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Chapter I

The Historical Development of the Locative Singular Case and Its Relationship to the Other Cases.

One of the first grammatical rules that a beginning Russian language student learns is that, of the six cases in the singular declension of Modern Russian, only the locative case must, without exception, be accompanied by a preposition at all times. However, when we examine the evidence from (Old) Church Slavonic manuscripts, as well as evidence from Old Russian manuscripts, we discover that examples of the locative case are, indeed, to be found without a preposition in certain contexts. This unbound locative, i.e., the nonprepositional locative construction, performed the same general functions as the modern day locative case performs, that is, designating a spatial relationship or a temporal relationship. In addition to these functions, the nonprepositional locative construction also acted as a verbal complement, a function which we no longer find the locative case performing in Modern Russian.

In the oldest extant documents from the Old Church Slavonic period (tenth century A.D.), we have evidence that the uses of the nonprepositional locative construction
overlapped with other syntactic constructions. In some contexts, the nonprepositional locative construction performed the same function as a prepositional locative construction, while in other contexts, this unbound locative performed the same function as a construction using another case. We shall see examples of these syntactic ambiguities in later chapters. In addition to the syntactic overlap, a comparison of the reconstructed and modern phonological relationship between the dative and locative cases reveals another ambiguity that bears further investigation.

If we examine the various stem classes in the Old Church Slavonic declension, which were, at the time of the first written documents, already beginning to show a collapse toward a more compact declensional system, we find the following relationship between the dative and locative cases:

- o-stems: dative /-u/, locative /-ě/
- ŭ-stems: dative /-ovi/, locative /-u/
- a-stems: dative /-ě/, locative /-ě/
- ĭ-stems: dative /-i/, locative /-i/
- consonantal stems:
  - masculine: dative /-i/, locative /-e/, /-i/
  - feminine: dative /-i/, locative /-e/, /-i/
  - neuter: dative /-i/, locative /-i/

Moreover, due to the results of certain phonological changes which had already taken place, desinences which we assume at one time differentiated the cases among the various stem
classes were identical. We find that the classification by stem class is gradually giving way to one based, more or less, on gender: a nonfeminine class, a nonneuter class, and a feminine class. An example of these changes is the result of the Law of Open Syllables, according to which all syllables had to end in a vowel. Hence, the reconstructed nominative case differentiation between o-stem nouns and ū-stem nouns was lost when the original /-s/ ending of the nominative case was dropped, accompanied by the raising of the thematic vowel in the o-stem nouns:

*rābās > rāb 'slave'
*sūnūs > syn 'son'

During the transition period from the stem classification to what we shall call a gender classification system, there was much borrowing of desinences among classes that were related to one another.

In addition to the above information, the loss of phonemic length resulted in further phonological ambiguities which are especially significant for our study of the relationship between the dative and locative cases. We can see from the above chart of the dative and locative singular desinences in Old Church Slavonic that only for the o-stem, ū-stem, and, possibly, the consonantal stem nouns was a distinction between these two cases maintained. It would, therefore, be helpful to investigate the hypothetically reconstructed Indo-European dative and locative singular case desinences in order to attempt to follow the
development of these two cases into Slavic.

Meillet (1969: 292-300) proposes the following system for the dative and locative cases in the singular declension of Indo-European. For the athematic class of noun stems, the dative desinence was */-ēi/*, which resulted in */-i/* in Common Slavic, while the Indo-European locative desinence was */-i/* which alternated with */-∅/*. The Common Slavic locative desinence was the zero grade of the Indo-European desinence for the consonantal stem, followed by */-e/* in the masculine and feminine consonantal stems. This */-e/* was a postpositional particle, so that we have kamene 'stone' (locative); this seems to be the most plausible explanation for the occurrence of */-ē/* for the locative singular desinence with the consonantal stem nouns, and not the characteristic */-ē/*. For the thematic stem nouns, the dative and locative desinences contracted with the thematic stem vowel. Meillet states that the Indo-European dative and locative singular desinences differed only by length: dative */-ōi/*, locative */-ōi/* or */-ei/*. This reconstructed dative desinence presents a problem with respect to the subsequent development of the dative in Common Slavic. For the a-stem nouns, the result is what we would predict: the lengthened grade of the desinence contracts with the thematic vowel and then monophthongizes to */-ē/*. However, the o-stem desinence is */-u/*, which is very difficult to explain in terms of the Indo-European desinence. Even under the influence
of vowel contraction with the thematic vowel, the resulting diphthong would have probably been *oi, which would have monophthongized to /-ě/.

A possible explanation for this development may lie in the borrowing of the dative desinence from another case and/or another declension class. The most likely source of such a borrowing by the o-stem nouns would have been the ū-stem nouns: both of these classes consist of non-feminine nouns, and, by the Common Slavic period, the nominative and accusative singular desinences are probably already identical. The desinence /-u/ occurs in the locative singular of the ū-stem nouns, and one wonders, in spite of the close relationship between the dative and locative cases, how likely it would be for the dative desinence to be borrowed from a locative desinence, where in this particular stem class, the dative and locative cases are not identical.

If we wish to explain the dative desinence as the result of a sound change, then we must assume that, either following the contraction of the stem vowel with the desinence, or even prior to this contraction, the -o- was not only raised, but also lengthened, resulting in some intermediate stage */-ui/ (see footnote 3), which then developed to /-u/. Although we could argue that we have an environment for vowel raising, i.e., the "loss" of the semi-vowel component of the diphthong (see p.3), we have no satisfactory explanation for a subsequent vowel lengthening. Hence, both of our possible explanations for the dative
desinence of o-stem nouns appear to be inadequate, and, indeed, we have not come across any explanation in our research that satisfactorily accounts for the appearance of /-u/ as the dative case ending.

What is immediately striking about the dative and locative singular desinences in Indo-European is that these two case endings were simply different ablaut grades of the same desinence, leading one to consider an even closer relationship between these two cases. In fact, Kuryłowicz (1964: 191) goes so far as to state that "the dative case owes its origin to the semantic split of the locative entailed by the possibility of its having either a primary or a secondary (figurative) meaning when used with personal nouns." He supports his thesis of the co-origin of these two cases by citing the following evidence:

1. The dative case desinence differs from the locative case desinence only as an apophonic variant.

2. The competition of the dative case and the locative case.

3. The functional merger of the dative and locative cases in Greek.

4. The rise of a new dative case in modern "analytical" languages, cf. ad in Romance languages, to in English; these prepositions have an original locative value, the semantic shade of goal appearing as a contextual
variant with verbs of motion.

5. In some Indo-European languages the function of goal is conspicuous in infinitives, whose origins go back to datives of abstract nouns.

Here we can turn from restricting ourselves to discussing the similarities of just the dative and locative cases, and investigate some of the relationships with the other cases. In addition to its primary function of indicating the stative location of an object, i.e., answering the question 'where,' the locative case also competed with the accusative case as an indicator of the goal of motion, answering the question 'where to' as well. It is with this context in mind that Kuryłowicz discusses the origin of the dative case as one to be used in reference to personal nouns.

Carrying the discussion of case relationships further, in the dual paradigm in Old Church Slavonic, we see that the genitive case and the locative case share the same desinence, as do the dative case and instrumental case. This may well point to an earlier common identity between these cases as well, an identity not attested by phonological evidence in the singular paradigm or plural paradigm of Old Church Slavonic. Kuryłowicz (1964: 199) also assigns the origin of the instrumental case as a secondary function of the locative case without, unfortunately, elaborating any further (see Chapter IV for our discussion of some locative-instrumental functional similarities).
these various relationships into consideration, we have an early nominal system which sets up the opposition Nominative-Accusative-Vocative vs. LOCATIVE, where this LOCATIVE case represents any relationship toward the verb not directly instigating the action or not being directly acted upon by the verbal action. Such a LOCATIVE case would also have included what has since developed into the accusative of the goal of motion. Therefore, we might say that the inflectional system of any language or language family is defined by the manner in which the locative relationships are distinguished, in other words, by the manner in which the LOCATIVE case has developed. "Case... is not present in 'deep structure' at all, but is merely the inflectional realization of particular syntactic relationships." (Lyons, 1966: 218).

Because of the semantic, and especially the phonological similarities between the dative case and the locative case, we would propose that the splitting of some early LOCATIVE case, a "case" which is, admittedly, not attested, into the various case relationships that we find in the modern Slavic languages occurred at various stages. If we assume that the development of a reconstructable dative case and locative case as two separate cases took place later than the development of the other cases, this would help to explain both the phonological similarities and the functional ambiguities between these two cases, as they are recorded in written evidence. Using such a theory
as the basis for the relationship of the dative and locative
cases in the preliterary period, we must now turn our
attention to the written material that we do have. Even
in the earliest of the written Slavic material, we still
see evidence of functional ambiguity and phonological
similarity, not only between the dative and locative cases
(though, indeed, it is more common with these two cases),
but with the locative case and instrumental and genitive
and accusative cases as well. In the early Slavic literary
period, we find a nonprepositional locative construction
which does not appear as an exclusive syntactic form in
any context. Since such a construction no longer exists
in any Slavic language, we intend to investigate each of
the contexts in which this unbound form did occur, namely
in contexts designating spatial relationships, temporal
relationships, and as verbal complement. By defining the
semantics of each of these categories, and by considering
the types of syntactic doublets that occur in each category,
we hope to determine the factors contributing to the
disappearance of the nonprepositional locative construction
in all Slavic languages.
If we include the so-called 'second locative' and 'second genitive' as separate cases, as many Slavic linguists do, then we must consider the number of cases in the singular declension of Modern Russian to be eight. However, introductory Russian grammars treat these two cases as part of the locative case and genitive case respectively; therefore, the beginning Russian student learns that there are six cases in the singular declension. For the purpose of this paper, the actual number of cases is irrelevant. The 'second locative' case will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter II.

This Indo-European */-ei/* is also reconstructed as the dative desinence for stems ending in a sonorant, that is, the normal grade of ũ-stems and ĭ-stems. The locative desinence was -∅, resulting in the following dative-locative relationships:

- ũ-stems:
  - dative: *sun + oy + ei > synovi
  - locative: *sun + oy + ∅ > synu

- ĭ-stems:
  - dative: *gœst + ei + ei > gosti
  - locative: *gœst + ei + ∅ > gosti

The dative singular desinence in Lithuanian is /-ui/.

This, at first, looks as though it might point to a common Balto-Slavic development, as far as the origin of the dative case desinence is concerned. If so, this still does not shed any light on the origin, itself of this desinence. However, it has been pointed out to me by Dr. David F. Robinson that this development in Lithuanian represents a Baltic innovation which is completely independent of the Slavic development. Nevertheless, Vaillant (1958: 31) points to the Lithuanian desinence as a parallel development with Slavic, simply mentioning the two desinences together as though this was the expected or predictable result of the Indo-European desinence */-oi/*:

Au datif, sl. -u répond à lit. -ui, dial. -ou de *uoi, i.e., *-oi, d'intonation douce... et où l'on peut reconnaître un produit de contraction
4. See Chapter III for illustrations where, for example, the nonprepositional dative construction is used to indicate an inanimate goal of motion.

5. This is not to say that there ever did exist a separate dative case and locative case in preliterary Greek, but simply that the functions of both the dative and locative cases, as we know them from the Slavic languages, were assumed by a single case.

6. Blake (1930: 38) sees the goal of motion and the resulting stative positioning as being closely related: All temporal and locative relations have theoretically three aspects, a stative indicating existence or rest at a time or place, an ablative indicating continuance or motion from a time or place, and a terminal indicating continuance or motion to a time or place. Some of these relationships add a fourth aspect indicating duration of time or extent in space. Blake's associating temporal relationships to locational relationships will be further elaborated when we discuss inherent case meaning in Chapter II.

7. Dr. Kenneth E. Naylor has brought to my attention the fact that in some Čakavian dialects there still can be found a common genitive-locative plural desinence.

8. Note, in this respect, the convergence of the dative, locative, and instrumental cases in the plural paradigm of all nouns in Modern Serbo-Croatian.

9. Evidence in Hittite not only points to a lack of distinction between the dative case and the locative case, but also indicates a much wider range of functions for this single case than is traditionally assigned to the dative and/or locative cases. Included in the functions of this single case are the designation of relationships of place, direction, goal, measurement, comparison, logical subject of a passive construction, probability, and time (Toporov, 1961: 276).

10. Fillmore (1968: 24-25) discusses the basic sentence structure as consisting of the 'proposition,' a tenseless set of relationships involving verbs and nouns, and the 'modality.' The proposition constituent is then expanded to include the verb and one or more of the following possible case categories:
Agentive: the case of the typically animate perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb.

Instrumental: the case of the inanimate force or object causally involved in the action or state identified by the verb.

Dative: the case of the animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb.

Factitive: the case of the object or being resulting from the action or state identified by the verb, or understood as a part of the meaning of the verb.

Locative: the case which identifies the location or spatial orientation of the state or action identified by the verb.

Objective: the semantically most neutral case, the case of anything representable by a noun whose role in the action or state identified by the semantic interpretation of the verb itself.

Noteworthy is the fact that this list of case functions does not provide a separate case for directional notation. Fillmore believes that location and direction are superficial differences determined by the constituent structure or nature of the associated verb.
Chapter II

The Locative Case in the Modern Slavic Languages

In addition to the historical evidence which we have from the Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian manuscripts, the inflectional structure of the Russian language itself would lead one to question the possible historical existence of a nonprepositional locative construction. Looking at the language from a synchronic point of view, one would expect that in a language such as Russian, which has such a high degree of inflection, the grammatical information contained in the desinence itself would be sufficient, in at least some instances, to indicate the syntactic function of the substantive in the locative case in a particular phrase or clause. In other words, we question the fact that the locative case does not function without necessarily resorting to a further definition of the contextual relationship of the particular substantive to the rest of the clause by means of a preposition. Consider the following examples:

1. a) Ivan čitaet knigu. Ivan is reading a book.
   b) Anna čitaet knigu. Anna is reading a book.
   c) Mat' čitaet knigu. Mother is reading a book.
2. a) Kniga Ivana ležit na stole. Ivan's book is on the table.
   b) Kniga Anny ležit na stole. Anna's book is on the table.
   c) Kniga materi ležit na stole. Mother's book is on the table.
3. a) Anna čitaet knigu Ivanu. Anna is reading a book to Ivan.
   b) Ivan čitaet knigu Anne. Ivan is reading a book to Anna.
   c) Ivan čitaet knigu materi. Ivan is reading a book to Mother.
4. a) Anna vidit Ivana. Anna sees Ivan.
   b) Ivan vidit Annu. Ivan sees Ann.
   c) Ivan vidit mat'. Ivan sees Mother.
5. a) Pis'mo, napisannoe Ivanom, ležit na stole. The letter, written by Ivan, is on the table.
   b) Pis'mo, napisannoe Annoj, ležit na stole. The letter, written by Anna, is on the table.
   c) Pis'mo, napisannoe mater'ju, ležit na stole. The letter, written by Mother, is on the table.
6. a) *Odejalo ležit Ivane. *The blanket is on Ivan.
   b) *Odejalo ležit Anne. *The blanket is on Anna.
   c) *Odejalo ležit materi. *The blanket is on Mother.

Above we have examples of the six cases of the singular declension of substantives in Modern Russian in the following order: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and locative. The first five
sets of examples are perfectly acceptable examples, grammatically speaking, of the use of a nonprepositional case construction. They illustrate how the semantic information about Ivan, Anna, and Mother is furnished by a combination of the morphological information of the stem and the information contained in the desinence. The information contained within the stem supplies us with the basic definition of the stem and the declension class of the noun, while this information, combined with the information contained in the desinence, completes the information about case and number. If any ambiguity still exists, e.g., if a single desinence can represent more than one case and/or number within a single declension class, then the sentence structure itself, as represented by word order and case government, should remove the potential ambiguity:

7. Ja vižu syna plemjanika. I see my nephew's son.

Since word order is not necessarily fixed in Russian, sentence 7 theoretically could mean either I see my nephew's son, or I see my son's nephew; in this case, /-a/ can either represent accusative singular or genitive singular. However, for the genitive of possession there is a rule for word order stating that the genitive immediately follows the noun to which it refers. Therefore, the sentence is not ambiguous.
Returning to our original six sets of examples, the sixth set, viz., the one exemplifying the locative case, is grammatically unacceptable. One cannot find any example in standard literary Russian, or for that matter, in any modern Slavic language, where the locative case may be used unaccompanied by a preposition (hence, the frequent alternate name of "prepositional case" for the locative case). In other words, with the exception of the locative case, the five other cases of substantival declension in modern Russian may be said to have a basic or inherent meaning which is exemplified by the unbound form of the substantive, that is, by the nonprepositional case construction. This inherent meaning is furnished by the grammatical and semantic information contained in the desinence combined with the grammatical information about the stem. The locative case too, of course, has a basic meaning, but this can never be exhibited in a nonprepositional construction in the modern Slavic languages, although historically such a construction did exist.

As we have shown, desinences need not be unique. Referring to examples 1-6, and to examples which will follow, the following classification system of nouns has been chosen:

Class I: All masculine nouns whose nominative singular desinence is /-Ø/; all neuter nouns whose nominative singular
desinence is /-o/.

Class II: All feminine nouns whose nominative singular desinence is /-a/; all masculine nouns whose nominative singular desinence is /-a/.

Class III: All feminine nouns whose nominative singular desinence is /-ø/.

