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ABSTRACT

In traditional English grammar, a “transitive” verb was typically defined simply as one that could take a direct object; thus, a verb was either transitive or intransitive, with no room for finer distinctions. Traditional grammars of Russian have likewise tended to make such a dichotomous distinction, considering as transitive only those verbs capable of taking an object in the accusative case. This traditional view ignores those nouns that have direct object-like qualities but are found in other grammatical cases—such as the dative, genitive, or instrumental—which arguably reflect a lower degree of transitivity.

Hopper and Thompson (1980) proposed parameters according to which the transitivity of a clause could be judged. Those parameters included the affectedness of the (grammatical) object, the volitionality of the subject, the aspect (telic vs. atelic) of the verb, and the individuation of the object (its “distinctness… from the [subject] and… from its own background”). Hopper and Thompson further proposed a Transitivity Hypothesis, according to which opposing features of transitivity could not be obligatorily combined.
The present study considers Hopper and Thompson’s heavily cited view of transitivity in light of phenomena observable in Czech and Russian. Their parameters seem quite applicable to issues of the choice of case in objects. For instance, the Russian verb *dvigat* ‘move’ will take an object in the instrumental case (generally a sign of lower transitivity) if a person is moving one’s own leg (low in terms of distinctness or individuation): *dvigat*’ *nogoj*; but if a person moves someone else’s leg (higher in individuation), the object will appear in the accusative, indicating higher transitivity: *dvigat*’ *nogu*. Additionally, if a person is intentionally moving his/her leg (higher volitionality), the object will appear in the accusative, rather than the instrumental.

For this study, I have gathered examples of this sort of case variation in Czech and Russian from dictionaries, Google searches, online corpora, and native speaker intuitions. The vast majority confirm the predictions of Hopper and Thompson. The relatively rare examples that contradict the Transitivity Hypothesis are also considered, but these usually turn out to be only apparent contradictions. The present study also seeks to resolve the more exceptional cases or paradoxes by reference to subtleties and complications by-and-large overlooked by Hopper and Thompson. It finds that their criteria are overwhelmingly valid and applicable, but that human language is, overall, a phenomenon of such immense complexity that one could hardly expect 100-percent conformity.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Goals of this dissertation

In this work, I examine transitivity in two representative nominative-accusative languages, Czech and Russian. I am interested primarily in how various aspects of transitivity work together to determine the choice of case of the object (hereafter Obj)—or patient (hereafter Pat), in terms of semantic roles. Thus, I mainly examine those verbs whose case government displays variation between prepositionless accusative and oblique case objects (genitive, dative, or instrumental) or prepositional constructions. I consider both semantic and morphosyntactic transitivity, including the differences between them, and their convergences or divergences in certain constructions. The discussion necessarily includes semantic factors such as volitionality and individuation, grammatical factors such as aspect\(^1\), and, where relevant, discourse factors such as topicality.

First and foremost, this dissertation is a detailed consideration of the Transitivity Hypothesis (hereafter TH) of Hopper and Thompson’s (1980) seminal article “Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse” and offers an evaluation of their ten parameters of transitivity:

---

\(^1\) In many instances, semantic features such as individuation may be grammatically encoded.
A. Participants
B. Kinesis
C. Aspect
D. Punctuality
E. Volitionality
F. Affirmation
G. Mode
H. Agency
I. Affectedness of O[bject]
J. Individuation of O[bject]

An extended discussion and critique of these parameters follows in the next chapter. I additionally consider whether there are parameters that should be added to this list or deleted from it, or whether in some instances two parameters should be consolidated under one heading or one parameter subsumed under the other.

In addition to these parameters and transitivity per se, the main issue that this dissertation considers is case. My preliminary dissertation work began with a consideration of case, and was initially inspired by works such as Jakobson’s (1936, 1958) work on case meaning. While seeking a better understanding of case variation, I came upon Hopper and Thompson (hereafter H & T). Their article seemed to explain much that I had discovered about instrumental/accusative alternations, for instance the use of accusative and instrumental objects of the Czech verb šetřit, as shown in the following examples:

(1a) šetřit benzin
(1b) šetřít benzinem
(1c) ušetřit benzin
(1c) *ušetřit benzinem

‘save-impf. gasoline-ACC’
‘save-impf. gasoline-INST’
‘save-pf. gasoline-ACC’
‘save-pf. gasoline-INST’
My observations up to that point on Slavic case also seemed to back up many of H & T’s claims, albeit with some qualifications.

1.2. Theoretical orientation

This work takes as its starting point the Functionalist view of language, in which, as Givón (1995: xv) explains, “one must make reference to the natural parameters that shape language and grammar: cognition and communication, the brain and language processing, social interaction and culture, change and variation, acquisition and evolution.” Despite this all-encompassing view of language, this dissertation does not need to consider all these parameters, but rather examines a few in detail.

These limitations are appropriate given the nature of transitivity and the Transitivity Hypothesis. As all of H & T’s parameters of transitivity are semantic, morphosyntactic, or pragmatic (discourse-related), those three areas will absorb most of our attention. However, as cognitive factors are often intertwined with semantics, much of my examination of transitivity in Slavic will be made with a view to cognition; indeed, the work ultimately is as much cognitivist as it is functionalist.

If my approach, then, ultimately combines both cognitivist and functionalist approaches and observations, it is due to my view that language is shaped in large part by reality, that humans also formulate their own views of reality in part through language, and that they also attempt to influence others’ perceptions of reality through language. For instance, they may be quite selective in their choice of what to emphasize in a given utterance. This last point is evidenced by notions such as foregrounding and backgrounding, the use of the passive voice to de-emphasize agency (cf. Simpson, 1993,
esp. pp. 92-109), and the possibility of deception. But these are inherently matters of discourse and pragmatics, which brings us back around to the functionalist perspective. The fact that we have come full circle should not be surprising, as the cognitivist and functionalist approaches to language are actually rather close kin. The website for the International Cognitive Linguistics Association states that the perspective of cognitive linguistics embraces “the idea that language is an integral part of cognition which reflects the interaction of cultural, psychological, communicative, and functional considerations…” (quoted from Janda 2000, emphasis added).

Neither a functionalist nor a cognitivist view precludes paying attention to language change and variation, and I certainly have occasion to discuss diachrony, especially recent development in case government or valence. Often, these diachronic changes take place gradually, first affecting grammatical objects of one category, say, human or animate, first, then moving on to affect others. However, I do not have much to say on the issues of language acquisition, as I am mostly concerned with well-formedness in adult language. Nevertheless, there will be some need to consider intergenerational differences in usage when these differences reflect diachronic developments of language.

1.3. Transitivity: differing notions

Interest in transitivity is nearly as old as the formal study of grammar, dating back to antiquity in the West. In the earliest days of such studies, the dominant view of transitivity was that every verb or clause could be viewed as unequivocally either transitive or intransitive. However, not all grammarians were in agreement about where the division between transitive and intransitive lay; this is exemplified by Priscian’s
revision of Apollonius’ notion of transitivity. While the former saw transitivity as solely involving a transfer between actants, the latter considered a change of actants to be transitive as well (Baratin 1998: 16-18). Reading nineteenth- and early twentieth-century grammars of Russian, and even later ones, one gets the impression that the notion of transitivity as a strictly either/or proposition was slow to die, while the debate over precisely where the division lies continues to rage. Thus, Morley, in his survey of Russian grammars from 1940 to 1970, notes that, in addition to the classifications of transitive and intransitive verbs, some scholars posited a third type, which he calls “oblique transitive,” in which there was a “prepositional complement or noun complement in a case other than the nominative or accusative, i.e., an oblique case” (1976: 27-28)². While the insistence that all verbs be either transitive or intransitive persists in many grammars, there is no consensus on which of the two types these oblique transitive verbs belong to.

The purely binary notion of transitivity has been seriously and widely challenged in recent years. H & T suggest a continuum of transitivity, and, similarly, Lemaréchal (1983) proposes various degrees of transitivity; he points to transitivity clines in Palau, a language belonging to the Indonesian branch of the Austronesian languages and spoken in the Palau Islands, as well as in ergative languages such as Georgian, and he closes with a warning of the “ethnocentric dangers” of employing too limited a notion of transitivity. Abraham (1984) also argues that the notion of transitivity is in a state of flux, as is clear from his title: “Transitivity – a Variable in Concept Formation.” In a similar vein, Chvany (1990a/1996: 161) remarks that the “conventional wisdom…is that Russian verbs

² Throughout this work, I shall use the term “oblique case” as Morely does here, i.e., to refer to cases other than nominative or accusative.
are either transitive or intransitive,” but that the term ‘transitivity’ “has recently been extended to new domains.” Chvany also states that the purpose of her paper is “to bring together little-noticed data and to suggest directions for further research on transitivity” (ibid).

This last statement describes, to a large extent, the goals of this dissertation, although it goes beyond merely suggesting directions for further research and looks in depth at transitivity in and of itself. The “new domains” explored in this dissertation have been largely defined in advance by H & T, but it is my hope to build upon their seminal work with a critique and analysis of those “domains”—or, put more properly in the language of H & T, “parameters.” The work of H & T has been a citation leader for years, and it is important because, in the words of Chvany (1990b/1996: 343), it was “the first systematic attempt to relate grounding to a global scalar typology of sentences.” There have been a number of studies centered on H & T (1980)—some positive, such as Abraham (1984); some based on H & T’s approach or otherwise acknowledging their indebtedness to H & T, such as van den Berg (1995), Hiirikoski (1995), and Verhaar (1990); and some containing friendly criticism3, such as Abraham (1983), Chvany (1990b/1996).

1.4. Semantic and morphosyntactic transitivity defined

Before delving into further theoretical considerations, I need to give a working definition of Transitivity (hereafter capitalized, as in H & T); I also need to make a

---

3 I have yet to find an article that is hostile to H & T (1980). Scholars who follow the tradition of Generative Syntax, Government and Binding, and the Minimalist Program tend, quite frankly, to ignore this article and similar functionalist approaches to grammatical questions. For instance, in a 42-page article entitled simply “Transitivity,” Bowers (2002) makes no mention of H & T.
distinction between semantic Transitivity and morphosyntactic Transitivity. Semantic Transitivity concerns the conceptual relationship between an Agent (hereafter Ag) and a Patient (hereafter Pat) and the action of the former on the latter. I use as a starting point Givón (1984, v. 1, 96-99), who proposes that prototypical transitive verbs require an agent subject and a patient-of-change object. He then proposes subclassifications according to the type of change involved: creation, destruction, physical change, change in location, etc. Givón further suggests that the prototypical transitive verb involves a “physical, discernable change in the state of its patient” (1984, v. 1: 97, emphasis in original) and that deviation from prototypical Transitivity may in many cases be a matter of the extent to which the change is “physical, obvious, concrete, accessible to observation, etc.” So we have the suggestion, then, as has also been noted above, that Transitivity is not an either/or proposition but may in fact be a continuum. We may define semantic Transitivity as follows: Semantic Transitivity refers to the effect that an Agent \(^4\) exerts on a Patient; that is to say, in prototypical Transitivity an action is effectively transferred from an Agent onto a Patient. That effect can be measured in terms of the degree to which the Patient is altered, as well as the extent to which that alteration is observable.

Grammatical or morphosyntactic Transitivity is, as the terms suggest, Transitivity as realized in the structure of language. In discussing this type of Transitivity, I use the terms “Subject” (hereafter Subj) and “Object” (hereafter Obj), rather than Ag and Pat. When doing so, I refer to their typical use in Slavic and other nominative-accusative

---

\(^4\) I use Agent in a general sense here; in ensuing discussion the “Agent” may in some instances be more properly described as a Cause.
languages.\textsuperscript{5} That is, the Subj is the actant encoded in the nominative case, which occurs with both transitive and intransitive verbs; the Obj is, in terms of sentence structure, the NP controlled by or subordinate to the verb, which typically (but not always, as I argue below) occurs in the ACC\textsuperscript{6}. Thus, in Czech and Russian, the NOM typically is used to encode the actant which is at one and the same time Ag and Subj, and the ACC is typically used to encode the Pat, which happens to coincide with the Obj\textsuperscript{7}. This nomenclature is employed to maintain the distinction between the semantic roles of Ag and Pat, on the one hand, and the grammatical relations of Subj and Obj, on the other.\textsuperscript{8}

Morphosyntactic Transitivity, by contrast, can be viewed in terms of structures which tend to bind Subj, Obj, and Verb closely together. This closer bond would seem to correspond to the closer conceptual distance between the Verb and Obj and is often expressed in the choice of the ACC case for the Obj, as opposed to oblique cases (cf. Haiman 1983: 790-2). (As becomes evident, however, this primacy of the ACC sometimes comes into conflict with issues of declension class, markedness, and saliency.) This conceptual closeness would also lead to the use of a \textit{prepositionless} accusative case, as opposed to one with a preposition, cf. Wierzbicka (1980: 72):

\begin{align*}
(2a) & \text{Ivan zatknul ščel' vatoj.} \quad \text{‘Ivan stuffed the chink-ACC with wadding-INST.’} \\
(2b) & \text{Ivan zatknul den'gi v ščel'}. \quad \text{‘Ivan stuffed the money-ACC into the chink-ACC.’}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{5} For a discussion of grammatical encoding of Ag and Pat in ergative languages, see Comrie (1989:110-116).

\textsuperscript{6} In some cases, one can refer to a “logical subject” or “logical object” encoded in a case other than the NOM or ACC, respectively. In such instances, I use the terms \textit{logical subject} and \textit{logical object} for the sake of clarity.

\textsuperscript{8} This approach differs from H & T, who use the terms A[g] and O[bj] to refer to both semantic roles and grammatical relations. When quoting H & T, I use their terminology, but I strive to keep the distinction clear.
Example (2a) indicates a closer connection between the action of filling and the chink; the purpose is to close the chink up. By contrast, (2b) indicates the closer relation between the action and the money, i.e., the purpose is to hide the money. The \( v + \text{ACC} \) construction in (2b), as opposed to the bare ACC in (2a), puts more distance, both conceptually and syntactically, between the action denoted by the Verb and the referent ‘chink’. Other morphosyntactic indications of Transitivity may include word order (cf. Haiman 1983: 792, H&T: 258-9) or the use of a transitive verb conjugation, as in Hungarian (H&T: 258).

1.5. Degrees of semantic transitivity exemplified

Given the notions of semantic Transitivity expressed just above, it is reasonable to place acts of creation and destruction at the high end of such a continuum, since creation and destruction involve a much higher degree of “change” than a change of state. Thus, we would find at the top of the scale sentences such as

(3a) God created the universe.
(3b) The terrorists destroyed the building.

A bit lower down the scale might be a sentence involving a permanent and sizeable or intense change:

(4a) The accident disfigured/maimed him for life.
(4b) The architects rebuilt the structure.
Still further down the ladder might be acts that fall into Givón’s (1984: 97) sub-category of “surface change”:

\[(5a) \text{They painted the wall green.}\]
\[(5b) \text{The children washed the dishes.}\]

While the absolute creation or destruction of the patient/object in examples (3a) and (3b) can quite reasonably considered to be higher in Transitivity than the partial changes in (4), which are relatively clearly higher in Transitivity than those in (5), we have reached a point in the examples in (5) where the picture becomes rather murky. It is debatable whether (5a) and (5b) are higher in Transitivity than the following:

\[(6a) \text{She moved her belongings into long-term storage.}\]
\[(6b) \text{He moved the pawn one space forward.}\]

Sentence (5a) is, under most circumstances, higher in Transitivity than (6b), since the change of color is a more permanent change and since the pawn can be easily moved back (physically but not according to the rules of chess). It also seems that (6a) should (again, under most circumstances or all other factors being equal) be considered more transitive than (5b), since the dishes will likely get soiled again very soon, whereas the belongings, as suggested by “long-term storage” are undergoing a longer-term change. While the notion of change being physical and discernable may come into play here, it seems that permanence better captures the difference in these utterances.

There are other subtle differences in the degree of Transitivity that can be expressed. For instance, we could say
(6c) They washed the dishes, dried them, and then packed them for moving.

Here we are talking about washing that is meant to last, preparing the dishes for something other than to be used again. It is hard to imagine criteria by which one could determine whether (6c) or (6a) is higher in Transitivity. Probably (6a) requires more work⁹, but are the changes in (6c) not as thorough-going in terms of the dishes as the changes in (6a) are to the belongings?

The matter is also complicated by the fact that different types of Pats are capable of responding to different types of change. For example, dishes can be created, cleaned, used, broken, etc.; books can be written, read, burned, etc. So it is difficult to compare sentences such as

(7a) Tolstoy wrote that novel.
(7b) The potter made the dish from clay.

since (7a) refers to an intellectual creation and (7b) refers to a physical creation. If we take Givón’s remarks about physical change too literally, we might assume that (7b) is the more transitive utterance, even though (7a) almost certainly requires more time and effort and is more of a creation ex nihilo. Of course, we are not referring to a physical book, but rather to the story in a more abstract sense, to the characters, plot, etc. For an act of physical creation equivalent to that of the potter, we might have to compare writing, in the sense of ‘authoring’, to printing. (Furthermore, it is not clear that the potter’s work is simply a matter of making a simple dish like any other, or something original and highly involved, etc., i.e., it is not clear from the context whether it is a

---

⁹ I discuss later whether additional semantic matters such as effort and intensity may be considered as parameters.
matter simply of production or whether it involves both creation and production.

Tolstoy’s work here is obviously one of creation, and arguably one of production as well.

I bring these matters up to illustrate the complicatedness of the issue.)

In order to avoid such apples-and-oranges comparison, we might simply compare sentences that differ only slightly, such as (8a) and (8b):

(8a) She moved (all) her books.
(8b) She moved some of her books.

Here the comparison is fairly simple, as it involves either the whole or part of the Pat. It would seem intuitively correct that the change in (8a) is higher in Transitivity than that of (8b), since it concerns all of the entity.

This brings us back to the question of morphosyntactic Transitivity. Such differences in Transitivity concerning the whole or part of the Obj. are typically expressed in Russian using the accusative or the genitive/partitive:

(9a) On vypil čaju. ‘He drank-pf. (up) some (of the) tea-PART.’
(9b) On vypil čaj. ‘He drank-pf. (up) (all of/the cup of) the tea-ACC.’

Another variable is the use of aspect, as one can say (9c) but not (9d):

(9c) On pil čaj. ‘He was drinking-impf. tea-ACC.’
(9d) *On pil čaju.10 ‘He was drinking-impf. (some of the) tea-PART.’

Apparently, then, we can say that the use of the perfective aspect in (9a) and (9b) expresses an action whose limit the speaker knows. In (9a) that limit extends only to a

---

10 But note the possibility of ne pil konjaku (Jakobson 1936: 92); negation will be taken into account in detail in the chapter on the genitive.
portion of the object, or at least an unspecified quantity, whereas in (9b) it extends to the whole of the object; therefore, the speaker can use the partitive in (9a) knowing that only a portion of the object has been affected. In (9c) and (9d), however, where the action expressed was ongoing at some time in the past, and the speaker does not know, or is not concerned with, the result, it can only be said that the subject was acting on a certain entity, the tea, or was engaged in the process of tea-drinking.

In terms of the lexicon, there is a further complication in the use of the perfectivizing po- prefix, which requires a (partitive) GEN Obj (when the verb takes an object at all):

(9e) On popil čaju. ‘He drank (for a short time/a small amount of) tea-PART.’  
(9f) *On popil čaj. ‘He drank (for a short time) tea-ACC.’

Here the use of the perfective indicates that the action is limited, but the limit of the action is vague and is not seen as extending to the whole of the object.

I leave off discussion of this problem to return to it in a fuller examination later. Suffice it to say at this point that the bulk of this dissertation deals with this and similar problems of aspect, case, definiteness (or referentiality or individuation) of the object.

1.6. Morphosyntactic transitivity and case

I proposed above that the prepositionless accusative case presents a stronger bond between subject, verb, and object, which also suggests that there is a link, albeit a weaker one, when the object occurs in an oblique case. In this section, I shall some of the problems having to do with the reflection of Transitivity in the surface forms of a language, namely those forms that are distinguished by their case. First, however, a
working definition of object as opposed to other syntactic elements is needed, since there is not total agreement among scholars as to what constitutes an object.

When referring to “objects” here, we use the language of Havránek and Jedlička (1970: 369-370) who distinguish between instrumental (and other oblique-case) objects or předměty, which must be in some way affected by the action even if that affectedness is not emphasized, and instrumental noun phrases which function as adverbials (i.e. of time, place, and manner) or příslovečná určení. Karlík et al. (1995: 242), in describing the instrumental as a “predominantly adverbial” case, refer to adverbiální určení as those NPs that answer questions such as “where” and “along what path,” a rather traditional means of determination. They also state that these adverbials usually occur with a preposition; however, we deal overwhelmingly with instances of prepositionless instrumentals. We also deal with many examples that could be interpreted as either adverbials of means or objects.

In a sentence like

(10a) Cz. Myl si ruce mýdlem. ‘He washed his hands-ACC with soap-INST’

the instrumental mýdlem is clearly an adverbial of means, since the ruce, as ACC Obj. is the affected DirObj. Even without a DirObj, it is fairly clear that the lesem in Cz. šel lesem ‘he went through the woods’ is an adverbial, since it indicates the path of the action. Furthermore, in instances where there is no explicit ACC Obj, but there is an explicit instrumental in the INST case, the status of the instrument can be fairly intuitively obvious; Havránek and Jedlička (1970: 370) contrast the Cz. example piši perem ‘I write with a pen-INST’, where the ‘pen’ is a tool for writing, with třesu stromem
‘I shake the tree-INST,’ where the “shaking affects the tree,” so that the noun in the INST in the latter example must be considered an Obj. (I elaborate on the justifications for such intuitional judgments and for the use of affectedness as a criterion of objecthood shortly.) However, the status of the INST NP is less clear in a phrase such as

(10b) Cz. hýbat rukama. ‘move one’s hands-INSTR.’

which is described by Janda & Clancy (2002: 26) as an example of “actions facilitated by instruments.” These authors also state that the INST phrase “represents something necessary to the performance of the action.” While it may be true that the hands are necessary to the action, it seems strange to think of the body parts, which are in fact moved, as instruments; certainly they are not instruments in the same sense that mydlem ‘soap-INSTR’ is in (10a). The fact remains that one is doing something to the body part in question, that is, it is to some degree or other affected by the action. Native informants often perceive such body parts as “less the tool than the object affected by the action,” according to Levine (1980: 11), who solicited the opinions of native speakers on Russian sentences comparable to (10a) and (10b), e.g., Pavel kačal golovoj ‘Paul shook his head’ (ibid: 20, note 6). To return to the more traditional – and intuitive – consideration of “what question does the phrase answer?” we should note that the rukama in (10b) cannot be elicited by the question Jak hýbala? ‘How did she move?’, but could be a response to ‘What did she move?’, although the “what” would be in the instrumental: Čím hýbala?12

11 One of Levine’s main points is that body parts are an integral part of the Ag/Subj., a matter to which we shall return in the chapters on the INST.

12 The question Co hýbala? ‘What-ACC did she move?’ would be possible only if there were an expectation that something had been moved from one place to another (and no body part was involved).
It is quite reasonable to take the view that such instrumental body parts are objects, or that sentences such as (10b) are transitive, but less transitive than their counterparts with ACC body parts. This is the stance taken by Wierzbicka (1980: 23-24) in analyzing sentences like (11a), which do not passivize and have no agentless reflexive counterparts (11b):

(11a) Ru. Ivan požal plečami. ‘Ivan shrugged his shoulders-INSTR.’
(11b) *Pleći Ivana požalis’. ‘Ivan’s shoulders-NOM shrugged-refl.’

Nevertheless, passivization of ACC body parts may be possible:

(11c) Ru. Bol’noj otkryl glaza. ‘The sick man opened his eyes-ACC.’
(11d) Glaza bol’nogo otkryl’s. ‘The eyes-NOM of the sick man opened-refl.

It is, of course, debatable whether (11d) represents a true passivization or is a middle voice construction. If we take the “true” passive equivalents

(11e) Glaza bol’nogo byli otkryty. ‘The eyes of the sick man were open(ed).’

it is ambiguous whether the sentence is semantically passive, describing something done to the eyes, or whether they describe the state of the eyes at some time in the past.

Wierzbicka also notes that the English equivalents behave in the same way, despite the lack of case marking in English: John’s eyes opened but *John’s shoulders shrugged.

Thus the sentences involving opening one’s eyes are “more transitive” than those involving shrugging one’s shoulders. That is, they are more transitive semantically, according to our definition of semantic Transitivity, since they involve a change of state,
a higher degree of affectedness. They would also seem to be more transitive syntactically, since they can passivize, a matter we address shortly below.

On the matter of ACC phrases, let us consider a sentence with a verb of motion, such as (12):

\begin{equation}
(12) \text{Cz. } \text{Jeli sme dva kilometry. } \text{‘We traveled two kilometers.’}
\end{equation}

Here the \textit{dva kilometry}, even though it is in the accusative, should be understood as an adverbial rather than as an object, since it describes the extent of the motion, and nothing happens to the kilometers. However, some scholars would disagree with this assessment; for examples, Krys’ko (1984: 80) claims that such accusative phrases with verbs of motion are objects representing the “overcoming of space” (\textit{preodelenie prostranstva}). It must be conceded that the argument can be made, and such matters are subject to differences of interpretation.\textsuperscript{13} Two native speakers of English can certainly have a legitimate debate over whether \textit{the channel} in \textit{to swim the channel} (vs. \textit{to swim across the channel}) is an object or an adverbial. But there can be no debating the status of the object in (13):

\begin{equation}
(13) \text{Cz. } \text{Ušetřili sme dvě koruny. } \text{‘We saved two crowns.’}
\end{equation}

Here something does happen to the two crowns: the money is accumulated.

\textsuperscript{13} Indeed, much of language change can be attributed to semantic re-interpretation of structures by a young generation of speakers; adverbials being re-interpreted as DirObjs seems a very real possibility. There are also poetic possibilities, such as \textit{to trudge a weary, dusty mile}, where the interpretation of distance as object seems even more correct intuitively.
Since we are now beginning to define grammatical objects according to the semantic criterion of affectedness, it would be useful to re-consider purely morphosyntactic properties that can be used as reliable criteria for the determination of the status of a clause as transitive or intransitive, or what degree of Transitivity it possesses. We can suggest that there is a continuum of structural Transitivity, just as there is a continuum of semantic Transitivity\(^\text{14}\), and we can find a way to prioritize matters in terms of degree of morphosyntactic Transitivity. The more of the following features a clause possesses, the more structurally transitive it is:

(A) passivizability;
(B) accusative object (without preposition, DirObj for non-case languages):
(C) affected object

As we have discussed, however, there may in some cases be disagreement over whether a given NP is an object or not, particularly when it may be seen either as a path or as an obstacle to be overcome. The issue of passivization, likewise, although it is a good test of Objecthood, is not always clear-cut. Some sentences with INST Objs passivize quite readily, as in the following Ru. examples (Kilby 1977: 79):

(14a) *Rabotnik rukovodit učreždeniem.* ‘An employee-NOM runs the establishment-INST.’

(14b) *Učreždenie rukovoditsja rabotnikom.* ‘The establishment-NOM is run by an employee-INST.’

The same can be said of verbs that (normally) take GEN Objs (Růžička 1967: 1730, cited in Fowler 1996: 528):

(14c) Cel’ byla dostignuta. ‘The goal was achieved.’

It is not always the case, however, that even traditionally “transitive” verbs with ACC Objs can passivize (Fowler 1996: 534):

(14d) ?*Vaza byla uvidena Olegom. ‘The vase was seen by Oleg.’

This is an instance where the active sentence (Oleg uvidel vazu) would have an ACC Obj with a low degree of (or no) Affectedness, since the act of seeing does not change the Obj.

The examples in (14) demonstrate that Objecthood is not an easy matter to determine, since even oblique-case complements can become the Subjs of passive sentences, mainly when affected, while some ACC-case complements cannot, mainly when unaffected. Nevertheless, one would not, at least traditionally, deny that ACC nouns like vazu are the Objs of transitive verbs like ‘see’. Thus, it seems that some combination of criteria, such as (A), (B), and (C) above, must be employed in order to determine Objecthood.

Fowler (1996) cites significant evidence that INST and GEN Objs generally behave syntactically and semantically like ACC Objs; i.e., they tend to occur in the same

15 The passive with byt’ + ppl. (of pf. verbs) is, of course, different from the –sja passive (with impf. verbs). Fowler (1996: 525) notes, “Passives formed from imperfective verbs by addition of the particle –sja are a bit more disputable [as true passives—MEN].” He goes on to cite Keenan (1985: 254) that the distinction between reflexives and –sja passives is a matter of semantic interpretation. As my current study is not primarily concerned with the nature of passivization, I cannot delve deeper into this matter.
position (or have the same “syntactic configurations”) in a clause, and they possess Patient-like qualities such as Affectedness. He also makes the distinction (ibid.: 538) between, for instance, INST Objs and INST instruments, especially since the latter can co-occur with an ACC Obj, as in *Ivan rezal xleb nožom* ‘Ivan cut the bread with a knife’. Fowler argues (ibid.)

> Under this account, Genitive and Instrumental complements of verbs which assign oblique lexical case are eligible for passivization because in syntactic terms, they are actually direct objects, with a superficial veneer of oblique morphological case.

I disagree with the use of the term “superficial veneer,” because I believe that such Objs appear in the INST due to a low degree of Affectedness, not because of arbitrary assignment of case in their surface structure. However, I do believe that such oblique-case complements are genuine Objs when they possess at least some quality of Affectedness. Fowler, furthermore, relies largely on the semantic criteria of Affectedness and Telicity when distinguishing oblique-case Objs from other oblique-case complements (cf. ibid: 533).

Thus, morphosyntactic criteria alone may not always suffice to determine the Transitivity of an utterance. When ambiguities crop up, it may be useful to eliminate from consideration as objects those things that are not affected by the action but are used in utterances to describe the action in some way: degree, extent, manner, etc. Still, (C) should be used reservedly, since syntactic properties should be used first and foremost in determining syntactic Transitivity; e.g., one would not deny that an ACC Obj of the verb

---

16 According to Fowler (1996: 542, note 22), the verb *lišit* ‘deprive’ is the only verb which takes both ACC and GEN arguments in such a manner, as in *Sud’i lišili ego graždanstva* ‘The judges stripped him-ACC of his citizenship-GEN’. Fowler argues that the GEN argument is a “true oblique argument” and not an Obj (ibid).
‘see’ in Russian is the Obj of a transitive verb. Therefore, (C) should rank below (A) and (B), and it should only be used when (A) and (B) do not suffice. These considerations would mean that (C) would be employed mainly in instances where passivizability is questionable, an ACC NP has adverbial qualities, an oblique-case NP has object-like qualities, or some combination thereof.

Following these criteria, a sentence such as

(15a) *She swam the channel.

may possibly be passivized to

(15b) ?The channel was swum by her.

but the awkwardness of the construction calls into question the degree of Transitivity of the verb swim.17 When distances are specifically mentioned, the argument for Transitivity would seem to be even weaker:

(15c) *She swam two miles.
(15d) */? Two miles was/were swum by her.

In Russian we find similar results:

(16a) *Ona proplyla dva versta. ‘She swam two versts.’
(16b) */?Dve versty bylo proplyto ej. ‘Two versts were swum by her.’

---

17 One may still consider it possible to say *The English Channel was first swum by Matthew Webb*, where *the English Channel* is foregrounded as a specific challenge or an object of conquest, and the feat of swimming (across) it as a historical first takes precedence over the Ag.
For the Russian equivalent of (15a), matters become more complicated, because there are two ways of expressing the idea\(^\text{18}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
(16c) \quad \text{Ona pereplyla čerez proliv.} & \quad \text{‘She swam across the channel.’} \\
(16d) \quad \text{Ona pereplyla proliv.} & \quad \text{‘She swam the channel.’}
\end{align*}
\]

There are difficulties with passivizing (16d), as the following examples show:

\[
\begin{align*}
(16e) \quad *? \text{Proliv byl pereplyt jej.} & \quad \text{‘The channel was swum by her.’} \\
(16f) \quad \text{Proliv byl pereplyt za pjet’ minut.} & \quad \text{‘The channel was swum in five minute.’} \\
(16g) \quad \text{Proliv byl pereplyt jej za pjet’ minut.} & \quad \text{‘The channel was swum by her in five minutes.’}
\end{align*}
\]

Example (16e) is somehow incomplete, according to one native speaker (a 49-year-old female), but the passive examples (16f) and (16g), which include an expression indicating the length of time taken to complete the action, are acceptable with or without the passive Ag in the INST.

This brings us to the criterion of case, the presence or absence of an accusative object, or the presence of an object in an oblique case. In the three Czech sentences

\[
\begin{align*}
(17a) \quad \text{Psal list.} & \quad \text{‘He wrote/was writing a letter-ACC.’} \\
(17b) \quad \text{Psal perem.} & \quad \text{‘He wrote/was writing with a pen-INSTR.’} \\
(17c) \quad \text{Psallow.} & \quad \text{‘He wrote/was writing.’}
\end{align*}
\]

it should be clear that (17a) is higher in Transitivity than (17c), where there is no stated object, and (17b), where there is also no object, the pen is clearly an instrument, and there

\(^{18}\) According to one native speaker (a 49-year-old female), there is more focus on *proliv* in (16d), the expression without the preposition. Also, Russian makes a lexical distinction between swimming a distance – *próplyť* – and swimming across an obstacle – *pereplyť*.
is no imaginable argument that it can be seen as affected by the action. Of course, we could add a fourth possibility

\[(17d) \text{Psalm list perem.} \text{ ‘He wrote/was writing a letter-ACC with a pen-INSTR.’}\]

in which the letter is clearly the affected object, the thing created in this case, and the pen is again the instrument. The distinction between instrument and object is not so clear-cut, however, in cases like the Russian sentences

\[(17e) \text{Ivan švyrjal kamni.} \text{ ‘Ivan was throwing stones-ACC.’}\]
\[(17f) \text{Ivan švyrjal kamnjami.} \text{ ‘Ivan was throwing stones-INSTR.’}\]

According to Wierzbicka (1980: 16), the use of the INST in (17f) is more “characteristic of idle, aimless activities”, and there is less emphasis on something happening to the stones, although, indeed, something does happen to them. So (17f) is lower in (morphosyntactic as well as semantic) Transitivity than (17e), but higher in Transitivity than in (17b), where nothing happens to the pen at all.

We should also consider sentences with an ACC object with a preposition, as in the following Czech examples:

\[(18a) \text{Jan hodil blatem na Petra.} \text{ ‘Jan threw mud at Petr-ACC.’}\]
\[(18b) \text{Jan ohodil Petra blatem.} \text{ ‘Jan threw mud on Petr-ACC.’}\]

In (18a), the use of the preposition \textit{na} can be taken as a sign of lower Transitivity, despite the fact that \textit{Petr} is clearly a goal of the action, whereas in (18b) \textit{Petr} is a more direct Patient of the action, as also indicated by the prefixed verb. (This use of the prefixed verb has a certain parallel in the Russian \textit{smotret’ na} + ACC ‘look at’ vs. \textit{osmotret’} + ACC.
‘examine; look over,’ although the parallel is not exact, since the verbs *smotret’* and *osmotret’* do not usually involve a third participant and involve a lower degree of Affectedness.) In (18b), furthermore, the mud is an instrument, but in (18a) its status as an instrument is not as clear; it can be seen as an instrument, yet at the same time the fact of its change of location suggests some object-like quality.

1.7. Transitivity and case: the problem exemplified

To give an introductory example of the kind of case alternation I examine in detail in this dissertation, let us consider one instance of alternation between DAT and ACC Objs of the Czech verb *škodit* and perfective forms *uškodit* (the basic aspectual counterpart) and *poškodit*, as well as derived imperfectives and the bi-aspectual *naškodit se*.

The basic form *škodit* takes a dative object, or in some instances an accusative object, or alternatively *na* + LOC. (According to the *SSJČ*, the verb takes an accusative in the meaning ‘break, violate’ [*poškozovat*].) Thus, we find examples with DAT Objs. such as *škodit sám sobě* ‘harm oneself’, *škodit celé společnosti* ‘harm the entire society/company’ (SSJČ) and *sucho škodí mladým porostům* ‘the drought is harming the new growths’ (SSČ), as opposed to the expression *to nic neškodí* ‘that doesn’t hurt anything’ (SSJC), which has an accusative object. Examples with the valence *na* + LOC include *škodit si na zdraví* ‘harm one’s (own) health’ and *housenky škodí na zelí* ‘the caterpillars are harming the cabbage (SSČ).’ Dative government would seem to be the norm for the aspectual counterpart, the perfective *uškodit: práce ti neuškodí* ‘work won’t hurt you’ (SSČ), *uškodit si* ‘harm one’s interests’ (Fronek), *neuškodilo vám to* ‘you aren’t
any the worse for it’ (Fronek), kroupy uškodili květům ‘the hailstones damaged the plants,’ silna káva uškodila srdci ‘strong coffee damaged (his/her) heart (SSJČ).

According to the SSJČ, uškodit, like the imperfective škodit, takes an accusative in the meaning of “cause (material) damage to something, partially destroy; violate” (poškodit), but the given dictionary unfortunately gives no examples of the accusative with this meaning. For the iterative derived from uškodit, uškozovat, the SSJČ gives only two examples, both with dative objects: jest žadost jejich jiným uškozovat ‘it is their request to harm the others, uškozujete sobě nejvíc tím, že... ‘you harm yourself most by...’.

For the perfective poškodit, the SSJČ gives as the principal meaning “cause (material) damage to something, partially destroy; violate,” and in this meaning it can only take an accusative, non-personal object (co in the dictionary indication of valence).

In meaning 2, “destroy, reduce the value of something; cause moral damage to something” (způsobit morální škodu na něčem), it takes an accusative co, or more rarely a dative čemu: poškodit něčí povest/svému zdraví ‘harm someone’s reputation/one’s (own) health. The third definition, which is logically more closely related to definition 1 than to 2, reads “to cause someone (material or moral) damage, loss, detriment, etc.;” and according to this reference work, the verb can only take an accusative object (koho, co).

This definition and valence is followed by examples such as rozhodčí poškodil hostující mužstvo ‘the referee hurt the home team’ and poškodit svým jednáním stat ‘to harm the state by one’s actions.’ The reflexive perfective poškodit se, again more closely related to definition 1, is given as only applicable to things and is defined as “to cease to be in a properly good state, to become defective.” One example is nábytek se při stěhování poškodil ‘the furniture became damaged during moving,’ which seems as much a passive
or middle construction and meaning as anything. Finally, a derived imperfective
poškozovati, along with its reflective form, is given with no further definitions, examples
or valences.

There is one final derivation of škodit to consider, the bi-aspectual naškodit se,
which is defined as “frequently and repeatedly cause damage.” The only example in the
SSJČ is naškodil se (nám) už dost ‘he has hurt us enough already.’

From the preceding discussion, it seems apparent that, in the various meanings
and forms of škodit and its derivatives, the more the object is damaged, the closer to
destruction it is, the more likely it is to occur in the accusative. Such objects are
At the same time, there remains a good deal of free variation in the language. The
reference works employed above give surprisingly few examples of the sort škodit si na
zdraví ‘to harm one’s (own) health’ (SSJČ), where there is a dative reflexive followed by
the na + LOC. There are also no instances of the dative of possession\(^{19}\) (usually a
pronoun) and accusative object in these dictionaries, although I have found such
constructions to be very common in Google searches, which frequently give results such
as oni nám poškodili auto ‘they damaged our car.’

We find a similar situation in the Russian povreždat/povredit ‘damage, injure,
hurt,’ which governs the accusative of the thing harmed or damaged and has an optional
human ethical dative: On povredil sebe nogu ‘He hurt his leg’ (Offord 1996: 339). This
example is given in contrast to vredit/povredit ‘injure, harm, hurt,’ the latter listed among
verbs governing the dative. Yet Dal’ (1881-2) indicates that the impf. vredit’ takes an

\(^{19}\) I use dative of possession as a general term to cover uses of the dative that others may refer to as “ethical
dative” or “dative of disadvantage.” None of the discussion here hinges on the label.
ACC of thing or DAT of person in his leading definition, followed by a possible ACC of person and even a possible DAT of thing: *Ne vredi i nedrugu/i nedruga* ‘Don’t harm even your enemy-DAT/-ACC’ and *Saxarnyja jastva vredjat’* zdorov’e/zdorov’ju ‘Sugary victuals harm [one’s] health-ACC/-DAT. Ušakov (1934-40) gives only dative objects for *vredit’*, but he also gives an ACC of thing (with no possibility of a human object) under his second definition of the pf. *povredit’* – *isportit’* (polamat’, poranit’ i t.p.) – which is given as the aspectual counterpart to *povreždat’. Dal’ gives a second definition for *povreždat*: *pomešat’, popreptastvovat’ ili voobšče nanesti vred’, ubytok, porču ‘hinder, impede or generally bring harm, loss, or spoilage’, under which the verb takes a dative of either person or thing: *Upadok cennosti deneg mnogo povredil našej torgovle* ‘The fall in the value of money very much damaged our trade-DAT’. Apparently this dative-only government is found in a meaning in which only the perfective is possible; Dal’ gives examples only in the perfective (past), and Ušakov lists this as his first definition for *povredit’, giving the imperfective counterpart *povreždat’* only for the second definition (which corresponds to Dal’’s first).

