

**INDIANA  
SLAVIC  
STUDIES**

Volume 13 (2002)

ISSN 0073-6929

**WHERE ONE'S TONGUE RULES WELL**

A FESTSCHRIFT FOR CHARLES E. TOWNSEND

EDITED BY

**LAURA A. JANDA, RONALD FELDSTEIN,  
& STEVEN FRANKS**

Cases in Collision, Cases in Collusion: The Semantic Space of Case in Czech and Russian\*

1. Introduction

Although all the Slavic languages have basically the "same" system of cases, each language uses these cases a bit differently. There are at least two good reasons to undertake contrastive analyses of Slavic case systems: 1) the better we understand the case systems, the better equipped we are to teach them to our students, particularly students who study more than one Slavic language; and 2) differences in case usage are not just a random pile of trivial facts—striking patterns indicate the conceptual underpinnings of the cognitive categories that cases represent. This article is offered in the spirit of three (of the many) things Charles Townsend has taught me: 1) the Czech and Russian languages and the value of contrastive studies; 2) the cardinal importance of the form-meaning relationship; and 3) the ethic that linguistic endeavors should be not only theoretically interesting, but practical and useful.

Imagine the following experiment: a dozen or so engineers are put in separate workshops containing roughly the same tools and materials and each is asked to build a car. They all succeed, and in some sense they all construct the "same" vehicle, but each car is different. The engineers are the Slavic nations; the workshops are their languages, the tools and materials are case concepts and other perceptual/conceptual experiences (along with a healthy dose of imagination). The cars are the syntactic vehicles of noun phrases: case systems. Though the cars might look quite different (and two of our engineers, the Bulgarian and the Macedonian, have built much smaller cars than the others), their overall function is approximately the same. What's important for us to note is that the differences are not random, but suggest various imaginative strategies in response to alternatives: one has to choose both what to ignore (since sensory input provides much more information than any one human being can meaningfully attend to or any one language can encode in its

\* I would like to thank Edna Andrews and Steven Clancy for their comments on an earlier version of this paper, and Eleonora Magomedova and the late Cyril Janda for their help with the accuracy of Russian and Czech data. Errors and omissions, etc. should be attributed to the author.

grammar), as well as how to resolve ambiguities (also rife in our sensory input). In the source domain of cars, we note that all the cars have propulsion, steering, and braking systems, though these systems might be based on different principles and designed very differently. In the target domain of case systems, all languages have ways to express destinations, reference points, and locations, but the specific syntactic design each language uses for these expressions may differ.

This article is written in the framework of cognitive linguistics, which means that the following assumptions are made: 1) meaning is the motivating force behind virtually all linguistic phenomena; 2) meaning is a coherent phenomenon (linguistic cognition is not separate from overall cognition) and is grounded in bodily experience; and 3) the phenomena of polysemy, metaphor, and metonymy are major forces in the functioning of language. For cases, this means that: 1) a given case always expresses meaning (whether or not it is in the presence of a preposition or other governing word); 2) case meaning is based on the perceptual/conceptual input of human embodied existence; and 3) a given case has a polysemous network of related meanings extended via metaphor and metonymy. Though this article is an outgrowth of considerable previous work on case semantics in Czech and Russian (especially Janda 1993, Janda & Clancy forthcoming a, Janda & Clancy forthcoming b, Chapter 3 of Janda & Townsend 2000, and Townsend & Komar 2000), this is my first exploration of how the same or similar meanings are expressed using different cases in different languages. The contrastive data point to well-motivated selections of logical alternatives from the perspective of prior semantic case descriptions. Thus the present contrastive analysis can be understood as a confirmation of these prior case descriptions.

## 2. Overview of Semantic Structure of Czech and Russian Cases

The following is an overview of the gross structure of case meanings used in previous publications to describe the Czech and Russian case systems (for details, please refer to Janda & Clancy forthcoming a and b—sample drafts of these two items are currently accessible at <http://www.unc.edu/~sclancy/casebooks.html>). At this level of abstraction (six cases with a combined total of fifteen submeanings), the two languages appear to have roughly the “same” case system (provided one ignores the Czech vocative, not included here because it has no sentential function). The basic submeanings of each case are listed as bullets, and the uses associated with each basic submeaning appear in parentheses. Elsewhere, specific submeanings will be listed with the name of the case appearing first and the submeaning given after a colon (e.g., nominative: a name):

### Nominative

- A name (naming, subject)
- An identity (predicative nominative)

### Genitive

- A source (prepositions and verbs expressing withdrawal)
- A goal (prepositions and verbs expressing approach)
- A whole (possession, ‘of’, quantification, secondary prepositions)
- A reference (negation, comparison, prepositions expressing nearness, dates)

### Dative

- A receiver/loser (indirect object)
- An experiencer (words expressing benefit, harm, and modal uses)
- A competitor (words expressing matching forces, submission, domination)

### Accusative

- A destination (all uses are refinements of this one, on a continuum from simple destination to expressions closer to *through* or *through to the end*)

### Locative

- A place (all uses refer to literal or metaphorical places)

### Instrumental

- A means (bare instrumental expressing means, instrument, path, agent)
- A label (predicative instrumental)
- An adjunct (preposition *s*)
- A landmark (prepositions of location: *nad*, *pod*, *před*/*pered*, *za*, *mezi*/*meždu*)

This system provides a greater level of detail than mere citations of cases, and it will be used throughout this article, particularly in reference to discrete contrasts.