Therefore, a desinence may lose its potential ambiguity as a result of being associated with different declension classes: /-u/ means "accusative singular" when combined with a Class II stem, while it means "dative singular" when combined with a Class I stem. Example 7 demonstrates how a desinence which has potential ambiguity within a single declension class may be disambiguated by the structure of its clause and additional disambiguating rules.

Since we cannot talk of the inherent meaning of "locative" as the meaning of the substantive stem plus the locative desinence, without an accompanying preposition, we have to look elsewhere. If we are to speak at all about an inherent meaning of the locative case we might do well to examine the second locative case, a case which occurs with some Class I masculine nouns, and some Class III nouns. The desinence for this case is always stressed, /-ů/ for Class I nouns, and /-i/ for Class III nouns, and, except for a small number of nouns (gorb 'hump', kol 'stake', krjuk 'hook', led 'ice', lob 'forehead','
mox 'moss', plot 'raft', polk 'regiment', skit 'hermitage', suk 'branch', rot 'mouth' rov 'ditch'), nouns which have the second locative case are stem stressed (the lists of nouns which take the second locative case are taken from Stankiewicz, 1968: 35 ff.). Therefore, the dative and second locative will always be distinguished by accent.

Stankiewicz (1968: 35) differentiates the two locative cases in that the second locative case designates the peripheral and quantitative (external) position of the entity within the message, while the "first" locative case designates a qualitative intrinsic relationship to the message. Almost always the second locative case indicates location while the "first" locative case, when the stem admits both locatives, will indicate nonlocational or metaphorical situations:

8. Ivan igraet v sadu. Ivan is playing in the garden.

9. Ivan govorit o sade. Ivan is talking about the garden.

10. Ivan igraet rol' v Vyšnevom sade. Ivan is playing a role in The Cherry Orchard.

Nevertheless, there are some nouns which admit the second locative which have lost any locational meaning (if there was ever any locational meaning to begin with) and are used only metaphorically:

v potu 'in a sweat'
Occasionally, a stem which has more than one meaning will differentiate these meanings in the locative, the second locative being reserved for only one of the meanings (the "first" locative can be used with both meanings):

\[
\text{na kraju 'on the edge' v kraje 'in the region'}
\]

When such a pair occurs, the more concrete locational meaning will undoubtedly be associated with the second locative. In the following list of stems with more than one meaning, the first meaning given will be the one which may admit the second locative: cvet 'bloom'; 'color', kraj 'edge'; 'region', krug 'circle (group)'; 'geometric circle', mex 'fur'; 'bellows', mir 'secular life'; 'world', 'peace', par 'steam'; 'fallow field', pol 'floor'; 'sex', rod 'dynasty'; 'kind', rjad 'row'; 'quantity', smotr 'inspection'; 'survey', svet 'light'; 'world', tok 'threshing floor'; 'electric current', xod 'entrance'; 'usage', val 'rampart'; 'cylinder', vek 'lifetime'; 'century', ugol 'corner'; 'angle', čast 'police section'; 'part', čest 'official esteem'; 'honor'.

We cannot argue that it is the frequent ambiguity of the locative and dative desinences, as exemplified by the Class II and Class III declensions, which has necessarily caused the locative case to always occur with a preposition. Even though the examples from Class I demonstrate no ambiguity between the desinences for the dative and locative singular, or, for that matter, between
the locative case and any other case desinence, we are still, none the less, restricted from using a "free" locative form, i.e., a locative which is not accompanied by a preposition. Since we know that at one time such a free locative was permissible, the development of the locative as a bound case was not restricted to particular declension classes, but rather was a general case phenomenon.

An examination of examples 1-6 also indicates that there is phonological ambiguity between the genitive and accusative singular with respect to the Class I animate stems. There is also a similarity of desinences for the nominative and accusative singular for inanimate nouns of the first declension:

11. Stol stoit na polu. The table is on the floor.

12. Stol Ivan vidit. It is the table that Ivan sees.

In spite of the similarity of desinences, all three cases, nominative, accusative, and genitive, can be used in nonprepositional constructions. There is even further potential ambiguity with Class III nouns, where the dative, genitive, and locative singular share a single desinence; nevertheless, there is no restriction within this declension for the use of nonprepositional constructions with the dative and genitive cases. In fact, for Class III nouns, the only completely phonologically unambiguous
case in the singular is the instrumental; the nominative and accusative singular also share the same desinence. The locative case, must, of course, remain a prepositional construction.

It may also be argued that, with the exception of the nominative case, the other cases are widely used with prepositions to provide additional spatial or temporal referential meaning. Here we might also mention another synchronic relationship between the locative case and another case, in this instance, the accusative singular. In modern Russian, these two cases are complementary with respect to motion toward (accusative case) and motion within or location at/in (locative case):

13. Ivan idet v universitet. Ivan is going to the university.
15. Ivan xodil v park. Ivan went to the park.
16. Ivan xodil v parke. Ivan was walking in the park.

It is interesting to note here that there is evidence in the Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian manuscripts which points to the locative case, both in the prepositional and nonprepositional constructions, being used to designate motion towards, as well as stative position at, some goal. This will be discussed further, and examples will be given in Chapter III.
We are still faced with the fact that the locative case is the only case which is exclusively bound to a preposition. This situation makes it worthy of examining the nature of this case in order to try and determine the reasons behind such a development. However, before continuing the discussion about the locative case in modern Russian and its relationship to the locative case in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian, it would be valuable to first examine the phonological characteristics of the locative case with respect to those of the dative case in the other modern Slavic languages. As is the situation for the locative case in Russian, this case also stands apart from the other cases in all the Slavic languages that have retained a declension system in that it must always be accompanied by a preposition. In addition to this, there is at least a partial syncretization of the locative case and the dative case in the singular declension of all Slavic languages.

Unless specified as otherwise, the following examples apply to both "hard stem" substantives (substantives whose stems end in a nonpalatalized consonant) and "soft stem" substantives (those substantives whose stems end in a palatalized or palatal consonant), with examples being given with hard stem substantives. This does not apply to examples from Class III, for all substantives which belong to this declension have soft stems. For
the first declension, examples will be given for both masculine and neuter substantives, and examples will also be given for both masculine inanimate and animate substantives. Certain relationships between the dative and locative cases will become apparent early in this investigation; however, for the sake of presenting a total picture of the situation in the Slavic languages, examples from all three declension classes will be given for each Slavic language.  

Since this presentation is not intended to be a definitive discussion of the relationship between the dative singular and the locative singular, but merely a survey of the two cases, we have restricted ourselves to one or two examples for each category when these examples are representative. When further clarification was felt to be necessary, more examples were used to illustrate. It should also be made clear that the fact that only one example for each category may be given does not necessarily indicate that these are the only possible desinences for that particular category. Rather, it indicates that for this particular category the syncretism or nonsyncretism exists for the dative and locative cases, regardless of the possible variety of desinences for this category.  

To begin our survey, we will discuss the relationship between the two cases in Russian. For Class I, there is no syncretism between the two cases:
masculine animate:

brat 'brother': dative bratu, locative o brate

syn 'son': dative synu, locative o syne

masculine inanimate:

stol 'table': dative stolu, locative o stole

sup 'soup': dative supu, locative o supe

neuter:

okno 'window': dative oknu, locative ob okne

slovo 'word': dative slovu, locative o slove

However, for Class II and Class III substantives, there is complete syncretization for the dative and locative singular:

Class II:

žena 'wife': dative žene, locative o žene

kniga 'book': dative knige, locative o knige

Class III:

kost' 'bone': dative kosti, locative o kosti

dver' 'door': dative dveri, locative o dveri

In Ukrainian, we can state that for nouns of the first declension, there is generally no dative-locative syncretism for masculine inanimate or neuter substantives, while there is syncretism for masculine animate nouns:

masculine animate:

rabortnik 'worker': dative rabotnikovi, rabotniku

locative rabotnikovi, rabotniku
muljar 'mason': dative muljarovi
locative o muljarovi
masculine inanimate:
dim 'house': dative domovi, locative o domi
pluh 'plow': dative pluhovi, locative o pluhe
neuter:
misto 'town': dative mistu, locative o misti
vikno 'window': dative viknu, locative o vikni
However, even for the masculine inanimate nouns, alternate desinences may exist which result in identical dative and locative forms:
kraj 'edge': dative krajevi, kraju
locative o krai, o kraju
For soft stem masculine animate Class I nouns, there are two variant desinences for both the dative and locative cases, one set of which disambiguates the two cases:
xlopec' 'fellow': dative xlopecvi
locative o xlopci, o xlopecvi
For Class II and Class III nouns, the dative and locative desinences are identical:
Class II:
fabrika 'factory': dative fabrici
locative o fabrici
ruka 'hand': dative ruce, locative o ruce
Class III:
radist' 'joy': dative radisti
locative o radisti
Like Ukrainian, the third East Slavic language, Belorussian, exhibits a difference in dative-locative syncretism for Class I nouns. The inanimate nouns generally distinguish between the desinences of the two cases, while animate nouns may show both syncretism and nonsyncretism:

masculine animate:

- syn 'son': dative synu, locative o synu
- slon 'elephant': dative slanu, locative o slane

masculine inanimate:

- stol 'table': dative stalu, locative o stale
- les 'forest': dative lesu, locative o lese

neuter:

- akno 'window': dative aknu, locative ab akne
- vozera 'lake': dative vozeru, locative a vozery

For both animate and inanimate nouns of the first declension whose stems end in a velar, /-u/ predominates as the locative singular desinence, resulting in dative-locative syncretism for these nouns:

- pjasok 'sand': dative pjasku, locative o pjasku
- voblaka 'cloud': dative voblaku

locative o voblaku

However, such velar stems may retain the desinence /-e/ and undergo palatalization of the velar; this would result in a loss of ambiguity between the two cases:

- berah 'shore': dative berahu
  locative o beraze
In addition to the velar stems, certain nonvelar stem
Class I nouns also have /-u/ as the locative desinence:

brat 'brother': dative bratu, locative o bratu

The dative and locative desinences for nouns of the second
and third declension in Belorussian are identical:

Class II:

halava 'head': dative halave
locative o halave

sjastra 'sister': dative sjastry
locative o sjastry

Class III:

kosc' 'bone': dative kasci, locative o kasci
noč 'night': dative nočy, locative o nočy

Although deBray (1969) lists the dative case and
the locative case as two separate cases in Serbo-Croatian,
and, indeed, for Class I and Class III nouns there may
be a difference in tone between the two cases (falling
for the dative case and rising for the locative case
when the difference is retained) native speakers of Serbo-
Croatian say that such tonal distinction is rarely, if
ever, made in the spoken language, and that these two cases
are not really thought of as separate cases):¹⁰

masculine animate:

drug 'friend': dative drugu, locative o drugu

mésar 'butcher': dative mésaru, locative o mésaru
masculine inanimate:

prózor 'window': dative prózoru
   locative o prózoru

stô 'table': dative stôlu, locative o stôlu

neuter:

sêlo 'village': dative sêlu, locative o sêlu

Class II:

žêna 'wife': dative žêni, locative o žêni

rúka 'hand': dative rúci, locative o rúci

Class III:

stvâr 'thing': dative stvâri, locative o stvâri

kôst 'bone': dative kôsti, locative o kôsti

The argument for the complete syncretization of the dative and locative cases in Serbo-Croatian is further strengthened by the fact that, from a synchronic point of view, the desinences for these two cases have also completely fallen together, along with the instrumental case, in the plural paradigm. It ought to be pointed out that the identity of the two cases in the plural may well have been a result of the identity in the singular; however, the question now is whether we can actually speak of two separate linguistic cases in contemporary Serbo-Croatian. An additional argument for stating that, linguistically speaking, the dative and locative are no longer separate cases in Serbo-Croatian is the tendency in the spoken language for the desinences of the dative and locative cases of the definite adjective to be identical (the dative and locative
adjectival desinences of the indefinite adjective are identical in the literary as well as the spoken language):

indefinite masculine:

dative dobru, locative dobru 'good'

definite masculine:

dative dobrom(u), locative dobrom(e)

definite/indefinite feminine:

dative dobroj, locative dobroj

The argument for the complete case identity between the dative and locative in Slovenian is somewhat weaker than in Serbo-Croatian. The desinences themselves are identical for nouns of all three declension classes with respect to these two cases. However, there also exist tonal distinctions for certain animate and inanimate nouns of the first declension:

masculine animate:

môž 'husband': dative môžu, locative o môžu

gôst 'guest': dative gôstu, locative o gôstu

masculine inanimate:

prst 'finger': dative prstu, locative o prstu

grâd 'town': dative grâdu, locative o grâdu

neuter:

léto 'summer': dative létu, locative o létu

ôkno 'window': dative ôknu, locative ob ôknu

The dative and locative desinences for the second and third declension nouns are identical, and the tone of
the stem is identical for both case forms as well:

Class II:

góra 'mountain': dative göri, locative o göri
lípa 'linden': dative līpi, locative o līpi

Class III:

kôst 'bone': dative kôsti, locative o kôsti
míš 'mouse': dative míši, locative o míši

Regarding this tonal distinction that is occasionally found in Class one substantives, Svane (1958: 28) states the following:

Die musikalischen intervalle, die bei dem steigenden und den beiden fallenden Akzenten hervortreten, weichen, den verschiedenen Dialekten entsprechend, von einander ab, ja, sind auch in einigen Mundarten völlig verschwunden. Die Intonationen werden deshalb in den slowenischen Schulen nicht als vorgeschriebenes Lehrfach angesehen, und man hat darum für den praktischen Gebrauch ein vereinfachtes System für die Angabe der Akzente ausgearbeitet. In dieser vereinfachten Methode wird der kurze fallende Akzent mit ^ angegeben, die beiden langen Akzente mit /.

Stankiewicz (1959a: 144) goes even further, and states that all pitch distinctions have been eliminated in Contemporary Standard Slovenian; he sees this as a case of a widespread diachronic tendency in Slavic accentology. In modern Slovenian, only quantity and stress constitute the phonemic prosodic alternations. Therefore, if we take into account the loss of phonemic pitch, we can speak of the complete syncretism of the dative and locative cases in Slovenian, at least for the singular paradigm.
As for the adjectives in Slovenian, the feminine singular exhibits complete syncretism for the dative and locative cases:

dative novi, locative novi 'new'

while the desinence for the masculine-neuter singular adjective locative case is similar, though not identical, to that of the dative case:

dative novemu, locative novem

We have already seen in our discussion of Serbo-Croatian that the definite adjective is tending toward complete dative-locative identity for all genders. Considering the tendency of the Slovenian nominal system, we might predict that a similar development might well take place for the masculine-neuter adjective in Slovenian as well.

In examining the dative and locative desinences in Czech, we must differentiate for both hard stems and soft stems. In Czech, the phenomenon of přehlaska 'fronting' has caused several interesting changes in the declension of the soft stem nouns. Přehlaska consists of the fronting and/or raising of a vowel which follows a palatal or palatalized consonant. As a general rule we can state the following about the dative and locative case desinences in Czech: all soft stem nouns, regardless of declension class, all Class I animate nouns, all Class II nouns and all Class III nouns have identical dative and locative desinences; only Class I inanimate nouns maintain a
distinction between the dative and locative singular.

masculine animate hard stem:

chlap 'fellow': dative chlapovi, chlapu
locative o chlapovi, chlapu

had 'snake': dative hadovi, hadu
locative o hadovi, hadu

masculine animate soft stem:

orač 'plowman': dative oracovi, oraci
locative ob oracovi, oraci

rybař 'fisherman': dative rybarovi, rybari
locative o rybarovi, rybari

masculine inanimate hard stem:

hrad 'castle': dative hradu, locative o hradě
les 'forest': dative lesu, locative o lesě

masculine inanimate soft stem:

mič 'ball': dative miči, locative o miči
klič 'key': dative kliči, locative o kliči

neuter hard stem:

mesto 'town': dative mestu, locative o mestě
okno 'window': dative oknu, locative ob okně

neuter soft stem:

moře 'sea': dative moři, locative o moři
pole 'field': dative poli, locative o poli

Class II:

žena 'wife': dative ženě, locative o ženě

sestra 'sister': dative sestře, locative o sestře
Class III:

kost 'bone': dative kosti, locative o kosti
čest 'honor': dative česti, locative o česti

Though not an alternate locative case desinence as a rule, /-u/ is also used for Class I inanimate nouns, both masculine and neuter. The class which admits such a desinence is, for the most part, restricted to stems ending in -k-, -h-, -ch-, and -r-. When this desinence is used, the dative and locative cases are identical:

potok 'brook': dative potoku
locative o potoku, potoce

For the dative and locative singular desinences in Slovak, nouns of the first declension distinguish between animate and inanimate nouns, the former having identical dative and locative endings, the latter different.

masculine animate:

chlap 'peasant': dative chlapovi
locative o chlapovi
rab 'slave': dative rabovi, locative o rabovi

masculine inanimate:

hrad 'castle': dative hradu, locative o hrade
dub 'oak': dative dubu, locative o dubu

neuter:

mesto 'town': dative mestu, locative o meste

Class II and Class III nouns have identical desinences for the dative and locative singular.
Class II:

żena 'wife': dative żene, locative o żene
ryba 'fish': dative rybe, locative o rybe

Class III:

kost’ 'bone': dative kosti, locative o kosti
noc 'night': dative noci, locative o noci

Although the dative and locative singular desinences for first declension nouns in Polish may vary, the general situation is that the dative and locative endings are different.

masculine animate:

student 'student': dative studentowi
locative o studencie
kot 'cat': dative kotu, locative o kocie

masculine inanimate:

dom 'house': dative domowi, locative o domu
stól 'table': dative stolowi
locative o stole

neuter:

słowo 'word': dative słowu, locative o słowie
okno 'window': dative oknu, locative ob oknie

Although the characteristic dative desinence for nouns of the first declension in Polish is /-owi/, a second possible dative desinence is /-u/. Similarly, the characteristic locative case desinence is /-e/; however, first declension nouns whose stems end in a velar tend to take
/-u/ as a locative case ending. A small number of Class I nouns whose stems do not end in a velar also take /-u/ as a locative ending (e.g., syn 'son': locative o synu). This situation may result in identical dative and locative endings:

róg 'horn': dative rogu, locative o rogu

It must be emphasized that not all Class I nouns whose stems end in a velar take /-u/ as a dative singular desinence, so that even though they may take /-u/ as a locative case ending, this does not necessarily result in dative-locative syncretism. In fact, in spite of the variety of dative and locative singular desinences, there is characteristically a differentiation between these two cases for Class I nouns.