The numbered examples above demonstrate that Transitivity is related to the completeness of the action, but this completeness can also refer to the totality of the object/patient; thus there should be, and at least quite often is, some observable correspondence between Transitivity, on the one hand, and aspect and case on the other. The examples with verbs of damage are meant to illustrate that Transitivity, case, and aspect are additionally bound up in issues of semantics and the lexicon, so that in our consideration of examples such as these, it is necessary to take all these issues into consideration. With regards to aspect, for example, we have to consider not only
grammatical aspect, but also Aktionsart, which encompasses a wider range of verbal nuances than simply the contrast between perfective and imperfective.

1.8. Methodology

The main method employed in this investigation is to consider verbs with valencies varying between accusative and either instrumental or genitive objects and to consider what factors play a role in the choice of case. Lists of such verbs are gathered from works such as Janda & Clancy (2002, 2006), as well as other works on case by Janda, and Plewes (1977). Examples are initially gathered from discussions of case in these works and in Wierzbicka (1980), Jakobson (1936), etc., as well as from dictionaries, including the standard “academy dictionaries” and other well-known reference works, such as Ušakov and the Czech valence dictionary Slovesa pro praxi ‘Verbs for practical use.’ These examples of usage are supplemented by data acquired through searches of the Czech National Corpus (hereafter ČNK for Český národní korpus), the National Corpus of the Russian Language (hereafter NKRJa for Nacional’nyj korpus russkogo jazyka)\(^{20}\) and the internet, namely Google searches. In this manner, I have been able to observe a fairly wide variety in case usage with these verbs\(^{21}\).

In my use of corpus data, I look mainly for examples of the case usage for the given verbs. The purpose of these corpora searches is to get a general idea of what is

---

\(^{20}\) When citing results from the Russian Corpus, I have used the numbers given in the results; in some cases, there is more than one result under the same number when there is more than one “hit” from the same source. When citing from the ČNK, I give the page number for the result (there are twenty unnumbered results for each page of results).

\(^{21}\) Although certain issues of discourse are ultimately important for this study, my research is not primarily focused on discourse, and it is not typical of discourse analysis in that I do not examine corpora of data in their entirety, nor do I make a statistical analysis of occurrences of one structure or another.
possible and what is not, and to supplement the examples found in reference works on, as well as linguistic studies of, the languages in question. The corpora are dominated by examples from literature and mass media, and, as such, are not particularly representative of the languages as a whole or of their respective speech communities\textsuperscript{22}. Much of the writing from literary and journalistic sources does, however, have the advantage of being quite imaginative, and, in this regard, it often pushes the potential of a language to its limits. Testing the boundaries of language in such a manner can be revealing in terms of which usages are possible and which are impossible. Thus, my use of corpus data is largely for the purpose of testing claims about language, testing its limits, and, to a lesser extent, observing trends or patterns in usage. It is not the purpose of this dissertation to make accurate frequency counts or to estimate the proportion by which one valency might be preferred over another.

However, in an attempt to make some useful observations about prevalent patterns, I sometimes make reference to the frequency with which given forms occur out of a sample pool of “the first 50 relevant examples.” Relevant examples, for the purposes of this study, are those in which an Obj of the verb searched for is stated explicitly in the clause in which the verb occurs. For a verb of ‘throwing’, for example, the aim of a search is to find all of those examples in which there is an explicit Obj of ‘throw’ in either the ACC or in the INST case. The verb will in some instances have no Obj, either explicit or implicit; in other instances, the object thrown will be stated in a preceding clause or phrase, then elided in the phrase with ‘throw’. As I wish to make no assumptions about which case the elided Obj would be in if it were explicitly stated, that

\textsuperscript{22} There are further problems, such as the accuracy of tagging. The ČNK claims 94% accuracy for its grammatical tagging.
result will not be counted as a “relevant result.” In some certain instances, I have deemed it necessary or useful to discount verbs used in certain meanings in which one finds no variation in case usage; the verbs *kidat’*/*kinut’* and *brosat’*/*brosit’* “throw,” for example, may be use in the meaning ‘leave, abandon,’ and in this meaning they take only ACC Objs. When such measures have been taken, they will be duly noted.

Some additional steps have been taken when using the individual corpora in order to get reasonably meaningful results. Generally, when searching in the NKRJa, I choose the grammatical feature *act* (active voice) in order to eliminate reflexive (medio-passive) and passive uses of the verbs. These search terms are referenced as they appear on the results page from the corpus (without spaces between the grammatical terms). Additionally, in most searches in the NKRJa, I chose the tag *pf* or *impf* for the verb, even though the infinitive form entered can itself be only one aspect or the other. The results are somewhat different (typically a greater number turn up) if the grammatical tag for aspect is omitted, but this should in no way qualitatively affect the outcome. I have therefore used the results for the tagged search, although in some instances it has been necessary to use the non-tagged searches in order to have ample data. Unless I specifically note what grammatical tags were used in a NKRJa search, the reader can assume that the results were tagged only for voice and aspect.

In my ČNK searches, I have used the synchronic corpus for the year 2000 (syn2000). I have manually eliminated reflexives and passives from printouts of the results (aspect does not present a problem, as one only obtains results for, say, the pf. if the lemma entered in the search is a pf. form). As for the Russian corpus searches, it has been occasionally necessary to eliminate certain results where the verb is used in
meaning for which there is no case alternation, and such deviations from my usual practice, are, of course, duly noted.

After gathering the examples, I then consulted native speakers, where necessary, for their impressions of why certain forms or structures were likely chosen over others in given situations. (In some cases, these observations then suggest additional questions about what is possible, impossible, questionable, or preferred, especially in terms of case valencies.) Finally, in order to test the limits of what is acceptable usage, or what is possible in certain situations of pragmatics, I contrived collocations and sought the reactions of native speakers of the languages in question. These reactions have, quite naturally, often included further examples of what kinds of utterances are or not possible or likely.
CHAPTER 2

PARAMETERS OF TRANSLITERITY CRITIQUEED

2.1. Introduction to parameters of transliterity

In Hopper and Thompson (1980: 251-3), the authors outline a set of “parameters of Transliterity,” or criteria for determining the level of transliterity inherent in the relationship between a verb and its object (or between agent and patient, in semantic terms). Each of these parameters or properties can be considered HIGH or LOW in transliterity. The combination of HIGH and LOW parameters in any clause can be used to determine its relative degree of overall transliterity. They further suggest that, in the event that formal indicators of any two of these parameters obligatorily co-occur in a clause, they will be either both high or both low.

The parameters listed by H & T (1980: 252) are restated here along with the properties that indicate high or low transliterity for each parameter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. PARTICIPANTS</td>
<td>2 or more participants, A[g] and O[bj]</td>
<td>1 participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. KINESIS</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>non-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ASPECT</td>
<td>telic</td>
<td>atelic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. PUNCTUALITY</td>
<td>punctual</td>
<td>non-punctual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. VOLITIONALITY</td>
<td>volitional</td>
<td>non-volitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. AFFIRMATION</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. MODE</td>
<td>realis</td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H & T later state (254-5) that, “In the grammars of all the languages we have examined, we find that these component features of Transitivity CO-VARY extensively and systematically.” Thus, “whenever an obligatory pairing of two Transitivity features occurs in the morphosyntax or semantics of a clause, THE PAIRED FEATURES ARE ALWAYS ON THE SAME SIDE OF THE HIGH-LOW TRANSITIVITY SCALE” (emphasis in original). They then frame their Transitivity Hypothesis thus:

If two clauses (a) and (b) in a language differ in that (a) is higher in Transitivity according to any of the feature 1A-J, then, if a concomitant grammatical or semantic difference appears elsewhere in the clause, that difference will also show (a) to be higher in Transitivity.

To this statement they add that “the Transitivity Hypothesis refers only to OBLIGATORY morphosyntactic markings or semantic interpretations” (255, emphasis in original). The question of obligatoriness is crucial to much of our discussion, since there are some phenomena in Slavic which have been cited as contradictions of the TH, but which upon more careful examination do not appear to be genuine contradictions, as they do not involve obligatory pairings of high and low transitivity features. There will be considerable discussion on this matter in the sections on contradictions of the TH and hypotheses to be tested below.

As H & T note, Parameters A – H deal with the action or the Agent thereof; parameters I and J deal with the (grammatical, at least in non-ergative languages) object,
or the “Patient” in the terms of semantic roles. They provide a more detailed discussion of the final Parameter J, INDIVIDUATION, saying, “The component of INDIVIDUATION … refers both to the distinctness of the patient from the A[gent] … and to its distinctness from its own background.” Following Timberlake (1975, 1977), they list the following properties of Individuation (253):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUATED</th>
<th>NON-INDIVIDUATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proper</td>
<td>common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human, animate</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referential, definite</td>
<td>non-referential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The criteria established by H&T, if valid, should have significant predictive power in terms of when languages employ the formal means at their disposal for marking degree of transitivity. Below is an outline of the criteria with their relevance to Czech and Russian case (and that of other Slavic languages). A detailed discussion of the more pertinent criteria, namely for certain semantic classes of Czech and Russian verbs, follows in subsequent chapters.

For now, I limit my observations on case to preliminaries, but let me remark here that intuitively the accusative seems to indicate higher transitivity than oblique cases. Haiman (1983: 791), relates this intuition to “the conceptual distance between verb and object,” which, in instances of lower transitivity, is “greater when the object is in an oblique case.” Even though Hopper and Thompson do not list case as a parameter of transitivity, they certainly imply that the accusative corresponds to higher transitivity than the genitive of negation – particularly in their discussion of Timberlake (1975). H & T
also refer to case in discussing the importance of the distinction between direct and indirect objects (259-60); while they do not specifically refer to case as a parameter in this context, there is certainly reason to consider it relevant here as well, given its extensive use for marking the indirect/direct object distinction. H & T further link case with transitivity in discussing the use of absolutive vs. oblique case-marking for ergative languages (263, 257), and they refer on several other occasions to case marking. Furthermore, in a (largely positive) critique of H & T, Abraham (1983) writes of the ACC (in Dutch, German, and Slavic) throughout his article as indicating higher Transitivity than does the DAT.

The present critique takes up one parameter at a time, for the most part; each parameter is discussed in isolation as far as possible. However, complete and total isolation is impossible, because some parameters, it appears, are dependent on or linked to others. The “Transitivity Hypothesis,” furthermore, concerns the combination of two (or potentially more) parameters; it assumes that they should both be high transitivity in one of two comparable clauses and both low in the other, when the differences between those clauses are obligatory. The question of such combinations of parameters is quite complicated and will be taken up in due time; it is necessary to begin with an examination of the individual parameters and their semantic and morphosyntactic relationships to transitivity. Finally, the approach to transitivity taken here, as bound up with case as it is, will necessarily entail some discussion of case along with each parameter.

23 They also cite the case marking of objects in Estonian in the NOM, GEN, or PART as relevant to transitivity (264). They mention the difference in usage of quasi-case directional versus locative suffixes as being relevant to transitivity in some sentences in Indonesian (261), and they also claim that the use of ACC vs. PART in Finnish correlates with aspect and by implication, therefore, transitivity (271).
2.2. Participants

In our definition of transitivity, an action is exerted by an Ag (or arguably a Cause in some instances) onto a Pat; thus the two participants Ag and Pat are nearly essential to any high-transitivity occurrence. This concept is stated in H & T (1980: 252) as follows: “No transfer can take place unless at least two participants are involved.” If there are only two participants involved, then they typically have the semantic roles (or relations) of Agent and Patient. There of course may be other participants involved, such as Instruments, Recipients, etc.

In canonically transitive sentences like (1),

(1) Cz. Bůh stvořil člověka. ‘God created man.’

we find a typical encoding of the Agent as NomSubj and Patient as AccObj. The issue would seem more problematic when dealing with three-participant clauses or events of the sort “X gives Y to Z,” e.g., (2):

(2) Ru. Deti dajut mame cvety ‘The children give Mama flowers.’

In (2), the dative indirect object can be viewed, in terms of case roles, as Recipient or Benefactive, but the role of the accusative “direct object”, as it is known in traditional grammars, is far less clear. Certainly the transferal of the action onto the Object/Patient in “God created man” is not the same kind of transferal “onto” the book in “John gave Mary a book.”24 The former brings something into being, while the latter simply changes its

---

24 For a consideration of the question of whether Y in X gave Y to Z is a Patient or a “Theme,” or should be more properly labeled a “Percept,” see Jackendoff 1987.
location or possession. This issue suggests the parameter Affectedness, discussed in I. below.

In sentences such as (3),

(3) Cz. *Mama upěkla dětem koláč.* ‘Mama baked the children a pie.’

we have an example in which the ACC Obj, by virtue of having been created, is much more clearly a Patient (and the Agent and Recipient remain in typical case and position). Given our definition and the examples of transitivity in the introductory chapter, which emphasize creation as a highly transitive act, we would therefore have to consider sentence (3) higher in transitivity than sentence (2); however, this determination is based on Affectedness and not on the parameter of Participants.

Verbs employing different valencies may change the grammatical relations among participants, sometimes emphasizing the gift and sometimes the receiver as the affected patient (although of course the affectedness of the gift is questionable, as we have just said), such as in the following Cz. sentences:

(4a) *Dařili mu auto.* ‘They gave him a present.’
(4b) *Obdarovali ho autem.* ‘They presented him with a car.’

In instances like these, we find two possible representations of the same act of giving; the difference in emphasis accounts for the morphosyntactic differences.

There is also the issue of verbs that have what seem to be patient objects in the instrumental, especially verbs which have body parts as objects of motion, such as Ru.* vertet' golovoj and maxnut' rukoj and their analogues in Cz., vrtět hlavou, mavat rukou.*
Even one Russian grammarian, Peškovskij (1938: 282, cited in Levine, 1980: 11), has written that an ACC DirObj would seem more logical with such verbs. Most of these verbs do, in fact, take ACC Objs in many instances, and it has been argued (Levine, 1980: 10) that when body parts are perceived as independent of the body, they are usually found in the accusative, but when they are understood as an extension of the body, they are typically found in the instrumental.

This last explanation is relevant to our discussion of participants, since an Ag operating on itself – or part of itself – arguably makes the action lower in transitivity, due to the identity (co-referentiality) of Ag and Pat or their lower degree of distinction one from the other. Just as a distinction must be made between semantic and syntactic transitivity, the distinction should also be made between semantic reflexivity, which involves the identity of Ag and Pat, and syntactic reflexivity. Syntactic reflexivity, furthermore, can express four types of semantic situations: 1) reciprocity, 2) detransitivity, 3) passive, or 4) middle object (which I would consider the “true” or semantic reflexive).

2.2.1. One-participant events

At this point, let us consider those events or utterances lower on the transitivity scale, namely those with only agent or patient (though they may contain other participants, such as instrument). Given our definition of transitivity, centered on the notion of transferal of an action from an Ag to a Pat, one-participant events would seem to be utterly excluded from the realm of transitivity. Furthermore, as we have discussed...

---

25 Yet many so-called “one-participant” clauses or utterances contain noun clauses conveying a role such as Benefactive, Theme, Instr, etc., instead of a Pat.
in our definition of transitivity, we need to be prepared to think of transitivity as a continuum, and not as an either/or proposition. We also must keep in mind the fact that syntactic transitivity does not always correspond neatly with semantic syntax, as discussed in the introductory chapter. Finally, H & T claim (265), “Morphosyntactic correlates of higher vs. lower Transitivity may be displayed even in clauses with only one NP argument.”

As an initial example, let us consider verbs of motion, which would seem to be inherently intransitive, but some of which, upon closer examination, reveal themselves to have some potential for transitivity. With ordinary verbs like ‘go,’ there is no syntactic transitivity, though the equivalent act of traveling to a certain place may be re-phrased with a different verb to indicate the place as a goal attained:

(5a) *I went to New York* vs. *I reached New York.*

Similarly, a path can often be seen as an obstacle overcome, with no change in verb, as in (5b) and (5c):

(5b) *He climbed up the cliff*
(5c) *He climbed the cliff.*

The Czech and Russian equivalents of (5a) are as follows:


A similar example to the examples of path vs. obstacle can be found in the Czech *projít* + INST ‘go through s.th.’ (path) vs. *projít* + ACC ‘go around’ (obstacle).
One area in which syntax does not seem to correspond with semantics is in expressions of possession, which can vary significantly from one language to the next, and even within a given language. In Latin one can find doublets of the sort exemplified by the examples in (7a):

(7a) Eo equus est/(Is) habet equum.
Him-DAT horse-NOM is/(He-NOM) has horse-ACC
‘He has a horse.’

in which the equivalent idea may be expressed using the dative of the possessor and nominative of thing possessed or by means of the usual “transitive” morphosyntax of the NOM of possessor and ACC of thing possessed. Possession, it should be noted, is not very transitive semantically, as it describes a relation between possessor and possession, rather than the possessor actually doing something with the possession. (In many cases, in fact, the verb ‘have’ is used with direct objects which are not possessions, e.g., I have a great job, a wonderful spouse, and three lovely children.) Thus, there is a significant structural difference in the Russian and Czech expressions for ‘I have money’

(7b) Cz. Mám peníze
Have-1sg money-NOM
Ru. U menja est’ den’gi.
at me-GEN is money
‘I have money.’

where Russian uses location to indicate the possessor while Cz. employs a verb meaning ‘have.’ A number of similar disparities can easily be found, all of them resulting in the differences between syntactic transitivity (as opposed to semantic transitivity, which for these utterances is the same) in the two languages, with Czech typically employing the expressions with higher syntactic transitivity.
Expressions meaning literally ‘I have hunger/thirst’ can be found in French, Italian, and German, but not in Russian. Isačenko (1974: esp. p. 67, cf. also Benveniste, 1960) saw this as part of the greater typological distinction of ‘have’ vs. ‘be’ languages in Europe. More pertinent to the subject at hand, it does not seem that the subject of these Czech sentences does anything to the object (other than experience it), much less possess it. Here, the verb has the function of expressing a state or condition which does not last; in this meaning, the verb mít ‘have’ shows a metaphorical relationship to its etymological meaning of “holding,” somewhat like the have in I have the Queen of spades in a card game. It seems, therefore, that Russian uses the means of expression in which semantic and syntactic degree of transitivity more closely coincide. The use of DAT + xočetsja is close to the DAT + adverbial expressions of sensation:

(8) Ru. Mne xolodno Me-DAT cold ‘I’m cold’

Here we have an expression with an experiencer DAT – the so-called “logical subject” – and no nominative or accusative; syntactic transitivity doesn’t get much lower than this. H & T (254) also refer to the phenomenon of the experiencer in an oblique case, as in

26 Verbs of perception likewise can be considered low in transitivity, as we take up in part H. below.
Spanish *Me-DAT gusta la cerveza* ‘I like beer,’ where the object is “not much of a patient.”

Sometimes the “logical subject” is in the accusative, as in the Russian

(9a) *Menja znobit*
   I-ACC chill-3sg
   ‘I am shivering’

where there is no stated subject, although one may consider that there is an implied subject – at least it is the *cause* of the action – such as “the cold” or perhaps “fever.” Such “impersonal” constructions are quite common in Czech and Russian, and typically correspond to actions low in semantic transitivity. This sentence may be contrasted with the roughly synonymous

(9b) *Ja drožaju (ot xoloda)*
   I-NOM shake (from cold-GEN)
   ‘I am shivering/shaking (from the cold).’

in which basically the same action is taking place. Both (9a) and (9b) demonstrate a physical reaction\(^\text{27}\). For this reason, then, it might be more reasonable to describe the *menja* in (9a) and the *ja* in (9b) as “undergoers” of the action in question, as it is difficult to attribute any significant degree of agentivity to them. In fact, it would probably be more accurate for the speaker of an utterance such as (9b) to refer to “my body” or “my limbs” as the subject of the sentence.

\(^{27}\) This is arguably not the same thing as an “experience,” since no awareness is required. I make this point because H & T refer to an “experiencer” in an oblique case as in Sp. *Me-DAT gusta la cerveza* ‘I like beer’, but the matter of whether the animate being involved is an experiencer or a more-or-less unconscious “undergoer” of an action need not distract us too much here; their treatment is morphosyntactically quite the same in many cases.
In (9a), as well as in (10), we see what might be considered a logical subject, since the sentence describes its reaction, but it is also, at least arguably or in some sense, a Patient, as it undergoes some process due to conditions outside itself.

(10) Cz. Petrem škublo
    Peter-INST jerk/tug-3sg neut.
    ‘Peter shuddered’ (Janda & Townsend 82).

In (10), as in (9a), it seems the Patient undergoes the act unintentionally, or perhaps even against his will. Sentence (10) should be considered lower in syntactic transitivity than (9) because the Patient is in an oblique case, and lower in semantic transitivity because the cause is even less clear. Additionally, one may find some causation, such as a sensation of fear, depending on the discourse context of the sentence, but a cause is no indication that any Agency is present in the action.

In general, sentences with an “empty subject” are low in transitivity, both semantically and syntactically. This holds as well for sentences with the pronoun to filling the empty subject position, as in:

(11a) Cz. Tady to smrdí rybinou ‘It stinks of fish here’ (Janda 2000: 81)
(11b) Cz. Páchne to hnilotinou ‘It reeks of putridity’ (Kryl: Bratřičku)

An absence of transfer is inherent in sentences where the “action” really represents a state (see the discussion of kinesis below), and the NP in the INST may be considered an adverbial\(^{28}\). The sentence actually describes the quality of the air or the atmosphere of a certain location and the sensation or impression produced. It is almost like saying “There

\(^{28}\) In one sense, these INST expressions may be seen as adverbials of manner, i.e., ‘like fish’, ‘like putridity’; however, the physical component, the cause of the smell, is also present.
was a smell of fish/putridity in the air.” (Note also that English in the glosses above creates a certain syntactic “distance” between the verb and “object” by means of the preposition of.)

It is just as easy to use this type of instrumental (of the noun whose quality is produced by a given sensation) with two-participant actions, such as:

(12a) Cz. Jídlo chutnalo česnekom. ‘The food tasted of garlic’ (J&T 81)
(12b) Cz. Sál zněl zpěvem. ‘The hall resounded with song’ (J&T 81)

In the first of these examples, we are clearly dealing with a state, and the INST NP is, again, arguably an adverbial. In the second we are dealing with a temporary quality and state, and it seems that we are also dealing here with a Subj/Pat. (and one could also argue that it is a location). Furthermore, it was the song that made the hall resound, which means that we also have here a cause (or, arguably, an instrument) in the INST. This construction with znít in Czech resembles middle voice constructions in English (cf. the English gloss given above), although, untypically for Czech, it is not reflexive.

Since we have just touched on the matter of voice in the preceding paragraph, let us address it a bit further here as appropriate for our discussion of Participants. It is worth remarking that reflexive constructions are those in which Participant 1 is the same as Participant 2, that is, \( P_1 = P_2 \). Still, properties other than appearance or sensation, like quantity, may be described with this subjectless structure:

(13) Hemží se tam rybami. ‘It’s teeming with fish there’ (MČ III: 28)
The use of the accusative reflexive may here preclude a further accusative object, but it is nevertheless clear that there is only one participant in the “action.” There is, however, also a (non-obligatory) location: *tam* ‘there’.

In the examples in (11)-(13), it seems we are dealing with adverbial (INST) phrases of manner rather than true objects as defined in the introductory chapter. There is more to the matter, however, as such sentences often involve a *cause* and a *location*. To exemplify, Fried (2005: 481) explains three types of expressions in Czech, each describing basically the same scene, but each have a different emphasis:

(14a) *V kuchyni voněla skořice.*
In kitchen-LOC smelled cinnamon-NOM
‘Cinnamon smelled in the kitchen.’

(14b) *Kuchyň voněla skořici.*
Kitchen-NOM smelled cinnamon-INST
‘The kitchen smelled of cinnamon.’

(14c) *V kuchyni vonělo skořici.*
In kitchen-LOC smelled cinnamon-INST
‘In the kitchen, there was the smell of cinnamon.’

The difference among these sentences is that in (14a), the cause of the smell is attributed directly to the cinnamon, in (14b) the smell of cinnamon is presented as a property of the kitchen, and (14c) presents the condition of the smell in the location of the kitchen. These sentences demonstrate that what is presented in (14a) and (14c) as a location can also be presented, as in (14b), as a Subj possessing a stative property. Thus, it is often the perspective of the speaker, or the perspective the speaker wishes to present, that determines the roles of the entities involved in the utterance.
While the matter of these participant roles is interesting and relevant to the matter of Transitivity, it is only obliquely relevant to the question of the Transitivity Hypothesis as we have stated it in terms of ACC vs. INST (or GEN) Objs for Slavic.

2.3. Kinesis

“Kinesis” can be defined as the transfer of an action from an agent to a patient, a notion essential in our definition of transitivity in the introductory chapter. To emphasize, kinesis necessarily involves an action, as opposed to a state. Thus, as H&T state, “Actions can be transferred from one participant to another, states cannot.” Thus something happens to Sally in I hugged Sally, but not in I like Sally.” Czech, like many Slavic (and non-Slavic) languages, expresses I hugged Jane with Jane in the accusative, but I like Jane can be rendered with Jane as the grammatical subject and the experiencer of the emotion in the dative, as in Czech Jana se mi líbí and Russian Ivana mne nравится.

With the verb ‘love,’ however, the object of affection is expressed in the accusative: Cz. miluju Janu, Ru. ja ljublju Ivanu. One could argue that, because the verb indicates a stronger affection for the object, more emotion is transferred onto the grammatical object, and the action is therefore more intense.

At any rate, kinesis would seem to be a valid factor for high transitivity, and the lack of kinesis for low transitivity for a given occurrence. While dative expressions are the most obvious illustrations of the kinesis factor, some examples are provided by verbs which indicate an emotional state and require an instrumental object, e.g. opovrhovat, pohrdat (zradci) ‘scorn, despise (traitors); chlubit se (úspěchy) ‘boast of (successes)’

---

29 This claim would seem to beg the question of how one should consider causatives, such as Ru. černit’ ‘blacken.’
(ČM 370). Since none of these verbs for emotional states with the instrumental shows any sign of alternation with the accusative, and also because kinesis is so inherently related to affectedness, this factor is not taken up separately in the following chapters.

2.4. Aspect – telicity

According to H&T (252), “An action viewed from its endpoint, i.e. a telic action, is more effectively transferred to a patient than one not provided with such an endpoint.” They give the examples of *I ate it up* and *I am eating it*, the Czech equivalents of which would be *Snědl jsem to* and *Jím to*. Czech and Russian also have a formal device, the perfective, for expressing the completeness of the action in the past tense.

For instance, in the entries for *vrhati/vrhnouti* ‘throw’ (SSJČ IV: 152-3), we find far more examples of instrumental objects with imperfective forms; in fact, the only example of the instrumental with the perfective verb is *v. kámen, kámenem (do vody)*, that is, an instance where the ACC and INSTR are equally valid. All other objects given in the examples with *vrhnouti* are in the accusative. A telling example is the phrase *v. všechny síly na západní frontu* ‘throw [dispatch] all forces to the western front’, which is described as “expressive” and indicates that the forces are being dispatched to the front with particular vigor. (This example also contains a strong element of will or “volitionality”; for a discussion of this parameter, see section 2.7. below.)

Other examples from these two listings demonstrate that the telicity of the action is only one factor involved; the other main factor is affectedness, a factor related to the object. Since the degree of affectedness of the object is largely dependent on the degree of completeness of the action, these two criteria, aspect and affectedness, are often
interdependent. The interdependence of these two criteria will be discussed at considerable length later, especially in the chapters on the INSTR. Furthermore, we have reason to believe that there is more at stake than simply grammatical aspect, but the whole range of meanings encoded in aspect in Slavic; namely, we should probably consider Aktionsart to be at least as important as aspect, if not more so. One of the other parameters mentioned by H & T, Punctuality, would seem to be a quality that might well be more properly subsumed under Aktionsart.

2.5. Punctuality

According to H&T (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; contrast kick (punctual) with carry (non-punctual).” From the wording of this quote, it is apparent that the authors are linking punctuality to the affectedness of the Patient. Beyond that, the matter of duration seems to be largely a lexical-semantic matter; again, it should probably be viewed as subordinate to Aktionsart. H & T do, in fact, note (271) that there is a strong correlation between “punctual actions and perfective predicates.”

In order to test the validity of the parameter of Punctuality in the present framework, one would have to consider whether those verbs which inherently indicate punctual actions are significantly more likely to take accusative objects. While it is not within the scope or intention of this study to conduct a statistical analysis, there are numerous examples of non-punctual verbs which take instrumental objects, even where those objects may well be considered “logical” direct objects. (In many instances, these
non-punctual verbs indicate states rather than actions, which tends to point to the relatedness of Kinesis and Punctuality.)

In order to consider how Punctuality can correlate with the use of oblique case objects, let us consider first verbs which take INSTR – and in some cases alternatively ACC – objects. It is useful to divide such verbs into several categories in order to demonstrate this correspondence.

Category 1 is verbs of sensation or “verbs of phenomena detected by the senses meaning ‘to issue from oneself light, sound, aroma, etc.’” (Šmilauer [1966: 200-204]): Cz. vonět růžemi ‘smell (pleasantly) of roses,’ chutnat česnekem ‘taste like garlic,’ etc. (PMČ: 242).

Category 2 is verbs of movement, including motion of body parts: Cz. hýbat rukama ‘wave one’s hands.’ For Russian, this group includes verbs such as švyrjať ‘to throw.’ For the sake of simplicity, phrases such as Ru. dyxat’ svežim vozduhom ‘breathe fresh air’ are subsumed under this category.

Category 3 contains verbs of occupation, such as Cz. zabývat se ‘occupy oneself (with)’ and verbs of control, such as vladnout ‘rule’ (Šmilauer 1966: 203): Přemyslovci vládli velikým a uzavřeným územím ‘The Przemyslids ruled a large and closed territory’. Russian verbs such as vladet’ ‘to have a mastery of’ and rukovodit’ ‘to manage’ also fall into this category. This category also includes, for many scholars, Czech verbs of saving and wasting (cf. Janda & Clancy 2006: 194, where these verbs are listed under “control, manipulation, enjoyment, and suffering”). This categorization is not entirely convincing to me, although one can discern some semantic connection between controlling and
having money or goods at one’s disposal, so for the sake of simplicity I will use this
categorization here.

Category 4 can be designated “verbs of mental and physical states” (PMČ: 242),
such as Cz. chlubit se or Ru. (po-) xvastat’sja, both meaning ‘to boast (of)’, Cz.
opovrhovat ‘scorn’, pohrdat ‘despise’, překypovat ‘be bursting (with emotion)’

Category 1 contains verbs indicating states and thus would have to be placed at or
near the non-punctual end of the punctuality scale. The impf. verbs in category 2 tend
toward the non-punctual end, as there is no clear endpoint to the action, but their pf.
counterparts, such as švyrnut’ ‘throw’, indicate punctual actions. Although most verbs of
governing or control (category 3) tend to be inherently process-oriented, Cz. verbs of
saving and wasting tend more strongly to take the ACC when in the pf and the INST
when in the impf, as is discussed in detail in the chapter on the INST. Category 4
contains mostly verbs that are non-punctual, since they indicate states of mind. (The Cz.
verbs vychloubat se, honosit se, pyšnit se ‘boast/be proud of’ have no pf counterparts; the
Ru. (po-)xvastat’sja is exceptional.) So only the verbs in categories 2 and 3 have much
potential to indicate punctual actions. Since verbs of saving and wasting and other verbs
of control are discussed in detail elsewhere in this study, I limit my discussion here to one
of the verbs of category 2.

I consider here the matter of one particular verb: klátit, a verb of movement which
can have the meaning ‘dangle’ or ‘shake down (fruit from a tree). This verb can take

---

The last three Cz. examples are from Janda & Clancy (2006: 195) and are listed among “words indicating
enjoyment and suffering.” As such, they are included in their section on “control, manipulation, enjoyment,
and suffering.” The connection between ‘scorn’ and ‘boast (of)’ is, like some of the other semantic
relations in these categorizations, somewhat tentative. ‘Boast’, also included in Janda & Clancy’s list for
“enjoyment and suffering,” may be a speech act, but it also reflects an attitude toward something, as does
‘scorn’, so there is some semantic connection. For the sake of convenience, I will adhere to the
categorization as given.
either an instrumental or accusative object, depending on the meaning. According to the
SSJČ (I: 872), the verb *klátit* takes an instrumental object when in meaning 1: ‘swing’
and an accusative object when in meaning 2: ‘knock down/off, shake off by (roughly)
shaking’ (*cloumáním srážet, setřásat*). In meaning 1 there is no indication of a change of
state or position. However, in meaning 2, where the action described is actually
removing something, i.e., is clearly transitive as it involves Affectedness of the Obj, the
accusative is required.

(15) *k. ovoce z větví; k. ořechy* (SSJČ I: 872) ‘shake down fruit from the branches,
to shake loose nuts’

The change or position, from a state of attachment to branches to separation from them, is
a clear instance of affectedness, a change in the state of the object.

We return to the notion of punctuality in our later discussion of how the criteria of
the Transitivity Hypothesis work together. Suffice it to say for the moment that most of
the verbs in these four categories indicate states or processes. When the action is
punctual, or, arguably, telic, as in meaning 2 (‘knock down’) of *klátit*, the verb is more
likely to take an ACC Obj.

H & T (266-8) do not elaborate much on their definition of Punctuality, but their
examples (esp. p. 267) tend to indicate that they contrast Punctuality with processes and
repeated actions. As we see below for verbs of saving and wasting, there are instances in
which prefixed pf. verbs indicating a one-time action may have “derived imperfectives”
which indicate a punctual or telic action which is repeated. In other words, there are

31 Furthermore, this verb tends to refer to branches or other appendages dangling—cf. *klátit nohama*—
therefore we are dealing with issues of separateness from or extension of the whole. These issues will be
dealt with more thoroughly in the chapters on the instrumental and on voice.
morpho-lexical devices available to Slavic languages for expressing repeated, telic actions. Such morpho-lexical and semantic issues are a very complicated matter of Aktionsart in Slavic, and these complications are not accounted for in H & T.

Turning to another matter, Punctuality can be expressed in various Slavic languages by means of the po- prefix, which mostly forms perfective verbs. This category is very productive in Russian and abounds in examples like poguljať ‘take a walk,’ poprobovat’ ‘try out,’ pokušat‘ have a bite to eat,’ etc. But when these verbs take an object, it is often in the (partitive) GEN, e.g. popiť moloka, čaju. This use of the GEN indicates a limited participation of the object in the action, and, indeed, the lack of completeness of the action on the object. This facet of the question, therefore, falls into the category of Individuation, which will be discussed later.

Another problem is that the po- prefix can be used to indicate inchoativity, e.g., Cz. pohnout + INSTR (also + s + INSTR or + ACC [HUM], depending on meaning, see SPP: 147). This again points to the idea that Aktionsart would make a more reliable parameter for Slavic than either Aspect or Punctuality taken alone.

2.6. Volitionality – purposefulness

H&T (252) write that “The effect on the patient is typically more apparent when the A[gent] is presented as acting purposefully; contrast I wrote your name (volitional) with I forgot your name (non-volitional).” They also refer (264) to the directedness of the action as being relevant to Transitivity.

In Czech and Russian, there are formal ways of indicating that actions such as remembering or forgetting (or losing) are volitional or non-volitional. The issue of
Volitionality is relevant for following pair of Russian sentences (McCawley [1976: 195-6], from Verhaar [1990: 108]):

(16a) *Ja vspomnil ètu noč’.* ‘I-NOM remembered this night-ACC.’
(16b) *Mne vspomnilas’ èta noč’.* ‘I-DAT remembered-refl. this-NOM night-NOM.’

The main semantic difference between these two sentences is that (16a) would normally indicate some effort or intention on the part of the Subj to recall the night in question, whereas (16b) reflects lower Volitionality on the part of the person remembering; the memory of the night came back to the person. The difference in Transitivity is reflected quite clearly in the use of the ACC for the more transitive action in (16a) as compared to the construction with NOM of the thing remembered and the DAT experiencer in (16b).³²

There are similar instances in Czech where the Pat is the Subj of the sentence and the person to whom the unfortunate event happens is in the DAT:

(17) *Něco vám upadlo.*

   something-N you-D fell

   ‘You dropped something.’

In this sentence, the DAT indicates that the event happened to the person in question, and, in this case, without the person’s knowledge or will, since people don’t usually drop things on purpose. In those events where things are intentionally dropped, we find a different verb in Czech, e.g. *spustit kotvu* ‘drop anchor’ or *spustit vědro do studně* ‘lower the bucket into the well.’ (The verb *spustit* also suggests a high degree of control.) In comparison to the example above, it would even sound a bit odd to use the volitional verb

³² Both of the examples in (16) are low in Transitivity, as *noč’* ‘night’ is hardly affected in either one.
spustit rather than the ethical dative expression above: *Spustil jste něco.\textsuperscript{33} This suggests that the question of Volitionality and Transitivity is as much a lexical-semantic issue as it is a morphosyntactic one. In any event, the means of expressing low Volitionality revolve around the use of the DAT for the person who undergoes the actions, and there is little relevance for the choice of INST or GEN Objs. Therefore it does not seems that the criterion of Volitionality of the Agent is very relevant to the ACC/INST opposition in Czech or Russian.

The Volitionality of the Pat may, however, have some relevance for issue of Transitivity in ways not predicted by H & T. Although H & T only point to the VOL of the Ag, in many instances the VOL of the Pat also plays a role in the choice of case. This is evident in the causative constructions in the following pair of Hungarian sentences (Comrie 1989: 174):

\begin{align*}
\text{(18a) } & \text{Én köhögtettem a gyereket.} \quad \text{‘I caused the child-ACC to cough’} \\
\text{(18a) } & \text{Én köhögtettem a gyerekkel.} \quad \text{‘I caused the child-INSTR to cough’}
\end{align*}

Example (18a) indicates that the Subj. caused the child to cough by some forceful action, such as slapping the child on the back, whereas (18b) indicates greater control on the part of the child, i.e. the child was encouraged to cough. One might even consider the possibility that the resistance of a Pat to the action of the Ag should be associated with higher transitivity; i.e., there is more transferal of the action onto the Pat if the Pat is not a willing participant. There is also the question of the will or degree of control of the

\textsuperscript{33} There is, however a verb upustit ‘drop’ used when the act is unintentional; thus, there is lexical differentiation in the matter of volition here, but no difference in terms of syntactic transitivity. Many non-volitional verbs in Czech take ACC Objs, such as ztratit ‘lose’, zapomenout ‘forget’ or other verbs with unintended negative results.
person addressed in imperative constructions, a question which will be taken up in the chapter on Aspect.

Finally, it should be remarked that volitionality correlates highly with animacy and agency, and this is due to the inherent nature of each of these parameters. “Protoypical agents are volitional” observes Croft (1991: 155); “hence, they are most likely human, or at least animate.” I take up this matter further in the conclusions to this chapter and in my discussions of Animacy.

2.7. Affirmation

H&T (252) describe the parameter of Affirmation simply as the “affirmative/negative parameter,” and it is clear from their table on the same page that the affirmative is to be taken as the high-Transitivity feature, negation, as the low. They discuss this parameter briefly, along with that of Mode in their section 2.8 (276-7) and again (briefly) in their section on discourse (287). In both of these discussions, they focus mainly on negation and its correlation with Irrealis; they claim (287) that “negation is a digression into a possible but non-real world.” In section 2.8, they also relate negation to the presence or absence of articles— or words like any or some – accompanying the DirObj in negated clauses in French and English. Although H & T do not actually give a working definition of Affirmation, it seems that they regard Affirmation as basically an assertion that something actually happened or is happening or will happen. Another way to regard Affirmation is simply as the absence of negation. In comparing affirmation

---

34 This leaves aside the possibilities of lying and fiction, but we assume that even these involve events in some contingent world of the imagination, or what the speaker wants the hearer to believe (at least in the sense of suspended disbelief in the case of fiction).
and negation, the latter is the marked member of the contrasting pair. It is not surprising, then, that most of the attention devoted to this parameter, in H & T and in other works I cite in this section, actually focused on negation. For Slavic, this has mainly to do with the GEN of negation.

