Negative microfilm received from university

66–5083

HILL, Stephen Phillips, 1936–

N– AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIAN PREPOSITIONS (BASED ON WRITTEN TEXTS OF THE ELEVENTH TO TWENTIETH CENTURIES).

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1965
Language and Literature, modern

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

N- AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF RUSSIAN PREPOSITIONS

(BASED ON WRITTEN TEXTS OF THE ELEVENTH TO TWENTIETH CENTURIES)

by
Stephen Phillips Hill

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1965

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Ladislav Matejka, Chairman
Professor Horace W. Dewey
Associate Professor Assya K. Humesky
Professor Herbert H. Paper

0.01 FOREWORD

0.011 The investigation of Slavic historical syntax has begun to receive extensive attention only in the last decade or so, and even then to a rather limited extent. As Lomtev, a scholar who has made a substantial contribution to this field, points out (1956: 2), "the scientific analysis of Russian historical syntax as an independent subject of investigation is in the stage of preliminary gathering of materials and study of sources."

While important accomplishments are being made in such compilations and monographic studies -- such as the work of the East Slavic syntax team

headed by Borkovskij (1961), there remain numerous areas of Slavic and Russian syntax which have yet to see any serious analysis; such is the case, for example, with many grammatical categories, as observed by Isačenko (1953: 201): "the comparative analysis of problems connected with grammatical categories has remained on the same level where it was left seventy years ago by F. Miklosich."

0.012 This neglect is especially true of the lesser grammatical categories, the so-called "auxiliary" parts of speech, which many excellent and detailed studies pass by in silence. A case in point is Diels' classic grammar of Old Church Slavonic, in whose 282 pages only about one-half of one page (1932: §135) is alloted to all of the auxiliary words together -- conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositions. And like Diels, most other leading linguistic scholars of the past have also concentrated almost exclusively on the major categories of nouns, verbs, etc.

Such an observation is made by Triomphe, one of those who has done recent work in this field (1958: 78):

> L'étude des prépositions dans les langues indo-européenes est l'une des tâches de la linguistique moderne. Les linguistes de la génération précédente ne l'avaient guère abordée, de sorte que les problèmes prépositionnels sont restés peu connus, innombrables et complexes.

The belated interest in the lesser categories, especially prepositions, was particularly stimulated in 1958 by the Fourth International Congress of Slavists, on whose agenda was included the history of preposition-case relationships, and at which a number of reports were read on prepositional topics. Before and after the Congress similar studies have been appearing in increasing number (for a list of many of these, see the Bibliography, §22 below).

And as Triomphe shows (1958: 79, 92), all of these specialized stud-

ies and many more will be needed before any historical dictionaries, summarizing books, or general theories of prepositions can be contemplated. To date, however, the heightened interest in prepositions has not yielded much that is particularly new, either in approach or results. Many of the recent articles and sections of grammars treating this topic have been reconsiderations of old semantic interpretations, albeit with larger and better organized bodies of material, but still without any consistent approach to the problem of prepositions as a single class, and lacking results characterizing this single class.

Thus it would seem the duty of future students of Slavic prepositions to follow the general advice offered by Sprinčak (1960: §6.3):

> To restrict oneself only to the traditionally applied methods and techniques of the past is impossible in the present day. A search for new, more effective methods of comparative-historical investigation of syntax is indispensable, as well as the improvement of old techniques for the comparative study of syntactic phenomena.

Such is the goal of the present work, an attempt to present a formalized and consistent analysis of the historical development of Russian prepositions as defined by their relationship to certain objects.

0.013 Gratitude is due to many people who have contributed help and advice in the preparation of this study, the basic idea of which was suggested by James Ferrell, the author's teacher in Slavic linguistics. The author is also obligated to the members of his doctoral committee -- Horace Dewey, Assya Humesky, Herbert Paper, and especially chairman Ladislav Matejka, who provided major assistance in revising the first version of this study. Acknowledgment is also to other members of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of Michigan; to the directors, staffs, and facilities of the Statistical Research Laboratory and of the Computing Center (both at Michigan), and of the Statistical Service Unit (at the Champaign - Urbana campus of the

University of Illinois); to the staffs and facilities of the Michigan, Illinois, Stanford, and California libraries; and, for particular suggestions or bibliographical aid, to I. B. Faden, Frank Y. Gladney, Norman Ingham, Roman Jakobson, Kurt Klein, Robert Magidoff, E. A. Moore, Alexander Schenker, Dale Winkels. All of the work compiling the data and typing the manuscript was done entirely by the author, and the responsibility for errors of whatever sort rests solely with him.

0.014 Citations. -- Each linguistic book or article referred to (by name of author) in the text will be identified in parentheses by its year of publication and its appropriate page(s) or section(s). Full bibliographic data about the cited work can be found in the Reference Bibliography, §22.02 below. For instance, a reference in the text such as "Vinogradov claims (1947: 230) that . . ." indicates that full information on this work may be found in the Reference Bibliography under VINOGRADOV, 1947, and the specific citation is from page 230 of the work.

The scientific format is also applied to references to volume, page, etc., which will be rendered according to the "LSA Style Sheet" of the Linguistic Society of America. A single number not preceded by any designation is that of the page (511 = p. 511), but if preceded by the symbol §, it is that of the section (§257 = sec. 257); needless repetition of numerals is avoided (511-7 = pp. 511-517), and no Roman numerals are used; two numbers separated by a period refer to volume and page (6.511 = Vol. VI, p. 511).

References to works printed in Russian use the appropriate Russian abbreviations (gl. = chapter, vyp. = fascicle, g. = year, etc.). Transliteration from Cyrillic to Latin will consistently follow the system of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL). This transliteration will be applied not only to bibliographi-

cal references and direct citations from Cyrillic texts, but also to familiar Russian names (Tolstoj, Čexov, etc.). Admittedly, such spellings create a very distorted appearance in the context of an English sentence, but the consistent employment of one such transliteration system seems the lesser of two evils, as compared with the concurrent use of "familiar" and "scientific" transliterations in the same work. (More details regarding transliteration and citation from primary historical sources are given in §2.30 below.)

0.02 TABLE OF CONTENTS

§		Page
0.01	FOREWORD	ii
0.02	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
0.03	LIST OF TABLES	ix
0.04	LIST OF APPENDIXES	xi
	PART ONE: BACKGROUND	
1.00	PREVIOUS STUDIES OF RUSSIAN PREPOSITIONS	2
2.00	INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION	34
	PART TWO: DIACHRONIC ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL PREPOSITIONS AND CONSTRUCTIONS	
3.00	SIMPLE PREPOSITIONS	56
4.00	DOUBLE PREPOSITIONS	93
5.00	ROOT PREPOSITIONS	101
6.00	SUFFIXED PREPOSITIONS	117
7.00	PREFIXED PREPOSITIONS	152
8.00	COMBINATION PREPOSITIONS	215
9.00	COMPARATIVE PREPOSITIONS	231
10.00	ADVERB PREPOSITIONS	247
11.00	GERUND PREPOSITIONS	254
12.00	SOME SPECIALIZED CONSTRUCTIONS WITH PREPOSITIONS	261
	PART THREE: SYNCHRONIC DESCRIPTION OF PREPOSITIONAL CATEGORIES	
13.00	OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC AND OLD RUSSIAN (1000-1399)	302

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

14.00 MIDDLE RUSSIAN (1400-1699) 308

15.00 THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (1700-1799) 314

16.00 THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (1800-1899) 319

17.00 THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (1900-1964) 328

18.00 CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF TEN CENTURIES (1000-1964) 344

PART FOUR: INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

19.00 THE DEVELOPMENT OF PREPOSITIONS 365

20.00 THE CLASSIFICATION OF PREPOSITIONS 387

APPENDIXES

21.00 PRIMARY SOURCES 406

22.00 BIBLIOGRAPHY 418

23.00 INDEX OF PREPOSITIONS 432

0.03 LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Inventories of Prepositions (§1.01)	3
2.	Inventories Differentiating Primary and Secondary Prepositions (§1.02)	4
3.	Word-Classes Occurring After Prepositions (§1.19)	17
4.	Page Breakdown of the Basic Corpus (§2.08)	39
5.	Combined Summary of Simple Prepositions (§3.19)	87
6.	Combined Summary of Exceptions with Simple Prepositions (§3.22)	90
7.	Combined Summary of Double Prepositions (§4.07)	98
8.	Combined Summary of Root Prepositions (§5.16)	114
9.	Combined Summary of Suffixed Prepositions (§6.28)	149
10.	Combined Summary of Prefixed Prepositions (§7.53)	210
11.	Combined Summary of Combination Prepositions (§8.10)	226
12.	Combined Summary of Comparative Prepositions (§9.12)	244
13.	Combined Summary of Adverb Prepositions (§10.04)	252
14.	Combined Summary of Gerund Prepositions (§11.09)	260
15.	Combined Summary of Negative-Indefinite Pronouns (§12.01)	262
16.	Combined Summary of Interposed Modifiers (§12.023)	269
17.	Combined Summary of Separated Modifiers (§12.024)	271
18.	Combined Summary of Intercalated Pronouns (§12.03)	277
19.	Combined Summary of Postpositioning (§12.04)	284
20.	Combined Summary of Adverbial Usage (§12.051)	290
21.	Synchronic Summary: 1000-1399 (§13.00)	303
22.	Synchronic Summary: 1400-1699 (§14.00)	309

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

23. Synchronic Summary: 1700-1799 (§15.00) 314

24. Synchronic Summary: 1800-1899 (§16.00) 319

25. Synchronic Summary: 1900-1964 (§17.00) 329

26. Basic Demarcation of the Status of Prepositional Categories in Twentieth-Century Russian (§17.11) 338

27. General Diachronic Summary: The Second Millennium (1000-1964) (§18.00) 345

28. Matrix of Individual Prepositions (§18.13) 359

0.04 LIST OF APPENDIXES

§		Page
21.00	PRIMARY SOURCES	406
21.01	Concordances and Dictionaries	406
21.02	The Basic Corpus	407
21.03	Key to Abbreviations of Primary Sources	411
22.00	BIBLIOGRAPHY	418
22.01	Modern Inventories of Prepositions (Including Primary/Secondary Inventories)	418
22.02	Full Reference Bibliography	419
23.00	INDEX OF PREPOSITIONS	432

PART ONE

BACKGROUND

1. PREVIOUS STUDIES OF RUSSIAN PREPOSITIONS

> Das Fehlen einer allgemeinen und theoretisch wohl fundierten Theorie der Präpositionen sowie die Anwendung historischer Gesichtspunkte bei der Beurteilung synchroner Spracherscheinungen erschweren ungemein eine exakte Analyse der hierher gehörenden Tatsachen.
>
> Isačenko (1962: §294)

1.01 Inventories of prepositions. -- How many prepositions are there in Modern Russian? For that matter, how many have there been at any given point in the history of the language? And which ones are they? Some idea about how difficult (and unresolved) these questions are at the present time can be gained by looking at the inventories of Modern Russian prepositions which have been established by various scholars over the past century. The following table, based on twenty-eight such inventories[1] published between 1854 and 1961, indicates how many inventories include each of the given prepositions.

[1] For sources of the twenty-eight inventories, see below, §22.01.

TABLE 1

PREPOSITIONAL INVENTORIES INCLUDING VARIOUS ITEMS

All 28 lists include these 13 items				27 lists include these 5 items				
v	po	bez	pered	u	do	na	nad	pro
k	iz	pod	čerez					
s	ot	pri						
o		dlja						

26 lists include		25 lists include		22 lists include	
krome	meždu	za	skvoz'	iz-za	radi
				iz-pod	sredi

20 lists include		19 lists include			18 lists include
mimo	protiv	okolo	posle	bliz	vne

17 lists include		16 lists include		15 lists include
vozle	vokrug	vdol'	vmesto	posredi

14 lists include	12 or less include
vopreki	many others

What is interesting here is not so much the fact that some of the basic primary prepositions are missing from certain inventories (do, for instance, is not listed by DeBray, na by Isengalieva, pro by Smirnickij, za by Vostokov, Buslaev, and Gvozdev, etc.); such omissions are obviously misprints or chance oversights, especially since most of the primary prepositions omitted in an inventory are discussed elsewhere in the cited work. Rather, the real significance is to be found in the various secondary prepositions which are listed only in some of the inventories (e.g., vopreki appears in just half of them), and in the fact that there is such a striking divergence among the inventories generally. Some of them (e.g., Buslaev) employ the "etymological" principle and list few more than the

original "true" prepositions (and not always all of them!), whereas others apply a broad syntactical criterion and compile a huge inventory which not only includes all the original prepositions but as many as 170 different items (Bondarenko).

1.02 An additional check was made of fifteen descriptions[1] of prepositions which draw some sort of distinction between "primary" and "secondary" (or "simple" and "adverbial") prepositions. In this category, too, there seems to be considerable difference of interpretation. Table 2 shows the number of these descriptions which characterize each preposition on the primary/secondary basis.

TABLE 2

Characterized as primary by all 15 lists, secondary by none	v, k, s, o, u, do, po, iz, ot, bez, nad, pod, pri, pro, pered, čerez (a total of 16 items[2])
Primary by 14, secondary by none (omitted by one)	na
Primary by 13, secondary by none (omitted by two)	za
Primary by 13, secondary by 2	dlja
Primary by 12, secondary by 2	meždu
Primary by 8, secondary by 5	radi
Primary by 7, secondary by 5	skvoz'
Primary by 6, secondary (or double) by 6	iz-za, iz-pod
Primary by 4, secondary by 8	bliz
Primary by 4, secondary by 11	krome
Primary by 2, secondary by 7	vopreki
Primary by 1, secondary by 12	mimo
Primary by 1, secondary by 11	vne
Primary by 1, secondary by 9	vmesto, sredi
Primary by 1, secondary by none	voz

[1] A list of the fifteen is given in the Appendix, §22.02 below.

[2] Cf. the first fifteen prepositions which had appeared in the speech of Gvozdev's infant son by the age of three years and two months: na, pro, u, v, iz, ot, s, za, pod, bez, ob, posle, čerez, dlja, do (1961: 459).

Any other prepositions in Table 1 are always categorized as "secondary." Once again, the opinions range from unanimous (v, k, etc.) to noticeable lack of agreement (skvoz', bliz, etc.). For that matter, the results of the two tables are not in complete accord with each other. Radi, for instance, is omitted by 6 of the 28 total lists, but 8 of 13 times it is ranked as a "primary"; compare krome, included in all but 2 of the 28 inventories, but considered "primary" by only 4 out of 15 which make that distinction.

1.03 There have also been some inconsistencies in the analysis of case government of prepositions. Lomtev (1956: §263), for example, refers to v and na as governing the genitive in one construction where the accusative is meant; the Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (1950ff.: 11.319) characterizes pri as an instrumental-governing preposition; Bondarenko (1961: 8) includes načinaja among accusative-governing gerund-prepositions; Mel'nyčuk (1961:175) interprets one instance of po plus dative as prepositional; Bulaxovskij (1958: 307) speaks of o with the instrumental; etc. These misstatements are clearly of no significance, and in fact probably arose through misprints. They are cited here merely to indicate the diversity of statements and interpretations one encounters in reading the literature dealing with prepositions.

1.04 A glance through one of these studies will give an overall idea of the kinds of problems which often crop up in analyses of the Russian prepositional inventory. Isengalieva's book on Russian and Kazakh prepositions (1959: 34-6) presents a list and classification of the former, in which the reader is struck by a number of interesting things.

Isengalieva's "prepositions proper" lack na, but include dlja, iz-za, iz-pod, meždu, radi, and skvoz' (moreover, the Table of Contents on p. 227

also places vne in this basic group, and footnote No. 100 on p. 34 does the same with krome). In the "Table of Usage of Prepositions Proper," na is again omitted, along with za and pod. A mutually-exclusive distinction is drawn between original adverbs which are now used only as prepositions and those which occur both prepositionally and adverbially -- vne turns up in both lists, and skvoz' (already listed in the "prepositions proper"), in the latter category. In the list of "deverbative" prepositions the reader notices soglasno, and finally, v rode (sic) is spelled as two words.

1.05 Such discrepancies are not peculiar to Russian. Brøndal observes them in classical and Western European grammatical tradition too (1950: §6), but then goes on to make certain questionable selections in his own analysis of various languages, rejecting any secondary prepositions (§14) while retaining a number of dead items from the distant past (§36, §58). And this difficulty is not yet solved, but is becoming more critical: the planned "Slavic Linguistic Atlas," according to Večerka (1960: 576), will probably have to leave out prepositions of "the newest type (v tečenie)" for the lack of a precise criterion for determination of "permanent prepositions."

Thus, the general situation of prepositional analysis can be summed up very aptly in the words of Sørensen (1957: 84):

> The demarcation of the catalogue of prepositions has been just as difficult. Its extent has changed according to the various bases of definition used, and the use of different bases of definition at the same time have [sic] involved that the demarcation has become blurred (cf. the not uncommon talk about prepositions proper and improper).

1.06 Attempts to define and characterize the preposition. -- What kinds of "bases of definition" have been employed for demarcation, that the resulting inventories to date should have presented such a wide range

of difference and even internal inconsistency? Some of the various kinds of definition will be summarized in the following sections.

1.07 The traditional approach to language as a subject for philosophical interpretation is not unknown to the category of prepositions. Brøndal's famous Théorie des prépositions is a leading example of this approach, as when he gives (1950: §14) "la définition du concept de préposition comme le moyen le plus simple dont la langue dispose pour exprimer la relation." The abstractness of Brøndal's treatment of prepositions has caused his book to be criticized by Wissemann (1958: 77), Triomphe (1958: 79), and Mel'nyčuk (1961: 126).

Another very general definition of prepositions comes from the pen of the outstanding Russian linguist Šaxmatov (1925: §24): "Adverbs which have taken on themselves the function of modifying objects in the closest manner (bližajšim obrazom) are called prepositions." The Czech Hruby's 1909 survey of Slavic prepositions not rarely shows a very impressionistic orientation, as when he explains a change by "loss of awareness of nominal origin," or when he attributes much importance to "semasiology" in explaining government (1909: 74, 69). But a modern student of Russian prepositions, the abovementioned Isengalieva, gives perhaps the most mentalistic definition of prepositions (1959: 15):

> A preposition is an auxiliary part of speech, realizing its potential meaning in combination with oblique cases, furthering the fuller expression of thought and specifying various relationships between objects and between actions and objects.

Even formulations by more structurally oriented linguists are sometimes not completely clear and to the point, as in Kuryłowicz's article on case government (1960: 132): "le changement en préposition a lieu au moment où l'adverbe ou le tour adverbial, déterminés jusqu'ici par le substantif, deviennent, par un renversement de hiérarchie, des déterminants

non-autonomes de ce dernier." (But this formulation does contain a key point which will be treated below; see §1.08.)

Another illustration of the difficulties entailed in a semantic approach is the recent debate among preposition specialists in the USSR (Bondarenko, Čerkasova, Finkel', Veselickij), who have been debating about how to classify historical combination-prepositions (v silu, etc.) in regard to their degree of autonomy or shades of meaning a century ago; Finkel', for instance, admits (1962b: 106) that in one nineteenth-century citation he "is inclined to attribute to po povodu a causal-objective meaning." (Italics mine.) These scholars have also taken pains to challenge Isačenko's recent claim of the foreign origin of many nineteenth-century prepositional constructions in Russian. For further such discussion and definitions, see Šiškov (1825, 1829), Ogonovskij (1877), numerous articles in Russkij jazyk v škole, etc. Extensive general surveys of the history of Russian prepositional investigations may be found in Isengalieva (1959: 3-38), Bukatevič (1949), Bagrjanskij (1947: 4-17), and Kolodjažnyj (1960: §§1-9); the universal-grammar approach to prepositions is discussed by Brøndal (1950: pp. xi-xxii, §§4-6).

1.08 Alongside of the broader, more general approaches outlined above, there have also been concrete observations and formulations of a more applicable, procedural type. That a preposition is a form characterized by government of cases has been pointed out by Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij (1909: 265), Ščerba (cited by Isengalieva [1959: 12]), and others. That it is an item which cannot be used independently of an object is given by Kuryłowicz as an important criterion in another article (1960: 47) -- although such a view is challenged by Bogolepov (1931: 49-50), who offers other cogent functional factors for consideration.

That "prepositions proper" function phonologically as proclitics, lacking independent stress and retaining voiced finals in combination with a following object, is explained by Bogorodicky (cited by Isengalieva [1959: 20]), Gvozdev (1958: §§702, 706), Słoński (1921), and in considerable detail by Avanesov (1956: §11). Vaillant (1950: 227-8) adds that such enclitic function includes the general possibility of metatony to the preposition. In regard to voiced-voiceless final consonants of Russian prepositions, see also Lunt (1958: §13.4).

1.09 Durnovo adds another trait -- namely, that the genitive singular of the pronoun ona only after certain prepositions occurs as nej rather than nee (1924: §411). The weakness of this criterion is its limitation to a couple of prepositions, and the same is also true in part for the foregoing characteristics: they do not give as broad but yet as clear-cut a basis for definition as would be desirable.

The two extremes are represented by the Kuryłowicz and the Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij views, respectively; the former's catalog of prepositions will be quite small, due to his rejection of any forms which have the possibility of occurring without an object, while the latter's catalog will be quite bulky, since every construction of the "v tečenie + gen." type (cf. above, §1.05) would have to be granted a place. The phonological criteria are also workable for the more basic prepositions, but like Kuryłowicz's rule will tend to place too narrow a limit on the inventory; besides, they are not readily applicable to the written records of the past. All these characteristics do have their uses, and important ones too, but for the present study some basis which is neither so exclusive nor so all-embracing seems called for.

1.10 But this does not necessitate a return to the complete flexi-

bility (and unreliability) of philosophical criteria, however. One linguist who recently did a large study of prepositions in Old Icelandic, Blaisdell, feels obliged to concede (1959: §3.8) that "there can be great advantage in applying purely formal criteria, but there are limits beyond which formal analysis cannot go. At this point meaning must be referred to." Perhaps -- but it is still worth making an effort to extend the limits. And it seems reasonable that a good semantic study of any grammatical category would need to be preceded by the establishment of a rather full inventory of the members of that category, so that the analyst will at least have a clearly-circumscribed area to work with (cf. Sørensen's remarks above, §1.05). This was true of an otherwise very thorough and well-done functional analysis of prepositions in Čexov, by Macdonald (1955), in which the initial inventory was set up on rather shaky and inconsistent grounds, thus weakening the overall value of the investigation.

In the present study, an attempt will be made to establish and apply formal, procedural criteria for identifying the prepositional category and tracing its historical development, with minimal reference to meaning.

1.11 Division into "primary" and "secondary." -- In the preceding discussion, mention was made of the differentiation of "primary" and "secondary" prepositions. Sørensen's observation of confusion of these subclasses was borne out by §1.02 above, a comparison of fifteen descriptions which made this distinction.

1.12 The concepts of "primary" and "secondary" prepositions have been variously labelled by the many scholars who have discussed them: "primary/derivative" (Čerkasova, Finkel'), "underived/derivative" (Bondarenko), "true/fictitious" (Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij), "vrai/faux" (Brøndal), "echte/unechte" (Miklosich, Ogonovskij, Diels, Hirt, Isačenko), "vlastní/

nevlastní" (Hrubý), "original/adverbial" (many scholars), "direct/indirect" (Bagrjanskij), "direct prepositions/adverbs" (Lomonosov), "proclitic" (Unbegaun)/"uneigentliche" (Diels), even "proper/improper" (Sørensen)! The distinction between them rests mainly on historical grounds -- whether the given item was an "actual" preposition in Common Slavic (or Old Church Slavonic), or whether it was an original adverb or other part of speech that later acquired prepositional usage. Not all descriptions, it would seem, use the same criterion for separating them.

Statements based on the origin and structure of the two sub-categories have been made, for example, by Buslaev (1881: §249) and by Hirt (1927: §§12-3) for Indo-European; the latter scholar contrasts the origin of the primaries (particles) with that of the secondaries (case forms of substantives).[1] Some descriptions, such as the Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: §989), Gvozdev (1958: §706), Šaxmatov (1925: §24), and Uxanov (1958: 300), offer semantic interpretations, with the difference between secondary and primary depending on whether the native speaker recognizes the etymological connections of the item, or else whether its meaning is specific or general. Such etymological considerations do not seem to hold too much promise for the present investigation, however (cf. above, §1.02).

---

[1] Cf. the "izafet" constructions of Persian, where, according to Rastorgueva (1953: 631, 650-1), secondary prepositions are marked by the suffix -ye: e.g., beja-ye šoma. The exact English translation of this, "instead of you" (in rapid speech usually /instèdə yúw/), reveals similar structures in English, with secondary prepositions marked by the element of.

Cf. also such English examples as "Ah'm sittin' on top of /ontápə/ the worl'" (song popularized by Al Jolson); "Inside of the Lines," "Outside of Paradise," Back of the Man," "Because of You" (film titles); "off of the shelf," "out of /áwtə/ the frying pan" (sayings); "for the sake of . . .," 'bn account of . . .," "in point of service," "on the heels of three straight defeats," "in terms of usage," etc.

Considerable material on such items in English may be found in Fries (1940: chap. 7).

1.13 Other linguists consider various formal markers as possible guidelines. Lomonosov as early as 1755 drew up a list of adverbial prepositions which "with cases compose themselves, also without such set themselves alone outside of combination." (1755: §461; italics and attempted archaic translation mine -- S.H.) Similar observations on the possibility of secondary prepositions occurring without objects, and impossibility of occurring as prefixes, can be found in Buslaev (1881: §249), Vaillant (1948: §124), Vinogradov (1947: 680), and especially in Šaxmatov (1925: §§491, 587). This criterion has merit and will be treated in the descriptive part of the present study (see below, §12.05 in particular). Karcevski, however, points out (1956: 208) a limitation to the second part of the criterion: only fourteen[1] prepositions are used as prefixes in Modern Russian, which means that the primary inventory would be very restrictive, and the secondary extremely large.

Another important formal observation regarding the two kinds of prepositions was made in the last century by Vostokov (1874: §95) -- namely, that only secondary prepositions can be separated from the object by one of the intercalated particles li, by, že. A few such constructions noted in passing in the corpus of the present study bear out Vostokov's rule (with the addition of de and to); for details, see §12.024 below. This is, of course, a function of stress, in that an enclitic directly follows only a word bearing independent stress -- a category shown by Bogorodickij and Gvozdev (§1.08 above) to include only adverbial prepositions. (More details given in Avanesov [1956: §§27-37]). These scholars add that the phonetic criterion of final unvoiced consonants can also serve to distinguish the two kinds of prepositions. But once more these observations are

[1]This number could be increased to seventeen, if such uncommon preverbs as protivo were also counted.

not so easy to apply to a large-scale study: stress is not indicated in (most) historical texts, and Vostokov's intercalated particles occur rather seldom in the present corpus.

1.14 A more promising basis for classification is that of government. The secondary prepositions, according to Hirt (1927: §§12-3) took genitive case only in Indo-European, while the primaries never governed genitive, dative, or nominative. Buslaev (1881: §249) and Šaxmatov (1925: §466) make similar observations, attributing the genitive-only government of secondary prepositions to their substantival origin. Hrubý adds (1909: 67) that only primary prepositions can govern more than one case (as in differentiating motion from location), and bases his etymological classification (pp. 67, 73) of Slavic prepositions on the case-government criterion: "this principle in Slavic is carried through with such consistency and precision that we were able in Part I to conclude according to government whether a certain preposition in origin is true or false (pravá/nepravá)."

For all Hrubý's optimism regarding the utility of case government in historical classification, it still appears that the characteristic of genitive vs. non-genitive government in Modern Russian is rather weak, in that five of the clearly primary prepositions (u, do, iz, ot, bez) now control only genitive, while certain items which scarcely seem "primary" do control non-genitive cases (skvoz', meždu). Similar limitations apply to another interesting feature of government -- namely, that time expressions can be constructed with almost all the primary prepositions (nad being a notable exception, according to Peškovskij [1956: 306], along with, perhaps, pro, u, and o), but with a very small number of secondaries (okolo, sredi).

All the diverse schemes which have been applied in distinguishing

"primaries" from "secondaries" are excellently summarized by Bagrjanskij (1947: 25-35), who also offers his own list of primaries.

1.15 Subdivision into "morphological" types. -- In this survey of previous inventories of Russian prepositions, one final point deserves attention. Among the various classification schemes there are a few which go further and sort out the prepositions into several sub-categories according to their origins. Vostokov was one of the first to make such a classification, taking notice of adverbial, nominal, adjectival, and gerundial types in a comprehensive inventory of secondary prepositions (1874: §97) which was far ahead of its time. Brøndal, in eliminating what he calls "false" prepositions (1950: §14), does distinguish among them the following sub-classes: "phrases" (on account of), "composite words" (without, be-low), "substantives" (Ger. trotz), "adjectives" (Fr. sauf), "adverbs," "participles, and "situatives" (Lat. intra).

Hruby's system applied to general Slavic is also rather detailed; he establishes (1909: 1-6) three basic classes, each with subtypes, which can be summarized thus:

1) "Improper": inflected forms of (a) nouns, (b) adjectives, (c) pronouns, (d) verbals

2) "Secondary": same as (1), except origin no longer recognized, and used only as prepositions (vnutri, etc.)

3) "Proper":
   (a) original simple prepositions
   (b) compounds ("coordinate," "subordinate," "prefixed," "with postposed particle")
   (c) "original complex prepositions" (derived with the suffixes -d, -z, -n, etc.)

1.16 Recent publications by Soviet linguists present a somewhat different classification, although one having questionable points of its own. Vinogradov (1947: 680-3) worked out a comprehensive "morphological inventory of prepositions" consisting of five classes:

1) Underived, "original"
2) Adverbial: (a) "circumstance" adverbs (okrest)
   (b) "quality" adverbs (kasatel'no)
3) Denominative (putem, po mere)
4) Deverbative (blagodarja)
5) Compound constructions (vpred' do)

Vinogradov's scheme has been followed exactly by Isengalieva (1959: 34-6), the Odessa Očerki (1958: 229-32), Isačenko (1962: §285), etc. The Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: 1.§995-8) also follows the scheme, with one modification: the "compound constructions" are mentioned as a sub-class of the "denominatives," leaving only the first four basic classes. All five of the classes are retained by Bondarenko (1961: 7-9, 48-65), who, however, differentiates two subgroups of the first class -- "simple" and "double" (iz-za), adds a third subgroup of adverbials -- those "functioning only as prepositions" (bliz), and renames the last class, more suitably, "compound prepositional phrases."

Although the above systems are reasonably complete and concise, they are somewhat lacking in the third essential of a good linguistic description -- consistency. For example, Isengalieva (1959: 35) puts vvidu in the "denominative" class but v rode (sic) in the "compound constructions" class; it is not easy to see any structural difference between these two items, except that the latter is spelled as two words -- by Isengalieva, be it noted -- not by contemporary Soviet writers and dictionaries! One change from Vinogradov is that Isengalieva mixes the vpred' do and the po mere types in the class of "compound constructions." Evidently the criterion implicit in such placement is whether any item is written with space between its components (za sčet = "construction," according to Isengalieva) or without space (nasčet = "denominative"). Compare the treatment of these same items in Bondarenko's huge inventory (1961: 48-65): he labels za sčet

as "denominative" and omits nasčet altogether. For one possible solution to all this confusion, see below (§§2.26, 20.17ff.).

1.17 Another objection to some of the foregoing classification principles is voiced by Belić, who shows (1957: 6-7, 14-5) that "new prepositions are always formed from adverbs, be they oblique cases of substantives or adverb formations in origin. . . . Adverbs represent a transitional stage through which prepositions must pass." This is also the view of Isačenko (1962: 552). Consequently, it does not seem justifiable to create separate classes of "adverbial" prepositions (Vinogradov's No. 2) and of "denominatives" (No. 3), since both, in a sense, are adverbs -- or both nouns, if we go back further, following Miklosich (1926: 196): "Die unechte Präpositionen ausnahmslos Nomina sind." This is especially true when both have the same endings: Vinogradov, for instance, calls okrest, poverx, vperedi, and krugom "adverbials" -- despite what could easily be construed as "denominative" structure. Notwithstanding some disagreements with particulars of the above classification systems, there can be no objection to the idea of classification as such, and an attempt to formulate a more consistent structural breakdown of prepositions will be given in §2.26 below (with concluding comments in §§20.17ff.)

1.18 Formal criteria. -- The various characteristics of prepositions surveyed above have for one reason or another not seemed to offer a practical basis for defining the prepositional inventory -- at least in such a way as to take into account the development and expansion which has occurred in this category, but without having to include indiscriminately all of the v tečenie type combinations.

Generally speaking, Indo-European prepositions themselves possess only a tiny hint of "inflection," called by Brøndal "status" (1950: §§11,

17C, 81.2°), and also mentioned in passing by Blaisdell (1959: §18.2). (Compare the markers of secondary prepositions, §§1.12ff. above.) Otherwise, the overall category of prepositions as such, according to Diels (1932: §135), Blaisdell (1959: §18.2), and Brøndal (1950: §4) has no inflection.

1.19 Therefore it becomes necessary to look outside the prepositions themselves for some formal marker to define the category. If we take the items which can function as prepositions in Russian, we find they can be <u>followed</u> (adjacent occurrence) by several word-classes:

TABLE 3

NOUN: V l j u d j a x .

ADJECTIVE: b e z m a l o g o , s l i š n i m .

PRONOUN: m e ž d u n a m i .

NUMERAL: o t d v u x d o p j a t i .

ADVERB: k b y s t r o tekuščemu Pslu (GOR'KIJ, Jarmarka v Goltve, <u>Izb.</u>, 88); besporjadki prodolžalis' s e š č e bol'šej siloj (ČERNYX [1953: 5]); sušč̌estvitel'noe s v p e r e d i stojaščim predlogom . . . (BONDARENKO [1961: 8]).

VERB: potomu čto v o k r u g b y l i . . . domá (PANOVA, <u>Sent. rom.</u>, gl. 22); na malen'kom stolike v o z l e stojala glinjanaja miska (DUDINCEV, <u>Ne xleb.</u>, 29).

PARTICLE: -- P o s e r e d ' - t o vysšego obščestva ne sest' by v lužu (SUXOVO-KOBYLIN, <u>Svad'ba Krečinskogo</u>, dej. 1, jav. 4); -- kukuškino jaičko v n e ee gnezde (GOR'KIJ, Ledoxod, <u>Izb.</u>, 268).

CONJUNCTION: v pozicii p e r e d i posle srednejazyčnogo soglasnogo (RASTORGUEVA, Tadžikso-russkij slovar' [Moskva, 1954], 532); s r e d i i l i vnačale nedeli (GONČAROV, <u>Son Obl.</u>, 112); s r e d i i rjadom s Ejzenštejnom, Pudovkinym, Kozincevym . . . (SOBOLEV, <u>Ljud. fil'm.</u>, 175); p o d i nad kryšej gudit veter (ČEXOV, Pis. Sobolevskomu; cited by Bondarenko [1961: 8]); artisty stojali o k o l o i l i za ėkranom (SOBOLEV, <u>Ljud. fil'm.</u>, 26); ni d o , n i posle nee (SOBOLEV, <u>Ljud. fil'm.</u>, 137); ni d o , n i posle V. N. Tatiščeva . . . (IOFA, <u>Sovr. Lomon.</u>); v m e s t o i narjadu s predlogom <u>po slučaju</u> (FINKEL' [1962b: 81]).

INSERTED PHRASE OR EXCLAMATION: delo vyšlo i z - z a , c a r s t v i e e m u n e b e s n o e , mertvogo trupa (ČEXOV, Unter Prišibeev, <u>Pov. ras.</u>, 43); p r i t a k o g o r o d a priemax izučenie jazyka . . . (ČERNYX [1953: 3]); . . . n a t a k o g o r o d a polemiku (ĖJXENBAUM, Teor. form., 1); čuvstvuju . . . neumenie otličit' prostuju rogul'ku o t

TABLE 3 -- Continued

B o g z n a e t čego (ZOŠČENKO, Rogul'ka, Pov. ras., 278).

Even ANOTHER PREPOSITION: i z - z a ložki boršča (ĖJZENŠTEJN, Bronenosec Potemkin, subtitr); strelki v b e z četverti tri (LIDIN, Otstupnik; cited by Bondarenko [1961: 33]); v b e z četverti desjat' nužno idti . . . čitat' lekciju (ČEXOV, Skučnaja istorija, abzac 25); s r e d i b e z malogo 40 fil'mov, sozdannyx im (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 115); my imeem delo s n a redkost' skupym . . . masterom (LEONOV, Izb.; cited by Bondarenko [33]); papirosa byla ostavlena . . . n a p o s l e ataki (SIMONOV, Dni i noči; cited by Bondarenko [33]); uletel . . . z a č e r e z granicu (MEROMSKIJ; cited by Bondarenko [50]); p o s l e d o obyknovenno stavitsja roditel'nyj padež (KARSKIJ [1957: 427]).

In Old Church Slavonic it is interesting to note that in combinations with adverbs, conjunctions, and verbs, the second element was not only an adjacent constituent, but in rare instances could also be an immediate constituent, serving as the "object" of the preposition. Vaillant demonstrates this (1948: §§124, 250) by such examples as s" vyše, o kak s"tvori (adverbs), v"ńegda (conjunction), and o izbaviti sę ima (verb infinitive).

1.20 It should be added in this connection that not all the types of environments listed above are typical for "prepositions." Only the first four (immediate constituent) types -- with noun, adjective, pronoun, or numeral -- can be called basic; the others are quite marginal. In the adjacent pairs of prepositions, for example, a once-frequent combination like v bez ... is now going out of use (cf. Lunt [1958: 176]).[1] Like-

[1] Compare also such adjacent prepositions of former times as the following: ja nigde ne byvaju, k r o m e v teatre (PUŠKIN, Pis. L. Puškinu, 1823 g.); anekdoty, kotorye vy rasskazyvaete (k r o m e o b Annenkove) byli v gazetax (GERCEN, Pis. Ščepkinu, 1837 g.); nečego i pisat', k r o m e p r o sebja (L. TOLSTOJ, Pis. A. Tolstoj, 1859 g.); sprosil u o k o l o stojaščix domašnix (EKATERINA II, Vsjak. vsjač., 5/VI/1769); k " o desnǫjǫ stojęštiim" (Suprasl., 123:16; cited by Vaillant [1948: §124]). The three examples of krome are cited by Levin (1958: 151-2, 157), who points out that krome is no longer followed directly by another preposition in the modern language, being separated by a noun or kak instead.

wise, note the impossibility of a logically-expected adjacent preposition after vmesto: on otpravil . . . bumagu v m e s t o Astraxani v Arxangel'sk (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 46). Compare also the following recent examples of adjacent prepositions which Rozental' (1957: §117) cites anonymously and criticizes as "stylistically unsuccessful": p r i v dva raza bol'šej zatrate; smotrel n a s o vsex storon mčavšixsja vsadnikov; vybral odnu i z d l j a menja prigotovlennyx knig. In short, the adjacent occurrence of two prepositions in Modern Russian is seriously limited.

1.21 As is evident from the variety of adjacent-constituent constructions into which "prepositions" can enter, the mere occurrence of one with any particular type of following word is not of very great utility for the present study. Let us now approach the problem from the other direction, looking at the word-classes which can occur after "prepositions," and see if any of them reveal any characteristic signs of their own when they follow prepositions.

In combinations involving pronoun objects we find two sub-classes which do have certain special characteristics in construction with prepositions. These are the forms built on the pronoun root j- (henceforth to be abbreviated "3PP," since they usually serve as the "third-person pronoun"), and the negative-indefinite pronouns (henceforth: "NIP"). In Modern Russian (and generally in the history of Slavic -- see §§19.02ff. below), the 3PP only when it is governed by a preposition has an initial n- (i.e., n-ego, n-emu, etc.) -- which does not otherwise occur with the 3PP forms. Compare the presence and absence of n- in the following citations (single underline = "preposition," double underline = 3PP, wavy underline = prepositional object other than 3PP).

Dlja n e e i dlja ee roditelej ja segodnja -- sumasšedšij (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 114)

Emu kazalos', čto ètot romans sočinen pro n e g o i pro Ninu, pro ix pervuju vstreču, zaroždenie ix ljubvi (PANOVA, Vremena, 289)

-- Nazvanie u n e e [bukvy] est', a prok v n e j kakoj? Ox, dlja čego že ix stol'ko nasypano v knižke . . ., v čem tut sekret? (PANOVA, Vremena, 51)

Note in these examples the so-called "epenthetic n-"[1] occurs only when the 3PP is governed by a preposition (indicated by double-spacing of letters in the above citations), and then always. (The initial nasal in the name Nina is of course part of the name, and is not due to prepositional government.) Violations of this bi-unique rule in Standard Modern Russian inevitably arouse a reaction, as Dudincev illustrates in this conversation between a police official and an old stoker who found a secret file:

-- Ja podumal, čto Revtribunalu vidnee, čto s ej delat' . . .
-- S ej, govoriš'? [Ne xleb., 250; italics Dudincev's.]

1.22 The fact that n- occurs in these conditions has probably been noted in every description of Russian dating back at least to Trediakovskij, who wrote in 1748: "In these words [ob nem", nej, nix"] the letter n finds itself not naturally, but for the sake of a sonance pleasant to the ear: these words ought by nature to have been em", ej, ix"" (Razgovor . . . ob ortografii, §228; in Xrest. Obn., 2.189). But while later linguists have been able to do without the old-fashioned "euphonic" explanation offered by Trediakovskij, they have continued for the most part to treat the prothesis of n- only within their discussion of pronouns, failing to illuminate what is potentially the most productive aspect of this interesting phenomenon -- its relationship with the prepositional category.

As has been shown above (§§1.01-1.17), the prepositional category is in need of some new, reasonably broad procedural definition based on concrete linguistic evidence. At the same time it is interesting to note that among the abundant examples of prepositional constructions cited in the grammars, dictionaries, and monographs, only rarely is one with a

[1] The traditional term "epenthetic n-" will be retained for the sake of convenience and clarity in the present study, which is based on the written language. Hence n- represents a transliteration of the graphic symbol Н, as well as a multi-purpose transcription of IE */n/, Com. Slav. /ń/, and Mod. Russ. /n'/. A detailed discussion of the origin of epenthetic n- and its many interpretations is given below (see §§19.02ff.).

3PP object (henceforth: "3PPO") mentioned. An exception is Borelius's study of the Safonovič Chronicle (1952: 64-5, 86-8), which does quote many such constructions.

1.23 Only a few scholars have gone outside the pronoun category to relate this epenthetic nasal to prepositions, where a potentially greater utility lies. Perhaps the first in point of time to draw this conclusion was Jakobson (1936: 275; italics his):

> Die Fürwörter . . . besagen öfters mittels verschiedener Wurzelmorpheme solche Bedeutungsunterschiede: . . . absonderlicherweise der Gegensatz der Angehörigkeit und Nichtangehörigkeit zu einer präpositionalen Fügung, die bei den Fürwörtern der dritten Person durch den Unterschied der Wurzelmorpheme n' und j folgerichtig ausgedrückt wird (nego-jego, nemu-jemu, neje-jeje usw.).

This penetrating observation was relegated to a footnote, however, and Jakobson seems to have done nothing further with it. Eleven years later his idea was expanded by Vinogradov (1947: 336):

> Neither is the circumstance without significance, that in the contemporary language prepositional forms of the oblique cases of the pronoun on, ona, ono, oni (nej, . . .) operate against prepositionless forms (ej, . . .), which depend directly on nouns and adjectives, on verbs, and on those prepositional adverbs in which the grammatical traits of the adverb -- rather than the preposition -- still predominate. [Italics mine -- S.H.]

Here Vinogradov, in addition to stating the fact that the pronoun forms with initial n- participate in prepositional constructions, also enumerates the environments other than prepositional in which the forms without n- are found (controlled by nouns, adjectives, verbs -- examples in §1.19 above, and by adverbs -- see §§5-7, 10, 20.03ff. below).

Both Jakobson and Vinogradov work with two sets of 3PP forms, the marked set (nego, etc.) signalling that it participates syntactically in a prepositional phrase, and the unmarked set (ego, etc.) not providing this signal. Following this method of analysis, based on the syntactic structure of the sentence, Jakobson and Vinogradov arrive at a definition of the prepositional phrase: a phrase containing the "prepositional" forms of the 3PP (nego, nix, etc.).

1.24 A prepositional phrase, once it has been clearly defined in this way, must of necessity contain a preposition. And in 1955 one scholar drew this line of reasoning to its logical conclusion and formulated what was apparently the first direct definition of the preposition itself, on the basis of its occurrence in phrases with the n-forms of the 3PP.

This was Macdonald's doctoral dissertation, Russian Prepositions[1] (1955: 7). The irony of the matter is that Macdonald, evidently the first student of Russian prepositions to express in print this particular implication of the phenomenon, neglected to put it to use in his own investigation, excluding from his extensive corpus even some items which by his own statement (1955: 8) ought to have been considered prepositions. Consequently his arbitrarily established inventory lacks consistency, including as it does (333-4) okromja and pomimo, but excluding vozle, vokrug, krugom, okolo, podle, posle, etc.

The final step came three years later, at the Moscow Slavistics Congress: Ferrell (1958: 80) offered -- and applied -- a strictly formal definition of the prepositional category:

> The n- forms of the pronoun [in Old Church Slavonic] denote that the immediately preceding word belongs to the category of the preposition. Hence, the preposition is a form class that is morphologically determined and is sharply separated from the general class of uninflected words. [Italics mine -- S.H.]

The application of this criterion to the various Slavic languages by Ferrell (1958: 100-1) shows that throughout West and East Slavic (except White-Russian) this "special morphological means . . . for establishing the category of the preposition" retains (almost) all of its validity up to the present day. Ferrell made one specific application of his criterion -- to Modern Spoken Czech -- establishing an inventory of 34 formally-determined prepositions. The goal of the present study will be to do the same for the entire history of written Russian (see below, esp. Table 28).

1.25 Utility of n-. -- That this morphological alternation supposedly belonging to the declension of a pronoun could also be relevant to

---

[1] From which it is unfortunately not possible (in view of Yale University's restrictions on the use of unpublished dissertations) to include any direct quotations in the present study.

the identification of prepositions might raise some doubt. The fact is that n- occurs only in phrases with a preposition governing a 3PP.[1] Thus the nasal is really the common property and the identifying mark of the prepositional phrase as a whole, since its appearance presupposes the co-occurrence of the preposition and the 3PPO, and it does not appear when either a preposition or a 3PP occurs separately.[2]

Consequently, it would be possible to use n- to identify either of the two constituents (the 3PP or the preposition), and the question as to which should be "identified" is a relative one. In other words, from the standpoint of which constituent can a more productive investigation be conducted, from which constituent can we gain more information about the history of the language?

To illustrate, let us set up a substitution frame, with the preposition s ("with") as the constant, and the instrumental-case objects im ("him") and imenem ("name") as the independent variable. The resulting phrases are s nim and s imenem. Then, on the strength of the dependent variable n- occurring only in the first phrase, we can say that im is identifiable as a "pronoun" -- as opposed to imenem, which is not, but a noun. The same experiment can be performed with ego ("him") and ètogo ("this") in the independent variable slot, after the constant bez ("without"). The resulting phrases are bez nego and bez ètogo. The appearance of n- in the first phrase permits the identification of ego as a "third-person pronoun" (or "protheticized," or "anaphoric," or "nasalizable" pronoun -- or any other special term we might wish to coin) -- in contrast to ètogo, which is not, but some other kind of pronoun.

But such a differentiation is of exceedingly little value, since it is already universally accepted that im and ego are forms of the 3PP, and

---

[1]For brevity and simplicity the following exposition will often contain statements such as "n- occurs with such-and-such a preposition," or "such-and-such a preposition governs n-," or "the first expansion of n- took place in Common Slavic" (§§19.07ff.), etc. Such abbreviated formulations can be interpreted on the syntactic level as "the n-form of the 3PP occurs with such-and-such a preposition," or "such-and-such a preposition controls the n-forms of the 3PP," etc.

[2]Except, of course, for petrified forms like ponimat' and doneliže; see below, §2.25.

that imenem and ètogo belong to other classes. Moreover, this has been the unchanging situation for several centuries (cf. O.C.S. s" ńim' vs. s" imenem'); there has been no increase whatsoever in the inventory of items which can occur after epenthetic n-.

Theoretically speaking, if Modern Russian had many constructions along the lines of *o nètom (actually ob ètom), or *k ntomu že (actually k tomu že), or *pod nigom (actually pod igom), or *po-notcovski (actually po-otcovski), or even *v nušax (actually v ušax), then we might want to attribute such an increase of the word-types capable of occurring after n- to some kind of development or change of pronoun or noun objects in general. But in reality no such increase has taken place. The only items which can follow n- in Modern Russian are the very same ones which could follow it in Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic -- namely, the forms of on, ona, ono, oni. And since the inventory of items capable of occurring after the epenthetic nasal has been very static over the past millennium, there seems to be little point in trying to establish any correlation between this inventory and the very dynamic growth of epenthetic n-itself.

1.26 When we turn our attention to the governing constituent of such constructions, an entirely different picture emerges. To illustrate, let us set up another substitution frame, this time with the ЗРРО ego as the constant, and the items v and vsledstvie as the independent variable. The resulting phrases v nego and vsledstvie ego enable us to identify v as an actual preposition, since it is followed by the dependent variable n-, whereas vsledstvie is not an actual preposition, since it is not followed by n-. Likewise, the same experiment done with vsledstvie and vperedi yields vsledstvie ego but vperedi nego, indicating a formal distinction between the actual preposition vperedi and the "adverb" or "denomina-

tive preposition" vsledstvie. And on this basis we can include both v and vperedi in the inventory of items which are followed by n-, but must exclude vsledstvie, which it is not followed by n-.

Thus the application of the Macdonald-Ferrell rule to Modern Russian enables us to differentiate between two form-classes within the function-class of prepositions in the broad sense. And in view of the present chaotic state of the Russian inventory of prepositions (§§1.01ff. above), it seems justifiable to utilize a criterion which makes possible an objective and consistent demarcation.

1.27 Of even greater potential value is the historical application of the rule of epenthetic n-. It is widely held that in Slavic languages (and many other Indo-European languages) there is a basic tendency towards expansion of the prepositional inventory, especially through the gradual transition of many original adverbs and "preposition plus noun" combinations to prepositional function (for details, see below, §§19.11ff.). And in the history of Russian there has also been a striking expansion of the inventory of items which can occur before n- (compare vperedi nego in the twentieth century, but vperedi ego in the nineteenth, etc., etc.). This dynamic growth has been pointed out by many scholars (see the following section).

The parallelism of these two developments (the expansion of prepositions generally, and of epenthetic n-) suggests that the latter can be interpreted as an overt, formal expression of the former. That is, the acquisition by a one-time adverb or other word-type of the possibility of being followed by n- can be equated with that item's entry into the inventory of the actual prepositions of the language.

To sum up: the marked growth in the occurrence of epenthetic n- over

the past thousand years is not matched by any corresponding growth in the inventory of items which occur after it (the 3PPO), but is matched by a striking growth of the inventory of items which occur before it -- the prepositions.[1] For this reason it seems pragmatically valid to utilize the modern distribution of n-, and its historical changes, to make differentiations in the modern inventory -- and to pinpoint historical changes -- of prepositions, rather than of pronoun objects.

1.28 Previous observations of the development of n-. -- The fact of historical changes in this phenomenon has been mentioned in most descriptions of Russian, but with very little documentation. One of the earliest scholars to note such changes was Grot in his 1883 edition of Deržavin's collected works; in the grammatical commentary, Grot remarks (1883: 346) that "after certain prepositions Deržavin puts [the 3PPO] without the epenthesis (prizvuk) n- in front: mež ix, meždu ix, skvoz' ix, bliz ego, vokrug ego."[2]

Hruby's discussion of n- at the beginning of this century (1909: 48-51 and in passing) does link it to the preposition, but only to the extent of considerable etymological and semantic speculation, without any investigation of the extension of this phenomenon in the historical epoch.

---

[1] Cf. contemporary Persian's tendency, observed by Pejsikov (1959: 52, 183), towards loss of izafet after secondary prepositions, "which sometimes serves as a formal marker of the grammaticalization of denominative prepositions"; e.g., tu ruzname ("inside the paper") instead of the earlier tu-ye ruzname ("inside of the paper").

Cf. also the English phrases on top the barn, off the record, outside the three-mile limit, inside Russia, etc., where of is no longer absolutely necessary.

[2] These five constructions, it transpires, are the only examples of secondary prepositions with the 3PPO in Grot's partial concordance of Deržavin (str. 357-440). From the material of the present study it is possible to add to Grot's list at least two more items without n-: protiv ix and posredstvom ego (see §§5.03, 6.07 below for details).

In 1914 the perceptive Serbian scholar Košutić (1950: §106) spotted the absence of n- after certain prepositions ("krome, mimo, okolo, meždu, protiv, etc.") in Puškin, Lermontov, and Čexov, then compared the contemporary state of things where the given prepositions did take n-.

1.29 One of the first modern treatments of changes in the epenthetic nasal is found in Unbegaun's study of sixteenth-century Russian (1935: 370-1), where he observes briefly that "l'emploi de n dit épenthétique diffère de celui du russe modern. Ce n n'apparaît, au XVIe siècle, qu'avec les prépositions proclitiques et n'a pas encore gagné les adverbes en valeur prépositionelle"; this is illustrated by five examples -- protiv ego and ix, meži and mežju imi, and okolo ego. Since the last three examples are borrowed from Sreznevskij's dictionary, and since only three essentially different prepositions are represented altogether, it would seem that Unbegaun's material on this phenomenon was rather limited.

A dozen years later Vinogradov brought attention (1947: 336) to nineteenth-century peculiarities in Čexov, Puškin, and Lermontov (protiv, meždu, okolo, mimo -- all without n-), and cited instances in the contemporary language where some secondary prepositions still retain the grammatical traits of their adverbial origin, demonstrating this point by comparison of naperekor emu, vopreki emu, na zlo ej (without n-), and mimo nego, protiv nego, vozle nix (with n-).

1.30 Within the last decade there have been a number of references to the development of n-. In Borelius's study of the late seventeenth-century Sáfonovič Chronicle, she points out (1952: 64-5) that n- never occurs with protiv, okolo, posle, and meži. A year later the Soviet Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: 1.§632) includes a (relatively) detailed con-

sideration of this problem; it recognizes several new prepositions which now take n- (posredi, szadi, naprotiv, vperedi, etc.), and states that n- is not used after comparatives (starše, etc.), nor after "prepositions of latest formation" (blagodarja, soglasno, vopreki, navstreču).[1] The Grammatika also devotes two paragraphs (1.§632) to the situation in nineteenth-century literary Russian, listing ten prepositions which occurred without n- (krugom, sredi, protiv, etc.), illustrated by four literary citations (for mež, meždu, sverx, and mimo).

1.31 Many perceptive comments on changes in the distribution of n- have been contributed by the late Bulaxovskij, whose Russian grammar and whose analysis of the early nineteenth-century literary language both contain brief sections on the problem. In his contemporary grammar (1952: 222), Bulaxovskij adds two very interesting notes (primečanija) in which he shows that a 3PPO separated from its governing preposition does not have n- (meždu nim i eju, nim i imi), and that "n- reveals a tendency to expand also to secondary prepositions and constructions which are functionally close to them: krome nix, po povodu nix; and even to the comparative: bliže nix, dal'še nix." This is perhaps the first recognition in print of the assumption of formal prepositional status by certain comparatives and "preposition plus noun" constructions (po povodu). Two years later Bulaxovskij stated (1954: 114) that epenthetic n- in the first four decades of the nineteenth century was restricted to real prepositions, and that "with adverbial prepositions [examples cited for mež(du), vkrug, mimo, and okolo],

[1] These normative rules and examples are restated almost word-for-word in some subsequent Soviet grammars -- e.g., Bajmut's contrastive Russian-Ukrainian grammar (1957: §39), or Pul'kina's large Russian textbook (1960: 177) which adds two more "prepositions of latest formation" (those not taking n-) -- vne and vsledstvie -- to the four mentioned by the Grammatika.

it still did not usually appear."

These descriptive remarks by Bulaxovskij run counter to the general vein of normative rules, such as the attempt of the Grammatika russkogo jazyka to legislate out of being the prepositionalized comparatives which Bulaxovskij does recognize. But even the latter's treatment is very sketchy (confined in his contemporary grammar to two "notes"), and as concerns his statements on nineteenth-century usage, the present study reveals that okolo and especially vkrug, although in flux, were already marked as prepositions more than half the time (see below, §§7.14, 7.06).

1.32 In 1953 Cocron in his doctoral dissertation (1953: 223) made a brief statement that in the second half of the seventeenth century "l'emploi du n- épenthétique se limite aux prépositions proclitiques et ne s'étend pas encore aux adverbes en valeur prépositionelle (protiv" ego au lieu de protiv" nego)." Only the one example is cited, without indication of source; note also the similarity of this statement to that of Unbegaun (quoted in §1.29 above).

Kjellberg's study of the mid-eighteenth century language of Krinovskij reveals (1957: 178) vaguely the same state of affairs as did Unbegaun's -- namely, the primary prepositions take the n-forms of the pronoun, while secondary prepositions (examples are given for bliz and meždu) do not.[1]

1.33 A most detailed treatment of the striking contemporary vacillations in usage is provided by Rozental' in his editorial manual (1957: §101), which lists over two dozen prepositions governing n- (including all nineteen [sic] primary and several secondary prepositions), and points out

[1] The present study does show isolated examples of mež(du) with the nasal, before and simultaneously with Krinovskij, and examples of a few adverb-prepositions with n- in the period examined by Cocron.

that classical writers' usages like krome ego are now obsolete. Rozental' goes on to make the original observation (§101) that n- does not appear with secondary prepositions governing the dative, and enumerates eight examples (vopreki, podobno, etc.). He explains the absence of n- both in dative forms and after constructions of the type v otnošenii . . . (seven similar constructions are also cited) by the fact that all these are "prepositions of latest origin." In this same connection, the construction v čest' nego (quoted without indication of source, presumably from the current press) is criticized as "inaccurate."

Rozental' concludes with the somewhat unrealistic statement that the nasal is "not used after the comparative degree" (examples with molože, lučše, vyše), and indicates that n- may or may not appear when the pronoun object is preceded by a modifier: u vsex nix and u vsex ix are both possible, the second being "considered more modern." (For a full treatment of comparatives, see below, §9; for modified pronoun objects, §12.02.)

1.34 A year later Vaillant published some acute remarks on the expansion-tendency of the epenthetic consonant, recognizing (1958: §246) that in Modern Russian

> il [n-] est de règle avec toutes les prépositions, ainsi instr. méždu nimi, et il s'étend dans la langue parlée au génitif complément de certains comparatifs adverbiaux: xuže negó . . . pour xuže ego; mais le russe a conservé jusqu'au XVIe siècle la distinction de la construction avec les prépositions anciennes, s nimi . . ., et les prépositions nouvelles, meždu imi.

Vaillant thus seems to be the second linguist to affirm in print the existence of "prepositionalized" comparatives; and in addition he, undoubtedly relying on Unbegaun's above-cited observations, mentions the approximate date of the expansion's beginning (sixteenth century -- a fairly accurate estimate, as will be examined in detail below; see §14).

1.35 The fact that n- developed over "a relatively long time" was pointed out in 1958 by the Odessa University's Očerki (1958: 156). In the same year Levin made a questionable reference to this problem (1958: 157, n.), by imputing to Puškin's usages (meždu imi, etc.) the status of "colloquial speech or substandard forms which had gotten into the literary language." As a matter of fact, as will be demonstrated below, the nineteenth-century literary language was in the midst of a profound shift in the adverb-preposition category. Moreover, the older literary norm was just the opposite of Levin's supposition: it was the epenthetic nasal's sporadic presence, rather than its absence, which was the deviation at that time. Nevertheless, further evidence of the prepositional category's unstable character is offered by this misleading statement, obviously based on the widely-changed norms of today.

This is shown by the currently-appearing sixteen-volume dictionary of Modern Russian (SSRLJ [1950ff.: 8.863, 868-9]), which labels the ЗРРО's lack of n- after prepositions as "archaic and regional," and cites Puškin (meždu im i eju, meždu imi), Belinskij (vmesto ego), Lermontov (mimo ego), and Ostrovskij (po em) as evidence. The last example -- with the original preposition po -- is clearly regional, but the others (with vmesto, etc.), as Levin failed to make clear, were common in the earlier nineteenth century and constitute violations (archaicisms) only from the standpoint of present-day Russian. The same type of comment can be found in modern editions of classic Russian writers, such as a Soviet publication of Gor'kij's collected works whose preface includes the remark that such peculiarities of Gor'kij's language as mimo ego would be retained in that edition.

1.36 In 1960 Matthews (1960: §445) explained that the nasal originated after certain primary prepositions (for details, see below, §§19.02ff.)

attested "in the eleventh century," then "in course of time . . . spread to all other prepositional syntagmata containing the personal pronoun (e.g., Nif., 1219: na n' . . .)." Matthews evidently is here considering only texts of East Slavic origin, since -- as will be shown below, §13.01 -- all sixteen primary prepositions (including na) were formally marked as such in the Old Church Slavonic literary language, at least two centuries before the time implied by Matthews (and by Ivanov in his recent historical grammar [1964: §179]) for the extension of n-. A year later Lomtev (1961: §80) attempted to prove the historical changes of n- through brief illustrations of its different fates in the East Slavic languages, and the following year Isačenko (1962: §244) mentioned the gradual expansion of n- in the nineteenth century.

The most recent study of epenthetic n-, and the first detailed original research to be published on the subject, is Blažev's 1962 article, which not only indicates differences in the use of n- in earlier centuries, but also analyzes modern-day usage when the ЗРРО has a modifier (ves', sam), citing two dozen examples from literature, and conducting a poll of informants. Results of Blažev's investigation will be considered in §12.026 below.

1.37 It is easily seen from the above collection of linguists' comments on the historical development of n- in Russian, that there is not complete unanimity (chronology-wise or inventory-wise) on this question, but what is most important, there is an apparent lack of compilations of concrete data from primary sources, on which to base reliable descriptive rules for the history of this well-known but little-studied phenomenon. With the exception of Blažev, no study cites more than half a dozen literary quotations illustrating the presence or absence of n- (most of those

usually from Puškin), and even Unbegaun's sixteenth-century description draws from the Sreznevskij dictionary to fill out its material.

All this is summed up by Ferrell (1958: 98), who while conceding that the origin and extension of n- "has been treated at some length," goes on to show that important questions remain unclarified, and that while the fourteenth-century system was "approximately the same [as that of Modern Russian], the details of the implementation of the system show considerable differences through the history of the language, and in some cases what, for instance, to Puškin were adverbs are now prepositions. All of this remains to be investigated fully."

1.38 The second formal criterion which can be used to test prepositional status is whether or not the item splits a negative or indefinite pronoun. Compare, on the one hand, ne za čto, ni iz-za čego, etc., but on the other, vrode ničego, nesmotrja ni na čto, etc.[1] Little attention has ever been given to this phenomenon in descriptions of Russian or Old Church Slavonic, as the linguists — e.g., Vaillant (1948: §94) -- have restricted themselves to mention of the fact, illustrated by one or two examples. In this instance, however, there can be little complaint, since such pronouns hardly ever occur with any prepositions except the "simple" category. This criterion has a considerably narrower range of application than does that of epenthetic n-, and consequently will be of little importance in the analysis below. (For further details, see §12.01.)

[1]Cf. in Ukrainian the possibility, shown by DeBray (1951: 99), of a preposition splitting the indefinite pronoun dexto, as in dé na kómu.

2. INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT INVESTIGATION

> Fluctuation in the frequency of speech-forms is a factor in all non-phonetic changes.
>
> Bloomfield (1933: §22.2)

2.01 Sources of data. -- The data for the present study was derived from a single type of source: as Matthews (1960: §171) puts it, "written material, on which the history of Russian must unavoidably be based." Written records are in fact the only real source for the historical period (compare also Bloomfield [1933: §17.1]), and although it would have been possible to introduce spoken data from living informants for the modern era, it seemed advisable in the interests of consistency (also simplicity and convenience) to limit the project entirely to an investigation of literary Russian -- as represented by written material. All the more so for a category like secondary prepositions, which in general are characteristic of scholarly, bookish language -- a point stressed by Kalečic (1958: 115, 118), Finkel' (1962b: 21), and Čerkasova (1955: 75).

2.02 Selection of texts. -- A difficult problem encountered in the present research turned out to be the preliminary establishment of a basic corpus. The difficulties were of two kinds: first, the selection of early texts whose content would be chronologically reliable within reasonable limits; and second, the elemental problem of finding copies of these texts. In practice, the establishment of the basic corpus was dependent on the simultaneous solution of these two interconnected factors, reliability and

accessibility.

2.03 The problem of evaluating various copies of historical written records (pamjatniki) is thoroughly examined in a recent article by Lixačev (1958), who shows that different criteria can be employed. For one purpose, the oldest copy may be needed; for another, the fullest, or the "most correct," or the closest to the original author's version, etc. -- or even, as Lixačev argues, the "best" copy may not coincide with any of these qualifications.

For purposes of the present investigation, however, the criterion of chronological reliability (minimum time lag) seemed most appropriate. That is, texts representative of the earlier stages of Russian were selected for analysis, if the (approximate) time of their writing (or copying) was no more than a century or two later than the presumed time of original composition. For this reason, such texts as the Igor Tale and the Story of Bygone Years were not included in the basic corpus because of the great time lag between their oldest extant copies (late fourteenth, sixteenth, even eighteenth century) and their presumably tenth- to twelfth-century origin. Any linguistic phenomenon attested in such written records could not be assigned with certainty either to the date of composition or to the date of available copies, since it would be impossible to prove whether the phenomenon was present in the original, or was introduced (or altered) by one copyist or another some centuries later -- a point made by Sobolevskij (1907: 11) and Ivanov (1964: §59), and emphasized repeatedly by Durnovo (1927: §§11, 27, 33).[1]

[1]The many deficiencies in the publication of Old Russian written records was made the subject of detailed discussion and criticism at a 1961 conference, reported by Knjazevskaja (1962), and in a symposium edited by Kotkov (1963: esp. the contributions by Kotkov and Baxturina). The whole

2.04 This same general consideration also holds, to a certain extent, for modern printed books. One interesting example is Gor'kij's use of the phrase "in front of her" in his story Devjatoe janvarja: the recent authoritative edition of his works (Sobranie sočinenij v 30 tt. [Moskva, 1950]) shows this as vpered ee, but a check of the original publication of this story (Berlin, 1907) reveals the same phrase with n- (vpered" neja). It transpires that the "authoritative" edition is based on a revised version of the story, done by Gor'kij in the middle twenties.

Thus dating of linguistic phenomena has perils even for the twentieth century. What may be the more desirable edition from the standpoint of literary history -- the one representing the author's final version of his creation -- is less desirable for purposes of linguistic chronology. In the above illustration, for example, the 1907 Ladyžnikov edition may not have entirely satisfied Gor'kij in style or content, or may have represented the linguistic feelings of the editor rather than the author (with the result that Gor'kij later made a number of changes), but still it offers concrete examples of linguistic usage in a definite year. And that is the best type of source for formal investigations such as the present one -- in which examples were checked when possible with original editions or early reprints, in order to minimize the possible time lag.

2.05 Before such chronological problems can be solved (or simultaneously with them), it is necessary to ascertain what prose texts representing the earlier centuries are extant and available, through newly-published critical editions or older ones accessible in libraries. Some

---

sphere of problems and difficulties connected with an investigation of written Russian via old documents is thoroughly examined by Unbegaun in his monograph on sixteenth-century Russian (1935: "Introduction," esp. pp. 29-35).

information about sources as such is given by almost any book on the history of Russian language or literature, but in most instances it is unsystematic and has insufficient chronological and critical detail, so as to be of limited usefulness in planning investigations such as the present one. A partial exception is Budovnic's dictionary of pre-eighteenth century literature (1962), which offers 400 pages of extensive bibliographical information, although it unfortunately does not attempt to give the dates of nearly all its texts. Other books which do provide a special section or chapter with source evaluations which have been very useful to this investigator are, first and foremost, Durnovo (1927: 24-97), and also Vinokur (1945: gl. 4), Čerynx (1954: §§5-12), Durnovo (1959: 354-9), Matthews (1960: chap. 5), and Ivanov (1964: §§7-16).

2.06 Emphasis on prose. -- A similar problem of text selection and availability arose in connection with the type of material to be drawn upon. It was decided to found the basic corpus (see §2.08 below) entirely on prose, as being more representative of the "standard language" of any given period -- even though this decision entailed some difficulty in locating sufficient prose material for the period around the turn of the nineteenth century. Poetic texts were not included in the basic corpus because they often deviate from the standard language of their time, especially in word order and lexicon.

2.07 Throughout this discussion, the importance of chronological identification has been repeatedly stressed. For a good description of formal changes which have occurred in the historical development of a language, one of the main questions which should be answered (besides "what?" and in some cases "why?") is that of "when?" Often important works on the

history of Russian -- Lomtev's 600-page volume (1956) is one instance -- go into considerable detail on the mechanisms and possible explanations of linguistic changes, but their treatment remains incomplete in that the general chronology of changes is given only in the vaguest terms (perhaps within two centuries, or four, or only in relative terms, or perhaps not at all) -- a shortcoming which is magnified if dates are not given for individual examples quoted from primary sources.

A similar criticism is voiced by Vinogradov (1957: 188-9), who decries the lack of complete and precise historical surveys in the field of Russian syntax. Even in the case of the Novgorod birch-bark documents (none of which bears a date), the importance of trying to establish an approximate date is stressed by Žukovskaja (1959: 24-9), who discusses in detail the various kinds of evidence which can be utilized for chronological purposes. But the strongest statement of the case for absolute chronology probably comes from the pen of Finkel' (1962b: 8):

> We cannot be satisfied with a general indication that secondary prepositions appear in the eighteenth century. In many instances there is a possibility of making this dating more precise -- not in terms of centuries, but in terms of decades.

In the present study every attempt will be made to establish the chronology of observed changes as precisely as the data will allow. This is possible because the author of this study followed the practice of Unbegaun (1935), Bulaxovskij (1954), and Matthews (1960) and assigned -- at the cost of not a little extra time and effort -- a date (approximate if necessary) to every example in the corpus. All examples of each preposition were then arranged in chronological order (see §2.10 below), and conclusions were formulated on the basis of this chronologically systematized material.

2.08 The material of the present study was drawn primarily from a basic corpus of prose texts with an estimated total length of 2,160,000 running words, assuming 300 words per page for the total number of pages read in the basic corpus (approximately 7,200). This basic corpus (material covered systematically for examples of prepositions with certain objects) was planned to insure a certain minimum representation for each period in the history of Russian, by including no less than 200 pages (actual number read in parentheses) for each of the following periods:[1]

TABLE 4

PAGE BREAKDOWN OF THE BASIC CORPUS

1000-1499 (ca. 212)	1850-1859 (232)
1500-1599 (270)	1860-1869 (318)
1600-1649 (363)	1870-1879 (209)
1650-1699 (228)	1880-1889 (219)
1700-1724 (204)	1890-1899 (206)
1725-1749 (338)	1900-1909 (230)
1750-1774 (205)	1910-1919 (206)
1775-1799 (207)	1920-1929 (523)
1800-1809 (239)	1930-1939 (462)
1810-1819 (202)	1940-1949 (389)
1820-1829 (201)	1950-1959 (895)
1830-1839 (231)	1960-1964 (200)
1840-1849 (224)	

As can be seen from the list, the amount of material checked is progressively larger for more recent centuries; for instance, the minimum coverage of 200 pages was assigned to each decade of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as compared with 200 pages for each half of the seventeenth century, etc. This breakdown was planned to provide the most intensive coverage for those centuries where the greatest expansion of epenthetic n- has taken place, and relatively less coverage for the earliest periods --

[1] The 200-page minimum was further qualified by the requirement that each period be represented by at least 50 pages from at least two different authors. The titles entering into the Basic Corpus are listed in §21.02.

when there was little, if any, change.

2.09 Supplementary corpus. -- Besides the basic corpus, many examples were also drawn from a thorough check of the preposition and pronoun entries in various dictionaries (the concordances of Puškin and of two O.C.S. manuscripts, Sreznevskij's dictionary of Old Russian, two multivolume Soviet dictionaries of Modern Russian -- titles given in §21.01), and from the appropriate sections in numerous books and articles on the history of Russian and on the modern language (see the Bibliography, §22.02 below). Further, any useful examples which came to the author's attention through random scanning of parts of other primary sources from various periods, and from numerous other recent Russian materials read in different connections, were also included. All of this unsystematically collected data constitutes the supplementary part of the corpus. Examples from the two types of sources were not differentiated, except that a check of supplementary examples was made against primary sources and examples, in order to achieve greater reliability and eliminate any duplication. The statistics in Table 4 on pages read do not reflect any of the sources of supplementary materials, which -- if they were counted (especially the large concordances) -- would considerably increase the total number of words checked.

2.10 Processing the data. -- The prepositional examples drawn from these various sources were processed on IBM machines. In this the present investigation follows the precedent set by Josselson in his pioneering word count of a decade ago (1953), perhaps the first compilational research in Russian to take advantage of the rapidity and accuracy of modern data-processing machines. The data of the present study was first coded (punched) on IBM cards, then it was sorted (classified) on the basis of various cri-

teria -- date, preposition type, special object category, etc. -- and finally the results were printed up in lists. Neither digital computers nor complex algebraic equations were required for the data-processing operations and the compilations presented below, which are relatively simple and straightforward. Nevertheless they were conducted as scientifically as possible, in accordance not only with the linguistic requirement that a description be complete, consistent, and concise, but also taking into account some recently published theoretical considerations about the compilation of linguistic data.

2.11 Criticism is justifiably levelled by Brøndal (1950: §6) at several monographs and statistical materials on prepositions with extensive data which is rendered partly meaningless for not having been organized around preliminary guiding principles or with reference to chronological or stylistic norms. Brøndal also sets down (§58) an important prerequisite for frequency counts: the results must be evaluated in relative terms.

Similar reservations are expressed by Chapman with reference to the Blaisdell monograph on Old Icelandic prepositions (1959), some of whose conclusions are shown to be not fully substantiated by scientific method. Chapman concurs (1960: 435) with the Brøndal demand that the definitions and structural analysis should come first. Further, Chapman argues (436) that the description should include both percentage tables and the raw figures on which they are based, so that the reader can check the data's level of significance -- or, if he wishes, can make additional comparisons not already provided. Chapman goes on to show (437-8) that small samples by the nature of probability theory are not likely to give an accurate representation of the whole, and that great reliance must not be placed on

their results. Likewise, he points out that Blaisdell's research covered a period of only one century -- an extremely short time-span in which to discern any fundamental trend in language, especially when the dates of the texts in question can only be established approximately.

2.12 The following analysis will begin with a definition of terms (§§2.18ff.), stating the kinds of items and constructions to be described, and then will describe the behavior of each individual item in these terms, based on empirical observation of the present corpus. For each item, inclusive dates and the raw figures entering into the percentages will be given, thus making it clear in what years some preposition or related phenomenon is attested (or not attested), and by how small (or large) a number of examples. When the number is small, this fact will be emphasized. As was discussed in §2.08 above, much primary and secondary source material was examined in order to find a substantial number of the not so common prepositional constructions in question: the total number tabulated in the corpus is 4,327 (not counting adverbial and certain other marginal constructions).[1] And this material represents a much longer period -- from ca. 1000 A.D. to 1964 (a total span of nearly a thousand years) -- which is also important, considering that some of the early texts are datable only within a century or two.

2.13 The inclusion of a considerable amount of supplementary material along with the basic corpus, as mentioned above, means that the raw figures in the statistical summaries of individual prepositions have no particular significance in themselves. Considerably more value can be attributed to the relative percentages derived from these raw figures. De-

[1] Blaisdell, by comparison, tabulated 1,393 examples (Chapman [437]).

scriptive rules can be established on the basis of such data, according to a recent theoretical monograph by Spang-Hanssen (1959: §§6-7), when a given phenomenon is observed not to occur in the material (assuming the possibility of its occurrence on the basis of chance).

Such an instance in the present study is the initial consonant n-. At the onset of the 3PPO of a "preposition," it either appears or does not appear -- no third alternative exists. In Jakobsonian terms, this can be considered a "yes-or-no" question, a mutually-exclusive binary opposition. The presence of epenthetic n- after a certain preposition marks that item positively as an "actual" preposition; the absence of n- here means that the item is unmarked -- or, more accurately, is marked negatively as a non-actual preposition.

The probability of n's occurrence after any given item at any given time would, on the basis of pure chance, be .5 (50%). And the fact that n- always appears here when preceded by certain items (which we will define as "actual prepositions") after a certain time in history, and never appears here before that time or when preceded by other items, is obviously a deviation from chance conditions. Cases of this sort, Spang-Hanssen shows (1959: §6), are due to the operation of language system or pattern.

2.14 Predictive chronology. -- The raw figures and relative percentages to be presented constitute empirical data describing the present corpus. And, as already mentioned, this data has a limitation imposed by the heterogeneity of sources in the corpus. The major findings of the present investigation must necessarily lie elsewhere -- in the field of prediction. According to Spang-Hanssen (§7), "the ascertainment of deviations from chance conditions always aims at setting up a hypothesis [i.e., prediction] on conditions in an open material; such hypotheses can be called (empiri-

cal) rules or laws."[1] Spang-Hanssen considers (§1) that "any description of open texts is in the nature of a hypothesis," since (§5) "the open material displays the system [i.e., langue, in contrast to the parole of a "closed text"]."

2.15 Therefore if a description based on an "open" corpus, such as this historical analysis of Russian prepositions, is to be of any real value, it must have some predictive reference to the overall chronological system (or patterning, or langue, or "immanent structure") of prepositional usage. Thus the present study involves a prediction of the chronological pattern of each preposition's development (in relation to epenthetic n-). This periodization -- not the raw figures, nor even the relative percentages -- is the major point to be made in the analysis of each preposition below, and is based on the hypothesis that it (the periodization) reflects the chronological development of the given preposition in the language as a whole, above and beyond the present corpus.

Herein lies the reason for the inclusion of the supplementary source material (working on the assumption that any preposition encountered at random in this material would have a 50/50 chance of governing or not governing n-): the more examples of any preposition (with the decisive objects) which are found in different time segments (centuries, decades, years), the more likely the preposition's predicted absolute chronology is to be accurate within those segments.[2]

---

[1] "Open material" is defined by Spang-Hanssen (§1) as an extensive corpus, a broad, heterogeneous set of sources (as opposed to "closed material": an intensive corpus such as a single text or the complete works of one author).

[2] Other researchers have looked at this matter differently. Blaisdell, for instance, limited his corpus to ten documents (1959: §3.9), and refused to include any supplementary material, even in categories where

2.16 Qualifications. -- Here it must be pointed out that this is possibly the first study which attempts to establish in broad outline the historical development of every preposition (with the specified objects) throughout the period of written texts, from Old Church Slavonic[1] up to present-day Russian. Hence it follows that only further research can ultimately prove whether the chronological summaries of each preposition have been established here with reasonable accuracy. Hopefully, most have been, and their results will have the validity of any structural hypothesis which is "founded upon a relevant empirical distribution and . . . as long as it is not contradicted." (Spang-Hanssen [1959: chap. 3].)

2.17 As pointed out above, the relative frequencies of "marked" and "unmarked" forms of the ЗРРО of prepositions will serve as the basis for establishing the pattern of chronological development of each preposition, and of the general categories of prepositions. In the following analysis, each preposition's history will be broken down into periods (details in §2.28) determined by the percentage of "marked" occurrences, and for each period the statistical evidence will also be specified.

Such is the only realistic way of representing those developments in language which happen by gradual drift over several decades or centuries,

---

his basic corpus was insufficient to be conclusive. But even Blaisdell made an exception (§2.7) with one document, in which he skipped from one part to another, upon finding that too many examples of a certain stereotyped construction were turning up and threatening to distort the results.

[1]The evidence indicates complete identity, insofar as government of n- is concerned, between Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian of the eleventh through fourteenth centuries. For this reason it was deemed possible to draw upon OCS texts as representing the oldest extant stage of Slavic prepositional constructions, to which Old Russian prepositional constructions were very closely related. Cf. also Bukatević (1953: 27): "The inventory of prepositions which were being used in Old Russian remained almost the same."

rather than by a sudden, complete break at a single point in time. Bloomfield thirty years ago had in mind this realistic approach to the problems of linguistic history when he wrote (1933: §22.2):

> Fluctuations in the frequency of forms could be accurately observed if we had a record of every utterance that was made in a speech-community during whatever period of time we wanted to study. We could then keep a tally-sheet for every form . . . ; whenever an utterance was made, we could score a point on the tally-sheet. . . . In this way we should obtain tables or graphs which showed the ups and downs in frequency of every form during the time covered by our records.

A similar outlook is implicit in Spang-Hanssen's theoretical supposition (1959: §42) that the "distinction between structure (as a framework of relations in terms of 'can occur / cannot occur') and conditions of usage (including relations in terms of 'more and less') is inappropriate for the description of empirical languages."

In other words, there are few absolutes in natural language, nor do languages change suddenly. Vacillation to a greater or lesser extent is usually present, and it can most faithfully be represented by statistics which reveal not only the dominant tendency, but also the extent of deviation from that tendency, accompanied by explanatory commentary. This is the approach of the present investigation, which will "lay all its cards on the table" by providing exact raw figures, percentages, and dates for each period in the development of each preposition and each prepositional category, and will draw (predictive) conclusions only as broad or as absolute as is warranted by the data in each instance.

2.18 Criteria and definitions of terms. -- In the following description (Parts Two and Three), all items will be checked for prepositional status on the basis of governing or not governing n- (and on the basis of splitting or not splitting negative-indefinite pronouns, if there are any such examples). The various kinds of items distinguished on these bases

will be defined below. (For other definitions, see Macdonald [1955: §§1.2-1.5] or Šaxmatov [1925: §491].)

2.19 A prepositional phrase is defined as consisting of a preposition and its object[1] (which may be simple or compound[2]).

2.20 For purposes of the present investigation, a preposition in the broadest sense is defined as any item, other than the inflected forms of a verb or an adjective, which controls an object (specifically, the 3PPO) in an oblique case form, and which in combination with its object forms a phrase capable of functioning as an adverbial modifier.[3]

2.21 Its object is the item which occurs in an oblique case form when controlled by the preposition (which may precede or follow[4] the object).

2.22 When the object is a 3PP beginning with n- in any given chronological period, the preposition is defined as actual, at that time. If the 3PPO lacks n- in any period, the preposition is defined as apparent, at that time.[5]

Likewise, when the object is a NIP, the preposition is defined as actual if it splits the object (ni k čemu, etc.); it is defined as appar-

---

[1]The present study retains the traditional terms "preposition," "object," "government," etc., for convenience. From a modern syntactic standpoint it might be preferable to speak of a phrase structure consisting of a nominal form in an oblique case controlled by or co-occurring with a "relator," which is in some sense a satellite to it.

[2]The rather special circumstances entailed in a compound object (vo vsex nix, meždu nami i imi, etc.) are treated in §§12.02ff. below.

[3]This definition was formulated so broadly as a starting point for gathering data in the present investigation, in order to permit the inclusion of many items (e.g., gerunds, quality adverbs) which as yet give no indication of assuming the formal prepositional status formulated in §2.22, but which may have this potential, as they sometimes occur in syntactic positions similar to those filled by the basic prepositions. In addition to the latter, this loose definition in Russian enables us to scrutinize such categories as gerunds (but we exclude other forms of verbs), indeclinable comparatives (but no other forms of adjectives -- which according to Kalečic cannot become prepositions [1958: 113-4]), and even interjections like gore emu.

[4]Unless there is a special need to distinguish postpositions as a special class, both preposed and postposed items will be referred to as "prepositions." For some specialized purposes, a more appropriate cover-term might be "appositions," or "posits" (Hans Kurath), or "ponents" (H. H. Paper), or "relators" (Blaisdell).

[5]For a more refined statement taking into account compound objects, see below: §12.025, n.

ent if it does not split the NIP (e.g., s nekotorym -- see §12.014 below).

The cover-term for both the 3PP and the NIP will be decisive objects, or decisive pronouns. Whether a preposition is "actual" or "apparent"[1] will be referred to as the status of that preposition.

2.23 When an item functioning part of the time as a preposition occurs alone (without an overt object), it is defined as an adverbial preposition or a preposition functioning adverbially.[2] A preposition which is not attested alone is defined as a dependent preposition. It should be noted that "adverbial" here is based on syntactic function, not historical origin (for which simply "adverb" is used).

2.24 Thus there is a small number of different possible combinations.

A) An "actual" preposition can be
   1) dependent in usage (e.g., v), or
   2) potentially adverbial (e.g., vokrug).

B) Likewise, an "apparent" preposition can be
   1) dependent (e.g., vne -- with some qualifications), or
   2) potentially adverbial (e.g., vsled).

The dependent category is subject to fluctuation due to the potential metalinguistic usage of any preposition, even the most simple (e.g., -- ne po, a pod [§3.074 below]. It might also be noted that among the supplementary source materials are some examples from Majakovskij's verse, in which he often likes to use normally "dependent" prepositions (iz,

---

[1]The terms "actual" and "apparent" (to be translated into Russian as nastojaščij and kažuščijsja, respectively) are used in the present study in a strictly neutral, descriptive sense, and not as evaluative terms. They will henceforth be set off by quotation marks to emphasize the special sense in which they are employed in the present work.

[2]This simplified definition of "adverbial usage" is applied throughout the present study in order to avoid complicated problems of distinguishing "true adverbial usage" from "elliptical phrases" or "grammatically incomplete prepositional phrases," where an "understood" or "omitted" object of the preposition is considered obligatory (cf. examples in §§3.084, 3.114, 3.173, etc.). Going into this topic would require a separate study beyond the scope of the present work.

nad, etc.) adverbially. Such usages stand out as extreme deviations from the general norms established in the corpus, and provide a cogent illustration of the differences between poetry and prose (which forms the basic part of the corpus -- see §§2.06, 2.08 above). Any examples from poetic texts quoted in the present study will be marked by an asterisk (*) at the beginning of the citation, in order that they may be clearly distinguished from prose material.

Two other combinations are also possible: an adverbial preposition and a dependent preposition which are not attested with the decisive objects (3PP and NIP). It is plainly impossible to define the status of such prepositions within the terms of the present approach, even though this does place us in the position of leaving undefined some prepositions from various periods in the history of Russian (e.g., po-za, putem, naka-nune, kasatel'no, v rezul'tate, etc.) which are not attested in the present corpus with any decisive pronouns. But as with efforts to prove genetic relationships among languages, there always remains the possibility of uncovering further evidence which would still permit us to identify new "actual" or "apparent" prepositions at some future date.

It goes without saying that a complete adverbial (an item which never takes an object) does not enter into the study of prepositions.

2.25 Certain limitations and exclusions have been made in the inventory of "actual" and "apparent" prepositions. In combinations of the type "vpred' do + object," only the second half of the "preposition" was taken into consideration; that is, such combinations govern as their second element (do) governs, and the very loosely-connected first element (adverbials of very diverse types) can be considered as a verb-modifier. In any case, the presence of the first element (vpred') is not reflected

by any change in the form of the 3PPO (which already has n-).

When the second element of such combinations as vpred' do is a "simple" preposition (§3 below), an additional preceding element was considered as part of the prepositional unit only when it is a "dependent" preposition (as the iz in iz-za -- a similarity pointed out by Peškovskij), since dependent prepositions by definition do not occur as autonomous adverbs, and thus cannot belong with the verb, but must be regarded as a part of the prepositional complex. Contrast this with the sootvetstvenno element (of sootvetstvenno s) which is of the adverbial type and not necessarily "dependent" on what follows, as the iz in iz-za is.

The occurrence of n with a prefix (doneliže, don'deže, otnjudu, ponimat', soNproNg") or a suffix (okr'st'njij) was also not taken into account in the corpus, in that this n belongs to fixed forms and their derivation, rather than to free syntactical combinations. (For details, see Vaillant [1950: §83].)

2.26 Plan for presentation of the data. -- As discussed in §§1.15ff. above, there have been many possible "morphological classifications" of prepositions. Here the Proto-Slavic and Indo-European etymological levels will not be utilized; for criticism and details regarding these matters, see Belić (1957), Netteberg (1957: 20), Vondrak (1928: 298-319), Hrubý (1909), Lomtev (1956: passim), Ryžkov (1957), Isengalieva (1959: 20-1), etc. The "morphological" classification used below for a preliminary arrangement of the data was first presented by the author in a recent article (Hill [1962]). It is intended mainly as a convenient means of classifying all prepositions under eight basic categories (plus one sub-category), which at the same time, it is hoped, offers a more consistent classification than any heretofore published (see criticism, §§1.15ff. above).

The "morphological" categories will be presented in the following order, under the numerical designation as indicated to the left:

§3. "Simple" prepositions (v)

§4. "Double" prepositions (iz-za)

§5. "Root" prepositions (protiv)

§6. "Suffixed" prepositions (sredi)

§7. "Prefixed" prepositions (vmestc)

§8. "Combination" prepositions (po povodu); this is really a subcategory of §7.

§9. "Comparative" prepositions (ran'še)

§10. "Adverb" prepositions (otnositel'no)

§11. "Gerund" prepositions (blagodarja)

2.27 Each preposition will be treated under the above-outlined class to which it belongs. In the class involving "suffixes," all those items ending in the same "suffix" will be grouped; in the "prefixed" category, all members with the same prefix will be arranged together; in the "comparative" category, all with the same type of ending will be grouped; and so on. "Simple" prepositions will be arranged according to phonological structure. In these respects the present study follows the arrangement used by Vinogradov in his analysis of adverbs (1947: č. 5, §§10-2), and the suggestion of Ščerba (quoted by Čerkasova [1955: 132]) that "all prepositions . . . must be studied in detail . . . not in alphabetical order, but as elements of grammar." There need not, however, be any difficulty in finding some particular preposition in this arrangement, as an alphabetical index of all prepositions is provided at the back (§23.00).

2.28 Format. -- The following information will be provided in the description of each preposition: period of "apparent" status (when the

given preposition virtually never governs n- or splits the NIP), transition period (covering, generally speaking, the time from the earliest "actual" example to the latest "apparent" one -- i.e., when examples of the two types of status co-occur), and period of "actual" status (when the preposition governs n- or splits the NIP virtually 100% of the time). For each of these periods will be indicated the number of attestations in the corpus of "actual" and "apparent" status, the relative percentages of "actual" examples, and the inclusive years within which each "status" is attested in the corpus. (Some prepositions have, of course, had only one "status" throughout their history, and only one period can be established for them.)

In the case of those prepositions which began their career (in the corpus, from ca. 1000 A.D. on) with "apparent" status and later shifted to "actual," an estimated turning point will be suggested: this is the date estimated (on the basis of the present corpus) to be the given preposition's point of breakthrough from "apparent" to "actual" status, after which the proportion of occurrences with n- undergoes a very sharp upturn in relation to the foregoing period. (As already emphasized, the chronological data is the major element of the analysis of each preposition; the raw figures and percentages are of secondary importance.)

