic dialects have been argued to be remnants of the
DA. Perhaps most frequently mentioned in the literature are the following examples from peripheral
north Russian dialects, which were first reported in 1902–1903.

(10) _ja vyexal uže zakativšis' solncu_ (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963: 449)
'I left when the sun had already gone down'

(11) _ja priexal ešče ne otošedši obedne_ (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963: 449)
'I came when Mass had not yet ended'

(12) _mužik skončalsja priexavšu stanovomu_ (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963: 449)
'the man died when the police superintendant came'

Example (12) is particularly striking because of the dative marking on the participial form
priexavšu. The use of an invariant form in (10) and (11) render these examples basically identical to
the 16th century western Russian example given in (6) and even Serbian examples like (4) and (5)
(_modulo_ morphological variation in the adverbial form).

Suggestive examples have been gathered from southwestern Russian dialects more recently,
during fieldwork for the Russian dialectological atlas. Example (13) is from the Brjansk _oblast'_, while
example (14) is from the Orlovskaja _oblast'_ (Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963: 449).

(13) _d'on p'at' prašlo jamu rad'ivšy_
'about five days passed after he was born'

(14) _s'em γ adoŭ jamu pam'oršy_
'seven years since he died'

The southwestern examples in (13) and (14) are somewhat distinct from the northern examples
in (10)–(12). Semantically, (13) and (14) both deal with the related concepts of birth and death. From

these attestations alone, it is not possible to determine the extent to which these are isolated constructions in these dialects, but such a coherent semantic grouping suggests at least that these are not entirely productive constructions. (13) and (14) also clearly express a strong degree of temporal priority, whereas (10)–(12) express what might be termed backgrounded simultaneity.

Turning to East South Slavic, it has been claimed that invariant gerunds ending in *-štem, -ščem, -(št)im,* and *k'um* are remnants of the DA. Examples below are drawn from Mladenov (1979: 309).

(15) *Eden den, <u>predeeščem si kraj ognišče snaa i sfekărva</u>, snaata ja opitfit svekărva si*
     'One day, when a daughter-in-law and mother-in-law were spinning by the fire,
the   daughter-in-law asked her mother-in-law'

(16) *<u>xodeeščem</u> pătem <u>trojcata bratia</u>, stretile edna češma...*
  'as the three brothers went along the path, they came across a well'

(17) *<u>Solomon...igraeščem</u> si ašici so decata, si izrekol...*
  'When Solomon...was playing knucklebones with the children, he said...'.

Mladenov (1979: 309) claims that these constructions are remnants of the DA, while Conev (1934: 554) emphatically disagrees. Neither scholar explicitly articulates the criteria they use to make their assertions. It may be noted, however, that in all three examples given above, the subject of the gerundial clause is the same as the subject of the matrix clause (although (15) actually has two subjects in the gerundial clause as compared to just one in the matrix clause). While this is quite distinct from the pattern observable in OCS DAs, the frequency of same-subject DAs did dramatically increase into middle Bulgarian. As a result, it is difficult to draw any unequivocal conclusions from this observation.

Evidence from West South Slavic has not traditionally been cited in discussions of the DA, but some suggestive examples do exist in the literature on the history of West South Slavic. Belić (1962: 192) provides the following examples drawn from "older sources" (without any further elaboration).

(18) *Tako <u>oni tijo govoreći</u>, čedo malo pade na zemljicu.*
  'So, as they were talking quietly, a small child fell onto the ground.'

(19) *<u>Medjedović gledajući u ručkonošu</u>, koja je bila krupna i zdrava i lijepa djevojka,*
  smili mu.
  'When Medjedović looked at the lunch-carrier, who was a large, healthy, beautiful
     girl, she became dear to him.'

(20) *A <u>Isus pogledavši na nj</u>, smilje mu.*
  'and Jesus looked at him and loved him' (Mark 10:21).