The question of the use of the GEN under negation in Russian has been worked out quite thoroughly in Timberlake (1975), whose findings are also briefly summarized in H&T (279). Klenin (1980) represents a continuation of Timberlake’s work in addition to drawing upon much earlier observations by Šaxmatov. All of these studies have to do with the opposition of genitive and accusative, and they deal mostly with properties of Individuation which determine, to a large extent, the choice of case of the Obj in negated clauses. While these studies confirm the generally validity of Individuation parameters for the choice of case for Objs in negated clauses, complex combinations of feathers may be involved, and some features may trump others. Mustajoki (1985) has made one of the most thorough studies of the problem to date, relying on questionnaires to determine how combinations of factors affect the choice of case under negation among native speakers of Russian. Among other things, he concludes (166-7) that adequate strength of negation will overcome the tendency to use the ACC for a concrete Obj.

---

35 In Czech, the genitive of negation remains only as an archaism, except with existential predicates (Timberlake 1975: 132).

36 One should also recognize that the choice of case under negation is not simply a matter of GEN vs. ACC in Objs; there are also issues related to the “scope of negation” which are very important for the choice of GEN vs. NOM Subj (cf. Babby [1980]).
2.8. Mode

In H&T (252), “This refers to the distinction between ‘realis’ and ‘irrealis’ encoding of events. An action which either did not occur, or which is presented as occurring in a non-real (contingent) world, is obviously less effective than one whose occurrence is actually asserted as corresponding directly with a real event.” The criterion of mode seems to have little to do with instrumental objects, but it can be quite significant for the choice of GEN vs. ACC Objs.

The criterion of mode can influence the choice of genitive in negated clauses in Russian, as Timberlake 1975 (129) noted,

Both the imperative and the conditional describe potential, nonactual events. When negated, both seem to presuppose that the positive action is a possibility; this is especially clear in the conditional sentences, where in fact the positive action...is presupposed to have occurred. Since a negated imperative or conditional may presuppose the positive event, the force of negation is less strong for them than it is for the indicative.

Timberlake comments on similar effects of the interrogative/declarative parameter, concluding that “in an interrogative sentence,... the force of negation is attenuated,” because the affirmative is assumed to be true. Thus, although the genitive of negation is preferred in both the affirmative and the interrogative, a negated accusative object is more acceptable in the interrogative than in the affirmative:

(19a) ?Ni odnu knigu ja ne pročital za vsë leto.
I didn’t read even one book all summer.

(19b) Ni odnoj knigi ja ne pročital za vsë leto.
I didn’t read even one book all summer.
He didn’t read even one book all summer?

I have been unable to discern any relevance of Mode for the ACC/INST opposition in the choice of case for Objs in Russian or Czech.

2.9. Agency

H & T never define exactly what they mean by “Agency,” exemplifying it briefly in section 1. where they introduce their parameters. In fact, they mention Agency specifically only one time after their introduction of the concept, and that is in their subsection 2.4. (pp. 264-266), which discusses largely Volitionality. In that subsection, they even seem to equate to Kinesis and Volitionality. They also change from a discussion of Volitionality in one paragraph (265) to the use of the term “Agency” in the first line of the next without any pause for explanation, almost as if they regarded the two terms as nearly interchangeable. For the present discussion, we regard Agency and Volitionality as separate, though likely interdependent, phenomena. “Agency” can be fairly safely assumed to refer to the potential of the Subj (for non-ergative languages) to act.

37 “The morphosyntax of a clause may also signal, in various ways, differences in DEGREE OF DIRECTED PHYSICAL ACTIVITY in the event to which the verb refers. The same property is sometimes referred to as a KINETIC quality; and the intervention of the conscious will which is usually a part of the meaning of this type of verb—the deliberateness or spontaneity of the A—is called the VOLITIONAL element.” (264, emphasis in original.)
Here H&T seem to be largely concerned with the Agency of the participant or agent which would be encoded in most western European languages as the grammatical subject. In their view, a “participant high in Agency can effect a transfer of an action in a way that those low in Agency cannot.” This is illustrated by the examples in H & T (252):

(20) **George startled me vs. The picture startled me.**

H & T’s only further reference to Agency in their section 2.4. (mentioned above\(^{38}\)), has to do with one-participant arguments, the examples being encoding of the “subject” in Eastern Pomo, a California Hokan language, in sentences where the actant is slipping or sliding or getting bumped into accidentally or on purpose (again we seem to be dealing more with Volitionality!).

Let us then consider The Czech equivalents for ‘startle’ as suggested by H & T’s example above. These equivalents can be listed as: *vylekat, ulekat, polekat,*; all of them take a human object in the ACC (listed in PřSJČ as *koho*; it would appear that an animal could also be the object of these verbs), and all can appear in the reflexive. They are all listed as *koho* (ACC Obj) in their non-refl. forms. In the reflexive, *vylekat se* takes *z* + GEN, *ulekat se* takes GEN or *z* + GEN, and *polekat se* takes GEN or INSTR. Only INAN arguments (*čeho, čím*) can be used in this manner with the reflexives. This would seem to indicate that the reflexive is used when the cause of the startling is INAN—and therefore

---

\(^{38}\) H & T (273) also mention Silverstein’s (1976) Agency Hierarchy, and they mention Agency again, along with Volitionality (286-7), in their section 4. on discourse. They refer to Volitionality frequently throughout the article.
low in Agency—so that it is demoted from Subj position (or Agent status). Thus, we have returned to an apparent incidence where Animacy takes precedence formally.

So it would seem fairly self-evident that degree of Agency is subject to or determined by an Animacy hierarchy, and that the question of Volitionality is also at play, as I have noted above in 2.2. and 2.6., as well in the first paragraph of this section. The question of whether Volitionality and Agency are subordinate to Animacy will be taken up further in the section on hypotheses to be tested. We shall also have more to say on Animacy in the Subj later in this chapter and in the chapter that follows.

2.10. Affectedness

Like the following criterion, Individuation, Affectedness has to do with the grammatical Obj, at least in the languages under consideration here[^39]. Affectedness concerns the degree to which the object is modified by the action in question. As noted in the Introduction, the objects of verbs like ‘create’ or ‘destroy’, ‘give life’ or ‘kill are maximally affected by the action,’ and these verbs might be termed “maximally transitive” verbs. Thus, in a sentence like Cz. Bůh stvořil Adama ‘God created Adam,’ Adam is maximally affected by the act of creation. We have also noted that other highly affected Objs may be those that undergo some sort of change (Givón 1984: v. 1, 96-7).

The importance of Affectedness can be generally seen in the contrast between verbs that take an ACC Obj and those that take an INSTR Obj. Wierzbicka (1980: 24) has noted the contrast between sentences like Ru. Ivan otkryl glaza ‘Ivan opened his eyes’ and Ivan požal plečami ‘Ivan shrugged his shoulders.’ In the first sentence, there is a clear emphasis on the change of state of the eyes, whereas in the second, there is no

[^39]: Not always in ergative languages.
indication of a change of state of shoulders. In Czech as for Russian, the verb for ‘wink’ or ‘blink’ also takes the instrumental of the word ‘eye(s)’: Cz. mrkat očima. Furthermore, of the verbs that take instrumental objects and express some sort of movement, practically every single one (except the verbs with a meaning similar to ‘whip’) indicates a motion that falls into one of the following categories:

(21a) back-and-forth: vrtět ocasem ‘wag one’s tail’

(21b) circular: točití kolečkem, kohoutkem, klikou (SSJČ III: 834) ‘turn/twist a wheel, faucet, handle’

(21c) repeated: tloucit rukou o stůl ‘bang one’s hand on the table.’

Potentially, any of the objects in these and similar expressions could be returned to its original position, and in any event no change in position is emphasized or made clear. Some of the verbs indicate a single (or paucal) back-and-forth action in which the object is clearly returned to its starting point, as in shrugging, winking, nodding and shaking one’s head. So, in terms of the degree to which a change is “physical, discernable” or “accessible to observation” (Givón 1984: v. 1, 97), those objects which are returned to their original position would have to be considered low in Affectedness.

As I have already indicated, one could argue that most of these instrumental objects are adverbial phrases of means, since, especially in the case of body parts, the objects moved are used to express emotions or clearly communicative signals (e.g., nodding or shaking one’s head to indicate ‘yes’ or ‘no,’ cf. Wierzbicka 1980: 25-6). I, however, agree more strongly with the assessment of Havránek and Jedlička (1960: 355):
“An object expresses a person, animal or thing which the verbal action directly affects, onto which it passes or to which it applies, or which necessarily complements it.”

There is also a very important pragmatic consideration with regards to affectedness and the verbs of motion that can take accusative or instrumental objects. If a question focuses on the displacement of an object, then the answer must have an ACC Obj:

(22) Kde jsou moje noviny? → Hodil jsem je/*jimi do koše.
‘Where is my newspaper? → ‘I threw it-ACC/*INST in the wastebasket.

When verbs of saving (or wasting) take an Accusative object, the affected quantity is that which is ‘saved up,’ i.e., the money moves from a state of being used as an instrument of purchase to a state where it is in more-or-less permanent savings, remaining basically untouched (at least until needed). In other words, it is that which is accumulated.

(23a) Našetřil jsem tisíc korun.
‘I have saved (up) a thousand-ACC crowns-GEN.

An INST Obj here would be impossible:

(23b) *Našetřil jsem tisicem korun.
‘I have saved (up) a thousand-INST crowns-GEN.

Note that we also have a perfective verb here, so, as we have remarked earlier as well, the criteria of aspect and affectedness often work in tandem. Quantity is also an important factor, which leads us naturally to the final criterion of the Transitivity Hypothesis, individuation.
2.11. Individuation

Klenin (1980: 65) writes that, in Russian, singular nouns, count nouns, and modified nouns, as opposed to plural, mass and unmodified nouns, are more likely to be in the accusative than the genitive, as illustrated by the following examples (Klenin 64):

(24a) *Dam tebe moloka.*  ‘I will give you milk-GEN.’
(24b) *Dam tebe tvoe moloko.*  ‘I will give you your milk-ACC.’

Timberlake’s study on Russian suggests that mass nouns are much more likely than count nouns to be found in the genitive in negated clauses, thus Šokolada ne xočeš? ‘Don’t you want some chocolate-GEN?’ is considered a grammatical or appropriate utterance, whereas Galštuka ne xočeš? ‘Don’t you want a necktie-GEN?’ is only marginably acceptable.

We now consider Timberlake’s sub-categories of individuation, listed at the beginning of this chapter. Further examination of the implications of these sub-categories for specific phenomena in Czech and Russian, as well as how they interact with other parameters of transitivity, are also present in subsequent chapters. For the convenience of the reader, Timberlake’s sub-categories are restated here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUATED</th>
<th>NON-INDIVIDUATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>proper</td>
<td>common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human, animate</td>
<td>inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>singular</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>referential, definite</td>
<td>non-referential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As far as the modern Slavic languages are concerned, the proper/common distinction seems to be relevant mainly when it coincides with the distinction between human or animate vs. inanimate. Thus, with verbs that have historically taken GEN Objs, e.g. ‘fear’, we find an increased usage of the ACC of named, human Objs in contemporary (most notably colloquial) Cz. and Ru.:

(25a) Ru. *Ja bojus’ Papu.*
    I  fear   Papa-ACC
    ‘I’m afraid of Papa.’

(25b) Cz. *Bojím se Tatu*
    I  fear   Daddy-ACC
    ‘I’m afraid of Daddy.’

However, it seems that, especially for Russian, the main criterion for determining the case of Objs of *bojat’sja* is Animacy rather than Properness.

Definiteness also plays a significant role in GEN-governing Ru. verbs such as *iskat’* ‘look for’ and *ždat’* ‘wait for’, as suggested by the following examples of *iskat’* from Wade (2000: 116):

(26a) *iskat’ vozmožnosti*      ‘seek an opportunity-GEN’
(26b) *iskat’ pomoči*           ‘seek assistance-GEN’
(26c) *iskat’ upavšuju igolku*   ‘look for a dropped needle-ACC’
(26d) *iskat’ svoje mesto v zali* ‘look for one’s-ACC place-ACC in the hall’

Generally, these examples reflect the principle that more concrete objects are more likely to be found in the accusative. Wade (2000: 116) also notes that, as an object of *iskat’, rabota* can be found in either case, “with the accusative (the more usual form) referring to more specific work.” Much the same can be said of the definiteness principle
in the rather well-known example of *iskat’ ženu* ‘look for [one’s] wife-ACC vs. *iskat’ ženy* ‘look for a wife-GEN’, i.e. ‘try to find a woman to marry’.

The concrete/abstract parameter plays a role in the choice of case of Objs in Czech. There are several verbs which have historically taken genitive objects – *užívat* ‘use’, *používat* ‘use’, *dobyt* ‘capture, conquer’, *pozbyt* ‘lose’ – which have in more modern times come to alternate between genitive and accusative objects. However, these verbs are more likely to take accusative objects when those objects are concrete and genitive objects when they are abstract, e.g. *pozbyt peníze*-ACC ‘to lose money’ vs. *pozbyt platnosti*-GEN ‘lose validity’ (Havránek and Jedlička 1960: 356). The preference for the ACC with concrete Objs provides additional confirmation for the predictions of H & T.

Regarding the singular/plural distinction, a singular noun is inherently more individuated, that is distinct “from its own background” (H & T: 253), than is an unquantified plural noun. That is, ‘book’ is more distinct from ‘books’ (e.g., ‘all the books on the shelf/in the room/in the world’), as it is implicitly quantified as one, whereas the plural, in the absence of any explicit quantifiers, is not. It may well be the case that a NP such as ‘two books’ is equally distinct from all possible books to which the speaker might be referring. (We consider the individuation of quantified Objs in the chapter on Czech verbs of saving and wasting.) With regard to the count/mass distinction, count nouns are “easier” to quantify by the mere use of numbers, and, as I have just suggested, are inherently quantified in the sg., while mass nouns are usually quantified by reference to some unit of measure: gallons, liters, kilograms; or containers: baskets, cups, handfuls, etc. In Cz and Ru, such quantifiers are followed by an entity in the genitive,
which is also the case for non-paucal numbers. It would seem that, in phrases with quantifiers followed by a GEN NP, the quantifier becomes the head of the (larger, superordinate) NP, which is further reflected in the grammar by verb agreement with the quantifier (when the NP is the Subj). With regards to both singular/plural and count/mass, it seems that the former member of each category is more nearly associated with noun phrases which are quantified more specifically. H & T (253) state, “The degree to which an action is transferred to a patient is a function of how completely that patient is AFFECTED; it is done more effectively in, say, *I drank up the milk* than in *I drank some of the milk.*” I am suggesting that an explicitly quantified Obj NP, such as ‘a gallon of gas’ or ‘two gallons of gas’, is more likely than a non-quantified one to be seen as completely affected by an action; therefore, the sort of combination of Affectedness and Individuation to which H & T refer here is likely applicable to the sort of quantified NPs to which I am referring, as well.

The question of referential/definite vs. non-referential is largely a discourse matter, as it involves issues of topicality. It can therefore not be solved by reference to utterances in isolation. While this is not a corpus-based study, most of my examination of referentiality will come after an examination of formal features of transitivity, when phenomena become evident that can only be explained, or best explained, by considering more carefully the contexts in which such utterances are or are not possible, appropriate, etc.
2.12. Contradictions to the Transitivity Hypothesis?

One criticism leveled at the TH is that, in Slavic, Gm, and Dutch, among other languages, animate, and especially human, Objs are much more likely to be in DAT than are inanimate Objs, which are more likely to be in the ACC (Abraham 1983: 19). A further difficulty with the Animacy distinction in Slavic, in particular, is the ACC/GEN syncretism, which has developed over the centuries due to issues of saliency, declensional class, etc. Klenin (1983: 109) has come up with, I believe, a satisfactory resolution of this “apparent contradiction” (to be discussed in the chapter on Animacy).

A further problem for the TH is that the GEN tends to be more marked (both formally and in terms of semantic markedness) than the ACC—a tendency that has been noted across a wide variety of languages (Greenberg 1966: 38). Furthermore, a transitive clause with a HUM or ANIM Pat is more semantically marked than one with an INAN Pat; a clause with an INAN Ag and ANIM Pat is more marked still (Comrie 1989: 128). Thus, the more highly marked a clause is semantically, the more marked it tends to be formally. We will consider the interaction of markedness and transitivity in the section on hypotheses to be tested, and subsequently in later chapters, especially in the chapter on Animacy.

In addition to Abraham’s critique on the question of animate Objs in the DAT, several studies have raised objections to the Transitivity Hypothesis or brought up examples of (at least supposed) exceptions to or contradictions of the Transitivity Hypothesis. One such work, van dan Berg (1995) takes up the matter of verb classes in Muna and discovers what appears to be a counterexample to the TH, only to conclude that a “synchronic anomaly” has come about due to diachronic processes, coincidence,
and homonymy of forms. Thus, van den Berg ultimately finds no genuine contradiction of the TH. This situation is somewhat similar to the issue of Animacy, introduced briefly above, in which case diachrony, syncretism, etc. all conspire to present the linguist with apparent contradictions of the TH. (See my chapters on Animacy and Aspect for further discussion of potential contradictions.)

Other problems have been proposed which provide more cogent challenges to the TH. I will examine some of them in this section while trying to explain what I view as misperceptions of the TH. Eventually, I will propose some clarifications by which the TH can be strengthened and made less vulnerable to such seeming contradictions. Most of the data evaluated here will be Slavic.

Chvany (1990b/1996: note 10), gives (27a), “where perfective combines with partitive genitive,” which she calls a “Russian contradiction” of the TH:

\[(27a) \text{On vypil vody.} \quad \text{‘He drank-pf. some water-GEN.’}\]

One difficulty with this claim is that pf. and part.GEN are not an OBLIGATORY pairing; (27b) is also a perfectly grammatical utterance:

\[(27b) \text{On vypil vodu.} \quad \text{‘He drank-pf. the water-ACC.’}\]

The semantic difference between (27a) and (27b) depends on whether the grammatical subject drank all the water and whether the water was previously referred to in the discourse (hence the definite article in the English gloss of (27b)). Since H & T (255) refer specifically to obligatory pairings of features, and the combination of pf. and GEN
in (27a) is not the only possibility, there is no genuine contradiction to the TH to be found here.

Wierzbicka (1988: 352, note 13) provides a more compelling instance of a contradiction of the TH when she observes the following pairs of Russian sentences:

(27c) On vypil moloka. ‘He drank-pf. milk-GEN.’
(27d) On pil moloko /*moloka. ‘He drank-impf. milk-ACC/*GEN.’
(27e) On s"el kaši. ‘He ate-pf. porridge-GEN.’
(27f) On el kašu/*kaši. ‘He ate-impf. porridge-ACC.’

In these examples there is an obligatory pairing of impf. and ACC\(^{40}\). Wierzbicka’s discussion, however, fails to cover the possibility of the following two combinations of aspect and case:

(27g) On vypil moloko. ‘he drank-pf. milk-ACC.’
(27h) On s"el kašu. ‘He ate-pf. porridge-ACC.’

which combines perfective aspect with higher transitivity (higher than the expression with the genitive). If there is a counter-example to the TH to be found in these examples, it would seem to be the restriction on the imperfective, where the GEN is barred, i.e., where there is an obligatory combination of the low-Transitivity feature of impf. and the high-Transitivity feature of ACC.

Nonetheless, even that restriction does not seem enough to count these examples as constituting a true contradiction of the TH. In general, in comparing two transitivity features in minimally differing sets of sentences, a situation in which there are no limitations, i.e., there are no obligatory pairings of features at all, and all permutations are

\(^{40}\) Her (unnumbered) example for the example numbered here as (27f) does not mention the incorrect utterance with GEN kaši.
possible, could be represented like this (taking aspect and case as a restricted set of features for purposes of illustration):

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\sqrt{1} & \sqrt{1} \\
\text{Aspect-HIGH (pf.)} & \text{Aspect-HIGH (pf.)} \\
\text{Case-HIGH (ACC)} & \text{Case-LOW (GEN)} \\
\sqrt{1} & \sqrt{1} \\
\text{Aspect-LOW (impf.)} & \text{Aspect-LOW (impf.)} \\
\text{Case-HIGH (ACC)} & \text{Case-LOW (GEN)}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2.1

Taking into account all the permutations of aspect and case in the examples in (27) above, we find the following situation:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\sqrt{(27g)}, (27h) \text{ (and (27b))} & \sqrt{(27c)}, (27e) \text{ (and (27a))} \\
\text{Aspect-HIGH (pf.)} & \text{Aspect-HIGH (pf.)} \\
\text{Case-HIGH (ACC)} & \text{Case-LOW (GEN)} \\
\sqrt{(27d)}, (27f) & *\text{(27d) (27f)} \\
\text{Aspect-LOW (impf.)} & \text{Aspect-LOW (impf.)} \\
\text{Case-HIGH (ACC)} & \text{Case-LOW (GEN)}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2.2

It appears that we do not have a violation of the TH here, as there is no obligatory pairing of high and low transitivity features. (We might also consider that case \textit{per se} is not a parameter of transitivity, but we could substitute individuation for case in the above
scheme and would still have a situation representative of the Russian examples under consideration.)

It is important to note, however, that H & T specifically restrict their comparisons to “two clauses,” just as Wierzbicka did for (23c) and (23d). Wierzbicka observed that in d) the ACC is obligatorily paired with the impf., while overlooking the fact that the GEN is not obligatorily paired with the pf.; the ACC is possible as well. Thus, if H & T are held to their words, one can indeed find a violation of the TH in the pair of sentences (27c) and (27d).

I take the view that H & T intended the strictest possible interpretation of the TH when they referred to obligatoriness immediately after formally stating their hypothesis. This understanding would require one to consider all four possible permutations of any two features, high and low. This approach would require examining more than two clauses. According to this clarification, the following sort of situation should never arise:

```
*clause w
Aspect-HIGH
Case-HIGH
\sqrt{clause y}
Aspect-LOW
Case-HIGH
\sqrt{clause x}
Aspect-HIGH
Case-LOW
*clause z
Aspect-LOW
Case-LOW
```

Figure 2.3: A genuine violation of the Transitivity Hypothesis

In this situation, clauses x and y obligatorily combine HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH features, since the combinations of HIGH-HIGH and LOW-LOW are impossible and
only the combinations HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH are possible. Such a situation would represent a genuine violation of the TH.

If we add to the features of aspect and case a third feature, Individuation, then we see that the interaction of this parameter with case is well behaved, according to the TH; however, the addition of a third factor complicates matters in a way that makes it difficult to evaluate all the permutations of comparable sentences by reference to the TH. When we take Individuation into consideration, we see that the GEN cannot be used in phrases like (28b) and (28d) with singular count nouns:

(28a) *On el tort.
     ‘He ate/was eating-impf. cake-ACC.’
(28b) *On el torta.
     ‘He ate/was eating-impf. cake-GEN.’
(28c) On s"el tort.
     ‘He ate-pf. (the) cake-ACC.’
(28d) *On s"el torta.
     ‘He ate-pf. cake-GEN.’

The fact that more highly individuated objects can occur only in the accusative is a fact in line with the predictions of the TH. It gives us the following situation, where in fact individuation is high in all instances:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{(28a)} & \text{Aspect-LOW} \\
\text{(28c)} & \text{Aspect-HIGH} \\
\text{Case-HIGH} & \text{Case-HIGH} \\
\text{Ind-HIGH} & \text{Ind-HIGH} \\
\text{*(28a)} & \text{*(28b)} \\
\text{*(28d)} & \text{Aspect-LOW} \\
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2.4
If we add to our consideration a mass noun, we have the following sorts of possibilities:

(29a) *On vypil vodu.* ‘He drank-pf. (the) water-ACC.’
(29b) *On vypil vody.* ‘He drank-pf. (some) water-GEN.’
(29c) *On pil vodu.* ‘He drank/was drinking-impf. (the?) water-ACC.’
(29d) *On pil vody.* ‘He drank/was drinking-impf. (some) water-GEN.’

In these instances, unlike the ones in (28), we have to take into account the definiteness or individuation of “water.” In (29a) the water must be individuated and definite, some definite amount of water, perhaps poured out specially for him, and at least in the context of discourse, it must be known to the listener. In (29b), it may or may not be definite, but it must be low in individuation, that is, it is an uncertain or unclear amount. In (29c), the water may again be definite or indefinite, although it is not clear if the person drank all the water in front of him. It seems useless to even consider the referentiality or definiteness of the water in (29d), as this utterance is impossible anyway. To the extent that it would be possible to hear such an utterance, even as a native-speaker error, the GEN would presumably have to refer to an indefinite quantity.

The possible permutations of transitivity features of the examples in (29) could be summed up as follows:

(29a) *On vypil vodu.* pf.—ACC—REF—INDIV
(29b) *On vypil vody.* pf.—GEN—REF—NON-IND
(29c) *On pil vodu.* impf.—ACC—REF—INDIV/NON-IND
(29d) *On pil vody.* impf.—GEN—REF—NON-IND

Note that in (29a), the highest in transitivity grammatically, the only semantic interpretations of individuation that are allowed are high. Put another way, of all the...
possible formal combinations of features, (29a) is the most restrictive in terms of possible semantic interpretation. Note also that there are no violations of the TH (except possibly in (29d), which is a type of “violation” that will be covered below).

The Transitivity Hypothesis, then, falls short in dealing with the various possible permutations of high and low transitivity features when those combinations involve three or more features. As we see from the examples above, matters become very complicated when more than one parameter even of individuation is taken into account. When H & T speak of obligatory combinations of features, they are presumably referring to those restrictions that are present in the grammar of a language which allow some combinations of formal features and that disallow others. Methodologically speaking, it is perhaps best, then, to limit the study of such restrictions to first determining which utterances are possible and which are impossible. Once it has been determined which combinations of formal features are allowable and which are obligatory, it becomes productive to examine in more detail which semantic features or discourse properties are involved, especially when the observable combinations of formal features reveal some unexpected combinations. At the same time, it is important constantly to keep in mind semantic issues when observing and analyzing the available data.

2.12.1. A problem involving three parameters: imperatives in Russian

The practice of isolating two parameters of transitivity seems necessary, because complications involving additional parameters often arise, as illustrated by another possible violation of the TH. Chvany (1990b: 343) cites the imperative clause in (30) as an example of “Russian contradictions that violate the Transitivity Hypotheses where
categories grammaticized together are not from the same column” of the high-low transitivity parameters detailed by H&T:

(30) Smotri ne upadi! ‘Watch out you don’t fall!’

Chvany notes that, in such an utterance, “a non-volitional perfective combines with negation.”

Sentence (30)—along with other imperatives in Russian – deserves special consideration in order to get the full picture of all the linguistic and grammatical phenomena in play. Chvany is correct – at least on the surface of things – in saying that this imperative construction violates the TH in that it obligatorily combines high and low transitivity features. In addition, closer examination reveals that there are other factors to consider. First of all, the non-volitional property of the clause is implied semantically and pragmatically, whereas the negative and imperfective are grammatically (formally) expressed. In Russian, negative imperative constructions are typically expressed in combination with the imperfective form of the verb, whereas in the much less common instances employing the perfective, the speaker is warning the listener not to allow something to happen that might occur through carelessness. One can, however, consider (30) as a warning against an event happening against the listener’s will; the listener is exhorted in this utterance to exert his/her will to avoid a certain result. Thus, the issue of Volitionality is not quite so clear-cut.

---

41 This sentence is, of course, an extremely low-transitivity utterance. Despite its (relative) lack of transitivity, it bares some comparison to sentences in Eastern Pomo (a Hokan language of northern California) cited in H & T (265) in their section on Agency and Volitionality. Those sentences expresses slipping (unintentionally and sliding (intentionally).
Now let us examine more closely the fact, just raised above, that imperatives combining negation and the perfective are rather the exception than the rule. To illustrate, consider several Russian examples that differ (formally) only in the combination of negation/affirmation and aspect:

(31a) Otkroj dver’!
‘Open-pf. the door!’ (neutral)

(31b) Otkryvaj dver’!
‘Open-impf. the door!’ (indicating impatience, urgency, or repeated action).

(31c) Ne otkryvaj dver’!
‘Don’t open-impf. the door!’ (neutral; also general advice, as in ‘Don’t open the door before finding out who’s ringing.’)

(31d) Ne otkroj dver’!
‘Don’t open-pf. the door!’ (e.g., because there’s a thief trying to get in)

Of these phrases, (31a) and (31c) are the unmarked or neutral utterances, combining the high-transitivity features affirmation and perfective, on the one hand, and the low-transitivity features negation and imperfective, on the other; thus, it falls in line with the predictions of the TH. Sentences (31b) and (31d) are the marked utterances. In terms of grammaticality alone, there is no violation of the TH: all four utterances (31a)-(31d) are grammatical. At the same time their appropriateness must be determined by semantic, pragmatic, and discourse considerations. When these latter issues are taken into account along with the question of grammaticality, and especially when we consider the semantic issue of volitionality, we are by all appearances still faced with a genuine violation of the TH in (31b) and (31d), even according to the clarification or stricter interpretation of the TH given above and represented graphically in Figure C. This violation is due to the
combinations of volitionality with both affirmation/negations and aspect, as suggested by Chvany’s example.

2.13. Hypotheses to be tested

In the examples in (31), we are dealing with not two but three parameters of transitivity simultaneously: Affirmation, Aspect, and Volitionality. The TH, as suggested above, seems to have been intended to speak only of comparisons involving two parameters at a time (H & T: 255): “If any two clauses ... differ in that [one] is higher according to any of the features ..., if a concomitant ... difference appears elsewhere... that difference will also...be higher.”

As also suggested above, it appears that some of the formulation of the TH needs to be refined: the wording “if a concomitant ... difference appears elsewhere” implies that ANY difference, or ANY AND ALL differences, should be on the same side of the transitivity scale (high or low). H & T, at one point in their explanation of the TH, use the word or where, by the problems raised above would indicate that the word and would have been more appropriate: “…the hypothesis predicts that no language will be found in which the O[bj] of a telic verb must be marked as, say, non-referential, or in which the O[bj] of an atelic verb is necessarily referential” (H & T: 255, emphasis added).

This leads us to our first major, formally stated hypothesis to be tested:

Hypothesis A—If a situation can be found in which two features can differ in terms of high or low transitivity, and they can be compared in a set of four minimally differing clauses in which no other parameters of transitivity differ, there will never arise a situation in which both combinations of HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH transitivity are mandatory and, conversely, neither pairing of both high (HIGH-HIGH) and both low (LOW-LOW) is possible in such minimally differing utterances.
The words “in which no other parameters of transitivity differ” are specifically used here to exclude those possible situations in which a third parameter (or possibly even more) co-vary with the differences in the first two parameters under consideration. The wording about the impossibility of situations in which only the pairings HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH are allowed by the grammar of a language is precisely what is illustrated in Figure 2.3, reproduced here:

```
*clause w
  Aspect-HIGH
  Case-HIGH
\clause y
  Aspect-LOW
  Case-HIGH
\clause x
  Aspect-HIGH
  Case-LOW
\clause z
  Aspect-LOW
  Case-LOW
```

Figure 2.3 (repeated from above)

Henceforth, I refer in the present work to the looser interpretation of the TH as the “original” TH and to the revised interpretation, as suggested in Hypothesis A, as the “stricter” or “revised” version or interpretation.

Furthermore, if we consider examples (31a) – d) in terms of formal features alone, then those utterances combining both high and low transitivity features are the marked utterances. In the examples from Timberlake (and many others cited in H&T 1980 and subsequent works), those utterances that combine high and low are either ungrammatical or questionable. Although the examples in (31) could represent a genuine violation of the letter of the law of the TH (if one picked only two sentences for comparison, rather than
all four permutations, as suggested above), they are quite in keeping with the spirit of the law. They demonstrate that TH – as formulated by H & T – is generally (though not absolutely) valid; thus they can also help us to refine TH by requiring us to take a more sophisticated and nuanced view of transitivity phenomena.

This leads us to our second hypothesis:

Hypothesis B—When possible combinations of any two formal transitivity features are considered, and any of those combinations are marked, those utterances combining of high and low transitivity features will involve more semantically marked usage than those combinations of both high or both low. That is, no combination of both high or both low will be marked if neither of the combinations of low and high (HIGH-LOW or LOW-HIGH) is marked.

To put it graphically, the following set of combinations (using capital letters as algebraic representations of unnamed features) and markedness may be possible:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Markedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>A-HIGH</td>
<td>B-HIGH</td>
<td>unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>A-HIGH</td>
<td>B-LOW</td>
<td>marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>A-LOW</td>
<td>B-HIGH</td>
<td>unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>A-LOW</td>
<td>B-LOW</td>
<td>unmarked</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5

It may also be possible for both clause x and clause z to be marked, but there will never be a situation in which the following set of combinations obtains:
Figure 2.6

Figure 2.7, however, appears remarkably similar to Figure B, in which a combination of LOW-LOW is not marked but barred, while all other combinations are allowed. It would seem odd that such a combination of LOW-LOW (or HIGH-HIGH), alone among the four permutations, can be barred, but such a combination cannot be marked (again, alone among the four combinations). Nevertheless, we have observed in the examples in (30) that (30b) and (30d), the examples combining LOW-HIGH and HIGH-LOW features, respectively, are the marked utterances, and we have not yet observed any instances such as that (presumably impossible or unlikely) situation depicted in Figure G. We will have opportunity to observe in the following study whether this pattern re-emerges. It may turn out, however, that no pattern of marked-unmarked, such as that illustrated by the examples in (30), emerges repeatedly. If not, it may well be due to the fact that markedness is not an absolute concept, much like Transitivity, as we have observed,

---

42 When such and “odd” situation arises, such as a bar on *el kaši ‘ate-impf. porridge-GEN’, then there must be some semantic explanation. In this case, a brief, feasible explanation, one that remains speculative at this point, is that the HIGH-LOW permutation is possible because both the pf. and the GEN indicate a limitation on the action; by contrast, since the impf. indicates no such limitation, it cannot combine with the GEN.
2.14. Additional questions for exploration

I have proposed two revisions or refinements of the TH raised above in Hypotheses A and B, and the data considered in the study of INST usage that follows will naturally be viewed with an eye towards these questions. Some questions that arise (a number of which have already been suggested above) in addition to these two major hypotheses are as follows:

- Q1: How many parameters can be considered at once? Isn’t the interaction of 10 parameters (or factors) more complex than H&T suggest?
- Q2: Is there a universal hierarchy of parameters? Or are the hierarchies language-specific?
- Q3: Does the TH really apply to extremely low-Transitivity events (or clauses)? Does it apply to events involving unusual sorts of Transitivity?

The last two questions raised here are brought up specifically in consideration of the possibility that Volitionality and Agency are subordinate to Animacy and of the possibility that non-canonical semantic Transitivity may be marked by unusual grammatical devices. The latter issue is related to the first, in my observation, since the question of ‘normal’ vs. ‘abnormal’ or canonical vs. non-canonical Transitivity often has to do with the Animacy of the Obj vis-à-vis that of the Subj, and, in many clauses involving two ANIM actants, the question arises as to whether the will of the Obj is subordinated to that of the Subj, or, put another way, to what extent the Obj/Pat cooperates in the action. The following chapter on Animacy, therefore, takes up the question of Animacy of both Subj and Obj as well as the issue of canonical Transitivity.
2.15. Additional preliminary conclusions and questions

We have seen that there are numerous parameters which may determine the likelihood that a verb will take an ACC Obj rather than an INST (or GEN) Obj. Many of these parameters seem to be inter-related and interdependent. The most important for our investigation seem to be Affectedness, Individuation, and Aspect. Therefore, these three parameters, in addition to the consideration of Animacy and Volitionality, form a large part of this study.
CHAPTER 3

ANIMACY

In the preceding chapter we touched upon some problems involving the category of Animacy. These problems have mainly to do with DAT Objs, which have a stronger tendency to be HUM or ANIM, and the G-A syncretism in the declension of animate nouns in most Slavic languages. In this chapter, we take up these and other discussions in greater detail.

3.1. Animacy and the dative case

Abraham (1983: 19) points to the distribution of DAT of person, ACC of thing as the “normal” one found in Modern High German. The same distribution is found in many languages, indeed. Even H&T (256) give a Spanish example which seems at first glance to contradict their hypothesis:

(1a) *Busco mi sombrero.* ‘I’m looking for my hat.’
(1b) *Busco a mi amigo.* ‘I’m looking for my friend.’

In (1b) the preposition *a* would seem to put a greater distance, both conceptually and syntactically, between verb and object, the greater distance typically being associated with lower transitivity. H & T, however, refer to this kind of object-marking as being
typical for more highly individuated nouns, although they do not explain why such sentences as (1b) should be considered higher in transitivity than those like (1a).

Following similar examples, H & T proceed to claim that “arguments known to grammar as indirect objects should in fact be Transitive O’s rather than what might be called ‘accusative’ O’s, since they tend to be definite and animate” (259)\(^{43}\). They point in a footnote to the preponderance of animate nouns among indirect objects in English, following Givón (1979: 54, in H & T 259).

The reasoning here seems, at least at first glance, to be inconsistent in that, in cases like (1) above, the presence of a preposition between the verb and Obj is taken as a sign of higher transitivity, whereas in other cases, the proximity of the Obj to the verb is taken as a sign of higher transitivity, as in the following examples (260):

(2a) *Clara wrote a letter to Santa Claus.*
(2b) *Clara wrote Santa Claus a letter.*

That is, they argue that *Santa Claus* in (2b) is higher in referentiality, and by implication, the clause is higher in transitivity. So it seems that H & T are trying to have it both ways: the placement of a preposition between verb and Obj can be taken as a sign of higher transitivity when it is convenient to make that claim, and the absence of a preposition can be taken as a sign of higher transitivity, when that claim is convenient. To be fair, H & T do make a more complex argument concerning the semantic role and individuation of the ANIM or HUM Obj. They point out that, in some languages, such as Bantu languages, animate benefactives are placed directly following verbs, just like animate accusatives,

\(^{43}\) This treatment of the “accusative” would seem to be at odds with their treatment of the ACC elsewhere (262, 264, 271), where the ACC is taken as a sign of higher transitivity in comparison to GEN or PART cases. They are not, however, dealing distinctly in terms of direct vs. oblique cases.
and thus “the animacy/definiteness criterion takes precedence over the semantic case; and when a human O is in competition with an inanimate O, the human wins out” (260). Presumably, by “wins out,” in instances like these, they mean that the Obj is in the immediate postverbal position, which would seem to be at odds with their claim made for examples (1a) and (1b). They also point to instances where the DAT NP “takes precedence over the patient NP” (260) in Shona (a Bantu language), as well as dative movement in English, e.g., *Give the book to me* vs. *Give me the book*. Still, H & T’s argumentation seems fraught with difficulties. For one thing, they are using a few relatively rare examples which contradict the intuitive observation that oblique case Objs (or those marked with a preposition) are somehow more conceptually distant (in the sense of Haiman 1983) from the verb, which seems to be the case more generally and cross-linguistically, which is, again, not consistent with their claims about (1a) and (1b) above. Secondly, the idea that a benefactive, DAT, or indirect Obj counts as a transitive object – and indeed can “win out” or “take precedence” over a PAT – does not conform very well to traditional and widely-held notions of transitivity.

It should be noted, however, that H & T refer repeatedly to participants as A[g] and O[bj], not Pat, and they do make a qualifying statement about participants in a footnote to their introduction of that parameter: “We make no claims about the grammatical relations that the NP arguments referring to these participants might bear to the verb. The term ‘patient’ refers to an O which is in fact the ‘receiver’ of the action in a cardinal transitive relationship” (252). Yet they often use the term “patient” in a sense synonymous with their “O”, e.g., “An action can be more effectively transferred to a patient which is individuated…” (253). Their arguments still beg the question what
criteria are to be used to determine the “true” transitive object in a sentence like *Sally threw the ball to John*. Is *John* the recipient of the action as well as the ball? –If *John* is the transitive object of such a sentence, then what is the role of *ball*, especially when compared to *Sally threw the ball*? This raises a third difficulty: if certain human objects “take precedence” in certain instances, despite their semantic roles, what criteria are generally valid? In other words, when do syntactic criteria trump semantic ones and vice versa? And when do semantic or syntactic criteria trump morphological case? These questions arise namely because H & T do not seem to have consistently applied criteria as to which syntactic structures are indicative of higher transitivity.

Regarding purely semantic criteria, the argument can also be made that recipients are more affected than (ACC) DObjs, e.g., in instances of transferal, where the ACC Obj only moves from one location or possessor to another. But then we have already said, in the introductory chapter, that movement is a possible element of transitivity, although not as high or prototypical an element of transitivity as creation or destruction. We have also said that possession is low in transitivity, since possession is really the state of a person’s control over some entity and thus does not involve kinesis. A change of possession, since it involves some type of transferal, is arguably higher in transitivity than the state of possession, but it still is not as concrete as a change of location, and therefore should probably not be considered as high in transitivity. Adding to semantic transitivity the matter of morphosyntactic transitivity, however, the latter does give some indication of the potential for a DAT Obj to be restated in a manner indicative of higher transitivity.