In rendering estimated and inclusive dates, the following practice will be employed. A single citation known to be from the thirteen century will be designated 1200/99, one known to be from the second half of the fifteenth century will be designated 1450/99, and one known to have been written first in 1825 but revised or republished in 1831, will be designated 1825/31. In other words, the diagonal (/) indicates a period within which a single example belongs.

For examples from chronicles or other early texts where only the latest possible date of writing is definite (i.e., "not after 1377," "not after 1425," etc.), the chronology will be indicated by this latest date preceded by a diagonal: /1377, /1425, etc. A group of examples of a single type but occurring in different years will be indicated by a hyphen between the date of the earliest and the latest examples: e.g., 1724-1941 means that several examples are attested, the earliest from 1724, the most recent from 1941.

2.29 To support this generalized chronological scheme for each preposition, and to provide something tangible for illustrative purposes, examples representing the earliest and most recent attestations (in the corpus) of "apparent" and of "actual" status will be given for each preposition, accompanied by indication of date and source for each citation. If the citation is from poetry, it will be marked with an asterisk (*); if from quoted speech, it will begin, as in Russian punctuation, with a dash (--); if from narrative or expository prose (the vast bulk of the material), it will be unmarked.

Within each citation, the preposition or prepositional phrase under discussion will be double-spaced (e.g., p o z a d i n i x byla vojna), according to the Russian practice. Each citation will be followed by indication of its source (in parentheses), with the author's name in capital letters; the titles of stories, poems, letters, etc., unmarked; and titles of books, plays, journals, etc., underlined. Citations from Old and Middle Russian documents will be identified, whenever possible, by sheet number (33a, 129b, etc.) or date of entry (for the chronicles) of the original. In Old Church Slavonic citations, chapter and verse, or sheet and line, will be separated by a colon (Ioan 14:3, etc.). Citations from jour-

nals will show the volume, issue, and page number in that order, and separated by periods (16.1.86 = Vol. XVI, No. I, p. 86). Sources which are abbreviated may be found in the Key to Primary Sources (§21.03 below).

2.30 As mentioned above (§0.014), all Cyrillic citations, bibliographical references, and Russian names will be transliterated according to the AATSEEL system. However, such special characters as "hard yer," "yat'," etc., will not be distinguished in many instances, as many of the critical editions of older sources used in this study do not render them, instead replacing them with their modern equivalents. Suprascript letters from old manuscripts will be brought into the line and enclosed in parentheses. For Proto-Slavic (Common Slavic) reconstructions, the back and front "reduced vowels" will be rendered *ъ and *ь, respectively. Direct quotations will retain (in transliteration) the spellings used in the documents themselves, but general references to prepositions outside of quoted context will be rendered in normalized modern spelling.

2.31 It is to be hoped that the use of dated citations will, in addition to providing documentation of the chronological findings of this investigation, also provide an impetus to further research, stimulating other scholars to seek even earlier (or more recent, as the case may be) examples of each period in the history of particular prepositions, thus expanding the frontiers of our knowledge about them. The main purpose of the present study is to chart the first rough contours of the absolute and relative chronology of all individual prepositions and prepositional categories in an area of usage (the "decisive objects") which, as discussed above, has not heretofore been systematically explored or mapped.

PART TWO

DIACHRONIC ANALYSIS OF INDIVIDUAL PREPOSITIONS AND CONSTRUCTIONS

"Figures do not lie."
Adam Riese (1492?-1559)

3. SIMPLE PREPOSITIONS

3.00 Introduction. -- The first and most basic morphological class, often referred to as "original" or "underived," is here designated as the "simple" prepositions. These prepositions, eighteen in number, will be presented in the following order: v, k, s, o(b), u, do, po, za, na, iz, ot, pri, pro, bez, v"z, nad, pod, pered. Except for pro and v"z, all of the "simple" prepositions are attested with considerable frequency, and with the status of "actual" prepositions, throughout the period under study, dating from around 1000 A.D. And this is the only category whose members have "actual" status in the earliest texts. Details are given below under the individual prepositions.

3.01 V ("in"), probably the most frequent of all prepositions, has clearly been an "actual" preposition since the earliest documents. In the present corpus only a scattered sample of all the "actual" examples (those where v governs n- or splits the NIP) were tabulated, but they still totalled over ten times as much as a complete tabulation of all "apparent" examples (n- missing or NIP not split) in the corpus -- which totalled 22. The overall pattern and the exceptions will first be summarized in concise form, and then peculiarities and special problems will be commented upon.

SUMMARY OF V

Period of "actual" status . . . . 235+ 22 91+%[a] . . . . . ca. 1000-1960

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: i v'věsiti i v ' n ' v' vrětišti (Suprasl., 112:4, etc. -- 69 total examples).

Latest "actual" example

1960: v o vsex n i x [jazykax] . . . vidno proisxoždenie značenija (TRUBAČEV, Slavjanskie ètimologii, 1.89; cited by Blažev [1962: 14]).

The 22 "apparent" examples

V"eže, vo eže, 8 examples (1190-1727); NIP, 7 (1727-1957); folk speech, 4 (1700-1923); interposed modifier, 1 (1960); misprint, 1 (1000/99); unaccounted for, 1 (/1377).

3.011 Exceptions. -- It can be seen that the 22 seemingly contradictory examples form only a very small part of the total, and fit into a few describable classifications. The statistics and examples for the overwhelming majority of the material (testifying to "actual" status) speak for themselves, and need no further commentary.

Seven of the exceptions involve the NIP, and will be treated in a separate section (§3.012). Another eight can be accounted for as occurrences of the fixed form vo eže functioning as a relative conjunction, often with a Biblical ring; e.g., 1190/99: Feodosii razumě v " j e ž e neprav'd'no sušče izg"nanie (Sb. Usp. sob., 58a). Some occurrences of v" eže in the corpus are, in fact, quotations of a passage from the Evangelie (Matfej 9:13). It should also be noted that even in Old Church Slavonic eže tends to be a fixed form, according to Vaillant (1948: §96). The only problem is that this relative is sometimes used by an author with the n-

[a]To be read as follows: 235+ examples of "actual" status, and 22 of "apparent" status, for a percentage of 91+% "actual," in the period ca. 1000-1960, inclusively. The symbol "+" indicates that only a sampling of the huge number of "actual" examples occurring in texts of the corpus were counted in the tabulation: merely enough to prove that v is, and has been, entirely "actual" throughout its history. The format of the citations and other parts of the summary is explained above (§§2.28ff.)

as well as without it; e.g., 1610/20: vsjak že ot svoego činu, v n e ž e zvan byst' (PALICYN, Skaz., 351a; Palicyn also uses voeže in his text). This ancient expression dies out in Middle Russian, being last attested in the present corpus in 1727. Further comments on voeže may be found in Bulaxovskij (1958: 374).

Another basic exception, accounting for four examples (all since 1700) is the omission of n- to characterize "folk speech"; e.g., 1923/26: -- ėtot gorodok očen' velikolepnyj, budet pobole Krasnodara, ljudi v e m očen' krasivye (BABEL', Pis'mo, Izb., 21, 22). The twentieth exception in the corpus turns out to be a misprint: 1000/99: byst" že i p'rě v ' i x " (Marianus, Luka 22:24); according to Buzuk (1924: 357-8), the original document has v" nx" (sic) here, which was misread by the modern editor, Jagić, as *v' ix".

The twenty-first exception is clearly occasioned by the interposition of a modifier before the ЗРРО: 1960: v o vsex i x [komandirovkax] prinimal učastie i avtor (MALYŠEV, Ust'-cilemskie sborniki, 4; cited by Blažev [1962: 14]). This exception cannot be considered completely predictable, however, in that there are two other examples in the corpus where such an interposition apparently does not interfere with the occurrence of n-: 1923: -- ja . . . sformiroval četyrnadcat' polkov i v o vsex n i x byl komandirom (FURMANOV, Čapaev; cited by Blažev [1962: 14]), and 1960: vo vsex nix (TRUBAČEV -- see summary above). A general discussion of the problem of interposed modifiers is presented in §12.02 below.

Serious difficulties arise in the twenty-second exception: /1377: da iměem" klętvu o(t) b[oga], v ' e g o ž e věruem" (Lavr. let., 972 g.; cited by Srez., 2.1050). This sentence from Svjatoslav's treaty with the Greeks might, on the one hand, be accounted for as a relative conjunction

with the peculiar behavior of vo eže as described above. But such an approach would overlook the fact that v negože also occurs in early documents -- including other editions of this same treaty! On the other hand, it may simply represent an extremely early stage of the development of prepositional phrases with the 3PPO, in which the n- was not yet generalized. However, since v is one of the prepositions whose etymology includes an original *n (*ven), this explanation is also rather unlikely. The best solution is simply to write off this example as one isolated exception among the 257 attestations of v which cannot be accounted for by any rule or broad class of exceptions.

3.012 Negatives. -- In Middle Russian another type of exception appears: the pronoun "nothing" (ničto) preceded, rather than split, by the preposition. In all there are 28 examples of v with the NIP in the corpus, of which 21 are split, 7 are not. These 7 exceptions all come since 1727, and have a meaning of "nothing," "a nothing," "nothingness" as a positive concept; e.g., 1934: obryvaetsja v ničto (LEBEDENKO, Tjaželyj divizion.; quoted in SSRLJ, 7.1336). They can be accounted for on the formal basis that none of the 7 examples is governed by a negative verb. Compare such split negatives as this one: 1957: ne verja ni vo čto (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 244); the governing verb is negative, and the construction as a whole represents the typical Russian "double negative." Almost all of the split negatives are governed by a negative verb, whereas none of the non-split examples are; the latter, instead of being "double negatives," are really "single positives."

3.013 Commentary. -- The "actual" status of v is so strong that a seeming exception like the following turns out on close examination to be

the use of ego as a possessive, and not as the 3PPO: 1729: *a poka v" basjnax" takix" vremja on" proxodit", lučšij sok" iz" našego měška v " e g o vxodit" (KANTEMIR, K svoemu umu, stix 70; Xrest. Obn., 2.115). This example involves ellipsis of the noun mešok (v ego mešok), and so was not counted in the statistical summary for v, since ego is not its object here.

Another group of ten examples from the years ca. 1500-ca. 1700 have been rendered misleading by the modern editor's division of words; e.g., ca. 1500: xoščet bo videti grad sej i v o n ' vniti i v nem pobyvati (Pov. o mosk. vzjatii, Rus. pov., 45). In some instances these are even rendered v on without the soft sign. But comparison with occurrences of na n' in the same texts shows that these must be interpreted as examples of the vocalization of a strong yer followed by the ancient masc. acc. form n': *vъ nь = vo n'. Thus these ten examples actually serve as confirmation of the rule of epenthetic n.

The strength of the "actual" status of v can be seen in the occurrence in the corpus of 16 prepositional phrases where the 3PP is intercalated between v and a noun functioning as its object, but the 3PP still begins with n-; e.g., 1000/99: i prěbyvajǫ v " n e g o ljub've (Marianus, Ioan 15:10). All 16 examples of this construction come in the period ca. 1000-1610, and 10 of them include the noun object mesto (v nego mesto); of the remaining 6, O.C.S. texts account for 4, and the final 2 appear in the expressions von'že čas and vonže den' in Middle Russian (e.g., PALICYN). In the early texts there seem to be few instances of the intercalated 3PP without n-, but compare v ix voli and na ego voli, /1377 (Suzd. let. Lavr. sp., 1237 g., 1206 g.). For more on v plus intercalated 3PP, see §7.03 below, on vmesto.

3:014 Miscellaneous. -- V is never attested in adverbial use, nor

is it postposed to its object.

3.02 K ("to") has been an "actual" preposition throughout the period of study. Indeed, only three exceptions, and easily accountable ones at that, were found in the entire corpus among 327 total attestations of k.

SUMMARY OF K

Period of "actual" status . . . . 324+ 3 99+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1962

Earliest "actual" example
1000/99: i narod" s"b"ra sę k " ń e m u (Suprasl., 18:12-3, etc. -- 193 total examples).

Latest "actual" example
1954: on brosalsja k n e j , bol'še brosit'sja bylo n e k k o m u (PANOVA, Vremena, 261).

The 3 "apparent" examples
Folk speech, 2 (1871); interposed modifier, 1 (1962).

3.021 Exceptions. -- Two of these, occurrences of k emu in folk songs collected by Rybnikov in 1871 (Il'ja Muromec v ssore, Byliny, 331, 333), represent the dialectisms typical of Russian folk songs. The only other exception comes in 1962: otnosiłsja k o vsemu e m u v celom (FINKEL' [1962b: 131]); it can be accounted for by the modifying pronoun vsemu which is interposed between the preposition and the 3PPO. Compare the regular treatment when the modifier is not interposed: 1834: v otnošenii k n e m u samomu (GOGOL', Ob arxitekture, SS, 6.39). The problem of interposed modifiers in general will be treated in §12.023 below.

3.022 Commentary. -- The firm "actual" status of k is illustrated by such contrasting examples as one from 1190/99: i se pride vest'nik" k " n e m u povědaja jemu oč'ju s"m"rt' (Bor. i Gl., Sb. Usp. sob., 9a); or this one, from 1696: podi k " n e m u i skaži emu čelobitie o(t) menja (LUDOLF, Gram. rus., 44).

3.023 Negatives. -- All attestations of k with a NIP in the corpus (eight were tabulated) were, without exception, split by the preposition; e.g., 1200/99: n i k " č e s o m u že bǫdet" (Marianus [Dečansk. sp.], Matfej 5:13); 1582/83: a n i x k o m u u gosudarja u našego takie ljubvi net (F. PISEMSKIJ, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 116).

3.024 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, k is never attested: (a) in adverbial usage, (b) postposed to its object, or (c) with an intercalated pronoun of the type v nego mesto.

3.03 S ("with") was a 100% "actual" preposition in the oldest texts of the corpus and maintained that unblemished status without any exceptions until the last three centuries, when sor "apparent" examples begin to turn up. These will be accounted for below. Overall, s shows a 97+% tendency toward "actual" status, and that proportion includes, as mentioned above (see p. 57, footnote), only a sampling of the total number of "actual" examples occurring in texts of the basic corpus.

SUMMARY OF S

Period of "actual" status . . . . 234+ 8 97+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1957

Earliest "actual" examole
1000/99: prěbyšę že zvěrie zatvoreni s ' ń i m a tri dni (Suprasl., 183:27-9, etc. -- 79 total examples).

Latest "actual" example
1957: tak Bad'in i ušel n i s č e m (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 252).

The 8 "apparent" examples
Interposed modifier, 4 (ca. 1731-1874); folk speech, 3 (1864-1957); NIP, 1 (1789).

3.031 Exceptions. -- Two of the three folk-speech exceptions occur in a single passage of Dudincev's Ne xlebom edinym already referred to (in §1.21 above): 1957: --napisano: "Delo" -- ja podumal, čto Revtribunalu vidnee, čto s ej delat' . . . -- S e j , govoriš'? Note that the sub-

standard language used by the old stoker in this passage involves not only omission of n-, but also treatment of the noun delo as feminine. The third exception from folk speech, also s" ej, is cited by Buslaev (1881: 204) from Rybnikov's collection of Pesni, 2.271 (published in 1864).

Four exceptions can be accounted for by the presence of an interposed modifier separating s from the 3PPO. They are: ca. 1731: Kupido prošč̌aetsja s o vsemj [sic] imi (Akt o Kal., 372, prim. 884); 1770: ne s odnimi i m i vy tak postupaete (N. NOVIKOV, Truten', list XV; Rus. proza, 318); and 1874: ja s o vsemi i m i imel dela. . . . tam, kuda ona poedet s o vsemi i m i (L. TOLSTOJ, A. Karenina; cited by Blaž̌ev [1962: 13]). The first example, from an eighteenth-century drama, contrasts with a similar expression, Vulkan prošč̌aetsja s njimi, on the same page, the only difference being in the interposition of vsemj (sic) in the first instance.

3.032 Negatives. -- In the corpus one non-split NIP occurs: 1789: [igraet]na billiarde s n e k o i m iz ego edinozemcev (RADIŠČ̌EV, Žit. Uš., 31). All the rest of the NIP constructions tabulated in the corpus (six examples) were split, including another occurrence of the same pronoun as above: /1377: jeda igumen" utaiv"sja n ě s k y i m i preneset' jego (Lavr. let., 1091 g., 70a). It seems clear that the pronoun nekij underwent a change between Old Russian and 1789, no longer being automatically split by a preposition but instead being treated as a simple adjective, as it is today.

3.033 Miscellaneous. -- One possible example of s which was not counted is cited here only for its curiosity value: 1865: o s " n j a g o (DAL', Tolkovyj slovar' živago velikorusskago jazyka; cited by Miklosich [1926: 447]). Dal' labels this as dialect material, from Saratov. One interesting example where the 3PP does not show n- after s was also not

counted in the statistics above, because of the obvious ellipsis of an understood object: 1938: [nastroenie] vsegda končalos' mjagkimi samoobvinenijami s ego storony i protestami -- s e e (KRYMOV, Tanker, 72). In the corpus, s is never attested in adverbial usage or postposed to its object.

3.04 O (ob) ("about") offers a picture much like that of s: an unmarked "actual" status from the beginning to Middle Russian, where a few more or less accountable exceptions begin to turn up.-- but not enough to lower the overall proportion of "actual" examples below 96+%.

SUMMARY OF O

Period of "actual" status . . . . 132+ 5 96+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1957

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: ioan" s'vědětel'stvuet o ń e m " glagolę . . . (Suprasl., 10:14, etc. -- 43 total examples).

A recent "actual" example

1954: i, gorjuja o n e m , ob ego neustroennoj žizni . . . (PANOVA, Vremena, 24).

The 5 "apparent" examples

NIP, 4 (ca. 1670-1857); folk speech, 1 (1923/26).

3.041 Exceptions. -- One of these is found in folk speech, or dialect: 1923/26: -- ja o b e m ne podumal (BABEL', Iisusov grex, Izb., 182).

3.042 Negatives. -- Here are the non-split negatives: 1670/80: aki o n e k o e m izverge (PALICYN, Skaz., 156b); 1736: istoričesko o n e k o i x predstavljaju (TATIŠČEV, Pis. Trediakovskomu, 18/II/1736; Xrest. Obn., 2.90); 1836: ničto o n i č e m (BELINSKIJ, title of an article); 1857: v razgovorax o n i č e m (POLONSKIJ, A. N. Majkovu; quoted in SSRLJ, 7.1336). These four exceptions all occur without a negative verb, and thus

really have a positive meaning (cf. also v, §3.012 above). In addition, the first two contain what is really an adjective, nekij. In the corpus, a total sampling of 21 split negatives was tabulated, as contrasted with only 4 non-split; typical examples of the former are: 1000/99: i n i o k o m ' ž e ne rodiši (Marianus, Matfej 22:16); 1500/99: Petr, jako že be emu obyčaj, n i o č e s o m ž e jarosti imeja . . . (Pov. o Petre i Fevronii, Rus. pov., 113); 1570: a ob inyx gosudarevyx delex n i o k o t o r y x paši Ivana ne vspraševali (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 75); and 1946: ee ne nado bylo n i o č e m prosit', ona ne nuždalas' ni v kakoj podskazke (PANOVA, Sputniki, 81).

3.043 Commentary. -- Intercalated pronouns of the type v nego mesto do not appear in the corpus, with the exception of one curious phrase: 1753: i čto o n e m " Rixmaně črez" gazety togda izdano (NAŠČOKIN, Zap., 294). The pronoun here is either being used as a demonstrative, or, more likely, the name Rixman is functioning as an appositive to the 3PP. An example of just the opposite type is also interesting: 1946: a o b e g o, Suprugova, vydajuščemsja povedenii . . . (PANOVA, Sputniki, 95); here the possessive function of the 3PP is clear, despite its separation from its noun.

3.044 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, o is not attested in adverbial usage or postposed to its object.

3.05 U ("near"), despite a considerable number of exceptions, has been almost entirely an "actual" preposition since the earliest texts.

SUMMARY OF U

Period of "actual" status . . . . 131+ 18 88+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1958

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: i prinesoše jelikože běaše u ń e g o kumir' (Suprasl., 6:28, etc. -- 10 total examples).

A recent "actual" example

1936: u n e g o i u ego podrugi budet prelestnyj domik (OLEŠA, Mysli o Čapline, Izb., 462).

The 18 "apparent" examples

Folk speech, 9 (ca. 1750-1938); u někoego, 3 (ca. 1500-1700); unaccounted for, 3 (ca. 1300-1731); interposed modifier, 2 (1882, 1942); text with White-Russian influence, 1 (ca. 1684).

3.051 Exceptions. -- Half of the 18 "apparent" examples occur in quoted folk speech and dialect; e.g., 1750/99: -- da ottovo to vot" i guba ta u e j razbita (Interljudii, Xrest. Obn., 2.235); 1918: -- u e j kerćnki est' v čulke! (BLOK, Dvenadcat', gl. 2); 1925: -- rasstegnula futljarčik, u e j tam skripka (LEONOV, Barsuki, 248); and several examples from various folk-songs (Byliny, 85, 228, etc.).

Two exceptions are associated with a modifier separating the pronoun from the preposition: 1882: čtoby vse izdanie . . . bylo u odnogo e g o v rukax (LESKOV, Pis. Ternovskomu, 8/IX/1882); ca. 1942: u vsex i x (BAŽOV, Malaxitovaja škatulka; cited by Blaževa [1962: 14]). Altogether in the corpus 16 instances of a modifier accompanying the 3PPO were tabulated, but the Leskov and Bažov examples are the only two where the modifier immediately precedes the 3PPO. All the other 14 instances either put the modifier after the pronoun, as 1886: u n e g o samogo javljaetsja oxota (ČEXOV, Detvora, Ras. pov., 26); or else they repeat the preposition, as in 1954: u vsex u n i x byli bditel'nye starorežimnye ženy (PANOVA, Vremena, 24'). And all the other 14 instances do show the epenthetic n-.

One of the exceptions is found in the Safonovič Chronicle (u e g o, 33:6), a text which shows strong traces of White-Russian influence. Another three exceptions do not seem so easily accounted for. Two are from old Novgorod documents: 1392: kto u i x tovar poimale (Gramoty velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova [Moskva, 1949], 81:25), and ca. 1400: tol'ko poc'ne pro-

davat' tobě, i t" [=ty] u j e i kupi (Novg. gram. na ber., Iz rask. 1953/54, No. 129). This second example is curious in that it is the only one of ten such constructions tabulated in the birch-bark documents which lacks n-; the other nine all have n-, including one like ca. 1100: e li u n e g o roba (No. 109). The third of the three problematic exceptions occurs in an old drama, in the midst of many examples where n- does occur: ca. 1731: želala ona Krizanta s nim sovokupitis plockj j dumaja čto on" u e (j) amuru iskala (Akt o Kal., 242, prim. 831).

3.052 Negatives. -- There are three non-split NIP objects of prepositions in the corpus, and all involve the expression u nekoego. All the other NIP constructions tabulated (ni u kogo, ne u kogo, ne u čego) are split by the preposition; e.g., 1610/20: v slux n i u k o g o ž e ne uslyšašja (PALICYN, Skaz., 143a).

3.053 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, u is not attested in adverbial usage or postposed to its object.

3.06 Do ("to") is the first of the two-phoneme prepositions to be examined in the present study. Though considerably less frequent than the five one-phoneme prepositions treated above, its status is as consistently "actual" as theirs is.

SUMMARY OF DO

Period of "actual" status . . . . 17+ 2 89+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1961

Earliest "actual" example
1000/99: i ne mogy proglagolati d o n e g o ž e d ' n e bǫdet" se (Marianus, Luka 1:20 -- the only O.C.S. example in the corpus).

A recent "actual" example
1938: no zavod žil d o n e g o i živet bez nego (KRYMOV, Tanker, 69).

The 2 "apparent" examples
Folk speech, 1 (1923/26); text with White-Russian influence, 1 (1684/87).

3.061 Exceptions. -- One is found in the Safonovič Chronicle of 1684/87 (152:28); the other is dialect speech from modern literature: 1923/26: -- d o e g o pjat' verst bežat' (BABEL', Smert' Dolgušova, Izb., 54). All other examples in the corpus do testify to "actual" status.

3.062 Negatives. -- All examples of a NIP object tabulated in the corpus are split by the preposition; e.g., 1870: emu net dela n i d o k a k i x rezul'tatov (SALTYKOV, Ist. odn. gor., 155); 1915: -- vse ravno n i d o č e g o xorošego ne doživeš' (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Utoli moja pečali, Pov. ras., 128).

3.063 Commentary. -- There are two intercalated-pronoun constructions in the corpus: 1000/99: do negože d'ne (see summary above), and 1000/99: d o n e g o ž e vrěmene ženix" est' s nimi (Pandekty Antioxa; cited by Srez., 1.859). These two phrases, modelled on Greek, in fact constitute the only two examples of do plus a 3PP in the corpus until the fifteenth century, when this example occurs: 1486/90: priide ot ugorskogo korolja Matteašja apoklisar' d o n e g o (Pov. o Drak., 95).

3.064 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, do is not attested postposed to its object. It does, however, occasionally occur without an object; e.g., 1924: *nas predavšie i d o i potóm, vokrug storožami èsery da Savinkovy, men'ševiki -- učenym kotóm (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Lenin, 228); 1961: d o i posle nego (A. LOKTEV, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1961.5.109); 1961: nikto iz akterov ni d o , ni posle nee ne imel takoj izvestnosti (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 137). The latter two examples do not constitute adverbial use, but only separation of do from its object.

3.07 Po ("after," "according to") has a good many attestations dating from the earliest texts, and which point toward nearly 100% "actual" status.

SUMMARY OF PO

Period of "actual" status . . . . 69+ 2 97+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1957

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: pěši i s"nuzii p o ńe m u xožd̆aaxǫ (Suprasl., 90:8, etc. -- 6 total examples).

Latest "actual" example

1957: častnik, emu daže pobeda kollektiva n i p o č e m (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 185).

The 2 "apparent" examples

Folk speech, 1 (1870); NIP, 1 (1672/73).

3.071 Exceptions. -- The folk-speech example comes from spoken dialog in an Ostrovskij play: 1870: -- Sčet -- ved' èto dokument, p o e m nado den'gi platit' (A. OSTROVSKIJ, Bešenye den'gi, dej. 3, jav. 12; P'esy, 338). The other exception is treated in the next section.

3.072 Negatives. -- The only non-split negative involves, as in some previous instances (see above), the indefinite pronoun nekij: 1672/73: p o n e k o e m vremeni (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 114). All the other NIP objects tabulated in the corpus are split; e.g., 1000/99: n ě p o k o l i c ě x " mesęcix" (Suprasl., 132); 1825: ne mog n i p o č e m u domyslit'sja, čto bylo by pričinoju sego opustošenija (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 541).

3.073 Commentary. -- The statistical summary on po did not include four examples with ellipsis of an understood noun object; they are: 1623/99: a persy i turki toe goru nazyvajut Sultana agry, toi gore zov p o i x (KOTOV, Kož., 65b); 1769: čto vse to xudo, čto ne p o e g o i emu ne nravitsja (N. NOVIKOV, Polem., list XX; Rus. proza, 311); 1771: *xot' delo p o e g o pletej sie dostojno (MAJKOV, Elisej, pes. 1, stix 62; Xrest. Kok., 517); 1861: načal on . . . rugat' drugix mužikov i osobenno bab, čto-nibud' ne p o e g o ili ne provorno delavšix (A. PISEMSKIJ, Bat'ka, Ras., 179). These four examples perform a function similar to that of po-moemu,

po-vašemu, etc., except that they have no declinable ending, and therefore present a certain tension between form and function. (A fuller discussion of possessives with ellipsis of the noun object is given in §12.06 below.)

3.074 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, po is not attested postposed to its object. There is one isolated example, in direct speech, of adverbial usage: 1943: -- značit, po l'du idti, -- pečal'no protjanul Ljapuškin. -- Ne p o , a pod, -- popravil kapitan (V. KOŽEVNIKOV, Pod ledjanoj kryšej; cited by Trofimov [1957: 263]).

3.08 Za ("behind") is another simple preposition which has a substantial number of exceptions to its "actual" status, but not enough to disguise the original picture, since all the exceptions come after 1500, and can be accounted for.

SUMMARY OF ZA

Period of "actual" status . . . . 85+ 11 89+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1957

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: ašte li k" bogu s"grěšit" kto molit' sę z a ń ' (Suprasl., 407:14-5, etc. -- 18 total examples).

A recent "actual" example

1927: . . . z a n e e vzjalis'. Dolgo terzali ee. (OLEŠA, Zavist', 93).

The 11 "apparent" examples

NIP, 6 (ca. 1540-1823); folk speech, 3 (ca. 1750-1892); interposed modifier, 1 (1896); dubious, 1 (ca. 1600).

3.081 Exceptions. -- More than half the total occur in constructions with the NIP, and will be discussed in the next section. One of the folk-speech examples is from quoted speech: 1892: -- upal by i ja z a i m (ČEXOV, Gusev, SS [PBg, 1903], 8.190). The other two such exceptions are found in a folk tale; e.g., ca. 1750/89: mnogo trudov z a i x položil (Smert' V. Buslaeva, Byliny, 379). Moving on to other deviations from the

norm, we find one which can only be labeled "dubious": 1600/15: Ivan Vasil'evič . . . nakazuet ix svoimi carskimi nakazan'mi, kako im za pravoslavnuju veru xristijanskuju, i za svjatyja cerkvi, z a e g o , gosudarja, i za ego gosudarevy deti, i za vse pravoslavnoe xristijanstvo na vragi stojati (Pov. ob osade, 129). Although this might suggest a possessive referring to the word "Christendom" further on in the text, it is rather an exception which simply cannot be accounted for.

Another of the 11 exceptions is directly related to the interposition of a modifier: 1896: -- Voz'mi sto, voz'mi vsex moix žen z a odnu e e ! (GOR'KIJ, Xan i ego syn, Izb., 84). This is the only instance in the corpus for za where a modifier precedes the ЗРРО; contrast the following example, where the modifier follows: 1954: on prišel smotret' na nee i torčat' vozle nee, i stvdjatsja z a n i x oboix (PANOVA, Vremena, 220).

3.082 Negatives. -- In the corpus, 11 constructions with a NIP were tabulated, of which 5 were split and 6 not split by the preposition. The latter examples, all occurring after 1500, follow a clear pattern. One involves the familiar nekoe: 1540/45: Ivan Vasil'evič položil opalu na vnuka . . . i na ego mater' . . . z a n e k o e ix pregrešenie (Vol-Perm. let., 1502 g., 489a). All the other non-split constructions (dating from between 1750 and 1823/28) involve a positive verb governing a "single negative"; e.g., 1772: Klavdii i Kaligula voinam svoim otdavali zemli z a n i č t o (TRET'JAKOV, Rassuždenie . . ., Jur. proiz., 304), etc. By contrast, all the tabulated examples of a split negative involve a negative verb, or, in one instance, a positive infinitive; e.g., ca. 1500: da travy roznyja jadjat, vse rukoju pravoju, a levoju ne priimetsja n i z a č t o (A. NIKITIN, Kož., 378b); 1957: -- n e z a č e m ej togda voobšče vnikat' vo vse èti istorii (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 282).

3.083 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, za is not attested postposed to its object. It is, however, attested once with an intercalated pronoun: 1672/73: ona že priteče ko mne i pala predo mnoju z a n j u ž e vinu (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 119). By the time of Avvakum such constructions had a very archaic, Biblical flavor, especially since the enclitic že originally functioned with such pronouns as a relative -- which does not seem to be the case here. Compare the following more modern type of example, occurring a century after Avvakum: 1770: . . . z a ee k nam snisxoždenie (ČULKOV, Prigož. pov., 183).

3.084 Adverbial use. -- In contrast to most of the other simple prepositions, za turns up rather often in adverbial use. In the corpus, seven examples of this objectless function were tabulated between the 1830's (VJAZEMSKIJ, BELINSKIJ) and 1957; e.g., 1938: -- odnim slovom, ja -- za (KRYMOV, Tanker, 98); 1924: *čto uvidiš'?! Tol'ko lob ego liš', i Nadežda Konstantinovna v tumane z a . . . (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Lenin, 253); 1957: počemu vdrug Avdiev vystupil " z a " ? (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 178). Incidentally, protiv (one antonym of za) also tends to occur adverbially with some frequency; details in §5.03 below.

3.09 Na ("on") has always been one of the more frequent prepositions, and has had the status of an "actual" preposition throughout the period under investigation, with better than 95% certainty.

SUMMARY OF NA

Period of "actual" status . . . . 211+ 11 95+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1958

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: k" neiže, reče, pride gospod' ište n a ń e i ploda very i ne obrěte n a ń e i (Suprasl., 346:15-6, etc. -- 78 total examples).

Latest "actual" example

1958: konus ee sveta ustremlen n a n i x troix (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 543).

The 11 "apparent" examples
Folk speech, 4 (ca. 1700-1923); interposed modifier, 4 (ca. 1300-1925); unaccounted for, 3 (ca. 1190-1731).

3.091 Exceptions. -- Of the four exceptions occurring in folk-speech or dialect passages, the modern one comes from the pen of Babel': 1923/26: -- Vidal, čego dajut? Xozjajstvuj n a e j (BABEL', Načal'nik, Izb., 26). The other three come from a collection of older folk songs and tales; e.g., 1700/89: buiny vetry ne vixnut" n a e ě ; . . . on" . . . kričit" n a e v o zyčnym golosom" (Sbornik K. Danilova; Xrest. Obn., 2.307, 317). Three of the "apparent" attestations of na raise serious problems in accounting for the absence of n-: 1190/99: s" nim' ot"xodit' ot" grada sego v" inu oblast'. T"gda ĝla jemu že n a j e g o poslušai ĝi i ne gněvaisja (Žitie Feodosija, Sb. Usp. sob., 34a); ca. 1600/99: i zmeja de ležit" na doroge i čerez eě perešel" voz", i tut eě zaterlo . . . N a e ě vozložila . . . (Lečeb., No. 480); ca. 1731: penjaja n a e g o (Akt o Kal., 161, prim. 220). The second of these probably betrays the influence of a dialect where n- did not develop, and the third occurs in a text which has several other examples with other simple prepositions, also without n-.

3.092 Modifiers. -- Four of the ten exceptions to the "actual" status of na are connected with the interposition of a modifier: 1300/99: n a vsěx" i x " (Čudovskij sb.; cited by Matthews [1960: §427]); 1771: * n a samogo e g o došla k nemu pros'ba (MAJKOV, Elisej; Xrest. Kok., 514); 1880/99: n a vsex i x [fabrikax] bylo zanjato okolo 400 rabočix (ČEXOV; cited by Blažev [1962: 13]); and 1925: -- u ej tam skripka, n a samoe e e i poxoža, xuden'kaja takaja (LEONOV, Barsuki, 248). These are the only four examples in the corpus for na where a modifier was interposed; on the other hand, six examples were tabulated where the modifier follows the pronoun, and all six do have n-; e.g., 1866: on smotrit n a n i x

n a v s e x , kak na detej, svysoka (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 50).

3.093 Negatives. -- All seven examples of the NIP tabulated in the corpus are split by the preposition; e.g., 1000/99: n i n a k o j e ž e z"lo . . . pustiti (Suprasl., 37:13, 275:11); 1957: -- n i n a k o g o ne žalujtes' personal'no (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 167). One ambiguous example which may represent a split negative is also worth citing for its curiosity value: 1600/20: požalovati obeščevaetca ix gosudar', jako n i na serdce u nix k o m u čajaniem takovyja ot nego milosti (Pov. ob osade, 130).

3.094 Commentary. -- As might be expected, the early texts have some evidence of intercalated pronouns, although not as much as in the case of v. There are two examples of na nem' že městě (Žitie Feodosija, Sb. Usp. sob., 46b; Žitie Nifonta XIII v. [cited by Srez., 1.1027]). (See also the sections on na meste and navstreču below (§§8.07, 7.11). Totally different is the following example, which was not included in the statistics above because the 3PP is functioning possessively to an understood object: 1789: opredelennye den'gi ne na našu byli pol'zu, no n a e g o (RADIŠČEV, Žit. Uš., 28).

3.095 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, na is not attested as an adverbial or as a postposition.

3.10 Iz ("from") does not occur too often with the 3PP or the NIP, and has a fair proportion of deviations from the norm of "actual" status. But though iz has an indicated proportion of only 80+% (see below), it should be kept in mind that all the exceptions occur in the last three centuries, and almost all of them involve the familiar non-split NIP. Furthermore, only a very small sampling of the total "actual" examples was tabulated (designated by "+"), since there is no need to "prove" the status of iz (or of any of the other "simple" prepositions). Due to the fact that

all exceptions were tabulated, the percentages given in the summary below and in those for the other "simple" prepositions have no precise significance, but offer only an indication of how overwhelming the percentages would be if all "actual" examples were included.

SUMMARY OF IZ

Period of "actual" status . . . . 28+ 7 80+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1954

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: viděx" dyma i ž [sic] n e ę do nyněš'njago vosxodęšta (Suprasl., 128:19, etc. -- 6 total examples).

Latest "actual" example

1954: a naverxu bylo nebo . . ., sin' i zoloto lilis' i z n e g o prazdnično i izobil'no (PANOVA, Vremena, 33).

The 7 "apparent" examples

NIP, 6 (1742-1950); unaccounted for, 1 (1829).

3.101 Exceptions. -- There is only one exception in the corpus involving the absence of n-, and it seems unaccountable: 1829: nel'zja li odnu i z i x [malorossijskix komedij] postavit' na zdešnij teatr (GOGOL', Pis. M. Gogol', 30/IV/1829; SS, 6.259). It is all the more curious in that earlier in the same letter Gogol' uses iz nix, and in the following letter iz nix again. All the other exceptions are with forms of the NIP.

3.102 Negatives. -- There is a clear-cut patterning of the 11 prepositions with NIP objects tabulated in the corpus: those constructed with infinitives or negative verbs (5) are split; those constructed with positive finite verbs or nouns (6) are not split. A pair of early and recent examples of each type follows: 1582/83: n i i s k o i x zemel' gosti xodit' dorogi ne proznali (F. PISEMSKIJ, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 143); 1849/52: . . . starogo vremeni mne osobenno xvalit' n i i z č e g o (TURGENEV, Odnodvorec Ovsjanikov; cited by Šaxmatov [1925: §463]); 1742: stixi sostojat" i z " n ě k o e g o opredělennago čisla slogov" (KAN-

TEMIR, Traktat o stixotvorstve, §4; Xrest. Obn., 2.141); 1950: voznikali i z n i č e g o (KOŽEVNIKOV, Živaja voda; quoted in SSRLJ, 7.1336).

3.103 Commentary. -- There is an attestation in the corpus of the intercalated-pronoun construction: /1377: v"ilmer' ozero velikoe, i z n e g o ž e ozera potečet' Volxov" (Lavr. let., vvedenie; cited by Srez., 1.1027). This construction probably dates from considerably before 1377.

3.104 Miscellaneous. -- Iz does not occur postposed to its object in the corpus. There is one very atypical instance where iz is used as an adverb, but it is from Majakovskij's poetry: 1913/29: *No smotrite -- i z , vyplyvajut Red i White Stary, s voroxom raznoobraznyx viz (MAJAKOVSKIJ; cited by Vinokur [1943: 93]). The use of simple prepositions without an object will be discussed generally in §12.05 below.

3.11 Ot ("from") occurs very frequently in the corpus, and shows a strong tendency toward "actual" status, especially in the early texts.

SUMMARY OF OT

Period of "actual" status . . . . 264+ & 97+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1958

Earliest "actual" example
1000/99: muxy o t " n e j u ot"goniti (Suprasl., 14:30, etc., -- 107 total examples).

Recent "actual" example
1954: on toskoval s neju i uxodil o t n e e (PANOVA, Vremena, 55).

The 8 "apparent" examples
Folk speech, 3 (1618-1911); unaccounted for, 2 (1766, 1810); interposed modifier (dubious), 1 (1958); NIP, 1 (ca. 1849); text with White-Russian influence, 1 (1684/87).

3.111 Exceptions. -- Nearly half of the exceptions stem from quoted colloquial speech; e.g., 1618/19: -- podi o t y e b o [sic] (DŽEMS, Slov., 18:11); 1879: -- Ot puli ne ubežiš'. -- Izvestno, gde o t e j ubežat'! (GARŠIN, Trus, Soč., 52). Another one of the eight exceptions turns up

in a previously-mentioned document with White-Russian traits: 1684/87: o t e g o (Saf. Chr., 36:14).

There are two "apparent" examples which cannot be accounted for: 1766: ". . . tajnyj Vertep", otstojašč" o t " - e j a ne daleko (TREDIAKOVSKIJ, Tilemaxida; Xrest. Obn., 2.226; cf. ot" nego later in the same work, p. 229!); 1810: on sovetuet mne s"ezdit' k Sumarokovu i o t e g o i ot sebja poprosit' za Vas . . . (A. TURGENEV, Pis. Bulg., 100; cf. ot nego just before in the same source, p. 98!). It is interesting to note the seeming inconsistency of each of these authors, in using both forms with and without n- after the same preposition.

3.112 Negatives. -- There is only one non-split negative construction in the corpus: 1849/84: ot skuki i o t n e č e g o delat' (GONČAROV, Son Obl., 110). It is the only occurrence of either nečto or ničto with ot. All the other negative constructions tabulated (9) are split by the preposition; e.g., 1190/99: tělo . . . n i o t " k o j e g o ž e pl"tojad'ca ni běaše poč'rnělo (Bor. i Gl., Sb. Usp. sob., 16c); 1946: ni k komu ne privjazyvajas' i n i o t k o g o ničego ne trebuja, ona prošťala vsem (PANOVA, Sputniki, 35).

3.113 Commentary. -- The last exception is a rather dubious instance of what may be an interposed modifier: 1958: ona by šaraxnulas' i o t prošlogo e g o i ot buduščego (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 655); the more probable alternative, of course, would be to take the ego here as a possessive -- in which case it would not even enter into consideration in this tabulation. The intercalated-pronoun construction is represented by four examples in the corpus for ot; e.g., 1200/1300: o t n e g o ž e dola (PAPA GRIGORIJ, Besedovnik, 2.24; cited by Srez., 1.1027); 1672/73: i voevoda o t " n i x " mjatežnikov" bojalsja (AVVAKUM, Žitie; cited by

Šaxmatov [1925: §463]).

3.114 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, ot is attested postposed to its object only once: 1913/29: *tam dom stoit, on ves' v okoškax, on Pjatnickoj napravo o t (MAJAKOVSKIJ; cited by Trofimov [1957: 263]). It also turns up twice in adverbial usage, and, predictably, both come from the same Futurist poet: 1927: *vse, čto zadavali -- do i o t -- i vse, čto zubrili vosem' let . . ., zabyvajut (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Gimnazist ili stroitel'; cited by Bondarenko [1961: 42]); 1913/29: esli pet' pro zalez-šix v ščeli, meč pod"javšix i pavšix o t (MAJAKOVSKIJ, SS [1939], 2.46; cited by Vinokur [1943: 93]).

3.12 Pri ("close to") is not frequent in comparison with the prepositions described above, at least from the standpoint of constructions where it governs the decisive pronouns.

SUMMARY OF PRI

Period of "actual" status . . . . 12+ 4 75+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1957

Earliest "actual" example
1000/99: um'r"šiim" p r i n e m " i po nem" povědati svoe čelovekoljubie (Suprasl., 462:2; also 541:24 -- just 2 examples).

A recent "actual" example
1927: a ja, Nikolaj Kavalerov, p r i n e m šut (OLEŠA, Zavist', 28).

The 4 "apparent" examples
Folk speech, 4 (ca. 1750-1923); no other exceptions.

3.121 Exceptions. -- Despite the infrequency of pri, and its relatively high proportion of "apparent" examples, it should be noted that none of them occurs prior to 1750 (i.e., between ca. 1000 and 1750 pri has an "unblemished" record), and all four exceptions occur in quoted speech and dialect; e.g., 1911/12: -- začal"on" p r i e j ešče pušče kuražit'sja (BUNIN, Nočnoj razgovor, Sux. pov., 169); 1750/99: -- a p r i e m "

tak" gorja nikogda ne byvalo! (Interljudija; Xrest. Obn., 2.236).

3.122 Negatives. -- All negative constructions tabulated in the corpus are normal -- that is, they are split by pri; e.g., 1000/99: i nikakože ne vredi ego n i p r i č e s o m ' ž e (Suprasl., 268:28-9); 1957: -- ty soveršenno n i p r i č e m ? (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 46).

3.123 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, pri is not attested in post-positional or adverbial usage.

3.13 Pro ("about") is the first "simple" preposition to be discussed which is totally unattested in the oldest (Old Church Slavonic) texts. The first examples of pro (with noun objects) appear in Old Russian documents no later than 1200/39 (Novg. gram. na ber., No. 147) or even perhaps as early as 1078 (IAKOV, Poslanie kn. Dmitriju do 1078 g.; cited by Srez., 2.1507-8, but from a later source). The earliest attestation in the present corpus for pro with a decisive pronoun comes only in 1316. From then on, it has an almost complete "actual" record.

SUMMARY OF PRO

Period of "actual" status . . . . 44+ 1 98+% 1316-1958

Earliest "actual" example

1316: knęzju velikomu Mixailu ne navoditi na Nov"gorod", ni bojarom" ego, n i p r o č t o ž e (Dog. gram. Novg. s v. k. Mix. Jaroslavovičem; cited by Srez., 2.1507).

Latest "actual" example

1958: Kolja Igumnov p r o n e g o govoril, čto Xarlampiev vret (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 617).

The 1 "apparent" example

Folk speech, 1 (1700/89). No other exceptions to "actual" status.

3.131 Exceptions. -- Here is the only "apparent" example attested with pro: 1700/89: -- ai goi udaloi dobroi molodetc" povodis" ty so ljudmi so tamožennymi ai tolko p r o i x " ty obed" dospei (Sadko; Xrest. Obn.,

2.313). For a comparison, in the same collection of old folk songs a few pages later pro is used with n-: ty sam" p r o n i x " znaeš" (N. Ramanoviču dano selo Preobraženskoe; Xrest. Obn., 2.316).

3.132 Negatives. -- All the negative constructions tabulated in the corpus are split by pro; e.g., 1567/69: a v gramotax v verujuščix n i p r o k o t o r y e dela ne pišut (VORONCOV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 44); 1859/84: -- tak vot opozorit' tebe čeloveka ni za čto, n i p r o č t o , -- govoril on, -- èto emu nepočem! (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 117).

3.133 Commentary. -- It should be pointed out that the earliest "actual" example found for pro involves a NIP (see summary above); if the chronology were to be established solely on the basis of the 3PPO with n-, then the dating would be pushed ahead to 1425, when the earliest attestation of n- was found: /1425: i prisla k nemu Rjurik" svat", žaluja p r o n ' , zane bě mu' derz" (Ipat. let., 231b, 1190 g.). It is to be hoped that future investigations will turn up even earlier examples than these.

3.134 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, pro is not attested in postpositional or adverbial usage.

3.14 Bez ("without") has a limited number of attestations with the decisive pronouns in the corpus, and rather many exceptions, but all of its early occurrences, from 1000 to 1647, are "actual"; the exceptions begin in Middle Russian, and can be accounted for.

SUMMARY OF BEZ

Period of "actual" status . . . . 16+ 7 70+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1959

Earliest "actual" example

ca. 1000: b e ž n e g o ž e milosti (Kievskie listki, No. 30).

Latest "actual" example

1959: èta zamečatel'naja duma stala v fil'me stol' organičeskoj, čto b e z n e e ego trudno uže i predstavit' (A. LEVADA, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1959.6.99).

The 7 "apparent" examples

NIP, 5 (ca. 1872-1958); text with White-Russian influence, 2 (1684/87).

3.141 Exceptions. -- Here are the two "apparent" examples from the document with White-Russian influence: 1684/87: b e z i x (Saf. Chr., 92:15), b e z e g o (Saf. Chr., 175:27). Curiously enough, this same chronicle has a later example where bez does govern n- (255:23).

3.142 Negatives. -- In the corpus, negative pronouns governed by bez are never split: all the examples tabulated (5) are of the same type; e.g., 1872/76: on terpet' ne mog sup b e z n i č e g o (SALTYKOV, Gospoda Golovlevy; quoted in SSRLJ, 7.1335); 1958: -- takaja molodaja, i čto že, odna živete, b e z n i k o g o ? (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 625). The Soviet Academy of Sciences dictionary (SSRLJ), which quotes the Saltykov example above, labels bez ničego as a fixed expression.

3.143 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, bez is not attested in postpositional usage. But it does occur occasionally in adverbial usage; e.g., 1822: s predisloviem ili b e z (PUŠKIN, Pis. No. 27; PSS [1958], t. 10); 1934: različnye povetrija 20 -- 30-x godov XX v. pronikli v Sovetskij Sojuz, odni -- s vizoj, drugie -- b e z (ÉRENBURG, Literaturnyj kritik, 1934.1.156; cited by Vinogradov [1947: 396]); 1957: -- prostite, s portfelem mne prixodit' ili b e z ? (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 194). Note the identical phrase structure in all three examples, with bez operating against s (whose object is understood to refer also to bez, but without being repeated after it.

3.15 V"z ("for") is included in this listing for the sake of completeness. It did begin its career with a limited possibility of prepo-

sitional function, and is attested with noun-objects a few times in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian (very early religious texts only). Typical examples are:

1000/99: i ot" ispl"nenię ego my v'si prijęxom" blagodat' v " z blagodat' (Zographensis, Ioan 1:16); 1000/99: položišę na mję z"lo v " z dobro (Sinajskaja psaltyr', 108:5); 1073: v"zdaje li sę v " z dobro zlo (Izbornik Svjatoslava, 188; cited by Srez., 1.371).

But despite its morphological structure of a "simple" preposition (rather, its lack of structure), and despite Leskien's inclusion (1955: §35.11) of it among the seventeen O.C.S. prepositions to which he attributes government of n-, v"z does not seem to be attested with any decisive pronouns. In any event, none were found in the present investigation, and nothing can be said on the "status" of v"z during its brief period of existence. (It still exists in Modern Russian as a prefix, but has not functioned as a preposition for several hundred years.)

3.16 Nad ("above") is the first preposition to be discussed which shows a 100% record of "actual" examples from 1000 to the present.

SUMMARY OF NAD

Period of "actual" status . . . . 42+ 0 100% . . . . . ca. 1000-1954

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: i d"žd" velik" s"nese n a d ń i m i t"č'jǫ i krǫgom" i byst' množ'stvo vod meždu imi (Suprasl., 568.18; also 562:15).

Latest "actual" example

1954: ej bylo neprijatno, čto n a d n e j u vse berut verx (PANOVA, Vremena, 49).

3.161 Exceptions. -- There are no "apparent" examples.

3.162 Commentary. -- The contrast between the use of nad as an object of a preposition and as a possessive is illustrated by the following

citation: 1600/20: . . . da pokažet n a d n i m i i n a d i x zemleju milost' (Pov. ob osade, 126). Here is another example where the 3PP does nót begin in n- because it is functioning possessively: 1957: on poprosil razrešit' dal'nejšuju rabotu n a d e g o , lopatinskoj, m a š i n o j (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 187).

3.163 Negatives. -- There was only one NIP construction tabulated in the corpus: ca. 1650: Amurat dlja togo byl velmi kručinen, čto n i n a d č e m izvjaz (Skanderbeg, 26).

3.164 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, nad is not attested postposed to its object. It does, however, turn up a few times without any immediately-following object; e.g., 1825: n a d ili pod Morem i Zemleju dolžno bylo postavit' Idillija Moskva (PUŠKIN, Pis. L. Puškinu, II/1825; cited by Trofimov [1957: 263]); 1929: * . . . voda i pod i n a d : čerez četyre goda, zdes' budet gorod-sad! (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Rasskaz Krenova, Izb., 1.401); 1929: my mčali avtomobilem v gorax pod, n a d i okolo obryvov (PIL'NJAK, Korni japonskogo solnca; cited by Bogolepov [1931: 50]). Such constructions, with nad used either adverbially or separated from its object, are the exception rather than the rule, it is safe to say.

3.17 Pod ("under"), while not occurring with the decisive pronouns extremely often, shows almost as absolute a record as nad.

SUMMARY OF POD

Period of "actual" status . . . . 24+ 1 96+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1938

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: ni bo ni d"sky běaše p o d " n i m " ni rogoziny (Suprasl., 555:5; also 276:3).

Latest "actual" example

1938: odna iz nix [šljupok] byla jarko osveščena zarevom požara, i p o d n e j za bortom vskipala rozovaja pena (KRYMOV, Tanker, 175)

The 1 "apparent" example
Folk speech, 1 (1901). There are no other exceptions to "actual" status.

3.171 Exceptions. -- The only "apparent" example of pod occurs in folklore: 1901: *i polotno p o d i m zemlja da podgibaetsja (Vas'ka pjanica . . . [recorded in 1901], Byliny, 155).

3.172 Negatives. -- The NIP objects tabulated in the corpus (4) were, without exception, split by pod; e.g., 1759: n i p o d k a k i m vidom (SUMAROKOV, Son sčastlivogo obščestva; Rus. proza, 1.71); 1887: ni za čto i n i p o d k a k i m predlogom (LESKOV, Čelovek na časax, Pov. ras., 401).

3.173 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, pod is not attested in post-positional usage. It is, however, attested a few times as an adverb. Examples are given above, under nad (see §3.164) and under po (§3.074); another example comes from Majakovskij: 1924: *steklo -- i vidite p o d . . . čto ego nesut s Paveleckogo, po gorodu, vzjatomu im u gospod (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Lenin, 248). There is also evidence that pod has had some possibility of functioning as an adverb and/or as a noun ("the underside of a stove"); e.g., 1899: lopata . . . šarkala o p o d peči (GOR'KIJ, Dvadcat' šest' i odna; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.236).

3.18 Pered ("before"), the last of the eighteen "simple" prepositions to be treated, shows a high percentage of "actual" examples, with only two (accountable) exceptions, and is rather widely attested throughout the period under study.

SUMMARY OF PERED

Period of "actual" status . . . 61+ 2 97+% . . . . . ca. 1000-1964

Earliest "actual" example

1000/99: prosv'tě sę velik" v temnici o neju, i aggel" gospod'n' sta p r ě d " n i m a , glagolę . . . (Suprasl., 182:2-4, etc. -- 17 total examples).

A recent "actual" example

1938: ona spešila vyložit' p e r e d n i m vse, čto nakopilos' u nee na duše. A emu kazalos', čto v temnote p e r e d n i m ne Musja (KRYMOV, Tanker, 57).

The 2 "apparent" examples

Interposed modifier, 2 (1801, 1872).

3.181 Exceptions. -- There are two "apparent" attestations of pered, and both are connected with the interpositioning of a modifier: 1801: pol-noe sobranie kak posrednikov, tak tjažuščixsja, i p r e d vsemi i m i prikazyvaja pročest' dokladnuju zapisku . . . (DERŽAVIN, Mnenie o pravax, Soč., 7.363); 1872: a p e r e d samym i m , na desjatinu mesta, stojat tatary verxami (L. TOLSTOJ, Kavkaz. pl., 51). These are the only two instances in the corpus where a modifier is interposed.

3.182 Negatives. -- The negative pronouns tabulated in the corpus are all split by pered; e.g., 1940: n i p e r e d k a k i m i žertvami (KALININ, O vospitanii i obučenii molodogo rabočego [Moskva, 1948], 107); 1964: dlja dostiženija svoix celej ne ostanavlivajutsja n i p e r e d č e m (Sovetskoe kino, 30/V/1964, str. 4).

3.183 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, pered is not attested as a postposition. It is, however, found (very rarely) in adverbial usage; e.g., /1377: Izjaslav . . . posla že p r e (d) s[y]na svoego M'stislava Kyevu (Lavr. let., 1069 g.; other versions of this passage have pred soboju); 1921: *i za, i nad, i pod, i p r e d , domov drednouty (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Misterija-buff, dej. 1; Izb., 2.371). The first example, designating motion, would be rendered by vpered in ordinary modern usage, and the second, designating location, by vperedi.

3.184 Additional commentary: peredi. -- In addition to the foregoing material relating to the "simple" preposition pered, there are also a very few occurrences of the "suffixed" preposition pered-i (pered-ě). It appears in the corpus between ca. 1000/99 and ca. 1377, with a record of no "actual" attestations and two "apparent" attestations. In other words, during its relatively short-lived existence, peredi was an "apparent" preposition. (A full summary will be presented in §6.19 below.)

3.19 Combined summary. -- The following table brings together the main information on each of the eighteen "simple" prepositions which were examined individually above. For each preposition, the number of "actual" and "apparent" attestations is indicated for the periods before and after 1400. Then comes the overall total of "actual" and "apparent" examples for all centuries (ca. 1000-1964), and the percentage of "actual" examples, followed by the "estimated turning point" (time of transition to "actual" status, according to the present data).

After these come two columns which show the number of "actual" and "apparent" attestations (separated by a colon) involving negative objects and interposed modifiers, respectively. Finally come two miscellaneous usages, adverbial function and postpositional function, which are indicated by the symbols "+" (i.e., is attested with the given function) and "-" (is not attested with the given function).

TABLE 5

COMBINED SUMMARY OF SIMPLE PREPOSITIONS

[illegible]-1399		1400-1964		Total			Est Trn Point	Miscellaneous			
Act	App	Act	App	Act	App	Pct		NIP	Intp Mod	Post Adv	pos
[illegible]	[illegible]	115+	19	235+	22	91+%	1000/99	21+:7	2:1	-	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	54+	3	324+	3	99+	1000/99	8+:0	0:1	-	-
[illegible]	0	95+	8	234+	8	97+	1000/99	6+:1	0:4	-	-
[illegible]	0	55+	5	132+	5	96+	1000/99	21+:4	-	-	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	97+	15	131+	18	88+	1000/99	4+:3	0:2	-	-
2	0	15+	2	17+	2	89+	1000/99	5+:0	-	-	-
[illegible]	0	38+	2	69+	2	97+	1000/99	5+:1	-	(+)	-
[illegible]	0	57+	11	85+	11	89+	1000/99	5+:6	0:1	+	-
[illegible]	[illegible]	65+	9	211+	11	95+	1000/99	7+:0	0:4	-	-
[illegible]	0	20+	7	28+	7	80+	1000/99	5+:6	-	(+)	-
[illegible]	0	87+	8	264+	8	97+	1000/99	9+:1	0:1	(+)	(+)
4	0	8+	4	12+	4	75+	1000/99	3+:0	-	-	-
4	0	12+	7	16+	7	70+	1000/99	0 :5	-	+	-
14	0	28+	0	42+	0	100	1000/99	1+:0	-	+	-
4	0	20+	1	24+	1	96+	1000/99	4+:0	-	+	-
[illegible]	0	37+	2	61+	2	97+	1000/99	4+:0	0:2	(+)	-
1	0	43+	1	44+	1	98+	1316?	6+:0	-	-	-
0	0	0	0	0	0	-	?	-	-	-	-
1091 (99.4%)	7	848+ (89+%)	105	1929+	112	94+%	1000/99 (median)	114+:34 (77+%)	2:16 (11%)	9+ 9-	1+ 17-

.20 Commentary. -- The most important fact in the above summary is almost 100% "actual" status of the simple prepositions in the earliest riod of the recorded history of Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian rly, 1000-1399). Of the seventeen prepositions attested with the de- ve pronouns in that period (v"z is not found), fourteen occur only "actual" status, and the other three (v, u, na) have an extremely number of exceptions, most of them explainable, and totaling only "apparent" examples -- as compared with a huge total of 1091 "actual" es (99.4%) in the same early period. This evidence weighs over-

whelmingly in favor of the conclusion that the simple prepositions had fully achieved "actual" status by the time of the earliest extant manuscripts.

Once this fact is established empirically, the statistics for the later centuries (1400 to the present day) have no particular interest. It is for this reason that no attempt was made to collect anything like a complete tabulation of all the examples of simple prepositions with the decisive pronouns in recent centuries; instead, all exceptions and only a smattering of "actual" examples were compiled, with the incomplete figures being designated by the symbol "+" in the columns for 1400-1964 and for the all-centuries total. Obviously, if all the thousands of occurrences of simple prepositions with the decisive pronouns had been included, the recent percentages would have run upwards of 99%, just as does the percentage for 1000-1399.

Another interesting fact in the "Total" column is that only nad of all the simple prepositions is never attested with any exceptions (in the present corpus): its status is literally 100% "actual." Moving on to the column headed "Estimated Turning Point," we see that all the simple prepositions except pro and v"z had made the transition to "actual" status no later than the eleventh century. According to the present evidence, pro made the transition no later than the fourteenth century -- with a strong possibility that further investigations can push this date back considerably. It is also to be hoped that some day at least one decisive occurrence of v"z can be uncovered for the early period when it was still in use. For that matter, it is not impossible that some unexpected find might turn up a pre-eleventh century manuscript with Old Church Slavonic or other texts which would enable us to extend the chronology of all the

simple prepositions back to an earlier date.

3.21 Miscellaneous. -- The last four columns in Table 5 present information on miscellaneous constructions involving the simple prepositions. When these prepositions govern a NIP object, the construction is split 114 times (actually more -- the figure is not a complete count) and not split 34 times: the ratio of split negatives is more than three-fourths (77+%). The 34 exceptions here can be accounted for by sub-categories (nekij, positive verb, bez ničego, etc.), but that is the subject for a separate study. (See also §12.01 below for a general survey of negative pronoun objects.)

A much more clear-cut basis of accounting for "apparent" examples is furnished by interposed-modifier constructions: of 18 such constructions with simple prepositions (of the type so vsemi [n]imi), 16 lack n-. The absence of the nasal here can be regarded as approximately nine-tenths (89%) predictable. (The overall influence of interposed modifiers on prepositional constructions is discussed in general terms in §12.023 below.)

Adverbial function is negligible for the simple category of prepositions. Of the eighteen members of the category, only nine are ever attested without an object -- and some of those by only one or two very marginal examples (the very marginal cases are enclosed in parentheses in the "Adverb" column). The Futurist poet Vladimir Majakovskij is mainly responsible for these examples, although do, za, and bez are used by a number of writers, especially in the last century or so. (See also §12.051 below.)

Postpositioning of the simple prepositions is non-existant, except for one instance of ot in the poetry of Majakovskij (see §3.114 above). This solitary exception, along with the deviant adverbial use of simple prepositions mentioned just above, serves as confirmation of how poetic language (Majakovskij's in particular) can be radically different from

normal prose language. It is for this reason that the basic corpus was founded only on prose; the secondary inclusion of some scattered examples from poetry can be instructive, if they are explicitly labeled as such, and if their deviations from the norm stand out as clearly as the above. Indeed, the very fact that they do stand out this clearly serves to put the norms (preposed placement, never without an object) in sharp relief. It also serves as an excellent illustration of the Latin maxim exceptio regulam probat ("the exception tests/probes the rule").

3.22 Exceptions. -- Not only does the proportion of exceptions to "actual" examples of the simple prepositions amount to less than 6% (cf. Table 5), but most of these so-called exceptions are predictable and can be accounted for under a number of rubrics, as follows:

TABLE 6

COMBINED SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONS (SIMPLE PREPOSITIONS)

Type	v	k	s	o	u	do	po	za	na	iz	ot	pri	pro	bez	pod	pered	Tot.	Pct.
Folk speech .	4	2	3	1	9	1	1	3	4	0	3	4	1	0	1	0	37	33%
Non-split NIP	7	0	1	4	3	0	1	6	0	6	1	0	0	5	0	0	34	30%
Interpos.mod.	1	1	4	0	2	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	14%
Unaccounted .	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	9%
voeže	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	7%
Wh.Russ.infl.	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	5	4%
Dubious . . .	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Misprint . .	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1%
Total . .	22	3	8	5	18	2	2	11	11	7	8	4	1	7	1	2	112	[a]99%

[a]Rounding error.

As the summary shows, roughly one-third (33%) of all exceptions (attestations of the simple prepositions without n- or with a non-split NIP)

stem from folk speech -- the direct quotation of "substandard" speech in novels and stories, as well as the archaic language of old folk songs and tales, etc. An additional 4% of the exceptions occur in the Safonovič Chronicle, a text with certain White-Russian traits. Taken together, these two rubrics account for 38% of all exceptions. (For a discussion of the widespread absence of n- in White Russian and elsewhere in East Slavic dialects, see Šaxmatov [1957: 310-1]; the historical divergence of White Russian from Ukrainian and "Great Russian" is examined below, in §§19.07ff.)

Another 14% of the exceptions are linked with the interposition of a modifier between the preposition and the 3PPO (so vsemi imi). As shown in §3.21 above, the absence of n- is nearly automatic after an interposed word (but not quite 100%: see §12.023 below).

The ten exceptions marked "unaccountable" in Table 6 do not lend themselves to any obvious explanation and are the real "exceptions" of the corpus. The other 102 so-called exceptions are all more or less accounted for under the various rubrics outlined (folk speech, etc.). Thus out of the 2041+ examples in the total corpus for the simple prepositions (1929+ "actual" and 112 "apparent"), only 10 examples seem completely unpredictable; this is a residue of less than one-half of one percent out of the total corpus, which cannot be handled in the present description. Of course, there is always the possibility that this figure may be decreased even more by the discovery of a way to account for some of the ten "unpredictable" cases.

3.23 Negative pronouns. -- One of the most important sources of exceptions is negative-indefinite pronouns which are not split by a simple preposition: these make up 30% of all exceptions to "actual" status of the simple prepositions. It is obvious that this proportion of exceptions

far exceeds the general proportion of negative pronouns in the total corpus, and raises the question whether the negative-indefinite pronoun material should have been counted together with the third-person pronoun material. Therefore let us see what the total percentages from Table 5 would look like, if the NIP constructions were not included in the total "actual"/ "apparent" figures:

	"Actual"	"Apparent"	Pct.
NIP: split / non-split	114+	34	77+%
3PPO: with n- / without n-	1815+	78	96+%
Both kinds of object	1929+	112	94+%

Although the difference between the combined percentage (94+%) and the percentage based only on constructions with the 3PPO (96+%) is quite small, it is nevertheless clear that there is a substantial difference between the 3PPO data alone and the NIP data alone (96+% vs. 77+%). In view of this divergence, it might be advisable in any further research to keep the two kinds of data separate. (Further remarks on some general features of NIP objects may be found in §12.01 below.)

4. DOUBLE PREPOSITIONS

4.00 Introduction. -- The second morphological class is labeled "double" prepositions. This class, like the foregoing, consists of "simple" prepositions, but only those used in pairs (hyphenated by spelling convention; see also §2.25 above). This category has few members, and is the smallest of the nine categories of prepositions treated in this study, at least insofar as literary Russian is concerned. Folk speech and some dialects, as well as some other Slavic languages, do have more, however.[1] Tagamlickaja, a specialist in double prepositions, suggests (1958: 86) that the scarcity of them in literary Russian (and literary Czech) is partly due to the early formation of the Russian and Czech literary languages, which tended to adhere to their established literary traditions and to resist the intrusion of folk elements.

The double prepositions of Russian which will be analyzed below, and in the following order, are: iz-za, iz-pod, s-pod, po-za, po-nad, po-pod. In the statistical summaries of each of these -- and of the prepositions of other categories to be examined in following sections -- all "actual" examples encountered in the corpus will be tabulated, so that percentages of "actual" vs. "apparent" examples will have a more or less precise value. Also the two earliest and latest examples, rather than one, will be cited for each preposition, since dating is an important factor in describing all secondary categories of prepositions. (Sampling, or partial tabulation of

[1] Marc Vey (1925) argues convincingly that even the ku (gu) of West Slavic may have originated as a double preposition: k + u = ku.

"actual" examples, was used only with the category of simple prepositions, where there was no question of "actual" status nor any need for complete tabulations and citations of many examples.

4.01 Iz-za ("from behind") is the most common double preposition of Modern Russian -- in fact, it is the only one which occurs with noticeable frequency. Although composed of two simple prepositions, iz and za, each of which is attested since the O.C.S. texts with "actual" status, iz-za itself does not appear at all until much later; the earliest attestation in the present corpus comes in the seventeenth century. Surprisingly, though, iz-za has a 100% record of "actual" examples, without a single exception, suggesting that it may have functioned as an "actual" preposition from the very time it came into being.

SUMMARY OF IZ-ZA

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	-	. . . . .	(?)
Period of "actual" status	35	0	100%	. . . . .	ca. 1600-1958
	35	0	100%		

Earliest "actual" examples

1600/99: i na inyx" svjatyx" jako ščity na sebě nosjat", i i z - z a n i x " zakon" Xristov" ruganii (KURBSKIJ, Posl. k starcu Vas'janu [sp. XVII v.], Soč., 387; cited by Ivanova [1957: 140]).

1649: te krest'jane i bobyli bežali i z - z a n i x [pomeščikov] v prošlyx godex (Uloženie, gl. 11, §5; also gl. 11, §2)

Latest "actual" examples

1957: rabočie rugajut ee, govorjat, čto i z - z a n e e cex lišitsja premij (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 78; also 241)

1958: . . . strašnaja bolezn', čtob i z - z a n e e panikovat' (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 532; also 641)

4.011 Commentary. -- There are no exceptions to iz-za's "actual" status: all 35 attestations over the last four centuries are "actual." Of these, 33 involve epenthetic n-, and 2 involve split negatives. The latter are: 1923: *soveršenno n e i z - z a č e g o bespokoit'sja (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Vesennij vopros, Izb., 1.93), and 1954: Gennadiju n e

i z - z a č e g o izlivat'sja pered nim v blagodarnosti (PANOVA, Vremena, 298).

Not only were no attestations of iz-za found prior to ca. 1600 (the earliest example, from Kurbskij, may be slightly earlier than that, since it is a copy of a document composed in the 1560's or 1570's), but only four examples with the decisive pronouns were found in the seventeenth century, and none in the eighteenth. In fact not until the 1830's does iz-za (with the decisive objects) begin to occur in the corpus frequently: it is encountered in almost every decade from 1832 up to the present day. From this can be seen the desirability of finding more examples with the decisive pronouns for the period prior to 1830, and especially prior to 1600 -- if any exist! The compilation of such material can be the task of future investigations. The present study has tentatively established that iz-za functions consistently as an "actual" preposition, and is attested with this function as far back as ca. 1600.

4.012 Miscellaneous. -- Iz-za is not attested in adverbial usage, or postposed to its object. The closest it comes to the former is a curious construction in direct speech: 1884: -- delo vyšlo i z - z a , carstvie emu nebesnoe, mertvogo trupa (ČEXOV, Unter Prišibeev, Ras. pov., 43).

4.02 Iz-pod ("from under") is like iz-za in many respects: it has 100% "actual" status, but based on a rather limited number of examples, and its frequent occurrences in the present corpus begin no earlier than the end of the 1820's.

SUMMARY OF IZ-POD

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	-	(?)
Period of "actual" status	14	0	100%	1828-1959
	14	0	100%	

Earliest "actual" examples

1828: *No vdrug sugrob zaševelilsja, i kto ž i z p o d n e g o javilsja? (PUŠKIN, Evgenij Onegin, gl. 5, strofa 12).

1830: čtob priučit' ee k voennoj žizni, sažal ee na pušku i palil i z p o d n e e (PUŠKIN, Zapiski Naščokina [zametka], PSS [1937], 11.191).

Latest "actual" examples

1955/58: Jurij Andreevič ottaščil skatannyj kover, kotorym založen byl niz vyxodnoj dveri, čtoby i z - p o d n e g o ne dulo . . ., i vyšel na kryl'co (PASTERNAK, Doktor Živago [Paris, 1959], 508).

1959: i z - p o d n e g o (XROMEC I VÊJZMAN, Učebnik russkogo jazyka dlja nerusskix [Moskva, 1959], č. 1, tablica predlogov).

4.021 Commentary. -- All fourteen examples confirming the "actual" status of iz-pod involve epenthetic n-; there are none with negatives. An example manifesting a clear contrast between the 3PP when governed by a verb and by a preposition occurs in 1886: -- my ego i z - p o d n e g o za nogi vytaščili (ČEXOV, Ty i vy, SS [1946], 5.363).

Of the fourteen examples, seven occur between 1828 and 1892, and another five between 1907 and 1927. That leaves only two attestations (with the decisive pronouns) in the corpus since 1927. It seems that iz-pod is perhaps used less often (with the given pronoun objects) in recent decades than it once was.

Again, as in the case of iz-za, it is to be hoped that future studies will supply additional examples of iz-pod (always with the given pronouns, of course), especially prior to 1828 -- if any can be found. It should be noted that the present corpus does include an example of iz-pod with a noun object, dating back to 1540/45: s" cerkvi . . . s"valilosja jabloko i z - p o d kresta (Vol-Perm. let., 1526 g.). This at least proves that iz-pod came into the written language no later than the first half of the sixteenth century, although we cannot tell whether its status was "actual" or "apparent" at that time.

4.022 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, iz-pod is not attested: (a) with negative pronouns, (b) adverbially, or (c) postposed.

4.03 S-pod ("from under") occurs in Russian as a Ukrainianism. There are no attestations of it with the decisive pronouns in the corpus, so its status cannot be determined. It is found mostly in the poetry of Majakovskij -- e.g., 1924: *[pogibšie] kommunary s - p o d ploščadi Krasnoj (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Lenin, 249; also 234); see also the 1927 poem Bruklinskij most. Quite possibly the demands of poetic meter, along with Majakovskij's fondness for Ukrainianisms, prompted him to use s-pod in these few instances as a variant of iz-pod.

4.04 Po-za ("around behind") is also rare in literary Russian, and is not attested with the decisive pronouns in the corpus. Its status can not be determined. It does occur a few times with noun objects, the earliest of which goes back to 1582/83: . . . ni x kotorym mestom p o z a Dvine k severnoj storone . . . gostem [ne] torgovati ni v karablex, ni na busax (F. PISEMSKIJ, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 134).

4.05 Po-nad ("around over"), another Ukrainian double preposition, is as rare in Russian as those listed just above, and like them, its status cannot be determined, due to a total absence in the corpus of attestations with the decisive pronouns. When it is used (with noun objects) by modern writers, it occurs in the quoted speech of Ukrainians, especially peasants; examples may be found in Korolenko's 1891 story Sudnyj den', and Šoloxov's 1933 novel Podnjataja celina. The most recent example noted in the present study is the title of a 1960 book by the Ukrainian E. Krotevič: Po-nad Slavutičem-Dneprom.

4.06 Po-pod ("around under"), another of these double prepositions which occasionally occur in dialect speech of literary characters but almost never in the authors' own (literary) language, is not attested with

the decisive pronouns in the present corpus. But there is an example of it with a noun object, dating from 1856/57: pojdut p o - p o d snegom ruč'i (SALTYKOV, Gubernskie očerki, Starec; cited by Bondarenko [1961: 50]).

4.07 After an examination of the individual members of the category of double prepositions, it is now fitting to put them together and study their behavior as a group. (The format of the table is the same as that of Table 5 above [§3.19], except that more chronological divisions are indicated, under each of which the numbers of "actual" and "apparent" examples are separated by a colon.)

TABLE 7

COMBINED SUMMARY OF DOUBLE PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total	Est Trn Point	NIP	Adv	Post pos
iz-za	-	4:0	-	12:0	19:0	35 0 100%	1600/49	2:0	-	-
iz-pod	-	-	-	7:0	7:0	14 0 100	1828	-	-	-
s-pod	-	-	-	-	-	0 0 -	?	-	-	-
po-za	-	-	-	-	-	0 0 -	?	-	-	-
po-nad	-	-	-	-	-	0 0 -	?	-	-	-
po-pod	-	-	-	-	-	0 0 -	?	-	-	-
Total	0:0 (0%)	4:0 (100%)	0:0 (0%)	19:0 (100%)	26:0 (100%)	49 0 100%	1600/1828 (median)	2:0	0	0

4.071 Commentary. -- The number of "actual" and "apparent" attestations are shown above for each double preposition within each of the five major chronological periods set up for the purpose of studying the general development of the category as a whole. These five periods, which can be equated with "Old Russian," "Middle Russian," and the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries, respectively, will also be utilized in the analysis of all the other prepositional categories to be examined in

following sections, thus facilitating comparison among them.

Of the six double prepositions treated above, only two are attested with the decisive pronouns: iz-za and iz-pod. And both show a status that is 100% "actual," without a single exception. It is interesting to compare this record with that of the "simple prepositions" summarized in §§3.19ff. above. The simple category has a certain number of exceptions, many of which were accounted for as "folk speech." In view of the absence of any such deviations involving double prepositions, the thought suggests itself that when a Russian author wishes to indicate that one of his characters is using "substandard" language, he has the character omit the epenthetic nasal only in the most obvious instances -- i.e., after simple prepositions, where the absence of n- is definitely felt as non-literary -- but not after other types of prepositions, such as the double category. Of course, a more likely explanation is that the very limited number of occurrences of the double prepositions (as compared with the huge number of occurrences of the simple group) militates against the probability of any exceptions turning up. A larger body of material might well produce a few exceptions.

4.072 Chronological commentary. -- In many previous studies of prepositions, there has been little material relating to the chronology of double prepositions. None are attested in Old Church Slavonic. Iz-za and iz-pod are not listed in Sreznevskij's basic Old Russian dictionary, nor do they appear in Vasmer's Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Ludolf's grammar of 1696 and Lomonosov's of 1755 do not list them either. According to the current Academy of Sciences dictionary (SSRLJ), iz-pod was first registered by a dictionary in 1834 (by Sokolov), and iz-za some years after that (by Dal').

This information, which would suggest that double prepositions are a relatively recent phenomenon in Russian, accords with the bulk of the data of the present study, wherein all "actual" examples of iz-pod, and all but four of iz-za (see Table 7), occur since 1828. On the other hand, though, there are four attestations of "iz-za + n-" in the seventeenth century, and iz-pod and po-za plus noun-objects are attested in 1540/45 and ca. 1590, respectively. This data, although limited, makes it appear that double prepositions began to occur in the written language around the sixteenth century. And in this connection it is interesting to note that a student of the history of Ukrainian prepositions, Mel'nyčuk (1961: 152-3), finds the earliest attestations of double prepositions in Ukrainian at about the same time, ca. 1556-1683. (A similar view, in reference to Russian, is expressed by Ivanova [1957: 133]).

The column in Table 7 headed "Est Trn Point" indicates the estimated turning point of each preposition's transition to "actual" status. Here only iz-za and iz-pod have such a date. The median, consequently, can be placed between the two dates, but it has little meaning -- much more material is needed, not only for the other double prepositions like po-za, but also for the pre-nineteenth century period of iz-za and iz-pod.

4.073 Miscellaneous. -- The last three columns at the right side of Table 7 provide information about adverbial and postpositional usage, and about government of negative objects. The former two functions are not attested for any double prepositions. And only iz-za occurs with negative objects in the corpus (two examples, both split). There are no attestations of interposed modifiers.

5. ROOT PREPOSITIONS

5.00 Introduction. -- This rather small category is designated "root prepositions," because it consists of single-morpheme units with a final consonant, without prefix or (overt) ending. Many of its members represent original accusative forms of nominals or adverbs, and/or contractions of original nominals or adverbs which lost a final vowel. As will be shown below, this is the first category discussed herein whose members (as opposed to the "simple" and "double" prepositions) show clear evidence of "apparent" status in the early years of their existence, and which assumed "actual" status only in recent centuries. They will be analyzed in the following order: bliz, mež, protiv, skvoz', čerez, and miscellaneous (those attested less than five times each).

5.01 Bliz (bliz') ("near") was an "apparent" preposition through the eighteenth century, and acquired "actual" status, with two exceptions, in the nineteenth. However, it rarely occurs in modern times (including only two examples with the 3PPO over the last hundred years of the present corpus), and is no longer of great importance in the language.

SUMMARY OF BLIZ

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	6	0%	ca. 1000-1791
Period of transition	7	2	78%	1828-1920
Period of "actual" status	1	0	100%	1961
Estimated turning point	.	.	. . . . .	1828
	8	8	50%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: v' vrěmę prišʼstija ix", Ijuda stojaše b l i z " i x (Suprasl., 413:13-4; also 17:9).

ca. 1700: um otnjal u milova, u nynešneva, kak b l i z e v o byl (AVVAKUM, Kn. tolk., 153).

Earliest "actual" examples

1828: ona, kazalosʼ, ne prinimala nikakogo učastija v tom, čto b l i z n e e proisxodilo (POGOREL'SKIJ, Dvojnik [M. 1960], 63).

1832/60: *nedvižim" byl" Arsenij, b l i z " n e j a , i krome voli otdal" by on" vse (LERMONTOV, Litvinka, 8:15; PSS [1891], 2.109).

Latest "apparent" examples

1860/80: b l i z ' e g o , rjadom s nim . . ., u nego, v nem (K. AKSAKOV [1880: 133]).

1920: *[baba] slyšit topot b l i z e ë , muzykoju veetsja: bitʼ na fronte panovʼë, mčat krasnoarmejcy (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Istorija pro bubliki . . ., Izb., 1.51).

Latest "actual" examples

1868: Godunov . . . sidit u stola. B l i z n e g o stojat Lup-Klešnin i knjazʼ Turenin (A. K. TOLSTOJ, Carʼ Fed., dej. 1, str. 178)

1961: b l i z n i x (L. FEJGINA, perevod Bunta mašin R. Rollana; Isk. kino, 1961.5.147)

5.011 Commentary. -- During the period of "apparent" status, aside from the six examples of the root preposition bliz, there is also one additional example, of blizu ego, in 1500/99; it confirms the pattern observed for bliz in the period before 1800. (Blizu will be treated in detail in §6.26 below; see also vblizi, §7.01.)

The chronological pattern for bliz itself is not completely clear, partly because of the small number of attestations with the decisive objects, partly because the "actual" and "apparent" examples in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are scattered, rather than grouped. As can be seen in the summary above, bliz with "apparent" status occurs as late as 1920, nearly a century after the first "actual" examples. In any event, the turning point in bliz's transition to "actual" status can be placed within the boundaries of the nineteenth century.

5.012 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, bliz is not attested with the NIP. There is only one example of postposed usage, in poetry: 1924:

*a potom, probivši burju razozlennuju, sjadeš', čtoby s o l n c a b l i z , i sčiščaeš' . . . (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Lenin, 189). There are examples of quasi-adverbial use in recent centuries. These consist of two types, either as part of a participle -- e.g., 1753: b l i z " iduščija galery (NAŠČOKIN, Zap., 291), and 1866: b l i z ležaščie pereulki (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 59); or as an independent adverbial word -- e.g., 1924: *Lenina ne vidno, no on b l i z (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Lenin, 231; also 229). All such constructions are quite marginal.

5.02 Mež ("between"), which has a substantial number of occurrences between 1550 and 1835, has almost entirely died out since then, its functions taken over by mežду (q.v., §6.11).

SUMMARY OF MEŽ

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	13	0%	1567-1570
Transition period	3	24	11%	1582-1835
Period of "actual" status	2	0	100%	1868-1921
Estimated turning point	5	37	12%	1868

Earliest "apparent" examples

1567/69: kak m e ž ' i m i bratstvo i ljubov' i susedstvo est' (VORONCOV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 15; also 28 and 48 -- 3 total examples).

1570: . . . gosudar' vaš k nemu poslal. A i napered sego mež gosudarej posly i poslanniki byvali i m e ž i x dobro bylo (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 70, etc. -- 10 total examples).

Earliest "actual" examples

1582/83: prigovorja na čem vozmožno m e ž n i m i ; gosudari dobromu delu sstatis' (F. PISEMSKIJ, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 130; but Pisemskij in two later passages [132, 148] does not use n-!).

1661/67: m e ž n i m i (KOTOŠIXIN, O Ross. car., 11; but in two other passages [11, 52], Kotošixin does not use n-! Cited by H. C. Sørensen, Scando-Slavica, 3.157).

Latest "apparent" examples

1830/39: m e ž i m i net ni odnoj moral'noj Vlasti (PUŠKIN, Gosti s"ezžalis' na daču, PSS [1937], 8.41).

1835: *a m e ž i m i sestra ix Elica (PUŠKIN, Pesni zapadnyx slavjan, No. 14, stroka 6).

Latest "actual" examples

1868: -- vse končeno m e ž n i m i i toboj! (A. K. TOLSTOJ, Car' Fed., 242).

1921: * . . . četyrnadcat' buržuev-bar, a m e ž n i m i . . . (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Misterija-buff, prolog).

5.021 Commentary. -- The chronological patterning of mež is very interesting. Up until the end of the sixteenth century, it was an "apparent" preposition. Then the first two "actual" examples occur, in texts by F. Pisemskij and Kotošixin (see the summary). But they are extremely sporadic and isolated, being used by two authors who also use mež without n- in the same texts, after which there follows a period of 160 more years (ca. 1670-1830) in which mež again has an unbroken sequence of eight consecutive "apparent" examples, before Lermontov uses it once with n- (1832). With the death of Puškin and Lermontov, mež virtually disappears from use, and the corpus contains only two more attestations (with the decisive pronouns) in the entire period following their death -- one of these is in a historical play, the other in Majakovskij's verse.(both quoted above). The turning point in mež's transition from "apparent" to "actual" status seems to fall in the middle of the nineteenth century; we can assume that if mež had survived, it would be an "actual" preposition today.

5.022 Miscellaneous. -- In passing it might be noted that mež usually governs the instrumental case (of the 3PP). There are 26 examples of mež subsequent to 1600, and 25 of them contain the instrumental; the one exception is mež nix in Lermontov's poetry). However, it should be mentioned that even at the present time mež still takes the genitive with some noun objects; e.g., svesiv ruki m e ž k o l e n (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 625). Mež is not attested in the corpus as an adverb, as a postposition, or with the NIP.

5.03 Protiv ("against"), a contraction of the original form protivu (q.v., §6.12), is the most frequently-attested root preposition in the corpus. And it made the transition to "actual" status quite some time ago, since which it has functioned as an "actual" preposition with very high consistency. The details follow.

SUMMARY OF PROTIV

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	29	0%	ca.	1486-1669
Transition period	36	15	71%	ca.	1675-1892
Period of "actual" status	21	0	100%		1895-1958
Estimated turning point	57	44	56%		1792

Earliest "apparent" examples

1486/90: nekogda že poide na nego voinstvom korol' ugorsky Matteaš, on že poide p r o t i v e m u , i sretesja s nim (Pov. o Drak., 96).

1567/69: a p r o t i v e e vzjati u Mixaila Jakovliča s tovariščі dokončal'naja gramota . . . (VORONCOV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 19, etc. -- 5 total examples).

Earliest "actual" examples

ca. 1675: i Dobrej prislal k Skanderbegu, čtob s nim bilsja sam na sam. I Skanderbeg poexal p r o t i v n e g o (Skanderbeg, 34 [insert from Vifanskij and Pogodinskij copies]).

1716: . . . s varvarami, čto n i p r o t i v k o g o stojat' mogli (Voinskij ustav; cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 406]).

1792/1820: -- skaži ej, čto Liza p r o t i v n e e vinovata (KARAMZIN, Bednaja Liza, 44).

Latest "apparent" examples

ca. 1850: -- Čto ž' dělat'-to, bratec", už', znat', takaja volja Božija, p r o t i v " e j a ne pojdeš' (A. OSTROVSKIJ, Svoi ljudi -- sočtemsja, dej. 2, jav. 10; SS [1874], 1.77).

1892: i p r o t i v i x na skameečke . . . sidel Nikodim (ČEXOV, Duèl', PSS [1903], 8.49; but on p. 82 of the same story Čexov uses protiv nee!)

Latest "actual" examples

1957: no Nadja vdrug počuvstvovala v sidjaščem p r o t i v n e e voennom strannuju naprjažennost', kotoraja ispugala ee (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 215).

1958: -- začem nam togda p r o t i v n e e vozbuždat' [delo]? (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 642).

5.031 Commentary. -- Both the early and late periods of protiv are completely clear; from its first appearance (fifteenth century) through

the 1660's, it is a completely "apparent" preposition, and from 1895 through the present, it is 100% "actual." But the middle (transition) period of protiv is more vague, in that it spans over two centuries, from the time of the earliest "actual" attestation in the corpus (ca. 1675) until the latest "apparent" attestation (1892). Nevertheless, somewhat greater precision can be achieved by locating, within the transition period, a turning point, before which most of the "apparent" examples would be concentrated, and after which most of the "actual" examples would cluster.

This turning point appears to fall around the end of the eighteenth century (1792). Before this, the proportion of "actual" to "apparent" in the corpus is 2:39 (=4.9%), and at that, one of the two "actual" examples is a split negative, in 1716 (see summary). (This, by the way, is the only attestation of protiv with a NIP in the corpus.) Counting in the other direction, from 1792 to the present day, the proportion of examples is 55:5 (=92%), which means that protiv has functioned as an "actual" preposition 92% of the time since 1792.

Another significant date, which can also be regarded as a turning point, is 1835. Prior to that date, the proportion is 14:42 (25%); since 1835, it is 43:2 (96%). Moreover, of the two attestations without n- since 1835, one involves "folk speech" in an Ostrovskij play (see summary, under ca. 1850). This leaves after 1835 only one isolated, unaccountable exception (Čexov, 1892); by 1892, the absence of n- after protiv was atypical, and even later in the same story Čexov did use the nasal with it.

5.032 Miscellaneous. -- Protiv occurs once in the corpus with a negative pronoun (1716 example in the summary). It does not occur postposed. It does occur as an adverb or even a noun occasionally in recent times; e.g., 1835: ix [polkov] bylo dovol'no p r o t i v i vdvoe bol'-

šego čisla tatar (PUŠKIN, Zap. Moro, 316); 1846: -- Vy ne za . . . -- Net, net, p r o t i v (GERCEN, Stancija Edrovo; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.716); 1932: -- Deti nam -- naša smena, -- ja ne p r o t i v za nimi pogljadet' (ZOŠČENKO, Proisšestvie, Pov. ras., 84); 1934/39: gluboko peredumav vse " z a " i " p r o t i v " (PRIŠVIN, Zolotoj rog; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.716). This usage in Modern Russian is very common.

5.04 Skvoz' ("through"), contracted from an original skvoze (q.v., §6.17), seems to have made the transition from "apparent" to "actual" status without any discernable intermediate mixed period.

SUMMARY OF SKVOZ'

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	2	0%	1791-1818
Period of "actual" status	23	0	100%	1834-1961
Estimated turning point	23	2	92%	1834

"Apparent" examples

1791: *tam" glas" svirělej, i zvonkix" trelej, s k v o z ' i x " izredka proběgaet" (DERŽAVIN, Ljubitelju xudožestv, Soč. [1864], 1.368).

1818: ostatok zavala teper' neob"jaten. . . . Terek s k v o z ' e g o promyl sebe protok (GRIBOEDOV, Put. zap., X/1818; Soč., 393).

Earliest "actual" examples

1834: on budet gljadet' s k v o z ' n i x [ukrašenija], kak skvoz' prozračnyj vual' (GOGOL', Ob arxitekture, SS, 6.59).

1841: na more podnjalsja tuman; edva s k v o z ' n e g o svetilsja fonar' (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 56; another example on p. 112).

Latest "actual" examples

1958: zelenye žaljuzi byli podnjaty, s k v o z ' n i x beleli zanaveski (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 593; also 537).

1961: okna zatjagivalis' černoj vual'ju i proxodivšie s k v o z ' n e e luči . . . sozdavali polnuju illjuziju . . . (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 67).