As is characteristic for the other Slavic languages, nouns of the second and third declension have identical dative and locative singular desinences.

Class II:

matka 'mother': dative matce, locative o matce
siostra 'sister': dative siostrze
locative o siostrze

Class III:

kość 'bone': dative kości, locative o kości
rzecz 'thing': dative rzeczy
locative o rzeczy
The first declension of nouns in Upper Lusatian shows an interesting development: all masculine nouns and neuter hard stem nouns differentiate between the dative and locative desinences, while the soft stem neuter nouns exhibit dative-locative syncretism:

masculine animate:
- nan 'father': dative nanej, locative o nanje
- muž 'husband': dative mužej, locative o mužu

masculine inanimate:
- dub 'oak': dative dubej, locative o dubje
- les 'forest': dative lesej, locative o lesu

neuter hard stem:
- słowo 'word': dative słowej, locative o słowje
- koło 'wheel': dative kołu, locative o kole

neuter soft stem:
- polo 'field': dative polu, locative o polu
- moro 'sea': dative moru, locative o moru

The desinence /-u/ may also serve as an alternate desinence for both the dative and locative singular of other Class I nouns, which can result in ambiguity between these two cases:

- nan 'father': dative nanej, nanu
  locative o nanje, nanu

Nouns of the second and third declensions in Upper Lusatian have identical dative and locative endings.
Class II:
ruka 'hand': dative ruce, locative o ruce
žona 'wife': dative žonje, locative o žonje

Class III:
noc 'night': dative nocu, locative o nocu
kosć 'bone': dative kosći, locative o kosći

In Lower Lusatian, the same pattern of dative-locative syncretism exists as in Upper Lusatian, with soft stem neuter nouns of the first declension, all second and all third declension nouns having identical dative and locative desinences.

masculine animate:
kon 'horse': dative konoju, locative o konu
muž 'husband': dative mužoju, locative o mužu

masculine inanimate:
dub 'oak': dative dubu, locative o dube
dom 'house': dative domu, locative o dom'e

neuter hard stem:
ślów 'word': dative ślowu, locative o ślówie
leto 'summer': dative letu, locative o lece

neuter soft stem:
daš 'gift': dative dašu, locative o dašu
mořo 'sea': dative mořu, locative o mořu

To avoid ambiguity, the alternate desinence /-oju/ may be used for the dative singular of soft stem neuter nouns:
mor 'sea': dative moru, moroju
locative o moru
Class II:
ryba 'fish': dative ryb’e, locative o ryb’e
šotsa 'sister': dative šotse, locative o šotse

Class III:
lubosć 'love': dative lubosci
locative o lubosci
kazn’ 'punishment': dative kazni, locative o kazni

Although not of major concern to our investigation, to complete our survey of the dative and locative we shall include a list of the desinences for these two cases for the plural paradigm of nouns and for the singular and plural paradigm of adjectives; we shall also include the dual paradigm where it is applicable. It should be kept in mind that for nouns in the dual and plural several languages lose the declension class distinction, and for adjectives in the singular, the only distinction made is masculine-neuter and feminine, while in the plural and dual there is only a single desinence for each of the cases. The following are the desinences for the plural paradigm of nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Locative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>-ax’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>‘-am’</td>
<td>-ax’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belorussian</td>
<td>‘-am’</td>
<td>-ax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I and III</td>
<td>-ima</td>
<td>-ima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>-ama</td>
<td>-ama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>-ih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>-ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>-im</td>
<td>-ih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I masculine</td>
<td>-ům</td>
<td>-ech, -ích</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I neuter</td>
<td>-ům, -im</td>
<td>-ech, -ách, -ích</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>-ám</td>
<td>-ách</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>-em, -im</td>
<td>-ech, -ích</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>-och</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine/neuter</td>
<td>-am</td>
<td>-ach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-om</td>
<td>-ach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-oj</td>
<td>-oj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-yx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following is the scheme of the dative and locative relationships among the adjectives. In this chart, MN will represent masculine and neuter singular, F will represent feminine singular, and P will represent the plural:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Locative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukrainian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-omu</td>
<td>-omu, -im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ij</td>
<td>-ij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-yx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belorussian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-omu</td>
<td>-ym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-oj</td>
<td>-oj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-yx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serbo-Croatian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-om(u)</td>
<td>-om(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-oj</td>
<td>-oj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-im</td>
<td>-im</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slovenian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-emu</td>
<td>-em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Czech</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-emu</td>
<td>-em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-ych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slovak</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-emu</td>
<td>-om</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ej</td>
<td>-ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-ych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-emu</td>
<td>-ym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ej</td>
<td>-ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-ych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Lusatian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-emu</td>
<td>-ym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ej</td>
<td>-ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-ych</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Lusatian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN</td>
<td>-emu</td>
<td>-em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-ej</td>
<td>-ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-ym</td>
<td>-ych</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize our investigation of the nouns of the singular paradigm, we include the following chart of the relationship of the dative and locative cases in the modern Slavic literary languages:

**Russian**
- Class I: dative ≠ locative
- Class II: dative = locative
- Class III: dative = locative

**Ukrainian**
- Class I: dative = locative (animate nouns)
- Class I: dative ≠ locative (inanimate nouns)
- Class II: dative = locative
Ukrainian
Class III dative = locative

Belorussian
Class I dative = locative (some animate nouns)
Class I dative ≠ locative (inanimate nouns, some animate nouns)
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

Serbo-Croatian
Class I dative = locative
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

Slovenian
Class I dative = locative
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

Czech
Class I dative = locative (animate nouns, soft stem nouns)
Class I dative ≠ locative (inanimate hard stem nouns)
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

Slovak
Class I dative = locative (animate nouns)
Class I dative ≠ locative (inanimate nouns)
Slovak
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

Polish
Class I dative ≠ locative
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

Lower Lusatian
Class I dative ≠ locative (masculine and neuter hard stem nouns)
Class I dative = locative (neuter soft stem nouns)
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

Upper Lusatian
Class I dative ≠ locative (masculine and neuter hard stem nouns)
Class I dative = locative (neuter soft stem nouns)
Class II dative = locative
Class III dative = locative

The sources of phonological similarity in the singular declension of the Slavic languages bear further examination in hopes of further delineating the various relationships among the cases within the singular declension as a whole,
and within each declension class itself. The ambiguities that exist between the dative and locative cases are apparent from the above survey, and we have mentioned the similarities which exist among the other cases as well (see footnote 7 of this chapter). We are now prepared to make certain generalizations concerning the synchronic state of the dative and locative cases in the modern Slavic languages. First of all, as evidenced by written documents in all Slavic languages, there has always been complete syncretism between the dative and locative singular for all substantives of the second and third declension. Second, for nouns of the first declension, with the exception of the possibility of alternating desinences, masculine inanimate nouns never have identical dative and locative desinences. Only in Upper Lusatian and Lower Lusatian do we find neuter nouns exhibiting dative-locative syncretism, and this applies only to soft stem neuter nouns. Third, the pattern of dative-locative syncretism appears to follow certain geographical regularities: the West South Slavic languages, Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian, are tending toward complete syncretism of both cases for all substantives; the Czecho-Slovak group distinguishes between animate and inanimate nouns of the first declension; Polish and the East Slavic languages, with the single exception of Ukrainian, and some examples in Belorussian, tend to exhibit no
dative-locative syncretism for Class I substantives; finally, the Lusatian group has a unique development, differentiating only the hard stem neuters from the soft stem neuters in this respect.

Because of the various relationships between the dative and locative cases among the various Slavic languages, it is apparent that the phonological similarity alone is not sufficient to account for the development of the locative case as an exclusively prepositional construction. It, therefore, becomes necessary to investigate the consequences of syntactic and semantic ambiguities in the inherent meaning of this case, and in the functional utilization of this case as evidenced by the written evidence in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian.
...the basic meanings of dependent cases may be met where the relationship of dependence is not disturbed by anything, where it appears in pure form... indeed the underlying relationships of nouns to other words which are defined by them present the meanings of case relationships.

2. The instrumental, accusative, and genitive cases also exist as nonprepositional constructions in contexts describing particular temporal relationships as well, so that we can posit a temporal aspect as well in the inherent case meaning:

Letom on rabotal na zavode. In the summer he worked at a factory.

On rabotal čas na zavode. He worked at the factory for an hour.

Pervogo maja on rabotal na zavode. He worked at the factory on May 1.

An unbound locative construction was used to describe certain temporal relationships also as we can see from the early written Slavic documents. This aspect of the locative case will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter IV.

3. The nouns led 'ice', lob 'forehead', mox 'moss', rot 'mouth', and rov 'ditch' all have asyllabic stems, i.e., l#d-, l#b-, m#x-, r#t-, and r#v-. Therefore, these nouns are automatically end stressed for all oblique cases, resulting in identical dative and locative singular forms.

4. Other nouns which admit a second locative in standard literary Russian are: ad 'hell', bal 'ball', baz 'barnyard', boj 'battle', bok 'side', bor 'pine forest', bort 'side of a ship', bred 'delirium', čad 'fumes', čan 'tub', dym 'smoke', fort 'fort', gaz 'gas'.
5. Meillet (1965) indicates that in Indo-European, the nominative case and the accusative case were originally distinguished within the o-stem declension: */-os/ (nominative case) and */-ON/ ( accusative case, where N represents some nasal consonant). Because of the phonological development in Proto-Slavic, the desinences for these two cases became identical. Although it would be unlikely that there would be any confusion between the designation "subject" and "object" where two inanimate substantives or an animate substantive and an inanimate substantive were concerned, in spite of the phonological identity, for o-stem substantives, both of which referred to animate beings, it became necessary, particularly in a language in which the word order was free, to clarify the distinction "subject" and "object". This was done by phonologically differentiating the nominative case desinence from the accusative case desinence when dealing with animates. The reason for the adaptation of the genitive singular o-stem desinence for the animate accusative will not be discussed here; what is important is that the resulting phonological similarity of the accusative animate and genitive singular apparently did not pose any comprehension difficulties for the speakers of the language. Nor did the identity of the nominative singular and the accusative singular inanimate desinences cause any problem.
6. To recapitulate, it is interesting to observe that there is always some phonological similarity in the singular declension of nouns in modern Russian: for Class I nouns there is ambiguity with respect to the accusative case and either the nominative case (for inanimate nouns) or the genitive case (animate masculine nouns), while there is no dative-locative identity for nouns of this declension (with the exception of those asyllabic nouns which admit the second locative, and the few monosyllabic nouns which are both end stressed and admit the second locative). On the other hand, for Class II nouns, there is dative-locative syncretism in the singular paradigm, while the nominative, accusative, genitive, and instrumental cases remain distinct from one another. Finally, for Class III nouns, in the singular paradigm only the instrumental case remains distinct: the dative, locative and genitive cases are identical, as are the nominative and accusative cases.

7. Interestingly enough, in the singular declension of nouns in all modern Slavic languages, when the desinences of the dative and locative cases are phonologically distinct, phonological identity exists elsewhere in the declension between at least two other cases. This identity will always be manifested between the accusative case and either the nominative or genitive cases, although the ambiguity is not necessarily restricted to these cases:
   Czech: hrad 'castle': genitive hradu, dative hradu

8. In both Bulgarian and Macedonian, there has been a loss of substantival declension with respect to the modification of desinences. Therefore, we cannot discuss dative-locative syncretism for these two languages within the framework which we have set up.

9. The exception to this is the few asyllabic and monosyllabic stems which admit the second locative. See pp 17-18.

10. According to Dr. Jasna Kragalott, a native speaker of Serbo-Croatian, if any distinction between these two cases are made at all by native speakers, it is that all prepositional constructions are considered to be "locative" and all nonprepositional constructions are considered to be "dative". I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Kragalott for pointing out much information concerning modern Serbo-Croatian to me.
11. For a more complete discussion of the syncretism of the dative and locative cases in modern Serbo-Croatian, see Naylor, 1971.

12. It must be emphasized that we are here speaking of the system in the Czech literary language. Whereas, in literary Czech, /-e/ predominates as the locative desinence for masculine hard stem inanimate nouns, in spoken Czech, the desinence /-u/ is used just as frequently as a locative ending, resulting in dative-locative identity here as well.

13. Slovenian is one of the Slavic languages which has retained the dual paradigm. We have the following desinences for nouns in the dual:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Dative</th>
<th>Locative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-oma</td>
<td>-ih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>-ama</td>
<td>-ah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>-(i)ma</td>
<td>-ih</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The desinence for the dative in the dual paradigm is identical with that of the instrumental case.

14. The upper Lusatian dual paradigm of nouns has the identical desinence for the dative, locative, and instrumental cases: -omaj.

15. The Lower Lusatian dual paradigm of nouns has the identical desinence for the dative, locative, and instrumental cases: -oma.

16. For adjectives in the dual paradigm in Slovenian, the dative case desinence is /-ima/, and the locative case desinence is /-ih/. The dual paradigm of the instrumental case of adjectives is identical with that of the dative case, while the dual of the genitive case of adjectives is identical with that of the locative case.

17. In upper Lusatian, the dual paradigm of adjectives has the identical desinence for the dative, locative, and instrumental cases: -ymaj.

18. In lower Lusatian, the dual paradigm of adjectives has the identical desinence for the dative, locative, and instrumental cases: -yma.

19. As we have noted, prěhlaska, the Czech system of vowel fronting and/or raising, results in dative-locative syncretism for soft stem nouns of the first declension, in spite of the fact that, historically, these two cases had different endings.
Chapter III
The Uses of the Unbound Locative: Spatial Designations

We shall now turn our attention to a survey of the occurrences of the nonprepositional construction of the locative case in written documents of Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian origin. For the purposes of uniformity in this work, all citations will be rendered in Latin transliteration from the old orthography. For example, "Къня Кие "He went to Kiev," will be rendered as exal Kieve.

Examples which have been taken from secondary sources will be indicated by noting the secondary source following the title of the original manuscript, by using the following abbreviations:

BO: Borkovskij, 1968
BU: Buslaev, 1861
FO: Fennell and Obolonsky, 1969
GR: Grigor'eva, 1948
LO: Lomtev, 1956
OB: Obnorskij and Barxudarov, 1952
SH: Shevelov and Holling, 1958
VA: Vaillant, 1964

50
The fact cannot be overemphasized, and, indeed, we shall repeat it throughout the following chapters, that, even at the time of the appearance of the first written Slavic documents in the middle of the tenth century, the nonprepositional locative construction as a syntactic feature can already be considered an archaic form. The locative case occurs overwhelmingly as a prepositional construction, and, when the nonprepositional locative does occur, we have no distinct linguistic environment, syntactic or semantic, where it occurs to the exclusion of any other syntactic construction. Whatever the context in which the nonprepositional locative construction does occur, we can always find elsewhere a syntactic doublet rendering the same function. These doublets may occur as prepositional locative constructions, or as constructions with another case (with the exception of the nominative case) either in a prepositional or nonprepositional form:

17. exal Kieve (unbound locative)
18. exal v Kieve (bound locative)
19. exal v Kiev (bound accusative)
20. exal Kievu (unbound dative)

All of the above examples may be translated as 'He went to Kiev.'

We can speak of three major categories in which the nonprepositional locative construction occurs. It
may designate a spatial relationship, it may designate a temporal relationship, or it may function as a verbal complement. It is interesting to note that the frequency of usage of the nonprepositional construction in any one of these three categories varies from the Old Church Slavonic documents to the Old Russian documents: the designation of a spatial relationship, i.e., the category which one might expect to be the most representative of the inherent meaning of the locative case, is the category of least frequent occurrence in Old Church Slavonic of the nonprepositional locative, while it is the category of most frequent occurrence in Old Russian. In contrast to this, the unbound locative as a verbal complement is rarely found in Old Russian manuscripts, while it is the most frequent usage of the nonprepositional locative in Old Church Slavonic. In fact, Bauer (1963: 263) states that Old Church Slavonic is the only Slavic language to maintain the nonprepositional construction of the locative case as a verbal complement in any significant quantity.