44 Word order is almost as important as case in H & T, since they are dealing with a huge variety of languages, and their study entails both case and word order as a means of encoding semantic roles, as relevant to saliency, foregrounding, and other conceptual phenomena relevant to their discussion of transitivity.
Often the same event involving a transfer of possession may be expressed in two different ways, e.g.:

(3a) Cz Dařili jsme mu nový počítač.
    We gave him-DAT new-ACC computer-ACC
    ‘We gave him a new computer.’

(3b) Obdarovali jsme ho novým počítačem.
    We presented him-ACC new-INSTR computer-INSTR
    ‘We presented him with a new computer.’

The examples in (3) display two lexically differentiated means of expression, where the prefixed verb seems to indicate that the recipient is “promoted” to the status of ACC Obj, and the Pat/Theme/ACC Obj is “demoted” to the INSTR case. It would seem reasonable to suggest that these two sentences reflect two possible versions of the same event. The roles of the participants in the event do not change, but ‘he’ and ‘a new computer’ have two potential roles each: the computer may be patient, or instrument; and ‘he’ may be recipient or patient, depending on the point of view one wishes to emphasize.

Representing the recipient of the gift in the ACC seems to be a morphological means of emphasizing the recipient’s Affectedness. Put another way, the participants in the two versions have different degrees of salience, reflecting different degrees of affectedness, as the speaker wishes to highlight. In instances like this, the semantics of the event itself do not change, but the lexical choice of the speaker and the resulting morphosyntax would appear to have some effect on the overall semantics of the utterance, on its implications, as we have already suggested in the introductory chapter. In any event, the fact that the human indirect or DAT Obj may potentially be restated as a clearly affected Pat in the
ACC tends to support H & T’s claim about the greater potential for affectedness of HUM/ANIM Objs (253, 295-61).

We have thus far discussed the matter of HUM/ANIM DAT/IndObjs only as regards prototypical verbs of giving; for Slavic, as for many other languages, we also need to consider less prototypical verbs governing the dative, such as the Czech and Russian verbs *pomáhat/pomagať* ‘help’, *dovolit/pozvoljať* ‘allow’, *sloužit/služiť* ‘serve’, *vadit/mešať* ‘bother’, etc.45 The list, depending on the language, may include a number of other verbs, including the equivalents of ‘call,’ ‘reward,’ ‘prevent,’ ‘harm,’ ‘resist,’ ‘avoid,’ etc. The Dat Objs of these verbs also tend to be overwhelmingly human, as in

(4) Ru. *Oni popomogali svoim učiteljam/Cz. Oni pomáhali svým učitelům.*
‘They helped their teachers-DAT.’

The fact that these dative objects typically have human referents, which are higher on the scale of Individuation (see below), whereas accusative objects follow a stronger tendency to have non-human or inanimate referents, might seem to contradict the Transitivity Hypothesis, an observation made by Abraham (1983: 19). However, we need to consider just why these verbs are more likely to take a HUM DAT Obj. Part of the reason that is that these Objs are sentient beings, thus able to feel the effects of the action on them, and the verbs represented in this list are of the type that produce some kind of feeling or reaction. This ability to feel or react has been related to the notion of “potential subjecthood.” As Janda (2003/2004: 1) remarks, “the Dative marks an item that has the

---

45 One may ask whether considering these dative-governing verbs is not going to far afield from the discussion of prototypical verbs of giving, as it is difficult to compare them to languages as highly inflected as most Slavic languages. The equivalents of these verbs in Romance languages may sometimes, however, require a corresponding preposition, as in the Fr. *permettre qch à qn*
capacity to react and therefore serve as a Subject.” While this is generally the case, it is quite possible for nonhuman entities to appear as DAT Objs; metaphorically, one may easily give or donate to charities, churches, or schools. However, such “nonhuman” nouns normally express institutions or collective entities which represent or consist of humans. Some recipients may be abstract: She donated considerable money to the cause. It should be recalled, moreover, that even such abstract nouns are quite subject to personification; the human mind and imagination are quite capable of conceptualizing things in a manner that differs from mundane experience. The human mind is also capable of disdaining or disregarding fellow humans, and so it is likewise possible that the entity transferred in a three-participant clause is human, but chattel: The king gave him 100 slaves. Indeed, in the original virility distinction which led to the animacy distinction in Slavic, only free adult human males counted as virile (Lunt 1974: 46, from Janda 1996: 326). In general, however, it is not common for animate nouns to be in such a role, and it is also rather exceptional for inanimate nouns to be in the recipient role. Nonetheless, in order for the general phenomenon of “Dative of person, Accusative of thing” to constitute a genuine contradiction of the TH, there would have to be a situation in which comparable clauses could mandatorily exclude the possibility of the opposite situation, Accusative of person, Dative of thing. Examples of the latter are perhaps rare, but still imaginable: She gave three sons to her country.

It could also be argued that, although examples such as the latter obey the letter of the law of the TH, they do not (as Abraham perhaps meant to imply) follow the spirit of the law. While this may be the case, we find other examples involving verbs governing the DAT which follow both the spirit and the letter of the law, especially when factors or
parameters other than Animacy and case are involved. One such example is to be found in H&T (their ex. 49 – p. 267), in a Hungarian example concerning the perfectivizing prefix *meg-*: *megsegít valakit* ‘helps someone-ACC’ vs. *segít valakinek* ‘helps someone-DAT.’ These examples are generally consistent with our observations in the introductory chapter on the various forms and meanings of Cz. *škodit, uškodit,* and *poškodit,* in that they demonstrate a preference for the ACC with pf. forms.

3.2. Volitionality of the object

We suggested in the previous chapter that the Volitionality of the Obj may play a role in the choice of case for that Obj. In the Hungarian examples (18a) and (18b) in section 2.6., an ACC is found where the Ag acts in a forceful way to make the Pat cough, but the INST (or comitative) case is used for the Pat when the Pat participates in the action. It seems that, in general, there is a preference in Russian for an oblique-case Obj when the Obj is not forced to do something but is left some degree of choice or participates willingly.

There are a number of verbs in Russian that involve an ANIM Subj influencing, forcing, allowing, helping, hindering etc. an ANIM Obj to perform an action expressed in the infinitive. These verbs demonstrate a range of levels of control or influence of the Subj over the Obj, as well as the will or intention of the Obj to perform the action. Many of these verbs have the valency Subj-NOM + verb + Obj-DAT + inf., but there are few that have the valency Subj-NOM + verb + Obj-ACC + inf. For Russian, examples of the first, DAT-governing group include *zapreščat’/zapretit’ ‘forbid’, mešať/pomešať ‘hinder’, velet’/povelet’ ‘order’, etc. The second, ACC-governing group includes verbs
like *zastavljet’/zastavit’* ‘force’, *umoljet’/umolit’* ‘implore’, *ubeždat’/ubedit’* ‘convince’, etc. Generally, the ACC-governing verbs express situations in which the Subj can be said to exert more control over the Obj than is the case with the DAT-governing verbs; however, yet this general semantic division does not apply across the board. For instance, some of these ACC-governing verbs, such as *ubeždat’* ‘convince’ don’t seem as “strong” as, say, *velet’* (+ DAT) in terms of the relationship between the NOM Subj’s will and that of the ACC Obj. To ‘convince’ or ‘talk someone into doing something’ does not require the Obj to perform the action, whereas *velet’* would be generally regarded as offering the Obj no choice in terms of whether to perform the action in question. One difference between the ACC-governing verbs and some of the DAT-governing verbs is that, with verbs such as *velet’*, the Subj has some authority over the Obj, and the DAT Obj is forced by social sanction or hierarchy to act upon the command. The ACC-governing verb *zastavljet’*, by contrast, implies more physical means of coercion.

In addition to the question of how much or little choice the Obj has in terms of whether or not to perform the action, it has been observed that the issue of “strength” of the verb is determined in part by the extent to which the Obj initiates or intends to perform the action (Nichols 1982: 330-331). For instance, many DAT-governing verbs such as ‘help’ and ‘hinder’ imply that the Obj had the initial intention of performing the action, and the Subj acted to further or prevent the performance of the action. In Nichols’ (ibid) study, the DAT-governing verbs were distributed by the Russian speakers among three categories: “strong,” “variable or unclear,” and “weak,” and there was variance among the speakers in terms of which verbs fell into which categories. Nichols (ibid) indicates that Russians placed all four of the ACC-governing verbs she included in her
survey in the “strong” category. Those verbs are: *zastavljat’* ‘force’, *prosit’* ‘ask’, *umoljat’* ‘implore’, and *posylat’* ‘send’, and they all imply that the Subj initiated the action in question.

These observations on verbs exhibiting various degrees of control suggest that there is some, though by no means an absolute, correlation between the degree of control exercised by the Subj over the Obj, and that other matters such as the responsibility for initiating the (secondary) action (i.e., whether that responsibility lies with the Subj or the Obj) also influence the perceived degree of strength of the verb. Generally, when the action is initiated by the Subj, the verb of control or influence will take an ACC Obj. In short, the issue of the Subj’s degree of choice or willingness to participate in an action has some influence over valency; nevertheless, there is some room for variation. I am expressing this point now because the question of the Obj’s volitionality comes into play with many of the INST-governing verbs studied in the following chapters. The matter of the degree of participation or cooperation of the Obj seems to be an important factor influencing the increased use of the valency *s + INST* for many of these verbs. I suggest that the use of *s* with many of these verbs is due in part to the inherent comitative meaning of this preposition.

### 3.3. Genitive-accusative syncretism

The fact that the category of Animacy in Slavic is one of the most widely discussed peculiarities in Slavic is in large part due to the development in Slavic languages of genitive-accusative syncretism, very rare among the branches of Indo-European. While the cause or causes of this development are still disputed among
scholars, it seems to be a reasonable conclusion that, even if perhaps it was not originally due to the necessity of distinguishing objects from subjects, then the saliency issue was at least a partial motivation for the later maintenance of the G-A, or that it “was very soon re-interpreted as its basic raison d’être” (Comrie: 1978, 36). That is, the original N-A syncretism in the o-stem masculine nouns could cause ambiguity in the interpretation of a basic Subj-Vb-DirObj sentence where both Subj and Obj are ANIM and MASC: which noun is the Subj and which the Obj? That G-A syncretism would result, rather than some other syncretism, seems to have had as its starting point verbs of perception which governed the GEN. This genitive usage spread to other semantic classes of verbs, when those verbs took certain HUM Objs, then apparently became reinterpreted as the ACC of at first a limited number of MASC HUM nouns, and then the syncretism spread to MASC ANIM more generally (Klenin 1983; see Janda 1999, esp. 204-5, for a concise summary of Klenin’s findings, as well as a thorough study of animacy and virility in modern Slavic). The use of G-A syncretism has spread in the various modern Slavic languages, and currently involves several different combinations of humanness, animacy, virility, gender, and number in those languages (Comrie 1978, Janda 1999).

The question then arises: What, if anything, does this case syncretism have to do with transitivity? To begin with, the apparent fact that this distinction arose from issues of ambiguity in basic transitive sentences would seem to have everything to do with transitivity. At this point one might, however, argue that, if the GEN is a sign of lower transitivity, then the spread of genitive or genitive-like forms to the accusative in order to mark transitive Objs would seem ironic from the standpoint of the TH and Timberlake (1975). One might further argue that the spread of GEN usage from verbs of perception,
which are low in transitivity since they do not contain the meaning of high affectedness of their objects, to higher transitivity verbs would also be ironic; at least, it is a tendency moving in the opposite direction from the more modern tendency, noted in the previous chapter, for verbs historically taking GEN Objs, such as Ru. bojat’sja ‘be afraid (of)’ and Cz. vzúžývat ‘use’, increasingly to take ACC Objs. Nevertheless, while the original change leading to the development of G-A may have involved the use of the GEN where the ACC had previously been used, it apparently became quickly reinterpreted as a change in declensional paradigm. With this last fact in mind, we should recall the matter of declensional class—the change did not affect those MASC ANIM nouns of the a-stem declension, since they had historically had a distinct ACC in –ę.

The apparent reason for the development of this G-A syncretism, to distinguish Obj from Subj, or to mark the Obj, is quite consistent with the observation that the GEN is typically a more marked case than the ACC. Oblique cases generally have been observed to be more marked than their direct case (NOM, ACC) counterparts; the latter occur more frequently, and they also tend rather strongly to have zero marking (Greenberg: 38). Of course, it is the zero marking of the old N-A syncretism that caused the saliency problem to begin with. Greenberg (1966: 38) also notes that Turkish has zero marking for NOM and indefinite ACC, but def. ACC and oblique take overt marking. This tendency to mark more highly individuated Objs calls to mind the marking of the HUM DObj in Spanish cited above in 1), as well as other such special marking of more definite and/or referential Objs exemplified by H & T (256-61). These data from Slavic, Spanish, and Turkish suggest that the motivation for such marking is greater in instances
where there would otherwise be morphological zero marking of the ACC or DirObj, leaving no formal distinction, other than perhaps word order, between Subj and Obj.

It seems that this tendency to mark more highly individuated Objs is related to a more general reflection of the propensity of language to mark certain NPs on the basis of saliency, not merely in order to avoid ambiguity. Along with the animacy distinction in Slavic, there is also a well-developed category of virility in some Slavic languages. The virility distinction is most widespread in West Slavic, where the virile class has special endings: -owie in Pl, -ové in Cz, and -ovia in Sk; it is also reflected in the DAT sg –ovi (owi) endings in Pl, Sk, and Ukr. This distinction is much more weakly represented in other Slavic languages, limited largely to special virile numerals, numerals which even in those languages are not always used (Janda: 1999, 221). Semantically, the virility distinction puts certain MASC nouns, most notably proper nouns (personal names and ethnonyms), kinship terms, and professions, into a special declensional class (Janda: 1999, 209-12); sometimes monosyllabic stems fall into this class, but this is largely due to their historic membership in, or later confusion with, the u-stem declension, which originally lent its morphological material to the virile endings. Janda (1999: 203) claims that this development is due to a general property of language to encode experience into self-other/figure-ground distinctions and that it organizes these distinctions in Slavic into the following continuum:

Self > humans like self > humans not like self > animals > small, discrete, countable concrete objects > masses and collectives > landscape features > ambient intangibles.

46 Janda notes that not all Slavic languages uniformly employ these distinctions.
This scale contains many of the same features as the H & T parameters, although here they are arranged as a larger hierarchy, rather than a set of binary parameters. It nevertheless posits much the same notion as the H & T parameters, as all the categories to the right of the > are implicitly “everything else,” i.e., everything to the right of humans and animals is understood to be INAN.

Comrie (1978: 31) suggests a somewhat simpler “multivalued parameter of animacy,” Male human > Female human > Animal > Inanimate, while at the same time suggesting other parameters involved in the G-A syncretism: i) animacy, ii) gender, iii) declensional class, iv) number, v) pronominality, and vi) person. He also notes that these parameters work differently in different Slavic languages, and that they do not operate independently: gender is seldom independent of animacy and declensional class (37), and the parameter of person is relevant solely within the pronouns (31). Furthermore, he notes that the spread of the GA to the plural depends on whether a given Slavic language retained or loss the distinction between o-stem masc. NOM –ı and ACC –ı (38). Thus, for instance, in East Slavic, where the –ı ending spread to the NOM, the GA has developed for the plural. This last issue brings us back to the question of saliency, which, he concludes, is the reason historically for the development of GA syncretism.47

The saliency issue is the main point of the functional approach that Comrie (1978) takes in his article, which is contrasted with a generative approach to understanding the phenomenon. H & T, although taking a functional approach, list their paradigms

47 Other issues also come into play: the spread of animate declensions to INAN, such as games in Polish, e.g., igrać v tenisa, as well as to certain nouns in Cz: paddık ‘parachute’ and panáık ‘[alcoholic] drink.’ The latter is easily explained due to the agentive – or agentive-like – suffix, which would seem to be a matter of derivational class. Furthermore, N-A syncretism is maintained in some expressions following prepositions which take ACC Obs, e.g., idti v soldaty ‘join the army’ lit. ‘go into the soldiers’ in Mod. Ru. This is evidence that the GA syncretism does not always hold where there is no ambiguity to be avoided. This is despite the general tendency for the G-A to take over in terms of declensional paradigms as a whole.
seemingly without regard to their interdependence, pointing more or less to a simple count of those features in the HIGH column, and those in the LOW (253). In taking account issues of saliency, Comrie, by stressing the communicative function of language, seems to be approaching his problem in a manner more typical of a functionalist than do H & T in approaching their problem.

The apparent contradiction of the TH presented by G-A syncretism has been summed up quite well by Dingley (2000: 64):

We appear to stand before a paradox, which is that, on the one hand, the gen. is being used to mark highly individuated objects in sentences which are consequently high in terms of transitivity, and yet, on the other hand, we have the gen. used to indicate negation and partivity, phenomena which reflect reduced levels of transitivity.

This statement about the G-A being a paradox follows Klenin’s (1983: 109) assessment of the issue: “[T]he genitive case form indicates, roughly, abnormal transitivity, whether plus or minus.” In other words, a typical transitive utterance involves an animate Subj. acting on an inanimate Obj. It is less usual for an animate Subj. to act on an animate Obj., even more unusual for an inanimate Subj. to act on an animate Obj. I would then argue that, whenever such apparent contradictions of the Transitivity Hypothesis occur, there is something marked about the utterance.

3.4. Markedness of utterances and (non-)canonical transitivity

We have observed that phrases with Objs higher in individuation or animacy can be considered indicative of a higher degree of transitivity than those with Objs lower in individuation or animacy. But this does not necessarily mean that such higher transitivity phrases are less marked. When we spoke in the introductory chapter of “prototypical”
transitive verbs, we did not claim that those prototypes are the most common types. It is much more common to have an ANIM Ag acting on an INAN Pat than the other way around. As Comrie (1989: 128) puts it:

> Although in principle either of A[ᵣ] and P[ᵣ] can be either animate or definite, it has been noted that in actual discourse there is a strong tendency for the information flow from A to P to correlate with an information flow from more to less animate and from more to less definite. In other words, the most natural kind of transitive construction is one where the A is high in animacy and definiteness, and the P is lower in animacy and definiteness; and any deviation from this pattern leads to a more marked construction.

This principle can be easily demonstrated by the following sorts of sentences:

(5a) *The woman crushed the tin can.*
(5b) *The tin can hit the woman.*
(5c) *The accident disfigured/maimed him for life.*
(5d) *The editor crumpled the paper and threw it away.*
(5e) *The man kicked the dog.*
(5f) *The dog bit the man.*

Examples (5a) and (5d), both with ANIM Subjs acting on INAN Pats, are unmarked. Most native speakers would judge (5b), which actually has an instrument as a Subj., to be more marked than the others. Furthermore, (5c), although sounding a bit more natural that (5b), is also marked, since it places a cause in the position of active Subj, whereas the less marked variant would be the passive voice with the cause in the phrase *by the accident.* (5e) sounds natural, as does (5f), although the latter would sound perhaps more natural if passivized.

According to Comrie (1989:130), there is a tendency to passivize or otherwise avoid Subjs low in definiteness: “languages seem rather to avoid… [marking of indefinite Ags,] either recasting them as passives or by using presentative
constructions.” Although Comrie is pointing to definiteness rather than animacy, his examples seem to point at least as well towards animacy:

(5g) A bus has just run over John.
(5h) John has just been run over by a bus.
(5i) A bird is drinking the milk.
(5j) There’s a bird drinking the milk.

The agency of the inanimate and indefinite a bus in (5g) can be deemphasized by means of passivization, and this construction is probably preferable to most native speakers of English in most situations. If bus were topical, then it might be preferable in the subject position, with the definite article, of course. But only under unusual circumstances would bus be the focus of the sentence, since we usually care more about a human being than about a vehicle. The non-human but ANIM a bird in (5j), receives a different treatment, but one which seems deemphasize the agency less than in (5h). Substitute the definite article for the indefinite article in (5i) and the sentence sounds perfectly normal.

We can now make several generalizations with regards to markedness and degree of transitivity. In general, an animate agent acting on an animate patient, represented by ANIM → ANIM, is generally higher in transitivity and more marked than ANIM → INAN, as illustrated by examples (6a) and (6b):

(6a) John struck Martha.
(6b) John struck the table.

Example (6a) would, in most contexts, be higher in Transitivity than (6b) due to the capacity of the Pat to feel pain or be injured, i.e., to be affected by the action.
The passive correlates of (6a) and (6b), *Martha was struck by John* and *The table was struck by John*, respectively, also reflect this difference in Transitivity, since the former sounds more normal than the latter. However, (6a) is more marked semantically in that such actions tend to be rarer, and usually such utterances generally raise more concern on the part of the hearer. Both of these situations, ANIM $\rightarrow$ ANIM and ANIM $\rightarrow$ INAN, are clearly less marked than anything with an inanimate agent, as in the following utterances:

(6c) A falling tree struck the house. (INAN $\rightarrow$ INAN)
(6d) A car struck Martha. (INAN $\rightarrow$ ANIM)

In my opinion, (6d) is generally higher in Transitivity than (6c), due again to Martha’s capacity to react or suffer injury or death. Additionally, since humans are generally more concerned with the well-being of other humans, (6d) is more marked than any of the other sentences in (6), since it places Martha in the Obj position. The usual expression of (6d) would be as follows:

(6e) Martha was struck by a car.

This tendency to passivize sentences expressing the action INAN $\rightarrow$ ANIM reflects the sort of priority placed on other humans as suggested by Janda’s self-other/figure-ground distinctions (explained above). It is difficult to say which of the situations ANIM $\rightarrow$ INAN or INAN $\rightarrow$ ANIM is generally higher in transitivity, but the latter is clearly more marked semantically, since INAN entities do not usually act on ANIM beings. The question of which sort of
utterance is generally more transitivity is difficult to answer, because there are many contexts in which such sentences could be uttered. If Martha was killed by the car, then (6d) would be higher in Transitivity than (6c). On the other hand, if Martha suffered only bruises, and the house was damaged beyond repair, then (6c) would probably be higher. These last two observations only compare Affectedness with Animacy; as I have previously suggested, there may be many other parameters involved.

The matter, raised above in (5g) and (5h), of our greater concern for John than for a bus (or our greater concern for Martha than for the house in examples (6c) and (6d)) brings up the issue of empathy, something already suggested before by the priority of the “humans like self” parameter in Janda’s (1999) hierarchy listed above. Humans have a tendency to empathize with other humans (especially those like themselves), to a lesser but still considerable extent with mammals (with issues of domesticity taking preference over intelligence), and less and less with birds, reptiles, and lower and lower animals. There is also a human tendency to withhold empathy from some humans unlike oneself, and to hold in disregard those considered chattel. In Slavic this last tendency is exemplified by the fact that the animacy distinction was extended first to free males, then later to slaves, and later still to females.

3.5. Summary of observations on animacy

We have noted in this chapter the relevance of the relative Animacy of Subj vs. Obj for the choice of case, and we have noted that, in instances of
abnormally high Transitivity, where an ANIM Ag acts on an ANIM Pat, there may be an unusual grammatical means of expressing that higher semantic Transitivity. There are also special means for indicating other kinds of non-canonical Transitivity, especially when an INAN Ag acts on an ANIM Pat. The matter of the Volitionality of the Ag vs. that of the Pat also seems to play an important role in the choice of case of the Obj, but this is a matter complicated by the potential of the Pat to cooperate in the action or to resist.
4.1. Transitivity and the instrumental case

While much has already been written on the choice of genitive vs. accusative objects in Slavic, relatively little attention has been devoted to verbs that can take either instrumental or accusative objects, especially in terms of transitivity or the TH. Of course, the seminal studies of invariant meaning in the Russian cases by Jakobson (1936, 1958) consider these matters to a limited extent. Some more recent studies, such as Wierzbicka (1980), have examined the case government of verbs such as Russian švyrjať/šyrmnut ‘throw’ and krutit ‘turn’; others have discussed verbs conveying movement of body parts, in phrases such as kačat/kačnut’ golovoj and požimat/požat’ plečami (Wierzbicka 1980: 23-27, Levine 1980). There has also been some discussion of whether verbs governing the INST can be passivized, as in Fowler (1996), which was mentioned in the introduction. Plewes (1977), in his study based on the concept of semantic invariance, deals extensively with INST-governing verbs in Czech and Russian, as well as the ACC-INST alternation in Objs of many of those verbs (see esp. 232-66).

48 Jakobson (1936) does not discuss verbs governing INST Objs, as we have defined them, per se, but he does mention the important fact of the tendency in Russian to distribute ANIM and INAN among cases: NOM-ANIM, ACC-INAN, INST-INAN, DAT-ANIM (88). This tendency has already been noted in the present study and will continue to be of great importance in this chapter.
In this and the following two chapters, I attempt to build on previous studies such as those by Wierzbicka and Levine with more detailed observations on the two main types of verbs just mentioned. In the third of these chapters dealing with the INST, I introduce another semantic category of verb which, as far as I have been able to determine, has entirely escaped the notice of scholars working on matters of transitivity and case—Czech verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting,’ which are likewise capable of taking either accusative or instrumental objects. Perhaps part of the reason they have received little or no attention is that instrumental-governing verbs of saving and wasting are limited in Slavic to Czech and Slovak (i.e., are not found in Russian). Even apart from the lack of previous study, these verbs deserve observation since they also display certain strong tendencies to act in accordance with the TH; for instance, they can take only an accusative object with the perfective.

Wierzbicka concludes that the instrumental objects of verbs like ‘throw’ and ‘turn’ can be regarded as “demoted” objects in constructions equivalent to the “antipassive” (1980: 22). Wierzbicka (ibid: 23-27) claims that in such phrases employing the accusative, emphasis is placed on the affectedness of the object. Levine (1980) believes that, for many verbs of movement, the essential criterion is whether the object moved falls into the category of “alienable” or “inalienable,” i.e., whether the Obj is perceived as inherently part of the Subj/Ag or not. For Levine, not just body parts, but even the oars in a sentence such as (1):

49 Wierzbicka argues (1980: 162, note 17) that, although the term antipassive typically applied only to ergative languages, where “agent promotion” is possible as well as object demotion, the term may be applied as well to languages in which agent promotion is impossible (since they cannot be promoted higher than the NOM). Her argument is that the term may be applied universally on the basis of semantic configurations. I leave the appropriateness of such labeling to the reader’s judgement, as I am concerned almost exclusively with object demotion.
are to be considered as extensions of the body. Such a view would seem to be related to the parameter of Individuation, as it clearly has to do with the distinction of the object or patient from the subject or agent. As I demonstrate below, while a number of factors influence the choice of case for objects of these verbs, the two factors that most consistently come into play are, indeed, affectedness and individuation.

4.2. Introduction to verbs of movement

“Movement” here refers to any sort of two-actant verbs of movement or displacement, in which the Patient is the referent of the grammatical object of the phrase. This stipulation is necessary to distinguish them from “verbs of motion,” such as Ru. *idti/xodit’* and *exat’/ezdit’*.

Movement verbs may be broken down, for purposes of convenience of study, into four subcategories: general movement, throwing, turning, and movement of body parts. Many of the primary verbs from this category – as well as their perfective and imperfective derivatives – display behavior that suggests that the choice of accusative or instrumental object is a matter as much of lexical-semantic considerations as of grammatical factors. In this view, when displacement of the object is

---

50 Janda (forthcoming: 10) uses the term “movement verbs,” apparently for much the same reason, although she doesn’t make the rationale for that usage explicit. Many verbs such as *nesti/nosit’* could also be included in the category of movement verbs, but since they govern only the ACC, they are of little concern to us here, except that we need to explain why they cannot govern the INST. Some discussion of this matter for Czech verbs such as *vláčet/vléci* is included in the section on general movement.

51 Admittedly, these categorizations are somewhat arbitrary. Part of the justification is that throwing and turning, in both Cz. and Ru., comprise a large number of movement verbs governing the INST or ACC. Movement of body parts probably constitutes an even larger category; it has received a fair amount of attention, although study of this category has been far from exhaustive. The “general motion” category, then, is something of a “miscellaneous” or “other” category.
emphasized, the semantic affectedness of the object is greater, and the transitivity of the verbal phrase is correspondingly higher.

One of the recurring themes in the discussion of movement verbs is the question of displacement; this issue is often reflected in whether the movement is in a single direction, with a likely endpoint, or whether the movement indicated is back and forth or circular, with no clear endpoint. In this sense the question can be regarded as one of telicity; a telic movement is (usually) in one direction only and has a clear endpoint, whereas an atelic movement, by definition, has no clear endpoint and can therefore more easily involve movement in more than one direction or movement in circles. With verbs of turning or rotation, circular or semi-circular movement is always involved, but there are clearly two types of turning: telic and atelic. The atelic variety concerns a more or less aimless spinning, while the telic variety involves a change of orientation or direction. I would argue that affectedness is the ultimate criteria; a telic motion nearly always changes the position or orientation of the object, but with atelic motion this is not necessarily the case. I say “not necessarily the case”, because it is possible that, for instance, after a certain amount of aimless spinning, an object may end up in a different position or orientation, but the goal of this kind of spinning is not for the object to end in any pre-determined position.

4.3. General movement

Under the heading of “general movement” I discuss the basic Russian and Czech equivalents of the English verb ‘move.’ This category, then, includes the
perfective/imperfective pairs \textit{dvigat’/dvinut’} for Russian and \textit{hýbat/hnout} as well as \textit{pohybovat/pohnout} for Czech.

### 4.3.1. The Russian verb \textit{dvigat’/dvinut’}

For the basic Russian impf. \textit{dvigat’}, in most of the meanings given by Ušakov, the verb takes an ACC Obj and emphasize a change of position or a change of state (e.g., from still to moving), reflecting the general tendency to have affected Objs in the ACC. These four meanings with the ACC are: \textit{peremešat’} ‘move, transfer, displace’; \textit{privodit’ v dviženie} ‘put into motion’; \textit{napravljet’}, \textit{zastavljat’ idti vperēd} ‘direct, force to go forward’; \textit{vyzyvat’ progress čego-n.} ‘stimulate the progress of s.th.’ The Obj may be INAN in all of these meanings, according to Ušakov; only in the meanings \textit{peremešat’} and \textit{napravljet’} may there also be HUM Objs.

Ušakov gives only two definitions in which the verb governs the INST. The first is \textit{ševeliť, proizvodiť dviženie} ‘move/budge/stir, produce motion,’ which is found only when the Obj is a body part: \textit{d. pal’cami} ‘move one’s fingers.’ The other INST-governing meaning of the verb is a very literary usage \textit{pobuždať kogo-n.} ‘induce, prompt,’ as in Ušakov’s example, \textit{Im dvižet čuvstvo sostradanija} ‘A feeling of compassion moves them’. The verb in this meaning is listed as taking \textit{kem} or \textit{čem} as an Obj; there is no pf. counterpart. So, in the first of these two uses of the INST, we find that there is no emphasis on displacement, and the Obj is a body part of a human or animal. In the second, we have a limited usage with no pf., and there is, once again, no emphasis on displacement, since utterances of this type refer to internal emotional processes. Furthermore the \textit{čuvstvo} ‘feeling’ is not really separate from the Pat, which is a further
feature of lower Transitivity. The only fact that might seem in discord with the TH is that, in the metaphorical meaning of ‘induce, prompt,’ where it has no pf., *dvigat’ can take a HUM Obj in the INST, whereas in the meaning ‘move/budge/stir,’ where it does have a pf. counterpart, the verb can only take an INAN (INST) Obj. This fact would seem to be due to the nature of Animacy; only an ANIM Obj would be capable of responding to this sort of emotional movement. It is still not a genuine contradiction of the TH, in that *dvigat’ ‘induce, prompt’ can take an INAN (INST) Obj, even when that Obj refers in some way or other to humans as a collective entity, or involves personification, as in (Google search for *dvižet*, 9.II.2007, result # 5; URL: http://news.by/342/2006-09-27/19572/):

(2) Fanatičnost *dvižet iskusstvom!* ‘Fanaticism moves art-INST!’

The Obj in this sentence is arguably a human entity, as in “the art world,” but it could also refer to human activity or production. A more clearcut example of human activity can be found in (Russian National Corpus search 9.II.2007, result # 3):

(3) Čto *dvižet našimi dejstvijami?* ‘What moves our activities-INST?’

So it is quite possible to have either an ANIM or INAN in the INST governed by *dvigat’ in the meaning ‘induce, prompt.’ It is also possible to have synecdochic *serdce* in the instrumental following *dvigat’ (Russian National Corpus search result # 4 for *dvigat’ and *serdce*):

52 For a further example of inseparability of the Subj from the Obj/Pat, see example (16b) below.
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Thus, one could come up with the following table of combinations of parameters for this meaning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*dvinut’ kem</th>
<th>*dvinut’ čem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf.-HIGH</td>
<td>pf. HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dvigat’ kem</td>
<td>dvigat’ čem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.1: **dvigat’/dvinut’ – ‘induce, prompt’

In this meaning, then, there is no contradiction of the (revised\(^{53}\)) TH, because, as we illustrated in the section on potential or apparent contradictions of the TH, only those situations involving obligatory combinations of 1HIGH-2LOW and 1LOW-2HIGH (with no possibility of 1HIGH-2HIGH or 1LOW-2LOW) constitute genuine violations. Graphically, unless the asterisks are in opposite corners (the HIGH-HIGH and LOW-LOW corners), there is no genuine violation of the TH, strictly taken. In the meaning ‘move/budge/stir,’ we find the following combination:

---

\(^{53}\) When I consider possible contradictions or violations of the TH in the present chapter, I refer to the revision of the TH, with more restrictive wording, suggested in Hypothesis A in the Critiques chapter. According to this language, “there will never arise a situation in which both combinations of HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH transitivitiy are mandatory and, conversely, neither pairing of both high (HIGH-HIGH) and both low (LOW-LOW) is possible in such minimally differing utterances.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*dvinut’ kem</th>
<th>dvinut’ čem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pf.-HIGH</td>
<td>pf. HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*dvigat’ kem</td>
<td>dvigat’ čem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: *dvigat’/dvinut’ – ‘move/budge/stir’

There is, of course, no contradiction in this table, since the verb can take only an INAN Obj in either aspect. Furthermore, there is no way one could make an apples-and-oranges (or perhaps a better term would be “oranges-and-tangerines”) comparison of the two meanings, in which a contradiction would occur, that is, in which the starred combinations would be in opposite corners, as explained above.

If we consider the pf. *dvinut’ without regard to distinctions in meaning, it is capable of taking either an INST or an ACC Obj, but it uses the INST mainly in instances of the Subj’s body parts, e.g., *dvinut’ rukoj. This would be in harmony with the TH, since the Subj’s body part would be an instance of lower Individuation.

The question of the use of the INST vs. the ACC with body part Objs of *dvigat’/dvinut’ is perhaps best answered in terms of two TH parameters, Volitionality and Individuation. Individuation here involves the distinctness of the Pat/Obj, as explained by H & T, who define IND as referring “both to the distinctness of the patient from the A[g]… and to its distinctness from its own background” (253). As concerns the distinctness of body parts from their possessor, the concept of Individuation can be

---

54 A Russian National Corpus search gives only 30 relevant results for *dvinut’; of these, only eight have an INST Obj, and of those eight Objs, only two are not body parts. One of these last two instances is *slegka dvinul stulom ‘…he gently/slightly moved the chair,’ where there is little emphasis on the displacement of the Obj. In two of the six instances with body parts, the body part belongs to someone other than the Subj.
developed beyond the extent made explicit by H & T. Levine (1980), referring to the traditional term *inalienable possession*, defines inalienable objects and properties as those “which are inherently associated with or permanently possessed by individual persons or other objects” (7). One example from Levine (1980: 10) illustrates the significance of both these parameters for the verb *dvigat*:

(5) *Ivan s trudom dvigal nogu v gipse.*
Ivan with difficulty moved leg-ACC in cast-PREP
‘Ivan had trouble moving his leg in a cast [sic].’

According to Levine, this is an example of the Ag “consciously manipulat[ing] a part of his body as though it were a separate detached entity” (ibid). Levine also considers this to be an instance of directed action. He also points out that an action involving an instrumental body part may “not [be] aided by another part of the body,” as in the following examples (10-11):

(6a) *Sverček krutil usami.* ‘The cricket flicked its antennae-INST.’
(6b) *Boris krutil usy (pal’cami).* ‘Boris twirled his moustache-ACC (fingers-INST).
(6c) *Boris krutil usami.* ‘Boris twirled his moustache-INST.’

In example (6a), the antennae are viewed as an extension of the cricket’s body, and therefore are not considered as detached or distinct from the Ag. In example (6b), the moustache must be viewed as an affected (separable) Obj, and the fingers as an instrument, in the plainest semantic sense. That is, the moustache, while a part of Boris’ body (although perhaps not prototypically so), is acted upon as if it were something separate from the body, temporarily appended to it, perhaps like an ornament, whereas
the fingers are employed to make the movement. (The moustache cannot move unaided by another body part; hence the ungrammaticality of (6c)). There are other instances where, in sentences more parallel to (6a) above, the thing moved is clearly separate from the body, but treated almost as an extension of the body of the Ag, as in the second option in each of the following (Levine 1980: 9):

(7a) Malčik šarkal nogami/tufljami. ‘The boy shuffled his feet/slippers.’
(7b) Soldat razmaxival rukoj/ruž ’ēm. ‘The soldier waved his hand/rifle.’
(7c) Galja trjasla rukoj/košel’ kom. ‘Galya shook her hand/purse.’

Furthermore, it is clear that, when the verb dvigat’ is used to refer to an action performed by one person on the body part of another person, the body part must be in the ACC (examples provided by a native-speaking informant, a 30-year-old female):

(8a) Medsestra dvigala nogu pacienta. ‘The nurse moved the patient’s leg-ACC.’
(8b) ?Medsestra dvigala emu nogu. ‘The nurse moved him-DAT leg-ACC.’
(8c) *Medsestra dvigala nogoj pacienta. ‘The nurse moved the patient’s leg-INST.’

I have only found one seeming deviation to the pattern described immediately above, the use of the ACC Obj when the Subj moves the body part of another being. In this very literary example, the fins of an underwater creature are moved by impersonal forces, and the fins are in the INST (NKRJa search for dvigat’ act, ipf; result 2.55):

55 In that search, of the first 50 relevant results, I found 23 uses of the INST. Of those 23 Objs, 11 were body parts, including the one in this example.
Here, an INAN Subj moves the body part of an animate being. The use of the INST is explainable, in terms of the TH, by the lack of Volitionality; furthermore, except for the ‘bottom currents,’ all the forces involved are more or less figurative (the ‘underwater rumblings, as sounds, cannot have a very physical effect on the fins, nor can the ‘secret signs’) and operate somehow to prompt the creature. There is also no emphasis on Affectedness, i.e. the fins are moved in a back-and-forth manner to propel the creature rather than being displaced to a new (more or less static) position. Thus, in Russian, there is a strong distinction between the use of the ACC and the INST with Objs of the verb dvigat’; the distinction has to do with whether or not the Obj moved is perceived as inherently, or inalienably, part of the Ag, *sensu strictu* (cf. examples (8a-c) above).\(^{56}\)

We have thus far discussed two levels of transitivity as reflected in the morphosyntactic properties of *dvigat’*/dvinut’. The higher of these two levels of transitivity is found in the ACC-governing uses of the verb, and the lower, in the INST-governing uses. We can now speak of a third level, that reflected by the various uses of the verb with the detransitivizing suffix –sja. In most of the meanings given by Ušakov for *dvigat’*, the refl. *dvigat’sja* has a passive meaning. It can also have a stative meaning, *naxodit’sja v dviženii* ‘be [lit. “find oneself”] in motion’; it can mean *trogat’sja s mesta,* *otpravljat’sja* ‘get going, depart’ (a colloquial or familiar usage); or it can, in another

\(^{56}\) I am referring here to the meaning ‘budge, stir.’ Of the 23 instances of INST Objs, 10 were humans or human actions, and in all of these uses, the verb had the meaning ‘induce, prompt.’ The remaining 2 non-body part Objs were ‘centuries’ and ‘universe.’
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colloquial usage, have to do with advancing in a career. The pf. dvinut’sja is simply the pf. counterpart, and has little more to reveal on the matter. Dvigat’sja/dvinut’sja cannot take an object in any grammatical case. Thus, in terms of both syntax and semantics, the reflexive, to the extent that the suffix –sja can be seen as referring to a Pat, has the lowest degree of Individuation, since Pat and Ag are identical.

4.3.2. The Czech verb hýbat/hnout

For Czech, the situation with the verbs hýbat/hnout and pohybovat/pohnout is rather murkier. The first definition given by the valency dictionary SPP for the (perfective) verb hnout is udělat malý pohyb části (svého, n. cizího) těla ‘make a small motion with a part of (one’s own or another’s) body’; the object here is in the instrumental:

(10) Když hýbnete zapěstím, boli to vás moc?
‘When you move your wrist-INST, does it hurt you much?’

