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The following abbreviations appear in the text or in glosses. For abbreviations of primary source document titles, see Appendix A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1p., 2p.</td>
<td>first person, second person, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>accusative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv.</td>
<td>adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aor.</td>
<td>aorist tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contr. conj.</td>
<td>contrastive conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dem.</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emph.</td>
<td>emphatic particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fut.</td>
<td>future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>genitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.</td>
<td>imperfect tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inf.</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inst.</td>
<td>instrumental case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg.</td>
<td>negative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Old Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Prepositionless Case Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poss.</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres.</td>
<td>present tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pron.</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refl.</td>
<td>reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
<td>singular number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.o.</td>
<td>someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.t.</td>
<td>something</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

When reading Old Russian texts, one of the first things we notice is that prepositions seem to be left out now and again, compared to what we would expect from our knowledge of Modern Russian. The more widely spread use of these so-called “prepositionless case constructions” (PCCs, known in Russian as bespredložnye konstrukcii\(^1\)) is a key characteristic of Old Russian. Although the distribution of PCCs and PPs (prepositional phrases) even in the earliest manuscripts might suggest haphazardness at first glance, it quickly becomes apparent that there were in fact patterns of usage. The complicated part, of course, is that these patterns changed over time, giving us a ‘moving target’.

But once we observe these patterns and see how they changed over the centuries, we can try to explain them. And through our analysis, we realize that the change from PCCs to PPs has far-flung ramifications, especially regarding the relationship of PPs to PCCs and the nature of case assignment. And finally, based on our knowledge and understanding of the past, we can try to predict what will happen in the future.

Procedure

But before we begin, a few words must be said about procedure. I started by reading through selected Old Russian texts to find what the system of PCCs

---

\(^1\)In general, I have followed traditional methods of transcription of the Russian. ‘j’ represents a high front glide (like ‘y’ in English ‘you’); ‘y’ is the high mid vowel [i]; ‘c’ is [ts] (as in the English ‘tsar’); ‘s’ and ‘x’ are fricatives; ‘ć’ is an affricate (diacritics are placed beneath capital letters for purely typographical reasons: Ç); ‘e’ is the diphthong [je]; ‘ë’ is a closed ‘e’; single apostrophes after consonants (as in kn’az) indicate that the consonant is ‘soft’ or palatalized; double apostrophes indicate the hardness of the preceding consonant (in Old Russian, these hard and soft signs represented the short vowels o and e); in examples of Old Church Slavic, o and e are nasalized vowels. In transcribing names of authors and books, however, I use a more Anglicized method, such as ‘ch’ instead of ‘ć’.
was like in the earliest stages of the Russian language, and then read later texts to see how this structure changed over time and across the genres.

The biggest limitation in this project is, as always, time. I simply did not have the time to read all of Old, Middle, and Modern Russian texts, obviously. I had to be satisfied with what I hope is a representative sampling of texts, with a number from each genre and each time period.

But here we run into a more subtle limitation: we, being creatures of the Information Age, are used to texts being more or less "monolithic" entities, i.e. set things that do not change, or they do, they have neat prefatory notes to the second and third editions explaining the changes. But in pre-Gutenberg times, when scribes laboriously copied out manuscripts, it was entirely commonplace to have a number of different versions of the same text, many written in times and places far removed from the original and with great liberties taken in not copying but rewriting the text. This makes it very difficult to say what the language of the 'original' author was, although at times it allows for some insightful comparisons of the language of the various copiers. And also, ancient texts are often ill-preserved and in places, illegible. Thus, there is often disagreement among editors, and we end up not knowing who to believe, unless we go back to the originals and try to make our own conclusions. For example, the Stender-Petersen version of *Povest' vremennyx let* has the following sentence:

(1) Ide Oleg" na Greky, Igorja *ostavi* "Kievě.

'Oleg went to the Greeks, [and] left Igor in Kiev.'

The Dmitriev version, however, has the following:

(2) Ide Oleg" na Greky, Igorja *ostaviv"* Kievě.

'Oleg went to the Greeks, having left Igor in Kiev.'

---

2For example, see Toporov, 14, or Obnorskij, 116.
The reading of "v" is crucial, as in (1) it is interpreted as a preposition, while in (2) it is the ending for the past tense verbal adverb, leaving Kiyev as a PCC.

Again, I am limited by time and materials. Not only do Russian Philologists like Obnorskij and Toporov have more practice reading the original documents, but they also have access, it seems, to the whole of Old Russian literature, and therefore have more sources to collect unambiguous data from. I am not terribly limited in finding trends, because trends should be more or less present in all the texts. But when it comes to finding, for example, archaic uses of PCCs in early modern Russian, I must step aside to my Russian colleagues and use their examples.

In general, for primary sources I read copies of the Old and Middle Russian texts, published in typeface form. I resorted to analyzing copies of the original manuscripts mostly only when there was a dispute in transcription between the published editions. Also, for example, when reading Povest' vremennyx let, I looked at the manuscript to see whether the apparent change in style on pages 31-33 in the Kozhin anthology corresponded to a change in handwriting (and was therefore written by a different scribe, who possibly came from a different linguistic background or copied from an earlier version).

The Prepositionless Case Constructions in Old Russian

PCCs are usually considered to be phrases (such as noun or quantifier phrases) in which the declinable word or words are used without a preposition, but declined in a particular case, to denote circumstances of either space or time (obstoyatel'stvo prostranstva or obstoyatel'stvo vremeni). But there are a

\[3\] Some examples circumstances of space and time in English are "through the door", "for three hours", and "in Moscow".
number of other constructions with actual arguments of the verb\textsuperscript{4} which underwent the transition from PCC to PP. For example, as we will see later, although indirect objects were expressed by a dative PCC in Old Russian and still is today in Standard Modern Russian, in Non-standard Middle Russian it could be expressed by the PP $k+dative$. Under this definition, the nominative subject is also a PCC, even though it never was used with a preposition.\textsuperscript{5} In listing the PCCs in Old Russian we will list all the PCCs, but focus on those that somehow changed in usage since Old Russian times. Since some PCCs never changed to PPs, we can to some extent set them aside in the discussion of those that changed. Thus, when we say that a certain text "had almost no PCCs", we are not referring to those PCCs which never changed, such as the nominative subject and most accusative subjects, nor to those PCCs which were only rarely replaced by PPs, such as the dative indirect object.

I mostly ignored the PCCs of circumstances of time (other than noting what phrases were possible), in part because time phrases are largely derivatives of spatial expressions. This is a natural process of metaphoric extension from concrete to abstract, as in from ‘in the room’ to ‘in the year 1434’. The other reason for my avoidance of time expressions is that in Old Russian, the patterns of case usage with time expressions were not very consistent, and usage in Modern Russian has become even more arbitrary (expressions of periods of time less than a week take the accusative, while periods longer than a week take the prepositional case, for example).

The following is a classification of the PCCs used in Old Russian (with the exception of the “trivial” constructions like the nominative subject, for reasons

\textsuperscript{4}Arguments of verbs include things like “I went to the store”, “He saw me”, and “She gave Aradhana a carrot.”

\textsuperscript{5}It is essential, in fact, to take note not only of what constructions changed, but also what did not change, and why. If we do not call the nominative subject a PCC, we do not allow ourselves to question why it did not change.
described above), grouped by case and followed by examples. Descriptions of usage, historical change, and analysis will follow in later sections.

The Nominative (iminitel’nyj padež)

The nominative was the archetypal means of expressing the subject (i.e., the subject with direct, non impersonal verbs; see the dative below for an explanation of these other ‘subjects’). It was also used for nominal predicates:

(3) Derevl’ane že radi byvše. (P. vr. 1.)
    villager-[nom. pl.] [emph.] happy-[nom. pl.] be-[3p. pl. impf.]
    ‘The villagers were happy.’

The Genitive (roditeľnyj padež)

One construction with the genitive was the genitive of attainment (roditeľnyj dostižatel’nyj):

(4) Kn’az’ vysoka stola dobud’et’. (Mol. D. Z.)
    prince-[nom. sg.] high-[gen. sg.] throne-[gen. sg.] to-be-[3p. sg. fut.]
    ‘The prince will reach a high throne’

(5) Doslužits’a bol’šej raboty (P. Russ.)
    to-serve-[3p. sg. fut.] big-[gen. sg.] work-[gen. sg.]
    ‘He will be worthy of great work.’

(6) Igor’ že, došed’ Dunaja, sozva družinu. (P. vr. 1.)
    Igor’-[nom. sg.] [emph.] to-go-[verbal adv. past] Dunaj-[gen. sg.]
    together-call-[3p. sg. aor.] company-[acc. sg.]
    ‘Igor’, having reached the Dunaj (river) called together his company.’

---

6Where possible and relevant, I will divide verbs into prefix, root, and suffixes, to more clearly convey the nature of the verb. Thus pereiti would be ‘across-go-[inf.] in the word-for-word translation, but probably appear as ‘to cross’ in the full sentence translation. The prefix do, however, is difficult to translate with one word in English. It means something like ‘up to’ or ‘until’, but I shall use the (hopefully) least misleading one word equivalent, ‘to’ hereafter. In the gloss, I give just the relevant morphological information. I could list ‘high-[adj. compar. masc. gen. sg.]’ and ‘to-be-[vb. indic. 3p. sg. simple fut.]’, but that would be excessive.
This construction was used to denote the attainment of some goal or the arrival at some place, and therefore called the *genitive of boundary* (roditelnýj padež predela) by some (Stestenko 1972, 95).