Interesting anomalies occur even within the three categories themselves when data from Old Church Slavonic are compared to that of Old Russian. For example, Bauer (1963: 265) points out that in Old Church Slavonic the infrequent occurrence of the nonprepositional locative as an indicator of a spatial relationship is most often
exemplified by a proper noun place name. Vaillant (1964: 185) goes even further to state that when the unbound locative does occur in such a context, it is not found with the names of places of Slavic origin:

21. byvšix c(esa)ri grade 'the one who had been in Constantinople' (Assemanius, VA, p. 185)

22. arxiep(isku)pa c(esa)ri grade 'the archbishop in Constantinople' (Assemanius, VA, p. 185)

The exact opposite applies to the Old Russian manuscripts: when the nonprepositional locative construction occurs in a context designating a spatial relationship, and the noun in question is a place name, it occurs exclusively with place names indicating cities of Slavic origin. Names of foreign cities, when used in the locative case, are always used in a prepositional construction (Grigor'eva, 1948: 132). A contrast of this phenomenon is excellently illustrated by the Ostromir Gospel (1056-1057), a document copied from Old Church Slavonic by a Russian scribe. The body of this document, i.e., the copy of the gospel itself, contains not a single example of the function of the nonprepositional locative construction designating a spatial relationship. We can assume that this reflects the infrequency of the occurrence of the unbound locative in this function in Old Church Slavonic. However, in the scribe's brief postscript which follows the gospel, there are two examples of the nonprepositional locative
in a spatial context. One of these examples follows:

23. Stol o(t)ca svoego Jaroslava Kieve 'the throne of his father, Jaroslav, in Kiev!' (Ostromir Gospel, SH, p. 1)

This would seem to indicate that the nonprepositional locative construction still existed in the spoken language. However, not knowing anything about the scribe and his geographical origins, we cannot tell if this is merely a dialectical phenomenon from this single example. Nevertheless, the fact that this construction occurs outside of the "literary" body of the text probably points to the fact that it is not being influenced by any textual considerations, but rather that the nature of this construction is still somewhat colloquial in Old Russian at this time.

As mentioned above, in Old Russian, the nonprepositional locative construction occurs most frequently in a spatial context. The majority of examples of the unbound construction occur with proper nouns, although within the limits of the occurrence of this form in this context, common nouns do not occur infrequently in a nonprepositional construction. The examples of the locative case used without a preposition with a common noun are, for all intents and purposes, exclusively restricted to nouns in the singular. The almost complete absence of the unbound locative construction in the plural attests to
the concrete locational meaning of the nonprepositional construction (Borkovskij, 1968: 264). When a plural noun does rarely occur as an unbound locative, there already tends to be a degree of adverbialization associated with this form, so that it has basically lost the significance of its case:

24. _položiša i u Svjatei Sofii golovax u deđa_ 'he was placed in Saint Sofia’s at the heads of his ancestors'  
(Novgorod chronicle, 13th century, BO, p. 264)

Nevertheless, we still can find examples where a common noun in the plural has a concrete locational meaning when it occurs in the nonprepositional construction:

25. _gorax bo priležaše vysokix i mestex pregynnyx_ 'located in the high mountains and dangerous towns'  
(Žitie svjatyx, 14th century, BU, p. 431)

The category of spatial relationships can be further subdivided itself. It is most convenient to deal with this category in terms of the syntactic contexts in which it can be found, although some linguists categorize this context according to the semantic connotations of the nonprepositional construction and its immediate environment. As an illustration of this latter system of categorization, we present the following categories which Borkovskij (1968: 264-284) includes in his discussion of the unbound locative:
1) Place names

a) Proper nouns

   'And Svjatoslav ruled in Kiev after having driven out his brother.'
   (Povest' vremennyx let po lavrent'evskoj letopisi, 12th century, LO, p. 236)

27. Prestavisja Volodimer syn Jaroslavl starej Novegorode.
   'Volodimer, the elder son of Jaroslav, died in Novgorod.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236)

28. Volodimer privede Mstislava s(y)na svoego iz Novagoroda a Novegorode sede Mstislavič.
   'Volodimer brought his son Mstislav from Novgorod, and Mstislav's son began to reign in Novgorod.'
   (Suzdal'skaja letopis', 14th century, LO, p. 236)

29. starej rjurik sede Novegorode
   'Rjurik the Elder reigned in Novgorod.'
   (Kormčaja kniga, 1282, BU, p. 390)

30. Posadi ubo sego okannago Svjatopulka v knjaženii Pinske, a Jaroslava - Novegorode, a Borisa - Rostove, a Gleba - Murome.
   'For he enthroned this wretched Svjatopulk in Pinsk, and Jaroslav in Novgorod, and Boris in Rostov, and Gleb in Murom.'
   (Skazanie i strast' i poxvala svjatomu mučeniku Borisa i Gleba, 12th century, FO, p. 21)

b) Common nouns

31. kněz že s Novgorodci byša verxu Volgy
   'the prince was with the Novgorodians at the headwaters of the Volga'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, BO, p. 264)

32. knjaz že s Novgorodci byša verxu Volgy
   'the prince was with the Novgorodians at the headwaters of the Volga'
   (Suzdal'skaja letopis', 14th century, LO, p. 237)
33. cerky založena byst monastyre
   'The church was founded in the monastery.'
   (Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century, BO, p. 264)

2) Sojourn or activity in a particular place

34. načalo knjazničija Izjaslavljja Kieve
   'the beginning of Izjaslav's reign in Kiev'

3. Designating the names of tribes or groups of people usually associated with a particular geographic area

35. pcsadi Izjasłava Polotiske a S(vja)topolka Turove a Jarosłava Rostove...S(vja)tosłava Derevex
   'Izjaslav was enthroned in Polotsk, and Svjatopolk in Turov and Jaroslav in Rostov and Svjatoslav in the land of the Derevs.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 14th century)

4. Direction. In addition to its stative locational meaning, the locative case, both the prepositional and nonprepositional constructions, was used to indicate direction as well. This would seem to indicate that there did at one time exist a closer relationship between the locative and accusative cases (and, for that matter, the dative case as well, since the dative also has a directional function, discussed below), since the accusative case was also used at this time, as it is still used in modern Russian, to specify direction. Examples of the nonprepositional locative construction used in a directional context are as follows:
36. V se že leto Novegorode ide Volxov
'In this summer Volxov went to Novgorod'
(Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236.

37. i poide Izjašlava k Dernovumu. i tu skupišaše vsi Klobucy i Poršane. tom ze meste prislaša k nemu Belgorodci i Vasilevci.
'And Izjaslav went to Dernov. And all the Klobucy and Poršane gathered. And the Belgorodians and Vasilevcy were sent to that place to him.'

38. tom meste priexaša o(t) Kijan muži narekuče ty naš knjaz.
'Men were sent to this place from the Kijs, saying you are our prince.'
(Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

39. esm' exal Kieve
'I went to Kiev'
(Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

Interestingly enough, a nonprepositional construction using the dative case may also be used to indicate the goal of motion. There is, of course, a directional aspect of motion directed toward a given object in the inherent meaning of the dative case, i.e., the notion of the indirect object. We might also add that in modern Russian the dative is used in a limited context with verbs of motion: the construction is always prepositional, the preposition being к 'toward', and the noun in the dative case must always be animate:

40. Ivan idet к врачу. Ivan is going to the doctor's.

In Old Russian we also have a nonprepositional dative construction occurring with verbs of motion, with the
noun in the dative being either animate or inanimate:

41. prišed Kievu
   'having arrived in Kiev'
   (Evangelij po Mstislavu, 1125-1132, BU, p. 35)

42. Jaroslav že sovkupiv Rusi, Varjagy, Sloveni
    poide protivu i pride Velynju
    'Jaroslav, then, gathered the Rus, Varjagy
     and Slovjane, and went to do battle and came
to Velyn'.
    (Boris and Gleb, 12th century, FO, p. 50)

43. togda Volodimer sovkupiv k sebe syny
    svoja tako že i David i Oleg s svoimi
    synāmi priidoša Vyšegorodu
    'then Volodimer having gathered his sons
to himself, both David and Oleg with their
sons came to Vyšegorod.'
    (Boris and Gleb, 12th century, FO, p. 50)

44. a (Izjaslav) mene posla Smolinsku
    'and Izjaslav sent me to Smolensk'
    (Poučenie Vladimira Monomaxa, c. 1125,
     FO, p. 58)

45. on ide Novugorodu a ja s polovci na Odresk
    i paky i-Smolinska k otoju pridox Černigovu
    'He went to Novgorod and I to Odresk with
    the Polovtsians and again from Smolensk
    I went to my father in Černigov.'
    (Poučenie Vladimera Monomaxa, c. 1125,
     FO, p. 58)

Grigor'eva (1948: 134) also notes another limited
subcategory which she classifies along with other non-
prepositional locative case forms that designate location:

V obščej masse slučaev bespredložnogo lokativa
mesta vydeljaetsja gruppa primerov, v kotoryx,
vследствие особого характера лексического значениа
глагола, им субъективное в локатив означает
не просто пространство, где происходит деястие,
a предмет, вне пределов которого деястие про-
исходит.

In the general mass of occurrences of the non-
prepositional locative of place, a group of examples
is separated in which, as a consequence of the
general character of the lexical meaning of the verb, the noun in the locative signifies not simply the space where the action occurs, but the object outside of whose limits the action takes place.

She goes on to state that such a use of the nonprepositional locative construction is found primarily in documents of Old Church Slavonic origin. She gives the following among her examples:

46. em že priležaxu vsi mnogy
    'many villages belonged to it'
    (Žitie Simona, 13th century, GR, p. 135)

47. Rana ne pristupit telesi tvoem
    'The wound (blow) will not strike your body.'
    (Psaltyr of 1296, GR, p. 135)

Putting aside these semantic categories in which the nonprepositional locative construction occurs as an indicator of a spatial relationship, we turn to some of the grammatical contexts into which this construction may be categorized. These grammatical contexts not only refer to the use of the locative construction itself, but to the grammatical environment in which it may be found as well. I shall use the categories which Lomtev (1956) discusses. They consist of the following:

1) Place names in the presence of an intransitive verb. Lomtev (1956: 236) states that the use of the unbound locative case occurs overwhelmingly with intransitive verbs. These nouns in the locative case may be either proper
nouns or common nouns.

48. Izjaslav sedit Kieve a Gleb Perejaslavl
   'Izjaslav reigns in Kiev and Gleb in Perjaslavl.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

49. tom meste priexaša o(t) Kijan muži
   'Men from the Kijs came to that place.'
   (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

50. prestavisja Volodimer syn jaroslavl starej
    Novgorode
   'Volodimer, the elder son of Jaroslav, died in Novgorod.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236)

51. V se že leto Novgorode ide Volxov
    'In this summer Volxov went to Novgorod'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236)

2) Place names in the presence of a transitive verb.

52. založi Volodimer svjatuju Sof'ju Novgorode
    'Volodimer laid the foundation of Saint Sofia's in Novgorod.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236)

53. posadi syna svoego Mstislava Polotske
    'He enthroned his son Mstislav in Polotsk.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236)

54. položiša i u s(vja)toj Sof'i pritvore
    'He laid him in Saint Sofia's in the vestibule.'
   (Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century, BO, p. 264)

3) Place names in the presence of finite verbs
   followed by an infinitive.

55. Svjatopolk že nača knjažiti Kieve
    'Svjatopolk began to reign in Kiev.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236)

4) Place names in the presence of a deverbal noun.

The nonprepositional locative construction
may either precede or follow the deverbal noun.

56. načalo knjaženija Izjaslava Kieve
   'the beginning of Izjaslav's reign in Kiev'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 438)

57. načalo S(vja)topolča Kieve knjaženija
   'the beginning of Svjatopolk's reign in Kiev'

5) Place names in the presence of participles in dative absolute constructions, marked by italics.

58. V se že leto osnovana byst cerky Pečerskaja
   igumenom Feodosiem i episkom Mixailom,
   mitropolitu Georgiju togda suščju v Greca
   Svjatoslav Kieve sedjaščju
   'This summer the Pechera Church was founded
   by the abbot Feodosij and the bishop Michael,
   Metropolitan Georgij then being in Greece
   and Svjatoslav reigning in Kiev.'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377, LO, p. 236)

59. Posla k nim syn svoj i byvšju emu Černigove
   'Having been in Černigov, his son was sent
to him.'
   (Suzdal'skaja letopis', 14th century, LO, p. 237)

60. Vasilkovi že suščju Volodimeri na prezrečnem meste,
   i jako priблиžisja post velikij,
   i mne suščju Volodimeri
   'Vasilok being in Volodimer at the afore-
   mentioned place, and the Great Fast was
   approaching while I was in Volodimer'
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

61. elma že ne vedjaju množy Vyšegorode ležaččju
   svjatoju mučeniku svjatoju strastoterpecu
   Kristovu roman i davida no gospod' ne
dadjaše takomu sokroviščju krytisja v zemli
   'Although many did not know the holy suffering
   and Christ's holy martyrdom of Roman and David,
   lying in Vyšegorod, the lord did not allow
   such a treasure to be hidden in the earth.'
   (Boris and Gleb, 12th century, FO, p. 39)
6) Place names which are composed of a noun modified by an adjective.

62. jako Perejaslavskom polku čto budet 'what will be in the Perejaslav regiment' (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

63. Antonove monastyre 'in Anton's monastery' (Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century, BO, p. 264)

64. zagorese Savkine dvore 'It caught fire in Savka's yard.' (Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century, BO, p. 264)

7) Place names which are composed of a noun modified by a number or a pronoun.

65. togo (že) me(sja)ca... to(m) že meste bra(t)ja vse (sneššaje) S(vja)topol(k) D(a)vid Oleg 'In that month all the brothers, Svjatopolk, David and Oleg gathered at that place.' (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

66. ne mogu s toboju žiti odinom meste 'I cannot live with you in the same place.' (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

67. ne byl veči tom 'He was not at the assembly.' (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

8) Place names where a single preposition governs a series of nouns.

68. v to źe leto ispisaša čestno pritvory vsja v Svjatej Sofii Novegorode 'This summer all the vestibules in Saint Sofia's in Novgorod were fittingly painted.' (Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century, SH, p. 9)

69. Rjurik v Belegorode zatvorisę a Mstislava zatvorisɑ Vysegorode 'Rurik was imprisoned in Belgorod and Mstislav was imprisoned in Vysegorod.' (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)
70. a ty s(y)n e(go) sediși v Peresopnici
da drugyj Belegorode
'and you, his son, reign in Peresopnic,
and the other in Belgorod'
(Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

71. znamenija bo v n(e)besi ili zvezda(x)
li s(o)lnći li pticami li eterom čim ne
na bl(a)go byvaet
'signs either in the sky or in the stars
or the sun or by birds or by something
which does not bode well'
(Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

9) A common noun which is bound to a preposition,
associated with a proper noun that is not bound
to a preposition.

72. ukrasiv ju postavi i v c(e)rkvi svoej
Volodimeri
'Having painted it he placed it in his
church in Volodimer.'
(Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

73. togo (že) le(ta) x(rist)oljubivyj kněz(z)
Konstěntin založi c(e)rkov Rostove na
dvore svoe(m)
'Vesat summer the Christ-loving prince,
Constantine laid the foundation of a church
in Rostov in his courtyard.'
(Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

74. i plakaše po nem brat Andrej i položi v
c(e)rkvi svja(toj bogorodicy Volodimeri
'And his brother Andrej mourned for him
and placed him in the Church of the Holy
Mother in Volodimer.'
(Ipat'evskaja letopis' c. 1425, BO, p. 267)

75. ide Mstisla(v) Kievu. i sede Kieve na stole
'Mstislav went to Kiev. And he ruled on
the throne in Kiev.'
(Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century)

76. im že napisasja v knigy životnja v vyšnem
grade i netlennem Jerusalem
'And it was written in the books of life
in the holy city and in immortal Jerusalem.'
(Slovo o zakone i blagodati mitropolita
Ilariona, 1037-1050, FO, p. 12)
The examples given above are from a relatively early period of the Russian (or, perhaps more correctly, East Slavic) literary development. Many of them are not from original works, such as the chronicles, but from copied documents, possibly reflecting more the source material than the state of the colloquial language at the time. There are examples of the nonprepositional locative construction even through the seventeenth century, but they become more and more infrequent, attesting to the nonproductivity of the form. We can say that by the seventeenth century any occurrence of the unbound locative case can probably be attributed to mere literary convention, an adherence to traditional literary formulae rather than a reflection of this construction still maintaining its roots in the colloquial speech of the time. Some examples of the nonprepositional locative as an indicator of spatial relationships in later works are:

77. ne deržati v našej vočine Moskve i velikom knjaženii i Velikom Novgorode 'not to rule in our fatherland, Moscow, nor in the great kingdom nor in Great Novgorod.' (Gramota Vasilija Dmitrieviča około 1396)

This first example belongs to the category of a preposition governing a series of nouns in the locative case, one of which is a proper noun.

78. i slyša ljudi jako Turiske sut' 'And the people heard how they are in Turisk.' (Uvarovskij spisok pervoj treti XVI v., BO, p. 270)
This example shows the use of the nonprepositional locative construction with a proper noun in the presence of a transitive verb.

79. est' že cerkvi svjatago Ioana Predteči dvore episkopli
"The church of Saint John of Predteč is in the bishop's courtyard."
(Uvarovskij spisok pervoj treti XVI v., BO, p. 269)

This final example shows a common noun in the presence of an intransitive verb.