Unlike the Russian examples in (8), the Obj is likewise in the instrumental when referring to movement of another person’s or animal’s body part; however, in this case the other animate being must be in the DAT, and this DAT, it would appear, is obligatory (examples from SPP entries):

(11a) Jakmile mi doktor hnal hlavou, zaječela jsem bolesti.
‘The moment me-DAT the doctor moved head-INST scream-pf. AUX pain-INST ‘The moment the doctor moved my head, I screamed out in pain.’
In these examples, it would seem that displacement (i.e., change of state) is not emphasized, and therefore an INST Obj can easily be expected as a marker of low transitivity.

By contrast, the second definition of *hnout* clearly emphasizes a change: *změnit polohu, popř. dosavadní stav něoho, něčeho* ‘change the position or present state of someone, something.’ Here the valency is *s* + INST for ANIM Objs, but either *s* + INST or the bare INST for INAN Objs. The same non-prepositional instrumental government is found in the corresponding meanings of the imperfective *hýbat*. This would seem to violate the spirit of the TH, in that the prep., usually taken as an indicator of lower Transitivity, is mandatory with more individuated ANIM Objs but optional with less individuated INAN Objs. It would violate the letter of the TH, however, only if the preposition *s* were required with ANIM but barred from INAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>kým</em> ANIM-HIGH Bare INST-(relatively) HIGH</th>
<th><em>s kým</em> ANIM-HIGH Prep. INST-LOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>čím</em> INAN-LOW Bare INST-(relatively) HIGH</td>
<td><em>s čím</em> INAN-LOW prep.-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.3: *hýbat/hnout* - ‘change the position or state of s.o./s.th.’
Here, we have a situation in which it is somewhat ironic that $s + \text{INST}$ is possible for an ANIM Obj but not for an INAN Obj, but we still have no genuine contradiction of the TH, as we do not have the situation, described above, in which there are asterisks in the opposite corners (the corners with the HIGH-HIGH and LOW-LOW combinations).

Diachronically speaking, the distribution of the bare INST and $s + \text{INST}$ suggests an ongoing change in which HUM Objs are increasingly found in the INST. In fact, Figure 4.3. covers all the possibilities (but glosses over some of the limitations) for the verb *hnout* taken as a unit with all its possible meanings (at least, defs. 1-5 in *SPP*); i.e. the bare INST is barred only with HUM Objs.\(^57\) The spread of the prepositional INST to HUM Objs first, then to INAN ones, is perhaps motivated by the semantic fact of human potential to act as collaborators or competitors/resistors in various actions. With verbs of motion, furthermore, the reality of human mobility also likely contributes to an inherent comitative sense of the preposition $s$.

The third definition of *hnout* from *SPP*, meaning ‘to continue in something, solve something’ (*pokročit v něčem, vyřešit něco*) also uses $s + \text{INST}$. It is by no means clear how this could be a unified definition; perhaps it is merely a convenient, albeit rather arbitrary, lumping together by lexicographers\(^58\). There is, nevertheless, some semantic similarity in the suggestion of progress. The (only three) examples provided by *SPP* are:

(12a) *Je načase, abychom s tou prací hnuli.*
   ‘It’s about time we got moving with that work.’

\(^57\) However, see examples (14a) and (14b) and discussion below for exceptions.

\(^58\) This definition corresponds roughly with that given in *PSJC*, *způsobit, aby něco pokročilo, aby se o něčem jednalo* ‘cause s.th. to continue, to be negotiated.’ *PSJC* also gives the bare INST as a possible valency, along with $s + \text{INST}$.
Example (12a) seem to come quite close to the English use of the preposition with, as in ‘continue/get on with s.th.,’ and it reflects a sort of inchoative meaning in that it refers to taking up an action or process. It is also quite possible that the metaphor underlying this use of *hnout* has to do with moving a barrier to progress. Example (12b) involves solving, but it also intimates that there will be no progress in the solving. The lack of progress suggests, albeit not very strongly, a connection between continuation and solving, and this continuation is only in a negative sense. Example (12c) suggests failure to come up with a solution. In all of these examples, we have ANIM Subjs acting on INAN Objs, and the valency does not vary (with the exception of the non-prepositional $s$ suggested in the *PSJC* entry for *hnout*), so everything is in accordance with the TH.

The fourth definition of this pf. verb, *silně zapůsobit, ovlivnit* ‘strongly influence,’ uses the prepositional INST (HUM) *s někým*. However, the corresponding imperfective for this fourth meaning, *hýbat*, takes a simple INST: *někym/něčím*. This is a curious combination of valencies. From the standpoint of the TH, it is no surprise that the pf. *hnout* can take only a HUM\(^59\) Obj, i.e., that it combines the more highly transitive pf. with a more individuated Obj. However, it is surprising that the prepositional INST with *s* is obligatory in the pf., whereas the impf. *hýbat* can take only a bare INST, albeit with an

\(^59\) *SPP* lists this valency in symbols as “inst [anim]” (brackets in original) but only gives the HUM pron. as part of its traditionally styled valency: *něco/ze... --hne – s někým*.
ANIM or INAN Obj. Thus, the following situation obtains for this particular definition of
the pf. *hnout:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*kým</th>
<th>*s kým</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare INST-(relatively) HIGH</td>
<td>Prep. INST-LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*čím</td>
<td>*s čím</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare INST-(relatively) HIGH</td>
<td>prep.-LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.4: *hnout – ‘strongly influence’*

Thus, we do not have a contradiction of the TH, as established in the Critiques Chapter,
since we have no mandatory combination of HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH, with the only
possibilities being in diagonally opposite blocks of the table.

For the impf. *hýbat*, except in its meaning of ‘change position or state’
60, ‘we have the following situation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>kým (*for ‘body part’)</th>
<th>*s kým</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare INST-(relatively) HIGH</td>
<td>Prep. INST-LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>čím</td>
<td>*s čím</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bare INST-(relatively) HIGH</td>
<td>prep.-LOW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5: *hýbat - ‘make a small motion with body part’, ‘strongly influence’*

60 The impf. cannot have the third meaning ‘continue with s.th., solve s.th.’ given above for the pf. *hnout.*
This situation likewise presents no such contradiction, where there would be asterisks in opposite corners.

In the meaning of ‘change position or state,’ the impf. *hýbat* has the valencies *s někým, s něčím, něčím*. One might, at first glance, be tempted to interpret these possible combinations as a violation of the TH, but, as we have indicated already, a real violation would have to involve a ban on the HIGH-HIGH and the LOW-LOW combination, which is not the case here, since three of the four permutations are possible. While the *SPP* makes no distinction between HUM, other ANIM, and INAN Objs, in my ČNK searches, I have come across two examples that contradict the *SPP*’s claim (or, at least, its implicit claim) that there can be no such valency as *s čím* with the pf. *hnout* in the meaning ‘move a body part.’ These two examples are:

(13a) …*s ní nemůže hnout*  ‘[she] can’t move it’
(13b) “*Nemůžu s ní hnout.*”  ‘I can’t move it.’

In both of these examples (# 16 and 17 from a search for *hnout*), which obviously both come from the same literary work and are in close proximity to each other within that work), the referent of the pron. *ní* is the arm of a hospital patient. (Phrase (13a) is uttered by the narrator of the story, (13b), by the patient in reported speech.) It seems, then, that it is possible to use the construction *s + INST* with a body part in this meaning, but only

---

61 The *SPP* gives, under this definition, one instance of an ANIM non-HUM Obj in the INST with the preposition *s*: *Chudák pes, hýbou s ním vši.* ‘The poor dog, fleas are moving him.’ In this phraseological usage, the second clause can be understood as ‘he is full of fleas.’ There is a similar expression also given as a phraseologism: *obytnými budovami hýbaly štěnice* ‘Bedbugs moved the residential buildings,’ e.g., ‘The buildings were full of bedbugs.’ This usage seems to be a metaphorical extension of ‘move’ that is used only in collocations involving vermin and host.
with a pronoun referring to that body part. This is perhaps a prosodic issue related to the clitic nature of the pronoun, but it is probably better explained by the general tendency of Common Czech (obecná čeština) to use the preposition s rather simply the bare INST (see Karlík et al. 1995: 243). This fact has apparently nothing to do with the fact that the reference is a body part, but it is simply representative of a greater tendency toward analytism (viewed by some as the result of German influence on the language). A native-speaking informant (a male in his early 30s) claims that it would sound strange to use the prepositionless INST in these sentences. The preference of Common or colloquial Czech for the prepositional INST suggests that, indeed, this is the direction in which the valency of the verb hnout is headed. The direction of implementation, then, is apparently for the valency s + INST to occur first with HUM Objs and pronouns, then later with INAN nouns. This hierarchy of implementation suggests the spread of the prepositional INST to more highly individuated Objs first, which is in fact the same direction of implementation observed by Timberlake (1975) for the ACC under negation, as well as for Objs of other verbs which have historically governed the GEN. The spread of the s + INST construction to more highly individuated Objs first is, however, problematic for the TH, as this construction is typically regarded as expressing lower Transitivity.

The question then arises of whether we have a contradiction if we compare the valencies for the impf. and pf. If we consider Animacy and the possibilities of a

---

62 In the first 50 relevant examples from my ČNK search for hnout, there are 30 examples with the bare INST of body parts; there are no examples of s + INST for body parts other than these two examples where the body part is represented by a pronoun. In none of the aforementioned 30 examples of the bare INST with body parts is the body part expressed by a pronoun.
prepositional INST, comparing the aspectual counterparts, we have the following combinations for the meaning ‘strongly influence’:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hnot s kým</td>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>pf.-HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hnot s čím</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td>pf.-HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hýbat s kým</td>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hýbat s čím</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.6: hýbat/hnot – ‘strongly influence’ and Animacy

Here again, we find no contradictions of the TH. In the prepositionless INST, we have the following:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*hnot kým</td>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>pf.-HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*hnot čím</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td>pf. HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hýbat kým</td>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hýbat čím</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
<td>impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.7: hýbat/hnot – ‘strongly influence’ and the bare INST

Once again, we have no genuine contradictions of the TH, because there are no obligatory combinations of HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH features. Furthermore, it appears that a bare INST is actually possible with HUM Objs for hnot in this meaning, despite SPP’s statement to the contrary. Two examples were found in the ČNK (both from results p. 6 for hnot, 18.VI.2007):
The presence of a HUM Obj in the bare INST is evidence that, as is perhaps also the case with the use of the prep. s with body parts, patterns from one meaning can be transferred to another meaning, or that the pattern used with one type of Obj may be applied by analogy to another type of Obj. That is, these relatively rare examples seem to demonstrate that a change of valency is taking place, or at least that the valency of the verb is in a state of flux in which new possibilities are in random alternation with the older ones. This seems to me a reasonable conclusion from the fact that a corpus search reveals more possibilities than a rather prescriptive valency dictionary allows for. The rarity of these examples with the bare INST of HUM Objs suggest that this construction is becoming something of an archaism, as does the fact that the prepositional INST with s is preferred in colloquial speech, as opposed to more formal styles (as suggested for the Russian GEN of negation by Timberlake [1975: 132-3]).

For the meaning of ‘change position, state,’ we find the following combinations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hnut s kým/*kým</th>
<th>hnut s čím/čim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH pf.-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW pf. HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hybat s kým/*kým</td>
<td>hybat s čím/čim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH impf.-LOW</td>
<td>INAN-LOW impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.8: hybat/hnut – ‘change position, state’
In this table, we have the same valencies for both the pf. and impf. The only potential contradiction of the TH is the ban on the bare INST with ANIM Objs. Yet we find here a situation that, as stated above for the pf. *hnout*, would violate the *letter* of the TH only if the preposition *s* were required with ANIM but barred from INAN.

A remarkable detail from the *SPP* is the fact that most of their examples of INAN Objs for the impf. *hýbat* are Objs that represent humans in a collective sense:

(15a) *Jaké zájmy dnes hýbají lidmi, co vůbec moderní společnosti?*  
What interests today move people-INST, what generally modern-INST society-INST

(15b) *Peníze hýbou sportem stále více.*  
Money moves sports-INST more and more.’

(15c) *Mathesiovy myšlenky dodnes hýbou obecným jazykozpytem.*  
‘Mathesius’ thoughts to this day move general linguistics-INST.’

(15d) (Figuratively)  
*Mladým Němcem tehdy hýbala vlna národního probuzení.*  
A wave of national awakening moved the young-INST German-INST then.

Even the singular ‘young German’ in ex. (15d) must be understood as representative of typical young Germans, or *Jungdeutsche* of the time (app. 1830-50). Furthermore, nouns referring to professional fields, such as ‘sports’ and ‘linguistics’, have to be seen as referring, in some collective sense, to humans involved in those endeavors.

4.3.3. The Czech verb *pohybovat/pohnout*  
The forms of *pohnout* provide only one significant difference from the closely related forms *hýbat/hnout*. Meaning 1 (‘make a small motion of a body part’) corresponds
to those for *hnout* and *hýbat* and likewise takes an instrumental object. Meaning 2
(‘change position’) corresponds to meaning 2 for *hnout* and *hýbat*, but takes *s + INST.*
Meaning 3 (corresponding to *hnout* meaning 3, ‘continue in s.th., solve s.th.’) takes the
same *s + INST*, as does meaning 4 (‘strongly influence’). Only in its fifth meaning does
*pohnout* demonstrate something significantly different—*přimět* ‘induce, persuade’, with
the valency *někdo/něco – pohne – někoho – k něčemu/aby…*, used in expressions like *p.
koho k slzám* ‘move s.o. to tears’. Here the sense of ‘move’ is obviously figurative, but
the Obj is HUM. It would seem that part of the motivation for the use of the ACC in these
cases has to do with the situationally reduced Volitionality of the Obj. This view would
be consistent with the government of verbs such as Russian *ubeždat* (+ ACC) ‘convince,’
*zastavljat* (+ACC) ‘force,’ as opposed to DAT-governing verbs such as *velet* ‘order,
command’. To force someone to do something leaves the Obj no choice in the matter
(zero volitionality); to persuade someone to do something usually involves changing the
other person’s mind or bringing that person’s will into line with one’s own.

In the meaning ‘strongly influence’, *pohnout* takes an *s + INST*, like the verb
*hnout* in the same meaning. Influencing someone does not have the strength that
persuasion does; it does not necessarily or definitively involve changing the other
person’s mind or intention. For this reason, the use of the prepositional INST is
compatible with the TH because, in the case of the stronger effect of the Subj upon the
Obj found in the meaning ‘induce, persuade,’ the Obj is in the ACC. There is apparently
another grammatical phenomenon involved as well: *hnout s někým* (‘influence’) cannot
take an infinitive or a dependent clause with *aby* + *l*-participle to indicate the action that a
person (or society, etc.) is moved to do. That is to say, in the meaning ‘induce’ we have
an ACC Obj followed by the action that a person performs under the sway of the Subj; the fact that the Obj is impelled to perform the action is an indication of the greater Affectedness of the Pat.

The imperfective counterpart to *pohnout, pohybovat*, also requires an INST Obj., and here it can indicate small motions or a change of position: *činit drobné pohyby* (části n. částmi vlastního těla); *měnit polohu něčeho* ‘make small movements (of a part or parts of one’s own body); change the position of something.’ The fact that this meaning has only to do with parts of one’s own body would seem to be in accordance with Levine (1980), as discussed for Russian *dvigat’* above.

Perhaps more interesting with this basic verb of movement is the constant use of the accusative in reflexive forms. The question here is whether this is merely a lexical (and, indeed, historical) matter; Slavic languages generally do not have well-developed or highly productive instrumental reflexive verbs or pronouns.63

4.3.4. Additional verbs for ‘move’

4.3.4.1. The Russian verb *ševeliť*/*ševel’nut’*

The Russian verb *ševeliť* can govern either the ACC or the INST, and the difference seems to be determined entirely by the Affectedness of the Obj. This verb can take only an ACC in its first meaning, ‘turn over’ (Oxford 1997), which indicates a lingering change in position; by contrast, it takes an INST in its second, ‘move, stir, budge’ (*slegka dvigat’* in Ušakov), where the Affectedness (change of state) of the Obj is

63 Czech – along with Slovak – has the most highly developed short-form dative reflexive of all the Slavic languages. And it seems, furthermore, that Czech does have an (apparently somewhat lexicalized) instrumental reflexive, which shall be discussed below under *hodit sebou*.
not so strongly emphasized. In the second meaning, the verb is apparently used primarily or even exclusively in relation to body parts, e.g., in the colloquial expression ševelit’ mozgami ‘use one’s wits’ (Oxford, Ušakov). A Russian National Corpus search for ševelit’ (active) gives, from the first 50 relevant results, 40 examples with Objs in the INST, all of which are body parts. The remaining 10 examples with the ACC all have Objs that are not body parts.

The pf. ševel’nut’ has the same basic meanings and apparently the same corresponding valencies; the listed examples take the INST: brov’ju ne ševel’nut’ ‘not bat an eye,’ pal’cem ne ševel’nut’ ‘not lift a finger,’ Vter nad skalou uvjadšej ševel’nět travaju.65 ‘The wind above the crag stirs the faded grass.’ In this last example, it is not a body part that is being moved, but there is an impersonal force as Subj. In this regard, this sentence is comparable to the low Transitivity of ex. (9), since both sentences involve an INAN Subj, low Volitionality, and low Affectedness.

A Russian National Corpus search for ševel’nut’ (active) gives, of the first 50 relevant results, 37 examples with Objs in the INST, all of which are body parts, and 13 examples with ACC Objs. Of those 13 ACC Objs, four are body parts and the rest are human or inanimate. The four body parts deserve some attention, since their appearance in the ACC is telling in terms of Individuation. I present two of those five examples here:

(16a) (result # 50) ...kotoryj gorjačim slovom ševel’nl eë mozgovye nervy...
‘... who by his hot word moved her brain-ACC nerves-ACC...’

---

64 This is not clear from Ušakov, who indicates only that ševel’nut’ is the one-time action for ševelit’.

65 The inclusion of the verb with this non-body part seems to be the result of a categorization of convenience by the author, i.e., there was no better category in which to include it. As arbitrary as this categorization seems, it is remarkably similar to that of def. 3 of hodit in SPP, discussed in section 5.3.1.
In example 16a), the Subj is moving another person’s nerves, so in this case the use of the ACC is explainable by the fact that the Subj is acting on an entity separate from himself, i.e., there is no Subject-Affectedness (which would mean lower Transitivity) involved. This sentence, then, is comparable to examples (5) and (8a)-(8c) with dvigat’ nogu vs. dvigat’ no-goj, which demonstrate the importance of inalienable possession to the choice of case of the Obj. The body part is low in Individuation, since it is distinct from the Subj. In (16b), we have an unusual, expressive literary example in which a smile is said to move someone’s lips. It is fair to say that the lips belong to the person and not to the smile; however, the smile is personified here, i.e., it is presented as if detached from the body part that produces it. There are two other instances from this Corpus search in which a smile moves someone’s lips.

4.3.4.2. The Czech verbs tahat and táhnout

The Czech verbs tahat and táhnout, generally speaking ‘pull,’ present some interesting anamolies from the standpoint of the TH. The impf. tahat can have meanings of ‘pull’ as various as to pull something or someone by a rope, by a part of the body or clothing, or by dragging; it can also refer to pulling someone into something, as in getting someone involved in an activity or situation. It takes an ACC Obj, except when that Obj

---

66 Result # 42 is from 1985; the other two are significantly separated from it in time, result # 45 is from 1852, and result # 46 is from 1864.
is used, as in the case of a rope or strap, to pull something else (regardless of whether that entity is explicitly mentioned in the same clause), as in (SPP):

\[(17) \text{Kostelník tahá za mohutný kožený řemen a zvony se rozeznívají.} \]
\[\text{‘The sexton pulls at the massive leather strap and the bells sound.’} \]

As this example shows, the valency for ‘pull s.o. by s.th’ is *tahat někoho-ACC za něco-ACC*. This valency reflects the higher transitivity (ACC) for the affected Obj; the body part, clothing, rope, etc. by which someone or something is pulled, the instrument or means, is quite logically in the syntactic position of lower transitivity (*za* + ACC), which is reflected by the presence of a preposition rather than a bare ACC. It is noteworthy that, in practically all the meanings of the impf. *tahat*, the definitions in *SPP* include adverbial or INST expressions such as *namáhavě* ‘with difficulty,’ *silou* ‘with force,’ or *násilím* ‘forcefully.’ All these expressions point to an intensity in the action, which implies that the Subj must work in order to bring about a change in the (position of) the Obj. This fact also implies Volitionality of the Subj.

The verb *táhnout* is differentiated from *tahat* in some of its meanings; it also has more meanings and a greater variety of valencies. While this verb has all the same basic valencies as *tahat*, it may also have a valency with an INST Obj. In the meaning *sunout po povrchu* ‘shift, slide over, across a surface,’ *SPP* gives the valency *někdo – táhne – něčím/něco – po něčem/přes něco* ‘s.o. pulls [moves] s.th.-INST/ACC over/across [the surface of] s.th.’ A frequent use of the verb in this meaning is found in chess, generally *táhnout pěščákem* ‘move a pawn-INST’ (Fronek). In this usage, the possibilities are somewhat limited (*SPP*):
(18a) *Táhni pěšcem na C4* ‘move-imper. the pawn-INST to C4’

(18b) *Korčnoj tăhne bílými figurkami, Fischer černými.*
Korchnoy moves white-INST pieces-INST, Fischer black-INST
‘Korchnoy is white, Fischer is black.’

(18c) *Kdo teď táhne?* ‘Whose move is it? (lit. ‘Who pulls now?’)

In example (18a), the Obj changes location; however, in chess, the purpose of moving pieces is not to change them, so it is not clear that we actually have an example of an affected Obj. The chess pieces are, in fact, markers of position; in that sense, one could say they act as quasi-instruments in that they are “something necessary to the performance of the action” (Janda & Clancy 2006: 188), much like ‘hands’ in waving or ‘head’ in nodding\(^{67}\). In a slightly different vein, one could see chess pieces as indicators of the abstract “power” that opposing pieces have over one another, that power being the ability to capture other pieces within their range. Thus, despite the differentiated functions or values of the pieces, in chess, each piece (belonging to one side or color) is part of a more complex set of pieces which work together. This fact should be clear from example (18b), where we have an unindividuated Obj, and there is no emphasis at all on a change of location; this sentence describes first and foremost which player is which.

Finally, sentence (18c) demonstrates the lowest-transitivity use of these examples, in that it has no Obj and no explicit Subj; therefore, the Obj is not known even if the choice of moves is limited. In (18b) as well as (18c), the verb describes a situation more than an action, and thus has to be considered as quite low in transitivity.

---

\(^{67}\) See also Wierzbicka (1980: 26) who refers to a “signaling function” of the head in nodding. I use the term “quasi-instrument,” because I see these body parts and other signaling devices as Objs with some, albeit a low, degree of Affectedness. Janda seems to regard them simply as “instruments.”
The other use of the verb in this meaning of ‘move s.th. across the surface of s.th.’ often involves Objs which can readily be seen as having some instrument-like qualities. Here, the motion across is expressed by po + LOC or přes + ACC, and táhnout may take either an ACC or an INST Obj (SPP):

(19a) Až potáhneš po papiře perem, dbej na to abys neudělal kaňku.
‘When you drag the pen-INST across the paper, be careful not to make a blot.’

(19b) Jihla táhla štětec po čtvrtce a loktem shodila kelímek s vodou.
‘Jihla moved the brush-ACC across the drawing paper and knocked over a/the cup of water with her elbow.’

(19c) Když táhnem smyčcem přes struny, musíme dávat pozor na nepříjemné skřípavé zvuky.
‘When we draw the bow-INST across the strings, we must be careful about unpleasant squeaking noises.’

At first glance, one might see little difference between the affectedness of the ACC Obj and the INST Objs in these examples; all three refer to some secondary consequence of the movement, and none of the sentences focuses primarily on the displacement of the Obj of táhnout. There is, however, an important difference between smyčec ‘bow’ in (19c) and štětec ‘brush’ in (19b): the bow, like the strings, is part of the instrument, albeit one that is physically separate, whereas the brush is not. In this regard, the bow may be seen as part of a set (somewhat like a chess piece). There is no such part-of-a-whole relationship between the brush in (19b) (or the pen in (19a)) and the paper. This may help explain the difference in case between (19b) and (19c), but not the choice of INST in (19a) as opposed to ACC in (19b). A further account of the differences lies in the emphasis in the second clause of (19c) on the (potential and undesirable) sound produced.
by the motion of the bow; perhaps because the ‘bow’ is perceived as an instrument and, therefore, more peripheral to the action, it receives a “demotion” from ACC to INST. This could account for the choice of INST in (19a) as well, as there is emphasis on the (also potential and unwanted) product of the motion of the pen in (19a): an ink blot. By implication, there is also in the speaker’s mind the intentional, desired result of the action, a well-formed line. Unlike (19a) and (19c), the undesired action of knocking over the water in (19b) is a more indirect, unforeseeable result of the movement of the brush. Example (19b), then, differs from the other two since there is some emphasis on a change of location: the brush has moved far enough that the artist’s elbow ends up knocking over a cup of water. In other words, while it is the elbow (also in the INST, an INST of means here) that produces the undesired result, it is in fact the distance moved by the brush (the ACC Obj) that explains the undesired result. So, it seems that Affectedness (change of location) is mainly responsible for the choice of ACC in (19b), whereas in (19a), the choice of INST is explained by the relationship of the pen to the blot; in (19c), there is a possible additional factor of Individuation (the lack of separateness of the bow from the instrument) as well as the relationship of the bow to the sound it produces. In (19b), the product (the spilled water) is not inherently connected with the Obj of táhnout (except insofar as one must dip the brush in water from time to time).

Finally, to consolidate the uses of tahat with those of táhnout above, which include both moving game pieces and moving other objects across a surface, let us consider an example from the ČNK, the only example out of 50 relevant results of an INST Obj with tahat:
(20) Daniel nosil vždycky v kapse starý kapesník, na který kdysi nakreslil čary potřebné ke hře, a černé a bílé boby, jimiž teď tahal po čárách na kapesníku.
‘Daniel always carried in his pocket an old handkerchief, on which he had at some time drawn lines necessary for a game, and the black and white beans which-INST they now drew across the lines on the handkerchief.’

Here, as in the examples with the chess pieces, the beans are used as markers, and this example illustrates the similarity of two relationships: that between the game pieces and the game board, and the relationship between a bow and a musical instrument (or its strings). In both instances, the object being drawn across the other entity and the entity across which it moves are part of a greater whole. The thing produced by such activity, even if it is not directly expressed by an ACC Obj in the clause with the INST, is the sound or the game (or the game’s positions). In this regard, the objects moved across the surface (or other entity) are not affected Objs, or at least not prototypically affected.

Example (20) is also interesting, because it is the lone example from the ČNK which contradicts the SPP’s implicit claim that no INST Obj is possible with this verb. This exceptional INST usage is likely due to analogy with the pf. In this particular instance, the use of the impf. is due to the narrative usage necessitated by the ongoing situation as it is described in this passage, especially given the presence of the word teď ‘now’ in the clause.

The verb táhnout additionally has two intransitive uses: (hromadně) se pohybovat, přesunovat, přemístovat ‘(collectively) move, shift, change place’ and vanout, foukat ‘blow.’ Examples of these two uses are, respectively (SPP):

(21a) Vítězná husitská vojska táhnou přes hranici...
‘The victorious Hussite armies are moving across the border…’
These examples would seem to provide instances of a semantic middle voice construction without the use of the reflexive, although the reflexive would be the normal means of expressing such a middle voice action in Czech, e.g. *Dveře se otevírají* ‘The doors are opening.’ It is perhaps also noteworthy that the Subjs of these uses of *táhnout* are low in Individuation; they are either collective, as in (21a)\(^{68}\), or else they are impersonal forces of nature such as the cold, as in (21b).

The verbs *tahat* and *táhnout* also have refl. valencies. In denoting a struggle to take something from someone, the valency is *tahat se o něco-ACC (s někým)*, in which case the *s + INST* is comitative, as it expresses an action engaged in by two competing entities. The use of *o + ACC* is explainable by reference to other verbs in which there is a struggle or effort *for (directed at)* some object, aim, or goal, as in *snažit se o něco* ‘strive, struggle for something’ or *usilovat o něco* ‘strive, struggle for something.’

In the meaning ‘carry with effort,’ the valency is *tahat se s něčím*, and in this case, the refl. seems explainable by reference to agent-affectedness: it is the grammatical Subj that is suffering the effects (like fatigue) of carrying object around. Put another way, the Obj is presented as a force to be struggled with. The use of the refl. is also likely due in part to the semantic notion of movement; that is, the Agent is actually moving itself, and it is having difficulty doing so due to the burden. In this regard, then, one can also see a comitative meaning to the preposition *s*, in that there is a notion of accompaniment; i.e., one is moving around *with* something.

\(^{68}\) That is, with the exception of instances of synecdoche, e.g. *Napoleon táhl na Moskvu v zimě* ‘Napoleon advanced on Moscow in winter’ (*SPP*), i.e., Napoleon and his army.
In the meaning ‘have a relationship,’ the valency is *tahat se s někým*. In this meaning as well, there is the notion of movement; a romantic relationship can also be expressed by *chodit s někým* (lit. and fig.) ‘go with someone’.

In addition to the ‘carry with effort’ meaning, *táhnout se* can refer to spreading out. Here, it can appear with adverbials indicating direction, or when it refers to lasting a long time. It cannot take Objs in either of these meanings.

In addition, *táhnout se* can also have a middle voice function, where it can refer to the flowing motion of an elastic or semi-liquid substance such as honey or dough. It also has figurative uses in seeking convenience, the company of others, etc. (in def. 6 of *SPP*, with the valencies *za + INST* or *k + DAT* of the person or thing sought).

In short, neither *tahat se* nor *táhnout se* can take a bare INST in any of their uses (except perhaps an INST of path, e.g. *táhnout se lesem*), and the use of *táhnout se* with *s + INST* would appear to be a comitative usage, as we have already suggested. Thus, these reflexive forms show lower Transitivity than their non-reflexive counterparts.

Of course, there are verbs with similar meanings, such as *vláčet/vléci, nosit*, etc. which only take ACC Objs. This is in large part due to the stronger emphasis on displacement of the Obj. It should be noted that both *tahat* and *táhnout* take mostly ACC Objs; they take INST Objs only in rather rare instances (1 of the first 50 relevant results for *tahat* in ČNK and 0 of 50 for *táhnout*). It appears that, as a lexical issue, *tahat* and *táhnout* are used with game pieces, which tend to occur in the INST, and the other verbs with similar meanings are not used in such collocations.

---

69 For these verbs, I have had to be careful to eliminate INST of manner, path, and means from the “relevant results” and to include in my count only those with true ACC or INST Objs.
The only difference in valency that now remains to be explained is the matter of drawing one thing across another (usually a surface), i.e., why there is the valency táhnout něčím po něčem as opposed to vláčet/vléci něco po něčem. SSc gives, for the definitions of vláčet/vléci něco po něčem a definition smýkavé tahat/táhnout ‘in a dragging manner pull.’ This dictionary gives examples employing vláčet/vléci sukni po zemi ‘drag a skirt over the ground,’ and collocations involving vláčet/vléci with Objs like bows, brushes, and pens are can only be used rather expressively to suggest that the action is being done poorly.

4.4. Verbs of turning

Among Czech and Russian verbs of turning, Czech točit, otočit, and otáčet are of primary interest, since these verbs display considerable variation between ACC and INST Objs. The Czech verb vrtět, which takes almost exclusively INST body parts as Objs, as in vrtět ocasem ‘wag [one’s] tail’ and vrtět hlavou ‘shake [one’s] head’, is of little interest, as it displays almost no variation from this pattern. It will, however, be included in the more general discussion of inalienable possession below, since body parts are low in Individuation because of their lack of (total) distinctness from the Ag/Subj. The Russian verb vertet’, likewise, displays little variation, but it merits some discussion, since it can, albeit in relatively rare instances, take a HUM INST Obj in the meaning of one person manipulating another, a fact which is of interest given our previous consideration of Animacy in both the Subj and the Obj.

70 The one deviation from the INST of body part I have found is in a ČNK search for this verb (result p. 1), where the Obj is prutem ‘rod-INST’, in which case the ‘rod’ may be seen as an extension of a body part (see the discussion of inalienable possession below).
4.4.1. Czech verbs of turning: točit, otočit, otáčet

Before beginning a detailed discussion of Czech verbs of turning, a note on Aspect is in order. The semantic relationship among the three etymologically related verbs of turning točit, otočit, and otáčet is a somewhat complicated matter of Aspect and Aktionsart. The genuine aspectual pair to be found among the three is otáčet—otočit; however, otočit may in many uses serve as the pf. counterpart to the impf. točit, particularly when there is an emphasis on a change of position in the Obj. The impf. točit may also have other aspectual counterparts, such as dotočit in the meaning ‘to tap/pour (e.g., a beer)’ when there is an emphasis on the completeness of the action. When referring to the creation of a film, the impf. točit has as its pf. counterpart natočit; however, the usual impf. counterpart of natočit is natáčet. These pf. counterparts to točit will not concern us further, as they all take ACC Objs, as does the impf. točit in the meanings just discussed; that is, there is no case alternation with these verbs that would shed any light on the particular problem of the implications of Aspect for the choice of case. We will nonetheless be quite concerned with the implications of Aspect for the choice of case among the three verbs that form the basis of this sub-section.

4.4.1.2. The Czech verb točit

Among the various definitions of the Cz. verb točit given in SSJČ, we find a continuum of Transitivity, especially when applying the parameter of Affectedness. The degrees of Transitivity are reflected by and large, though not perfectly, by the choice of the case of the Obj. Several of those meanings (2, 4, 8, 9, and 10 in SSJČ) imply a highly
affected Obj; hence the case is ACC, as one would expect according to the H & T parameters. These meanings are listed here, along with their valencies:

Def. 2 – ‘create with such a [circular] movement’, co čím\(^{71}\)/co.
Def. 4 – ‘by rolling create something from something (else)’, co, φ.
Def. 8 – ‘let flow by opening a tap’, co/φ.
Def. 9 – ‘shoot, film’, co/φ.
Def. 10 – ‘record’ (a sound recording), co nac\(^{72}\).

Def. 2 includes such actions as točit vázu ‘turn a vase’ (as on a potter’s wheel). Def. 4 includes točit si cigaretu ‘roll [oneself] a cigarette’, which involves the creation of cigarettes from tobacco. Def. 8 covers examples such as točit pivo do sklenice ‘pour beer into a glass’, which involves movement of the liquid from a larger container into a smaller one. In def. 9 and 10, we naturally find ACC Objs only, since this meaning refers to creating a film or recording something onto something else, e.g., točit árii na gramofonovou desku lit. ‘turn an aria-ACC onto a gramophone record’, and creation is a highly transitive act, as we discussed in Chapter 1.

In another meaning 3, ‘wrap s.th. around/onto s.th.,’ the valency is co kolem/okolo čeho or co nac. Here, the material being wrapped around the other object undergoes a change of position and thus is found in the bare ACC. Def. 3 also refers winding one thing onto another; since it refers here to a change in location of the Obj, the verb takes an ACC Obj. As suggested by Givón (1984: 96-97), such a change of location is an example of prototypical transitivity.

\(^{71}\) Here, the INST čím is a genuine instrument or means, as in točit (palcí) mlýnek, ‘turn a grinder-ACC (with [one’s] fingers-INST)’ (SSJČ).

\(^{72}\) Here, nac means ‘onto something’, i.e. onto a tape.
Additionally, there are two other definitions in which the verb *točit* indicates a change of direction or orientation of the Obj. Definition 5 denotes a change of direction (*směr pohybu*), e.g. *točit vůz na širší silnici* ‘turn the truck onto a wider highway’; in this meaning, the verb can take only an ACC Obj. In def. 6, *dávat něčemu nový, jiný směr vůbec* ‘give s.th. a new, different direction whatsoever,’ the verb can take either an ACC or INST Obj (SSJC):

(22a) *t. hlavu k někomu, ke dveřím*

‘turn one’s head-ACC to s.o./toward the door’

(22b) *t. řeč jinam, na jiné pole*

‘turn speech-ACC elsewhere/to another field’
‘change the subject of conversation’

(22c) *t. očima po někom*

‘turn one’s eyes-INST towards s.o.’

(22a) probably uses the ACC since there is a definite change in the direction in which one is looking or towards which one’s attention is directed; thus, we have here higher Affectedness, since there is an indication of the change of orientation of the head. This example provides a rare instance of the use of the ACC with a body part with this verb. Furthermore, the pf. *otočit* would be more typical than the impf. (see discussion of *otočit* below). The use of the ACC may be due to a fixed valency the construction with *k + DAT* indicating direction. Example (22b), likewise, indicates a change, and in this instance, not merely a change of direction, but a change of the topic altogether. This use

---

73 In this meaning, the verb can also be used in an intransitive or middle voice sense: *první vůz už točí* ‘the first truck is already turning.’

74 As observed in the next chapter for Czech verbs of throwing, certain prepositional expressions indicating a direction or target necessitate that the Obj be in the ACC.
of the verb, also, is more typical of the pf. *otočit*; the use of the impf. here would typically refer to repeated changes of, or attempts to change, the topic of conversation. Example (22c) involves the direction of one’s gaze and therefore can also be seen as involving high Affectedness. However, the expression includes the construction *po + LOC* with a HUM Obj, and this construction seems to require that the Obj turned be in the ACC, much as we have observed for Cz. verbs of throwing. It seems that the valency of the verb *točit* with the *po + LOC* construction requires an ACC Obj; this valency may also be due to the semantics of the *po + LOC* construction, which indicates a change in direction, that is, a strong enough Affectedness to necessitate the ACC. This observation seems to be borne out by an example from my ČNK search for *točit* (result p. 3):

(22d) *Stálo to na zadních nohou a točilo to po člověku hlavou.*

‘It stood on its hind legs and turned [its] head-INST at one/a person.’

There is, however, an example that is somewhat problematic for this last interpretation (*SSJČ*): *točit lod’ po větru* ‘turn a/the ship in the direction of the wind’, but, in this expression, the preposition *po* has a different meaning, and the wind is a moving entity to be followed rather than a target towards which an action is directed. The expression could be accurately translated as ‘turn a/the ship downwind’.

Definition 1 of *točit* deserves substantial discussion, since its valencies are more varied and demonstrate patterns similar to those discussed for *hnout* and other Cz. verbs above. Def. 1 means to turn something in a ‘circular motion in place or in a small arc’ (*kruhový pohyb na místě n. v malém oblouku*). This would seem to indicate a lower degree of Affectedness, since there is no emphasis on a change of state, i.e. the turning
may stop at almost any point, and the object could conceivably end up in the same place or position\textsuperscript{75}. Not surprisingly, then, the verb in this meaning most commonly takes an INST Obj: INST-INAN; \textit{s + INST-HUM}, more rarely \textit{INST-HUM}; ACC-INAN (\textit{čím}; \textit{s kým}, \textit{řidče kým}; \textit{co}). It is noteworthy that the preposition \textit{s + INST} is preferred with HUM Objs\textsuperscript{76}, and that HUM Objs may not occur in the ACC. Some examples are (SSJČ):

\begin{itemize}
\item (23a) \textit{t. kolečkem, kohoutkem, klikou} ‘spin a small wheel/tap/handle-INST’
\item (23b) \textit{t. čepicí nad hlavou} ‘spin a cap-INST above one’s head’
\item (23c) \textit{t. si hůlčičkou} ‘twirl (refl.-DAT pron.) a small stick-INST’
\item (23d) \textit{t. (s) někým (jakou čamrdou) (při tanci ap.)} ‘spin someone(-s + INST) (like a top-INST) (in a dance, etc.)’
\item (23e) \textit{t. maso na rožni} ‘turn meat-ACC on a spit’
\item (23f) \textit{t. starý kolovrátek} ‘turn an old spinning wheel-ACC’
\end{itemize}

In these examples, it seems that (23b) and (23c) have mostly to do with aimless spinning. This would seem to be especially the case in (23b), where the DAT refl. is a typical expression that an activity is done for one’s amusement but with no particular goal or purpose. Example (23a), however, at least seems to imply some purpose, yet the Obj is still in the INST. This may be due to the fact that there is no specific endpoint of the movement in mind; a wheel may be turned round and round, a hand, back and forth.

From my ČNK search for \textit{točit}, it appears that \textit{točit klikou} is a very common expression (found in seven of the first relevant 23 examples). However, I do not propose that it is merely a frozen expression, but rather one that is very consistently used with Objs that have a very instrumental-type function. These Objs are typically smaller parts of a larger

\textsuperscript{75} There may be, further, an issue of whether the Obj is turned along a fairly obvious or well-defined axis of rotation, which would be the case with a steering wheel or key but not with a ship.