These examples are similar to the older Serbian examples given in (4) and (5), but without the dative case marking on the subject of the DA. Unlike examples (15)–(17), these examples obey the

disjoint-subject constraint characteristic of DAs in earlier Slavic, especially OCS.

3.   The Origin Debate

As mentioned in the introduction, scholars have disagreed about the origin of the DA since at least the end of the 19ᵗʰ century. The main locus of disagreement is the role of Greek in the development of the Slavic DA. While some scholars (beginning with Miklosich 1883) see the DA as a construction native to Common Slavic, others (such as Belorussov 1899) have argued that Greek influence during the establishment of Slavic literacy and translations of scripture from Greek to Slavic triggered the emergence of the DA in Slavic texts. Not all scholars who take this position see the DA as exclusively a calque of the Greek genitive absolute; some scholars within this framework have also pointed out the importance of structural factors in Slavic that facilitated the adoption of the Greek GA (see Corin 1995 for an extensive review of the relevant hypotheses).

The argument in favor of Greek origins for the Slavic DA draws on three main considerations. First, the usage of the DA in OCS parallels Greek more closely - both semantically and syntactically - than the usage of the DA in post-OCS Slavic. Second, the DA does not exist productively in any Slavic language. Third, in medieval Slavic texts, usage of the DA seems to be linked to higher-style texts. For a detailed discussion in Serbian, see Kurešević (2006: 54-56, 2007). This point is also broadly accepted as regards middle Bulgarian; while the formal and semantic properties of the DA in works of the Tărnovo school differ from those in OCS (Leafgren 2002: 159, Xaralampiev 2006: 192, 270-271), there is no doubt that these works reflect a carefully crafted literary style sharply distinct from the spoken language at the time. In addition to these three main points, the evolution of the DA over time in Slavic impressionistically looks like that of a foreign construction that writers learned to varying   extents.

The argument that the DA was originally native to Slavic likewise rests on three major considerations. First, absolute constructions of this type are common in older Indo-European languages (genitive absolute in Greek, ablative absolute in Latin, locative absolute in Sanskrit). Much like the Slavic DA, the dative absolute in Gothic has been argued to be a calque from Greek (Lane 1970: 254 reviewing Lockwood 1968). A dative absolute is also found in Baltic (Press 1973: 17). Second, the dialect evidence discussed in section 2.3 is used to support the Slavic origin of the DA. Third, it may be noted that even in the gospels, the DA does not always correspond to a Greek GA. This fact has been noted even by scholars who support the Greek origin hypothesis, who explain it in terms of translation practices (e.g. Skupskij 1993).

The dispute about the origins of the DA is not primarily due to disagreement about the relevant facts. Instead, the disagreement has to do with the interpretation of the facts at hand - which pieces of data are most important, which can be explained satisfactorily in other ways, etc. Broadly speaking, the question at hand is simple: what is the distributional profile of a construction borrowed into a literary language, but absent in the spoken varieties of that language? Adherents of the Greek origin hypothesis believe that the diachronic trajectory of the DA is consistent with such an origin, and that dialectal evidence must then be explained through some other mechanism. Adherents of the Slavic origin hypothesis believe that the diachronic trajectory of the DA is not necessarily that of a borrowed construction, and that the dialectal and comparative evidence is of crucial importance.

Both of these viewpoints depend on unarticulated assumptions about the likely diachronic path

of a construction borrowed directly into a literary language but absent in the spoken language. This question is too general to be answered on the basis of the Slavic data alone. A comparative perspective is necessary. In particular, a first necessary step is to identify instances of such borrowing and to describe the evolution of the constructions at hand. Section 4 of this paper does so, using the case study of the Persian *izafet* in Ottoman Turkish.