To conclude our discussion of the nonprepositional locative construction used to designate a spatial relationship, it is important to bear in mind that most proper noun place names belong to the first declension. In other words, no phonological similarities existed between the locative singular and any other case. Those place names that are either second or third declension nouns, such as Moskva and Tver' are rarely, if ever found in a nonprepositional construction. Hence when we do find the unbound locative form in this context, the combination of the concreteness of the place name and the nonambiguity of the locative desinence does not confuse the usage of this syntactic structure. This will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter V.
Footnotes

1. According to Bauer (1963: 269), the explanation for the infrequency of the unbound locative case as an indicator of spatial relationships in Old Church Slavonic manuscripts is the influence of the original Greek sources for the majority of the written material. Greek does not distinguish a unique locative case, but rather only the nominative, accusative, genitive and dative cases. The locational function of the locative case is rendered by a prepositional dative construction, specifically, "en + the dative case to render "in a particular place.""

2. The use of place names indicating non-Slavic locations, to the exclusion of place names indicating Slavic locations, with a nonprepositional locative construction is not easily explainable. As mentioned in footnote 1 of this chapter, the Greek sources for the Old Church Slavonic manuscripts did not differentiate a separate locative case, spatial relationships being indicated by an appropriate prepositional construction. Therefore, the designation of a spatial relationship by a pure, i.e., unbound, locative form either has a different source or is an innovation. One should, however, keep in mind the relative infrequency with which the nonprepositional locative construction in this context is found in Old Church Slavonic. Bauer (1963: 265) claims that only .5% of all locative constructions which referred to spatial orientations were not accompanied by a preposition.

3. Grigor'eva explains this by the fact that the prevalence of the prepositional construction with the locative case in Old Church Slavonic manuscripts, where the Russian scribe could use in his living language equally a prepositional or a nonprepositional locative construction, determined the exclusive use of the prepositional locative construction in the presence of names of foreign towns when they occurred in Old Russian manuscripts. Unfortunately, she does not go on further to develop this idea, although one feels that it still does not adequately explain this
phenomenon. While example 23 from the Ostromir Gospel seems to indicate a familiarity with the nonprepositional construction on the part of this particular scribe, one might wish to argue whether the Russian scribes in the XI - XIV centuries, the period to which Grigo'eva refers, equally used a prepositional construction or nonprepositional construction to render the locative case in their living language. One need only point out the relative infrequency of the unbound locative in the written documents. Therefore, while we do not wish to claim that the nonprepositional locative construction had already disappeared from the spoken language, we would hesitate to agree that it shared an equal usage with the prepositional locative construction.

If we keep in mind that, on the contrary, the nonprepositional locative form is already an archaic construction at the time of even the earliest written Slavic documents, this helps to explain why in Old Russian manuscripts the use of the unbound form was confined to place names indicating Slavic cities: if we consider that many of the place names referring to non-Slavic cities are at this time being introduced into the existing language for the first time as new lexical items, then we would not be incorrect in expecting that such a new item would not be used in a syntactic construction that is already felt to be an archaism, but rather would be used with the more contemporary form, i.e., the prepositional construction.

4. The categories are Borkovskij's (1968), while the examples come from various sources.

5. Examples of the nonprepositional locative construction with common nouns used to designate a spatial relationship not only have a greater tendency toward becoming adverbialized than do those with proper nouns, due to the nonspecificity of the common noun, but some of these constructions may already be considered to be lexicalized as adverbs, e.g., gore 'above' and dolu 'below', or as prepositions, e.g., srede 'among':

az vxožu srede polka
'I am going among (literally, 'in the middle of') the troops.'
(Sbornik soderažačega v sebe kn. Isusa Navina, Sudej Ruf i Esthir s nekotorymi drugimi stat'jami, 12th century, BU, p. 126)
And having looked at the sky and having sighed above (literally, 'on the mountain') he began to pray with these words.' (Boris i Gleb, 12th century, FO, p. 26)

6. Note that these first two examples, 31 and 32, are the same lexical items from two different chronicles; both use the nonprepositional construction. This may well point already to a degree of adverbialization with verxa.

7. Borkovskij's (1968: 264) term for this category is prebyvanie ili dejatel'nost' v kakim-to meste.

8. Both proper nouns and common nouns may occur in this semantic context. In connection with this, certain nonprepositional locative constructions involving common nouns which have already become adverbialized, e.g., gore 'above', and dolu 'below' may be used interchangeably with accusative case forms or special directional adverbs to answer the question 'where to?':

i poide po Dnepru gore
'and he went above along the Dnepr'

9. In the Pougenie Vladimira Monomaxa (c. 1125), we find this nonprepositional construction with the dative case indicating the goal of motion, where the goal is an inanimate destination, especially abundant. In addition to the examples already given, 44 and 45, there is an entire passage where the repetition of this construction is noteworthy:

I Starodubu idoxom na Olga, zane sja bjaše
priložil k polovcem. I na Bog(uslavl) idoxom
s Svjatopolkom na Bonjaka za Rus'.
I Smolinsk idoxom s Davydom smirivšesja...
I potom paki idoxom k Rostovu na zimu, i po
3 zimy xodixom Smolinsku. I-Smolenska idox
Rostovu...
I na zimu Smolinsku idox, i-Smolenska po Veliče
dni vylodox; i Gjurgeva mati umre.
Perejaslavlj prišed na leto sobrax brat'ju.
I Bonjak prđe so vsemi polovci k Ksnjatinju,
idoxom za ne iz Perejaslavlj za Sulu, i Bog
ny pomože, i polky ix pobedixom i knjazi iz-
imaxom lepšil i po Rož(d)estve stvorixom mir
s Aepeju i poim u nego dčer idoxom Smolensku
i potom idox Rostovu
'And I went to Starodub against Oleg because he allied himself with the Polovtsians. And I went to Boguslavl with Svjatopolk against Bonjak for Rus'. And I went to Smolensk with David, who had submitted... And then again I went to Rostov for the winter, and after three winters I went to Smolensk. From Smolensk I went to Rostov... And I went to Smolensk for the winter, and I left from Smolensk after Easter Sunday, and George's mother died.' Having arrived in Perejaslavl for the summer I gathered my brothers. And Bonjak came with all the Polovtsians to Ksnjatin', I went after them from Perejaslavl beyond the Sula, and God helped us and I captured their best princes and after Christmas I made peace with Aepa and I took his daughter, I went to Smolensk. And then I went to Rostov. (FO, p. 60).

Within this passage we see the same interchangeability of the prepositional and nonprepositional constructions with the dative case that we have witnessed with the locative case. Notice that we have idox Rostovu, a prepositional construction, immediately followed by idox Rostovu, the nonprepositional construction.

10. As Grigor'eva herself points out, this category has been subdivided because of the special character of the verbs. Therefore, one might be inclined to argue that this unbound locative construction is more immediately a result of verbal government than an example of a spatial relationship. Verbal government of the locative case will be discussed in detail in Chapters IV and V.

11. Note that here, even within the same sentence, the place name indicating a non-Slavic location occurs accompanied by a preposition, v Grecax 'in Greece', while the place name indicating a Slavic location occurs without a preposition, Kieve 'in Kiev'. Nevertheless, it could be argued that the influence of the preposition is extended to both place names. However, see below, footnote 14.

12. Borkovskij (1968: 264) feels that the degree of concreteness in the locative meaning is enhanced by an adjectival modifier. Not only does the adjective tend to make the common noun more specific, but
so many examples of these adjectives in nonpreposi-
tional constructions are derived from proper nouns,
which tends to make the reference to the common
noun even more specific.

13. The degree of concrete locativeness is also strength-
ened, albeit to a lesser extent than with an adjectival
modifier, by a pronominal or a numerical modifier.

14. In Contemporary Standard Russian it is still possible
for one preposition to govern a series of substan-
tives; however, this is permissible only if those
substantives are joined by the conjunction и 'and',
and only if the substantives are not proper nouns.
Obviously, at the time that these documents were
written, the influence of the preposition is felt
beyond the limitations of the modern language.

15. This would attest to the more concrete lexical meaning
of the proper noun being sufficient to carry the
inherent locative meaning, while the more general
semantic connotation of the common noun needs further
definition within the context. This additional
definition is, of course, provided by the preposition.
Notice that the proper noun in the nonprepositional
construction may either precede or follow the common
noun and preposition.

16. Here we have a situation where the common noun which
is governed by a preposition not only follows the
proper noun, but the preposition which, had it been
used, would have governed the proper noun, y, is
different from the preposition which is governing
the common noun, на. Therefore, it is impossible
for the preposition na to be considered to have
had a postpositional influence on the preceding
proper noun. See also example 75.

17. Jerusalim is obviously not a place name designating
a Slavic location. However, there are two trends
working here. The first is the government of the
previous preposition being felt to some degree (note
that throughout the rest of this particular document,
whenever this place name occurs in the locative case,
it is always found in a prepositional construction).
The second is that this work is "written in the
high style of Byzantine panegyrics," (Fennell and
Obolonsky, 1969: 154), and is probably influenced
by the style of the Old Church Slavonic manuscripts
in which the nonprepositional locative constructions
were found with place names of non-Slavic locations.
Of the three categories in which the nonprepositional locative construction may occur, those contexts designating temporal relationships tend to be maintained longer than those designating either spatial relationships or verbal complements.
Chapter IV
The Use of the Unbound Locative: Temporal Relationships
And Verbal Complements

The category of the temporal relationship as expressed by a nonprepositional construction with the locative case is especially important. In addition to its being a relatively productive category for both Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian manuscripts, it reflects a phenomenon of all nonnominative cases, except for the dative case, of a nonprepositional construction used to indicate a particular time sequence. Basically, the semantics of the various nonprepositional temporal relationships are as follows: the accusative case indicates time spent performing a particular action, the genitive case indicates a specific date on which the action was performed, and the instrumental case indicates part of a day or part of a year during which the action was performed. These temporal relationships were not quite so semantically distinct from one another, as evidenced by the early manuscripts; this led to the existence of doublets among the various cases in regard to this context.

The nonprepositional locative construction as a designator of a temporal relationship occurred relatively
more frequently in comparison with the nonprepositional
locative construction as a designator of a spatial rela-
tionship in Old Church Slavonic; they occur with about
the same frequency in Old Russian manuscripts as they
do in Old Church Slavonic. In general, the locative of
time expressed the time segment during which the action
took place, although the action itself did not necessarily
occur continually during the expressed time sequence.
This semantic context holds true for both Old Church
Slavonic and Old Russian.

The expressions which are most frequently found
in the nonprepositional constructions of the locative
case in temporal contexts are vesna 'spring', leto 'summer',
osen' 'autumn', zima 'winter', noč' 'night', den' 'day',
polnoč' 'midnight', polden' 'noon', utro 'morning',
večer 'evening', nedelja 'week', and čas 'hour', and
occasionally with a few other substantives. The following
are examples of the unbound locative used in a temporal
case:

80. idoša vesne na polovce S(vja)topolk i
Volodiimer
'In the spring Svjatopolk and Volodiimer
went against the Polovtsians.'
(Lavrent'evskaja.letopis', 1377, BO, p. 271)

81. ide vl(adr)ika D(a)vid v Tfer vesne
'the commander David went to Tver in the
spring'
(Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century)

82. da kak grédy kopati vesne i navo(z) klasti
a navoz zime zapasati
'and how going one is to dig in the spring and to place the fertilizer and to store the fertilizer in the winter' (Domostroj po spisku Konšina, 16th century)

83. ide Vsevolod... na čjud zime
'in the winter Vsevolod went against the Čjuds'
(Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century, LO, p. 241)

84. a v rusu kn(ja)že ezdit v osen' kako pošlo. a lete ezdeti na vzvad zveri gonit'
'and you, prince are to go to Rus' in the autumn and in the summer go to hunt wild animals'
(Novgorodskaja gramota, 1371, BO, p. 271)

85. a v Rusu ti knjaže ezdit na tretiju zimu a lete knjaže ezdit na ozvado zveri gonit
'and you, prince, are to go to Rus' for the third winter and in the summer go hunt wild animals'
(Pamjatnik istorii Velikogo Novgoroda, LO, p. 242)

86. i lete na krilu vetrenjuju
'in the summer on the wind's wings'
(Slovo sv. Kirilla Episkopa Turkovskogo, 12th century, BU, p. 370)

87. i exaša lete na sanex
'and in the summer they went by sled'
(Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

88. a utre vstav b(o)g moliti(sja)
'and in the morning having gotten up to pray to God'
(Domostroj, p. 61)

89. sedeščju ti zime v teple xramine
'you sitting in a warm house in the winter'
(Zlataja cep', 14th century, BU, p. 492)

The time sequence gains a greater degree of concreteness with the addition of a modifier, usually a pronoun (especially a demonstrative pronoun) or a numeral, much in the same way that the nonprepositional locative
construction expressing a spatial relationship with a common noun also becomes more concrete in the presence of a modifier:

90. *tom že dni stvori mir*  
   'on that day peace was made'  
   (Suzdal'skaja letopis', 14th century, LO, p. 241)

91. *i ne be tu meča. be bo tom dni vynely*  
   'There was no sword there, for they took them out that day.'  
   (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

92. *se molvil Vasilko si noči k Ulanovi*  
   'That night Vasilko spoke to Ulan'  
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

93. *tom že lete prislašasę Novgorodci k Mstislavu*  
   'That summer the Novgorodians were sent to Mstislav.'  
   (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

94. *toj že zime posla Andrej s(y)na svoego*  
   'that winter Andrej sent his son'  
   (Ipat'evskaja letopis', c. 1425)

95. *pervom (že) dni ne vedoša e(go)*  
   'On the first day they did not know him'  
   (Povest' o Kitovrase, BO, p. 272)

96. *i tom čase by(se) jako i mertv*  
   'and at that moment he was as if dead'  
   (Lavrent'evskaja letopis', 1377)

97. *i tom čase ruce ima usoxoste*  
   'and at that moment their two hands dried up'  
   (Žitie Nifonta, 1219, OB, p. 42)

98. *i tom čase byst ruka cela*  
   'and at that moment his hand was whole'  
   (Boris i Gleb, 12th century, FO, p. 45)

99. *i odinom čase vse pogore*  
   'and immediately everything was burned'  
   (Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century, BO, p. 272)
Many linguists, among them Borkovskij, Grigor'eva, Bauer, and Obnorskij, agree that the evidence that appears even as early as the Old Church Slavonic manuscripts concerning these nonprepositional locative constructions of temporal relationships points to the fact that these constructions are already showing at least a partial degree of adverbialization, an extreme view being taken by Obnorskij and Barxudarov (1952: 42) that, as a group, these time expressions are already fixed and should no longer be considered inflected forms. This would find a parallel with the nonprepositional locative expressions designating location which had become adverbialized, such as gore 'above'. Whatever the actual status of these time expressions, it is significant that the non-prepositional locative construction designating a temporal relationship was the category of unbound locative expressions that was most resistant to disappearance. These expressions lasted into the seventeenth century:

100. Včera byl pjan, deneg bylo v mošne mnogo, utre vstal xvatilsja za mošnu, ničego ne syskal
'Yesterday I was drunk, there was a lot of money in my purse; in the morning I arose, my purse was missing, and I did not find anything.'
(Prazdnik kabackix jaryžek, 17th century, LO, p. 242)

Such an occurrence of the nonprepositional locative construction may certainly be attributed to the adherence to literary formulae. However, if these expressions
were felt to be completely adverbialized, that is, fixed expressions, then this too might account for this particular category of the unbound locative lasting longer than the other categories.

The unbound locative functioning as a time expression always did coexist simultaneously with a prepositional locative construction; in addition to this, semantic doublets could be found with the accusative case as well, both prepositional and nonprepositional forms. Once again we find a correspondence that relates the accusative case to the locative. Although in the modern language the semantics of the accusative case in a time expression is more narrowly defined, Grigor'eva (1948: 134) not only equates the accusative of time with the locative of time, but also cites the nonprepositional genitive construction as another form which could carry the same semantic information as the nonprepositional locative, giving us a total of five syntactic constructions that could fulfill the same semantic function with regard to expressing a temporal relationship:

- toм Že lete (unbound locative)
- v toм Že lete (bound locative)
- to Že leto (unbound accusative)
- v to Že leto (bound accusative)
- togo Že leta (unbound genitive)

The above were at one time all translatable as 'this summer.'
The third and final category in which the nonprepositional locative construction occurs in Old Church Slavonic, and to a much lesser extent Old Russian, is that of the verbal complement. Though this context is extremely rare in Old Russian, it is the category of most frequent occurrence of the unbound locative form in Old Church Slavonic. Semantically, the verb governing the noun in the locative case usually indicated contact or action resulting in contact, joining, or addition, while the substantive in the locative case expressed the point of contact. This verbal government was, at first, exclusively with a nonprepositional construction (Bauer, 1963: 273); the majority of verbs which governed the locative case were prefixed either by pri- or na-. One is immediately struck by the fact that the prepositions pri 'in the vicinity of' and na 'upon' both govern the locative case. In fact, the relationship between preposition and prefix is undeniable when one examines the entire inventory of prefixes and prepositions. In this context, the verbal complement is being both positionally and semantically related to the rest of the sentence, particularly to the verb, by means of a prefix rather than a preposition, both the prefix and the preposition being semantically identical.

A significant number of verbs in Old Church Slavonic which governed the locative case were reflexive verbs,
that is, verbs ending in -se. These verbs tended to maintain the unbound locative verbal complement longer than the nonreflexive verbs. Bauer (1963: 284) explains this by the fact that the trend of the semantic emphasis being shifted from the result of the action, i.e., the complement, to the process of the action itself, i.e., the verb, probably took place later with the reflexive verbs than with the nonreflexive verbs. This may have been so since the direction of the action of a reflexive verb does not fall directly upon the complement to begin with.