5.041 Commentary. -- The chronological summary for skvoz' presents a sharp break between its "apparent" and "actual" periods: no examples without n- after 1818, none with n- before 1834. But though the turning point is estimated to fall around 1834, the shortage of early data makes

it very desirable for future studies to add considerably more material prior to 1830, and especially prior to 1791 -- if any exists. The complete absence of any decisive examples before 1791 should be viewed in the light of some occurrences of skvoze in texts of earlier centuries (Old and Middle Russian); for details, see under skvoze, §6.17 below.

5.042 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, skvoz' does not occur either with a negative object or postposed. Two examples of adverbial usage were found in the last four centuries, however: 1618/19: s c r o i s prošla = the bullet is gonne thorowe (DŽEMS, Slov., 63:25); 1895: -- vstavajte, pojdem v les i projdem ego s k v o z ' , ved' imeet že on konec (GOR'KIJ, Staruxa Izergil', Izb., 64). But since both of these involve the spoken language, it can be concluded that skvoz' in the Russian literary language of recent centuries does not function as an adverb (a function now performed by naskvoz'). The dialect form skroz' occurs once in the corpus, in the speech of a peasant: 1911/12: -- kak skroz' zem' provalilas' (BUNIN, Nočnoj razgovor, Sux. pov., 140).

5.05 Čerez ("through"), which occasionally appeared as črez or čres in earlier texts, does not occur in the oldest documents (especially Old Church Slavonic), but after making its appearance in Russian, it relatively soon makes the transition to the status of an "actual" preposition.

SUMMARY OF ČEREZ

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%		?
Transition period	5	4	56%	ca.	1500-1750
Period of "actual" status	38	1	97%		1768-1962
Estimated turning point	~~. .~~ 43	~~. .~~ 5	~~. .~~ 90%		1768

Earliest "actual" examples

ca. 1500: . . . čelověk" . . . javljalsja im" vse s" xvostom, a vyrezan" na kameni, a xvost" č e r e z " n e g o sažen' (A. NIKITIN, Xož., 378a [twice]).

1500/20: i napolnišasja rvy trupija čeloveča do verxu, jako č r e z n i x xoditi turkom, aky po stepenem (Pov. vzjat. Car., 62).

Earliest "apparent" examples

1600/99: i zmeja de ležit" na doroge i č e r e z e ě pereše̋l" voz" (Lečeb. XVII v., No. 480).

1672/73: doščenik na kamen' brosila voda; č r e z e v o l'etsja, a v nevo ne jdet (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 81; also 57).

Latest "apparent" examples

1750/89: *kamen' stoit, v vyšinu tri saženi pečatnye, a i č e r e z e g o , tol'ko topor podat' (Smert' V. Buslaeva, Byliny, 376).

1927: [Upravljajuščij:] -- Gde èti čertovy dve devicy? Č e r e z n i x nabljudaetsja polnaja gibel'. [Monter Mjakišev:] -- Vot oni, čertovy devicy! Tol'ko ne č e r e z i x gibel', a čerez menja. (ZOŠČENKO, Monter, Pov. ras., 43-4).

Latest "actual" examples

1961: snova dver' -- č e r e z n e e ljudi uxodjat (A. LOKTEV, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1961.5.109).

1962: [Čerkasova] perexodit k rassmotreniju svjazej predloga v silu s glagol'nymi formami, č e r e z n e g o upravljajuščimi suščestvitel'nymi (FINKEL', [1962b: 144; also 87]).

5.051 Commentary. -- Čerez presents a rather peculiar chronological picture. After not occurring at all in Old Church Slavonic, it appears occasionally in Old Russian, but only with noun objects, as far as the present corpus is concerned; e.g., 1073: ne vyše mysliti č r ě s " podob'noe (Izbornik Svjatoslava; cited by Srez., 3.1542). But in its first decisive occurrences with the 3PPO (around 1500), epenthetic n- is present, and it is only later (in the 1600's) that some "apparent" examples are attested -- the reverse of the usual sequence. But some of these "apparent" examples arouse suspicion: the one from 1600/99 occurs in the same phrase with na eě (quoted in §3.09 above); the one from 1750/89 stems from folklore (Byliny), where n- is often missing; and the one from 1927 occurs in direct speech in a Zoščenko story. If these three examples were therefore to be discounted (as "folk speech"), that would leave in the entire corpus for čerez only two "apparent" examples -- both from Avvakum (1672/73).

Another important factor to keep in mind is the possibility that

čerez did indeed go through a period of "apparent" status, which could well fall within the years 1000-1500, for which the present corpus has no evidence, pro or con. It is to be hoped that future research can fill this gap.

After Avvakum, the first "actual" attestation comes in the year 1768 (I. TRET'JAKOV: črez nix) and seems to mark the turning point of čerez to "actual" status. From 1768 on, this preposition is followed by n- 38 out of 39 times (the one exception is from Zoščenko: see above); before 1768, on the other hand, the proportion is only 5 out of 9 times. Ultimately the picture can be fully clarified only by compilation of further data on čerez prior to the nineteenth century, inasmuch as 37 attestations of čerez with n- come after 1800, as against only 6 in all the centuries before that.

5.052 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, čerez is not attested with negative pronouns. There is an attestation with a modifier qualifying the 3PPO: /1824: * č e r e z nix odnix (D. GORČAKOV, Poslanie k Dolgorukovu; cited by Bulaxovskij [1954: 369]); no problem arises, though, since the modifier does not interfere with the 3PPO, which is still directly preceded by the preposition. Čerez is basically a dependent preposition, but there are a few attestations, marginal to be sure, of adverbial usage; e.g., 1448/68: so mxu dolom" prjamo č e r e z " poperek" boru k" granovitoj sosně (Akty juridičeskie; cited by Buslaev [1881: 475]); 1852/54: [murav'i] podlezali pod nee [xvorostinu], drugie perelezali č e r e z , a nekotorye . . . (L. TOLSTOJ, Detstvo i otročestvo; cited by Vinogradov [1947: 395-6]); 1866: očen' mnogo ljudej na edinično zlo ne smotreli, a šagali č e r e z (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak.; cited by Vinogradov [1947: 395-6]); 1915: *. . . skakali č e r e z (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Koe-čto po povodu dirižera, PSS [1955], 1.90).

There are also two unusual examples where čerez can be regarded as an adverb, or possibly as a postposition: ca. 1735/40: no k tomu poležno znat' botaniku ili znanie sily rošČenij; takož anatomiju ili rasčlenenie č r e z " čtob soveršenno poznat' vnutrennix" tela svoego častej položenie . . . (TATIŠČEV, Razgovor dvu prijateléj . . ., Xrest. Obn., 2.85); and 1800/1908: i Fedor Vodovič perebrel ozero č e r e z (ONČUKOV, Severnye skazki; cited by Šaxmatov [1925: §463]). But the Germanized syntax of the first example and the folkloristic origin of the second render them both quite marginal, regardless of how we choose to interpret them.

5.06 Miscellaneous root prepositions. -- In this section are gathered the other historical and dialectal odds and ends which fall under the classification of root prepositions. Of them, iskr', konec, lic, niz, nic, proč, prjam', and storon' will not be gone into -- they are not attested in the corpus. (For details on all these ancient root prepositions, see Ryžkov [1957: 495].)

5.07 Verx ("top"), which at one time had some possibility of prepositional use, is not attested in the corpus; however, its suffixed counterpart verxu is attested (see §6.09 below), as well as naverx(u) (§7.10), poverx (§7.16), and sverx (§7.25).

5.08 Von ("outside"), which still occurs adverbially today, is not attested as a preposition in the corpus. But there is considerable data on a related preposition, vne (see §6.02 below).

5.09 Zad (zad') ("behind") is not attested as a preposition in the corpus. Derivatives of it do occur, though, and will be treated in the appropriate sections below: zadi (§6.14), pozadi (§7.19), szadi (§7.26).

5.10 Kanun ("the eve") is not attested with the decisive pronouns.

It does, however, appear with noun objects a couple of times: ca. 1500: i k a n u n Spasova dni priĭxal . . . Maxmet (A. NIKITIN, Kož., 374a); 1540/45: v četverg, k a n u n Mixailovu dni (Vol-Perm. let., 453a, 1480 g.). Not even its modern equivalent nakanune is attested in the corpus with the ЗРРО, unfortunately, so nothing further can be said about either of them.

5.11 Kraj ("edge") is not attested with the decisive pronouns, although an example was found where it controls a noun object: ca. 1500/20: k r a j polja i ezera (Pov. o Petre, careviče ordynskom; Rus. pov., 104). This looks like a fixed expression dating back several centuries earlier than the given text.

5.12 Krug ("'round") is attested a few times in Middle-Russian texts, but in the modern language it functions only as a noun ("circle"), never as a preposition. Following are the four decisive examples found in the present corpus.

"Apparent" example

ca. 1500/25: k r u g e g o stojat (Pritča o vitjaze i o smerti; cited by Bukatevič [1957: 125]).

"Actual" examples

1623/99: stoit gora vysoka, krugla, s odnu storonu pesočna, a z druguju kamenna i k r u g n e e xod (KOTOV, Kož., 30a).

1752: *zemlja s" xodjaščeju k r u g " n e j lunoj tečet" (LOMONOSOV, Pis. o pol'zě stekla; Xrest. Obn., 2.265).

1865/1907: -- ne xodi k r u g n j a g o (Slovar' Dalja, dialect example; cited by Lomtev [1956: 296]).

5.121 Commentary. -- Although there are far too few examples to prove anything, there is a possibility that krug made the transition from "apparent" to "actual" status between the first quarter of the sixteenth century and the first quarter of the seventeenth. However, its existence was shortlived, and it was supplanted by krugom (see §6.06) and vokrug (§7.06). Krug is not attested in the corpus with the NIP or in postposed

usage. With a noun object, it is attested as late as 1819: vidim šaxov stan k r u g ego dvorca (GRIBOEDOV, Put. zap., 11/VII/1819; Soč., 419).

5.13 Prez ("through") found its way into the corpus through two examples in the Safonovič Chronicle, as cited by Borelius (1952): 1684/87: p r e z n y x (18:24), p r e z n e g o (220:10). The presence of prez is one of the obvious western traits of this manuscript (cf. White Russian prez, praz), although it is perhaps surprising that prez should govern n- in a text where some simple prepositions do not always govern it. The preposition which in the Russian literary language performs the same function as prez has already been described above (čerez, §5.05).

5.14 Sred' ("among"), a contraction of sredi, is attested twice in nineteenth-century poetry: 1835: * s r e d ' n i x , sred' ètix golyx skal (BARATYNSKIJ; cited by Bulaxovskij [1954: 451]); 1836: * -- i vse ix otopru, i stanu sam s r e d ' n i x gljadet' na bleščuščie grudy (PUŠKIN, Skupoj rycar', sc. 2, stroka 78). Although both examples are "actual," they are insufficient to be conclusive. However, taken in combination with the data on sredi (q.v., §6.05), they can contribute to the establishment of a chronological pattern for the pair of prepositions -- which are probably simply free variants of each other, used in accordance with the demands of poetic meter. Puškin uses sredi more than sred' in prose, but sred' more in his non-prose writings. It should be mentioned that this root preposition sometimes occurs in the true East Slavic form with full vocalization, sered', although not with the decisive objects; e.g., sered' polaty (1582/83, F. PISEMSKIJ), sered' cerkvi (1639/40, F. ELČIN), sered' leta (1861, A. PISEMSKIJ). See also the material on posredi below (§7.23).

5.15 Utr' ("inside"), which Ryžkov lists among the root preposi-

tions, is not attested in the corpus. But there are many occurrences of its derivative vnutri (q.v., §7.04).

5.16 To conclude the analysis of root prepositions, here is a combined summary of all members of the category which have any decisive attestations, arranged roughly in order of "estimated turning point."

TABLE 8

COMBINED SUMMARY OF ROOT PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total			Est Trn Point	NIP	Adv	Post pos.
krug	-	1:1	1:0	1:0	-	3	1	75%	1623/99?	-	-	-
čerez	-	5:3	1:1	26:0	11:1	43	5	90%	1768	-	+	(+)
protiv	-	1:35	2:4	35:5	19:0	57	44	56%	1792	1:0	+	-
bliz	0:2	-	0:4	7:1	1:1	8	8	50%	1828	-	+	(+)
skvoz'	-	-	0:1	10:1	13:0	23	2	92%	1834	-	(+)	-
sred'	-	-	-	?:0	-	2	0	100%	1835??	-	-	-
mež	-	2:28	0:2	2:7	1:0	5	37	12%	1868	-	-	-
prez	-	2:0	-	-	-	2	0	100%	--	-	-	-
Total	0:2 (0%)	11:67 (14%)	4:12 (25%)	83:14 (86%)	45:2 (96%)	143	97	60%	1828 (median)	1:0	4+ 4-	2+ 6-

5.161 Commentary. -- Many interesting facts are revealed by the total line across the bottom of the summary. The "root" category as a whole undergoes a clearly marked progression in the direction of "actual" status, from 0% and 14% in the pre-1700 period, up to 86% and 96% in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This category's total percentage for all centuries combined is also interesting: it is only 60%, a figure differing sharply from the categories previously discussed. (The "simple" and "double" categories, it will be remembered, show a total proportion of virtually 100% throughout their history.) The "root" prepositions have

this relatively low percentage because they have begun to govern epenthetic n- only in the last two centuries.

In the column indicating estimated turning points, as has already been emphasized in previous sections, the year shown for each preposition is only a first attempt at establishment of the date when it made its major shift toward "actual" status (assuming that there is such a point in time where the growth of n- reaches a turning point). Thus the absolute chronology is still in the stage of rough approximations based on the present data, and subject to being made as much more exact as data from further research can make it.

Nevertheless, the relative chronology deriving from a comparison of the dates of individual prepositions within a category, and of different categories as units, can be more meaningful. Discounting krug, sred', and prez as having too few attestations (indicated by a question mark in the "turning point" column), we can see that the rest of the root prepositions made the breakthrough to "actual" status around the last third of the eighteenth century (čerez, protiv), or the middle third of the nineteenth (bliz, skvoz', mež). The median of these five major prepositions is 1828 -- a considerable departure from the median of the "simple" category (not later than the eleventh century), as well as from the medians of the categories to be examined in following sections.

5.162 Miscellaneous. -- The columns indicating government of negative pronouns and adverbial and postpositional usage merely summarize what has been discussed in connection with the individual prepositions above, with the symbol "+" representing "yes" (the given item is so attested), and "-" representing "no" (is not so attested). Adverbial usage is rare for the root prepositions generally: mež seems never to be attested with-

out an object, and skvoz', bliz, and čerez almost never. In fact, only protiv (and von, from among the miscellaneous minor items of the category), occur regularly as adverbs. Here we see a similarity to the "simple" category, whose members do not function as adverbs either.

Only protiv is found to occur with a negative object in the corpus, and only bliz and possibly čerez are attested postposed. All of these instances are extremely marginal, and are enclosed in parentheses in the appropriate columns of the summary. There are no interposed modifiers attested with the root prepositions.

6. SUFFIXED PREPOSITIONS

6.00 Introduction. -- Prepositions assigned to the "suffixed" category differ from those of the "root" class only by the presence of endings (-a, -e, -i, -om/em, -o, -u) which can be likened to various inflectional morphemes, and which -- except for -om/em -- end in a vowel. These are obviously not "suffixes" in the accepted usage of the term; it was chosen only as a matter of convenience (it forms an adjective more readily than does the term "ending" -- although the latter would be more accurate). In the description below, suffixed prepositions occurring four or more times each will be arranged according to their endings, in the following order: dlj-a; vn-e, krom-e; rad-i, sred-i; krug-om, posredstv-om; mim-o; verx-u, vstreč-u, mežd-u, protiv-u; and those occurring less than four times each will be grouped at the end, under miscellaneous.

It might be mentioned that the present study assigns several more members to this category of prepositions with "endings" than has been the case with previous studies, many of which include only two -- putem and posredstvom. A case in point is the Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: §997), which is obviously incorrect at least in omitting krugom, whatever might be said about its other omissions of suffixed prepositions whose "endings" are no longer so obvious: sredi, mežду, dlja, vne, etc. But these should not be differentiated from posredstvom, since in present-day Russian, according to Kalečic (1958: 121), even it functions only as a preposition with a fixed form, due to the disappearance of its original noun posredstvo -- which has been supplanted by posredničestvo in the modern language.

Moreover, from the historical point of view all of the suffixed prepositions (even dlja and vne) began their careers with "apparent" status, and all were clearly composed of root plus declensional ending. Thus for the present study of the historical development of prepositions and prepositional categories, there is no reason not to group posredstvom, krugom, vstreču, and dlja all in the same general "morphological" category.

The opposite extreme in assigning prepositions to the suffixed category is Isačenko (1962: §296), who includes even imeni among them. Be that as it may, the "morphological" classification of prepositions, whichever classificatory system one chooses, is only a convenience for the sake of arranging the prepositions in some order prior to the analysis of each one individually. What matters is the analysis itself.

6.01 Dlja (= dělě, dělja, děl'ma in early texts) ("for") was one of the earliest secondary prepositions to make the transition to "actual" status. In fact, many modern inventories of prepositions include dlja as one of the primary prepositions, along with s, u, na, pod, etc. This is quite understandable: it no longer has an obvious ending or a root vowel (dělě → dlja), and its present three-phoneme composition /dl'i/ or /dl'a/ gives it the same phonological structure as other primaries (pri, pro). Dlja also has one of the highest frequencies of any preposition in Modern Russian, a fact in strong contrast with Old Church Slavonic, where the synonymous radi (q.v., §6.04) was much more frequent than dlja (cf. Vondrak [1928: 300-19]).

SUMMARY OF DLJA (DEL'MA, DELJA, DLI)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	12	0%	ca. 1000-1649
Transition period	1	1	50%	ca. 1661-1675
Period of "actual" status . . .	338	2	99%	ca. 1724-1960
Estimated turning point				1724/52
	339	15	96%	

Earliest "apparent" examples (del'ma, delja)

1000/99: da čto viny, j e ę ž e d ě l " m a xotęt" i [Iisusa] izgubiti? (Suprasl., 396:13; also 419:23, 423:6).

1000/99: -- a si murom' nozě mi pomaza, e g o ž e d ě l j a glagol'ǫ ti (Suprasl., 395:15; also 336:29).

Earliest "apparent" examples (dlja postposed)

1570: -- o tom u menja nakazu net i byti mne u nego n e č e g o d l j a (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 68, 70).

1573: a čto pisal esi o brate svoem Irike korole, budto nam e g o d l j a bylo s toboju vojna počat' (IVAN GROZNYJ, Gram. k švedskomu korolju; cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 306]).

Earliest "apparent" examples (preposed)

1600/01: velikij gosudar' naš . . ., v družbu i v ljubov' ego [šaxa] prinjal, i d l j a e g o mnogie gorody v vostočnoj strane . . . postaviti povelel (MIKULIN, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 188).

1649: da budet tot ix Bojarin i d l j a i x v prikaze ob"javitsja: i na nego istcu dati sud (Uloženie, gl. 10, §139).

Earliest "actual" examples

1661/67: n i d l j a k a k i x del" (KOTOŠIXIN, O Ross. car.; in Xrest. Obn., 1.299).

1724/52: a razboinikov mnitsja mně bolši trex pytok" n e d l j a č e g o pytat' (POSOŠKOV, Kniga o skudosti i bogatstve, gl. 3; in Xrest. Obn., 2.13).

1752: *prirodnyj smysl" ego vsegda i těsn" i skuden", Feb" d l j a n e g o est' glux", i Pegaz" takže truden" (TREDIAKOVSKIJ, Nauka o stixotvorenii i poèzii, gl. 1; Xrest. Obn., 2.206).

Latest "apparent" examples

1887: vospominat' o smerti d l j a i x vse ravno, čto priznavat'sja v tom, čto oni živut ne tak, kak togo trebuet ot nix ix razumnoe soznanie (L. TOLSTOJ, O žizni, konec glavy 27).

ca. 1951: žizn' nezametno d l j a vsex i x stirala grani . . . (E. PERMJAK, Dragocennoe nasledstvo; cited by Blažev [1962: 14]).

Recent "actual" examples

1957: pisali d l j a n e g o otčet o ego vpečatlenijax (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 233, etc. -- 12 total examples).

1960: . . . sravnit' različnye jazyki i zatem izvleč' faktor, obščij d l j a vsex n i x . . ., skol'ko by ix ni privlekalos' dlja sravnenija (ZVEGINCEV, Novoe v lingvistike, vyp. 1; cited by Blažev [1962: 14]).

6.011 Chronological commentary. -- The early period of dlja, in which not a single n- or split negative is attested from the eleventh through the sixteenth century, is dominated by a factor heretofore of no importance: postpositioning. Dlja, alone among the "prepositions" discussed so far, was consistently placed after its object (that is, the de-

cisive pronoun objects) until the 1600's. Thus every so-called "apparent" attestation in the corpus for dlja until the 1600's took either the form ego dlja (if the object was a 3PP), or the form nečego dlja (if the object was a NIP). The first breakaway from postpositioning arises in the key 1600/01 example from Mikulin (see summary above). From examples of this type we can hazard a guess that all the constructions of the type ego dlja in preceding centuries would not have had n- even if dlja had been preposed.

And with this key example (Mikulin) begins the seventeenth century, in the course of which dlja makes the changeover from postposition to preposition. After that century, from 1724/52 on, dlja is never attested postposed -- and always splits the NIP and governs the epenthetic nasal (with two isolated exceptions out of 340 total instances). Taking 1724/52 as the estimated turning point, and counting backward, we find that dlja was "actual" only 1 of 13 times (8%) before that, the one "actual" example being a split negative (1661/67, Kotošixin). On the other hand, counting forward from that time, we find 216 consecutive "actual" examples from 1724/52 until the series is finally interrupted by an unaccountable exception in 1887 (Tolstoj citation in the summary), and then another long series of "actual" examples extending to the present day, with just one more exception (ca. 1951, Permjak), where an interposed modifier separates the preposition from its object. Thus dlja is 99+% "actual" after 1724/52.

6.012 Postpositioning, negatives. -- As mentioned above, dlja with the decisive pronouns is postposed consistently, ca. 1000-1579, and occasionally, ca. 1600-1675.[1] After that, dlja is preposed consistently. Of the total of 11 postposed examples, ca. 1000-1675, 6 involve the 3PPO, 5 involve the NIP. It is worth noting that these 11 postposed examples con-

[1]There are even non-decisive examples as late as the early eighteenth century; e.g., 1705: čego dlja (PETR I, Pis'ma i bumagi, 3.340).

stitute 11 of the 15 total "apparent" examples in the entire history of dlja. Speaking of negative pro . there are the 5 early instances, 1570-1675, where the NIP is not split because dlja is postposed. But after dlja became a preposition, it splits a NIP 24 times (ca. 1661-1959); thus the overall proportion of split negatives is 24:5, or 83%. Some typical examples of negatives from various epochs follow: ca. 1675: i budete o tom kajatca, da ne pomožete n e č e g o d l j a (Skanderbeg, 27,161 [insert from Vifanskij copy]); 1789/1816: nam dlja vas lišnix bljud gotovit' n e d l j a č e g o (A. BOLOTOV, Žiz. prikl.). These two examples contrast the earlier postposed use of dlja with the more recent preposed placement. Compare also: 1798:—n i d l j a k a k i x pričin ne vyjdu ni na mig (KAPNIST, Jabeda); 1859/84: n i d l j a č e g o drugogo ne bylo teper' mesta u nego v duše (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 311).

6.013 Miscellaneous. -- Altogether in the corpus for dlja, eight instances were tabulated where the pronoun object is accompanied by a modifier. In four of these, the modifier follows the pronoun, and each time, as expected, the pronoun begins with n-; e.g., 1834: on ljubil nauku d l j a n e e že samoj (GOGOL', Al-Mamun, SS, 61). In the other four instances (all falling within the decade 1950-60), the modifier is interposed, but in three of the four, the 3PPO still begins with n-, despite being separated from the preposition; e.g., 1957: u imen sušč̌estvitel'nyx . . ., možno otmetit' obšč̌ee d l j a vsex n i x svojstvo (IVANOVA [1957: 125]). The only example where n- does not appear is cited in the summary at the beginning of the analysis of dlja. (For a detailed examination of interposed modifiers in general, see §12.023.) To conclude the description of dlja, be it noted that it is not attested as an adverb, and that the spelling dli occurs in 1809: . . . soveršenno d l i n e g o čužd̆yja . . . (ŽUKOVSKIJ, O basne i basnjax Krylova, Soč., 328). (Cf.

also one example of dlja-radi, §8.01 below.)

6.02 Vne (v"n-ě) ("outside") presents an interesting contrast with dlja. Although both today have the phonologic structure of simple prepositions (consonant + resonant + vowel), dlja has consistently functioned as an "actual" preposition since the eighteenth century, whereas vne is attested only by "apparent" examples right up to the present day.

SUMMARY OF VNE

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 15 0% 1782-1963
Period of "actual" status . . . . 0 0 0 . . . . . none

Earliest "apparent" examples

1782: "Pravo" otnositsja ili k samomu čeloveku . . . ili k veščam, v n e e g o naxodjaščimsja (RADIŠČEV, Opyt o zakonodavstve; Jur. proiz., 439).

1874: zvatel'nyj, kak i imenitel'nyj, imeja opredelennuju dejatel'nost' v predloženii, stoit ne v n e e g o , a v nem (POTEBNJA, Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike, tom 1-2 [Moskva, 1958], 101).

Latest "apparent" examples

1962: èto poslednee vystupaet tol'ko v sočetanii po povodu i v n e e g o ne suščestvuet (FINKEL' [1962b: 85]).

1963: . . . v stixe tex vozmožnostej, kakie založeny v jazyke v n e e g o (NIKONOV, stat'ja, International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, 6.7).

6.021 Commentary. -- Although the results are surprising, vne's chronological pattern is absolutely clear: it is an "apparent" preposition today, just as it has always been, without a single attestation of n- throughout its history. This is evident from such contrasting phrases as 1892: -- pokoj i dovol'stvo čeloveka ne v n e e g o , a v nem samom (ČEXOV, Palata No. 6, Izb., 186); and 1959: ono [značenie nekotoryx morfem] četko v nix ne tol'ko v sostave slov . . ., no i v n e i x (ŠANSKIJ, Očerki po russkomu slovoobrazovaniju i leksikologii, 57).

There is no problem about estimating a "turning point" here, since vne has never made the turn. That possibility is not excluded in the

future, however, and it will be interesting to watch for "actual" examples in coming decades. As to the early period, it would also be helpful to have more material there, inasmuch as only one of the fifteen attestations of vne (with the decisive pronouns) comes before 1870. There are attestations with noun objects, however, which do go back much further than the 1782 Radiščev example; e.g., 1000/99: v ' n ě grada (Suprasl., 14:25); 1610/20: vnutr' obiteli i v n e mel'nicy (PALICYN, Skaz., 167b). Noun objects, unfortunately, do not prove anything about prepositional "status" as defined herein, so it will be desirable for future investigations to locate occurrences of vne with the decisive pronouns in the early period. It can be predicted that any such occurrences will lack n-.

6.022 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, vne is not attested with a negative object or postposed. It does, however, occur adverbially in recent centuries, but very seldom; e.g., ca. 1870/89: pravil'nost' kruga i izgiba v n e i vnutri byli zamečatel'ny (MIKLUXO-MAKLAJ, Putešestvija; cited by Kalamanova [1955: 122]); 1961: vse oni naxodilis' v n e , a ne vnutri (illustrative example: BONDARENKO [1961: 52]). In Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian it entered into the composition of the adverb-prepositions ot"v'nědu (Marianus, Mark 7:15) and vneudu (Sb. Usp. sob., 4a; Pov. mosk. plen., 44).

6.03 Krome ("besides") began as an "apparent" preposition, made the transition to "actual" status in the nineteenth century, and has been "actual" consistently since then.

SUMMARY OF KROME

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	22	0%	ca. 1300-1883
Transition period	0	0	0%	(none)
Period of "actual" status	16	1	94%	1884-1959
Estimated turning point	.	.	. . . . .	1884
	16	23	41%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

ca. 1300/99: i x že k r o m ě nikto že uzrit' Gospoda (Poslanie ap. Pavla Evrejam", 12:14, po sp. XIV v.; cited by Srez., 1.1328).

ca. 1400: laskai okolo vsjakogo člvka k r o m ě i i v" oči (Knigi glagolemy Zlataja čep' Troicko-Sergeevskoj lavry; cited by Srez., 3.643).

Latest "apparent" examples

1883: graf . . . ne xotel, čtoby Arkadij ešče kogo, k r o m e e g o , ostrig, obril i pričesal (LESKOV, Tupejnyj xudožnik, gl. 4; Pov. ras., 300).

1922: na beregu, k r o m e i x dvux, nikogo bolee ne bylo (A. GRIN, Alye par., 11; but on p. 67 of the same work, Grin uses krome nee!).

Earliest "actual" examples

1884: èto byl ego cvetnik, potomu čto, k r o m e n e g o , počti nikto ne xodil v èto zabrošennoe mestečko (GARŠIN, Skazka o žabe i roze, Soč., 218).

1886: -- i ja otdalsja naukam". . . . Ja byl ix" rabom" i, k r o m ě n i x " , ne xotel" znat' nikakogo drugogo solnca (ČEXOV, Na puti, PSS 4.185; cited by Macdonald).

Latest "actual" examples

1957: nikto, k r o m e n i x dvoix, ne znaet suščestva izobretenija (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 222).

1959: nikto, k r o m e n e g o samogo i zritelja, ne budet znat' o ego nevinovnosti (JU. XANJUTIN, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1959.9.67).

6.031 Commentary. -- Krome presents a sharply defined pattern in its "status" development: its first 22 attestations (with 3PPO) lack n-, in the period ca. 1300-1883. This pattern receives additional support from one "apparent" example of the prefixed preposition okrome in 1769 (it will be included in the section on the prefixed category, §7.44 below). Although the earliest attestation of krome goes back no further than 1300, it did exist in Old Church Slavonic; e.g., 1000/99: da ne pos"let" ix" k r o m ě strany (Marianus, Mark 5:10); and it is to be hoped that future studies will uncover decisive examples before the fourteenth century. On the basis of the present findings, it is to be confidently predicted that any such examples will be "apparent" (without n-).

The modern period is almost as well defined: from 1884 to the present, krome is a 94% "actual" preposition, with only one exception lacking

n-, and that involving a modifier (krome ix dvux), and in the same work with an occurrence of krome plus n- (see Grin example in summary). This indicates 1884 as the chronological turning point: counting forward from that point, there are 16 "actual" examples and 1 "apparent"; counting backward from 1884, there are 22 consecutive "apparent" examples.

6.032 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, krome is not attested with negative pronouns. It is attested once postposed (cited in the summary above: ca. 1300/99), and three times with modifiers qualifying its pronoun object (1922, 1957, and 1959 citations in summary). These modifiers are not interposed, but in the 1922 example (Grin), even a following modifier seems to have influenced the absence of n-. Unlike most of the prepositions heretofore described, krome has had very wide use as an adverb (or conjunction) in recent times. Dozens of examples have been collected by Levin in a recent article (1956) on the subject. Some of the various non-prepositional functions of krome are seen in these examples: 1823: ja nigde ne byvaju, k r o m e v teatre (PUŠKIN, Pis. L. Puškinu; cited by Levin [1956: 152]); 1834: čužd vsemu k r o m e svoemu dolgu (PUŠKIN, Putešestvie iz Moskvy v Peterburg; PSS, 11.233); 1910/21: -- komu by èto priexat' tak pozdno? -- . . . a komu že k r o m e ? (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Petušok; cited by Levin [1956: 159]); and 1958: -- ona že bol'še ničego ne umeet, k r o m e kak vsex vgonjat' v tosku (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 554). The modern tendency is to place kak after krome when it functions as a conjunction, as illustrated by the quotation from Panova in the above series.

6.04 Radi ("for the sake of") became an "actual" preposition only recently, after its early history was dominated by postpositioning.

SUMMARY OF RADI

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	41	0%	ca. 1000-1731
Transition period	1	2	33%	1886-1915
Period of "actual" status . . .	14	0	100%	1925-1960
Estimated turning point			. . . . .	1925
	15	43	26%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

ca. 1000: samogo e g o r a d i (Kievskie listki, No. 30).
1000/99: rasp'rě že byst" v" narodě e g o r a d i , edini že ot" nix" xotěaxǫ i jęti (Marianus, Ioan 7:43-4, etc. -- 5 total examples).

Earliest "actual" examples

1886: r a d i n e j a on" gubit" lučšie dni svoej kar'ery i molodosti (ČEXOV, Nesčast'e, PSS 4.202-3; cited by Macdonald [1955]).
1925: Katušin . . . byl napugan vsem ètim šumom, proisxodivšim r a d i n e g o (LEONOV, Barsuki, 95).

Latest "apparent" examples

1907/22: oni pravdu rodili, r a d i e e pogibajut (GOR'KIJ, Mat'; cited by Lomtev [1956: 399]).
1915: -- ali ja ne grešil r a d i i x , -- žalovalsja ded (GOR'KIJ, Detstvo; cited by Lomtev [1956: 399]).

Latest "actual" examples

1958: -- ljažet r a d i n e g o pod poezd i vzojdet na èšafot (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 661, etc. -- 5 total examples).
1960: no vse oni [priemy] ispol'zujutsja dramaturgom ne r a d i n i x samix (N. MINC, predislovie, Artur Miller: P'esy [Moskva: Iskusstvo, 1960], 14).

6.041 Commentary. -- The high frequency of radi in earlier texts (especially in Old Church Slavonic where it far surpasses dělě in frequency -- cf. Vaillant [1948: 185-6]) offers a well-documented picture of its "apparent" status from the eleventh to the eighteenth century, and of its placement -- all 41 "apparent" examples are postposed (usually in the form ego že radi). But after ca. 1731 the picture fades, as radi all but disappears from the language of literature (insofar as occurrence with the decisive pronouns is concerned) until the twentieth century. During this period there are some attestations of radi (1769, Tret'jakov, postposed; 1789, Radiščev, postposed and preposed; 1822, Puškin, preposed), but these are in construction with noun objects. There is one exception -- dlja-radi

evo in Sumarokov (see §8.01 below). Thus there is a substantial gap in the data, extending over most of the eighteenth and all of the nineteenth century, and to fill it in with several examples of radi plus the decisive pronouns -- if any can be found -- is a task for future investigations. One thing is clear, however: radi has consistently functioned as an "actual" preposition since at least 1925.

6.042 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, radi is not attested in adverbial usage. It is attested once with a negative object: 1000/99: n i č s o ž e r a d i (Suprasl., 47:14), which it does not split, due to postpositioning. It is attested three times with a modifier qualifying its 3PPO (see the examples from ca. 1000 and 1960 [twice] in the summary above), although in all three the modifier is not interposed and does not have any effect on the presence or absence of n-.

As mentioned above, all examples of radi with the decisive pronouns between ca. 1000 and 1731 are postposed; all between 1886 and the present are preposed. It is true that radi began to be preposed earlier than 1731 -- e.g., 1672/73: puskaj gor'kie mučatsja vse r a d i Xrista! (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 75) -- but not with the decisive pronouns. And on the other hand, it is also true that radi remains postposed even today in certain expressions with non-decisive objects; e.g., 1958: -- tak čego r a d i ej volynit'sja za rešetkoj (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 656); 1961: spravedlivosti r a d i sleduet otmetit', čto . . . (V. RAZUMNYJ, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1961.3.128).

One other curiosity worth noting about radi is the appearance in early texts of examples paralleling the intercalated genitive construction. The difference is that radi is not (exactly) preposed; e.g., 1000/99: mnogaago r a d i ix" r a d i ix" [sic] nevěr'stva (Suprasl., 24:12); nadežde r a d i ego jǫže imě k" Xristosu (Suprasl., 266:8); 1500/20:

ljubjaše bo ego, mužestva r a d i ego i razuma (Pov. vzjat. Car., 74); 1500/99: knjagini že ego Fevronii boljare ego ne ljubjaxu žen radi svoix, jako byst' knjagini ne otečestva r a d i eja (Pov. Petr. Fevr., 112); 1610/20: o poslex x korolju Žikgimantu Pol'skomu syna r a d i ego koroleviča Vladislava na gosudarstvo Moskovskoe (PALICYN, Skaz., 5a). In these instances, ranging in time from the eleventh to the early seventeenth century, the placement of radi immediately before the 3PP never leads to the occurrence of epenthetic n-, especially since the 3PP here is functioning as a possessive to the noun, not as the object of radi. This shows a basic difference, in the early centuries when they occurred, between the normal intercalated constructions of the type v nego mesto and those of the type syna radi ego; in each type the possessive 3PP was immediately preceded by a "preposition," but v at that time was an "actual" preposition and always took n-, while radi was "apparent" and never took n-.

6.05 Sredi ("among") becomes frequent in the nineteenth century, in the course of which it makes the transition to "actual" status.

SUMMARY OF SREDI

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	2	0%	ca.	1400/1499
Transition period	1	4	20%		1834-1858
Period of "actual" status	37	2	95%		1864-1960
Estimated turning point	38	8	83%		1864

Earliest "apparent" examples

ca. 1400/99(?): i s"v'rěšę kosti ego s r ě d ě e(g) (Kniga pr. Iezekiilja, 24:5, po sp. XV v., s rukopisi UPYRJA LIXOGO 1047 g.; cited by Srez., 3.484).

1486/90: množestvo bo okrug stola ego; on že s r e d i i x jadjaše (Pov. o Drak., 95).

Earliest "actual" examples

1834: priroda . . . raskinula stepi prekrasnye . . ., často neožidanno s r e d i n i x oprokinula kosogor . . . (GOGOL', Vzgl. na sost., 24).

1864/67: čtoby on dejstvoval s r e d i n i x arxierejski (MEL'NIKOV-PEČERSKIJ, Očerki popovščiny, 1.6; cited by Čerkasova [1964: 190]).

Latest "apparent" examples

1902: [Šiškin:] -- Prosto nam prijatno byvat' v ix srede . . . Oni bezyskusstvenny . . . s r e d i i x dyšiš' čem-to zdorovym . . . kak v lesu. (GOR'KIJ, Meščane; P'esy, 49).

1924/31: tol'ko s vysoty teorii partija možet jasno uvidet' pričiny raznoglasij s r e d i e e (GOR'KIJ, Lenin, Lit. por., 21; but on p. 50 of this same work Gor'kij uses sredi nix!).

Latest "actual" examples

1960: na dvux verxnix polkax stojali knigi, i s r e d i n i x Puškin, Gogol', Turgenev (PANOVA, Iz avtobiografii, 4).

1960: Potebnja sdelal rjad važnyx naučnyx otkrytij . . . s r e d i n i x ego učenie o razloženii sostavnogo skazuemogo (SPRINČAK [1960: 26]).

6.051 Commentary. -- Although sredi (= srědě = seredě) has existed in Russian since at least the eleventh century (cf. 1096: neskv'rnyja ov'ca s e r e d ě v"lk" [Služebn. mineja za okt., list 126; cited by Srez., 3.339]), it is attested with a decisive pronoun object in all the materials of the corpus prior to 1834 only twice (see summary above). There is also one other early example which may represent a prepositional use of srede: ca. 1600/20: na vysokom li xolmu stoiši, vysočajše že togo i preizobitel'nejšu goru išču i s r e d e j u [eju? sredeju?] vladeti načinaj (Pov. ob osade, 133); but this sentence is highly dubious and was not included in the statistics. This means that definite conclusions about sredi before the 1830's can be drawn only after more examples from that time can be found.

On the other hand, there is enough material from that point on to show that the middle decades of the nineteenth century were a period of transition for sredi, with the turning point falling around 1864/67: counting backward from that point to the earliest attestations, we find a proportion of one "actual" and six "apparent" examples (17%), whereas counting forward from 1864/67 to the present, the proportion is 37 "actual" and only 2 "apparent" (95%). Moreover, the only two "apparent" examples occur in the works of a single writer, Gor'kij -- who is extremely con-

servative in the use of n- after secondary prepositions (cf. also radi, mimo, vokrug, posle, etc., where his archaic tendencies are evident). Aside from Gor'kij, sredi has been fully "actual" for the past hundred years of the present corpus.

Before leaving the chronology of sredi, it is appropriate to refer back to the root preposition sred' (§5.14 above), which has two "actual" attestations in the years 1835-36, and to the prefixed preposition posredi (§7.23 below), whose first "actual" example comes only in 1907. These dates do not contradict the data of sredi, and will be grouped into one combined summary in §7.23 below.

6.052 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, sredi is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. In recent times it does not appear without an object, except for one borderline case: 1961: i sredi tex, kto dvigal vpered sovetskoe kinoiskusstvo, s r e d i i rjadom s Ejzenštejnom, Pudovkinym, Kozincevym . . . (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 175).

6.06 Krugom ("around"), apparently a modern descendant of krug (see §5.12 above), appears first as an "apparent" preposition in the eighteenth century, shifts to "actual" status in the course of the nineteenth, and although remaining "actual" in the present century, is now in the process of going out of use.

SUMMARY OF KRUGOM

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	2	0%	ca.	1740-1771
Transition period	2	5	29%		1833-1866
Period of "actual" status	7	0	100%	ca.	1879-1955
Estimated turning point	9	7	56%		1879/84

Earliest "apparent" examples

1740/57: * k r u g o m E g o iz oblakov, gremjaščie peruny blesčut (LOMONOSOV, Oda na vzjatie Xotina, strofa 11; Krest. Obn., 2.253).

1771: * k r u g o m e g o sobor pisaček raznyx byl (MAJKOV, Elisej, 1:468; Xrest. Kok., 525).

Earliest "actual" examples

1833/34: k r u g o m n e e [cerkvi Vasilija Blažennogo] rassejano . . . množestvo vtoroklassnyx glav (LERMONTOV, Panorama Moskvy, Izb. proiz. [Moskva 1953], 260).

1841: vot k r u g o m n e g o sobralsja narod (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 21; but later in the same story [p. 82] Lermontov uses krugom ego!).

Latest "apparent" examples

1859/84: les k r u g o m e g o i v duše vse čaše i temnee (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 78; also 61).

1866: brodjaga . . . vidit ego vo sne, zelenuju travku k r u g o m e g o (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 518).

Latest "actual" examples

1943: poètomu i žizn' k r u g o m n e e takže dolžna byla rasti (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Katja, Pov. ras., 240).

1955/58: postepenno on vse bolee polno zabyval, gde on i čto k r u g o m n e g o (PASTERNAK, Doktor Živago [Paris, 1959], 482).

6.061 Commentary. -- Krugom differs considerably from krug (q.v.) in respect to chronology: the latter is attested with n- as early as 1623/99, whereas the former's first such attestation comes only in 1833/34. Krugom as a preposition does date back at least to the seventeenth century; e.g., 1623/99: a k r u g o m goroda rov i vorota (KOTOV, Kož., 19b); but with the decisive pronouns it first is noted ("apparent" status) a century later. Thus it is to be hoped that future research can supply more examples before the 1830's. It can be predicted that the longer before 1830 such examples occur, the greater is the probability that they will be "apparent."

The chronological turning point of krugom seems to fall around 1880: before that, the record shows two "actual" and seven "apparent" (29%); after that, it is seven and zero (100%). Also worthy of note is that krugom (as a preposition governing the decisive objects) is attested in the corpus only five times since 1900, and only twice since 1922; moreover, three of these five examples come from the pen of A. N. Tolstoj (1915, 1922,

1943), which would suggest that krugom as a preposition no longer enjoys as widespread usage as it once may have had.

6.062 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, krugom is not attested with negative pronouns. It is attested with a modifier qualifying the 3PPO: 1859/84: k r u g o m e g o samogo rezvjatsja ego maljutki, lezut k nemu na koleni (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 61); however, the modifier is not interposed and cannot be said to have an effect on the presence or absence of n- here. The most common function of krugom in present-day Russian seems to be adverbial, as the following recent citations illustrate: 1925: god nužen ee krugom obojti (LEONOV, Barsuki, 262); 1939: my sami k r u g o m pole obošli (PRIŠVIN, Smetlivyj beljak, Ras. oxot., 27), 1946: zdanija bez kryš i okon. K r u g o m skelety zdanij (PANOVA, Sputniki, 200); 1957: on ogljanulsja i, vidja, čto nikogo k r u g o m net, . . . (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 93); 1958: -- Kto? Kto? -- sprašivali krugom (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 511).

6.07 Posredstvom (= posredstvo + instr. ending) ("by means") came into the literary language relatively recently, as an "apparent" preposition, but it is starting to undergo the transition to "actual" status.

SUMMARY OF POSREDSTVOM

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	3	0%	ca.	1801-1861
Transition period	1	2	33%		1945-1962
Estimated turning point					(none)
	1	5	17%		

Earliest "apparent" examples

1801: p o s r e d s t v o m " e g o (DERŽAVIN, Mnenie o pravax, Soč. [1872], 352).

1825: . . . priznat' xotja odnogo iz počtennyx rycarej lesnoj nevesty i p o s r e d s t v o m e g o uznat' ee obitališče . . . (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 564).

"Actual" example

1945: èto byvaet v tom slučae, kogda govorjaščij p o s r e d s t v o m n e e obozna čaet, čto vyraženny j glagolom process otnositsja . . . (AVANESOV I SIDOROV [1945: 195]).

Latest "apparent" examples

1956: "I črez ix (= p o s r e d s t v o m i x) prexodit osvjaščenie na vtoruju troicu" (LOMTEV [1956: 407]; the quote is from Avvakum, but the parenthetical gloss is Lomtev's).

1962: p o s r e d s t v o m i x [sredstv massovoj propagandy] konservativnoe pravitel'stvo provodit svoju politiku gonki vooruženij (Novye knigi, 1962.33.10).

6.071 Commentary. -- Hardly anything can be concluded about the chronology of posredstvom, other than the fact that only one example out of six has been found where it takes n-, and so this preposition must be considered to have only begun the transition to "actual" status. Future decades will tell the story.

6.072 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, posredstvom is not attested with negative pronouns or in adverbial function. It is attested (once), however, as a postposition: 1768: takoe izobretenie svetu darovali, čtob onogo p o s r e d s t v o m moreplavatel' . . . mog uznat', gde on naxoditsja (I. TRET'JAKOV, Slovo o proisšestvii, Jur. proiz., 272). This example also indicates that although posredstvom is attested with the decisive pronouns first in 1801 (see summary above), it did exist a generation or more before that. (A detailed analysis of posredstvom and putem, with emphasis on semantics, is given by Kalečic [1958].)

6.08 Mimo (cf. the verb minut') ("past") is reasonably well attested from the fourteenth century on. It seems to have made the transition from "apparent" to "actual" status between the middle of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth, and is now firmly established in the camp of the "actual" prepositions.

SUMMARY OF MIMO

Period of "apparent" status . . .	2	28	7%	ca. 1377-1849
Transition period	14	10	58%	ca. 1859-1920
Period of "actual" status	25	0	100%	1925-1958
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .	1877
	41	38	52%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

/1377: pobeže byk" m i m o i (Lavr. let., 992 g.; cited by Srez., 2.141; in fifteenth-century copies [Radz., Akad.] this construction is rendered mimo ego).

ca. 1500/20: oružija bo vsja i strely suetno padaxu i m i m o e g o letajušče, ne ulučaxut ego (Pov. vzjat. Car., 67; same on 72).

Earliest "actual" examples

/1425: i pobeže vol" m i m o n ' (Ipat. let., 46a, 993 g.; but sixteenth- and seventeenth-century copies [Xlebn., Pogod.] have mimo ego here!).

/1425: i bjaxu v nem' [gorode] zaperlisja Pruzi i ne by(s) im' m i m o n ' poiti k gorodu (Ipat. let., 291b, 1277 g.; this phrase is spelled mimo on' in sixteenth- and seventeen-century copies [Xlebn., Pogod.]).

1859/84: nikakaja mysl', a ešče menee ispolnenie, ne pronosilos' m i m o n e e (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 369; but in 5 other passages of this work Gončarov uses mimo without n-).

Latest "apparent" examples

1902: Elena (proxodja m i m o e g o) . . . (GOR'KIJ, Meščane [stage directions], P'esy, 92).

1920/22: *šel volšebnik m i m o i x (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Rasskaz pro to, kak kuma o Vrangele tolkovala . . .; PSS [1956], 2.64).

Latest "actual" examples

1957: [Nadja] smotrela, kak tečet m i m o n e e prežnjaja trudovaja žizn' (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 47, etc. -- 9 total examples).

1958: ženščina . . . ne sprosila -- čego im nado, ne pošla za nimi. Sevast'janov vzošel m i m o n e e (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 625; also 510).

6.081 Commentary. -- The pattern of chronological development of mimo, as characterized in the opening paragraph above, is quite similar to that of the other suffixed prepositions, with one major exception: mimo is attested twice with n- back in 1425 -- which is separated by more than four centuries, and by 26 consecutive "apparent" examples, from the next earliest "actual" example! While these two occurrences cannot be accounted for in the light of the rest of the material on mimo, it is interesting to compare them with a similarly unexplained early "actual" example of skvoze

(see §6.17 below). Both mimo and skvoze then governed the accusative case, and in all three examples the 3PPO was in the form n'.

This suggests the possibility that the occurrence of the initial n- in these three instances is in some way connected with the original form of the masculine accusative pronoun *jь (which, without the support of n-, could be expected to appear in the ambiguous form i -- as indeed it does in the 1377 example cited above: mimo i). Contrast this with what happened later, when mimo began to govern genitive: the genitive 3PP form ego could easily stand without n- (as it does in a sixteenth-century copy of one of the mimo constructions: mimo ego).

But whatever the explanation, the 1425 examples remain isolated from the total picture for mimo -- which continued to function as an "apparent" preposition until late in the nineteenth century; cf. this contrast in 1570: gosudar' m i m o e g o poslal k Turskomu . . ., kak . . . iz Azova vest' k n e m u v Krym prišla (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 71). The turning point seems to fall around 1877: before that, there are 4 "actual" and 36 "apparent" examples (10%); whereas counting forward from 1877 to the present, the ratio is 37 to 2 (95%). Moreover, mimo today is specified as an n-governing preposition by Soviet prescriptive grammar (Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: §632]). Compare also the modern "actual" status of the prefixed preposition pomimo (§7.20 below).

6.082 Miscellaneous.-- In the corpus, mimo is not attested with negative pronouns. It is rarely attested postposed; e.g., 1717/49: --*Vidjaše sebja uže gonima, da minuet li stra[x] sej e g o m i m o (Ist. car. Dav., stroka 634; Pam. rus. dramy, 486); 1831: Puškin . . . kak dux pronessja e g o [nadziratelja] m i m o i . . . očutilsja v Peterburge (GOGOL', Pis. Žukovskomu, 10/IX/1831). Moreover, mimo also functions

as an adverb in modern times, and rather frequently; e.g., 1835: M i m o , m i m o vse èto! (GOGOL', Pis. M. Pogodinu, 6/XII/1835); 1924: otkryli pal'bu v čeloveka, kotoryj šel po provoloke. On byl v dvux šagax ot fonarja. . . . Puli leteli m i m o . Tolpa revela v vostorge. Bax! Bax! -- M i m o ! Ura! M i m o ! (OLEŠA, Tri tolstjaka, Izb., 145-6); 1946: tridcat' let smert' xodila rjadom s nim. -- Dolžno, i na ètot raz m i m o , -- podumal on (DUDINCEV, Izbuška Snarskogo, Pov. ras., 29); 1946: ona . . . bystrym šagom prošla m i m o i vyšla von (PANOVA, Sputniki, 41).

6.09 Verxu ("atop") had a shortlived existence, during which time its status was "apparent."

SUMMARY OF VERXU

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 5 0% . . . . . ca. 1000-1466

Examples

1000/99: a iže kl'net" sę darom' iže est" v r " x u e g o (Marianus, Matfej, 23:18; also 21:7, 23:20).
1000/99: nes"ši že i mti jego, povr"že i v r ' x u i x " (Suprasl., 80:22).
1456/66: da v e r x u e j a [strel'nicy] boi (Koženie gostja Vasilija, 4; cited by Uxanov [1958: 309]).

6.091 Commentary. -- Verxu was lost fairly early, and in recent centuries has been supplanted by naverxu, poverx, and sverx, which will be described in the section on prefixed prepositions (see §§7.10, 7.16, 7.25 below).

6.10 Vstreču ("to meet") also occurs rather seldom, although it is used as late as the early twentieth century (by Gor'kij).

SUMMARY OF VSTREČU

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 4 0% . . . . . ca. 1600-1936

ca. 1600/1799: tot čas vooružilsja i sev na konja Buelana so l'vami v s t r e č u i m poexal (Istorija korolevića Arxilabona, 101; cited by Lomtev [1956: 321]).
1907: ženščina . . . pošla vpered, na štyki, vytjanutye v s t r e č u e j . Za neju brosilis' ešče ljudi . . . (GOR'KIJ, Dev. jan., 12).
1923: Petruxa . . . poplyl . . . k pesčanomu beregu, gde . v s t r e č u e m u nagibalis' pod vetrom kusty (GOR'KIJ, Moi universitety, gl. 18; quoted in SSRLJ, 2.887-8).
1927/36: vsled ėkipažam i v s t r e č u i m gusto dvigalas' tolpa mužščin (GOR'KIJ, Žizn' K. Samgina; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 1.302).

6.101 Commentary. -- Vstreču's status is entirely "apparent." It is unlikely that any changes will occur in the future, since vstreču has been almost completely crowded out of the modern standard language by navstreču (q.v., §7.11). No attestations of vstreču were found with negative objects or postposed, but a probable example of adverbial usage did turn up: 1570: a kak Ivanu x Kafe prixoditi, Kasim-beg prislal k nemu v s t r e č u zjatja svoego (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 68-9).

6.11 Meždu (= mežju, meži, meždo) ("between") is, like dlja, a very frequent preposition in Russian. It is attested with "apparent" status from earliest times until the eighteenth century; in the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries it slowly makes the transition to "actual" status. In the early twentieth century this process is completed -- with the exception of "double-object" constructions (see §6.112 below).

SUMMARY OF MEŽDU

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	12	0%	ca.	1000-1736
Transition period	90	78	54%	ca.	1740-1907
Period of "actual" status	29	3	91%		1912-1963
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. .		1856
	119	93	56%		

Earliest "apparent" examples
1000/99: d"žd" velik" s"nese nad ńimi . . . i byst" množ'stvo vod m e ž d u i m i i krǫgom" t"č'jǫ bliz" (Suprasl., 568:19).
/1377: Georgii knę(z) . . . stvor' mir" m e ž i i m i (Suzd. let., 1226 g.; also 1207 g.)

Earliest "actual" examples

1740/57: *krutit reka Tatarsku krov', čto protekala m e ž d u n i m i (LOMONOSOV, Oda na vzjatie Xotina, strofa 13).

1763/64: m e ž d u n i m i (LOMONOSOV, Kratkoe opisanie raznyx putešestvij . . .; Rus. proza, 49, 54).

Latest "apparent" examples (unseparated)

1903: m e ž d u e j u [seroj stenoj] i krasnoj stenoj -- uzkij proxod (GOR'KIJ, Na dne, stage directions to act 3).

1907: m e ž d u e j u [tolpoj] i soldatami obrazovalos' neskol'ko sažen zemli, splošʹ pokrytoj telami. Odni iz nix, vstavaja . . . (GOR'KIJ, Dev. jan., 26; but on p. 14 of the same story Gor'kij uses mežду nimi!).

Latest "apparent" examples (separated)

1924: . . . okazalas' m e ž d u nami i i m i , kak soglašatel' mežду dvumja buferami (X. XERSONSKIJ, stat'ja, Izvestija, 2/X/1924; cited by N. Lebedev, Očerk istorii kino SSSR [Moskva, 1947], 101).

1935/52: m e ž d u n i m i e j u , m e ž d u n i m i i m i (illustrative examples: BULAXOVSKIJ [1952: gl. 4, §5]).

Latest "actual" examples

1958: mnogo let i v'jug ležalo m e ž d u n i m i ego pervoj knigoj (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 514, etc. -- 4 total examples).

1963: ešče bolee širokij vodorazdel sleduet provesti m e ž d u n i m i oboimi i Pazolini (G. BOGEMSKIJ, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1963.8.125).

6.111 Commentary. -- The abundance of material for mežду creates almost an embarrasment of riches: the boundary lines between periods are not easy to draw, and the "transition period" during which "actual" and "apparent" examples co-exist extends over a very long time.[1] Nevertheless, the general picture can be established reasonably well. In the first eight centuries that it is attested, mežду has fully "apparent" status, before the first sporadic examples of n- are seen in the mid-eighteenth century. But the examples without n- remain strong for another century: between the first attested "actual" example (ca. 1740) and the middle of the nineteenth century (1847), the proportion of "actual" to "apparent" is 40 to 72 (36%).

The middle of the nineteenth century seems to mark the turning point

[1]It is entirely possible that the same problem would arise for many of the rarer prepositions described with rather clear-cut chronological outlines in the present study -- if they were attested as often as mežду! But in such cases mention is made of the fact that the observed patterns are based on a limited number of attestations.

in mežду's transition to "actual" status: from 1856 through 1907, its proportion reaches 50 "actual" and 6 "apparent" examples (89%). From then on to the present, mežду can be regarded as a completely "actual" preposition, since in the years 1912-63, as indicated in the chronological summary above, it is attested 29 of 32 times with n- (91%) -- and all 3 absences of n- occur when the 3PPO is separated from the preposition (examples quoted in summary above). A more generalized summary can be achieved by combining the materials on mežду with those on mež (§5.02 above) and on promež (§7.24 below); such an overall summary will be given at the end of the description of promež.

6.112 Separation of pronoun objects. -- This brings up the question of separated pronoun-objects in general -- a question of some importance for mežду, which quite often takes two objects with the conjunction i in between (mežду + object A + i + object B). Obviously, the insertion of a 3PPO in slot B will create a certain tension as to whether such a pronoun, separated from the preposition governing it, should still begin with n-. This is essentially the same problem discussed a number of times above in connection with interposed modifiers.

In the corpus for mežду, a tabulation of double-object constructions shows six instances since 1859[1] where the 3PP fills slot B, and in only one of the six does epenthetic n- still appear: 1930: net m e ž d u nami i n i m i [belymi] nikakoj srednej linii (GAJDAR, Škola; cited by Blažev [1962: 14]). The most recent of the five examples without n- are quoted above in the summary; another is from 1859/84: -- kakaja bezdna ležit

[1]There is a seventh example of the double-object construction, in 1833/34: m e ž d u i m i e j u (PUŠKIN, Pikovaja dama, PSS, 8.235). However, it occurs in a period when mežду was still "apparent" most of the time, and so does not prove anything (cf. the absence of n- not only with the separated 3PPO eju, but also with the unseparated im).

m e ž d u mnoj i e j u (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 317); this example is especially interesting because elsewhere in his novel Gončarov does use n- with mežďu (e.g., mežďu nim i soboj, mežďu nim i temi).

In addition to the six examples of the double-object construction since 1859, there is also one example of the interposed modifier construction: ca. 1870/83: dolgo m e ž d u oboimi i m i tjanulos' samoe mučitel'noe molčanie (G. USPENSKIJ, Nravy Rast. ul., 107); but when no modifier intervenes, Uspenskij does use the n- element after mežďu. The absence of n- here means that altogether in the corpus since 1859, mežďu is separated from its 3PPO seven times, and in six of these the 3PPO lacks n-; this evidence supports the theory of Ferrell (1958: 81) in regard to the government of mežďu with separated objects.

If these seven specialized examples are subtracted from the total data for mežďu, we find that since the estimated turning point (1856), there have been only three other exceptions to completely "actual" status out of 81 examples (= 95% "actual"). One of these three is from 1866: ob ètom nikogda ni slova ne bylo upomjanuto m e ž d u e j u i Raskol'nikovym (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 513); the other two are by GOR'KIJ (see the 1903 and 1907 examples in the summary). It cannot go unnoticed that all three of these exceptions involve the double-object construction, but with the 3PPO occupying slot A, where it is not separated. There are, unfortunately, enough instances where the pronoun in slot A does begin with n- to prevent the establishment of any rule which would incorporate slot A along with slot B as a neutralizing position as far as n- is concerned.

6.113 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, mežďu is not attested postposed or with a negative object. It is attested once in adverbial usage: 1925: *na sever s juga idut avenju, na zapad s vostoka -- strity. A

m e ž d u -- (kuda ix stroitel' zavez!) -- doma nevozmožnoj dliny (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Brodvej, Izb., 1.213). This is clearly an exceptional case, typical only for the language of Majakovskij. An exceptional usage of another type finds the preposition repeated before double objects: 1190/99: ty, gi, viž' i sudi m e ž j u mnoju i m e ž j u brat"m' moim' (Bor. i Gl., Sb. Usp. sob., 12b). Repetition of prepositions is not uncommon with simple prepositions like s and u (cf. Bulaxovskij [1958: 404-5]), but quite unusual for meždu.

6.12 Protivu ("against") was used a great deal in early centuries, but went gradually out of use in Middle Russian as its contracted form protiv increased in frequency. Protivu seems to have died with Puškin.

SUMMARY OF PROTIVU

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	38	0%	ca. 1000-1650
Transition period	8	9	47%	ca. 1680-1834
Estimated turning point	8	47	14%	(none)

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: narod" iže bě s" nim', egda . . . vъskrěsi ego ot" mr"tvyx". Sego radi i p r o t i v ǫ e m u izide narod" (Marianus, Ioan, 12:17-8; also 12:13).

1000/99: cěsar' že, iz"š"d" p r o t i v ǫ j e m u , pokloni sę jemu i prosi molitvy ot' nego (Suprasl., 199:10-2; also 117:2).

Earliest "actual" examples

ca. 1680/99: Kolibaš ne postojal bylo p r o t i v u n e g o, . . . a opjat' ukrepilsja (Skanderbeg, 13 [insert from Egorov copy]).

1769: budem žit', kak otcy naši žili, s tem baryšom p r o t i v u n i x , čto my oščuščaem bolee . . . čelovekoljubija (PATRIKIJ PRAVDOMYSLOV [EKATERINA II], Vsjak. vsjač., 28/VIII/1769; Rus. proza, 307).

Latest "apparent" examples

1825: umestilis' p r o t i v u i x [esaulov] svjaščennik i d'jačok (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 573).

1834: vyslannyj p r o t i v u i x otrjad prognal ix (PUŠKIN, Ist. Pug., 24, etc.; altogether in this work Puškin uses protivu with n- 5 times and without n- 5 times).

Latest "actual" examples

1833/41: mery, prinjatye p r o t i v u n i x pravitel'stvom, okazalis' nedostatočnymi (PUŠKIN, Dubrovskij, PSS, 8.185).

1834: Pugačev . . . pri vide vyxodjaščego p r o t i v u n e g o vojska stal otstupat' (PUŠKIN, Ist. Pug., 16, etc. -- total 5 with n-, 5 without n-).

6.121 Commentary. -- The pattern of chronological development of protivu shows consistent "apparent" status from the earliest texts through the seventeenth century, then the beginnings of transition to "actual" status in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Protivu had almost achieved a "parity" between "actual" and "apparent" occurrences when it disappeared, in the 1830's if not earlier (its last attestations are all in historical fiction).

6.122 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, protivu is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. It is attested, at least in early times, as an adverb; e.g., ca. 1600/20: xrist'janskoe že množestvo voi jaki zvezdy nebesnye p r o t i v u krepjaščesja, vozxoda na stenu (Pov. ob osade, 144). There is also an attestation in the corpus of the interposed-modifier construction: 1611/39: stoit odin p r o t i v u vsex i x (Novaja povest' o preslavnom Rossijskom carstve; cited by Blažev [1962: 14]). It is doubtful that the absence of n- here can be attributed to the interposition, though; at that time protivu was still "apparent" even in normal circumstances.

Returning to the topic of chronology, it must be mentioned that nothing conclusive can be said about protivu in isolation from protiv, if they are -- as they seem to be -- freely alternating forms (allomorphs) of the same morpheme. A more balanced overall picture of the historical development of the prepositional family built on the root protiv- can be gained by combining the figures for protiv and protivu -- along with the limited amount of data on naprotiv (§7.13 below) and suprotiv (§7.52); such a combined summary is presented below at the end of the discussion of naprotiv.

6.13 Miscellaneous suffixed prepositions. -- In this section are collected all the isolated examples and relics coming under the classification of suffixed prepositions, and occurring less than four times each. Altogether they present one "actual" and fifteen "apparent" examples.

6.14 Zadě and zadi ("behind") are each attested once in the corpus: /1425: Rjurik" i Svjatoslav" poidosta z a d ě i x " (Ipat. let., 1184 g.; cited by Srez., 2.909); 1620/39: rostriga . . . vsegda so mnogim voinstvom jazdjaše, predi že i z a d i e g o vo bronex tekušče (PALICYN, Skaz., 340a). Other than observing the "apparent" status of these two forms, nothing can be concluded from this limited material, but it will be brought into the discussion of the prepositions pozadi and szadi below (see §§7.19, 7.26). Zadě (zadi) evidently had some possibility of adverbial use in Old Russian (cf. Srez., 1.909).

6.15 Razve ("except") occurs occasionally as a preposition in early texts, but only one example with the decisive pronouns was found: 1000/99: edin" est", i něst" inogo r a z v ě e g o (Marianus, Mark 12:32). As with almost all the other suffixed prepositions described in this miscellaneous section, this example lacks n-. With noun objects razve (and razvee) continues to function somewhat like a preposition perhaps as late as the seventeenth century -- e.g., 1610/20: i be toja nošči ničto že ino ot gradskix ljudej slyšati r a z v e vozdyxanie i plač' (PALICYN, Skaz., 61a). But due to the occurrence of the accusative case after it, this probably should be regarded as a conjunction rather than a preposition (cf. the modern usage of kak, as in ne kto inoj, kak . . .), and a similar interpretation may also apply to this curious example from 1858/86: no trogat' bylo nečego, k r o m e r a z v e nezrelyx fig (GONČAROV, Fregat Pallada; cited by Levin [1956: 151]).

6.16 Svěńe and svěn' ("aside") are not attested with the decisive pronouns, although they did exist in very early times, occurring with noun objects; e.g., 1000/99: s v ě ń e sǫdiišta (Suprasl., 1:15; cited by Vaillant [1948: §126]); 1282: s v ě n e udavleniny i m'rtv'činy (Novgorodskaja kormčaja, 85; cited by Srez., 3.289).

6.17 Skvoze ("through") gave way to the contracted form skvoz' (q.v., §5.04) in the seventeenth century and no longer exists. It is attested in early texts by one example with n- and two without n-:

ca. 1500: a grad že ego velmi velik", okolo ego tri rovy, da s k v o z ě e g o rěka tečet' (A. NIKITIN, Kož., 390a).
ca. 1500(?): vsjak' mimoxodjai s k v o z ě n ' (Kniga pr. Sofonii, 2:15; po sp. XV i XVII vv., sp. s rukopisi UPYRJA LIXOGO 1047 g.; cited by Srez., 3.369).
1610/20: i strežaxu toliko krepce, jako nikako že propolsti s k v o z e i x vozmožno (PALICYN, Skaz., 118b).

Nothing can be concluded about the development of skvoze (note above the attestation of only three decisive examples) in isolation from skvoz'. Besides, serious problems are raised by the one example containing n-, both in regard to chronology and to its "actual" status. Occurring in a fifteenth- or seventeenth-century copy of a text composed in 1047 as cited by a 1903 dictionary (Sreznevskij), the example from Upyr' Lixoj is not only difficult to date, but also to account for its early attestation of the epenthetic nasal. If the example should indeed by rendered faithfully from its eleventh-century original, then the presence of n- is all the more curious, since the findings of the present investigation indicate that other secondary prepositions (including skvoz') developed n- several centuries later. But compare two similar early examples of mimo n' in §6.08 above; the solution to this problem may lie in the special accusative form n', which perhaps had supplanted the ancient ì (*jě) in certain environments before it was itself replaced by the modern genitive-accusative form ego.

It is certain that the form skvozě has existed since the O.C.S. texts -- e.g., 1000/99: v" to vrěmę pride ĩs" s k v o z ě sěaniě (Marianus, Matfej 12:1, etc.) -- but the problem is in determining when it began to govern n- with the 3PPO. Firm conclusions must wait upon the compilation of considerably more decisive examples from the early centuries. With the present data, however, it is possible to gain a more complete picture by combining the material for skvoze with that for skvoz':

COMBINED SUMMARY: SKVOZ', SKVOZE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	1	4	20%	ca. 1500-1818
Period of "actual" status	23	0	100%	1834-1961
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .	1834
	24	4	86%	

This combined summary tends to support the pattern already established for skvoz' (cf. §5.04 above), which made the transition to "actual" status at the beginning of the nineteenth century. No examples were found where skvoze functioned adverbially, with a negative object, or postposed.

6.18 Jedě ("near, attending") is attested once, in Old Church Slavonic, ca. 1000/99: doiždeže prav"da obratit" sję na sǫd". I j ę d ě e j ę v'si pravi sr"d'cem' (Sinajskaja psaltyr', 93:15; cited by Vaillant [1948: §126]). Judging from this solitary occurrence, its status was "apparent."

6.19 Peredi ("'fore") is found two times in very early texts, with "apparent" status. It no longer exists. The examples: /1377: položiša p r e d i i m " zlato i pavoloki (Lavr. let., 971 g.; cited by Srez., 1.1329); /1377: simi bo slovesy vari(x) tę p e r e d i j e g o ž e počajax" o(t) tebe (Pis. Vladimira Monomaxa, Lavr. let., 1096 g.; cited by Srez., 2.903).

The exact chronology is quite vague, in that both examples cited above may well have been composed considerably before the date of the text in question (the Laurentian Chronicle of 1377). However, it is obvious that they are very old. There is also one interesting example as late as 1620/39: rostriga . . . vsegda so mnogim voinstvom jazdjaše, p r e d i že i zadi ego v bronex tekušče (PALICYN, Skaz., 340a); but it offers no direct evidence about the status of peredi. Another example which was not counted due to its ambiguity occurs in 1000/99: v"skr"sni gi vari ję p r ě d ě i m " . I izbavi dšo mojo ot" neč"stiva orožʺě tvoego (Sinajskaja psaltyr', 16:13; cited by Doritsch [1910: 181]). This is probably a haplology for an imperative verb (prědě̌i imʺ), rather than a suffixed preposition.

It is interesting to contrast the "apparent" status of the suffixed preposition peredi with the "actual" status of the simple pered (§3.18 above), in the same period and throughout its history. This provides a convincing illustration of the differences in "status" between the simple category and the suffixed category of prepositions. On the other hand, the prefixed vperedi betrays a pattern akin to peredi, being attested always without n- until the late nineteenth century. For details, see under vperedi (§7.08 below). In closing, it should be mentioned that peredi is not attested with negative objects or postposed, but does occur adverbially; e.g., 1282: otdast' že p e r e d i ili za kon' . . . čto budet' čjužego vzęlʺ (Russkaja pravda [po sp. Novg. kormčej], stroki 880-4; also 124, 892).

6.20 Pereki ("against") has a couple of "apparent" attestations, one postposed: /1425: to rekše, poidoša i m " p e r e k y (Ipat. let., 1147 g.; cited by Srez., 2.909); ca. 1500/1620: i poslavʺ p r e k y e m u muži svoja (Ipat. let., 1157 g. [po Xleb. i Pogod. sp.]; cited by

Srez., 2.909). The form preky, generally regarded as an old instrumental plural from the nominal prěk", was soon supplanted by the prefixed prepositions vopreki (q.v., §7.07), and poperek (§7.21). Preky had some possibility of adverbial usage in Old Russian (see Srez., 2.909, 2.1657).

6.21 Premy ("to compare to") has one attestation of "apparent" status: 1271: jako že nĕst' p r ě m y e m u (Kniga Iova, 2:3, Paremejnik; cited by Srez., 2.1670). A more frequent form of this preposition, prěmo ("opposite"), is attested three times, all without n-, ca. 1000-1957; its statistics are included under §12.02 below.

6.22 Kolo ("'round") is attested by one somewhat dubious example: 1415: i okrug" k o l o e j a [cerkvi] i osnovanie i eže obxodiši okrug" eja (EPIFANIJ, Poslanie k Kirillu; cited by Ryžkov [1957: 511]). If this indeed represents an occurrence of kolo functioning as a preposition (with genitive government), then it can be of some assistance in establishing the chronology of its prefixed counterpart okolo (see §7.14 below). Otherwise kolo seems to be used only as a noun.

6.23 Mesto ("'stead") is attested once (with a decisive pronoun) in the corpus: ca. 1650/99: i za istinu . . . sam m e s t o e g o v napast' predaetsja (Materialy dlja istorii ispravlenija bogosluženyx knig, 94; cited by Ivanova [1957: 128]). This example fits into the pattern indicated below for vmesto (q.v., §7.03). Mesto is not attested with negative objects or adverbially, but it is of course constantly used as a noun. There is one example of postpositioning: /1425: a se mene m ě s t o piskop" že Mark" (Ipat. let., 1287 g.; cited by Srez., 2.248).

6.24 Putem ("via, by means") is listed as a preposition by several grammars of Modern Russian, but in the corpus it unfortunately is never

attested with a decisive pronoun, so nothing can be concluded about its "status," past or present. An example of its use with a noun object: 1904/21: u nego uže vyrabotalis', p u t e m podražanija vzroslym, priemy zapravskogo akrobata (KUPRIN, Belyj pudel'; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.757).

6.25 Sposobom ("by means") is found once in the corpus, although not with a decisive pronoun: ca. 1600/99: s p o s o b o m onyx lodok dostavljaemy budut . . . (Prisoedinenie Kryma, 306; cited by Bukatevič [1958: 139]). Lacking decisive objects, it remains outside the scope of this investigation.

6.26 Blizu ("near") is attested once in the corpus: 1500/99: razslablennyj [gost'] . . . moljaše ego, da prineset b l i z u e g o toe svjatuju ikonu (Pov. o Luke koločskom, Rus. pov., 116). This example without n- fits into the pattern indicated above for bliz (§5.01), which already has an unbroken sequence of six "apparent" attestations from the eleventh through the eighteenth century. (See also the data on vblizi, §7.01 below.)

6.27 Pomoščiju ("with the help") is attested by one example: 1825: p o m o š č i j u i x (ŠIŠKOV [1825: 263]). Compare, in Modern Russian, the prepositional use of pri pomošči, s pomošč'ju, etc. (see §8.09 below).

6.28 Combined summary. -- Having completed a survey of the individual suffixed prepositions, it is now appropriate to put all the data together and study the category as a whole. In the following table, the prepositions are arranged roughly in order of "estimated turning point."

TABLE 9

COMBINED SUMMARY OF SUFFIXED PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total			Est Trn Point	Adv	Post pos.
dlja	0:5	1:8	33:0	200:1	105:1	339	15	96%	1724/52	-	0:11
mežďu	0:3	0:5	7:9	77:70	35:6	119	93	56%	1856	(+)	-
sredi	-	0:2	-	9:4	29:2	38	8	83%	1864	-	-
mimo	0:1	2:5	0:1	10:29	29:2	41	38	52%	1877	+	0:2
krugom	-	-	0:2	4:5	5:0	9	7	56%	1879/84	+	-
krome	0:1	0:3	0:2	4:16	12:1	16	23	41%	1884	+	0:1
radi	0:33	0:4	0:4	1:0	14:2	15	43	26%	1925	-	0:41
posrdstvm	-	-	-	0:3	1:2	1	5	17%	none	(-)	+
protivu	0:15	1:23	1:2	6:7	-	8	47	14%	none	(+)	-
skvoze	-	1:2	-	-	-	1	2	33%	none	-	-
vne	-	-	0:1	0:3	0:11	0	15	0%	none	(+)	-
verxu	0:4	0:1	-	-	-	0	5	0%	none	(+)	-
vstreču	-	0:1	-	-	0:3	0	4	0%	none	(+)	-
peredi	0:2	-	-	-	-	0	2	0%	none	(+)	-
zade(-i)	-	0:2	-	-	-	0	2	0%	none	(+)	-
pereki	-	0:2	-	-	-	0	2	0%	none	(+)	0:1
blizu	-	0:1	-	-	-	0	1	0%	none	-	-
kolo	-	0:1	-	-	-	0	1	0%	none	(-)	-
mesto	-	0:1	-	-	-	0	1	0%	none	(-)	+
pomoščiju	-	-	-	0:1	-	0	1	0%	none	(-)	-
premy	0:1	-	-	-	-	0	1	0%	none	-	-
razve	0:1	-	-	-	-	0	1	0%	none	+	-
jeďe	0:1	-	-	-	-	0	1	0%	none	-	-
Total	0:67 (0%)	5:61 (8%)	41:21 (66%)	311:139 (69%)	230:30 (88%)	587	318	65%	1877 (med.)	11+ 12-	0:56

Negative objects: dlja, 24:5 (all 5 postposed); radi, 0:1 (postposed). Interposed modifier: dlja, 3:1; mežďu, 0:1; protivu, 0:1. Separated 3PPO: mežďu, 1:6.

6.281 Commentary. -- The total line across the bottom of the table discloses the suffixed prepositions' steadily developing tendency to govern n- and split negatives: the percentage grows from 0% in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian (1000-1399), to 66% in the eighteenth century, to 88% in the twentieth century. Moving on to the "estimated turning point" column, we note that the first suffixed preposition to make the transition

to "actual" status is dlja, around the first half of the eighteenth century, followed by mežду, sredi, mimo, krugom, and krome -- all in the last half of the nineteenth century, and finally radi around the beginning of the twentieth. The median estimated turning point of these seven prepositions is around 1877. Aside from these seven, all the other suffixed prepositions have not (yet) shifted to "actual" status, and only time will tell whether such likely candidates as posredstvom and vne will acquire the capacity to control n- in some future decades.

6.282 Miscellaneous. -- The column headed "adverbs" indicates how many suffixed prepositions are attested (at least once) as an adverbial. According to the results of the present investigation, as many as eleven of these items are not attested adverbially -- dlja, sredi, radi, etc. However, it should be added that the four marked with the "-" symbol in parentheses -- posredstvom, kolo, mesto, and pomoščiju -- have had the possibility of independent occurrence as nouns, and thus are not in the same class with really dependent prepositions like dlja. (The symbol "+" enclosed in parentheses indicates that adverbial usage, while attested, is very rare for the given preposition, or is attested only in earlier centuries.)

The postpositioning column shows that seven items are attested after their object, with a total of 56 examples of "apparent" status and none of "actual." (Posredstvom and mesto do occur postposed, but only to non-decisive objects in the corpus.) The other miscellaneous figures at the bottom indicate that only dlja and radi are attested in the corpus with negative objects, for a total of 24 split examples, and 6 non-split (all 6 are due to postpositioning, and thus are included also in the postposed column). Interposed-modifier constructions are found only with dlja,

<u>mežđu</u>, and <u>protivu</u>, for a total of three "actual" (with <u>n</u>-) and two "apparent" (without <u>n</u>-) examples. All of these assorted special types of "apparent" and "actual" examples are already taken into account in the "total" column, which includes all 3PP objects and all NIP objects.

7. PREFIXED PREPOSITIONS

7.00 Introduction. -- The members of the "prefixed" category differ from those of the two preceding categories by the presence of a prefix attached to their root morpheme (the root morpheme, in its turn, may or may not have an overt ending). This is the largest category of prepositions, with v- and po- being the most commonly used prefixes. In the description below, prefixed prepositions occurring four or more times each will be arranged according to their "prefixes," in the following order: vblizi, vdogonku, vmesto, vnutri, vozle, vokrug, vopreki, vperedi, vsled; naverx(u), navstreču, napererez, naprotiv; okolo, okrest; poverx, podelom, podle, pozadi, pomimo, poperek, posle, posredi; promež; sverx, szadi; and all others will be grouped at the end, under miscellaneous.

7.01 Vblizi ("near"), derived from bliz (q.v., §5.01), is attested only a few times, with mixed status.

SUMMARY OF VBLIZI

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	1	0%		1814
Transition period	2	1	67%	ca.	1880-1899
Period of "actual" status	1	0	100%		1922
Estimated turning point	÷ 3	. 2	. . 60%		1922?

"Apparent" examples

1814: *no vdrug za rošč̌ej osvetila, v b l i z i e j xiž̌inu luna . . ., s volnen'em syna uxvatila, i k nej približ̌ilas' (PUŠKIN, Romans, PSS, 1.84).

1899: kogda v b l i z i i x nikogo ne bylo, on vdrug privlekal ee k sebe (ČEXOV, Dama s sobač̌koj, PSS, 12.67; but on p.69 of the same story Čexov uses vblizi nix!).

"Actual" examples

1880/83: v b l i z i n e e [jamskoj povozki], na lužku, xodili tri sputannye lošadi (SALTYKOV, Blagonamerennye reči, č. 5; quoted in SSRLJ, 2.70).

1899: v b l i z i n i x [lip i berez] uže ne xočetsja dumat' o gorax i more (ČEXOV, Dama s sobačkoj, PSS, 12.69).

1922: veslo rezko plesnulo v b l i z i n e e (GRIN, Alye par., 70).

7.012 Commentary. -- The data on vblizi is so sparse as to render the above chronological summary extremely tentative, pending the location of more examples. Vblizi is not attested with negative objects or postposed. But it is used adverbially in the modern language; e.g., 1946: mat' naxoditsja v b l i z i ot nego (FADEEV, Molodaja gvardija; cited by Isengalieva [1959: 194]). This last example, incidentally, shows one way of avoiding the question of whether to put n- with vblizi: use it as an adverb followed by the simple preposition ot.

7.013 Although there is little material on vblizi, what there is can be combined with that for bliz, blizu, the "comparative" bliže (from §9.03), and the "adverb" blizko (§10.02), to give a somewhat fuller picture:

COMBINED SUMMARY: BLIŹ, BLIZU, VBLIZI, BLIŻE, BLIZKO

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	8	0%	ca.	1000-1791
Transition period	10	5	67%		1814-1925
Period of "actual" status	2	0	100%	ca.	1935-1961
	12	13	48%		

This combined data shows that the bliz- family is "apparent" through the eighteenth century, then in process of transition during the nineteenth, and in recent years has become "actual." The twentieth-century material is not sufficient and consistent enough, however, to permit the establishment of an "estimated turning point." Prepositions built on bliz-, it seems, are declining in use, judging from their few recent attestations with the ЗРРО.

7.02 Vdogon(ku) ("after") has very few attestations, all "apparent."

SUMMARY OF VDOGON(KU)

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 4 0% . . . . . ca. 1900-1957

Examples

1900/08: ona v d o g o n k u e m u kriknula (KUPRIN, Na perelome, gl. 4; quoted in SSRLJ, 2.99).

1915: -- veli siju minutu lošadej podavat'! -- kriknul e j v d o g o n - k u Rastegin (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Prikl. Rast., 75).

1928/35: protivnik bežal k gorodu. V d o g o n e m u poneslis' krasnye kazač'i sotni (A. N. TOLSTOJ, 18-j god; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 1.177).

1957: oni rešili brosit' svoj kamen' xotja by e m u v d o g o n k u (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 207).

7.021 Commentary. -- The above four examples constitute the only attestations of vdogonku in the corpus, and though scanty, they point toward completely "apparent" status in this century. This preposition is not attested with negative objects. It does occur postposed, as in two of the four citations above. It also can be used adverbially; e.g., 1946: -- my eščе vstretimsja! -- kriknul v d o g o n k u Nikolaj (G. BEREZKO, Noč' polkovodca; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 1.177).

7.03 Vmesto ("instead") has an interesting history: it began as a two-word combination between which objects or possessives were intercalated (e.g., v Sergeevo mesto), but then in the course of the seventeenth century the two components joined together to form a single preposition which governed genitive (e.g., vmesto Sergeja). And only two centuries after that did vmesto change its status to "actual." The following summary is divided into two parts, first showing the two-word combination (with intercalated objects) of the early centuries, then the real preposition of recent centuries.

SUMMARY OF V ... MESTO (SEPARATED)

Period of "actual"(!) status	10	0	100%	. . . . .	ca. 1000-1620
Period of "apparent"(!) status . . .	0	7	0%	. . . . .	1649-1667
Estimated turning point	10	7	59%	. . . . .	1649

Earliest "actual" examples

1000/99: i iti i počrěti v ' ńego město ot' rěky (Suprasl., 551:3-6; also 193:15).

ca. 1170/1200: vina že . . . pričęstitisę ne dostoit', n" v " nego město črěpljut m'nixom" rivifinaja uxa (Ustav studijskij cerkovnyj i monastyrskij, 207; cited by Srez., 2.248).

Latest "actual" examples

1551: on" ot" cerkvi ego izgna i v nego mesto paki Evfimija . . . postavi na patrijaršestvo (Stoglav, 117; quoted in Voprosy istorii russkogo jazyka [Moskva: Izdat MGU, 1959], 247).

ca. 1600/20: -- pravednyj bo, -- reče, -- živ budet, v nego že mesta [sic] predaetca nečestivyj (Pov. ob osade, 164).

"Apparent" examples

1649: pristavu v ego mesto privesti s soboju čeloveka, ili ego krest'janina za porukami že (Uloženie, gl. 10, §141, etc. -- 5 total examples; cited by Černyx [1953: 371]).

1661/67: v ix město, v ego město (KOTOŠIXIN, O Ross. carst., in Xrest. Obn., 1.298 [twice]).

7.031 Commentary on v ... mesto. -- This two-word combination with intercalated objects manifests a pattern of development exactly the opposite of the norm. It began its career with "actual" status, by taking n- when its object was the 3PP, but then, some centuries later, it lost this abiliity to govern n- and shifted to "apparent" status -- all the time maintaining its separated, two-word structure (for details, see Bulaxovskij [1958: 305]).

And for this reason it is not really accurate to regard the early v ... mesto as a preposition at all,[1] any more than it would be to label v ... ljubvi or v ... meru as prepositions at that same time, merely be-

[1]Note that Vaillant (1948: §§124, 126) in discussing v ... mesto among O.C.S. prepositions, is careful to refer to it as a "locution."

cause they also happened to occur in such constructions as v' nego ljub"ve and v' njože mĕrǫ. As has already been shown (§3.01 above), the occurrence of n- between v" and an immediately following 3PP was virtually automatic in Old Church Slavonic (and, to an extent, in Old Russian), regardless of whether the 3PP was the object of the preposition or not. Accordingly, the present analysis counts such constructions as v nego mesto, za nju že vinu, etc., as examples of the government of the simple preposition involved (v, za, etc.), and not of the combination. (The above statistical summary of v ... mesto is given only to furnish a complete picture of the development of vmesto; it will not be included in the overall summary at the end of the section on prefixed prepositions, §7.53 below.) To conclude the discussion of v ... mesto, be it noted that it is not attested in the corpus with negative pronouns or adverbially.

7.032 Now, let us turn to the modern one-word preposition vmesto:

SUMMARY OF VMESTO (NOT SEPARATED)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	11	0%	ca. 1610-1810
Transition period	3	8	27%	1813-1888
Period of "actual" status	21	0	100%	ca. 1896-1962
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .	1896/1900
	24	19	56%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

1610/20: [Godunov] povele v m e s t o e j a [pšenicy] rož davati na prinošenie Bogu (PALICYN, Skaz., 19b; also on 11b).

1720: eželi že prezident, ili kto v m e s t o e g o otpravljaet, sie prenebrežet . . . (General'nyj reglament; cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 309]).

Earliest "actual" examples

1813: no možno v m e s t o n e g o prikomandirovat' drugix (A. TURGENEV, Pis. Bulg., No. 100, 25/III/1813).

1832: galstukov černyx ne nosjat; v m e s t o n i x upotrebljajut sinie (GOGOL', Pis. Danilevskomu, 1/I/1832).

Latest "apparent" examples

1873: zato v m e s t o e g o otkliknulsja iz dal'nego ugla nebol'šoj ryžen'kij čeloveček (LESKOV, Zapeč. ang., 52).

1888: ona isčezla v temnoj dveri, i v m e s t o e e na poroge pokazalas' . . . armjanka (ČEXOV, Krasavicy, Pov. ras., 152).

Latest "actual" examples

1957: starinnogo derevjannogo osobnjaka ne bylo. . . . V m e s t o n e g o . . . byla razvita bol'šaja kruglaja klumba (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 240).

1962: predlog po pričine ne javljaetsja zdes' edinstvenno vozmožnym -- v m e s t o n e g o . . . upotrebljajutsja vsledstvie, iz-za i t. p. (FINKEL' [1962b: 37; also 52, 214]).

7.033 Commentary. -- The one-word preposition vmesto traces the chronological development of v ... mesto in reverse. It arises in the seventeenth century, with "apparent" status -- which it retains for 200 years. Note the contrast, in an example of this period, between vmesto and simple v: 1748: my privykli videt' bukvu ě v smešennyx skladax soglasnymi, čto eželi v n i x stavit' e v m e s t o e j a , to . . . (TREDIAKOVSKIJ, Razgovor . . . ob ortografii, §198; Krest. Obn., 2.181). In the seventeenth century, as mentioned above, there is also one "apparent" example of mesto (see §6.23); this fits in with the pattern established for vmesto, making twelve consecutive examples without n-, ca. 1610-1810.

In the early nineteenth century, scattered occurrences with n- mark the beginning of the transitional, or mixed, period, which lasts until the end of that century. In the 1900's vmesto has been 100% "actual" -- even when written in abbreviated form, as in 1930: v m . n e e (KARSKIJ, Vvedenie, Russkaja pravda [izd. 1930 g.], 10). In regard to the birth of vmesto from the old separated v ... mesto, it seems to come in the seventeenth century; before that, all attestations in the corpus take the form v ... mesto with intercalated objects; after that, they all take the form vmesto with following objects.

7.034 Miscellaneous. -- Vmesto is not attested in the corpus with negative pronouns or postposed. It also does not occur adverbially, with isolated exceptions; e.g., 1610/20: smesivšesja vsi ljudie v m e s t o

litovskie i troickie, i byst' boj (PALICYN, Skaz., 100a); 1962: v m e s t o i narjadu s predlogom po slučaju vystupaet prosto po (FINKEL' [1962b: 81]). In the first instance (there are several occurrences of this in Old and Middle Russian), vmesto is playing the same adverbial role as the modern vmeste; in the latter, it is paired with a preposition governing a different case and separating it from the object, but even here vmesto might still be considered a preposition rather than an adverb.

7.04 Vnutri ("inside") was totally "apparent" until quite recently; only in the last forty years has it begun the transition to "actual" status -- a transition which is still going on. Vnutri, by the way, has a unique characteristic, etymologically speaking: it is a preposition which already contains an epenthetic n- within it (*vъn + ǫtr' = v"nutri); for details on the history of n-, see §19.02 below.

SUMMARY OF VNUTRI (VNUTR')

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	7	0%	1741-1916
Transition period	8	7	53%	1923-1962
Estimated possible turning point	8	14	36%	1947?

Earliest "apparent" examples

1741: *podnjavšis', brat ego šumel, kak jad v n u t r i e g o kipel (LOMONOSOV, Pervye trofei . . ., PSS [1959], 8.45).

1825: oni legli nic u sej nory i žadnymi glazami gljadeli v n u t r ' e e (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 499).

Earliest "actual" examples

1923/37: on . . . topnul nogoj -- i točno dosku v n u t r i n e g o stali razryvat' (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Aėlita [Kiev, 1958], 372).

