

The
**Carl Beck
Papers**

in Russian &
East European Studies

Number 1704

Alla Nedashkivska

**The Pragmatic Bases
of the ‘Variation’
between -A
and -Zero in the
Accusative in
Contemporary
Ukrainian**

***Dr. Alla Nedashkivska* is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Modern Languages and Cultural Studies: Germanic, Romance, Slavic at the University of Alberta in Edmonton, Canada.**

No. 1704, November 2004

© 2004 by The Center for Russian and East European Studies, a program of the University Center for International Studies, University of Pittsburgh

ISSN 0889-275X

The Carl Beck Papers

Editors: William Chase, Bob Donnorummo, Ronald H. Linden

Managing Editor: Eileen O'Malley

Editorial Assistant: Janine Fisher

Cover Design: Mark Weixel

Submissions to *The Carl Beck Papers* are welcome. Manuscripts must be in English, double-spaced throughout, and between 40 and 100 pages in length. Acceptance is based on anonymous review. Mail submissions to: Editor, *The Carl Beck Papers*, Center for Russian and East European Studies, 4400 Posvar Hall, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260.

The Pragmatic Bases of the ‘Variation’ Between -a and -zero in the Accusative in Contemporary Ukrainian

Alla Nedashkivska

Abstract:

The present study raises the problem of Accusative case marking for masculine inanimate nouns in contemporary Ukrainian. Constructions of the type *napysaty lyst-Ø* and *napysaty lyst-a* ‘to write a letter’, with the unmarked zero ending in the former and the marked -a ending in the latter, constitute the focus of the investigation. The assumption, common in Ukrainian scholarship that the two variants exist in the language as ‘optional’, ‘synonymous’, parallel, or as ‘stylistic variants’ is challenged. The major objective is to provide a systematic synchronic description and analysis of each case marking under investigation and to demonstrate that each construction is not a sole variant of another, and has its own domain of function and usage, as well as to show that the existence and functioning of these constructions depends on internal language mechanisms. The analysis considers Transitivity, pragmatic and discourse variables and their ties with case marking in Ukrainian. A multi-dimensional model, the Prototypical Discourse Situation Model, is proposed. This model is based on the premises of Hopper and Thompson’s Transitivity Hypothesis (1980), Yokoyama’s Transactional Discourse Model (1986), and Zaitseva’s Theory of Utterance (1994, 1995). The model proves to be crucial in providing answers to questions as to the choice and function of the constructions under investigation. The Transitivity domain of the model strongly supports the power of Hopper and Thompson’s (1980) Transitivity Hypothesis, extending the hypothesis beyond the direct object properties with respect to the overt morphosyntactic manifestation of the level of utterance Transitivity. The components of Transitivity relevant for the accusative marking are: object Individuation and affectedness, punctuality, volitionality, and the number of arguments. Pragmatic and discourse domains are brought into the analysis in order to resolve such questions as why two paired case markings are not interchangeable in the same context, what precludes their free variation, and how the choice of a particular construction codes a particular message conveyed by the speaker in a given discourse situation. The pragmatic

domain of the model incorporates the notions of the Prototypical Discourse Situation, the speaker's conceptualization of an event with respect to the hearer's knowledge, and the status of the speaker's and the hearer's shared knowledge. The discourse dimension encompasses the study of text/discourse structure, and notions of discourse topic and discourse saliency. The proposed model proves to be essential not only in explaining choices, but also in portraying patterns in which specific case marking occurs. The study argues that to capture the generalizations underlying the 'doublet' phenomena, the grammar of Ukrainian must recognize that not every set of variants in the language may be referred to as a grammatical or stylistic doublet.

1.0. Introduction

Ja napyšu tobi lyst-Ø or *Ja napyšu tobi lyst-a* ‘I will write you a letter’— a doublet case marking of inanimate masculine accusatives that does not fit any morphosyntactic rules, has remained a puzzling question for Ukrainian linguists and a common question for students of Ukrainian. Specifically, an animate accusative case marking with the ending -a for masculine inanimate nouns, instead of the ‘standard’ -Ø morpheme, is extremely common in both spoken and written contemporary Ukrainian. Nonetheless, no adequate grammatical account for this syncretism of inanimates with animates has yet been proposed in Ukrainian linguistics, nor have there been any specific accounts of this feature in grammars and textbooks of the contemporary language. Most standard formal descriptions of Ukrainian only briefly admit the presence of ‘variation’ in accusative forms for masculine inanimates such as *napysaty lyst-Ø* and *napysaty lyst-a* ‘to write a letter’. Statements regarding the existence of parallel forms, however, seem more conjectural than analytical; they do not answer, but rather, raise questions as to when, why, and where a masculine inanimate noun is marked with -a and not -Ø. These questions are the focus of the present study.

Ukrainian is not alone in the domain of morphological syncretism in accusative. It shares the phenomenon of -a accusative, to various degrees, with other Slavic languages such as Polish, Slovak, Belarusian, and Upper Lusatian. Most of the research with respect to this phenomenon has been done on Polish (see 1.2 below). Polish, perhaps, is the closest to Ukrainian with respect to the scope and the distribution of -a marking on inanimate objects. However, statements of a comparative nature are best deferred until more studies of other Slavic languages will have been carried out.

The present study concentrates on Ukrainian. First, it offers a short overview of previous hypotheses regarding the use of the -a accusative marker for masculine inanimates in Polish and Ukrainian scholarship, where most of the research has been done. It then advocates the hypothesis that the choice for or against the -a marking is connected with Transitivity factors and additionally depends heavily on pragmatics (the speaker’s point of view, the knowledge the speaker wants to activate in discourse, and the status of shared knowledge of the speaker and the hearer) and on discourse, including text/discourse structure as well as the notions of discourse topic and discourse saliency. The present

study is a contribution to the problem of the ramifications of Transitivity, pragmatics, and discourse for case marking in Ukrainian.¹

1.1. Accusative Marking in Ukrainian

Ukrainian, similarly to other Slavic languages that preserve case, marks accusative objects as illustrated in table 1 (nominative and genitive are added for reference). Morphological data is from the *Orfohrafičnyj Slovnyk Ukrajin's'koji Movy*: 1994.

Table 1: Ukrainian Object Marking

	Masculine		Neuter	Feminine	
	<i>animate</i>	<i>inanimate</i>		<i>a-stems</i>	<i>consonant-stems</i>
Nom	student 'student'	lyst, ukol 'letter', 'injection'	vikno 'window'	knyžka 'book'	ljubov 'love'
Gen	student-a	lyst-a, ukol-u	vikn-a	knyžk-y	ljubov-i
Acc	student-a	lyst-Ø/lyst-a, ukol- Ø/ukol-a	vikno	knyžk-u	ljubov

From table 1, it is seen that feminine consonant-stems and neuters display in the accusative syncretic forms with the nominative. Feminine a-stems, in the accusative, exhibit the special marker -u. In the genitive singular, masculine nouns could take two different endings: -a and -u. Masculine animate nouns take uniformly -a. Masculine inanimates allow for either -a or -u. The distribution could be summarized as the following: -a often occurs with concrete, well defined nouns; the -u ending is the marker of some foreign, abstract, non-count nouns, liquids and substances, nouns denoting objects with no clear limits, as well as buildings and institutions. As seen in table 1, masculine animates syncretize accusative and genitive in -a. Masculine inanimates present a special case in which one variant of the accusative (*lyst, ukol*) is syncretic with the nominative; the other variant marked with -a (*lysta, ukola*—cf. example 27.2) is not necessarily syncretic with the genitive (*lysta, ukolu*), but rather with the animate accusative in -a. Analysis of accusative masculine inanimates, their distribution, use, and constraints regarding the use of -a or -Ø (zero) marking forms the content of the present study, beginning

with an overview of hypotheses regarding the ‘parallel’ accusative marking for masculine objects begins.

1.2. Accusative in -a in Slavic Scholarship

In contrast to Ukrainian scholarship, linguists of Polish have devoted considerable attention to the phenomenon of the -a accusative in Polish and other Slavic languages. They generally explain it within either the “extended animacy hypothesis” or the “extended genitive hypothesis” (Holvoet 1991: 113). Holvoet, in his discussion of “genitive-like accusatives” (112-16), presents a brief overview of proponents of both hypotheses, but is not convinced by either, and states that in Polish, inanimate masculines taking the accusative ending reserved for animate nouns for the most part can be grouped in more or less easily definable semantic classes:

- a) names of dances and plays: tańczyć mazura, walca...
- b) names of currencies: dać dukata, guldena...
- c) nouns denoting actions, often quick and more or less vehement physical actions: dać/dostać szturchańca, przytyka; wyrządzić psikusa, splatać figła. (113)

Holvoet (1991) is correct in his statement that neither hypothesis alone is sufficient for the analysis of “genitive-like accusatives.” However, what is often overlooked, including by Holvoet, is the fact that the two hypotheses should be separated, as they are applicable to two distinct phenomena that may be collectively termed “genitive-like accusatives” (also in Ukrainian [U], similarly to Polish [P]). One phenomenon is the use of genitive case marking for nouns of all genders in the singular and plural to denote either object indefiniteness/indeterminacy or limitation in time (note that masculine inanimates, in the singular, may take either the genitive -a or -u ending): U *daj velosypeda*, P *daj roweru* ‘give me your bike for a moment’, U *potrebuju telefonu* ‘I need a telephone (in order to use it now)’,² U *spivaty jakojis’ pisni* ‘to sing some kind of song’, U *spivaty pisen’* ‘to sing some songs’. This

phenomenon belongs under the “extended genitive” hypothesis. Another phenomenon, which is addressed by the “extended animacy” hypothesis, concerns -a marking for masculine inanimate objects only in the singular (in the genitive they may be marked with either -a or -u, see table 1) that are either accusative direct objects or prepositional accusatives: *U siv na velosy^{peda}* ‘he sat on the bicycle’, *bery telefona* ‘take the phone’, *P kupilem kwiatka* ‘I bought a flower’.

The “extended genitive” hypothesis is represented by Jurkowski (1959: 121-33), who discusses masculine inanimate object marking under partitive genitives, classifying genitives into five groups: genitive of limited object (unspecified quantity) *daty xliba* ‘give some bread’, genitive of limited object (unspecified quality) *spivaty pisni* ‘to sing a song’, genitive of limited time *daty noža* ‘to give a knife’, genitive partitive-resultative *distaty harjačky* ‘to get a fever’, and genitive partitive intentional *vzjaty noža* ‘to take a knife’. Examples such as *vzjaty niź/vzjaty noža* ‘to take a knife’ or *daty niź/daty noža* ‘to give a knife’ are difficult to ascribe to genitive. First, these examples are presented out of context: ‘to take’ and ‘to give’ does not always imply ‘for a limited time’. Second, both verbs *vzjaty* and *daty* in the contemporary language are used mostly with the accusative (unless object itself is partitive). For instance, sentences with the feminine genitive complements of the type **Vona vzjala/pozyczyła knyžky^{Gen} z biblioteky* ‘She took/borrowed a book from the library’ are inadmissible in the language.

Another proponent of the “extended genitive” hypothesis is Zagorska Brooks (1967), according to whom, in Polish, the determinate quality of an object is marked with the accusative (*P daj mi ten czarny ołówek* ‘give me this black pencil’) and the indeterminate quality of the object is indicated by the genitive (*P daj mi ołówka* ‘give me a pencil’) (395). She states that “the accusative-genitive contrast in positive sentences in Polish is only partially operative since it occurs only with some verbs and only with some nouns used as objects” (400). However, under the discussion of determinate vs. indeterminate objects, she includes examples such as *palić papierosa* ‘to smoke a cigarette’, and *grać w brydża* ‘to play bridge’. The latter in particular cannot be labeled as genitive in Polish, as the preposition *w* ‘in/into’ governs accusative or locative cases (with games, it is the accusative). The former example, according to Swan (1988: 12), should be viewed as a complete verb-noun

expression or a bound collocation, similar to idioms. Therefore, these examples may not belong under the “extended genitive” hypothesis.

Another adherent of the “extended genitive” hypothesis is Wierzbicka, who terms masculine inanimates that allow an -a ending as nouns “which exhibit unorthodox behavior” (1983: 258). The genitive begins to function as an accusative when there is a meaning of “quick use”; objects which are by their very nature “not very serious,” such as “less serious articles of food” (*P zjeść banana* ‘to eat the banana’), are marked with genitive (259). In addition, she views the -a marker as an indicator of an action consisting “in using the object momentarily, as a means to an end, and perhaps to an end which is not very serious” (*wziąć pasa* ‘take a belt’ representing a quick beating, but not **wziąć rewolwera* ‘take a revolver’ to kill someone) (260).

The “extended animacy” hypothesis is far more widely represented in Polish scholarship than the “extended genitive.” Hjelmslev (1959) and Kucała (1978) discuss the extension of the category of ‘animacy’ beyond biological animacy. For instance, Kucała (93-106) semantically groups nouns that can take the -a ending in accusative. She presents the following categories: inanimate nouns that describe people—*kwiatka* ‘flower’, *tumana* ‘fog’ etc.; planets—*Marsa* ‘Mars’, *Saturna* ‘Saturn’; animal fur—*lisa* ‘fox’, *barana* ‘sheep’; toys and decorations—*misia* ‘teddy bear’, *motylka* ‘bow tie’; nouns that carry names of their inventors—*mauzera* ‘Mauser’; newspapers—“*Robotnika*” ‘The Worker’; inanimates with the shape of animate—*manekina* ‘manikin’, *robota* ‘robot’; commercial goods such as cigarettes—*papierosa* ‘cigarette’, television sets—*korala* ‘Koral’, wine and beer—*szampana* ‘Champagne’ or *pilznera* ‘Pilsner’, and cars—*fiata* ‘Fiat’; names of dances and musical pieces—*walca* ‘waltz’, *poloneza* ‘polonaise’; types of movement—*jechać galopa* ‘to gallop’; names of games—*grać w pokera* ‘to play poker’; monetary denominations—*centa* ‘cent’; mushrooms—*grzyba* ‘mushroom’; flowers—*tulipana* ‘tulip’; vegetables—*buraka* ‘beet’; trees—*klona* ‘maple tree’; culinary dishes, including pastries and candies—*kotleta* ‘cutlet’, *rogala* ‘roll’, *toffiego* ‘toffee’; diseases—*raka* ‘cancer’; some body parts—*palca* ‘finger’; and some idiomatic expressions.

Swan (1988) proposes the cover term “facultative animacy” for the -a accusative in Polish and discusses its vitality in certain semantic and morphological classes. According to him, facultative animacy is stronger in:

nouns with suffixes -ak or -ec, specific terms rather than generic, slang terms, diminutives, and nouns marked in genitive with -a and not -u (13-15). In addition, brand names whose genitive is regularly -u “easily undergo facultative animization, involving replacing both the Gen. sg. in -u and the Acc. sg. in -o with -a” (15). Interestingly, Ukrainian differs from Polish in this respect; specifically, in Ukrainian, those nouns that take -u in genitive and allow -a in accusative, preserve -u in genitive. In his appendix (27-33), Swan presents forty-five classes of nouns, ranking them from weak to strong facultative animacy. He suggests that the status ‘animate’ changes from a ‘natural’ to a ‘grammatical’ gender category (3). However, Swan does not exclude entirely the “extended genitive” hypothesis, noting that a noun with relatively strong facultative animacy is marked with -a in indefinite contexts; thus ascribing “the association of the -a ending with indefiniteness to semantic interference from the Gen., with which the *fac.an.* Acc. is almost always identical” (13).

Mindak (1990), while dealing primarily with Polish, includes data from other Slavic languages such as Ukrainian, Slovak, Belarusian, and Upper Lusatian that mark the masculine inanimates with -a in accusative. According to Mindak, in Polish and its dialects, the opposition animate/inanimate (animacy is understood in a traditional sense as including people and animals) ceased to function as a grammatical category creating a situation in which nouns are classified as belonging to a particular lexical class (43). Further, the desemantization of syncretism accusative=genitive created the semantic category of masculine animacy (*kategoria męskożywności*) in the singular (56). Mindak also enumerates lexical-semantic classes in which masculines [+Person] are marked with -a. For Polish, Ukrainian, and Slovak, the major classes include chess pieces and playing card ranks, names of games and dances, and brand names of cars, as well as names of mushrooms and some trees (63-64). Belarusian, according to Mindak, exhibits the -a accusative only in non-literary spoken variants and in a limited way in such classes as monetary units, names of games, and playing card ranks (64). Similarly, Upper Lusatian displays the feature sporadically for monetary units with the suffix -ak, names of mushrooms, brands of cars, chess pieces, and playing card ranks (64-65).

For Ukrainian, Ševelov (1963) may be cited as the adherent of the “extended animacy” hypothesis. According to him,

the use of the genitive case in the role of the accusative for nouns not denoting animate beings, clearly reflects the influence of nouns which denote animate beings.

This influence may be perceived externally in the fact that only the genitive ending in -a can perform the function of the accusative; the forms ending in -u have not penetrated the accusative simply because they could not be supported by a parallel in the names of animate beings. (168)

In addition, Ševelov mentions that forms with the -a ending in the accusative “to a certain extent, personify the object” and “can . . . actively withstand the action of the subject” (168). In constructions with these forms, the action itself becomes more pronounced and shows “quick movement and execution” (M. Sulyma 1926: 37, cited in Ševelov 1963: 168). Ševelov cites the following examples: *Vidkynuv stil’cja i pidijšov do materi* ‘He pushed the chair back and came up to his mother’; *Bere šaha až trusyt’sja: tjažko joho braty* ‘He takes a penny—he trembles: it is difficult to take it’; *Vin til’kyščo nahnuvsja vodu pyt’, a ja v toj ment noža jomu promiž lopatok* ‘He had only just bent down to get a drink of water when at that very moment I pushed the knife in between his shoulder blades’ (168). Further, Ševelov states that “there is no clear dividing line between the genitive and accusative case of the object. In many instances either may be used without much change in meaning or level of language” (169). This statement will be challenged in the analysis presented later in this essay.