In addition to the reflexive-nonreflexive opposition, those verbs which had a more abstract meaning tended to maintain the nonprepositional locative construction as a verbal complement longer than those verbs which expressed more concrete action. The verbs of more abstract meaning were regarded more as idioms, with the verb plus complement taken as an entire unit, while the more concrete verbs required a more clearly specified complement. If such a complement was to be provided by the locative, the substantive would necessarily have to be accompanied by a preposition for the sake of this needed clarity.

Nevertheless, as with the other categories already discussed in which the nonprepositional locative construction occurs, other syntactic forms were in competition with the unbound locative as a verbal complement from
the earliest evidence in the Old Church Slavonic documents. For this category, however, the semantic doublets occur more frequently with other case forms than with the prepositional locative construction. This was especially true for the dative case and, to a lesser extent, the genitive case. From the written documents we can see that the dative case was then, as with the modern Slavic languages, phonologically identical to the locative case in the singular paradigm of several of the declension classes, while the genitive and locative cases shared a common desinence in the dual paradigm. Vaillant (1964: 186) cites the following examples:

101. kosnq se vskrilii rize
    'I touched the hem of his garment.'
    (locative case)

102. kosnqy se ego
    'having touched him'
    (genitive case)

103. priložiti telesseudoem
    'to stick to one's body'
    (locative case)

104. priložiti telesi svoemu
    'to stick to one's body'
    (dative case)

Examples 103 and 104 are taken from the same text, Matthew VI, 27; the locative case appears in Marianus and Zographensis; the dative case appears in Assemanius. Assemanius is the youngest of the three texts.

It is unfortunate that the overwhelming majority of examples of verbal government requiring the
prepositional locative construction as a complement occur with nouns having a phonologically indistinct dative and locative singular. This, of course, makes it difficult to ascertain just when the locative case as a nonprepositional construction ceased to be employed as a verbal complement. According to Bauer (1963: 274), the following verbs have been unmistakenly attested to govern the locative case in a nonprepositional construction. That is to say that there are examples of these verbs governing substantives in the locative case where the desinences for the dative and locative cases would be phonologically distinct:

- **kosnoći se** 'to touch'
- **prikasati se, prikosnoći se** 'to touch'
- **prilepiti sq.** 'to cling to', 'to adhere', 'to stick'
- **prikladati** 'to compare to'
- **priložiti** 'to add to', 'to stick to'
- **priložiti se** 'to be added to'
- **prilagati** 'to add to', 'to compare'
- **prilagati se** 'to be added', 'to be compared', 'to be enthusiastic'
- **priležati** 'to be zealous', 'to take care of'
- **pristati** 'to come up to', 'to consult', 'to anchor'

Because of these attested occurrences of verbs governing a nonprepositional locative construction, and because of the morphological and semantic similarities of prefixes
such as pri- and na- and the corresponding prepositions which govern the locative case, Bauer (1963: 274) also assumes that the following verbs also, at least at one time, did govern the locative case in Old Church Slavonic, even though there may be only one or two available examples, all of which are with substantives whose dative and locative singular desinences are identical:

priseděti 'to sit by'
pristavlěti, pristaviti 'to add', 'to appoint'
priklučiti se 'to happen', 'to be present'
priraziti se 'to strike against'
pripasti 'to fall near', 'to happen', 'to belong',
           'to approach'
približiti se 'to approach'
pričeštati se, pričestiti se 'to participate',
           'to share'
pričitati, pričisti 'to add', 'to count'
pričitati se, pričisti se 'to be added', 'to be counted', 'to be due'
pričetati 'to meet'
priobštiti 'to participate', 'to partake'
primešati se, primesiti se 'to be mixed together',
           'to be joined'
pričiniti 'to fit closely'
prigvozditi 'to nail to'
privezati 'to tie to'
priprešti 'to harness'
privoditi 'to bring to'
pristqpitī 'to come up to', 'to step up to'
pripodobiti se 'to be adapted to'
prisěšti 'to touch'
prizrěti 'to look at', 'to look after'
privyvati 'to arrive'
privrěšti se 'to be thrown'
privyknati 'to become accustomed to'
pridražati se 'to hold closely', 'to join'
prikloniti 'to bow', 'to bend'
prikolesnqti se 'to touch'
prikupiti se 'to be profitable'
prinuditi 'to force', 'to try hard'
priplesti 'to drag in', 'to implicate'
piprěti se 'to deny', 'to be quarrelsome'
pripuštati 'to couple'
piravñniti 'to make equal', 'to make even'
prisvoiti 'to confer', 'to award'
pritqknožti 'to demonstrate', 'to bring forward', 'to strike'
naležati 'to lie on', 'to press on'
napadati 'to fall on', 'to attack'
nadšati se 'to place oneself on', 'to rely on'
zazrěti 'to reproach', 'to scorn'
potqknožti se 'to stumble on', 'to rest against'
oprětí se, 'to support against', 'to strike against'
obesiti se, 'to be hung up'
váležati 'to put into', 'to attach to'
szplesti 'to interlace', 'to weave'
szvákapiti 'to gather together'
dorešti 'to finish speaking'
szravlniti se, 'to be compared to'
szćetati se, 'to be joined together'
udati se, 'to succeed', 'to manage'
ukloniti se, 'to be inclined', 'to be deflected',
'to be turned away'
visěti 'to be hanging'
vezěti 'to tie', 'to bind'
drižati se, 'to join'
eti se, 'to be taken', 'to be seized'
ćetati se, 'to meet'
obştstvovati 'to participate', 'to partake'
krěpiti se, 'to become strong'
retovati se, 'to compete'
sezati 'to touch'.

It must be emphasized once again that, in addition to the dative-locative phonological identity in the singular paradigm, examples of these verbs governing what appears to be a nonprepositional locative construction may occur only once or twice in all of the written documents
that we have available. Under such conditions it is virtually impossible to definitely state that what we have is, indeed, an unbound locative form. Evidence supplied by the verb itself, e.g., semantics and prefixation, must be compared to those reliably attested examples of verbal government with the locative case. This especially holds true when the substantive in question is one for which there is dative-locative identity, or genitive-locative identity.

In Old Russian, the competition from other cases, both semantically and syntactically, was extremely strong for the nonprepositional locative construction as a verbal complement. Grigor'eva (1948) categorizes the occurrence of the unbound locative complement according to its function: as a source of the action (источник деястия), as a direct object, as an object expressing the goal of motion (объект как цель движения), and as a "second" direct object. She further subdivides the first group according to the semantics of the verbs within this group. The first subcategory consists of perceptual or communicative verbs which govern the locative case as a direct object or as an indirect object:

- vpijati 'to exclaim', 'to yell'
- glagolati 'to speak'
- rešči 'to talk'
- vedati 'to know'
povedeti 'to relate', 'to announce', 'to report'
svedetel'stvovati 'to witness'
pomenuti 'to remember', 'to recall'

An example of the use of the nonprepositional locative construction as a verbal complement in this context follows:

105. i v to vreme posla Jaroslav k Glebu, otečnej smerti g(lago)la
'and at that time Jaroslav sent (news) to Gleb and told of his father's death'
(Letopis' Perejasl. Suzd., GR, p. 143)

The second subcategory of this first group of verbs consists of verbs, all of which have the semantic connotation of 'caring for' or 'looking after'. These verbs govern the nonprepositional locative construction as an indirect object:

promyšljati 'to take care of'
peščisja 'to worry about'
pospešestrovati 'to take care of'
vzdrevnovati 'to take care of'
priležati 'to take care of'

We cite the following as an example of the unbound locative complement in this context:

106. na nam tebe ne vziskajuščem no vidimyx six preiležaščem
'for we do not seek you, but care for visible things'
(Slovo o zakone i blagodi Mitropolita Ilariona, c. 1050, FO, p. 19)

Semantic doublets for this function of the locative complement may occur with a prepositional locative
construction, a nonprepositional dative construction, or a nonprepositional instrumental construction:

107. ne pečetesja ni o čem že 'Don't worry about anything.' (Žitie Feodosja, GR, p. 145)

prepositional locative

108. ne pečetesja dušeju vašeju 'Do not worry about your soul.' (Ostromir Gospel, 1056-1057, GR, p. 145)

As a complement which represents the goal of motion or the resulting contact from some motion, the unbound locative occurs with a lexically clearcut group of verbs which indicate some striving toward this goal. Most of these verbs are similar to many of those Old Church Slavonic verbs which also could govern a nonprepositional locative complement:

- prikosnutisja 'to touch'
- prikolesatisja 'to touch'
- prisjazati 'to touch'
- prijatisja 'to take'
- privjazatisja 'to attach', 'to tie'
- pristupiti 'to come up to', 'to step up to'
- pričaščatisja 'to participate in', 'to partake of'
- primesitisja 'to be mixed together', 'to be joined'
- prilepitisja 'to cling to', 'to adhere'
- priležati 'to join'
približatisja, približitisja 'to approach'
prikupitisja 'to be profitable'
prigvaždatisja 'to be nailed to'
pricepititsja 'to be coupled'
prisvoititsja 'to confer', 'to award'
prikladatisja 'to compare to'
priobscatisja 'to participate'
pribežati 'to flee to', 'to take refuge'
pristaviti 'to add', 'to appoint'
pripereti 'to press'
pristajati 'to come up to', 'to anchor'

The following examples illustrate the use of the non-prepositional locative construction as a complement indicating motion or the resulting contact of that motion:

109. nad sima nogāmi krovotočivuju podolce
      ricy prikosnuvšise
      'above these feet having touched the hem
      of the garment'
      (Slovo Kirilla Turovskogo na antipasxu,
      14th century, OB, p. 88)

110. ne smeti im ni približititsja em i ešče
      isdaleča
      'not to dare them nor to approach him
      from afar'
      (Žitie Feodosija, GR, p. 148)

A prepositional dative construction with k, as well as
a nonprepositional dative construction could also function
identically to the locative in this context:
111. Jako ne prikosnutisja emu smert'  
'that death not touch him'  
(Zitie Feodosija, GR, p. 148)  
nonprepositional locative

112. Jako že smeti' im ni približitisja k  
tebе  
'not to dare them nor to approach you'  
(Zitie Feodosija, GR, p. 148)  
prepositional dative

The following Old Russian verbs govern the non-prepositional locative construction as a direct object:

- nadejatisja 'to place oneself on', 'to rely on'
- napadati 'to fall upon', 'to attack'
- naležati 'to lie on', 'to press on'
- oxopitисja 'to be entwined', 'to embrace'
- obrazitisja 'to strike against', 'to shatter on'
- operetisja 'to support', 'to strike against'
- obesitisja 'to be hung up'
- vželati 'to wish for'

Grigor'ева gives the following examples of the locative complement in this context:

113. napadše em, zuby svoimi xapaxu  
'having attacked him they grabbed him  
by their teeth'  
(Zitie Ioanna Bogoslova, GR, p. 150)

114. i oxopivsja em plakašesja gorko  
'and having embraced him he wept bitterly'  
(Zitie Feodosiјa, GR, p. 150)

The final category of the nonprepositional locative construction as a verbal complement is what I have chosen to label the "second direct object." What is meant by this is that when a verb governs two objects, both
of which refer to the same person or object, the first substantive is rendered by the accusative case, the second by the locative case.\textsuperscript{12} The verbs which may govern the nonprepositional locative in this context are:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{jati, pojati} 'to take'
  \item \textit{staviti} 'to place', 'to stand', 'to put', 'to stop'
  \item \textit{privesti} 'to bring'
  \item \textit{veniti} 'to offer for sale'
  \item \textit{imeti} 'to have'
  \item \textit{položiti} 'to lay down', 'to set down'\textsuperscript{13}
\end{itemize}

Grigor'eva cites the following examples:

115. Izjaslav že, stvoriv svadbu, poja ju sebe žene
'Izjaslav, having made a wedding, took her for his wife.'
(Perejaslavskaja-Suzdal'skaja letopis', 1154, GR, p. 151)

116. Zane subo Nason syn Amipadam' sego sestru Elizavefu privede sebe žene.
'Nason, Amipadam's son, brought this one's sister, Elizabeth, as a wife for himself.'
(Georgij Amartol, 14th century, GR, p. 151)

A semantically similar structure could be found with a nonprepositional accusative construction, a prepositional construction with \textit{v} plus the locative case, and, frequently, with a nonprepositional instrumental construction:

117. xoščju ponjati doč tvoju ženoju sebe
'I want to take your daughter as my wife.'
(Novgorođskaja letopis', 13th century, GR, p. 151
nonprepositional instrumental
In summation, with regard to the nonprepositional locative construction as a verbal complement, three points should be noted and/or reemphasized. First of all, although the list of verbs which could govern an unbound locative construction appears to be rather extensive, the actual occurrence of such forms with these verbs may only be evidenced a single time, and this one example may not be a definite attestation of the locative construction. When such a construction does occur it may be phonologically identical with the dative case, so that positive identification of the form as a locative is impossible. Secondly, a significant number of these examples occur with a pronoun as the substantive in the locative case. There was, at the time that these manuscripts were being written, a considerable amount of confusion of pronominal forms, especially between the dative and locative cases in the singular paradigm. In addition, if we consider the unbound locative case as a verbal complement to have been strongly influenced by the Old Church Slavonic texts from which many of the Old Russian documents were copied, it must be remembered that there was a tendency to use enclitic forms of pronouns as verbal complements in nonprepositional constructions. This, perhaps, indicated a practice to couple the verb and the pronoun as a single syntactic structure, so that the copying into Old Russian would have seen a continuation
of this practice as long as the nonprepositional locative construction was still felt to be a part of the living language. Finally, when semantic doublets do occur as verbal complements, it is usually a question of case government, i.e., the verb in question may govern a number of other cases in addition to the locative, rather than a contrast between the nonprepositional locative construction and the prepositional locative construction. This probably reflects a more complex syntactic relationship in the verb-complement unit, as well as a semantic shift in the understanding of verbal government (see Chapter V).

The verbal government of the nonprepositional locative construction is as close as we are able to come to an exclusive use of the unbound locative with respect to the locative case accompanied by a preposition, although semantic doublets with other case constructions do exist. In the complement function of the locative case, the meaning of the verb itself is of prime importance in the final determination of the case of the complement, rather than the need for concrete specification of the complement.
1. Bauer estimates that 6.7% of all locative case constructions signifying temporal relationships in Old Church Slavonic were nonprepositional. Compare this to only .5% of all locative constructions signifying spatial relationships in Old Church Slavonic being nonprepositional (1963: 265).

2. Notice that most of these nouns in modern Russian are associated with the instrumental case in contexts indicating temporal relationships.

3. Although the seasons named in this example and in the one immediately preceding are different (osen' 'autumn' in example 84, and zima 'winter' in example 85), the syntactic construction for both of these sentences is basically identical, though they may slightly differ semantically. In both examples, the season first mentioned is in a prepositional construction with the accusative case, while the second season mentioned is in a nonprepositional locative construction. In example 85, the two time expressions are semantically distinguishable:

'And you, prince, are to go to Rus' for the third winter (i.e., go and stay for the length of the third winter) and in the summer (i.e., at some point in time during the summer) go hunt wild animals.'

However, in example 84, both time expressions are semantically identical with respect to how the time period is delineated, although they differ with respect to case:

'And you, prince, are to go to Rus' in the autumn (i.e., at some point in time during the autumn)... and in the summer (i.e., at some point in time during the summer) go hunt wild animals.'

4. Obnorskij and Barxudarov (1952: 42) claim that this expression has already become completely adverbialized, having the meaning of 'at that time' rather than
the literal meaning of 'at that hour'. This would also apply to the examples immediately preceding, 96 and 97.

5. The expression of time in this example has also definitely become completely adverbialized. It has the meaning of 'in a matter of minutes' or 'immediately' rather than the literal meaning of 'in one hour'.

6. Expressions in modern Russian such as v kakom-to godu 'in some year', and v kotorom času 'at what time' would attest to this. As discussed in Chapter II, in modern Russian there is a limited number of nouns of the first and third declensions which have a unique, "second" locative case desinence, either /-u/ or /-i/, always stressed. The origin of this desinence, as well as the /-u/ desinence for the two time expressions mentioned above, must date back to the ū-stem desinence for the locative case in Old Church Slavonic, /-u/. When the original stem class distinctions were lost, and the o-stem and ū-stem declensions fell together, these time expressions retained what may now be considered a peculiar locative case desinence. This would lead one to assume that these expressions had already become adverbialized, and were not considered to be inflected forms when the two declension classes fell together (an investigation of the list of substantives that admit the second locative desinence shows that these are the only two nouns which designate time in the entire group). Note that in the modern language:

On postupil v universitet v prošlom godu.
'He entered the university last year.'

but

On govoril o prošlom gode.
'He was speaking about last year.'

This analogically follows the pattern that is typical of those nouns which admit a second locative:

On igraet v sadu.
'He is playing in the garden.'

On govoril o sade.
'He was speaking about the garden.'

What is particularly interesting is the grammar of the expression v kotorom času. If we do consider this to be a locative case form, and not simply a fixed expression, then we must contend with the apparent anomaly of the question being posed in the locative case, but the answer being given in the accusative case:

V kotorom času on priexal?
'At what time did he arrive?'
On priexal v čas.
'He arrived at one o'clock.'

This would be the only context in Contemporary Standard Russian where the answer to a question is expressed in a case different from the case in which the question was given.