1925: Sene vdrug stalo žutko ot nastupivšej v n u t r i n e g o tiši-ny (LEONOV, Barsuki, 88; but on p.316 of the same work Leonov uses vnutri ego).

Latest "apparent" examples

1957: na ėtom zaveršaetsja otstuplenie. V n u t r i e g o -- svjaz' kadrov čisto logičeskaja (B. AL'TŠULER, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1957. 11.123).

1961: za fabuloj ili, vernee, v n u t r i ee Dostoevskij raskryvaet složnuju istoriju (M. BLEJMAN, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1961.11.71).

Latest "actual" examples

1961: sinonimičeskie svjazi v n u t r i n e g o [vinitel'nogo padeža] šire i raznoobraznee v sravnenii s drugimi padežami (BONDARENKO [1961: 38]).

1962: vse predloženie i predlog v n u t r i n e g o imejut xarakter pričinno-sledstvennyj (FINKEL' [1962b: 64]).

7.041 Commentary. -- Although no decisive examples with vnutri are attested before 1741, and only one before 1825 (see summary above), it did exist as a preposition considerably earlier; e.g., ca. 1500: byst' v n u t r ' g r a d a seča velika i vneudu seča (Pov. mosk. plen., 46). When more early decisive examples are found in the future, it is safe to assume that they will consistently lack epenthetic n-. And while speaking of the scarcity of early decisive attestations of vnutri (and of several other secondary prepositions), it might be mentioned that in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, writers often used the onyj adjectival forms of the third-person pronoun, such as vnutri onogo (1777, FONVIZIN) or vnutri onyx (1825, NAREŽNYJ). The declensional pattern of these pronoun forms excludes both members of the binary opposition "n- : non n-" and all such examples are therefore valueless in determining the "status" of any preposition governing them.

Looking at the other end of the time-span, it is very interesting to note that today vnutri is only in the middle of its transition to n-governing status, having achieved a parity of "apparent" and "actual" examples in the last forty years. For this reason the summary above omits any "period of 'actual' status," since such a period can be assigned only to a span of years within which virtually all examples are "actual." And that is still in the future, although the turning point may already have been reached: counting forward from 1947 to the present, the proportion of "actual" to "apparent" attestations is 6:3 (67%), whereas counting

backward from that time to the earliest examples, the proportion is 2:11 (15%). Compare also one example of iznutri ego in 1928 (§7.35 below) -- which fits in with the pattern of evidence for vnutri.

7.042 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, vnutri is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. It does, however, freely occur as an adverb in recent times; e.g., čto-to, ne podčinjajuščeesja opredeleniju, sidit u menja v n u t r i (GARŠIN, Trus, Soč., 38); 1925: budto čto otorvalos' u menja v n u t r i (ZOŠČENKO, Pacientka, Pov. ras., 26); 1946: kak oni mogut . . . est' moroženoe, xodit' v teatr, kogda v n u t r i u nix voet "uuu!" (PANOVA, Sputniki, 56). Such phrases indicate the possibility that native speakers sometimes avoid using personal pronouns as the object of vnutri by inserting the simple preposition u to govern the pronoun, while vnutri functions as an adverb. (And this once again helps to deplete the stock of potentially decisive examples which could be used to determine the status of vnutri.) In Old Church Slavonic this preposition enters into the composition of the adverb-preposition v"nǫtr'jǫdu ("inwards"); e.g., 1000/99: c͡srstvie bžie v " n ǫ t r ' - ǫ d ǫ v" vas" est" (Marianus, Luka 17:22), etc. (See also Vaillant [1948: §143c].)

7.05 Vozle ("alongside"), supposedly consisting of the prefix v"z and the root *dlěg (Vondrak [1928: 300-19]), made the transition to "actual" status before the middle of the nineteenth century, and has been 100% "actual" ever since.

SUMMARY OF VOZLE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%	(?)
Transition period	12	2	86%	1835-1841
Period of "actual" status	39	0	100%	1842-1959
Estimated turning point	51	2	96%	1842

"Apparent" examples

1835: prismotr" za nim" uveličili ešče boleě. Daže za stolom" ne klali v o z l ě e g o noža (GOGOL', Starosv. pom., 143 [po izd. 1835 g.]; but earlier in the same story Gogol' uses vozle nego. Moreover, in the 1842 edition of this story, the first example is changed to vozle nego!).

1841: ja velel v o z l e e g o [Kazbiča] položit' den'gi (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 21; but everywhere else in this novel -- a total of 9 times -- Lermontov uses n- after vozle).

Earliest "actual" examples

1835: voz" s" dynjami, stojaščij vozlě ambara, otprjažennyj vol", lěnivo ležaščij v o z l ě n e g o (GOGOL', Starosv. pom., 124; see note above).

1836: a v o z l e n e g o [Fontana] kto èto s takim važnym i prekrasnym vidom? (PUŠKIN, Francuzskaja akademija, PSS, 12.48).

Latest "actual" examples

1959: Saša tože ostanovilas' v o z l e n i x (BAŠ [1959: 263]).

1959: v grafe, otvedennoj dlja nix ili v o z l e n i x , sdelan znak (Slov. rus. jaz., 3.715).

7.051 Commentary. -- As is evident from the above summary, further data on vozle before the 1830's is indispensable to complete the picture and determine in what period, if any, vozle was an "apparent" preposition. But the present material does show quite clearly the last stages of the transition and the entire "actual" period. One very meaningful example in this regard is the 1842 re-edition of "Starosvetskie pomeščiki," in which one example of vozle ego from the first (1835) edition is changed to include epenthetic n-. It should be pointed out that although the present corpus has no decisive examples before the 1830's, there are attestations of vozle with noun objects several centuries earlier; e.g., /1377: i staša v " z l ě rěku šatry na berezě (Suzd. let., 1207 g.); see also examples from ca. 1500 (Rus. pov., 101) and 1610/20 (PALICYN, Skaz., 20a).

7.052 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, vozle is not attested with negative pronouns. It does not occur postposed, except, perhaps, for the following example: 1623/99: a pod gorodom sošli v reki Oka-reka da Vol-

ga, Oki v o z l j a posadami povyše goroda k stepi tečet promež gor ručej (KOTOV, Xož., 5a). Vozle does function as an adverb in recent times; e.g., 1841: ee mat' byla daleko, i v o z l e nikogo iz znakomyx ej kavalerov ne bylo (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 91); 1900: on tol'ko čto vyšel iz-za svoego stola i, stoja v o z l e , . . . podnosil ko rtu stakan (ANDREEV, Pervyj gonorar, Pov. ras., 92); 1957: na malen'kom stolike v o z l e stojala glinjanaja miska (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 29).

7.06 Vokrug ("around") seems to have completed the transition to "actual" status by the time of Puškin's death, after which it functions consistently as an "actual" preposition -- until the beginning of this century, when there are a few unexpected examples without n-. Vokrug has, however, been completely "actual" in the last quarter-century.

SUMMARY OF VOKRUG (VKRUG)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%	(?)
Transition period	49	12	80%	ca. 1779-1930
Period of "actual" status	23	0	100%	1938-1961
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .	1841
	72	12	86%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

1783/94: *inoj v o k r u g e e nyrjaet (BOGDANOVIČ, Dušen'ka; Xrest. Kok., 540).

1791: * v o k r u g e g o (DERŽAVIN, Potemkinskago prazdnika opisanie, Soč. [1864], 1.402).

Earliest "actual" examples

1779: *toskujut v k r u g n e e prekrasnye mesta (XERASKOV, Rossijada; Xrest. Kok., 572, 573).

1808: v tixoj polunočnoj proxladě razlivalos' v o k r u g " n e g o eja prisutstvie (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Mar'ina rošča, Soč., 307, etc.).

Latest "apparent" examples

1923: a ja ètakim gusem, ètakim buržuem nerezanym, v'jus' v o k r u g e e i predlagaju . . . (ZOŠČENKO, Aristokratka, 17; but on the same page Zoščenko uses vokrug nee too! [Pov. ras., 17]).

1930: vy opisyvaete ulicu poselka, v o k r u g e g o , verojatno -- polja, a nad nim sine-černoe nebo (GOR'KIJ, Pis. načinajuščim pisateljam, No. 3; O literature [izd. 1961 g.], 195).

Latest "actual" examples

1960: znaj (znaj sebe) možet učastvovat' v formirovanii celogo otrezka predloženija -- skazuemogo i gruppirujuščixsja v o k r u g n e g o vtorostepennyx členov (ŠVEDOVA, Sint. rus. raz., 102).

1961: spory v o k r u g n e g o [Čuxraja] doxodili do samyx krajnix toček (A. KARAGANOV, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1961.3.18).

7.061 Commentary. -- The absence of decisive examples prior to 1779, while preventing any conclusions about the status of vokrug in earlier times, can be compensated for by the inclusion of data on krug (§5.12), krugom (§6.06), and okrug (§7.45) -- all of which are attested earlier. A combined summary of these four prepositions will be presented at the end of this section. It should also be mentioned that vokrug itself did exist long before 1779; e.g., 1400/99: oni že v o k r u g grada vsego ob"exaša (Pov. mosk. vzjat., 40); however, no decisive objects were found in the earlier texts.

Looking at the period which is reasonably well documented, we find that between 1779 and 1834, vokrug is attested with n- 12 times, without it 9 times -- in other words, it is a period of coexistence of "actual" and "apparent" usage. Indeed, the same writers sometimes use n-, sometimes omit it; Žukovskij, for instance, in prose texts written in 1808 uses the n-forms four times, whereas in a 1798 composition he writes vokrug" ego. Puškin also alternates the "apparent" and "actual" treatment of vokrug, but after his death there is a clear turning point.

Counting forward from 1841, we find in the corpus a sequence of 26 consecutive "actual" examples, finally interrupted by an example without n- in 1915 (Gor'kij). There are two more deviations in the following decade, one from the pen of Zoščenko, the other also from Gor'kij (both cited above). Occurring after a long period of 100% "actual" status, and followed by another unbroken period extending to the present day, these

three examples raise the problem of whether they should be written off as "exceptions." But all three occur in the author's narrative, and not, as might be expected, in quoted dialog (in Zoščenko's case it is hard to tell the difference); moreover, Gor'kij in both his phrases contrasts vokrug (without n-) with nad (with n-). The best solution seems to be to consider these examples as part of the overall chronological pattern, marking the end of the transition period, while keeping 1841 as the estimated turning point: before 1841 the proportion of "actual" attestations is 57%, as compared with a proportion of 95% (60:3) since 1841.

7.062 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, vokrug is not attested with negative pronouns. Nor is it attested postposed, except for a pair of poetic constructions by Deržavin and Dmitriev (quoted by Bulaxovskij [1958: 426]). Like many of the other prefixed prepositions, vokrug is freely used as an adverb in recent times; e.g., 1957: on po-prežnemu ničego ne zamečal v o k r u g (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 112); 1959: v o k r u g ščelkali fotoapparatami turisty (A. SPEŠNEV, Obyknovennaja istorija, in Isk. kino, 1959.9.29). As to the one-syllable form vkrug, it is restricted almost entirely to the poetry of the late 1700's and early 1800's, with the exception of one example from 1925: u doma popad'i gruzili podvodu, v k r u g n e e kopošilis' barsuki (LEONOV, Barsuki, 276).

7.063 To conclude this analysis, a summary combining all four prepositions with the root krug- is presented below:

COMBINED SUMMARY: KRUG, KRUGOM, OKRUG, VOKRUG

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	4	0%	ca. 1000-1525
Transition period	20	16	56%	1623-1866
Period of "actual" status	64	3	95%	1868-1961
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .	1868
	84	23	79%	

The exact numbers in this summary have no great significance, since they are obtained by adding heterogeneous material, but they do point to the general outlines of the development of this family of prepositions: completely "apparent" status through the fifteenth century, mixed status until the mid-nineteenth century, and almost 100% "actual" since then.

7.07 Vopreki ("in spite") is, like vne, a universally acknowledged "preposition" which turns out to be attested only with "apparent" status.

SUMMARY OF VOPREKI

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 12 0% 1808-1963

Earliest examples

1808: pisatel' . . . ne dolžen" nadějat'sja v" nem" [světě] uspěxa: mnění, sliškom ne ograničennoe. V o p r e k i e m u , pozvoljaju sebě utverždat', čto . . . (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Pis. obšč., 266).

1827: v o p r e k i i m s a m i m (PUŠKIN, Ob al'manaxe Severnaja lira; PSS, 11.48).

Latest examples

1960: . . . svobodnoe dejstvie, osuščestvljajuščeesja nezavisimo ot kakix-libo . . . drugix dejstvij, vozmožno -- v o p r e k i i m (ŠVEDOVA, Sint. rus. raz., 72).

1963: čto proisxodit ne blagodarja sisteme kapitalističeskogo predprinimatel'stva, a v o p r e k i e j (S. S. GINZBURG, Kinematografija dorevoljucionnoj Rossii [Moskva, 1963], 9).

7.071 Commentary. -- The conclusion based on the observations of the present investigation that vopreki is always used without n-, agrees with the prescriptive statements of several grammarians in recent years, among them Vinogradov (1947: 336), the Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: 1.§632), Rozental' (1957: §101), and Gvozdev (1958: §472). As is the case with vne, however, there always remains a possibility that future decades will see changes in the pattern heretofore observed (cf. especially the pattern of the related preposition poperek, which now takes n-). And although no decisive examples of vopreki were observed before the nineteenth century, there is a strong possibility that future studies

will be able to extend the "apparent" period back to a much earlier date, in view of the existence of its "ancestor-preposition" pereky in Old Russian (see §6.20 above).

7.072 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, vopreki is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. In older texts it had some possibility of adverbial use; e.g., 1610/20: oni že o sem nebregše i v " p r e k i glagolaxu (PALICYN, Skaz., 109b; also 122a).

7.08 Vperedi ("in front") made the transition to "actual" status in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

SUMMARY OF VPEREDI (VPERED)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	4	0%	ca.	1823-1874
Transition period	3	10	23%		1883-1912
Period of "actual" status	12.	.1.	92%		1915-1957
Estimated turning point	.	.	. . . . .		1915
	15	15	50%		

Earliest "apparent" examples

1823/28: Grafinja-babuška, grafinja-vnučka, v p e r e d i i x lakej. (GRIBOEDOV, Gore ot uma, dej. 4, jav. 1 [stage directions]).

1850: Olenin vse otstaval ot starogo oxotnika, i djadja Eroška, šagax v dvadcati v p e r e d i e g o , nagnulsja (L. TOLSTOJ, Kazaki, gl. 19; quoted in SSRLJ, 2.758).

Earliest "actual" examples

1883: staričok, sidevšij v p e r e d i n e g o , v pervom rjadu . . . (ČEXOV, Smert' činovnika, Ras. pov., 35).

1903: . . . čto otnositsja k kratkomu izloženiju soderžanija p'esy, pomeščennomu v p e r e d i n e j a (V. PERETC, Pam. rus. dramy, str. xiii).

Latest "apparent" examples

1912: tol'ko načal on propovedovat', a drugie čerti vyskakivajut v p e r e d e g o i tože propovedujut (ANDREEV, Pravila dobra, Pov. ras., 492).

1957: u Gomera predlog neredko stavitsja ne neposredstvenno pered padežom, k kotoromu otnositsja, no ili, naxodjas' v p e r e d i e g o , otdaljaetsja ot nego odnim ili neskol'kimi slovami, ili stavitsja posle nego (SERGEJ SOBOLEVSKIJ, Kratkij očerk drevne-grečeskogo jazyka; in Drevne-grečesko-russkij slovar' [Moskva, 1958], 2.1895).

Latest "actual" examples

1954: Saša pobežal v p e r e d i n e g o (PANOVA, Vremena, 108).

1957: on uporno, spokojno šel po nej i sejčas, i v p e r e d i n e g o tumanilis' bezrazličnye prostranstva (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 243, etc.)

7.081 Commentary. -- Similar to many other members of the prefixed category, vperedi is not attested with decisive pronouns until the early nineteenth century. But it came into existence much earlier, probably in the sixteenth century: the earliest example found by Ryžkov and Borkovskij (see Ryžkov [1957: 507]) dates from 1588, and in the present corpus there is an occurrence in the same century: 1500/99: -- az že v o p r e d v a s načnu s vragi bratisja! (Pov. o carice Dinare, Rus. pov., 90). Nevertheless, this lack of early decisive examples can be partly filled in by including the material on peredi, napered, and prežde -- as will be done at the end of this section.

But judging from the period which is documented (ca. 1823 on), it can reasonably be assumed that any earlier examples found at some future time will be completely "apparent," since the first attestation of n- in the present corpus comes only in 1883. And even beyond that date, up to 1912, the occurrences without n- continue to dominate; a case in point is an 1886 text in which vperedi's "apparent" status is clearly contrasted with three "actual" prepositions in the same paragraph: mantii na nix byli zlatotkannye, . . . nad nimi nesli parčovyj baldaxin. I v p e r e d i i x i szadi šli voiny. . . . Vokrug nix stali načal'niki (GARŠIN, Skaz. Ag., 289).

It is only since 1915 that vperedi can be said to have assumed "actual" status: from that date to the present, the proportion of "actual" examples is 12 out of 13. Moreover, the one exception (1957, Sobolevskij) can be accounted for by the age of the author -- if, as available information indicates, Sergej Sobolevskij was indeed born in 1864.

A comparison of the birth-year of all authors of attested examples of vperedi shows that it is always used with epenthetic n- by authors born in 1883 or after (A. N. Tolstoj, Babel', Makarenko, Panova, etc.), but is not always used with n- by authors born earlier than that: Gor'kij, Andreev, Sipovskij, L. Tolstoj, Garšin, etc. -- and this includes S. I. Sobolevskij. The observed "actual" status of vperedi in the last fifty years is confirmed by the Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: 1.§632), which includes it among those prepositions which "should" take n-.

7.082 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, vperedi is not attested with negative objects. It occurs once as a postposition: 1941: *v šineli armejskoj, poxodnoj, kak budto p o l k o v v p e r e d i , idet on (TIXONOV, Kirov s nami; cited by Trofimov [1957: 263]). As an adverb, vperedi is freely used in Modern Russian; e.g., 1954: my že znaem, čto gore ego nenadolgo, čto v p e r e d i u nego mnogo sčast'ja! (PANOVA, Vremena, 354); 1957: nogi sami dvinulis' i ponesli ego v p e r e d (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 92, etc.). One final remark: the statistical summary of vperedi above did not include one ambiguous example -- 1960: kazalos', čto mir oprokinulsja, čto on žestok, bessmyslen, čto v p e r e d i e g o ždet xaos (A. KUKARKIN, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1960.9.139); probably the ego here is the object of the verb rather than of the preposition.

7.083 To present a fuller picture of secondary prepositions built on the root pered-, here is a combination of the data for vperedi plus peredi (from §6.19), napered (§7.37), and prežde (§9.09):

COMBINED SUMMARY: VPERED(I), PEREDI, NAPERED, PREŽDE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	21	0%	ca.	1000-1876
Transition period	3	10	23%		1883-1912
Period of "actual" status	13	1	93%		1915-1957
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .		1915
	16	32	33%		

This combined chronology does not differ from that of vperedi, except that the "apparent" period is extended back several centuries. The data of another related preposition, pered, obviously could not be grouped with these secondary prepositions, in that pered belongs to a category (simple prepositions) which have been 99+% "actual" from the time of the earliest texts.

7.09 Vsled ("after") is an entirely "apparent" preposition, and always has been -- with one unique exception in the eleventh century.

SUMMARY OF VSLED

Period of "apparent" status . . . 1 56 2% . . . . . ca. 1000-1958
Estimated turning point . . . . . (none)

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: s"šed"šu emu s" gory, v ' s l ě d " e g o idǫ narodi mnozi (Marianus, Matfej 8:1, etc. -- 10 total examples).
1000/99: v'si byv"šii poidošę v ' s l ě d " j e g o (Suprasl., 32: 19-20; also 223:7).

Only "actual" example

1000/99: oni že . . . dašę jemu dva zlatika, i šed"še v ' s l ě d " ń e g o doidošę města (Suprasl., 145:24-6; the n- in this example was scratched out in the manuscript, quite possibly immediately after the word was written, but the blank space and hook remain).

Latest "apparent" examples (preposed)

1949: v s l e d e m u uxodili iz lagerja melkie gruppy (BABAEVSKIJ, Kavaler zolotoj zvezdy, č. 1, gl. 26; cited by Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 2.§84]).
1957/61: v s l e d e j (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

Latest "apparent" examples (postposed)

1957: [Leonid] sošćurilsja na mig e j v s l e d (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 291).
1958: Sevast'janov posmotrel i m v s l e d (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 573).

7.091 Commentary. -- Vsled is classified by modern grammarians (Rozental', etc.) as one of those "dative-governing prepositions of adverbial origin [which] do not take initial n-." And on the basis of the data summarized above, this statement proves to be completely accurate

for the entire history of vsled -- except for the one scratched-out n- in the Suprasliensis manuscript. Since this occurrence of n- is unique, it seems justifiable to assume that the scribe wrote it accidentally before correcting it himself. Good evidence of vsled's "apparent" status in contrast with an "actual" preposition is seen in this example: 1906: Tat'jana, posmotrev v s l e d e m u , xočet idti z a n i m (GOR'KIJ, Vragi, dej. 3 [stage directions]; P'esy, 251).

7.092 Miscellaneous. -- Postpositioning in the last century has played an increasingly important role in vsled's government of (pronoun) objects: of its total of 56 attestations without n-, 43 are preposed to the 3PPO, and 13 are postposed. All of these 13 come in the last hundred years. Vsled is not attested in the corpus with negative objects. On the other hand, it does occur (occasionally) as an adverb; e.g., 1888: posylaju èto pis'mo v s l e d za sročnoj telegrammoj (ČEXOV, Pis. Suvorinu, 19/XII/1888; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 1.302). In conclusion, it should be mentioned that two related prepositions will be treated below; one of them, vsledstvie (§7.33), resembles vsled in having "apparent" status, while the other, posle (§7.22), manifests a very different pattern, having made the transition to "actual" status nearly two centuries ago. See also §§17.05, 17.13, 18.15 on the possible importance of dative-case government in the "apparent" status of frequent prepositions like vsled.

7.10 Naverx(u) ("on top") has always been completely "apparent," but with a very low functional load -- it is rarely attested with the decisive pronouns.

SUMMARY OF NAVERX(U)

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 5 0% . . . . . ca. 1377-1925

Earliest "apparent" examples

/1377: i obratisja bolězn' jego na glavu jemu i n a v e r x " j e g o nepravda jego snide(t) (Suzd. let., 1207 g.).

ca. 1600/20: samopaly zanarjaženy na vse četyre storony, n a v e r x že i x vysypano s pud zel'ja (Pov. ob osade, 164).

Latest "apparent" examples

1752: *ja dlja toj s" Parnasskix" gor" spuskajus', i nyně ot" neja n a v e r ' x " i x " vozvraščajus' (LOMONOSOV, Pis. o pol'zě stekla, Xrest. Obn., 2.263).

1925: kolodeznaja žerd' s voronoj, sidevšej n a v e r x u e e , četko černelo na sizom nebe (LEONOV, Barsuki, 312).

7.101 Commentary. -- This material on naverx(u) is too limited (and scattered) to be of any particular significance. However, in combination with the data on the related prepositions verxu (§6.09), poverx (§7.16), and sverx (§7.25), it will help to provide a better documented overall picture of the history of this family of prepositions. There are no attestations of naverx(u) with negative objects or postposed. But it is often used adverbially in recent times, especially in the sense of "upstairs."

7.11 Navstreču ("to meet") is another preposition which has never taken epenthetic n- right up to the present day.

SUMMARY OF NAVSTREČU

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 34 0% 1730-1958

Earliest "apparent" examples

1730: tako pobežal" ja e m u n a v s t r ě č j u izo vsei moči (TREDIAKOVSKIJ, Ězda v" Ostrov" ljubvi, Xrest. Obn., 2.154).

1822/25: *iz temnogo lesa n a v s t r e č u e m u , idet vdoxnovennyj kudesnik (PUŠKIN, Pesn' o veščem Olege; quoted in SSRLJ, 7.89).

Latest "apparent" examples (preposed)

1938: za nim po pjatam dvigalas' ogromnaja figura Gusejna. N a v s t r e č u i m kinulsja Volodja (KRYMOV, Tanker, 172).

1957/61: n a v s t r e č u e m u (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

Latest "apparent" examples (postposed)

1957: e j n a v s t r e č u to i delo vyxodili molodye inženery (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 225).

1958: ona vstala e m u n a v s t r e č u (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 594).

7.111 Commentary. -- Navstreču belongs to the same category as vopreki: both are so-called "dative-governing prepositions of adverbial origin," which descriptively and prescriptively (cf. Rozental' or the Grammatika russkogo jazyka) govern the 3PPO always without epenthetic n-. The contrast between navstreču, a secondary preposition, and a simple one like za is illustrated by the 1938 example quoted above from Krymov (see summary). Although the "apparent" attestations in the corpus do not go back further than 1730, it is possible that future investigations will uncover earlier ones, since navstreču did exist, with other functions, prior to that; e.g., 1582: Jakov na knjaz' Nikolaeve žalovan'e, n a i x v s t r e č e , bil čelom (Otčet posla Ja. Molvjaninova; cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 315]); or 1672/73: [car'] pišet k nemu poslanie n a v s t r e č u (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 64). It can be safely assumed that any early examples will lack n-. The "apparent" status of vstreču (see §6.10 above) -- four examples without n- -- points toward the same conclusion.

7.112 Miscellaneous. -- All 34 "apparent" attestations of navstreču occur with the 3PPO; there are no negative pronouns. Of these 34, 25 are preposed to the pronoun object, and 9 are postposed. And all the postposed examples fall within the twentieth century; it would seem that navstreču in recent years is becoming less and less a preposition and more and more a postposition (cf. also vsled). Navstreču also has the possibility of adverbial usage in recent times; e.g., 1948/49: Kolja pobežal k nemu n a v s t r e č u (PAUSTOVSKIJ, Pov. o lesax; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 2.460).

7.12 Napererez ("cutting across to") is a new preposition which to date has completely "apparent" status.

SUMMARY OF NAPEREREZ

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 4 0% 1872-1959

Examples

1872: Žilin . . . vidit, e m u n a p e r e r e z katjat šestero. Pod nim lošad' dobraja (L. TOLSTOJ, Kavkaz. pl., 51).

1912: s gory . . . katilis' Djatlovy . . ., a n a p e r e r e z i m -- vdol' berega -- šel seryj okolodočnyj (GOR'KIJ, Ledoxod, Izb., 282).

1958: Sevast'janov vstal. . . . E m u n a p e r e r e z , v profil', . . . prošel Spir'ka Savčuk (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 569).

1959: Aleksej bežit n a p e r e r e r e z e m u [poezdu] (ČUXRAJ I EŽOV, Ballada o soldate, in Isk. kino, 1959.4.62).

7.121 Commentary. -- This preposition seems to be of fairly recent origin, to the extent that all the attested (decisive) examples fall within the last hundred years. And although its occurrences are not frequent, napererez is still a part of the present-day language; it will be interesting to observe in future decades whether it will move toward n-governing status, or will remain as it is now. Napererez is not attested in the corpus with negative objects. It is attested, twice, postposed (see the summary, 1872 and 1958 examples). Napererez also occurs without an object; e.g., 1936: čtoby sokratit' put' k ozeru, Sergej vzjal napererez čerez tropku (GAJDAR, Voennaja tajna; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 2.521).

7.13 Naprotiv ("opposite") has a record of almost total "actual" status throughout its history. This history, however, has been quite short -- judging from its few occurrences with decisive pronouns -- and it has a very low functional load.

SUMMARY OF NAPROTIV

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%	(?)
Transition period	1	1	50%	1869-1907
Period of "actual" status	5	0	100%	1915-1953
Estimated turning point	6	1	86%	1869?

Earliest "actual" examples

1869: -- a eželi my v" nem" nastojaščej krěposti ne najdem", posadim" n a p r o t i v " n e g o molodca (A. OSTROVSKIJ, Gorjačee serdce, dej. 4, jav. 1; SS [1874], 7.423).

1915: Raisa prilegla na divančik, Aleksandr Dem'janovič sel n a p r o t i v n e e k stolu (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Prikl. Rast., 111).

Only "apparent" example

1907: slon" poslušno saditsja. . . . N a p r o t i v e g o saditsja devočka. Meždu nimi stavjat stol" (KUPRIN, Slon; PSS [1912], 7.259).

Latest "actual" examples

1920: v gostinice . . . sidjat obyčno byvšij pomeščik Dmitrij Dmitrievič Teplov i n a p r o t i v n e g o , na divane, ego drug, Jazykov (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Aktrisa, Pov. ras., 16; also 15, 19).

1953: n a p r o t i v n e g o (illustrative example: Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 1.§632]).

7.131 Commentary. -- The rarity of this preposition with the 3PPO is emphasized by the fact that four of the seven total attestations come from the pen of A. N. Tolstoj. Moreover, the only example since 1920 is a theoretical example given by the Academy Grammar to illustrate its statement of the usage of n- with various prepositions. Thus we may expect in general that on those infrequent occasions in Modern Russian when naprotiv governs the 3PPO, initial n- will be present. But considerably more material will be needed to determine its status before the twentieth century.

7.132 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, naprotiv is not attested with negative objects or postposed. But it does have the ability to function adverbially, both in a spatial sense -- e.g., 1938: v zerkale n a p r o t i v uvidel Evgenij Stepanovič svoe . . . lico (KRYMOV, Tanker, 72), and in a logical sense -- e.g., 1836: nel'zja otvergat', čtoby g. Senkovskij ne imel svedenij; n a p r o t i v , očen' vidno, čto on mnogo čital (GOGOL', O dviženii žurnal'noj literatury, SS, 89).

7.133 Although the material on naprotiv is in itself quite sparse, it can contribute, when grouped together with the data on protiv (§5.03),

on protivu (§6.12), and on suprotiv (§7.52), to the formation of a reasonably well-documented overall history of this complex built on the root protiv-:

COMBINED SUMMARY: PROTIV, PROTIVU, NAPROTIV, SUPROTIV

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	67	0%	ca. 1000-1669
Transition period	53	27	66%	ca. 1675-1907
Period of "actual" status	18	1	95%	1915-1958
Estimated turning point	. . 71	. . 95	. . 43%	1835 or 1895

As can be seen from a comparison of this combined summary with that for protiv alone (§5.03 above), the inclusion of the material on its derivatives makes little change in the general outline. The early data on protivu, however, does enable us to extend the beginning of the "apparent" period back to the eleventh century (protiv's first attestation in the corpus comes only in the fifteenth).

The placement of the estimated turning point is also influenced by the additional material (which contains a greater concentration of later "apparent" examples than does that for protiv). It will be remembered that the turning point of protiv alone was estimated either at 1792 (after which the percentage of "actual" is 92%), or possibly at 1835 (after which: 96%). The pattern of the combined material, on the other hand, indicates the probable final break at 1895, after which there are only two exceptions -- one of suprotiv in quoted speech and one of naprotiv -- out of 28 total examples (= 93%). Another possibility for the turning point would be 1835, since counting forward from then to the present, the ratio is 49:5 (91%), and of the five deviations, two are from direct speech, and another is from pseudo-folk poetry. Also of interest in this connection is the brief analysis of suprotiv, to be given in §7.52 below.

7.14 Okolo ("around") has a sharply defined pattern of development:

complete "apparent" status from the twelfth century until the beginning of the nineteenth, then a brief transition era covering the two decades up to the death of Puškin, and finally, from the mid-nineteenth century through the present day, 100% "actual" status.

SUMMARY OF OKOLO

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	24	0%	ca.	1190-1813
Transition period	19	15	56%		1819-1836
Period of "actual" status	63	0	100%	ca.	1847-1958
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .		1847/52
	82	39	68%		

Earliest "apparent" examples

1190/99: i mnozi ljudie stojaxu o k o l o j e g o , z'rošče i divjaščesja (Bor. i Gl., Sb. Usp. sob., 21c).

/1377: ljaxove že načxavše ubiša i. i družinu o k o l o j e g o izbiša (Suzd. let., 1206 g.).

Earliest "actual" examples

1819: tut my . . . razveli ogni, o k o l o n i x inye sogrevalis' (GRIBOEDOV, Put. zap., 2/II/1819, Soč., 404; also 403, 410).

1828: Asprux" sidjaščij, vsě o k o l o n e g o stojat" (GRIBOEDOV, Rod. Zen., 315 [twice]).

Latest "apparent" examples

1835/37: vse trinadcat' pali tut že, dorogo prodav svoju žizn': o k o l o i x leglo 65 tatar (PUŠKIN, Zap. Moro, 317).

1836/37: meždu tem o k o l o e g o [Pugačeva] otrjady soedinjalis' (PUŠKIN, Kapitanskaja dočka; PSS 8.363; but in two other passages in the same work [pp. 295, 347], Puškin uses okolo nego!)

Latest "actual" examples

1957: ee sumki i knigi stopkami stojali o k o l o n e e , na polu (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 18, etc. -- 7 total examples).

1958: -- my s nej malo byvali. . . . No kogda svoboden, vsegda o k o l o n e j (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 581).

7.141 Commentary. -- The inability of okolo to govern the initial nasal prior to the nineteenth century is manifest in contrasting examples such as the following: 1600/01: a o k o l o e e šli dvorjane s rogatinami, a p e r e d n e j u nesli sablju (MIKULIN, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 183); 1665: nyne uže v tretie o k o l o e e duxovenstvo xodjat i xotjat besov i z n e e vygnat' (Kuranty 1665 g.; cited by Bulaxovskij

[1958: 317]). Additional confirmation of okolo's "apparent" status in Old and Middle Russian comes from another source -- an example of the related preposition kolo without n- in 1415 (see §6.22 above).

The very short transition period of okolo begins with Griboedov, the first attested writer to use n- after this preposition, and ends with Puškin, the last attested writer to omit n- after it. And since a considerable portion of the material from this period (1819-36) comes from the pen of Puškin (his prose works), it is interesting to look at his individual record. Between 1822 and 1830, he uses okolo with a ЗРРО 5 times, all without n- (= 0%); between 1831 and 1836, he uses it with such pronouns 19 times, 12 with n-, 7 without (= 63%). Thus Puškin in general (based on his prose, as recorded by the Slovar' jazyka Puškina) reveals an equal preference for "actual" and "apparent" status of okolo (12:12 = 50%). Although the "turning point" of okolo is estimated in the above summary at 1847/52, it is entirely possible that this can be pushed back to around 1840 or earlier, if future investigations locate decisive examples to fill the ten-year gap in the present corpus (1837-46).

7.142 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, okolo is not attested with negatives, nor is it postposed. However, it does function freely as an adverb; typical examples in the last hundred years are: 1859/84: -- najmite villu, oknami na jug, . . . čtob o k o l o byli muzyka da ženščiny (GONČAROV, Oblomov, 68); 1920: Teplov vertelsja o k o l o , starajas' obratit' vnimanie aktrisy na edu (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Aktrisa, Pov. ras., 21); 1956: soedinilsja ves' karavan, sostojavšij iz pjatisot čelovek ili o k o l o (I. A. VASILENKO, Sovremennyj russkij jazyk [sb. upraž.]; cited by Bondarenko [1961: 35]). To conclude this survey of miscellaneous constructions, let us note two examples where okolo is most likely

adverbial, although it might seem remotely linked to an object: 1961: pri demonstracii fil'ma artisty stojali o k o l o ili za ėkranom i gromko povtorjali tekst (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 26); and ca. 1500: Max-tum" sidit na krovati na zolotoj, . . . da o k o l o ljudej ego mnogo množestvo, da pered nim" pěvci (A. NIKITIN, Kož., 385b).

7.15 Okrest ("around") is labeled by Mel'nyčuk (1961: 134) as a "rare absolute synonym [of okolo], which is characteristic only for texts written in Church Slavonic style." Okrest is attested only a few times in the corpus, all of them "apparent" up until the end of the eighteenth century. It disappeared from literary usage (judging from attestations with the decisive pronouns) very early in the nineteenth century.

SUMMARY OF OKREST (OKR'ST", OKR"ST')

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	6	0%	ca.	1000-1769
Transition period	3	1	75%		1808-1822
Period of "actual" status	0	0	0%		(none?)
	3	7	30%		

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: i s"gl̥dav" stoj̥ešt̥j̥ o k r " s t ' e g o , glagola: se mati moě (Marianus, Mark 3:34).

1190/99: vidě želěza iže běša na nem' . . . izlamana ležašča o k r ' s t " j e g o (Bor. i Gl., Sb. Usp. sob., 23b)

The only 'actual" examples

1808: . . . kogda zamečaju o k r e s t " n e g o porjadok (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Kto istinno dobryj i sčastlivyj, Soč. 262; also 265).

1808: tišina i mračnost' o k r e s t " n e g o carstvujut (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Mar'ina rošča, Soč., 309).

Latest "apparent" examples

1769: obyvateli . . . počli za blago poselit'sja ili v samom Rime, ili o k r e s t e g o (I. TRET'JAKOV, Slovo o rimskom pravlenii, Jur. proiz., 289).

1822: *Tam belozerskij knjaz' i čada, dostojnye ego ljubvi, i o k r e s t i x tatar gromada, v svoej potopšaja krovi (RYLEEV, Dmitrij Donskoj; in Poėty puškinskoj pory [Leningrad, 1954], 154).

7.151 Commentary. -- It is reasonably definite that okrest was "apparent" through most of its history, but the transition period is less

conclusive, especially since all three examples of n- come from one writer (Žukovskij). In the corpus, okrest is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. In one unusual construction it is separated from its object: 1610/20: ljudie že, o k r e s t živuščei o b i t e l i , ne tokmo v selex, no i ot gradov, mnozi pritekše . . . ko obiteli (PALICYN, Skaz., 56a). Okrest in earlier centuries was sometimes used adverbially; e.g., 1766: *byli na sej ostrovki s cvetuščimi Lipami o k r e s t ", byli Topoli dreva . . . (TREDIAKOVSKIJ, Tilem.; Xrest. Obn., 2.225).

7.16 Poverx ("on top"), with only a few decisive attestations, is almost entirely an "actual" preposition in this century.

SUMMARY OF POVERX

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%		(?)
Transition period	3	1	75%	ca.	1911-1933
Period of "actual" status	2	0	100%		1957-1958
Estimated turning point	5	1	83%		1911?

Earliest "actual" examples

1911: bez šapki, v nepodpojasannoj rubaxe i černom čapane p o v e r x n e e , on vstal . . . (GOR'KIJ, Žizn' M. Kožemjaxina, gl. 2; quoted in Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 2.1.258]).

1922: Nikita naložil potnik, . . . poponu, p o v e r x n e e -- sedlo (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Detstvo Nikity, Klopik; PSS [1948], 4.82).

The only "apparent" example

1933/44: pri ètom na dno probirki osjadet snačala pesok, a zatem, p o v e r x e g o , glina (B. V. VSESVJATSKIJ, Botanika, Sostav počvy; cited by Turkevich, Russian for the Scientist [Van Nostrand, 1959], 161).

Latest "actual" examples

1957: v nekotoryx mestax mašinopisnyj tekst zakleen sovsem i p o v e r x n e g o vpisan drugoj (S. VLADIMIRSKIJ, stat'ja, Isk, kino, 1957.11.125).

1958: kogda mostovaja ustarevala i kul'turnyj sloj po storonam ee narastal, p o v e r x n e e klali novuju mostovuju (ARCIXOVSKIJ, Novg. gram. na ber., iz raskopok 1953-54 gg., 5).

7.161 Commentary. -- Although poverx can reasonably be regarded as an n-governing preposition in the twentieth century, nothing whatsoever can be said about its status before 1911 -- there are no decisive examples before that. Since poverx did exist as a preposition as far back as 1623/99: a pojasy krug sebja [persy] nosjat velikie kušaki, a p o v e r x kušakov šaly višnevy (KOTOV, Kož., 60b), it is to be hoped that future studies will find attestations with the decisive pronouns in previous centuries, and thus complete the chronological picture of poverx. Something can be done along this line within the limits of the present materials, however, by combining the figures for each of the prepositions built on the root verx-; this will be done below, following the section on sverx (§7.252).

7.162 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, there are no attestations of poverx with negative pronouns or postposed. It can occur adverbially; e.g., 1869: po krovle novogo doma tolkutsja golubi, p o v e r x rejut lastočki (GONČAROV, Obryv; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.218).

7.17 Podelom ("serves . . . right") translates into English as an expression, but in terms of its function in Russian, it should be classified as a dative-governing preposition of the prefixed type (po + del- + old dat. pl. ending -om = "according to the deeds of"). It is seldom used, but when it is -- and with a 3PPO -- its status is completely "apparent."

SUMMARY OF PODELOM

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 6 0% . . . . . ca. 1397-1946

Earliest "apparent" examples

ca. 1397: da vozdast' emu G[i] protivu p o d ě l o m " e g o (EPIFANIJ, Žitie Stefana Permskogo, 699a; cited by Srez., 2.1593).

1669/99: da prostit gospod' Bog . . . egda priidet vozdati komuždo p o d e l o m e g o (AVVAKUM, Čelob. No. 4, 194).

Latest "apparent" examples

1887/89: -- Izba-to u nej . . . posmotrite! brevna živogo net! -- I p o d e l o m e j , -- rešaet Sonečka (SALTYKOV, Pošexonskaja starina; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.257).

1946: Eti voennye s nasmeškoj nabljudali, kak Suprugov uxaživaet za neju. O, dura, p o d e l o m e j . . . (PANOVA, Sputniki, 218).

7.171 Commentary. -- If podelom survives in the contemporary language of future decades, it is dubious that it will ever begin to take epenthetic n-: it occurs very rarely, it has a somewhat Biblical flavor, and it governs dative (cf. vopreki, navstreču, vsled, etc.). All the evidence points toward continued "apparent" status -- a tendency exactly the opposite of the related (but much older) preposition dlja. In the corpus, podelom is not attested with negative objects or as a postposition. It does occur adverbially in the modern language; e.g., 1946: -- esli by nas privlekli ne po ošibke, a p o d e l o m , za nastojaščee učastie . . ., nam bylo by legče? (FEDIN, Pervye radosti; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.257).

7.18 Podle (from *po-dolg-) ("alongside") is another preposition which is used quite seldom in Modern Russian (cf. the higher frequency of its synonym vozle). But it did flourish in preceding centuries, and made the transition to "actual" status between the early seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries.

SUMMARY OF PODLE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	1	0%	1570
Transition period	22	9	71%	ca. 1623-1833
Period of "actual" status	21	0	100%	1834-1955
Estimated turning point	43	10	81%	1809

Earliest "apparent" examples

1570: saltan sidit na svoem car'skom meste, a p o d l e e g o stojat s saadakom da z sabljuju (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 79).

1672/73: . . . blagoslovja evo, mertvova, i s nim pocelovavsja, opjat' p o d l e e g o spat' ljagu (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 114).

Earliest "actual" examples

1623/99: a gora nevelika i nevysoka, tolko p o d l e n e e exat' užasno (KOTOV, Kož., 30b).

ca. 1731: Glagolet Armelina unyvno, za ne(j) stoit paž, p o d l e n e (j) sidjat damy (Akt. o Kal., 152; but in 3 other places in this same play [str. 3, 7, 362], podle is used without n-).

Latest "apparent" examples

1808: . . . sažaet ee p o d l e e g o na kresla (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Tri pojasa, Soč., 280).

1833/41: Troekurov posadil gostja p o d l e e e (PUŠKIN, Dubrovskij, PSS, 8.208; but in other prose dating from 1833 [Pikovaja dama, Pis.], Puškin uses podle 3 times with n-)

Latest "actual" examples

ca. 1950/62: Nikita s ozabočennym vidom stojal p o d l e n e g o (E. USPENSKAJA, Pervenec goroda; Short Stories by Soviet Writers [Moskva, ca. 1962], 32).

1955: p o d l e n e e igrali deti (illustrative example: KALAMANOVA [1955: 124]).

7.181 Commentary. -- Eventhough podle occurs with n- as early as 1623/99, it existed as a preposition at least three centuries before that;[1] therefore there remains a possibility that future investigations can uncover early decisive examples which would permit the extension of the "apparent" (or "transition") period further back than the earliest decisive attestation in the present corpus (1570). Looking in the other direction, however, we find rather good documentation for the seventeenth through nineteenth centuries, which indicates that from 1834 on, podle has been 100% "actual," and that from 1809 on, it has been "actual" 38 times out of a total of 39 (=97%); in contrast, counting backward from 1809, the proportion is 5 out of 14 (=36%). On this basis, the estimated turning point of podle's shift to "actual" status is assigned to the year 1809.

[1] Cf. several fourteenth-century examples cited by Lomtev (1956: 294-5), and also podl"g"rěko in Old Church Slavonic (Suprasl., 146:10).

But after attaining n-governing status so early (relative to other secondary prepositions), podle enjoyed only a few decades of widespread use and then virtually disappeared from the literary language; this is evident from the fact that only three of the 53 total attestations of podle come after 1872! (Compare vozle [§7.05], which also has 53 total attestations, of which 37 come after 1872.)

7.182 Miscellaneous. -- It should be mentioned that one of the "apparent" examples of podle is connected with an interposed modifier: 1789/1816: vmesto togo, čtob . . . udarit' p o d l e s a m o j ej i v pustoe mesto, popadi ja prjamo v nee (BOLOTOV, Žiz. prikl; cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 180]); it is problematic whether epenthetic n- would have been present at that date, even if there had been no interposition. In the corpus, podle is not attested with negative pronouns or postposed. During its period of vitality in the eighteenth and first part of the nineteenth century, it functioned freely as an adverb; e.g., 1866: [Raskol'nikov] snjal i položil furažku na stol i minut desjat' stojal p o d l e , nepodvižno (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 259).

7.19 Pozadi ("in back") changed to "actual" status at the beginning of the present century, and has maintained it since that time.

SUMMARY OF POZADI

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	6	0%	ca. 1661-1907
Transition period	0	0	0%	(none?)
Period of "actual" status	17	2	89%	1915-1961
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .	1915
	17	8	68%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

1661/67: a p o z a d i i x nesut carskoe telo popy (KOTOŠIXIN, O Ross. carst., 20; cited by Bukatevič [1958: 133]).

1825: meždu tem dvoe niščix terlis' p o z a d i i x i okazyvali velikoe iskusstvo v provorstve ruk svoix (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 564).

Earliest "actual" examples

1915: vdrug p o z a d i n e g o krjaknulo, xolodnye ruki udarili v spinu (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Prikl. Rast., 94).

1920: naletel na nee Teplov s otnesennoj v storonu furažkoj. P o z a d i n e g o delal kakie-to neopredelennye žesty . . . [illegible]al'nik stancii (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Aktrisa, Pov. ras., 21).

Latest "apparent" examples

1957: u Gomera predlog-pristavka . . . neredko otdeljaetsja ot prostogo glagola . . . i stavitsja ili vperedi, ili p o z a d i e g o (S. I. SOBOLEVSKIJ, Kratkij očerk grammatiki drevnegrečeskogo jazyka; in Drevnegrečesko-russkij slovar' [Moskva, 1958], 2.1896).

1958: bazary naxodjatsja okolo ploščadi. P o z a d i i x i po storonam, i na perekrestkax est' ešče bazary, i vse oni kamennye (N. A. KUZNECOVA, sovremennyj perevod teksta, Koženie Kotova, 80).

Latest "actual" examples

1956: ètot glasnyj v odnom i tom že korne možet naxodit'sja to pered plavnym, to p o z a d i n e g o (N. KONDRAŠOV, Slavjanskie jazyki [Moskva, 1956], 180).

1961: p o z a d i n e e slyšatsja gluxie udary molotok-pilonov (L. FEJGINA, perevod Bunta mašin R. Rollana; Isk. kino, 1961.5.141; also 146).

7.191 Commentary. -- Most of the attested examples of pozadi fall within the twentieth century. There are just four decisive examples in the entire nineteenth century[1] and only one decisive example in all centuries preceding the nineteenth (1661/67: see summary). But there are non-decisive occurrences of pozadi at least as far back as the sixteenth century, so there is hope that future studies can supply more early data. The pattern of the present material, however, when taken in conjunction with that of zadi (§6.14) and szadi (§7.26) indicates rather clearly that this "family" of prepositions originating from the root zad- had only "apparent" status from its first appearance in the language up to the end of the nineteenth century, whereas the present century has been a period of mostly "actual" status.

It was necessary in the foregoing sentence to use the qualification

---

[1] Puškin never uses pozadi with any kind of object, and pozad' only twice -- with noun objects.

"mostly," because pozadi, after a span of fifteen consecutive attestations with n- over four decades (1915-56), unexpectedly turns up with two "apparent" examples in 1957 and 1958 (quoted in summary). But it may be justifiable to write these two off as accountable exceptions. The 1957 example comes from the pen of the above-mentioned S. I. Sobolevskij, who was born in 1864, presumably[1] -- i.e., before the birth-year of the first author to use n- after pozadi (A. N. Tolstoj, 1883). The example from 1958 occurs in the modern translation of an early seventeenth-century text, the Koženie by Kotov, in which the translator explicitly (p. 21) retains "certain peculiarities of the [original] author's style." And although there is no pozadi construction in the original, perhaps we can assume that the translator, in adding it, chose to treat it as an "apparent" preposition in imitation of archaic style. It therefore seems permissable to place the estimated turning point of pozadi at the year of its first "actual" attestation, 1915 -- after which the "actual/apparent" ratio is 17:2 (=89%), with both "apparent" examples to some extent accountable.

7.192 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, pozadi is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. But it does occur regularly in the modern language as an adverb; e.g., 1858/63/81: mestoimenie se . . . možet stojat' ili pered svoim glagolom, ili p o z a d i , otdeljajas' ot nego . . . (BUSLAEV [1881: 560-1]); 1915: Rastegin privstaval i ogljadyvalsja. P o z a d i nad prigorkom pojavilas' pyl' (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Prikl. Rast., 97, etc.); 1957: mašina tronulas', čelovek ètot ostalsja p o z a d i (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 238).

---

[1] Cf. the discussion of his exceptional usage of vperedi, also without n- (§7.08 above).

7.20 Pomimo ("apart from") has an unblemished record: 100% "actual" status since its first attestation. This record, however, is based on only seven examples, all in this century.

SUMMARY OF POMIMO

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%		(?)
Period of "actual" status	7	0	100%	ca.	1910-1961
	7	0	100%		

Earliest "actual" examples

1910/59: . . . svojstvenno tol'ko dannomu individuumu i nikomu p o m i m o n e g o (A. A. ČUPROV, Očerki po teorii statistiki, očerk 1, §6 [p. 55 of the second edition, 1959]).

1938: da i ne proizošlo li vse èto p o m i m o n e g o ? (KRYMOV, Tanker, 183).

Latest "actual" examples

1961: esli pomošč' staršix mladšim est' pričiny uspexa poslednix, . . . to p o m i m o n e e est' nemalo i slučajnyx pričin (R. JURENEV, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1961.8.9).

1961: p o m i m o n e e v fil'me učastvovali izvestnye artisty (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 113).

7.201 Commentary. -- In the corpus, pomimo is not attested: (a) with negative objects, (b) postposed, or (c) as an adverb. The scarcity of its occurrences with the 3PPO is probably due to the fact that the data of the present study is drawn mostly from artistic literature, while pomimo is a very "scholarly" word. However, it is to be hoped that future investigations will locate decisive occurrences at least in the nineteenth century, if not earlier, since pomimo must have been used without n- at one time.

7.202 Be that as it may, the present materials indicate clearly that in the mid-twentieth century pomimo is an "actual" preposition; moreover, some idea of overall chronology can be gained by combining its data with that for the suffixed preposition mimo (from §6.08):

COMBINED SUMMARY: MIMO, POMIMO

Period of "apparent" status . . .	2	28	7%	ca.	1377-1849
Transition period	15	10	56%	ca.	1859-1920
Period of "actual" status	31	0	100%		1925-1961
Estimated turning point	48	38	56%		1877

Grouping of the figures on the two prepositions introduces little change into the chronological pattern of mimo, except that it provides better documentation for the present century, especially for the 100% "actual" period. The estimated turning point now divides the data into the following proportions: before 1877, a ratio of 4 "actual" to 36 "apparent" (=10%); since 1877, a ratio of 44 "actual" to 2 "apparent" (=96%).

7.21 Poperek ("crosswise") is another extremely infrequent preposition, whose few decisive attestations point toward "actual" status in this century, "apparent" previously. But in both instances the functional load is very low.

SUMMARY OF POPEREK

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	2	0%	ca.	1700-1856
Period of "actual" status	2	0	100%		1938-1944
Estimated turning point	2	2	50%		1938?

"Apparent" examples

ca. 1700/50: *nevesta vpol" osma aršina. p o p e r e k " e e polovina. vortu kalina a vnosu vyrasla rebina (Rospis' pridanomu [tekst luboč-noj kartinki], Xrest. Obn., 2.112).

1836/56: p o p e r e k e g o ležit čudo-judo ryba (ERŠOV, Konek-gorbunok; cited by Kalamanova [1955: 120]).

"Actual" examples

1938: vse uvideli oprokinutuju šljupku. Ona kačalas', i p o p e r e k n e e ležali čelovečeskie tela (KRYMOV, Tanker, 179).

1944: geolog otkryl pervuju stranička i p o p e r e k n e e krupno i četko napisal . . . (I. EFREMOV, Belyj rog).

7.211 Commentary. -- In the absence of more material on poperek -- and in view of the marginality of one or two of the attestations

which are in the corpus -- it is impossible to make any firm statements about the chronology of poperek. But since it did exist, at least in adverbial function, as far back as the fourteenth century,[1] there is a good chance that eventually more material will be gathered providing better information about the "status" of poperek, and about its history.

7.212 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, poperek is not attested with negative pronouns. There is an example of postpositioning: 1924: *ja by stal by [sic] v perekore šestvij, poklonenijam i tolpam p o p e - r e k . (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Lenin, 192). And poperek still functions as an adverb in the modern language; e.g., 1866: ona stoit v dverjax p o p e - r e k i ne daet emu projti (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 73); 1958: èto byla platforma, otkrytaja s bokov; skam'i dlja passažirov stojali p o - p e r e k , a vdol' platformy po obe storony tjanulas' podnožka (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 478).

7.213 Before leaving poperek, let us combine its few examples with those from the other prepositions, past and present, which are derived from the same root: pereky (from §6.20), vopreki (§7.07), and naperekor (§7.38).

COMBINED SUMMARY: PEREKY, VOPREKI, NAPEREKOR, POPEREK

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	8	0%	ca.	1425-1904
Transition period	2	10	17%		1938-1963
Estimated turning point	$\frac{.}{2}$	$\frac{.}{18}$	$\frac{.}{10\%}$		(none)

It is very evident that poperek does not share the general tendency of this "family" deriving from prek-, since it is the only member with any "actual" examples. Perhaps this fact can be connected with its case government: poperek takes the genitive, whereas the others govern (or

[1] E.g., /1377: korolju prišedšu čeres" gory i slyša, ože Ljaxove idu(t) k Volodimerju Olgovičem' v pomoč' poide k ni(m) p o p e r e (k) k Volodirmerju (Suzd. let., 144a, 1206 g.)

governed) dative. (For more on the relationship of case government to "status," see §§17.05 and 18.15 below.) Of the overall total of 18 examples without n- in the above combined summary, two involve postpositioning: pereky (/1425), and naperekor (1904); the others are all preposed.

7.22 Posle (from po + sled-) in its various forms (all meaning "after") follows the classical pattern of development: fully "apparent" status from the eleventh to the mid-eighteenth century, mixed examples from that point until the 1830's, then virtually 100% "actual" status up to the present day.

SUMMARY OF POSLE (POSLĚŽDE, POSLĚŽE, POSLEDI)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	23	0%	ca.	1000-1755
Transition period	7	4	64%		1766-1830
Period of "actual" status	34	1	97%		1833-1957
Estimated turning point	41	28	59%		1833

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: p o s l ě ž d e ž e i x " vsex" um'rět" i žena (Marianus, Matfej 22:27)

1540/45: prestavisja knjagini Uliana . . . i p o s l e e ě ženilsja syn" eja knjaz' Fedor" (Vol-perm. let., 1504 g.; also 1515 g.)

Earliest "actual" examples

1766/68: žena i deti, kotorye ostalis' p o s l e n e g o naslednikami . . . (ČULKOV, Peresm., 98; also 123, 128).

1789: Fedor . . . načal pisat' o knige Gel'vecievoj pis'ma, koix najdeny p o s l e n e g o tol'ko kasajuščiesja do načala pervoj knigi (RADIŠČEV, Žit. Uš., 40).

Latest "apparent" examples

1830: verojatno nikto by ne osmelilsja p o s l e e g o [Bajrona] kosnut'sja sego predmeta (PUŠKIN, Oproverženie na kritiku; PSS, 11.160; but the same passage, as rewritten by Puškin that same year [PSS, 11.165], has posle nego!).

1924/31: ne pomnju, do Vladimira Il'iča ili p o s l e e g o na Kapri byl G. V. Plexanov (GOR'KIJ, Lenin; Lit. por., [Moskva, 1963], 30).

Latest "actual" examples

1954: . . . proxodit Pervoe maja, prazdnik rabočej vesny. A p o s l e n e g o vozvraščajutsja xoloda (PANOVA, Vremena, 127; also 185).

1957: familija Šutikova stojala v otčetax odnoj iz poslednix, p o s l e n e g o šli uže pisateli i žurnalisty (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 232, etc.).

7.221 Commentary. -- The total absence of n- in the early period is supported by contrasting examples like the following, which clearly exhibit the distinction made at that time between posle and "actual" prepositions: 1570: napered z dvora pošli janyčane, a z a n i m i poexali voevody i spagi mnogie, a p o s l e i x veleli exati Ivanu (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 79); and 1600/01: i fevralja v 24 den' êrl' Êksetckoj kažnen smert'ju v Vyšegorode; i p o s l e e g o p o n e m v Lunde bylo velikoe setovanie (MIKULIN, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 181).

The turning point seems to fall around 1830, the year of the last attested "apparent" example from the pen of Puškin (prose writings only) -- and the next-to-last "apparent" example in the present corpus. It is doubly interesting that this 1830 example (quoted in the summary) lacked n- only in Puškin's first draft, and in the second draft it was changed to posle nego. Counting backward from 1830, the proportion of "actual" to "apparent" examples is 7:27 (21%); counting forward, since 1830, the proportion is 34:1 (97%). The lone exception comes a century after Puškin, in a work by Gor'kij (see the 1924/31 example in the summary), interrupting a sequence of 26 consecutive occurrences of n- since 1830. In general Gor'kij is quite niggardly in using n- after secondary prepositions (compare also radi, sredi, mimo, vokrug, etc.); it is ironic that a "progressive" writer (content-wise) like Gor'kij should be "reactionary" in regard to this facet of his language and style. Since Gor'kij, posle is a 100% "actual" preposition.

7.222 Miscellaneous. -- The form posledi occurs in 1724/52: po-

slědi ego (POSOŠKOV, Kniga o skudosti i bogatstve, 61; Krest. Obn., 2.13). The forms poslež̆de and poslež̆e, here included along with posle, have been interpreted as "comparatives" by some other scholars, such as Ryžkov (1957: 382).

In the corpus, posle is not attested with negative objects or as a postposition. But it does often occur as an adverb in recent times, especially in colloquial style; e.g., 1866: -- Čaju-to xoš'? -- P o s l e , progovoril on (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 65), 1926: P o s l e storonoj ja uznal, skol'ko poboev vynes gordon na lesnoj službe (PRIŠVIN, Vernyj, Ras. oxot., 45); 1928: Gusev srazu sviter na sebja napjalil i kal'sony vzjal. P o s l e dve nedeli xodil s kal'sonami na rukax. Vsem pokazyval (ZOŠČENKO, Kačestvo produkcii, Pov. ras., 58). In adverbial usage, posle can even precede a third-person pronoun without any influence on it; e.g., 1852/61: tetka . . . prosit, čtoby [ja] ne otkazal i ixnej nuž̆de, a čto p o s l e oni zaplatjat. (A. PISEMSKIJ, Piterščik, Ras., 37). To conclude the discussion of posle, let it be pointed out that it differs greatly from the related preposition vsled, whose status is totally "apparent" in Modern Russian (details in §7.09 above).

7.23 Posredi ("amidst"), after many centuries of completely "apparent" status, became an n-governing preposition in this century. It has, however, become quite rare in the last 250 years, giving way to sredi (q.v., §6.05).

SUMMARY OF POSREDI (POSREDĚ, POSREDU, POSRED)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	31	0%	ca.	1000-1876
Transition period	0	0	0%		(?)
Period of "actual" status	4	0	100%		1907-1953
Estimated turning point	$\frac{+}{4}$	$\frac{+}{31}$	$\frac{+}{11\%}$		1907

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: togda sǫšte v" Ijudei da bĕgajǫt" v" gory, i iže p o s r ĕ d ĕ e g o da isxodǫt" (Marianus, Luka 21:21, etc. -- 8 total examples).

1000/99: i my jedini m̃ p o s r ĕ d u i x " obrǫštaxom sǫ (Suprasl., 72:26, etc. -- 2 examples of posredu, 6 of posrede).

Latest "apparent" examples

1866: Raskol'nikov vošel v svoju kamorku i stal p o s r e d i e e (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 404).

1876/83: vse u Xrista, i On sam p o s r e d i i x , i prostiraet k nim ruki (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Mal'čik u Xrista na elke, Dnevnik pisatelja za 1876 g., 19).

Earliest "actual" examples

1907: ulica pustela, a p o s r e d i n e j a na zemle javilis' temnye bugry (GOR'KIJ, Dev. jan., 35).

1912/15: bol'šaja komnata, p o s r e d i n e e pis'mennyj stol, tri kresla (GOR'KIJ, Starik, dejstvie 3 [stage directions]; cited by Bondarenko [1961: 55]).

Latest "actual" examples

1920: ploščad' posredi goroda bol'šaja i pyl'naja. P o s r e d i n e e kruglyj god stoit luža (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Aktrisa, Pov. ras., 15).

1953: p o s r e d i n i x (illustrative example: Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 1.§632]).

7.231 Commentary. -- It is interesting to note the chronological imbalance of posredi: of its total of 35 attestations with the 3PPO, only six come after 1700. And of these six, four are by two writers (Dostoevskij and Gor'kij), and the only one since 1920 is an illustrative example of n-governing prepositions in the Academy of Sciences grammar (all quoted in the summary above). This indicates that although the (limited) descriptive evidence of the present corpus and the prescriptive statement of the Grammatika both accord "actual" status to posredi in the modern literary language, this status has a low functional load. A comparison with sredi is illuminating: the latter has a total of 46 decisive attestations, of which only 2 or 3 come before 1834, and 31 of the 46 fall within the twentieth century.

7.232 The estimated turning point for posredi is put, very approximately, at 1907, but the scarcity of recent data leaves this date

subject to considerable change, pending the location of further decisive examples in the last two centuries. Nevertheless, a more generalized, "rounded-off" picture can be gained by combining the material on posredi with that on sredi, on sred' (from §5.14), and on posredine (§7.50):

COMBINED SUMMARY: SRED', SREDI, POSREDI, POSREDINE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	31	0%	ca.	1000-1700
Transition period	27	10	73%		1834-1924
Period of "actual" status	17	0	100%		1925-1960
Estimated turning point	44	41	52%		1878

This generalized pattern for the preposition "family" deriving from sred- fits into the classical pattern: entirely "apparent" status from the earliest texts until the early nineteenth century, then an era of transition extending over several decades, and 100% "actual" status through most of this century. The joint estimated turning point divides the combined material in the following proportions: before 1878, 5 "actual" attestations and 37 "apparent" (=12%); since 1878, 39 "actual" and 4 "apparent" (=91%). Of the four "apparent" examples since the estimated turning point, two are with posredine (which seems to be lagging in the acquisition of "actual" status), and three come from the pen of Gor'kij.

7.233 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, posredi is not attested with negative pronouns or postposed. To the extent that it still exists in the modern language, it can function as an adverb; e.g., 1858/86: gostinaja byla eščе bol'še zaly; . . . p o s r e d i stojal . . . stol (GONČAROV, Fregat Pallada; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.438).

7.24 Promež ("betwixt") is seldom attested throughout the history of the language. The present data indicates that it made the transition to "actual" status in the mid-nineteenth century, but it died out of the

literary language soon thereafter.

SUMMARY OF PROMEŽ, PROMEŽ(D)U, PROMEŽI

Period of "apparent" status	0	8	0%	ca. 1377-1674
Transition period	0	0	0%	(none?)
Period of "actual" status	5	0	100%	1842-1912
Estimated turning point	5	8	38%	1842?

Earliest "apparent" examples

/1377: i zamalo boju ne by(s) p r o m e ž i i m i (Suzd. let., 1297 g.).
1400/99: i stojaxu rati prẹmo sebě, a p r o m e ž u i m i [o]vrag" krut" (Suzd. let. [po Akad. sp.], 1373 g.; cited by Srez., 2.1544).

Latest "apparent" examples

ca. 1600/30: p r o m e ž i m i govor i šum velik (Pamjatniki Smutnogo vremeni, 185; cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 349]).
1624/74: p r o m e ž i m i (MOROZOV, Akty, 41; cited by Bukatevič [1953: 29]).

Earliest "actual" examples

1842: indejkam i kuram ne bylo čisla; p r o m e ž n i x rasxažival petux (GOGOL', Mertvye duši; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 3.676).
1886: -- a p r o m e ž n i x budet postojalyj dvor (ČEXOV, Ty i vy, SS [1946], 5.362).

Latest "actual" examples

1911/12: -- A tut, gljad', vyšla p r o m e ž " n i x " razstrojka kakaj-to, on" ee i brosil" (BUNIN, Xorošaja žizn', Sux. pov., 190).
1912: -- eželi ja vižu gde p r o m e ž d u n i x zlobu . . ., ja vsegda objazan èto vskryt' (GOR'KIJ, Gubin; quoted in SSRLJ, 11.1200).

7.241 Commentary. -- The limited amount of data on promež can be partly compensated for by combining it with that on mež and mežду -- as will be done at the end of this section. But the available data does tell us that promež was definitely an "apparent" preposition at least until the seventeenth century; this pattern is especially manifest in the example from the period 1624/74 (MOROZOV), which also contains an "actual" construction, pered neju, in the same sentence. After these early seventeenth-century examples, there are no more attestations till the nineteenth century, when it is used occasionally by writers to give a colloquial, folksy touch -- and, interestingly enough, always with n-.

Of the last four decisive examples of <u>promež</u> in the corpus (1886-1912), three occur in quoted speech (see summary above), and only one is in the author's narrative: 1899: vsjudu navaleny grudy kamnej, na kotorye s trudom možno vzobrat'sja, i p r o m e ž n i x rastet molodaja rjabina (ANDREEV, Pet'ka na dače, <u>Pov. ras.</u>, 40).

7.242 <u>Miscellaneous</u>. -- In the corpus, <u>promež(du)</u> is not attested with negative objects or postposed. There is one attestation of adverbial use in recent times: 1928: * reklamy: gusinuju pečenku, avto, liker. I v"evšis' v pečenku, p r o m e ž d u povis plakat na zabore Kamenistom (MAJAKOVSKIJ, Stixotvorenie o prodannoj teljatine, <u>Izb.</u>, 1.361).

7.243 Here is a generalized picture of all prepositions built on the root <u>mež</u>-:

COMBINED SUMMARY: <u>MEŽ</u>(-<u>I</u>, -<u>U</u>), <u>MEŽDU</u>, <u>PROMEŽ</u>(-<u>U</u>, -<u>I</u>, -<u>DU</u>)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	2	50	4%	<u>ca.</u>	1000-1736
Transition period	95	86	52%	<u>ca.</u>	1740-1907
Period of "actual" status	32	3	91%	<u>ca.</u>	1911-1963
Estimated turning point					1856
	129	139	48%		

The overall pattern is virtually identical with that of <u>mežду</u> above (§6.11). The period of "apparent" status has only two isolated exceptions (single attestations of <u>mež</u> with <u>n</u>- in 1582/83 and 1661/67) until the transition period begins in the mid-eighteenth century. The transition period can be considered to be finally at an end in 1907: after that there are only three exceptions to 100% "actual" status (all three of which involve a separated object in "slot B"). The estimated turning point divides the total material as follows: before 1856, a ratio of 44 "actual" to 130 "apparent" attestations (=25%); since 1856, a ratio of 85 to 9 (=90%). Furthermore, of the nine deviations since 1856, six can be accounted for as separated objects.

7.25 Sverx ("on top") is extremely rare with decisive objects, but what material there is points toward "actual" status in this century.

SUMMARY OF SVERX

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%	.(?)
Transition period	1	1	50%	ca. 1729-1832
Period of "actual" status	2	0	100%	ca. 1907-1956
Estimated turning point	3	1	75%	1907/22?

Examples

ca. 1729/43: obvertěv" tě pučki [volós] bumagoju, s v e r x " n e j a gorjačimi železnymi ščipcami nagrěvaem"(KANTEMIR, K svoemu umu; prim. k stixu 109; Xrest. Obn., 2.122).

1832: d'jak" vlěz" v" nego [měšok] i šel" na samoe dno, tak" čto s v e r x " e g o možno bylo nasypat' ešče s" polměška uglja (GOGOL', Noč' pered Roždestvom, PSS [1867], 1.189; quoted in Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 1.§632).

1907/22: v odnoj rubaške i kofte s v e r x n e e (GOR'KIJ, Mat', č. 2, gl. 3; quoted in SSRLJ, 13.311).

1928/56: osoboe "bezlično predikativnoe" značenie ravno svojstvenno vsem im, pričem s v e r x n e g o mnogie imejut značenija narečij (PEŠKOVSKIJ [1956: 352]).

7.251 Commentary. -- Nothing definite can be concluded about sverx on the basis of so little data from every century. It did exist as a preposition as far back as the seventeenth century -- e.g., 1649: a s v e r x toja občija ssylki poval'nym obyskom syskivati ne posylati (Uloženie, gl. 10, §167) -- so perhaps eventually a more substantial body of decisive examples can be accumulated. In the corpus, sverx(u) is not attested with negative pronouns or postposed. As for adverbial use in recent times, sverx does not seem to function without an object, but sverxu does; e.g., 1921: s v e r x u s gory otkryvalsja velikolepnyj vid vo vse storony (VLAD. ARSEN'EV, Po Ussurijskomu kraju; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 4.59).

7.252 Although sverx is poorly documented, its material can be combined with the data for the related prepositions verxu (§6.09), na-

verxu (§7.10), and poverx (§7.16) to provide a more generalized pattern of overall development.

COMBINED SUMMARY: VERXU, NAVERXU, POVERX, SVERX

Period of "apparent" status	0	8	0%	ca.	1000-1673
Transition period	6	4	60%	ca.	1729-1933
Period of "actual" status	2	0	100%		1957-1958
Estimated turning point	8	12	40%		1907/11

The general outlines emerge reasonably clearly in the combined data (although considerably more examples still should be added by future studies). The complex of prepositions built on the root verx- has "apparent" status from the earlier texts through the seventeenth century, and then undergoes a long period of mixed "apparent" and "actual" usage -- which is perhaps not yet ended. The estimated turning point yields the following breakdown: before 1907/11, one "actual" and ten "apparent" examples (=9%); since 1907/11, seven "actual" and two "apparent" (=78%).

7.26 Szadi ("behind") was completely "apparent" until the late nineteenth century, then made the shift to "actual" status, and is now a fully n-governing preposition.

SUMMARY OF S(O)ZADI

Period of "apparent" status	0	6	0%	ca.	1610-1872
Transition period	9	5	64%	ca.	1888-1926
Period of "actual" status	7	0	100%		1948-1957
Estimated turning point	16	11	59%		1948

Earliest "apparent" examples

1610/20: rozstriga . . . vsegda so mnogim voin'stvom ezdjaše. Spredi že i s o z a d i e g o vo bronjax tekuščе . . . (PALICYN, Skaz., 25b).

1841: Kazbič, budto koška, nyrnul iz-za kusta, pryg s z a d i e g o na lošad' (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 26).

Earliest "actual" examples

1888: s z a d i n e e sidela ryžaja sobaka s ostrymi ušami (ČEXOV, Step'; Izb., 149b).

1895: -- groza byla -- tam, s z a d i n i x , nad lesom (GOR'KIJ, Staruxa Izergil', Izb., 66).

Latest "apparent" examples

1926: Jarik [sobaka] . . . sidel u stola vo vremja obeda, a Kèt s z a d i e g o motala obrubkom (PRIŠVIN, Ljubov' Jarika, Ras. oxot., 61).

1926/29: Pojavljaetsja Petrenko, s z a d i e g o dva syščika (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Azef, kartina 2 [stage directions]; SS [M-L, 1929], 14.113).

Latest "actual" examples

1953: s z a d i n e g o (illustrative example: Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 1.§632]).

1957: v ètu minutu s z a d i n i x ostanovilsja vz"erošennyj i prjamoj Kolja (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 67, etc. -- 4 total examples).

7.261 Commentary. -- As with many other secondary prepositions, the data for szadi is extremely scanty before the mid-nineteenth century. But judging from the available material, we can predict "apparent" status for any examples from the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century and from all preceding centuries, which would be uncovered in future investigations. By the same token, the twentieth century is essentially a time of "actual" usage for szadi (note the Grammatika russkogo jazyka's inclusion of it among prepositions which govern n- in Modern Russian). There are, however, a few exceptions (examples lacking n-) as recently as the 1920's; for instance, Leonov in his 1925 novel Barsuki uses both szadi ego (213, 214) and szadi nix (237). Unfortunately, there is a gap in the material, from the late 'twenties to the late 'forties of this century, and it is to be hoped that attestations from these years can be gained in future research, so that a more precise break between the transitional and "actual" periods can be established. However, this can be effected to some extent with the present data, by combining it with that from a few related prepositions (see §7.263 below).

7.262 Miscellaneous. -- One example of szadi was not counted in the statistical summary due to its ambiguity: 1876: vdrug emu počudilos', čto s z a d i e g o kto-to s x v a t i l za xalatik (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Mal'čik u Xrista na elke); the pronoun ego here is very likely the

object of the verb, rather than of the preposition. Szadi is not attested in the corpus with negative pronouns or postposed. On the other hand, it does function adverbially in recent times; e.g., 1866: no v ètu minutu kto-to krepko sxvatil ego s z a d i , meždu nimi stal gorodovoj (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 46, etc.); 1957: -- Vy čto-to skazali? -- rasterjanno sprosila Nadja, podxodja k nemu s z a d i , naklonjajas' nad nim (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 160, etc.).

7.263 Here is a generalized survey of all prepositions with the root zad- -- zade and zadi (from §6.14), nazadi (§7.36), pozadi (§7.19), and szadi (§7.26):

COMBINED SUMMARY: ZADE, ZADI, NAZADI, POZADI, SZADI

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	15	0%	ca.	1425-1872
Transition period	14	6	70%	ca.	1888-1926
Period of "actual" status	19	2	90%		1927-1961
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .		1927
	33	23	59%		

The almost total absence of examples from Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic is interesting in this joint summary, as is the lateness of the estimated turning point (1927). Before 1927, there are a total of 14 examples with n- and 21 without (=40%); since 1927, the proportion, as indicated by the summary, is 19:2 (=90%). Another noticeable characteristic of the joint turning point is the fact that it does not divide the combined data into two groups as neatly as has been the case with many other secondary prepositions.[1] The reason for the lack of a clear break in the material on zad- is that the "apparent" examples are concentrated near the end of the transition period, rather than near the beginning, as would logically be expected (and is empirically observed with most other secondary prepositions in this description). If the number of ex-

[1]Cf. the combined results of the root sred-: 12% "actual" before its turning point, 97% "actual" after it.

amples with the zad- prepositions were very large, then such a quirk in the turning point would indicate a retrogression in the development of the prepositions' status (i.e., a stronger tendency to take n- in the late nineteenth century than in the early twentieth). But pending the accumulation of several more examples from the period in question, it is preferable to regard this simply as a chance peculiarity -- which can easily arise in a relatively small sample.

7.27 Miscellaneous prefixed prepositions. -- In this section are collected all prefixed prepositions attested between one and three times each with the decisive pronouns. (Those with four or more examples are treated individually above.) Since there are more than two dozen such isolated items and historical and dialectal relics, only one combined summary will be given for all, followed by selected examples -- some with commentary, some without.

COMBINED SUMMARY: ALL "MISCELLANEOUS" PREFIXED PREPOSITIONS

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	26	0%	ca. 1000-1925
Transition period	5	8	38%	1928-1963
Period of "actual" status	0	0	0%	(none)
	5	34	13%	

It is interesting to note that the five occurrences of epenthetic n-, all of which come within the last 36 years, represent four prepositions: vrode (two examples), vdol', vzamen, and nasčet. Some attention will be devoted to each of these in the appropriate sections below, as they represent potential "actual" prepositions in the decades to come. One other fact worth noting about the combined summary: of the 34 total "apparent" attestations, there is 1 postposed and 33 preposed.

7.28 Vverxu ("at the top"). No decisive examples, but is attested

once with a noun object in 1789 (RADIŠČEV, Žit. Uš., 26). Today functions as an adverb.

7.29 Vdol' ("along") has one "apparent" example and one "actual." 1750/89: *Stali molodcy zabavljatisja, poperek togo kamenja poskakivati, a v d o l ' - to e g o ne smejut skakat' (Smert' V. Buslaeva, Byliny, 377); 1958: krepost' kamennaja, belaja vozvyšaetsja na zemljanom valu, v d o l ' n e e tjanutsja posady (N. KUZNECOVA, sovremennyj perevod teksta, Koženie Kotova, 65). The latter example is perhaps not very typical, occurring as it does in a stylized modern rendition of an early seventeenth-century document. In the modern language, vdol' usually functions adverbially, including compounds of the type vdol' po . . . .

7.30 Vzamen ("to replace") has one "actual" attestation and two "apparent." 1797: Slova otmenjaemye: . . . v z a m e n i x poveleno upotrebljat': . . . (Dekret Pavla I ob iz"jatii iz upotreblenija nekotoryx slov; cited by Vinogradov, Očerki po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XVII-XIX vv., 193); 1958: v nix [tradicionnyx podxodax] imejutsja i položitel'nye storony. . . . K tomu že v z a m e n i x ne vyrabotano novyx rešenij (GVOZDEV [1958: 2.3]); and 1963: V z a m e n n i x [staryx kopij] v fil'mofond ežednevno postupajut novye kopii (A. A. ANAŠKIN, Kinoprokat i ego problemy [Moskva, 1963], 131). It can also occur as an adverb.

7.31 Vovnutr' ("to the inside"): no decisive examples. It does occur once with a noun object, in 1866/83 (USPENSKIJ, Nravy Ras. ul., 93). Compare vnutri (§7.04) and iznutri (§7.35).

7.32 Vrode ("like") has two "actual" attestations and one "appar-

ent" (involving a negative pronoun). 1933: on, merzavec, . . . pil pivo i igral v domino . . . s kakim-to v r o d e n e g o proxvostom (ZOŠČENKO, Istorija odnoj žizni, Pov. ras., gl. 13); 1957: -- knižka ne gorit, poka ee ne rastrepleš', kak sleduet. A tebja, -- on ulybnulsja, -- tebja v r o d e n i č e g o . . . prinimaet! (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 229); and 1959: v r o d e n i x = solar syjakty (ISENGALIEVA [1959: 189]).

Vrode, which occurs more often in the colloquial language, is well on its way to "actual" status, especially since the only exception above is a dubious non-split negative. Vrode is attested with noun objects as early as 1837 (GOGOL', Pis. Prokopoviču, 25/I/1837; SS, 313), and it is to be hoped that more data can be uncovered which would clarify its historical development, insofar as the 3PPO is concerned. In the modern language vrode is also used as (part of) a conjunction -- vrode kak . . . .

7.33 Vsledstvie ("in consequence") has one "apparent" attestation. 1962: xozjajstvennaja mysl' prišla avtoru v golovu ne po pričine, konečno, urožaja orexov, ne po povodu urožaja, daže ne v s l e d s t v i e e g o , a imenno v svjazi s nim (FINKEL' [1962b: 70]). Note the contrast in this example between the presence of n- after the simple preposition s and its absence after the prefixed vsledstvie. There is one other attestation in the corpus of vsledstvie with a third-person pronoun, in the late eighteenth century; but, as often happened at that time, the pronoun is in the onyj form, and so the example proves nothing: 1780/89: No. 1. O složenii čuvstvitel'nom čeloveka. -- V s l e d s t v i e o n o g o išče t prijatnogo i ubegaet bolezn' (RADIŠČEV, O dobrodeteljax, Jur. proiz., 457). Vsledstvie does not seem to be used adverbially in Modern Russian.

7.34 V"skraj ("beside") has one "apparent" attestation in the

corpus, before disappearing very early. 1190/99: blaženyj že bě v " - s k r a i j e g o sědę i dolu niča (Žit. Feod., Sb. Usp. sob., 60a). With noun objects it occurs as late as the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but in writers with an archaic style, such as AVVAKUM (Poslanie Simeonu; in Žitie i dr. soč., 270) and RADIŠČEV (Žit. Uš., 28). No examples of adverbial use were found.

7.35 Iznutri ("from inside") has one "apparent" example in the corpus. 1928/56: ot predloga iz on [predlog s] otličaetsja tem, čto oboznačaet otdelenie ot poverxnosti predmeta, a ne i z n u t r i e g o (PEŠKOVSKIJ [1956: 312]). This occurrence supports the pattern observed above for vnutri (§7.04). Iznutri with noun objects is attested as far back as 1610/20 (PALICYN, Skaz., 116b; spelled izvnutr'). But its most common function is adverbial; e.g., 1902: legkim ne xvatalo vozduxu, čto-to i z n u t r i mešalo emu vojti (KURPIN, V cirke, Pov. ras., 223).

7.36 Nazadi ("in back") has two "apparent" attestations: ca. 1680/99: a Skanderbeg . . . vybral sorok čelovek dobryx molodcov i . . . poslal v gorod z zapasom, a sam, n a z a d i i x, stal v gorax (Skanderbeg, 24 [po Egor. sp.]); 1867: n a z a d i e g o vidno bylo ogromnoe prostranstvo (L. TOLSTOJ, Vojna i mir; quoted in SSRLJ, 7.207). The lack of initial n- in preceding centuries agrees with the total pattern of the family of prepositions containing the root zad-; for a discussion of this, see §7.263 above. In regard to adverbial use, the form nazad ("back," also "ago") is very frequent in the modern language.

7.37 Napered ("in advance") has three "apparent" attestations, all in Middle Russian. 1540/45: tatarove že, poslyšev velikogo knjazja voevod, skoro vozvratišasja, a n a p e r e d i x zaidoša po lesom

pěšie mnogie ljudi (Vol-Perm. let., 508b, 1517 g.); 1600/01: priexala korolevna v posad v dva časa noči; a n a p e r e d e e exali posadskie ljudi (MIKULIN, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 172); 1600/01: tot lord, otstav v Lunde ot lorda erl' Ėksetckogo, pribežal n a p e r e d e g o na lord èrl' Ėksetckogo dvor (MIKULIN, the same work, 180).

Today napered functions only as an adverb; e.g., 1957: daže Evgenij Ustinovič, znajuščij vse n a p e r e d , načal udivljat'sja (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 146). To gain an idea how napered (as a preposition) fits into the general development of the family of secondary prepositions containing the root pered-, see §7.083 above.

7.38 Naperekor ("to spite"), a rare preposition, has three "apparent attestations, of which one is postposed. 1904: doma Fedoru Mixajloviču kazalos', vse delalos' e m u n a p e r e k o r (L. TOLSTOJ, Fal. kup., 311); 1947: n a p e r e k o r e m u (illustrative example: VINOGRADOV [1947: 336]); and 1957/61: n a p e r e k o r i m (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]). It does function as an adverb in Modern Russian; e.g., 1954: -- Vse-taki ja kuplju tebe velosiped, -- skazal on. -- Ni za čto! -- skazala ona. . . . -- Nu počemu? -- Konečno, esli ty načneš' delat' n a p e r e k o r . (PANOVA, Vremena, 139). Compare also the combined summary of related prepositions with the root prek- (§7.213 above).

7.39 Napodobie ("similar to") is attested only once with a decisive pronoun, and that is only an example invented to illustrate the fact that it does not govern epenthetic n-: 1957/61: n a p o d o b i e e g o (ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]). As a preposition napodobie existed as far back as 1766/68 (ČULKOV, Peresm., 101), but the attestation is with a noun object. Compare also the adverb preposition podobno, attested four times

with fully "apparent" status (§10.02). No examples of napodobie without an object were found.

7.40 Naskvoz' ("through") occurs a couple of times following a 3PP, but cannot be considered as a postposition governing an object; e.g., 1957: Šutikov . . . poxlopyval truby, prisev, prosmatrival i x n a s k v o z ' (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 185, etc.). It is clear that naskvoz' must be regarded as an adverb rather than a preposition (but see skvoz', §5.04 above, which performs the corresponding prepositional function).

7.41 Nasredi: no decisive attestations. There is one example with a noun object, however: ca. 1700/50: egda budu n a s r e d i dorogi, iznemog, taščа po zemle ryby (AVVAKUM, Žitie [po sp. XVIII v.], 121).

7.42 Nasčet has one attestation (recent) of "actual" status, and one (older) of "apparent" status. 1820: tvoi četyre stixa n a s č e t e g o v poslanii k Dmitrievu -- prekrasny (PUŠKIN, Pis. Vjazemskomu, ca. 21/IV/1820; PSS [1958], t. 10, No. 11). 1928: Odin bylo parniška svetloj ličnost'ju promel'knul v moej žizni. Da i to sejčas n a s č e t n e g o naxožus' v razdum'e. (ZOŠČENKO, Vstreča, Pov. ras., 48). Occurring mostly in colloquial language at present (compare also vrode), nasčet will need more frequent use in literary style -- with the decisive objects, of course -- before its status can be established; the data is still too limited. There is also the possibility that future studies will be able to fill in the picture, since nasčet did exist as a preposition as early as 1789 (RADIŠČEV, Žit. Uš., 37), and was also used with noun objects in the nineteenth century: e.g., 1837: ja spra-

vljalsja v Kanceljarii n a š č e t [sic] pis'ma generala Šarngorsta (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Pis. M. Dostoevskomu, 3/XII/1837; Pis'ma, t. 4, No. 800). No examples of adverbial usage of nasčet were found.

7.43 Odale (odal') ("at some distance") is attested three times with "apparent" status, all in Middle Russian. /1425: i staša, pri-(š)edše k nemu, o d a l ' e g o (Ipat. let., 1261 g.; cited by Srez., Dopolnenija, 201); 1558/1699: a blizko k" nim" ne prixodil", o d a l e i x " stal" (Putešestvie arxid'jakona Gennadija i gostja Vas. Poznjakova; cited by Srez., 2.612); 1570: saltan sidel na runduke na krae, a pod nim byl tjušak zolotnoj, a po storonam o d a l e g o podle stenu bol'šie vzgolov'ja pokladeny (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 78). Odale occurs with noun objects as late as the end of the seventeenth century (e.g., AVVAKUM, Poslanie "Čadom cerkovnym" o d'jakone Fedore; Žitie i dr. soč., 258), and adverbially as late as nineteenth-century poetry (GRIBOEDOV, Gore ot uma; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 2.807).

7.44 Okrome ("except"), a onetime alternate form of krome (q.v.), has one "apparent" attestation in the corpus. 1769: odna [ženščina] vzdumala odinoždy, čto o k r o m e e j a u vsex umy rasstroilis' (EKATERINA II, Vsjak. vsjač., 15/XII/1769; Rus. proza, 1.317). The absence of n- here accords well with the pattern observed above for krome -- whose first "actual" example did not come before 1836 (details in §6.03). Okrome in early times had some possibility of adverbial use (see Srez., 2.649).

7.45 Okrug ("around") is attested three times without n- in Old Russian, before eventually giving way to vokrug (q.v.). 1000/99: o k r ǫ g " bo sǫštǫjǫ j e g o strany ljub'jaxǫ jego (Suprasl., 568:

6-7); 1190/99: i nača glati stojašče o k r u g " j e g o : č'to stoite z'rešče? (Bor. i Gl., Sb. Usp. sob., 12a); 1415: i okrug" kolo eja [cerkvi] i osnovanie i eže obxodiši o k r u g " e j a (EPIFANIJ, Poslanie k Kirillu; cited by Ryžkov [1957: 511]). The first of the three citations is quite unusual in that the preposition is widely separated from its object. On the subject of vokrug, the modern equivalent of okrug, see §7.06 above (wherein is also given a combined summary of all prepositions originating from the root krug-). Okrug still occurs occasionally, with a clear archaic-substandard coloring, as a preposition and as an adverb (e.g., 1937: PAVLENKO I ÊJZENŠTEJN, Aleksandr Nevskij; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 2.838).

7.46 Oprič' ("besides") occurs once (without n-) in the corpus, and that in quoted "folk-speech." 1903: [Luka:] -- Zemlja-to ne vsja v tvoem učastke pomestilas' . . . ostalos' malen'ko i o p r i č ' e g o (GOR'KIJ, Na dne; P'esy, 138). Although extremely rare in Modern Russian, oprič' existed as a preposition as far back as the fourteenth century (examples in Srez., all with a noun object), and the noun deriving from it (opričnina) became as widespread as the preposition. In regard to adverbial use, no examples of oprič' were found, but Sreznevskij (2.693) cites two examples of oprisn' and oprisně functioning without an object.

7.47 Oproče ("apart") has one "apparent" example, in which it is separated from its 3PPO by an enclitic particle. 1582/83: a velela tebe korolevna vzjati s soboju odnogo Elizar'ja, a o p r o č e by e g o, inogo by esi ne vzjal s soboju (F. PISEMSKIJ, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 153). The related form proč still exists in Modern Russian, where it functions as an adverb ("away," "off"). Oproče itself had some possi-

bility of adverbial use; e.g., 1600/01: budet [= esli] mne veliš' sideti s soboju v koče vmeste, i ja gotov; a budet veliš' o p r o č e v drugoj koče, to na tvoej že vole (MIKULIN, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 164).

7.48 Ostoron ("aside") is also attested only once, without n-. 1731/99: on že o s t o r o n e e' na pravo(j) ruke saditca (Akt o Kal., 216, prim. No. 627). There are also some examples in the corpus of postoron' from ca. 1377 to 1567 (Suzd. let., 1263 g.; Put. rus. posl., 11; etc.) but unfortunately none are with decisive pronoun objects. No adverbial examples were found.

7.49 Otaj ("secretly") has one "apparent" attestation: 1000/99: jaže o t a i j e g o s"grěšaaše (Suprasl., 169:8). Although otaj occurs with a noun object as late as 1630/39 (otai svekra i svekrovi, in the Pov. ob Ul'janii Muromskoj; cited by Bukatevič [1958: 133]), it had been dead (except for Church Slavonic style) long before that. Otaj did have the possibility of adverbial use (see Srez., 2.756).

7.50 Posredine ("in the middle") is attested twice without n-. 1911/23: my s nim šli po kraju ploščadi goroda Borisoglebska, a p o s r e d i n e e e , v . . . grjazi, baraxtalsja p'janyj meščanin (GOR'KIJ, Karonin, Lit. por., 80); 1915: Ščepkin prošel čerez alleju na kruglyj dvor. P o s r e d i n e e g o , obnesennye čugunnoj rešetkoj, podnimalis' pixty i eli (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Prikl. Rast., 106). It also occurs -- with non-decisive objects -- as early as 1825 (po seredine onogo; NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 573). Posredine is used primarily as an adverb in Modern Russian. (Compare also the overall picture of all prepositions built on the root sred-, in §7.232 above.)