A similar view is proposed by Vyxovanec’ (1987), who states that the shift of the genitive form of masculine inanimates to the accusative is explained by the influence of animate nouns. He classifies the -a accusative as the “second form of accusative functioning as object” and not as genitive. He also notes that this phenomenon is present only in the spoken language and the language of literature (102). In an earlier work (1971: 33), Vyxovanec’ fancifully relates the presence of the -a accusative to the alleged melodiousness of the Ukrainian language; that is, the -a ending is used if the next word begins with a consonant, as in *napysav dokirlyvoho lysta takoho zmistu* ‘he wrote a reproachful letter of such content’. In this work, Vyxovanec’ agrees with Matvijenko (1930: 55), according to whom the difference between the -Ø and -a accusatives lies in the

tempo of pronunciation and intonation of the language (cited in Vyxovanec' 1971: 33).

Sulyma (1928) sees the -Ø accusative as a marker “for the most part, of certainty, resolve, and, sometimes, some kind of immovability; for instance, *Anarx pročitav cej lyst* [‘Anarx read this letter’]” (37; transl. AN). By contrast, “phrases with accusative reminiscent of genitive characterize an instability of an action, indecisiveness, and, in cases that lack such meanings, then lively and animated movement, process of performance; for example, *Zaxvatit' ocjoho lantuxa z jablukamy* [‘Take along this bag with apples’]” (37; transl. AN). Bulaxovs'kyj (1951: 77) relates the use of the -a ending to stylistics and notes that these forms bring about the element of vivacity or animation and, to a certain extent, personify the objects. Kovaliv (1973: 19), praising Ukrainian for being rich in doublet phrases, states that based on nominative and genitive cases, the accusative in Ukrainian has doublet forms such as *kupyty olivec* ‘and *kupyty olivcja* ‘to buy a pencil’, *napysaty lyst* and *napysaty lysta* ‘to write a letter’.

Zatovkanjuk (1971) takes the matter further, and arrives at the conclusion that “the replacement of the -Ø ending (*vzjav niž* [‘took knife’] by the explicit ending (*vzjav noža* [‘took knife’] may be explained by the tendency to avoid morphological and syntactic homonymy, by the asymmetry of accusative singular and plural endings, by the prosodic and stylistic factors, and by lexicalized -a accusatives” (142; trans. AN). He emphasizes prosody and stylistics, as well as the presence of lexicalized, facultative accusatives, which he considers salient factors in the choice of the -a accusative. He adds that, in some instances, the -a forms are obligatory to differentiate idiomatic meaning from nonidiomatic (*pidnesty harbuza* ‘to reject a marriage proposal’ and *pidnesty harbuz/harbuza* ‘to give someone a pumpkin’) (140). However, Zatovkanjuk’s approach is in no way analytical; it merely enumerates examples (phrases only) and acknowledges their existence in the language. In his article, Zatovkanjuk has some interesting insights, which he does not pursue. He states that any parallel forms that coexist synchronically in the language over a long period of time, begin to differentiate for the most part stylistically and are suitable for a particular speech situation, and that it is important to study the factors that stimulate the variance in the language and the spread of the -a forms (132). He provides clear evidence that

-a forms are accusatives and not genitives, since they occur with the prepositions governing the accusative aside from the direct object forms.³

This overview of hypotheses for the -a accusative concerning relevant Slavic languages shows that there have been various attempts to explain the phenomenon either by extension of the category of animacy or by extension of the use of the genitive. A number of studies present a lexical-semantic approach, consisting in classifying the inanimate masculines that allow the -a ending into certain classes. In addition, there are works that seek to adduce evidence in support of prosody and stylistics as motivating factors for the use of the -a ending. All the studies mentioned admit the widespread use of the -a accusative, in Polish and Ukrainian in particular. However, the presence of ‘variation’ or ‘parallelism’ in forms such as *vzjaty niž* and *vzjaty noža* ‘to take a knife’ as an accusative marking remains a puzzle. In particular, questions such as why the speaker chooses one or another form in a particular environment, and when and where the constructions are not interchangeable remain unanswered. The phenomenon of the doublet accusative requires a thorough examination and analysis.

In the following sections, based on the Ukrainian data only, I will investigate the occurrence of the -a accusative (*Acc-a* henceforth) and its relationship to the -Ø accusative from the perspective of the Transitivity Hypothesis, pragmatics, and discourse.⁴ I will show that the speaker’s choice of a particular form is strongly influenced by the degree of utterance Transitivity, as well as the speaker’s intention to convey a particular message (pragmatics) in relation to the overall context (discourse). Emphasis will be placed on the fact that the speaker conceptualizes the event with respect to a prototypical discourse situation, organizing discourse within a particular discourse frame in order to signal to the hearer discourse salient or nonsalient elements. It is important to keep in mind that the -Ø ending is the unmarked accusative variant for masculine inanimates, whereas the -a ending can be licensed as a specific marker of the high Transitivity level and of particular pragmatic and discourse strategies (see below), and which can (on occasion of nonlicensing) be precluded.

2.0. Methodology

This analysis is primarily based on a corpus of examples extracted from primary-source texts. Due to the synchronic nature of the study, I concentrate on contemporary writing (1989-1998), citing examples from works predominantly by authors born after World War II. Authors were chosen to represent various areas of Ukrainian in order to illustrate that the phenomenon of *Acc-a* is not merely a dialectal characteristic. In addition, by incorporating various styles of literature, I can present an illustrative example of the spoken variant of the language. Hypothetical examples, or citations from nineteenth or early twentieth century literary Ukrainian, are avoided. ⁵ I also present examples from literature to native speakers in the form of questionnaires distributed in Ukraine, during annual research trips from 1995 through 1999. The questionnaire data helped to verify the possibility or (un)acceptability of specific case markings. The subjects were Ukrainian speaking, urban university students, both female and male, of an average age of twenty one, who are considered likely to be representatives of the literary standard over the next generation or so.

3.0. Accusative in -a and the Transitivity Hypothesis

This section initiates the analysis with the lexical-semantic grouping of Ukrainian masculine inanimates that allow the -a accusative and discusses how this grouping is better understood if placed within the Transitivity Hypothesis perspective.

The theory of Transitivity that I utilize in this study was developed by Hopper and Thompson (1980). According to this theory, Transitivity is a composite property of a clause, “ultimately pragmatic in origin, depending on the co-presence of up to ten parameters” (Hopper 1987: 460), for which they propose a scale according to which clauses can be ranked (see table 2).

Table 2: Transitivity Hierarchy

“High Transitivity”	“Low Transitivity”
A. 2 participants	A. 1 participant
B. action	B. non-action
C. telic	C. atelic
D. punctual	D. non-punctual
E. volitional	E. non-volitional
F. affirmation	F. negation
G. realis	G. irrealis
H. A high in potency	H. A low in potency
I. O totally affected	I. O not affected
J. O highly individuated	J. O non-individuated
Source: (Hopper and Thompson 1980: 252)	

Factors influencing Transitivity relevant to the present discussion are object properties contributing to object individuation (J), as well as verbal properties such as punctuality (D), volitionality (E), the number of arguments (A), and the degree of affectedness of the object (I).

I shall deal first with the question of whether masculine inanimate nouns allowing *Acc-a* may be grouped in any consistent way. In contrast to previous studies on the subject, I will begin by discussing masculine inanimates that do not allow *Acc-a* under any condition. The comparison of the two groups (that is the $-\emptyset$ group, nouns that do not allow *Acc-a* and the $-a/-\emptyset$ group in which either ending is possible) will prove to be fruitful for a more sound understanding of the latter, which constitutes the main topic of my analysis. 6 I consider both accusative direct objects and objects of prepositions.

3.1. Object Properties and Transitivity

This section classifies masculine inanimate nouns according to their properties as objects and discusses their grouping in light of the Transitivity Hypothesis.

The analyzed data suggest that the *Acc-a* marking is prohibited for nouns that are: abstract, substances, liquids, geographic objects, objects with no clear

limits, mass or collective nouns, and nouns denoting part of an object. Consider the following:

(1)	Rada	perevela	podyx/*podyxa,	na	povni	hrudy
	Rada _{Nom}	caught	breath _{Acc-Ø/*Acc-a}	on	full	chest _{Acc}
	vvibrala	hirkavyj	dux/*duxa	paloho lystu	počula	i vpiznala
	inhaled	bitter	smell _{Acc-Ø/*Acc-a}	fallen leaves _{Gen}	heard	and recognized
	vlasnyj	hlybokyj	smišok/*smiška	-zitzannja –	jak u xvylyny	ljubovi...
	her own	deep	laughter _{Acc-ØDim/*Acc-a}	sigh _{Acc}	As in minutes _{Acc}	love _{Gen}

‘Rada caught her breath, fully inhaled the bitter smell of fallen leaves, heard and recognized her own deep laughter-sigh – like during minutes of love...’ (Zabužko 1989: 15)

(2)	Potim	pyly	kypjatok/*kypjatka	zabilenyj	zhuščenyj	molokom
	then	drank _{3Pl}	boiling water _{Acc-Ø/*Acc-a}	whitened _{Acc}	condensed	milk _{Inst}

‘Then they drank boiling water whitened with condensed milk...’ (Hordasevič 1990: 88)

(3)	A	teper	ujavy	sobi	staryj	hustyj	lis/*lisa
	and	now	imagine _{imp}	self-a _{Sg}	old	deep	forest _{Acc-Ø/*Acc-a}

‘And now imagine to yourself an old deep forest.’ (Hordasevič 1990:

(4)	don’ka	myla za	neji	sxody	čy pidmitala	dvir/*dvora.
	daughter _{Nom}	washed for	her _{Acc}	stairs _{Acc}	or swept	courtyard _{Acc-Ø/*Acc-a}

‘... her daughter washed for her the stairs or swept the court-yard’. (Hordasevič 1990: 48)

(5)	povern uv i,	šmatuj učy	odjah/* odjaha	ob reštky	skla,	vytjah	Lopatu	nahoru
	turned and	ripping	clothes Acc- Ø/*Acc-a	against shards _A cc	glass _{Gen}	dragge d	Lopata Acc	up

‘... he turned and, ripping his clothes against the shards of glass, dragged Lopata upstairs.’ (Uljanenko 1994: 25)

(6.1)	vin	hryze	nihot’/*nihtja	velykoho pal’cja	livoji ruky
	he _{Nom}	chews	nail _{Acc-Ø/*Acc-a}	big finger _{Gen}	left hand _{Gen}

‘He chews the nail on a big finger of his left hand.’ (Ješkilev 1996/9: 14)

(6.2)	Po tomu	[Vitalij]	zazyrav	na kuxnju,	vidrizav šmat/*š mata	xliba	j
	after that	[Vitalij] Nom	peeked	on kitchen _A cc	cut piece _{Acc- Ø/*Acc-a}	bread _{Gen}	and
	Kovbasy	i	povertav sja	do	materi...		
	sausage _G en	and	returned	to	mother _{Ge} n		

‘After that [Vitalij] peeked into the kitchen, cut a piece of bread and sausage and returned to his mother...’ (Ševčuk 1990: 48-49)

Examples 1-6 admit only -Ø accusative for object marking: (1) illustrates the -Ø marking of three abstract objects, in (2) the object is a liquid, (3) is an example of a geographic object, in (5) one finds an object with no clear limits, (6.1) presents a case of object that is a piece of another object, and (6.2) is a case of an object ‘a piece’ which overtly is a part of another object. Note that in both (6.1) and (6.2), the part is immediately followed by an adnominal genitive naming the thing of which it is a part. My data show that in such environments both markings of the accusative are possible (cf. 14.1 and 14.2). When (6.1)

and (6.2) are compared with (14.1) and (14.2), the former examples are uttered without modifiers. Moreover, in (6.1) the object *nihot* ‘nail’ does not always have to be followed by an adnominal genitive of *palec* ‘finger’; a ‘nail’ is normally perceived as a part of a finger. In (6.2), *šmat xliba* ‘a piece of bread’ could almost be treated as a set phrase (similarly *šmat kovbasy* ‘a piece of sausage’ etc.).

To a certain extent, the -a ending is not favored by objects which are used indefinitely or without modification and with the meaning ‘some’, as in

(7)	Na byl’ci	ližka	Pamva	namacav	jakyjs’	sveter/*jakohos svetra
	On frame _{Loc}	bed _{Gen}	Pamva _{Nom}	found	some	sweater _{Acc-Ø}
	i	zabrav	joho	do	kuxni	bo
	and	took	it _{Acc}	to	kitchen _{Gen}	since
	troxy	zmerz				
	a bit	got cold _{3Sg}				

‘On the frame of the bed, Pamva found some kind of sweater and took it to the kitchen since he felt a bit cold’. (Proxas’ko 1996: 97)

The group of masculines that allow either -a or -Ø ending in accusative differs from the -Ø group above and includes the following nouns: concrete, major body parts; articles of clothing; proper names; whole objects; count, and, to a certain extent, modified (when compared to unmodified or less modified) nouns.⁷ Consider these examples:

(8)	Na cej raz	musyv	zapaľjuvaty	sirnyka	i
	This time	had	light _{inf}	match _{Acc-a}	and
	počav	hovoryty			
	began	talk _{inf}			

‘This time he had to light the match and he began to talk’. (Proxas’ko 1996: 93)

(9.1)	krov blood _{Nom}	jušyt' flows	na on	bilyj white	komirec' collar _{Acc}	tenisky shirt _{Gen}
	hirkotoju bitterness _{Inst}	zapovnjuje fill _{pres}	rota. mouth _{Acc-a}			

‘...blood is flowing onto the white collar of the shirt and is filling the mouth with bitterness’. (Uljanenko 1994: 50)

(9.2)	tepliv was getting warmer	Piskarenko Piskarenko _{Nom}	pidvodyv was raising	pal’cja finger _{Acc-} a	dohory up	vypyrajučy sticking out
	odutle bloated	čerevo stomach _{Acc}				

‘...Piskarenko was getting warmer, was raising his finger, and sticking out his bloated stomach’. (Uljanenko 1994/9: 30)

(9.3)	<i>Sobol’</i> <i>Sobol’_{Nom}</i>	<i>povertaje</i> <i>t’sja</i> <i>turns</i>	<i>ščob</i> <i>that</i>	<i>viddaty</i> <i>return_{inf}</i>	<i>Stjobec’kij</i> <i>Stjobec’ka_{Dat}</i>	<i>cyrkul’</i> <i>compasses</i> <i>Acc-a</i>	<i>i</i> <i>and</i>
	<i>Markevyč</i> <i>Markevyč_{Nom}</i>	<i>pokazuje</i> <i>shows</i>	<i>jij</i> <i>she_D</i> <i>at</i>	<i>jazyka</i> <i>tongue_{Acc-}</i> <i>a</i>			

‘*Sobol’* turns around in order to return compasses to *Stjobec’ka*, and *Markevyč* sticks out his tongue to her’. (Ješkilev 1996/9: 15)

(9.4)	Dytyna	zнову	holosno	zakryčala	ale
	child _{Nom}	again	loudly	started to cry	but
	maty	tut že	zatkнула	jij	rota
	mother _{Nom}	right a way	plugged	it _{Dat}	mouth _{Acc-a}
	soskoju	natjahненоju	na	pljašečku	z
	with nipple _{Inst}	attached	on	bottle _{AccDim}	with
	molokom	Dytyna	zatyxla		
	milk _{Inst}	child _{Nom}	quieted down		

‘The child started crying loudly again but its mother right a way plugged its mouth with a nipple which was attached to the bottle with milk. The child quieted down’. (Hordasevyč 1990: 72)

(10.1)	Švydko	znjav	plašča	odjah	kil’ka
	quickly	took off	coat _{Acc-a}	wore	a couple
	svetriv	natjahnuv	šlejky	i	zнову
	sweaters _{Gen}	pulled on	breech- bands _{Acc}	and	again
	plašča	Kovtnuv	dvi	tabletky	nitroglicerynu
	coat _{Acc-a}	swallowed	two _{Acc}	tablets	nitroglycerin _{Gen}
	i	vyjšov	na	sxody	
	and	exited	on	stairway	

‘He quickly took his coat off, put on a couple of sweaters, pulled on the breech-bands and again the coat. He swallowed two tablets of nitroglycerin and exited to the stairway’. (Proxas’ko 1996/10: 94)

(10.2)	Syrovatko	znimav	kartuza	obtyrav	vnytrišnim	bokom
	Syrovatko _{Nom}	took off	cap _{Acc-a}	wiped	inner	side _{Inst}
	doloni	čolo	zabyvajuč	viddyx	od	nespodivanoj
	palm _{Gen}	forehead _{Acc}	holding	sigh _{Acc-Ø}	from	unexpected
	xorobrostiti	sidav	na	pletenuh	kytajs'koh	stil'cja
	courage _{Gen}	sat	on	wicker	Chinese	chair _{Acc-a}

‘Syrovatko was taking off his cap, wiping his forehead with the inside of his palm while holding back a sigh from his unexpected courage, and was sitting down on the wicker Chinese chair’. (Uljanenko 1994: 47)

(10.3)	Borys	siv	na	posteli	skynuvšy
	Borys _{Nom}	sat	on	bed _{Loc}	having taken
	z	sebe	kožuxa		
	from	self _{3Sg}	sheepskin		
			coat _{Acc-a}		

‘Borys sat on the bed, having taken off his sheepskin coat’. (Ševčuk 1990: 23)

(11.1)	Olesju	nabery	vody	zlyj	tatovi	na
	Oles' _{Voc}	get _{imp}	water _{Gen}	pour _{imp}	dad _{Dat}	on
	ruky	Bukvarja	čytav?			
	hands _{Acc}	ABC's _{Acc-}	read _{past-}			
			aSg			

‘-Oles’, get some water and pour it on dad’s hands. Did you read your ABC’s?’ (Morhovs’kyj 1996: 49)

(11.2)	Uperše	žyvcm	pobačy v	dolara	považno	vyrik
	for the first time	alive	saw _{1Sg}	dollar _{Acc-a}	reliably	said
	Oharok	Lyšu	sobi	na	zhadku	A ja
	Oharok _{Nom}	will leave _{1Sg}	self _{Dat1Sg}	for	remembrance _{Ac}	and I
	moskovs'k oho	rublja	z	heneralom	zveselyvsja	Šumer
	Moscow	ruble _{Acc-a}	with	general _{Inst}	rejoiced	Shumer _{Nom}
	i	popljuvavš y	ljapnuv	sobi	na	loba
	and	having spat	stuck	self _{Dat3Sg}	on	forehead _{Acc} -a
	moskovku					
	Moscow ruble _{AccFem}					

‘ “For the first time I saw a dollar,” —Oharok said reliably. “I’ll leave it for myself as a remembrance.”