4.   Persian *izafet* in Ottoman Turkish

Ottoman Turkish provides a useful point of comparison to medieval Slavic; both languages were premodern literary varieties that evolved to be sharply distinct from the corresponding spoken languages. Ottoman Turkish - understood as a literary variety - incorporated massive amounts of borrowings from Arabic and Persian. For the most part, these borrowings were lexical, but certain grammatical elements were borrowed as well. An example of this is the Persian *izafet* construction, which was used in Ottoman Turkish with lexemes of Arabic or Persian origin.

Izafet is a term used in Turkish grammar[1] to refer to the semantic and syntactic linking of two or more nominal elements. This term refers both to possessive and compounding structures, although possessive and compound constructions are formally distinguished in Turkish. Examples (21) and (22) below illustrate native Turkish *izafet* constructions. (21) is a possessive construction, in which the possessor is marked by the genitive case and the possessed object is marked by a 3sg marker (corresponding to the possessor).

(21) *Mehmet-in   anne-si*
       Mehmet-GEN mother-3SG.POSS
       'Mehmet's mother'

(22) *Türkiye-Ø cumhuriyet-i*
       Turkey-NOM republic-3SG.POSS
       'The Republic of Turkey'

Example (22) illustrates a compound construction. In these constructions, there is no genitive case marking, as found in (21). Contrastingly, Persian forms both constructions identically, as shown in (23) and (24), which are the translation into Persian of examples (21) and (22) respectively.

(23) *mādar-e   Mehmet*
       mother-PART Mehmet
       'Mehmet's mother'

(24) *jumhuri-ye   Torkiye*
       republic-PART Turkey

---

1   In Persian, the term is *ezafe*. The Turkish term *izafet* is used in this paper because of the primary focus on Turkish.

'The Republic of Turkey'

The Persian *izafet* construction is sharply distinct from the native Turkish constructions. Word order is reversed, and an unstressed particle is used to mark the linkage of the nouns instead of the Turkish possessive marker which can be used (for possessive constructions) with the genitive case.

In Ottoman Turkish, Persian *izafet* constructions were used with words from Persian and Arabic. An example of this is given in (25), which can then be compared with the modern Turkish equivalent in (26).

(25) *Devlet-i ʿ Aliyye-yi ʿ osmâniyye*
state-PART sublime-PART Ottoman
'The Sublime Ottoman State' (= the Ottoman Empire)

(26) *Yüce Osmanlı Devlet-i*
sublime Ottoman state-3SG.POSS
'The Sublime Ottoman State'

Sources suggest that the restriction to Perso-Arabic lexemes was generally respected (Redhouse 1884: 165–167, Timurtaş 2005: 260) although Hagoupian (1907: 261) hedges, saying "...the Persian method is used, especially when the words employed are either Arabic or Persian." The actual frequency of mistakes is not at all obvious, but mistakes do not seem to be pervasive. The Persian *izafet* construction in Ottoman Turkish also does not evolve to any notable extent.

Furthermore, Persian *izafet* constructions do not generally spread into spoken Turkish. The language reform of the early twentieth century complicates matters for the modern researcher; many Persian and Arabic elements were removed from the standard language during this reform. For this reason, modern spoken Turkish is not always indicative of the linguistic consciousness of speakers from the early period of the twentieth century. Nonetheless, some evidence exists that humorous fixed phrases such as *deyyus-u ekber* 'great pimp' have been maintained to some extent in the spoken language into the modern period.[2]

Contrastingly, some Turkic dialects spoken in heavy contact with Indo-European languages have undergone shifts in *izafet* constructions. The West Rumelian dialects of Turkish spoken in Macedonia and Kosovo illustrate this possibility (Friedman 2003). Example (27) shows an incorrect *izafet* construction, in which a possessive *izafet* construction is used instead of a compounding construction:

(27) *Prişṭine'-nin Üniversite-si* (Friedman 2003)
Prishtina-GEN university-3SG.POSS
'Prishtina University / University of Prishtina'

---

2 A Google search in May 2011 yielded ~12,500 results for "deyyus-u ekber" and between ~100–1500 hits for variant spellings. The results included many links to web forms in which speakers were inquiring about the meaning of the phrase.