7.51 Sboku ("on the side") has one "apparent" occurrence in the

corpus: 1867: čerez nix i s b o k u i x [drov], perepletajas', padali teni (L. TOLSTOJ, Vojna i mir, kn. 2, č. 4, gl. 11; quoted in SSRLJ, 13.232). This example offers a definite contrast, in the year 1867, between the "actual" status of čerez and the "apparent" status of sboku. Today sboku functions mostly as an adverb.

7.52 Suprotiv ("against"), an archaic and substandard alternate of protiv (q.v., §5.03), occurs in the corpus three times with "apparent" status, 1705-1931. Here are the attestations: 1705: A čtob nikogo ne bylo s u p r o t i v e v o (PETR I, Pis. i bum., 3.418; cited by Šaxmatov [1925: §463]); 1871: * s u p r o t i v e g o carevna Polonêznaja sidit (A. K. TOLSTOJ, Aleša Popovič; quoted in SSRLJ, 14.1205); 1931: -- S u p r o t i v i x , plemjannikov-to êtix, -- mir, nu, a oboronit'sja miru -- nečem! (GOR'KIJ, Rasskaz o gerojax, Izb., 330). Contrast this with the root preposition protiv, which has been 96% "actual" since 1835; a combined summary of all prepositions containing the root protiv is given at the end of the section on naprotiv, §7.133 above. In comparison with its related prepositions like protiv and naprotiv, suprotiv is somewhat retarded in its development of "actual" status. Regarding adverbial function, suprotiv did have the possibility of occurrence without objects in past centuries (see Srez., 3.623).

7.53 Combined summary. -- Having explored the chronological development of each of the above prepositions individually, now let us turn to the prefixed category as a whole. Due to the great number of items belonging to this class, the amount of material is large enough to furnish a rather solid picture of the category's gradual development in the direction of "actual" status. The format of Table 10 is the same as that of tables summarizing the other categories above.

TABLE 10

COMBINED SUMMARY OF PREFIXED PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total			Est Trn Point	Post pos.	Adv
okrest	0:2	0:1	0:3	3:1	-	3	7	30%	1808?	-	(+)
podle	-	1:2	4:6	35:2	3:0	43	10	81%	1809	-	+
posle	0:1	0:20	4:3	21:3	16:1	41	28	59%	1833	-	+
vokrug	-	-	2:3	33:6	37:3	72	12	86%	1841	+	+
vozle	-	-	-	29:2	22:0	51	2	96%	1842	-	+
promež	0:1	0:7	-	3:0	2:0	5	8	38%	1842?	-	(+)
okolo	0:3	0:14	0:6	47:16	35:0	82	39	68%	1847/52	-	+
vmesto	-	0:2	0:8	4:9	20:0	24	19	56%	1896/900	-	(+)
posredi	0:21	0:7	0:1	0:2	4:0	4	31	11%	1907	-	+
sverx(u)	-	-	1:0	0:1	2:0	3	1	75%	1907/22?	-	-(+)
pomimo	-	-	-	-	7:0	7	0	100%	1910?	-	-
poverx	-	-	-	-	5:1	5	1	83%	1911?	-	+
naprotiv	-	-	-	1:0	5:1	6	1	86%	1915	-	+
pozadi	-	0:1	-	0:4	17:3	17	8	68%	1915	-	+
vperedi	-	-	-	1:12	14:3	15	15	50%	1915	+	+
vblizi	-	-	-	2:2	1:0	3	2	60%	1922?	-	+
nasčet	-	-	-	0:1	1:0	1	1	50%	1928?	-	-
vrode	-	-	-	-	2:1	2	1	67%	1933?	+	+
poperek	-	-	0:1	0:1	2:0	2	2	50%	1938?	+	+
vnutri	-	-	0:1	0:3	8:10	8	14	36%	1947?	-	+
szadi	-	0:1	-	4:5	12:5	16	11	59%	1948	-	+
vdol'	-	-	0:1	-	1:0	1	1	50%	1958?	-	+
vzamen	-	-	0:1	-	1:1	1	2	33%	none	-	+
vsled	1:17	0:1	-	0:10	0:28	1	56	2%	"	0:13	+
navstreču	-	-	0:1	0:15	0:18	0	34	0%	"	0:9	+
vopreki	-	-	-	0:3	0:9	0	12	0%	"	-	(+)
naverx(u)	0:1	0:2	0:1	-	0:1	0	5	0%	"	-	+
napererez	-	-	-	0:1	0:3	0	4	0%	"	0:2	+
vdogonku	-	-	-	-	0:4	0	4	0%	"	0:2	+
podelom	0:1	-	0:1	0:3	0:1	0	6	0%	"	-	(+)
napered	-	0:3	-	-	-	0	3	0%	"	-	+
naperekor	-	-	-	-	0:3	0	3	0%	"	0:1	+
odal(e)	-	0:3	-	-	-	0	3	0%	"	-	(+)
okrug	0:2	0:1	-	-	-	0	3	0%	"	-	(+)
suprotiv	-	-	0:1	0:1	0:1	0	3	0%	"	-	(+)
nazadi	-	0:1	-	0:1	-	0	2	0%	"	-	+
posredine	-	-	-	-	0:2	0	2	0%	"	-	+
vsledstvie	-	-	-	-	0:1	0	1	0%	"	-	-
v"skraj	0:1	-	-	-	-	0	1	0%	"	-	-
iznutri	-	-	-	-	0:1	0	1	0%	"	-	+
napodobie	-	-	-	-	0:1	0	1	0%	"	-	-
okrome	-	-	0:1	-	-	0	1	0%	"	-	(+)
oprič'	-	-	-	-	0:1	0	1	0%	"	-	-
oproče	-	0:1	-	-	-	0	1	0%	"	-	(+)
ostoron	-	-	0:1	-	-	0	1	0%	"	-	-

TABLE 10 -- Continued

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total			Est Trn Point	Post pos.	Adv
otaj	0:1	-	-	-	-	0	1	0%	none	-	(+)
sboku	-	-	-	0:1	-	0	1	0%	"	-	+
Total	1:51 (2%)	1:67 (1%)	11:40 (22%)	183:105 (64%)	217:103 (68%)	413	366	53%	1900/10 (median)	0:27	39+ 8-

Negative objects: vrode, 0:1. Interposed modifier: podle, 0:1. Separation of 3PPO by particle, etc.: vdol', 0:1; naverx, 0:1; okolo, 0:1; okrug, 0:1; oproče, 0:1; posle, 0:1.

7.531 Commentary. -- The gradual development of the prefixed category of prepositions can be seen in the "Total" line across the bottom of Table 10: the proportion of "actual" attestations in the periods 1000-1399 and 1400-1699 is virtually zero (2%, 1%), but then it rises to about one-fifth (22%) in the eighteenth century, and jumps to around two-thirds (64%, 68%) in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The unexpectedly small difference between the last two centuries is partly due to the fact that substantially more material was collected from the twentieth century than from the nineteenth, which means that the former's total includes more examples of new secondary prepositions like vdogonku and of older ones like vsled which have never acquired the ability to govern n-. But if we take any of those prepositions which have completed the transition to "actual" status (posle, vokrug, vozle, etc.), we find that their individual percentages of "actual" examples are higher in the twentieth century than in the nineteenth; for instance, okolo is only 75% "actual" in the nineteenth century (47 attestations with n-, 16 without), but is 100% "actual" in the twentieth (35 examples with n-, none without). The

same is true all the way down the line.

Many of the individual prepositions are not attested often enough to give their "estimated turning point" any particular reliability: these are marked with a question mark (?) opposite the indicated date in the turning point column. But following down this column and noting only those prepositions which do have a reasonable number of attestations, we see that podle seems to have made the transition to "actual" status first of all the prefixed prepositions (estimated date: 1809), followed by posle (1833), and vokrug, vozle, and okolo (around 1840-50). Then there is a long jump up to the turn of the twentieth century, where we find vmesto and possibly posredi and sverx making the transition. "Actual" status has been acquired most recently by szadi and perhaps vnutri in the 1940's.

It is significant that no prefixed preposition has a turning point before the nineteenth century, and only about half a dozen of them make the transition in the first half of that century. The majority of prefixed prepositions have either made the transition in the first half of the twentieth century, or have not begun to govern n- at all -- as is the case with vsled and navstreču, dative-governing prepositions which seem completely incapable of being followed by n-. The median of the estimated turning points for the first twenty-two prefixed prepositions (i.e., those for which a date is indicated in the turning point column), falls around 1900/1910. Compare this with the estimated median of the suffixed category from §6.28 above (1877), and of the root category from §5.16 above (1828). Of course, the simple and double categories have been "actual" much longer than that.

7.532 Miscellaneous. -- The "Postposed" column indicates whether

or not the given preposition is attested postposed to an object, and, secondly, if any decisive pronouns are involved in postpositioned constructions, what is the proportion of those with n- to those without n-. For instance, vokrug occurs in the corpus postposed, but only to non-decisive objects (indicated by a simple "+"); on the other hand, vsled is attested 13 times postposed to the decisive pronouns, and in all 13 of these constructions the 3PPO lacks n- (indicated by "0:13").

The "Adverb" column indicates whether each preposition is known to occur adverbially (without any object). When the "+" symbol is enclosed in parentheses, this designates that the given preposition is attested adverbially, but very rarely or only in previous centuries. Thus, adding up the column on adverbial usage, we find that no more than eight of the prefixed prepositions are not known to occur without an object -- sverx (but sverxu does), pomimo, nasčet, etc. -- but that thirty-nine are attested at least to some extent adverbially. And it is quite possible that further evidence may be found proving that even more than thirty-nine can function adverbially (or could, during the time when they were a part of the language).

It is interesting that of the 779 total attestations of prefixed prepositions with decisive objects (413 "actual" examples, 366 "apparent"), only one involves a negative pronoun (with vrode), and all the others involve epenthetic n-. There is only one example of an interposed modifier (with podle), and six examples of some other type of separation between the preposition and the 3PPO (with posle, vdol', naverx, okolo, okrug, oproče). It is evident that these "inhibiting" factors (postpositioning, interposed modifier, negative pronoun object, separation of preposition from 3PPO) are not favorable to the "actual"

status of any preposition, but they make up a very small part of the total material: 35 examples (27 postposed, 6 separations of object, 1 non-split negative, 1 interposed modifier), all of "apparent" status, out of a grand total of 366 "apparent" examples for all prefixed prepositions. Thus, if all these 35 examples with some inhibiting factor were discounted, there would still be 331 total "apparent" examples, and the total percentage (413 "actual" compared with 331 "apparent") would be raised only three points, from 53% to 56%.

8. COMBINATION PREPOSITIONS

8.00 Introduction. -- This should really be regarded as no more than an extension of the preceding category (prefixed prepositions), but in the "combination" category the prefix is separated from the root by a space (in printing and writing): v silu, po povodu, pri pomošči, dlja-radi (rare), etc. Aside from this purely graphic distinction,[1] there seems to be no intrinsic difference between, let us say, vmesto (prefixed) and na mesto (combination), or between nasčet and za sčet, or between vrode and v centre. Thus in the present investigation, the "combination" label serves as a sort of catch-all covering all phrases of the type "preposition + noun-stem designating inanimate object (with or without overt ending) + 3PP in genitive or dative case" which were not already included in the "prefixed" classification. In other words, if vo krug ego developed into vokrug nego, and po povodu ee is now developing into popovodu nee, it is a fair assumption that someday pri pomošči ix may become pripomošči nix (but it is doubtful that in Russian s drugom ego will ever become *sdrugom nego, or ot ee imeni will ever become *otnee-imeni).

Since the combination category is explicity designated as a catch-all, its membership is open-ended and extremely diverse and scattered: very many different phrases have been collected, out of the infinite number possible, but each is represented by only a couple of examples.

[1] A valid, objective basis for writing these with or without space will be offered below (§§20.14ff.).

(Compare this with the "simple" category, whose membership is closed and relatively small, but whose members occur with high individual frequencies.)

8.01 For this reason, one combined summary will be presented for all combination prepositions counted together, accompanied by twenty typical early and recent "apparent" examples. Individual sections will then be devoted only to those eight combinations which have at least one "actual" example in the corpus: vo vremja, v otnošenii, v centre, v čest', v čisle, na mesto, po povodu, and pri pomošči. It is these eight which on the basis of the present evidence seem to have some chance of achieving "actual" status in decades to come.

SUMMARY OF ALL COMBINATION PREPOSITIONS

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	66+	0%	. . . . .	ca. 1000-1923
Transition period	10	53+	16%	. . . . .	ca. 1925-1963
Period of "actual" status	0	0	0%	. . . . .	(none)
Estimated turning point	.	. . .	. .	. . . . .	(none)
	10	119+	8%		

Typical early "apparent" examples

1000/99: i da věrǫjǫšte životа věč"naago imate v " i m ę e g o (Marianus, Ioan 20:31).

1000/99: . . . prizyvajǫštem" bа priti n a p o m o š t ' i m " (Suprasl., 530:9-10).

1000/99: i tek" jedin" ot bratię n a s ' r ě t e n ' e j e g o , v'zęti vodonos' ot' ńego (Suprasl., 551:3-4).

ca. 1250/99: prestavisja raba bžija Anna, igumenija s̑tyja Varvara i postaviša n a m e s t e e j a Mar'm'janu (Novg. I let., 1167 g.; cited by Srez., 2.246).

1623/99: čto pro nix pisano i to im ne na slavu, no na ukoriznu, i ponos, i n a p a g u b u i m ! (KOTOV, Kož., 58a).

ca. 1758: --*ja d l j a r a d i e v o gotova umeret' (SUMAROKOV, Jaropolk i Demiza; cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 484]).

1801/02: xozjain otdal zemlju v naem "B" . . . čtoby zemlju obrabotyvat' v p o l ' z u e g o -- "B" (RADIŠČEV, Proekt gr. ul., 507).

1808: v k r u g u i x (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Pis. obšč., 275 [twice]).

1834: iz Azii, i z s r e d i n y e e , iz stepej, vybrosivšix stol'ko narodov v Evropu . . . (GOGOL', Vzgl. na sost., 24).

1858/61: kak by p o d - l a d e m u , zavarilas' kuter'ma (A. PISEMSKIJ, Tysjača duš, č. 2, gl. 7; cited by Šaxmatov [1925: §465]).

Typical recent "apparent" examples

1938: ja podnjal krik, čtob prišel glavnyj vrač, no vmesto nego vdrug prišel ètot samyj lekpom. . . . I p r i v i d e e g o ja okončatel'no poterjal svoe soznanie (ZOŠČENKO, Istorija moej žizni, Pov. ras., 140).

1952/55: vse èto -- obrazcy zakreplennogo upotreblenija slov. . . . V p r o t i v o p o l o ž n o s t ' i m , sinonimy so svobodnym upotrebleniem mogut vstupat' . . . (GVOZDEV, Oč. stil., 61).

1954: . . . bol'še raznyx veščej na doroge i p o s t o r o n a m e e. Černel kotlovan, okolo nego navaleny . . . (PANOVA, Vremena, 140).

1956: slova "i tatarovjam i murzam", napisannye na levom pole s takim že znakom v n a č a l e i x , otnosjatsja sjuda (MALYŠEV, Opisanie rukopisi, Povest' o Suxane [Moskva-Leningrad, 1956], 132).

1956: vynosnye bukvy vstrečajutsja v načale slova, v s e r e d i n e e g o i v konce (MALYŠEV, Opisanie rukopisi, Povest' o Suxane, 129).

1956: k č i s l u i x [predložnyx konstrukcij] otnositsja konstrukcija . . . (LOMTEV [1956: §226]).

1960: takie postroenija obrazujutsja po svoim osobym pravilam; v o s n o v e i x ležit opredelennaja model' (ŠVEDOVA, Sint. rus. raz., 10).

1960: no n a s m e n u i m prišli novye mastera (E. KARCEVA, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1960.12.145).

1961: sootnošenie meždu nimi [s i na] možet byt' oboznačeno: s poverxnosti ili ot predmeta -- na poverxnost' ili v s t o r o n u e g o (BONDARENKO [1961: 25]).

1963: v fil'me, osobenno v k o n c e e g o , ètot personaž bolee individualizirovan (F. DVIN, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1963.5.138).

8.02 Vo vremja ("in the time," "during") has only one attestation with the decisive pronouns: ca. 1925/45: v o v r e m j a n e e [besedy] vam mogut zadat' celyj rjad voprosov (KALININ, O komm. vosp.; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 2.758). Although vo vremja occurs very often as a unit (in the sense of "during"), it almost never takes a ЗРРО, and so the one "actual" example just quoted remains insufficient to draw any conclusions. This quotation from Kalinin is also one of the earlier attestations of n- after any combination preposition in the corpus.

8.03 V otnošenii ("in reference") has several attestations, two of them "actual," and so a columnar summary will be given:

SUMMARY OF V OTNOŠENII

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	0	0%		(?)
Transition period	2	4	33%	ca.	1952-1962
Estimated turning point	2	4	33%		none

"Apparent" examples

1952/55: v o t n o š e n i i i x [neologizmov] net opredelennosti v ustanovlenii xronologičeskix ramok (GVOZDEV, Oč. stil., §112).

1954: -- u nego do six por ne ustanovili apparata, -- dogadlivo i četko, čtoby ne ostavalos' nikakix somnenij v o t n o š e n i i e g o , skazal Morščixin (LEONOV, Russkij les; cited by Blažev [1962: 15]).

1957/61: v o t n o š e n i i e e (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

1962: ne imeet značenija i naličnyj v o t n o š e n i i i x [vtoričnyx predlogov] raznoboj v terminologii (FINKEL' [1962b: 3]).

"Actual" examples

1954: . . . slučis' v ètoj perepiske kakie-libo kriminal'nye v o t n o š e n i i n e g o svedenija, razgovor ètot, konečno, proisxodil by v inom meste (LEONOV, Russkij les; cited by Blažev [1962: 16]).

1960: čto kasaetsja logičeski neobosnovannoj semantiki, to v o t n o š e n i i n e e vseobščaja grammatika otgraničivaetsja tem, čto . . . (ZVEGINCEV, Istorija jazykoznanija v XIX i XX vv.; cited by Blažev [1962: 16]).

8.031 Commentary. -- V otnošenii is another combination preposition which occurs as a unit quite frequently, especially in "learned" or "official" style. And, as the above examples (several borrowed from Blažev) illustrate, it has already begun the transition to "actual" status, to the extent that, for instance, Leonov uses both n- and non-n- forms in the same novel (see summary). This despite the attempt by normative grammarians (e.g., Rozental') to legislate against the use of epenthetic n- after such combination prepositions. Only time will tell whether their efforts to prevent v otnošenii from attaining fully "actual" status will be successful. (See also the current development of the adverb preposition otnositel'no in §10.01 below.)

8.04 V centre ("in the center") has several attestations, including one with initial n-. All will be presented in the following summary:

SUMMARY OF V CENTRE

Period of "apparent" status	0	0	0%		(?)
Transition period	1	4	20%	ca.	1955-1962
Estimated turning point	1	4	20%		none

"Actual" example

ca. 1955: v centre xrama -- svjatoe svjatyx (altar'), a v c e n t r e n e g o -- kamen' pered kovčegom zaveta (N. AŠUKIN, Krylatye slova [izd. 1955 g.], stat'ja "Pup zemli," 461).

"Apparent" examples

1957: tam daže sobralas' nebol'šaja kompanija. V c e n t r e e e sidel akademik Saratovcev (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 291).

1959: "Krasnye list'ja" -- rasskaz o mnogix ljudjax, xotja v c e n t r e e g o stoit obraz odnogo geroja (V. ŠALUNOVSKIJ, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1959.8.100).

1961: V c e n t r e i x [rasskazov] -- sud'by leningradskix detej (Novye knigi, 1961.22.49).

1962: V c e n t r e e g o [rasskaza] -- Arxilox, izvestnyj drevnegrečeskij poèt (Novye knigi, 1962.34.31).

8.041 Commentary. -- It will take one or two more "actual" examples before we can say that v centre is definitely moving toward "actual" status. Nevertheless, it will be interesting to see if this combination preposition will follow the same line of development which was taken in the past by its predecessors, po sredě (= posredi today) and sredě (= sredi today).

8.05 V čest' ("in honor") has two older "apparent" examples and one recent "actual" example. They are:

1860/80: pit' na nix, v č e s t ' i x (illustrative example: K. S. AKSAKOV [1880: 135]).

1896: bylo ustroeno mnogo prazdnikov v č e s t ' e g o , vse murzy ostrova sobralis' na nix (GOR'KIJ, Ian i ego syn, Izb., 83).

1957/61: èti čuvstva Garibal'di vyrazil na bankete v č e s t ' n e g o u Gercena (author unknown [possibly the Soviet press]; cited by Rozental' [1957: §101]).

It is significant that in quoting the third ("actual") example, Rozental' calls it an "imprecise form," and adds the correction "needs to be: v čest' ego." Also note that back in the time of Aksakov, a

hundred years ago, v čest' clearly contrasted with the simple preposition na (see the first example above), and a similar contrast is also seen in the citation from Gor'kij. Once again, we can only wait and observe what developments the future will bring.

8.06 V čisle ("in the number") has two older occurrences without n-, and one from this century with n-. They are:

1825: -- znakomyx u menja mnogo, a v č i s l e i x odin iz kelejnikov ego preosvjaščenstva (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 536).
1866: on ne tol'ko ne pomnil v podrobnosti vsex veščej, sobstvenno im poxiščennyx, no daže v č i s l e i x ošibsja (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 509).
1927: Karinskij . . . otnosit k XI v. tol'ko dvadcat' rukopisej, v č i s l e n i x i takie, kotorye . . . (DURNOVO [1927: §26, n.]).

It should be pointed out that in the second citation above (from Dostoevskij), v čisle is used in its literal meaning (rather than in its modern unitary sense of "among"), and is directly controlled by the verbal expression ošibit'sja + v + prepositional case of noun. In other words, this is a good example of what Peškovskij (1956: 285) refers to as "strong government." It is also interesting that in Durnovo's book (from which the one "actual" example comes), there is also an instance of k čislu ix (p. 96) -- showing that Durnovo makes a distinction between the "actual" status of the combination preposition v čisle and the "apparent" status of the prepositional phrase k čislu.

In the last few decades the only occurrences of v čisle with a 3PP, judging from the present corpus, have involved the intercalation of the pronoun; e.g., 1954: xodjat agitatory; Jul'ka v i x č i s l e . (PANOVA, Vremena, 345); 1958: -- razve to, čto delajut moi sverstniki, ja v i x č i s l e , -- ne est' bor'ba? (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 666). No intercalated examples were counted in the statistical summary of combination prepositions, since they involve an entirely different kind of construc-

tion. However, there will be a separate discussion of intercalated constructions below (§12.03); see also the following preposition (na mesto).

8.07 Na mesto ("in place") should not, strictly speaking, have been alloted a separate section here, equally with v otnošenii, v čisle, etc., since there is not a single attestation of *na mesto nego in the corpus. However, there are two very early attestations of an intercalated n-form of the 3PP, and na mesto does occur as a combination very frequently: in the corpus, there are a total of 15 intercalated constructions (which were not counted in the category's overall summary), and 9 more non-intercalated constructions (which were counted). Therefore, the chronological summary of na mesto will be presented (as was that of vmesto) in two parts: na ... mesto (separated) and na mesto ... (not separated). Forms with the prepositional ending na meste are also included.

SUMMARY OF NA ... MESTO (SEPARATED)

Period of "actual" status	2	0	100%	ca.	1190-1219
Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	13	0%		1825-1958
Estimated turning point	2	13	13%		(?)

"Actual" examples

1190/99: ne bo jego vidě dv'r'mi izlěz"ša ni paky dv'rmi v"lěz"ša, n" n a n e m ' ž e m ě s t ě javiv"sja, na tom' že paky i nevidim" byst' (Sb. Usp. sob., Žit. Feod., 46b).

1219: nemogyj usnu n a n e m " ž e m ě s t ě sědjaše (Žitie Nifonta, 126; cited by Srez., 1.1027).

Earliest "apparent" examples

1825: kto by n a e g o m e s t e ne soglasilsja na takoe lestnoe predloženie? (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 507).

1841: ja by n a e g o m e s t e umer s gorja (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 40; also 92, 126).

Latest "apparent" examples

1957: konvejer peredvinulsja, pustaja izložnica vstala n a e e m e s t o (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 258).

1958: oni snjali malen'kij portret s lentami i povesili n a e g o m e s t o novyj bol'šoj portret. Lenin byl na nem gosudarstvennyj, strogij (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 552; also 559).

8.071 Commentary. -- In the absence of any examples between the thirteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is impossible to determine just when the intercalated 3PP lost its epenthetic n-, but judging from the overall data on intercalated constructions in general (§12.03 below) and from na mesto ... (see below), the turning point might be placed around the thirteenth century. Hopefully, more material for the intervening period of na mesto ... can be added by future studies. It is interesting to note that in the last few decades of this century, na ... mesto with intercalated object seems to be gaining in frequency, relative to na mesto ... with following object.

8.072 Now let us turn to the chronological pattern of this latter construction, which truly fits into the "combination preposition" category (and whose statistics were included in the summary of the entire category). Here also examples both of na mesto ... and of na meste ... are included.

SUMMARY OF NA MESTO ... (NOT SEPARATED)

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 9 0% . . . . . ca. 1250-1957

Earliest "apparent" examples

ca. 1250/99: prestavisja raba bžija Anna, igumenija styja Varvara i postaviša n a m e s t e e j a Mar'm'janu (Novg. I let., 1167 g.: cited by Srez., 2.246).

1766/68: [on] promenjal na den'gi Telemax i kupil n a m e s t o e g o černyj taftjanoj mantilet (ČULKOV, Peresm., 123).

Latest "apparent" examples

1943: na moskovskix ulicax isčezali gnilye domiški i n a m e s t o i x bystro vyrastali gromady ili "kompleksy" (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Katja, Pov. ras., 241).

1957: on . . . ušel ot nee. . . . A n a m e s t e e g o sidel kamenno-tverdyj ispolnitel' dolga (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 243).

8.073 Commentary. -- The combination preposition na mesto ... makes its appearance in the language, evidently, earlier than does vme-

sto (first attested in the form vmesto eja only in 1610/20; see §7.03). Na mesto is, however, less highly developed in regard to "status": vmesto began to govern n- in the course of the nineteenth century, and has been 100% "actual" throughout the twentieth century, whereas na mesto is fully "apparent" to this day. It is, of course, within the realm of possibility that the present generation will witness the first occurrences of n- after na mesto. The pressure of vmesto and of combination prepositions like v otnošenii and po povodu is on the side of such a development, although an inhibiting factor in this instance may be the fact that in recent decades na mesto seems to be used more often with intercalated object (na ego mesto) than it does with following object (na mesto ego), and this tends to hinder the fusion of na and mesto into a single combination preposition.

Looking at this from another angle, we might speculate that native speakers, feeling the tension toward the use of n- after na mesto, resort to the intercalation of the 3PP in order to avoid making a choice between the n- and non-n- forms of the pronoun, since -- as discussed above -- the intercalated position (na ... mesto) in Modern Russian is a position of neutralization insofar as the presence or absence of n- is concerned. This type of speculation, however, goes beyond the behavioristic approach of the present formal analysis, and will be left without further attention.

8.073 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, na mesto ... and na ... mesto are not attested with negative pronouns or postposed. The phrase na mesto can easily function without an object (i.e., as an adverbial).

8.08 Po povodu ("on the subject") has three attestations of "actual" status, more than any other combination preposition in the

corpus.

SUMMARY OF PO POVODU

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	5	0%	1859-1923
Transition period	3	2	60%	ca. 1935-1961
Estimated turning point	3	7	30%	(?)

Earliest "apparent" examples

1859: [oni] rady prinjat' ego za predstavitelja obrazovannosti i p o p o v o d u e g o izlit' svoe negodovanie na novye porjadki (DOBROLJUBOV, Temnoe carstvo; cited by Finkel' [1962b: 99]).

1880/83: mnogo pročuvstvovannyx slov skazali my ob ètom mužike, i daže ne odnu slezu prolili p o p o v o d u e g o (SALTYKOV, Blagonamerennye reči, gl. 14; also gl. 10; cited by Čerkasova [1955: 88]).

"Actual" examples

1935/52: p o p o v o d u n i x (illustrative example: BULAXOVSKIJ [1952: gl. 4, §5]).

1950/58: Šaxmatov svoe nabljudenie ne soprovoždaet kakim-libo ob"jasneniem, a Obnorskij p o p o v o d u n e g o dumaet, čto sut' dela zaključaetsja . . . (BULAXOVSKIJ [1958: 211, n. 1]).

1957: mne kažetsja, p o p o v o d u n e e [recenzii na Orfografičeskij slovar'] vpolne zakonno postavit' neskol'ko voprosov (BULAXOVSKIJ, stat'ja, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1957.5.110).

Latest "apparent" examples

1957: -- ja proizvožu veščи, po povodu kotoryx ljudi budut vstupat' v otnošenija. Byli by veščи, a už komu vstupat' p o p o v o d u i x . . . v otnošenija, -- on zasmejalsja (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 17).

1957/61: p o p o v o d u e e (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

8.081 Commentary. -- The most striking fact about the citations for po povodu is that all three "actual" attestations were written by the late linguist Leonid Bulaxovskij (1888-1961).[1] In view of this fact, it will be necessary to collect more material for recent decades before attempting to draw any definite conclusions about the "status" of po povodu, especially since Rozental' in his 1957 handbook (see the last citation in the summary above) specifies the normative usage as being

[1] In passing it is interesting to note that the prominent Russian-born linguist Roman Jakobson, when asked about his own usage, replied that if he were to use this combination preposition with a 3PPO, he would say po povodu nego. (Personal communication to the author, April 19, 1961.)

without the n-. In any event, it is clear that po povodu is on the way to "actual" status. And one factor influencing this shift is its frequency of occurrence; it has been used rather often in literary Russian since the nineteenth century, when it served as a convenient equivalent of the French à propos de. (A detailed survey of the history of po povodu, with emphasis on its semantic development, is given by Finkel' [1962b: gl. 3].)

8.082 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, po povodu is not attested with negative pronouns or postposed. It does have some possibility of use without an object, as does any combination preposition whose elements retain some of their independent functions; e.g., 1842: -- gosudar' stroit v Moskve dvorec! -- skazal cenzor (Kačenovskij). Tut, p o p o v o d u , zavjazalsja u cenzorov razgovor, edinstvennyj v mire (GOGOL', Pis. Pletnevu, 7/I/1842; cited by Finkel' [1962b: 87]). But this example is rare.

8.09 Pri pomošči ("with the aid") is attested in the corpus once with "actual" status and twice with "apparent" status, all in the last ten years. Here are the examples:

1955: . . . svoditsja k vyrabotke apparata podčinenija i k oformleniju p r i p o m o š č i n e g o tex že samyx prostyx vyskazyvanij (G. S. KNABE, stat'ja, Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1955.1.113).
1956: obosoblennyj p r i p o m o š č i e g o [vyraženija krome kak] člen predloženija stavitsja v različnyx padežax (LEVIN [1956: 152]).
1957/61: p r i p o m o š č i e g o (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

Again, there is not enough material to warrant any conclusions about pri pomošči itself, but when taken together with all the other combination prepositions, this material contributes to our overall awareness of the beginnings of a transition to "actual" status by some members of the category. Before leaving the subject of pri pomošči, it might be mentioned that the same root occurs in a few other prepositions

of various types -- pomoščʹju, na pomoščʹ, s pomoščʹju -- all of which have entirely "apparent" status.

8.10 Combined summary. -- The plan of the present work has probably become clear by now: the categories of Russian prepositions are being treated in accordance with the time of acquisition of "actual" status. First came the simple prepositions, which have controlled n- since the earliest texts; they are followed by the double category in Middle Russian, and by the root category, whose members had acquired "actual" status by the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries; then come the suffixed and prefixed categories, some of whose members became "actual" prepositions in preceding centuries, while others are still developing toward that result. The category under discussion here, combination prepositions, has begun in the last few decades to recapitulate the development of the prefixed category -- of which it is really an extension. Here is a chronological breakdown of all combination prepositions taken together.

TABLE 11

COMBINED SUMMARY OF COMBINATION PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total			Trn Pt.	Neg Obj	Post pos.	Int Mod
po povodu	-	-	-	0:3	3:4	3	7	30%	none	-	-	-
v otnošenii	-	-	-	-	2:4	2	4	33%	none	-	-	-
all others	0:6+	0:6+	0:3+	0:32+	5:61+	5	108+	4%	none	-	-	-
Total	0:6+ (0%)	0:6+ (0%)	0:3+ (0%)	0:35+ (0%)	10:69+ (13%)	10	119+	8%	none	-	-	-

8.101 Commentary. -- Just as the prefixed prepositions began mak-

ing the transition to "actual" status in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, so now are some of the combination prepositions starting to make the same shift, within the last generation or two in this century. If we take 1925 as the approximate time of the first breakthrough of n- after combination prepositions, the total material breaks down into the following proportions: before 1925, no "actual" and 65+ "apparent" attestations (= 0%); since 1925, 10 "actual" and 53+ "apparent" (= 16%).

The fact that the "combination" category's ratio of "actual" attestations has risen from zero to something less than one-sixth[1] in four decades (despite contemporary normative grammars' denial of their right to govern n-) suggests that this embryonic tendency should be closely watched in the decades immediately ahead. By the year 2050 or 2100 we will undoubtedly have a much clearer conception as to the outcome of this development. While it is rather unlikely that epenthetic n- will spread to all combination prepositions in the foreseeable future, there is a very strong possibility that certain of the most frequently-occurring members of this group (e.g., po povodu, v otnošenii) will complete the transition to the status of "actual" prepositions very soon -- perhaps by the year 2000.

8.102 Miscellaneous. -- The various kinds of miscellaneous constructions are of little importance for the "combination" category. There are no attestations of NIP objects or of interposed modifiers. Also postpositioning does not seem to be in evidence. On the other hand, there are many examples of intercalated pronouns splitting the combination: iz ix čisla, po ix adresu, s ego pomošč'ju, po ego slovam, ot ee imeni, v ee prisutstvii, etc., etc. But such constructions cannot be

[1]Perhaps considerably less than one-sixth (16%), since the "apparent" figures have been undercounted.

said to represent the specified canonical form "prefix + stem designating inanimate object (with or without ending) + 3PP in gen. or dat. case," and so no intercalated constructions were included in the chronological-statistical summary. The question of adverbial use (without any object) is of no real significance for combination prepositions, since such combinations are made up of prepositions and nouns in more or less free combination, and for them prepositional usage with an object (dependent genitive or dative) is the unusual feature.

8.103 Only two unusual types of combination prepositions which occur a few times in the data remain to be mentioned. First, "substandard" combinations of the type dlja-radi, iz-radi, iz-meždu, etc. There was only one attestation of these with the decisive pronouns -- dlja radi evo, written ca. 1758 by Sumarokov (full citation in summary, §8.01). There are also other occurrences in the corpus, but unfortunately only with noun objects. Here are a few examples: 1620/39: i inii srama radi skončavaxusja bedne, z a otečestva r a d i (PALICYN, Skaz., 331a); 1846: -- A tak, -- inogda, naprimer, po slučaju, -- iz delikatnosti, drugoj raz -- i z r a d i soveršennoj svoej bezzaščitnosti . . . (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Dvojnik; cited by Bulaxovskij [1954: 358]); ca. 1860/69: i z - p r o m e ž listočkov vybežal stebelek s počkoj (K. D. UŠINSKIJ, Istorija odnoj jablon'ki; cited by Bondarenko [1961: 51]); 1900: -- Tridcat' godov, -- bajut stariki, -- takoj vody ne bylo, -- govoril požiloj mel'nik. -- Beda narodu-to. . . . D l j a - r a d i prazdnika-to. (ANDREEV, Na reke, Pov. ras., 71). The last citation indicates the level of language where such prepositions are ordinarily encountered. A century and a half before Andreev, Trediakovskij expressed his feelings about the use of such prepositions in the literary language

when he criticized the style of Sumarokov's Xorev:

> No na čto ešče sii sledujuščii "dva griba v" borščˇ," govorja po Ukrainski, d l j a r a d i , vmesto odnogo r a d i , ili odnogoˇ" d l j a ? Kak" Oda, tak" i Tragedija ne terpit" ploščadnogo upotreblenija. (TREDIAKOVSKIJ, Pis'mo . . . o stixotvorenii . . . avtora dvux" od"; Xrest. Obn., 2.203).

Matters of stylistics and levels of language aside, there is also another question regarding the treatment of these prepositions: should items like dlja-radi be classified as "combination" prepositions, or should they be placed in the "double" preposition category (iz-za, etc.) -- where most grammars and inventories of prepositions place them? But by restricting the "double" category only to those which are composed of two "simple" prepositions (see §2.25 above), we are able to assign all others (i.e., those whose second element is a secondary preposition, as the radi in za-radi, etc.) to the "combination" category, along with za sčet and the like. Somewhat similar reasoning is expressed by Tagamlickaja, author of an article on this subject, who writes (1958: 73) that from the standpoint of the contemporary language, prepositions of the type naprotiv cannot be distinguished from those of the type za-radi.

The other unusual combination preposition which is worth mentioning in conclusion is a probable instance of borrowing from English in the form of the loan-translation v terminax ("in terms"). It is used by the Jakobson-influenced Soviet linguist Vjačeslav V. Ivanov in a booklet about the phonological pioneer Baudouin de Courtenay: 1960: fonologičeskie različija . . . mogut byt' sformulirovany v t e r m i n a x ix prosodičeskix svojstv (V. V. IVANOV, a chapter in Boduèn de Kurtenè [pod red. S. Bernštejna], 39). The likelihood that this is a loan translation of the English in terms of is heightened by the number of other Western phonological terms in the same quotation. It will be

most interesting to follow the fate of this new combination preposition in Russian, and see whether it will retrace the path of development of v otnošenii, po povodu, etc.

9. COMPARATIVE PREPOSITIONS

9.00 Introduction. -- This category includes indeclinable forms of comparatives occurring the corpus and controlling the 3PP in the genitive case; e.g., sil'nee ego ("stronger than he"), lučše ee ("better than she"), ran'še nix ("earlier than they"), etc. Declinable comparatives (bolee sil'nyj, čem on, etc.) are excluded from the investigation, inasmuch as they do not control the "compared object" and hence have no preposition-like function.

Since there are two main types of indeclinable comparatives -- those ending in -ee (-ej) and those ending in -e preceded by a palatal consonant and/or stem-truncation -- and since membership in the comparative preposition category is open-ended and extremely diverse and scattered (an infinite number of possible candidates, and a large number of different comparatives tabulated in the corpus, each with a small number of examples), the most efficient and meaningful way to present the data is by first breaking it down into two large sub-groups according to the endings. After that, individual sections will be devoted only to those ten comparatives which are attested with at least one "actual" example. And in conclusion a chronological matrix of all comparative prepositions will be given.

9.01 Comparatives in -ee. -- Indeclinable comparatives with this ending (which is sometimes realized in speech as -ej) undergo no stem change before addition of the ending, and thus bear a very close resem-

blance to their corresponding positive adjectives; e.g., sil'n-ee ("stronger") ← sil'n-yj ("strong"). Whether or not this close resemblance to adjectives is a factor, it is indisputable that -ee comparatives have virtually no tendency to become "actual" prepositions; in fact, there is only one example of n- after a -ee comparative in the entire corpus.

SUMMARY OF ALL -EE COMPARATIVES

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	16+	0%	ca. 1700-1930
Transition period	1	5+	17%	ca. 1932-1961
Estimated turning point	1	21+	5%	(none)

Earliest "apparent" examples

ca. 1700: a car'-et, pet', v te pory čaetsja i mnitsja butto i vprjam' takov, s v j a t e e e g o net! (AVVAKUM, Kn. tolk., 154).

1766/68: r o s k o š n e e e g o vy ne syščete vo vsej vselennoj (ČULKOV, Peresm., 96).

1769: [nekotorye pisateli] zljatsja na tex, koi rassudkom d o s t a t o č n e e i x (N. NOVIKOV, Truten', list 14, 28/VII/1769; Rus. proza, 302).

1809: . . . r a n ě e i x (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Dva slova ot izdatelja; Soč., 319).

1820: doprosčik umnee, a tot, kto vzjal na sebja trud otvečat' emu, . . . u m n e e vsex i x (PUŠKIN, Pis. Gnediču, 4/XII/1820; PSS [1958], t. 10, No. 15).

Only "actual" example

1932/36: odin iz korablej zaščiščal vxod v rejd, osveščaja ego prožektorom. M o r i s t e e n e g o xodili dva dozornyx minonosca i minnye katery (NOVIKOV-PRIBOJ, Cusima, kn. 1, č. 1, gl. 5 [str. 39 izd. 1936 g.])

Latest "apparent" examples

1944: my vdvoem s Kolej byli s i l ' n e e e g o , počtomu on nas ne trogal (FEDIN, Sazany, 1).

1953: s m e l e e i x (illustrative example: Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 1.§632]).

1958: on . . . soveršaet bol'šee, čem ego literaturnye prototipy, ne potomu, čto on s m e l e e i u p o r n e e i x , a potomu . . . (G. ČAXIR'JAN, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1958.6.80).

1959: trudno najti čeloveka p r i m i t i v n e e i g r u b e e e e [kuxarki]. (V. ŠALUNOVSKIJ, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1959.8.100).

1961: ona okazyvaetsja kuda p r o v o r n e j i x i t r e e e g o (N. ZAJCEV, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1961.7.99).

9.011 Commentary. -- The one "actual" example of moristee nego (see above, 1932/36 example) remains isolated among -ee comparatives,

and is the only occurrence of moristee in the corpus, so it is impossible to say whether moristee has some individual tendency to be followed by n-, until more material is found. It is interesting to note in this connection that the same example of moristee is also quoted by the Academy of Sciences dictionary (SSRLJ, 6.1265), which "normalizes" it to moristee ego!

As the summary shows, all other -ee comparatives are totally unattested with the epenthetic nasal, including one item which functions -- like moristee -- in a "directional" sense: 1923: -- Vidite, apparat pobleskivaet? -- Vižu teper', da. -- A von, p r a v e e e g o , -- sidit. (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Aèlita [Kiev, 1958], 285). Compare also a minimally contrasting pair like the following: 1890/97: ja gljažu n a n e e i mne stydno, čto ja s č a s t l i v e e e e (N. MIXAJLOVSKIJ, Ob otcax . . . i o g. Čexove, SS [1897], 6.781); this example manifests the sharp distinction in "status" between na and sčastlivee at the end of the last century -- and the same distinction is made nearly this sharply today.

9.012 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, -ee comparatives are not attested with negative pronouns; all 21 "apparent" examples involve the 3PP. Of these, one has the comparative postposed: 1825: vse im podobnye . . . byli i x i s k u s n e e (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 546); and one other has an interposed modifier: 1820: umnee vsex ix (PUŠKIN; see summary above for full quotation and source). Judging from examples contemporary to these, and which did not involve postpositioning or interposed modifiers, it is certain that these two examples would have lacked n- even without the interference of these inhibiting factors. It goes without saying that all comparatives can occur adverbially, and in fact do occur thus more frequently than they do with a genitive object.

9.02 Comparatives in -ǰe. -- A much more pronounced tendency toward "actual" status is shown by those comparatives which undergo a stem change before the addition of the ending -e: molodoj → moložе, širokij → šire, vysokij → vyše, deševyj → deševle, xorošij → lučše, etc. It is perhaps significant that the form of the -ǰe comparatives bears less resemblance to the declinable positive adjectives to which they correspond, than does the form of the -ee comparatives, but whatever the reason, we find a total of eleven examples of initial n- after -ǰe comparatives in the corpus.

SUMMARY OF ALL -ǰE COMPARATIVES

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	62+	0%	ca. 1000-1907
Transition period	11	24+	31-%	1910-1962
Period of "actual" status	0	0	0%	(none)
Estimated turning point	. .	. .	. . . . .	(none)
	11	86+	11-%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: ne vy li p a č e i x " luč"ši este? (Marianus, Matfej 6:26).
1000/99: v'zvěsti . . . o byv"šiix" p r ě ž d e j e g o i pri ńem" v" Xerson'stě gradě (Suprasl., 541:21-5; also 14:14, 540:13).
ca. 1500/20: i tako požiša leta mnoga, zazirajuščim Petrovym detem, eže v Orde v y š e i x čest' priimaxu (Pov. Petr. car., 103).
1600/01: -- posly i poslanniki byvajut u nego na piru, i te dei sadjatca n i ž e e g o (MIKULIN, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 178).
1672/73: v domu že moem inye rodnye dva brata -- Koz'ma i Gerasim, b o l ' š i e v o , a ne smogli uderžat' evo, Evfimija (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 111).

"Actual" examples

1910-1961: see under the individual comparatives below -- vyše, ran'še, etc.

Recent "apparent" examples

1952: ostatki 13-j stroki soxranilis', i n i ž e e nikakix sledov ot bukv ne imeetsja (ARCIXOVSKIJ, Novg. gram. na ber., iz raskopok 1951 g., 16).
1954: on beret u nee topor i ispravljaet nasadku. Ona smirno stoit rjadom. Ne x u ž e e g o ona by èto sdelala. (PANOVA, Vremena, 55).
1954: u Gennadija s ego kvartirnoj xozjajkoj ljubov', a ona e g o s t a r š e let na desjat' (PANOVA, Vremena, 84).
1957/61: brat m o l o ž e e g o (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).
1962: ob"jektnoe [značenie] javljaetsja pervičnym, bolee starym, a pričinnoe vozniklo iz nego ili p o z ž e e g o (FINKEL' [1962b: 83]).

9.021 Commentary. -- The eleven "actual" examples will be quoted and discussed under the appropriate comparatives to be treated individually below. And it is significant that there are only eleven attestations of n- after -že comparatives, compared with 86+ attestations lacking n-; moreover, all eleven come in the recent past, since 1910. It is clear that up until the twentieth century all comparatives were fully "apparent" as far as prepositional function is concerned: compare, in the examples quoted in the summary, such minimally contrasting prepositional phrases as prežde ego vs. pri ńem" in the Suprasliensis manuscript, and u nego vs. niže ego in the Mikulin citation from 1600/01. Even in this century the tendency toward "actual" status is far from predominant: the proportion of examples with n- is less than one-third of the total since 1910, and even in the sixties we find minimally contrasting examples like iz nego vs. pozže ego (the quotation from Finkel', 1962). Another factor to content with is the insistence of normative grammars -- Grammatika russkogo jazyka, Rozental', etc. -- that comparatives "should not" be followed by n-.

9.022 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, -že comparatives are not found with a NIP. There are three attestations of postpositioning: 1808: e g o n i ž e (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Pis. obšč., 273); 1825: -- ja byl gorazdo i x b o g a č e (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 554), and 1954: e g o s t a r š e (PANOVA: see summary above for full quotation and source). This means that all 86 "apparent" examples of -že comparatives involve the 3PPO, of which three are dependent on a postposed comparative, the other 83 on a normal, preposed comparative. There is one other unusual example, in which the comparative is separated by a particle: ca. 1500/30: [mitropolit Klim] byst' že knižnik" i filosof, p r e ž e b o

e g o ne byval takov" v Rusi (Mosk. let. svod, 1147 g.). As to adverbial use, all comparatives occur as often without dependent genitives as with them.

The following sections are devoted to the nine individual -ˇe comparatives attested at least once each with epenthetic n-: bliže, vyše, dal'še, lučše, niže, pozže, prežde, ran'še, and uže. (The tenth item, moristee, is treated above under -ee comparatives: §9.01.)

9.03 Bliže ("nearer") has one "apparent" and one "actual" example: 1925: b l i ž e e g o [mamonta] iz nekosi meljatnika pokazyvaetsja ryžaja golova (PRIŠVIN, Gon, Ras. oxot., 15); 1935/52: b l i ž e n i x (illustrative example: BULAXOVSKIJ [1952: 222]). There is not enough material to draw any conclusions, especially since the one "actual" example is presumably coined by Bulaxovskij himself to illustrate his observation that comparatives are beginning to govern n-. For a broader view, see the combined summary of the various prepositions derived from the root bliz- (§7.013 above).

9.04 Vyše ("higher") has a larger number of examples, and they will be presented in a tabular summary.

SUMMARY OF VYŠE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	12	0%	ca. 1500-1906
Transition period	1	4	20%	1910-1957
Estimated turning point	1	16	6%	(none)

Earliest "apparent" examples

1500/20: v y š e i x (full citation and source given in §9.02).
1823: est' u nas ljudi, kotorye v y š e e e [publiki]. (PUŠKIN, Pis. Gnediču, 13/V/1823; PSS, t. 13, No. 52).

"Actual" example

1910: opasnost' umeret' ot čaxotki dlja vozrasta 21-25 let, . . . okazyvaetsja liš' nemnogim bolee čem v poltora raza v y š e n e e [opasnosti dlja 16-20 let]. (ČUPROV, Očerki po teoretičeskoj statistike [izd. 1959 g.], 154).

Latest "apparent" examples

1954: Klava ego žestoko oskorbila, postaviv Šurika v y š e e g o ; to kazalos', čto ona prekrasna i bez nee nevozmožno žit' (PANOVA, Vremena, 224).

1957/61: on naxoditsja v y š e i x (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

9.041 Commentary. -- Vyše is typical of comparative prepositions: an occurrence of epenthetic n- once, but also a large number of examples without n-. In addition, vyše is one of the comparatives denied "actual" status by Rozental', and it is used in contrast to bez (which has "actual" status) in one sentence by the contemporary writer Panova (see just above). In the corpus, vyše is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. It is often used adverbially. (The prefixed comparative svyše is not attested in the corpus with any decisive pronouns; its status remains undefined.)

9.05 Dal'še ("further") is unattested except for one example which was probably coined by Bulaxovskij himself: 1935/52: d a l ' š e n i x (illustrative example: BULAXOVSKIJ [1952: 222]).

9.06 Lučše ("better") is one of the few suppletive comparatives of Russian (cf. xorošij "good"), and is also one of the more frequent members of the comparative inventory. It is well documented with the decisive pronouns, but there is only one attestation of n- among them.

SUMMARY OF LUČŠE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	16	0%	ca. 1700-1957
Transition (?) period	1	0	100%	1961
Estimated turning point	.	.	. . . . .	(?)
	1	16	6%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

ca. 1700: čto o nix tužit'? Xristos i l u t č e i x byl (AVVAKUM, Žitie, 102).

ca. 1730: -- i to ja znaju l u č š e e č (Šutovskaja komedija, šen' A, dej. 7, list 26; Pam. rus. dramy, 526).

Latest "apparent" examples

1896/1908: kogda na obščix sobranijax nado spasat' situaciju -- l u č š e e g o ne najti (KUPRIN, Molox, Pov. ras., 7).
1957/61: ja nikogo ne znaju l u č š e e e (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

"Actual" example

1961: nikto l u č š e n e g o [Levickogo] ne mog peredat' ličnost' i poèziju (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 67).

9.061 Commentary. -- The fact that the most recent attestation of lučše reflects "actual" status is not necessarily meaningful, but is probably the result of chance. Before it could be concluded that lučše is now an "actual" preposition, several more examples would have to be collected from the past decade or two -- and from the first half of the twentieth century generally, since 15 out of the 17 attestations without n- come before 1900. In previous centuries, of course, lučše functioned as a completely "apparent" preposition, as can be seen by the minimal contrast between o nix and lutče ix in Avvakum (see summary, ca. 1700). In the corpus, lučše is not attested with negative pronouns or postposed. It often functions adverbially.

9.07 Niže ("lower") occurs in the corpus a handful of times, one of which has epenthetic n-:

SUMMARY OF NIŽE (PONIŽE)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	5	0%	1600-1952
Transition (?) period	1	0	100%	1958
Estimated turning point	1	5	17%	(?)

Earliest "apparent" examples

1600/01: -- n i ž e e g o (MIKULIN: full citation and source in §9.02).
1808: . . . e g o n i ž e (ŽUKOVSKIJ, Pis. obšč., 273).

Latest "apparent" examples

1915: nepodvižno v nem [gidroplane] sidel letčik, deržа ruli. P o n i ž e e g o -- nabljudatel' (A. N. TOLSTOJ, Pod vodoj, Pov. ras., 167).
1952: n i ž e e e (ARCIXOVSKIJ: full citation and source in §9.02).

"Actual" example

1958: on možet naxodit'sja kak vyše maksimuma ionizacii ètogo sloja, tak i n i ž e n e g o (Pervye iskusstvennye sputniki [Moskva, 1958], 11).

9.071 Commentary. -- Once again, as with lučše, the comparative niže seems to be starting a shift to "actual" status within the last few years, but future research will have to add more examples from the 'fifties and 'sixties before we can be certain. In earlier times, on the other hand, the data shows clear contrasts between the absence of n- after niže and its presence after u (see summary above, 1600/01) and after v (see summary, 1915).

9.072 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, niže is not attested with negative pronouns. It occurs once postposed (see the 1808 example in the summary). It normally functions as an adverb. An instance of the form poniže (see summary, 1915) was included along with the material on niže proper, since it seems to belong here more than to the prefixed, combination, or even double categories -- where some other scholars classify prefixed comparatives (cf. Bondarenko [1961: 55], and Mel'nyčuk [1961: 151-2]).

9.08 Pozže ("later") has one "actual" and two "apparent" attestations, all within the last few years:

1958: Dovženko prišel v kino p o z ž e i x vsex (R. JURENEV, Aleksandr Dovženko [Moskva, 1958], 14).
1961: Bauèr, Gardin, Ural'skij, Sabinskij prišli v kino p o z ž e n e g o [Protazanova]. (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 93).
1962: iz dvux ukazannyx značenij ob"jektnoe javljaetsja pervičnym, bolee starym, a pričinnoe vozniklo iz nego ili p o z ž e e g o (FINKEL' [1962b: 83]).

An interesting contrast of almost identical sentences is furnished by the 1958 and 1961 examples above, the first without n-, the second with it. Although the former has a modifier qualifying the pronoun ob-

ject, it is not interposed and hence should have no influence on the object. Perhaps the difference is connected with the age of the writers: Jurenev, who is older than Sobolev, may be more conservative in using the comparative prepositions. The 1962 example above furnishes a juxtaposition of pozže to iz in positions of minimal contrast (each followed by the dependent genitive form of the masculine 3PP) -- and pozže does not take n-.

9.09 Prežde ("prior") is the only preposition included in this comparative category, about which some question might be raised -- on the grounds that it could instead be assigned to the suffixed category (i.e., prepositions with inflection-like endings). But prežde is classified as a comparative by Old Church Slavonic expert Paul Diels (1932: §87, Anm. 1) and by Ryžkov (1957: 383), who interpret it as pred + neut. compar. suffix -je = prežde. Moreover, the relationship of prežde (comparative preposition) to pered (preposition) to perednij (adjective) can be analogized with the relationship of bliže (comparative preposition) to bliz (preposition) to bliskij (adjective). Be that as it may, the basic question of this analysis is determination of the development of "status" of prežde (Old Russ. preže) -- for which there is fairly good documentation up until the recent past:

SUMMARY OF PREŽDE (PREŽE)

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	12	0%	ca. 1000-1883
Transition (?) period	1	0	100%	1920/25
Period of "actual" status	0	0	0%	(?)
Estimated turning point	1	12	8%	(?)

Earliest "apparent" examples

1000/99: p r ě z d e j e g o i p r i n e m " (Suprasl., 541:24; also 14:14, 540:13).

1500/30: [mitropolit Klim] byst' že knižnik" i filosof, p r e ž e bo e g o ne byval takov" v Rusi (Mosk. let. svod, 1147 g.)

Latest "apparent" examples

1842: časom p r e ž d e e g o otpravilsja starik Murazov (GOGOL', Mertvye duši [isprav. red.]; quoted in SSRLJ, 11.202).

1876/83: ta umerla ešče p r e ž d e e g o (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Mal'čik u Xrista na elke, Dnevnik pisatelja za 1876 g., 19).

"Actual" example

1920/25: prežde vsego, p r e ž d e n e g o (illustrative example: ŠAXMATOV [1925: §465]).

9.091 Commentary. -- Prežde's chronological pattern is similar to those of niže, lučše, etc., in that its most recent attestation speaks for "actual" status, but is alone among several previous "apparent" attestations. The lack of recent decisive data on the "Church Slavonic" preposition prežde (only one example[1] and that evidently coined by Šaxmatov himself, since 1876) seems to indicate that it is dying out -- except for the fixed expression prežde vsego. If that is the case, then perhaps its place is being taken by the comparative to be discussed next -- ran'še (see §9.10). In any event, it is quite clear that in the well-documented period, up until the mid-nineteenth century, prežde functioned as an "apparent" preposition. It is also illuminating to view the development of prežde in the context of the other prepositions derived from the root pred-; a combined summary of this "family" (§7.083 above) shows the turning point to fall around 1915, with almost no examples of n- before that date, and nearly all with n- since 1915.

9.092 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, prežde is not attested with negative pronouns or as a postposition. It does occur once with the particle bo interposed between it and the pronoun object (see under 1500/30 in the summary). Like the other comparatives, prežde functions freely as an adverb. In closing, it might be noted that there is an

[1] After the corpus was closed, one other recent example turned up: 1949/58: on pojdet tuda p r e ž d e n e e (illustrative example: A. SMIRNICKIJ, Russko-anglijskij slovar' [Moskva, 1958, 3-'e izd.], 589).

occurrence of the form prež in the corpus, although not with a 3PPO: ca. 1650: i prišel Baleban vo Albaniju p r e ž Jagupa (Skanderbeg, 48).

9.10 Ran'še ("earlier") is the only[1] comparative preposition with more than one example of n- in the corpus (it has three, in the last 18 years), and thus can be regarded as the only one which is already well on its way to "actual" status -- which it has perhaps already attained.

SUMMARY OF RAN'ŠE

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	1	0%	1912
Period of "actual" status	3	0	100%	1946-1958
Estimated turning point	3	1	75%	1946?

"Apparent" example

1912: ja znaju ix -- orlovskie, vmeste rabotal s nimi i vmeste rassčitalsja; ušel ja r a n ' š e i x , čtoby vstretit' vosxod solnca (GOR'KIJ, Roždenie čeloveka, Izb., 255).

"Actual" examples

1946: tol'ko nado vse ubrat' akkuratno: vdrug on vernetsja r a n ' š e n e e ? (PANOVA, Sputniki, 44).

1946: počti odnovremenno s F. I. Buslaevym i daže neskol'ko r a n ' š e n e g o vystupil na naučno-lingvističeskom poprišče I. I. Sreznevskij (V. VINOGRADOV, stat'ja, Učenye zapiski MGU, 106.81).

1958: djad'ka Pimen umer r a n ' š e n e e (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 480).

9.101 Commentary. -- As already mentioned, the increasing modern importance of ran'še as a preposition dovetails with the decline of the use of prežde in this century. And if the category of comparative prepositions continues to develop toward "actual" status, one of the major factors will undoubtedly be the precedent set by ran'še. Nonetheless, the small amount of material on ran'še dictates further research to fill in the gap between 1912 and 1946, and also to locate confirming data in the decade of the 'sixties. In the corpus, ran'še is not attested with negative pronouns or postposed. It often occurs without an object.

[1]The only one, that is, until the discovery of a second attestation of n- with prežde (see p. 241, n. 1).

There is in the corpus one instance of the form ranee ix" (ŽUKOVSKIJ, 1809 g.); but since it has the -ee ending, it was counted in that category (§9.01 above) rather than here.

9.11 Xuže ("worse") is attested only once with ., many times without it -- a proportion, incidentally, very similar to that of its opposite number lučše (q.v., §9.06).

SUMMARY OF XUŽE

Period of "apparent" status	0	5	0%	1778-1879
Transition period	1	5	17%	1927-1954
Period of "actual" status	0	0	0%	(none)
Estimated turning point				(none)
	1	10	9%	

Earliest "apparent" examples

1778: čuvstvuju, čto Bog sozdal nas ne x u ž e i x [znatnyx vel'mož] ljud'mi (FONVIZIN, Pis. Paninu iz Francii, No. 5, 14/VI/1778; Rus. proza, 1.481).

1820: voobšče igraet on x u ž e e g o (PUŠKIN, Moi zamečanija o russkom teatre; PSS, 11.13).

"Actual" example

1927: kto dal emu pravo davit' menja? Čem ja x u ž e n e g o ? (OLEŠA, Zavist', 57; but on p. 66 of the same work, Oleša uses xuže without n-!).

Latest "apparent" examples

1938: -- Kažetsja mne, čto ja ne x u ž e e g o ponimat' mogu (KRYMOV, Tanker, 28; also 62).

1954: on beret u nee topor i ispravljaet nasadku. . . . Ne x u ž e e g o ona by èto sdelala (PANOVA, Vremena, 55).

9.111 Commentary. -- The weakness of xuže's tendency toward government of n-, as indicated by a proportion of one-to-ten in the data, is emphasized by the fact that in the same Oleša novel where one "actual" example occurs, we also find an "apparent" example in a similar construction only a few pages later: 1927: Zavist' vzjala k mašine -- vot ono čto! Čem ja x u ž e e e ? (OLEŠA, Zavist', 66). Compare also the contrast between u nee and xuže ego in the 1954 example (Panova). The corpus has no attestations of postpositioning or the NIP after xuže.

9.12 Combined summary. -- Having looked at the sub-groups and some individual members of the comparative preposition category, let us now study the total data in combined form:

TABLE 12

COMBINED SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total		Trn Point	Post pos.	Int Mod	Sep Obj	Neg Obj
moristee	-	-	-	-	1:0	1	0	none	-	-	-	-
other -ee	-	-	0:3+	0:9+	0:9+	0	21+	none	0:1	0:1	-	-
ran'še	-	-	-	-	3:1	3	1	1946?	-	-	-	-
dal'še	-	-	-	-	1:0	1	0	none	-	-	-	-
bliže	-	-	-	-	1:1	1	1	none	-	-	-	-
pozže	-	-	-	-	1:2	1	2	none	-	-	-	-
niže	-	0:1	-	0:2	1:2	1	5	none	0:1	-	-	-
xuže	-	-	0:1	0:4	1:5	1	10	none	-	-	-	-
prežde	0:3	0:1	0:2	0:6	1:0	1	12	none?	-	-	0:1	-
vyše	-	0:1	-	0:10	1:5	1	16	none	-	-	-	-
lučše	-	-	0:3	0:12	1:1	1	16	none	-	-	-	-
other -ˇe	0:1+	0:1+	0:1+	0:10+	0:9+	0	22+	none	0:2	-	-	-
Total	0:4+ (0%)	0:4+ (0%)	0:10+ (0%)	0:53+ (0%)	12:35+ (26-%)	12	106+ (10-%)	none	0:4	0:1	0:1	-

9.121 Commentary. -- The most striking fact revealed by Table 12 is the complete break between the twentieth century and all previous centuries in regard to prepositional "status" of comparatives. No comparative is ever attested with n- in a sequence of 73 consecutive occurrences from ca. 1000 until ca. 1910; but since that date, the proportion jumps noticeably to 12 examples with n- and 33 without n- (27% "actual"). This new tendency, however, is still far from achieving dominance, except for the one item ran'še, which seems to have already made the transition (see §9.10 above). Undoubtedly another fifty or hundred years will be necesary before we can tell for certain whether the new tendency to treat com-

paratives as "actual" prepositions is destined to triumph, or whether it will be stamped out by the efforts of normative grammars, which make a point of including comparatives among those word-types after which "initial n- is not used." But the new development also has its heralds: a pair of linguists as prominent as Bulaxovskij (1952: 222) and Vaillant (1958: §246) have commented upon the growing tendency of n- to occur after comparatives, relating it to the overall expansion of n-.

9.122 We should not overlook the possibility that this development might take a selective path and eventually be utilized to differentiate formally between two semantic classes of indeclinable comparatives which are now undifferentiated. Such morphological specialization of a formerly random feature is not an unknown thing in many categories of many languages (cf. Bloomfield [1933: §23.5]). In the present case, indeclinable comparatives can be attributed a predicative function, as in ja u m n e e brata, or an adverbial function, as in ja govorju u m n e e brata (see also Peškovskij [1956: 328]). Replacing the noun brat by the 3PP, we obtain ja umnee ego and ja govorju umnee ego -- in other words, there is at present no formal distinction made between these two functions of the comparative. But the new tendency of n- to occur after comparatives makes possible a distinction here, which may someday be realized in a regular opposition of the type ja umnee ego : *ja govorju umnee nego.[1]

[1]The potential for the development of such an opposition is felt in the spoken language, with perhaps a slightly different basis of differentiation -- intonation. Robert Magidoff (in a seminar discussion) mentioned the contrast in his speech between pairs of sentences like (1a) Ona xuže ego and (1b) Xuže nego ne byvaet, or between (2a) Da, ja xuže ego and (2b) Čem ja xuže nego. In these contrasting pairs, it would seem that n- is precluded after comparatives on which the major stress of the sentence falls (examples 1a and 2a), but may occur after comparatives which do not have the major stress (1b and 2b). If this is so, then the comparatives with potentially "actual" status (1b, 2b) are very reminiscent of one phonological criterion mentioned in §1.08 above -- namely,

Perhaps the first hint of this differentiation comes in the fact that those comparatives which betray a tendency toward "actual" status in the present corpus are precisely those, like ran'še, which least resemble adjectives in form (cf. §9.02 above), and in addition are those which perform a verb-modifying role in the specific sentence where the n- is found. Of the total of twelve examples in the corpus where a comparative governs n-, eight involve a verb-modifying function, only one (xuže, §9.11) involves a predicative function, and the other three cannot be determined. It will be most interesting to follow this embryonic tendency to differentiate verb-modifying and noun-modifying comparatives in the future, and learn whether it will come to fruition.

9.123 Miscellaneous. -- The "Total" column in Table 12 does not include any percentages for individual prepositions, because each has so few occurrences that percentages have no meaning. On the other hand, the percentage for the category as a whole within each of the major time segments is meaningful; these figures are given in parentheses along the bottom of the table. None of the comparative prepositions are attested with negative pronouns, but all of them have the possibility of adverbial usage. The few examples of postpositioning, of interposed modifiers, and of other types of separated objects are indicated in the right-hand columns in Table 12. All of them play a very negligible role in the "status" of comparatives.

---

that "real" prepositions have no independent stress and behave as proclitics. To say more about these matters would require a separate investigation going beyonds the limits of the present study of written Russian, but they certainly bear looking into at some future time.

10. ADVERB PREPOSITIONS

10.00 Introduction. -- The category of "adverb prepositions" includes those items which are morphologically characterized as such (otnositel'no, podobno, etc.), while excluding the traditional "prepositional adverbs" (bliz, sredi, vokrug, navstreču, etc.) which are treated elsewhere above, under formal categories to which they can more appropriately be assigned. The category of real "adverb prepositions" is recognized and treated briefly by Kalamanova (1955: 125-6), and corresponds to Vinogradov's sub-class of "quality adverbs" (lumped by him together with the so-called "circumstance adverbs" like poverx).[1]

Some amorphous odds and ends occurring in the corpus with a dependent 3PP and not fitting into any of the prepositional categories of the present investigation (net, žal', atu, etc.) were also included among adverb prepositions, but only for the lack of anywhere else to put them -- admittedly not an ideal solution. The figures presented below for the amorphous items (mostly interjections) are suggestive rather than precise, since only a representative sample of their occurrences without n- was tabulated, for comparative purposes.

As might be expected, this very heterogeneous category of adverb prepositions manifests practically no tendency toward "actual" status; otnositel'no, in fact, is the only member with any attestations of n-. Accordingly, the material will be presented in three subclasses: (a)

[1]For a different interpretation of this category, see Čerkasova (1964: 227, n. 6).

otnositel'no, (b) all other -o adverbs, and (c) the amorphous material. The data for subclass (c), and to an extent also for (b), is included mainly for control purposes, to provide a contrast to the preceding categories and to otnositel'no within this category. Consequently, no exhaustive tabulation of all nu ego or čto emu's was made -- only enough to show their completely "apparent" status.

10.01 Otnositel'no ("regarding") has a very limited number of occurrences in the corpus, but these indicate a marked tendency toward "actual" status in the twentieth century.

SUMMARY OF OTNOSITEL'NO

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	2	0%		1801,1892
Period of "actual" status	3	0	100%	ca.	1897-1952
Estimated turning point	3	2	60%	ca.	1897/1917

"Apparent" examples

1801/02: podtverždenie i popuščenija ili neotricanija v slučae obščego vladenija mnogix objazyvajut každogo o t n o s i t e l ' n o e g o vo vladenie učastka (RADIŠČEV, Proekt gr. ul., 511-2).

1892: o t n o s i t e l ' n o e e ja ne imel nikakix opredelennyx namerenij (ČEXOV, Strax; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 2.951).

"Actual" examples

ca. 1897/1917: ni odna iz sobak . . . ne napravila k nim [kuskam mjasa] svoix dviženij v silu zritel'nyx razdraženij, isključitel'no orientirujas' o t n o s i t e l ' n o n i x pri pomošči zapaxov (I. PAVLOV; cited by Gvozdev, Oč. stil., §313).

1951: o t n o s i t e l ' n o n i x [nosovyx glasnyx] takže trebuetsja dokazat', est' li što samostojatel'nye fonemy (S. ŠAUMJAN, stat'ja, Učenye zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija, 3.399).

1952: što kasaetsja perioda vostočnoslavjanskoj pis'mennosti ot XI do XIV v., . . . to avtor . . . našel poleznym ograničit'sja o t n o s i t e l ' n o n e g o tol'ko obščimi zamečanijami (BULAXOVSKIJ, [1958: 4]).

10.011 Commentary. -- The general contours of otnositel'no's development are clear: "apparent" status up to the end of the nineteenth century, and "actual" status for most of the twentieth. However, the material is inadequate to fill in all the details in the intermediate

eras, and it will be necessary to wait on the compilation of data from these gaps (between 1801 and 1892,[1] and between the Pavlov example and 1951) before the chronological outlines can be established with some precision. However, a somewhat better idea can be gained by combining the figures for otnositel'no with those for v otnošenii (from §8.03):

COMBINED SUMMARY: OTNOSITEL'NO, V OTNOŠENII

Period of "apparent" status . . .	0	2	0%	1801,1892
Transition period	5	4	56%	ca. 1897-1962
Estimated turning point	5	6	45%	(none?)

This "rounded-off" data shows the family based on the stem otnos- to be currently in the midst of a shift toward "actual" status. Since 1950, for example, there is a joint total of four attestations of n-, but also four without n- -- making it impossible as yet to discern any definite "turning point" in this shift.

10.012 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, otnositel'no is not attested with negative pronouns; all five decisive examples involve the 3PPO. But there is one other unusual kind of object which was not counted in the statistical summary, but which might testify to "apparent" status: 1950/59: primerom takix izmenenij javljaetsja dviženie tel o t n o s i t e l ' n o d r u g d r u g a (A. V. PERYŠKIN, Kurs fiziki [izd. 6-e, Moskva, 1959], 1.3; also 1.7). The fact that this construction is not split (that is, *drug otnositel'no druga), as we would expect if the preposition were "actual" (cf. drug o druge, drug s drugom), bears a close analogy to the behavior of negative pronouns with prepositions. However, a separate investigation would be required to authenticate this, and so it will not be

[1] After the tabulation was completed and the corpus closed, one other example of otnositel'no turned up, which would help to fill this gap: 1862: o t n o s i t e l ' n o i x ne moglo byt' kolebanij (L. TOLSTOJ, Polikuška, Izb., 3).

dwelled upon here. Otnositel'no does not occur in the corpus postposed. It does occur as an adverb in Modern Russian, with the meaning "relatively."

10.02 Other adverbs in -o. -- Apart from otnositel'no, the category of adverbs ending in -o reveals not the slightest tendency to govern n-, judging from the present corpus.

SUMMARY OF ALL -O ADVERBS EXCEPT OTNOSITEL'NO

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 21+ 0% . . . . . ca. 1000-1962

Various early "apparent" examples

1000/99: viděv" že s"t'nik" stojęi p r ě m o e m u (Marianus, Mark 15:39).

1730: uže my b l i z k o e g o [ostrova] tak" byli, čto my mogli vse vidět' v" nem" bez" vsjakoi trudnosti (TREDIAKOVSKIJ, Ězda v" ostrov" Ljubvi; Xrest. Obn., 2.152).

1833: načalo vsex nauk podobno načalu Nila; p o d o b n o e m u , oni sostavljajutsja sovokupleniem mnogix nezametnyx ruč'ev (GERCEN, Analitičeskoe izloženie solnečnoj sistemy; quoted in Slov. rus. jaz., 4.246).

1866: mečta . . . do togo neosuščestvima, čto emu daže stalo s t y d n o e e (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 198).

1938: -- Privjazalsja ja k nemu kak-to: počemu da otčego? On oborval: delaj, ne razgovarivaj! Ne n u ž n o e m u , čtoby ja znal, kogda on sam znaet (KRYMOV, Tanker, 28).

Various recent "apparent" examples

1943: ona mečtala, p o d o b n o i m , poslužit' svjatomu narodnomu delu (P. LIDOV, Zoja Kosmodem'janskaja [Gospolitizdat, 1943], 4).

1946: i èto bylo č u ž d o e m u (PANOVA, Sputniki, 157).

1957/61: s o o t v e t s t v e n n o i m (illustrative example: ROZENTAL' [1957: §101]).

1958: on uter glaza. -- Ž a l k o e e . . . . Kak vspomnju o nej -- serdce krov'ju oblivaetsja. (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 604).

1962: s o g l a s n o i m [ograničitel'nym tendencijam], predlog vvidu upotrebljaetsja . . . (FINKEL', [1962a: 19]).

10.021 Commentary. -- No commentary is really necessary for this category, as a glance through the typical examples will show. Indeed, such items as nužno, stydno, and žalko are so remote from ordinary prepositional usage that they doubtlessly will never acquire "actual"

prepositional status in Russian. Such adverbs were included here as a control group, to illustrate the one extreme in status: items which take a dependent 3PP in an oblique case, but which are incapable of being followed by epenthetic n-. This conclusion is supported by Soviet prescriptive grammar, which includes podobno, soglasno, and sootvetstvenno among prepositional words which "should not" be used with n- (see Rozental' [1957: §101]; Grammatika russkogo jazyka [1953: 1.§632]).

In the corpus, there are no decisive attestations of such adverb prepositions of former times as kasatel'no, protivno, and ravno. If any examples are found in further research, it can be predicted that they will lack n-. It should also be mentioned that blizko (one "apparent" example in 1730: see summary above) lost its prepositional function early, but its relatives bliz, vblizi, and bliže still occur prepositionally to some extent; for an overall summary of prepositions built on the root bliz-, see §7.013.

10.022 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, the group of "other adverb prepositions in -o" is not attested postposed or with negative pronouns. All of them, evidently, do occur as adverbs (without any object).

10.03 Amorphous items. -- This third and final group of quasi-adverb prepositions includes even less likely candidates for "actual" status than the preceding group: interjections, "category of state," etc. The results of a partial count as presented in the following summary, speak for themselves.

SUMMARY OF ALL AMORPHOUS ADVERBS

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 22+ 0% 1834-1958

Earliest "apparent" examples

1834: no g o r e e m u , esli on ne umel skryt' vsex ee nedostatkov! (GOGOL', Neskol'ko slov o Puškine, SS, 6.35).

1861: -- A t u - a t u e g o ! -- travil ego kučer Petr (A. PISEMSKIJ, Bat'ka, Ras., 177).
1866: -- Tak n e t i x -to? Stranno. . . . Kuda by staruxe ujti? (DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., 80).
1896/1908: Nine vdrug stalo ž a l ' e g o (KUPRIN, Molox, Pov. ras., 63).
1928: [Abram:] -- N u e e [Ljudmilu] . . . [Vasja:] -- Nu-s! (KATAEV, Kvadratura kruga, dej. 1, jav. 11).

Latest "apparent" examples

1938: -- Nužno obrubit' buksir... Nemedlenno d o l o j e g o , v vodu ... Ponjal? (KRYMOV, Tanker, 168).
1954: -- Tebja segodnja sprašival Saša Ljubimov. -- Saška? Č t o e m u ? (PANOVA, Vremena, 23).
1954: Ona priezžala . . . i ne govorila -- s p a s i b o e j : "Ty izmenilsja" ili "ty postarel," -- a smotrela na nego izučajuščim, vnikajuščim vzgljadom (PANOVA, Vremena, 289).
1957: -- Vidite, kak by vam skazat', zdes' i izobretenie i vrode kak n e t e g o (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 30, etc.)
1958: -- N u e e k bogu, takuju žizn'. (PANOVA, Sent. rom., 531, etc.)

10.031 Commentary. -- As can be seen from the examples, many of these miscellaneous items occur in quoted speech, and belong to various "parts of speech." None is attested with epenthetic n-. All occur much more often in what could be called adverbial usage than they do with a dependent genitive or dative.

10.04 Summary of adverb prepositions. -- All of the material from the preceding sections is brought together here, in order to present this category in its general chronological outline.

TABLE 13

COMBINED SUMMARY OF ADVERB PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total	Est Trn Point	Adv	Neg Obj	Post pos.
otnositel'no	-	-	-	1:2	2:0	3 2 60 %	1897/917	+	-	-
others in -o	0:1+	0:2+	0:1+	0:3+	0:14+	0 21+ 0 %	none	+	-	-
amorphous	-	-	-	0:5+	0:17+	0 22+ 0 %	none	+	-	-
Total	0:1+ (0%)	0:2+ (0%)	0:1+ (0%)	1:10+ (9-%)	2:31+ (6-%)	3 45+ 6-%	--	all	-	-

There is little need for "estimated turning points" here, in that otnositel'no is the only adverb preposition with any hint of "actual" status. The only other members of this category which might have some potential for developing n- will probably never do so, because they govern the dative case (podobno, soglasno, sootvetstvenno) and tend to fall together with such dative-governing prepositions as vopreki, navstreču, and blagodarja, which are completely "apparent." A few other adverb prepositions which did take the genitive case have gone out of use in Modern Russian (prjamo, blisko, kasatel'no), and so have no opportunity of developing n-, either. All in all, this is a category with virtually no tendency toward "actual" status -- a category within which otnositel'no stands completely isolated. Consequently the category totals and percentages in Table 13 have no value, since the only "actual" examples belong to one item, while all the others behave entirely differently.

11. GERUND PREPOSITIONS

11.00 Introduction. -- The final category of prepositions to be described, consisting of gerunds which occur in a prepositional function, stands last also in regard to "status." No gerund is ever attested with epenthetic n- (except for one scribal error in a sixteenth-century chronicle), and so the category must be considered completely "apparent." Since relatively few members of the gerund category occur in the corpus, each will be examined separately, in the following order: blagodarja, isključaja, prišed, spustja, nevziraja na, nesmotrja na, ne doezžaja/doexav, and ne doxodja/došedši. A number of other gerunds, not attested in the corpus with any decisive pronouns, are not included: vključaja, končaja, ne sčitaja, vyključaja, pogodja, etc.

11.01 Blagodarja ("thanks to"), the most frequent of all the gerund prepositions, occurs in the corpus 17 times without n-, all in the last two centuries.

SUMMARY OF BLAGODARJA

Period of "apparent" status . . . 0 17 0% 1815-1963

Earliest "apparent" examples (accusative)

1815: *-- Tak, esli neskol'ko tebja sej den' ispravil, e g o b l a g o d a r j a : on i menja nastavil, čtob vkusam ja tvoim staralas' snisxodit' (GRIBOEDOV, Molodye suprugi, jav. 14; cited by Čerkasova [1956: 150]).

1836: peremirie bylo . . . spasitel'nym potomu, čto b l a g o d a r j a e g o ja . . . bezopasno stoju pered pexotoj (DAVYDOV, Zanjatie Drezdena; cited by Čerkasova [1956: 146]).

Earliest "apparent" examples (dative)

1858/86: B l a g o d a r j a e m u my ni na minutu ne soskučilis' (GONČAROV, Fregat Pallada; cited by Čerkasova [1956: 149]).

1895: A vot v protivnikax Marksa ètogo priznaka i ne zamečaetsja, nesmotrja na ix èkstraordinarnost' . . ., a možet byt', vpročem, i b l a g o d a r j a e j (G. PLEXANOV, K voprosu o razvitii monističeskogo vzgljada na istoriju; cited by Finkel' [1962b: 209]).

Latest "apparent" examples

1960: de Kurtenè dal črezvyčajno podrobnuju klassifikaciju čeredovanij. . . . B l a g o d a r j a e j okazyvaetsja vozmožnym provesti stratifikaciju (V. N. TOPOROV, stat'ja, I. A. Boduèn de Kurtenè [Moskva, 1960], 36).

1963: -- B l a g o d a r j a i m [rasskazam o vojne] ja uznal vojnu ne tol'ko umom, no i počuvstvoval serdcem (V. IVAŠOV, interv'ju, Isk. kino, 1963.10.148).

11.011 Commentary. -- The question of when blagodarja acquired prepositional function has been a subject of debate among scholars (Čerkasova, Finkel', etc.), who have operated with different criteria -- semantics, type of object governed, case government. While not going into this general question, the present study has borrowed many of their examples to help establish the "status" of blagodarja, with a concrete result: whether "true gerund" or "gerund-preposition," whether governing accusative or dative, blagodarja has controlled the 3PPO consistently without epenthetic n-, since at least 1815. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, when it was in the twilight zone between gerund and preposition, blagodarja governed the accusative (note the first two examples in the summary above), and even in recent years we find such an example as the following: 1959: zriteli moskovskix kinoteatrov privetstvovali, naprimer, Džul'ettu Mazina, b l a g o d a r j a e e za Noči Kabirii (S. GERASIMOV, stat'ja, Isk. kino, 1959.10.14). But apart from these three instances (the last clearly a "true gerund"), blagodarja occurs in the corpus with the dative case (of the 3PPO). Thus, if blagodarja is defined as a "preposition" only on those occasions when

it takes the dative, it is still completely "apparent," based on 14 attestations with the dative of the 3PPO (covering the years 1858-1963). Moreover, blagodarja is specified as a non n-governing preposition by normative Soviet sources (Grammatika russkogo jazyka, Rozental') in recent years.

11.012 Miscellaneous. -- In the corpus, blagodarja is not attested with negative pronouns, or in adverbial use. There is one instance of postpositioning, in 1815 (see Griboedov quotation in the summary).

11.02 Isključaja ("excluding") is not attested in the corpus with the decisive pronouns. It did, however, occur as a preposition with noun objects as far back as the eighteenth century; e.g., 1789: my pošli k nemu, i s k l j u č a j a k.[njazja] T.[rubeckogo], kotoryj sidel pod strażeju (RADIŠČEV, Žit. UŠ., 32). If future investigations furnish some examples of isključaja with decisive objects, it is to be expected that they will lack n-. (The older form vyključaja is found by Čerkasova [1956: 166-7] to occur as early as 1729.)

11.03 Prišed ("having come") has one attestation where it is followed by epenthetic n- -- thanks to a scribal error: 1540/45: nougorodcy vozmutišasja i voskolebašasja, jako p'jani, a sii, p r i š e d n i x , načaša preže streljati ix (Vol-Perm. let., 399a, 1471 g.). This totally anomalous example is rendered prišed na nix or simply prišed in slightly later copies (Sinod., Akad., Čertkov.) of the same passage, so it can be written off as a momentary slip of the pen (compare the one corrected example of vsled nego in the Suprasliensis, §7.09 above).

11.04 Spustja ("later") is not attested in the corpus with the decisive pronouns. It did, however, occur with a noun object (nedelju

spustja) as early as 1649 (Uloženie, gl. 10, §§139-40). Compare Čerkasova's study (1956: 452-7), where she also finds the first example of spustja as a preposition (postposition) in the seventeenth century.

11.05 Nevziraja na ("regardless") is rather rare, particularly in Modern Russian. It is attested once with a negative object, which it does not split as a unit: 1957: -- Ulučšajte mašinu, n e v z i r a j a n i n a č t o . (DUDINCEV, Ne xleb., 92). On the basis of this construction, it seems that nevziraja na must be classified not as "a preposition," but rather as "the preposition na, preceded by an adverbial or verbal word"; if it were a unit preposition, we would expect the word order to be *ni nevziraja-na čto (cf. ne iz-za čego).

11.06 Nesmotrja na ("in spite of"), a very frequent expression in Modern Russian, is attested four times with negative pronouns. It behaves in the same way as nevziraja na: its simple preposition na splits the negative, but the gerund component remains outside. For instance, this example from 1880: derevo bylo uprjamo, ne žalelo list'ev, n e s m o t r j a n i n a č t o davilo na rešetki (GARŠIN, Attalea princeps, Soč., 97); or in 1961: N e s m o t r j a n i n a č t o , na studii ustanovilas' xorošaja, družeskaja, tvorčeskaja atmosfera (SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm., 94). There are no attestations in the corpus with any ЗРРО, unfortunately, but these negative expressions which are not split by the nesmotrja component indicate that perhaps nesmotrja na as a unit does not qualify for status as an "actual" preposition, any more than constructions of the type vpred' do qualify (see §2.25 above). Of course, na and do qualify as completely "actual" prepositions of the simple category, but the adverbial elements which precede them (vpred',

nesmotrja) do not seem to be bound to them tightly enough to coparticipate in their "actual" status, as for example when the adverbials fail to be inserted between the two halves of a split negative.

11.07 Ne doezžaja and ne doexav(ši) ("just short of," "just outside," en route to"[?]) do not seem to have been noticed in other studies of Russian gerund-prepositions.[1] Although unattested with the decisive pronouns and generally infrequent with any objects, they do occur a few times with what appears to be a prepositional function, designating an action not performed by the subject of the same verb which they modify.

A total of eight examples (with noun objects) were collected in the corpus, of which about half might be labeled as prepositional. Here is one early and one recent example: 1600/01: I togo že dni Grigorej i Ivaško v ostrovy ezdili, i, n e d o e z ž a j a o s t r o v a , vstretil korolevnin lovčej sor Robor Vrax (MIKULIN, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 197); 1932: Nam vspominaetsja odno dovol'no original'noe sobytie, kotoroe razvernulos' na našix glazax v poezde, n e d o e z ž a j a Novorossijska. (ZOŠČENKO, Proisšestvie, 81).

This last citation is from Zoščenko's folksy style, and in general the "dangling" ne doezžaja/doexav is not common in the modern standard language. Compare an example of its use as a "true gerund," where it does refer to the same actor: 1841: N e d o e z ž a j a slobodki, ja povernul napravo po uščel'ju (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 133).

---

[1] They are not included, for example, in the otherwise extensive inventory compiled by Vinogradov (1947: 682). The diverse "adverbial" (obstojatel'stvo) functions of motion-gerunds like ne doezžaja and vyšed are discussed by S. G. Nikiforov in his Glagol, ego kategorii i formy v russkoj pis'mennosti II polov. XVI v. (Moskva, 1952), str. 281. However, even Nikiforov does not draw any parallels here with prepositional function.

11.08 Ne doxodja/došed(ši) ("just outside of," "just short of," "en route to"[?]) parallels the foregoing pair, but refers to motion on foot. A total of five occurrences (all with noun objects) was collected in the corpus, of which two might be labeled "gerund prepositions": 1700/99: A živet" onaja nevesta[:] za jauzoi na arbate na voroncovskom" pole bliz všivoi Gorki na pokrovki n e d o x o d j a petrovki za serpuxovskie voroty. vo gorodnikax n e d o x o d j a vorotnikov pozadi ekimanskoi. n e d o x o d j a mešanskoi. (Rospis' pridanomu [Russkie narodnye kartinki]; Krest. Obn., 2.112); and 1818: Nakonec dobiraemsja do Krestovoj gory. Nemnogo n e d o x o d j a dotudova istok gor uže k jugu. Vid Krestovoj, krutoj spusk . . . (GRIBOEDOV, Put. zap., okt. 1818 g. [6-j perexod]; str. 394).

No examples more recent than the one from Griboedov were noted in the corpus. Compare the use of this expression as a "true gerund": 1570: i te dei krymskie totarove, n e d o š e d Astoroxani, nazad voročalisja s nuži (NOVOSIL'CEV, Spisok; Put. rus. posl., 65-6).

11.09 Combined summary. -- Following is a summary of the gerund prepositions, breaking down their occurrences by chronological periods in the same format as in previous tables, even though with this category there is very little material to summarize.

TABLE 14

COMBINED SUMMARY OF GERUND PREPOSITIONS

Item	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total	Trn Point	Post pos.	Adv	Neg Obj
blagodarja	-	-	-	0:4	0:13	0 17	none	0:1	-	-
prišed	-	1:0	-	-	-	1 0	none	-	+	-
nesmotrja na	-	-	-	-	-	0 0	none	-	-	(4)[a]
nevziraja na	-	-	-	-	-	0 0	none	-	-	(1)[a]
Total	0:0 (0%)	1:0 (100%)	0:0 (0%)	0:4 (0%)	0:13 (0%)	1 17 (6%)	none	0:1	-	(5)[a]

[a]Designates a negative pronoun split only by the simple preposition but not by the gerund component, hence not counted in the "actual" : "apparent" ratios.

11.091 Commentary. -- Virtually all the decisive material on gerund prepositions belongs to one item -- blagodarja. And it has been fully "apparent" from the early nineteenth century up to the present day. In fact, the gerund-preposition category in general can be characterized as fully "apparent," if we discount the one scribal error associated with prišed in the Middle Russian period. Consequently, there is no problem of ascertaining any "estimated turning points."

It is unlikely that the gerund category will undergo any change of status in the foreseeable future, since its clearly verbal origin seems to operate against any identification of the gerund prepositions with the mainstream of secondary prepositions, which do not have an obvious alternant function as do the gerunds. If there is any change, however, it will probably happen first to blagodarja, the one member of this group which occurs quite frequently in a prepositional function.

For further details on the gerund prepositions in general and on blagodarja in particular, see Čerkasova (1956) and Finkel' (1962b: gl. 7).

12. SPECIALIZED CONSTRUCTIONS WITH PREPOSITIONS

12.00 In this section a number of miscellaneous constructions, some of which have been depicted above as "inhibiting factors" in the use of n- after various individual prepositions, will now be examined in more general terms. The constructions will be taken up in the following order: negative-indefinite pronouns (§12.01), 3PPO accompanied by modifier (§12.02), intercalated 3PP (§12.03), postpositioning (§12.04), adverbial usage (§12.05), ellipsis of object (§12.06), and onyj-type object (§12.07).

12.01 Negative-indefinite objects. -- This type of prepositional object, which plays a role of some importance with the simple prepositions, turns out to be almost non-existent with all the other categories, as is shown by the following table.