“And I —a Moscow ruble with the general!” —Šumer rejoiced and, having spat a couple of times, stuck the ruble onto his forehead.’ (Nečerda 1995: 59)

(11.3)	Moja?	Ty	skazav	“tvoja”?!	Polkovnyk Bez	odkynuv
	my _{Fem}	you	said	your _{Fem}	colonel Bez _{Nom}	throw _{past}
	Jahodi	joho	kalašnyka	Stan’	u	strij
	Jahoda _{Dat}	his	Kalashnikov _{Acc-a}	stand _{imp}	in	line _{Acc-Ø}
	i	ne	varnjakaj			
	and	not	complain _{imp}			

“—My? You said ‘your’?!” Colonel Bez threw Jahoda his Kalashnikov... “Get back to the line and don’t complain.” (Nečerda 1995: 39)

(12)	Lord	perevodyv	zir	i	bačyv	u
	Lord _{Nom}	turned	glance _{Acc-Ø}	and	saw	in
	tumani	syni	pljamy	žovti	obrazky	ščo
	fog _{Loc}	blue	spots _{Acc}	yellow	images _{AccDim}	that
	viddaljalysja	j	tanuly	a	po tomu	Bron’ku
	moved away	and	disappeared	and	after that	Bron’ka _{Acc}
	ščo	vystrybuje	prysidaje navpočipky	tjahne	i	Lorda
	that	jumps	squats	drags	and	Lord _{Acc}
	Za komira					
	By collar _{Acc-a}					

‘Lord glanced about and saw in the fog some blue spots, small yellow images that were moving away and disappearing, and then Bron’ka, who jumps, squats, and drags Lord by the collar’. (Uljanenko 1994: 23)

(13)	U dil'nyci, at	odryhnuvšy district office _{Loc}	mjatnym having burped	pereharom mint excess _{Inst}	likeru liquor _{Gen}	pidtoptanyj downtrodden
	major major _{Nom}	tyc'nuv thrust	papera paper _{Acc-a}	"Pyšy write _{imprSg}	svoloč dirty	ščo scum _{Voc}
	potrebuju that need _{1Sg}	likuvat'sja undergo _{inf} treatment	od from	alkoholja alcohol _{Gen}		

'At the district office, having burped from a mint excess of liquor, the downtrodden major thrust a paper: "Write, you dirty scum, that I need to get some treatment from alcohol'. (Uljanenko 1994: 36)

(14.1)	a	babi Piskuryysi	tyc'nuly	cupkoho	arkuša	paperu
	and	old Piskuryxa _{Dat}	thrust _{3Pl}	stiff	sheet _{Acc-a}	paper _{Gen}
	de where	vona she _{Nom}	pitnijučy sweating	od from	povahy honor _{Gen}	za for
	doručeno entrusted	doxumenta document _{Acc-a}	postavyla placed	xrestyka cross _{Acc-a}		

'and they thrust a stiff sheet of paper at the old Piskuryxa lady, on which she, sweating from the honor "for the entrusted document," placed the cross [her mark]...' (Uljanenko 1994: 52)

(14.2)	staryj old man _{Nom}	u in	dovhopolomu long	xalati robe _{Loc}	krad'koma sneakily	vytjahnul took out
	skladenoho folded	učetvero in four	šmatka ₈ piece _{Acc-a}	paperu paper _{Gen}	ohryskom tip _{Inst}	olivcja pencil
	ščos' something _{Acc}	zanotuvav wrote down				

‘...an old man in a long robe sneakily took out a piece of paper folded in four and wrote something down with the tip of a pencil’. (Uljanenko 1994: 21)

Examples 8-14 display -a marking for accusative objects (note that similar object could be marked also with the -Ø, see below examples 15-21): (8) is an example of a concrete object, (9) represents four cases of body parts marked with -a, in (10) three examples of objects denoting articles of clothing are found, (11) exemplifies cases of the marking of brand and specific names (including money denominations). Whole objects, not their parts, appear in all of them; (13) is an example of a count noun, and (14) offers two examples of highly modified objects. Table 3 summarizes the contents of the two groups (examples 1-8 and 8-14)

Table 3: Distribution of Masculine Inanimate Accusative Endings

-a/-Ø group	-Ø group
A concrete	A' abstract, objects with no clear limits, geographical terms
B whole objects	B' not whole objects/parts (not body parts)
C count	C' mass/collective, substances, liquids
D modified	D' indefinite ('some') articles of clothing, tools, weapons, monetary denominations ⁹
E brand and specific names	
F body parts,	
G geometrical shapes	

The contents of the two groups defined in table 3 are closely related to the Individuation Hierarchy proposed by Hopper and Thompson (1980) (also Timberlake (1977)) reproduced in table 4.

Table 4: Individuation Hierarchy

Individuated	Non-Individuated
Proper	common
human, animate	inanimate
concrete	abstract
singular	plural
count	mass
referential, definite	non-referential
Source: Hopper and Thompson 1980: 253	

It is evident that according to the object properties alone, the nouns that do not allow *Acc-a* are less individuated and are low in Transitivity (tables 3 and 4, second column), whereas nouns that allow *Acc-a* are more individuated and are marked by a higher degree of Transitivity (tables 3 and 4, first column).

It is noteworthy that in examples 8-14 the choice of the $-\emptyset$ ending is not entirely ruled out; objects represented in 8-14 may also be marked with the $-\emptyset$ ending. Therefore, this begs the question of the conditions for the choice of $-a$ or $-\emptyset$ in the first group. Consider a third set of examples, displaying objects similar to those in 8-14 but with a different case marking, suggesting that perhaps object properties alone cannot be the sole determining factor in marking preference:

(15)	Tym časom	Jakiv	distav	syharetu	ale	sirnykiv
	same time	Jakiv _{Nom}	pulled out	cigarette _{Acc}	but	matches _{Gen}
	jak	i	todi	kolys'	u	njoho
	as	and	then	sometime	at	he _{Gen}
	ne	bulo	Ja	distav	svoji	zapalyv
	not	was _{Neut}	I	got	mine _{AccPl}	lit
	sirnyka	ale	z	nevidomyx	pryčyn	u
	match _{Acc-a}	but	from	unknown	reasons _{Gen}	at
	mene	zatretily	ruky	Ja	vypustyv	sirnyk
	I _{Gen}	Started to shake	hands _{Nom}	I _{Nom}	dropped	match _{Acc-Ø}
	i	kynuv	korobku	Jakovu		
	and	threw	box _{Acc}	Jakiv _{Dat}		

‘At the same time, Jakiv pulled out a cigarette, but, as before, he didn’t have any matches. I got mine, lit a match, but due to unknown reasons, my hands started to shake... I dropped the match and threw the box to Jakiv...’ (Kaška 1995: 9)

(16)	Narešti	žinka	za	stolom	dojila	boršč
	finally	woman _{Nom}	at	table _{Inst}	ate up	beet soup _{Acc-Ø}
	do	rešty	doloneju	vyterla	rot	i
	till	end	with palm _{Inst}	wiped	mouth _{Acc-Ø}	and
skazala	Dosyt'	joho [dytynu]	poloskaty	Nu	to	
said	enough	he [child] <i>Acc</i>	rinse _{inf}	so	then	
davaj	rušnyk					
give _{imp}	towel _{Acc-Ø}					

‘Finally the woman at the table ... ate up her beet soup to the bottom, wiped her mouth with her palm and said:

“Enough rinsing him...”

“So, give the towel...” (Hordasevyč 1990: 72)

(17)	Ci	švendjaly	tupcjuvaly	nepodalik	i	pryjemno
	these _{Nom}	wondered	marked time	nearby	and	pleasantly
	vybalušuvalys'	na	kožux	i	domyny	zobabič
stared	at	sheepskin coat _{Acc-Ø}	and	houses _{Acc}	on the side	
i	kušči					
and	bushes _{Acc}					

‘These were wondering around, marking time nearby and were staring pleasantly at a sheepskin coat, and houses on the side, and bushes’. (Nečerda 1995: 34)

(18)	Ukynuv	ključa	v	unitaz	Odjahnuvsja	vsuvsja
	threw	key _{Acc-a}	in	toilet _{Acc-Ø}	got dressed	put on shoes
	Znjav	z	hvizdka	i	zaklav	za
	took	from	nail _{Gen}	and	placed	behind
	pleče	slavetnyj	avtomat	Kalašnykova		
	shoulder _{Acc}	famous	machine gun _{Acc-Ø}	Kalashnikov _{Gen}		

‘He threw the key into the toilet. He got dressed and put on shoes. He took the famous Kalashnikov machine gun from the nail and placed it on his shoulder’. (Nečerda 1995: 33)

(19)	Ja	takož	bačyla	u	dzerkali	pidnjatyj
	I	also	saw	in	mirror _{Loc}	raised
	komir	Respondentovoho	plašča,10	collar _{Acc-Ø}	Respondent’s	coat _{Gen}
	vkryte	dribnymy	krapel’kamy	joho	čolo	tonki
	covered	tiny	drops	his	forehead _{Acc}	slim
	huby	livu	brovu	deščo	pidnjatu	nad
	lips _{Acc}	left	eyebrow _{Acc}	a bit	lifted	above
	okom	same	oko			
	eye _{Inst}	itself	eye _{Acc}			

‘In the mirror I also saw the raised collar of the Respondent’s coat, his forehead covered with tiny drops, his slim lips, the left eyebrow which is a bit lifted above the eye, and the eye itself’. (Andruxovyč 1996: 30)

(20)	Pamva	rozvažavsja	probujúčy	samokrutky	z	riznyx
	Pamva	had fun	trying	handrolled cigarettes _{Acc}	from	various
	gatunkiv	tjutjunu	vpytujučy	pro	miscevist'	probujúčy
	types _{Gen}	tobacco _{Gen}	asking	about	origin _{Acc}	trying
	pal'cjamy	cydulkovyj	papir			
	with fingers _{Inst}	cigarette	paper _{Acc-Ø}			

'Pamva was having fun trying handrolled cigarettes from various types of tobacco, asking about their origin, testing with his fingers the cigarette paper'. (Proxas'ko 1996: 91)

(21)	Bušhol'c	obernuvsja	majnuv	polamy	xalata	vytjah
	Bushgoltz _{Nom}	turned	waved	with fold _{InstPl}	robe _{Gen}	took out
	arkuš	paperu	skladenoho	včetvero	i	zrobyv
	sheet _{Acc-Ø}	paper _{Gen}	folded	in four	and	made
	vyhljad	ščo	pyše			
	impression _{Acc-Ø}	that	write _{3Sg}			

'Bushgoltz turned around, waved with the fold of his robe, took out the sheet of paper folded in four, and made the impression that he was writing'. (Uljanenko 1994: 25)

Example 15 exhibits the use of the object *sirnyk* 'a match' twice, first with the -a marking and then with the -Ø marking (cf. with -a marking in 8). In (16), the object, a body part, *rot* 'mouth', is marked with the -Ø ending (cf. with -a marking in 9.1 and 9.4). In example 17 the object is *kožux* 'sheepskin coat', an article of clothing, which, unlike (10.3), is marked with -Ø. Example 18 displays the object *avtomat Kalašnykova* with the -Ø ending unlike the object in (11.3) "*kalašnyka*". The object in (19), *komir* 'collar', is another example of -Ø marking, unlike the same object in (12) exhibiting the -a ending. Example 20 marks the object with -Ø, whereas in (13) the same object is marked with -

a. The structure of (21) is very similar to (14.1) and (14.2); however, in (21), *arkuš* ‘sheet of paper’ shows the -Ø ending.

The difference in case marking among examples 18-21 and 11-14, exhibiting similar objects, may be explained by reference to the degree of object Individuation. In (18) the object is a common noun, *avtomat Kalašnykova*, where as in (11.3) the object is a brand name, “*kalašnyka*”. The object *komir* in (19) is clearly a part of the participant’s jacket; however, in (12), *za komira*, there is no reference to *komir* being a part of something, and thus it is perceived as a whole object. The difference between (20) and (13) also lies in the object. Example 13 uses *papir* in a specific, individuated sense equaling ‘the document’. By contrast, in (20), even though the speaker is talking about specific paper, the object *papir* here is a noncount, mass noun. Example 21 is structurally similar to (14.1) and (14.2). The objects in (14.1), *cupkoho arkuš paperu*, and in (14.2), *skladenoho učetvero šmatka paperu*, are modified, and the description in both cases refers to the accusative object. In 21, however, *arkuš paperu, skladenoho včetvero*, the description does not refer to the accusative *arkuš* but to the genitive *paperu*; thus the object in (21), in contrast to both (14.1) and (14.2), is less modified (note also that if the -a ending is found in (21), *arkuša paperu, skladenoho včetvero*, the descriptive complement phrase would refer to the accusative *arkuša* and not the genitive *paperu*; in this instance, the accusative object is highly modified and marked with -a).

Therefore, it may be said that according to object Individuation properties, the objects in (11)-(14) are more individuated, display a higher degree of Transitivity, and are marked with the -a ending. By contrast, similar objects in (18)-(21) score lower on the Transitivity scale, are less individuated and are marked with -Ø.11 Nonetheless, the same may not be said regarding other examples; that is, object properties alone do not influence the case marking in (15)-(17) if compared with (8)-(10). The explanation for case marking has to be considered to be beyond the matter of object properties alone.

Besides object qualities, the Transitivity Hypothesis includes other criteria for determining the degree of Transitivity. Components of Transitivity also include verbal properties such as punctuality, volitionality, the number of arguments, as well as the affectedness of the object.

3.2. Verbal Properties and Transitivity

This section seeks to explain the case marking in examples 15-17, as well as similar examples, further testing the Transitivity Hypothesis and its explanatory power in morphosyntax of case marking. The analyzed data adduces evidence for considering punctuality, volitionality, the number of arguments, and the degree of affectedness of the object which influence the degree of utterance Transitivity. In accordance with the Hopper and Thompson hypothesis (1980), if an utterance exhibits an action characterized as punctual, volitional, with an agent high in potency, and with an object totally affected, the degree of Transitivity is high (note that since Transitivity is a composite property of an utterance, not all these properties need to be present in a single utterance). Contrariwise, an utterance is marked by a low level of Transitivity if an action is nonpunctual, nonvolitional, with an agent low in potency, and with an unaffected object. Consider examples 15-17 and 9.4, 10.3, repeated here as (22)-(24) and (25), (26) respectively:

(22)	Tym časom	Jakiv	distav	syharetu,	ale	sirnykiv,
	same time	Jakiv _{Nom}	pulled out	cigarette _{Acc}	but	matches _{Gen}
	jak	i	todi	kolys',	u	njoho
	as	and	then	sometime	at	he _{Gen}
	ne	bulo.				
	not	was _{Neut}				

(22 a)	Ja	distav	svoji,	zapalyv	sirnyka,	ale
	I	got	mine _{AccPl}	lit	match _{Acc-a}	but
	z	nevidomyx	pryčyn	u	mene	zatremtily
	from	unknown	circumstances _{Gen}	at	I _{Gen}	started to shake
	ruky...					
	hands _N					
	om					

(22 b)	Ja	vypustyv	sirnyk	i	kynuv	korobku
	I _{Nom}	dropped	match _{Acc-Ø}	and	threw	box _{Acc}
	Jakovu...					
	Jakiv _{Dat}					
	‘At the same time, Jakiv pulled out a cigarette, but, as before, he didn’t have any matches. I got mine, lit a match, but due to unknown circumstances, my hands started to shake... I dropped the match and threw the box to Jakiv...’ (Kaška 1995/7-8: 9)					

(23)	Narešti	žinka	za	stolom...	dojila	boršč
	finally	woman _{Nom}	at	table _{Inst}	ate up	beet soup _{Acc-Ø}
	do	rešty,	doloneju	vyterla	rot	i
	till	end	with palm _{Inst}	wiped	mouth _{Acc-Ø}	and
	skazala:	—Dosyt’	joho [dytynu]	poloskaty...	—Nu,	to
	said	enough	he [child] <i>Acc</i>	rinse _{inf}	so	then
	davaj	rušnyk...				
	give _{imp}	towel _{Acc-Ø}				

‘Finally the woman at the table ... ate up her beet soup till the bottom, wiped her mouth with her palm and said:

“Enough rinsing him...”

