

Instrumental: case form and case function

This study is an attempt to discover the primitive function of the case relationship labelled "Instrumental" in the Slavic case system within the framework of anthropocentric language theory, and to reconstruct the derivational processes leading from that function to the present-day functional load of the Polish Instrumental case form.

The category of case is understood in the broadest sense, as a category of grammatical dependence of a noun phrase. Several generalizations offered here are based on the results of an exhaustive contrastive analysis of the exponents of grammatical dependence in Polish and in Macedonian (their inventory, distribution and functional load).

Let us begin with a short presentation of the hypothetical primitive functions of other case forms. Categorical semantics of a case form is understood as a selectional restriction imposed on the noun phrase in question by a predicate formalized in the governing verb.

The hypothetical functional pattern is the following:

Nominative - /+pers I/; the nominative is a syntactic position reserved for a noun phrase referring to the first human (animate) object participating in the narrated event, i.e. for the human (animate) agent.

Accusative - /-pers I/; the accusative is a position reserved for a noun phrase referring to the material object of an operation that the human agent performs. Actually this entails no restrictions, since a human being is *ipso facto* a material object and can be treated as such.

Dative - /+pers II/; the dative is a case of a noun phrase referring to the second (= secondary in the communicative perspective) human being partaking in the event; when the nominative position is blocked, the dative noun phrase is automatically promoted to the function of unique personal participant of the event.

Locative - /+locus/; the locative is reserved for a noun phrase referring to the localizer of the event. Originally it appeared without prepositions (there

still are residues of that stage in Macedonian dialects) and then with an obligatory preposition making the spatial relation more precise.

Genitive - /+pers/; a little longer commentary is in order here to explain our choice of the selectional restriction originally built into the genitive. Syntactically the genitive is the case of a noun phrase dependent on another noun phrase (see below) and as such - in the light of numerous IE facts - would be satisfactorily explained as the case of a noun phrase referring to a personal possessor (on the assumption that possession is a basic noun-to-noun relation reflected in language and that it is expressed both at the sentence level and at the level of the noun phrase). This, however, is not the case in Slavic. Slavic languages have at their disposal the morphological category of possessive adjectives (with the *-ov/-in-* suffixes), originally marked as /+possessor/. At one stage it was a common Slavic category; today it is gradually being eliminated in favor of the genitive case construction, which is a secondary function of the Slavic genitive. Thus as a primitive we posit another classical noun-to-noun relation, i.e. the part-whole relation. From the point of view of modern Slavic case systems the genitive is basically a grammatical case - a form appearing in the process of transferring propositional content (primarily formalized in basic sentence patterns: $NP_N \cdot V$ and $NP_N \cdot V \cdot NP_A$) from the sentence level to the noun phrase level.

The Vocative, in my view, is not a case and does not belong to the above paradigm.

In light of the above, there is no split into grammatical and semantic cases, but rather we have to recognize

- /a/ two types of polarized (complementary) semantic markedness: the /±pers/ axis (with case endings as basic exponents) and the /±locus/ axis (represented by the locative ending) with a network of prepositional expressions as its extension, and
- /b/ the syntactic (also semantically based) opposition between the primary noun-to-verb cases and the noun-to-noun genitive form.

It is also worth emphasizing that the noun phrases with the /+pers/ case function (i.e. N and D) have almost without exception unequivocally identified referents, the locative noun phrase usually has a specified if not an identified referent, while the accusative noun phrase is often generic. In

other words, there is correlation between the /+pers/ and /+def/ characteristics and something more than a mere coincidence of cooccurrence between the /+locus/ and /+specified/, while the absence of selectional restrictions favors generic use.

Two issues emerge from the preceding discussion: 1. Is there a unique instrumental semantic and/or syntactic function, and 2. If so, where does it fit in the system as a whole?

Before discussing these problems, let us first examine an ordered sample of Polish and Macedonian constructions, including instrumental forms in the former.

Taking into account mere surface factors - syntactic position and/or presence of an accompanying preposition - there are four main types of constructions in Polish:

a) adverbial instrumental without preposition, b) adverbial instrumental with the preposition *z/ze*, c) adverbial instrumental with other prepositions, d) predicative instrumental.

In Macedonian the correlation between a propositional structure and its formal exponents is not the same as in Polish. Therefore I have ordered my examples into one continuous sequence from a) to d).