TABLE 15

COMBINED SUMMARY OF NEGATIVE-INDEFINITE PRONOUNS

Simple Prepositions				Secondary Prepositions			
Item	Split	Not	Pct.	Item	Split	Not	Pct.
k	8+	0	100%	iz-za	2	0	100%
na	7+	0	100%	protiv	1	0	100%
pro	6+	0	100%	dlja	24	5	83%
do	5+	0	100%	radi	0	1	0%
pod	4+	0	100%	vrode	0	1	0%
pered	4+	0	100%	all others . .	0	0	-
pri	3+	0	100%				
nad	1+	0	100%				
ot	9+	1	90%				
s	6+	1	86%				
o	21+	4	84%				
po	5+	1	83%				
v	21+	7	75%				
u	4+	3	57%				
za	5+	6	45%				
iz	5+	6	45%				
bez	0	5	0%				
Total	114+	34	77+%		27	7	79%
Grand total	141+	41	77+%				

12.011 This summary does not include the two examples of drug druga with adverb prepositions (see §10.01), nor five examples of NIP objects which are split only by the second component of the expressions nesmotrja na and nevziraja na (see §§11.05, 11.06). But even these materials would

have little effect on the basic fact that secondary prepositions are almost never found with negative-indefinite objects -- in contrast to the simple category, which freely occurs with such objects.

In the corpus, a grand total of 182 examples of prepositions plus NIP objects were tabulated (141 split : 41 non-split). Of these, the simple prepositions account for 148 (114 : 34). This leaves only 34 total examples of NIP objects with all the secondary categories combined (27 split : 7 non-split) -- and of these, 29 are connected with just one preposition: dlja. This means that altogether 177 of the grand total of 182 NIP constructions tabulated in the corpus are accounted for by only eighteen prepositions (seventeen simple plus dlja), and all the other hundred-odd prepositions in the entire language account for a mere five examples (iz-za two; protiv, radi, and vrode one each).

12.012 From these facts we can draw two conclusions. First, dlja in recent centuries has acquired practically all the characteristics of the simple prepositions, including the characteristic of occurring with negative objects as often as they do. Second, the negative pronouns are of virtually no utility in differentiating secondary prepositions in regard to "actual" and "apparent" status, for the simple reason that such prepositions almost never occur with these objects.

The incorporation of the data on NIP constructions into that on 3PPO constructions thus proves to have a result nearly the opposite of that anticipated. This supplementary data on negatives, instead of clarifying the chronological development of the secondary prepositions, as was hoped, actually was of no real use except with dlja, protiv, and pro; at the same time, however, the incorporation of this data had an undesirable effect on the results for the simple prepositions, since with them the NIP objects are much less consistent than the 3PP objects (cf. §3.23

above)! Therefore it seems that any future investigations of the "status" of prepositions might obtain more consistent results if negative-indefinite pronouns were kept separate from the main data on the presence or absence of n- with the third-person pronoun.

12.013 However, this does not mean that the negative constructions should be completely left out of research on prepositional "status." The behavior of NIP objects of prepositions has interesting features of its own, which can shed light on the development of the prepositional category. A good example of this is the transition of the two early postpositions, dlja and radi, to prepositioning, which is reflected in the changed placement of these two items in constructions with NIP objects (details in §§6.01, 6.04 above). Also the fact that only certain prepositions ever occur with negative-indefinite objects is in itself significant, and permits us to group dlja with the simple prepositions in this respect, and to oppose them to all other prepositional categories (root, prefixed, comparative, etc.), which are practically unattested with NIP objects.

12.014 Another area in which these pronouns are of potential interest is their own variety of form and function -- an area which undoubtedly is connected with seeming inconsistencies in behavior. For instance, when governed by bez, the tendency for the NIP objects is to remain non-split (e.g., bez ničego, §3.14 above). A similar resistance to splitting is observed when the "preposition + NIP" construction is not associated with a negated verb (cf. §3.082: ja ni za čto ne ujdu vs. otdavali zemlju za ničto). Still another factor of considerable importance is the historical variation in indefinite pronouns like nekotoryj and nekij. In Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian they were regularly split by prepositions like all other NIP objects (e.g., §3.032: utaiv"sę nĕ s kyimi);

but around the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries they evidently coalesced into units, which thereafter functioned like positive adjectives or nouns rather than like typical negatives (e.g., §3.032: s nekoim iz ego edinozemcev).

12.015 It is possible that these inhibiting factors related to the NIP objects could themselves be systematically described in such a way that they could be converted from seeming "exceptions" into fully predictable patterns. Such a refinement of the NIP data is beyond the limits of the present study, but remains a highly desirable undertaking for some future investigation.

12.02 Pronoun object accompanied by modifier. -- One of the most interesting syntactical subsystems within prepositional government of the 3PPO is to be found in the various types of constructions which can occur when the 3PPO is accompanied by a modifier. Until Blažev's important study of two years ago (1962), very little attention had been paid to this subsystem, and that was not entirely accurate. In the present investigation, the data on such constructions will be broken down into four subtypes, and each will be treated separately below, as follows: u nego samogo type (§12.021), u nego u samogo type (§12.022), u samogo (n)ego type (§12.023), meždu nami i (n)imi type (§12.024); and these will be followed by conclusions (§12.025), and remarks about Blažev's findings (§12.026).

12.021 Postposed modifier. -- Constructions of the type u nego samogo, with the modifier postposed to the 3PPO, reveal the following total pattern of behavior in the corpus, from 1000/99 to 1963: 39 attestations with n-, 4 attestations without n-. Typical examples of the former type are: ot" nix" prěstoeštiix" (1000/99, Suprasl.), čerez nix odnix (/1824, GORČAKOV), vokrug nego odnogo (1925, LEONOV), meždu nimi dvumja (1927, OLEŠA), za nix oboix (1954, PANOVA).[1] The ratio of attestations with n- is 91%, and the only four exceptions involve secondary prepositions: vopreki im samim (1827, PUŠKIN), krugom ego samogo (1859/84, GONČAROV), krome ix dvux (1922, A. GRIN), and pozže ix vsex (1959, JURENEV).

Aside from the third exception (with krome), where the modifier does seem to have inhibited the expected occurrence of n- (see §§6.03),

[1]Full citations, exact source references, etc., may be found in the section on the appropriate individual preposition in §§3.-11. above.

the other three exceptions are predictable because they involve prepositions which at the given time did not have "actual" status even without a modifier. In other words, the 43 examples of the present corpus (with one exception) indicate that in constructions of the type "preposition + 3PPO + modifier," the form of the 3PPO (whether it has n- or not) is solely determined by the "status" of the preposition itself, and the postposed modifier is of no significance.

12.022 Repeated preposition. -- Constructions of the type u nego u samogo and u samogo u nego, with the preposition repeated before each component of the object, reveal the following total pattern of behavior in the corpus, from 1000/99 to 1958: 16 attestations with n-, no attestations without n-. Thus the proportion of examples where epenthetic n- occurs is 100%. Of these 16 attestations, only 4 place the modifier first (e.g., u vsex u nix [1954, PANOVA]), and the other 12 (75%) place the 3PPO first (e.g., v nem v odnom [1866, DOSTOEVSKIJ]). The prepositions involved in these constructions all belong to the simple category, with u the most popular (10 examples); the other 6 examples are divided up among v, o, s, and na. This rather infrequent phenomenon, then, where the preposition is repeated before the 3PPO and its modifier, may be described without any supplementary rules or qualifications, by simple reference to the "status" of the preposition itself: the form of the 3PPO in such constructions is 100% predictable from the "status" of the preposition involved.

A completely different question, of course, is why the preposition was repeated in the first place. One cannot help but think that when a Russian begins to say (or, less often, to write) "with all of them" in the form u vsex ..., he faces a troublesome choice of including or omit-

ting epenthetic n- -- a choice which can be avoided by the simple expedient of repeating the preposition: u vsex + u + nix! This is one of the fascinating problems investigated by Blažev (1962:15), and also commented upon by Bulaxovskij (1958: 404-5). But, as already pointed out at the beginning of this section, the predominant tendency is to place the modifier after the 3PPO, either in the form u nix vsex (without repetition) or in the form u nix u vsex (with repetition).

12.023 Interposed modifier. -- Constructions of the type u samogo (n)ego, with the modifier interposed between the preposition and its 3PPO, reveal a pattern of behavior which is less simple and clear-cut than that of the two types described just above, but which is also more interesting for analysis. Passing comments about such constructions have been made by Vinogradov (1947: 336) and Peškovskij (1956: 159), who both claim that it is impossible to interpose a modifier between the preposition and its pronoun object; Peškovskij, however, makes an exception for sam, and Vinogradov for sam and odin -- which they admit have a limited possibility of interpositioning. In a different context, Ferrell declares (1958: 81, 95) that the 3PPO begins with n- "only when the dependent pronoun occurs immediately after the preposition." (Italics mine; the implication is that if anything is interposed, n- does not appear.) These limitations, as we shall see below, do not reflect the facts with complete exactness, and need some modification.

A total of 26 interposed-modifier constructions were tabulated in the present corpus, and can be classified according to the following table.

TABLE 16

COMBINED SUMMARY OF INTERPOSED MODIFIERS

Item	By periods 1300-1896	By periods 1923-1962	Total Act	Total App	Total Pct	Interposed modifier ves'	sam	odin	oba	prošlyj
dlja . . .	0:0	3:1	3	1	75%	4	-	-	-	-
v	0:0	2:1	2	1	67%	3	-	-	-	-
k	0:0	0:1	0	1	0%	1	-	-	-	-
za	0:1	0:0	0	1	0%	-	-	1	-	-
ot	0:0	0:1	0	1	0%	-	-	-	-	1
protivu . .	0:1	0:0	0	1	0%	1	-	-	-	-
meždu . . .	0:1	0:0	0	1	0%	-	-	-	1	-
podle . . .	0:1	0:0	0	1	0%	-	1	-	-	-
umnee . . .	0:1	0:0	0	1	0%	1	-	-	-	-
u	0:1	0:1	0	2	0%	1	-	1	-	-
pered . . .	0:2	0:0	0	2	0%	1	1	-	-	-
s	0:4	0:0	0	4	0%	3	-	1	-	-
na	0:3	0:1	0	4	0%	2	2	-	-	-
all others	0:0	0:0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	0:15 (0%)	5:6 (45%)	5	21	19%	17	4	3	1	1

This table shows, first of all, that up until the twentieth century, epenthetic n- never occured after an interposed modifier: there are 15 attestations in the corpus, between 1300 and 1896, and all 15 lack n-. Moreover, 11 of these 15 examples involve simple prepositions (s 4 times, na 3, etc.), whose status is unquestionably "actual" under normal circumstances. That is to say, the absence of n- in such examples as na vxěx" ix" (1300/99, Čudovskij sbornik), s odnimi imi (1770, N. NOVIKOV), pered samym im (1872, L. TOLSTOJ), u odnogo ego (1882, LESKOV), za odnu ee (1896, GOR'KIJ), etc., can be accounted for only on the basis of the interposed modifier. Not included in the table is one early example where the modifier precedes the 3PPO, but is not actually interposed: samogo ego radi (ca. 1000, Kievskie listki).

A somewhat different picture emerges from the table in regard to the twentieth century: between 1923 and 1962 in the corpus there are six attestations without n-, but there are also five which do have n- (45%). Interestingly enough, all five occur with only two prepositions, dlja (three) and v (two). And every one of the five involves the interposed modifier ves' and the plural pronoun nix. Examples of each type are: dlja vsex ix (ca. 1951, PERMJAK), dlja vsex nix (1957, IVANOVA); vo vsex ix (1960, MALYŠEV), vo vsex nix (1923, FURMANOV); na samoe ee (1925, LEONOV); u vsex ix (ca. 1942, BAŽOV); ko vsemu emu (1962, FINKEL'); ot prošlogo ego (1958, PANOVA; a dubious example [cf. §3.11 above]), etc.

Thus we may conclude that from the eleventh century through the nineteenth, the interpositioning of a modifier absolutely "prevents" the occurrence of n- with any preposition, regardless of its general "status" at the time. But in the twentieth century, the probability of the presence of n- after an interposed modifier is something less than one-half, with the chances of n- occurring being improved considerably if the governing preposition is dlja or v, the 3PPO is plural, and the interposed word is ves'.

These findings also help to improve the statements by Vinogradov, Peškovskij, and Ferrell quoted above at the beginning of §12.023. The interposed-modifier slot can be filled not only by sam and odin, as the first two scholars claim, but also by oba and particularly ves': of the 26 attestations in this corpus, 17 involve ves', 4 sam, 3 odin, etc. And Ferrell's rule that the epenthetic consonant is restricted to the position immediately following the preposition must be modified for the twentieth century, in which the interposition of a modifier "prevents" the occurrence of n- not much more than half the time (according to the

data of the present corpus). These results are very similar to those obtained by Blaževev (1962), who found 121 examples of the type vo vsex nix versus 116 of the type vo vsex ix, and 4 of the type u samogo nego versus 10 of the type u samogo ego. Thus Blaževev's percentage of n- in interposed-modifier constructions (based on a poll of Bulgarian-Russian translations by informants) comes out to just under 50% (125 with n-, 126 without) -- a figure which agreees very closely with the much smaller amount of material in the present corpus based on printed literary texts.

12.024 Intervening particle or phrase. -- In Part One of this study, mention was made of Vostokov's observation that a secondary preposition could be separated from its object by a particle or phrase, as in posredi že dorogi and posle·de togo (see §1.13). The corpus of the present investigation includes a few examples of such separated constructions involving the 3PPO, which have already been mentioned above in the summaries of the appropriate individual prepositions.

TABLE 17

COMBINED SUMMARY OF SEPARATED OBJECTS

Item	Date(s)	Act	App	Pct
meždu	ca. 1833-1935	1	6	14%
okrug	1000/99	0	1	0%
okolo	ca. 1500	0	1	0%
prežde	1500/30	0	1	0%
oproče	1582/83	0	1	0%
naverx	1600/20	0	1	0%
vdol'	1750/89	0	1	0%
posle(žde) . .	1000/99	0	1	0%
Total	ca. 1000-1935	1	13	7%

This data naturally breaks down into two main groups: the material

on mežду with double objects, all coming in the last two centuries, and the material on all the other prepositions, dating from Old Church Slavonic and Middle Russian. In the latter group, the absence of n- in examples like oproče by ego (1582/83, Put. rus. posl.), etc., has no particular significance, as all seven of the prepositions (vdol', naverx, okolo, etc.) had completely "apparent" status at the time of the given examples, and so would not have governed n- even under normal circumstances, without any separation of object.[1]

---

[1]A random collection was made of a number of examples of the Vostokov constructions where the object is a noun. Here is the material, arranged by centuries:

Twelfth century: o k r ' s t " ž e st'l'pa (Sb. Usp. sob., 67d).

Fifteenth century: Izjaslav" že . . . v"ěxa v n ě v bok im", i načaša seči (Ipat. let., 1146 g.; cited by Srez., Dopolnenija, 23).

Sixteenth century: a d l j a d e i togo noč'ju prixoditi, čtob nixto ne uznal tatar (Put. rus. posl., 95); skol' davno on v Lundu prišel -- n a p e r e d l i nas ili oposle? (Put. rus. posl., 107); a o p r o č e b agličan [sic] (Put. rus. posl., 134); i p o s l e d e togo gosudar' vaš . . . velel (Put. rus. posl., 143).

Seventeenth century: p r o t i v ž e pivnogo dvora (PALICYN, Skaz., 75a); i p r o t i v d e , gosudar', moix otpisok, on . . . (Mat. Razina, č. 3, No. 19); k a s a t e l ' n o ž e dereven' (Prisoedinenie Kryma, 306; cited by Bukatevič [1958: 137]); d l j a ž e gosudareva krestnogo celovan'ja . . . (Pis. T. Birdjukina-Zajceva, 1608 g.); a d l j a e m u berežen'ja tex šub vzjati s soboju (Nakaz Š. Kubasovu, 1611 g.); i d l j a , gosudar', tovo on . . . otpuščen (MOROZOV, Akty, č. 1, No. 69); i d l j a d e , gosudar', togo otošel on (Mat. Razina, č. 3, No. 14). (The last five examples are cited by Bulaxovskij [1958: 426].)

Eighteenth century: p r o t i v u ž e sego (Rus. pov., 148; po sp. načala XVIII v.); v n u t r ' ž e serdca ego (Istorija o Pariže i Vene; Krest. Obn., 2.40).

Nineteenth century: p o s r e d i ž e dorogi (NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša, 507); p o s e r e d ' - t o vysšego obščestva ne sest' by v lužu (SUXOVO-KOBYLIN, Svad'ba Krečinskogo, dej. 1, jav. 4).

Twentieth century: kukuškino jaičko v n e ee gnezde (GOR'KIJ, Ledoxod, Izb., 268).

Compare also constructions with an inserted phrase or expression,

The other half of the data, relating to mežду in constructions of the type discussed in detail above (§6.112), has considerably more value. As already explained, six of the seven attestations of "mežду + object A + i + 3PPO" come in texts written since 1859 -- the "estimated turning point" of mežду. Examples are mežду mnoj i eju (1859/84, GONČAROV), mežду nami i imi (1924, XERSONSKIJ), mežду nim i imi (1935/52, BULAXOVSKIJ). And the fact that in five of these six examples the separated 3PPO (filling "slot B") does not begin with n- -- in a period when mežду had already acquired "actual" status in normal circumstances -- forces us to the conclusion that the absence of n- in examples like the above can be accounted for only on the basis of the separation of the 3PPO.

It is in this connection that Ferrell's generalization (the 3PPO can begin with n- only when it "occurs immediately after the preposition") is valid. It is entirely possible, of course, that with time even this generalization will need to be revised, if the exception mežду nami i nimi (1930, GAJDAR) is any indication of a new, germinating tendency, which may gradually take root and spread. This is precisely what is now happening to interposed-modifier constructions (see §12.023), where the gravitation towards n- when a 3PPO is governed by a preposition is so strong that it is beginning to make itself felt even through an intervening word (dlja vsex nix, etc.). The fact that two words intervene between mežду and its

---

of which several were cited in §1.19 above: pri takogo roda priemax; iz-za, carstvie emu nebesnoe, mertvogo trupa; ot Bog znaet čego, etc. Such inserted phrases can follow simple prepositions with no difficulty, it would seem. Otherwise, however, the little particles like že and by seem to occur only after secondary prepositions (note that dlja was still an adverb-preposition until late in the seventeenth century!).

The only exceptions to this rule of Vostokov's are the two curious examples of ne coming after v (v ně v bok, v ne ee gnezde), one in the fifteenth century, one in the twentieth. In Old Church Slavonic there was also an exception which is mentioned by Vaillant (1950: 227): iždekoni; it was, however, already a fixed form at that time.

"slot B" object seems to exert a greater resistance to the occurrence of n-, than does the single interposed-modifier word. However, we must not exclude the possibility that within another fifty or hundred years the epenthetic nasal might be occurring regularly after both these constructions.

12.025 Conclusions. -- All of the foregoing discussion may be summarized as follows: a modifier or other word or phrase accompanying the 3PPO of a preposition needs to be taken into account in predicting the presence or absence of n- only if the modifier or other element intervenes so that the 3PPO does not follow directly after the preposition. In all other circumstances -- when the modifier does not precede the 3PPO (§12.021), or when the preposition is repeated before the 3PPO (§12.022) -- the form of the latter can be predicted strictly on the basis of the "status" of the governing preposition, without reference to any other elements.

On the other hand, when the modifier (or other element, such as a particle) is interposed, creating a separation of preposition and object, the form of the 3PPO can be predicted on the basis of this fact alone, for the entire period up until the 1920's and 1930's. Prior to that time, the epenthetic nasal never occurred when the 3PPO was separated from its governing preposition by any element -- be it an interposed modifier (§12.023) or an intervening particle (§12.024).

The foregoing statements consistently cover all aspects of the situation, except for separated objects in the period since the 1920's and 1930's. Here the state of affairs has been in flux for the past four decades: the tendency of "actual" prepositions to govern n- is beginning to overcome the power of intervening elements to inhibit the use of n- here. If the new development continues unabated, the eventual result

will be that the form of the 3PPO in any position after its governing preposition -- whether immediately after or separated -- will be predictable strictly on the basis of the "status" of the governing preposition, and intervening elements will have no influence on the matter.[1] Even if this new development is eventually realized, however, there is still another inhibiting factor which has as yet betrayed no sign of weakening before the ever-widening expansion of the epenthetic nasal -- postpositioning. This factor will be examined below in some detail (see §12.04).

12.026 Before concluding the discussion of constructions with modifiers, it is interesting to look again at Blažev's study (1962), which in fact seems to be the first published research on the history and contemporary status of n- with Russian prepositions. Blažev notes that modern normative grammars, in prescribing where n- should and should not be used, neglect the special circumstances created by the interpositioning of a modifier. For this reason Blažev conducted a poll of thirteen informants, who were given many Bulgarian prepositional phrases with interposed modifiers to translate into Russian. His findings, some of which are mentioned above (§12.023), disclose the following breakdown of 442 Russian prepositional phrases resulting from the translation of originals of the type vəv vsički tjax: 237 (54%) retain the modifier interposed (u vsex [n]ix), but the rest change the structure in translation; 140 (32%) add a noun (u vsex ètix ljudej), 40 (9%) repeat the preposition (u vsex u nix or u nix u vsex), and 25 (6%) shift the modifier to a position after the pronoun (u nix vsex). These statistics indicate that Russian has a considerable resistance to interposed modifiers in general, since Blažev's informants in fully 46% of his plural examples

---

[1] With this information it is now possible to reformulate the definition stated in §2.22 more precisely: an "actual" preposition is that item preceding the n-form of the 3PP, which, if removed, would cause loss of the n-. For instance, on the one hand, ja za nego vs. ja -- ego; thus za is "actual" because its removal causes the n- to drop. But, on the other hand, vsex nix vs. nix; thus vsex is not an "actual" preposition because its removal does not affect n-, and we know that this has to be an incomplete phrase (the whole of which will be something like dlja vsex nix). Taking the complete phrase dlja vsex nix, we can prove that dlja is the "actual" preposition, since if we remove it from the phrase, the 3PP will lose its nasal (vsex ix). The same test can be applied to the other type of compound object (as meždu nami i nimi): both nami and i can be removed without affecting n-, but meždu (the "actual" preposition) cannot.

restructured the original in such a way that the choice between the n- and the non-n- forms of the 3PPO was neutralized.

In another group of examples involving singular constructions like ses samata neja, the resistance is even more noticeable: of 104 total Russian phrases resulting from translation of such Bulgarian originals, only 14 (13%) retain the interposed modifier, and all the others show changes which neutralize the choice between presence and absence of n-. This resistance to interpositioning of modifiers, as revealed by Blažev's research, is undoubtedly conditioned to a considerable extent by the problems arising from a choice of n- and non-n- forms in such positions, and the fact that interpositioning occurs rarely in Russian in its turn accounts for the relative slowness with which the epenthetic consonant is developing in such interposed constructions (cf. §12.023 above).

One final note on Blažev's study: he finds that his informants almost always omit the n- in interposed constructions involving secondary prepositions like po povodu vsex ix, otnositel'no vsex ix, etc. This is understandable: these secondary prepositions are only beginning to move toward "actual" status in normal circumstances, without any inhibiting factors, and the interpositioning of a modifier is quite enough to counteract their new tendency which is not yet firmly established.

12.03 Intercalated pronouns. -- The opposite side of the coin from the construction treated just above is represented by prepositional phrases where a modifying 3PP is intercalated between the preposition and its noun object: v (n)ego mesto, za nju že vinu, etc. Note the structural difference between this new type, which places the 3PP ahead of a noun-object which it only modifies and which is the true object of the preposition, as contrasted with those types analyzed in §12.02 above, wherein the 3PP itself served as the object of the preposition, and in turn was modified by some additional element (so vsemi [n]imi, etc.).

In the intercalated-pronoun type of construction, the 3PP functions as an attributive element (possessive or otherwise) which is dependent not directly upon the preposition, but upon the noun governed by the preposition: v + (ego + mesto). Syntactically speaking, the immediate constituents are the preposition and the noun. Be that as it may, the earliest extant documents reveal a certain influence of the preposition on the intercalated pronoun. The subsequent history of the language shows a rapid loss of this influence, however. The following table gives some idea of this development in chronological terms.

TABLE 18

COMBINED SUMMARY OF INTERCALATED PRONOUNS

	1000-1300		1377-1753		1801-1959		Total		
Governing preposition	n-	ø-	n-	ø-	n-	ø-	n-	ø-	Pct
Simple prepositions	16+	0	13+	9+	0	45+	29+	54+	35%
Postposed (radi)	0	2	0	3	0	0+	0	5+	0%
Total	16+ (89%)	2	13 (52%)	12+	0 (0%)	45+	29+	59+	33%

This entire table is based on a scattered sampling of intercalated constructions, and all the figures should be taken only as very crude approximations of general trends, not as complete totals based on an exhaustive tabulation. These general trends will be examined individually in the following sections.

12.031 Radi (postposed). -- According to the present data, a 3PP immediately following -- but not governed by -- radi, never has epenthetic n-. A typical example is mužestva r a d i ego (1500/20, Rus. pov.); others may be found in §6.04 above. This type of construction does not, strictly speaking, involve an intercalated pronoun, since radi is postposed, but it does involve the same immediate contiguity of preposition (postposition) and 3PP as in the intercalated-pronoun construction. This immediate contiguity had an influence on the form of a 3PP only when the preposition belonged to the simple category -- as will be shown in the following paragraph.

12.032 Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian. -- According to the present data, a 3PP immediately following -- but not governed by -- a simple preposition, does have epenthetic n- from the eleventh through the thirteenth century. Typical examples are v' nego ljub"ve (1000/99, Marianus) and v nego město (ca. 1300/50, Novg. I let.); others may be found under bez (§3.14), v (§3.01), vmesto (§7.03), do (§3.06), and ot (§3.11). The rather sketchy evidence of the present study (16 examples of intercalated pronouns, all with n-) contradicts the view of Diels (1932: §46, Anm. 2) that n- occurs in Old Church Slavonic only when the pronoun stands "in unmittelbarer syntaktischer Verbindung" with the preposition, and that n- allegedly does not occur at the onset of ego, eę, and ix" "wenn diese als Possessiva syntaktisch zum folgenden gehören."

As has been pointed out by Vaillant (1948: §44) and by Ferrell (1958: 79, 80, 94), the only necessary condition for the occurrence of the epenthetic nasal in Old Church Slavonic (and Old Russian) is that a simple preposition be immediately followed by a 3PP. The preposition must be "simple" (cf. o neju vs. okr"st' ego); it must be immediately adjacent to the following pronoun (cf. na nix" vs. na vsěx" ix"); and the pronoun must be a 3PP -- i.e., have the root *j- (cf. ot" ńix" vs. ot" inyx" or na ńem' vs. na Jem' [ethnographic name in the O.R. chronicle]).

However, in the early centuries there does not seem to be any firm requirement of syntactical dependence of the type existing in more recent centuries (and which Diels mistakenly assumes also for Old Church Slavonic): v nego with the pronoun functioning as the immediate constituent of the preposition is possible in all stages of the language, but in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian v" nego ljub've (1000/99, Marianus), with the 3PP functioning only as the adjacent constituent to the preposition, is also possible (at least to a limited extent in the earliest times).

It must be emphasized once again that before the state of affairs in the early centuries can be known with exactness, much more material is needed. As Ferrell points out (1958: 80), the 3PP is not often intercalated in Old Church Slavonic; instead, the usual practice is to place the pronoun after the modified word (ot" lica ego, etc.).

Another important reservation about drawing premature conclusions regarding these constructions stems from the fact that more than half of the examples of prepositional phrases with an intercalated n-form in the years 1000/1300 (present corpus) involve the single construction v nego mesto. This construction, as will be discussed in the following section, probably was already close to the status of a phraseological unit in the early centuries. Another component which must be taken into

consideration in discussing the intercalated constructions is the very common particle *že*, which -- in combination with the 3PP -- functioned as a relative, in imitation of Greek originals, as in *v' njǫ že měrǫ* = *en hǭ métrǭ* (Mat. 7:2). A substantial number of the intercalated 3PP constructions summarized in Table 18 above involve this relative function of the 3PP (by adding *-že* to it), rather than a possessive function (the *only* frequent representative of which is *v nego mesto*).

12.033 *Middle Russian*. -- According to the present data, a 3PP immediately following -- but not governed by -- a simple preposition, varies between forms with *n-* and without *n-* from the fourteenth through the eighteenth centuries. Typical examples of each type: *v nego mesto* (/1377, *Suzd. let.*), *s nim Rixmanom* (1753, NAŠČOKIN), but *v ix" voli* (/1377, *Suzd. let.*), *v ego mesto* (1661/67, KOTOŠIXIN), etc. The overall proportion tabulated in the corpus is 13 examples with *n-* and 9 without, covering the years /1377 to 1753. But since this tabulation is quite sketchy and far from exhaustive, the figures mean little, except that the *n-* and non-*n-* forms of the 3PP in intercalated constructions coexist in the given period. And again approximately one-half of the examples (11 out of 22) stem from the expression *v (n)ego (že) mesto* -- an expression which seems to have lost its epenthetic *n-* around the middle of the seventeenth century (details in §7.03 above).

Another feature of interest in this period is a few attestations where the intercalated pronoun seems to have an attributive function: *ot nix" mjatežnikov"* (1672/73, AVVAKUM), *o nem" Rixmaně* (1753, NAŠČOKIN), etc. Other examples of this same usage are noted by Cocron (1953: 276) in the second half of the seventeenth century: *s" nim" Demkoju*, *u nego Arximarita*. Such material contradicts the statement by Miklosich (1926:

82) that "jě ist demonstrativ; es kann nicht attributiv stehen." Of course, Miklosich is right for the vast majority of examples -- the 3PP almost always functions as a demonstrative, and sometimes as a relative with že (vo n' že den', etc.); attributive use is relatively quite rare. There is also the possibility that even these rare examples should be classed as pronoun object plus appositive, with a pause between them: s nim, Demkoj, or ot nix -- mjatežnikov. Although the old texts show no comma or dash separating the pronoun and the noun, punctuation was not rigorously established in those centuries, and the absence of any punctuation mark is perhaps not a compelling reason to regard the pronouns here as attributives.

12.034 Modern Russian. -- According to the present data, a 3PP immediately following -- but not governed by -- a simple preposition, never occurs with n- in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Typical examples are: v ego pol'zu (1801/02, RADIŠČEV), na ego meste (1958, PANOVA), etc.; there are many, many others (see §8.102 above). In the modern language it is completely impossible for an intercalated 3PP to take n- (cf. v čisle [n]ix but only v ix čisle), and has been impossible since around 1753 (the time of the most recent attestation of n- in this construction).

This fact (established on a count of 45 examples from the last two centuries) leads to a sharp opposition, in the modern language, between phrases where a 3PP functions as an immediate constituent to the preposition (v nix), and phrases where it functions only as an adjacent constituent to the preposition (v ix čisle). In the modern language, adjacent location is not enough for the 3PP to begin with n-; instead, the requirement is immediate constituency -- syntactical government of the

3PP by the preposition (*i.e.*, the 3PP must function as the object of the preposition, in order to begin with *n*-). Indeed, so decisive is the role played by immediate constituent structure in Modern Russian prepositional phrases that it is beginning to be felt even when the 3PPO is *not* adjacent -- as in *vo vsex nix*, *dlja vsex nix*. (See also §12.023 above.)

12.035 *Conclusions*. -- Contrasted with the situation just described for Modern Russian is the decisive role played by word order in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian (cf. §12.032 above). Here the form of the 3PP is not dependent upon a syntactical relationship (immediate constituency), as in Modern Russian, but upon a *positional* relationship: it must occur directly after the preposition. Thus in the ancient language we find not only *v" nego* but also *v" nego město* and *ot" negože jazyka*. So decisive is the role played by adjacent-constituent structure in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian that it retains its power even when the 3PP is *not* the object of the preposition (as in *v" ńego ljub"ve*, etc.).

With the limited amount of data available on intercalated pronouns in the present tabulation, it is premature to attempt to establish an "estimated turning point" for the transition from *n*-forms to non-*n*-forms in intercalated position. As is shown by the combined summary in Table 18 (§12.03), from *ca.* 1377 to 1753 examples with and without *n*- co-occur in something like equal proportions. Therefore it seems prudent to restrict the description to the statement that the earliest attestations without *n*- come *ca.* 1377, and the most recent attestations with *n*- come in 1753; presumably the fourteenth and eighteenth centuries represent the outer limits of the transition period, with a possibility that its beginning may go back to the thirteenth (or even the twelfth) century.

It is interesting to note the difference between Old Russian and Modern Russian in regard to phrase types which can include the epenthetic consonant. In Old Russian, phrases like v nego mesto are entirely possible, but in the modern language they can never include n-. On the other hand, phrases like vmesto nego are entirely possible today, but in the older stages of the language up until the last century or two, they could never include n-. This indicates a complete reversal of the behavior of the epenthetic nasal in relation to phrase types.

12.04 Postpositioning. -- Very few Russian "prepositions" are ever attested after their object; the overwhelming majority of examples in the corpus for all prepositions from all periods precede the governed word. The following table summarizes the relatively few occurrences of postpositions which are found in the corpus.

TABLE 19

COMBINED SUMMARY OF POSTPOSITIONING

Item	Act	App	Pct
radi	0	41	0%
vsled	0	13	0%
dlja	0	11	0%
navstreču	0	9	0%
mimo	0	2	0%
vdogonku	0	2	0%
napererez	0	2	0%
krome	0	1	0%
pereky	0	1	0%
naperekor	0	1	0%
iskusnee	0	1	0%
bogače	0	1	0%
niže	0	1	0%
starše	0	1	0%
blagodarja	0	1	0%
Total	0	88	0%

Postposed only to non-decisive objects: ot, bliz, čerez, posredstvom, mesto, vokrug, vperedi, vrode, poperek.

12.041 Commentary. -- As can be seen from the "total" line at the bottom of the table, there are in the corpus only 88 total attestations of postpositions with the decisive pronouns (82 with the 3PP and 6 with a NIP). And all 88 of these examples lack epenthetic n- or have a non-split negative, as the case may be. Thus the likelihood that a postposi-

tion will have "actual" status at any time in the history of Russian is precisely zero (0%): up to the present day, no postposition has ever been attested with the n-form of the 3PPO (and, of course, a postposition by definition cannot split a NIP, since it follows it).

Looking at the individual totals, we find that almost all the decisive examples of postpositioning in the present corpus involve only four items: radi (41 decisive examples), dlja (11), vsled (13), and navstreču (9); the remaining 14 attestations are scattered among several other postpositions of very minor importance. At this point it should also be noted that the figures for dlja and radi derive only from Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian (also a bit in Middle Russian); in the modern language, both occur almost entirely preposed. On the other hand, the data on vsled and navstreču as postpositions comes mostly from the last century or two; earlier both tended to be preposed. For further discussion of these four important postpositions, see above: dlja (§6.01), radi (§6.04), vsled (§7.09), and navstreču (§7.11).

12.042 Miscellaneous. -- In Table 19 above, there are fifteen items which occur postposed to the decisive pronouns, and nine additional items which are attested postposed only to non-decisive objects, and even then only in very exceptional circumstances (poetry, etc.). Thus altogether the corpus has 24 items which are attested postposed, out of a total of more than a hundred different prepositions in the language. Of these twenty-four items, nine are members of the "prefixed" morphological category, seven of the "suffixed" category, and the remainder are divided up among "comparative," "root," "simple," and "gerund" types.

An even sharper contrast is furnished by a comparison of the total number of decisive examples with all postpositions in the corpus (88),

with the grand total of decisive examples with both preposed and postposed usage (4327). Subtracting, we find that there are altogether in the corpus 4239 attestations where the preposition precedes the decisive pronoun object, as against only 88 where it follows. Thus the relative weight of postpositioning is only 2% of the whole, and we can say that the term "preposition" in application to Russian is appropriate around 98% of the time.

The nine items listed at the bottom of Table 19 -- ot, bliz, čerez, vokrug, etc. -- can still be regarded as consistent prepositions, which happen to be attested only in one or two marginal postposed constructions. Some of these derive from poetry: ot (§3.11) and bliz (§5.01) are used postposed only by Majakovskij, vokrug (§7.06) only by Deržavin and Dmitriev, etc. Once again, the extremely limited number of these exceptions proves how exceptional the phenomenon of postpositioning is in Russian, especially with the "simple," "double," and "root" categories -- exceptio regulam probat.

One final point of interest. All of the decisive attestations of postpositions described above do not tell us whether the absence of n- is due to postpositioning, or simply to the fact that the given item does not take n- in general. A close look at the material shows that the only items attested postposed to decisive pronouns in the corpus, are never attested preposed to these pronouns with n-, in the same period. Thus, vsled (see §7.09) when postposed does not govern n-, of course, but when preposed it does not take n-, either; the same is true of vdogonku, navstreču, napererez, bogače, iskusnee, blagodarja, etc. Even with dlja and radi this pattern holds true: they occur postposed (to decisive objects) only in earlier centuries, at which time they never occurred preposed to these objects with n-; by the same token, when they occur pre-

posed and do govern n- in the last two or three centuries, they are never attested postposed to the decisive pronouns. So the question of a cause-and-effect relationship here must remain unanswered, at least until more data is compiled; we cannot say that postpositioning "causes" the absence of n-, but only that whenever a preposition occurs postposed to a decisive pronoun, the epenthetic consonant is absent. (The existence of two or three examples of dlja ego, dlja ix in the first half of the seventeenth century suggests that prior to the eighteenth century dlja was incapable of governing n- in any circumstances, whether preposed or postposed, and that all the pre-seventeenth century attestations of the type ego dlja would have lacked n- even if dlja had directly preceded the 3PPO, rather than following it.)

12.05 Adverbial usage. -- Several decades ago Bogolepov made the observation (1931: 49) "everyone recognizes that the process of adverbs changing into prepositions is going on constantly, but there is no recognition of the reverse process of prepositions being used independently, without oblique cases." This latter phenomenon (called "absolute" usage by Karcevskij [1936: 108]) has been somewhat neglected, it is true, by scholars doing research on Russian; but a few of them (Bukatevič, Kalamanova, Vinogradov, as well as Bogolepov and Karcevski) have discussed the possibility in more or less theoretical terms, and Vinokur has analyzed this process in the poetry of Majakovskij.

In fact, the definition of a preposition occurring without an object as an "adverb" goes all the way back to the classical grammarian Melanchthon (see Brøndal [1950: §§6, 50]), and Blaisdell has recently analyzed the phenomenon in Old Icelandic (1959).[1] A somewhat different slant, in Russian syntactical analysis, is taken by Isačenko (1962: §294), who interprets items like svyše and otnositel'no when used adverbially as different words from the homophonous prepositions, and labels them svyše$_1$ (the adverb) and svyše$_2$ (the preposition). This approach has a certain utility, especially if we would take advantage of it to define every item functioning adverbially as a separate word, and thus eliminate the entire problem of "adverbial" usage of prepositions -- which by definition would

[1]Modern English is also undergoing interesting changes of the same type. Compare the nominal use of prepositions in "I've got a little in with Mayor O'Dwyer"(Jim Bishop, Mark Hellinger, 329), its adjectival use in the current expressions "in-group" and "out-group," and its adverbial function in the following quotations: "The whole point about Alma [character in From Here to Eternity] was that she was a tramp who had to look like anything but." (Donna Reed, TV Guide, May 6, 1961, p. 15); "the lot of us went around looking as black as the ace of." (Bessie Love, Films and Filming, July 1962, p. 44); and the British-Australian expression "to have a cuppa [tea]." Similar examples like "he came to" and "wrong end to" are mentioned by Householder in a recent review (Language, 35.3.517).

no longer exist! However, inasmuch as the aim of the present study is to explore a wide range of formal functions or potential functions of prepositions (in the broad sense), the Isačenko interpretation will not be applied here, but merely mentioned as a possible alternative for future investigations.

12.051 Adverbial usage of items ordinarily regarded as prepositions does not lend itself to the kind of detailed statistical analysis which was applied above to the various prepositional constructions involving third-person pronouns and negative pronouns. Rather, all one can say here is that in the corpus certain "prepositions" are sometimes attested without any overt object -- i.e., they can function as an adverb; whereas other prepositions are never attested without an overt object -- i.e., they seemingly cannot function as an adverb. But there are qualifications implicit even in a limited statement of this nature. For one thing, it does not take into account the relative normality or abnormality of adverbial usage for various prepositions: some common prepositions may occur as adverbs only in one or two very marginal cases (as in Majakovskij's poetry), while others may actually occur without an object more often than with one. Furthermore, whenever the question of any linguistic usage is put in absolute terms ("yes or no"), it must be kept in mind that any preposition which in the present corpus never occurs adverbially might possibly turn up with this function in the very next document or grammar to be examined -- and in one instant the given preposition would jump all the way from the "no" category to the "yes" category. Bearing these reservations in mind, we move on to a survey of adverbial usage of prepositions.

TABLE 20

COMBINED SUMMARY OF ADVERBIAL USAGE

Category	No. used as Adv.	No. not as Adv.	Pct Adv
Simple	9	9	50%
Double	0	2	0%
Root	4	5	44%
Suffixed	12	11	52%
Prefixed	39	8	83%
Combination	(all?)	(none)	100%?
Comparative	(all)	(none)	100%
Adverb	(all?)	(none)	100%?
Gerund	(all?)	(none)	100%?

Individual prepositions attested as adverbs:

Simple (9): do, za, bez, nad, pod, (po), (iz), (ot), (pered).
Double (0): none.
Root (4): čerez, protiv, bliz, (skvoz').
Suffixed (12): mimo, krugom, krome, razve, (meždu), (protivu), (vne), (verxu), (vstreču), (peredi), (zadi), (pereky).
Prefixed (39): all members of this category except the following 8 items -- sverx, pomimo, naščet, vsledstvie, (v"-skraj), napodobie, (oprič'), (ostoron).
Combination, Comparative, Adverb, and Gerund: (evidently most if not all members of these groups can occur as adverbs).

12.052 Commentary. -- It must be emphasized once again that no claim is made for the mathematical accuracy of the above table on adverbial usage. Its fragmentary nature is emphasized by the fact that the source for most of the material on the more basic categories' adverb functioning came from the primary corpus of the present study and various secondary sources, whereas much of the data on secondary prepositions (especially the prefixed group) was taken from the Slovar' russkogo jazyka (1957-61). It is for this reason that nothing definite can be said about the last categories (combination, comparative, etc.): they are not

listed as prepositions or single units in most dictionaries, and so there is no convenient source in which to check whether or not they can occur without an object -- although it is assumed that in general they all may occur thus. (For a different viewpoint, see Čerkasova [1964: 225-30], who asserts that many secondary prepositions have never served as adverbials.)

But with all these particular reservations, one general, fundamental fact emerges clearly: the tendency of the nine categories of prepositions toward "independent" usage is in inverse proportion to their tendency toward "actual" status. The most basic categories, those which earliest and most fully acquired the power to govern n- (simple, double, also root and suffixed) are precisely those categories which are least inclined to occur as adverbs; on the other hand, the most recent secondary categories of prepositions -- those which manifest little if any tendency toward government of n- even in the present century (gerund, adverb, comparative, combination, also prefixed) -- are precisely the categories whose members are most likely to occur as adverbs. These two general groups will be treated separately below. (For examples of the adverbial function of each individual preposition, see above, §§3.-11., under the appropriate item.)

12.053 Simple, double, root, suffixed prepositions. -- These four major categories have relatively little tendency to occur adverbially. According to Table 20, only about half of their members are ever attested as adverbs: simple about 50%, double 0%, root 44%, suffixed 52%. Furthermore, even many of these attestations (indicated by parentheses in the lower part of Table 20) are very marginal; in the simple class, for instance, po, iz, ot, and pered occur adverbially in the corpus only

once or twice each, as does skvoz' in the root class, meždu in the suffixed class, etc. Thus, constructions like ne po, a pod (1943, KOŽEVNIKOV), vse, čto zadavali -- do i ot (1927, MAJAKOVSKIJ), i za, i nad, i pod, i pred -- domov drednouty (1921, MAJAKOVSKIJ), etc., are very abnormal in the general system of the language.

As was discussed above in §3.21, only three of the simple prepositions can be considered to have a definite (although infrequent) tendency toward adverb usage among prose writers: do (often in juxtaposition to posle), za (often in juxtaposition to protiv), and bez (often in juxtaposition to s); e.g., počemu vdrug Avdiev vystupil "za"? (1957, DUDINCEV), s predisloviem ili bez (1822, PUŠKIN), etc.

Special attention is paid to the independent use of bez, za, and also protiv, by Bukatevič (1958: 134-5), who dates this phenomenon "in the last half of the nineteenth century and our time" (although the earliest examples of bez and za turn up in Puškin, Gercen, and other early-nineteenth century writers). Bukatevič also cites a protest raised by Nikolič in 1877 against the adverbialization of basic prepositions -- a tendency which was felt by conservative grammarians of Nikolič's time to be "against the spirit of the Russian language." Subsequent developments have shown that Russian definitely does have such a tendency toward adverbialization (in particular instances) of basic prepositions, but that this tendency is very restricted and can not yet be regarded as forming a basic element of language system (as it does, for instance, in the Germanic languages). For further discussion of these four basic categories functioning as adverbs, see Vinogradov (1947: 395-6), Bogolepov (1931: 49-50), Kalamanova (1955), and especially Vinokur (1943: 93), who shows how Majakovskij tries to maintain or restore the "concrete"

meaning of basic prepositions like iz, ot, čerez, and bliz by using them without an object.

12.054 Prefixed, combination, comparative, adverb, and gerund prepositions. -- These secondary categories have a very pronounced tendency to occur as adverbs, which extends to almost all of their members (about 80% to 100% of the items in each category). For instance, na malen'kom stolike vozle (1957, DUDINCEV), pozadi nad prigorkom (1915, A. N. TOLSTOJ), on byl v centre, oni pridut na smenu, gde vy byli ran'še, lučše pozdno, čem nikogda, otnositel'no govorja, on šel ne smotrja, etc. It must be admitted that, practically speaking, some of the combination, gerund, and adverb prepositions are almost always used with a dependent genitive or dative of some kind (v otnošenii čego, podobno komu, blagodarja komu, etc.). Moreover, if we would accept Isačenko's interpretation (see §12.05 above) that there are homophonous prepositions and adverbs which he labels otnositel'no$_1$ and otnositel'no$_2$, then we could say that many of these secondary prepositions are totally dependent and must always take an object.

In the light of these facts, it is advisable here merely to state that most of the prepositions belonging to the five secondary categories described in this section evidently have at least some strong possibility of independent usage. A thorough description of the individual behavior of each preposition within these types would require a separate investigation going beyond the scope of the present research.

12.055 One other point which might be considered briefly is the increasing frequency of quasi-adverb usage of basic prepositions in compound phrases of the type do i posle nego (1961, LOKTEV), ni do, ni posle

V. N. Tatiščeva (1949, IOFA), nad ili pod Morem i Zemleju (1825, PUŠKIN), pod i nad kryšej gudit veter (ca. 1885/1904, ČEXOV), sredi ili vnačale nedeli (1849, GONČAROV), etc. (See also §1.19 above.) This type of construction, with two prepositions separated by a conjunction but both "governing" the same object, is treated by Tagamlickaja (1958: 95), who states that it is not native to Russian (and probably to Slavic generally); she goes on to say, however, that it can occur in Russian if both prepositions govern the same case, as in do i posle revoljucii.

Tagamlickaja's observations are generally accurate, but it must be pointed out that her rule of homogeneous case government does not always apply in twentieth-century Russian, as the following examples illustrate: v gorax pod, nad i okolo obryvov (1929, PIL'NJAK), v pozicii pered i posle srednejazyčnogo soglasnogo (1954, RASTORGUEVA), sredi i rjadom s Ejzenštejnom, Pudovkinym, . . . (1961, SOBOLEV), stojali okolo ili za èkranom (1961, SOBOLEV), and vmesto i narjadu s predlogom (1962, FINKEL'). In rare examples like these it would seem that the prepositions have acquired almost as much independence as have the prepositions of so-called "analytic" languages like English, and that semantics and function-class membership here have taken precedence over formal rules of morphology and syntax -- which tend to dominate the structure of so-called "synthetic" languages like Russian.

Of course, it is also quite possible that these examples can simply be written off as "stylistic inaccuracies," "careless usage," "poor grammar," etc., especially since there are very few of them. And because there is such limited data on these compound prepositional phrases with heterogeneous case government, the present study will go no further than a simple observation of this marginal phenomenon, postponing any generalizations until such a time as it will become more general.

12.06 Ellipsis of object. -- In his article on the 3PP, Ferrell comments in a footnote (1958: 81, n.) "this is not to say that certain elliptic constructions 'v ego' could not complete a phrase: 'Oni živut ne v ee dome, a v ego,' but the phrase is marked as elliptic." This theoretical remark receives practical confirmation in the present corpus, which contains eight such constructions, dating from 1623/99 to 1938. These constructions involve four different prepositions -- po (four examples), v (two), na (one), and s (one) -- as in the following citations:

ca. 1700: nest' li-de i vo tvoej duši takovago smuščenija, jakože i v e g o , Saulove, merskoj. (AVVAKUM, Kn. tolk., 157).
1789: opredelennye den'gi ne na našu byli pol'zu, no n a e g o . (RADIŠČEV, Žit. Uš., 28).
1861: načal on . . . rugat' drugix mužikov i osobenno bab, čto-nibud' ne p o e g o ili ne provorno delavšix. (A. PISEMSKIJ, Bat'ka, Ras., 179).
1938: nastroenie . . . vsegda končalos' mjagkimi samoobvinenijami s ego storony i protestami -- s e e . (KRYMOV, Tanker, 72).

The other four examples may be found above under the "miscellaneous" sections of the individual prepositions v (§3.01) and po (§3.07). There is also one example of a different type, which involves metalinguistic use of the pronoun forms rather than ellipsis of a noun object: 1919: u Majkova net različija m e ž d u eja i . . . neja. (DURNOVO, Izv. Otd. russk. jaz. i slov., 23.2.104). Here Durnovo is discussing eja and neja themselves, as linguistic forms (in opposition to ee and nee, respectively), hence the curious forms of the 3PP which would otherwise be very irregular.

Perhaps the most interesting of the eight basic elliptical constructions treated in this section are those containing the preposition po, and standing for the expressions po ego [mneniju], po ego [duše], and po ix [jazyku] (see citations under §3.07). Although such combinations are theoretically quite possible -- on the analogy of po-moemu,

po-našemu, po-vašemu, po-russki, etc. -- they rarely seem to occur in practice, judging from the data of the present corpus. And when they do occur, a certain tension must arise: on the one hand, the pronoun is functioning only as a possessive modifier (po ego [mneniju]) and so should not take initial n-; but on the other hand, when a 3PP occurs directly after a preposition and is not itself followed by an expressed noun (po ego ...), it almost invariably functions as the object of the preposition, and hence begins with n- (cf. po nem, po nix, etc.).

One solution to this problem has been found in those Slavic languages which have developed third-person possessive adjectives along the lines of Serbo-Croatian njegov, njezin, etc. (see Ferrell [1958: 97]). While this development has not taken place in literary Russian, there nevertheless are such possessives in "substandard" Russian and various dialects (evonyj, ejnyj, ixnij), and their use can resolve the tension created by elliptical constructions with prepositions like those quoted above; e.g., 1841: p o - i x n e m u , on vse-taki ee muž (LERMONTOV, Geroj, 20). It is conceivable that these possessives would have attained wider acceptance in the standard language, if this type of prepositional phrase were very commonly used. But in practice it seems that constructions like po ego and po ix occur so rarely that the language has managed to get along on its present resources, without resorting to wide usage of ixnij and the other possessives.

Another important factor involved here and a more general consideration of the problem will be discussed below in Part Four (§19.09).

12.07 Onyj-type object. -- The occurrence in eighteenth and early-nineteenth century texts of prepositional phrases like meždu onymi (1745/1763, TATIŠČEV), posle onogo (1766/68, ČULKOV), posredstvom onogo (1768, I. TRET'JAKOV), protivu onyx (1769, EKATERINA II), vnutri onogo (1777, FONVIZIN), vne onogo (1785, Ustav dvorjanskoj imperii XVIII veka [Moskva, 1960], 171), črez onyj (1789, RADIŠČEV), po povodu onyx (1789/1816, BOLOTOV), vblizi onyx (1812, DERŽAVIN), okolo onogo (1825, NAREŽNYJ), vmesto onyx (1834, GREČ), blagodarja onomu (1870, SALTYKOV), etc., brings up an interesting question: is the use of these adjectival third-person pronoun forms in any way connected with the occurrence of secondary prepositions?

At a stage of development when secondary prepositions were just beginning to vacillate between "actual" and "apparent" status, is it possible that Russian writers resorted to the onyj-forms of the object of these prepositions in order to avoid choosing between the 3PPO forms with n- and without n-? In other words, when the language (the written language only, in this instance) had at its disposal two alternate sets of 3PP forms (on, ego, emu, ona, ej, etc., alongside of onyj, onago, onomu, onaja, onoj, etc.), is it not logical to suppose that those forms which neutralize the difficult choice between the presence and absence of n- would be preferred for use after those prepositions whose "status" is not firmly fixed?

The evidence of the present study, however, makes it appear that this is not the case. While the onyj-forms do occur a number of times with secondary prepositions (examples cited above), they also occur regularly in many other functions as well, including that of object of "simple" preposition: na onoj (1700/99, Facecija o Šute), po onym" (1725/55,

KANTEMIR), bez onyx" (1736, TATIŠČEV), k" onym" (1748, TREDIAKOVSKIJ), so onoj (1753, NAŠČOKIN), za onye (1801, RADIŠČEV), pri onom (1789, RADIŠČEV), ob onoj (1801/02, RADIŠČEV), ot onogo (1801/02, RADIŠČEV), v onogo (1825, NAREŽNYJ), nad onym (1825, NAREŽNYJ), etc. In fact, more than half (25 out of 45) of the prepositional phrases with an onyj-type object tabulated in the corpus involve simple prepositions.

Thus it would seem that the eighteenth-century tendency to use pronoun forms of the onyj type is by no means restricted to the secondary prepositions, but on the contrary is more often related to the simple category than to the secondaries. All that really can be concluded is that this tendency lowers the potential number of decisive pronoun examples in any given text of that period, since every time that a construction of the type vmesto onyx (instead of vmesto [n]ix) occurs in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, that makes one less example where we could have determined the author's preference for "actual" or "apparent" status of the preposition in question.

PART THREE

SYNCHRONIC DESCRIPTION OF PREPOSITIONAL CATEGORIES

> The littering (*zasorenie*) of language not rarely is connected with the inappropriate use of so-called new prepositions (*v dele*, *po linii*, *v časti*, *za sčet*, etc.), which gives birth to bureaucratic (*kanceljarskie*) phrases, depriving speech of the necessary simplicity, liveliness, and emotionality . . . *e.g.*, *v silu slabosti kul'tmassovoj raboty*.
>
> Rozental' (1959: 20)

Introduction to Part Three. -- Now that the paths of development of each of the hundred-odd individual prepositions have been traced in diachronic outline over the last ten centuries, it is time to move to a higher level of analysis and study the behavior of the nine general categories of prepositions, each as a unit. At this level, there is enough data to permit the analysis to be meaningfully conducted on a synchronic basis. In other words, many of the individual prepositions are attested so few times in some centuries (or longer periods) that rules formulated to describe their individual behavior within that period would be very inconclusive. Indeed, as has been pointed out above, the lack of data for some prepositions has extended over their entire history, and has rendered their chronological picture vague and inconclusive.

But when we group together all the prepositions belonging to one or another of the major categories (simple, root, prefixed, etc.), we can then segment our corpus into a few basic time-segments (Old Russian, nineteenth century, etc.), and have enough material on each category to justify an attempt to establish the strictly synchronic pattern of the separate categories within each of these basic periods.

Scholars in the past have divided the general history of Russian grammar into varying numbers of periods, and with varying points of separation between them. Whatever its exact chronological breakdown (if any), this division has usually followed the classical Indo-European plan of "Old," "Middle," and "Modern" or "Contemporary" Russian. A different tack was recently taken by Matthews (1960: §272), who segmented Russian historical grammar into only two basic periods, stating that the "line of cleavage runs through the borderlands of the seventeenth and eight-

eenth centuries." But none of these general classifications needs to be accepted in advance for the establishment of the chronological development of one specific category. As Lehmann (1963: 289) recently suggested in a discussion of historical grammars, "the problem of setting up successive stages of a language . . . will simply [be determined] by prominent breaks in structure, rather than by external events such as shifts in dynasties, religions, or habitat." He goes on to say that "the structural breaks will vary with the purpose of a grammar."

Following this realistic approach of compartmentalizing the history of the language on a post hoc basis, to fit what seem to be the basic contours of development of prepositions as studied in Part Two above, the following synchronic analysis is segmented into five basic periods, which are rounded off to the nearest hundred years for convenience: 1000-1399 (the status quo), 1400-1699 (embryonic changes), 1700-1799 (first major shifts), 1800-1899 (the prepositional revolution), and 1900-1964 (expansion and consolidation).

In the following five sections (§§13.-17.), each of these periods will be described as a synchronic entity. Such an approach entails a certain distortion, in that there will obviously be some variation within the bounds of a period lasting one or three centuries and encompassing different writers and genres. But any synchronic description of any living language, past or present, is possible only if we accept the convention that all the data of a given period represents "a single point in time."

13. OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC AND OLD RUSSIAN (1000-1399)

PERIOD OF THE STATUS QUO

13.00 Introduction. -- As explained above (§2.16, n.), the data from Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian texts is grouped together, inasmuch as there seems to be no noticeable difference in the behavior of prepositions in O.C.S. texts of the eleventh century and O.R. texts of the twelfth or fourteenth centuries. In fact, the first changes of prepositional "status" (judging from the present corpus) occur only in the fifteenth century; hence it was decided to take the turn of the fifteenth century as the dividing line between the first two basic periods of prepositional history. It goes without saying, of course, that the history of Slavic prepositions and their "status" begins much earlier than 1000 A.D. But in the absence of original documents dating from before that time, any discussion of the behavior of prepositional constructions in the pre-1000 epoch would be hypothetical, and will not be touched upon in this descriptive section (see, however, the interpretative part, §§19.02ff. below).

The plan for this section on the earliest period (and for each of the following synchronic sections) will be to present first a synchronic tabular summary by categories, and then to discuss the inventory of each of the nine categories in a separate subsection (simple prepositions in §13.01, double in §13.02, etc.). The tabular summary provides, for each category, the number of different items (prepositions) occurring in the

period (according to the present corpus), the number of different items which have any "actual" examples and which have 50% or more "actual" examples; then, more importantly, the total number of attestations of "actual" and of "apparent" status, followed by the percentage of "actual" examples. Note that the simple category will be placed last in vertical order, so as to emphasize the contrast between it and all the secondary categories taken together.

TABLE 21

SYNCHRONIC SUMMARY: 1000-1399

Category	Different Items			Total Examples		
	No. Items	Any Act	50% Act	Act	App	Pct
Double	0	-	-	-	-	-
Root	1	0	0	0	2	0%
Suffixed	11	0	0	0	67	0%
Prefixed	11	1	0	1	51	2%
Combination . . .	4	0	0	0	6+	0%
Comparative . . .	2	0	0	0	4+	0%
Adverb	1	0	0	0	1+	0%
Gerund	0	-	-	-	-	-
Secondary total	30	1	0	1	131+	0.8%
Simple	17	17	17	1091	7	99.4%
Grand total . .	47	18	17	1092	138+	--

13.01 Simple prepositions (99.4% "actual"). -- The inventory of simple prepositions attested (with decisive pronouns) in this earliest period numbers seventeen: v, k, s, o(b), u, do, po, za, na, iz", ot", pri, pro, bez, nad", pod", and pered" (prěd"). The rare v"z is not attested in this period (or any other period) with any decisive pronouns, and so is not included in the inventory. Pro is also rare in the period, being completely absent from the O.C.S. manuscripts, and is included only on

the strength of one example of ni pro čto že in a 1316 Old Russian document.

Aside from these two, however, the rest of the complete inventory of simple prepositions is all present and fully accounted for in the earliest O.C.S. texts. And they all have "actual" status at this time, with a total of 1091 "actual" and only 7 "apparent" attestations. These 7 exceptions involve only three prepositions -- v (3), u (2), and na (2); the other fourteen prepositions all have a perfect record, without a single exception, from 1000 to 1399. (For details on individual prepositions and exceptions, see under the appropriate prepositions in §3.)

These figures prove that the "simple" category of prepositions had attained 100% (really 99.4% -- with some of the exceptions "accountable") "actual" status by the eleventh century, as attested by the Old Church Slavonic texts. And except for the belated appearance of pro a couple of centuries later, the Old Russian documents examined in the present corpus are in complete agreement with those of Old Church Slavonic (the statistics in Table 21 include both groups of texts). These findings leave open the question of when the simple prepositions first acquired "actual" status, in view of the fact that only three of them (v, k, s) originally occurred with n- in the Proto-Slavic period (see §19.02 below), but it is a certainty that n- had spread to all sixteen (if not also v"z and pro) no later than the eleventh century, and was used after them with virtually 100% consistency. Another finding which emerges from Table 21 is the sharp contrast between the simple category and all the secondary categories together; this will be commented upon below (§13.10).

13.02 Double prepositions (--). -- Evidently no double prepositions existed in the earliest period; none is attested in the present

corpus, with decisive or any other kinds of object. The question of the time of origin of this category, which has been rather neglected in previous studies of Russian prepositions, was discussed above (§4.072).

13.03 Root prepositions (0%). -- Only one member of this category is attested with decisive objects in the earliest period: bliz" has two examples of "apparent" status. Other members definitely existed in this period (e.g., črez" with noun objects in 1073), but there is no evidence in the corpus about their status.

13.04 Suffixed prepositions (0%). -- This category has totally "apparent" status in the earliest period, with all 67 attestations lacking n- or not splitting negatives. The inventory of "suffixed" items consists of radi (no "actual" and 33 "apparent attestations), protivu (0:15), delja-del'ma (0:5), verxu (0:4), meždu (0:3), peredi (0:2), mimo (0:1), krome (0:1), premy (0:1), razve (0:1), and jedě (0:1). Each of these is a completely "apparent" preposition in the years 1000-1399.

13.05 Prefixed prepositions (2%). -- This category has 51 "apparent" attestations and only one "actual." Moreover, the one deviation, involving vsled, was actually corrected by the scribe, who scratched out the n- which he had first written in the phrase v'sled" ńego (see §7.09 above). Thus it is justifiable to regard this category as totally "apparent" in the earliest period. The inventory consists of the following items: posredi (0:21), vsled (1:17), okolo (0:3), okrest (0:2), okrug (0:2), poslěde (0:1), promež (0:1), naverxu (0:1), podelom (0:1), v"skraj (0:1), otaj (0:1).

13.06 Combination prepositions (0%). -- This category is totally

"apparent," with at least six examples lacking n- and none having n-. As has already been mentioned, an exhaustive count of all constructions of the type "simple preposition + noun + ego/emu" would undoubtedly increase the number of "apparent" examples to a figure higher than six in this earliest period. The tabulated inventory consists of v" imę (0:2), na s'rĕten'e (0:2), na pomošč' (0:1), and na městо (0:1). These items can really be regarded as part of the prefixed category above, especially since the old manuscripts do not consistently use modern word divisions anyway. Thus the combined total of both categories is 57+ "apparent" and 1 "actual."

13.07 Comparative prepositions (0%). -- This category has (at least) four attestations without n- and none with it; it can be considered totally "apparent" in the earliest period. The inventory consists of only two items: prežde (0:3), and pače (0:1).

13.08 Adverb prepositions (0%). -- In the present corpus only one attestation of this category was tabulated, and that was "apparent": prĕmo. It seems reasonable to assume that any further examples of adverb prepositions which may turn up in documents of the earliest period will also be totally "apparent."

13.09 Gerund prepositions (--). -- The present corpus does not contain any examples of this category with the decisive objects.

13.10 Conclusions. -- The earliest period, covering the years 1000 to 1399, is herein referred to as "the time of status quo" because it opens with only the simple category possessing "actual" status, and closes with exactly the same state of affairs. As can be seen in Table 21 above, the simple category has an overall proportion of 99.4% "actu-

al" occurrences in this early period, whereas the grouped total of all secondary categories amounts to less than 0.8% "actual." This latter percentage is based on a grouped total of 131+ "apparent" examples, and only 1 "actual" example (of vsled -- which the scribe corrected). Thus the complete dichotomy of simple prepositions in opposition to all secondary categories is eloquently expressed by the two sets of figures: simple prepositions are virtually 100% "actual," all others are virtually 100% "apparent" (or 0% "actual"). The total number of different items ("prepositions") attested in this period is 47, including 17 simple and 30 secondary prepositions.

14. MIDDLE RUSSIAN (1400-1699)

PERIOD OF EMBRYONIC CHANGE

14.00 Introduction. -- The second major period in the history of Russian prepositions is composed of those three centuries when the first hints of change begin to appear in the status quo of Old Russian. This epoch opens with the fifteenth century and closes before the start of the eighteenth -- the first century when major transitions are noticeable. This second period, covering the fifteenth through the seventeenth century, also coincides, roughly speaking, with the concept of "Middle Russian" as used by historical grammarians like Vinokur (1945: gl. 7). The plan for presentation of the data is the same as that of the preceding section, except that no full count was made of simple prepositions: they had already achieved total "actual" status by the beginning of the preceding period.

(See at the top of p. 309 for Table 22.)

14.01 Simple prepositions (99+%). -- The inventory of this category includes the same seventeen items as were attested in the previous period: v, k, s, o(b), etc. (cf. §13.01). Aside from the complete disappearance of v"z and the increased frequency of pro, the composition of this category is unchanged. No exhaustive count was made of all simple prepositions with decisive pronouns in Middle Russian, and so no figures are presented for them in Table 22. However, if a detailed breakdown based on an exhaustive count were given, the proportion of "actual" ex-

amples would be on the level of 99+%, just as it has been since around 1000 A.D.

TABLE 22

SYNCHRONIC SUMMARY: 1400-1699

Category	No. Items	Any Act	50% Act	Act	App	Pct
Double	1	1	1	4	0	100%
Root	5	5	3	11	67	14%
Suffixed	15	4	0	5	61	8%
Prefixed	16	1	0	1	67	1%
Combination . . .	4	0	0	0	6+	0%
Comparative . . .	4	0	0	0	4+	0%
Adverb	1	0	0	0	2+	0%
Gerund	1	1	1	1	0	100%
Secondary total	47	12	5	22	207+	10-%
Simple	17	17	17	..	..	99+%
Grand total . .	64	29	22	--	--	--

14.02 Double prepositions (100%). -- Only one member of this category is attested with the decisive pronouns in Middle Russian: iz-za (4:0). It is known that other members of the category did exist at this time, such as iz-pod and po-za (see §4.072 above), but no decisive attestations were found for them. In any event, the category can be regarded as 100% "actual" from this period on. In passing it might be noted that the perfect record of the double category in this period perhaps indicates that it should not be included with the subtotal of the other secondary categories -- all of which were still close to 0% "actual" at the time. This will be taken up in the conclusions, §14.10 below.

14.03 Root prepositions (14%). -- This category takes its first step toward "actual" status in Middle Russian -- albeit a small step, as it achieves a proportion of about one-seventh (14%) "actual" attestations for the period, with 11 "actual" examples and 67 "apparent." The inventory consists of the following five items, with ratios indicated in parentheses: čerez (5:3), prez (2:0), mež (2:28), krug (1:1), protiv (1:35). Obviously, the whole category is in flux: each attested member has at least one example of "actual" status, and each (except the rare dialectal prez) has at least one of "apparent" status.

14.04 Suffixed prepositions (8%). -- This category in Middle Russian manifests a very slight tendency toward "actual" status, with a ratio of 5 "actual" to 61 "apparent" attestations. The inventory consists of the following items: mimo (2:5), skvoze (1:2), dlja (1:8), protivu (1:23), meždu (0:5), radi (0:4), krome (0:3), sredi (0:2), zadi (0:2), pereky (0:2), verxu (0:1), vstreču (0:1), blizu (0:1), kolo (0:1), and mesto (0:1). As can be seen from the figures, only four suffixed prepositions have any attestations of "actual" status (mimo, skvoze, dlja, protivu), and with each of these, the "actual" examples are outweighed by the "apparent." All the other eleven attested items do not show a single example of "actual" status in Middle Russian.

14.05 Prefixed prepositions (1%). -- This category in Middle Russian has only one exception to completely "apparent" status, out of 68 total examples. The inventory includes the following sixteen items -- of which only podle ever occurs with n-: podle (1:2), posle (0:20), okolo (0:14), promež (0:7), posredi (0:7), napered (0:3), odal(e) (0:3), vmesto (0:2), naverx(u) (0:2); and okrest, pozadi, szadi, vsled, nazadi,

okrug, and oproče (each 0:1).

14.06 Combination prepositions (0%). -- This category in Middle Russian is totally "apparent," based on (at least) six examples. The number of items tabulated is four: v stretenie (0:2), vo imja (0:2), na stretenie (0:1), na pagubu (0:1). If this material were combined with that for the similar category of prefixed prepositions, the overall result would be 73 "apparent" and only 1 "actual" example.

14.07 Comparative prepositions (0%). -- This category is fully "apparent" in Middle Russian, judging from the four tabulated examples: niže (0:1), prežde (0:1), vyše (0:1), and bol'še (0:1).

14.08 Adverb prepositions (0%). -- This category is also fully "apparent," although the data consists of only two examples of the same item -- prjamo (0:2).

14.09 Gerund prepositions (100%!). -- A curious but easily explainable anomaly turns up in this category, as the only attestation is prišed nix (details in §11.03 above). Since this example is contradictory to the synchronic evidence of all other secondary categories in this period, and since later copies of the same document rewrite the phrase without nix or add na nix, we can discount the example as a scribal error. Thus it is not necessary to assign "actual" status to the gerund category in Middle Russian, despite this one anomaly.

14.10 Conclusions. -- The period 1400-1699, which roughly coincides with the dominance of Muscovite Russia, and which is herein labeled as "Middle Russian," can be regarded as the period where the first embryonic changes in prepositional status begin to occur. The simple category,

of course, remains completely "actual," without retrogression, but some of the secondary categories, as indicated in Table 22, begin to reveal hints of breaking away from completely "apparent" status, with 22 "actual" attestations out of 229+ total examples for a percentage of 10-%. Of the forty-seven different secondary prepositions attested in Middle Russian, only twelve have any "actual" examples: iz-za (4:0), čerez (5:3), prez (2:0), mež (2:28), krug (1:1), protiv (1:35), mimo (2:5), skvoze (1:2), dlja (1:8), protivu (1:23), podle (1:2), and -- with reservations! -- prišed (1:0). The other thirty-five secondary prepositions are totally "apparent." Contrast this with the seventeen simple prepositions, all of which are virtually 100% "actual" throughout this period.

This contrast might be made even sharper if the double category were counted with the simple group rather than with the secondaries. Both simple and double prepositions are regarded as sub-divisions of the same general primary type of preposition and are grouped under a common rubric ("non-derivative," etc.) by several scholars, such as Bondarenko (1961: 7). Such a grouping might also be justified on practical grounds, inasmuch as the double category in Middle Russian is already 100% "actual," whereas no other secondary category is more than 14% "actual" (judging from the present corpus). Thus if the synchronic summary in Table 22 were revised to group the double category with the simple group, their joint proportion would remain on the level of 99+%, whereas the total of all other secondaries (excluding the double group) would be reduced to a ratio of only 8% (based on 207+ "apparent" examples vs. a revised total of only 18 "actual" examples).

Another interesting phenomenon is revealed by the percentage column in Table 22: the declining progression of "actual" percentages as we

move from category to category. Going down the table, we find both the simple and the double class with nearly 100%, then a drop-off to 14% for the root class, down to 8% for suffixed, 1% for prefixed, and 0% for the remainder (excluding prišed!).

This hierarchy of categories may be connected with morphological complexity: the simple prepositions (e.g., v) have a simpler structure than, say, the suffixed prepositions (e.g., sred-i), and these in turn are simpler than the prefixed category (e.g., v-mest-o). Unfortunately there is not enough morphological difference between all of the prepositional categories to permit us to establish some kind of mathematical law (according to which the number of elements or morphemes in a preposition would be inversely proportional to its tendency toward "actual" status). Nonetheless the faint outlines of such a relationship can be discerned in the hierarchy which is visible in Table 22 above (in the "percentage" column), and the same hierarchy will also be noted when we come to nineteenth- and twentieth-century Russian (§§16 and 17 below).

15. THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY (1700-1799)

PERIOD OF THE FIRST MAJOR SHIFTS

15.00 Introduction. -- The third basic period established for purposes of tracing the development of Russian prepositions is the eighteenth century. This period opens with the rise of Peter the Great and the westernization of Russia; extends through the great development of a new scholarly language and style as typified by the scientific, philological, and historical writings of Trediakovskij, Lomonosov, and Tatiščev; and ends with the literary, journalistic, and political writings of Novikov, Fonvizin, Čulkov, and Radiščev. But more important for present purposes is the fact that the eighteenth century is the time when the first major changes in prepositional "status" take place, as will be shown below.

TABLE 23

SYNCHRONIC SUMMARY: 1700-1799

Category	No. Items	Any Act	50% Act	Act	App	Pct
Double	0	-	-	-	-	-
Root	6	3	2	4	12	25%
Suffixed	8	3	1	41	21	66%
Prefixed	18	4	2	11	40	22%
Combination . . .	3	0	0	0	3+	0%
Comparative . . .	7	0	0	0	10+	0%
Adverb	1	0	0	0	1+	0%
Gerund	0	-	-	-	-	-
Secondary total	43	10	5	56	87+	39-%
Simple	17	17	17	..	..	99+%
Grand total . .	60	27	22	--	--	--

15.01 Simple prepositions (99+%). -- This category's "status" and inventory remains the same as in the preceding periods: it consists of seventeen prepositions, each of which consistently governs n- and splits negatives, with less than 1% exceptions. As with the Middle Russian period, no exhaustive count was made of simple prepositions in the eighteenth century, hence no statistical breakdown is given in Table 23 above.

15.02 Double prepositions (--). -- Not a single example of any double preposition was found in the corpus for 1700-1799. Therefore the question of this category's "status" in the given period remains open, until such a time as additional materials will supply the needed data. If any such examples are found, it is probable that their status will be "actual" (as it was in the preceding period -- cf. §14.02 above).

15.03 Root prepositions (25%). -- In the eighteenth century this category is not often attested, but its proportion of "actual" examples is a noticeable one-fourth (based on 4 "actual" and 12 "apparent" attestations). The inventory includes the following six items, with the ratio of each in parentheses: krug (1:0), čerez (1:1), protiv (2:4), bliz (0:4), mež (0:2), and skvoz' (0:1). As the figures show, every member of this category except krug is attested without n-, but only three are attested with it -- krug, čerez, and protiv. There are far too few examples here to be of any great significance, but they suggest that the root category is still a long way from total assumption of "actual" status.

15.04 Suffixed prepositions (66%). -- This category in the eighteenth century has already progressed beyond the root and prefixed categories, and has attained a proportion of two-thirds "actual" status, with 41 attestations of n- or split negatives, and only 21 of the oppo-

site. However, this relatively high proportion derives almost entirely from the data on a single preposition, dlja, which has a ratio of 33 "actual" and no "apparent" examples attested in the corpus. Altogether, the inventory of suffixed prepositions includes eight members: dlja (33:0), meždu (7:9), protivu (1:2), radi (0:4), krugom (0:2), krome (0:2), mimo (0:1), and vne (0:1). Thus we see that almost all the members of this category are still "apparent," as only three (dlja, meždu, and protivu) have any attestations of "actual" status, and only one (dlja) has a ratio over 50%. The high frequency of examples with dlja, coupled with its early transition to "actual" status, has created a somewhat misleading overall total for the suffixed category.

15.05 Prefixed prepositions (22%). -- This category in the years 1700-1799 resembles the root class in that its proportion of "actual" attestations is a low but noticeable one-fifth (22%). Altogether there are 11 "actual" and 40 "apparent" examples in the corpus, representing the following inventory of eighteen different prepositions: posle (4:3), podle (4:6), vokrug (2:3), sverx (1:0), vmesto (0:8), okolo (0:6), okrest (0:3), and posredi, poperek, vnutri, vdol', vzamen, navstreču, naverx(u), podelom, okrome, ostoron, suprotiv (each 0:1). Only four of the eighteen prepositions -- posle, podle, vokrug, and sverx -- are ever attested in this period with "actual" status, and only two have a ratio above 50%: posle and sverx. The category on the whole is much closer to "apparent" than to "actual" status.

15.06 Combination prepositions (0%). -- This category is entirely "apparent" in the eighteenth century, although in the present corpus only three examples were tabulated: v seredine (0:1), na mesto (0:1), and

dlja-radi (0:1). When further material is collected, however, it is quite likely that the same pattern, without n-, will be observed.

15.07 Comparative prepositions (0%). -- This category is fully "apparent," based on 10 tabulated examples lacking n-. The inventory consists of the following seven items: lučše (0:3), prežde (0:2), and xuže, men'še, svjatee, roskošnee, dostatočnee (each 0:1).

15.08 Adverb prepositions (0%). -- In this category only one example was tabulated, and it predictably is "apparent": blisko (0:1). Thus the adverb category joins with the comparatives and the combinations described just above: all three groups manifest absolute resistance to any encroachment of "actual" status.

15.09 Gerund prepositions (--). -- No examples of gerunds governing decisive pronouns were found in the corpus. Presumably if any are uncovered by future research, their status will be "apparent."

15.10 Conclusions. -- Thanks primarily to one suffixed preposition, dlja, the secondary categories of prepositions in eighteenth-century Russian show a very noticeable (although not yet dominant) tendency toward "actual" status: altogether, the eight secondary categories have 56 "actual" and 87+ "apparent" attestations, for a proportion of 39-%. However, if we subtract dlja's record of 33:0, the remainder of the secondaries prove to be much weaker in their tendency to govern n- and split negatives, with a total ratio of 23:87+ (=21-%). And this proportion, around one-fifth, seems to be characteristic of the secondary categories generally in the eighteenth century, inasmuch as the root and prefixed categories also fall around this level (25% and 22%, respectively).

But whether or not we include dlja in the statistics, it is clear

that secondary prepositions show a much stronger tendency toward "actual" status in the eighteenth century than they did previously. Their overall proportion in Middle Russian, it will be remembered (see §14.00, Table 22), was only 10-%, and in the period of Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian (§13.00, Table 21) it was an infinitesimally small 0.8%. The eighteenth century's proportion of 39-% (with dlja) or even 21-% (without dlja) represents a very marked change from what went before. It is for this reason that the years 1700-1799 are referred to as the "period of the first major shifts." And even though the gap between the secondary categories and the simple category is still very wide (39% vs. 99%), it is considerably less wide than heretofore.

Other statistical evidence relating to the eighteenth century, as summarized in Table 23, does not differ noticeably from preceding periods. For instance, out of forty-three different secondary prepositions attested in the eighteenth century, only ten have at least one "actual" example: krug (1:0), čerez (1:1), protiv (2:4), dlja (33:0), meždu (7:9), protivu (1:2), posle (4:3), podle (4:6), vokrug (2:3), and sverx (1:0). This is almost identical with the Middle Russian figures (twelve out of forty-eight different secondary prepositions with one or more "actual" attestations). Likewise, the number of individual prepositions which are at least 50% "actual" is about the same in the eighteenth century as in the preceding period; there are five of these in the 1700's (dlja, posle, krug, čerez, sverx), and also five in Middle Russian. These observations relating to individual prepositions should not be attributed any significance, however, since the number of examples involved with each item is very small -- and very subject to chance variation. It is rather the total for each category as a whole, and the total of all the secondary categories combined, which have the real significance.

16. THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (1800-1899)

PERIOD OF THE PREPOSITIONAL REVOLUTION

16.00 The fourth basic period of prepositional history encompasses the nineteenth century, from Žukovskij and Deržavin, through Puškin, Gogol', and Dostoevskij, to Tolstoj, Garšin, and Čexov. It is the century in which literature becomes, for the first time, a profession and livelihood for many men from various social and financial backgrounds, and in which Russian literature begins to reach a wide reading public not only among various classes of Russian society, but also throughout the world. And as will be demonstrated below, this more or less revolutionary expansion of literature is accompanied by equally vast and revolutionary changes in the "status" of prepositions in the literary language.

TABLE 24

SYNCHRONIC SUMMARY: 1800-1899

Category	No. Items	Any Act	50% Act	Act	App	Pct
Double	2	2	2	19	0	100%
Root	7	7	6	83	14	86%
Suffixed	11	8	4	311	139	69%
Prefixed	26	12	9	183	105	64%
Combination . . .	23	0	0	0	35+	0%
Comparative . . .	19	0	0	0	53+	0%
Adverb	7	1	0	1	10+	9-%
Gerund	1	0	0	0	4	0%
Secondary total	96	30	21	597	360+	62-%
Simple	17	17	17	...	...	99+%
Grand total . .	113	47	38	--	--	--

16.01 Simple prepositions (99+%). -- This category remains the same as in previous periods: all of its seventeen members are virtually 100% "actual." No exhaustive count was made, and no figures are given.

16.02 Double prepositions (100%). -- This category establishes itself firmly, with 100% "actual" status based on 19 attestations in the nineteenth century. Its inventory consists of only two members which are attested with the decisive pronouns: iz-za (12:0), and iz-pod (7:0). Other double prepositions are known to exist in the nineteenth century (po-za, etc.), but do not occur with the decisive pronouns in the corpus.

16.03 Root prepositions (86%). -- This category has an overwhelming majority of "actual" attestations in the nineteenth century (83 out of 97 total), and can be considered as having made the transition to "actual" status. Its inventory is composed of the following seven members: čerez (26:0), skvoz' (10:1), protiv (35:5), bliz (7:1), sred' (2:0), krug (1:0), and mež (2:7). This individual breakdown reveals that only one of the seven root prepositions (mež) has a ratio under 50%; in fact, the other six members are far above that, with a high of 100% (čerez, etc.) and a low of 88% (bliz, protiv). Clearly, the nineteenth century is the time of transition for the root category.

16.04 Suffixed prepositions (69%). -- This category in the 1800's manifests a less overwhelming tendency toward "actual" status than does the root class, but nevertheless the suffixed class does achieve a proportion of over two-thirds "actual," based on 311 "actual" and 139 "apparent" attestations. The inventory of suffixed prepositions in the nineteenth century comprises the following eleven items: dlja (200:1), sredi (9:4), radi (1:0), meždu (77:70), protivu (6:7), krugom (4:5), mimo (10:

29), krome (4:16), posredstvom (0:3), vne (0:3), pomoščiju (0:1). Dlja is obviously a complete "actual" preposition, with only one exception out of 201 total occurrences, and radi, sredi, and meždu are also over the 50% mark. In addition to these four, there are also four other members of the category which have at least some "actual" examples (although less than 50%): protivu, krugom, mimo, and krome. Thus in the suffixed category there are eight different prepositions which at least part of the time are used with "actual" status in the 1800's.

The category's overall proportion of 69% is strongly influenced by the high percentage of dlja; if the latter were subtracted, the new total percentage without dlja would be reduced to 45% (based on reduced totals of 111 "actual" and 138 "apparent" examples). But even though 45% is less than one-half, it is still a meaningful value. A diachronic fact of interest here is the median "estimated turning point" for the suffixed category -- which falls around 1877; see details above (§6.28).

16.05 Prefixed prepositions (64%). -- This category has a proportion of nearly two-thirds "actual" occurrences in the nineteenth century, based on 183 "actual" and 105 "apparent" attestations. The prefixed inventory is made up of the following twenty-six items: podle (35:2), vozle (29:2), posle (21:3), vokrug (33:6), okolo (47:16), promež (3:0), naprotiv (1:0), okrest (3:1), vblizi (2:2), szadi (4:5), vmesto (4:9), vperedi (1:12), navstreču (0:15), vsled (0:10), pozadi (0:4), vnutri (0:3), vopreki (0:3), podelom (0:3), posredi (0:2); and sverx(u), nasčet, poperek, napererez, nazadi, sboku, suprotiv (each 0:1).

Out of this category's twenty-six members, nine have a majority (50% or more) of "actual" examples: podle, vozle, posle, vokrug, okolo, promež, naprotiv, okrest, and vblizi; an additional three members were

attested at least once each with "actual" status (szadi, vmesto, vperedi). Thus, twelve of the twenty-six prefixed prepositions in this period show at least some tendency toward government of n-.

It is interesting to note that three of the highest percentages among frequently-occurring prefixed prepositions belong to the only members of the category which end in -e: podle, vozle, posle. This phenomenon is probably connected with the fact that these prepositions by the nineteenth century no longer had any recognizable etymology, and in fact from a synchronic standpoint could hardly even be classified as prefixed. (In the present study a single "morphological" principle of classification is maintained for all centuries, in order that the development of various categories and individual prepositions may be gauged from century to century by maintaining a constant basis for comparison. Whenever a preposition makes the transition to "actual" status, or even if it only differs sharply from the other members of its category, we can assume that for the speakers or writers who were using the preposition, it was felt as belonging to a new category -- or, at any rate, was used by them as if it were a member of a category with a greater tendency toward "actual" status.)

16.06 Combination prepositions (0%). -- This category in the nineteenth century is entirely "apparent," based on 35 attestations. Twenty-three different items make up the inventory: na mesto (0:3), na dne (0:3), po povodu (0:3), v glub(ine) (0:2), v krugu (0:2), v čisle (0:2), iz sre-(din)y (0:2), v konce (0:2), v čest' (0:2); and v pol'zu, v rassuždenii, v seredine, v vidu, v nedre, na veršine, pri vide, pod lad, po slovam, na pomošč', po mneniju, v poxvalu, v nizu, na kraju (each 0:1). In this period for the first time the combination and prefixed categories differ

widely in regard to "status": the former category stands totally resistant to any occurrences of "actual" status, while the latter reaches a level of nearly two-thirds (64%) "actual" attestations. (In previous centuries both classes had been close to zero percent.)

16.07 Comparative prepositions (0%). -- This category stands completely proof to any incursion of "actual" status in the 1800's, with an unbroken record of 53 tabulated attestations of "apparent" status. The inventory of tabulated comparatives includes nineteen different items: lučše (0:12), vyše (0:10), prežde (0:6), starše (0:5), uže (0:4), niže (0:2), bol'še (0:2), umnee (0:2); and ranee, iskusnee, staree, strojnee, pročnee, mudree, sčastlivee, bogače, zorče, počišče (each 0:1). These nineteen items can be grouped into two general sub-categories: those ending in -ˇe, which have a total ratio of 0:44, and those ending in -ee, which have a total ratio of 0:9.

16.08 Adverb prepositions (9-%). -- This category is the only one of the final four which shows any breakthrough of "actual" examples; it has one, out of at least eleven total examples. However, the dating of this one example, otnositel'no nix in Pavlov (details in §10.01 above) is no more exact than within the approximate period 1897-1917, and may actually belong to the early twentieth century; moreover, there are also two "appparent" attestations of otnositel'no in the 1800's. Nonetheless it is not without significance that this one example should be with otnotel'no, which, as will be shown below (§17.08), in the twentieth century is also the only adverb preposition to make the transition to "actual" status.

The nineteenth-century inventory of adverb prepositions includes the following items: otnositel'no (1:2), podobno (0:2), atu (0:2); and stydno, gore, žal', net (each 0:1). Grouping this data under the sub-

rubrics of "adverbs ending in -o" and "amorphous adverbs" (cf. §10.00), we find sub-totals of 1:5+ for the former and 0:5+ for the latter. It should be mentioned here that the indicated proportion of "actual" examples is probably much too high, due to the small amount of data which was collected; as more is gathered in the future, it is quite probable that the percentage will drop considerably.

16.09 Gerund prepositions (0%). -- This category, which consists of only one item attested with the decisive pronouns, is completely "apparent." The one member is blagodarja, with a ratio of 0:4.

16.10 Conclusions. According to the picture presented by the summary in Table 24, the nineteenth century is indeed the period of prepositional revolution. While the simple prepositions remain constant with an unchanged record of nearly 100% "actual" status, the secondary prepositions for the first time exceed a majority of "actual" examples, with an overall proportion of 62-%, based on 597 "actual" and 360+ "apparent" attestations. (Compare the previous periods: 39-% in the eighteenth century, 10-% in Middle Russian, 0.8% in the earliest period.)

The major categories of secondary prepositions also have notably high percentages themselves: the double group stands at 100%, the root group at 86%, suffixed at 69%, and prefixed at 64%. Each of these major categories as a whole can be regarded as having reached, or passed, the midpoint of its transition to "actual" status by the end of the nineteenth century. In passing it might be noted that these categories reveal the same hierarchy of percentages as they did in Middle Russian (cf. §14.10), ranging from simple and double at the top (both around 100%), down to the root class (86%), on down to the suffixed and prefixed groups, and ending with those classes whose morphological structure is more com-

plex and very recognizably secondary -- the combination, comparative, adverb, and gerund classes (each around 0%).

16.11 Once again we see that the double category is completely "actual," in which respect it more closely resembles the simple prepositions than the other secondaries. If we would remove the double category's score from the combined total of all secondaries (in Table 24), the new reduced proportion excluding the doubles would still be 62-%, based on a reduced total of 578 "actual" and 360+ "apparent" examples. Since the theoretical removal of the figures for the double category does not alter the total percentage of all secondaries combined (it was also 62-% including the double group), it is quite clear that the nineteenth-century prepositional revolution is not merely the reflection of a certain number of examples in any one category, but of profound shifts in the secondary categories generally.

Another component which strongly influenced the figures for the eighteenth century (cf. §15.04 above) was dlja, the most frequently attested of all secondary prepositions. Despite an even larger number of attestations in the nineteenth century, its influence on the secondary totals is much less noticeable: if we would remove dlja's hugh ratio of 200:1, the redueced proportion for all the other secondary prepositions in the nineteenth century would be 53-%, based on reduced totals of 397 "actual" and 359+ "apparent" examples. Consequently, even without dlja the secondary prepositions in the nineteenth century exceed 50% "actual" status -- a fact which once again demonstrates that the prepositional revolution is far-reaching and not restricted to any one high-frequency preposition.

16.12 Looking once again at Table 24, we can glean interesting

information from the column indicating the number of different items (prepositions) in each category. The simple inventory remains intact, of course, with all seventeen of its members from preceding periods (see §13.01 above), but the secondaries show a high total of 96 different items in the nineteenth century (compared with about half that number in preceding periods). This difference, it must be emphasized, is due mainly to the much larger amount of nineteenth-century literary material -- as compared with the material for previous centuries -- which was covered in the basic corpus of the present research (see §2.08). But a more meaningful statistic can be found in the number of different prepositions among these ninety-six which are at least 50% "actual."

In the nineteenth century there are twenty-one secondary prepositions with no less than 50% "actual" status: dlja (200:1), čerez (26:0), iz-za (12:0), iz-pod (7:0), podle (35:2), vozle (29:2), skvoz' (10:1), protiv (35:5), posle (21:3), bliz (7:1), vokrug (33:6), okolo (47:16), sredi (9:4), promež (3:0), sred' (2:0), krug (1:0), radi (1:0), naprotiv (1:0), okrest (3:1), meždu (77:70), and vblizi (2:2). These twenty-one items make up the inventory of completely or semi-"actual" prepositions of the 1800's, from among the total of ninety-six different secondary prepositions attested in the given century. (This fraction of 21 more or less "actual" prepositions out of 96 total secondary prepositions in the nineteenth century compares with only 5 out of 43 items in the eighteenth century, and 5 out of 48 in Middle Russian.)