“So, give the towel...” (Hordasevič 1990: 72)

(24)	Ci	švendjaly	tupcjuvaly	nepodalik	i	pryjemno
	these _{Nom}	wondered	marked time	nearby	and	pleasantly
	vybalušivalys’	na	kožux	i	domyny	zobabič,
	stared	at	sheepskin coat _{Acc-Ø}	and	houses _{Acc}	on the side
	i	kušči				
	and	bushes _{Acc}				

‘These were wondering around, marking time nearby and were staring pleasantly at a sheepskin coat, and houses on the side, and bushes’. (Nečerda 1995: 34)

(25)	Dytyna	zнову	holosno	zakryčala,	ale	maty
	child _{Nom}	again	loudly	started to cry	but	mother _{Nom}
	tut že	zatkнула	jij	rota	soskoju,	natjahnenoju
right a way	plugged	it _{Dat}	mouth _{Acc-a}	with nipple _{Inst}	attached	
na	pljašečku	z	molokom.	Dytyna	zatyxla.	
on	bottle _{AccDim}	with	milk _{Inst}	child _{Nom}	quieted down	

‘The child started crying loudly again but its mother right a way plugged its mouth with a nipple which was attached to the bottle with milk. The child quieted down’. (Hordasevyč 1990: 72)

(26)	Borys	siv	na	posteli,	skynuvšy	z
	Borys _{Nom}	sat	on	bed _{Loc}	having taken	from
	sebe	kožuxa.				
self _{3Sg}	sheepskin coat _{Acc-a}					

‘Borys sat on the bed having taken off his sheepskin coat’. (Ševčuk 1990: 23)

Example 22 has two instances of the object *sirnyk* ‘match’, marked in (22a) with the -a ending but in (22b) with the -Ø. The difference here may be seen in verbal characteristics: in (22a), the verb is punctual, volitional, and the object is clearly affected (‘the match is lit’); on the contrary in (22b), even though the verb is also punctual, the action is nonvolitional with no clear affectedness of the object. Therefore, it may be said that the Transitivity level in (22a) is higher and is manifested morphosyntactically by the -a ending. Example 22b scores lower on the Transitivity scale, thus displaying the -Ø marking. In (23), the participant ‘wiped her mouth after eating’. In example 25, with a similar object, *rot* ‘mouth’, the participant ‘plugged the child’s mouth with a nipple’. In both examples the action is punctual; however, the action in (25), unlike in (23), is performed with the specific intention ‘to stop the child from crying’, suggesting

greater affectedness of the object. Therefore, it appears that the object in (25) is more affected than the object in (23), which is signaled by the object marking: -a for a more affected object, and -Ø for a less affected object (see also 9.1, in which the object 'mouth' is affected and marked with -a). Similarly, examples (24) and (26) may be differentiated according to the degree of object affectedness. The verb *skynuty* 'to take off' in (26) suggests direct physical contact of the agent and the object; thus the object is affected, unlike in (24), in which the participants are simply staring at the object *kožux* without affecting it in any way.¹² Therefore, based on the degree of object affectedness, utterance (26) is marked by a higher level of Transitivity than utterance (24); the difference is again signaled by distinct morphosyntax, -a in (26) and -Ø in (24).

To further demonstrate the effects of Transitivity on the morphosyntactic marking of objects consider examples 27-30, in which object affectedness influences the degree of Transitivity and thus the accusative marking of an object (note that in the following examples, the -Ø marking is not completely ruled out; however, -a is a special marker of high Transitivity).

(27.1)	U	kredensi	šukajučy	hornjatko	Pamva	znajšov
	in	cabinet _{Loc}	searching	cup _{Acc}	Pamva _{Nom}	found
	kil'ka	ampul	kalipsolu	todi	vyhornuv	use
	a					
	few	ampoules _{Gen}	calypsol _{Gen}	then	raked out	everything
		<i>n</i>				
	zi	smitnyka	i	vidnajšo	odnorazovy	špryc
				v	j	
	from	waste basket	and	found	disposable	syringe _{Acc-Ø}
	vona	može	povernutysj	zovsim	inšoju	pravdopodobn
			a			o
	she _{No}	can	return	entirely	different _{Inst}	likely
	<i>m</i>					
	ne	probude	dovho v			
			reanimaciji			
	not	will be _{3Sg}	long in			
			intensive			
			care _{Loc}			

'In the cabinet, searching for a cup, Pamva found a few ampoules of calypsol, then he raked out everything from the waste basket and found a disposable syringe; she might return entirely different; it is likely that she is not going to be long in intensive care.' (Proxas'ko 1996: 97)

(27.2)	Vyklykal y	likarja	pryjixav	molodyj	iz zažurenym	donyzu
	called _{3Pl}	doctor _{Acc}	arrived	young _{Nom}	with sad	down
	pohljado m	trišky	z	rota	konjakom	popaxuval o
	look _{Inst}	a bit	from	mouth _{Gen}	cognac _{Inst}	smelled
	zrobyv	ukola	i	protyrajučy	ruky	
	made	injection _{Acc} -a	and	wiping	hands _{Acc}	
	spyrtom	zvernuv	uvahu	na	vyrazky	Davno
	with spirit _{Inst}	turned	attention _{Ac} c	at	ulcer _{Acc}	long
	take	u	neji	Piskuryxa	počuła	ščos'
	this _{Nom}	at	she _{Gen}	Piskuryxa _{No} m	felt	some
	neladne	j	Ta	ne	duže	baba
	trouble	and	and	not	very	old lady _{Nom}
	rozvodyl a	rukamy	til'ky	oči	pereljakan o	bihaly
	parted	hands _{Inst}	only	eyes _{Nom}	in fear	jumped
	Može	z tyžden'	bude	Treba		
	maybe	about week	will be	necessary		
	neodmin no	zrobyty	analiz krovi	j,	zahnnavšy	u
	certainly	do _{inf}	blood test _{Acc-Ø}	and	having driven	in
	venu	Mariji	hrubeznu	holku	natjahnuv	cilo ho
	vein _{Acc}	Marija _{Gen}	thick _{Augm}	needle _{Acc}	filled	entire
	špryca					

syringe _{Ac}

c-a

‘They called a doctor. A young one arrived with a depressed look, and one could smell a bit of cognac on his breath. He made an injection and, wiping his hand with spirit, he turned his attention to the ulcer: “How long has she had this?” “Not very long,” the old Piskuryxa lady felt some trouble and was parting her hands; only her eyes were jumping in fear. “Maybe it’ll be a week...” “Certainly, a blood test is necessary...” and, having driven a very thick needle into Marija’s vein, he filled the entire syringe.’ (Uljanenko 1994: 52)

(28.1)	Vidšukav	sirnyčky	Čyrknuv	raz	znajšov	nedopalok svičky
	found _{3SgMasc}	matches _{Acc}	struck	once	found	candle- stub _{Acc-Ø}
	na	pidvikonni	zapalyv	jiji	Kuxon’ka	xytnulasja
	on	window ledge _{Loc}	lit	it _{Acc}	kitchen _{NomDim}	swayed
	vodnočas	iz	usim	načynnjam	i	zavmerla
	same time	with	all	dishes _{Inst}	and	stood
	osvitlena					
	stock-still					
	lit _{NomFem}					

‘He found matches. He struck once, found a candle stub at the window ledge, and lit it. The kitchen and all of the dishes swayed and then stood stock-still in the light.’ (Lazaruk 1996: 14)

(28.2)	Staryj	vidču v,	ščo	vohkist’	od	lavky	projšla kriz’
	old man _{Nom}	felt	that	dampness <i>Nom</i>	from	bench _{Gen}	went through
	odežu	j	nepryjemno	xolodyla;	syhareta,	jaku	kuryv,
	clothes <i>Acc</i>	and	unpleasantly	chilled	cigarette _N <i>om</i>	which	smoked ₃ <i>Sg</i>

zdaľasj a	priloj u,	i	vin	vypľjunuv	nedopalk a.
seeme d	fusty _{In} st	and	he	spat	butt _{Acc-a}

‘The old man felt that the dampness from the bench went through his clothes and was making him unpleasantly chilly; the cigarette which he was smoking seemed fusty and he spat out the butt.’ (Ševčuk 1990: 11)

(29.1)	Naostanok, after all	odnače, however	vse ž nevertheles	obstežyly checked	rajkom district office _{Acc-Ø}	vdruhe; for the seco time
	nijakoho none	spec- special	čy or	prosto simply	bufeta buffet _{Gen}	ne not
	vyjavyly, found _{3Pl}	zate but	na on	stelažax shelves _{Loc}	u in	pidvali basement _{Lo} c
	nadybaly found	kupu pile _{Acc}	novisin’ky very new	brezentovy tarpaulin	rukavyc’ gloves _{Gen}	i and
	zelenu green	soldats’ku military	kasku helmet _{Acc}	iz with	stjobany quilted	pidšolomny under-helm
	(jiji it _{Acc})	naščos’ for some re	zatrofeji took	buv sob was self _{3s}	Oharok), Oharok _{Nom}	a na dodaču and in addition
	polotnjanyj linen	hromizdky heavy	kvadrat , square _{Acc-Ø}	obernenyj turned	do to	stiny... wall _{Gen}
	Kartyna painting _{Nom}	nu, what	cyrk! circus			

‘After all, however, they nevertheless checked the district committee for the second time; they didn’t find any special or regular buffet but, on the shelves in the

basement, they found a pile of new tarpaulin gloves and a green military helmet with a quilted under-helmet (for some reason, Oharok took it for himself), and, in addition to that, a heavy linen square turned to the wall...

“A painting, what a joke!”

(29.2)	Tak	daleko	do	El’ Hreko,	pohodyvs’	Oharok,
	yes	far	to	El Greco	looked	Oharok _{Nom}
	rozvernuvšy	kvadrata	tlom	do	takoho- sjakoho	svitla.
	having opened	square _{Acc-a}	facing	to	feeble	light _{Gen}
	i ne	Rubens!				
	and not	Rubens				

“Yes... it’s far from El Greco,” agreed Oharok having opened up the square facing the feeble light. “And it is not Rubens!” (Nečerda 199: 25)

(30.1)	Zvyklo	zčvirknuv	mežy	kyrzjaky	sobi,	pidmorhnuv
	by habit	spat _{3Sg}	between	boots _{Acc}	self	winked _{3Sg}
	jaskravij	gavi,	ščo	pišodrala,	bulo,	trotuárom
	bright	crow _{Dat}	that	walked	was	sidewalk _{Inst}
	blukala	nepodalik,	ta j	odzadkuvav	na	cilyj
	wandered	nearby	and	backtracked _{3Sg}	for	entire
	kvartal.	Potomu	zvernuv	na	paralel’nu,	vyšče,
	block _{Acc-Ø}	then	turned _{3Sg}	on	parallel	above
	vulycju...					
	street _{Acc}					

‘By habit, he spat between his boots, winked to the bright crow that was walking and was wandering nearby on the sidewalk, and he backtracked for an entire block. Then he turned to the parallel street above ...’

(30.2)	Popidstinnju	(cjoho razu	vpravniše,	snuvkiše)	zdolav	kvartala,
	along walls	this time	more skillfully	scurrying	conquered _{3Sg}	block _{Acc-a}
	rivnyj	za	dovžynoju	ščojno	zhajanomu	na
	same	in	length _{Inst}	just	passed _{DatMasc}	on
	Puškins'kij...					
	Pushkin street _{Loc}					

‘Along the buildings (this time more skillfully, scurrying) he conquered a block the same in length to the one he just passed on Pushkin street...’ (Nečerda 1995: 55)

(31)	a) Natalka	(a) nalyla (b) *nalyla	čajnyka čajnyk	j	postavyla	na
	Natalka _{Nom}	pour _{past}	teakettle _{Acc-a/*Acc-Ø}	and	place _{past}	on
	haz.					
	gas _{Acc}					

‘Natalka poured the teakettle and placed it on the gas.’ (Ševčuk 1990: 18)

In (27), the object displaying both $-\emptyset$ and $-a$ marking is *špryc* ‘syringe’. In (27.1), the participant only finds the syringe without performing any further actions on it. On the contrary, in (27.2), the participant performs the blood test and ‘fills the entire syringe with blood’. Hence, the object in (27.2) is more affected than in (27.1), and the higher Transitivity level in (27.2) occurs as $-a$ marking on the object. Example 27.2 displays another $-a$ accusative object, *ukol* ‘an injection’. Even though this object scores low with respect to the Individuation properties (semiconcrete or semiabstract), its governing verb raises the level of Transitivity as it is both punctual and volitional (see the discussion of punctuality and volitionality below). In example 28, the object is *nedopalok* ‘a candlestub’. In (28.1), the participant finds a candlestub, and in

(28.2) with similar object, the participant spits out a [cigarette] butt. At first glance neither object is affected; however, in (28.1) the affectedness is overt with respect to the candle, and not on ‘a candlestub’, suggesting lower Transitivity in (28.1) with the -Ø marking than in (28.2) with the object marked with -a. Example 29 is another example in which a given object is marked differently. In (29.1), participants find the object *kvadrat*, which refers to a painting. Note that the participants in (29.1) were searching for various things, but not specifically for the painting; that is, they found the painting without any specific effort directed toward the painting itself; their actions were not purposeful or volitional with respect to the painting. However, later in the passage, in (29.2), due to their curiosity, and now intentionally and volitionally, they unrolled the painting. The affectedness of the object is seen in (29.2), and the -a marking on the object signals a higher degree of Transitivity in (29.2) than in (29.1). In (30), the object under consideration is *kvartal*. In the first example, (30.1), the participant simply states that he backtracked one block; the object ‘block’ is not affected, as the accusative prepositional phrase denotes distance. By contrast, in (30.2), the speaker marks the object with -a to denote object affectedness and the higher level of Transitivity; in (30.2), the participant ‘conquered the block’ (note also that in 30.1 only one NP is present, whereas in 30.2 there are two NPs; see below how the number of NPs affects the level of Transitivity and object marking). Finally, example 31, presented alone, is a case of full object affectedness. Utterance carries the meaning of ‘filling the teakettle to the top’ and it implies ‘with water’ (note that the verb ‘to pour’ in Ukrainian governs the accusative; genitive is allowed only if partitive). Variant 31b is inadmissible; the only way it could be uttered is if one adds some specifications such as *nalyty čajnyk vody* ‘to pour a teakettle full of water’ or *nalyty vody v čajnyk* ‘to pour water into the kettle’. Evidently, examples 27-31 present cases in which object affectedness along with, in some cases, purposiveness and volitionality of an action influence the degree of utterance Transitivity which, in turn, is signaled by the marking on the accusative object.

Punctuality is another component of an utterance closely related to object affectedness which contributes to the level of Transitivity. According to Hopper and Thompson (1980: 252), “actions carried out with no obvious transitional phase between inception and completion have a more marked effect

on their patients than actions which are inherently on-going.” The effects of punctuality on object marking is seen in example 32:

(32.1)	V	rukax	Axim	trymav	knyžku	v zolotystij paliturci,
	in	hands _{Loc}	Axim _{Nom}	held	book _{Acc}	in golden cover _{Loc}
	arkuši	synjuvatoho	paperu	j	olivec’.	
	sheets _{Acc}	kind of blue	paper _{Gen}	and	pencil _{Acc-Ø}	

‘In his hands Axim was holding a book in a golden cover, sheets of a kind of blue paper and a pencil’. (Javors’kyj 1998: 45)

32.2	Raptom	u	povitri	des’	za	rojalem
	suddenly	in	air _{Loc}	somewhere	behind	piano _{Inst}
	zabryniv	čarivnyj	naspiv,	i	v	cju
	rang out	charming	melody _{Nom}	and	in	this
	ž	myt’	anhelyk	zjavyvsja.	Ta	ne vstyh
	very	moment	angel _{NomDim}	appeared	but	not managed _{3Sg}
	Avesalom	sxopyty	olivecja 13	j	zapysaty	kil’ka
	Avesalom _{Nom}	catch _{Inf}	pencil _{Acc-a}	and	write down _{Inf}	few
	not,	jak	anhelyk	znyk.		
	notes _{Gen}	as	angel _{NomDim}	disappeared _{3Sg}		

‘Suddenly, in the air somewhere behind the piano, a charming melody rang out, and at the very same moment a little angel appeared. However, Avesalom couldn’t even catch a pencil and write a few notes down as the little angel disappeared’. (Javors’kyj 1998: 30)

In example 32.1, the participant is holding various things, among which is *olivec’* ‘pencil’. The action in this example is ongoing and nonpunctual, suggesting a low level of Transitivity. On the contrary, in (32.2), the action

carries the sense of completion with a more marked effect on the object (even though the completion doesn't occur), indicating the higher degree of utterance Transitivity which occurs overtly on the object.

The number of arguments in an utterance may also affect the degree of Transitivity; that is, Transitivity is higher if two or more arguments are present, and lower in utterances with only one argument. According to Hopper and Thompson, reflexives “in many languages have properties which can be explained by appealing to their intermediate status between one-argument and two-argument clauses: compared with one-argument clauses, they may be more Transitive . . . ; compared with two-argument clauses, they typically display features associated with lower Transitivity” (1980: 277).¹⁴ In addition, they note that clauses which lack a second participant may still be Transitive since Transitivity is not a dichotomy, but rather, a continuum, suggesting that “clauses lacking an overt O[bject] must be locatable somewhere on this continuum: but it does not necessarily follow that such clauses are situated at the extreme intransitive end” (266). These claims are supported by the following Ukrainian data:

(33)

I	xoč	skil'ky	baba	molylasja	u
and	no matter	how much	old lady _{Nom}	prayed _{3sg}	in
porožnij,	kutok	ne	mynulo	j	pivroku,
empty	corner _{Acc-∅}	not	passed	even	half a year
jak	Piskarjovy	pereselylysja	na	rih	Volodymyrs'koji
as	Piskarovs _{Nom}	moved _{3pl}	on	corner _{Acc-∅}	Volodymyrs'ka _{Gen}
j	Proriznoji.				
and	Prorizna _{Gen}				

‘And no matter how much the old lady prayed in the direction of the empty corner, not even a half a year had passed as the Piskarjovs moved to the corner of Volodymyrs'ka and Prorizna.’ (Uljanenko 1994: 31)

(34)	baba Piskarenčyxa old lady Piskarenčyxa _{Nom}	prolepetala babbled _{3Sg}	“svjat-svjat” dear God	i and	perexrestylasja crossed _{3Sg}	v in
	porožnij empty	kut. corner _{Acc-Ø}				

‘...the old Piskarenčyxa lady babbled “Dear God” and crossed herself in the direction of an empty corner’. (Uljanenko 1994: 31)

(35)	Baba Piskuryxa old lady Piskuryxa _{Nom}	prohovoryla said aloud _{3Sg}	svoje her	“svjat-svjat”, dear God	poklala laid _{3Sg}	xresty crosses _{Acc}
	na on	porožnjoho empty	kuta. corner _{Acc-a}			

‘The old Piskuryxa lady said aloud her “Dear God” and laid crosses in an empty corner’. (Uljanenko 1994: 35)

(36)	Dovho long	toj that	Sultaniška Sultan _{NomDim}	zahanjav was pinning _{3Sg}	mene I _{Acc}	v in
	kutka, corner _{Acc-a}	usix all _{Acc}	mojix my _{AccPl}	prybrav... got _{3Sg}	– stukač snitch _{Nom}	stukačom... snitch _{Inst}

‘For a long time that little Sultan was pinning me into the corner, he got all of my friends... “What a snitch...”’ (Uljanenko 1994: 72)

In reflexives (33) and (34), the direct object is lacking and no transfer of an action into the object takes place; thus the Transitivity level of both is low. In (35) and (36), by contrast, two participants are present, that is, both the agent and the object, suggesting a transfer of action and a higher Transitivity level, signaled by the marking -a on the accusative object of the preposition (cf. also 24).