## 3. Typology of Differential Case Usage

The case usage of any single Slavic language is a complex, richly textured phenomenon. When two such systems are juxtaposed, the available comparisons are no less varied. Three types of differences can be recognized: 1) variations in the range or strength of a case usage (a phenomenon exists in both languages, but is more robust in one than in the other); 2) variations in construal and syntax (a given idea is expressed in the different languages using

entirely different grammatical constructions, from differing viewpoints): 3) discrete differences in case distribution (a given idea is expressed using one case in one language, but another case in another language). This typology is not strictly discrete, but it will help organize the discussion and focus attention on the facts most relevant to a contrastive analysis, namely those aggregated under 3)—discrete differences in case distribution. Sections 4, 5, and 6 will briefly describe all three types of differences and the remainder of the article (sections 7, 8, and 9) will be devoted to detailed description and discussion of the third type of difference. Although an attempt has been made to be as inclusive as possible in gathering evidence of differential case usage, some differences may have been overlooked. The trends that will be noted, however, are quite strong and it is unlikely that additional data would significantly alter the overall picture.

#### 4. Variations in the Range or Strength of a Case Usage

Overall, the Czech dative case shows some stronger tendencies than the Russian dative, whereas the Russian genitive and instrumental display some more robust uses than their Czech counterparts. The Czech dative is extended to pragmatic domains much more readily than the Russian dative, yielding frequent use of both the ethical dative (e.g., *Včera jsem ti měla sinou horečku* 'Yesterday I had a high fever — and you should care') and "beneficial" *si* (e.g., *Veźmi si deštník* 'Take your/ian umbrella — for your benefit'). Similar uses of the dative are considerably rarer in Russian. In Czech, the dative can be governed by all three types of "competitor" verbs: verbs expressing matching forces (*rovnat se* 'be equal to'), submission (*podlehat* 'submit to'), and domination (*dominovat* 'dominate'). In Russian the dative is used only for verbs expressing matching forces (*равняться* 'be equal to') and submission (*подвергаться* 'submit to'). Russian instead uses the instrumental with verbs expressing domination (*заведовать* 'be in charge of, *правит* 'rule; govern', etc.). This use of the instrumental is rare in Czech and usually refers to objects dominated (not people; the only common examples are *vládnout* 'rule; use masterfully' and *hospodařit* 'manage').

The Russian genitive shows some more vigorous tendencies than its Czech counterpart in the areas of partitive usage (in Czech the partitive genitive is relatively rare, although in Colloquial Czech the partitive forms of two words *chleba* 'bread' and *sejra* 'cheese' have completely eclipsed their nominative and accusative forms; however Czech can use the bare genitive to express large quantities, as *Tam bylo holek!* 'Wow, there were a lot of girls there!', which is rare in Russian); the genitive of negation (which is rare and largely limited to fixed phrases like *Není divu* 'That's no surprise' in Czech); and the second genitive (and second locative—both are still active semantic distinctions in

Russian; the status of the *-u* endings in Czech is primarily morphological, not semantic). Furthermore, Russian makes subtle distinctions between the use of genitive: a goal and accusative: a destination with certain verbs (like *ždat* 'wait', *trebovat* 'need'); whereas any such distinctions are much less apparent in Czech, and at any rate the use of genitive: a goal with verbs (like *potřebovat* 'need', *používat* 'use') is waning and perhaps dying out.

The Russian instrumental: a means is more active in certain domains than the Czech instrumental. Russian possession verbs frequently govern instrumental: a means (*vládat* 'possess', *voročat* 'have control of', *obladat* 'possess', *ovládat* 'take possession of', *raspolagat* 'have at one's disposal'), whereas this usage is represented by only one verb in Czech (*disponovat* 'have at one's disposal'); cf. the differences in uses of the Czech dative vs. Russian instrumental with expressions of domination above. Russian has a relatively large number of verbs denoting positive or negative appreciation that use instrumental: a means (*vozmuščet'ja* 'be indignant at', *vosxičat'ja* 'be carried away by, admire', *naslaždat'ja* 'enjoy', *prenebregat* 'despise' — at least thirteen such verbs, plus associated nouns and adjectives); whereas Czech has only three (*opovrhovat* 'scorn', *kochat se* 'delight in', and *pohtdat* 'despise'). The predicate instrumental (instrumental: a label) is much more common in Russian than in Czech, which prefers nominative: a name; cf. Russian *Ona bude učitelnicí* 'She will be a teacher' vs. the Czech equivalent *Ona bude učitelka/učitelkou*.

These variations in the range or strength of case phenomena indicate some systematic differences between Czech and Russian, but they do not provide discrete contrasts. All of the case uses listed above exist in both languages, though the frequency and extent of these uses differ somewhat.

#### 5. Variations in Construal and Syntax

Differences in case usage are frequently embedded in the larger phenomenon of differing syntactic constructions, themselves artifacts of the different ways that people construe experience. At this level, Czech and Russian syntax differ primarily in their treatment of possession and modals, subjects and apposition, passives and middles, and multiplication and measurement. Some of the constructions presented here share the properties of the variations in range or strength of case usage: in some cases a given construction exists in both languages, yet its status is very different, being the normative expression in one language, but marginal in the other.