Another genitive construction was the *genitive of avoidance* (roditelnýj otložitelnýj):

(7) Starejšiny že grada iz"nima. (P. vr. l.)
   Elder-[acc. pl.] [emph.] city-[gen. sg.] out-take-[3p. sg. aor].
   ‘He took the elders out of the city’

(8) Izbyti grexov svoix (P. vr. l.)
   out-be-[inf.] sin-[gen. pl.] [reflexive possessive]-[gen. pl.]
   ‘to be free of one’s sins’

(9) No bojus’a poxulenija tvoego. (Mol. D. Z.)
   ‘But I fear your criticism.’

(10) Deti begajut uroda, a gospod’ p’anogo čeloveka. (Mol. D. Z.)
    children-[nom. pl.] run-[3p. pl. pres.] monster-[gen. sg.]
    [contrastive conj.] god-[nom. sg.] drunk-[gen. sg.] person-[gen. sg.]
    ‘Children run from a monster, whereas god runs from a drunk person.’

This construction denoted an object of fear and avoidance, or an object or person away from which an action was directed.

The final genitive construction7 denoting circumstances of space is the *partitive genitive*, in a broad sense:

(11) I sego svyaščeno go nyně priimayušče xľeba, tako vkušaem”,
    jako že i oni xľeba nebesnogo. (Sl. na Ant.)

---

7Stetsenko also mentions the genitive of goal (roditelnýj padež so snacheniem tseli), but it is only used with the supine, as in ‘I posla Yaropolk iskat’ brata’ (and Yaropolk sent [them] to seek [his] brother). Jakobson uses ‘genitive of goal’ for what I call ‘genitive of attainment’.

‘And receiving now this holy bread, thus we partake as they did of the heavenly bread.’

(12) Çto radi boyats’a ego, egože se nosit” na sobe kresta? (P. vr. 1.)


‘Why fear one who carries a cross on himself?’

(13) A xto moix” boyar” imet” slużyti moej kn’agyne... (Dux. gr. 1389)


‘But which of my nobles can serve my princess?’

Stetsenko, however, does not mention constructions like (11), the strictly partive genitive. He is most likely biased by the fact that in Modern Russian we still use a PCC for the partitive, and therefore takes its presence in Old Russian as a given. He calls (12) roditelnyj nepolnogo ob”ekta (genitive of incomplete object) and (13) čast’ celogo (part of a whole). These distinctions between part of a mass noun, part of a count noun, and part of a whole or group, however, obscure the concept of partitiveness common to all three.

The genitive of time denoted a period of time not fully occupied by an event. That is, the action occurred at some point within the period of time denoted by the genitive, but not during all of it. It was used with names of seasons, months, days, and parts of the day (Stetsenko 1972, 94). For example:

(14) Počax” že pisati mesaca oktabr’a. (P. Vl. Mon.)

begin-[1p. sg. aor.] [emph.] write-[inf.] month-[gen. sg.]

October-[gen. sg.]

‘I began to write in October.’

8Note that ego is a genitive of avoidance.
(15) I bežaša na Sulu toe noči. (P. Vl. Mon.)
    and run-[3p. pl. aor.] to Sula-[acc. sg.] that-[gen. sg.] night-[gen. sg.]
    ‘And they ran to Sula that night.’

The Dative (datelnyj padež)

The most common dative PCC showing circumstances of space was the dative of direction:

(16) I prišed Tmutorokan’u (P. vr. 1.)
    and come-[verbal adv. past] Tmutorokan’-[dat. sg.]
    ‘and having come to Tmutorokan’

(17) A mene posla Smolen’sku. (P. V. Mon.)
    ‘But he sent me to Smolensk’

(18) A sam ide Kur’sku. (P. V. Mon.)
    ‘But he himself went to Kur’sk.

This construction was used primarily with names of cities toward which an action was directed, either with or without entry. One could often determine whether or not the action included entry into the city from the context. Stetsenko presents the following examples, in which the first implies lack of entry and the second implies entry:

(19) I pride Volodimer” Kievu c” voi mnogi, i ne može Jaropolk”
    stati protivu i zatvoris’a Kiev. (P. vr. 1.)
    ‘Vladimer came to Kiev with large armies, and Jaropolk could not stand against him and shut himself in Kiev.

(20) Az” m’stila uže obidu muža svoego, kogda pridoša Kievu. (P. vr. 1.)
    ‘I had already avenged the insult to my husband, when I came to Kiev.

The dative of direction could also be used with people:
(21) Ta idox Perslav'ju otc'u. (P. V. Mon.)
then go-[fp. sg. aor.] Perslav'-[dat. sg.] father-[dat. sg.]
'Then I went to father Pereslavl.'

(22) Prixidixom kn'agine. (P. vr. l.)
come-[fp. pl. aor.] princess-[dat. sg.]
'We came to [see] the princess.'

Another dative PCC was the dative of possession:

(23) ovca i voly toržennikom" (O. ev.)
sheep-[nom. pl.] and bull-[nom. pl.] merchant-[dat. pl.]
'the merchant's sheep and bulls'

There were, however, also a number of dative PCCs indicating arguments of the verb. Most obviously, the dative was used for indirect objects:

(24) Çego xoščeši, damy ti. (P. vr. l.)
'We will give you whatever you want.

There were also dative objects of 'verbs of indirect action'. As opposed to verbs of direct action, like 'to love', 'to kill', and 'to throw', these verbs of indirect action do not directly affect their object or are not directly oriented at the object:

(25) I semu čudu divuems'a. (P. VI. Mon.)
and this-[dat. sg.] wonder-[dat. sg.] marvel-[1p. pl. pres.]
'And we marvel at this wonder.'

(26) a serdcem smeyut mi s'a (Mol. D. Z.)
[refl.]
'but in their hearts they are laughing at me'

The dative object is an oblique one, not directly affected by the action but still a participant in it.
In addition to indirect sorts of objects, there were indirect sorts of subjects, such as the 'logical' subject of indirect verbs (similar to the English 'methinks' or the Spanish 'me gusta'):

(27) L'ubo komuždo slušati ix. (P. vr. l.)
pleasing each-[dat.] listen-[inf.] [3p. pl. acc.]
'Everyone liked to listen to them.'

The other 'indirect' subject was the subject of impersonal constructions, most often with an infinitive:

(28) Ot čego mi est' umreti? (P. vr. l.)
from what-[gen.] [1p. sg. dat.] be-[3p. sg. pres.] die-[inf.]
'What am I going to die from?'

(29) Tomu platiti nemčinou. (Dog. gr.)
[dem. pron.]-[dat. sg.] pay-[inf.] invalid-[dat. sg.]
'That one shall pay the injured person.'

And finally, there is the dative of involved person (or the ethical dative, to use Jakobson's term). Stetsenko applies Shaxmatov's term of datelnýj zainteresovanogo lica (dative of the interested person) to sentences like (25) and (26), saying that the dative denotes "a person, in the interests of whom the verbal action was completed." (1974, 97) It is particularly doubtful, however, that (25) is showing that one is dying for one's own selfish interests. Only one sentence cited by Stetsenko deserves distinction as a separate use of the dative:

(30) Otec' ti umerl", a Sv'atopolk" sedit" ti Kyеve. (P. vr. l.)
'Your father died, and Svjatopolk is taking your place in Kiev.'

Note that the first ti is a dative of possession, and Kyеve is a locative PCC. I had to take liberties with the translation to show that the dative of involved person indicates that Svjatopolk's action of sitting (or, more loosely, staying) in Kiev
indirectly affects the addressee (whose right to the throne was being usurped by his brother Svjatopolk).

In spite of the apparent multitude of different meanings and usages of the dative PCCs, we must keep in mind that they share a common thread, that of the basic meaning of the dative. The purpose of this paper is not to derive the basic meanings of each case, as Jakobson did so thoroughly for Modern Russian, but later on, we will highlight a few qualitative changes in the basic case meaning that affected the usage of PCCs.

The Accusative (vinitělnỳj padež)

The most common accusative PCC was the accusative of direct object. It denoted an object directly affected by an action:

(31) I razbiša mnogy polaty, i pozgoša cerkvi. (P. vr. 1.)
and apart-hit-[3p. pl. aor.] many palace-[acc. pl.] and burn-[3p. pl. aor.] church-[acc. pl.]
'And they wrecked many palaces, and burned churches.'

Stetsenko differentiates between two meanings of the accusative of direction, that of "space occupied by an action" (as in prebroditis'a Dnepr 'to ford the Dnieper'), and of "a place, into or at which an action is directed" (1974, 99):

(32) Gleb' že vnide Černigov'. (P. vr. 1.)
'Gleb went into Černigov.'

There was also the accusative of time. As Stetsenko shows, it was used to denote periods of time both completely and uncompletely occupied by the action, the latter meaning being the same as the genitive of time. Stetsenko gives the following examples:
In the first example, the activity occupies the whole period of time, while in the second it does not (Stetsenko 1974, 98).

The Instrumental (tvoritelnyj padež)

The instrumental of means was widely used to denote means by which an action was done, usually used with inanimate nouns:

(35) Aže kto kogo udarit' batogom', l'ubo żerd'ju, l'ubo p'ast'ju, ili čašěju, ili rogom, ili tylesniju, to 12 griven". (Rus. Pr.)

If who-[nom.] who-[acc.] hit-[3p. sg. pres.] whip-[inst. sg.] or pole-[inst. sg.] or palm-[inst. sg.] or cup-[inst. sg.] or horn-[inst. sg.] or butt-[inst. sg.] then 12 grivna-[gen. pl.]

'If someone hits someone else with a whip, a pole, the palm of one's hand, a cup, a horn, or the butt of a weapon, then [they must pay] 12 grivnas.'

Animate 'instruments' are also possible:

(36) Rusinu ne upirati Latinina ognem' poslumom' (Dog. gr.)

Russian-[dat. sg.] not accuse-[inf.] Latin-[acc. sg.] one-[inst. sg.]

witness-[inst. sg.]

'A Russian shall not accuse a Latin, having just one witness.'