- /1/ *Piotr napełnia butkę mlekiem.* ~ *Петре ја поли кањтата со млеко.* - cf. also constructions with verbs like *wypełnia*, *wypycha*, *napycha*, *karmi*, *poi*, *nasyc*... and *objada się*, *opycha się*, *upija się*, *upaja się*...
- /2/ *Piotr przykrywa łóżko kocem.* ~ *Петре го покрива креветот со ќебе.* - cf. also constructions with verbs like *krzyje*, *pokrywa*, *zakrywa*, *zasłania*, *przesłania*, *obkłada*, *wykłada*, *owija*, *zawija*, *powleka*, *obsypuje*, *przetyka*, *przekłada*, *obrzuca*...
- /3/ *Piotr rządzi państwem.* ~ *Петре ја владее државата.* - cf. also constructions with verbs like a) *zarządza*, *kieruje*..., b) *rozporządza*, *dysponuje*...

- /4/ *Piotr rzuca kulą. ~ Петре фрла куле/...со фулето. - cf. also constructions with verbs like a) ciska, miota..., b) ziele, zalatuje, pachnie, dyszy..., lśni...*
- /5/ *Piotr gardzi Janem. ~ Петре го презира Јанета. - cf. also constructions with the verb pomiata.*
- /6/ *Piotr zajmuje się pisaniami. ~ Петре се занимава со пишување. - cf. also constructions with verbs like zachwycę się, interesuję się, martwi się, cieszy się, bawi się...*
- /7/ *Piotr kiwa głową. ~ Петре клима со глава. - cf. also constructions with verbs like a) gryzie, liże, mruga, macha..., b) mówi... głosem, patrzy... okiem, idzie... krokiem...*
- /8/ *Piotr kroi chleb nożem. ~ Петре го сече лебот со нож. - cf. also constructions with verbs like a) kosi, żnie, pić, rozciera, szuje..., b) ozdabia, upiększa, ilustruje...*
- /9/ *Of. constructions like Silnik jest poruszany ręką., Raki wybiera się rękami., Mac. Раковите се фаќаат со раце.*
- /10/ *Piotr rozmawia z Janem. ~ Петре разговара со Јане. - cf. also constructions with verbs like a) koresponduje, walczy, klóci się, żeni się..., b) graniczy, styka się...*
- /11/ *Piotr miesza kawę z mlekiem. ~ Петре го меша кафето со млеко. - cf. also constructions with verbs like płacze, myli, łączy, swata...*
- /12/ *Piotr pracuje z Janem. ~ Петре работи со Јанета. - cf. also constructions like Piotr i Jan pracują razem., etc.*
- /13/ *Piotr pracuje z wysiłkiem. ~ Петре работи со напор. - cf. also expressions like z radością, z wahaniem, z energią, z zapałem etc.*
- /14/ *Piotr idzie drogą/lasem... ~ Петре оди по патот/низ шумата. - cf. also temporal adverbials like wieczorem, posą.../вечер, noce...*
- /15/ *Piotr jest nauczycielem. ~ Петре е учител. - cf. also constructions with other copula-verbs like bywa, staje się, zostaje...*

/16/ *Piotra wybrano przewodniczącym.* ~ *Петре го избраа претседател.* - cf. also constructions with verbs like *obwołuje, mianuje...*, Mac. like *оди војник*, etc.

The first two groups of constructions quoted above, /1/ and /2/, offer, in my opinion, the best diagnostic context to reconstruct what the primitive instrumental function must have been. The Instrumental appears here as an adverbial case and the semantic equivalents of our Polish and Macedonian verbs entail an instrumental noun phrase in all the Slavic languages, Old Church Slavic included. The Instrumental is a case form of the noun phrase referring to the second (i.e. secondary in the communicative perspective of the corresponding proposition) /-pers/ object participating in the event. It refers not to the direct object of the operation in question but to an accompanying object. Hence we have total unmarkedness on the /±pers/ axis and, as a corollary thereof, the instrumental object appears usually as nonidentified, specified and/or purely generic. On the contrary, both types of constructions have overt locative converses: *X napełnia/pokrywa Y* - *Z-em* is equivalent to *X umieszcza Z w/na Y-u*, etc. Thus, it seems that the instrumental was not unmarked on the /±locus/ axis - the presence of the instrumental object within the spatial parameters of the event was of relevance. It should be mentioned that in Macedonian dialects /1/ can still be residually found without preposition and *полни вода* is accepted even in Standard Macedonian,

The third group (cf. /3/ above) is not this clear, since there is no accusative noun phrase as opposed to the instrumental one; therefore in Macedonian the primarily instrumental NP is advanced to the accusative position.¹ It was also once an all-Slavic construction. Vaillant (1977, 98) argues that we are confronted here with a locative construction (cf. Polish *rządzi państwem* vs. *rządzi w państwie*). I would like to present in this connection a striking parallel with the type *rozporządza/dysponuje*, Mac. *располага со...*, which could be given a paraphrase 'może dokonywać dowolnych operacji na...' - the object is presented not as a goal of a definite operation but as being - totally and uniquely - within the scope of the activity of the agent.