In Czech possessors and modal experiencers tend to be marked nominative: a name, as subjects of verbs (*Jan má nové auto* 'Jan has a new car', *Jan musí koupit nové auto* 'Jan must buy a new car'), whereas equivalent Russian constructions usually suggest a less personal, more passive viewpoint, in which the possessor is more like a location (*U Ivana nová mašina* 'Ivan has



a new car [lit: By **Ivan-GEN** there is a new car]) and the modal is an impersonal experience (*Ivanu nado kupit' novuju mašinu* 'Ivan needs to buy a new car [lit: For **Ivan-DAT** it is necessary to buy a new car]). Likewise, when pain is caused by a body part (an inalienable possession), the Czech possessor is an accusative direct object (*Hlava mě boří* 'My head hurts [lit: The head hurts me-ACC]), but the Russian possessor is a location (*U menja bořit golova* 'My head hurts [lit: By me-GEN the head hurts]). Consistent with this picture is the fact that the possessive dative: an experiencer (which doesn't really signal possession, but rather any benefit or harm that a possessor experiences due to possessions—something that one would expect to be more sensitive to if one were examining an event from the point of view of an active possessor) is much more common in Czech (*Dům nám shořel* 'Our house burned down [lit: The house burned down on us]) than in Russian (*Naš dom sgorel* 'Our house burned down').

Although Czech readily omits subject pronouns (though Russian doesn't), Czech is less tolerant of truly subjectless sentences than Russian. Czech has no subjectless constructions with accusative direct objects of the type occasioned by Russian *tošnit'* 'feel nauseated, triest' 'be shaken', etc. The only subjectless accusative construction that seems to exist in Czech is the *Je vidět hora* 'The mountain is visible' type, but note that it is frequently constructed with a nominative subject as *Je vidět hora*. Examples like *Petrem škřablo* 'Petr shuddered [lit: Shuddered by means of Petr-INST]' are rare in Czech. Dative impersonal expressions are less common in Czech than in Russian, and sometimes these expressions acquire subjects in Czech, either by promoting an adverb to subjecthood (*Bylo/Byla mi zima* 'I was cold [lit: Was cold to me]'—the *Byla* version shows subject agreement for *zima*) or by inserting to as a "dummy *it*" (*Bylo nám smutno/To nám bylo smutno* 'We were sad'). By contrast, Russian clings steadfastly to the use of the nominative in appositives, whereas Czech often declines appositives (*v řece Vltavě* 'in the river Vltava'—here the name of the river also appears in the locative), although in some situations this is optional (*do banky Bohemia/Bohemie* 'to the Bohemia bank'—here the name of the bank may be nominative or genitive).

The range of the instrumental agent in non-transitive constructions differs in the two languages. In Russian instrumental agents appear with both the past passive participle (for perfective verbs: *Ozonovala dyra byla obnaručena specialistami* 'The ozone hole was discovered by specialists') and with (imperfective) verbs passivized by *-sja/-s'* (*Takie knigi čítajusia štrókimi massami* 'Such books are read by the broad masses'). In Czech only the past passive participle (used in either aspect) admits the instrumental agent (*Ozónová díra byla objevena specialisty* 'The ozone hole was discovered by specialists'), but instrumental agents cannot be used with Czech *se* (the

equivalent of Russian *-sja/-s'*), which perhaps represents more of a middle than true passive voice (*Takové knihy se dobře čtou* 'Such books are nice to read'—no agent can be inserted here).

Some Russian constructions use the instrumental to indicate multiplication and measurement, but Czech lacks equivalent constructions, using instead constructions that have either other cases or no case at all. Russian uses the instrumental for multiplication, as in *šest'ju pjar' trídcať* 'six times five is thirty'. Multiplication in Czech is achieved by using the *krát* 'times' suffix rather than a case construction: *šestkrát pět je třicet* 'six times five is thirty'. Both Czech and Russian have a construction used to indicate both the parameter (weight, volume, etc.) and the number of units of measurement attributed to an object, but in Czech the parameter appears with the preposition *o* and the locative case and the number of units appears in the genitive (*kniha o váze pět kilogramů* 'a book weighing five kilos'), whereas in Russian the parameter is cited in the instrumental and the number of units is governed by the preposition *v* in the accusative (*kniga vesom v pjat' kilogrammov* 'a book weighing five kilos'). The construal of the relationships that hold between the object, the parameter, and the units of measurement is clearly very different in the two languages.

Differences associated with differing construals and resultant constructional syntax do not offer us discrete contrasts of case usage. Here the use of a given case is symptomatic of larger phenomena existing at a different level. Often there are no real equivalents and/or the contrast is not just between one case in one language and another in the other, but rather between two very different constructions employing different arrays of cases.

#### 6. Discrete Differences in Case Distribution

The foregoing discussion of how factors such as range, strength, syntax, and construal figure in differing case uses is not meant to be dismissive, nor to indicate that these types of differences are entirely distinct from or irrelevant to the discrete differences to be discussed below. In reality, all three types of differences form a continuum and certainly the first two types of factors have some influence on the third one. However, the discrete differences provide the only opportunity we have to compare case use cross-linguistically in a relatively unambiguous way. They represent the crispest differences in case usage, and have therefore special value for both the researcher and the learner. Still, these differences are not perfectly clean (since we are dealing with real languages); some fuzzy spots will be noted below.