There is a slight difference in usage between the strict instrumental of means of an animate noun and the instrumental of agent (as in the English sentence 'This was done by John.'), but it is not important for our purposes.

---

9The grivna was a monetary unit in Old Russia.

10The instrumental would be translated more literally as "with [or by means of] one witness." Note that this sentence has an impersonal construction with a dative subject.
Another instrumental PCC was the *instrumental of space*. Although it is called the *instrumental of confinement of space* (tvoritelnyj ograničenija prostranstva) by some such as Sobinnikova, it seems most closely parallel to a spatial sense of the instrumental of means.

(37) *vojti voroty* (P. vr. l.)
    in-go-[inf.] gates-[inst. pl.]
    ‘to enter through the gates’

(38) *igti dlinnym put’m’* (P. V. Mon.)
    go-[inf.] long-[inst. sg.] road-[inst. sg.]
    ‘to go by a long road’

The instrumental of space showed the path or segment of space in which an action was completed. This is not to say that it was equivalent to the use of the prepositional, which showed the location of an action as well, as we shall see below. The instrumental of space can be thought of as answering the questions ‘how’ and ‘where’ were the action done, retaining the sense of ‘spatial means’. Thus (37) can be an answer to all of ‘How does one enter?’, ‘Where does one enter?’, and ‘By what means does one enter?’

As with the accusative, the instrumental could be used to show time both completely and incompletely occupied by an action, as in the following two examples, respectively:

(39) *I tr’mi g’n’mi vozdvignu ju.* (O. Ev.)
    and three-[instr. pl.] day-[instr. pl.] up-move-[3p. pl. impf.] [3p. sg. acc.]
    ‘And for three days they raised [the church]’

(40) *Sv’atopolk že pride nočiju Vyšegorodu.* (P. vr. l.)
    Sv’atopolk-[nom. sg.] [emph.] come-[3p. sg. aor.] night-[instr. sg.]
    Vyšegorod-[dat. sg.]
    ‘Sv’atopolk came to Vyšegorod at night.’
The Locative (mestnyj or predložnyj padež)\(^{11}\)

The chief use of the locative case as a PCC was, eponymously, the locative. Usually formed from names of cities, it was used to show the place of an event.

(41) M’stislavu sušču Tmutorokani
Mstislav-[dat. sg.] be-[past. part. dat. sg.] Tmutorokan’-[prep. sg.]\(^{12}\)
‘While Mstislav was in Tmutorokan’

(42) I zatvoris’a Kieve s l’ud’mi svoimi
and shut-[3p. sg. aor. refl.] Kiev-[prep. sg.] with people-[inst. pl.]
[refl. poss.]-[inst. pl.]
‘And he shut himself in Kiev with his people.’

There was also a temporal meaning of the prepositional, which was apparently the same as the genitive, denoting a period of time not fully occupied by the action (Stetsenko 1974, 102), as in:

(43) To i paky xodixom, toм že lete,... bit’’s’a Černigovu s Borisom’
(P. vr. 1.)
then and then go-[1p. pl. aor.] that-[prep. sg.] [emph.] year-
[prep. sg.] fight-[supine]\(^{13}\) Černigov-[dat. sg.] with Boris-[instr. sg.]
‘And then, that very year, we went to Černigov to fight with Boris.’

Toporov finds traces of a fascinating, seemingly oxymoronic construction, the locative of direction. He gives the following examples (1961, 25 and 34):

(44) èxati Kievé
‘to go to Kiev’

---

\(^{11}\)In Modern Russian this case is usually referred to as the “prepositional”, because it is used only with prepositions. As we will see, this is not the case with Old Russian, so it makes more sense to refer to it by its chief particular meaning, the locative.

\(^{12}\)This is an example of the independent dative (datel’nyi samostatel’nyi) construction, in which both the subject and participial form of the verb were in the dative. It could be used both as an independent sentence and as a subordinate clause of time.

\(^{13}\)The supine, characterized by a hard sign (‘) instead of the infinitive’s soft sign (’), was used with verbs of motion to denote the goal of movement.
(45) približit’sa em’
   ‘to approach him’

(46) kosnut’sa em’
   ‘to touch him’

(47) nadejat’sa kom’
   ‘to have faith in s.o.’

All four use the locative PCC in a non-locational sense: the first clearly shows
direction; the second through fourth show a combination of directionality and an
oblique object. (45) is very directional, (47) is an oblique object, and (46) is
somewhere in between. We should not let the gloss confuse us: although the
English shows a direct object, the Russian verbs are reflexive, having the s’a
ending, and thus can only have an oblique object. We could think of (46) as ‘to
touch oneself to him,’ which embodies both directional and oblique object senses.

**Historical Changes in PCCs**

Unfortunately, most historical grammars of Russian stop at describing the
PCCs, showing simply that they existed at some time but no longer do. In this
section, we will try to answer the questions what changes occurred in the history
of Russian and when, so we will be better prepared to explain why they
happened.

My initial hypothesis was that the shift from PCCs to PPs would act at
different paces in the different strata of society, and therefore in the different
genres of literature. That is, I hoped to find that texts primarily of church origin,
being based on or highly influenced by the traditionality and conservatism of
Old Church Slavic, would most strongly resist the transition from PCCs to PPs.
Texts in the tradition of Russian literature, however, would have been more open
to change, but not as quickly changing as business and trade documents, which are naturally closest to the innovative everyday style of speech.

By reading numerous texts from the Old and Middle Russian periods (roughly the 11th through 17th centuries), however, I have discovered that my initial hypothesis is not entirely correct. Overall, we do see a trend moving from PCCs to PPs, and business documents and lay texts not of the literary norm do characteristically exhibit more rapid change from PCCs to PPs, but church documents do not generally contain a lot of PCCs, compared to works of other contemporary genres.

Before we look at the trends found within each genre, we must examine how we are dividing up the texts into genres.

Methods of Classification

Following convention, I have divided the texts into three groups: Bookish/Religious, Literary, and Non-standard texts. These groups correspond to Lomonosov's famous classification of the three levels of Russian literary style: high, middle, and low.

My criteria for classification are both extra-linguistic and linguistic. The former criteria include the context and purpose of the document: Bible translations, sermons, and lives of the saints naturally form one sort of group, while historical sagas and other artistic creations form another, and wills, peace treaties, and letters written by ill-educated folk form another. The latter criteria include phonetic, morphological, and syntactic patterns that correspond to the literary norm of the day or represent archaisms or neologisms.
And of course, these groupings do not express the full complexity of the situation. Many texts are in between two groups, having many characteristics of both.

**Diachronic Intra-genre Analysis of PCC to PP Change**

We will start with the trends within each genre through time. We find an gradual overall shift from PCCs to PPs by comparing earlier and later documents within each genre.

**Bookish/Religious Style**

As with all the genres, bookish and religious texts exhibit a trend of increasing use of PPs throughout history. But although early church documents do not use a lot of PPs, they also do not use a lot of PCCs. The matter is chiefly complicated by Old Church Slavic. OCS is a Southern Slavic language (while Russian is Eastern Slavic) which was in close contact with Russian for a long time, being the language used in the Russian Orthodox Church. In fact, in early church documents it blended with Russian to the point that it is sometimes difficult to say what was written in OCS and what in OR.

We could easily explain the lack of PCCs in the earliest Russian religious documents if there were no PCCs in the language they were primarily influenced by, OCS. But in fact, it had a system remarkably similar to that of Old Russian. The solution to this puzzle lies in the nature of these early texts: they were chiefly translations from Greek or other languages. And as such, they stylistically imitated the PCC-less character of the originals. And the church texts which were not translations imitated the PCC-less style of the other texts.\(^{14}\)

\(^{14}\) For a good explanation of this with respect to the locative, see Toporov 1961, 10.
To show these trends more concretely, we must look at several representative texts. First of all, *Ostromirovo Evangelie*, from 1056, has almost all PCCs and very few PPs. Among the prominent PCCs are datives of possession (‘ovca i voly *toržennikom* ‘the merchants’ sheep and bulls’) and locatives (‘pravl’aaše stol...*Kyevë*, ‘ruling the throne in Kieve’). An example of the rare PP in O. Ev. is ‘a iže piet’ *ot vody* (‘and whoever drinks *of the water*, a partitive genitive). *Slovo o Borise i Glebe*, written in the early twelfth century, also has a style filled with PCCs. If there are more examples of PCCs from *Bor. i Gl.*, it is because it is longer and therefore more contexts for their use arose. We can find all sorts of PCCs, including instrumentals of space (‘idyi *put’m*”, ‘going by the path’), locatives (‘sedya *Kyevë*’, ‘staying in Kiev’), and datives of direction (‘Prišed *Vyšegorodu noč* ota’j ‘He came to Vyšegrod one night.’). But we also find many examples of PPs, such as ‘očužennyj *ot tvoeja dobroty*’ (‘estranged from your goodness’, instead of a genitive of separation) and ‘I o *sem* slovese točiju utešašes’a i radovašes’a’ (‘right away being comforted by these words and rejoicing’, instead of either an instrumental to go with ‘to comfort’ or dative with ‘to rejoice’).

*Slovo na antipasxu*, however, shows that by the 14th century (as that is the estimated date of the earliest extant version), many more PCCs had changed or were changing to PPs. As is always characteristic of texts from a period of transition, there are many inconsistencies, as in the following sentence:

(48) *Pasxa bo izbavlenie miru est’ i svobozdenie ot ada.*

‘For Easter is the escape *from the world* and the liberation *from hell*.’