\textsuperscript{76} I have been able to find one exception which, as in examples (13a) and (13b) above, involves a prep. with an INAN referent (ČNK result p. 10 for \textit{točit}): \textit{val pohrabáč a postavil si ho mezi nohy a točil s ním. ‘…[he] took a [fireplace] poker and stood it between his legs and turned it(s + INST).’
tool or instrument, such as tuning pegs or knobs (two examples in ČNK) or a steering wheel (three examples in ČNK). Since the purpose of turning such Objs is not so much to change its position but to alter something else, i.e., to turn something on or off, to tune a string or change the frequency of a radio, the INST shows a lack of emphasis on the Affectedness of the Obj. Finally, when there is a clear change in the position of the Obj and no explicit indication that the Obj is moved back to its original position, then the ACC is used, e.g. (o)točit volant doprava ‘turn-impf. (pf.) a/the steering wheel-ACC to the right’, as opposed to točit volantem ‘turn-impf. a/the steering wheel-INST’ but.

Example (23d), with a HUM Obj, also implies (acc. to the note in SSJČ) that the action subordinates the person to the Subj’s will, or that one can move the other person essentially at will. At the same time, the sense seems to indicate that the second actant (the Obj) is cooperating in the action. So it doesn’t necessarily indicate a subordination of will or lack of volitionality on the part of the Pat. In any event, (23d) may well be one variant where the less typical usage, that of a HUM acting on another HUM rather than a thing, is expressed in a more highly marked syntactic form, that is, with a prep. phrase. Examples (23e) and (23f) do not imply any potential endpoint to the action, although at least in (23e), one can see a purpose to the action, namely, to cook the meat, which implies a change of state. But, in general, one can see that this sort of spinning would tend to be lower in Transitivity due to the lack of a clear endpoint of the action.

I have also been able to observe from my ČNK search for točit that, when a small object is being turned in one’s hand as a more-or-less aimless action, the INST is preferred. These actions include turning a tužkou v ruce ‘pencil in [one’s] hand’ (result p. 13), mezi prsty krabičkou od sirek ‘a matchbox between [one’s] fingers’ (p. 4), sklenkou
vina mezi prstý ‘between [one’s] fingers a glass of wine’ (p. 4), and svým snubním
prstýnkem kolem prstu ‘her engagement ring around [her] finger’ (p. 8). One might also
add that, in such actions, the Objs are being turned or rotated in position with no
predictable stopping point.

Finally, there is a colloquial usage (def. 8) meaning ‘dance,’ which can take no
Obj. This would be the lowest-transitivity meaning of the word, since it refers
semantically to a one-actant activity and permits no syntactic Obj.

This leads us to the refl. točit se, which, according to most of the definitions under
the entry for točit in SSJČ, can express expresses a low-Transitivity meaning of Agent-
Affectedness, the equivalent of the Eng. intransitive ‘turn’. The refl. can also express a
sensation felt by a DAT experiencer, as in the following expression:

(24) točí se mi hlava lit. ‘turn-refl. me-DAT head’, i.e., ‘I feel dizzy’

This use of the refl. is included under def. 1 for točit se (the basic Ag-affected meaning)
in SSJČ, but I would argue that it should be included separately, since it differs from the
basic “middle voice” meaning in that this usage always includes another actant and has a
different valency and argument structure.

The refl. točit se has other uses in which the refl. pron. seems to act as a
detransitizing element. Def. 6 of točit se in SSJČ refers to a deft ability to move or to
manipulate something, and the expression can refer to a middle voice movement with no
Obj, e.g., ta se umí ale točit ‘she really knows how to move’, or in a somewhat more
transitive sense with an Obj in the valency točit se s + INST, e.g., dověde se točit s kosou
‘he will learn how to handle a scythe’. There is also a usage, not included among the
SSJČ definitions, which refers to deeply affecting a person’s emotions or physical state in a negative way, to deeply trouble someone or make someone feel faint. This usage has the valency \textit{točit se s + INST}, as in (ČNK, results for \textit{točit}):

(25a) (result p. 3) Pak se bloudila po dvoře a svět se s ní točil a ani necítila...
‘Then she wandered around the courtyard and the world turned-refl. with her-INST and she didn’t even feel…’

(25b) (result p. 7) Trochu se to se mnou všechno točí a kolena citím, jako by nebyla moje.
‘All that turns-refl. with me, and I feel my knees as if they were not mine.’

In both of these examples, the ‘world’ or ‘everything’ is deeply affecting the emotions or sense of alertness or awareness of a HUM Obj. The ‘world’ is used in a hyperbolic sense and thus cannot be taken literally. In both sentences, the implication is that the “whole situation” is affecting the person in question. In any event, we have INAN Subjs acting on ANIM Objs, and thus we have a situation of abnormal Transitivity. This non-canonical semantic Transitivity is reflected in the structure of the utterances by means of two formal indicators of low Transitivity: the refl. pron. \textit{se} and the construction \textit{s + INST}.

We can observe in these various uses of the verb \textit{točit} a strong tendency for more highly affected Objs, mainly created Objs and those undergoing a change in location, orientation, or direction, to appear in the ACC. When there is no specific endpoint to the action, as in spinning round and round or turning back and forth, the Obj is overwhelmingly in the INST. However, the use of the INST in (23d) \textit{točit (s) někým (jakou čamrdou)} ‘spin someone(-s + INST) (like a top-INST) is paradoxical in terms of the TH, since it involves a HUM, i.e., more highly individuated, Obj in the (sometimes
prepositional) INST. This construction, especially with the preposition s may be an example of marking of non-canonical Transitivity, or of the subordination of one participant’s will to that of another, or of the second actant’s cooperation in the act.

4.4.1.3. The Czech verb otočit

Otočit can mean ‘to turn s.th. in place or a small arc’ (def. 1, SSJČ), as in the impf. točit (def. 1), but unlike točit it can only take an INAN Obj, either INST or ACC: o. klič,kličem v zámku ‘turn a key-INST/ACC in the lock’; o. kolečkem ‘turn a wheel’; o. vypínač, vypínačem ‘turn a switch-ACC/INST’. In definitions 2, 3, and 4, we find meanings having to do with a change in direction or orientation, i.e.:

Def. 2 – ‘change the original position of s.th. from down to up (or vice versa)’
Def. 3 – ‘change the direction of motion or position of s.th. in the opposite [direction] in place or in a small arc’
Def. 4 – ‘give s.th. a new, different direction’

The valencies for these definitions are all listed as INAN ACC\(^77\) (along with the possibility of no Obj for def. 3). SPP admits the possibility of an ANIM ACC Obj for (SPP’s and SSJČ’s) def. 4. of otočit, e.g. (SPP), „Otočte ho na záda,“ zavelel doktor. “‘Turn him-ACC on his back,” ordered the doctor’. In this example, we see an unusual lack of volitionality on the part of the Pat; such an utterance would usually imply that the doctor’s assistants were to turn the patient over without any participation, or resistance, on the part of that person. This lack of Volitionality on the part of the Pat stands in stark contrast to the example of the dance partner in (23d), where the Pat/Obj is a willing

\(^77\) According to the SSJČ, it is possible to have an INAN Obj in the s + INST construction; the SSJČ entry gives the examples otočit víz, s vozem for def. 3. This example appears despite the lack of this valency among the listed possibilities. I have not been able to find an example of s + INST for an Obj of otočit other than this one.
participant in the action. In SSJČ’s def. 5., we find the meaning of ‘wrap s.th. around/onto s.th. (else)’ with the valency INAN ACC, and we find the ACC valency due to the high Affectedness of the Obj, much the same as for def. 3 of točit as explained above. For def. 6, meaning to ‘wrap s.th./s.o up in s.th.,’ we have the co/koho čím valency, where the INST čím represents the material in which the ACC Obj is wrapped. In this meaning, we have a (more or less) totally affected Obj, and thus the ACC is the only possibility.

The SSJČ def. 4 for otočit, ‘give s.th. a new, different direction’, corresponds very closely to def. 6 for točit, as given above. (SSJČ gives as the valency for this def. co kam ‘what-ACC to where’, with the kam generically indicating the new direction, usually specified by an adverbial phrase in actual utterances.) It seems, from my ČNK search for otočit, that this meaning is more common for the pf. otočit than for the impf. točit. The greater emphasis on the new direction of the Obj for def. 4 is reflected by the relatively frequent use of the ACC for body parts, whereas we have come to expect the INST for body parts because of their lack of Individuation; 21 of the 30 ACC Objs (of the first 50 relevant results) that appeared in that search were body parts, and 15 of those body parts were ‘head’ (another two were ‘eyes’). Most of these examples with ACC body parts contained no prep. phrase indicating the direction of movement, but there were occasional examples with prep. phrases such as ke stropu ‘toward the ceiling’, k plakátu ‘toward the poster’, as well as adverbials such as zpátky ‘back’, dolů ‘down’, and na stranu ‘to the side’. All examples obeyed the rule, suggested above for točit as well as vrhat/vrhnout, that only an ACC can be used with k + DAT. (I found no examples in either INST or ACC with po + LOC.) Furthermore, there was only one example in which
a body part, ‘head’, occurred in the INST. These results seem to show that, as might be expected for a pf. verb, there is a greater sense of finality to the action, in this case, a greater emphasis on the new position or orientation of the Obj. This semantic emphasis on change or Affectedness seems to override, for this verb, the fact that the body part is a part of the Subj/Agent.78

Although the ACC, as opposed to the INST, of body parts is markedly more frequent for otočit than for točit, there is a similar frequency for the use of the INST with Objs such as ‘key’ or ‘switch’ (16 of the 20 Objs in the INST). In three of these examples, a ‘key’ was turned v zámku ‘in a/the ‘lock’ or v zapalování ‘in a/the ignition’; this condition seems to deemphasize the ‘key’ as an independent entity and background it as part of a larger tool or system. Google searches also confirm the preference for the INST in such expressions. The past-tense phrase with the INST otočil klíčem v zámku garnered 23 results 256 with repetitions, as opposed to 3 (of 3) for the ACC counterpart otočil klíč v zámku; the infinitive with the INST otočit klíčem v zámku garnered 19 (of 19) results vs. zero for the inf. phrase with the ACC otočit klíč v zámku. So it seems that, for the verb otočit, as opposed to točit, the new direction or orientation of a body part takes precedence over its lack of separateness from the Subj/Ag, whereas small tools like ‘keys’ and ‘switches’ may often seen as parts of a larger apparatus. In any event, in collocations such as otočil klíčem v zámku and other phrases involving otočit and a small instrument such as a key or switch, the focus tends to be on the action rather than on the Obj.

78 It may also be the case that, in instances like these, the turning of ‘head’ or ‘eyes’ is metaphorical for the direction of one’s attention.
In summary, the more frequent use of the ACC with *otočit* in meanings that emphasize the Affectedness of the Obj, in these instances a change in position or direction, provides an illustration of the combination of the pf. with Affectedness which follows from the predictions of the TH. The fact that the noun *klič* ‘key’ tends to occur in the INST when it is turned in a lock or ignition, that is, turned in place, corresponding to def. 1 in *SSJČ*, points to a general preference for the INST when there is little emphasis on the change of position of the Obj. The fact that the INST can co-occur with the pf. is not a contradiction of the TH, since it is not an obligatory combination, i.e., it is perfectly possible to have a highly affected ACC Obj with the pf. as well. Finally, the example of the patient, in the ACC, being turned on his back points to an answer to our questions about the Volitionality of the Obj/Pat. It seems ACC is preferred since the Pat has no opportunity to either participate in the action or resist; in the examples we have observed where the Pat has such an opportunity, the INST is preferred, usually with the preposition *s* ‘with’, which has a potential comitative connotation.

**4.4.1.4. The Czech verb *otáčet***

The impf. *otáčet* has the same meanings and valencies as def. 1.-4. of *otočit*.

Some examples are (*SSJČ*):

(26a) *o. maso na rožni* ‘turn meat-ACC on a spit’
(26b) *o. kolem* ‘turn a wheel-INST’
(26c) *o. hůlkou v ruce* ‘twirl a small stick-INST in one’s hand’
(26d) *vítr otáčí lopatky/lopatkami větrníku* ‘the wind turned the blades-ACC/INST of the windmill’
Here we find much the same situation as with *točit*: the meat on the spit is the only example where the turning has much of a purpose in terms of the Obj, i.e., to cook the meat. I have found the following example, in a ČNK search for *otáčet*, which may shed some light on the issue (result p. 6):

(26e) ...*otáčeli spížem a opékali celého toho velblouda...*
  ‘...[they] turned the spit-INST and roasted that whole camel...’

It seems, then, that the spit in such examples is a genuine instrument of the turning/cooking, and therefore the meat, when it occurs as the Obj of *otáčet* must have such a Patient-like quality, especially when compared to the spit in an phrase like (26a), that it must be in the ACC.

In the instance of the ‘wind’ in (26d), we find an INAN cause of the action with an INAN INST Obj. This action caused by a natural force seems similar to the example in the discussion of *ševal’nut* above: *Veter nad skaloju uvjadšej ševal’ňeti travoju*. ‘The wind above the crag stirs the faded-INST grass-INST.’ We have, in (26d) an example of non-canonical Transitivity, since there is an INAN Subj (or Ag) acting on an INAN Obj. We find an example of even less canonical Transitivity in the following example (ČNK search for *otáčet*, p. 7):

(26f) *Voda viřila, otáčela jím, obracela ho hlavou dolů.*
  ‘[The] water whirled, turned him-INST, turned him upside down’

In this example of an INAN Subj acting on an ANIM Obj, we are not surprised to find the INST as a marker of unusual Transitivity, in this case a form that usually marks low Transitivity.
In this discussion of otáčet, we have observed that turning meat on a spit requires the ACC form of ‘meat’, the affected Obj, whereas the instrument of turning, ‘spit’, must be in the INST when it is present. We have also found examples of non-canonical semantic Transitivity involving INAN Subjs; these examples seem to require an INST Obj. Even when the Subj of such an utterance involving non-canonical Transitivity is HUM, it is found in the INST.

4.4.2. The Russian verb vertet’ ‘twirl, turn round and round’

The Russian verb vertet’ can take an ACC or INST Obj, depending on the meaning in which it is used. Not surprisingly, ACC Objs are used in those definitions indicating greater Affectedness. In Ožegov, only the ACC is found with def. 1., privodit’ v krugovoe dviženie ‘put into a circular motion’ and def. 4., which has to do with creating things by rolling, as in cigars. Def. 2. shows less emphasis on Affectedness, as it refers to twisting from side to side, and in this definition it may take an ACC of person or thing, but the INST is limited to things. This is quite in line with the TH. Examples in Ožegov are:

(27a) vertet’ kuklu v rukax ‘twist a puppet in one’s hands’
(27b) vertet’ golovoj ‘turn one’s head’

These examples show, once again, that the body part of the Agent, being lower in Individuation, is more likely to be in the INST. The third definition has to do with manipulating someone, having someone wrapped around one’s finger: vertela mužem,

---

79 As covered in the ensuing discussion, body parts are overwhelmingly the Objs found in the INST. In a separate NKRJa search for “vertet’ act,imp” (28.V.2007), I found one example of an INST that was not a body part: malen’koj olkoj ‘little-INST shelf-INST’.
kak xotela ‘she twisted (manipulated) her husband-INST as she wanted.’ In this meaning, of course, we have only ANIM Objs and only in the INST. This is another instance of the fact that, when the Pat’s will is subordinated to that of the Ag, then the Pat may be found in an oblique case, the more marked case. This use of the INST here can in this sense be compared to the use of s + INST, more highly marked than the bare INST, found in the Cz. example of točit s kým when referring to spinning s.o., almost at will, on the dance floor. These observations are confirmed by a NKRJa search (for “vertet’act” 24.II.2007), in which, of the first 50 relevant results, 10 had as Objs the INST form of body parts, and one had the INST of a person being manipulated (result 56):

(28) …on rasskazyval ej o kakoj-to Nataške, kotoraja vertela im dva goda, kak xotela…

‘…he told her about a certain Nataška, who twisted [manipulated] him-INST for two years as she pleased…’

It is noteworthy that this example, like the one from Ožegov above, contains the words kak xotela ‘as she wanted/pleased’, emphasizing the subordination of the will of the Obj to that of the Subj. Such examples, then, provide evidence that there is a kind of “abnormal” Transitivity present, and that abnormally high Transitivity is, ironically, indicated by a formal means that would normally indicate lower Transitivity.

4.5. Inalienable possession

We have noted above the concept of inalienable possession, especially as employed by Levine (1980) to refer to body parts which are seen as inherently connected with the Ag/Subj. Czech and Russian both display a pronounced tendency to have verbal
phrases involving movement of body parts employing the INST. A partial listing is given below for the purpose of introduction:

Cz.  (Janda and Clancy 2006: 188)
klátt nohama ‘swing one’s legs’

vrtět ocasem ‘wag one’s tail’
mávat rukou ‘wave one’s hand (also kývat/kývnout hlavou/rukou [bi-asp])
krčí rameny ‘shrug one’s shoulders’

mrkat očima ‘blink one’s eyes’
lomit rukama ‘wring one’s hands’

Ru.  (Janda and Clancy 2002: 26)
požat’ plečami ‘shrug one’s shoulders’

maxat’/zamaxat’ rukoj ‘wave one’s hand’
(from other sources)
ščēlnnut’ pal’ cami ‘snap one’s fingers’ (Ožegov, entry for ščēlnnut’)
kačat’ golovoj ‘shake one’s head’ (Plewes 1977: 248)

These and numerous other semantically similar verbs may also take ACC Objs, especially when those Objs are not body parts. In Russian, the Objs of these verbs tend strongly to be in the ACC when they are the body part of a being other than the Subj; Czech tends to put these Objs in the INST when they belong to a being different from the Subj, but such utterances are marked by the use of the DAT of possession for the other being. Furthermore, many non-body parts may also occur in the INST when Objs of these verbs are seen as inalienably possessed by the Subj. In this section, I address, in addition to the “usual” valency of INST for body parts, these three issues: 1) ACC of non-body parts, and 2) non-body parts treated as inalienable possessions in the INST. The use of the ACC of body parts not belonging to the Subj has already been discussed substantially for Ru. dvigat’ ‘move’ and Cz. hnout ‘move’, and will therefore be discussed only briefly in this section.
4.5.1. The accusative with objects other than body parts

H & T state (253) that Individuation refers, among other things, to the “distinctness of the patient from the A[g].” Since the body parts typically moved in the actions indicated by the verbs listed above (and others similar in meaning) are inseparable from the Ag/Subj, they fall into the category of low Individuation, and it is therefore not surprising that the body parts are in the INST. An Obj which is not part of the Ag’s body would typically be more highly individuated. When utterances employing many of these same verbs involve movement of an Obj other than the Ag’s body part(s), we often find an Obj in the ACC:

(29a) Ru. kačat’ dítja ‘rock the/a child’ (Plewes: 248)

In fact, the only INST the verb kačat’ can take is listed as čem, but it can take ACC čto/kogo (Ožegov: kačat’ entry, Plewes: 248), and the same is true of the Cz. verb kolébat (čím or co/koho) (Plewes: 248 [no valency given in SPP or SSČ]). The verb kolébat takes an INST Obj in kolébat tělem ‘sway [one’s] body-INST but an ACC in kolébat dítě ‘rock the/a child’ (Plewes: 248). It is true, however, that the Russian kačat’ can take an INST non-body part, e.g. (Ožegov):

(29b) Les kačal verxuškami derev’ev. The forest swayed the tips-INST of the trees.’

In (29b), we do not have a body part, but the tips of the trees are nevertheless very much part of the forest, and the motion is analogous to the action of a living being moving a body part. This example may be viewed in contrast to the following example (Ožegov):
(29c) _Veter sil’no kačal berězy._ ‘The wind strongly swayed the trees.’

In (29c), the trees are separate from the Subj ‘wind’, unlike the ‘tips of the trees’ in the ‘forest’ in example (29b).  

As we noted in the critiques chapter (ex. (15)), the Cz. verb _klátit_ can take an ACC Obj, especially when the Obj is seen as affected by the action:

(30) _klátit ovoce z větví_ ‘shake down fruit-ACC from the branches’

The fruit in this example, in addition to being highly affected, is very much separate from anyone who might be performing the action. It is also true that the verb _klátit_ in this instance is semantically different from its use in the expression _klátit nohama_ ‘swing one’s legs’. The same might also be said of other verbs which often or typically have INST body part Objs, such as Cz. _krčít_, as in _krčít rameny_ ‘shrug one’s shoulders’, which can also have the meaning ‘bend, turn up’, in which it is used with ACC Objs like _sukni_ ‘skirt’ or _nohy_ ‘legs’ (Plewes 1977: 250). There is a subtle difference in Affectedness with _nohy_, in which a change of position may be emphasized (cf. the SSČ example _krčít nohy v kolenou_ ‘bend [one’s] legs-ACC at the knees’), as opposed to the momentary change of position in shrugging, in which the shoulders usually return immediately to their original position. Additionally, as we have observed on numerous occasions thus far in this chapter, a number of factors may be at work, and the use of shoulders as an instrument of communication in shrugging may be an additional semantic element.

---

80 This example differs from _Veter nad skaloju uvjadšej ševelnět travoju._ ‘The wind above the crag stirs the faded-INST grass-INST’, in which the INST is employed. Different verbs, of course, have different valencies, and it appears that they may also differ in terms of how they treat non-canonical semantic Transitivity, which we have in both of these instances of the ‘wind’ moving ‘grass’ and ‘trees’.
contributing to the choice of the INST. The Russian verb požimat’, which is likewise used to express shrugging with ‘shoulders’ in the INST, can also have the meaning ‘press, squeeze’ (Plewes: ibid), and in this meaning it takes an ACC Obj, as in the common expression požimat’ ruku ‘squeeze, shake [s.o.’s] hand-ACC’, and here, of course, the body part ‘hand’ belongs to a person other than the Subj.

Similarly to the semantic differentiations of the Ru. verbs kačat’ and požimat’ and the Cz. verbs klátit and krčit, the Cz. verb lomit, which usually means ‘break,’ is sometimes used in an idiom meaning to ‘wring one’s hands’:

(31a) lomit/zalomit rukama ‘wring one’s hands’

But there is also a more complicated lexical and semantic aspect to this verb and its derivatives. First of all, this is the only usage in which the basic impf. verb lomit can take an INST. The normal pf. counterpart zlomit can take only an ACC Obj. The usual construction referring to breaking a bone employs the ethical DAT (or DAT of possession):

(31b) Zlomila si ruku/nohu. ‘She broke her hand/leg.’

Such a break is normally an event and not a process, and therefore, the impf. is almost never used.

In this sub-section, we have observed that the Ru. verbs kačat’ and požimat’ and the Cz. verbs klátit, krčit, and lomit take INST Objs referring to body parts of the Subj, but they take ACC Objs when referring to entities separate from the Subj. Although the meanings of these verbs may be differentiated between their uses with the INST and the
ACC, the uses with the body parts in expressions like ‘shake one’s head’ and ‘shrug one’s shoulders’ are apparent extensions of the other (usually more basic) meanings. The use of the INST for body parts of the Subj may therefore be seen as confirmation that a less individuated Obj, in these cases inalienable possessions, is more likely to be found in the INST than a more individuated Obj.

4.5.2. The instrumental with inalienable possessions other than body parts

As we have observed, inalienable possession may also refer to objects attached to the body, as in (7a)–(7c), presented again here for the convenience of the reader:

(7a) *Malčik šarkal nogami/tufljami.* ‘The boy shuffled his feet/slippers.’
(7b) *Soldat razmaxival rukoj/ruž’ēm.* ‘The soldier waved his hand/rifle.’
(7c) *Galja trjasla rukoj/košel’ kom.* ‘Galya shook her hand/purse.’

These INST Objs may also be non-body parts which are also seen as moving with the body, almost as though they were body parts, as in example (1) above: *On lenivo ševelil veslami* ‘He lazily moved the oars’. Levine further argues that the ACC is used when this sense of moving with the body is not present, as in (Levine 1980: 9) the following examples:

(32a) *Ona vertela čaškoj.* ‘She spun the cup-INST.’
(32b) *Ona vertela čašku.* ‘She spun the cup-ACC.’

Levine’s argument is that, in (32a) the cup is moving with her hand, whereas in (32b) she is spinning the cup like a top, i.e., it is not moving in tandem with her hand. An example of the Czech verb *točit* ‘turn’ suggests that, for Czech as well, Objs may have a close
association with the body of the Ag/Subj, and in such cases, that Obj will be in the INST
(ČNK search for točit, result p. 8):

(32c) ...stál na přídí a točil veslem ve vodě jako rybím ocasem.
‘...stood at the bow and turned the oar-INST in the water like a
fishtail-INST.’

The phrase jako rybím ocasem ‘like a fishtail-INST’ makes the analogy of the oar with a
body part very obvious. There is a difference between this example and that of spinning
the cup (INST) in that, in (32c), not only is the rower moving the oar like a body part, but
the oar also is attached (most probably) to the boat with an oarlock. Imagining the scene,
the reader can most likely picture the boat, shaped rather like the front two-thirds of a
fish’s body, with the oar being in the analogous position of a tail and moving back and
forth like a tail. We also have to consider that the oar is an instrument of motion, and in
this regard also, it may be demoted to the INST. The oar is also part of a greater whole,
which includes the rower, the boat, and the oar, and in this regard, the oar may be seen as
somewhat analogous to the keys turning in locks, as many of the examples above under
točit/otočit/otáčet. Yet all of these entities together bare resemblance to the movement of
a fish in water, and for this reason, the oar is inherently part of the whole, and,
 furthermore, it is inherently part of the action, rather than having an action performed on
it, and all of these factors likely contribute to the choice of the INST rather than the ACC.

The Russian verb trjasti ‘shake’ exhibits to a large extent the use of the INST
form Objs that may be seen as extensions of the body. In a NKRJa search for
“trjasti act&ipf” (24.II.2007), the objects in ten of the first 50 results are in the INST. Of
these ten results in the INST, seven are body parts. One of the non-body parts is jubkami
‘skirts,’ shaken in a cabaret dance; another refers to clothing, another refers to ‘bags’
which are part of a Santa Claus costume. Clothing and parts of costumes, which are
attached to the body, can be seen as extensions of the body, or as “inalienable
possessions,” as is argued in Levine (1980: 9), who points to examples such as:

(33a) Galja trjasla rukoj/košel’kom. ‘Galya shook her hand-INST/purse-INST.’

One of the ten examples (from the RNC data) which have instrumental objects of the
verb trjasti is the following:

(33b) …podonka i prostitutka dolžny bespreryvno trjasti genitalijami i
pistoletami…
‘...the riff-raff and the prostitute are supposed to continuously shake their
genitalia-INST and pistols-INST...’

This clause, describing a theater scene, displays parallel treatment of body parts and
objects in contact with the body. So we see again the near-equivalence of an object held
in one’s hand with a body part. The only INST Obj found among the results for trjasti
which even arguably deviates from this pattern (of instrumental only for body parts or
extensions of the body) is the shaking of a piece of paper emphatically (RNC):

(33c) Jurij Nikiforenko… trjas obraščeniem predstavitelej...
‘Yurii Nikiforenko … shook the appeal-INST of the representatives...’

Even in this example, it is perfectly reasonable to see the document as an extension of the
body, as Nikiforenko is apparently shaking it much like he would a finger or fist. Finally,
the only example of these 50 results in which a body part is found in the ACC is when that body part belongs to someone other than the subject of the clause (RNC):81:

(33d) *Kirkorov dolgo i gorjačo trjas ruku, blagodaril predstavitelej...*  
‘Kirkorov long and warmly shook hand-ACC, thanked the representatives…’

There are a number of Czech verbs of movement which demonstrate very similar properties, such as *hnout* ‘move,’ which, as we have noted above, takes the INST if the Obj is the subject’s own body part but the ACC (along with a DAT of possession) if the body part belongs to someone else.

In a rather different instance, with the Cz. verb *třásl* ‘shake,’ when shaking someone else’s hand, we find the INST of ‘hand’ along with the ethical DAT:

(34) *Třásl jí rukou.*  ‘He shook her-DAT hand-INST.’

Here we have the same sort of treatment of the object as noted for Cz. *hnout* above. Finally, the Cz. verb *točit* ‘turn’ takes an ACC Obj when that Obj is the body part of someone other than the Subj, e.g. (*PSJČ*):

(35) *Začala násilím točit jeho hlavu k sobě.*  
‘She began forcefully to turn his head-ACC toward herself.’

This is another instance involving a number of factors that might contribute to the preference for the ACC: the clear change in direction or orientation of the head, the use of force indicating a strong element of Volitionality (as well as resistance on the part of the other person), as well as, of course, the fact that it is someone else’s head.

---

81 Similar results obtain in Czech for verbs of movement such as shaking, turning, or moving.
Furthermore, the use of the poss. pron., rather than a DAT of possession, seems to emphasize the separateness of the head from the Subj as well as its distinctness from the action. Some of these factors are interdependent, e.g. the distinctness of the ‘head’ from the Subj and the use of force to move it, since one would not normally use force to move one’s own head. Yet even if force were not present, the fact of having to reach out to move another person’s body part would tend to favor the use of the ACC due to the inherent presence of Volitionality. All of these observations tend to support the notion of the interplay of various factors, yet this interplay does not undermine the suggestion raised in this section that inalienable possession may be an important factor in the choice of case of the Obj.

4.5.3. Conclusions on inalienable possession

We have observed that when the Obj of certain verbs of movement is a body part of the Subj, then that Obj is in the INST. When a non-body part, such as clothing or oars, are inherently part of the action, or when it is viewed as moving in tandem with the person performing the action, then it is found in the INST. When a separate person or object is involved, even the body part of another animate entity, then that person or thing is in the ACC. This “rule” applies consistently to the verbs Ru. verbs kačat’ and požimat’ and the Cz. verbs klátit, krčít, and lomit and appears to be a strong tendency with the Cz. verbs točit and třástit and the Russian verb trjasti. It also applies, at least generally, to the Russian verb dvigat’ ‘move’, but the Cz. equivalent hnout uses the INST of body parts of other ANIM beings with the DAT of possession of that being. This discussion confirms
that, at least for many Czech and Russian verbs, inalienable possession, as defined and
exemplified by Levine (1980), may be seen as a valid (sub-) parameter of Individuation.

4.6. Conclusions on movement verbs – implications for the TH

4.6.1. Phenomena in accordance with the TH

For the verbs discussed, we have observed a strong correlation between
Affectedness and the accusative for both Czech and Russian, especially for the verbs of
turning. We have also found a strong correlation between inalienable possession, which
has inherently to do with lower Individuation, and the use of the INST.

4.6.2. Apparent contradictions of the TH

We have observed apparent contradictions of the TH in the preference for se +
INST, as opposed to the bare INST for HUM/ANIM Objs with some verbs in Czech, but
we have found no genuine contradictions, as the following chart, reproduced from above,
demonstrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hnout s kým/*kým</th>
<th>hnout s čím/čím</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH pf.-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW pf. HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hýbat s kým/*kým</td>
<td>hýbat s čím/čím</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH impf.-LOW</td>
<td>INAN-LOW impf.-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.8: hýbat/hnout – ‘change position, state’
As I have stated above for several such figures, there can only be a genuine contradiction of the revised, stronger TH when there are asterisks in opposite corners of the figure, that is, when there are obligatory combinations of HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH features.

We have also noted that the diachronic hierarchy of implementation is somewhat paradoxical for the TH. While the spread of the \( s + \) INST construction first to ANIM, then to INAN, Objs is in the same direction as that observed by Timberlake (1975) for the spread of the ACC under negation (from more to less individuated Objs), the prepositional INST would normally be taken as an indicator of low Transitivity feature, whereas the ACC indicates higher Transitivity. There is an interesting semantic complication involved in this phenomenon, however, since the question of the Volitionality of the Obj apparently comes into play—only an ANIM, and usually HUM, Obj is capable of willingly participating in the action. We have observed this to be particularly the case in an expression *točit s kým* ‘turn someone’, which can refer to the activity of dancing as partners. The preposition \( s \), furthermore, contains a strong comitative meaning; thus, it is fairly natural that this preposition would be used when there is some sense of willing involvement of the Obj in the action. This valency, having taken hold (more or less) for ANIM Objs, would then be available for spread into other uses.

Finally, we have observed that there are sometimes complicated interactions of several features, as in the examples in (19), reproduced here:

(19a) *Až potáhneš po papiře perem, dbej na to abys neudělal kaňku.*

‘When you drag the pen-INST across the paper, be careful not to make a blot.’
These examples demonstrate three (possibly four) different factors that may influence the choice of case: 1) the displacement of the Obj (Affectedness); 2) the product of that Obj's movement, i.e., the Affectedness of another entity relative to that of the Obj dragged or drawn (across the surface); the instrument-like properties of the thing pulled or dragged; and (perhaps) the extent to which the Obj moved is seen as inherently belonging to a set, as in ‘pen and paper’ or ‘bow and strings/cello’. Such a complex interplay of parameters makes it difficult to predict precisely which case will be preferred in a given utterance.

The relative Affectedness of the Obj relative to some other entity comes up repeatedly in Chapter 5, on verbs of throwing, where we find numerous additional examples which illustrate the problem of several factors in play at once.
CHAPTER 5

VERBS OF THROWING

5.1. Introduction to Verbs of Throwing

Verbs of throwing constitute a large sub-category of verbs, many of which, in both Czech and Russian, may take either an ACC or an INST Obj. There are some facts which support individuation as a factor in the choice of case, and others which do not. It is hard to find a strong correlation between case and aspect.

5.2. Russian verbs of throwing

5.2.1. The Russian verb *brosat'/brosit’*

For the Russian aspectual pair *brosat’/brosit’,* most meanings require an ACC Obj.; for example, in Ušakov, we find only (def. 2) one out of nine definitions of the impf. *brosat’* which takes and INST Obj—nacelivajas’ čem-n., puskat’, zastavljat’ letet’ po vozduxu i padat’ ‘aiming s.th., to release [it] or make [it] fly through the air and fall.’ However, this definition is quite similar to Ušakov’s def. 1, which takes an ACC: vypustiv iz ruki sil’nym razmaxom, zastavljat’ letet’ i padat’ v daleke ‘releasing [s.th.] from one’s hand with a strong swing, make [it] fly and fall in the distance.’ There does not seem to be a great difference between these two definitions that would account for the difference in case, at least not according to the H & T criteria. The goal-orientedness of
the aiming in def. 2 (not mentioned in def. 1) can be seen as an indicator of high
Transitivity\textsuperscript{82}, while the \textit{v daleke} ‘in the distance’ in def. 1 (not mentioned in def. 2)
emphasizes displacement. So, it seems that the emphasis on displacement, i.e.,
Affectedness, wins out in terms of the choice of the ACC in Ušakov’s def. 1\textsuperscript{83}. If this is
the reasoning behind Ušakov’s use of two slightly differing definitions, it seems to me
that Ušakov is making a petty distinction merely in order to account for the difference in
case. By contrast, Ožegov does not make the distinction between these two meanings,
giving a single definition with the valency \textit{čto i čem: vypustiv iz ruki (s razmaxom),
zastavit’ ili dat’ poletet’ i upast’} ‘having released from [one’s] hand, make or let fly and
fall.’ Dal’ likewise makes no distinction between meanings for INST and ACC
government. However, closer inspection reveals a very strong tendency to use the ACC
when there is focus on the Obj thrown, the INST when there is focus on the target (see
discussion below).

Ušakov’s def. 3, \textit{nebrežno klast’, švyrjat’} ‘negligently place, throw,’ also does not
seem to imply directedness – the use of the word ‘negligently’ would seem to imply
nearly the opposite – but there may still be focus on the Patient (as opposed to the action).
This definition only takes an INAN Obj. (\textit{čto}), and the only example in Ušakov is \textit{ne b. okurkov!}
‘Don’t throw (cigarette, cigar) butts!,’ which has to be taken as a posted sign
using the infinitive (and the GEN of negation\textsuperscript{84}). The action referred to in this ex. would

\textsuperscript{82} One could speak of “directionality,” in the sense of Jakobson 1958 (1971: 109).

\textsuperscript{83} Ušakov gives as his only example of his def. 2. \textit{b. butylkami v drake}, ‘throw bottles in a fight,’ which
does not seem to imply strongly a directedness of the action.

\textsuperscript{84} The ACC would be expected in the contemporary language; it seems that Ušakov is being very
traditional in using the GEN as the automatic correlate of the ACC under negation.
certainly be a negligent action, but the obvious concern is for the results of the action, i.e., the unwanted butts littering the floor or ground.

Ušakov’s def. 4 has a valency of HUM/INAN (kogo-čto) and focuses on displacement of the Pat: …perebrasyvat’ na kakoe-n. mesto ‘throw over to some other place.’ This meaning and usage, combining Animacy of the Obj with Affectedness (a clear change in location) is perfectly in line with the predictions of the TH.

Ušakov’s defs. 5 and 6 are semantically more distant from the ordinary ‘throw’ meaning. Def. 5 has as its valency kogo-čto and has the meaning pokidat’, ostavljat’ ‘to leave.’ Def. 6 is the meaning ‘quit, stop’ and, in this definition, the verb can take either an INAN čto or an infinitive verb. Both of these meanings are readily apparent metaphorical extensions of the basic meaning of ‘throw’ and here suggest a more specific, but figurative, sense of ‘cast away, toss aside’; the more specific meaning, in its literal use, conveys a change of location and, thus, high Affectedness, and the metaphorical use apparently maintains that original valency.

Ušakov’s def. 7 is the figurative meaning of uttering something sharply: b. obvinenie, b. vyzov ‘throw out an accusation, throw out a challenge.’ One can discern a substantial degree of Affectedness in this usage, if one takes the view that it stresses that the accusation or challenge is, if not created by the act of utterance, made explicit or public by the act. In any event, this usage is a metaphorical extension of def. 1, and it appears that it, like the uses in defs. 5 and 6, maintains the valency of the root meaning.

Ušakov’s def. 8 relates to brosat’/brosit’ in impersonal expressions; in this usage, the valency is kogo-čto vo čto: Menja brosaet to v žar, to v xolod. ‘I am thrown now into heat, now into cold.’ This use suggests a high degree of Affectedness of the Obj., as it
stresses a strong change of state (whether physical or perceptual), while at the same time
the cause of the action is not stated. This combination of the low Transitivity feature of
having only one participant, combined with the high Affectedness of the Obj., would
seem rather paradoxical from the standpoint of the TH. This fact is perhaps best
explained by reference to the high degree of emphasis on the Pat, which would seem to
be made at the expense of the cause or implied Ag. Furthermore, this meaning of the verb
also is a metaphorical extension of the meaning in def. 1. Finally, it is possible to have an
explicit Subj in a very similar meaning, ‘throw s.o., s.th. into a situation’ (Russian
National Corpus search for *brosat’* [indic|imper|imper2|inf|ger]&act&ipf, result #
45):

(1) Činovniki obeščajut ne brosať na proizvol sudby mestnjuju pressu.
‘Officials promise not to throw the local-ACC press-ACC to the mercy of fate.’

In this example, there is a slightly different valency with *na* + ACC (which still indicates
directionality) for the situation into which the entity is thrown, and that entity in this case
is an INAN noun which represents a group of humans.

Ušakov’s def. 9. is a colloquial usage with the meaning *rastočat’, promatyvat’*
(*den’gi*) ‘waste, squander (money)’: On brosaet tysjači na prixoti. ‘He wastes thousands
on whims.’ The use of the ACC in this sense of aimless or reckless spending may seem
inconsistent with the aimlessness of the action that might generally cause the INST to be
preferred in such a meaning, and it may also seem inconsistent with the use of the INST
in švyrjat’ *den’gam* described below. However, there is some notion that the money is
gone, never to return, and in this regard it can be seen as a highly affected Obj (see the
discussion of Cz verbs of saving and wasting in the following chapter). The verb may also be used in an expression explicitly emphasizing the loss of money, as in *On brosaet den’gi na veter ‘He throws money-ACC to the wind*.85

To sum up the above account of the valencies for various meanings of *brosat’*, we find some degree of emphasis on Affectedness for those definitions that can take only an ACC Obj., but there is not an overwhelming degree of consistency. For definition 3 (‘negligently place, throw’), we have observed that there is some emphasis on the Obj rather than the (directedness of) action, although one could argue that there is also some concern with the result of the action. One may see some lack of consistency in the emphasis on Affectedness in def. 9 ‘waste, squander’, but it appears that the overriding emphasis in this meaning is on (more or less permanent) *loss*, which would be consistent with Affectedness. We also see no great distinction between definitions 1 and 2, despite the difference in valency.

The definitions and valencies for *brosit’* given by Ožegov & Švedova are as follows86:

---

85 Example provided by 49-year-old female native speaker.

86 Under *brosat’, we find only the reference “see *brosit’*” in Ožegov & Švedova. For the perfective *brosit’, we have only two meanings in Ušakov: 1, pf. of *brosat’, and 2, the meaning ‘stop, quit.’ Ušakov does not give the valencies for the pf.
From Ožegov & Švedova, then, it seems a bit clearer that the generic ‘throw’ (1) can take either an ACC or an INST obj., but a HUM Obj. cannot occur in the INST. This last fact is consistent with the idea that if a human is thrown, that person would almost certainly be the affected Obj and not an instrument used to hit a target. In those meanings where displacement is emphasized (2 and 3), only an ACC Obj. is possible. The other meanings have been covered above in the discussion of the impfv. *brosat’*.