Theoretically, given six cases, fourteen pairings of one case in Czech vs. a different one in Russian are possible, but only seven are realized. At the level of submeanings, the data are even more telling: given the fifteen case submeanings listed above, 104 pairings of one case usage in Czech vs. a

different one in Russian are possible.<sup>1</sup> Only eighteen such differences are realized (less than 20%). Of these eighteen discrete differences, thirteen are realized multiple times (and often such that the same difference occurs both Czech vs. Russian and Russian vs. Czech) and can be clumped into some six significant aggregates, leaving a remainder of four less significant (and less systematic) differences in usage. These data suggest very strongly that the differences between the case systems of the two languages are not random, but instead represent significant, cognitively salient logical alternatives. The six significant aggregates are: 1) nominative: a name vs. genitive: a reference; 2) instrumental: a means/a landmark vs. accusative: a destination; 3) instrumental: a means/an adjunct vs. locative: a place; 4) genitive: a goal/a reference/a whole vs. accusative: a destination (and occasionally locative: a place); 5) accusative: a destination vs. locative: a place; 6) dative: a competitor/a recipient/loser (and occasionally instrumental: a landmark) vs. genitive: a goal/a source/a reference. These aggregates and their cognitive significance will be discussed in detail, followed by briefer discussions of the remaining four case differences (which are not robust and do not provide enough data to support extensive discussion). The four less significant differences are: 1) nominative: a name vs. accusative: a destination; 2) instrumental: an adjunct vs. dative: a competitor; 3) genitive: a source vs. instrumental: a means; 4) dative: an experienter vs. accusative: a destination.

### 7. The Six Significant Aggregates

This group constitutes the most distinctive and widespread differences between Czech and Russian case usage, the clearest target for both researchers and learners. Our goal will be not merely to describe these differences, but to motivate them as the results of various cognitive strategies analogous to the varying design strategies of our imaginary automotive engineers. Note that for each of the aggregates, the data are bi-directional. In other words, for aggregate 1) nominative: a name vs. genitive: a reference, we see this difference in terms of both Czech nominative: a name vs. Russian genitive: a reference and Russian nominative: a name vs. Czech genitive: a reference. Again this fact shows that the differences themselves indicate significant cognitive junctures. It is as if we looked at two of our experimental cars, car A and car B, and discovered that

<sup>1</sup> The mathematical formula for calculating the number of possible pairings is the sum of all  $(x - n)$  where  $x$  = the number of items that can be paired and  $n$  ranges from 1 to  $x - 1$ . Thus, for the six cases, we have  $(6 - 1) + (6 - 2) + (6 - 3) + (6 - 4) + (6 - 5) = 15$  (the number of possible pairings). As outlined in section 2, the Slavic case system contains a total of fifteen submeanings. At this level of detail, the formula yields  $(15 - 1) + (15 - 2) + (15 - 3) + \dots + (15 - 14) = 104$ .

car A had hydraulic suspension and mechanical brakes, but car B had mechanical suspension and hydraulic brakes. Taken together, these differences point to a more abstract comparison of the various features of mechanical and hydraulic systems. We will attempt to step back and make comparisons of case semantics at this more abstract level, offering a cognitive analysis of the competing motives that explain the differences.

#### 1) Nominative: a name vs. genitive: a reference

In Czech, all dates, such as today's and tomorrow's, are expressed as temporal reference points using genitive: a reference: *Dnes je/Zitra bude čtvrtého* 'Today is/Tomorrow will be the fourth', but in Russian, only dates that describe when something takes place appear as genitive: a reference: all other dates are expressed as nominative: a name: *Segodna/Zavtra budet čtvrtioe* 'Today is/Tomorrow will be the fourth'. Conversely, Russian can use genitive: a reference to express the reference point of a comparison: *Ivan starše menja* 'Ivan is older than I' (although of course nominative: a name is also available for this purpose: *Ivan starše, čem ja*); but Czech can only use nominative: a name: *Ivan je starší, než ja*.

#### Cognitive analysis:

A name (a function of nominative: a name) can be understood as a mental address for its referent, the cognitive location of referential activity. It can be argued that this concept overlaps somewhat with that of a point of reference (a function of genitive: a reference). Abstractly, names and reference points share some referential functions, motivating this affinity.

#### 2) Instrumental: a means/a landmark vs. accusative: a destination

First let's examine instances where Czech uses instrumental: a means/a landmark, but Russian uses accusative: a destination. Czech use of instrumental: a means to express paths of motion is quite robust: *Šli jsme lesem 'We went through the forest', Vlak jede tunelem* 'The train is going through a tunnel'. This use of the instrumental is marginal in Russian, which instead uses a preposition *čerez* + accusative: a destination: *My šli čerez les; Pozd edel čerez tunnel* (but note that Czech also uses accusative: a destination for the prepositions *skrz* 'through' and *přes* 'across'). Verbs meaning 'waste' and 'save' show a parallel distinction, governing instrumental: a means in Czech: *Třeba šetřitě časem, ale plynivě penězmi!* 'Maybe you are saving time, but you are wasting money!', but accusative: a destination in Russian: *Vy možet byt' ekonomitě vremenja, no vy traitě den'gi!* (but note that in Russian *ekonomit' 'save'* can also govern *na* + locative: a place). To say how long ago something



happened, Czech uses the preposition *před* + instrumental: a landmark: *Přestěhováni jsme se sem před rokem* 'We moved here a year ago'; but Russian uses accusative: a destination + *naзад*: *My sjudá perecežali god naзад*. In the case of Russian, this makes a symmetrical system that assigns the accusative for any time removed from the present, whether past or future (note the analogous future expression *My nuda peredem čerez god* 'We will move there in a year'; Czech also uses the accusative for the future: *Přestěhujeme se tam za rok* 'We will move there in a year').