Standard Turkish would have no genitive here (see the contrast between examples (21) and (22)). This may be due to the influence of neighboring Indo-European languages, which do not distinguish compounds and possessives. Structurally, (27) is reminiscent of the Albanian equivalent given   in   example   (28):

(28) *Universitet-i i   Prishtin-ës*
     university-DEF PART Prishtina-GEN
     'University of Prishtina / Prishtina University'

Furthermore, the word order in *izafet* constructions can be shifted to match that found in the languages that West Rumelian Turkish had been in contact with. This is shown in (29), the word order of which is identical to that found in Albanian (30), and Macedonian (31).

(29) *baba-si   Ali-nin* (Friedman 2003)
     father-3SG.POSS Ali-GEN
     'Ali's father'

(30) *baba-i   i   Ali-ut*
     father-DEF PART Ali-GEN
     'Ali's father'

(31) *Tatko na Ali*
     father of Ali
     'Ali's father'

Analogously, Turkic varieties spoken in Iran, in heavy contact with Persian, borrow *izafet* constructions, which can occasionally even be extended to Turkic lexemes, as shown in (32):

(32) *balï γ -e   mäxsus* (Kıral 2006: 161)
     fish-PART particular
     'this particular fish'

5. Comparisons and Conclusions

When comparing the Slavic DA to the Persian *izafet* in Ottoman Turkish, it is immediately clear that the diachronic trajectories of the two constructions are very different. The Slavic DA evolves in a coherent way: syntactic restrictions are loosened, and semantically the DA evolves from expressing primarily temporal antecedence to a more generalized backgrounding. Contrastingly, the Persian *izafet* remains basically static in Ottoman Turkish. Suggestive dialectal evidence exists for the DA, but not for the Persian *izafet.* While isolated humorous phrases employing the Persian *izafet* have percolated into spoken Turkish, such constructions are used primarily by educated speakers and are not always generally understood. Contrastingly, the dialectal evidence for Slavic is drawn from less educated, rural speakers. This point is illustrated even more sharply by the fact that *izafet*

constructions in spoken Turkish can and do undergo influence from neighboring languages – but precisely on the spoken level, rather than through the mechanism of literary diffusion. This consideration suggests that the evidence from Slavic dialects is potentially of decisive importance in the origin debate. The sharp discrepancies between the Slavic DA and the Persian *izafet* in Ottoman Turkish militate against the Greek origin hypothesis.

While the comparison between the Slavic DA and the Persian *izafet* in Ottoman Turkish is suggestive, it is a first step. The more general problem remains of characterizing the behavior of constructions borrowed from one literary language into another literary language without being mediated by the spoken variety. This is not the most common path for borrowing. It implies the existence of a codified literary language, but in many cases, foreign elements are deliberately excluded from the literary language. For a foreign element to be integrated into such a literary language, it seems necessary for another literary tradition to exist with enough prestige to override this tendency. One such case study may be the influence of Greek on classical Latin. Syntactic Grecisms in classical Latin were described and analyzed by Coleman (1975). Overall, they seem to behave much more like the Persian *izafet* in Ottoman Turkish than like the Slavic DA. Further points of comparison may be drawn from the Muslim word, such as the integration of Arabic grammar into Persian, or even the presence of the Persian *izafet* in Urdu (Bögel et al. 2008).

REFERENCES

Belić, Aleksandar. 1962. Istorija srpskohrvatskog jezika, knj. i sv. 2: reči sa konjugacijom. Beograd: Naučna knjiga.

Bögel, Tina, Miriam Butt, and Sebastian Sulger. 2008. Urdu Ezafe and the Morphology-Syntax Interface.   Proceedings of the LFG08 Conference. CSLI Publications, Stanford University.