The first part of the sentence uses a genitive of separation or avoidance, while the second uses a PP. But despite the inconsistencies, PPs predominate overall.
Continuing on to the 16th century’s *Slovo o zakone i blagodati*, we find very few PCCs, even considering the brevity of the text. The only PCC is something like a dative of possession:

(49) I nareče Avraam im’a emu - Izmail
   and on-said-[3p. sg. aor.] Avraam-[nom. sg.] name-[acc. sg.]
   [3p. dat. sg.] Izmail-[acc. sg.]
   ‘and Abraham gave him his name - Ishmael.’

**Literary Style**

The earliest works of Russian literature, such as *Povest’ vremennyx let, Poučenie Vladimir Monomaxa*, and *Slovo o Polku Igoreve*, are our richest sources of data on PCCs in Old Russian. PCCs predominate, but there are many inconsistencies of usage in which both PCCs and PPs are used in the same function. By the 13th century there was a mostly equal mix of PCCs and PPs, as in *Molenie Daniila Zatočnika*. There were somewhat more PPs that PCs by the late 14th century and *ZadonsCina*. PPs came to dominate by the early 16th century, although a few PCCs remain, as seen in *Povest’ o Pskovskom vz’atii*. By the late 16th century, the time of Ivan the Terrible and his correspondence with Gr’aznyi, most of these PCCs are replaced as well.

But we must not be misled by instances of supposedly extinct PCCs appearing in late literary texts. Writers often use archaisms and “vulgar” speech for stylistic effect. For example, relics of old constructions can be found in Pushkin, as in the following use of the dative with a verb of indirect action, from “The Gypsy” (in Chenyx 1954, 292):

(50) Kak smejalis’ togda My tvoej cedine!
   ‘gray hair’-[dat. sg.]
   ‘How we laughed then at your gray hair!’
Like religious texts, literary texts were not free from the influence of foreign languages. A prime example of this is the opening section of *Povest’ vremennyx let*, which is a cosmology translated into Russian. Not coincidentally, that section has almost no PCCs, while later sections which originally written in Russian are strewn with them.

**Non-literary Style**

In non-literary sources, such as trade documents and wills, the trend of PCCs being replaced by PPs is the same as in other genres, but the earliest sources were much farther along in the transition than correspondingly early literary texts. This is because, as we will show more conclusively below, the non-literary sources are the ‘avante garde’, fearless and accidental iconoclasts charting new ground for linguistic change. Business and trade documents are rich sources of data attesting the new PPs that were entering the language. Of course, not all neologisms take hold, so although many of these attested new PPs are currently used in Russian, and some sound as bizarre to us as they probably did to contemporary speakers of Standard Russian.

Prepositional Phrases dominate in *Dogovornaja gramota* of 1229, although there are a few PCCs. There are many datives as subjects of impersonal verb constructions such as in (29), one instrumental of means in (36), and very few locative PCCs, only with the city Smolensk (the city in which the document was written). Otherwise, there are just PPs.

*Duxovnoe zaveščanie*, written just a little later in 1270, is literally strewn with prepositions. There are, in fact, no less than 53 prepositions in 57 lines. This can partly be explained by the repetitive nature of the document, as it is a will saying what Clement is bequeathing to whom. Not only is the quantity of
prepositions interesting, however, but also their uses. There are several usages found in neither Old nor Modern Russian literary texts, such as the following:

(51) A v skotě v ovcaх і v smín'ax rozdelit' s ženoju moeju na pol.
[contr. conj.] in cattle-[loc. sg.] in sheep-[loc. pl.] and in pig-[loc. pl.] apart-divide-[inf.] with wife-[inst. sg.] [lp. sg. poss.]-[inst. sg.] on half-[acc. sg.]
‘And divide in half with my wife the cattle, the sheep, and the pigs.’ (by sense, more like ‘in the cattle, sheep, and pigs, make a division, giving half to my wife’)

(52) A pro se klan’ajus’a igumenu i vsem bratie.
‘And I swear to this by the bishop and all the brethren.’

The former example is especially interesting, in that PPs are used for what would usually be the direct object, changing the meaning from ‘divide the cattle in half’ to something closer to ‘make a division in half in the cattle.’ The latter example, using a PP with pro instead of an oblique case (such as the dative with indirect verbs), is characteristic of modern non-standard speech as well.

There are even more novel uses of prepositions in the gramotki from the 17th century, small letters mostly from vassals to their lords. For example, from the letter F. Borodin D’ad’e Vasiliju Vladimiroviču (Tarabasova 1969, 12):

(53) I ko mně pišet čto ja k nemy ne pisyval i ja pro neo i ne vedal čto on na Moskvě l’il na službe.
‘And he writes to me that I hadn’t written to him and I did not know about him whether he was in Moscow or in the army.’

The first two italicized PPs are in the place of the dative PCCs which would be used in both Standard Modern Russian and Old Russian. The third is a PP common in Non-standard Modern Russian, as is the fourth. The fifth is the only PP in this sentence that does not transgress literary norms of either the 17th century or today. The point is not, however, to show that the author of the letter

15Another trait of nonstandard speech is the indiscriminate use of the preposition v ‘in’ and na ‘on’. According to the literary norm one should say v Moskve, not na Moskve.
got these forms ‘wrong’ according to some standard, but to demonstrate the increase in prepositionality in non-literary texts, which naturally means that many prepositions were ‘out of place’ compared to the literary norm.

This trend of increasing prepositionality in non-standard speech continues through the present day. Verbs which govern an indirect case, such as radovat’s’a (‘to be happy [about something]’; this is a ‘verb of indirect action’), are often used with PPs in non-standard speech. Thus we might hear the PP complement radovat’s’a o čem-nibud’ instead of the dative PCC radovat’s’a čemu-nibud’ (both can be translated as ‘to be happy about something’). Non-standard speech also has a very rich supply of prepositions due to its production of compound prepositions, such as po-za ‘beyond’ and po-pod ‘underneath’.

The Chronology of PCC to PP Changes

Reading through Old and Middle Russian texts, it immediately becomes obvious that all PCCs did not change to PPs over the same period of time. At a time when one sort of PCC was in a state of transition, being used roughly as often as its PP ‘equivalent’, some PCCs were already extinct and others had not yet begun to change. We must do both synchronic and diachronic analyses (i.e., looking at both cross-sections of time and patterns through time) to reconstruct the chronology not just of individual constructions but of the system as a whole. This will be essential to our later analysis. It is almost impossible to

---

18 Ideally, we would also follow up these analyses with a comparative study of Slavic languages. As we can see, many changes were already well under way by the beginning of the Russian era. If similar processes occurred only in Belorussian and Ukrainian, we would suspect that the changes started during the time of Common East Slavic (because those two languages and Russian are the East Slavic languages). But if these processes continued in more or less all the Slavic languages, the changes must have started during Common Slavic.
pin down exactly when certain changes started, but by analyzing the relative frequency of forms and the contexts of their occurrence, we can come up with estimates.

The Accusative

The first PCC to be replaced by a PP was the accusative of direction. It is found in Old Russian texts only extremely rarely. Indeed, I did not find any corroboration for Stetsenko’s examples like (32) from Povest’ vremennyx let, a 12th century literary text. The accusative of direction is not even listed by many historical grammarians. If it was ever a productive construction, it was in a period prior to Old Russian. It is possible that it was construed as a direct object (prebresti reku ‘to cross a river’) instead of an adjunct. Stentsenko’s counterexample would be “L’udie že bežaša vnešnij grad” (The people ran into the outer city’ 1972, 98), in which ‘to run’ cannot be construed as a transitive verb. His example, however, is probably simply the result of the omission of the preposition v ‘into’ before a word beginning with ‘v’, which is a fairly common.

Another construction which disappeared very early was the accusative of distant object. In the overwhelming majority of cases one finds instead PPs of the type slyšat’ o smerti (or slyšat’ pro smert’ in non-standard sources) ‘to hear of s.o.’s death’, instead of slyšat’ smert’, which has the direct object in the accusative just like other direct objects.

The other uses of the accusative as direct object, however, have been preserved through the present day. The change of some PCCs to PPs (prebresti reku→prebresti čerez reku ‘to ford a river’, slyšat’ smert’→slyšat’ o smerti ‘to hear of s.o.’s death’) represents a narrowing of the conception of direct objects.

The Locative
The locative of place (hereafter referred to simply as the locative; other uses of the locative case, such as the locative of direction, are referred to by their full names) is found only in the earliest Russian religious and literary documents (such as O. Ev., P. vr. I., and Bor. i Gl.), and even there they are a rarity. The locative had similar currency in OCS, as it could only be used to designate location with words that in and of themselves clearly denote places, such as cities or the very word ‘place’. For example, Gorshkov cites the following (Gorshkov 1963, 209):

(54) jako sot" soxraneny kosti naša sem' městě (Suprasl'skaja rukopis')
   'but our bones are preserved in this place'

(55) byvšyx" cęsari gradě (Assemanievo evangelie)
   'having been in Tsargrad'

In OR the locative was used almost exclusively with city names and with the word mesto ('place'). Toporov separates locatives into two categories: those in which the locative is constrained by the noun, and those in which the locative is constrained by the verb. That is, in the first case, the character of the noun determines if it could be used in the locative. Not just any city’s name could be used in the locative, but just famous ones’, Toporov demonstrates. The PCC locative occurs much more often with the names of cities that were well known to speakers of Old Russian, such as Kiev, Novgorod, Smolensk and Polock. (Toporov 1961, 20) Less famous cities, especially foreign ones, however, were used more often with the PP, as in Ondreju učašču v Sinopii ('while Andrei was studying in Sinopia', from P. vr. I.). Of course, these are just trends, and although Rome was certainly famous, we find Ondrej že, byv v Rime, pride v Sinopiju ('Andrei, having been in Rome, came to Sinopia', also in P. vr. I.). But the overall trend is clear: the number of words which could be used in the PCC
locative gradually constricted over time. By the 13th century, the locative of place was, effectively, replaced by PPs such as *v Moskve*.