Another difference between earlier periods and the revolutionary nineteenth century lies in the number of different secondary prepositions which have at least one "actual" attestation: there are 30 of such items in the nineteenth century (12 prefixed, 8 suffixed, 7 root, 2 double, 1 adverb) out of the total of 96 secondary prepositions, as compared with

10 items out of 43 total in the eighteenth century, 12 items out of 47 in Middle Russian, and only 1 out of 30 in the earliest period. Thus we see that the expansion of "actual" status (principally n-) is beginning to touch more and more different prepositions in the nineteenth century, even those which have not yet achieved a predominance of "actual" examples, but are only beginning on the path to "actual" status.

17. THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (1900-1964)

PERIOD OF CONSOLIDATION AND EXPANSION

17.00 Introduction. -- The last of the five basic chronological subdivisions reflecting the historical development of Russian prepositions is that of the present century, 1000-1964. This sixty-five year period -- which includes the literary work of such writers as Gor'kij, A. N. Tolstoj, Andreev, Majakovskij, Zoščenko, Panova, etc. -- extends from the reign of the last czar, through the Communist Revolution, industrialization, and the creation of the "socialist bloc," to the present position of the USSR as one of the world's two dominant countries, with its military and political power as well as its space satellites. The marked "democratization" of literature in the Soviet Union, with the rise of "proletarian" writers, the achievement of nearly universal literacy, and the production of large quantities of printed materials in all fields of expository prose as well as artistic literature, has been accompanied, in the area of Russian prepositions and their "status," by a consolidation of nineteenth-century changes and an expansion of the overall inventory -- as is shown by Table 25 on the next page.

17.01 Simple prepositions (99+%). -- The inventory of simple prepositions in twentieth-century Russian remains virtually 100% "actual," and is composed of the same seventeen items as were present in previous periods: v, k, s, o, u, do, po, za, na, iz, ot, pri, pro, bez, nad, pod, pered. The members of this category, incidentally, seem to have under-

gone surprisingly little change in overall frequency since the earliest period, with the possible exception of pri (very frequent in twentieth-century Russian, especially the written language) and pro (rather rare today, especially in the written language). However, an analysis of the absolute frequency of this category would be the subject of a separate study, and is mentioned only in passing here.

TABLE 25

SYNCHRONIC SUMMARY: 1900-1964

Category	No. Items	Any Act	50% Act	Act	App	Pct
Double	2	2	2	26	0	100%
Root	5	5	5	45	2	96%
Suffixed	10	8	7	230	30	88%
Prefixed	36	22	21	217	103	68%
Combination . . .	39	7	3	10	69+	13-%
Comparative . . .	23	10	6	12	35+	26-%
Adverb	14	1	1	2	31+	6-%
Gerund	1	0	0	0	13	0%
Secondary total	130	55	45	542	283+	66-%
Simple	17	17	17	...	...	99+%
Grand total . .	147	72	62	--	--	--

17.02 Double prepositions (100%). -- This category is 100% "actual" in the twentieth century, based on 26 attestations. The inventory consists of only two items which are found with the decisive pronouns: iz-za (19:0) and iz-pod (7:0). There are other double prepositions in the modern language (mostly spoken), such as po-nad and po-za, but they have very low frequencies in written Russian and no decisive examples of them were found in the corpus.

17.03 Root prepositions (96%). -- This category is almost complete-

ly "actual" in the present century, with only two exceptions out of forty-seven total attestations for a proportion of 96%. Its inventory consists of the following five items: protiv (19:0), skvoz' (13:0), čerez (11:1), mež (1:0), and bliz (1:1). The root category seems to be of somewhat limited importance in twentieth-century Russian, as only three of its members (protiv, skvoz', čerez) have any noticeable frequency of occurrence.

17.04 Suffixed prepositions (88%). -- This category in the twentieth century is very close to complete "actual" status, with a proportion of nearly nine-tenths (88%), based on 230 "actual" and only 30 "apparent" attestations. The inventory of suffixed prepositions includes ten different items: dlja (105:1), sredi (29:2), mimo (29:2), krome (12:1), radi (14:2), meždu (35:6), krugom (5:0), posredstvom (1:2), vne (0:11), and vstreču (0:3). As these figures indicate, seven of the ten members of the category have already assumed full "actual" status or are extremely close to it, and only three -- the archaic vstreču, the new posredstvom, and the intractible vne -- hold out against the expansion of epenthetic n- in the present century.

17.05 Prefixed prepositions (68%). -- This category is over two-thirds "actual" in the 1900's, with 217 "actual" and 103 "apparent" attestations. Even a solid percentage on this level (68%) is deceptively low, however, inasmuch as there is a sharp division within the category, which comprises in all thirty-six prefixed prepositions. About half of these members have very high ratios and can be considered to have completed the transition to "actual" status, whereas the other half of the inventory manifests virtually no tendency toward "actual" status and has large numbers of "apparent" examples, with few if any "actual" examples

to counterbalance them. Let us look at these two sub-groups separately.

There are twenty-two prefixed prepositions (out of the total of thirty-six) which have one or more "actual" attestations: okolo (35:0), vozle (22:0), vmesto (20:0), pomimo (7:0), posredi (4:0), posle (16:1), vokrug (37:3), pozadi (17:3), vperedi (14:3), poverx (5:1), naprotiv (5:1), podle (3:0), promež (2:0), sverx (2:0), poperek (2:0), vblizi (1:0), naščet (1:0), vdol' (1:0), szadi (12:5), vrode (2:1), vzamen (1:1), vnutri (8:10). It is very obvious that all of these twenty-two items, except for the last two (and those with only one or two examples) are tending very strongly toward full "actual" status; the combined total for the twenty-two is 217 "actual" and only 29 "apparent" examples, for a very high joint proportion of 82%. Moreover, if we would exclude vnutri, the lowest-ranking member of the top twenty-two (its ratio is less than one-half), the joint total of the top twenty-one prefixed prepositions would reach a high of 92%. In other words, the leading twenty-one or twenty-two members of the prefixed category are extremely close to 100% "actual" status.

The other fourteen members of the category are totally "apparent": vsled (0:28), navstreču (0:18), vopreki (0:9), vdogonku (0:4), napererez (0:3), naperekor (0:3), posredine (0:2); and naverx(u), podelom, vsledstvie, iznutri, napodobie, oprič', and suprotiv (each 0:1). Their joint total is zero "actual" and 74 "apparent" examples. It is perhaps significant that several members of this group are characterized by dative government and/or by postpositioning -- factors which strongly inhibit the development of "actual" status (cf. §§7.111 and 12.04 above). Compare the other sub-group (the top twenty-two) above: every one of its members governs the genitive case. In any event, this split within the prefixed category should be kept in mind when considering the category's

overall proportion of 68% -- which is built on one older, genitive-governing sub-group with a proportion of 82%, and a newer, partly dative-governing sub-group with a proportion of 0%. (See §§20.17ff. for a suggestion on splitting this category.)

17.06 Combination prepositions (13-%). -- This category in the twentieth century shows a small but noticeable beginning of a tendency toward "actual" status: it has 10 "actual" examples out of a total of 79+ attestations. These 79 examples are widely scattered among thirty-nine different items, most of which have only one or two attestations. Only seven items have any "actual" attestations in the twentieth century: po povodu (3:4), v otnošenii (2:4), vo vremja (1:0), v čest' (1:0), v čisle (1:0), pri pomošči (1:2), and v centre (1:4). This small sub-group accounts for all ten of the category's "actual" examples, and has a combined ratio of 10:14 (= 42%).

The remaining thirty-two items tabulated in the combination category have no "actual" examples and a combined ratio of 0:55 (= 0%). Among these thirty-two "apparent" prepositions, the following eleven have more than one attestation each: v konce (0:7), na mesto (0:4), v seredine (0:4), na smenu (0:4), v glub(ine) (0:3), v protivoves (0:2), na konce (0:2), k čislu (0:2), pri vide (0:2), v osnove (0:2), and v storonu (0:2); all the rest of the data consists of single examples.

Once again we find a division of a category into two sub-groups, just as with the prefixed category above. Here the combination prepositions break down into one smaller sub-group with some receptivity to "actual" status, and one larger sub-group with total resistance to it. But the picture is much less clear here because the combination category includes so many scattered items, none of which has more than seven tabu-

lated attestations in the present century (compare, in other categories, dlja with 106, meždu with 41, vokrug with 40, okolo with 35, etc.). This means that much more data for individual combination prepositions will be needed -- as well as another century or two of further development -- before the details of the category can be defined precisely. At present we must be content with a generalization about the category as a whole: it is less than one-seventh (13-%) "actual" in the period 1900-1964.

17.07 Comparative prepositions (26-%). -- This category manifests a very noticeable, but still far from predominant, tendency toward "actual" status, with 12 "actual" and 35+ "apparent" attestations (i.e., about one-fourth) in the twentieth century. Thus the comparatives have the most developed "status" among the four minor categories of secondary prepositions (combinations, comparatives, adverbs, gerunds).

The comparative class has an inventory of twenty-three different items, of which ten are attested at least once with n-: ran'še (3:1), prežde (1:0), dal'še (1:0), moristee (1:0), bliže (1:1), lučše (1:1), pozže (1:2), niže (1:2), xuže (1:5), vyše (1:5). Together these ten items account for all 12 "actual" examples of the category, and 17 "apparent" examples, for a proportion of 41%.

The other thirteen members of the comparative category (as attested in the present corpus) have no "actual" attestations, and a combined ratio of 0:18+ (= 0%). They are: starše (0:4), molože (0:3); and pravee, umnej, skoree, ispravnee, sil'nee, smelee, upornee, grubee, xitree, reže, stojče (each 0:1). Similar to the combination category discussed above, there are not enough attestations of the various separate comparative prepositions to make any conclusions about them individually; the individual figures are given above for completeness, not because they have

any significance in themselves. But there is significance in the total for the category as a whole: we can say that comparative prepositions in the years 1900-1964 have roughly a one-fourth tendency to occur with n-, with the strongest manifestation of this tendency among -že forms, and with the likelihood that this tendency will grow even more pronounced in the last third of this century.

17.08 Adverb prepositions (6-%). -- This mixed category in the present century betrays only a slight tendency to govern n-: it has 2 "actual" and 31+ "apparent" tabulated examples for a percentage of 6-% (i.e., less than one-sixteenth). Both of the "actual" examples belong to otnositel'no -- the only member of the adverb category with any probability of assuming complete "actual" status. Aside from otnositel'no (2:0), the rest of the adverb category consists of thirteen other miscellaneous items of very diverse structure (or lack of structure: see §10.00 above) and which are seemingly proof against any incursion of "actual" examples. They are: net (0:5), nu (0:4), žalko (0:4), žal' (0:3), spasibo (0:3), soglasno (0:3), podobno (0:2), skol'ko (0:2); and nužno, čužđo, sootvetstvenno, čto, and doloj (each 0:1). These thirteen items account for all 31 of the category's "appparent" examples.

This category is used in the present study not only for true adverbs -- i.e., adjective-stems ending in -o -- but also as a catch-all for amorphous items like nu and žal', which do not seem to lend themselves to inclusion in any other category.[1] Breaking the data down into these two sub-groups, we obtain a ratio for the -o adverbs of 2:14 (= 13%), and for the amorphous items, 0:17 (= 0%). It need not be mentioned again

[1]Except, perhaps, for the root category (bliz, protiv, etc.); however, the amorphous items are completely different from them in "status."

that the only two "actual" attestations are with otnositel'no, which is thus isolated from all the other adverb prepositions, having nearly, if not entirely, "actual" status in the twentieth century.

17.09 Gerund prepositions (0%). -- This category is completely "apparent," with 13 attestations, all lacking n-, in the period 1900-1964. The only member of the category attested with the decisive (3PP) objects is blagodarja, whose ratio, of course, is 0:13 (0%). It has already been explained (§§11.05ff.) that the gerunds nesmotrja na and nevziraja na enter into phrases with na, but that the gerund element itself in these phrases does not occur in such a way as would permit us to assign it either "actual" or "apparent" status. On the basis of the present evidence for gerunds in the twentieth century, it seems probable that any and all gerund-prepositions occurring now or in the last third of this century will manifest no tendency whatsoever toward "actual" status.

17.10 Conclusions. -- A look at the synchronic summary for 1900-1964 (Table 25, p. 329) shows that this latest period in the history of Russian prepositions represents a continued expansion of the inventory of different prepositions, and a consolidation of the tremendous gains in "status" which took place in the nineteenth century. The number of different secondary prepositions (occurring with the decisive pronouns) totals 130 in the twentieth century, as compared with 96 in the nineteenth century (cf. §16.00). These figures, of course, are highly dependent on sample size, as has already been mentioned, and they have no real significance except to suggest that there are more different items functioning as prepositions (in the broad sense) now than there were a hundred years

ago.

Much more meaningful information can be gained from the percentage column in Table 25. It shows no radical changes from the nineteenth century: the combined "status" of all secondary categories is just under two-thirds (66-%) in the period 1900-1964, based on 542 "actual" and 283+ "apparent" attestations for all secondary categories together. (Compare the nineteenth century's combined proportion of 62-%.) Further, a comparison of the percentages of the eight separate secondary categories (root, prefixed, adverb, etc.) with the corresponding figures for the 1800's (Table 24, §16.00) discloses that most of the separate categories are only a few percentage points higher in the present century, with the largest differences noticeable in the comparatives (0% in the nineteenth century, 26-% in the twentieth) and in the suffixed group (69% and 88%, respectively).

These rather modest increases are quite different from the revolutionary changes which took place between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (compare §15.00 with §16.00), and characterize the twentieth century as a period of expansion of the inventory of secondary prepositions and of consolidation of their"actual" status. Two separate categories typify this general line of development: the root class is 96% "actual" in the 1900's, as compared with 86% in the 1800's and 25% in the 1700's; the prefixed class is 68% "actual" in the 1900's, as compared with 64% in the 1800's and 22% in the 1700's.

An exception to this trend of consolidation and maturity is represented by three minor categories -- combinations, comparatives, and adverbs -- for which the twentieth century is the time of embryonic change, of the first small innovations in the direction of "actual" sta-

tus (note their proportions of 13-%, 26-%, and 6-%, respectively). It is very possible that these small beginnings of change will eventually culminate in large-scale, revolutionary shifts of these categories in future centuries, but that is a development about which only time will tell. (Further implications of these innovations will be examined below, in §18.08.)

17.11 The hierarchy of categories which was noted in previous sections on Middle Russian (§14.10) and on the nineteenth century (§16.10) is also evident in twentieth-century Russian. The simple and double categories stand at the head of the list, with 100% or 99+% "actual" status, followed by the root (96%), suffixed (88%), and prefixed (68%) categories. The four minor secondary categories bring up the rear with very low proportions: comparatives (26-%), combinations (13-%), adverbs (6-%), and gerunds (0%). Thus the declining progression of percentages is reflected all the way down the roster of secondary categories, and, as in previous periods, gives some hint of correlation between morphological simplicity and "status."

It is clear from the above discussion that among the various prepositional categories there is a basic dichotomy, which can be expressed as follows: in the twentieth century, the line of demarcation for prepositional status separates the four minor secondary categories (plus the lower half of the prefixed group) from all the other categories (simple, double, root, suffixed, top half of prefixed). The minor secondary categories have little or no tendency toward "actual" status in this century, whereas the other (major) categories have a very strong, if not complete, tendency in that direction. The contrast can be seen in Table 26.

TABLE 26

BASIC DEMARCATION OF THE STATUS OF PREPOSITIONAL CATEGORIES IN TWENTIETH-CENTURY RUSSIAN

Minor secondaries	Act	App	Pct	All others	Act	App	Pct
Comparative	12	35+	26-%	Simple	+	+	99+%
Combination	10	69+	13-%	Double	26	0	100 %
Adverb	2	31+	6-%	Root	45	2	96 %
Gerund	0	13	0 %	Suffixed	230	30	88 %
Prefixed (lower 14)	0	74	0 %	Prefixed (top 22)	217	29	82 %
Minor total . . .	24	222+	9-%	Major total . .	518+	61	89+%

This dichotomy is made very evident by the contrast of the total percentages of the minor and of the major categories: the former have a combined total of no more than one-eleventh (9-%) "actual" examples, whereas the latter have a combined total of more than eight-ninths (89+%) "actual" examples (without counting anything for the simple category -- which would raise the overall ratio even higher). We can predict, with considerable accuracy, that in the period 1900-1964 a 3PPO governed by any preposition belonging to the minor secondary categories[1] will not begin with epenthetic n-, but when governed (and preceded) by any preposition belonging to the major categories (simple, root, etc.), it will begin with epenthetic n-. This dichotomy has one serious qualification: it will probably not remain clear much longer. The minor secondary categories have already entered, although in a small way, into a period of embryonic change, and give promise of partly closing the gap between

[1]This sub-rubric "minor secondary category" as used herein is somewhat analogous to the rubric "preposition of latest formation" as used (rather imprecisely) in contemporary Soviet grammars: both terms refer to those secondary prepositions which do not have "actual" status in the twentieth century.

themselves and the major categories within the next century or two.

17.12 The inventory of Modern Russian prepositions. -- The present study opened with a survey of the inconsistencies and lack of agreement among various inventories of Modern Russian prepositions (see above, §§1.01ff.). At that point it was suggested the epenthetic n- could be used as a criterion for distinguishing "actual" from "apparent" prepositions, and for determining the inventory of "actual" prepositions in Modern Russian (or any other stage of the language's history).

Each of the immediately preceding synchronic sections of this study (§§13.10, 14.10, 15.10, 16.10) contained a list of those prepositions which were at least 50% "actual" in each period of the history of Russian. These lists can be considered the inventories of "actual" prepositions for each period (with the reservation that some items are too infrequently attested to be reliable without further data). And by the same token, those secondary prepositions which meet this criterion in the twentieth century can be considered the inventory of "actual" prepositions of present-day Russian (along with, of course, the seventeen simple prepositions). Following is a list of all forty-five secondary prepositions which have at least 50% "actual" status in the present corpus since 1900:

Double: iz-za (19:0), iz-pod (7:0); root: protiv (19:0), skvoz' (13:0), čerez (11:1), mež (1:0), bliz (1:1); suffixed: dlja (105:1), sredi (29:2), mimo (29:2), krome (12:1), radi (14:2), meždu (35:6), krugom (5:0); prefixed: okolo (35:0), vozle (22:0), vmesto (20:0), pomimo (7:0), posredi (4:0), posle (16:1), vokrug (37:3), pozadi (17:3), vperedi (14:3), poverx (5:1), naprotiv (5:1), podle (3:0), promež (2:0), sverx (2:0), poperek (2:0), vblizi (1:0), nasčet (1:0), vdol' (1:0), szadi

(12:5), vrode (2:1), vzamen (1:1); combination: vo vremja (1:0), v čest' (1:0), v čisle (1:0); comparative: ran'še (3:1), prežde (1:0), dal'še (1:0), moristee (1:0), bliže (1:1), lučše (1:1); adverb: otnositel'no (2:0); gerund: none.

It must be strongly emphasized that several of these forty-five items have so few attestations that further data must be accumulated before they can definitely be assigned "actual" status. (Some of these, such as vo vremja, ran'še, and otnositel'no, are relatively new and just beginning to be followed by n-, while others, like bliz, promež, and vdol', are old and on the verge of dying out.) If we exclude from the above list all items with less than five "actual" attestations in the twentieth century, and add the seventeen members of the simple category, we can establish an inventory of the principal "actual" prepositions of twentieth-century Russian:

Simple: v, k, s, o, u, do, po, za, na, iz, ot, pri, pro, bez, nad, pod, pered.

Double: iz-za, iz-pod.

Root: protiv, skvoz', čerez.

Suffixed: dlja, sredi, mimo, krome, radi, meždu, krugom.

Prefixed: okolo, vozle, vmesto, pomimo, posle, vokrug, pozadi, vperedi, poverx, naprotiv, szadi.

Combination, comparative, adverb, gerund: each none.

This inventory of the forty principal "actual" prepositions, seventeen simple and twenty-three secondary, does not exhaust the prepositional resources of Modern Russian. The present study (§17.00, Table 25) showed in the 1900's a total of 17 different simple and 130 different secondary prepositions (in the broad sense), for an overall total of 147 different items which occur at least once with a decisive pronoun in the twentieth

century, based on the present corpus. (There is no need to add that all prepositions can and do occur with numerous other types of object as well!)

17.13 Forty of these, as we have just seen, make up the inventory of principal "actual" prepositions. Now let us look at the other side of the coin -- the principal "apparent" prepositions from each of the separate categories as described above (§§17.02-17.09). Following is the inventory of the "apparent" prepositions with at least five "appparent" attestations in the twentieth century:

Simple, double, root: none.

Suffixed: vne (0:11).

Prefixed: vnutri (8:10), vsled (0:28), navstreču (0:18), vopreki (0:9).

Combination: v konce (0:7).

Comparative: uže (1:5), vyše (1:5).

Adverb: net (0:5).

Gerund: blagodarja (0:13).

It is important to keep in mind that this inventory, like that of "actual" prepositions just above, is far from exhaustive: it enumerates only those items which are attested with the decisive pronoun objects five or more times in the present corpus for the twentieth century.

Within the inventory of principal "apparent" prepositions, only three items have any "actual" examples: vnutri (8:10), uže (1:5), vyše (1:5). Vnutri will probably make the transition to "actual" status within the next generation or two; the comparatives will undoubtedly take much longer. The other seven principal "apparent" prepositions -- vne, vsled, navstreču, vopreki, v konce, net, and blagodarja -- do not have a single example of n- or a split negative in the corpus, and obviously have a very high resistance to "actual" status. The inhibiting factors

here are numerous: dative government (vsled, navstreču, vopreki, blagodarja), some tendency to be postposed (vsled, navstreču, net), verb-like function (net), infrequent occurrence with the decisive pronouns (v konce, uže, vyše, net), etc.

These inhibiting factors do not apply only to vnutri -- which is, in fact, already well on its way out of the "apparent" group, with 44% "actual" status in this century -- and to the intractible vne. For reason or reasons as yet undetermined, vne seems utterly resistant to any development of "actual" status, despite several strong motivations in this direction: simple phonological structure, genitive government, non-occurrence as adverb, constant placement preposed to its object (further details in §6.02 above). Perhaps vne is destined to become one of the unsolved mysteries of Russian prepositional "status." Or, perhaps, in time even it may succumb to this ever-growing trend.

17.14 It is interesting to compare the inventories of "actual" and "apparent" prepositions which make up the twentieth-century total of 147 different items used as prepositions in the present corpus. In the period 1900-1964, there are a total of 72 different items each with at least one "actual" example, as against 75 different items which have no "actual" examples. There is less balance in regard to those whose status is at least 50% "actual": 62 different items have at least half "actual" attestations, compared with 85 which have less than half of their examples with n- or a split NIP.

A more interesting point of comparison lies in the size of the principal inventories: in the twentieth century there are 40 different "actual" prepositions each attested five or more times, but only 10 different "apparent" prepositions with five or more attestations. This seems

to indicate that those items which are frequently used as prepositions are more likely to have "actual" than "apparent" status, and vice versa; in other words, it is likely that there is some connection between frequency of occurrence (with the decisive objects) and "actual" status.[1] This hypothesis, however, can be substantiated only by further and more detailed research, especially into the minor secondary categories. Most of the members of these minor categories are completely "apparent," and their "apparent" examples were somewhat undercounted in the present investigation (designated by the symbol "+" in the tables), once it was definitely established that they are totally "apparent."

[1]Compare also the history of dlja (§§15.04, 16.04), whose early and complete attainment of "actual" status can be connected with its extremely high frequency as a preposition.

18. CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF TEN CENTURIES (1000-1964)

A MILLENIUM OF RUSSIAN PREPOSITIONS

18.00 Introduction. -- After surveying synchronically each of the five basic periods in the development of Russian prepositions, it is now appropriate to take a broad look at the overall history of this category, at the turning points and crucial stages in its thousand-year history, and at the main directions and tendencies in its past, present, and future.

For this purpose, the separate sets of statistics from each of the five synchronic summaries will be brought together in Table 27, a diachronic summary of the whole millennium of Russian prepositional development. For reasons of clarity and space limitations, the summary is presented in two parts, each of which expresses the same information in different form. The first half is of less interest, giving as it does the absolute numbers of "actual" and "apparent" examples -- which in themselves prove nothing. Of much greater interest is the second half of the table, which expresses these same values in relative terms: the percentage of examples in which each prepositional category has "actual" status.

TABLE 27

GENERAL DIACHRONIC SUMMARY: THE SECOND MILLENNIUM (1000-1964)

IN ABSOLUTE TERMS

Category	1000-1399		1400-1699		1700-1799		1800-1899		1900-1964		Total 1000-1964	
Double	0	0	4	0	0	0	19	0	26	0	49	0
Root	0	2	11	67	4	12	83	14	45	2	143	97
Suffixed	0	67	5	61	41	21	311	139	230	30	587	318
Prefixed	1	51	1	67	11	40	183	105	217	103	413	366
Combination . .	0	6+	0	6+	0	3+	0	35+	10	69+	10	119+
Comparative . .	0	4+	0	4+	0	10+	0	53+	12	35+	12	106+
Adverb	0	1+	0	2+	0	1+	1	10+	2	31+	3	45+
Gerund	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	13	1	17
Secondary total	1	131+	22	207+	56	87+	597	360+	542	283+	1218	1068+
Simple	1091	7	(not broken down by centuries)								1929+	112
Grand total . .	1092	138+	--		--		--		--		3147+	1180+

IN RELATIVE TERMS

Category	1000-1399	1400-1699	1700-1799	1800-1899	1900-1964	Total 1000-1964
Double	--	100%	--	100%	100%	100%
Root	0%	14%	25%	86%	96%	60%
Suffixed	0%	8%	66%	69%	88%	65%
Prefixed	2%	1%	22%	64%	68%	53%
Combination . .	0%	0%	0%	0%	13-%	8-%
Comparative . .	0%	0%	0%	0%	26-%	10-%
Adverb	0%	0%	0%	9-%	6-%	6-%
Gerund	--	100%	--	0%	0%	6-%
Secondary total	1-%	10-%	39-%	62-%	66-%	53-%
Simple	99+%	(not broken down by centuries)				94+%

18.01 Commentary. -- Looking at the relative figures, we first of all notice the uniformly high percentages of the simple category, and the contrast between it and all the secondary categories. The simple prepositions in the period 1000-1399 had a proportion of 99.4% (based on 1091 "actual" and 7 "apparent" attestations). In view of the fact that the

simple category established its "actual" status in this first period, no exhaustive count was made of its occurrences in later periods: it can safely be assumed that the simple prepositions have remained 99+% "actual" throughout their subsequent history.[1]

Moving on to the secondary categories in Table 27, we detect a clear progression in an upward and right-hand direction: the higher a category is located in the table, and the farther to the right in the chronological columns, the greater is its tendency to have "actual" status. Among categories of secondary prepositions, the strongest overall tendency toward "actual" status is shown by the double category (100%), followed by the root and suffixed categories (60% and 65%, respectively), the prefixed group (53%), and finally the minor secondary categories at the bottom (ranging from 6-% to 10-%). Likewise, the combined total of all secondary categories is highest in the period 1900-1964 (66-%), second-highest in 1800-1899 (62-%), descending on down to 39-% in 1700-1799, 10-% in 1400-1699, and reaching the low of only 1-% in 1000-1399.

This relative summary provides a very compelling and concise overall view of the developmental scheme of Russian prepositions: the horizontal lines depict the the regular chronological growth of "actual" status, from the earliest period through twentieth-century Russian; and the vertical columns reveal the regular hierarchy of categories, from the simple and double categories at the top, down to adverbs and gerunds at the bottom.

---

[1] A partial tabulation which was made of the simple prepositions in the years 1400-1964 included all exceptions which were encountered, but only a smattering of the innumerable "actual" occurrences: these partial figures come out to 838+ "actual" and 105 "apparent," for an under-counted proportion of 89+%. When these partial figures for 1400-1964 are added to the exhaustive figures for 1000-1399, they produce, as indicated in Table 27, an all-time total of only 94+% (which is admittedly under-counted) for the simple category. An exhaustive count would have shown 99+%.

Making allowances for some discrepancies due to small samples, we find that each of the separate categories reflects the same growth pattern in microcosm; for instance, the root category is 0% "actual" in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian, grows to 14% in Middle Russian, to 25% in the eighteenth century, to 86% in the nineteenth, and 96% in the twentieth centuries. Likewise, each of the five historical periods reveals the same hierarchy of categories in microcosm; an example is the twentieth century, in which the double category is 100% "actual," followed by the root category (96%), the suffixed group (88%), etc., down to the adverb and gerund groups (6-% and 0%, respectively).

18.02 Discrepancies. -- There are, of course, some discrepancies in this overall scheme which require allowances. The most obvious (and easily explainable) is the unlikely proportion of 100% shown for the gerund category in the period 1400-1699. But a glance at the absolute (upper) half of the table tells us that in the given period there is only one example of gerunds with decisive pronouns (specifically, prišed nix -- which, on top of everything else, is a scribal error), and so we discount the 100% here as a sampling (and scribal) error. (It is for this reason that the absolute (upper) half of the table is provided: any percentages which are questionable -- or even those which are not questionable -- can be checked against the raw figures to determine how many examples have produced the given percentage.)

A less transparent discrepancy is the unexpectedly high proportion of 66% for the suffixed category in the period 1700-1799. Since this proportion is based on a total of 62 examples (41 "actual," 21 "apparent"), we cannot discount it so easily as the single example of prišed. It is interesting to note that this disproportionately high percentage

for the suffixed category in the eighteenth century is reflected also by the same category's all-time total in the right-hand column (65%). Comparing the suffixed and root categories, we see that in each period, except 1700-1799, the root category has a higher percentage of "actual" attestations than does the suffixed group, but the latter's surprisingly high score in the one century is enough to raise it slightly above the root category in the all-time total (65% vs. 60%).

The major factor in this discrepancy is undoubtedly the presence of dlja -- a very high frequency preposition with a high "actual" percentage -- in the suffixed category (cf. §§15.04, 16.04 above). If dlja were not counted at all in the suffixed category, then the latter's proportion for 1700-1799 would drop to 28%, and its all-time total to 45% -- figures somewhat more in line with the relation between the suffixed and the other categories. However, dlja is a member of this category as herein defined, and its data in other centuries does fit in with the category generally, so if we discounted it here to clear up one discrepancy, another would be created somewhere else along the line.

Such exceptions and discrepancies as these are usually levelled out as we move to more general totals in the bottom line of the table or in its right-hand column. When seen in the light of the overwhelming majority of non-exceptions, a few discrepancies take on the proper perspective and do not seriously contradict the two general trends which are the main subject of the present investigation -- namely, the chronological growth of secondary prepositions and the hierarchy of prepositional categories.

18.03 Periodizing the history of prepositions. -- Establishment of the principal stages in the history of a language and the turning points between them has always been a bone of contention in the study

of Russian. Vinogradov recently took his fellow scholar Bulaxovskij to task in this regard, alleging (1957: 189) that parts of the latter's Istoričeskie kommentarii k russkomu literaturnomu jazyku are "lacking in historical-chronological definitiveness and cannot serve as the basic periodization of the development of the Russian literary language's syntactic structure. . . . It appears that a large part of the syntactic traits singled out [by Bulaxovskij] became established in the Russian literary language of the end of the eighteenth and start of the nineteenth century." This same time is proposed by Vinogradov in his own research (1947: 695-6) as the period of "intensive growth of new Russian prepositions."

A similar view is expressed by Bukatevič (1953: 40), who finds that "the influx of new prepositions into the literary language, especially in governmental and business (kanceljarsko-delovoj) style, has intensified since the eighteenth century." Finkel', another specialist in Russian prepositions, directs special attention (1962b: 167 and in passing) to the fact that several of the newer prepositions like vvidu are first registered by a dictionary only in 1895, by Grot (Slovar' Vtorago otdělenija imp. Akademii nauk", pod red. Ja. K. Grota). Finkel', however, goes on to cite examples from his own research showing that many of these "new" prepositions were already in use in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Another scholar who has conducted a detailed investigation into the history of prepositions is Čerkasova; she finds (1955: 75) that "the process of formation of nominal prepositions procedes especially intensely beginning with the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century in the styles of official business, science, and journalism, the role

of prepositions becomes especially significant." Elsewhere Čerkasova writes (1962: 119) that "almost all complex-compound prepositions [of the type v svjazi s] arose in the nineteenth century," and in another book (1964: 237) she generalizes that "the nineteenth century can be called the century of nominal prepositions proper." This generalization Čerkasova bases on her finding (1964: 228-9, 276-7) that the only productive type of preposition in the last half of the nineteenth century was the nominal type (v silu, v otličie ot, etc.), after the innovations of the eighteenth century -- the adverb (kasatel'no) and gerund (vyključaja) types -- had lost their productivity and tended to die out around the 1830's and 1840's.

The comments cited above show that these scholars are in general agreement that the main, intense development of Russian prepositions took place in the nineteenth century, after it had begun in the latter part of the eighteenth. And although this consensus chronology fits in very closely with the present study's characterization of the nineteenth century as the period of "prepositional revolution" (see §18.06 below), it should be borne in mind that two entirely different approaches to prepositions are involved here.

Bukatevič, Čerkasova, Finkel', etc., are dealing with prepositions on a level of general prepositional usage with emphasis on semantics; a typical problem which they try to solve is to determine when an item like blagodarja (Boga), v rassuždenii (sego), etc., ceased being a phrase with "full nominal or verbal meaning" and became a single, "semantically weak," compound preposition; or, when the meaning of dlja switched from "cause" to "purpose." Consequently, their chronology of an individual item is based on occurrence of the item with what they interpret as "prepositional

function" or "prepositional meaning," and their chronology of a particular category is based on the period when that type of formation (denominative, deverbative, etc.) was productive. The investigations of Bukatevič, Čerkasova, Finkel', etc., are very valuable for showing changes of function and meaning which various prepositions have undergone.

The present study has been directed not at a duplication of their work, but at quite a different problem: a determination of changes in the formal status of individual prepositions and categories, on the basis of a strict procedural definition ("does the item govern n- and split negatives?"). It is to be hoped that the limited but specific results of the present formal investigation will be complementary to the vague but broad results of previous semantic studies, and that each will have its own value. The very fact that the two different approaches both hit upon the nineteenth century as the time of great changes is all the more significant for having been arrived at independently.

18.04 The formal history of Russian prepositions has been herein divided, according to the results of the present research, into five basic periods, each representing a different stage in the development of secondary prepositions. The simple prepositions, as already explained, remain unchanged throughout the entire time, and so they are not taken into consideration in establishing the periodization.[1]

The first period, covering the years 1000-1399 (i.e., Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian) is the time of the status quo: all secondary prepositions throughout this period show no signs of "actual" status,

[1] We can, however, assume a sixth stage, extending backward from 1000 A.D. or from 800 A.D. to the time when the simple prepositions were split into two sub-groups, but this pre-written epoch remains outside the scope of the descriptive research; see §19.02ff.

with just one exception in the prefixed category (vsled nego) -- an exception which was scratched out. Thus all secondary categories have a combined proportion of only 0.8%, in contrast to 99.4% for the simple category. This forms an almost complete dichotomy, with the line of demarcation for "actual" status being drawn between the simple category and all others. No changes are observed in this situation between the beginning and end of the period, which is therefore called the status quo. (See also §2.16 above.)

18.05 The second period, covering the years 1400-1699 (i.e., Middle Russian), is characterized as the period of embryonic change: a few (twelve) secondary prepositions, especially iz-za and čerez, begin to show the first signs of movement in the direction of "actual" status. But these innovations are very small, totalling only 10-% of all decisive examples for secondary prepositions. In this period the dichotomy is drawn between the simple and double categories (each around 99+% or 100%), on the one hand, and all other categories, on the other hand.

The third period, covering the years 1700-1799 (the eighteenth century), is the epoch of the first major shifts: the combined total of all secondary categories reaches 39-% "actual," and a handful of individual prepositions like dlja, posle, meždu, and podle approach or pass the 50% mark. In this century the old dichotomy is no longer so clear-cut, and dlja in particular becomes the first secondary preposition to jump the barrier between 0% and 100% "actual" status. However, most of the secondary categories in general remain on a low level, between 0% and 25% "actual."

18.06 The fourth period, covering the years 1800-1899 (the nine-

teenth century), is called the prepositional revolution: the overall proportion of secondary prepositions passes the 50% mark and reaches almost two-thirds "actual" status (62-%). Moreover, the root, suffixed, and prefixed categories, in addition to the simple and double classes, all achieve high levels of "actual" status, ranging from 100% down to 64%, and all can be regarded as having passed the midpoint of transition to "actual" status.

The nineteenth century is also the time when numerous individual prepositions make the transition to "actual" status, especially iz-pod, podle, vozle, skvoz', posle, bliz, vokrug, okolo, sredi, etc. (not to mention iz-za, dlja, čerez, and protiv, which had made the transition earlier). At this time we also see an important change in the old dichotomy between those categories whose status is "actual" and those whose status is "apparent": in the 1800's the line of demarcation passes between the minor secondary categories (combination, comparative, adverb, and gerund), which have a combined total of only 1% "actual" status, and all other categories (simple, double, root, suffixed, prefixed), which have a combined total of 70%. This basic change was brought about by the shift of the major secondary categories (root, prefixed, etc.) away from their original "apparent" status, and into the camp of "actual" prepositions along with its original occupants, the simple prepositions.

18.07 The fifth period, covering the years 1900-1964 (the twentieth century), is labelled as the time of consolidation and expansion: more individual items are added to the inventory of "actual" prepositions, and each secondary category increases its "actual" percentage somewhat. However, the overall rise in "actual" examples of all secondary categories combined is very slight (from 62-% to 66-%). In the present century the

inventory of "actual" prepositions is enlarged by the addition of several new items: radi, vmesto, pomimo, pozadi, vperedi, szadi, etc. At the same time some older items like protivu, mež, bliz, posredi, etc., have already died out, or are in the process of doing so. The twentieth century is a period of maturity, of consolidation of previous revolutionary changes, insofar as the major secondary categories are concerned: these are the categories which reached or passed the two-thirds mark of "actual" status in the nineteenth century, and for which the present century is a time of ordering and levelling out of minor exceptions.

This maturation brings the major secondary categories almost onto the same level as the simple category, since they now have a combined proportion of 89% "actual" status (for details, see §17.11 above). In contrast, the minor secondary categories have a combined total of only 9-%. Thus the new "actual" : "apparent" dichotomy, which arose in the nineteenth century, grows stronger and more clearly defined in the twentieth; and the line of demarcation, despite being shifted to new ground (it now separates minor secondary categories from all other categories, whereas in Old Church Slavonic it separated the simple category from all others), again becomes nearly as sharply drawn today as it was a thousand years ago. After breaking down in the eighteenth century, the fundamental opposition within the prepositional inventory, between those categories which are "actual" and those which are "apparent," is restored in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[1]

18.08 Generalizations. -- The right-hand column in Table 27, in-

[1]This new opposition, between the minor secondary categories and all others, also seems to be reflected in the frequent adverbial use of the former and the seriously limited adverbial use of the latter (cf. §12.05 above).

dicating the all-time "actual" : "apparent" totals, has a few slight discrepancies. The all-time proportion for the simple category is shown as only 94+% for the reasons outlined above (p. 346, n. 1); this percentage therefore must be taken with the reservation that it is highly undercounted. And the percentages of the secondary categories must be taken with a different reservation: the amount of material covered was much larger for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries than for earlier periods; hence, the proportions from recent centuries will have much greater weight in the all-time total composite percentages. This fact, plus the disproportionately high percentage for the suffixed category in the eighteenth century, probably accounts for the fact that the root category has an all-time percentage slightly below that of the suffixed class.

Taking into account these reservations and discrepancies, the all-time total column does provide a general reflection of the hierarchy of categories as discussed above. On an all-time basis, the four minor categories are grouped at the bottom of the list, with extremely low scores (from 10-% to 6-%). Then come the suffixed, root, and prefixed categories with intermediate scores (from 65% to 53%). And at the very top of the hierarchy are the simple and double classes, each with nearly 100% "actual" status throughout its entire history. In §14.10 above it was pointed out that on a long-term basis the behavior of the double category is much closer to the simple group than to the other secondary groups; however, the inclusion of the double class in the combined total of all secondary categories has little effect on the all-time total percentage: it is 53-% if the double group is included with the other seven secondary categories, and would be 52-% if the double group were not included with them.

18.09 In the preceding sections it was pointed out that the secondary categories, especially the major ones, show only a slight increase in percentage of "actual" examples between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The difference, in fact, is so small (62-% vs. 66-% overall) that there would be no need of setting up the twentieth century as a separate period, distinct from the nineteenth -- if it were not for the minor secondary categories. The only significant difference between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is in these minor secondary categories, which begin to show the first scattered, sporadic innovations, the first hints of embryonic change, in the 1900's. As shown above (§§17.10ff.), there are twenty-four different "actual" attestations (= 9-%) of the minor secondary categories in this century, as compared with only one (= 1-%) in the late nineteenth century. And it is this current small-scale change in the minor secondary categories which sets the twentieth century apart from the nineteenth.

18.10 In fact, the present evidence indicates that the minor secondary categories are beginning to recapitulate the developmental scheme of the major categories, with a time lag of about three centuries. The major secondary classes underwent their first small beginnings of change in Middle Russian (cf. §14); the minor categories are undergoing them in the twentieth century. If the same time-table holds true for the latter as for the former, then we can expect that the minor categories will undergo their own "prepositional revolution" around the twenty-second century, and a period of "maturity and consolidation" around the twenty-third century.

And if this development of the minor categories does continue according to such a time-table, it will eventually destroy the new opposi-

tion between the major and minor secondary categories, which was established in the 1800's and somewhat strengthened in the 1900's (cf. §18.07 above). It is almost as if the developmental scheme of the language is unreceptive to stable oppositions -- as soon as a state of equilibrium is achieved, the dynamic forces which brought about this state continue to act, and eventually lead to its destruction. The old opposition, between the simple category and all others, was established before 1000 A.D., but began to weaken in Middle Russian and finally collapsed in the prepositional revolution of the nineteenth century. In fact, it can be assumed that even earlier there had been still another opposition, between v, k, s and all other prepositions (see §19.08), but it gave way to the state of affairs which is attested in Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian. And today the new opposition, between minor secondary categories and all others, is itself in danger of eventual collapse -- if the development of the minor categories continues.

18.11 All of these cyclic changes can be attributed to the ever-growing expansion of "actual" status (i.e., of epenthetic n-), which began sometime before 800 A.D. with only three prepositions (see §19.08), and has now extended to nearly half a hundred, with very strong indications of continuing expansion in the future. The fact that the changes follow a cyclic pattern is itself very interesting. The whole developmental scheme of Russian prepositional "status" is marked by these recapitulation cycles: first, presumably, came the three original n-prepositions v, k, and s; then, in the first millennium, the other so-called "simple" prepositions (e.g., po) recapitulated their development; later, in Middle Russian and the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the major secondary categories (e.g., posle) went through the same process; and now,

in the twentieth century, the minor secondary categories (e.g., po povodu) give evidence of beginning the very same recapitulation cycle all over again.

18.12 It is interesting to note a kind of similarity between these developmental patterns in the system of Russian prepositions and the patterns of evolution in biological systems. The gradual development of early "apparent" categories of prepositions into modern "actual" categories reminds one of the gradual evolution of early, primitive types of organisms into modern, more highly developed species. And the synchronic hierarchy of prepositional categories arranged in order of their tendency toward "actual" status in a certain period is somewhat analogical to the systematic classification of organisms within a certain phylum into sub-types (class, order, family, genus, species, etc.) arranged in order of complexity of development. Thus in certain respects it appears that the system of a grammatical category (such as prepositions) of a living language, both in its diachronic and its synchronic aspects, has parallels with the evolutionary processes and classificatory relationships of organic phenomena.

18.13 Chronology of individual prepositions. -- Having gained an overall perspective on the evolution and interrelationships of the nine prepositional categories, we can now move to a brief survey of the four or five dozen individual prepositions to which an "estimated turning point" was assigned in Part Two (§§3.-11. above). This will be presented in the form of a matrix with the chronological divisions on the vertical axis, and the categories on the horizontal axis. "Estimated turning points" are given in parentheses, with question marks indicating dubious dates arising from a very small amount of data.

TABLE 28: MATRIX OF INDIVIDUAL PREPOSITIONS

Simple	Double	Root	Suffixed	Prefixed	Minor categ.
1000					1000
v k s o u do po za na iz ot pri bez nad pod pered (1000/99)					
1300					1300
pro (1316?)					
1600					1600
	iz-za (1600/49)	krug (1623/99?)			
1700			dlja (1724/52)		1700
		čerez (1768) protiv(1792)			
1800				okrest (1808?) podle (1809) posle (1833) vokrug (1841) vozle (1842) promež (1842?) okolo(1847/52)	1800
	iz-pod (1828)	bliz (1828) skvoz'(1834) sred'(1835?)			
1850			meždu(1856) sredi(1864) mimo (1877) krugom(1879/84) krome(1884)		1850
		mež (1868)			
1900				vmesto(1896/1900) posredi(1907) sverx(1907/22?) pomimo (1910?) poverx (1911?) naprotiv(1915) pozadi (1915) vperedi (1915)	osnositel'no (1897/1917?)
1930			radi(1925)	vblizi (1922?) vrode (1933?)	1930
				poperek(1938?) vnutri (1947?) szadi (1948)	ran'še (1946?)
1964			posredstvom?		po povodu? 1964
(none)	po-za? po-nad? po-pod?	(none)	vne?	nasčet? vdol'? vzamen? others?	v otnošenii? other combinations? other comparatives in -še?
2100?					

18.14 Commentary. -- Although the individual prepositions and estimated turning points in this matrix are subject to modification as more material is collected in the future, the general cycles of development and hierarchies among the nine categories are brought out very graphically by this arrangement in Table 28. Almost all members of the simple category are placed by their estimated turning points in the earliest century of the material investigated, and after them the first categories of which any members make the transition are the double, root, and suffixed groups, in the 1600's and 1700's. The first important items which become "actual" prepositions after Old Church Slavonic seem to be pro (1316?), iz-za (1600/1649), dlja (1724/52), čerez (1768), and protiv (1792).

By contrast, no prefixed prepositions make the transition to "actual" status until the 1800's, and many of them do not make it until the beginning of the 1900's. It is interesting to note that the nineteenth century seems to be divided into two halves by the suffixed and prefixed categories. In the first half of the century, the transition to "actual" status is made by a handful of prefixed prepositions (podle, posle, etc.), but not by any suffixed items. The second half of the nineteenth century, on the other hand, is the turning point for a small group of suffixed prepositions (meždu, sredi, mimo, etc.), but not for any members of the prefixed category until the very end of the century, when vmesto seems to have made the transition.

Finally, the minor secondary categories show no turning points until the twentieth century, when otnositel'no and ran'še have evidently made the transition. The time segment at the bottom of the matrix, between 1964 and 2100(?), allows space for a few items which, according to the evidence, may undergo the transition in the not-too-distant future.

18.15 Case government. -- An interesting and potentially significant aspect of the development of Russian prepositions, which was not examined in detail by the present study, is the question of case government. It will be noticed in Table 28 above that almost all of the non-original prepositions govern the genitive case. A spot check indicates, in fact, that all attestations of epenthetic n- in the corpus occur with genitive forms of the 3PPO, except with the following prepositions:

v (acc., prep.), k (dat.), s (inst., acc.), o (prep., acc.), po (dat., prep., acc.), za (inst., acc.), na (prep., acc.), pri (prep.), nad (inst., acc.), pod (inst., acc.), pered (inst., acc.), pro (acc.), mimo (acc.), skvoze/skvoz' (acc.), čerez (acc.), and meždu/mež (inst.).

Of the sixteen (eighteen if skvoze and mež are counted separately) prepositions in this list, eleven go back to the earliest texts of the corpus, and the twelfth, pro, dates from no later than the fourteenth century. Thus the only secondary prepositions which govern n- plus a case other than the genitive are mimo (two examples, /1425), skvoze (one example, ca. 1500), skvoz', čerez, meždu, and mež. It is true that other secondary prepositions, such as protivu (dative) and vozle (accusative), originally could govern cases other than the genitive, but all of their attestations with n- in the present corpus involve genitive (although many of their attestations lacking n- do involve other cases!).

The fact that so many genitive-governing secondary prepositions have acquired "actual" status, especially in the last two centuries, whereas čerez, skvoz', and mež(du) are the only non-genitive governors to attain this status (plus very early marginal examples with mimo and skvoze), suggests the possibility that government of a case other than genitive produces very strong resistance to "actual" status. Another fact pointing to the same conclusion is the existence in Modern Russian

of several non-genitive-governing secondary prepositions which seem completely unable to be followed by n-, even sporadically: vopreki, vsled, blagodarja, etc. (further details in §§17.05, 17.13 above). In fact, the last time a non-genitive-governing preposition made the transition from "apparent" to "actual" status was a century ago, when the barrier was jumped by meždu/mež (estimated turning point: 1856/68). Prior to that, the transition was completed by skvoz' (1834) and čerez (1768); no other non-genitive-governors have ever done so since the simple prepositions acquired "actual" status in the first millennium. (Compare this with the very large number of genitive-governing prepositions which have made the transition in the same period.)

There is a serious reservation which must be considered, however, before attempting to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between non-genitive case government and resistance to "actual" status. And that is simply that the vast majority of secondary prepositions in Russian govern, and always have governed, only the genitive case. The number of prepositions controlling other cases all or part of the time is small, and a number of items which once had non-genitive government, like protiv(u), podle, mimo, vozle, etc., have lost it and become full genitive governors. There has been relatively little opportunity for non-genitive prepositions to acquire "actual" status partly because there have been relatively few non-genitive prepositions in the language.

Before giving a final answer to the question of the relationship between "status" and case government, it will be necessary to wait and see what happens to modern dative-governing prepositions like vopreki and vsled in future generations. If, despite very frequent occurrence as prepositions, they prove unable to gain "actual" status in the future (and they will be held back by the tradition that no non-genitive governor

has succeeded in doing so since <u>meždu</u> in the mid-nineteenth century), then there will be good reason to conclude that in the modern period genitive government has become an indispensable characteristic of "actual" prepositions, and that non-genitive government automatically precludes "actual" status. But this is a question which only time can answer.

PART FOUR

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

> With the passage of time, prepositional constructions began in a more exact and differentiated way to denote functions which had previously been performed primarily by case forms, since at this level of development, the language system was enriched by possibilities which it formerly had not had. . . . The history of government in Russian syntax is essentially the history of the gradual disappearance from use of case forms with one or another meaning, and the gradual development, expansion, strengthening, and improvement of prepositions with case forms for the same and new meanings.
>
> Lomtev (1956: 22-3)

19. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PREPOSITIONS

19.00 As has been amply demonstrated in the foregoing parts, the development of Russian prepositions has been marked by a series of important changes. Chief among these is the transition to prepositional status (or, as Ščerba and Čerkasova call it, opredložívanie) of adverbs of all types, noun phrases, comparatives, gerunds, etc. After completing an empirical analysis of this development, we will now pass to a consideration of some broader implications.

19.01 Fluctuating categories. -- Contemporary Standard Russian is, generally speaking, an established and ordered literary language with definite "norms" governing most of its morphological phenomena, as expounded in works issued by the USSR Academy of Sciences, like the Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: 1.3-5). Within the normalized system of inflection, however, there are a few "fluctuating categories" or "fluid areas" in which different forms alternate, coexist, or compete with each other; some of these are examined in recent articles by Benson (1961) and Hingley (1958). Another of the relatively rare areas of fluctuation in Russian morphology is the presence or absence of epenthetic n- when a 3PPO is governed by a secondary preposition -- the subject of the present investigation. This fluctuation was an unusual phenomenon, according to Meillet (1934: §173) even in the earliest Slavic texts: "Le cas de -n finale est le seul où une trace de flottement ait persisté jusqu'à l'époque historique."

The degree of fluctuation of the epenthetic consonant has varied

in different stages of the history of Russian, from virtually none in the earliest stage (see §18.04), to a considerable amount in the last three centuries (§§18.05ff.). In terms of categories, the greatest fluctuation (unpredictability) was probably in the eighteenth century, when the secondary categories reached 39-% "actual" status, as contrasted with the 99+% mark of the simple group, for a differential of only around 60%. In terms of individual prepositions, there seems to have been more vacillation of suffixed and prefixed items like mežду and okolo in the nineteenth century than there is in the twentieth (they have now achieved 100% "actual" status), but considerably more fluctuation among comparatives, combinations, and adverbs (vyše, po povodu, otnositel'no, etc.) today than in previous centuries (when there was none at all).

Thus it seems that there will continue to be considerable unpredictability in the form of the ЗРРО after many secondary prepositions (especially the minor categories) in the foreseeable future. One thing which is predictable, however, is that these fluctuations will continue to lead in only one general direction, and that is toward the ever-increasing presence (rather than absence) of the epenthetic nasal. Each separate prepositional category has manifested this movement only in an upward direction (toward "actual" status) from period to period throughout the ten centuries of written materials under investigation, as can be seen in the diachronic summary in Table 27 (§18.00) above.

The only exceptions to this basic trend are the simple prepositions -- which have been 100% "actual" from their first attestations and hence have no further to go, and the isolated individual prepositions like čerez (§5.05) and szadi (§7.26) -- whose seemingly irregular development is possibly the result of an inadequate sample.

Another indication of this upward trend is seen in the occasional revisions of prepositional constructions in republications of texts, such as vozle ego in "Starosvetskie pomeščiki" by Gogol' (izd. 1835 g., str. 143), which was changed to vozle nego seven years later (izd. 1842 g.); or Puškin's posle ego in the rough draft of a journalistic article (PSS, 11.160), which he revised to posle nego in the second draft (11.165). Almost never are such changes noted in the opposite direction; one such example is Gor'kij's vpered" neja (Dev. jan., izd. 1907 g.), which was revised to vpered ee in the 1920's (see §2.04 above); another is Novikov-Priboj's moristee nego (Cusima, 1932/36 g.), which the Slovar' russkogo jazyka (1957-61) chooses to quote in the form moristee ego (see §9.01) -- apparently in a misguided attempt at "standardization."

19.02 Origin of n-. -- It was stated above (§§1.28ff.) that previous scholars have done little in the way of detailed factual research on the expansion of the epenthetic consonant in the historical period (after about 1000 A.D.). But at the same time most of them do provide a detailed theoretical explanation of the origin of n- and how it first came to be associated with prepositions. The generally accepted theory, best expounded by Meillet (1910), Vaillant (1950: 204-7), Van Wijk (1957: 79-80), and Lehr-Spławiński (1959: §58), is that Common Slavic had three prepositions ending in *-n -- namely, *vȍn, *sȍn, and *kȍn, which went back to Indo-European *en (cf. Grk. en, Ger. an, O.Pr. en), *sem/som (cf. Skt. sam-; Grk. háma, syn, ksyn; Lat. cum; Ger. sammt; O.Pr. sen), and probably *kam (cf. Ved. kám, Av. kąm, also Maced. kon).[1]

[1]For other suggestions about the source of *n-, see Hrubý (1909: 8-10, 48-9), who points out some similarities to the I.E. *-na (Skt. a-nā, Grk. a-ná, etc.), and Stang (1957), who suggests that the instrumental-governing prepositions nadȍ, podȍ, prědȍ may have originated from the Old

These three proclitics lost their nasal element before a consonant (*sexoditi, *ve xlěbě, *ke tomu, etc.) according to the law of open syllables or rising sonority, but often kept it before a vowel or *j (*seniti, *seneti, *ven uši, *ven ědra, *ven otrě, *ven jegda = veńegda, *ken jemu = keńemu, etc.). This retention of the nasal took place with some verbs (*seniti), some adverbs (*veńegda), very rarely with nouns (*ve-n-ědra), but most often with the anaphoric-relative pronoun *jě(že), creating a whole series of prepositional phrases of the type *ven jemě = veńemě, *sen jeju = seńeju, *ken jime = keńime, etc. The prehistoric epoch when this situation is assumed to have existed is therefore a sixth period in the history of Russian (Slavic) prepositions -- the period when *n presumably occurred only after three prepositions (cf. also §§13.01, 18.04).

19.03 The first expansion of n-. -- The key moment occurred in Common Slavic when the nasal began to occur as an epenthetic or liason element between the 3PP and other prepositions which originally had not ended in *n, such as o, u, do, po, za, na, etc. This development, which probably took place in the first millennium if not before, and which can be called "the first expansion of n-," resulted in the situation attested in Late Common Slavic (Old Church Slavonic) where new phrases like o ńei (from *o jei), do ńego (from *do jego), po ńemu (from *po jemu), na ńix" (from *na jixe), etc., formed a common system with the inherited v" ńei (from *veńei), s" ńego, k" ńemu, v" ńix", etc. Whether the n in such constructions should be interpreted as a component of the preposition or of the pronoun will be discussed later, along with a number of factors which

---

Prussian-Slavic suffixal element *-den (whence the *n before prepositions). A detailed discussion of the forms and functions of the anaphoric-relative pronoun *jě in Old Church Slavonic may be found in Blagova (1963).

can be cited to account for the development (see below, §§19.04ff.).

The expansion of *n to phrases involving prepositions other than the original three must have proceeded gradually over a span of several centuries in the pre-historic period, and we perhaps have some evidence for this in the contrast between v"nǫtr' and izǫtr', and in the coexistence of doublets like doideže (the older form) and doń'deže (the newer form) in Old Church Slavonic, as well as the seven isolated attestations of simple prepositions without n- (amounting to only 0.6% of all examples) in the period 1000-1399 of the present corpus (see §§3.19f. above). But the earliest substantial evidence which we have -- the Old Church Slavonic manuscripts -- already presents a picture of completed development: the epenthetic nasal is used virtually 100% of the time after the sixteen simple prepositions (v", k", s", o, u, do, po, za, na, ot", iz, pri, bez, nad", pod", prěd") whenever they are followed by the 3PP in Old Church Slavonic -- and, soon thereafter, also with the Old Russian pro (see §13.01 above).

These conclusions of the present investigation are in close accord with those reached long ago by Leskien, who lists (1955: §35.11) the seventeen "eigentliche, echte" prepositions to which he attributes control of epenthetic n-. Leskien in fact seems to be the only scholar who has actually presented a full list of the prepositions in question (although the present evidence suggests that, due to the lack of decisive attestations, v"z should be omitted from Leskien's list -- which otherwise tallies exactly with the inventory arrived at in the present research).

The same general descriptive statement is made by Lehr-Spławiński (1959: §58), who, however, in lieu of a list says simply that n- occurs after "one-syllable prepositions." Such a statement is not completely accurate, because, as Diels shows (1932: §46.2), the list of one-syllable

prepositions must be supplemented by ot", prěd", pod", and nad", which also definitely take n- in Old Church Slavonic. But at the same time Diels makes a different misstatement, when he says (1932: §46.2) that n- occurs only when the preposition and the 3PP are in direct syntactic construction with each other, but not when the 3PP is used as a possessive. Several years later this was corrected by Vaillant (1948: §44) and Ferrell (1958: 79-80), who show that in Old Church Slavonic the epenthetic consonant occurs with intercalated pronouns of the type v" ńego město, and who specifically mention some secondary prepositions which do not take n- (meždu, prěmo, razvě, radi, bliz").

19.04 Motivating factors. -- After the above descriptive treatment, it is appropriate to attempt an interpretation of the origin and expansion of epenthetic n from a structural viewpoint, and to consider the various factors which may have motivated the development.

It is generally agreed that in Common Slavic before the effects of the law of rising sonority (open syllables) were felt, the three key prepositions had the form *vən, *sən, *kən in all positions: *vən jixə, *vən těxə, etc. Then the said law "took effect" through a series of sound changes which eliminated closed syllables, with the result that the three prepositions now had different allomorphs depending on the following phoneme: v" ńix" but v" těx" (loss of n before a consonant). But beyond this generally-accepted point of departure, scholars differ in the way that they account for the extension of *n to the other simple prepositions.

The traditional approach, represented by Kuznecov (1953: 137-8), Cvoždev (1958: 271), and Bulaxovskij (1958: 183), suggests that in Proto-Slavic the three prepositions "in the overwhelming majority of cases" occurred without the nasal, and therefore when it did occur in a few com-

binations like *vonědra, *sońimi, *kuńemu, *vonǫgle, *sonęti, *vonǫtro, etc., "the prepositional element was easily perceived as *vo, *so, *ko," while the second element "began to be understood" as *nědra (cf. Russ. nedra), *ńimi, *ńemu, *ngle (cf. S.C. dialect nugao), *nęti (cf. Russ. obnjat'), *nǫtro (cf. Russ. nutro), etc. This assumed process of the reinterpretation of *n is called "metanalysis" by Matthews (1960: §445) and pererazloženie by Gvozdev (1958: §472). But the traditional reasoning, according to which the nasal was "no longer perceived" as a part of the preposition because the preposition usually occurred without it (i.e., in preconsonantal environment, etc.) is not necessarily compelling, because at the same time it can be pointed out that the pronouns also occurred very often without being preceded by the three nasal-final prepositions -- so that *n might not have been "perceived" as a part of the pronouns either!

19.05 This "metanalysis" can be accounted for by a number of other factors which perhaps make more sense structurally. Some of them are phonologic: (1) after the law of rising sonority took effect, all syllables in Common Slavic ended in a vowel; hence, all combinations of the type *vońixo, *sońimi, etc., were pronounced /vo ńi xo/, /so ńi mi/, etc., with the syllable break coming before /n/ and placing it with the pronoun (see Van Wijk [1957: 79]); (2) the nasal coalesced with the initial *j of the 3PP, resulting in a single (palatal) phoneme *ń, which could then have been "perceived" as the 3PP root after prepositions (Van Wijk [1957: 80], Vaillant [1950: 206], Kuznecov [1953: 137]); (3) it is pointed out by Galton (1956: 171) that the "tendency to attach initial glides is indeed a living thing in Slav. . . . Under the operation of this tendency, the number of words with initial vowels has been substantially curtailed." As a manifestation of this general tendency, the epenthesis of n is seen

by Hruby (1909: 48, n.) as one of the means of avoiding hiatus of adjacent vowels.[1]

There are also possible morphological factors: (4) other pronouns in Slavic (except in" and the later Russian ètot) in all oblique cases begin with a consonant: compare, in Old Church Slavonic, do česo with do ńego, na v'sem' with na ńem', po sim" with po ńim", za m"nojǫ with za ńejǫ, prěd" nami with prěd" ńimi, etc. (see also Černyx [1954: 208]); thus the frequency of an initial consonant, especially a nasal consonant, in other pronoun objects, would form a pattern into which the 3PP could fit; (5) in Common Slavic practically every "word" ended in a vowel (two or three exceptions are discussed in §20.09 below), so that a pattern is formed according to which a phrase of the type /keńei/ might be analyzed as k" ńei rather than *k"ń ei.

19.06 Thus it does seem that there were a number of factors which could have helped to motivate the "metanalysis" of the nasal to the 3PP. There are also precedents in other languages where a final nasal was lost except for liason (sandhi), and then became metanalyzed as the initial of certain words occurring after it. Bloomfield (1933: 419) cites the examples of English newt (presumably from O.E. an efeta), nickname (from an eke-name), and for the nonce (from for then anes). Compare also eclipsis in Old Irish, where fer n- ("man," acc.) and beo n- ("living") derive their liason nasal from the I.E. acc. ending *-om, *-on (see Meillet [1953: 321]), and the genitive pronoun forms arN- ("us") and bharN- ("you")

[1] It is interesting to note that such a development does not take place in similar circumstances in German and French, where such prepositional phrases as bei ihr, zu ihm, and entre eux (alongside entre nous and other types of liason in French) do not develop any liason-consonant.

also show a partial preservation of an ancient nasal. Vaillant mentions (1958: 424) that there is even such a development involving prepositional phrases with d- in Old Prussian; e.g., kirsa din ("on him"), which evidently arose from *kirsad in.

The next step in the process was easy. Once the *ń began to function as the root of the 3PP when preceded by (certain) prepositions, it was logical to carry this *ń by analogy to those phrases where the 3PP was preceded by any similar preposition: *seńimi = s" ńimi = za ńimi (from *za jimi) = u ńego (from *u jego), etc., etc. In view of the fact that the nasal had spread to all sixteen (perhaps eighteen) simple prepositions by Late Common Slavic (if not before), and in view of the structural factors cited above, it does seem justifiable to interpret epenthetic n- as a "metanalyzed" component of the pronoun, which simultaneously serves as a signal of the preceding preposition's "status."

19.07 Geographical area of the first expansion of n-. -- There is one other serious question relating to the regular occurrence of n- with the 3PP after all sixteen (or eighteen) simple prepositions: was this phenomenon present in all dialect areas of Late Common Slavic, or was it present in Old Bulgarian and Old Macedonian (reflected in the Old Church Slavonic manuscripts), but absent from the East Slavic dialect group which later produced Old Russian? The latter point of view is expressed by Lomtev and by Matthews, who implies (1960: §445) that n occurred in eleventh-century Old Russian only with v", k", and s", adding that "in the course of time the use of 'metanalytical' n spread to all other prepositional syntagma containing the personal pronoun (e.g., Nif., 1219: na n' . . .)." Lomtev states explicitly (1961: §80) that in Common Slavic the n element occurred only with v" and s", not with other

prepositions such as o em' and u ego, and that "in subsequent history the fate of this n was different in all East Slavic languages. In Russian [and Ukrainian] the use of n spread to all prepositions, . . . [but] in White-Russian the case forms of the 3PP without n became fixed . . . even after prepositions -- cf. . . . da jego, . . . k jamu, . . . z ëj, . . . ab im, etc."

The theory that modern White-Russian betrays the original situation of Common East Slavic, and that the spread of n to all simple prepositions was a later development peculiar only to Great-Russian and Ukrainian, seems to have little support. Van Wijk, for instance, says (1957: 80) that the expansion of n to other simple prepositions like do, na, ot, za, and po "is a Common Slavic phenomenon." Šaxmatov (1957: 310) includes among phenomena "common to all East Slavic dialects" the "disappearance in dialects of epenthetic n," and goes on to point out that this disappearance is dominant in White-Russian and Ukrainian left-bank dialects, and also frequent among Great-Russian dialects. (The same proposition is repeated by Ivanov [1964: §179], who adds that some northern dialects show the reverse phenomenon of n even outside of prepositional phrases: skazal nemu, etc.) The key word here is disappearance: Šaxmatov feels that n was originally present in East Slavic with prepositions, but was later lost in many dialects.

19.08 This viewpoint is supported by the recent historical grammar of the White-Russian Academy of Sciences, Narysy pa historyi belaruskaj movy, which finds (1957: 127-8) that "in [White-Russian] monuments of the fourteenth to seventeenth centuries, just as in Common East Slavic, the oblique-case forms of the third-person singular and plural pronoun after prepositions were consistently used with epenthetic n," and goes on to

cite examples of n after u, v, s", ot", k, pered, nad, na, po, and even posle (in 1488! -- cf. the lateness of this development in Great-Russian, §7.22 above). The Narysy concludes (1957: 128):

> Thus, the third-person pronoun forms with epenthetic n were proper to the literary language of the White-Russian nationality. There are reasons to suspect that such forms were used also in the living White-Russian language, but later were crowded out and disappeared under the influence of the forms without n.

A cursory check of several White-Russian historical texts in the Xrèstamatyja pa historyi belaruskaj movy (1961) tends to confirm the consistent occurrence of n with prepositions in the White-Russian literary language as late as the seventeenth century; compare attestations of za nim (1655); o nem", na nego, z nego, v nem", even protivko nemu (1637); nad nim", do nego (1612); u nix", pry nim", k" nemu, z nix", even dlja nix" (ca. 1600), etc. The only exceptions noted were with secondary prepositions like podlě iego, plus two examples of za iego (ca. 1600).

Another important point to consider is modern White-Russian's lack of the nasal even in the phrases v im, s im, and k jamu -- where there most definitely was an n in Common Slavic! All of these observations support the theory that epenthetic n- did indeed occur after all simple prepositions in Common East-Slavic as well as Late Common Slavic, and that the absence of n- in modern White-Russian and several dialects of Great-Russian and Ukrainian is a more recent development occasioned by these dialects' loss of an already-existing nasal within the last three or four centuries.

19.09 Structural changes since the breakup of Common Slavic. -- The above discussion was devoted to reconstructed developments in the Common Slavic period, referred to as "the first expansion of n-." Now let us examine what happened during the second millennium, after the

individual Slavic languages had begun to take shape.

Ferrell has shown (1958: 94-5) that there is a basic dichotomy among modern Slavic languages, between those which use the n-forms of the 3PP in most or all cases only when the 3PP is governed by a preposition (West Slavic and East Slavic, except White-Russian), and those which use the n-forms independently of prepositional phrases, as Serbo-Croatian njega vidim, Bulgarian dadoh nemu knigata, a ne na neja, etc. (all three of the South Slavic languages). Ferrell goes on to point out (p. 97) that the first group of languages uses the genitive 3PP forms without n as possessives (Russ. ego brat, ix mašina, etc.), whereas the second group obligatorily uses special possessive adjectives instead (S.C. njegov brat, njihova mašina, etc.).

The correlation between these two dichotomies, Ferrell concludes (p. 97), reveals the two groups' differing solutions of the problem of intercalated genitive pronouns. In the first group, ambiguities of the type of Old Russ. v" nego // v" nego město were eliminated by specializing the n as the mark of a 3PP governed by a preposition, so that the absence of n became a clear mark of possessive function of the 3PP, and a formal distinction was created -- v nego (obj. of preposition) : v ego mesto (possessive). In the second group, ambiguities of the type of Old Serb. od njega // od njega brata were eliminated by creating a special set of declinable adjectives clearly designating possession, and making possible a formal distinction -- od njega (obj. of prep.) : od njegova brata (possessive).

These new oppositions resolved older ambiguities which, according to Ferrell's hypothesis, had apparently arisen when a change in word order in Old Russian, Old Serbian, etc., shifted the typical phrase structure

from Common Slavic *vъ ljubъve jego to Old Russian v" nego ljub"vi.

19.10 This same hypothesis may be applied to the "second expansion of n-" in the history of Russian. Since the seventeenth century this phenomenon has led to the assumption of "actual" status (control of n-) by two or three dozen secondary prepositions which originally were "apparent." The descriptive evidence for the "second expansion of n-" was presented above (Parts Two and Three); now let us explore some possible motivating factors which could have been involved in such a profound change. Among them are those phonologic and morphologic factors which were cited above (see §§19.04f.) in connection with the "first expansion of n-"; they could, and quite possibly did, continue to play a role in the individual Slavic languages, including Russian.

There is also the possibility of a series of analogical changes set off by Ferrell's suggested change in word order (1958: 97). Such a chain of events probably would have worked in a sequence like the following, beginning about the time of Old Church Slavonic.

1. iz ńego : iz doma jego :: bliz" jego : bliz" doma jego

Then Ferrell's analogy of the preposed possessives (moj dom", iz našego doma, etc.) would have led to the preposing of the third-person possessive genitives, too:

2. iz ńego : iz ńego doma :: bliz" jego : bliz" jego doma

Here we find an ambiguity arising in each set: the genitive pronoun used as the object of a preposition, and the genitive pronoun used as a possessive, are both expressed by identical forms (ńego after iz, jego after bliz"). In Old Russian, the ambiguity of the type iz ńego : iz ńego doma was resolved very early, apparently on the analogy of the contrast between iz ńego (obj. of prep.) and jego dom" (simple noun phrase) by

dropping n- when the pronoun was not governed by the preposition. This produced the following situation by the time of Middle Russian:

3. iz nego : iz ego doma :: bliz ego : bliz ego doma

There still remained the ambiguity after secondary prepositions, like bliz, wherein different functions were performed by the same form ego. Beginning in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in Russian, this remaining ambiguity was slowly resolved by analogy with the now-established opposition iz nego : iz ego doma, by extending the epenthetic n- to all 3PP objects governed by preposition-like words, secondary as well as primary; that is,

4. iz nego : iz ego doma :: bliz nego : bliz ego doma

In Modern Russian, differentiated function is once again equated with differentiated form in both halves of the equation, just as it was in Common Slavic (stage No. 1 above). This is essentially the way things stand today, although the process of adaption of the second half of the equation to the first is still going on, and there are numerous secondary prepositions (vne, vopreki, blagodarja, etc., etc.), unlike bliz, which have not yet been completely affected by the working of the analogy.

19.11 Basic trend: expansion of prepositions. -- Both the first and the second expansion of n-, and other related phenomena treated above, can be regarded as manifestations of what Tagamlickaja (1958: 62) describes in the following terms: "The tendency toward expansion and multiplication of the inventory (sostav) of the prepositional category . . . [is] extremely characteristic of all Indo-European languages." This widespread basic trend is also observed by Isačenko (1962: 552), who interprets it in a rather abstact, mentalistic way:

Die allgemeine Entwicklung der modernen Sprachen spiegelt die

> Fortschritte des menschlichen Geistes wider and verlangt eine immer feinere Differenzierung der immer adäquater erkannten Ordnung der Dinge, und diese Differenzierung äussert sich notwendigerweise auch im sprunghaften Ansteigen präpositioneller Wörter besonders in den entwickelten Schriftsprachen.

Among the modern languages in which secondary prepositions are playing a very important role is English, with "combination prepositions" like instead of, on top (of), in point of, in terms of, during the time of, for the purpose of, in regard to, etc., etc. (see above, §1.12, n.). Numerous other examples are cited and discussed by Fries (1940: chap. 7), and secondary prepositions in various languages are examined by Brøndal (1950: §14) and Hrubý (1909: 23-4).

19.12 Various manifestations. -- In the history of Russian the general trend has had various manifestations, one of the most basic of which is described by Lomtev (see the epigraph to Part Four, p. 364 above): the replacement of constructions involving bare case forms by prepositional constructions. Several examples of one-time prepositionless constructions which have now acquired a preposition are discussed by Sprinčak (1960: §43) and Isengalieva (1959: §16), such as the "ablative genitive" (korablja tvoego izidǫ), the "genitive of the whole" (kto sę nas ostal" živyx"), the "accusative of direction" (i pride Xolm"), the "accusative of point in time" (az" utro poslju po vy), the "dative of direction" (sam" ide Kur'sku), the "locative of place" (Izęslav" sěde Kyevě), the "locative of time" (tom" že lětě), the "comitative instrumental" (čelovek rusymi vlasy), the "instrumental of cause" (pravil'noju vinoju posadili evo), etc.[1]

[1]Examples of archaic prepositionless constructions occur as stylistic devices in the twentieth-century poetry of Majakovskij: trudom povoračivaja šeju, sklonilas' ruke, etc.; see Vinokur (1943: 94-95). Another example, preserved in dialects of Modern Russian, is the "instru-

All of these constructions in the modern literary language are expressed with the help of prepositions -- a phenomenon which, according to Bulaxovskij (1958: 298), is "partly the result of a general tendency of the Slavic languages to express temporal and spatial meanings of nouns by means of prepositions," and which, in the words of Isengalieva (1959: 33), "bears witness to the development of the functions of prepositions in supplementing the meanings of cases, in order to satisfy the demands of developing language and thought." Whether or not we choose to give a mentalistic interpretation to the extension of prepositions to many constructions which formerly were expressed by case ending alone, it is clear that this development has indeed taken place on a considerable scale, and that it represents a significant change in the structure of Modern Russian as opposed to Old Russian.

19.13 This phenomenon is associated by Jakubinskij with verbal voice. He theorizes (1953: §§550-4) that in the early development of Slavic, the opposition of transitive and intransitive verbs became linked with the opposition between prepositionless (accusative) and prepositional government, respectively, as in <u>rublju drova</u> (trans. verb + dir. obj.) vs. <u>sižu na zemle</u> (intrans. verb + prepositional constr.). When conflicts occur, as in the old prepositionless locative with an intransitive verb (<u>sěde Kyevě</u>), they are resolved "with the establishment of the norm by which intransitive relationships are expressed by prepositional phrases, [so that the old locative case] inevitably is prepositionalized" (§554).

---

mental of route" (<u>idu polem, dorogoj</u>), which is prevalent around Saratov and the north; the construction is even extended, by analogy, to adverbs: <u>tudoju, sjudoju, kudoju</u>. (Private communication from Kurt Klein.) Further discussion of prepositionless constructions may be found in Grigor'eva (1948), Bukatevič (1956, 1957), Bulaxovskij (1958: 296-300), Jakubinskij (1953: §§396-419), and Kalamanova (1955: 111).

Jakubinskij makes the generalization (§552) that

> one of the most important reasons for the use of former independent adverbs in the capacity of prepositions is the birth of the opposition of transitive and intransitive voices. Prepositions, by origin adverbs with local-temporal content, could best express the intransitive connection of the subject through the verb with the object.

In this connection Hrubý (1909: 67) suggests that after the original spatial meanings of old case endings had weakened in Slavic, the predicate -- especially adverbial prepositions in it -- helps to differentiate meanings of motion, rest, or departure. The starting point for the assumption of prepositional function by an adverbial word may simply have been its random occurrence between a verb (often of motion) and a noun in the predicate (Uxanov [1958: 301]). Such an unconnected adjacent placement can be seen in these two modern examples: general i oficery obošli v o k r u g koljasku (GOGOL', Koljasku), and -- my sami k r u g o m pole obošli (PRIŠVIN, Smetlivyj beljak). With the passage of time -- and with the pressure of the factors cited above by Isengalieva, Jakubinskij, and Hrubý -- such adjacent groups of words which occur together often enough can sometimes assume a syntactic interdependence (government): the adverbial word becomes a preposition controlling the noun. (See also Bogorodickij's comments on this, as quoted by Isengalieva [1959: 20-1].)

19.14 Modern Russian has many examples of secondary or more explicit prepositional usages than was once the case. Vnutri, for instance, is a secondary preposition whose function is much more limited and specific than is that of v. And po, which was widely used in former times with a very broad "semantic spectrum," has now given up some of its former functions to more specialized constructions: in the function of "as" it may yield to po mere + genitive; in the function of "to, up to" it may remain

(po uši, po pojas); and in the nearly opposite meaning of "after" (po nekotorom" vremeni, pos"lati po Gleba), it has given way to posle (temporal) and za (spatial). For many other examples, see Bukatevič (1958).

A quite recent manifestation of the expansion of prepositions is seen among indeclinable comparatives when used with the genitive case of the source of comparison (ran'še Borisa, lučše nego, etc.). The syntactic bond between the two members of these phrases is becoming stronger in recent decades, and is approaching the strength of prepositional government (as revealed by the growing frequency of n- after some of these comparatives). This is just one more illustration of how the adjacent placement of one adverbial item and one nominal word in an oblique case can gradually develop into a prepositional phrase.

19.15 Motivating factors. -- The present investigation has been directed mainly at an accurate description of the formal and chronological patterning of prepositions. Outside of observations of some possible underlying tendencies of this patterning, and some suggestions about what directions it may take in the future, the discussion has been conducted on a non-speculative, non-abstract, more or less concrete level. However, in this concluding section it seems only fair to consider some of the more subjective, abstract "explanations," which may be attributed to the general expansion of the number and frequency of prepositions in Russian (and many other languages).

One of the supposed starting points in this expansion is considered by Jakubinskij (see §19.11 above) to be the generalization of prepositions in (most) intransitive predicates, to polarize the opposition between transitive and intransitive verbs. The same development is viewed by Kalamanova (1955: 112) in more general terms:

> The conflict between the restrictiveness and immobility of the system of case endings and their extremely diverse grammatical content is removed by strengthening the functional role of prepositions which are capable of expressing case meanings. . . . Prepositions did in fact serve the purpose of renewing form, brought about by the developing content in the language. . . . This testifies to the development of the category of prepositions drawn from other parts of speech, for supplementing the meanings of cases, in order to satisfy the needs of developing language and thought.

Undoubtedly both the specific factor cited by Jakubinskij, and the more general need to expand the restricted, immobile prepositionless constructions cited by Kalamanova, served to motivate the extension of prepositions (mainly the simple category) to many new constructions which formerly had only a case ending.

19.16 These expanded functions can be equated with a widened sphere of meanings expressed by each of the given prepositions, including the more abstract and formal grammatical relations (o, po, pri, etc.). The fact that these simple prepositions have no clear etymology, according to Tagamlickaja (1958: 92), adds to the ambiguity arising from their semantic broadening. Thus, the high frequency, wide range of meanings, ambiguity, increased abstractness, even the "empty" (vide) reference of the simple prepositions, puts them under a heavy functional load in the language, and leads to the next link in the reconstructed chain of prepositional development, as described by Vinogradov (1947: 683):

> A characteristic phenomenon is revealed in the morphological structure of prepositions: as the primary prepositions lose more and more of their lexical individuality, turning from word-morphemes into case prefixes and verbal postpositions, new, analytical, complex types of prepositions arise and spread.

Čerkasova (1956: 133) regards this phenomenon in much the same light:

> The primary prepositions, which Old Russian inherited basically from Common Slavic, proved to be insufficient to satisfy the needs of communication and expression of thought. In connection with the development of cognitive activity of people, with the establishment of finer and more differentiated connections and relations between

> objects and phenomena of objective reality, there arises a necessity to create means for expressing them, in particular -- new prepositions. . . . For supplementing this category of words in the process of the historical development of Russian, utilization is made of material already available in the language: new prepositions arise on the basis of certain forms of "full-meaning" words (adverbs, nouns, and, to a lesser extent, verbal forms).

Čerkasova goes on to show (1955: 134) how the new secondary prepositions deriving from adverbs, nouns, etc., usually enter into usage with "one definite meaning, on the basis of which other more abstract meanings develop (cf. po povodu, po slučaju, za sčet, etc.)."

19.17 Thus a kind of recurring cycle is reconstructed, in which, presumably, the prepositionless case-constructions of Common Slavic become inadequate for the growing knowledge and more precise mental activity of the people using the language, resulting in the extended use of already-existing simple prepositions, which resolve ambiguities and make possible more exact expression. But these simple prepositions in their turn presumably become overworked and inadequate to the task of human communication in Middle and Modern Russian, with its further expansion of knowledge and sophistication demanding even more precise expression, and the result is the creation and utilization of more and more secondary prepositions, like putem, vokrug, otnositel'no, po povodu, etc., etc., which have limited usage and very exact meaning (due to the obviousness of their derivation). And looking into the future, we can predict that in time even these new secondary prepositions will find their etymological clearness dimming as their frequency and sphere of meanings expands beyond the point of diminishing returns, and once again there will arise a need for new, exact, unambiguous secondary prepositions.

19.18 Not all Soviet scholars go along with this approach, it must

be pointed out. Jakubinskij, in fact, goes to some length to discredit it, basing his view on the fate of the so-called "exclusive and inclusive dative" in the "Tale of Bygone Years." According to Jakubinskij's theory (1953: §§406f.), there was originally an opposition, revealed in the Laurentian and Novgorod chronicles, between the "exclusive dative" implying approach but not entrance (poide k" Muromu), and the "inclusive dative" implying approach plus actual entrance (prišed" Smolinsku); the latter construction eventually gave way to the accusative with v (v"nide v" Kyev"). But Jakubinskij finds (1953: §409f.) that the dialects reflected in the Radzivill and Academy copies (of the Laurentian Chronicle) replace the "inclusive dative" not by v + acc., as expected, but by k + dat., resulting in a confusion between two formerly distinct meanings. From this he concludes that

> this replacement . . . completely (načisto) disproves the opinion of certain scholars who claim that prepositional phrases develop in language for "making precise" the expression of spatial and other relationships in connection "with the development of thinking." What kind of precision is it, when the development of a prepositional instead of a prepositionless phrase actually destroys that "precision" (the differentiation of exclusive and inclusive dative) which formerly had existed in the language? Evidently it is a matter not of precision, but of the conditions of development of the structure of the Slavic clause, a result of which is the appearance of prepositions in general and the subsequent spread in various instances of prepositional at the expense of prepositionless phrases. [All quotation marks and italics Jakubinskij's!]

19.19 This kind of skepticism is a very healthy thing, when seen against the background of the traditional mentalistic "explanations" of the development of Russian prepositions quoted above. But Jakubinskij may be going too far in the opposite direction, setting up rather flimsy evidence (his hypothesis of the opposition of the "exclusive and inclusive dative") and then finding a few dialectal contradictions to this evidence, on the basis of which he tries to reject the whole general men-

talistic explanation of the rise of prepositions. While it is always highly desirable to subject a vague, traditional theory to doubt, it is often rather hard to disprove it, especially with as little evidence as Jakubinskij produces. Whether it can ever be proven is, of course, an equally difficult question: how does one prove what goes on in the consciousness of a native speaker or in the collective consciousness of several million native speakers (especially those who are no longer living)?

One can only take such a theory for what it is worth, examine it, and note its parallels with the more tangible trends in the development of prepositional "status" as described above (see §18). An especially interesting parallel can be found with the recurrent cycles of acquisition of "actual" status by various categories of prepositions, from the "first expansion of n-" in Common Slavic to the "second expansion of n-" in the past few centuries of the history of Russian. The mentalistic "explanation" cannot replace the compilation and classification of concrete data, but it may furnish valuable insights when its theoretical reconstructions of thought processes and workings of analogy have counterparts in the empirical description.

20. THE CLASSIFICATION OF PREPOSITIONS

20.00 In Part One (§§1.05ff.), considerable attention was directed at the general problems of establishing an inventory of prepositions in Modern Russian. The difficulties mentioned there, and the two extremes in inventory (Kuryłowicz's and Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij's) are not unknown in descriptions of other languages, either.

20.01 External demarcation: the overall inventory. -- One extreme, that of an extremely small inventory, limited only to the fifteen or so "simple" ("original") prepositions of the language in question, is represented by Agard's analysis of Rumanian (1958: §§11, 11.12 [n. 69]), and by Blaisdell's of Old Icelandic (1959: §20.5). In setting up their inventories, both these scholars explicitly exclude any secondary prepositions, such as the "prefixed" or "combination" type, and even go so far as to extract simple prepositions from ossified secondary prepositions whose root no longer occurs as a free form (an analogous step in Russian would be to segment poperek or vnutri into "po- and v- + object").

Realizing the distortions produced by such a restrictive approach, other scholars have gone to the opposite extreme of a very large inventory including dozens, perhaps hundreds, of "combination" prepositions, alongside the more primary types. This approach is typified by Fries in English (1940: 114-5), and by Čerkasova (1955) and Bondarenko (1961: 48-65) in Russian; Bondarenko, in fact, compiles a grand total of 170 different items which he labels as "prepositions." The drawback of the Fries-

Bondarenko type of inventory becomes evident when it is carried to its logical conclusion: as pointed out by Šmelev (1961: 501), if the list includes v oblasti (+ gen.), then why not v sfere ...; and if v sfere ..., then why not v stole ..., etc. In other words, what is to keep the inventory from growing to infinity through the inclusion of every combination of simple preposition plus noun (followed by dependent genitive or dative), as v stole + učitelja, etc., etc.?

20.02 Degrees of prepositionalization: a continuum. -- The explanation for this difficulty lies in the non-discrete nature of the prepositional category. It is a continuum running from undisputed simple prepositions like po (+ gorodu) at one extreme, to clearly non-prepositional phrases like po ulice (+ goroda) at the other, and with a series of intermediate secondary items which have been prepositionalized to varying degrees. The fact that the prepositional inventory is made up of items in various stages of prepositionalization is observed by Bogorodickij (cited by Isengalieva [1959: 19-20]), and by the Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: §§996-7). This idea is carried further by Belić (1957: 14-5), who in disagreeing with Čerkasova's all-inclusive inventory of combination prepositions proposes that we should distinguish three degrees of such prepositional constructions, with the third being "ready-made combination prepositions like vvidu."

20.03 Accepting Belić's suggestion and expanding on it, we can arrive at the most satisfactory solution to the problem of overall prepositional inventories by setting up a schematic presentation[1] of the continuum of prepositionalized item-types based on the simple preposition po,

[1]Note other observations of continuousness in language made by Bolinger (1961: 7-11, 23, 45), who attempts to represent them schematically.

and containing at least six steps which shade off into one another:

po ... po-za ... posle ... pozadi ... po povodu ... po ulice ...

The left section of the spectrum, representing simple prepositions, is the only part of the total inventory which is recognized by such scholars as Kuryłowicz, Blaisdell, and Agard (see above). This is clearly too restrictive a view. The second and third sections (po-za and posle types) have achieved almost total prepositionalization, and their number is also small and finite, as is that of the first section. (Most inventories of Russian prepositions do include the second and third sections with some approximation of completeness.) The fourth, fifth, and sixth sections (pozadi, po povodu, po ulice) reveal a progressively less prepositionalized series of stages in the inventory, with more independent usage and a clearer etymology.

As we move more to the right, the membership of the sections approaches infinity (and a higher degree of fluctuation): the number of po ulice ... type constructions in the language is countless, and the same is probably true also of the po povodu ... type -- although members of this fifth section are beginning to undergo prepositionalization, a process which will gradually carry them into the fourth (pozadi) section. In fact, the whole continuum is in a constant state of imperceptibly slow movement toward the left: there are no sharp, permanent boundaries between the sections, which for practical purposes can be considered non-discrete.

20.04 Thus we can conclude that the overall inventory of Russian prepositions in the broad sense can never be determined absolutely, since its boundaries are not fixed. The closer we move to the left side of the spectrum, the easier it becomes to establish a finite inventory with

definite characteristics (e.g., Modern Russian has seventeen simple prepositions); but the more we go toward the right side, the less clearly defined is the membership, until the extreme right side of the spectrum becomes completely lacking in definable prepositional characteristics, and completely infinite as to number of members. (For more detail on this approach, see the article by Hill [1962: 56-7].)

20.05 Internal demarcation: a dichotomy within the category. -- Once it is recognized that the overall inventory of prepositions will never be totally fixed (due to the openness of the right side of the spectrum), it becomes desirable to find a line of internal demarcation which is as far toward the right as possible, but also is drawn according to some objective, non-mentalistic criterion. This line presumably will pass somewhere through the fourth (pozadi) or fifth (po povodu) sections of the continuum discussed above, and will separate those items to its left -- whose function is mainly prepositional, from those to its right -- whose function is mainly non-prepositional, i.e., adverbial. (The items falling on the left side of the line can then be considered as comprising the major prepositions of the language.)

20.06 Establishing such a dichotomy within the overall inventory of prepositions in the broad sense has been a difficult problem for scholars analyzing both the history and the modern state of Russian. An example of the former is Birnbaum (1960a: 51), who admits "teilweise ist es dabei schwer, die Wortart zu klassifizieren, da der Übergang (vom Adverb zur Präposition) sich sozusagen erst gerade vollzieht. Das gilt z.B. von protivu, das vielfach schon als Präposition fungiert." Less realistic in her approach to Modern Russian is Isengalieva (1959: 34-5), who simply offers the flat statement that "adverbs make the transition to preposition

in case of the construction (sočetanie) of the adverb with a substantive in an oblique case and of the semantic linkage of the adverb with the case form." The subjectivity and general unreliability of Isengalieva's approach is revealed by several inconsistencies within her own inventories (see §1.16 above), whereas Birnbaum is candid enough to admit that he lacks a procedural criterion for pinpointing the transition from adverb to preposition.[1]

One good criterion is proposed by Bogorodickij (cited by Isengalieva [1959: 20]), who says that "the adverb's loss of an autonomous stress and subordination to the stress of the following word serves as an external expression of this change [to preposition]." But while useful for contemporary spoken Russian, Bogorodickij's criterion does not promise much aid in classification of prepositions in previous centuries, where stress is not often indicated in written documents. (For further discussion of such criteria, see §§1.05ff. above.)