Belorussov, I. 1899. Datel'nyj samostojatel'nyj padež v pamjatnikax cerkovno-slavjanskoj i drevne-russkoj pis'mennosti. Russkij filologičeskij vestnik 41: 71-146.

Borkovskij, V. I. and P. S. Kuznecov. 1963. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moscow.

Coleman, Robert. 1975. Greek Influence on Latin Syntax. Transactions of the Philological Society 74/1:101-156.

Conev, Ben'o. 1934. Istorija na bălgarskija ezik. Sofia.

Corin, Andrew. 1995. The Dative Absolute in Old Church Slavonic and Old East Slavic. Die Welt der Slaven 42:251-284.

Friedman, Victor. 2003. Turkish Dialects in Macedonia and Kosovo. in Friedman, Victor. Turkish in Macedonia and Beyond: Studies in Contact, Typology, and Other Phenomena in the Balkans and the Caucasus. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Grickat, Irena. 1972. Aktuelni jezički i tekstološki problemi u starim srpskim ćirilskim spomenicima. Belgrade: Narodna biblioteka SR Srbije.

Györfi, Beáta. 2007. Istoričeskoe izmenenie sintaksičeskogo statusa pričastnyx oborotov v drevnerusskom jazyke (na materiale Suzdal'skoj letopisi po Lavrent'evskomu spisku). Ph.D. Thesis, University of Debrecen.

Hagopian, V. H. 1907. Ottoman-Turkish Conversation-Grammar. London.

Kıral, Filiz. 2006. Izafet constructions in Turkic varieties of Iran. in Boeschoten, Hendrik and Lars Johanson, eds. Turkic Languages in Contact. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. pp. 158-165

Kurešević, Marina. 2006. Apsolutni dativ u srpskoj srednjovekovnoj pismenosti. Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku 49/1:35-112.

Kurešević, Marina. 2007. Funckionalna raslojenost srpskoslovenskog jezika posmatrana kroz upotrebu apsolutnog dativa. Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku 50/1-2:429-447.

Lane, George S. 1970. Review of Historical German Syntax by W. B. Lockwood. The German Quarterly   43/2:252-256.

Leafgren, John. 2002. The Dative Absolute in Middle Bulgarian Texts. Zeitschrift für Slavistik 47/2:147-161.

Lockwood, W. B. 1968. Historical German Syntax. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Miklosich, F. 1883. Vergleichende Syntax der slavischen Sprachen. Vienna.

Mladenov, Stefan. 1979. Istorija na bălgarskija ezik. Sofia: BAN.

Press, J. Ian. 1973. The Syntax of Absolute Constructions in Slavonic and Baltic, with Reference to Finno-Ugrian. The Slavonic and East European Review 122:11-21.

Redhouse, J. W. 1884. A Simplified Grammar of the Ottoman-Turkish Language. London: Trübner & Co.

Saxarova, Anna. 2010. K voprosu o diskursivnyx funkcijax pričastnyx konstrukcij v russkoj letopisi. Russian Linguistics 34:87-11.

Skupskij, Boris I. 1993. Prosixoždenie datel'nogo samostojatel'nogo v pervonačal'nom slavjanskom perevode. Slovo 41-43:49-59.

Stanislav, Ján. 1933/4. Dativ absolutný v starej cirkevnej slovančine. Byzanto-slavica V:1-112.

Timurtaş, Faruk K. 2005. Osmanlı Türkçesi Grameri. Istanbul: Basım Yayım Dağıtım.

Worth, Dean S. 1994. The Dative Absolute in the Primary Chronicle: Some Observations. Harvard Ukrainian Studies 18/1–2:29–46.

Xaralampiev, Ivan. 2006. Po vekovnite păteki na bălgarskija ezik. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber.

Živov, Viktor M. 2008. Referentnaja struktura i porjadok slov: Datel'nyj samostojatel'nyj v dvux drevnix cerkovnoslavjanskix tekstax. Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščenii 15/1:5–57.