We will now focus on the converse contrasts, where Russian uses instrumental: a means/a landmark, but Czech uses accusative: a destination. Groupings can be expressed in Russian via instrumental: a means, as in: *Fašisty ubívali hudej tysjačami* 'The fascists murdered people by the thousands'. The only Czech equivalent uses accusative: a destination for the numeral: *Fašisté zabíjeli tisíce lidí* 'The fascists murdered thousands of people'. Likewise, in the domain of time, a grouping of contiguous durations can be expressed with instrumental: a means in Russian: *Éto prodolžalos' vekami* 'That lasted centuries', but the Czech equivalent is accusative: a destination: *To trvalo stáletí*. Czech consistently distinguishes between the destination and locational uses of the prepositions *nad* 'above', *pod* 'below', *před* 'in front of', *za* 'behind', and *mezi* 'between'; Czech assigns accusative: a destination to all destinational uses: *Prosim, pověs lampu nad stůl* 'Please hang the lamp above the table'. Russian makes this distinction only for *pod* 'below' and *za* 'behind'; the other prepositions govern instrumental: a landmark even when referring to a destination: *Požalujsta, pověs lampu nad stolem*.

#### Cognitive Analysis:

The semantic notions of 'through' and 'to' are cognitively linked. Both Czech and Russian can use the accusative case for both notions. Czech *lesem* (instrumental: a means) vs. Russian *čerez les* (accusative: a destination) plays on the same linkage between movement through a space and a destination beyond a space, but it cuts across case boundaries. Russian *tysjačami* and *vekami* (instrumental: a means) vs. Czech *tisíce* and *stáletí* (accusative: a destination) instantiate the difference between understanding groupings as a path through the whole and time periods as a path through time as opposed to viewing them as destinations or targets of activity. Additionally, we must note the cognitive connection between a 'way' in the sense of a 'path' (which can be a path *through* something) and a 'way' in the sense of a 'means' (the very polysemy of English *way* is indicative of this connection, which is just as strong in the Slavic languages). A path facilitating movement is analogous to a means or instrument facilitating any other activity. Czech *časem* and *penězi* betrays an understanding of resources as the means to achieving waste or thrift (similar

to the way in which both languages use instrumental: a means with body parts for stereotypical gestures like waving and nodding; the body parts are a means to achieving gestures), whereas resources are merely the destinations of wasteful or thrifty activities in Russian *vrenija* and *den'gi* (where they behave like any accusative direct object would in either language). Cross-linguistically it is extremely common for languages to treat the endpoint of a trajectory similarly to the entire trajectory; this metonymic relationship motivates the use of English *over* for both *Sally lives over the hill* and *Bill walked over the hill*. Both languages indicate the metonymic relationship by using the same set of prepositions both for trajectories to proximal locations and for existence at such locations: Czech *nad, pod, před, za, mezi* and Russian *nad, pod, pered, za, meždu*. Czech distinguishes between motion (accusative: a destination) and location (instrumental: a landmark) for all of these prepositions, but in Russian some of these prepositions use the instrumental even for motion, further reinforcing the metonymic link between trajectory and endpoint. The distinction of Russian *naзад* + accusative: a destination vs. Czech *před* + instrumental: a landmark shows that Slavic case systems can indicate a point that is some distance away (like an endpoint) using both the accusative and instrumental cases.

In sum, this comparison brings out two important generalizations. The first is that the object of an action can be understood just as an object, or it can be understood more specifically as a means for realizing an action, as a conduit for the action. The second generalization is that the gestalt understanding of movement creates strong links among concepts such as 'through', 'to', and 'at the endpoint'. These links facilitate metonymic analogies, enabling languages to treat these concepts similarly.

#### 3) Instrumental: a means/an adjunct vs. locative: a place

In Czech the most usual way to say that someone rides a given form of transportation or speaks a given language is by using instrumental: a means: *Ježdíme vlakem* 'We ride the train', *Mluvíme spisovným jazykem* 'We speak the literary language'. Although Russian can use instrumental: a means for this purpose, the normal Russian mode of expression in both instances uses the preposition *na* + locative: a place: *My ezdim na poezde*, *My govorim na literaturnom jazyke*. Conversely, Russian consistently uses instrumental: a means to express seasons of the year and times of the day (*vesnoj* 'in spring', *letom* 'in summer', *osenju* 'in autumn', *zimnoj* 'in winter', *utrom* 'in the morning', *dnem* 'in the afternoon', *večero* 'in the evening', *nočju* 'at night'). Czech, however, doesn't present such a consistent picture: the equivalents for most of these time expressions involve a preposition *v/na* + locative: a place (*na*

*jaře* 'in spring', *v létě* 'in summer', *v zimě* 'in winter', *ve dne* 'in the daytime', *v noci* 'at night'); some of these times are expressed by adverbs in Czech (*ráno* 'in the morning', *večer* 'in the evening'), and there is an isolated example of *na* + accusative: a destination (*na podzim* 'in autumn'), but the primary contrast is instrumental: a means vs. locative: a place. A similar contrast is presented by the Czech and Russian expressions for walking with a cane; in Czech the cane appears as locative: a place after a preposition: *Náš dědeček chodí o holi* 'Our grandfather walks with a cane', but Russian uses instrumental: an adjunct: *Náš dědečka ходит с палкой*.