The above interpretation displays an obvious link with our fourth group (cf. /4a/ above). Most revealing is the Polish opposition *rzuca kamień* 'dokonuje operacji na kamieniu' vs. *rzuca kamieniem* 'posługuje się kamieniem, żeby...' which can be rendered in Macedonian only on the condition that the (accusative and/or instrumental) object is unequivocally identified

(which is rather untypical - cf. above), while the opposition is neutralized in generic usage; cf. *го фрла каменот в. фрла со каменот* as against *фрла камен*. If our analysis is correct, in a construction like *Rzuca kamieniem w kolekę*, the instrumental NP should be treated as a transform of an autonomous predication and the construction as a whole would be a diathetic derivative from a causal compound structure (cf. above: *postuguje się kamieniem, żeby... /bo chce.../*). And if this is the case, then all the classical instrumental Instrumentals (cf. above /8/) should be treated as derivatives. This is precisely the line of argumentation that leads to the conclusion that our groups /1/ and /2/ are a better starting point for the reconstruction of the primitive function of the adverbial instrumental case. NB, the Macedonian "instrumentalis instrumenti" obligatorily appears with the preposition *co*.

Our group /4b/ seems to have an ablative /+locus/ basis and points to the "agent" as a source emitting concrete and/or abstract "missiles". And this constitutes a link, the only link between /4a/ and /4b/. Some of the predicates that belong to this series in Polish, have another formalization in Macedonian, cf. e.g. *мириса/смирди на...*

Our type /5/ is semantically difficult to explain. However, it is present in almost all Slavic languages and is known in OCS as well, cf. OCS *gnęsati sę* Euch79^a5, Rus. *пренебрегать*, Cz. *pohrdati...* (see Vaillant 1977, 97). To explain it as a degradation of a human being to the position (and function) of a material inanimate object would amount to providing support in favor of our /-pers/ interpretation. But it is also possible to include the OCS *gnęsati sę* in our /6/ group (cf. below) and treat the Modern Slavic constructions as its semantic derivatives.

Group /6/ embraces verbs expressing relations perceived originally as reflexive, hence the accusative position is blocked by the reflexive pronoun and the object noun phrase is automatically demoted to the instrumental position.

Of major interest in connection with the interpretation I propose are the constructions in group /7/. This group embraces classical relations of the mind-and-body type, i.e. relations between a human agent and different parts of his body. Selectional restrictions built into the corresponding predicates define quite exhaustively and in some instances even unambiguously the part of the body in question. Hence, there is no need to repeat it once more with the aid of a NP, cf. Polish *gryzie... zębami, liże...*

językiem, etc. In this situation an instrumental NP appears only as a formal pattern enabling us to express additional predication, in the form of the so called nonomissible determiners, cf. *o s t r y m i z ę b a m i*, *g o r ą - c y m j ę z y k i e m*, etc.

Most instructive is the comparison between "open" constructions like *wyciąga rękę/пружа рака, podnosi głowę/ дига глава*, etc. with an accusative NP referring to a part of the body on the one hand and our type *kiwa głową/клима со глава, macha ręką/мавта со рака* on the other. While in the former constructions the part of the body is treated as a direct object of the agent's performance and its referent cannot be selected by the verbal expression alone, in "our" instrumental constructions the object is once more demoted to secondary position since 1. it is predictable and 2. it serves only as an accessory and not as a direct object of the operation performed. *Kiwanie głową, machanie ręką* etc. express only a conventional signal of some internal state (emotion, desire) of the agent.

At the same time "serving as accessory" presents a link with the series in /8/, since the classical instrumental NPs are usually also entailed by verbs selecting their instrumental complements primarily on the basis of selectional restrictions, cf. *szyje... igłą/szydłem/ na maszynie, myje... mydłem*, etc.

In Macedonian /7/ and /8/ the preposition *co* obligatory appears.

Our series /9/ contains diathetic derivatives, with the dominating predicate formalized as an *-n/-t-* participle. The direct object of the original basic construction is promoted to the position of the agent (nominative position) and - since the *-n/-t-* participle does not combine with an accusative NP, the original agent - now demoted - takes the form of an instrumental NP. And the very fact that the accusative object is by definition excluded from the so called passive construction corroborates our hypothesis of the instrumental as a secondary, demoted object.