The directional locative was not, according to Toporov, a productive construction even in the earliest times of Old Russian. Instead, there were mere traces of the old PCCs preserved in the government of several verbs (especially verbs with the prefix *pri*, indicating drawing near to something, as in (45)) and in some frozen expressions (such as *pojati ženê*, ‘to marry [a woman]’, which literally means, ‘to catch a wife’). These constructions are found only in the earliest religious and literary texts, such as *Žitie Feodosija Pečerskogo* and *Povest’ vremennyx let.* (Toporov 1961, 24) Although one might expect such ‘relics’ to have died out by the modern era, they are in fact preserved even today, albeit in slightly modified form. They appear to be the direct predecessors to constructions like *priznavat’s’a v čem-to* ‘to admit to something’ and *nuždat’s’a v čem-to* ‘to have need of something’ in Modern Russian, and the modern descendent of *pojati ženê* is *ženit’s’a na kom-to* ‘to marry s.o.’. These three phrases all have PPs with the locative case denoting oblique objects.

The Genitive

The genitive PCCs held on much longer than the locative, and the transition period is more easily documented. Most genitive PCCs were replaced by PPs by the 15th century. According to Chernyx, some examples of are found up to the 17th century, although it is likely that they had acquired stylistic usage as archaisms (Chernyx 1954, 294). Some traces of the old constructions, however, are preserved even today.

---

19I hesitate to suggest that the presence of this prefix alone allowed this construction, but we cannot venture a guess on the semantic requirements, and this is one pattern that we do see.
In the earliest Russian documents, the genitive of attainment was almost always used with verbs that by themselves denoted some sort of reaching, such as those in (4) to (6). If the verb did not in itself have goal-oriented or reaching meaning, a PP was used:

(56) poklonites' do zemli (P. vr. 1.)
    'bow to the ground'

(57) Ni voznesе do oblak bogata nemyslena. (Mol. D. Z.)
    'Don’t raise up to the clouds a foolish rich person.

However, approximately by the 15th century, the PP was used even with a verb of attainment or goal; as in *Perepiska Ivana Groznogo s Vasiliem Gr'aznym* of 1574:

(58) Došedše do čużej zemli
    to-go-[v. adv. past] to foreign-[gen. sg.] land-[gen. sg.]
    'Having reached foreign lands'

The genitive of attainment is preserved in Modern Russian as lexical case assignment for a few verbs, such as dobyt's'a 'to achieve' and kasat's'a 'to touch'.

Similar to the genitive of attainment, in the earliest sources the genitive of avoidance had to be used with verbs showing avoidance of one sort or another, as in (7) through (11). Early sources, such as *Povest' vremennyx let*, have more PCCs than PPs in contexts of avoidance. Compare (7) through (11) with the following:

(59) Episkopy, i popy i igumeny... s l'ubov'ju vsimajte ot nix
    blagosloven'e, i ne ustran'aites' ot nix
    'The bishops, and the priests and clerics... take their blessing
    with love, and do not turn away from them.'

Whereas in the former examples, avoidance of something (such as being taken out of a burning city and being free of one’s sins) is emphasized, in (59) actual avoidance is not implied, or if it is it is not a strong. In the same texts, PPs are more likely in contexts where avoidance is not emphasized, as in the following:
In later literary texts, there are even more cases of mixed usage, such as in Molenie Daniila Zatočnika. Compare (9) and (10) to the following:

(61) ašče ot ogn’a usterežišis’a (Mol. D. Z.)

‘if you beware of fire’

Both imply avoidance, but the first uses a PCC and the second a PP. Genitive of avoidance PCCs predominate in nonliterary documents, and become even less frequent over time. For example, in Dogovornaja Gramota (of 1229) we find PPs even with verbs of avoidance:

(62) Izbavi m’a ot rva sego (Dog. Gr.)

‘Save me from this hole’

As with the genitive of attainment, the genitive of avoidance is preserved in the form of lexical case assignment with verbs like bojat’s’a ‘to be afraid of’. The genitive is used because ‘that just happens to be the case bojat’s’a governs.’ But distinctions such as izbegat’ čego-to ‘to avoid something’ vs. ubegat’ ot čego-to ‘to run away from something’, remind us of the case assignment’s origin in semantics. In Vladimir Dal’s famous dictionary, we find the entry for an archaic use of ubegat’ with a PP, ubegat’ čego-to, with the meaning of ‘to avoid’ (Dal’ 1978 v. 4, 459). When the verb was used with a sense of avoidance and not mere movement away from something, it licensed the PCC. Nowadays, however, there is not this element of free choice, and ubegat’ cannot be used with a PCC complement.

The Dative
The dative PCCs had a somewhat varied fate. The dative of direction was replaced by the PP k plus the dative for both places and people. With places, the dative lost the possibility of expressing entrance into the city as well as movement towards it. For example, now we would say 'kogda my exali k Moskve' ('while we were going towards Moscow'), which does not imply that we actually reached or entered Moscow. If entrance needs to be emphasized, the PP consisting of v plus the accusative is used, as it was in Old Russian. The dative of direction PCC is preserved in Modern Russian in the form domoj ('homewards', as in 'Ja idu domoj', 'I am going home'; this is from domovi, the dative singular of dom 'house', as it used to decline according to the paradigm of nouns ending in -ū).

Prepositional phrases began to replace the dative PCCs expressing possession, an involved person, the object of an indirect action, the subject of an indirect verb, and occasionally, even the indirect object. The dative of possession was replaced by other constructions, such as the genitive ('stol Al'osši', 'Alyosha's chair'), personal adjectives ('Al'osšin stol', 'Alyosha's chair'), and possessive pronouns ('moj stol', 'my chair').

We still find the dative of involved person (or 'ethical dative') in casual speech, as Jakobson shows in his examples (1936, 46):

(63) Prišol on tebe domoj, vse dveri nastež.
    'He came (for you) home, all the doors wide open.'

(64) Tut vam takoj kavardak načals'a.
    'Here (for you) began such confusion.'

The number of verbs that can be used with the dative to show indirect actions, however, has decreased. For example, divit's'a is often used with the PP
na čto-to instead of the dative, utešat’ ‘to comfort’ takes the accusative, smejat’s’a ‘to laugh’ takes the PP nad čem-to.20

Although the dative continues to be used as the subject of impersonal constructions like mne nравит’s’a ‘I like’, relatively late in the history of Russian (by the 15th century, approximately) the dative stopped being used as the subject of infinitival impersonal constructions. In Modern Russian, infinitival impersonal constructions are not used with subjects in any case, but are blanket statements which apply to everyone, in effect the strongest sort of imperative: Ne kurit’!

Perhaps the oddest feature of the history of the dative in Russian is that at times, in even the commonest uses of the dative, that of indirect object with verbs of giving and as a sort of indirect object with verbs of telling, the PCC was replaced by a PP. In very many Old Russian religious and literary texts we find reče k nemu instead of reče emu (both meaning ‘s/he said to him’). And in Middle Russian non-standard documents, we find constructions like (53) and the following, also from Tarabasova’s collection of 17th century letters, which both use PPs for the indirect object:

(65) čtob on ko mně zaočnoe svoe miloserdie podal...
‘so he would give me his mercy in his absence...’

Obnorskij asserts that reče k nemu is a Grecism21, which is plausible, considering that many of the religious texts were translated from Greek. But this construction appears rather often in non-religious texts, as in Poučenie Vladimira Monomaxa and Povest’ vremennyx let, so we would have to posit some sort of strong stylistic imitation. There certainly are some OCS phonological elements in

---

20See Lunt for a number of such verbs from OCS which are no longer used with the dative in Russian. Lunt 1955, 130.
21In Gribble 1973, 13, for example.
these texts, such as ašče instead of aže, or grad instead of gorod, so OCS influence is undeniable.

But nonetheless, the fact that there are many similar constructions which replaced the dative PCC should give us pause in classifying reče k nemu as the result of Greek influence. In addition to the examples above, we have the following:

(66) ašče li vy budete krest celovati k brat' ili g komu (P. V. Mon.)
    ‘if you will kiss the cross for the brethren or for anyone’

(67) K ženam nelepym ne besedovati (P. V. Mon.)
    to woman-[dat. pl.] foolish-[dat. pl.] [neg.] converse-[inf.]
    ‘Do not converse with foolish women.’

We will return to this question later, in the analysis section.

The Instrumental

The instrumental PCCs have been more or less preserved in Modern Russian. The instrumental of means is still commonly used, as in phrases like pisat’ ručkoj (‘to write with a pen’), just as it was in Old Russian. Animate nouns are still used as instruments of means and agent:

(68) On prigrozil žandarmom brod’age.
    ‘He threatened the vagabond with calling a gendarme.’

(69) Mašina byla slomanna mnoj.
    ‘The car was wrecked by me.

The instrumental of space is still used, although it is often replaced by the PP čerez čto-to ‘through something’. Some (e.g., Stetsenko and Sobinnokova) say

---

22The second preposition k was apparently written as g, by disassimilation from the initial consonant of the following komu.
23The example is Jakobson’s, with Miner’s translation. Jakobson 1936, 42.
that the instrumental of space does not exist anymore, but there are clearly
elements, such as Majakovskij's 'Morem čisl, bukv plavaj/ryboj v vode' ('Through the sea of numbers and letters, swim like a fish in water'), or more
prosaically, 'My šli lesom' ('We went through the forest'). In the last example
especially, we could replace the instrumental with the PP: čerez les. Like the
standard instrumental of means, this sort of 'instrumental of spatial means' answers the question 'How did you go?' or 'By what route?' not 'Where did you

go?'

And finally, the instrumental of time lost its productivity and was
preserved only in a few adverbialized noun forms, such as utrom, dn'om, and
nočju ('in the morning', 'in the afternoon' and 'at night').