#### Cognitive analysis:

The connection between a path and a way of doing something is important to this series of distinctions as well. As we saw above, this cognitive link allows us to equate a means with a path. Let us add to this the observation that a path is also a location for activity, the place where movement happens. If these mental equations are transitive, then a means = a path = a place; from the perspective of the case system, this means that there is a potential overlap between instrumental and locative, motivating the alternative case markings of modes of transportation and languages above. Curiously, the use of *na* with these words in Russian is restricted to these constructions (elsewhere *v* is used to describe items in vehicles or languages); perhaps the notion of a path (all words meaning 'path' use *na* in Russian) has also motivated the selection of the preposition. Natural languages provide ample evidence that people understand time in terms of space (note, for example, the use of similar arrays of prepositions and cases in time and space expressions in both Czech and Russian). Even in English, a *duration* is something that one goes *through*: the Russian use of instrumental: a means for seasons and times of the day points to a conceptualization of durations as paths through time. Of course we can also understand durations as *expanses* of time; the Czech use of locative: a place is motivated by this identification of times with places. An elderly person can either be located at the site of a cane, or can be understood as being accompanied by the cane. In other words, accompaniment assumes co-location, motivating a cognitive overlap between locative: a place and instrumental: an adjunct. Briefly stated, the conceptualization of a path as a place motivates a choice between instrumental: a means and locative: a place; and if *x* is 'with', *y*, then they are in the same place, motivating a choice between instrumental: an adjunct and locative: a place.

- 4) *Genitive: a goal/a reference/a whole vs. accusative: a destination (and occasionally locative: a place)*

This contrast involves a fairly large nexus of example types, so we will start with examples where Czech uses the genitive case, but Russian uses the accusative or locative. Use of Czech *do* + genitive: a goal to express movement 'to' a place corresponds very closely to the use of Russian *v* + accusative: a destination. Compare Czech  *Děti idou do školy* 'The children are walking to school' vs. Russian  *Дети идут в школу* (note that Czech uses *v* + accusative: a destination only to express change of state, time, and with the verbs *věřit* 'believe', *doufat* 'hope'). There are a number of time expressions for which Czech uses genitive, but Russian does not. For example, Czech can use genitive: a reference, as in: *toho dne* 'on that day', whereas the Russian equivalent uses *v* + accusative: a destination: *v étom deni* (but note that Czech can also use the accusative, as in *v ten den* 'on that day', and that the Russian adverb *segodnja* 'today' is a frozen genitive form). Similarly Czech uses genitive: a reference in: *létosního roku* 'last year', which corresponds to Russian locative: a place in *v étom godu* 'last year'.

Preposition + case combinations expressing 'during' present bi-directional contrasts. Czech uses *za* + genitive: a reference (*za komunismu* 'under communism'), and *o* + locative: a place (*o Vánočích* 'during the Christmas season'), which correspond to Russian *pri* + locative: a place (*pri kommunismě*) and *na* + accusative: a destination (*na Rožďastro*).

The remaining differences involve examples of Czech accusative: a destination corresponding to Russian genitive: a goal/a reference. Czech expresses the concept 'for' using the prepositions *pro*, *na*, and *za* + accusative: a destination; Russian also uses *na*, *za*, in addition to *v* (and rarely *pro*) + accusative: a destination. However, the most common Russian expression is *dlya* + genitive: a goal, and it is this construction that usually contrasts with Czech *pro* + accusative: a destination; compare: Russian *Ja éto sdělala dlya vas* vs. Czech *Udělala jsem to pro vás* 'I did it for you'. Both Czech and Russian have the preposition *mimo* 'past', but it governs accusative: a destination in Czech, and genitive: a reference in Russian; compare: Czech *Prošel mimo naše okna* vs. Russian *Он prošel мимо наших окон* 'He went past our windows'. In Czech the object of the verb *přát* 'wish' is accusative: a destination, whereas the object of the equivalent Russian verb *žélat'* 'wish' is genitive: a goal; compare: Czech *Přejú Vám šťastnou cestu* vs. Russian *Жéлая вам счастливого пути* 'I wish you a pleasant journey'. When one is overwhelmed, in Czech one can say *To je nad mé síly* 'That's beyond my strength', using *nad* + accusative: a destination; but the Russian expression, *Éto svyšé moix sil* instead uses the genitive: a reference (because comparatives govern the genitive in Russian; cf.



1) above). Czech *kromě* and Russian *krome* both mean 'except' and both govern genitive: a reference, but Czech also uses *až na* + accusative: a destination for this purpose; compare Czech *Hasiči zachránili všechny až na dva* vs. Russian *Požární spasi vse krome dvoir* 'The firemen saved all but two [people]'.  
*Cognitive analysis:*

At stake here are a number of different ways to view a point or object: as an intended goal (genitive: a goal); as a destination, with less stress on intention (accusative: a destination); as a reference point (genitive: a reference); or as a static location (locative: a place). The expressions in this nexus differ in how they highlight these various ways of conceptualizing points and objects. The most robust differences (Czech *do* vs. Russian *na* and Czech *pro* vs. Russian *dla*, plus the more isolated Czech *přát* vs. Russian *želat*) also involve the two conceptualizations that are cognitively closest: the difference between genitive: a goal and accusative: a destination, since goals and destinations are nearly synonymous.