7. I would not argue that these time expressions do not show some degree of adverbialization; however, I cannot agree that the entire category of nonprepositional locative constructions which indicate temporal relationships had become a group of fixed expressions. If they had become completely adverbialized, it does not seem likely that in modern Russian part of this group would have been replaced by a prepositional locative construction (v kakom-to mesjace 'in some month'), part by a prepositional accusative construction (v kakoj-to den' 'on some day'), and part by a nonprepositional instrumental construction (kakim-to vremenem goda 'in some season', kakoj-to čast'ju dnja 'at some part of the day'). In other words, if the nonprepositional locative forms had already become completely adverbialized, and, consequently, lost their case identity, we would expect that at least some of these expressions would have been maintained in such a form. Obviously there still had to be felt some degree of locativeness, and the nonprepositional locative, as a form which was disappearing functionally in all other contexts, could not be retained in the temporal context either.

8. For this entry, Lunt (Old Church Slavonic Glossary) lists the following possibilities as verbal complements: locative, v + accusative, k + dative, na + accusative, and do + genitive. This illustrates quite well the complexities of verbal government, the semantic ambiguities that were in operation at this time, and the difficulty in positively attesting verbal government for any particular verb.

9. The verb priležati, literally 'to join', has, in this context, lost all of its concrete locational significance. It is used here in the abstract sense of 'to take care of'. The unbound locative has also lost all of its "locativeness" as well, and is used strictly in the abstract sense. This allows for the occurrence of the nonprepositional locative construction in the plural, vidimyx six 'visible things'. The literal meaning of the verb can still be found at this time to be used.
10. Grigor'eva (1948: 150) uses the term *прямой объект*, although the majority of these verbs are reflexive, and, therefore, cannot, strictly speaking, be said to take a direct object.

11. Grigor'eva (1948: 151) refers to this category as *качество прямого объекта его состояние*.

12. Compare the use of the instrumental case as a second direct object in modern Russian:

   Vybrali ego prezidentom.
   'They elected him president.'

13. See the Appendix for the case of the verbal complement which these verbs govern in modern Russian.

14. Bespredložnyj lokativ mog upotrebljat'sja pri glagolax, kotorye uže v svoem leksičeskom značenii zaključali ukazanie na otnošenija... togda, kak predložnyj lokativ v tom slučae, esli konkretnoe mestnoe otnošenie ne opredeljalos' samim glagola...

   (Grigor'eva, 1948: 154)

   'The nonprepositional locative could be used in the presence of verbs which already in their lexical meaning included an indication of the relationship... then as a prepositional locative in such a case if a concrete locative relationship was not defined by the very meaning of the verb...'


Chapter V

The Locative Case as an Exclusively Bound Case in Modern Russian

Up to this point in our work, we have attempted to merely present the locative case as it appeared in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian manuscripts. Throughout the discussion we have either mentioned or simply hinted at possible reasons for its occurrence in a prepositional or nonprepositional construction, for semantic and syntactic doublets, and for the complete disappearance of the nonprepositional form. It is now necessary to investigate more fully the conditions under which the locative case occurred in general in order to attempt to determine the reasons for the ultimate loss of the unbound form.

Because of the relatively late appearance of written materials in any Slavic language, we find ourselves investigating a phenomenon which was close to extinction even in its earliest written manifestation. We have no syntactic or semantic context where the unbound locative construction was used to the complete exclusion of the
bound locative construction or some other case form. Nevertheless, it seems necessary to assume that at some preliterary time the nonprepositional locative construction did have an exclusive function, if only on the assumption that languages tend not to be deliberately redundant.

In Chapter I of our work, we discussed the reconstructed developments and the historical developments relating to the origins of the dative and locative cases, and the phonological ambiguities which arose as a result of this development. We also surveyed the current status of these two cases in the modern Slavic languages in order to gain a synchronic perspective of the dative-locative relationship. In our investigation of the occurrence of the nonprepositional locative construction in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian, we have discussed this structure as one which occurs in three distinct contexts: as an expression of a spatial relationship, as an expression of a temporal relationship, and as a verbal complement. To understand the loss of the unbound locative, it is necessary to discuss in greater detail these three different environments in which the nonprepositional locative construction occurred, and to consider this together with the phonological and semantic information we have already discussed in Chapter I.

As an indicator of a spatial relationship, we have already determined certain factors related to the appearance
of the locative case as either a bound or an unbound form. First, in Old Church Slavonic the unbound locative designating an actual location was relatively rare, while in Old Russian this construction occurred relatively frequently. Second, when this construction did occur, the nonprepositional locative was used more often with proper nouns than with common nouns.

We have already proposed, following Bauer (1963: 265), that the reason for the infrequency of the nonprepositional locative construction in Old Church Slavonic to designate a spatial relationship is that our written Old Church Slavonic documents consist of translations, the majority of which are from original Greek texts. In Ancient Greek, the dative case and locative case as we know them in Slavic were rendered by a single case; the locational relationships were always accompanied by a preposition. Assuming the possibility of using either the prepositional or nonprepositional construction in Slavic, this linguistic characteristic of Greek certainly may be assumed to account for the preponderence of prepositional locative constructions.

When we turn our attention to Old Russian, we have a twofold development. As Toporov (1961: 10-11) points out, we must exercise caution before generalizing about the state of the spoken language with respect to the locative case, as reflected in the written manuscripts.
In the inventory of Old Russian documents we have both materials copied from Old Church Slavonic sources, e.g., religious texts, which may more closely reflect the style and often the syntax of the source language, and original material, e.g., the chronicles, which may be presumed in the majority of cases to be closer in style and syntax to the colloquial language. Nevertheless, even when considering the original Old Russian material, one must remain cognizant of the style and content of each individual document to determine whether the syntax is a reflection of an imitative style rather than a reflection of the colloquial language. By an imitative style, we have in mind that the author of an original document, for example, one dealing with religious matters, might deliberately have chosen to copy the style of the Old Church Slavonic religious documents, which were probably familiar to a scribe at that time. However, unlike Toporov, we believe that it is still valuable to consider both the copied material and the original material. The example of the Ostromir Gospel, example 23 given in Chapter III, illustrates our point quite well. Here we have a situation where we have a copied religious text which has not a single example of a nonprepositional locative construction designating a spatial relationship within the body of the text, yet in the scribe's postscript to the text we have two examples of the nonprepositional construction. It seems
to us that this necessarily points to the nonprepositional locative construction as a viable syntactic structure in the colloquial language, or at least in the dialect of the scribe at this time (the middle of the eleventh century).

In addition to this, the overwhelming use of the locative case in prepositional constructions in such literature is a fairly reliable confirmation that, semantically, both the bound locative and unbound locative forms were fulfilling identical functions at this time, with respect to indicating a spatial relationship. Even a copy must conform to the semantic and syntactic norms of the target language. Of course, the scribe, in attempting to imitate the style of the language of the model manuscript might purposely violate certain rules in his own language. However, the consistent use of the nonprepositional locative construction throughout the early written period of Old Russian tends to point to the existence of this construction in the spoken language as well, even though the use of this form is rather infrequent. The consistency of the usage of the prepositional locative construction throughout documents dealing with a variety of subject matter also tends to point to the overlapping functions of both the bound and unbound locative structures. If, in Old Russian, the unbound locative case fulfilled a specific, exclusive function, we would expect that
this would had to have been reflected in some of the copies, regardless of the syntactical features of the particular context in the original language. In other words, we can thus justify the increase in use of the nonprepositional locative construction in Old Russian over the use of this structure in Old Church Slavonic, just as we can accept the appearance of such a construction, however infrequently, in Old Church Slavonic, where in the source language, Greek, no such construction ever existed.

The degree to which the manuscripts written in Old Church Slavonic, which is a South Slavic language, reflect the spoken language of the South Slavic area can be argued, especially considering the fact that this is a language primarily of religious texts taken from Greek sources. However, comparative evidence (Toporov, 1961) shows that the nonprepositional locative construction existed in each of the three major Slavic language areas (East Slavic, West Slavic, and South Slavic). Although each area reflects particular developments of the locative case in terms of the categories in which the unbound form appeared most often, that this form did exist in the various Slavic languages would indicate that the nonprepositional locative was a Common Slavic construction. That the nonprepositional locative construction does not exist in any modern Slavic language seems to
indicate that the unbound locative form had not only lost its original exclusive function, but also was already beginning to be replaced by the prepositional locative form or some other case form before the dissolution of Common Slavic into the daughter languages.

As a designator of spatial relationships, the locative can be categorized as an adverbal case (Bauer, 1963: 264). This case tends to express concrete relationships in its inherent locational meaning. According to Meillet (1965: 371), "nouns designating place of action, direction, point of origin, etc. are preceded by prepositions, whereas abstract meanings do not require prepositions." In other words, the greater the necessity for specifying the designation of the noun, the greater the necessity for a preposition to further define the direction or location of this noun. The relative lack of abstract meaning for the locative case in general associates this case, more than any other case, with a preposition, at least in the spatial context of the case. This helps to explain the eventual disappearance of the nonprepositional locative construction as an indicator of a spatial relationship; however, we must still deal with the fact that the nonprepositional locative construction did exist in this context.

It is here that the preference of the nonprepositional construction for proper nouns becomes clearer. The proper
noun contains within itself a degree of concreteness which is sufficient to unambiguously carry the designation of the locative case desinence without further definition by an accompanying pronoun. The proper noun refers to a specific location in and of itself, while the locative case desinence indicates the kind of location related to this place, specifically 'in', or 'at'. Other locational relationships that are rendered by the locative, e.g., 'in the vicinity of', must be further defined by a preposition, regardless of whether or not the location is a proper noun place name. The grammar of most of these place names was such that there was no phonological similarity between the dative and locative cases in the singular paradigm, and the places that were most often found in nonprepositional locative constructions were those that were well known and would not tend to cause any semantic confusion: Kiev, Novgorod, Smolensk, Černigov, Polock, T'mutaran', Yvesgorod, Perejaslavl', Turov, Pskov, Kursk, Múrom, Vladimir, Rostov, Luck, Belgorod, Terbovl', Beloozero, Ropsk, Dorogobuž, Debrjansk, Pinsk, Vitebsk, Bužsk, Suzdal', Beloberež'e, and Car'grad (Toporov, 1961: 20).

In dealing with common nouns, a certain degree of specificity could be achieved with the addition of a modifier, especially if that modifier were a possessive derived from a proper noun as in examples 62, 63, and
Of course, in these examples it is still the proper noun which is carrying the semantic load of concreteness.

The common noun without a modifier was found in the nonprepositional locative construction, but it was accompanied by a preposition much more frequently than were proper nouns. In such cases, the meaning of the preposition rather than the noun stem plus locative case desinence carried the necessary meaning to define the exact nature of the locativeness. This is clearly illustrated by a phrase in which a proper noun occurs without a preceding preposition, followed by a common noun governed by a preposition:

118. i sede Kieve na stole
'and he ruled on the throne in Kiev'
(Novgorodskaja letopis', 13th century)

Here there can be no question of postpositional government by the preposition, for the prepositional locative construction with the place name would have had to have been v Kieve; the preposition na can only be governing stol.

That a nonprepositional construction with a common noun existed at all for the locative case is interestingly
dealt with by Mareš (1967: 501) in a general discussion of the relationship between case and preposition:

Originally the ptosis and its aspect were the bearer of meaning, the preposition was nothing more than a complementary appendix; e.g., PS v' garde, pri garde: garde (static aspect of the ptosis lungens = L) + 'in (static) contact with the town', v' = 'inside of' (nearly an adverb), pri = 'close at'. In historical times the center of gravity of the whole meaning was transferred to the preposition. With prepositions taking two (rarely three) cases, the role of the case is nothing more than a kind of lexicalized token of grammatical dependence; e.g., the fact that k" is used with the dative can be explained only from the historical point of view.

Thus, in conclusion, we can state that the obligatory use of a preposition with the locative case to express a spatial relationship probably originated with the common nouns as a result of both a general tendency of the preposition to be the primary bearer of the locational meaning of the locative case, and the semantic necessity to specify the exact relationship of the generally defined common noun. The bound locative case as a feature of proper nouns is more likely a result of the general tendency shown by the common noun to be used with a preposition in the locative case. In fact, if the nonprepositional locative construction did at some time have an exclusive function, and we assume that it did, then we would say that it was most likely the designation of spatial relationships of proper nouns, among other possibilities. Once the preposition became the carrier of the locative
meaning, the prepositional construction was extended analogically to proper nouns as well, so that the non-prepositional locative construction lost its semantic exclusiveness, leading to its eventual disappearance in this context.

In reference to what we have labelled "inherent" case meaning, we have mentioned that there appears to be a temporal aspect as well as a locational aspect. However, the semantics of this temporal aspect seem to be rather arbitrary in terms of case assignment. In modern Russian we have more or less clear cut prepositional and non-prepositional contexts for various time expressions: we have a prepositional accusative construction to designate 'on a particular day' (v kakoj-to den'); a non-prepositional accusative construction to render time spent performing an action (On rabotał na nedelju. 'He worked for a week.'); a prepositional accusative construction to indicate time spent after an action is performed (On priexal v Moskvu na nedelju. 'He arrived in Moscow for a week.'); another prepositional accusative construction to render time spent before an action is performed (On prijdeł v Moskvu čerez nedelju. 'He will come to Moscow in a week.'); and a prepositional accusative construction to render time spent completing an action (On pročital roman za nedelju. 'He read the book in a week.'). In addition to these accusative
time expressions, we have a nonprepositional genitive construction to render some point on a particular date (pervogo maja 'on May 1st'), and a prepositional locative construction to render both 'in a particular month' (v kakom-to mesjace) and 'in a particular year' (v tysjača devjatsot semdesjat vos'mom godu 'in 1978'). To render 'in a particular season', a nonprepositional instrumental construction is used (kakim-to vremenem goda); notice that the time segment covered by 'season' falls within the two time segments rendered by the locative case, months and years. The nonprepositional instrumental also renders parts of the day (kakoj-to čast'ju dnja).

In Old Russian, if we accept Grigor'eva's statement (1948: 139) that the nonprepositional locative construction as a designator of a temporal relationship was in competition not only with its prepositional counterpart, but also with a nonprepositional accusative, a prepositional accusative, a nonprepositional genitive, and a nonprepositional instrumental construction, then we must assume that the temporal meanings of these cases, though once undoubtedly distinguishable, had by the time of these written documents deviated considerably from their original distinctions. The result was that several syntactic structures shared an identical semantic function. Since languages tend to eliminate redundancy or ambiguity, a trend arose which either categorized a particular syntactic
construction with a particular semantic time expression, or altogether eliminated a syntactic structure in a temporal context.

The nonprepositional locative construction as an example of a temporal relationship was the most viable of all the unbound locative constructions in Old Russian, lasting into the seventeenth century in the literary language, as example 100 illustrates:

\[ \text{Včera byl pijan, deneg bylo v mošne mnogo, utre vstal xvatilsja za mošnu, ničega ne syskal} \]

'Yesterday I was drunk, there was a lot of money in my purse; in the morning I arose, my purse was missing, and I did not find anything.'

(Prazdnik kabackix jaryžek, 17th century, LO, p. 242)

That this function of the nonprepositional locative construction lasted so long attests to a greater degree of adverbialization for this particular category than for the other two. This greater degree of adverbialization for this particular aspect of the locative case may be explained, in part, by the narrower lexical composition of the substantives which could possibly be affected by this category of locative usage. The adverbialization of the entire category of temporal relationships required the adverbialization of a finite number of lexical items, while the complete adverbialization of spatial relationships or verbal complements would have required the adverbialization of an entire semantic group, rather than individual lexical items. That the nonprepositional locative
construction as a designator of a temporal relationship eventually did disappear attests to the fact that this function of the locative case never became completely adverbialized, but always retained a certain sense of its locativeness within its identity as a nominal phrase.

During the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries, although the nonprepositional locative construction of time could still be found relatively frequently, the nonprepositional locative construction designating place or a verbal complement had, except for isolated occurrences, completely disappeared. Several trends related to the locative case as a time expression may be observed. Expressions of shorter periods of time appear to have been taken over by accusative case time expressions, while competition between locative and instrumental constructions remains with regard to larger periods of time and parts of the day. In one direction, as a doublet with the nonprepositional instrumental construction, the unbound locative, as a nonprepositional construction, was formally an isolated syntactic structure within the "new limits" of the locative case. That is, there was no longer a corresponding nonprepositional locative construction designating either a spatial relationship or a verbal complement. These latter two functions of the locative case as a nonprepositional form were either replaced by the locative case accompanied by a preposition,
as was the case with most locational expressions, or
other case constructions, as was the case with most of
the locative verbal complements. This is to say that
the nonprepositional locative construction was no longer
a productive form, if, indeed, we can consider this
structure to have been productive at all during the period
of Slavic written documentation.

On the other hand, the nonprepositional instrumental
construction as an expression of a temporal relationship
was just one of a number of possible nonprepositional
instrumental constructions. The nonprepositional instru­
mental was a more acceptable form syntactically than the
nonprepositional locative, the former having analogical
unbound constructions. This instrumental construction
then replaced the locative case in some of the latter's
temporal aspects.