20.07 A related question which has also been the cause of some difficulty is the problem of whether secondary prepositions which go back to a nominal origin must have gone through an adverb stage. It is claimed by Vinogradov (1947: 681-2), Čerkasova (1964: 226-7), and Isengalieva (1959: 21) that, in Isengalieva's words, "prior to the eighteenth century substantives made the transition to prepositions through adverbs, gradually losing their material meaning. But since the end of the eight-

[1]Similar problems are encountered by Fraenkel (1929: 280-1) in analyzing Lithuanian postpositions and prepositions: "Oftmals kann man zweifelhaft sein, ob man bereits von präpositionalem Gebrauch oder nur von Verbindungen bestimmter Nominalformen mit attributivem Genetiv reden darf." However, Fraenkel goes on to show (p. 281) that "die präpositionale Funktion liegt unzweifelhaft bei gewissen Merkmalen des davon abhängigen Wortes vor. Hierzu gehört der Ersatz des possessiven màno usw. durch manẽs usw. sowie die konsequente Nachstellung des Genetivs von Nomina und Pronomina."

eenth century, nouns make the transition to prepositions directly." Belić, on the other hand, asserts (1957: 7) that "adverbs represent a transitional stage through which prepositions must pass." While this argument does not yet seem to be settled decisively, the more convincing evidence is furnished by proponents of the former viewpoint, especially in the rich documentation of Čerkasova (1964: 226-7).

20.08 One of the most practical procedural solutions to the problem of establishing a dichotomy within the overall prepositional inventory is offered by the present investigation (see Parts Two and Three above), which draws the line between "actual prepositions" and "apparent prepositions" on the basis of whether they govern a 3PPO with epenthetic n- or without it. Accordingly, the major prepositions of Russian (at any point in its history) are defined as those which have "actual" status in most of their occurrences; by the same token, those which have "apparent" status most or all of the time in a given period are marked as being outside the pale of the inventory of major prepositions.

While avoiding the subjectivity found in many analyses of prepositions, this procedural definition at the same time lends itself to application to historical changes which have occurred in the inventory of prepositions, revealing how most secondary prepositions were first attested with "apparent" status and then gradually (or perhaps not so gradually in some instances) made the transition to "actual" status, and how the inventory of major prepositions now totals around four dozen, whereas it once numbered only sixteen or eighteen. And this gradual expansion of the inventory of major prepositions is also reflected in the continuum or spectrum discussed above (§20.03), wherein the dividing line now passes somewhere through the fourth (pozadi) or fifth (po povodu) sections, hav-

ing thus shifted far to the right of its original location near the left side of the spectrum.

It is true, as has already been stated above (§18.03), that the criterion of epenthetic n- has certain limitations, such as the impossibility of defining the "status" of those items which do not seem to be attested with the decisive objects. But even this may be a sort of negative criterion, since if we find no examples, say, of snaruži or vdol' plus the decisive pronouns in Modern Russian (but do find some examples of snaruži u nego or vdol' po nej), we can conclude that snaruži and vdol', whatever they may be, are not "actual prepositions."

20.09 The spelling of prepositional phrases. -- The preceding examination of the history and applications of the epenthetic nasal has not gone into the less "structural" but no less "practical" question of orthography: should the n- be written at the onset of the pronoun object, as it is in the orthography of modern Slavic languages including Russian (s nimi), or should it be considered as a part of the preposition, as it functioned in prehistoric times (*sen jimi)? This question in relation to Old Church Slavonic is discussed by Ferrell (1958: 78) in the following terms:

> If one sets up, for example, v" and v"n as morpheme variants, then a general economy results in the case of most compound verbs of the type v"nimati as opposed to the simplex imati and in the case of such forms as v"nuši as opposed to the simplex uši. This solution, however, is subject to very substantial difficulties in that the -n- appears regularly after all prepositions before the third person pronoun whereas its appearance before other vowel initial morphemes is restricted or sporadic. In view of this it is probably more economical to regard the -n- as part of the pronoun.

This reasoning, however, might also work in the other direction, since -n- occurs regularly after prepositions but not after other types of morphemes.

Another factor which should be considered is the canonical form of words in Old Church Slavonic: almost all of them, according to the law of open syllables, ended in a vowel. The only exceptions to this rule, writes Diels (1932: §22), were the prepositions iz, v"z, bez, probably ob, and also the prefix raz- (none of which occurred independently). The very fact that the only items ending in a consonant were (certain) prepositions raises the very interesting possibility of interpreting the -n- when it occurred generally (in Old Church Slavonic) as a component of the preposition. This would produce an inventory of sixteen or eighteen simple prepositions with the following consonant-final allomorphs which would occur always before the 3PP and sometimes before other morphemes with an initial vowel: v"n, s"n, k"n, on, un, don, pon, zan, nan, izn, ot"n, prin, (pron), bezn, (v"zn), nad"n, pod"n, prěd"n. Elsewhere, each of these morphemes would have the allomorphic shape v", s", k", o, u, etc. (without final -n-). But this solution would also raise no small difficulties (note the terminal cluster in izn, bezn, and v"zn), and so it is probably better to go along with the traditional interpretation of -n- as a part of the pronoun -- while acknowledging that such a solution is only the lesser of two evils, and does not remove all the difficulties at hand.

20.10 The epenthetic consonant also brings up some interesting questions in Modern Russian. In a typical prepositional phrase like u nego, for instance, how many morphemes are there? The most logical morphophonemic segmentation would give three: /u/, /n'/, /ovó/. Of course, the third (masc. gen. adj. ending) is automatically conditioned by the occurrence of the preposition, and would perhaps be interpreted somewhat differently by Kuryłowicz. In a 1937 article (published 1960: 131-4) he analyzes prepositional phrases of the type Lat. extra urbem into only two morphemes -- urb- and extra ... -em, with the former designated as

the "autonomous morpheme" and the latter consisting of a "principal submorpheme" extra and a "complementary submorpheme" -em.

This kind of intermediate-constituent approach with discontinuous morphemes (extra ... -em), whether we accept it or not, has interesting implications for the analysis of u nego in regard to the nasal. If we take /n'/ as one allomorph of the 3PP root (alternating with /j-/: nego/ego), then on what level does the alternation occur? Trubetskoj (1934: §72) labelled it as "the only case of free alternation and of a consonant alternating with a disjunctive alternant in a pronoun." But since /n'/ occurs whenever the 3PP is immediately preceded and governed by an "actual" preposition, perhaps we could classify this as an automatic alternation on the morphologic-syntactic level. But the fluctuations introduced by compound objects (dlja vsex [n]ix, meždu nami i [n]imi, etc.) and by new semi-"actual" prepositions (vnutri, po povodu, etc.) raise some difficulties here. Such questions as these could form the basis for a detailed theoretical study -- which is beyond the limits of the present work.

20.11 Where should n- be written? -- Bearing more closely on the present study is another idea expressed by Kuryłowicz in the same article, explaining why prepositions in many Indo-European languages are written separately (with a space) from their head-word, despite the fact that they form a phonological and accentual unit with it (Lat. ad Rhodani, etc.). According to Kuryłowicz (1960: 133), "si la préposition n'était jamais séparée par un autre mot du substantif auquel elle appartient, elle formerait une unité graphique avec ce substantif."

20.12 Applying this line of reasoning to Modern Russian prepositional phrases with the 3PPO, we arrive at a good reason why such phrases as /vn'ĭx/ and vp'ir'id'ĭn'ivó/ are spelled v nix and vperedi nego, rather than *vn ix and *vperedin ego. The -n- element of such phrases cannot

be separated from the pronoun (*vn vsex ix never occurs), but it does have some possibility of separation from the preposition (cf. vo vsex nix, etc.). This unbreakable connection between n and a 3PPO provides a structural justification for the modern literary language's orthographic convention that the nasal must be spelled with the pronoun, not with the preposition -- i.e., vo (vsex) nix.

But this conclusion, valid for the twentieth century, raises a very provocative question regarding previous centuries: where should the n have been written in, say, the nineteenth century, or Old Russian? In those periods the epenthetic consonant occurred only when the preposition and the 3PPO were together (v nix), and could not be separated from either component (vo vsex ix was the only possible form when there was an intervening word). It is tempting to suggest that for the history of Russian after the acquisition of word-final consonants and before the twentieth century, the epenthetic nasal might have been written as a part of the preposition -- vn ix, iz-zan ee, čerezn ego, sredin ee, okolon ix, etc. Such a spelling system would have permitted us to say that any preposition written with final n would be definable, by that very fact, as an "actual" preposition. The result would be a dichotomy within the overall inventory of prepositions, between those with a potential -n (realized only when a 3PPO follows), and those which never have a final -n. Thus for nineteenth-century Russian we would have a contrast between vozle(n) and vnutri, and between dlja(n) and krome, etc.

20.13 There is no need to press this point, however, since the way words are or have been written does not necessarily have any relation to their place in the language system. The use of a space between preposition and object does not reflect any pause or break in pronunciation

(they are realized as a single phonological word), and as a matter of fact, in Old and Middle Russian written words generally were not often separated by spaces.

Furthermore, even if we do regard the n as a part of the pronoun rather than of the preposition, there is still no bar to a listing procedure in the description of the grammar which would divide the inventory of prepositions into two groups, with n indicated after all members of the "actual" group but not after members of the "apparent" group: meždu (n), vmesto (n), etc., but vopreki, podelom, etc. This, in fact, would be a most desirable improvement for all grammars of Modern Russian (or eighteenth-century Russian, or whatever period) to make -- an indication after each preposition whether or not it takes the epenthetic nasal when governing third-person pronouns.

20.14 Prefixed or combination preposition? -- Another orthographic question relates to secondary prepositions of the prefixed and combination categories -- vvidu, v krugu, poperek, po povodu, navstreču, na mesto, etc. When these categories were first introduced and defined above (see §8.00), it was emphasized that the distinction between them is rather arbitrary, being based on the not-always-consistent spelling conventions of normative grammar. A similar observation was made over two centuries ago by Lomonosov, who remarked (1755: 633) that words like pozadi seem to be composed of two prepositions followed by a noun.

In descriptions of Modern Russian prepositions there is a certain amount of disagreement on the classification and even the spelling of this type of secondary preposition. Bondarenko, for example, labels as "adverb prepositions" krugom, vokrug, vsled, navstreču, nakanune, poverx, posredine, sboku, sverxu, snizu, etc. (1961: 51-6), but labels as "denomi-

native prepositions" v vide, vvidu, v glub' (sic), v krugu, vmesto, v načale (sic), vrode, v silu, vsledstvie, za sčet, napodobie, po povodu, posredstvom, putem, etc. (1961: 57-61), and finally, omits nasčet altogether. Similar rather arbitrary listings are to be found in Vinogradov (1947: 681-2), who calls krugom, vmesto, vokrug, okrest, and poverx "adverb prepositions," but posredstvom, putem, nasčet, napodobie, and a large number of two-word spellings like po mere and po časti "denominative prepositions." The Grammatika russkogo jazyka presents a listing extremely similar to Bondarenko's, except that it does include nasčet ("denominative"), but is otherwise somewhat less extensive.

Seemingly the most confused inventory of these prepositions is Isengalieva's; many of its inadequacies were pointed out above (see §1.16). Isengalieva, for instance, labels vnizu, nakanune, and posredine as "adverb prepositions"; vvidu and nasčet as "denominative"; and v vidax, v rode (sic), za sčet, po povodu, gljadja na, po napravleniju k, etc., as "prepositional constructions."

20.15 No sharp distinction seems to be established between the "adverb" and "denominative" types in these inventories, which for some reason put krugom in one class but putem in the other, or nakanune in one but nasčet in the other, etc. But where there does seem to be a very clear distinction is Isengalieva's separation (1959: 35-6) of the "constructions" class from both the "adverb" and "denominative" classes. This distinction is entirely a matter of one-word or two-word spelling: every "construction" in Isengalieva's list has a space in spelling -- even v rode (which normative orthography writes as one word!) -- and every "adverb" and "denominative" preposition in her lists has no space.

And although the other inventories cited in §20.14 do not make such

a bi-unique graphic distinction between "adverb" and "denominative" prepositions, their general tendency to do this is manifest. Bondarenko, for instance, has 28 prefixed prepositions (sboku, etc.) in his "adverb" category, and all 28 (100%) are written as one word; whereas of the 53 such items in his "denominative" category, there are 46 (87%) which are written as two words. This use of a written or printed space as the criterion for separating classes of prepositions is stated explicitly by Čerkasova (1964: 226, n. 5):

> By the term "simple" we designate prepositions which consist of one component (posredstvom, vključaja); by the term "complex" (sostavnye) -- prepositions which are composed of two components (vo vremja, ne sčitaja, sudja po); by the term "compound-complex" -- prepositions which are composed of three components (ne vziraja na, v sravnenii s).

20.16 Thus we see that the general practice in classifying types of Russian prepositions has been to group them according to the presence or absence of graphic space between their printed components, and there have even been some inconsistencies in placing this space (Bondarenko's v glub', v načale, Isengalieva's v rode, Čerkasova's ne vziraja na). However, the use of a shaky criterion of this type has recently been rejected by Finkel', who says (1962: 3) that "although some of them are written together, and others separately, this has no significance," and goes on to show (1962: 135) that "v silu is just as complete and undoubted a preposition in Modern Russian as is, e.g., vvidu or vsledstvie," and the fact that they differ "only graphically . . . is in no sense decisive," especially since v silu "is itself encountered [with] one-word spelling." In the same connection, Belić has written (1957: 10) that "a preposition must be either one word or one complex word. Until it becomes such, the given construction represents either an adverb preposition or a prepositional syntagma, but it still is not a preposition."

20.17 A proposal for reform. -- In view of all these matters, especially the lack of a consistent graphic treatment and interpretation of prefixed and combination prepositions in Modern Russian, it might be appropriate to apply the formal criterion of the present study in an effort to bring some order into the written form of these prepositions. Such a reform could be effected in the following way:

1) If the preposition is "actual" (followed by n-), spell it as one word; (a) thus prefixed prepositions like vokrug (nee), okolo (nix), vmesto (nego), sverx (nix), naprotiv (nee), nasčet (nego), vrode (nee), poperek (nix), etc., would simply continue to be written as they are now -- without a space; (b) but erstwhile combination prepositions like po povodu and v otnošenii when treated as "actual" prepositions would be written popovodu (nee) and votnošenii (nix), and in the future the same change would probably be carried out with včisle (nego), pripomošči (nee), etc. -- if these items do in fact develop "actual" status.

2) If the preposition is "apparent" (followed by the ЗРРО without n-), spell it as two words; (a) thus the vast majority of what are now combination prepositions would continue to be written with a space -- v konce (ego), v storonu (ix), na smenu (im), v osnove (ee), v seredine (ego), etc. -- in the foreseeable future; (b) but certain changes would be necessary among those erstwhile prefixed prepositions which do not take epenthetic n-: po delom (emu), v dogonku (ej), na pererez (im), vo preki (im), na vstreču (emu), v sled (ej), na perekor (im), po sredine (ee), etc.

20.18 If such a reform were effected in Modern Russian orthography, the result would be a consistent recognition of the high degree of prepositionalization which has been undergone by those items which have the

power to govern n- in the present-day language: all would be written as one word -- as befits their function in the language today.

Such a reform would also make possible a consistent distinction between "actual" and "apparent" prepositions in the categories heretofore referred to as "prefixed" and "combination" types (vmesto, na mesto, etc.), and would make it possible to reclassify the members of these categories, so that every neo-prefixed preposition would have "actual" status (pomimo and popovodu), and every neo-combination preposition would have "apparent" status (v konce and v sled).

This reform would also clear up the problem mentioned in §§17.05, 17.06, and 17.11, namely, the fact that in twentieth-century Russian most prefixed prepositions are virtually 100% "actual," but a few of them are still 0% "actual." The proposed orthographic reform would respell these latter items (navstreču, vopreki, etc.) as two-word combinations -- na vstreču, vo preki, and would then shift them down to the neo-combination category. As a result of this shift (and of the possible shift of po povodu and v otnošenii up into the neo-prefixed category), there would be a very sharp distinction (as suggested in §17.11) between the "minor" secondary categories (gerunds, adverbs, comparatives, neo-combinations) and the "major" categories (simple, double, root, suffixed, neo-prefixed), because all of the neo-prefixed prepositions would now come under the "major" categories, and no splitting of the prefixed category would be needed any longer.

20.19 Although there is a current discussion in the Soviet Union regarding more or less serious reforms of Russian orthography (see Klein [1964]), it is not too likely that the above suggestions will have any chance of influencing the eventual changes (if any) which will be made.

One objection which would immediately be raised, for instance, is that some of the prefixed prepositions which have "apparent" status (vopreki, podelom, iznutri, naperekor, vdogonku) consist of a simple preposition plus a bound form which never occurs in isolation: -preki, -delom (after po, that is), -nutri, -perekor, -dogonku. For this reason it would be rather difficult to persuade anyone to respell these as neo-combination prepositions -- that is, with a space (*vo preki, *po delom, *iz nutri, *na perekor, *v dogonku).

Stranger inconsistencies than these, however, can be found elsewhere in Russian orthography, and so the present proposal for reform is perhaps as deserving of consideration as is the current rather haphazard orthography of Russian secondary prepositions -- which admittedly leaves something to be desired. And there is no question that every grammar offering a list of Russian prepositions should take up the suggestion made above (§20.13) that every preposition should be accompanied by an indication of its "status" (with or without n-).

20.20 Desiderata for future investigations. -- Inasmuch as the present study of Russian prepositions occurring with the decisive objects has been only the first exploration of the territory in question, the results achieved should be considered accordingly: as a rough outline map which gives -- it is to be hoped -- a good indication of the major features of the whole terrain and their interrelationships (that is, the diachronic development and synchronic inventories of individual prepositions and prepositional categories). It is also to be hoped that this approximate chart will provide encouragement and serve as a starting point for future investigators, who will be able to concentrate their explorations on specific features or sub-areas within the entire territory, and to map

them with correspondingly greater accuracy and detail. Following is a list of some of the specific questions which might serve as a subject of concentrated studies in the future.

1) Do the oldest Old Russian texts use n- after all simple prepositions with as complete consistency as do the Old Church Slavonic texts?

2) Is there any pattern in the scattered exceptions (absences of n- after simple prepositions) which turn up occasionally in Old Russian texts, which would reveal information about the pre-written stage of the language?

3) Can pro be dated with "actual" status any earlier than 1316, and can any attestations of v"z with the decisive pronouns be found which would permit its inclusion among the "actual" prepositions of Late Common Slavic?

4) When did the double prepositions (iz-za, etc.) first appear? How early can they be assigned "actual" status?

5) Was the masculine accusative form n' used in the Hypatian Chronicle after mimo and skvoze only because its predecessor, the old accusative i (*jə), had already been lost? (Otherwise these two prepositions do not occur with n- until several hundred years later.)

6) How would the picture of secondary prepositions' "status" in the eighteenth century be changed if considerably more material were collected for that period? (It is the least documented of the critical last three centuries in the present investigation.)

7) How would the picture of the "status" of rarely attested secondary prepositions like vrode, vzamen, naščet, putem, vblizi, etc., be changed if considerably more decisive attestations of them were found in the twentieth century?

8) Would any aspects of the general picture established in the present study be changed if source material for the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries were drawn from commercial, scientific, or official documents (rather than from literary sources, which were the main source for the present investigation)?

9) Could a better chronological scheme of the development of individual prepositions and categories be established on the basis of the birth-year of the author of each example? (A cursory check suggests that this would produce results not appreciably different from those based on the year of writing of the text in which each attestation occurs -- the method used in the present investigation.)

10) What rules can be formulated about the behavior of various types of negative-indefinite pronouns which would account for the many iregularities in the present data (mostly with simple prepositions)?

11) Has the general frequency of prepositions (with all kinds of object) increased from Old Church Slavonic or Old Russian to twentieth-century Russian, and if so, by how much? (It would seem that the only way to establish this would be to calculate the ratio of prepositions to total running words in O.C.S. and O.R. texts which have been translated into Modern Russian, and then compare it with the same ratio of of prepositions to total words in the modern translations.)

12) And, perhaps the most important question, how did the "second expansion of <u>n</u>-" progress in other Slavic languages, such as Polish, Czech, or Ukrainian? How did the specialization of the <u>n</u>-forms (for emphatic use) progress in the history of the South Slavic languages? What is the exact history of the disappearance of <u>n</u>- in White Russian? And what do these different paths of development reveal about the dialect differentiation of Late Common Slavic?

APPENDIXES

21.00 PRIMARY SOURCES

Following is a list of primary sources from which the materials of the present investigation were compiled. It is divided into three parts, with the first two containing the systematically-checked sources in chronological order, and the third all source-abbreviations used in the body of the study, alphabetically arranged.

21.01 Concordances and dictionaries. -- Following are those concordances and dictionaries which were systematically checked for examples of prepositions with the decisive pronouns. They are arranged in order of the chronological period which they cover.

JAGIĆ, VATROSLAV. "Slovoukazatel'," in Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenica Codex Marianus glagoliticus (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1960), 477-607.

MEYER, KARL H. Altkirchenslawisch-griechisches Wörterbuch des Codex Suprasliensis. Glückstadt und Hamburg: J. J. Augustin, 1935.

KURASZKIEWICZ, WŁADYSŁAW. Gramoty nowogrodzkie na brzozowej korze. Zeszyt A: str. 94-105. Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe, 1957.

SREZNEVSKIJ, IZMAIL I. Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkago jazyka. Tomy 1-3. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk", 1893-1903 (fotomexaničeskoe pereizdanie: Moskva, 1958).

Slovar' jazyka Puškina. Pod redakciej V. V. Vinogradova. Tomy 1-3 i priloženie. Moskva: Gosizdat inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej, 1956-1961.

Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Pod redakciej V. I. Černyševa i dr. Tomy 1-16ff. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1950-63ff.

Slovar' russkogo jazyka. Pod redakciej S. G. Barxudarova i dr. Tomy 1-4. Moskva-Leningrad: Gosizdat inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej, 1957-1961.

21.02 The basic corpus. -- Following is a list of the texts entering into the "Basic Corpus" of the present investigation, as outlined in §2.08 above. The list is arranged roughly in chronological order. Enclosed in parentheses is the number of modern printed pages which were examined in each text. Abbreviations are resolved in §21.03.

1000/99: Marianus and Suprasl. (No pages counted)

1190/99: Sb. Usp. sob., 1a-68b, 85b-86d. (100 printed pages)

ca. 1100-1499: Novg. gram. na ber., Nos. 1-194. (approx. 20)

/1282: Russkaja pravda po spisku Novgorodskoj kormčej. Pod redakciej E. F. Karskogo. Moskva-Leningrad: 1930. (approx. 20)

/1377: Suzd. let., 1200-1305, 1377 gg. (74 cols. = 37 pp.)

1400/99: Rus. pov., 39-46, 85-7. (10)

1486/90: Rus. pov., 92-7. (6)

ca. 1500: A. NIKITIN, Kož. [po Troick. sp.]. (19)

1500/49: Rus. pov., 46-78, 98-105. (41)

1500/99: Rus. pov., 88-91, 108-18. (15)

1540/45: Vol-perm. let., 1475-1539 gg. (65)

1567-83: Put. rus. posl., 7-155. (149)

1600-40: Put. rus. posl., 156-226. (71)

1600/20: Rus. pov., 124-66. (42)

1610/20: PALICYN, Skaz., "okončatel'naja redakcija,""pervaja redakcija pervyx šesti glav." (155 + 29)

1618/19: DŽEMS, Slov. (No pages counted)

1623/99: KOTOV, Kož. (35)

1649: Uloženie, raznye glavy. (31)

ca. 1650: Skanderbeg. (45)

1664-72: AVVAKUM, Žitie i dr. soč., 53-122, 179-93, 195-202, 207-10, 219-20. (96)

1661/67: KOTOŠIXIN, O Ross. carst., 298-306. (9)

1696: LUDOLF, Gram. rus. (approx. 35)

ca. 1670-1725: AVVAKUM, Kn. tolk., Čelob., 149-74, 194-5, 202-5, 225-36, 238, 249-76, 281-92, 295-302. (89)

1700-49: Xrest. Obn., 2.5-321 [entire volume]. (316)

1717-49: Pam. rus. dramy, 389-558; also stage directions and notes, 1-387. (approx. 180)

1753-64: LOMONOSOV, raznye teksty, Rus. proza, 1.46-60. (14)

1759: SUMAROKOV, raznye teksty, Rus. proza, 1.65-76. (11)

1768-70: ČULKOV, Peresm., Prigož. pov. (78)

1768-72: I. TRET'JAKOV, teksty, Jur. proiz., 267-304. (40)

1768-74: Reči deputatov Pugačeva, Rus. proza, 1.228-44, 255-72. (33)

1769: N. NOVIKOV I EKATERINA, polemika, Rus. proza, 1.291-321. (30)

1777-83: FONVIZIN, teksty, Rus. proza, 1.465-82, 527-39. (30)

1780/89: RADIŠČEV, teksty, Jur. proiz., 433-58. (26)

1789: RADIŠČEV, Žit. Uš. (33)

1792: KARAMZIN, Bednaja Liza. (26)

1797-99: ŽUKOVSKIJ, teksty, Soč., 5.215-26. (11)

1800-09: ŽUKOVSKIJ, teksty, Soč., 5.226-398. (170)

1801-08: DERŽAVIN, teksty, Soč., 7.341-76, 479-87. (38)

1801/02: RADIŠČEV, teksty, Jur. proiz., 459-555. (97)

1803: KARAMZIN, Čuvstvitel'nyj i xolodnyj, Rus. proza, 2.250-60. (11)

1810-18: ŽUKOVSKIJ, teksty, Soč., 5.398-421. (20)

1810-19: A. TURGENEV, Pis. Bulg., 87-169. (82)

1811-16: DERŽAVIN, teksty, Soč., 7.471-8, 489-95, 516-23, 629-36. (29)

1818-28: GRIBOEDOV, teksty, Soč., 314-21, 357-82, 392-427, 471-83. (70)

1820-37: PUŠKIN, prose works indexed in concordance (see Slovar' jazyka Puškina, in §21.01).

1820-22: PUŠKIN, Pis., PSS [1958], 10.15-51. (33)

1824/29: GOGOL', Pis., SS, 6.239-61. (22)

1825: NAREŽNYJ, Garkuša. (146)

1830-37: GOGOL', teksty, SS, 6.17-82, 85-106, 261-320. (147)

1833: PUŠKIN, Pis., PSS [1958], 10.425-60. (30)

1833-37: DOSTOEVSKIJ, Pis., 4.227-42. (15)

1834-37: LERMONTOV, Panorama Moskvy, Ašik-Kerib, Izbrannye proizvedenija (Moskva-Leningrad: GIDL, 1953), 257-70. (13)

1835: GOGOL', Starosv. pom. (26)

1840/41: LERMONTOV, Geroj naš. vr. (146)

1847/48: TURGENEV, Malinovaja voda, L'gov, Burmistr, Lebedjan'; in Rasskazy iz "Zapisok oxotnika" (Moskva: GIXL, 1952), 3-22, 42-55, 65-76. (42)

1849: GONČAROV, Son Obl. (36)

1852-55: A. PISEMSKIJ, Ras., 13-42, 85-96. (41)

1857-58: DOSTOEVSKIJ, Pis., 4.260-8, 328-9. (9)

1859/84: GONČAROV, Oblomov, č. 1 (krome Sna), č. 4. (182)

1861: A. PISEMSKIJ, Bat'ka, Ras., 172-200. (28)

1866: DOSTOEVSKIJ, Prest. nak., čč. 1, 3, 5, èpilog. (254)

1866: USPENSKIJ, Nravy Rast. ul., gl. 4-8. (36)

1869/71: SALTYKOV, Ist. odn. gor., 121-98. (77)

1872: L. TOLSTOJ, Kavkaz. pl. (19)

1878-79: GARŠIN, Soč., 15-91, 315-38. (100)

1879: LESKOV, Čertogon, Pov. ras., 199-211. (13)

1880-87: GARŠIN, Soč., 92-9, 118-83, 200-23, 289-98, 308-12. (113)

1881-82: LESKOV, Pis., SS, 249-68. (20)

1887: LESKOV, Čelovek na časax, Pov. ras., 399-417. (19)

1883-89: ČEXOV, Ras. pov., 23-70, 149-67. (67)

1895-97: GOR'KIJ, Izb., 49-98. (50)

1896-1908: KUPRIN, Molox. (79)

1898-99: ANDREEV, Pov. ras., 3-66. (64)

1899: ČEXOV, Po delam služby, Ras. pov., 255-67. (13)

1900: ANDREEV, Na reke, Pervyj gonorar, Molčanie, Pov. ras., 67-107. (41)

1902-07: KUPRIN, V cirke, Kak ja byl akterom, Gambrinus, Pov. ras., 207-34, 254-310. (85)

1904: L. TOLSTOJ, Fal. kup. (51)

1907: GOR'KIJ, Dev. jan. (23)

1908: SERAFIMOVIČ, Peski, in Izbrannye proizvedenija (Moskva: Ogiz, 1946), 140-69. (30)

1911-15: GOR'KIJ, Izb., 232-87. (56)
1912: ANDREEV, Pravila dobra, Pov. ras., 473-97. (25)
1913-20: A. N. TOLSTOJ, Pov. ras., 15-27, 68-179. (125)

1922-29: ZOŠČENKO, Pov. ras., 5-64. (60)
1924-28: PRIŠVIN, Ras. oxot., 3-22, 28-31, 35-79. (69)
1925: LEONOV, Barsuki. (362)
1927: OLEŠA, Zavist'. (101)

1930-39: ZOŠČENKO, Pov. ras., 65-217, 418-521. (256)
1938: KRYMOV, Tanker. (196)
1938-39: PRIŠVIN, Ras. oxot., 23-7, 80-4. (10)

1940-45: ZOŠČENKO, Pov. ras., 251-304. (54)
1941-42: PRIŠVIN, Ras. oxot., 32-4, 85-97. (16)
1943: A. N. TOLSTOJ, Pov. ras., 3-14, 240-68. (41)
1945: PANOVA, Sputniki. (218)
1946-49: DUDINCEV, Pov. ras., 3-30, 168-209. (70)

1951-56: ZOŠČENKO, Pov. ras., 304-45. (40)
1954: PANOVA, Vremena. (349)
1957: DUDINCEV, Ne xleb. (289)
1958-59: PANOVA, Iz avtobiografii, Sent. rom. (217)

1961: SOBOLEV, Ljud. fil'm. (175)
1961: BONDARENKO, Predlogi v sovremennom russkom jazyke [see in Reference Bibliography, §22.02]. (approx. 25)

21.03 Key to abbreviations of primary sources. -- This key identifies in English alphabetical order those primary sources which are abbreviated in this study whenever citations are made from them. (Most sources from which are drawn only one or two citations are identified at the point of citation rather than being abbreviated.) Page numbers in citations are given according to the pages of the edition used in the present study.

The following basic abbreviations are used generally:

dog. gram.	dogovornaja gramota
GIDL	Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo detskoj literatury
GIXL	Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo xudožestvennoj literatury
gram.	gramota, gramoty
izb.	izbrannoe, izbrannye
Izdat. AN SSSR	Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR
Ogiz	Ob"edinenie gosudarstvennyx izdatel'stv RSFSR
pis.	pis'mo, pis'ma
pov.	povest', povesti
proiz.	proizvedenija
PSS	Polnoe sobranie sočinenij
ras.	rasskaz, rasskazy
sobr.	sobranie
soč.	sočinenija
sp.	spisok
SS	Sobranie sočinenij
Učpedgiz	Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo Ministerstva prosveščenija RSFSR
xož.	ožitie, ožitie
xrest.	xrestomatija
Žit.	Žitie

Akt o Kal. = Akt" o Kaleandrě i Neonildě. In Pam. rus. dramy, 1-387.

ANDREEV (LEONID). Pov. ras. = Povesti i rasskazy. Moskva: GIXL, 1957.

AVVAKUM. Čelob. = Čelobitnye carju. In Žit. i dr. soč., 185-202.

AVVAKUM. Kn. tolk. = Iz Knigi tolkovanij. In Žit. i dr. soč., 149-75.

AVVAKUM. Žitie. In Žit. i dr. soč., 53-122.

AVVAKUM. Žit. i dr. soč. = Žitie protopopa Avvakuma im samim napisannoe i drugie ego sočinenija. Pod obščej redakciej N. K. Gudzija. Moskva: Goslitizdat, 1960.

BABEL' (ISAAK). Izb. = Izbrannoe. Moskva: GIXL, 1957.

BOLOTOV (ANDREJ). Žiz. prikl. = Žizn' i priključenija Andreja Bolotova, opisannye samim dlja svoix potomkov. Cited by Bulaxovskij (1958) and by Finkel' (1962b).

Bor. i Gl. = Skazanie i strast' i poxvala svjatoju mučeniku Borisa i Gleba. In Sb. Usp. sob., 8b-26a.

BUNIN (IVAN). Sux. pov. = Suxodol", Povesti i razskazy, 1911-1912 gg. Izd. 2. Moskva: Knigoizdatel'stvo pisatelej, 1912.

Byliny = Byliny. (Biblioteka poèta," Bol'šaja serija.) Izd. 2. Leningrad: Sovetskij pisatel', 1957.

ČEXOV (ANTON). Izb. = Izbrannoe. Moskva: GIXL, 1946.

ČEXOV (ANTON). PSS = Polnoe sobranie sočinenij. Izd. 2. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdanie Tovariščestva A. F. Marks, 1903.

ČEXOV (ANTON). Ras. pov. = Rasskazy i povesti. Moskva: GIDL, 1958.

ČULKOV (MIXAIL). Peresm. = Iz sbornika Peresmešnik ili slavenskie skazki. In Rus. proza, 1.89-132.

ČULKOV (MIXAIL). Prigož. pov. = Prigožaja povarixa. In Rus. proza, 1.157-92.

DERŽAVIN (GAVRILO). Soč. = Sočinenija. Tom 7. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija nauk", 1872.

DERŽAVIN (GAVRILO). Soč. [1864] = Sočinenija. Tom 1. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija nauk", 1864.

DŽEMS (RIČARD). Slov. = Russko-anglijskij slovar'-dnevnik Ričarda Džemsa. Pod redakciej B. A. Larina. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1959.

DOSTOEVSKIJ (FEDOR). Pis. = Pis'ma. Tom 3 (1872-1877 gg.), Tom 4 (1878-1881 gg.). Moskva: GIXL, 1934, 1959.

DOSTOEVSKIJ (FEDOR). Prest. nak. = Prestuplenie i nakazanie. Moskva: GIXL, 1955.

DUDINCEV (VLADIMIR). Ne xleb. = Ne xlebom edinym. Munich (Mjunxen): Central'noe ob"edinenie političeskix èmigrantov iz SSSR, 1957.

DUDINCEV (VLADIMIR). Pov. ras. = Povesti i rasskazy. Moskva: Vsesojuznoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo, Trudrezervizdat, 1959.

EKATERINA II. Vsjak. vsjač. = Vsjakaja vsjačina. In Rus. proza, 1.291-321.

ÈJXENBAUM (BORIS). Teor. form. = "Teorija formal'nogo metoda," Michigan Slavic Materials, Vol. 2, pp. 1ff.

GARŠIN (VSEVOLOD). Skaz. Ag. = Skazanie o gordom Agee. In Soč., 289-98.

GARŠIN (VSEVOLOD). Soč. = Sočinenija. Moskva: GIXL, 1955.

GOGOL' (NIKOLAJ). Vzgl. na sost. = Vzgljad na sostavlenie Malorossii. In SS, 22-32.

GOGOL' (NIKOLAJ). Pis. = Pis'ma. In SS, 239-320.

GOGOL' (NIKOLAJ). Starosv. pom. = Starosvetskie pomeščiki. In Povesti (Moskva: GIDL, 1957), 123-48. [Citations checked against PSS, izd.

2 (Moskva, 1867), tom 1, str. 299-322.]

GONČAROV (IVAN). Oblomov = Oblomov. Moskva: Učpedgiz, 1959. [Checked against PSS (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Glazunova, 1887).]

GONČAROV (IVAN). Son Obl. = Son Oblomova. In Oblomov, 79-115.

GOR'KIJ (MAKSIM). Dev. jan. = Devjatoe janvarja. Berlin: J. Ladischnikow-Verlag G.m.b.H., 1907.

GOR'KIJ (MAKSIM). Izb. = Izbrannoe. Moskva: Ogiz, 1944.

GOR'KIJ (MAKSIM). Lit. por. = Literaturnye portrety. ("Žizn' zamečatel'nyx ljudej," vyp. 358.) Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Molodaja gvardija," 1963.

GOR'KIJ (MAKSIM). Na dne. In P'esy, 119-88.

GOR'KIJ (MAKSIM). P'esy = P'esy. Moskva-Leningrad: GIDL, 1952.

GRIBOEDOV (ALEKSANDR). Put. zap. = Putevye zapiski. In Soč., 392-427.

GRIBOEDOV (ALEKSANDR). Rod. Zen. = Rodamist i Zenobija. In Soč., 314-9.

GRIBOEDOV (ALEKSANDR). Soč. = Sočinenija. Pod redakciej V. Orlova. Moskva: GIXL, 1953.

GRIN (ALEKSANDR). Alye par. = Alye parusa. In Alye parusa i drugie rasskazy. Rostov: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno, 1959.

GVOZDEV (A. N.). Oč. stil. = Očerki po stilistike russkogo jazyka. Izd. 2. Moskva: Učpedgiz, 1955.

IOFA (L. E.). Sovr. Lomon. = Sovremenniki Lomonosova. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno, 1949.

Ipat. let. = Lětopis' po Ipat'evskomu spisku. (Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, tom 2.) Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury, 1962.

Isk. kino = Iskusstvo kino (ežemesjačnyj žurnal).

Ist. car. Dav. = Istorija o carě Davidě i carě Solomoně. In Pam. rus. dramy, 455-92.

Jur. proiz. = Juridičeskie proizvedenija progressivnyx russkix myslitelej: Vtoraja polovina XVIII veka. Pod redakciej S. A. Pokrovskogo. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo juridičeskoj literatury, 1959.

KALININ (MIXAIL). O komm. vosp. = O kommunističeskom vospitanii. Quoted in Slov. rus. jaz.

KARAMZIN (NIKOLAJ). Bednaja Liza. Moskva: GIDL, 1957. [Checked against other publications of the same story in Xrest. Kok. and in N. M. Karamzin, Izbrannye sočinenija, pod red. P. Berkova (Moskva-Leningrad, 1964), tom 1, str. 605-21.]

KOZMA. Bogomil. = Traité contre les Bogomiles du prêtre Cosmas. Cited by Vaillant (1948).

KOTOŠIXIN (GRIGORIJ). O Ross. carst. = O Rossii v carstvovanie Alekseja Mixajloviča. In Xrest. Obn., 1.298-306.

KOTOV (FEDOT). Xož. = Xoženie kupca Fedota Kotova v Persiju. Pod redakciej N. A. Kuznecovoj. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury, 1958.

KRYMOV (JURIJ). Tanker = Tanker "Derbent." Moskva: GIXL, 1950.

KUPRIN (ALEKSANDR). Pov. ras. = Povesti i rasskazy. Leningrad: GIDL, 1958.

Lavr. let. = Lětopis' po Lavrent'evskomu spisku. (Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, tom 1.) Moskva: Izdatel'stvo vostočnoj literatury, 1962.

LEONOV (LEONID). Barsuki. Izd. 3. Moskva: Sovetskij pisatel', 1957.

LERMONTOV (MIXAIL). Geroj = Geroj našego vremeni. Moskva: GIXL, 1959.

LESKOV (NIKOLAJ). Pis. = Pis'ma. In SS, 249-68.

LESKOV (NIKOLAJ). Pov. ras. = Povesti i rasskazy. Moskva: Moskovskij rabočij, 1954.

LESKOV (NIKOLAJ). SS = Sobranie sočinenij v odinnadcati tomax. Tom 11. Moskva: GIXL, 1958.

LESKOV (NIKOLAJ). Zapeč. ang. = Zapečatlennyj angel. In Pov. ras., 51-116.

Lečeb. XVII v. = Lečebnik XVII v. po Sinodal'noj rukopisi. Cited by Bulaxovskij (1958).

LUDOLF (HEINRICH). Gram. rus. = Grammatica russica. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1959.

MAJAKOVSKIJ (VLADIMIR). Izb. = Izbrannye proizvedenija v dvux tomax. Moskva: GIXL, 1960.

MAJAKOVSKIJ (VLADIMIR). Lenin Vladimir Il'ič Lenin. In Izb., 2.188-259.

Marianus = Quattuor evangeliorum versionis palaeoslovenica Codex Marianus glagoliticus, characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum. Edidit V. Jagić. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1960.

Mat. Razina = Materialy dlja istorii vozmuščenija St. Razina. Cited by Bulaxovskij (1958).

MOROZOV (BORIS). Akty = Akty xozjajstva bojarina B. I. Morozova. Cited by Bulaxovskij (1958) and Bukatevič (1953).

Mosk. let. svod = Moskovskij letopisnyj svod konca XV veka. (Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, tom 25.) Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1949.

NAREŽNYJ (VASILIJ). Garkuša = Garkuša, malorossijskij razbojnik. In Izbrannye sočinenija (Moskva: GIXL, 1956), 2.459-604.

NAŠČOKIN (VASILIJ). Zap. = Zapiski Vasil'ja Aleksandrova syna Naščokina. In Xrest. Obn., 2.290-6.

NIKITIN (AFANASIJ). Xož. = Xoženie za tri morja Afanasija Nikitina 1466-1472 gg. Izd. 2. (Literaturnye pamjatniki.) Pod redakciej V. P. Adrianovoj-Peretc. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1958.

Novg. gram. na ber. = Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste: iz raskopok 1951 g., 1953-54 gg. i t. p. Pod redakciej A. V. Arcixovskogo i B. I. Borkovskogo. Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1952-57.

Novg. I let. = Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov. Pod redakciej A. N. Nasonova. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1950.

NOVIKOV (NIKOLAJ). Polemika = Polemika s Ekaterinoj II v 1769 g. In Rus. proza, 1.291-321.

OLEŠA (JURIJ). Izb. = Izbrannye sočinenija. Moskva: GIXL, 1956.

OLEŠA (JURIJ). Zavist'. In Izb., 25-126.

OSTROVSKIJ (ALEKSANDR). P'esy. Kazan': Tatknigoizdat, 1955.

PALICYN (AVRAAMIJ). Skaz. = Skazanie Avraamija Palicyna. Pod redakciej L. V. Čerepnina. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1955.

Pam. rus. dramy = Pamjatniki russkoj dramy èpoxi Petra Velikogo. Pod redakciej V. N. Peretca. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdanie Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk", 1903.

PANOVA (VERA). Iz avtobiografii. In odnotomnik Sputniki, Kružilixa, Sentimental'nyj roman (Moskva-Leningrad: GIXL, 1960), 3-8.

PANOVA (VERA). Sent. rom. = Sentimental'nyj roman. In odnotomnik (see above item), 467-677.

PANOVA (VERA). Sputniki. In odnotomnik (see above), 11-227.

PANOVA (VERA). Vremena = Vremena goda. Leningrad: Sovetskij pisatel', 1954.

PETR I. Pis. i bum. = Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, ca. 1930-1956.

PISEMSKIJ (ALEKSEJ). Ras. = Rasskazy. Moskva: GIXL, 1955.

Pov. mosk. plen. = Povest' o moskovskom vzjatii ot carja Taxtamyša i o plenenii zemli Russkyja. In Rus. pov., 42-8.

Pov. ob osade = Povest' ob osade Pskova Stefanom Batoriem. In Rus. pov., 124-66.

Pov. o Drak. = Povest' o munt'janskom voevode Drakule. In Rus. pov., 92-7.

Pov. Petr. car. = Povest' o Petre, careviče ordynskom. In Rus. pov., 98-105.

Pov. Petr. Fevr. = Povest' o Petre i Fevronii Muromskix. In Rus. pov., 108-15.

Pov. vzjat. Car. = Povest' o vzjatii Car'grada turkami. In Rus. pov., 55-78.

PRIŠVIN (MIXAIL). Ras. oxot. = Rasskazy oxotnika. Moskva: GIXL, 1959.

PUŠKIN (ALEKSANDR). Ist. Pug. = Istorija Pugačeva. In PSS, tom 9.

PUŠKIN (ALEKSANDR). PSS = Polnoe sobranie sočinenij v šestnadcati tomax: Jubilejnoe izdanie 1937 g. Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1937-1949.

PUŠKIN (ALEKSANDR). PSS [1958] = Polnoe sobranie sočinenij v desjati tomax. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Xudožestvennaja literatura," 1958.

PUŠKIN (ALEKSANDR). Zap. Moro = Zapiski grafa Moro-de Braze. In PSS, tom 10.

Put. rus. posl. = Putešestvija russkix poslov XVI-XVII vv.: Statejnye spiski. (Literaturnye pamjatniki.) Pod redakciej D. S. Lixačeva. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1954.

RADIŠČEV (ALEKSANDR). Proekt gr. ul. = Proekt graždanskogo Uloženija. In Jur. proiz., 484-555.

RADIŠČEV (ALEKSANDR). Žit. Uš. = Žitie Fedora Vasil'eviča Ušakova. In Izbrannoe (Moskva: Moskovskij rabočij, 1959), 16-49.

Radz. sp. = Lavrent'evskaja letopis' po Radzivil'skomu spisku. (See Lavr. let.)

Rus. pov. = Russkie povesti XV-XVI vekov. Pod redakciej B. A. Larina. Moskva-Leningrad: GIXL, 1958.

Rus. proza = Russkaja proza XVIII veka. Pod redakciej G. P. Makogonenko. Tom 1. Moskva-Leningrad: GIXL, 1950.

SALTYKOV [SALTYKOV-ŠČEDRIN] (MIXAIL). Ist. odn. gor. = Istorija odnogo goroda. Moskva: GIXL, 1953.

Saf. Chr. = Safonovičs Chronik. Cited by Borelius (1952).

Sb. Usp. sob. = Sbornik XII věka Moskovskago Uspenskago sobora. Pod redakciej A. A. Šaxmatova i P. A. Lavrova. Vyp. 1. The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1957.

Skanderbeg = Povest' o Skanderbege. Pod redakciej N. N. Rozova i N. A. Čistjakovoj. (Literaturnye pamjatniki.) Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1957.

Slov. rus. jaz. = Slovar' russkogo jazyka. (Full information in §21.01.)

SOBOLEV (RUVIM). Ljud. fil'm. = Ljudi i film'my russkogo dorevoljucionnogo kino. Moskva: Iskusstvo, 1961.

Srez. = Sreznevskij, I. I., Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkago jazyka. (Full information in §21.01.)

SSRLJ = Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. (Full information in §21.01.)

Suzd. let. = Suzdal'skaja lětopis' po Lavrent'evskomu spisku. (Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, tom 1, vyp. 2.) Izd. 2. Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1927.

Suprasl. = Suprasl'skaja rukopis'. Trud Sergěja Sever'janova. (Pamjatniki staroslavjanskogo jazyka, tom 2, vyp. 1.) Tomy 1-2. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1956.

ŠVEDOVA (NATAL'JA). Sint. rus. raz. = Očerki po sintaksisu russkoj razgovornoj reči. Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1960.

TOLSTOJ, A. K. (ALEKSEJ K.). Car' Fed. = Car' Feodor Ioannovič. Berlin: Petropolis, 1922.

TOLSTOJ, A. N. (ALEKSEJ N.). Pov. ras. = Povesti i rasskazy. Moskva: GIXL, 1954.

TOLSTOJ, A. N. (ALEKSEJ N.). Prikl. Rast. = Priključenija Rastegina. In Pov. ras., 68-113.

TOLSTOJ, L. (LEV). A. Karenina = Anna Karenina. Quoted in SSRLJ.

TOLSTOJ, L. (LEV). Fal. kup. = Fal'šivyj kupon. In Izb., 311-61.

TOLSTOJ, L. (LEV). Izb. = Izbrannye povesti i rasskazy. Tom 2. Moskva: Ogiz, 1947.

TOLSTOJ, L. (LEV). Kavkaz. pl. = Kavkazskij plennik. In Izb., 50-68.

TREDIAKOVSKIJ (VASILIJ). Tilem. = Tilemaxida. In Xrest. Obn., 2.221-31.

TURGENEV, A. (ALEKSANDR). Pis. Bulg. = Pis'ma Aleksandra Turgeneva Bulgakovym. Pod redakciej I. K. Luppol. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno, 1939.

Uloženie = Sobornoe Uloženie carja Alekseja Mixajloviča 1649 g. (Pamjatniki russkogo prava, vyp. 6.) Pod redakciej K. A. Sofronenko. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo juridičeskoj literatury, 1957. [Checked with the original printed edition of 1649.]

USPENSKIJ (GLEB). Nravy Ras. ul. = Nravy Rasterjaevoj ulicy. Moskva: GIXL, 1953.

Vol-Perm. let. = Vologodsko-permskaja letopis'. (Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej, tom 26.) Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1959.

Xrest. Kok. = Xrestomatija po russkoj literature XVIII veka. Sostavitel' A. V. Kokorev. Izd. 2. Moskva: Učpedgiz, 1956.

Xrest. Obn. = Xrestomatija po istorii russkogo jazyka. Sostaviteli S. P. Obnorskij i S. G. Barxudarov. Moskva: Učpedgiz, 1952 (čast' 1), 1948 (čast' 2 [vyp. 2]).

ZOŠČENKO (MIXAIL). Pov. ras. = Rasskazy, fel'etony, povesti. Moskva: GIXL, 1958.

Žit. Fed. = Žitie prp(d)bnaago o͡ca našego Feodosija. In Sb. Usp. sob., 26a-67c.

ŽUKOVSKIJ (VASILIJ). Pis. obšč. = Pisatel' v obščestve. In Soč., tom 5.

ŽUKOVSKIJ (VASILIJ). Soč. = Sočinenija. Izd. 8. Tom 5. Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo Glazunova, 1885.

22.00 BIBLIOGRAPHY

22.01 The twenty-eight inventories of prepositions used in §1.01 were compiled by the following scholars (for full titles, see §22.02):

Aksakov (1880: pribavlenie, str. 149)
Avanesov (1945: 225)
Bondarenko (1961: 48-65)
Brøndal (1950: §96A)
Buslaev (1881: §76, p. 160)
Davydov (1854: §§319, 326)
DeBray (1951: 50)
Dienes (1951: §§176-88)
Forbes (1916: §79)
Froelichowa (1961: §§75-7)
Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953: §§995-8)
Gvozdev (1958: §§702-7)
Isengalieva (1959: 34-6)
Karcevski (1956: 208-10).
Macdonald (1955: 333-4)
Magner (1961: 39-40)
Matejka (1959: pp. V1-V5)
Mazon (1949: §72)
Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij (1909: gl. 12)
Peškovskij (1956: 508)
Potapova (1958: 2.349, tabl. 6)
Pul'kina (1959: tabl. 33)
Smirnickij (1958: 949 [§27])
Spector (1936: 22-3)
Šaxmatov (1925: §§460-8)
Unbegaun (1951: 283-93)
Vinogradov (1947: 680-3)
Vostokov (1874: §95)

The fifteen inventories making a primary/secondary distinction and used in §1.02 were compiled by the following scholars:

Aksakov (1880)
Bondarenko (1961)
Davydov (1854)
Grammatika russkogo jazyka (1953)
Gvozdev (1958)
Isengalieva (1959)
Magner (1961)
Mazon (1949)

Ovsjaniko-Kulikovskij (1909)
Spector (1936)
Unbegaun (1951)
Vinogradov (1947)
Vostokov (1874)
and Brøndal (1950) and Bagrjanskij (1947) -- who both establish only a "primary" group by excluding all "secondaries."

22.02 Full reference bibliography. -- Following is a list of works (other than primary sources) which were consulted and/or quoted in the present study. Also included are a few basic understanding analyses of prepositions which were not available to the author (indicated by an asterisk). All works are arranged in English alphabetical order.

AGARD, FREDERICK B. (1958) Structural Sketch of Rumanian. ("Language Monographs," No. 26.) Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America (at the Waverly Press).

AKSAKOV, KONSTANTIN S. (1880) Opyt russkoj grammatiki. (Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, tom 3, pribavlenie, str. 128-51.) Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija.

AVANESOV, RUBEN, I SIDOROV, V. N. (1945) Očerk grammatiki russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

AVANESOV, RUBEN. (1956) Fonetika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

BAGRJANSKIJ, I. M. (1947) Istorija razvitija učenija o predlogax v russkoj lingvistike, Trudy Uzbekskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta (Novaja serija), No. 33, str. 1-35.

BAJEC, ANTON. (1959) Besedotvorje slovenskega jezika. Del 4: Predlogi in predpone. Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

BAJMUT, T. V. I DR. (1957) Porivnjal'na hramatyka ukraïns'koï i rosijs'koï mov. Kiev: Radjans'ka škola.

BAŠ, EVA G. I DR. (1959) Bespredložnoe i predložnoe upravlenie. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

BELIĆ, ALEKSANDR. (1937) Sur le développement des syntagmes adverbiaux, Acta jutlandica, 9.1.406-8.

BELIĆ. (1949) "Deprefiksacija" u slovenskim jezicima (Predlozi tipa iznad i slični pojavi), Južnoslovenski filolog, 18.87-101.

BELIĆ. (1957-58) Padežnaja sistema i proisxoždenie predlogov, Južnoslovenski filolog, 22.1-17.

BENSON, MORTON. (1961) Soviet standardization of Russian, Slavic and European Journal, 19.3.263-78.

BIRNBAUM, HENRIK. (1960a) Linguistische Beobachtungen an einem altrussischen Text, International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, 3.51.

BIRNBAUM. (1960b) Neuere Arbeiten über russisches Syntax, Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, 29.1.154-5.

BITEXTINA, G. A., I LUCKAJA, N. N. (1960) Predložnoe i bespredložnoe upravlenie v russkom jazyke. Moskva: Vyssaja škola.

BLAGOVA, E. (1963) K značeniju i upotrebleniju mestoimenija *jĕ v staroslavjanskom jazyke, Vorposy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija, 7.34-42.

BLAISDELL, FOSTER W., JR. (1959) Preposition-Adverbs in Old Icelandic. ("University of California Publications in Linguistics," Vol. 17.) Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

BLAŽEV, B. T. (1962) K voprosu ob upotreblenii ličnogo mestoimenija tret'ego lica s načal'nym n-, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1962.2.13-6.

BLOOMFIELD, LEONARD. (1933) Language. New York: Henry Holt and Co.

BOGOLEPOV, A. N. (1931) K učeniju o predloge v sovremennoj russkoj grammatike, Russkij jazyk v sovetskoj škole, 1931.2.46-52.

BOLINGER, DWIGHT. (1961) Generality, Gradience, and the All-or-None. ("Janua linguarum," Vol. 14.) The Hague: Mouton and Co.

*BONDARENKO, VASILIJ S. (1954) Prostranstvennye otnošenija, vyražaemye s pomošč'ju predlogov, Učenye zapiski Moskovskogo gorodskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta imeni Potemkina, 33.3.19-41.

BONDARENKO. (1961) Predlogi v sovremennom russkom jazyke. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

BORELIUS, CECELIA. (1952) Safonovičs Chronik. ("Publications de l'Institut slave d'Upsal," No. 6.) Uppsala: L'Institut slave.

BORKOVSKIJ, VIKTOR I. (1949) Sintaksis drevnerusskix gramot. Tom 1: Prostoe predloženie. L'vov: L'vovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet imeni Franko.

BORKOVSKIJ. (1961) Zadači i metody sravnitel'no-istoričeskogo sintaksisa vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov, Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR (Otdelenie literatury i jazyka), 20.3.223-30.

BRØNDAL, VIGGO. (1950) Théorie des prépositions. Traduction française par Pierre Naert. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard.

BRUGMANN, FRIEDRICH K. (1905) Abrégé de Grammaire comparée des langues indo-européenes, §§586-620. Paris: C. Klincksieck.

BUDOVNIC, I. U. (1962) Slovar' russkoj, ukrainskoj, belorusskoj pis'mennosti i literatury do XVIII veka. Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR.

BUKATEVIČ, N. I. (1949) Razvitie učenija o predlogax v russkoj lingvističeskoj literature, Sbornik Filologičeskogo fakul'teta Odesskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2.131-42.

BUKATEVIČ. (1953) Razvitie značenij i sostava predlogov v russkom literaturnom jazyke, Sbornik Fil. fak. Odesskogo gos. un-ta, tom 3.

BUKATEVIČ. (1956) K voprosu o razvitii predložnyx konstrukcij v russkom literaturnom jazyke, Trudy Odesskogo gos. un-ta (Serija filologiče-

skix nauk), 5.111-28.

BUKATEVIČ. (1957) K voprosu . . . (prodolženie), Trudy Odesskogo gos. un-ta (Serija filol. nauk), 6.123-34.

BUKATEVIČ. (1958) K voprosu . . . (prodolženie), Trudy Odesskogo gos. un-ta (Serija filol. nauk), 8.129-45.

*BUKATEVIČ. (1957-58b) Opyt istoričeskogo izučenija predlogov i predložnyx sočetanij v russkom literaturnom jazyke. Tomy 1-2. Odessa: Odesskij gosudarstvennyj universitet imeni Mečnikova.

BULAXOVSKIJ, LEONID. (1952) Kurs russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Tom 1. Izd. 5. Kiev: Radjans'ka škola.

BULAXOVSKIJ. (1954) Russkij literaturnyj jazyk pervoj poloviny XIX veka: Fonetika, morfologija, udarenie, sintaksis. Izd. 2. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

BULAXOVSKIJ. (1958) Istoričeskij kommentarij k russkomu literaturnomu jazyku. Izd. 5. Kiev: Radjans'ka škola.

*BUNINA, M. S. (1954) Iz nabljudenij nad vtoroobraznymi predlogami sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka, Učenye zapiski Moskovskogo gorodskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta imeni Potemkina, 33.3.43-7.

BUSLAEV, FEDOR. (1881) Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Pereizdanie 1959 g. po poslednemu prižiznennomu izdaniju. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

BUZUK, P. (1924) Zamečanija o Mariinskom evangelii, Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Akademii Nauk SSSR, 29.357-8.

BYLINSKIJ, KONSTANTIN, I ROZENTAL', DITMAR. (1961) Literaturnoe redaktirovanie. Izd. 2. [Izd. 1: 1957 g.] Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Iskusstvo."

CHAPMAN, KENNETH. (1960) Review of Preposition Adverbs in Old Icelandic, by Foster W. Blaisdell, Jr., Language, 36.3.433-40.

COCRON, FRIEDRICH. (1953) La langue russe dans la seconde moitié du XVII^e siècle. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Sorbonne, Paris.

*ČERKASOVA, E. T. (1954) K izučeniju obrazovanija russkix otymennyx predlogov, Učenye zapiski Moskovskogo gorodskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta imeni Potemkina, tom 33, vyp. 3.

ČERKASOVA. (1955) K izučeniju obrazovanija russkix otymennyx predlogov, Issledovanija po grammatike russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (Sbornik statej, pod red. N. S. Pospelova i N. Ju. Švedovoj [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 73-139.

ČERKASOVA. (1956) K voprosu ob obrazovanii otglagol'nyx predlogov, Issledovanija po sintaksisu russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (Sbornik statej, pod red. V. P. Suxotina [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 131-76.

ČERKASOVA. (1962) K izučeniju obrazovanija russkix otymennyx predlogov (Složnosostavnye otymennyx predlogi), Materialy i issledovanija po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (pod red. R. I. Avanesova [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 5.111-52.

ČERKASOVA. (1964) Izmenenija v sostave predlogov, Očerki po istoričeskoj grammatike russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XIX veka: Glagol,

narečie, predlogi, sojuzy (pod red. V. V. Vinogradova i N. Ju. Švedova [Moskva: Nauka]), 225-76.

*ČERNYŠEV, V. I. (1948) O nekotoryx russkix prefiksax i predlogax, Jazyk i myšlenie, 11.376-94.

ČERNYX, PAVEL. (1953) Jazyk Uloženija 1649 goda. Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR.

ČERNYX. (1954) Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Izd. 2. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

ČISTJAKOV, V. F. (1946) Predlogi v russkom jazyke, Trudy Voronežskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 14.1.68-73.

*ČIVIKOVA, T. N. (1948) Iz istorii predlogov: sinonimičeskie predložnye konstrukcii v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke, Učenye zapiski Moskovskogo oblastnogo pedagogičeskogo instituta, tom 12 ("Trudy Kafedry russkogo jazyka," vyp. 1).

DAVYDOV, IVAN I. (1854) Opyt obščesravnitel'noj grammatiki russkogo jazyka. Izd. 3. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk".

DE BRAY, R. G. A. (1951) Guide to the Slavonic Languages. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd.

DEMIDOVA, A. K. (1957) Perexod predložno-imennyx sočetanij v narečija, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1957.5.85-92.

DIELS, PAUL. (1932) Altkirchenslavische Grammatik. Teil 1: Grammatik. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

DIENES, GEDEON. (1951) Orosz nyelvtani segédkönyv [Russian Language Guide]. Budapest: Magyar State Press.

DORITSCH, AL. (1910) Gebrauch der altbulgarischen Adverbia, Jahresberichte des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig, 16.81-192.

DURNOVO, NIKOLAJ. (1927) Vvedenie v istoriju russkogo jazyka. ("Spisy filosofické fakulty Masarykovy university v Brně," No. 20.) Brno: Masaryková universita.

DURNOVO. (1959) Očerk istorii russkogo jazyka. Photomechanic reprint of 1924 edition. The Hague: Mouton and Company.

*ENDZELIN, JAN. (1905) Latyšskie predlogi. Jur'ev [Dorpat]: Tipografija K. Mattisena.

FARGO, NANCY, AND RUBIN, JOAN. (1957a) Three Russian Prepositions. (Seminar Work Paper MT-30.) Washington, D. C.: Research Project in Machine Translation, Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University. (6 pages, mimeographed.)

FARGO AND RUBIN. (1957b) The Russian Preposition k. (Seminar Work Paper MT-31.) Washington, D. C.: same source as preceding item. (3 pages, mimeographed.)

FARGO AND RUBIN. (1957c) Prepositions s and iz. (Seminar Work Paper MT-57. Washington, D. C.: same source as preceding item. (3 pages, mimeographed.)

FERRELL, JAMES. (1958) The Systems of the Third Person Pronoun with Particular Reference to the Category of the Preposition in Slavic Lan-

guages, American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavicists ("Slavistic Printings and Reprintings," Vol. 21 [The Hague: Mouton and Company]), 77-102.

FINKEL', ALEKSANDR M. (1956) O značenii i upotreblenii predloga blagodarja, Russkij jazyka v škole, 1956.6.13-6.

*FINKEL'. (1960a) Predlog radi v pričinnom značenii, Učenye zapiski Xar'kovskogo universiteta, 109.7-26.

*FINKEL'. (1960b) Predlog čerez v pričinnom značenii, Učenye zapiski Xar'kovskogo universiteta, 109.27-46.

FINKEL'. (1962a) Značenie i upotreblenie predloga vvidu, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1962.1.19-21.

FINKEL'. (1962b) Proizvodnye pričinnye predlogi v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke. Xar'kov: Izdatel'stvo Xar'kovskogo Ordena trudovogo krasnogo znameni gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni Gor'kogo.

FORBES, NEVILL. (1916) Russian Grammar. 2d ed. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.

FRAENKEL, ERNST. (1929) Syntax der litauischen Postpositionen und Präpositionen. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, Band 19.) Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

FRIES, CHARLES C. (1940) American English Grammar. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co.

FROELICHOWA, M., I DR. (1961) Gramatyka języka rosyjskiego. Warszawa: Państwowe zakłady Wydawnictw szkolnych.

FRUMKINA, R. (1960) Primenenie statističeskix metodov v jazykoznanii, Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1960.4.129-33.

GABKA, K. (1961) Zur Systematisierung der Präpositionen des Russischen im Vergleich zur deutschen Sprache, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Ernst-Moritz-Arndt-Universität (Greifswald, Germany), 10.9-15.

GALTON, HERBERT. (1956) Did Sandhi Exist in Old Slav? Indogermanische Forschungen, 62.2.167-76.

*GOMONOV, I. T. (1952) Predlogi i predložnye sočetanija v proze A. S. Puškina. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Leningradskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, Leningrad.

Grammatika russkogo jazyka. (1953) Pod redakciej V. V. Vinogradova, E. S. Istrinoj i S. G. Barxudarova. Tomy 1-2. Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR.

GREČ, NIKOLAJ. (1827) Praktičeskaja russkaja grammatika. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskago sanktpeterburgskago vospitatel'nago doma.

*GRIGOR'EVA, A. D. (1948) K otnošenijam predložnosti i bespredložnosti lokativa v drevnerusskom jazyke, Doklady i soobščenija Instituta russkogo jazyka, vyp. 1, str. 127ff.

GRIGOR'EVA. (1951) K izučeniju sintaksisa predložnogo upravlenija v russkom literaturnom jazyke pervoj treti XIX veka (upotreblenie predloga po v jazyke Puškina), Materialy i issledovanija po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka (Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR), 2.167-203.

GROT, JAKOB. (1883) Jazyk"Deržavina. Sočinenija Gavriila Deržavina (Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija nauk"), 9.346, 357-440.

GVOZDEV, ALEKSANDR N. (1958) Sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj jazyk. Čast' 1. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

GVOZDEV. (1961) Voprosy izučenija detskoj reči. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Akademii pedagogičeskix nauk RSFSR.

HARPER, KENNETH E. (1964) The Position of Prepositional Phrases in Russian, Mechanical Translation, 8.1.5-10.

HARRIS, ZELLIG. (1946) From Morpheme to Utterance, Language, 22.161-83.

HAVLÁTOVÁ, ANEŽKA. (1949) Review of Über den Gebrauch der Präpositionen im altbulgarischen Codex Zographensis, by T. Nilsson, Listy filologické, 73.2.115-6.

HILL, STEVEN P. (1962) Some Considerations of Russian Prepositions, Broadsheet (Journal of the Association of Teachers of Russian [London]), May, 1962, pp. 56-7.

HINGLEY, RONALD. (1958) "Fluid Areas" in Russian Declension, Slavonic and East European Review, 37.88.80-98.

HIRT, HERMANN. (1927) Indogermanische Grammatik. Teil 3, §§12-3. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung.

HRUBÝ, VĚNCESLAV. (1909) Předložky slovanské. Praga: I. L. Kober, tiskem "Unie."

ISAČENKO, A. V. (1953) O sravnitel'no-istoričeskom izučenii grammatičeskix kategorij v slavjanskix jazykax, Slavia, 21.2.201.

ISAČENKO. (1962) Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart. Teil 1: Formenlehre. Halle, Germany: Max Niemeyer-Verlag.

ISENGALIEVA, VALENTINA. (1955a) K istorii učenija o russkix predlogax, Voprosy izučenija russkogo jazyka (Sbornik lingvističeskix statej, pod red. X. X. Maxmudova [Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Kazaxskoj SSR]), 453-9.

ISENGALIEVA. (1955b) O nekotoryx èkvivalentax russkix predlogov v kazaxskom jazyke, Voprosy izučenija russkogo jazyka (same as the preceding item), 336-94.

ISENGALIEVA. (1959) Russkie predlogi i ix èkvivalenty v kazaxskom jazyke. Alma-Ata: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk Kazaxskoj SSR.

IVANOV, VALERIJ V. (1964) Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo "Prosveščenie."

IVANOVA, V. A. (1957) Predložnye konstrukcii, vyražavšie pričinnoe značenie v drevnerusskom jazyke, Vestnik Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta (Istoriko-filologičeskaja serija), 1957.2.120-46.

JAKOBSON, ROMAN. (1936) Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus, Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, 6.240-88.

JAKUBINSKIJ, LEV P. (1953) Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

JELITTE, HERBERT. (1961) Studien zum Adverbium und zur adverbialen Be-

stimmung im Altkirchenslavischen. ("Frankfurter Abhandlungen zur Slavistik," Band 5.) Meisenheim am Glan, Germany: Hochschule des Landes Hessen.

JOSSELSON, HARRY H. (1953) The Russian Word Count. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

KALAMANOVA, N. A. (1955) Perexod narečij v predlogi, Voprosy jazykoznanija L'vovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta imeni Franko, 1.108-27.

KALEČIC, E. P. (1958) K voprosu obrazovanija vtoričnyx predlogov, Učenye zapiski Sverdlovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta, 16. 113-24.

*KALNBERZIN', R. JA. (1957) Sintaksičeskaja sinonimija predložnyx sočetanij sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka s pričinnymi otnošenijami, Izvestija Akademii Nauk Latvijskoj SSR, 1957.3.116ff.

*KALNBERZIN'. (1958) Sootnositel'noe upotreblenie predložnyx konstrukcij s pričinnym vidom otnošenij v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke, Izvestija Akademii Nauk Latvijskoj SSR, 1958.11.136ff.

KARCEVSKI, SERGE. (1936) Sur la nature de l'adverbe, Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, 6.107-11.

KARCEVSKI. (1948) Notes sur la morphologie russe. 2eme éd. Geneva, Switzerland: École d'interprètes de l'Université de Genève.

KARCEVSKI. (1956) Manuel pratique et théoretique de russe. Geneva, Switzerland: Droz.

KARSKIJ, EVFIMIJ. (1956) Belorussy: Jazyk belorusskogo naroda. Vyp. 2/3, str. 78-81, 420-44. Moskva; Izdat. AN SSSR.

KJELLBERG, LENNART. (1957) La langue de Gedeon Krinovskij. ("Publications de l'Institut slave d'Upsal," No. 13.) Uppsala: L'institut slave.

KLEIN, KURT. (1964) Recent Soviet Discussion on Reform of Russian Orthography, Slavic and East European Journal, 8.1.54-61.

KNJAZEVSKAJA, O. A. (1962) Xronikal'nye zametki [o S"ezde po publikacii pamjatnikov drevnerusskogo jayzka], Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1962.3. 153-5.

KOLODJAŽNYJ, ANDREJ S. (1960) Pryjmennyk. Xarkiv: Vydavnyctvo Xarkivs'koho Ordena trudovoho červonoho prapora deržavnoho universytetu imeni Gor'koho.

KOPECKIJ, L. V. (1957) Ruské předložky v předložkových výrazech času, Materiály pro ruské semináře, 2.67-83.

KOŠUTIĆ, RADOVAN. (1950) Gramatika ruskog jezika. Čast 2: Oblici. Izd. 2. Beograd: Izdavačko Preduzeće Narodne Republike Srbije, "Naučna knjiga."

KOTKOV, S. I. (1963) O sovmestnom izdanii drevnerusskix skoropisnyx pamjatnikov lingvistami i istorikami, Lingvističeskoe istočnikovedenie (Sbornik pod red. S. I. Kotkova [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 3-23.

KULAKOVA, S. A. (1959) Razvitie otymennyx predlogov, vyražajuščix pričinno-sledstvennye otnošenija [v francuzskom jazyke], Učenye

zapiski Leningradskogo instituta imeni Gercena, 212.79-90.

*KULINIČ, E. G. (1953) Izmenenija v upotreblenii predlogov v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Kiev.

KURYŁOWICZ, JERZY. (1960) Esquisses linguistiques. ("Prace językoznawcze Polskiej Akademii Nauk," No. 19.) Wrocław-Kraków: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

KUZNECOV, P. S. (1953) Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka: Morfologija. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

LEHMANN, W. P. (1963) Review of Tentative Typology of Romance Historical Grammars, by Yakov Malkiel, Language, 39.2.286-90.

LEHR-SPŁAWIŃSKI, TADEUSZ, I BARTULA, CZESŁAW. (1959) Zarys gramatyki języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego na tle porównawczym. Wyd. 4. Wrocław-Kraków: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolińskich.

LESKIEN, AUGUST. (1955) Handbuch der altbulgarischen Sprache. Aufl. 7. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.

LEVIN, B. V. (1956) O značenijax predloga krome v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke, Akademiku Viktoru Vladimiroviču Vinogradovu, k ego šestidesjatiletiju (Sbornik statej, pod red. S. G. Barxudarova i dr. [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 147-54.

LEVIN. (1957) Nabljudenija nad stilističeskimi izmenenijami v leksike, Materialy i issledovanija po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka, 4.114-8.

LEVIN. (1958) Kratkij očerk istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno.

LIXAČEV, D. S. (1958) Ob istoričeskoj i formal'noj klassifikacii spiskov drevneslavjanskix pamjatnikov, Slavjanskaja filologija (Sbornik statej k IV Meždunarodnomu s"ezdu slavistov, pod red. S. B. Bernštejna [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 1.264-74.

LOMONOSOV, MIXAJLO. (1755) Rossijskaja grammatika. (Polnoe sobranie sočinenij, tom 7, gl. 6, 9, 10.) Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR, 1952.

LOMTEV, TIMOFEJ P. (1948) Utraty i ograničenija v upotreblenii predložnyx form vinitel'nogo padeža v istorii russkogo jazyka staršej pory, Doklady i soobščenija Filologičeskogo fakul'teta Moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 7.56-66.

LOMTEV. (1956) Očerki po istoričeskomu sintaksisu russkogo jazyka. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

LOMTEV. (1961) Sravnitel'no-istoričeskaja grammatika vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov. Moskva: Vysšaja škola.

LUDOLF, HEINRICH. (1696) Grammatica russica. Reprint of original edition. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1959.

LUNT, HORACE G. (1958) Fundamentals of Russian. New York: W. W. Norton and Co.

MACDONALD, RODERICK ROSS. (1955) Russian Prepositions. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Slavic Languages, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

MAGNER, THOMAS. (1961) Applied Linguistics: Russian -- A Guide for Teachers. Boston: Heath and Company.

MARKOV, A. A. (1916) Review of "Lingvističeskie spektry," by N. A. Morozov (see below), Izvestija Akademii Nauk, Serija 6, 10.4.239-42.

MATEJKA, LADISLAV. (1959) Grammatical Coding for Prepositions, Computation Laboratory Report [Harvard University], No. NSf - 3 (August, 1959).

MATTHEWS, WILLIAM K. (1960) Russian Historical Grammar. London: University of London, Athlone Press.

MAZON, ANDRÉ. (1949) Grammaire de la langue russe. 3eme éd. Paris: L'institut d'études slaves.

MEILLET, ANTOINE. (1910) Review of Grammatik der altbulgarischen Sprache, by August Leskien, Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 172.1.372-4.

MEILLET. (1934) Le slave commun. 2eme éd. Paris: E. Champion.

MEILLET. (1953) Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes. 9ème éd. Paris: Librairie Hachette.

MEL'NYČUK, O. S. (1961) Istoryčnyj rozvytok funkcij i skladu pryjmennykiv v ukraïns'kij movi, Slov'jans'ke movoznavstvo (Kiev), 3.124-94.

MIKLOSICH, FRANZ. (1926) Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen. Aufl. 2. Band 4. Vienna: W. Braumüller.

MOROZOV, N. A. (1915) Lingvističeskie spektry, Izvestija Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti, 20.4.93-134.

NAHTIGAL, RAJKO. (1952) Slovanski jeziki. Izd. 2. Ljubljana: Univerza v Ljubljani, tiskarna "Jože Moškrič."

Narysy pa historyi belaruskaj movy. (1957) Pod rèdakciej P. F. Hlebki i dr. Minsk: Dzjaržawnae vučebna-pedahahičnae vydavectva Ministèrstva asvety BSSR.

NETTEBERG, KRISTINE. (1957) O formacjach przyimkowych i przedrostkowych, Scando-slavica, 5.19-29.

NILSSON, T. (1944) Über den Gebrauch der Präpositionen im altbulgarischen Codex Zographensis. Stockholm, Sweden: Kungl. Boktryckeriet P. A. Nordstedt & Söner.

Očerki po sravnitel'noj grammatike vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov. (1958). Pod redakciej N. I. Bukateviča. Odessa: Odesskij gosudarstvennyj universitet imeni Mečnikova.

OGONOVSKI, EMIL. (1877) Przyimki v językach staroslowiańskim, ruskim i polskim, Rozprawy Akademii umiejętności (Wydział filologiczny [Kraków]), 5.17-222.

OVSJANIKO-KULIKOVSKIJ, DMITRIJ N. (1909) Rukovodstvo k izučeniju sintaksisa russkago jazyka. Izd. 2. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno.

PACAK, MILOS. (1964) Prepositional Constructions [in Russian]: Structural Delimitations, Abstracts of Papers for the 1964 Annual Meeting of the Association for Machine Translation and Computational Linguistics (Indiana University, July 29-30, 1964), p. 5.

PARTENADZE, M. K. (1954) Predložnye konstrukcii v gramotax XVII v.,

Trudy Batumskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta, 4.43-63.

PEJSIKOV, LAZAR' S. (1959) Voprosy sintaksisa persidskogo jazyka. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Instituta meždunarodnyx otnošenij.

PEŠKOVSKIJ, ALEKSANDR M. (1956) Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščenii. Izd. 7. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

PETERSON, MIXAIL N. (1923) Očerk sintaksisa russkogo jazyka. Moskva-Petrograd: Gosizdat.

PETERSON. (1955) O častjax reči v russkom jazyke, Voprosy grammatičeskogo stroja (Sbornik statej, pod red. V. V. Vinogradova i dr. [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 178-87.

POPOV, B. V. (1957) Izučenie predlogov v VI klasse, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1957.6.75-80.

*POPOVA, L. N. (1958) Pričinnye ottenki nekotoryx predlogov v russkom jazyke, Naučnye doklady Vysšej školy (Serija filologičeskix nauk), 1958, vyp. 3.

POTAPOVA, NINA. (1958) Russian: Elementary Course, 2d ed. Book 2. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.

POTEBNJA, A. A. (1941) Iz zapisok po russkoj grammatike. Tom 4. Moskva-Leningrad: Izdat. AN SSSR.

PRAVDIN, A. B. (1958) Iz istorii predloga protiv, Učenye zapiski Tartuskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 65.165-72.

PUL'KINA, IL'ZA M. (1959) Kratkij spravočnik po russkoj grammatike. Izd. 5. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

PUL'KINA I ZAXAVA-NEKRASOVA, E. B. (1960) Učebnik russkogo jazyka dlja studentov-inostrancev. Izd. 2. Moskva: Vysšaja škola.

RASTORGUEVA, V. S. (1953) Kratkij očerk grammatiki persidskogo jazyka, Persidsko-russkij slovar' (sost. Boris V. Miller [Moskva: Gosizdat inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej]), 631, 650-1.

RIXTER, G. I. (1955) Nabljudenija nad pervoobraznymi predlogami i predložnymi konstrukcijami v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1955.6.12-6.

*ROSLOVEC, JA. I. (1953) Upotreblenie predlogov v formal'nyx značenijax v sovremennom russkom jazyke. Avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Moskovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet, Moskva.

ROZENTAL', DITMAR È. (1957) Literaturnoe redaktirovanie. (See above under BYLINSKIJ.)

ROZENTAL'. (1959) Kul'tura reči. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.

RYŽKOV, N. S. (1957) Morfologija i semantika imennyx narečij v drevnerusskix pamjatnikax XI-XIV vekov, Trudy Instituta jazykoznanija, 8. 471-517.

SLOŃSKI, STANISŁAW. (1921) Przyimki w polskiem "sandhi," Prace lingwistyczne ofiarowane Janowi Baudouinowi de Courtenay (Kraków), 180-91.

Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. (1950-63ff.) Pod redakciej V. I. Černyševa i dr. Tomy 1-15ff. Moskva-Leningrad:

Izdat. AN SSSR.

SMIRNICKIJ, A. I. (1958) Russko-anglijskij slovar'. Izd. 3. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyx i nacional'nyx slovarej.

SOBOLEVSKIJ, A. I. (1907) Lekcii po istorii russkago jazyka. Izd. 4. Photomechanic reprint. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1962.

SØRENSEN, HANS C. (1957) Studies on Case in Russian. Copenhagen: I kommission hos Rosenhilde og Bagger.

SPANG-HANSSEN, HENNING. (1959) Probability and Structural Classification in Language Description. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.

SPECTOR, IVAR. (1936) Russian Prepositions and How to Use Them. Seattle, Washington: University of Washington Book Shop.

SPRINČAK, JAKOV A. (1960) Očerk russkogo istoričeskogo sintaksisa (prostoe predloženie). Kiev: Radjans'ka škola.

STANG, C. S. (1957) Eine preussisch-slavische Sonderbildung [prepositions in -d"], Scando-slavica, 3.236-9.

ŠAPIRO, A. B. (1947) Ob obrazovanii narečij v sovremennom russkom jazyke, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1947.1.28-38.

ŠAXMATOV, ALEKSANDR A. (1925) Sintaksis russkogo jazyka. Photomechanic reprint. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1963.

ŠAXMATOV. (1957) Istoričeskaja morfologija russkogo jazyka. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

ŠEKUROVA, G. V. (1958) O nekotoryx osobennostjax razvitija predložnoj sistemy [pro] v russkom jazyke, Učenye zapiski Čečeno-ingušskogo pedagogičeskogo instituta, 11.50-67.

ŠIŠKOV, ALEKSANDR S. (1825) Nečto o predlogax, Sobranie sočinenij i perevodov (Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno), 5.262-70.

ŠIŠKOV. (1829) Prodolženie rassuždenija o predlogax, Sobranie sočinenij i perevodov (Sankt-Peterburg: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno), 13.23-51.

ŠMELEV, D. N. (1961) K voprosu o "proizvodnyx" služebnyx častjax reči i meždometijax, Izvestija Akademii Nauk SSSR (Otdelenie literatury i jazyka), 20.6.501.

TAGAMLICKAJA, G. (1955) K voprosu o predložnom upravlenii [za] v russkom i bolgarskom jazykax, Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet (Filologičeski fakultet), 51.1.275-448.

TAGAMLICKAJA. (1958) Složenie predlogov kak sredstvo popolnenija kategorii predlogov v slavjanskix jazykax, Slavjanskaja filologija (Sbornik statej k IV Meždunarodnomu s"ezdu slavistov [Moskva: Izdat. AN SSSR]), 3.61-96.

TRIOMPHE, ROBERT. (1958) "Ob" slave, Slavjanskaja filologija (same as preceding item), 1.78-92.

*TROCIK, E. D. (1957) O sinonimii predlogov. Odessa: Izdatel'stvo neizvestno.

TROFIMOV, VLADIMIR. (1957) Sovremennyj russkij literaturnyj jazyk: Morfologija. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta.

TRUBETSKOJ, NIKOLAJ. (1934) Das morphonologische System der russischen Sprache. (Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague, Vol. 5, Pt. 2.)

*TRUŠKOV, V. K. (1957) Priem uznavanija predlogov-narečij i predlogov-sušč̌estvitel'nyx, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1957.5.51-2.

UNBEGAUN, BORIS. (1935) La langue russe au XVI^{e} siècle. (La bibliothèque russe, tome XVI.) Paris: L'institut d'études slaves de l'Université de Paris.

UNBEGAUN. (1951) Grammaire russe. Lyon, France: Imprimerie artistique en couleurs.

UXANOV, G. P. (1958) Predložnye konstrukcii v "Xoženii Afanasija Nikitina," Sbornik statej po jazykoznaniju professoru MGU V. V. Vinogradovu v den' ego šestidesjatiletija (pod red. A. I. Efimova [Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta]), 296-311.

VAILLANT, ANDRÉ. (1948) Manuel du vieux slave. Tome 1: Grammaire. Paris: L'institut d'études slaves.

VAILLANT. (1950) Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome 1: Phonétique. Lyon, France: Imprimerie artistique en couleurs.

VAILLANT. (1958) Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. Tome 2, partie 2: Flexion pronominale. Lyon, France: Imprimerie artistique en couleurs.

VAN WIJK [VAN-VEJK], NICOLAUS. (1957) Istorija staroslavjanskogo jazyka. Perevod s nemeckogo V. V. Borodič. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo inostrannoj literatury.

VASMER, MAX. (1953-58) Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bände 1-3. Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsverlag.

VEČERKA, RADOSLAV. (1960) Předložky v slovanském jazykovém atlase, Slavia, 29.4.576-81.

VERDIANI, CARLO. (1956) Manuale di slavo antico. Firenze: Sansoni.

VESELITSKIJ, V. V. (1962) Review of Predlogi v sovremennom russkom jazyke, by V. S. Bondarenko, Russkij jazyk v škole, 1962.4.110-2.

*VESELITSKIJ. (1964) Russkie predlogi i ix sootvetstvija v anglijskom jazyke. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannyx jazykax.

VEY, MARC. (1925) Une préposition composée: ku, gu; Mélanges publiées en l'honneur de M. Paul Boyer (Paris: H. Champion), 313-23.

VINOGRADOV, VIKTOR V. (1947) Russkij jazyk. Moskva-Leningrad: Učpedgiz.

VINOGRADOV. (1957) Izučenie russkogo literaturnogo jazyka za poslednee desjatiletie v SSSR, Beogradski međunarodni slavistički sastanak, 15-21.IX.1955 (odgovnorni redaktor Dr. Kiril Taranovski [Beograd: Naučno delo Srpske Akademije nauka]), 151-97.

VINOKUR, GRIGORIJ. (1943) Majakovskij, novator jazyka. Moskva: Sovetskij pisatel'.

VINOKUR. (1945) Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. V sbornike Izbrannye raboty po russkomu jazyka (Moskva: Učpedgiz, 1959), 9-110.

VON DER OSTEN-SACKEN, W. FRHR. (1911) Ergänzungen zu Doritsch, Archiv für slavische Philologie, 32.120-30. [See also Doritsch above.]

VONDRÁK, WENZEL. (1928) Vergleichende slavische Grammatik. Aufl. 2. Band 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

VOSTOKOV, ALEKSANDR X. (1874) Russkaja grammatika. Izd. 12. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaja Akademija nauk".

*VYGONNAJA, M. P. (1954) Predlogi i predložnyx sočetanija v jazyke "Povesti vremennyx let," avtoreferat kandidatskoj dissertacii, Leningradskij universitet, Leningrad.

WISSEMANN, HEINZ. (1958) Review of Théorie des prépositions, by Viggo Brøndal, Indogermanische Forschungen, 64.1.69-77.

Xrèstamatyja pa historyi belaruskaj movy. (1961) Častka 1. Pod rèdakciej R. I. Avanesava. Minsk: Vydavectva Akadèmii navuk Belaruskaj SSR.

ZASORINA, L. N. (1961) Opyt sistemnogo analiza predlogov [ot, s, iz, iz-za, po] sovremennogo russkogo jazyka, Učenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 301.64-84.

ŽUKOVSKAJA, LIDIJA. (1959) Novgorodskie berestjanye gramoty. Moskva: Učpedgiz.

23.00 INDEX OF PREPOSITIONS

The following index includes, in Russian alphabetical order, all prepositions analyzed individually in the present study. The first reference is to the section (§) above, which contains the chronological summary of the individual preposition. If there is also a second number (separated from the first by a semi-colon), it refers to the section which contains a combined summary of the given preposition with other prepositions sharing a common root. For miscellaneous secondary prepositions which are not analyzed individually (e.g., v konce, starše, etc.), see at the end of the index, under the appropriate general category.

bez 3.14
blagodarja 11.01
bliže 9.03; 7.013
bliz 5.01; 7.013
blizko 10.02; 7.013
blizu 6.26; 7.013

v 3.01
vblizi 7.01; 7.013
vverxu 7.28
vdogon(ku) 7.02
vdol' 7.29
verx 5.07
verxu 6.09; 7.252
vzamen 7.30
vmesto 7.032
v ... mesto 7.03
vne 6.02
vnutr'(i) 7.04
vovnutr' 7.31
vo vremja 8.02
vozle 7.05
vokrug 7.06; 7.063
von 5.08
vopreki 7.07; 7.213
v otnošenii 8.03; 10.011
vpered(i) 7.08; 7.083
vrode 7.32
vsled 7.09
vsledstvie 7.33
vstreču 6.10
v centre 8.04
v čest' 8.05
v čisle 8.06
v"z 3.15
v"skraj 7.34
vyše 9.04

dal'še 9.05
del'ma (see dlja)
delja (see dlja)
dlja 6.01
dlja-radi 8.01
do 3.06

za 3.08
zade 6.14; 7.263
zadi (see zade)

iz 3.10
iz-za 4.01
iznutri 7.35

iz-pod 4.02
isključaja 11.02

k 3.02
kanun 5.10
kolo 6.22
kraj 5.11
krome 6.03
krug 5.12; 7.063
krugom 6.06; 7.063

lučše 9.06

mež 5.02; 7.24
meži (see mežđu)
mež(d)u 6.11; 7.24
mesto 6.23
mimo 6.08; 7.202
moristee 9.01

na 3.09
naverx(u) 7.10; 7.252
navstreču 7.11
nad 3.16
nazadi 7.36; 7.263
na mesto 8.072
na ... mesto 8.07
napered 7.37; 7.083
naperekor 7.38; 7.213
napererez 7.12
napodobie 7.39
naprotiv 7.13; 7.13
naskvoz' 7.40
nasredi 7.41
nasčet 7.42
nevziraja na 11.05
ne doezžaja 11.07
ne doexav (see ne doezžaja)
ne došedši (see ne doxodja)
ne doxodja 11.08
nesmotrja na 11.06
niže 9.07

o(b) 3.04
odal(e) 7.43
okolo 7.14
okrest 7.15
okrome 7.44
okrug 7.45; 7.063
oprič' 7.46
oproče 7.47
ostoron 7.48
ot 3.11
otaj 7.49
otnositel'no 10.01; 10.011

pered 3.18
peredi 6.19; 7.083
pereky 6.20; 7.213
po 3.07
poverx 7.16; 7.252
pod 3.17
podelom 7.17
podle 7.18
podobno 10.02
po-za 4.04
pozadi 7.19; 7.263
pozže 9.08
pomimo 7.20; 7.202
pomoščiju 6.27
po-nad 4.05
poperek 7.21; 7.213
po povodu 8.08
po-pod 4.06
posle 7.22
posledi (see posle)
posležde (see posle)
posrede (see posredi)
posredi 7.23; 7.232
posredine 7.50; 7.232
posredstvom 8.07
posred(u) (see posredi)
pred (see pered)
predi (see peredi)
prež(d)e 9.09; 7.083
prez 5.13
preki (see pereky)
premo 10.02
premy 6.21
pri 3.12
pri pomošči 8.09
prišed 11.03
pro 3.13
promež(du) 7.24; 7.24
protiv 5.03; 7.133
protivu 6.12; 7.133
putem 6.24

radi 6.04
razve 6.15
ran'še 9.10

s 3.03
sboku 7.51
svene 6.16
sverx 7.25; 7.252
sered' (see sred')
szadi 7.26; 7.263
skvoz' 5.04; 6.17
skvoze 6.17; 6.17

soglasno 10.02
sootvetstvenno 10.02
s-pod 4.03
sposobom 6.25
spustja 11.04
sredi 6.05; 7.232
sred' 5.14; 7.232
suprotiv 7.52; 7.133

u 3.05

xuže 9.11

č(e)rez 5.05

jęde 6.18

Miscellaneous:
adverbs (amorphous) 10.03
adverbs in -o 10.02
combinations 8.01
comparatives in -ě 9.02
comparatives in -ee 9.01