5) *Accusative: a destination vs. locative: a place*

A musical instrument that is played appears as accusative: a destination in Czech, but locative: a place in Russian; compare Czech *hrát na klavír* vs. Russian *igrat' na rojale* 'play the piano'. Both Czech and Russian use the preposition *o* + locative: a place to describe the topic of conversation, but whereas Russian uses locative: a place consistently even in the idiom *O čem idel reč?* 'What's the topic of conversation?', the Czech equivalent uses accusative: a destination: *O čí to jde?* (which can also mean 'What's the [main] point?'). Both languages use *v* + accusative a destination to tell time on the hour (Czech *v šest hodin* and Russian *v šest časov* 'at six o'clock'), but Czech can also use *o* + locative: a place: *o šesté hodině* 'at six o'clock'.  
*Cognitive analysis:*

This set of differences overlaps with the larger nexus of 4) both in terms of data and cognitive alternatives. Here the choice is between viewing a point or object as a destination (involving some metaphorical understanding of directionality) or as simply a location in the various domains of activity, discourse, and time. In other words, one can understand playing as something directed toward the piano (the Czech interpretation), or as an activity that takes place at the location of the piano (the Russian interpretation). The most usual way for both languages to view a discourse topic is as a location, though in Czech it is also possible to view a topic more like a target (and therefore destination). By

contrast, both languages show a strong tendency to view times as destinations for events (just as physical destinations are where movement goes, so times are where events are placed), but this does not exclude the possibility of understanding a time as a location (static setting) for an event.

6) *Dative: a competitor/a recipient/loser (and rarely instrumental: a landmark) vs. genitive: a goal/a source/a reference*

Czech prepositions *proti* 'against' and *kvůli* 'for the sake of' + dative: a competitor correspond to Russian *protiv* 'against' and *radi* 'for the sake of' + genitive: a goal; compare: Czech *Nejsm proti tomu* vs. Russian *Ja ne protiv žtogo* 'I'm not against that'; Czech *Udělal to kvůli rodině* vs. Russian *On eto sdělal radi sem f* 'He did it for the sake of his family'. Conversely, Czech has a time expression using genitive: a goal that corresponds to a Russian expression using dative: a competitor; compare: Czech *Přijedu domů do desáté hodiny* vs. Russian *Prjedu domoj k desjati časam* 'I'll come home by/toward ten o'clock'. In Czech, when a transaction takes place, the person who loses possession of an item is marked with dative: a receiver/loser, but Russian uses *ot* + genitive: a source/a reference; compare: Czech *Vzali mi peníze* vs. Russian *Oni vzjali u menja denjgi* 'They took the money from me'. The syntax of expressions meaning 'escape' shows the same difference; compare: Czech *Srnka utekla myslivci* vs. Russian *Sernia ubežala ot oxotnika* 'The doe ran away from the hunter' (but note that in some contexts Czech can also use *od* + genitive: a source and even *před* + instrumental: a landmark).  
*Cognitive analysis:*

Dative: a competitor views the relationship between two entities in terms of a comparison of power and influence, here involving either bringing a matching force (Czech *proti*) or submitting to the force of something else (the needs of others as in Czech *kvůli* or a deadline as in Russian *k*). Bringing a matching force or submitting to the influence of something can also be viewed simply as approaching a goal (without concern for differential power, as in Czech *do*, and Russian *protiv* and *radi*), motivating a choice between logical alternatives. A person experiencing a loss can be construed either as a loser parallel to a recipient (as in Czech), or as the source or location of what is removed (as in Russian), motivating a similar choice between dative and genitive.

## 8. The Four Less Significant Differences

1) *Nominative: a name vs. accusative: a destination*

Russian can use *za* + nominative: a name for a naming function in the idiomatic expression *Čto éto za čelovek?* 'What kind of a person is that?', whereas Czech uses accusative: a destination (consistent with other similar uses of *za*) *Co je to za člověka?* Here one could argue that naming indicates an object that attention is directed toward, motivating the selection of either naming (nominative: a name) or direction of attention (accusative: a destination).

2) *Instrumental: an adjunct vs. dative: a competitor*

Congratulations are offered using instrumental: an adjunct in Russian, but dative: a competitor in Czech; compare: Russian *Pozdravjaju s dnem roždenija* vs. Czech *Gratuluji k narozeninám* 'Happy Birthday' (note also that if a person is mentioned, the person is accusative in Russian, but dative in Czech; but this is a minimal instance of differing ranges of dative use with verbs of communication, a phenomenon that exists in both languages).

3) *Genitive: a source vs. instrumental: a means*

Causes can be expressed in Russian using *ot* + genitive: a source, corresponding to Czech use of instrumental: a means; compare: Czech *trásl se chladem*; Russian *radost' poskakovala*; *bolesti a strachem nevěděti, co dělat*; *zemřel hladem* vs. Russian *on triassja ot xoloda*; *skakal ot radosti*; *ot boli i ot straxa ne znal*; *čto delal*; *umer ot goloda* 'he shook from the cold; jumped for joy; due to pain and fear he did not know what he was doing; he died of hunger'. It seems that whereas Czech understands these causes as instruments or means of the actions they incite, for Russian a cause is a source for an action, motivating choice between instrumental: a means and genitive: a source.

4) *Dative: an experiencer vs. accusative: a destination*

Both Czech and Russian can use accusative: a destination in combination with prepositions (simple and complex) that express 'in spite of', for example Czech *přes* and Russian *nesmotřa na*. Russian can additionally express 'in spite of' using *vopreki* + dative: an experiencer, creating a contrast with Czech *přes* + accusative: a destination. The Russian use of dative: an experiencer emphasizes the potential harm involved, whereas the Czech accusative: a destination is neutral in this respect (which is reasonable, since *přes* has a wider range of meanings).