A parallel between the Instrumental and the Genitive suggests itself in this connection: the Genitive serves as a transform of both A and N at the NP level and the Instrumental seems to fulfil the same function at the sentence level, if the N and/or the A have to be eliminated on semantic grounds. However, the above is not the only way of effecting passive transformation in Slavic. The construction with the instrumental agent is old.

Today it is still a characteristic of Russian, while in Polish and in Macedonian prepositional expressions are preferred, with *przez* and *од* respectively.

Examples /10/-/13/ are obligatorily construed as prepositional expressions both in Polish and in Macedonian, with prepositions *z/ze* and *co* respectively. The individual series differ from one another in the entailment between the verb and the prepositional expression and in the basic semantics of the expression.

If the nominative NP (referring to the first term of the relationship in question) is singulative in meaning, then verbs belonging to our series /10/ and /11/ entail the prepositional expression obligatorily - it refers to the second term of the basic relationship. In such a context the preposition itself could be thought of as an extension of the verbal form, hence instead of *rozmawia*, *koresponduje* etc. we should speak of *rozmawia z*, *koresponduje z* etc. Constructions like *X rozmawia z Y-em* are derivatives from *X i Y rozmawiają*, endowed with the explicitly expressed hierarchy of the two terms of the relationship and with *z* + Instrumental as the exponent of that specific diathesis. /10a/ differs from /10b/ in that it has a /+pers/ agent. It is worth mentioning here that verbs which do not entail a *z*-expression as such, when used with a singulative direct object behave as typical *z*-verbs, cf. e.g. *Piotr i Jan/Piotr z Janem przenieśli ławkę do cienia.*, and the like; however, a *z*-expression is then attached directly to the nominative NP.

/10/ and /11/ differ in that the latter is dominated by a predicate of causation.

In /12/ and /13/ there is no obligatory entailment between the verb and the prepositional expression. The prepositional expression is a transform of an independent predicative structure forming an ordered conjunction with the structure based on the dominating verb. In /12/ it is the referents of the two NPs standing in the same relationship towards the verbal predicate that constitute a conjunction, cf. *Jan przyszedł z Jerzym.* as against *Jan i Jerzy przyszli razem.*, *Anna gotuje groch z kapustą.* as against *Anna gotuje razem groch i kapustę.*, etc. Constructions of this type are known as *instrumentalis socii* (*sociativus*).

In /13/ the instrumental NP is a nominalization defining a psychological and/or physical state of the agent, cf. *Jan pracuje z wysiłkiem* vs.

Jan pracuje i wysiła się przytem/wkłada wysiłek w tę pracę., Ewa czeka na Jana z radością. vs. *Ewa czeka na Jana i cieszy się perspektywą spotkania z nim.* From the point of view of the functional perspective of the text, the *z*-expression is a rheme. These constructions are known as *instrumentalis modi*.

In /14/ the instrumental NP is a transform of a spatial and/or temporal predication. It is a /+locus/ NP. In Macedonian we find adverbial prepositional expressions with spatial meaning and/or adverbs deriving from the former instrumental case form with temporal meaning.

Finally, /15/ and /16/ include predicative instrumental, both in the basic (cf /15/) and in derivative syntactic constructions (cf /16/). In Macedonian the unmarked dictionary form of the respective substantive is used. In case of the singular feminine substantives they could - on the diachronic axis - be interpreted as deriving directly from the old instrumental form.

The predicative instrumental pattern emerged, in all probability, as a Common Slavic dialectal innovation. In OCS it is found only in the Codex Suprasliensis. In Modern Slavic languages it is a generally known pattern, often bookish, and it is being eliminated in favor of the predicative Nominative. Apparently Vaillant is right when writing that "le substantif predicat à l'instrumental indique la manière d'être" (1977, 93), i.e. that it should be treated as a semantic derivative of the *instrumentalis modi*.

What conclusions can we draw from this short review concerning the primitive function/s/ of the instrumental case form and its exponents in Polish and Macedonian?

In light of the proposed interpretation we offer the following conclusions.

Two basic formal units in Polish and two in Macedonian appeared in our examples but there is no direct correspondence between the two pairs. In Polish we have 1. the instrumental case and 2. *z/ze* + the instrumental case form; in Macedonian, 1. the unmarked independent substantive form (= with no morphological exponents of grammatical dependence) and 2. *co* + the dependent substantive form appearing with all prepositions.

We shall focus our attention on Polish forms without prepositions. They seem to fulfill three major functions.

A. In the framework of the anthropocentric theory (i.e. as an adverbial case, as a complement entailed by the corresponding predicate) the Instrumental is characterized as the case of the second /-pers/ object participating in the event. In this function in Macedonian we still have remnants of the "synthetic" case form without prepositions; it is being eliminated in favor of the co-constructions, which became the basic exponent of the adverbial instrumental function. It is not without interest that a parallel process was carried out in Sorbian, Slovene and also in some Polish and Czech dialects.