Interestingly, the lexical-semantic groupings of masculine inanimates allowing the -a ending, presented in earlier hypotheses, may be successfully placed and explained within the Transitivity theory. For instance, it was claimed (Mindak 1990: 63-64) that the brand names of cars, currencies, names of mushrooms, dances, and card games allow accusative -a. According to object properties and Individuation level, brand names of cars and currencies are in the category of proper names and are highly Transitive (example 11.2 illustrates objects denoting currencies with -a marking). Names of mushrooms (as well as some trees and plants such as *dub/duba* ‘oak tree’, *klen/klena* ‘maple tree’; vegetables and fruits such as *burjak/burjaka* ‘beet’, *ohirok/ohirka* ‘cucumber’; and some food items such as *varenyk/varenyka* ‘dumpling’, *nalysnyk/nalysnyka* ‘crêpe’) are marked depending on the specificity of the object or the lack thereof. Consider (37):

(37.1)	Ja	znajšla	hryb.
	I	found	mushroom _{Acc-∅}

‘I found a mushroom’.

(37.2)	Ja	znajšla	hryba	(also: pidosyčnyka,	masljuka)
	I	found	mushroom _{Acc-a}	(aspens- mushroom _{Acc-a}	butter- mushroom _{Acc-a})

‘I found the (white) mushroom’. (aspens-mushroom, butter-mushroom)

Example 37.1 presents object *hryb* as a general object, not a particular type of mushroom. On the other hand, in example 37.2, the use of *hryba* carries the meaning *biloho hryba* ‘white mushroom’, which, in Ukrainian, is a specific type of mushroom, ‘boletus’, hence the marking is -a (similar for ‘aspens-mushroom’ and ‘butter-mushroom’). Regarding dances and card games, consider the following two sentences with different accusative marking:

(38.1)	Vony	ljubljat'	val's.	(brydž)
	they	like	waltz _{Acc-Ø}	(bridge _{Acc-Ø})

'They like the waltz'. (bridge)

(38.2)	Vony	tancjuvaly	val'sa	cilu	nič.	(hraly brydža)
	they	were dancing	waltz _{Acc-a}	entire	night	(were playing bridge _{Acc-a})

'They were dancing the waltz the entire night'. (were playing bridge)

In the first case, (38.1), the -Ø marking on the object signals low Transitivity, as the activity is ongoing and the level of agent participation in the event is low. By contrast, in (38.2), even though the action is ongoing, it is more concrete and agents are actively involved. In this example, an action brings to life a dance step or a game by executing it. Example 38.2 presents a creation-accusative, particularly high in Transitivity, suggesting a higher degree of Transitivity in (38.2) than in (38.1).¹⁵ Therefore, the Transitivity Hypothesis captures the case marking variation for nouns listed previously as belonging to a particular lexical-semantic class allowing accusative -a ending.

The analysis in sections 3.1 and 3.2 demonstrated that the accusative marking of masculine inanimate objects may be helpfully viewed in light of the Transitivity Hypothesis. The level of Transitivity is manifested morphosyntactically and is signaled by either the -Ø or by -a accusative ending on the object, indicating a low and high degree of Transitivity, respectively. The components of Transitivity relevant for the accusative marking are: object Individuation and affectedness, punctuality, volitionality, and the number of arguments. The discussion illustrated widely attested grammatical strategies for the accusative marking of objects with respect to the Transitivity scale. However, careful examination of the data raises doubts as to the full sufficiency of Transitivity alone. In several examples, which I present in subsequent sections, the level of Transitivity is either difficult to assess or has to be found beyond the sentence level. Thus far, I explained the morphosyntactic properties of the accusative object on the sentence level and showed in which types of

utterances either -Ø or -a marking are more likely to be found. Thus, the analysis above was for the most part structural, and did not provide any definite insights as to when one or the other ending is chosen by the speaker in a particular context. In the subsequent sections, I will add two other dimensions to the analysis, by asking how the morphosyntax of accusative objects relates to the levels of pragmatics and discourse.

4.0. The Role of Pragmatics and Discourse in Accusative Case Marking

4.1. Introduction

This section analyzes the different markers, -Ø vs. -a, of the same accusative case as consequences of pragmatic and discourse factors. The approach taken here contributes to a better understanding of the presence of ‘doublet’ markers of the same case, their functioning, the domains of their usage, and constraints regarding their choice. The analysis is based on the assumption that a given case marker carries not only a certain case meaning and performs a certain function, but also carries an additional meaning and function depending on the speaker’s intention to convey a particular message in a specific discourse environment.

In the foregoing discussion, I demonstrated that the accusative case marking strongly depends on grammatical features that influence the degree of utterance Transitivity. However, further analysis of the data will suggest that the Transitivity approach is useful only when an accusative object is not recurrent in the text; that is, it does not figure prominently in the discourse frame of the passage in which it occurs, as will be seen in examples in extended narrative later in this study. In such instances, the marking of the object may be determined on the sentence level based on object properties, verb features, and object affectedness. In instances where the same object appears as a recurring part of a particular discourse, the Transitivity Hypothesis usually falls short in elucidating the object case marking. Consider example 39, in which the object *harbuz* ‘pumpkin’ occurs three times in the accusative: twice with -a and one time with -Ø ending. According to the Transitivity Hypothesis, the markings in (39.3) and (39.4) should be the same, be they -Ø or -a (same object, perfective verbs, and thus the same level of Transitivity); however, the markings in these examples differ:16

- (39.1) ...pal'čyky tjahlysja do derevjanoji taci, de ležav rizanyj na skybky pečenyj *harbuz*. (13)
- (39.2) “Pryhoščajtesja”, —podala **harbuza**.
 Dyvyłasja, jak rozdratovano pohlynaje skybku... (*woman offers ‘pumpkin’ to her male guests; they are eating it; then her mother arrives*)
 “Z kym ce ty razmovljaješ?
 “Ni z kym, —zašarilasja i podyvyłas’ za porožnij stil. —Sydžu, čekaju tebe”.
- (39.3) Vid mamy vijnulo cerkvoju. Vona postavyla na stil košyk iz jablukamy.
 “Os’ vysvjatyla na Spasa, —rozvjazala xustku. —Ty spekla **harbuza**? i vyno, frukty... Mav xtos’ pryjty?”
 “Ni”, —movyla xolodno. (16) (*conversation continues; the young women thinks about her life*)
- (39.4) ...V tu nedilju znovu speču **harbuz**, zahadaju zahadky. (17)

39.1 ‘... fingers were drawn toward the wooden tray, where slices of *baked pumpkin* lay’.

39.2 “Help yourself,” she offered **the pumpkin**. She was looking how he, in irritation, was swallowing the slice...

“With whom are you speaking?”

“With no one.” She blushed and looked on an empty table. “I’m sitting and waiting for you.”

39.3 ‘The mother exuded the scent of church. She placed the basket of apples on the table. “Here, I blessed them for the holidays.” She untied her scarf. “Did you bake **a pumpkin**? And [I see] wine, and fruits... Was someone supposed to come?”

“No,” she replied stiffly.’

39.4 ‘...Next Sunday I’ll bake a **pumpkin** again and will pose riddles’.
(Danylenko 1997: 13-17)

In order to explain the object marking in (39), one must opt for a solution transcending sentence-level analysis. I contend that in (39), as well as in similar examples which will be discussed below, the choice of the accusative marking depends heavily on pragmatics and discourse; in particular, the Prototypical Discourse Situation (PDS), the speaker’s conceptualization of an event with respect to the hearer’s knowledge; the status of shared, metinformational knowledge; and discourse saliency of a particular utterance with respect to discourse frame and the topic of discourse.

4.2. Pragmatics and Discourse Model

The discourse/pragmatics aspect of my analysis proceeds from the assumption that the choice of a particular construction by a speaker is closely related to the question of how the speaker conceptualizes events and situations with respect both to a particular discourse and the real world in general. When choosing a particular construction, a “speaker codes a pragmatic contrast, i.e., . . . what mattered, from the speaker’s point of view in the given discourse context” (Givon 1982: 87). In addition, a speaker’s “decisions are also affected by the speaker/addressee relationship and by the pool of their knowledge assessed by the speaker as shared/non-shared” (Zaitseva 1994: 107). The framework I utilize in this study is based partially on Zaitseva’s study on speaker perspective in the grammar and lexicon (1995) and on her contribution to the Theory of Utterance (1994). She presents three interrelated linguistic levels (1994: 106-08).

1. Extralinguistic level (subjective, individual knowledge): the speaker’s actual knowledge of the event or experience to be narrated; the actual knowledge of the discourse situation in which the real individuals are engaged; the speaker’s conceptualization of the actual event/experience.

2. Prelinguistic level (objective, common knowledge): the knowledge of some Prototypical Situations associated with linguistic expressions.
3. Linguistic/semantic level (objective, common): the knowledge of the meaning of an individual lexical item (or other linguistic structure) constituted by the fixed set of the components of a Prototypical Situation [Semantic Invariants] and the characteristics of these components.

Zaitseva also distinguishes between “two statuses of knowledge: common, the property of all the members of a community, and individual, subjective” (106). Accepting this framework, a linguistic representation of particular information (‘coding’ in Zaitseva’s terms) may be characterized as “a process of the speaker’s mapping his/her subjective extralinguistic experience/knowledge (which also includes the speaker’s idea of the addressee’s state of knowledge) onto S[emantic] I[nvariant]s of some objectively existing code structure” (108-09).

The theoretical model applied, referred to as the Prototypical Discourse Situation Model (PDSM), rests on the premise that the choice of a particular construction depends strongly on the speaker’s conceptualization of events and situations with respect to a particular discourse (Prototypical Discourse Situation); the real world in general; and the status of shared, metainformational knowledge of both the speaker and the hearer. Within this model, it is claimed that the choice of a particular grammatical device constitutes the process of the speaker’s mapping his/her knowledge of the prototypical discourse situation onto the existing linguistic code. Moreover, the structure of the prototypical situation of discourse is such that “every utterance feeds the knowledge sets of both interlocutors (‘I hear what I say and you hear what I say and we both know we heard it’),” and “it is this status of the mutual awareness of the fact that the knowledge item is shared that blocks the acceptability of the contradictory characteristics of a linguistic form of an utterance” (Zaitseva 1994: 114). In other words, violation of the status of metainformational knowledge results in the unacceptability of a certain grammatical device in a particular context.

I expand the discourse dimension of the present model by incorporating notions related to discourse organization; in particular, the *topic of discourse*

and *discourse saliency*. The discourse topic organizes the information of a passage and “is determined by what, from some perspectives, seems the most important fact(s) of the story” (van Dijk 1981: 187). Furthermore, “the notion of ‘topic’ is clearly an intuitively satisfactory way of describing the unifying principle which makes one stretch of discourse ‘about’ something and the next stretch ‘about’ something else” (Brown and Yule 1983: 69-70); in other words, a text segment may be viewed as a unit if it is on a particular ‘topic’. The term *discourse saliency* is partially adapted from Maria Manoliu-Manea (1994), according to whom, it refers to the amount of knowledge the speaker wants to activate by uttering a certain text (1994: 22). In addition, in the present framework, a construction is considered as marked by a high degree of discourse saliency if it pertains to the topic of discourse. The relation of discourse saliency to the knowledge activated in text underscores the close links between the pragmatic concepts of the speaker’s (and hearer’s) knowledge sets and notions based on the organization of discourse.

4.3. Prototypical Discourse Situation Model and Accusative Marking

This section applies the Prototypical Discourse Situation Model, incorporating the following pragmatic concepts: Prototypical Discourse Situation, the speaker’s conceptualization of the event, and the status of metinformational knowledge. I will focus primarily on the speaker’s construing the event against the background of the PDS in which accusative objects occur, examining the status of shared knowledge of both the speaker and the hearer, and mapping this knowledge onto the linguistic marking of accusative objects in the text.

Numerous examples from literature exhibit a particular masculine inanimate object in the accusative throughout a particular PDS a number of times and often with different markings, either -Ø or -a. Close examination of the data suggests that each of these examples occurs within a particular discourse structure; however, all may be brought under the same discourse organizational pattern, as represented in table 5.

Table 5: Accusative Marking Pattern

Place of the Object in PDS	Marking
1st mention	if Acc, -Ø marking; any case other than Acc; indirect reference
2nd mention (! participants being the same as in 1st mention)	if Acc, -a marking
last mention (! emphasis on the end of object participation in PDS)	if Acc, -Ø marking

This pattern is seen in example 39 above. In (39.1), at the very beginning of the story, *harbuz* in the nominative case occurs as a part of the description of the table. In (40.2), and (40.3) one finds two subsequent mentions of the object with *Acc-a* marking. The last mention of *harbuz* occurs at the end of the story, where the marking is -Ø.

To illustrate the pattern presented in table 5 further, consider the following set of examples:

(40.1) Moavita bula jedynym pasażyrom “Astry”. Vona sydila v tisnij kajuti... Moavita tulyla do sercja **synij konvertyk**, v jakomu zberihavsja purpurovyj metelyk iz zolotymy kružal’cjamy na kryl’cjax. Cjoho metelyka jij kupyv legioner Vuzcypilon u stolyci imperiji Sediolani pid čas jixnjoho ostannjoho pobačennja navesni mynuloho roku. Vuzcypiloniv podarunok buv dlja neji najdorožčoju relikvijeju, z jakoju vona nikoly ne rozlučalasja. V tremtinni suyx metelykovyx krylec’ vona vidučuvala byttja cercja svoho koxanoho...*(she is on her way to see him)*... (36)

two pages down:

(40.2) Rvučkyj podob vitru raptom vyxopyv iz Moavitynyx ruk **konvertyka** z metelykom i ponis joho po palubi.

(40.3) B hruđjax divčyny ten'knulo. Jij zďalosja, ščo zaraz vona os'-os' vtratyt' ščas' najdorožče, i Moavita striloju metnulasja lovyty **konvertyk**.

(40.4) ...Čerez sekundu ođyn iz snarjadiv vlučyv prosto v šljupku i, cilkovyto rozročyv jiji, znis u more, zaxopyvšy zi soboju Moavitu. Nixto na brygu ne bačyv, jak Moavitu naviky pohlynulu xvyli. (38)

40.1 'Moavita was the only passenger on the "Astra." She sat in a cramped cuddy... Moavita clutched to her heart **a blue envelope** in which was kept a purple butterfly with golden rings on the wings. Legionnaire Vuzcypilon bought this butterfly for her in the capital of the empire Sediolan during their last date in the spring of last year. Vuzcypilon's gift was her dearest relic which she always kept with her. In the trembling of the dry butterfly's wings she felt the heartbeat of her beloved.'

40.2 'A gusty burst of wind suddenly took **the envelope** with the butterfly from Moavita's hands and took it along the deck'.

40.3 'The young women felt her heart sink. It seemed to her that she was about to lose something most dear, and Moavita flew like a shot to catch **the envelope**'.

40.4 '...In a second, one of the bursts hit directly into the lifeboat, destroyed it completely and took it to sea, Moavita along with it. No one in the boat ever saw how the waves absorbed Moavita forever'. (Javors'kyj 1998: 36-38)

(41.1) Naostanok, odnače, vse ž obstežyly rajkom vdruhe; nijakoho spec-čy prosto bufeta ne vyjavyly, zate na stelažax u pidvali nadybaly kupu novisin'kyx brezentovyx rukavyc' i zelenu soldats'ku kasku iz stjobanym pidšolomnykom (jiji naščas' zatrofejiv buv sobi Oharok), a na dodaču — **polotnjanyj hromizdkyj kvadrat**, obernenyj do stiny...

—Kartyna...nu, cyrk!

(41.2) —Tak...daleko do El' Hreko, —pohodyvs' Oharok, rozvernuyšy **kvadrata** tlom do takoho-sjakoho svitla. —I ne Rubens!

(41.3) (*participants talk about the painting*)

41.1 'After all, however, they nevertheless checked the district committee for the second time; they didn't find any special or regular buffet but, on the shelves in the basement, they found a pile of new tarpaulin gloves and a green military helmet with a quilted under-helmet (for some reason, Oharok took it for himself), and, in addition to that, a **heavy linen square** turned to the wall...

'A painting... what a joke!'"

41.2 "'Yes... it's far from El Greco," agreed Oharok having opened up **the square** facing the feeble light. "And it is not Rubens!"' (Nečerda 1995: 25)

(42.1) Prypuščen' ne brakuvalo, v prote zijšlysja na dumci, ščo Junak dremenuv buv, ubojavšys' oružnyx ljudej, a *muzyku, samohrajku* svoju lyšyv umysne, lybon', jak platnju za postij.

Dosnidaly ponuro. Polkovnyk Bez obstežyv jixnje tyrlo pry stodoli...

(42.2) Po tomu, zhadavšy pro zatrofejenu kasetu, xutko povisyv **mahnitofona** sobi na šyju.(20)

(42.3) ...Zahublenu Junakom kasetu vin ne povernuv. Jiji vlasnyk, ušyvajučys', lyšaje **mahnitofona**. Umysno?... Prynajmi nesprosta.

(42.4) Polkovnyk Bez dobuv iz škirjanoho čoxla ošatno vynikeljovanu rič. To buv "*Panasonic*" ostannjoho vypusku...Ci mahnitofony, nezvažajučy na portatyvnist', maly nadzvyčajno čutlyvyj mikrofون.