Analysis

Traditional accounts of Russian prepositionless case constructions simply
demonstrate their existence in Old Russian and absence in Modern Russian.25
By treating these changes as arbitrary processes which just happened, these
authors commit two grave errors: first of all, they fail to uncover the constituent
and underlying processes that produced the changes, and second, they ignore
the greater context of these changes and their unifying factor, i.e. the shift from a
synthetic language to an analytic one.

A common example is the following: "With verbs of motion, formed with
the prefix do-, the genitive of attainment was used, signifying an object, up to
which the verbal action spread." (Stetsenko 1972, 95)26 This point of view is

24Note that this is another use of the instrumental, showing comparison: 'like a fish'.
26Chernyx says the same thing about the genitive of avoidance, effectively. Although
he says that the verb had to have a meaning of 'separation' or 'division' for the PCC to
be possible, he also says "the verb must begin with the same or a similar preposition-
largely due to the high correlation between verbs of motion with the prefix *do-* and objects of attainment in the genitive, which we saw in examples (4) through (6):

The underlying assumption is that the cases have no independent meaning and that nouns, adjectives, and pronouns are assigned case by the verb. In many ways this view is supported by Modern Russian syntax, in which lexical case assignment plays a large role. It indeed seems rather arbitrary that, for example, *dorozhit'* 'to value something' requires a complement in the instrumental, or *pozvonit'* (to call [on the phone])' requires a dative.

However, in Old Russian the case is not as strong for verbal case assignment. For one thing, case assignment was less idiosyncratic, in that greater numbers of verbs shared the government patterns that now seem arbitrary mostly because they seem to be 'exceptions'. Those patterns, of course, were not arbitrary at all, but semantically motivated. It makes sense, for example, that verbs of indirect action were used with the dative (such as (25) and (26)), because that use fits with the general meaning of the dative. In terms of Jakobson's features, the dative means [+marginal], [+directional], and [-scope]. It would take too much space to explain those terms here and show how they fit, but one can also think of *radovat's'a čemu-to* as 'to feel happiness towards something', which makes it more easily interpretable as similar to the standard indirect object.

Anyway, the strongest argument against verbal case assignment is that verbs did not always rigidly take the same case. In addition to traditional

---

prefix." (1954, 290) This is often the case, because the prefixes which have those connotations are also the prepositions used (such as *iz* and *of*), but there are instances both of the PCC used with a verb with no prefix (10), and of the PP used with a verb with an "appropriate" prefix but lacking the necessary semantic requirements. Thus we see that it is not the verb itself which licenses the PCC, but the context, which licenses both the verb and the object.
examples used to combat Structural Case Assignment\textsuperscript{27}, here are a few examples from Old Russian:

(70) Nest’ li kogo, iže by mogl na onu stranu dojti? (P. vr. 1.)
\[\text{[neg.]}-\text{be-}[3p. \text{sg. pres.}] \text{[interrog.]} \text{who-}[\text{gen.}], \text{[rel. nom. sg.]} \text{[subj.]} \text{can-}[\text{sg. past}] \text{onto}[\text{dem. pron.}]\text{[acc. sg.]} \text{side-[acc. sg.]} \text{to-go-[inf.]}?\]
‘Is there no one who would be able to go over \textit{to the other side}?’

(71) Temže i iz Rusi možet’ iti... i na vostok doiti v žrebij Simov (P. vr. 1.)
\[\text{[dem. pron.-][instr. sg.-][emph.]} \text{and from Russia-[gen. sg.]} \text{can-}[3p. \text{sg. pres.}] \text{go-[inf.]} \text{and to east-[acc. sg.]} \text{to-go-[inf.]} \text{into lot-[acc. sg.]} \text{Sim-[personal adj.-][acc. sg.]}\]
‘And by it [the Volga] one can go from Russia and to the east go \textit{into the lot of Sim}.’

As opposed to (4) through (6), in these examples the verb is prefixed with \textit{do}- but there is no genitive of attainment (nor is it merely a case of the PCC being replaced by the equivalent PP, which would be \textit{do onoja strany} and \textit{do žrebogo Simova}, respectively. Instead, the verb is used with prepositional phrases using \textit{na} and \textit{v} with the accusative case. The prefix \textit{do-} implies movement up to something, but the genitive also carries part of the meaning. Because it lacks the genitive, (70) does not mean ‘Is there anyone who could reach the other side?’, as the answer ‘I reče edin otrok, ‘az preidu’” (“And one youth said, ‘I will go across.’”) shows. And (71) does not have the full sense of attainment, implying that the lot of Sim (one of the three brothers, between whom the world was divided, according to the cosmology of the \textit{Povest’}) is far away, but not so far that it is a feat to \textit{reach} it. The prefix and preposition \textit{do-} are still the strongest signifiers of attainment, but the genitive by itself also carries this meaning.

\textsuperscript{27}For example, “Detej prislo” vs. “Deti prisli” and “pit’ vodku” vs. “pit’ vodki”. See Roman Jakobson’s famous \textit{Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre [General Theory of Case: General Meanings in the Russian Case System]} 1936, especially 59-60.
Russian has “optimal redundancy” (i.e., overdetermination of factors, up to the minimal point necessary to make sure one’s point is clear), which is common in most languages. Sentences like (4) through (6) do not have the preposition do, because they already have the prefix do- on the verb and a genitive noun phrase. Sentences without the verbal prefix do-, however, like (70) and (71) must have the preposition do to achieve optimal redundancy. We find the same principle at work in English: we say ‘I went into the bar’ and ‘I entered the bar’, but not ‘I entered into the bar’, because enter already has the meaning of going into something. The preposition in would therefore be redundant, although it is interesting to note that we can still say ‘We entered into a social contract’, most likely due to the abstractness of social contracts.

Now that we understand the contextual variation of some types of PCCs and PPs in Old Russian texts, we are in a position to explain the historical change. It is not likely that a principle as basic as optimal redundancy would change, requiring more and more redundancy and therefore adding new redundant prepositions. Instead, the cases were losing their meanings. The genitive by itself no longer carried strong enough a meaning of avoidance or attainment, the locative no longer specified location clearly enough, and so forth. They began to require prepositions to reinforce the meaning of the verb, gradually limiting the environments available for PCCs, as we observed in the locative, the dative, and the genitive. This had the effect of producing phrases like (51) through (53), (58), (62), and (65).

---

28. The reason why we do not say ‘I went the bar,’ however, is not just that it does not give enough information. The verb ‘to go’ cannot have a direct complement, so must have a PP.

29. It would be wrong to say that just started to lost their meaning in OR, or that they have already lost all their meaning today. We will discuss the situation in Modern Russian in more detail below.
Taking a step back from the individual circumstances of each PCC’s change, we see a pattern beginning to emerge. No nominative PCCs were never replaced by PPs, the locative PCCs were all replaced by PPs, and the other cases fall somewhere in between. The following is a summary of the chronology of PCC to PP change we saw earlier:

Fig. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Changes Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>A few early changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Some PCCs still preserved, many lost by 17th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>PCCs for all non-temporal meanings intact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Some PCCs still preserved, many lost by 15th or 16th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>All PCCs lost by 13th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This pattern, surprisingly enough, is very similar to Jakobson’s chart of the “case hierarchy”, which shows each case’s opposition to the others in terms of a set of three features: [+marginal] (the inst., dat., and loc.), [+scope] (the gen. and loc.), and [+directional] (the acc. and dat.). As Jakobson describes it,

“...in each distinctive opposition the marked case is either to the right of or beneath the unmarked one:

Fig. 2:30

\[(N - A) - G \quad | \quad | \quad (I - D) - L\]

30I am ignoring the distinction Jakobson makes between the so-called “G I” and “G II” and “L I” and “L II” (the first and second genitives and locatives).
“It is typical of all of these cases that the marking is always of a negative sort: it lowers the referent in the hierarchy, limiting it in some way... The more correlative features a case carries, the more limited and suppressed is the functioning of its referent in the utterance and the more complex is the remaining utterance structure.” (Jakobson 1936, 61-62)

The similarity in patterns is certainly not coincidental. The cases with the most limited usage, i.e. the most marked ones, began to lose their meaning first. Since the locative, genitive, and dative are all marked for two features, they were the first to go. Actually, the locative lost its meaning first, which suggests that there is something different about the feature [+ scope] that makes it somehow even lower in the hierarchy than the dative, for example, which is marked for the features [+ marginality] and [+ direction]. Anyway, the cases which are only marked for one feature, the instrumental and accusative, have lost very few of their PCC functions. The accusative is somewhat of an anomaly, because we would expect it to lose some of its PCCs only very late, but it in fact lost some very early (namely the accusatives of direction and distant object). Maybe it has just not yet lost a PCC, such as the “weakly governed object” (as in ‘stoit trista rublej’ ‘it costs 300 rubles’). The nominative, in turn, has not lost any PCCs.

Related Processes

Not all changes, however, can be explained in terms of loss of case meaning. It is not too hard to explain, for example, the fact that the dative PCC stopped being used in (primarily infinitival) impersonal constructions when we look at sentences like the following, from Dogovornaja Gramota:

(72) Ažе boudête rousinou platiti latineskomou a ne vosxočt platiti, to t' latineskomou prositi dětskogo ou tiouna

'If a Russian will have to pay a Latin and he does not want to pay, then the Latin should complain to the prince through the magistrate.'

Word order helped to show which dative was which: the indirect object usually follows the verb, while the logical subject of an impersonal verb precedes it. Thus, in the sentence above, the first dative is a logical subject, the second is an indirect object, and the third is a logical subject. Unfortunately, however, this rule does not always hold, and we must piece together the meanings by looking at the context. For example:

(73) Platiti nemčinou pervēe. (Dog. gr.)
    pay-[inf.] invalid-[dat. sg.] first
    'He shall pay the injured person first.'