An obvious semantic derivative of the adverbial instrumental is the "instrumental of the accompanying factor", which subsumes instrumental *modi*, instrumental *socii* and instrumental *instrumenti*.

The constructions where the instrumental serves as a device of ordering a conjunction and/or emphasizing the presence of its subordinated member obligatorily require the preposition *z/ze* in Polish.

The adverbial instrumental more often than not is generic. Sometimes it is referentially specified, and it almost never refers to an identified object.

B. In the framework of the localistic theory (i.e. as an adverbial case) the instrumental in some uses can be characterized as /+locus/ (which entails /+tempus/ as well). In both Polish and Macedonian spatial and/or temporal constructions with or without prepositions can be found. What is of overriding importance for our analysis is the fact that prepositions *z/ze* and *co* are actually excluded from the spatial/temporal semantic field, being reserved for the adverbial functions.

In Polish, adverbial preposition + Instrumental constructions serve to express the genuine locative (static) meaning, as against the directional meaning (cf. *pod stołem* vs. *pod stół* etc.). In Macedonian, apart from the nominal root itself, a preposition is by definition the unique exponent of the spatial/temporal meaning of the prepositional expression which it dominates; hence the problem of instrumental prepositional expressions does not arise.

C. The third major instrumental function is the predicative function. In the diachronic perspective we could accept Vaillant's hypothesis that it was instrumental *modi* that entered the predicative position. However, this is

only another way of saying that the instrumental modi is a typical use for a maximally unmarked adverbial form.

It seems to me that the predicative function (and position) should be understood as a distinct, specific case function. It is not a Nominative or an Instrumental that enters a predicative position, but the maximally unmarked adverbial case form, a dictionary form. It would be desirable to reserve an "empty slot" for such a form in any paradigm of the category of case. It is not accidental (although the rule has no surface exponents in the majority of Slavic languages) that the nominative is almost always /+definite/ and the predicative form is by definition /-definite/. Hence, logically, a "synthetic" language (such as Polish) introduces the instrumental form in the predicative function and an analytic language, with the category of definiteness strictly grammaticalized, i.e. Macedonian, uses the /-definite/ form.

Finally, I should say that the functional hierarchy suggested here is not only a hierarchy of major instrumental functions but of the case functions as well. A case is an adverbial category and as such it has to be analysed in the framework of the anthropocentric theory. Case forms unmarked or weakly marked on the /±pers/ axis perform spatial (adverbial) functions and the maximally unmarked case form assumes predicative function.

Notes

- ¹ The alternative construction *владее со држава(та)* is of secondary origin, due to Serbo-Croatian influence.

Selected bibliography

Исследования по синтаксису старославянского языка, Прага 1963.

Ivić, M.: 1983, 'Lingvističke konsekvence različitog pristupa odnosu "deo - celina"', *Lingvistički ogledi*, Beograd, 215-225.

Ivić, M.: 1983, 'O semantičkim okolnostima od kojih zavisi obavezna determinacija kvalifikativnog tipa', *Lingvistički ogledi*, Beograd, 189-196.

Ивић, М.: 1954, *Значења српскохрватског инструментала и њихов развој*, Београд.

Kuryłowicz, J.: 1948, *La construction ergative et le développement "stadial" du langage*, (= *Annali della Scuola Superiore di Pisa*).

Lazard, G.: 1984, *Actance Variations and Categories of the Object, Objects*, F. Plank (ed.), Academic Press (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers).

Mindak, J.: 1988, *Formy gramatykalizacji cech /+pers/ i /+anim/ w języku polskim na szerszym tle słowiańskim i pozasłowiańskim*, manuscript, diss., Instytut Słowianoznawstwa PAN.

Rokoszowa, J.: 1981, 'Antropocentryzm języka i znaczenie tego faktu dla badań nad stroną', *Studia Gramatyczne* IV, 127-184.

Topolińska, Z.: 1985, *Autour de la notion de relation possessive*, (= *Prilozi MANU*, X 1).

Topolińska, Z.: 1986, 'Dativus vs. genetivus', *Prace Filologiczne* XXXIII, 365-371.

Тополињска, З.: 1988, 'Дативниот однос и кирилметодијевското наследство', *Кирилметодијевскиот период и кирилметодијевската традиција во Македонија*, МАНУ, Скопје, 153-157.

Тополињска, З.: Синтакса на јужномакедонските говори (unfinished manuscript).

Vaillant, A.: 1977, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves V. La syntaxe*, Paris.