- (42.5) Ruku mav netrepetnu, koly vmykav **“Panasonika”** j troxy odmotav buv navspak švydkoplynnu kasetu; vključyv vidtvorennja i... (21) (*they are listening to the tape*)
- (42.6) ...Dali jde perelik usjakyx detalej, —vymknuv **mahnitofona** Polkovnyk Bez. —Paxne smalenym. Ne prohady b. (26)
- (42.7) —A provokacijeju tobi ne paxne? —zironizuvav Netreba. —Može, vony tam, u centri, grandioznu jevrejs’ku ryzanyu namyslyly vlaštvaty! Ot i zamanjyut’ prostakiv u takyj sposib, —kyvnuv **na “Panasonik”**.
- (42.8) (*conversation about provocation*) (27)

42.1 ‘There was enough of suppositions; however, they agreed that Youngster had fled having feared the armed people, but his *self-playing music* he left on purpose, like a pay for the stay.

They finished their breakfast dejectedly. Colonel Bez examined their entrance hall near the threshing barn.’

42.2 ‘After that, having remembered about the captured cassette, [he] quickly hung **the tape player** on his neck.’

42.3 ‘...He did not return the tape lost by the Youngster. Its owner, fleeing, left **the tape player**. On purpose?.. Well, at least for some reason.’

42.4 ‘Colonel Bez got the neatly shined thing from the leather case. It was the newest model *“Panasonic”*... These tape players, regardless of their portability, had incredibly sensitive microphones’.

42.5 ‘His hand couldn’t wait when he was turning on **“the Panasonic”** and he rewound the fast moving tape a bit; he pushed play and...’

42.6 “...Then there is an enumeration of various details,” Colonel Bez turned off **the tape player**. “Something is not right. If only we don’t make a mistake.”

42.7 “Don’t you think it’s a provocation?” Netreba said ironically. “Maybe the powers that be decided to organize a grandiose Jewish massacre! And that’s why they are luring simpletons in such a way,” he nodded at **“the Panasonic”**. 17 (Nečerda 1995: 26-27)

(43.1) ... v cjomu parkanys’ku najšly vičmy čymali vorota, ščo buly trymalysja na blahen’komu, z drotu, *hačečku*...

(43.2) Tym časom za vorit’my pryhotuvannja, vydko, zaveršyls’, bo **hačka** probuvaly oberežno vyxytaty z kutka. (32)

...—Davaj! —skomanduvav Netreba.

(43.3) —Sam znaju... —Oharok ozyrnuvsja na myt’ i mumijnoju dolon’koju vysadyv **hačok** dohory. (33)

43.1 ‘...in this huge fence they found with their eyes quite a gate that was hanging on a *tiny wire hook*...’

43.2 ‘At the same time, behind the gate, it seemed that the preparation had finished because they were trying carefully to shake out **the hook** from the corner.

...“Come on!” ordered Netreba.’

43.3 “I know myself...” Oharok turned around for a second and with his little mummy-like palm forced **the hook** up’. (Nečerda 1995: 32-33)

(44.1) Čomu ce meni? Čom same ja?! —tak samo pošepky vyzviryvsvja Polkovnyk Bez. —On Harmatjukov... u njoho ž i xolodna zbroja majet'sja...

(44.2) —To j viz'my v njoho **kortyk!**

—Ta j ne vmiju ja... ne navčenyj, aby z samym nožem! —vidmahavsja Polkovnyk Bez.

(44.3) ... Harmatjukov oxoče protjahnuv zbroju, a Polkovnyk Bez taky vzjav, umyt' zbljakajučy bižučymy vrozlit, mjasatymy tymy zmorškamy na lobi; vyvažuvav na doloni **kortyk**; kolupavsja žalom pid nihtem i – zvolikavsja, bidkav. (32)

... (*a scene with a wild horse which the participants are trying to kill*)

(44.4) —Polkovnyku, maješ **kortyka** moho, porišy zvirynu!

—Ja tobi ne toreador!

—Ty bojahuz, Polkovnyku, – kryčyt' Harmatjukov...(34)

(44.5) ...Bojače probylos' očam vid neonu...; povoli rozlipljuvalys' pal'ci...; proces pryzyvčajennja do zabutoho svitla ne mynuv durno: zastrybaly, zauľjuljukaly, puskaly bul'ky... —tak nače zdytynily byly kodljaky, tak niby podosi ne vony trymaly za pazuxoju storožkoho kamenja, čy, jak Harmatjukov, **kortyka**...(58)

44.1 “‘Why me? Why only me?!’” the same way Colonel Bez growled, whispering. “‘There, Harmatjukov... he even has some cold steel...’”

44.2 “‘So, take **a dagger** from him!’”

“‘I can’t...I haven’t been taught with only a knife!’” Colonel Bez was trying to get away.’

44.3 ‘Harmatjukov willingly offered the weapon and Colonel Bez, nevertheless, took it suddenly withering with those meaty forehead wrinkles running different ways; he was weighing **the dagger** on his palm and picking with an edge under his nail and he was lingering, grumbling.’

44.4 “Colonel, you have **my dagger**, finish the animal!”

“I’m not a toreador!”

“You are a coward, Colonel,” Harmatjukov screams...

44.5 ‘...It was painful for the eyes from the neon...; fingers slowly began to move...; the process of getting used to the forgotten light did not pass without a trace: they started to jump, lullaby and make bubbles... –it looked like the brats turned into kids again as if not their hearts held burdens, or as Harmatjukov **the dagger**...’ (Nečerda 1995: 32-58)

Example 40 displays the accusative of *konvertyk* ‘envelope’ with -Ø marking in (40.1) and (40.3); *Acc-a* is found in (40.2). In (40.1), the object is introduced for the first time (-Ø marking); in (40.2), the object is known to the hearer and thus the marking is -a, and, finally, in (40.3), the last mention of the object occurs with the -Ø. Example 29, repeated here as (41) for convenience, is similar. In this passage, the first mention of *kvadrat* ‘square’ (=‘painting’) in (41.1) exhibits -Ø marking, whereas the second reference, in (41.2), displays -a. The third phase of the pattern is not overt here, as there is no final mention of *kvadrat*; it is known, however, that the participants continue discussing the painting while using the feminine noun *kartyna* ‘painting’ instead of *kvadrat* ‘square’. In example 42, the object is ‘the tape player’, and the first mention of it is found in (42.1) as *muzyka samohrajka* ‘self playing music’. In both (42.2) and (42.3), the next mention of it is marked with -a. In (42.5), the speaker refers to the tape player by the brand name “*Panasonik*” and marks it with -a because it is known from (42.4) and the conversation continues about the same object

as before. The speaker continues to mark the object with -a in (42.6); the object is known again. Finally, in (42.7), the accusative object of the preposition is marked with -Ø as the conversation changes and the object ceases to participate further in the context. In (43), the object *hačočok* ‘little hook’ is mentioned for the first time in (43.1) and occurs in prepositional case. The next mention of *hačok*, in (43.2), is in accusative and is marked with -a. The last activity performed on the object *hačok* ‘hook’ is signaled with the -Ø marking in (43.3). Example 44 is interesting in two respects: first, it still follows the pattern proposed in table 5, and second, it provides evidence for the fact that the choice of marking follows the pattern if the same participants are involved in activities engaging the object. Example 44.2 presents the object *kortyk* ‘dagger’ for the first time; however, from (44.1), it is known that the participant *Harmatjukov* has it. The next mention of the object is found in (44.3); however the object is still marked with -Ø. This marking is due to the fact that, unlike in (44.1) and (44.2), the *kortyk* in (44.3) belongs to a different participant, *Polkovnyk Bez*, and in his possession it is mentioned for the first time; hence the -Ø marking. Segment (44.4) presents a second mention of the *kortyk* in *Polkovnyk Bez*’s possession, and thus is marked with -a. In the second mention of *kortyk* as *Harmatjukov*’s possession, it is marked with -a, as in (44.5). There is no emphasis in the text on the end of the *kortyk*’s participation; therefore, the third phase of the pattern is absent.

Examples 39-44 seem to present a compelling confirmation of claims made in table 5. The patterning of object marking in these examples, widely confirmed by text counts, suggests that there is a clear organized conceptualization the event on the part of the speaker. When the PDS includes activities performed around a particular object and the object is uttered more than one time throughout lengthy parts of a text, the speaker construes the event against the background of the entire PDS, taking into consideration the hearer’s set of knowledge. Based on the data collected, it may be assumed that the speaker, in conceptualizing the event containing multiple participations of an object, structures the linguistic expression (or coding) of this event according to the pattern presented in table 5. This suggests that the pattern may be regarded as a particular structure of linguistic expressions associated with the knowledge of PDS involving multiple participation of a masculine

inanimate object. This means that the speaker introducing the object for the first time marks it with $-\emptyset$ if accusative is the case, which in turn is accepted by the hearer, as it constitutes the shared knowledge of the code. Further, in the next mention of the object in accusative, the speaker chooses the $-a$ marker for masculine inanimates to signal the fact that the object is known, shared, and still belongs to the domain of activities performed by the same participants as in the first mention. Finally, the last phase of the pattern occurs only if the speaker wants to activate the knowledge about the object as ending its participation in the context (clearly, this phase is not obligatory). Deviation from this pattern violates the metinformatinal status of knowledge of both interlocutors, thus creating an unacceptable linguistic form of utterance.¹⁸ With this in mind, let me return to examples 40-44 and 39.

In example 40, the PDS is “participant Moavita’s trip to her beloved.” The object *konvertyk* is an important part of this PDS; it is a gift to Moavita from her beloved. In (40.1), the speaker introduces the object, and the *konvertyk* along with its details enters the set of shared knowledge of both the speaker and the hearer. By uttering *konvertyk* with an $-a$ ending in (40.2) (note that this mention is two pages after 40.1 the speaker signals the reference to the same object as in (40.1)). The choice of the $-\emptyset$ ending would signal the fact that the object in (40.2) is different from the one in (40.1), which would violate the status of metinformatinal knowledge. In (40.3), the speaker informs the hearer of the fact that the *konvertyk* may be lost and then signals the end of *konvertyk*’s participation in PDS by the $-\emptyset$ accusative ending. The following segment 40.4 informs the hearer of Moavita’s death. The choice of the $-a$ marker in (40.3) would violate the status of metinformatinal knowledge, producing an unacceptable construction: with the $-a$ marker, the information entering the hearer’s set would be “Moavita will catch the envelope and she will continue her trip carrying her beloved’s gift.”

In example 41, the PDS is the “participants’ searching and finding things in the region district building.” One of the objects found is *kvadrat* ‘square’. This object is introduced by the speaker in (41.1) and is unknown to both the speaker and the hearer. Prior to (41.2), the information about *kvadrat* as ‘a painting’ enters the set of shared knowledge of both the speaker and the hearer. Because of the fact that *kvadrat* in (41.2) refers to the same object as in

(41.1), it is marked with -a; that is, in (41.2), *kvadrat*, as ‘a painting’, is known to both the speaker and the hearer.

The PDS of example 42 is the “participants’ conversation about their captive who fled, leaving behind his tape player.” In (42.1), the speaker utters the information about the tape player as ‘self-playing music’. In (42.2), based on the fact that the information about the object *mahnitofon* is shared (the captive left it behind), the case marking is -a. Similarly in (42.3), the reference is still to the tape player that was abandoned by the captive; hence the -a marking. Further in the conversation, in (42.4), the speaker refers to the tape player by the brand name, “*Panasonik*,” and in (42.5), in the next reference to the object, “*Panasonik*” is marked with -a as it is known to both the speaker and the hearer. The object is marked again with -a in the next segment, (42.6), and both the speaker and the hearer share information that the conversation is still about the same object. The choice of -Ø marking in (42.2)-(42.6) would violate the status of metainformational knowledge; a -Ø ending would signal a reference to a different object. In the last segment of this passage, (42.7), the speaker utters a new set of information, the ‘possibility of provocation’, and “*Panasonik*” ends its participation in the PDS; the participants’ concerns turn elsewhere. Note that following (42.7), in (42.8), the participants are not engaged in any activities regarding the tape player but are concerned with the possibility of a provocation. Therefore, if the speaker were to mark the object with -a in (42.7), the hearer would expect the participants to continue their activities with the object; however, this would violate the status of shared knowledge of the PDS, and thus the -a marking in (42.7) is blocked.

In (43), the PDS is the “participants’ attempts to open the gates which were locked with a hook.” In (43.2), the speaker marks the object *hačok* with -a as the information about this object is known and shared based on the prior segment (43.1); a -Ø marking would cut the links between objects in (43.2) and (43.1), violating the status of metainformational knowledge. In (43.3), the speaker informs the hearer about the last activity performed on the object; the -Ø coding signals to both interlocutors that *hačok* has ended its participation in the PDS.

Example 44 needs to be divided with respect to PDSs. The PDS of (44.1)-(44.4) is the “participants’ attempt to convince Polkovnyk Bez to take the dagger and kill the wild horse with it.” Segment (44.5) represents the

speaker's commenting on the situation in which the participants of the story are in a dark place. At the beginning of passage 44, in (44.1), the speaker introduces to the hearer the fact that participant Harmatjukov is the one who has some cold steel. In the next segment, the object *kortyk* 'dagger' is introduced, entering the shared knowledge as the object belonging to Harmatjukov. Only a -Ø ending is allowed here because the object enters the interlocutors' sets of knowledge as an unknown. In (44.3), the speaker introduces *kortyk* again, marking it with -Ø. By this marking the speaker signals to the hearer that something is different between the *kortyk* in (44.3) and (44.2); in fact, in (44.3), Polkovnyk Bez and not Harmatjukov has the object. This means that prior to (44.4), both the speaker and the hearer share the information that the *kortyk* used to belong to Harmatjukov, but now it is in Polkovnyk Bez's possession. The speaker marks *kortyk* in (44.4) with -a, as Polkovnyk Bez still has it. A -Ø ending in this segment could have resulted in the following: either it would violate the status of shared knowledge, based on the knowledge of the discourse situation, or produce a different meaning, violating the status of metinformational knowledge. The sentence with the -Ø accusative, *Polkovnyku, maješ kortyk mij*, could be translated as 'Colonel, you can have the dagger' and not 'Colonel, you have the dagger'. Therefore, the marking -a in (44.4) relies strongly on the interlocutors' knowledge of the PDS. The last segment of (44), (44.5), is a statement made at the end of the story. Prior to this statement, throughout the entire story, the shared knowledge is that *kortyk* remains in Harmatjukov's possession and it is an important part of him and his description throughout the story, and the *Acc-a* is the choice.

A similar analysis applies to example 39 with the object *harbuz* 'pumpkin'. The speaker and the hearer share the information that the object *harbuz* is the same in (39.1)-(39.3), as the events are taking place in the course of a single day. The *Acc-a* marking on the object in (39.2) and (39.3) is based on the fact that the object is known to both the speaker and the hearer earlier, in (39.1). A -Ø marking is precluded in (39.2) and (39.3) because it would signal a reference to some other *harbuz*. However, in (39.4), the marking is, in fact, -Ø, signaling the end of object's participation in the PDS, and of no reference to the previous mention of *harbuz* in (39.4).

This analysis demonstrates that inanimate masculine object marking is not random or haphazard. The speaker, in conceptualizing the event within a

particular PDS that contains multiple participations of a particular object, maps his/her knowledge of the discourse situation to the specific linguistic expression. It is important that this mapping is performed along with the speaker's assessment of the hearer's knowledge sets in order to preclude the violation of metinformational status of knowledge.

In the discussion of the pattern of masculine inanimate object marking, I mentioned that during the second phase, that is, when the object enters the interlocutors' sets of knowledge as a known quantity, the object may appear in the discourse multiple times. The marking of the object in this phase, if accusative, was shown to be -a; however, -Ø is found also (examples are presented in the next section). This suggests that the second phase of the larger PDS has its own structure and that pragmatic features alone, such as the PDS and the status of metinformational knowledge, are not sufficient to explain every instance of accusative marking; in particular, the occurrence of -Ø marking during the second phase in which the object enters as an entity known to both interlocutors. In such instances, discourse analysis must be considered.

4.4. Discourse Analysis of the Accusative Marking

This section analyzes the choice of case marking from the perspective of discourse, further providing evidence for a "systematic correlation between message and code" (Givon 1983: 15). It shows that the relationship between the PDS and discourse notions such as discourse topic and discourse saliency are prominent in the speaker's assignment of coding to a particular construction (see section 4.2). In this analysis, a construction is marked with a high degree of discourse saliency if it pertains to the topic of discourse and is an important part of the PDS.

A detailed analysis of the data provides extensive confirmation of the fact that the choice of case marking for masculine inanimates in the accusative case is an indicator of the speaker's organization of discourse. Speakers relate their knowledge to the PDS as a whole and to how the object fits into the PDS. The examples discussed suggest that the choice of case marking signals the degree of discourse saliency of a particular object in a particular construction, as well as the relationship of a particular object to the topic of discourse. Consider example 45:

- (45.1) Nedoladno dovhopole pal'to nahori vidrazu ž uvinčuvalosja čornym i zavelykym, jak na njoho, *kapeljuxom* iz považnymy krysamy, tož Oharok u cim odinni mymovoli skydavs' na ljudynu-nevydymku... (9)
- (45.2) Harmatjukov odšukav u snihu j prynis Oharkovi ščelepu, obrusyv **kapeljuxa** i takož podav u sami ruky. (14)
- (45.3) ...Oharok skynuv **kapeljux** i vdjačno vklonyvsja Šumerovyču. (18)
- (45.4) ...Oharok, aby spovna vdity svoho vatažka, navit' **kapeljuxa** do kraju zsunuv—obiruč try mav joho pozad timeni—i buv to jak čornyj nimb. (20)
- (45.5) ...[Oharok] Oščadlyvo, krysamy dohory, vstanovyv na snihu **kapeljux**, ubravsja v trofejnoho soldats'koho šoloma,¹⁹ jakomoha zručniše prypasuvav remin'čyka pid žmen'koju zolotyx sijanciv i rivnoju stupoju rušyv do vorit... (32)

45.1 'The awkward long-skirted coat was crowned immediately on top with a *black hat*, oversized for him, with a serious brim, so in this outfit Oharok involuntarily looked like an invisible being...'

45.2 'Harmatjukov found the jaw in the snow and brought it to Oharok, shook the **hat** and also gave it to him into his hands.'