(74) Tomou platiti nemčinou. (ibid.)
    [dem. pron. dat. sg.] pay-[inf.] invalid-[dat. sg.]
    'That one shall pay the injured person.'

There are too many datives being used in different ways. In general, language strives to have different forms for different meanings, so would avoid producing sentences like (72), changing that use of the dative (as the most metaphorically removed from the central meaning of the case) to another construction, namely a modal construction with nado or nužno and the dative. The transition to a modal construction, in fact, is remarkably similar to the transition from a PCC to a PP, in that the modal makes the relationship with the noun more clear because the case itself no longer was sufficient.

And although the quantitative changes in case meaning (i.e., decrease in strength) are essential, there are also more subtle changes in qualitative meaning.

31 Detskij (the nominative of detskogo) here means 'a young prince' (otrok kn'azeskij), not 'childlike', as it does today and in other contexts in OR.
Interestingly enough, at various stages in Old Russian the genitive, locative, and dative cases all could be used with directional meanings. The genitive constructions I am referring to are the genitives of attainment and avoidance, both PCC and their modern-day descendent, the PPs with \textit{ot}, \textit{iz}, and \textit{do}. Jakobson does not call these directional:

"The very possibility of using the [genitive] simultaneously in two different directions [i.e. away from something, in the case of the gen. of avoidance, and towards something, with the gen. of attainment] shows that the [genitive] has, in itself, no directional implication." (Jakobson 1936, 23)

However, it is not contradictory to say that the genitive could show direction, and just not specify which one. The verb gives the specific meaning of avoidance or attainment depending on whether it meant ‘avoid’ or ‘approach’, for example. And it is fully allowable within Jakobson’s system to say that a case merely ‘can’ show something, instead of always showing it. For example, the genitive also has no statement of predication, so sometimes does (as in \textit{detej prišlo}, ‘some children came’) and sometimes does not (as in \textit{dom otca}, ‘the father’s house’).

The same seems to be true of the locative, although the directional meaning of the locative case is strongly opposed to the case’s predominantly locational meaning. It will require further study to understand how those meanings arose and related to each other, for the coexistence of two such opposite usages presents a strong challenge to the Jakobsonian proposition that each case has a core, underlying meaning. At any rate, the locative lost its directional sense.

The dative has also lost its directionality, partially. We see the transition to PPs as evidence of either a general loss of case meaning (as with the locative), or of a quantitative meaning shift (as with the genitive, which now requires prepositions to show directionality), so the use of the preposition \textit{k} with the
dative of direction is an immediate clue that directionality is no longer as strong in the dative. And because many other dative PCCs are retained, there can not be a general loss of case meaning. Some other PCCs which were strongly directional have also changed case, such as 'vozzreti k ikone'→ 'vozzreti na ikonu' ('to look at the icon', with an accusative PP replacing a dative PP), but the evidence is hardly conclusive for a complete loss of directionality.

In Jakobson’s analysis of case meanings (1936, 64), the dative is described as [+direction] (or [+reference]), [-scope], and [+limitation]. Although I agree with his selection of features and their markedness, the problem with his analysis of the dative and of the case system in general is that language is not so rigid and binary. It is fluid and dynamic, and any analysis of case must allow for these subtle shifts in meaning. In his system, there is no room to say that directionality became a less key element of the dative’s meaning. Unfortunately, this is not the place to lay out a whole new system of case. I am merely showing how we need these shifts in meaning to explain some of the phenomena of the PCC to PP change, and saying that Jakobson’s system cannot account for them.

One of the results of a qualitative change in case meaning is that some PCCs which used to fit the case’s meaning end up being left behind (or the case meaning stays the same and the construction is re-construed; see below). Prepositions are added to clarify the relation because the meaning of the case can no longer be relied on to show it. For example, when the dative began to become less emphatically directional, the preposition \( k \) was added to show direction towards something and to denote objects of indirect verbs. But occasionally, the meaning of the construction and the case meaning are so far apart that the construction changes to a different case. We have seen examples both of prepositions being added (exat’ \( k \) kievu; ženit’\( s’ \)a na kom) and of case switching
(of course, the preposition would be changed as well, but for our purposes we are treating the meaning of the prepositions as subordinate to the case meaning):

\[(77) \text{K ženam nelepym (→ s ženami nelepymi) ne besedovati. (P. VI. Mon.)} \]
\[\begin{align*}
&\text{to woman-[dat. pl.] indecent-[dat. pl.] (→ with woman-[inst. pl.] } \\
&\text{indecent-[inst. pl.]) [neg.] converse-[inf.]} \\
&\text{‘Do not talk to / with indecent women’}
\end{align*}\]

Here, the meaning of *besedovat’* ‘to converse’ has changed from (the construction following the arrow in the parentheses would be the later, more modern equivalent, although we would be more likely to say something like *Ne razgovarivaj s nepriličnymi ženščinami*). The change is similar to the difference in English between ‘to talk to’ and ‘to talk with’. This semantic change requires an accompanying syntactic change, namely the switch from dative to instrumental complement.

And finally, we need not be overly concerned by isolated exceptions such the current use of the PCC ‘kasat’s’a kogo-to’ ‘to touch or concern s.o.’ instead of ‘kasat’s’a do kogo-to’ which we often find in 19th century literature. This is a switch from PP to PCC, not what we would expect. It certainly is not a result of the productivity of the genitive of goal, because that is one of the only contexts in which that sort of PCC is found. It might be a hypercorrective form (as in “Yolanda sat between Gertrude and I”). Or more probably, the preposition *do* was added to go along with the general PCC to PP transition, but later dropped because its usual meaning of “up to” (as in ‘My exali poezdom do Moskvy’ ‘We went by train to Moscow.’) did not fit with the overall meaning of the phrase (as in ‘Vaši problemy ne kasajut’s’a menja’, ‘Your problems do not concern me.’).

The Shift to Analyticity
When we analyzing the history of many different constructions, it is easy to think that they are somehow unrelated, and when put together merely form a trend, i.e. an overall shift in some direction that is driven by more or less independent component motivations. But that is not very enlightening.

Let us instead reverse the causality and focus on the overall process which is realized in all these different ways: the shift in the Indoeuropean languages toward analyticity. Whatever force was behind that shift made the loss of case meaning that went hand in hand with the collapse of the Old Russian declension system. The process in general is as follows: first the cases lose their meaning. Then, because there is "no form without meaning," as the saying goes, without semantic distinctions the morphological distinctions are lost as well. Thus, the declension system as a whole collapses. This happened in English and the transition from Latin to the Romance languages, we know, and it is happening now in Russian. There used to be five declensions, and now there are basically two. No cases have been lost yet, except for the vocative, but many declensions have lost some distinctions (for example, the genitive, dative, instrumental, and prepositional cases for feminine adjectives are all -o). The lack of morphological distinctions between cases requires prepositions and function words to be added to make the grammatical and semantic relations clear.

Ramifications

Once we have completed this analysis, we need to apply it to a few standard assumptions and reanalyze them in light of our new understanding.

The Relationship of PPs and PCCs

First of all, it is clear that Jakobson's description of the preposition's role is wrong, at least when applied to Old Russian:

"In a language which has both a system of prepositions and an independent case system, the meanings in the two systems are differentiated in the sense that when prepositions are used the relation itself is independently perceived, while in the case of inflection, the relation becomes a kind of property of the object denoted." (Jakobson 1936, 9)

It is very possible that PPs and PCCs have somehow taken on this semantic distinction in Modern Russian. But in the course of PCC to PP change, the insertion of a preposition merely 'butresses' the meaning of the case, instead of changing it somehow. No one has found any semantic difference in the constructions themselves, other than clarifying or making the case usage more definite. We might expect to find prepositions used in the transition period to add logical emphasis, as in 'The enemy was right in Kiev,' but no one has found conclusive evidence. There is just too much conflicting data. Without significant correlations, there is little way to tell mistakes from intentional stresses.

And it is essential to distinguish between semantic differences in the constructions themselves and pragmatic differences in the contexts in which the constructions are used. There is indeed a difference in meaning between ubegat'

---

33 Some PCCs are still in the process of changing to PPs, however, so we might expect Jakobson's differentiation of meaning not to apply equally to all phrases.
34 See Toporov's discussion with regards to the locative (1961, 32).
čego-to vs. ubegat' ot čego-to (see page 27), but I claim that it is in the pragmatics licensing the genitive of avoidance. If the context did not have strong enough a connotation of avoidance, the PP was used. After time passed and the PCCs became frozen expressions, it began to appear that the difference in form (PP or PCC) produces the difference in meaning, not vice versa.

In light of this analysis of the relationship of PCCs and PPs, we find motivation for further objection to descriptions of PCCs as basically prepositional phrases without prepositions. (Chernyx 1954, 290, e.g.) On the contrary, many PPs were created from *the addition* of preposition to PCCs.

It is important to keep in mind that at no point in the history of Russian were there no prepositional phrases whatsoever. This is not such a far-fetched concept, as there are languages with much more complex case systems than Russian’s. For example, as Thomas Sebeok shows in his work *Finnish and Hungarian Case Systems* (1946), Finnish fifteen cases, with many like the allative, inessive, prothetic, and partitive that show relationships expressed by PPs in most languages (Sebeok 1946). There were always PPs in Russian, and very many of these were not merely ‘mutated PCCs’. Even in the earliest sources, for example, we find PPs such as *s kem* ‘with s.o.’, *protivou čego* ‘across from s.t.’ *pod čem* ‘beneath s.t.’