In the other direction, the nonprepositional locative
construction expressing a temporal relationship was
influenced by the trend of the other nonprepositional
locative constructions, and retained only the prepositional
structure to designate a temporal relationship when the
locative case maintained this function. Having retained
whatever degree of locativeness, however slight, the
nonprepositional locative case time expressions eventually
became bound necessarily to a preposition by virtue of
the corresponding developments within the other locative
categories of spatial relationships and verbal complements, whenever the locative case was called for in a temporal context.

In dealing with the locative case as a verbal complement, we eventually move even further away from concrete locative meaning, and must deal with more abstract considerations. Just what is it that determines case government in any particular language? The scope of this work does not allow us to consider the origins of verbal government, but, instead, we must accept the fact that, given certain features of locativeness, certain verbs semantically referred to locative relationships, and the locative case as a verbal complement is taken as a syntactic fact. What we are taking under consideration is the relatively frequent occurrence of such locative complements as nonprepositional constructions in Old Church Slavonic, and their infrequent occurrence and eventual disappearance as evidenced by Old Russian documents.

If we examine the list of verbs given in Chapter IV which at one time governed the locative case without an accompanying preposition, we see that not only is the majority of these verbs prefixed, but most of these prefixes indicate some degree of static contact: pri- 'in the presence of', na- 'upon', v- 'in'. These three prefixes all correspond to prepositions which govern
the locative case. In other words, what we are saying is that these pre-positioned morphemes correspond to the spatial regime of case locativeness, whether this refers simply to the locative case desinence, or to the combination of a post-positioned morpheme, that is, the preposition, and a substantive stem plus locative case desinence. Bauer (1963: 273) claims that verbal government was, at first, exclusively the domain of the non-prepositional case constructions, which is to say that at some preliterary point use of both the preverb and the preposition would have been redundant: the preverb functioned semantically and syntactically (in requiring a certain case complement) identically to the preposition. This, of course, would refer only to when the preverb and preposition had the same meaning. In the case of nonprefixed verbs or verbs with prefixes that were not semantically associated with the locative case, the verbs themselves contained the semantics of joining or addition, i.e., the semantics of locativeness.

The concrete locative meaning of these verbs which governed the locative case, in some instances, changed into a more abstract meaning. Instead of exclusively dealing with the actual contact resulting from some action, an additional connotation of a simple relationship to the action was incorporated within the limits of the locative meaning of the verb-plus-complement unit. Hence,
the verb prikosnutisja not only meant literally 'to touch', but received the additional connotation of 'to touch upon', or 'to deal with'. Other verbs completely lost their semantic locativeness and retained only their metaphorical or secondary abstract meanings: nadejatisja, which originally meant 'to place oneself upon' came to be used only in the sense of 'to hope for' or 'to rely on'. In spite of the semantic changes which these verbs underwent, they, at least initially, continued to maintain their locative case government. However, because the locative meaning of these verbs was weakened, the concrete spatial meaning of the locative complements weakened as well, and tended to refer to more abstract designations. Whereas, as the indicator of a spatial relationship the common nouns tended to be accompanied by a preposition in order to further specify the locational relationship, as a verbal complement the locational relationship was weakening, and there was no need to further delineate any such relationship by means of a preposition. Therefore, in Old Church Slavonic, as long as the nonprepositional construction is still a possible syntactic structure, the unbound locative as a verbal complement is still a viable form.

The reasons for the disappearance of the nonprepositional locative construction as a verbal complement must be sought not only in the complement, but in the
syntax and the semantics of the verb itself. Keeping in mind the phonological similarities of the locative case with both the dative case and the genitive case, the former in the singular paradigm and the latter in the dual paradigm, we turn once again to the tendency to replace the concrete locative meaning, or at least to supplement this meaning with a more abstract sense in line with the changes in the semantics of the verb. As long as the verbal complement retained its concrete locative meaning, focus was at least evenly distributed between the verb and the complement, if not more focused on the complement, the desinence of the complement enhancing the locativeness of the verb. However, with the semantic shift from the concrete to the abstract, attention had to become more focused on the verb rather than on the case of the complement: the abstract meaning is conditioned by the verb, and the case of the complement becomes almost incidental, a purely grammatical manifestation rather than a semantic one as well. The simultaneous trend for the locative case to be accompanied by a preposition, especially when dealing with a common noun, the phonological similarities between the locative case and other case forms, and the shift of focus of attention more exclusively to the verb all combine not so much to replace the nonprepositional locative construction by another construction, either prepositional or
nonprepositional, but more to reinterpret this complement in terms of one of the phonologically identical cases, usually the dative, sometimes the genitive. These two cases were less concrete and more adaptable to abstract contexts than the locative case was. Especially noteworthy in this function is the fact that the change of the nonprepositional locative verbal complement did not simply consist of replacing the unbound locative with a bound locative, but involved a change in the interpretation of the case structure itself. This would also seem to point to the loss of concrete locative meaning in the verbal complement.
1. In his discussion of the nonprepositional locative case, Toporov does not consider any Old Russian material which has been copied from Old Church Slavonic to be valid in discussing the state of this syntactic structure in Old Russian. He also tends to avoid Old Russian religious material in general, stating that the style of such material is imitative of Old Church Slavonic style, and it is impossible to determine to what degree this was reflected in the syntax of the copied document. Thus, he feels that such documents do not provide a reliable indication of the spoken language at this time.

2. Definite information about the dialectical distribution of the nonprepositional locative construction is hardly possible to obtain, since the manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries do not allow us to draw any conclusions about the exact geographical locations of the material. The northern documents tended to retain the unbound locative longer, and the Novgorod and Kiev documents have a more frequent occurrence of the nonprepositional locative construction than do the Galycian-Volhynian and the Smolensk documents (Toporov, 1961: 18).

3. Note the possible ambiguity in Contemporary Standard Russian if a nonprepositional locative construction were permitted:

*On stoit (v) zdanii.
*'He is standing in the building.'

*On stoit (na) zdanii.
*'He is standing on the building.'

No such ambiguity would exist, however, if the nonprepositional locative construction were still permitted with a proper noun:

*On živet Moskve.
*'He lives in Moscow.'

4. See below the discussion of the locative case as a verbal complement for a similar development.

Footnotes
5. As noted in Chapter III, there were certain lexical items within the category of spatial relationships that did become adverbialized, e.g., gore 'above'. However, the inventory of possible substantives to be used in this particular category included pronouns, lexical items that certainly would resist adverbialization. In addition, we must also include in this category proper nouns, which also would hardly have tended to become fixed expressions. Add to this the total number of substantives that could be used in a context of designating a spatial relationship, and the complete adverbialization of this category becomes unrealistic.

6. Just what did determine the use of the nonprepositional instrumental construction in one context, i.e., parts of the day or seasons, and the prepositional locative construction in another, i.e., months and years, seems impossible to determine.
Conclusions

In the modern Slavic languages, we are confronted with the fact that the locative case is the only case which must be accompanied by a preposition at all times. Nevertheless, we have indisputable evidence that a non-prepositional construction did, at one time, exist. We have, therefore, attempted to explain the disappearance of this nonprepositional locative construction. Such a disappearance at first seems to be at odds with the syntax of a highly inflected language, such as Russian: we would expect that there would be some context in which the stem of the substantive plus the locative desinence, without the further modification of a preposition, would function both semantically and syntactically. However, for the locative case this is not so in any modern Slavic language.

The problem which has presented itself at every stage of this investigation is the fact that from the very beginning of our written evidence for the Slavic languages, the nonprepositional locative construction was already a form which was disappearing. The occurrences of this construction are so rare, in relation to the
other syntactic structures that were also functioning in a semantically identical manner, that we have no context where the nonprepositional locative construction occurs to the complete exclusion of some other construction, whether that be a prepositional locative construction, or some other case form. The locative case, in general, occurred in three major contexts: as an indicator of a spatial relationship, as an indicator of a temporal relationship, and as a verbal complement. By observing the trends of the locative case within these three categories, we have tried to construct a reasonable theory as to the disappearance of the nonprepositional locative form.

A major premise of this work, if not always stated throughout, has been that languages tend to avoid ambiguities and redundancies. Hence, our major objective has been to point out the various similarities associated with the nonprepositional locative construction and other syntactic forms, both phonologically and functionally, in each of the three categories of locative usage. By indicating both the phonological and functional redundancies, we feel that we have described possible environments for the replacement of the unbound locative form.

Of the other cases in the singular paradigm, the locative case is most closely related to the dative case in both form and usage. In the modern Slavic languages,
of all the oblique cases the dative and locative cases are the most alike, phonologically speaking, as we have illustrated by our initial survey of these two cases in Chapter II. In Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic, the phonological similarities of these two cases is further amplified not only by the functional overlapping that we may observe, but also by their functional exclusiveness as well. In terms of the category of spatial relationships, we presented examples where the dative case could be functionally substituted for the locative case, for example, to designate the goal of motion (examples 41-45 in Chapter III). In terms of the category of verbal complements, the examples in Old Russian are rare, but, when they do occur, the substantive is often one of the second or third declension, the declensions in which there exists dative-locative syncretism in the singular paradigm. Therefore, outside of using the information contained in the verb itself, especially in the verbal prefix, it is usually impossible to determine for sure if the complement is in the dative case or in the locative case.

In terms of the category of temporal relationships, the dative singular is the only one of the oblique cases in the singular paradigm in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian that does not have a nonprepositional construction to designate a particular time relationship. In discussing inherent case meaning, we concluded that it was necessary
to include a temporal aspect as well. That the dative case lacks this temporal aspect in a nonprepositional construction, coupled with the similarities that this case shares with the locative points to a very close relationship, if not a common origin, between these two cases. When we investigated the historical origins of these two cases, this relationship proved to be even tighter, strengthening the hypothesis that the dative and locative cases originated from a single parent case, and that these two cases remained more closely associated than the locative case might have been with any other case for a longer period of time.

Although the locative case appears to be most closely related to the dative case, there is certainly evidence that there is an obvious locative-genitive relationship. This is functionally represented by the number of verbs that formerly governed a nonprepositional locative complement, but now govern a genitive complement (see the Appendix), and phonologically represented by the shared desinence in the dual paradigm. To a lesser extent we can observe a locative-instrumental relationship, which is illustrated by the fact of the functional assumption of some of the temporal aspects of the former nonprepositional locative. A locative-accusative relationship is illustrated by the fact that, historically, both cases could be used to indicate the goal of motion. All of
these intercase relationships have led us to hypothesize a possible common origin for all the oblique case functions, with the dative-locative functions remaining common after the other cases had split away from this common case origin. Only later did the dative and locative cases split from each other.

Of necessity, the designation of a spatial relationship had to be a specific one; the less concrete the noun, the greater the necessity to further modify the locational relationship by means of a preposition. At the other extreme, the function which was most removed from the locational aspect of the locative case was the temporal aspect. This category of the nonprepositional locative construction remained an isolated function and unaffected longer from the trend to always use the locative case with a preposition. Nevertheless, by virtue of the fact that it was still a locative function, this temporal aspect of the locative case eventually did conform to this trend, and this resulted in the elimination of the nonprepositional locative construction as a designator of a temporal relationship as well.

As a verbal complement, the nonprepositional locative construction falls semantically between the spatial relationship and the temporal relationship in terms of locativeness. We had to consider the relationship between the verb and the governed case in order to determine
the factors which led to the replacement of the non-prepositional locative construction with other syntactic forms. The semantic shift within the verb-complement unit from the complement to the verb itself eventually reduced the locativeness of the entire unit, so that the trend of exclusive prepositional usage as a locative trait did not so much affect this function directly, as much as cause a reorientation of case usage, specifically, a reinterpretation of case government with these particular verbs.

We have tried to show that it was not simply the nonprepositional construction, per se, as a syntactic structure that was lost, but that the disappearance of this form was the result of functional ambiguities evolving both independently and interdependently within each functional category of the locative case, coupled with the overall phonological similarity of the locative case with the dative and genitive cases that resulted in the locative case being the only case in modern Russian, and, for that matter, in all the modern Slavic languages, which must at all times be accompanied by a preposition.

A question which then arises is where this tendency for the locative case to be used with prepositions at all times may lead in modern Russian. We have seen that in Serbo-Croatian the locative case and dative case may basically be considered to be a single case; we have also
noted a similar tendency in Slovenian. However, beyond the obvious phonological identity between the dative and locative cases in the singular paradigm in all Slavic languages in the second and third declension, and in the first declension of some Slavic languages, there is a more subtle functional identity that must be noted. This concerns the oblique cases in modern Russian. If we consider the prepositional instrumental constructions, we find that those prepositions which govern this case, with the exception of s 'with', all refer to location: za 'behind', 'beyond'; pered 'in front of'; nad 'above'; pod 'under'; and među 'between'. There does not appear to be any specific characteristics of these locational relationships that should lead to their governing the instrumental case, as opposed to v 'in'; na 'upon'; or pri 'in the vicinity of' governing the locative case. That is, there does not seem to be anything implicit in the first group of prepositions that would require instrumental government instead of locative government. This is further substantiated by the fact that the corresponding case of the goal of motion defined by both sets of prepositions is rendered by the accusative case:

119. Kniga ležit na stole.
    'The book is on the table.'
    prepositional case

120. Ja položil knigu na stol.
    'I put the book on the table.'
    accusative case
If we examine the genitive case, and the prepositions which govern it, we see that several of these prepositions refer to location or motion: у 'by'; около 'near'; из 'from'; от 'from'; с 'from', and others. In fact, in terms of these prepositions, we can say that there is nothing inherent in "genitiveness" that, from a synchronic viewpoint, influences this particular case government.

Since the locative case has, for all practical purposes, become a fixed prepositional construction, we would propose that this structure will eventually lose its "sense" of case construction. In addition, we feel that all prepositional constructions that refer to location will, as a result of this, eventually fall under a single "case" government, while all prepositional constructions that refer to the goal of motion will do likewise. In fact, what we foresee is almost a complete return to the original LOCATIVE case that we reconstructed in Chapter I: this LOCATIVE originally split into what we have come to consider the various oblique case functions. All the oblique cases existed as nonprepositional constructions which illustrated their inherent meanings, as well as prepositional constructions that either defined the case function further or
served in more abstract contexts. Because of the characteristics of the locative construction, this case eventually became syntactically bound to a preposition, while, at the same time, several of its functions were assumed by other case constructions. Because of its phonological similarities with other cases, and because the locative case has become a fixed prepositional form, we can foresee an eventual Location versus Motion case dichotomy replacing the current system. This is not to say that the inflectional system will reduce to a Nominative-Accusative-Locational-Motion system, since the basic meaning of a case such as the instrumental cannot be reduced to any one of these four categories. However, we do see such a system as a more logical simplification of the current one.
Appendix

The following is a list of verbs in modern Russian which formerly governed the nonprepositional locative case, and the current verbal government in the contemporary language. Not all of the verbs in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian which governed the locative case now exist in the modern language; our list has been taken from the Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka, published in 1955 by the Akademija nauk SSSR:

kasat'sja, kosnut'sja: genitive

prikasat'sja, prikosnut'sja: k + dative

prilepljat'sja, prilepit'sja: k + dative

prikładyvat', priložit': accusative; k + dative

prikładyvat'sja, priložitsja: k + dative

prilagat', priložit': accusative; k + dative

prileżat': k + dative

prilagat'sja, priložit'sja: k + dative

pristavat', pristat': k + dative

prisedat': na + locative

pristavljet' pristavit': k + dative

prikłjučat'sja, priključit'sja: s + instrumental; dative
pripadat', pripast': na + accusative; k + dative
približat'sja, priblizit'sja: k + dative
pričitat', pričest': accusative; k + dative
pričitat'sja, pričest'sja: k + dative
priobščat', priobščit': accusative; k + dative
primešivat'sja, primešat'sja: k + dative;
v + accusative
pričinjat', pričinit': accusative
prigvoždat', prigvozdit': k + dative
privjazyvat', privjazat': k + dative
priprjagat', pripjac': accusative
privodit', privesti: v + accusative, na + accusative, k + dative
pristupat', pristupit': k + dative
prizrevat', prizret': accusative
pribyvat', pribyt': v + locative/accusative, na + locative/accusative, k + dative, u + genitive
privykat', privyknut': k + dative
priderživat'sja, prideržat'sja: genitive
priklonjat', priklonit': accusative
prinuždat', prinudit': accusative; k + dative
pripletat', priplesti: accusative
priravnivat', priravnjat': accusative; k + dative
prisvaivat', prisvoit': accusative; dative
pritykat', pritknut': accusative
pričaščat'sja, pričastit'sja: dative
pricepljat'sja, pricepit'sja: k + dative
pribežat': na + accusative; v + accusative;
 k + dative
pripirat', priperet': accusative; k + dative
naležat': accusative
napađat', napast': na + accusative
nadejat'sja: na + accusative
potykat'sja: o + accusative
spletat', splesti: accusative
sovokupljet', sovokupit': accusative; s + instrumental; v + accusative
sravnivat'sja, sravnit'sja: s + instrumental; v + locative
sočetat'sja: s + instrumental
uklonjat'sja, uklonit'sja: ot + genitive
viset': various prepositions plus locative or instrumental
vjazat', svjazat': accusative
deržat'sja: za + accusative; na + locative; genitive
vopijat', vopit': accusative
vedat': accusative; instrumental
povedat': accusative; dative
svidetel'stvovat': o + locative
pominat', pomjanut': accusative
promyšljat': instrumental
peč'sja: o + locative
pospešestvovat': dative
opirat'sja, operet'sja: na + accusative
stavit', postavit': na + accusative; v + accusative
imet': accusative
klast', položit': na + accusative; v + accusative
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