45.3 '... Oharok took off the **hat** and thankfully bowed to Shumerovych.'

45.4 '...Oharok, in order to trick his headman even slid his **hat** to the edge—holding it with both hands behind the top of his head—And he looked like a black nimbus.'

45.5 ...[Oharok] protectively installed his **hat** with the brim up on the snow, put on the captured military helmet, as comfortably as he could

he fastened his belt under the handful of golden seedlings and set out toward the gate with a steady step'. (Nečerda 1995: 9-32)

In general, the structure of (45) fits the pattern of table 5: the introduction of the object *kapeljux* is found in (45.1); the next references with *Acc-a* occur in (45.2) and (45.4). And the last reference, in which the participant exchanges his hat for a helmet, is found in (45.5) with the $-\emptyset$ marking. The problem is, however, with the marking of *kapeljux* in (45.3): the object is known to both the speaker and the hearer, and based on the status of metainformational knowledge, the expected marking is *-a*, not $-\emptyset$. Nonetheless, $-\emptyset$ is the choice here. This problem may be solved if discourse analysis is applied. The topic of discourse in which *kapeljux* figures prominently is structured around “events happening with Oharok and how they affect his appearance.” All segments of (45), except (45.3), are related to Oharok’s appearance: in (45.1), the speaker overtly describes how Oharok looks in his clothes (of which the *kapeljux* is a part), in (45.2), Oharok’s friend is handing him his hat in order to restore his previous appearance; in (45.4), Oharok, having pushed back his hat, looks like a ‘black nimbus’, and finally in (45.5), he decides to change his look by switching his headpiece from a hat to a helmet. By contrast, segment (45.3) does not comment in any way on Oharok’s appearance; the speaker conveys the message that Oharok is greeting another participant of the passage. This suggests that construction 45.3 falls outside of the main discourse frame in which the object *kapeljux* occurs as a part of Oharok’s description, and it constitutes the signal of the low discourse saliency of (45.3). In fact, the speaker, by marking this segment with $-\emptyset$, signals the switch from the main discourse frame. A similar situation in which object case marking signals a switch from the main discourse frame is found in example 46:

(46.1) (*Roman rides his boat frequently*)... i vin ryzyknuv provesty **čovna** jakraz popid kuščem—musyv doklasty zusyl’, ščob joho ob toj kušč ne vdarylo. Ljuba sxopylasja za štaxetyny parkana i stežyla za joho vybrykamy...

- (46.2) Može, tomu vin znvou vyrvavsja na seredynu tečiji, postavyv **čovna** do švydu j pustyv joho vnyz, led'-led' torkajučys' veslamy vody,
- (46.3) ščob **čovn** ne zakrutylo. ...
- (46.4) V cej čas joho huknuv iz bereha Malyj, i Roman pidjixav, ščob uzjaty brata... (*they decide to gather some firewood*). Nezabarom zaklaly **čovna** haluzzjam tak, ščo ne bačyly odyn odnoho...

46.1 '...And he took a chance to steer **his boat** right under the bush—he had to add some extra force so that he wouldn't hit the bush. Ljuba held the fence poles and watched his tricks...'

46.2 'Maybe that's why he drove to the middle of the current, placed **his boat** with the current and let it go down, barely touching the water with the oars,'

46.3 'so **the boat** would not be spun about...'

46.4 'At that time Malyj called him from the shore, and Roman approached to take his brother along... Soon after they filled **the boat** with branches so high that they couldn't see each other...' (Ševčuk 1990: 56)

Example 46 presents a case with object *čovn* 'boat' marked with both -a and -Ø, and as in (45), it follows the pattern of table 5. Prior to (46.1), the speaker introduces the object by uttering the information about the participant riding his boat. Therefore, in (46.1), the object is already known, and this is signaled by -a marking. Similarly in (46.2) and (46.4), the choice is -a because the object is known to both interlocutors. However, in (46.3), the object is marked with -Ø despite the fact that *čovn* is known to both the speaker and the hearer and participates further in the discourse following this segment. Consequently, the case marking here does not solely depend on pragmatics, but also on discourse factors. The discourse topic of (46) is the "participant's ride in the boat," and

the boat functions as an object around which the participant's activities are structured. First, the participant steers his boat in (46.1), then, in (46.2), lets his boat go with the current, and finally, in (46.4), the participant and his brother fill the boat with branches. In all three segments, the speaker activates knowledge about the participant's activities on the boat, suggesting the discourse saliency of this information and its core place in the discourse frame. By contrast, segment 46.3 falls outside the main discourse frame. The information uttered in (46.3) is not about the participant's activities in the boat; the speaker only comments here on the participant's reason for placing the boat in a particular position so that the boat would not be spun about. Accordingly, segment 46.3 is not discourse salient as it neither pertains to the main discourse frame nor belongs to the discourse topic of (46). The -Ø marking on the object in (46) is an indicator of a switch from the main discourse frame on the part of the speaker. To illustrate further the importance of case marking on the object as a sign of a switch from the main discourse frame, consider example 47:

(47.1) —Žinoče “ljubyt’, ne ljubyt’” ščos’ take, čoho j ne rozbereš, —skazav Didenko.—Aby vona vid nas ne pišla. Požuj *lavrovoho lystka*, onde v korobci.

(47.2) Syn ne perečyv. Roztyrav zubamy **suxoho lystka** i dyvyvsja na bat’ka tymy ž kruhlymy očenjatamy.

(47.3) —Naviščo ty joho tut trymaješ? —spytav.

—Koho?

—Ta ž **lavrovyj lyst**.

—Dlja tebe. (*father and son are still sitting and talking*)

(47.4) ... Borys movčav. Cmokav, smokčučy **lavrovoho lystka**, i dyvyvsja u rozčynene vikno. (*conversation continues*)

(47.5) ...Borys movčav. Smoktav **rozzhovanyj lavrovyj lystok**, i Didenko vid toho až dratuvatysja stav.

—Ty vajlo i šmata!—skazav vin.

47.1 ““A woman’s ‘love, don’t love’ is something that is not understandable,” said Didenko. “As long as she doesn’t leave us. Chew *the bay leaf* a bit, it’s there in the box””.

47.2 ‘The son did not argue. He was rubbing **the dry leaf** with his teeth and was looking at his father with those same round little eyes’.

47.3 ““Why do you keep it here?” he asked.

“Who?”

“**Bay leaf**, what else.”

“For you””.

47.4 ‘... Borys was quiet. He was smacking his lips, chewing **the bay leaf** and looking at the open window.’

47.5 ‘... Borys was quiet. He was sucking on the chewed **bay leaf**, and Didenko became irritated by this.

“You are a lout and a ne’er-do-well!” he said’. (Ševčuk 1990: 24)

Analogously to both (45) and (46), passage 47 follows the pattern of table 5. The object under consideration here is *lavrovyj lystok* ‘bay leaf’. The first mention of the object is found in (47.1); note that the case here is not accusative, but genitive of limited time (the meaning here is ‘chew for a short while’ signaled by the verb prefix *po-*). The next occurrence of the object as known, and hence with -a marking, is in (47.2) in which the son chews the bay leaf. This activity continues in (47.4) and the object is still marked as known with the -a. In (47.5), the participant still chews the bay leaf; however, by choosing

the -Ø ending the speaker signals the end of object participation in the PDS (*lavrovyy lystok* does not occur in the text following 47.5). The -Ø ending also occurs in (47.3), in this case signaling not the end of object participation in PDS, as in (47.5), but a switch from the main discourse frame. The topic of discourse of (47) is a “father and son’s conversation during which the son chews the bay leaf”; that is, ‘the bay leaf’ is the object of the son’s chewing. In this function the object occurs throughout the entire passage 47 except (47.3). In (47.3), the son asks his father why he keeps bay leaf in the room. Here, the son does not reference the particular bay leaves being chewed (the object of the PDS); rather, he is simply asking why, in general, the father keeps bay leaf in the room. Therefore, this mention of *lavrovyy lyst* functions in the background of the PDS and is not discourse salient. Consequently, segments (47.1), (47.2), (47.4), and (47.5) are discourse salient and belong to the main discourse frame; accordingly, the object marking conforms to the pattern of table 5 (known objects are marked with -a, -Ø signals the end of object participation in PDS).

Examples 45-47 present instances in which both -Ø and -a markings occur on the same object. Discourse salient segments in these examples are marked according to the pattern of table 5 as they belong to the main discourse frame. Segments that fall outside of the main discourse frame are marked with -Ø.

It would, however, be an oversimplification to state that the only means to signal a switch in the main discourse frame is with a switch from the -a marking to a -Ø marking. In instances in which there is a low discourse Transitivity, the signal of the shift away from the main discourse frame is a switch to the -a marking. Example 48 shows the retention of the -Ø marking throughout the main discourse frame.

(48.1) Ivan Hundjak na prizvys’ko Bičunoza **čuxaje svij nis...** (*about the teacher*)

(48.2) Bičunoza dali *čuxajet’sja*. (12)

(48.3) Ivan Hundjak na prizvys’ko Bičunoza **perestaje čuxaty nosa** i zapysuje datu. Mitov štovxaje joho stilec’. Bičunoza ne obertajet’sja. Vin

vyvodyt' čyso "1794" i zhaduje, ščo Halyna Sobol' žyve v devjanosto četvertij kvartyri. Jomu znovu sverbyt' *nis*. (14)

(48.4) Pislja nevelykoji pauzy Bičunoza **znovu počynaje čuxaty nis...**

(48.5) Vsi učni 9-A klasu na prizvyšče Hundjak (okrim Bičunozy) otrymujut' peršyj hradus posvjaty i mistyčnyj stupin' Učnja; Ivan Hundjak-Bičunoza *za napolehlyve čuxannja nosa* otrymuje druhyj hradus i stupin' Pidmajstra. (16)

(48.6) Bičunoza **znovu čuxaje nis**. (20)

48.1 'Ivan Hundjak by the nickname Bichunoza **is scratching his nose...**'

48.2 'Bichunoza *keeps scratching*'.

48.3 'Ivan Hundjak by the nickname Bichunoza **stops scratching his nose** and writes down the date. Mitov pushes his chair. Bichunoza doesn't turn around. He draws the number "1794" and remembers that Halyna Sobol' lives in the ninety-fourth apartment. His nose is itchy again'.

48.4 'After a short pause Bichunoza again **starts scratching his nose...**'

48.5 'All the pupils of class 9-A with the name Hundjak (except Bichunoza) earn the first title and the mystical degree of the Pupil; Ivan Hundjak-Bichunoza for his *persistent nose scratching* earns the second grade and the degree of the Apprentice'.

48.6 'Bichunoza again **scratches his nose**'. (Ješkilev 1996:12-20)

In example 48, which is a part of a general “class setting” PDS, the discourse topic is “Bichunoza’s nose-scratching throughout the entire class session.” Segments belonging to this main frame (the participant’s nose-scratching) are: (48.1) in which the participant is scratching his nose, (48.2) in which he continues scratching, (48.4) in which he begins scratching his nose again, (48.5) in which the participant gets special acknowledgment for his persistent scratching, and (48.6) in which he scratches his nose yet again. Among these segments, the ones containing accusative object marking, (48.1), (48.4), and (48.6), occur with the $-\emptyset$ ending. *Acc-a* is found only in (48.3) in which the participant stops scratching his nose (he doesn’t scratch), suggesting that in this example the *-a* marking signals the switch from the main discourse frame (he scratches). Therefore, in example 48, the speaker organizes discourse in such a way that objects are marked with $-\emptyset$ to represent the salient parts of discourse, whereas *Acc-a* indicates low discourse saliency and the switch from the main discourse frame. Consequently, in example 48, the speaker’s concern is not to signal the object as known or unknown (the common and shared knowledge of both the speaker and the hearer is that, throughout the entire context, the ‘nose’ is always Bichunoza’s; hence the $-\emptyset$ marking), but rather to signal a switch in the line of activities, with respect to the main discourse frame, happening to the object.

From the analysis above it follows that it would be incorrect to state that either the *-a* or $-\emptyset$ ending on the object marks the discourse saliency of a particular construction. Instead, what appears to be true is that the speaker, in conceptualizing an event and in structuring discourse, makes the decision about assigning a degree of discourse saliency to a particular construction and marks it depending on the structure of the PDS in general. Based on analyzed data and text counts, the following generalizations about the question as to when the speaker marks the salient objects with $-\emptyset$ and when with *-a* may be made:

- (i) *-a* marking on objects, in discourse salient segments, is found in instances when the object recurs in the context of PDS and is engaged in different activities, often sequential; the pattern of table 5 is followed. A switch from the main discourse frame, if present, is signaled by the $-\emptyset$ marking.

- (ii) -Ø marking on objects, in discourse salient segments, is found in instances when the object recurs iteratively, signaling a low degree of Transitivity; that is, when the object is engaged in the same, repeated activity throughout the PDS. A switch from the main discourse frame, if present, is signaled by the -a marking.

Claim (ii) was illustrated in example 48 and is also seen in (49) and (50):

(49.1) Tetjana Jurkivna dviči pidrjad dyvyt'sja **na hodynnyk**... (20)

(49.2) Tetjana Jurkivna dyvyt'sja **na hodynnyk**. (23)

49.1 'Tetjana Jurkivna looks **at (her) watch** twice in a row...'

49.2 'Tetjana Jurkivna looks **at the watch**'. (Ješkilev 1996: 20-23)

(50.1) Lidija natjahnula **trenuval'nyj kostjum**, zašnuruvala krosovky i pobihla robyty rankovu zarjadku. (46)

(50.2) Ščoranku Lidija prokydalas'... natjahuvala **trenuval'nyj kostjum** i jšla na "svij" sportmajdančyk. (51)

50.1 'Lidija put on her **workout suit**, laced her tennis shoes, and ran to do her morning exercise'.

50.2 'Every morning Lidija woke up...put on her **workout suit** and went to "her own" sports field'. (Hordasevyč 1990: 46-51)

The PDS of (49) is "a class setting" in which a teacher, the participant, is looking at her watch. The participant performs this action many times throughout the entire story. Each time, the object *hodynnyk* 'watch' is marked

with -Ø due to the iterative nature of the activity. No switch from the main discourse frame is present; thus no -a marking on the object occurs (note that *hodynyk* in accusative case allows both markings). Likewise, in example (50), with the PDS structured around “Lidija’s workout every morning,” the activity performed by the participant in both (50.1) and (50.2) is the same and is habitual (‘every morning Lidija wears her workout suit’). Therefore, the object *trenoval’nyj kostjum* is marked with -Ø in both segments. The marking -a does not occur here as there is no switch from the main discourse frame (note that *kostjum* allows both accusative markings).

The -Ø marking on objects in examples 48-50 may be explained by the low level of Transitivity of utterances in which these objects occur. This is based on the fact that utterances 48-50 with the -Ø marked objects function in discourse iteratively. In particular, it appears that iterativity is closely related to imperfectivity, repeatedness, the ongoing nature of an action, and partial transfer of an action onto the object with each occurrence of the utterance in text. Imperfectivity is understood here according to Hopper and Thompson (1980: 285-86) not simply as a characteristic of the predicate, but as a characteristic emerging in discourse.

The claim made in (i) was illustrated above by examples 45-47 and is further supported by examples discussed earlier, (39)-(44). In all these examples, the second mention of the object, entering the interlocutors’ pool of knowledge as known, is marked with -a if the object pertains to salient parts of discourse and is a part of the main discourse frame. In cases with known objects which do not belong to the main discourse frame, the object marking is -Ø. In addition, in these examples, the emphasis on the end of object participation in the PDS, if present, is marked with -Ø. This marking may be viewed from a discourse perspective as the marker of the switch in discourse topic. In (39), with the discourse topic “participant’s hosting of male friends and offering pumpkin to them,” the -Ø marking in the last segment, (39.4), signals a topic switch, “plans for next week.” Similarly, in (40), with the discourse topic “participant’s trip to her beloved carrying his gift,” the switch in discourse topic occurs in (40.3), as the following discourse presents information about the participant’s (40) death and involves different participants in the story. Likewise, example 42 exhibits a case of topic switch. The main discourse topic is “participants’ activities around the tape recorder as a listening device”;

however, in the last segment, in (42.7), the switch occurs and the participants view the object as “the possibility of provocation.” Example 45 is another illustration of discourse topic switch; (45.1)-(45.4) present *kapeljux* ‘a hat’ as the object pertaining to the participant’s appearance (the participant’s appearance, including the *kapeljux*, is the discourse topic). In (45.5), ‘a helmet’ becomes a part of the participant’s appearance, signaling the switch. In (47), the discourse topic is a “father and son’s conversation during which the son chews a bay leaf.” The ‘bay leaf’ in this passage is the means to kill the smell of alcohol, and drinking is the topic of participants’ conversation. After the last mention of the ‘bay leaf’ the conversation switches to the son’s problem with his wife, thus signaling a switch.²⁰

Examples 39-50 illustrate widely attested discourse and pragmatic strategies for the marking of masculine inanimate objects and clearly present evidence for the importance of both pragmatics and discourse analyses in the discussion of the choice of object marking.

4.5. Summary

The foregoing analysis of masculine inanimate object marking from pragmatic and discourse perspectives has demonstrated that the marking of objects recurring in a text depends on the speaker’s conceptualization of the event against the background of the PDS and the structure of discourse. In construing the event, the speaker considers the knowledge of the code, as well as the hearer’s knowledge of the PDS. In addition, the speaker, in organizing the discourse, assigns the degree of discourse saliency to a particular construction which he/she codes with a particular object marker according to the object’s role and place in a particular discourse frame. Consequently, both pragmatic and discourse notions are well captured by the PDSM and are crucial for object marking.

I noted that in cases in which the speaker provides information about the object as involved in the PDS iteratively (contexts of low Transitivity), the marker of discourse saliency is $-\emptyset$. *Acc-a* in such instances signals the low degree of discourse saliency of a segment and a switch from the main discourse frame (examples 48-50).