Since these dictionary entries and examples do not give us the entire picture of what factors affect the choice of case in the Objs. of *brosat’* and *brosit’*, we shall also consider sample sentences from the Russian National Corpus. But first, let us consider the close synonym *švyrjat’*/*švyrnut’* and then return to more discussion of *brosat’*/*brosit’*; the NKRJa examples for these two aspectual pairs deserve some more or less side-by-side comparison.

### 5.2.2. The Russian verb *švyrjat’*/*švyrnut’*

The verb *švyrjat’*/*švyrnut’* is generally considered to be colloquial. Ožegov (1970) gives only one definition, *S siloj brosat’* (na blizkoe rasstojanie) ‘throw with force (at a close distance)’, and the valencies čto and čem. Ušakov gives examples of the pf. *švyrnut’* using each of the possible cases in the Obj, and gives the valencies for the impf. *švyrjat’* as kogo-čto and kem-čem. In the figurative meaning ‘waste’ (Ušakov’s def. 2), the valencies are čto or čem.

The most common example of this second, figurative meaning is *švyrjat’* *den’gami* ‘to throw one’s money around, to spend recklessly.’ If the ACC is used –
švyryjat’ den’gi – the meaning can only be taken as literal, and the Obj as concrete\(^\text{87}\), i.e. ‘to throw coins and/or banknotes.’ These different uses of the A and I in literal and figurative meanings would seem to be in general accordance with the individuation parameter of concrete/abstract. It does not hold, however, that the object of throwing verbs will always be in the INST when the meaning of the phrase is non-concrete; one can say, for instance, *on brosil na menja serdityj vzgljad* (Oxford) ‘he threw an angry glance at me.’ This sentence is somewhat figurative in that the ‘throwing’ is not done in the usual literal sense involving the use of arms to throw an object. It is arguably still rather high in Transitivity for two reasons: 1) it is the verb rather than the object that is used figuratively (but the ‘angry glance’ is low in concreteness, since it suggests both a medium and a message simultaneously), and 2) the facial expression is created by the act of, say, frowning, and the expression is in fact aimed at a target or recipient. It would be a genuine contradiction of the TH only if one could find two such phrases differing only in the case of the Obj, where the figurative or abstract meaning is in the ACC and the literal or concrete meaning in the INST.

Wierzbicka (1980: 19) notes the importance of the affectedness of the Obj, claiming that “It is interesting to note that verbs and verbal phrases which imply a change of state in the object can never take an instrumental object.” Thus one can say *Ivan švyryjal kamnjami* ‘Ivan was throwing stones-INST,’ implying, in her interpretation, that Ivan was not interested in what happened to the stone, but *Ivan švyrnul kamnem v vodu* ‘Ivan threw the stone-INST in the water’ is impossible/unacceptable because the change of place of the object is emphasized, so the only possible sentence is *Ivan švyrnul*

\(^{87}\) In the figurative meaning, the ‘money’ would be more abstract, not referring so much to coins and banknotes as to (careless use of) one’s financial resources.
Yet when the stone is thrown at a human, one must say Ivan švyrnul kamen' v Petra, rather than *Ivan švyrnul kamen’ v Petra ‘Ivan threw a stone-ACC at Peter,’ since the action is directed at ‘Petr,’ the Patient, and he is the one who is affected (the one that Ivan wanted to hit).

Of course, one can see in this description a prototypical Agent-(HUM) Patient-Instrument relationship, even if those participants are not represented by a typically – for Slavic – NOM-(bare) ACC-INST morphosyntactic structural relationship. A likely explanation for the use of v + ACC, rather the bare ACC, in such constructions with ‘throw’ is that the Obj in the ACC following the prep. is merely the target of the action and is not necessarily hit, i.e., affected; thus, the Obj undergoes a kind of demotion from the bare ACC to v + ACC.

With the verbs švyrjat'/švyrnut’, brosat’/brosit’, and kidat'/kinut’ ‘throw, fling, case’, the HUM Obj (target) in the v + ACC construction is nevertheless higher in terms of transitivity than the INST Obj (thing thrown), but lower than a bare ACC (which is possible for the thing thrown when its Affectedness is emphasized). Wierzbicka (1980: 19) also asserts that *Ivan švyrnul kamenem v vodu ‘Ivan threw the stone-INST in the water-ACC is impossible, since a “change of state in the object” is implied. Native speakers, furthermore, affirm that a sentence such as *Mal’čiki švyrjali kamnjami v vodu ‘The boys were throwing stones in the water,’ is also impermissible, even though the Obj is less individuated, and the action, in most typical contexts, would tend to be seen as rather idle, i.e., there is no real interest in what happens to the stones. NKRJa results tend to confirm these observations; of my first 50 relevant results for švyr’nut’ act&pf, 18 have
the valency ACC + vo čto and 18 have the valency ACC + na čto. There are only three results with an INST Obj, and all of those involve v kogo.

Contrary to Wierzbicka’s claim, the valency INST v + ACC is possible, albeit only in rare contexts. Of my first 50 relevant results for a search for švyrjat’ act&ipf, only five results have an INST Obj; of those five, two have the valency INST Obj v kogo, two have the valency INST Obj vo čto, and one has an INST Obj with v + ACC-ANIM-nonhuman. Three representative examples are:

(2a) (NKRJa 13) Petr begal po beregu i švyrjal v nix kamnjami.
‘Petr ran along the bank and threw stones-INSTR at them.’

(2b) (NKRJa 54) Ja zlilsja i švyrjal v klesta pustymi šiškami...
‘I was angry and threw empty-INSTR cones-INSTR at the crossbill.’

(2c) (NKRJa 25) Aleksei perestal vyežžat’ iz svoego dvorca, potomu čto na ulicax emu svisteli, švyrjali v karetu grjaz’ju.
‘Aleksei stopped going out of his palace, because [people] on the street would whistle at him and throw dirt-INSTR at [his] carriage.’

These examples demonstrate that the affectedness of the person or animal – or vehicle – involved takes precedence over the object thrown. In example (2b), for instance, the thrower directs his anger at the bird by throwing, and it is intuitively obvious that the thrower intends to hit the bird, or scare it, or make it fly away. In (2c), there is a similar emotional action on the part of the throwers, one of resentment or anger, and it is directed at the carriage which is representative of its passenger, Aleksei. So, even though the carriage is not, strictly speaking, an ANIM entity, it plays a role in the sentence analogous to that of a human, and therefore the use of the INST grjaz’ju is rather consistent with that in (2a) and (2b) and with those from Wierzbicka cited above.
There is, as I have mentioned, one other example of an INST Obj (thing thrown) from the five examples found of švyrjať čem v kogo/čto (NKRJa 24):

(2d) ...i švyrjať kamnjami v poezda, čtoby razbiť steklo...
‘...and throw stones-INST at trains in order to break the glass…’

In this example, even though the trains cannot be affected in the same manner as an ANIM Obj (i.e., with a physical or emotional reaction), the emphasis in the second clause on breaking windows is indicative of the desire to affect the prepositional Obj; thus, it is more or less understandable that the semantic roles, and their morphosyntactic representations, are the same as in the other three examples. The affectedness of the stone(s) is not an issue in any of these examples.

In my NKRJa search for švyr’nut’act&p, I found only three examples with the INST, all of them with the valency švyr’nut’ čem v kogo. Given the lack of variation, these examples have little to show in terms of the parameters under discussion, except to confirm the general principles described by Wierzbicka. It is, however, interesting that there are three examples in which the thrown object, in the ACC, is directed at a person’s face or other body part, of which two are given here:

(3a) (NKRJa 25) Ja by èto baraxlo emu v lico švyrnula. I would that-ACC junk-ACC him-DAT in face-ACC throw. ‘I would throw that junk in his face.’

(3b) (NKRJa 51) …ostavalos’ liš’ švyr’nut’ im pravdu v lico… …it remained only to throw them-DAT truth-ACC in face-ACC …it remained only to throw the truth in their face[s]…’

---

88 One might also argue that the movement of the vehicles gives them an animate-like quality.
In these examples, we see the use of the DAT of inalienable possession with body parts. The thrower performs the action in a mood of defiance or contempt. The DAT Obj is the undergoer of an emotional Affectedness (more so for ex. (3b). In (3a) the Affectedness is physical as well), a typical role for a DAT Obj, and the face is the specific body part at which the object thrown is aimed, and, therefore, as the target, is found in the ACC following v, as is typical for the targets of throwing, as we have observed above. One can compare such constructions with those in which the DAT Obj plays a genuinely benefactive role (Oxford 1997, entry for ‘throw’):

(4) Bros’te/kin’te mne polotence! ‘Throw me my towel.’

Here, the recipient of the throwing is in a role parallel to that of a typical three-participant ‘give’ construction. The main semantic difference between this example and those immediately preceding is that throwing something in someone’s face is an act of defiance or disrespect.

In a NKRJa search for brosat, I have found, for the first 50 relevant examples, only two instances of an INST Obj, both of those with v kogo. There also two examples in which there is an ACC Obj thrown with v +ACC-ANIM. Those four examples are:

(5a) (NKRJa 9) Potom brosali v neř mjačíkem i daže pytalis’ stukat’ po mjaču palkoj.
‘Then they threw a ball-INST at her and even tried to strike the ball with a stick.’

(5b) (NKRJa result 25) ...zaščitniki „kreposti” brosajut snežki v napadajuščix.
‘…the defenders of the “fortress” throw snowballs-ACC at the attackers.’

89 Here, the full search term was brosat (indic|imper|imper2|inflger)&act&ipf. The “relevant examples” do not include the meaning ‘abandon, quit, leave.’
(5c) (NKRJa result 1) Čtoby dobyť frukty, nužno brosať kameški v obez'janu.
   ‘In order to get fruit-pl, you have to throw pebbles-ACC at the monkey.’

(5d) (NKRJa result 1) Togda ona budet rvat' frukty i brosat' imi v vas.
   ‘Then it will tear fruit-ACC-pl off and throw them-INST at you.’

In (5a), we have $v + \text{ACC-HUM}$ and the thrown entity in the INST, which is perfectly consistent with the patterns observed for švyrjať/švyrnutť above. In (5b), we have the $v + \text{ACC}$ with a HUM target, but the snowballs are in the ACC, which deviates from this pattern. There is no particular difference in the focus on the ACC Objs in the $v + \text{ACC}$ phrases; it seems that in both cases, there would be emphasis on the Affectedness of these human targets. Possible explanations of the difference might be that in (5b) the attempt to repel the attackers is part of a larger strategy and thus the ‘attackers’ recede from the center of attention or that in a snowball fight, there tends to be greater emphasis on ‘snowballs.’ The latter explanation seems to be the better one; in a snowball fight, snowballs are integral to the activity, and are thus non-arbitrary\(^{90}\).

The difference in case between (5c) (ACC) and (5d) (INST), which are sequential sentences from the same source, is more difficult to explain. Both sentences involve ANIM targets, but in d) one would expect greater emphasis on what happens to the fruits, since one is interested in getting them from the ape (hence, one would expect to find ‘fruits’ in the ACC), whereas in c) there is greater emphasis on getting an emotional reaction from the ‘monkey’ and less interest in what happens to the stones. Thus, in (5c), it would seem that ‘stones’ has a more genuinely instrumental character, and the INST

\(^{90}\) This observation seems to be borne out by Google search results (23.VII.2007): “brosat' snežki” (with the search terms in quotation marks, as a collocation) garnered 876 results vs. 10 for “brosat' snežkami”;
“brosal snežki” dominates “brosal snežkami” 91:2, and “brosali snežki” dominates “brosali snežkami” 287:26.
would seem more natural, according to the factors we have discussed thus far. Therefore, the fact that (5c) has an ACC Obj (the thing thrown) and (5d) has a thrown Obj in the INST is perhaps explainable in terms of the difference between the HUM ‘you’ as opposed to the ANIM but non-HUM ‘ape’ of (5d). It appears, however, that a better explanation is that brosat’ kameški ‘throw pebbles-ACC’ is a fairly fixed (or frozen) collocation, so that not much variation is to be expected in terms of the case of the Obj91.

Even then, this differs from the treatment of the ‘cones-INST’ thrown at the ‘crossbill’ above and repeated here for the reader’s convenience:

(2b) (NKRJa result 54) Ja zlilsja i švyrjal v klesta pustymi šiškami...
‘I was angry and threw empty-INST cones-INST at the crossbill.’

A likely explanation for the difference in patterns is that the verb brosat’/brosit’ is in a period of synchronic change in which there is greater random variation than there is for švyrjat/švyrnut’. That is, švyrjat/švyrnut’ seems to have a stable valency with v + ACC-ANIM + INST (thrown Obj) and v + ACC-INAN + ACC (thrown Obj), allowing for exceptions such as švyrjat’ kamnjami v poezda which have subtler semantic motivations as explained above. That is, if there is a particular reason that the focus should be on an inanimate target and on the Affectedness of that target, then the object thrown will be in the INST, as that oblique case will occur with an Obj on which there is less focus in the utterance.

91 Google search results (23.VII.2007) show that, for the following search terms, the ACC dominates the INST in the following ratios: “brosat’ kameški” vs. “brosat’ kameškami” – 1,020:2, “brosaet kameški” vs. “brosaet kameškam” – 493:0 “brosit’ kameški” vs. “brosit’ kameškami” – 34:0, “brosil kameški” vs. “brosil’ kameškam” – 47:1.
In these definitions of švyrjať/švyrnut', we see the preference for the ACC in meanings emphasizing Affectedness. In those meanings where there is a choice of ACC or INST for the Obj thrown, we see that the Affectedness of the thing thrown relative to that of the target tends to determine the choice of case. That is, if the Affectedness of the thing thrown takes precedence over the Affectedness of the target, then the thing thrown appears in ACC; otherwise, it appears in the INST.

5.2.3. The Russian verb kidat'/kinut'

The synonymous aspectual pair kidat'/kinut' shows yet different behavior. In a more traditional reference work, Ušakov\(^92\) gives an example Mal’čiška kidal kamnjami v voron ‘The boy threw/was throwing stones at the crows.’ Here, it seems that the same principle outlined by Wierzbicka (and suggest by Ushakov’s valencies for brosat’ as čto, čem vo čto) comes into play: throwing an object at a target (especially a living one) means that the object thrown must be in the INST. Data from the NKRJa, however, suggest otherwise. Of the first 50 relevant results\(^93\) for kidat’act, there are five examples of the thrown object in the INST; of those, three are combined with v kogo, one has v sobak ‘at dogs,’ and one has no other participant (target). There are three examples of ACC + v kogo, and another where the target is an animal, which suggests even more random variation than we find with brosit’/brosat’. Some of the more noteworthy examples are as follows:

(6a) (NKRJa 20) V otvet v Eropkina stali kidat’ kamnjami i polen’jami.
   ‘In response they started to throw stones-INST and logs-INST at Eropkin.’

\(^92\) He gives the valency for kidat’ as only kogo-čto (he does not give the valency for the pf. kinut’).

\(^93\) Results with the meaning ‘leave, abandon’ were not counted.
(6b) (NKRJa 2) *On to stojal na odnoj noge, to kidal v Caplju vetkami, to obzyval eë.*

‘He would stand on one leg, or throw branches at Heron, or call her names.’

(6c) (NKRJa 55) *Pomnju, kak pri pojavlenii povozki s sobačim jaščikom staruški kidalı kamnjami v sobak, čtoby progrnat’ ix podal’še.*

‘I remember how, at the appearance of the vehicle with the dog bin, old ladies would throw stones-INST at the dogs to drive them farther on.’

(6d) (NKRJa 41) *Ran’še gaišniki v motociklistov svoi milicejskie palki kidalı, a teper’ prosto otvoračivajutsja, čtoby ranu ne beredit’ – oštrafovát’ bajkera nevozmožno.*

‘Earlier traffic cops would throw their-ACC police-ACC sticks-ACC at motorcyclists, and now they just turn away, in order not to open a[n old] wound – it’s impossible to fine/ticket a biker.’

(6e) (NKRJa 18) *On kidal v zverja list’ja, pugovicy ot rubaški.*

‘He threw leaves-ACC and buttons-ACC from his shirt at the beast.’

The difference in case between, on the one hand, (6a), (6b), and (6c) (INST), and, on the other, (6d) and (6e) (INST), is probably best explained in terms of definiteness; policejskie palki ‘police sticks’ is modified by svoj ‘their [own]’ and the pugovicy ‘buttons’ are definite, since they are from a specific shirt. The list’ja ‘leaves,’ however, seem to be indefinite, although the coordination of this Obj with the definite ‘buttons’ may explain the fact that ‘leaves’ also appears in the ACC. It would seem, then, that the choice of case for the object thrown with the impf. verbs brosat’ and kidat’ depends in part on definiteness.
The pf. counterparts to these verbs, however, show more regularity. Of the first 50 relevant results for the pf. *kinut’*, there are four examples of INST + *v kogo* and not a single example of ACC + *v kogo*. Two illustrative examples are:

(7a) (NKRJa 1) *Esli ja navral, kin’te v menja tuxlym pomidorom.*
‘If I have lied, throw a rotten-INST tomato-INST at me.’

(7b) (NKRJa 94) *Kogda ja vižu molodëž’ v glaženyx džinsax i akkuratnen’ktx maečkax, mne xočetsja kinut’ v nix čem-nibud’…*
‘When I see youth in ironed jeans and neat tee-shirts, I feel like throwing something-INST at them…’

In both of these instances, the emphasis is on shaming the person at whom the entity is thrown, especially in (7a) where having a rotten tomato thrown at one would be a particular disgrace; in (7b), perhaps, there is more emphasis on the anger of the speaker and (potential) thrower, but the point is still to evoke a negative emotional reaction from the person at whom the thing is directed. Furthermore, in each of these examples, the object thrown is indefinite and non-referential. Thus, in both cases, there is a greater emphasis on the Affectedness of the person at whom the action of throwing is directed than there is on the Affectedness of the thing thrown.

5.2.4. Summary of Russian verbs of throwing

We have observed that, for the Russian verbs *brosat’/brosit’, švyryjat’/šyrynut’, kidat’/kinut’*, the Affectedness of the Obj seems to be the primary factor in the choice of case. For those meanings of these verbs that stress the Affectedness of the Obj, only the

---

94 There is one example of the INST without *v + ACC* (target): (result 2) ...*mogut i butylkaj kinut’, i mordu nabit’...* ‘they can even throw a bottle-INST, and smash [his] face...’ In this example, there is clear emphasis on the Affectedness of the face, even if it the word ‘face’ is not explicitly used in the phrase with *kinut*. 
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ACC is possible. In other meanings, the choice of case is related not only to the Affectedness of the Obj, but also to its degree of Affectedness relative to the target, expressed by the $v + \text{ACC}$ construction.

Nevertheless, as we have observed, a number of other factors may come into play, such as definiteness (of the Obj, particularly for švyrjat′/švyrnut′ in our examples from the NKRJa). Foregrounding, namely whether the thing thrown or the target is foregrounded may also play a role. Native speakers have indicated (in an informal email discussion) that the choice of case of the entity thrown depends (in accordance with the arguments of Wierzbicka cited above) on what is more important or central to the utterance—the target or the thing thrown. When the focus is on the target, usually HUM, the thing thrown is in the INST; when the emphasis is on the thing thrown (as it is when the thing thrown is inherently part of the sport or activity, as observed above for brosat′ snežki ‘throw snowballs’), that Obj is in the ACC. One speaker (a 49-year-old female, in a separate consultation) claims that, in a sentence like On brosil knigu v Petrova ‘He threw a book-ACC at Petrov,’ there is concern about what happened to the book, e.g., it was damaged in the action. Additionally, a dangerous object might be in the ACC if the speaker wishes to call attention to the hazard the object poses.

The use of the ACC to foreground such an Obj, even if there is no emphasis on its Affectedness, points to a complex interplay of factors in the choice of case, despite the apparent primacy of Affectedness. When asked whether they prefer an ACC or INST Obj when the object thrown $v$ okno ‘at a/the window’, speakers indicated a variety of factors for determining case, namely those already discussed; one speaker, interestingly, included a factor I had not yet considered, viewpoint, i.e., whether the speaker’s view
was near to or far from, or inside or outside, the window. The diversity of these responses, in addition to the diversity of uses we have observed from corpus results, demonstrates that there are multiple factors involved in determining the choice of case, even for fairly simple utterances.

Such instances of foregrounding the thing thrown, however, are relatively rare when the target is a person; one is usually concerned with the human affected by an action, and therefore sentences such as *On brosil knigoj v Petrova* ‘He threw a book-INST at Petrov’ are more common. This greater concern with humans is reflective of the priority that humans place on themselves and other beings or entities like them, as suggested by Janda (1999: 203) in her FIGURE-GROUND scale:

```
self > humans like self > humans not like self > animals > small, discrete countable concrete objects > masses and collectives > landscape features > ambient intangibles
```

In addition to the fact of human concern with other humans, there is the fact that a HUM Obj is more likely to be affected by the action (at least, in ways of interest to other humans), and this Affectedness may be an emotional reaction, such as we observed for the throwing of a rotten tomato at someone, or it may be physical, i.e., the harm done, such as a knot on the head. There may occasionally be concern with the affect on the object thrown, especially a more delicate, valuable item like a book or vase, as in the example given above *On brosil knigu v Petrova* ‘He threw a book-ACC at Petrov’, but that is almost never the case with an ordinary object such as a rock or snowball\(^{95}\). So, the greater concern for humans tends to take precedence over concern for inanimate objects,

\(^{95}\) As we noted above, ‘snowballs’ and ‘pebbles’ occur almost exclusively in the ACC with *brosat*, a seemingly frozen collocation.
and this greater concern is due both to human-centeredness and to the capability of humans (as opposed to inanimate objects) to react to or be affected by an action.

This discussion raises the question of the use of the prep. \( v + \text{ACC} \) rather than a bare ACC. The prep. \( v \) in these constructions is indicative of a target rather than a fully affected Obj. A fully affected Obj in the bare ACC is found with prefixed throwing verbs that promote the target to the status of fully affected Obj, such as \( zabrasyvat’ kogo-\text{ACC} \), \( čem-\text{INST} \) ‘pelt someone with something’. The \( v + \text{ACC} \) in the simple (non-derived) forms we have discussed thus far indicates directionality to some extent, while not indicating quite the same high degree of Transitivity and Affectedness that the bare ACC indicates. INAN targets of throwing, however, are perceived as lower in Affectedness than HUM targets in the same syntactic position, i.e., in the \( v + \text{ACC} \) position. Thus, sentences like *Ivan švyrnul kamnem v vodu ‘Ivan threw the stone-INST in the water’ are impossible, because it would be placing the INAN target ‘water’ in a position of higher syntactic Transitivity than the stone, which in this instance takes precedence over the water.

Furthermore, the semantics of the preposition makes a difference in the choice of case for the object thrown. None of three verbs just discussed, \( brosat’/brosit’, švyrjat’/švyrnut’, \) and \( kidat’/kinut’ \) can take an INST Obj when the target is indicated by the construction \( na + \text{ACC} \), as Objs of this construction are not targeted as precisely by the thrower as when they are in the construction \( v + \text{ACC} \).
5.3. Czech verbs of throwing

For Czech verbs of throwing, matters are not quite so clear-cut, especially in structures like *házet/hodit* [pf./impf.] *kamen/kamenem* [ACC/INST] *po někom/něčem*, as we shall see below. We begin then, with the most basic Czech verb of throwing, *házet/hodit*, and then move on to discuss the basically synonymous *vrhat/vrhnout*.

5.3.1. The Czech verb *házet/hodit*

It is quite clear, under *SPP*’s def. 1 a, which emphasizes displacement, that the verb can only take an ACC Obj. in this meaning. This is also the meaning which commonly takes a human DAT Obj., as in

(8) *Hodíš Milanovi klíče nebo mám jít dolů otevřít?*
    ‘Are you going to throw Milan the keys-ACC or am I to go downstairs and open up?’

This sentence puts a clear emphasis on the movement of the keys from one person’s hands to another’s, which is a change of position rather than possession, and it is very parallel in morphosyntactic structure to a typical Agent-Patient-Recipient/Benefactive construction.

Def. 1 b requires a HUM Pat, as demonstrated by the following example from *SPP*:

(9) *Při defenestraci hodil rozuzlený dav z okna pany Slavatu a Martinice.*
    ‘During the defenestration the furious mob threw Misters-ACC Slavata-ACC and Martinice-ACC out the window.’
In def. 2 – ‘put into motion through the air, as a rule with the intent of hitting; fling’ – the verb can take either case in either aspect, and the verb phrases involved often include an expression of the target, namely po někom/po něčem, or some other adverbial phrase. The SPP notes, however, “The meaning of affectedness and change of place recedes into the background in expressions” like the following:

(10a) Hodil granatem 20 metrů.
‘He threw a/the grenade-INST twenty meters.’

(10b) Oštěpem hodila málo a do finále nepostoupila.
‘She threw the javelin-INST only a short distance and did not advance to the final round.’

In such sentences, the authors add, the phrase in the position usually taken by po někom/po něčem is a “numerical or qualifying expression.” The Affectedness recedes into the background in example (10a), where there is emphasis on the displacement of the Obj. and no other result is mentioned; thus, distance takes precedence and becomes foregrounded. In example (10b), there is some mention of the result and the motive for the throwing, so the INST is understandable as indicating the partially instrumental role of the javelin; it is primarily to do something to the javelin that the javelin is thrown. Here, also, the distance seems to be foregrounded and the Obj backgrounded by comparison.

Two examples with the derived pf. dohodit may help demonstrate why the Affectedness of the object thrown becomes less central to the utterance (Čapek: “Rekord”):

(11a) Ten chlap by dohodil závodní kouli dobrých šestnáct a čtvrt.
‘That fellow would throw-a shot-a good sixteen and a quarter.’

(11b) …dohodí šestikilovým kamenem přes Sázavu.
‘…will throw a six-kilo-INST stone-INST across the Sázava [river].’

In these instances, the prefix do- indicates that a certain goal or mark was reached; with this emphasis on the distance achieved, there is less focus on the Obj thrown. This observation, however, does not seem to agree with all possible examples, even those from the same story (Čapek: “Rekord”):

(11c) Ale tenhle kamen, pane, jsem hodil jenom patnáct a půl metrů.
‘But that-ACC stone-ACC, sir, I only threw fifteen and a half meters.’

In this case, however, the stone is definite, and it receives greater focus in the sentence than the distance, as reflected also in its appearance before the verb.

An INST Obj is more common when there is a target (especially a HUM one) indicated in the construction po někom/po něčem, as illustrated by the following example (Čapek: “Rekord”):

(12a) …tak tys hodil tímhle kamenem po Pudilovi?
‘…so you threw this-INST stone-INST at Pudil?’

Even though the stone in this sentence is clearly definite, it is in the INST. Examples from the SPP entry for hodit under def. 2 vary considerably in terms of their use of the INST and ACC:

(12b) Cizí kluk po něm hodil kamenem, ale Péťa včas uhnul.
‘The strange boy threw a stone-INST at him, but Pete stepped aside in time.’

(12c) S chutí bych po něm tu vázu hodila.
‘I would gladly throw that-ACC vase-ACC at him.’

(12d) Hospodář hodil po kočce pohrabáčem.
    ‘The inn-keeper threw a poker-INST at the cat.’

3c) Představ si, žena po mně hodila váleček na nudle.
    ‘Imagine, [my] wife threw a rolling-pin-ACC at my noggin.’

(12f) Jeden z útočníků hodil po jedoucím autě granátem.
    ‘One of the assailants threw a grenade-INST at the moving car.’

(12g) Jen řečník vystoupil, dav na něj házel shnilá rajčata.
    ‘The speaker barely got on stage, when the crowd threw [started throwing] rotten-ACC tomatoes-ACC at him.’

Here, we have a mix of valencies: ACC or INST with the pron. in po něm ‘at him’ in (12b) and (12c), the use of the INST when the target (LOC Obj of the prep. po) is ANIM but non-HUM in (12d), the ACC when the thing thrown is aimed at a body part (of someone other than the thrower, who is indicated, again, by po + LOC) in e), the INST in (12f) when the target is a moving vehicle (comparable to the Russian examples above where the target is a moving train or carriage), the ACC in (12g) when the objects are rotten tomatoes (in contrast to the Russian ex. (7a) above, where ‘rotten tomato’ appears in the INST). These examples demonstrate that either the ACC or the INST is permissible – but not obligatory – when the target is indicated in the prep. construction po někom/po něčem. That is, there seems to be some amount of free variation, which suggests synchronic dynamism and/or dialect differences.

In def. 3 – make a swift movement with some part of the body – házet/hodit can take only an INST Obj. In all the examples given in SPP (except the figurative ones explained in the next paragraph), the body parts belong to the Subj/Agent, and are typically used to express some emotion.
(13) Jarmila hodila hlavou a urazeně odešla.
   ‘Jarmila tossed her head-INST and walked off insulted.’

Clearly in a sentence such as this, there is no emphasis on any change of position of the
head of any duration; it almost certainly returns to its normal position once she has
finished expressing her indignation. Therefore the object, low in Affectedness, is
expressed in the INST. This throwing of one’s (own) body parts is consistent with our
observations on inalienable possession raised above in the discussion of *dvigat’ nogoj* vs.
*dvigat’ nogu* and in the section on inalienable possession.

The following “figurative” (přen.[esené]) expressions are included in this Def. 3,
although they do not involve body parts, and it is difficult to imagine even any analogy to
body parts. (“Figurative” was likely a categorization of convenience for the
authors/editors of *SPP.*) They are nevertheless good examples of low Transitivity, and
therefore the presence of an INST Obj. is consistent with our observations. The two
examples given by *SPP* under def. 3 for *hodit* are:

(14a) Silný vítr házel praporem ze strany na stranu.
   ‘The strong wind tossed the banner-INST from side to side.’

(14b) Bouře se neutišila ani v noci a vlny dále házely lod’kou na vzedmutých
   hřebenech.
   ‘The storm did not calm down even during the night and the waves continued
to toss the boat-INST around on the rough crests.’

The side to side motion of the flag is nonetheless indicative of a reversible action, or at
least its effects are negligibly short-lived\(^96\). Much the same could be said of the second

\(^{96}\text{One might, in fact, discern some analogy to waving hands in this example.}\)
action, where there is no indication of a change in location, only the more-or-less vertical motion of “tossing” on the waves. \(^{97}\) Regardless of whether these last two examples fit well into the category of throwing of body parts or inalienable objects, they do contain the following indicators of low Transitivity:

- Low Agency (because the Agent is inanimate) \(^{98}\)
- Low Volitionality (also because the Agent is inanimate)
- Imperfective
- Durative Action (Low in Punctuality)
- Low Affectedness

In def. 4, ‘give, ration,’ the valencies are given in *SPP* as \(někdo – hodí – něco/někoho – někomu\), as is typical with verbs of giving. (The DAT Obj need not be human – *SPP* gives the example *Johanová hodíla malé rybičky slepicím* ‘Johanová threw little fish to the hens.’) The fact that the object is transferred from Agent to Benefactive is indicative of high Transitivity. There is a greater sense of directedness in this use for the additional reason that it has a distributive meaning, which is likewise illustrated by the following example:

\[(15) \quad \text{Parťák hodil každému brigadníkovi nové pracovní rukavice.} \]
\[‘The foreman threw each temporary worker new-ACC work-ACC
gloves-ACC.’\]

If the verb were to be used in the impf., it would not convey the sense that each pair of gloves was directed toward a single worker. Since the verb in this meaning must express such directedness, it can appear only in the pf.

\(^{97}\) The English sentence *The ship was tossing on the waves*, which expresses essentially the same action, is also a good example of a low transitivity expression.

\(^{98}\) Indeed, actions driven by natural forces are often expressed as subjectless clauses in Slavic.
The fifth and final definition, ‘deliver a speech, talk’ (pronášet, říkat), has a figurative connotation – ‘to throw around words/numbers’ – and in this usage the verb can be only in the impf., the Obj only in the INST:

(16) Referent házel číslly, v nichž se poslucháč málo orientoval.
‘The speaker threw around numbers-INST in which the listener was little oriented.’

In this example we have three indicators of low Transitivity: abstract, imperfective, plural. There is also a strong suggestion that the action is aimless and that the numbers thrown did not reach their goal in any appreciable way.

In summary, with the verb házet/hodit, the INST is required with body parts, with words and numbers used in speech, and with the “figurative” meanings (in SPP’s categorization) in which forces of nature move INAN Objs. Furthermore, the INST is usual in utterances in which the main focus is on the distance an object is thrown. Házet/hodit displays variation between the ACC and INST with the construction po + LOC (target), but the ACC is required in all other instances. These facts correspond well to the predictions of H & T, with the possible exception of the variation with po + LOC, which nevertheless does not contradict the notions of Transitivity we have examined and developed thus far.

5.3.2. The Czech verb házet/hodit se/sebou

The verb házet/hodit with the instrumental reflexive pronoun sebou seems somewhat problematic for the Transitivity Hypothesis. The fact that it is reflexive, i.e., that it involves agent-affectedness, makes it a lower in Transitivity than its non-reflexive
counterpart, which makes the use of the INST refl. somewhat more understandable.

However, the ACC se is used with the overwhelming majority of low-transitivity reflexive verbs in the Czech lexicon, including with the verb hodí se, a near-synonym of házet/hodí sebou described below, and with the verb házet/hodí, the INST refl. pron. sebou seems to combine with high-Transitivity features such as perfectivity and (some features of) Affectedness in ways that the ACC refl. pron. se does not. It is tempting to write házet/hodí sebou off as a lexical oddity, and, indeed, some Czech speakers see it as little more than a stylistic variant of házet/hodí se. Nevertheless, we will examine it in some detail to see if there is anything relevant to the TH to be discerned.

In Def. 1 in SPP, ‘relocate oneself with a swift motion’ (prudkým pohybem se přemístit), we would seem to have an emphasis on displacement—the verb přemístit stresses change of location—as well as on Punctuality. The two examples given in SPP are:

(17a) Pavel sotva přišel domů, hodil sebou na gauč a usnul.
Pavel had barely come home, threw himself-INST on the couch and fell asleep.

(17b) Kapr sebou nečekaně hodil zpátky do vody.
‘The carp unexpectedly threw itself-INST back into the water.’

Both these examples explicitly state a target at which the motion is directed; they both indicate a rather sudden motion, and both are in the pf. Thus, both actions are telic, punctual, and indicative of change of position. With such indicators of high Transitivity, the use of the INST with this verb is perhaps problematic for the TH, but the fact that the verbs are reflexive in (17) is perhaps one indicator of low Transitivity.
In *SPP*’s Def. 2 of *hodit sebou*, ‘swiftly start moving’ (*prudce se pohnout*), the verb can occur (apparently) only in the pf. An example given for this definition is:

(18) *Zvíře sebou naposled hodilo a zůstalo bez hnutí.*

‘The animal tossed for the last time and remained motionless.’

Here, the *hodit sebou* lacks the goal-orientation of definition 1; indeed, according to the valencies given in *SPP*, it cannot take any adverbials indicating goal of the motion. In this meaning, the verb is still indicative of a quick or sudden action, and thus it understandably must be in the perfective. Finally, this verb in the second meaning, according to *SPP*, can also have the figurative meaning ‘hurry.’ In this usage, it is frequently used in the imperative, with a meaning similar to ‘Get a move on!’; this would presumably be low in Transitivity, since it indicates only a need to get going and does not indicate any specific way in which the Ag is affected.

Besides *házet/hodit sebou*, there is also a verb of movement *hodit se*, with an accusative reflexive object⁹⁹. According to the *SSJČ*, this verb may also be *hodit sebou* when the Subj is a living being. This fact would also seem to contradict the TH: if the Subj. and Obj. are coreferential, then the ANIM Subj/Obj would be both more individuated as an Obj. and have more Agency as a Subj; both Animacy and Individuation are indicators of higher Transitivity. Apart from this, there seems to be little in the behavior of *hodit* with the refl. prons. *se* and *sebou* that is genuinely in conflict with the TH. For instance, the *SSJČ* give the examples *hodil sebou na zem* ‘he threw himself-INST to the ground’ and *hodil se do vody* ‘he threw himself-ACC into the

---

⁹⁹ *SPP* only gives the meaning of the homonym ‘be convenient, suitable,’ which does not concern us here, since it is not a verb of movement.
water’, which both indicate displacement, but the second involves immersion, which is higher in terms of Affectedness than displacement alone. The contrast between these two examples is perfectly in line with the TH.

Much of the usage of the ACC refl. pron. occurs in fixed expressions. The SS/JČ gives several examples, none of which can take the INST sebou, such as hodit se do parády/do pucu/do gala lit. ‘throw oneself into finery/into one’s Sunday best/into formal dress’. In this expression, there is an emphasis on putting oneself into clothing, which would seem to be higher in Agent-Affectedness, since it involves visible change of the Subj, than expressions indicating merely change of location. There is also an imperative expression, hod’ se rybám lit. ‘throw yourself to the fish’, i.e. ‘leave me alone, go jump in a lake’, which, taken literally, could be seen as indicating Agent-Affectedness, but which, of course, should not be taken literally. There is little discernable patterning in terms of the choice of ACC or INST here. That is, although there is no patterning that would be predicted by the TH, there is none that contradicts it.

For the impf. házet, we find both INST sebou and ACC se with both ANIM and INAN referents (SS/JČ):

(19a) házel sebou v horečce ‘he was tossing and turning in a fever’ (INST)
(19b) vůz sebou házá ‘the vehicle is tossing about’ (INST)
(19c) ryba se házela v síti ‘the fish was tossing around in the net’ (ACC)
(19d) cop se hazel ‘the braid/pigtail was tossing about’ (ACC)

In each of these examples, we have, typically for the impf., movement with no clear endpoint. These movements are also unconscious, i.e., non-volitional, actions. This observation is particularly noteworthy in example (19a), where the HUM Ag is tossing in
a fever in a manner that is unintentional, brought on by the pain of the illness. The Subjs
in (19a) and (19d), and probably (19c), cannot have volition. The impf. házet may also be
used in the impf. counterparts to many of the expressions given above for the pf. hodit,
i.e., házet sebou do parády/do pucu/do gala.

Thus, the only contradiction of the original TH that we find for the reflexive uses
of házet/hodit is the restriction of the INST refl. pron. sebou to the ANIM in the pf. To
explain graphically, let us consider the sort of table we have used above:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hodit se</th>
<th>*hodit se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC-HIGH</td>
<td>ACC-HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hodit sebou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIM-HIGH</td>
<td>INAN-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST-LOW</td>
<td>INST-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Figure 5.1: hodit se/sebou

For the revised, stricter version of the TH that we have proposed, we still find no
contradiction here, as there are no asterisks in opposite corners. We can also compare the
valencies for the pf. with those for the impf.; however, there is no need to compare those
valencies for the ANIM, as both se and sebou are possible for the ANIM referents in both
aspects.

Comparing the possible occurrences of se and sebou for the INAN in both
aspects, we come up with the following situation:
Thus, once again, we do not have a genuine contradiction of the revised TH, since we do not have asterisks in opposite corners; that is, we do not have obligatory combinations of HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH features. Once again, we find a situation in which there is a general violation of the predictions of H & T, in that the combination of the pf. *hodit with theINST sebou is limited to the ANIM, but we do not have a genuine violation of the stricter interpretation of the TH.

**5.3.3. The Czech verb vrhat/vrhnut ‘throw’**

I will begin my discussion of vrhat/vrhnut by listing the seven meanings given by SPP along with their valencies.