Through the history of Russian, as we have seen, we find a steady increase in the use of prepositions. But in addition to increase in the use of existing prepositions (such as čerež ‘through’ being used instead of the accusative of direction of (32) or, occasionally, instead of the instrumental of space of (37) and (38)), it is sometimes claimed (Sobinnikova, in a lecture in May 1994) that there is also an overall increase in the number of different prepositions. The only “new” prepositions, however, seem to be compounds such as *po-pod* ‘underneath’ and *v dobavok tomu* ‘in addition to’. If these truly denote some sort of new
relationship, it is obviously one that could not have been expressed before by a PCC, so their creation cannot be explained by the transition from PCCs to PPs.

Case Assignment

And most importantly, our analysis makes us reanalyze the basic mechanism of case assignment. As we saw earlier, the cases had independent meanings. Therefore, nouns did not mechanically get case from the verb, but from the same source that determined the basic sense of the sentence, i.e. directly from the speaker. Speakers had the freedom to choose the various lexical items in an utterance, so they could in theory choose any case for any situation. According to this model, many sentences would be generated by the grammar that would most likely not be uttered. The only syntactic constraint would be the Case Filter, which makes sure that everything gets case that needs it (in effect, all declinable words: nouns, adjectives, pronouns, participles, etc.). Many sentences could be generated but would sound strange, such as a verb in the aorist tense used with a time word in a case showing an extended period of time, or the locative (disregarding Toporov's bizarre directional locative) used with a verb of direction. The same is true in English: sentences like are generated which the semantics would rule at best bizarre (as in "For three hours, Eustace slammed the door once," in which the single telic eventuality of the verb does not match the extended period of time expressed by the PP) or at worst non-sensical (as in "Archibald sat into Moscow," in which the directionality of the verb clashes with the locationality of the verb sit). This is not too different from the insertion of lexical items into the syntactic tree, as in Chomsky's famous "Colorless green ideas sleep furiously." Selection restrictions are to some extent flexible, and these odd sentences are still generated, even if they require stretches of interpretation.
The loss of case meanings certainly has a great effect on the basic workings of Case. As Jakobson has shown, the cases still have a good deal of meaning, but lexical case assignment plays a much greater role now than in Old Russian. There may come a time when case assignment will be completely mechanical, in which case (no pun intended) my analysis of Case will no longer hold.

The Future of Russian

Just as much as it is a cardinal sin to treat language as an arbitrary, unchanging system, it is also a sin to treat the current state of a language merely an end-product, the result of long series of processes. It has not stopped changing simply because we lack the perspective to see the changes happening around us. Although speculation is often precarious at best, we must look to the future and make predictions based on the logical extension of the processes we have observed were at work in the past.

Thus easy answer to the question “What lies in the future?” is “more of the same.” We will see the same basic transition from PCCs to PPs occur in the future, certainly. There are still many PCCs in modern Russian, and some of these will be replaced by PPs. How to figure out which ones will change, however, is more difficult. Based on theory, we can say that the “most oblique” cases (especially the dative and genitive, as the locative case already lost all its PCCs and became the prepositional) will continue lose their meaning the fastest, while the nominative and accusative are not at all likely to lose their meaning, or at least their main use as subject and object, respectively. As we speculated above, the accusative might lose its “weakly governed object” usage. If this process is carried out to its logical end, we would get a language with only
nominative and accusative cases, with other functions expressed by prepositions or maybe even word order.

We could also make predictions based on empirical data. The literary norm of today is often the stuffy archaicism of tomorrow, and the vulgar uneducated error of today the standard of tomorrow. By paying particular attention to the "innovations" or "errors" of the common people, such as izbegat' ot opasnosti instead of izbegat' opasnosti ('to avoid danger'), radovat's'a o uspexe for radovat's'a uspexu ('to be happy about a success'), we can what direction the language is moving in. Of course, we must again take a lesson from history (this time from our analysis of PPs in 14th and 15th century non-literary texts but not in Modern or Old Russian literary works, such as (46) through (48)): not all "innovations" become productive, and some errors are not "innovations" but archaicisms already discarded by the literary norm.

We can expect the hallmark of growing analyticity, morphological "impoverishment" or "economization", to make its presence more known. The case system will collapse even further as the cases continue to lose their meaning. In turn, prepositions will be added to more PCCs to distinguish those usages from others, because the morphology will no longer do so clearly enough.

And as the cases lose their meaning and the case system shifts around, there will be more qualitative shifts in meaning, producing the inevitable "strays": frozen forms and constructions like domoj (a dative of direction PCC) and ženit's'a na kom-to (a locative PP from a locative of direction PCC), and constructions which change their case, like besedovati s kem-to (with the instrumental instead of the dative).

Of course, it is almost impossible to guess exactly which constructions will become the rule and which the exception, or what new forms will arise and what will become extinct. This chaotic (in the scientific usage of the word) fluidity and
eternal unpredictability is both the essential beauty of language and the bane of linguistics as a science. After all, only half of the task of science is to explain how things got this way. The other half is to make predictions and say what will happen in the future. And since language does not change in a few short minutes like in a lab beaker, we are not likely to be able to verify our own predictions. At least we can hope to further our knowledge of how our language works today and how it got to that point, thereby broadening our understanding of how language in general functions and changes. Indeed, we realize that one of the essential functions of language, being a chaotic system, is to constantly change.
Appendix A- Primary Sources

The following is a list of all the primary sources I read for this paper. For each, the transliterated Russian title is in italics, followed by the abbreviation I use elsewhere for ease of reference, the English translation, where it is found (listed by the editor and page number; if no page number is listed, the document is found in the entire book), a brief description of its style, and the date of the original.

Domostroj (Dom.)- ‘Order of the House’
in Gribble, 227-229; in Dmitriev, 313-324
Russian literary document, but of lower style.
mid 16th c.

Dogovornaja gramota Smolenskogo Kn’aza Mstislava Davidoviča s Rigoju i s Gotskim beregom (Dog. gr.)- ‘Peace Treaty of Mstislav Davidovich with Riga and the Gothic bank’
in Gribble, 125-128
Old Russian nonliterary document.
1229

Duxovnoe zaveščanie Novgorodca Klementa (Dux. zav.)- ‘Spiritual Will of Clement of Novgorod’
in Gribble, 130-131
Old Russian nonliterary document.
1270

Gramotki- ‘Short letters’
in Tarabasova.
Middle Russian non-standard letters, primarily from vassals to feudal lords
17th c.

Molienie Daniila Zatočnika (Mol. D. Z.)- ‘Daniel the Exile’s Lament’
in Dmitriev, 163-168; in Stender-Peterson, 141-152
a very unique and cryptic Old Russian text, combining literary style with many aphorisms and folk sayings.
late 13th c.
Novaja povešt' o preslavnom Rossiskom carstve (Nov. pov.) - 'The New Tale of the Most Glorious Russian Kingdom'
in Dmitriev, 373-388
Middle Russian literary text
1610

Ostromirovo Evangeli (O. Ev.) - 'The Gospel of Ostromir'
in Gribble, 12-23
Religious text of strongly Old Church Slavic character
1056

Perepiska Ivan Groznogo s Vasiliem Gr'aznym (P. I. Groz.) - 'Ivan the Terrible's Correspondence with Vasilij Grjaznyj'
in Dmitriev, 344-370; in Gribble, 234-241
Middle Russian literary text, tending towards casual style
1574

Pověšenie Vladimira Monomaxa (P. V. Mon.) - 'The Teachings of Vladimir Monomax'
in Dmitriev, 104-112
Old Russian literary text
1096

Povest' o Pskovskom vz'ati (P. o. Pskov.) - 'The Tale of the Capture of Pskov'
in Dmitriev, 272-278
Middle Russian literary text
early 16th c.

Povest' vremennyx let (P. vr. l.) - 'The Tale of Bygone Years'
in Dmitriev, 9-24; in Kozhin, 23-33; Rejngardt
Old Russian literary text
1116

Pravda Russkaja (P. Russ.) - 'The Russian Law'
in Gribble, 131-132, 172-173; in Kozhin 12-14; Grekov
Old Russian document, with style between literary and non-standard (similar to Dogovornaja gramota above).
1440

Skazanie o Boris i Glebe (Bor. i Gl.) - 'The Story of Boris and Gleb'
in Dmitriev, 52-64
Old Church Slavic/Old Russian text
12th c.

*Slovo Kirilla Turovskogo na antipasxu* (Sl. na ant.) - 'Cyril of Turov's Sermon on Lent'
in Gribble 142-145; in Stender-Peterson, 109-113
Late Old Russian religious text

14th c.

*Slovo o zakone i blagodati Kievskogo metropolita Ilariona* (Sl. o zak. i blag.) -
'Metropolitan Hilarion's Sermon on Law and Grace'
in Gribble 198-202, in Stender-Peteresen 109-113
Middle Russian religious text

16th c.

*Zadonschina* (Zad.)-
in Gribble 192-195; in Dmitriev 211-219
Late Old Russian text

late 14th c.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bookish/Religious Texts</th>
<th>Russian Literary Texts</th>
<th>Non-literary sources - Wills, trade doc’s, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ostromirovo Evangelie-1056</td>
<td>Poučenie Vladimira Monomaxa-1096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skazanie o Borise i Glebe-12th c.</td>
<td>Povest’ vremennyx let-1116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molenie Daniila Zatočnika- late 13th c.</td>
<td>Dogovornaja gramota Smolenskogo Kn’aza-1229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duxovnoe zaveščanie Novgorodca Klementa-1270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovo na antipasxu-14th c.</td>
<td>Zadonščina- late 14th c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pravda Russkaja-1440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovo o zakone i blagodati 16th c.</td>
<td>Povest’ o Pskovskom vz’atii- early 16th c.</td>
<td>Domostroj- mid 16th c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perеписка Ivan Groznogo s Vasilem Gr’aznym-1574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Novaja povest’ o preslavnom Rossijском carstve-1610</td>
<td>Gramotki-17th c.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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