Examples with the object involved in various, often sequential, types of activities present cases with *-a* as a marker of discourse saliency. In these

examples, when the object enters the context as a known entity, it is marked with -a if it is activated by the speaker as discourse salient and belongs to the main discourse frame. The -Ø marking in these examples signals a switch from the main discourse frame or a switch in discourse topic (examples 39-47).

The distribution of -a and -Ø endings, when viewed from a pragmatic/discourse perspective, hints at the possibility of the development of definite/indefinite markings of the object in contemporary Ukrainian (in some ways, similar to articles in English). This could be an evolving phenomenon in contemporary Ukrainian and is well worth analyzing further.

5.0. Conclusions

This study presents a new approach to the problem of accusative case marking “variation” for masculine inanimates in Ukrainian. In contrast to previous studies on the subject, I support neither the “extended animacy” nor the “extended genitive” approach; instead, I offer the hypothesis that accusative marking is connected with Transitivity factors and, additionally, depends on pragmatics and discourse. Therefore, this hypothesis is multifaceted. In addition to analyzing the presence of the *Acc-a* phenomenon in the language and possible groupings of nouns allowing or precluding -a, I address questions as to why the speaker chooses either the -a or -Ø ending in a particular discourse structure, as well as what motivates or precludes the choice. Moreover, this analysis is a contribution to the problem of the interaction of case marking, pragmatics and discourse, a new branch in the study of case in general.

Use of the Transitivity Hypothesis is fruitful for cases in which objects are not recurrent in the text. Masculine inanimates were classified according to their properties as objects, their level of Individuation, and their admittance or not of the *Acc-a*. I concluded that nouns that are abstract, substances, liquids, geographic objects, objects with no clear limits, mass or collective nouns, and nouns denoting part of an object (in other words, nonindividuated nouns) do not allow *Acc-a* marking. In this group, the low level of Individuation contributes to the low level of utterance Transitivity, which is signaled by the -Ø accusative ending. Nouns that are concrete, major body parts and extensions thereof, articles of clothing, proper names and brand names, whole objects and not their parts, count and highly modified nouns allow both -Ø and -a marking. The possibility of both endings is due to the fact that the Individuation level of nouns

in the second group is higher than of those in the first group, and the high level of utterance Transitivity influenced by the high level of Individuation may be manifested by the -a ending. Therefore, case marking depends on the level of noun Individuation which, in turn, influences the degree of utterance Transitivity. The ramifications of the degree of utterance Transitivity for case marking were studied further, incorporating other features of an utterance, such as punctuality, volitionality, number of arguments in the event, and object affectedness. In instances with a punctual verb, volitional activity, no less than two arguments, and with an affected object, the level of Transitivity was higher than in cases with a nonpunctual verb, nonvolitional activity, one argument, and a nonaffected object. It was underscored that the level of Transitivity is manifested morphosyntactically and is signaled by the $-\emptyset$ or by -a accusative ending on the object, indicating a low or high degree respectively.

The PDSM, incorporating pragmatic and discourse analysis, proved to be crucial in situations involving recurring objects. Numerous examples confirmed that the choice of case marking appears to adhere closely to the following pragmatic factors: the PDS and the speaker's conceptualization of the event, the knowledge of both the speaker and the hearer of the code and of PDS, the status of metinformational knowledge, and how all these factors allow or preclude certain markers. Further, it was emphasized that pragmatic factors are in close contact with discourse. Discourse notions crucial for object marking are: discourse structure and the speaker's organization of discourse, the topic of discourse and discourse frame, as well as discourse saliency assigned by the speaker to a particular construction. Both pragmatic and discourse factors are well captured by the PDSM, which explains the morphosyntactic choice and motivation for it.

This analysis contributes to a better understanding of variation in Ukrainian object marking and presents arguments against considering doublet marking as random, haphazard, puzzling, or stylistically determined in the language; that is, object marking in Ukrainian is not in free variation.

Bibliography

- Brooks, Maria Zagorska. 1967. "The Accusative-Genitive Contrast in Some Polish Constructions." In *To Honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Brown, Gillian, and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bulaxovs'kyj, L. 1951. *Syntaksys*. Kiev: Radjans'ka škola.
- Delancey, Scott. 1987. "Transitivity in Grammar and Cognition." In Russell S. Tomlin, ed., *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givon, Talmy. 1982. "Logic vs. Pragmatics with Human Language as The Referee: Toward an Empirically Viable Epistemology." *Journal of Pragmatics* 6: 81-133.
- Givon, Talmy, ed. 1983. *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Typological Studies in Language 3. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Grappin, H. 1951. "Comment en polonais des génitifs sont devenus et deviennent des accusatives." *Revue d'Etudes Slaves* 28: 50-67.
- Hjelmslev, L. 1959. "Animé et inanimé, personnel et non-personnel." In: *Essais linguistiques, Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague* 12. Copenhagen.
- Hoekstra, Teun. 1984. *Transitivity: Grammatical Relations in Government-Binding Theory*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

- Holvoet, Axel. 1991. *Transitivity and Clause Structure in Polish: A Study in Case Marking*. Warsaw.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1987. "Stability and change in VN/NV Alternating Languages: A Study in Pragmatics and Linguistic Typology." In Verschueren and Bertucelli-Papi, eds., *The Pragmatic Perspective*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- — —. 1995. "The Category 'Event' in Natural Discourse and Logic." In Werner Abraham, Talmy Givon, and Sandra A. Thompson, eds. *Discourse Grammar and Typology: Papers in Honor of John W. M. Verhaar*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul J., and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse." *Language* 56/2: 251-99.
- Jurkowki, M. 1959. "Depelniacz czastkowy w jezyku ukrainskim (w porównaniu z polskim)." *Slavia Orientalis* 8/4: 121-34.
- Klenin, E. 1983. *Animacy in Russian: A New Interpretation*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- — —. 1980. "Individuation: A Historical Case Study." In Catherine V. Chvany and Richard D. Brecht, eds., *Morphosyntax in Slavic*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Kovaliv, P. 1973. *Problema Slovospolučen'*. New York: Naukove Tovarystvo Im. Ševčenko.
- Krys'ko, V. B. 1994. *Razvitie kategorii oduševlennosti v istorii russkogo jazyka*. Moscow: Lyceum.
- Kucała, Marian. 1978. *Rodzaj gramatyczny w historii polszczyzny*. Prace Inst. Języka Polskiego. PAN 23, Wrocław, Ossolineum.

- Lazard, G. 1984. "Actance variations and categories of the object." In F. Plank, ed., *Objects: Toward a Theory of Grammatical Relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1994. *Discourse and Pragmatic Constraints on Grammatical Choices: A Grammar of Surprises*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Matvijenko, O. 1930. "Nazovna ta rodova forma znaxidnoho vidminka." *Zbirnyk deržavnyx central'nyx kursiv ukrajinoznavstva* 3. Kharkov.
- Mindak, J. 1990. *Jezykowa kategoria zywoznosci w polszczyźnie i slowianszczyźnie (na tle innych jezyków swiata). Próba ujecia typologicznego*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Plušč, M. Ja. 1994. *Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*. Kiev: Vyšča škola.
- Ševelov, George Y. 1963. *The Syntax of Modern Literary Ukrainian*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sulyma, M. 1928. *Ukrajins'ka fraza*. Kharkov. Reprint 1988. In Olexa Horbatsch, ed., *Grammatici Ucraini*. Vol. 6. Munich: Ukrainische Freie Universität.
- Swan, Oscar E. 1988. *Facultative Animacy in Polish: A Study in Grammatical Gender Formation*. Carl Beck Papers in Russian and East European Studies 606. Pittsburgh: Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Pittsburgh.
- Timberlake, A. 1977. "Hierarchies in the Genitive of Negation." Reprint 1986. In Richard D. Brecht and James S. Levine, eds., *Case in Slavic*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1985. "Remarks on Transitivity." *Journal of Linguistics* 21: 385-96.

- Tymcenko, Je. 1926. *Vokatyv i instrumental' v ukrajins'kij movi*. Kiev: UAN.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1981. *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- — —. 1977. *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- van Dijk, Teun A., ed. 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Dimensions of Discourse*. Vol. 2. London: Academic Press.
- van Dijk, Teun A., and Walter Kintsch. 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. London: Academic Press.
- Vyxovanec', I. P. 1993. *Hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy*. Kiev: Lybid'.
- — —. 1975. *Morfolohična budova sučasnoji ukrajins'koji movy*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- — —. 1992. *Narysy z funkcional'noho syntaksysu ukrajins'koji movy*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- — —. 1971. *Syntaksys znaxidnoho vidminka v sučasnij ukrajins'kij movi*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- — —. 1987. *Systema vidminkiv ukrajins'koji movy*. Kiev: Naukova dumka.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1983. "The Semantics of Case Marking." *Studies in Language* 7/2: 247-75.
- Yokoyama, Olga T. 1986. *Discourse and Word Order*. Pragmatics and Beyond Companion series 6. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- — —. 1995. “Non-propositional Encoding of Discourse Strategies.” In Barbara H. Rartee and Petr Sgall, eds., *Discourse and Meaning: Papers in Honor of Eva Hajicová*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- — —. 1991. “Shifters and Non-verbal Categories of Russian.” In L. Waugh and S. Rudy, eds., *New Vistas in Grammar: Invariance and Variation. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 49*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zaitseva, V. 1994. “The Metaphoric Nature of Coding: Toward a Theory of Utterance.” *Journal of Pragmatics 22*: 103-26.
- — —. 1995. *The Speaker’s Perspective in Grammar and Lexicon: The Case of Russian*. New York: P. Lang.
- Zatovkanjuk, Mikolas. 1971. “Protystavlenija form -a/-u gen. sg. masc. v ukrajins’kij ta bilorus’kij movax.” *Slavia* (Prague) 40: 20-33.

Dictionaries

Orfohrafičnyj Slovnyk Ukrajins’koi Movy. 1994. Kiev: Dovira.

Corpora

Andruxovyč, Jurij. 1996. “Perverzija.” *Sučasnist’ 1*: 9-85.

Danylenko, Volodymyr. 1997. “Kimnata z cyklamenamy. Svjato harbuzovoji knjahyni.” *Sučasnist’ 12*: 9-17

Hordasevyč, Halyna. 1990. *Prekrasni imena žinoči*. Donetsk: Donbas.

Javors’kyj, Volodymyr. 1998. “Napivsonni lysty z Diamantovoji imperiji i Korolivstva Pivničnoji Zemli.” *Sučasnist’ 1,2*: 14-40, 37-67.

Ješkilev, Volodymyr. 1996. “Konspekt vidkrytoho uroku.” *Sučasnist’ 9*: 10-23.

- Kaška, Volodymyr. 1995. "Žytlo." *Sučasnist'* 7-8: 8-58.
- Lazaruk, Myroslav. 1998. "Zatopleni svity." *Sučasnist'* 2: 10-26.
- Morhovykyj, Anton. 1996. "Firopa jesy." *Sučasnist'* 11.
- Nečerda, Borys. 1995. "Kvadro." *Sučasnist'* 11: 5-60.
- Proxas'ko, Taras. 1996. "Vid čuttja prysutnosti." *Sučasnist'* 10: 81-97.
- Ševčuk, Valerij. 1990. *Dzyhar odvičnyj*. Kiev: Molod'.
- Ul'janenko, Oles'. 1994. "Stalinka." *Sučasnist'* 9: 21-76.
- Zabužko, Oksana. 1989. "Inoplanetjanka." *Sučasnist'* 9-11: 14-47.

1. The phenomenon of an animate accusative case marking with the ending -a for masculine inanimate nouns is not an innovation in the language (see Kryś'ko 1994). The present study, while recognizing the importance of the diachronic aspects of the accusative marking in Ukrainian, focuses only on its synchronic level; historical analysis deserves further investigation.
2. Accusative *potrebuju telefon* 'I need a phone' implies that I don't have a phone in my apartment, therefore I need to get one for general use (not for a limited time).
3. Zatovkanjuk also discusses the situation of the -a accusative in Belarusian. He states that the Belarusian forms in the South-West Belarusian ethnic territory are similar to the Ukrainian forms; however, the -a accusatives in Belarusian are more limited and are not included into the literary standard (1971: 140-142).
4. Only masculine inanimate nouns that display either -Ø, -a, or both in accusative singular will be considered in the present analysis. The so-called 'indeterminate genitives', or 'genitives of limited affectedness' that apply to nouns of all genders in singular or plural will not be analyzed in this paper as they are representatives of a separate phenomenon pertaining to the genitive case, as mentioned earlier.
5. It should be noted that the majority of contemporary formal descriptions of Ukrainian, usually under the heading "Sučasna ukrajins'ka literaturna mova", even though purporting to describe the contemporary language, present examples from 19th or early 20th century literary Ukrainian (cf. Pljušč 1994, Vyxovanec' 1993).
6. My research indicates that in Ukrainian, there is no group of masculine inanimates that take the -a ending exclusively (except some idioms and slang expressions, cf. footnote 7). Specifically, unlike in Polish (see Swan 1988), in Ukrainian one cannot discuss the category of facultative animacy.
7. A number of idioms and slang expressions always display the accusative marking -a:

vrizaty ljapasa, 'to cut a slap=to slap someone', *derty nosa* 'to tear a nose=to be snobby', *pidhynaty xvosta* 'to tuck a tail=to be afraid', *daty kopnjaka* 'to give a kick=to kick someone', *xoč kilka na holovi tešy* 'even if to hew a stake on the head=a

stubborn person', *xoč liktja vkusy* 'even if to bite an elbow=hopeless situation', *vrizaty duba* 'to cut an oak tree=to die', *vlomyty drjučka* 'to break a cutgel=to die', *vlipyty fingala* 'to glue a black eye=give someone a black eye'

There are also idioms that are used only with -Ø marking:

poklasty v rot 'to place in the mouth=to do something for someone', *ni v zub nohoju* 'not with a leg into the tooth=to not understand at all', *postavyty xrest* 'to place a cross=to finish, to quit', *jak kotu pid xvist* 'as if to a cat under its tail=unnecessary'.

Since in these cases one does not have to deal with 'variation', they will not be discussed in the present analysis.

8. Note that the object *šmatok* 'a piece' here is used in the meaning of 'a sheet', and not as a part/piece of a sheet of paper, which differs from the use of the object 'a piece' in example 6.2.

9. The group of nouns consisting of body-parts or extensions thereof (articles of clothing, mechanisms of work, tools, weapons, and sometimes monetary denominations) has been used by the proponents of the "extended animacy" hypothesis to illustrate the spread of the -a ending into these noun classes. As will be shown below, in Ukrainian, there are numerous masculine inanimates allowing the -a ending which may not be linked in any way to the "extension of animacy".

10. In both (18) and (19), the first noun phrase in accusative precedes a following adnominal genitive; however, this formal-mechanical feature does not influence marking (-Ø) on the accusative object (cf. examples 6 and 21).

11. Holvoet (1991: 166-167), in his brief statement about Transitivity and Individuation, notes that it is a possibility that the continuously expanding group of masculine inanimate nouns with an accusative in -a may be regarded as more individuated objects which are specifically marked. Holvoet, viewing Transitivity as based on causality, is not convinced of case marking dependence on Transitivity (157-169). However, he only briefly discusses *Acc_a* marking, or genitive-like accusatives in his terminology, mainly outlining other approaches to the problem (112-116).

12. In Ukrainian, the verb ‘to take off’ governs accusative which allows both -a and -Ø endings. For instance: *Ja skynula kul’čyk-Ø / kul’čyk -a* ‘I took off an earring’ but *Ja skynula odyh kul’čyk-Ø /*odnoho kul’čyk-a* ‘I took off one earring’. In the former, both endings are allowed and the choice will depend on factors discussed. In the latter, only the -Ø ending is allowed based on the low Individuation level of the object as it is ‘a part of the pair’ (cf. also the occurrence of both -a and -Ø ending with ‘to take off’ in example 45.3).

13. This object is not a genitive of negation: the negative verb *ne vstyh* governs *sxopyty*, and *sxopyty* governs accusative *olivcja*. This may be confirmed if compared with the parallel constructions but with masculine inanimate objects which do not favor -a accusative: *Vin ne vstyh vidrizaty šmat-Ø /*šmat-a kovbasy* ‘He did not manage to cut a slice of sausage’ or *Vin ne vstyh perevesty podyx-Ø /*podyx-a* ‘He did not manage to catch his breath’. In the former, the object is a part of another object, and in the latter, the object is abstract, suggesting that in both instances objects are marked by a low Individuation, and the low Transitivity level is signaled by the -Ø ending.

14. Hopper and Thompson support this claim by analyzing data from Spanish, Bantu languages, French, and Russian (1980: 276-278).

15. According to Wierzbicka (1983) in the case of games and dances, the accusative is equal in form to the genitive, implying a quick and ‘not serious’ action; that is, “a game is restricted in time, and, by definition, is devoid of a serious purpose, and so is a dance” (Wierzbicka 1983: 261).

16. In sections dealing with pragmatic and discourse analysis, examples, due to their length, are not glossed. Accusatives with both -a and -Ø marking are in bold face, and non-Accusative referential mention of objects are presented in italics.

17. Note that in this and other examples, the accusative marking may not be explained by reference to the Transitivity Hypothesis alone. The -a ending may be explained by reference to Transitivity in (42.2), (42.5), and (42.6) as the verbs are punctual and the objects are affected. However, in (42.3), the verb is non-punctual and the object is not affected; nevertheless, the marking is also -a. In addition, the same proper name object is marked differently in (42.5) and (42.7).

18. Note that this pattern applies also to examples presented earlier. In (15), the speaker introduces first ‘his matches’, after which he ‘lit a match’ (*sirnyka_{Acc-a}*), and then he ‘drops the match’ (*sirnyk_{Acc-∅}*), which is the last mention of this item.

19. This object marking with *Acc-a* is based on the fact that this object is known to both the speaker and the hearer from the preceding discourse when Oharok finds *kaska* (a synonym of *šolom*) ‘helmet’ (p. 25).

20. Givon (1983) discusses special marking of objects in Israeli Hebrew. An object that is an important, persistent topic in the discourse is marked with the numeral ‘one’; contrariwise, an object that retains no import in the discourse appears with no morphological marking (Givon 1983: 26-27).