## 9. Conclusion

Discrete Case Contrast		Motive
Czech	Russian	
1) nominative: a name vs. genitive: a reference <i>Dnes je Zima bude čtvrtého</i>	<i>Sogoda Zavtra budet červnoe</i>	Names and reference points share referential functions
<i>Ivan je starší, než já</i>	<i>Ivan starše menja</i>	
2) instrumental: a means/a landmark vs. accusative: a destination <i>Šli jsme lesem, Vítek jde tunelom</i> <i>Třeba šetřit časem, ale plývají penězi!</i> <i>Přestehovali jsme se sem před rokem</i>	<i>My šli čerez les, Počezd edel čerez tunel!</i> <i>Vy možet byt' ekonomiče vremenja, no vy tratite den gi!</i> <i>My studa perecahi god nozad rokem</i>	Understanding groupings and time periods as paths as opposed to viewing them as destinations of activity; understanding resources as the means to achieving activity or as merely the destinations of activity; treating the endpoint of a trajectory similarly to the entire trajectory
3) instrumental: a means/an adjunct vs. locative: a place <i>Jedním vlakem, Mirošine spisovným jazykem</i>	<i>My ezdim na počezde, My govornu na literaturnom jazyke</i>	A means = a path = a place; a duration is something that one goes through vs. durations as expanses of time; being 'with' = being at/near
<i>Naš dědeček chodil o holi</i>	<i>Naš dedička xodil s palčkoj</i>	
4) Genitive: a goal/a reference/a whole vs. accusative: a destination (and occasionally locative: a place) <i>Děti jdou do školy tobo dne; letošního roku za komunismu; o Vlnočech Učelada jsem to pro vas Přešla jsem naše okna Přeja Van štasinou cestu To je nad mě síly Hradit zachrěvati všechny až na dva</i>	<i>Děti idut v školu v etot den; v etom godu pri komunismu; nu Roždestvo Ja eto sčelada dlja vas On prošel mimo našix okon Zelaju vam ščastlivogo puti Eto syže moix sil Požarnye spaxi vaxa kroome dvoix</i>	A point or object can be viewed as an intended goal, as a destination, or as a static location
5) Accusative: a destination vs. locative: a place <i>hbit na Klavir Oč to jdel? v šest' časov</i>	<i>igrat' na rojale O čem idet reč? v šest' časov</i>	Point or object can be viewed as a destination or as a location
6) Dative: a competitor/a recipient/loser (and rarely instrumental: a landmark) vs. genitive: a goal/a source/a reference		

<i>Nejsem proti tomu Udělal to kvůli rodnině Přijdu domů do desáté hodiny Vzali mi peníze Srnka ulekla myslivce!</i>	<i>Ja ne protiv štogo On éto sdelal radi sem'i Prijedu domoj k desjati časam Oni vzjali u menja den'gi Serna ubežala ot oxotnika</i>	Bringing a matching force or substituting to something vs. approaching a goal; a loser is parallel to a recipient vs. the source or location of what is removed
--	--	---

At the level of the six cases, only the following contrasts (seven of the fourteen theoretically possible) are represented in the six significant aggregates: nominative vs. genitive, accusative vs. genitive, accusative vs. instrumental, accusative vs. locative, genitive vs. dative, instrumental vs. locative, and genitive vs. locative (this last contrast is relatively less robust than the others). The accusative and genitive cases appear to be the center of gravity of the case systems, each providing contrasts with three other cases. Two contrasts with other cases are provided by the instrumental, and, to a lesser extent, the locative. The nominative and the dative are the most isolated cases in the system, providing systematic contrasts with only one other case each. The contrast between dative: a receiver/loser/a competitor with genitive: a goal and the contrast of genitive: a goal with accusative: a destination point to a semantic component of directionality shared by the dative, genitive, and accusative (though note that Jakobson 1936/1971 and 1958/1971 attributes directionality only to the dative and accusative). The contrasts between accusative: a destination and locative: a place, between accusative: a destination and instrumental: a landmark/a means, and between instrumental: a means and locative: a place are indicative of the role of metonymy in language, connecting endpoints, paths, trajectories, and locations. Nominative: a name, genitive: a reference, and accusative: a destination can all be understood as having a referential function.

The case systems of Czech and Russian are overdetermined and consist of partially overlapping cognitive categories. These systems present choices of logical alternatives which can be conventionalized differently in the two languages. A contrastive study offers us an opportunity to consider the different ways that people can interpret their perceptions of reality and then sanction these interpretations in their grammar. The choices are not entirely equal, since the selection of one case over another means that certain concepts are emphasized and others are ignored. It is interesting to note that the largest number of systematic differences is generated by the semantic field of time. This is perhaps no surprise, since we have no direct physical experience of time, only of its effects on objects, events, and ourselves. Time is understood entirely in metaphorical terms, providing many opportunities for languages to use different syntactic means to highlight certain parallels between time and space, while suppressing others.

## References

- Jakobson, Roman O. 1936/1971. "Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre: Gesamtbedeutungen der russischen Kasus", *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague*: reprinted in *Selected Writings*, v. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 23-71.
- . 1958/1971. "Morfologičeskije nabljudenija nad slavjanskim sklonenim". *American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists*: reprinted in *Selected Writings*, v. 2. The Hague: Mouton, 154-183.
- Janda, Laura A. 1993. *A Geography of Case Semantics: The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental (=Cognitive Linguistics Research, v. 4)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Janda, Laura A. and Steven J. Clancy. forthcoming a. *The Case Book for Russian*.
- . forthcoming b. *The Case Book for Czech*.
- Janda, Laura A. and Charles E. Townsend. 2000. *Czech*. Munich: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Townsend, Charles E. and Eric Komar. 2000. *Czech through Russian*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Laura Janda  
Dept. of Slavic Languages  
CB #3165,  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3165 USA  
janda@unc.edu