1. ‘swiftly throw, fling with the aim of hitting’ – impf./pf. – ACC [HUM or INAN]/INST [INAN] – po něčem/po někom/na něčeho/na někoho/za nekým/do něčeho

2. ‘move (přemíšťovat/přemístit) with a swift motion’ – impf./pf. – ACC – někam

3. ‘suddenly, in a great quantity send, give’ – impf./pf – ACC – na něco/do něčeho
4. ‘be the source of something, emit’ (or ‘cast’ as in light or shadow) –
impf./pf. – ACC – někam

5. bookish ‘put someone in an onerous or unpleasant situation’ – impf./pf.
– ACC [HUM] – do něčeho

6. ‘act in someone’s detriment, harm’ – impf./pf. – ACC [něco] – na
někoho/na něco

7. ‘bear a large number of young’ impf./pf. – A [někoho]

For def. 1, the fact that HUM Objs can only be in the ACC, while INAN Objs can be in
either the ACC or the INST, is perfectly consistent with the TH. There may be some
correlation between the preposition used for the target and whether that target is animate,
but no clear patterns emerge from the examples in SPP. No clear patterns emerge for a
correlation between case and aspect.

\[(20a) (SSJC) tím (smitím) vrhali po obraze\]
\[‘they threw-impf. that-INST (garbage-INST) at the picture’\]

\[(20b) (SSJC) vrhat poleno do ohně\]
\[‘throw-impf. a log-ACC into [onto] the fire’\]

\[(20c) (SPP) Jan Kubiš ... vrhá odjištěnou bombu na auto, v němž jede Reinhard Heydrich.\]
\[‘Jan Kubiš … throws-impf. a/the armed-ACC bomb-ACC at the car in which Reinhard Heydrich is riding.’\]

\[(20d) (SPP) Křižáci vrhali na střechy domů kameny a po lidech kopími.\]
\[‘The crusaders threw-impf. stones-ACC/INST\textsuperscript{100} at the roofs of houses
and lances-INST at people.’\]

\textsuperscript{100} The form \textit{kameny} is ambiguous and could ACC pl. or INST pl. Most such ambiguous forms have been
deliberately avoided in the selection of examples, although it is probably INST here given its coordination
with the clearly INST \textit{kopími}.\]
In the examples in (20), no correlation emerges between case and definiteness ((20a) vs. (20d, e, f, g, h) and possibly (20c); nor between case and the mass/count parameter (20a) vs. (20b); that is, there is no clear correlation here between case and Individuation. From these examples, it seems that, in general, only an ACC Obj may be used with this verb when the target is in the na + ACC construction, as we see in ((20c) and ((20e)\(^{101}\)), regardless of whether the target is ANIM or INAN. The same is generally true if the target or goal is in the do + GEN position, as in ((20b) and ((20g). Example ((20f) seems to indicate the futility of the action and suggests that the intended targets were (likely) not hit; therefore, we find the INST Obj in this sentence of lower Transitivity. This leaves the three examples with po + LOC construction for the target of throwing. ((20d) has an INST Obj of ‘throw’ and a human target, the Affectedness of which can be seen as the intent of the Subj to cause injury or death to the target. Example ((20a) has an INAN target, but one which nevertheless displays a high degree of Affectedness, as there is an

---

\(^{101}\) Example (41e) also makes explicit a downward direction, thus increasing the likelihood of an ACC Obj.
apparently deliberate attempt to damage or deface the image. In example ((20h), the only example here with a pf. verb, the presence of the quantifier několik in the ACC (the quantifier governs the GEN of the quantified noun) seems to override the fact that the target was not hit is irrelevant, in contrast to the use of the INST in (20f), where the targets were apparently missed. The first clause emphasizes that there was a quantity of stones thrown on a given occasion, and those stones are all encompassed by the action described.\footnote{102} Therefore, there is little choice but the combination of the pf. with the ACC of the quantifier.

I will now discuss some examples of vrhnout from Google searches, since the SPP examples include only one example of the pf., and since my ČNK searches for vrhat and vrhnout turned up no variation.\footnote{103} A Google search (14.VIII.2007) for “vrhl kamenem” turned up only two results:

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{(21a)} ...a tak jsem po ní vrhl kamenem ale netrefil se.
\begin{quote}
‘and so I threw-pf. a stone-INST at her but missed.’
\end{quote}
\item \textbf{(21b)} Rozhořčeně vrhl kamenem do vody.
\begin{quote}
‘[He] indignantly threw-pf. a stone-INST into the water.’
\end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

Example (21a), somewhat like (41f) above, the use of the INST is understandable in terms of the lack of success of the action. In (21b), the emotion of the thrower, stated adverbially, indicates that the action was done primarily to express anger and not for the...

\footnote{102} The INST NP několika kameny may also be awkward for some speakers, at least when the semantic role of the object thrown is not so obviously that of an instrument. An aversion to the use of the INST of quantified NPs is described for the verb šetřit ‘save’ in the next chapter.

\footnote{103} In the ČNK search, in the first 50 relevant examples of each of the aspects, vrhat and vrhnout, the verb takes only ACC Objs; thus, these examples do not shed light on the variation between ACC and INST.
purpose of moving the stone or hitting a target. Thus, the ‘stone’ has something of a function of an instrument, since it is used as a means of expression.

By contrast, a Google search for “vrhl kámen” ‘threw-pf.-masc. [a/the] stone’ (14.VIII.2007) gave 21 results, and many of these contain prepositional expressions indicating the target such as *po něm, na něj, and do + GEN*. The first result contains the adverbial expression *směrem k portálu* ‘in the direction of the portal’, which indicates the sort of directedness of the action which generally requires the ACC. We observed above for the verb *hodíť* that, when a measure of distance is given, the Obj of ‘throw’ is usually in the INST, since the distance comes into focus in the utterance, and the Obj, consequently, becomes demoted (from ACC to INST). In the search, however, we find the following example (result #3 for “vrhl kámen”, 14.VIII.2007):

(22) *vrhl kámen na vzdálenost 26 a půl stopy*  
‘threw-pf. the stone-ACC [to/for] a distance of 26-and-a-half feet’.

Ultimately, this use of the ACC followed immediately by the phrase with *na + ACC* is not a deviation, as the use of *na + ACC*, for a measure of distance as well as for a target, requires that the Obj thrown be in the ACC.

A Google search (14.VIII.2007) for “vrhl oštěp” ‘threw-pf.-masc. spear’ turned up 17 results. Of these 17 results, seven include expressions indicating that the spear hit its target, as in the following examples:

(23a) (result # 6) *Waagoth vrhl oštěp a zasáhl zvíře do hrudi.*  
‘Waagoth threw-pf. [his] spear-ACC and hit the animal in the chest’

(23b) (result # 10) *...udělal pár kroků a vrhl oštěp. Nemínul.*  
‘took a couple of steps and threw-pf. [his] spear-ACC. He didn’t miss.’
Note that, in these examples, the target is not included in the VP with *vrhnout*, so one might say that, since the phrase lacks *po + LOC*, the Obj thrown will automatically be in the ACC. One can, however, find clauses in which no other actants are mentioned, and the Obj of throwing is still in the INST, as in the following (Google search for “vrhl oštěpem”, 14.VIII.2007, result # 3):

(23c) *Vrhl oštěpem, a ten proplul arénou po celé její délce a zabodl se do středu terče.*

‘[He] threw-pf.-masc. the javelin-INST, and it sailed through the arena along its entire length and drove into the center of the target.’

In the first clause of this sentence, there is a focus on the action rather than on the Obj; thus the (somewhat deemphasized) Obj is in the INST. In the second clause, the focus switches to the ‘javelin’, as indicated by the referential pronoun *ten* ‘that [one]’. Thus, it is only in the second clause that another actant, the ‘target’, comes into play. Another of the 17 results for “vrhl oštěp” (result #4, not counted among the seven mentioned above in which the spear hit its target) indicates specifically that the spear did not hit an apparent intended target, but other factors contribute to the choice of the ACC:

(23d) *Vší silou vrhl oštěp, ale minul Persea a oštěp se zabodl do podušky. To bylo povel k boji.*

‘With all his strength he threw-pf. his spear-ACC, but he missed Perseus and the spear drove into a/the cushion. That was a command/signal to (begin) the fight.’

In this instance, the adverbial ‘with all his strength’ would seem to emphasize the directedness of the action (although this is not necessarily the case), and there is also
information about where the spear ended up. The second sentence indicates that the action was an order, to those under the command of Perseus’ enemy, to commence a fight. Although one might make the argument that the spear was an instrument of communication, a signal, the action of throwing was intended just as much to hit Perseus. It seems, therefore, that all of the other factors which tend to indicate higher Transitivity override any tendency toward the INST as an indicator of lower Transitivity.

Generally speaking, Objs of vrhnout from searches for various collocations such as “vrhl kouli”\textsuperscript{104} ‘throw a/the shot’ are “well-behaved” in terms of obeying the rule “ACC only with do + GEN” (with the exception of kamenem do vody in (42b) above). When distances are involved without the preposition do, we always find the INST form of the Obj, e.g., …vrhl kouli 9,56 m… ‘…threw-pf.-masc. the shot-INST 9.56 m…’ (Google search for “vrhl kouli”, 14.VIII.2007, result #1). This regular use of the INST is very consistent with the observations made above for hodit. When the distance is indicated by the expression do vydálenosti…, the Obj is always in the ACC, e.g., …vrhl kouli do vydálenosti 13.69 m… ‘…threw-pf.-masc. the shot a distance of 13.69 m…’ (ibid. result #6). I have found no exceptions to the rule “ACC Obj with na + ACC.

At this point, let me briefly sum up the analysis for SPP’s def. 1 for vrhat/vrhnout, ‘swiftly throw, fling with the aim of hitting’, the only definition in which there is alternation between the ACC and INST. I have found no exceptions to the use of the ACC when the target is indicated by na + ACC, and only one when the target is indicated by do + GEN (42b). I have only found one exception to the use of the INST with a target in the construction po + LOC (41h), which contains the quantifier několik in

\textsuperscript{104} This search (14.VIII.2007), without the long vowel diacritic, garnered results with both the ACC kouli and the INST kouli.
the ACC. Finally the choice of ACC for indicating an Obj thrown very deliberately at a
target, especially when that target is hit (exx. (43a-c) above) is very consistent,
demonstrating the preference for the ACC when a sense of achievement is present or
inherent in the utterance. It seems that, in general accordance with the TH, the ACC of
the object thrown is strongly preferred when the goal-orientedness of the action is
emphasized. However, when there is an animate target in the po + LOC construction, the
INST is preferred for the object thrown, much as for Russian verbs of throwing with an
animate target in the v + ACC construction.

Def. 2 from SPP, ‘move with a swift motion’, clear emphasizes the change of
place (Affectedness) of the object thrown and can only take an ACC Obj, as in the
following examples:

(24a) Vrhli jsme do ohně celá velká polena.
     ‘We threw-pf. whole-ACC large-ACC logs-ACC on the fire.’

(24b) Tlaková vlna vrhla lidi i zvířata k zemi.
     ‘The pressure wave threw people-ACC and animals-ACC to the ground.’

From these examples, it is clear that, in this definition, vrhnout can take humans, animals
and inanimate entities as Objs, all in the ACC, since this meaning of the verb emphasizes
a change of location. Example (24a), by its similarity to (20b), both involving throwing
logs on a fire, demonstrates the close semantic similarity between these two definitions.

Def. 1, ‘swiftly throw, fling with the aim of hitting’, seems to differ largely from def. 2 in
that the former refers mainly to throwing at a target, or that the target is more heavily
emphasized in relation to the object thrown (with some degree of semantic overlap
between the two). Thus, in def. 1, an INST Obj is often found, namely when the
Affectedness of the target takes precedence over the Affectedness of the thing thrown, as opposed to def. 2, where the emphasis is always on the Affectedness of the thing thrown; this is the sort of pattern predicted by the TH.

Def. 3 in the *SPP*, ‘send, give’, includes examples such as the following:

(25) *Velitel vrhal na obranu města tisíce mužů ve zbroji.*
    ‘The commander threw-pf. at the defense of the city thousands-ACC of men-GEN in arms.’

In this usage the verb ‘throw’ is somewhat figurative, but the object is not abstract, and the movement of the Obj is an instance of high Affectedness. There is an intensity of action – overwhelming force is suggested – and the deliberate movement of the men is obvious. Thus, we have an ACC Obj with a verb connoting Volitionality and Affectedness, as the TH suggests we should find.

Under def. 4, ‘emit, cast (light, shadows, glances)’, we find examples such as the following:

(26a) *Hoch znovu zkoušel, jak dobře vrhá lampička světlo do dálky.*
    ‘The boy tested again how well the lamp cast-impf. light-ACC into the distance.’

(26b) *Lékaři ještě vrhli zdrcující pohled na Švejka, který uctivě couval pozpátku ke dvěřím, zdvořile se uklaneje.*
    ‘The doctors still cast a menacing-ACC glance-ACC at Švejk, who respectfully retreated backwards towards the door, politely bowing.

In (26a), the subject, being the source or origin of the light is, in a sense, generating it. Such acts of creation are the highest form of Transitivity, according to Givón (1984: 96-97). Similar to the examples in def. 3, the verb ‘throw’ or ‘cast’ is somewhat figurative in
this usage, but the Obj, although not as concrete as men, is still understood literally\textsuperscript{105}. In (26b), the ‘menacing glance’ is perceivable, although a facial expression rather than a solid object. The doctors are creating the glance and, in a sense, aiming it deliberately at their target, Švejk, as in the Russian example of \textit{brosit’ serdityj vzgład} above.

Def. 5, ‘put s.o. in a situation’, can is largely figurative, but it can also, according to \textit{SPP}\textsuperscript{106}, subsume expressions such as ‘throw s.o. in jail’:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(27a)] \textit{Válka vrhla celé národy do neštěstí a bídy}.
\hspace{1em}‘The war threw entire-ACC nations-ACC into misfortune and poverty.’
\item[(27b)] \textit{Totalitní vláda vrhá do vězení občany demokratického smýšlení}.
\hspace{1em}‘The totalitarian government throws citizens-ACC of democratic opinion into prison.’
\end{itemize}

There should be no question about the Affectedness of the (HUM) Objs of the verb \textit{vrhat/vrhnout} in this usage; their entire life situation is changed in (27a), although the action of ‘throwing’ is figurative. The use of the verb in (27b) is more literal; although it probably does not involve literally throwing humans, there is emphasis on movement from one place (or condition, e.g. of freedom) to another. Despite the figurative usage, this metaphorical extension of the basic meaning of the verb still strongly emphasizes Affectedness; therefore, the use of the ACC follows from the TH.

Def. 6, ‘act to someone’s detriment’, includes mostly abstract Objs, as in the first example given by \textit{SPP}:

\begin{itemize}
\item[105] Of the first 50 relevant \textit{ČNK} examples for the impf. \textit{vrhat}, 22 of the Objs are ‘light’, ‘shadows’, or ‘glances’. As many of the examples found in the \textit{ČNK} are from literary sources, it is understandable that this more figurative, expressive use of the verb appears more frequently than it might in other texts.
\item[106] This, once more, seems to be a lexicographer’s convenience of categorization, as the movement of a people into jail in (27b) is a much more literal movement than throwing them into misery in (27a).
\end{itemize}
(28a) Moničino chování vrhalo celé roky hanbu na patricijskou rodnou její matky.
     ‘Monica’s behavior cast whole-ACC years-ACC of shame(-GEN) on the 
     patrician family of her mother.’

There are also examples given under this definition which involve light or shadows in a 
non-literal sense:

(28b) Poslední události vrhly stín na česko-německé vztahy.
     ‘The last events cast a shadow-ACC on Czech-German relations.’

Example (28b) demonstrates further the potential for overlap between meanings (here, for 
meanings 4 and 6), as noted above for meanings 1 and 2, and for the transfer of usage 
from a literal (speaking here mainly of the Obj, e.g., ‘light’ or ‘shadow’) to a figurative 
one\textsuperscript{107}. It seems, furthermore, that even in the transferred, extended, or figurative 
meanings in definitions 3-6, Objs obey the general valency of ACC of Obj thrown when 
co-occurring with \textit{na} + ACC or \textit{do} + GEN of the target, goal, or destination, as mentioned 
above for def. 1.

Def. 7, ‘bear a large number of young’, refers to animals and is used in 
expressions like (\textit{SPP}) Králíce vrhla osm mladých ‘The rabbit bore eight young’. This 
metaphorical extension of the basic meaning of the verb can be understood, in a sense, as 
‘throwing out’ young; it is an expression that reflects high Affectedness (birth or 
creation) and hence is used only with ANIM Objs.

\textsuperscript{107} Such an overlap can also be seen in English expressions such as ‘cast a shadow’, ‘cast doubt’, cast a 
shadow of doubt’.
5.4. Conclusion to verbs of throwing

In general, for both Czech and Russian verbs of throwing, the most important parameter seems to be that of Affectedness. In those meanings of these verbs in which the Affectedness of the object thrown is stressed, we find that Obj in the ACC. In many uses, however, the Affectedness of the thing thrown comes into “competition”, as it were, with that of the target. These uses, in which the target is explicitly mentioned, in the \textit{po + LOC} construction in Czech and in the \textit{v + ACC} construction in Russian, involve some variation between the ACC and INST for the object thrown. In these instances, the main factor determining the choice between these two case is the relative Affectedness of the thing thrown vs. that of the target; however, other factors may come into play. A partial listing of those factors includes the following: backgrounding/foregrounding (especially for Russian), the intention or chance of hitting the target, the viewpoint of the speaker (at least for one Russian), even quantification of the object thrown (for Czech). As we have observed, the case determined by the complex interaction of these and other factors may vary from one utterance to the next and from one speaker to the next. Furthermore, for the Czech verb \textit{házet/hodit}, as opposed to \textit{vrhat/vrhnout}, there seems to be relatively free variation between the ACC and INST with the \textit{po + LOC} construction for the target.

All these verbs, in both Czech and Russian, are very “well-behaved”, however, in using exclusively the ACC when the target of the throwing is indicated by a \textit{na + ACC} construction in Russian and the constructions \textit{do + GEN} and \textit{k + DAT} in Czech. It seems that in these last three valencies with a prepositional expression for the target, the emphasis is on the displacement of the object thrown; therefore it must be in the ACC.
In short, the very strong correlation of the ACC with Affectedness for Obj of these verbs would seem to be a general confirmation of the TH, but the variations involving large numbers of factors suggest that it is too simple to be applied universally.
CHAPTER 6

CZECH VERBS OF ‘SAVING’ AND ‘WASTING’

6.1. Introduction to saving and wasting

A number of Czech verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’ provide interesting material for study in terms of case alternation and parameters of Transitivity, since the Objs of these verbs vary in terms of Individuation, namely along the abstract/concrete and count/mass parameters, and the choice of case for these Objs largely, albeit not entirely, conforms to the predictions of H & T. These verbs are also interesting as something of a curiosity, since the use of the INST with these verbs is, among Slavic languages, unique to Czech and Slovak. Nevertheless, they can be seen as semantically similar to a class of verbs of ‘control’, ‘use’ or ‘management’, many of which take INST Objs in other Slavic languages, such as Ru. rukovodit’ ‘manage’ or upotrebljat’sja ‘use’, as well as the Cz. verb disponovat ‘have at one’s disposal’. Probably the most semantically similar Ru. verb is rasporjažat’sja/rasporjadit’sja ‘manage’ which, like the Czech verbs under consideration, can refer to management in an economical sense and can in many collocations take den’gami ‘money-INST’ as an Obj. In this chapter, I will consider those verbs which are capable of taking an INST or ACC Obj, i.e., šetřit/ušetřit, hospodařit,
spořit/upořít, all meaning ‘save’, and their opposites mrhat, and marnit, both meaning ‘waste’.

We will not take a great deal of space to consider synonyms of these verbs which take only the ACC, such as střádat and hromadit, both of which mean ‘save’. Both of these verbs have the more specific meaning ‘accumulate, amass’ and, as we will discuss below for the verb šetřit in similar meanings having to do with accumulation, can only take the ACC, since an accumulated Obj is more highly affected than an Obj of ‘save’ in the sense of ‘use economically’, which entails a somewhat instrumental function of the money or other resource.

We have raised the issue of ‘saving’ in the sense of accumulation, as opposed to economical use of resources, it is useful at this point to provide an illustration of the difference between these two types of saving. One can imagine two piles of money, one from which money is spent, another into which money is added. In some uses of verbs like šetřit, money or other entities from the first pile (hereafter the ‘from pile’) will typically be expressed in the INST (in such instances, a semantically precise English translation of these Czech verbs would be ‘use economically’). In contrast, the money (or other resources) in the second pile (hereafter the ‘into pile’), i.e. the accumulated money, will be expressed in the ACC. The accumulated money may be the final total of money or the amount added to some pre-existing sum. There may be a third entity of money (or other resources) involved in saving, i.e., the amount of money saved on a given purchase, as in I saved ten dollars on this printer cartridge, where the person paid twenty dollars instead of the usual thirty. In this type of saving, which also implies no instrumental function of the money, we also expect to find the Obj in the ACC, since this type of
saving is higher in Affectedness than economical use. I will henceforth refer to this type of saving as a ‘reduction in consumption/expenditure’.

Although ‘wasting’ is the opposite of saving, the two ‘piles’ concept also usefully illustrates different kinds of wasting. One can use available resources inefficiently, in which case one is dealing with the ‘from pile’, and, in descriptions of such events in Czech, an INST Obj is usually found. One can also waste a day, an ink cartridge, a gallon of gasoline, or a hundred dollars, in which case the wasting is exhausting or using up a more certain entity, usually a singular count noun or a quantified noun, and in this usage we expect to find the Obj in the ACC. In such cases, rather the opposite of the case with saving, the entity is gone, never to return, and in this regard it is more highly affected than one which one has at one’s disposal and uses inefficiently but with no particular endpoint to the wasting. Therefore, we may also expect that the wasting of a definite quantity will tend strongly to be expressed with a pf. verb.

6.2. The Czech verb of ‘saving’ šetřit/ušetřit

We begin our discussion of Czech verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’ with the most basic verb of saving and wasting, the impf. šetřit, from which a number of prefixed derivations are formed, as well as its pf. aspectual counterpart, ušetřit.

In SS/Č, def. 1 is given as ‘by limiting financial expenditures, accumulate’, and, in this meaning, the verb takes an ACC Obj or no Obj. It may also take other prepositional phrases indicating the purpose or beneficiary of the saving, e.g., nač; pro koho ‘for what; for whom’. Since this first definition of šetřit refers to accumulation, as
discussed in the introduction to this chapter above, it is no surprise that the verb in this
meaning can only take an ACC Obj, as in example (1) (SSJČ):

(1) šetřil peníze, aby mohl cestovat  ‘saved money-ACC so that he could travel’

Clearly, in example (1), the saving refers to setting aside money, and the money is
arguably more affected in this case than when one is limiting expenses, i.e. the money
saved goes into a bank account, investments, but it is not referred to as an instrument of
purchase. There is present in this example a sense of accumulation, and that accumulation
implies Affectedness; either the money is added onto, or, if there was no money
originally saved, then a creation of savings is implied. (Even if accumulated money is set
aside in order to be used later as an instrument o purchase, that future use is not
emphasized in this meaning).

In the def. 2 listed in SSJČ, the verb has more to do with limiting consumption
(omezovat spotřebu), and in this meaning šetřit can take either an ACC or an INST Obj
(or s + INST, and even more rarely GEN):

(2a) š. pracovní materiál  ‘save labor-ACC [industrial] material-ACC’
(2b) š. krmivem  ‘save feed-INST
(2c) š. s chlebem  ‘save bread-[s + INST]’
(2d) š. vodou, electrickou energií  ‘save water-INST, electrical-INST
energy-INST’
(2e) š. slovy (rarely) slov  ‘save words-INST/GEN’

The difference between these first two definitions has been noted by Plewes (1977: 236-
7), as illustrated by his examples musíme šetřit čas  ‘we must save time’ and musíme šetřit
časem  ‘we must save time/be economical on time.’ We see in the examples in (2) that the
INST seems to be preferred in this meaning, but the ACC is still possible, since only context (not given in these SSJČ examples) can determine whether entity saved is used economically, or whether it is a reduction in consumption. The rare use of the G in (2e) also remains to be explained, but see comments on *naspořit i* and *ušetřit* below.)

The third meaning listed is ‘protect from consumption (*opotřebování*), damage or destruction’, and in this meaning the verb takes an ACC (or archaic GEN) Obj, as in the following examples:

(3a) š. si oči, nervy ‘save one’s-DAT refl. eyes-ACC, nerves-ACC’
(3b) š. sily pro rozhodující zápas ‘save strength-ACC[pl.] for the deciding match’
(3c) š. Obuv ‘save footwear-ACC’
(3d) š. národní majetek ‘save state-ACC property-ACC’

These phrases also behave according to expectation; the entity saved is in the ACC, since the action expressed indicates a reduction in consumption.

Defs. 4 - 8 include ‘set store by’, ‘protect’, and ‘treat/attend to [a patient]’, and are not closely related to the basic meaning of ‘save’ (with the exception of the meaning ‘protect’); furthermore, they all take and ACC Obj and therefore do not concern us greatly here.

Interestingly, in the examples in (1) and (2) we are dealing with mostly mass nouns, but in (3) we have more instances of quantifiable nouns like oči and nervy. It seems that in this meaning of ‘save’ the protection from damage or consumption extends to the whole of the entity saved, and it is easier to conceive of that action extending to the
whole of the Obj when that Obj is a count noun or a quantified noun, as opposed to an unquantified mass noun; thus, both Affectedness and Individuation come into play.\textsuperscript{108}

Example (3b) provides an informative example of the importance of semantics in determining whether an Obj is ACC or INST, because it clearly indicates the preservation of strength since it will be needed in the near future. It also provides a suggestion of some semantic overlap between ‘saving up’ and ‘accumulating’, since one can also think of ‘saving up’ energy or strength.

\textit{SSJČ} admits no possibility of an INST Obj for the pf. \textit{ušetřit} (but see below for the genitive with the perfective), since the meaning of the pf. have to do with accumulation or spending a certain quantity less than would ordinarily be the case (e.g., twenty crowns rather than thirty). The following data demonstrate not only the impossibility of an INST with the pf., but also a preference for the pf. with quantified Objs\textsuperscript{109}:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(4a)] \textit{Jezdli jsme autem, abychom šetřili časem}
\hfill \textit{We went by car in order to save-impf. time-INST.}.
\item[(4b)] *\textit{Jeli jsme autem, abychom šetřili časem}.
\hfill \textit{We went by car in order to save-impf. time-INST.}.
\item[(4c)] \textit{Jeli jsme autem, abychom ušetřili čas}.
\hfill \textit{We went by car in order to save-pf. time-ACC.}.
\item[(4d)] \textit{Jeli jsme autem, a ušetřili jsme dvacet minut}.
\hfill \textit{We went by car and saved-pf. twenty-ACC minutes-GEN.}.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{108} Indeed, the preservation of an object is a kind of affectedness, though not as strong as the creation of something or its increase, displacement, etc.

\textsuperscript{109} In phrases involving a quantified Obj, if the quantifier is a number greater than five, it becomes the (accusative) head of the NP and the noun and any adjectives are accordingly in the genitive plural. In the instrumental, the number takes the instrumental form (the general oblique case form for numerals) and the noun and any adjectives are also in the instrumental.
Note that with the iterative, or indeterminate, form jezdit ‘travel’ in order to save time in (4a), the combination impf. + INST is preferred for the second clause, but in the past tense, in (4b) – (4e), where a single trip was made in order to save time, only the combination pf. + ACC is permissible, regardless of whether the second clause is a result or purpose clause.

The following examples demonstrate the limitation on the use of the INST for an entity that is explicitly quantified, even when the verb is in the impf.:

(5a) Ušetřil jsem dvacet eur při nákupu.
     ‘I saved-pf. twenty-ACC euros-GEN on the purchase.’

(5b) Šetřil jsem dvaceti eury při nákupu.
     ‘I saved-impf. twenty-INST euros-GEN on the purchase.’

(5c) *Ušetřil jsem dvacet eury při nákupu.
     ‘I saved-pf. twenty-INST euros-GEN on the purchase.’

Example (5a) implies that the subject of the sentence paid twenty euros less than would have normally been the case, (5b) implies that the person had only twenty euros with which to make the purchase and used the money judiciously. Some speakers, however, doubt the correctness of sentence (5b). If, indeed, such an utterance is generally not possible, then it points to the general observation I have been able to make that any quantified object must be in the accusative.
It seems that a specific quantity of an entity must be viewed as more definite, in some sense of the word ‘definite’, than is an entity which is not explicitly quantified. The NP *an hour* or *one hour* is clearly more individuated than the mass noun *time*, which has no boundary in terms of beginning or end; *time* is not an entity that has no limits.

Given this suggestion that quantification may be a parameter of Individuation, let us return to the Individuation parameters as given by H & T. The following paragraphs are a brief consideration of possible Objs of šetřit organized by some of those parameters of Individuation.

Regarding the Human, Animate/Inanimate parameter, the verb šetřit may be used in the sense ‘to save someone’ in the sense of saving someone’s life or saving someone from an unpleasant fate (*SSJČ* def. 5). It is hard to imagine a use of šetřit in the economical sense of ‘save’ with humans, but cynical phrases and phrases involving slaves are possible. Cattle or other livestock are also possible animate objects that could be used with verbs of saving or wasting. Some native speakers indicate that the utterance *Farmáři šetřili dobytkem* ‘The farmers saved (on) cattle-ISNT is acceptable/neutral, whereas *Farmáři šetřili dobytek*, with an ACC Obj, is questionable. With the plural of ‘cows’, *Farmáři šetřili krávami* ‘The farmers saved (on) cows-INST is considered correct, but *Farmáři šetřili krávy*, with an ACC Obj, is wrong/questionable. Here also, we have several parameters coming into play at once: animacy, singular/plural, and mass/count; the preference for the INST with less individuated nouns is perfectly predictable from the TH.

---

110 The meaning ‘rescue’ or ‘save’ (especially someone’s soul in a religious sense) is typically expressed in Cz. by the verb *spasit*, which can only take an ACC.
On the matter of the Concrete/Abstract parameter, ‘time’ is a common abstract object of verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’, and, as we have seen, can be used in either case, depending partly on semantics. ‘Electricity’, also seen in some of the examples above, is concrete, being a physical entity, but intangible. One can also save, that is ‘preserve intact’, one’s reputation, but in this meaning, the accusative is used. This use of the verb corresponds to SSJČ’s def. 3, as explained above; however, this use could, in my opinion just as easily belong to def. 7 ‘preserve’ (zachovávat). It seems that the authors/editors of the given reference work preferred to exclude from the examples under this def. most of those which do not involve a GEN Obj, since they claim that this the verb šetřit in def. 7 takes a GEN Obj, ‘more rarely’ an ACC. Most of their examples under this definition are abstract nouns such as ‘rights’ and ‘laws’, similarly to the Objs of verbs such as užit and použit discussed in Chapter 2, and this preference for the GEN with abstract nouns is also what might be expected from the TH.

We have suggested above, in our discussion of the examples numbered (3), (4), and (5), that quantified entities are more individuated that non-quantified entities, and we have also suggested that singular nouns are inherently quantified. Thus, with both singular NPs and with explicitly quantified NPs, the action that affects them has a semantically clear boundary, and such boundaries on the action tend to be expressed in Czech by use of the pf.

In the following examples involving the singular unit of time ‘hour’, as well as Aspect, that both the accusative and perfective are required:

(6a) *Jela autem a šetřila hodinou.
‘She went by car and saved-impf. an hour-INST.’
(6b) *Jela autem a šetřila hodinu.
     ‘She went by car and saved-impf. an hour-ACC.’

(6c) *Jela autem a ušetřila hodinou.
     ‘She went by car and saved-pf. an hour-INST.’

(6d) Jela autem a ušetřila hodinu.
     ‘She went by car and saved-pf. an hour-ACC.’

The examples in (6) demonstrate an absolute correlation between the perfective and singular, count nouns. This correlation would appear to be a strong confirmation of the TH.

The count/mass parameter also is applicable to the impf. šetřit, as the following examples, with a preference for mass nouns in the instrumental, show:

(7a) Jede autem aby šetřil časem.
     ‘He goes by car in order to save time-INST.’

(7b) ?Jede autem aby šetřil čas.
     ‘He goes by car in order to save time-ACC.’

(7c) Jel jsem na motorce a šetřil jsem benzinem.
     ‘I went on a motorcycle and saved gas’-INST.’

(7d) *Jel jsem na motorce a šetřil jsem benzin.
     ‘I went on a motorcycle and saved gas’-ACC.’

These examples contrast with the examples in (6), where the singular count noun hodina is acceptable only in the accusative. They also demonstrate that the INST is preferred for a mass Obj regardless of whether the Obj is concrete (‘gas’) or abstract (‘time’).

As suggested above for the unit of time ‘hour’, if the amount of gasoline is quantified by reference to a unit, then the unit will appear in the accusative:
In these examples, we see once again the preference for the combination of the accusative and perfective when the Obj is a more highly individuated NP. These examples provide further evidence that the TH is highly applicable to the verb šetřit/ušetřit.

When considering the interaction of definiteness with other parameters, however, we see that Objs of the impf. šetřit are do not behave entirely according to the predictions of the TH:

(8a) ?Chceme šetřit ty peníze.
‘We want to save-impf. that-ACC money-ACC.’

(8b) Chceme šetřit těmi penězi.
‘We want to save-impf. that-INST money-INST.’

Without the demonstrative adjective, either the ACC or INST of ‘money’ can be used with the impf. šetřit; however, when the demonstrative form is present, and the ‘money’ is definite, the IMPF is preferred. There is a good semantic explanation for this deviation from the expectations of the TH. A definite entity of money is money already established in the context of discourse; therefore, it is usually money already possessed, not an amount to be saved up. Money already possessed is money to be used wisely; referring to
our earlier illustration, it is money in the ‘from pile’. For this reason, definite ‘money’ in such contexts is usually expressed in the INST with the verb šetřit. It is even possible to use the INST with a quantified Obj with the demonstrative adjective, as in the following:

(8c) Chceme šetřit těmi pěti korunami.
    ‘We want to save-impf. those-INST five-INST crowns-INST.’

(8d) Chceme šetřit těch pět korun.
    ‘We want to save-impf. those-GEN five-ACC crowns-GEN.’

This would seem to be a further contradiction of (our extended observations on quantity and) the TH, since both a specific quantity and definiteness are involved, but the same semantic and discourse exception that applies to (8a) and (8b) also applies to (8c) and (8d). In most contexts, the previously mentioned five crowns would normally be part of an already established amount of money; i.e., it is not money that is being accumulated but the money that is already in one’s possession and being used economically, the money in the ‘from’ pile. The valency banning the INST from the pf. still applies in this instance:

(8e) *Chceme ušetřit těmi pěti korunami.
    ‘We want to save-pf. those-INST five-INST crowns-INST.’

(8f) Chceme ušetřit těch pět korun.
    ‘We want to save-pf. those-GEN five-ACC crowns-GEN.’

The reason for the ban on the INST with the pf., as suggested above, is that the pf. can only refer to accumulation or spending a specific quantity less than the usual or expected amount.
A final note on the imperfective šetřit and perfective ušetřit is order before moving on to other prefixed forms. The SSJČ lists the GEN as an archaic possibility for the meanings 2 and 3 in the perfective; in the imperfective the GEN is still possible but rare. It is perfectly in keeping with the Transitivitiy Hypothesis that the genitive would go out of usage with the perfective before completely disappearing from the imperfective. It is also possible, but not readily apparent from the brief explanation in the SSJČ, that the act of saving in these GEN uses does not extend to the whole of the object. In other words quantity – or rather a limitation thereof – is emphasized, as with the (rare but possible) use of GEN with naspořit.

The various prefixes that can be added to the root form šetřit behave somewhat differently, both because they differ semantically, and because they are necessarily perfective. I shall argue that the difference, their far greater tendency to take accusative objects, is a property of their meaning first and foremost. Their meanings largely imply acquisition or accumulation (this applies also to synonymous verbs). Their derived imperfectives generally also take accusative objects, since they are used to indicate that the action is completed but repeated. Since the semantic component of completeness is still present, the grammatical aspect is not the prime factor in the preference for accusative over instrumental. In other words, Aktionsart seems more important.

The first important indicator of this tendency to use only the accusative with verbs that reflect completeness is the derived imperfective, or iterative, form ušetřovat, which permits only an ACC Obj. This property is no doubt due to the fact that this verb expresses a repeated telic action.
6.3. Synonyms of šetřit

Prefixed derivatives of šetřit deserve some attention, as do its synonyms hospodařit and spořit and their prefixed derivatives, since they display similar correlations between the ACC and Affectedness. The verbs našetřit, pošetřit, and naspořit are interesting since they are both capable of taking GEN Objs.

The pf. vyšetřit, in one meaning refers to accumulation and is basically synonymous with the aspectual counterpart of šetřit, ušetřit. The verb in this meaning can only take an ACC Obj; this is also the case with its meaning of ‘investigate’. Zašetřit, an archaic word, likewise refers to accumulation and can only take an ACC. Ošetřit means ‘attend to’ (e.g., a patient) and can only take ACC Objs. The pf. verb našetřit can take an ACC Obj and, when there is emphasis on quantity, a GEN Obj. The pf. verb pošetřit is likewise capable of taking an ACC or a GEN Obj.

Hospodařit s čím is translated in Fronek as ‘to be economical with’; the verb with na statku means ‘run a farm’ and with v domácnosti means ‘run the household.’ In SSJČ it is intransitive in the last two meanings, but according to this earlier reference work could be used with or without the preposition: hospodařit (s) časem, (se) zdravím. (Simple cases are giving way in Czech to prepositional cases, cf. Jelínek 2002.) Dohospodařit (na čem) means to ‘stop economizing (on s.th.).’ All other prefixed forms take an accusative object: o-/obhospodařit, nahospodařit, and uhospodařit all imply accumulation; zahospodařit means ‘briefly economize’ and also takes an ACC Obj. Prohospodařit, means to ‘waste through poor economy’ and přihospodařit indicates accumulation in an additive sense.
*Spořit* in its first definition in *SSJČ* means simply *šetřit* and has the following valencies: ~; co; nač; pro koho; na kom, čem. Its second meaning is ‘spend or consume little; save’ (*málo vydávat, málo spotřebovat; šetřít*), and in this meaning its valencies are: co; čím; s čím; *čeho* (asterisk here indicating rarity of usage in *SSJČ*). The examples of this meaning given in *SSJČ* – *s. potraviny; s. vodou; s. energií; s. s místem* indicate a preference for the instrumental; since the emphasis in this meaning is on economical use, the preference for the INST corresponds to our observations thus far for the meanings of *šetřit*. Returning here to our earlier illustration of the two piles of money, it seems that these instrumental objects refer to entities from which one spends or consumes. The verb *naspořit* has the valencies ACC and, with emphasis on quantity, GEN. This verb and it and has the meaning ‘accumulate by saving’ (*spořením shromaždit*). All other prefixed forms – *na- se, při-, u-, and za-* take accusative objects. The derived imperfective *uspořovati*, now archaic, also takes an accusative object.

Like *šetřit*, *hospodařit* and *spořit* also show a strong preference for the ACC when accumulation or Affectedness is stressed and for the INST when it is not. Their prefixed derivatives also emphasize accumulation and take the ACC, as do the derived imperfectives based on these prefixed perfectives. The use of the GEN with the pf. verbs *našetřit, pošetřit*, and *naspořit* is of interest, since the use of the GEN with the pf., and the impossibility of the GEN with the impf. would seem to be a contradiction to the TH. The semantics of the prefixes *na- and po-*, however, deserve special consideration that will be covered in the next chapter.
6.4. Antonyms of šetřit

Among the Czech verbs of wasting *mrhat, plýtvat, marnit, mařit, utratit*, only *mrhat* shows alternation between the INST and ACC. We will consider all of these verbs briefly to observe the interaction of their semantics with the choice of case for the Obj.

The verb *plýtvat*, alone among these verbs, takes exclusively INST Objs (and can also have the valency *s čím* in colloquial language), since this verb, in the impf., refers to inefficient or frivolous use. However, in its prefixed (pf.) derivatives, it can only take an ACC Obj. These derived forms are *proplýtvat, rozplýtvat, and vyplýtvat*, all of which refer to the complete waste or exhaustion of the entity in question. The fact that only an ACC Obj can occur when the action affects the entirety of that Obj is perfectly in keeping with the predictions of the TH. The only derived imperfective of these prefixed perfectives for which the valency is listed in *SSJČ* is *rozplýtvávat*, which also takes only an ACC Obj. The fact that this impf., which refers to an action that is complete but repeated, can take only an ACC Obj suggests that telicity, and not merely grammatical aspect, is a significant factor in the choice of case.

The verb *mrhat*, meaning ‘carelessly waste’ (*lehkomyslně promarňovat*), takes an instrumental object but more rarely an accusative in the first meaning given by *SSJČ*, which refers to frivolous waste. In this meaning, which refers to inefficient use, we are not surprised to find a preference for the INST, since this meaning does not (usually) refer to a complete exhaustion of the entity. In the second meaning, ‘destroy, ruin’ (*ničit, kazit*), listed as archaic by *SSJČ*, it can only take an accusative object. The use of the ACC in this meaning, referring to greater affectedness than the first, is natural, following the predictions of the TH. The pf. aspectual counterpart *zmrhat* can only take an
accusative object; again, the completeness of the action and the total affectedness of the Obj correspond with higher transitivity. The prefixed perfective promrhat, as well its derived imperfective promrhávati, with an emphasis on the totality of the action on the object, can likewise only occur with an accusative.

The impf. verb mařit, as well as its pf. counterpart zmařit, meaning ‘destroy, ruin’ can only take an accusative object. Like mrhat, mařit can also take the prefix pro-, again with an emphasis on totality, and this form can also take an accusative object alone. The verb marnit takes only an accusative object (although one native speaker indicated the possibility of an instrumental object for the imperfective only). With the purely perfectivizing prefix z- it can only take an ACC Obj., as is also the case with the iterative form zmarňovat. Exclusively accusative government is also found with the forms promarnit and promarňovati. The use of the ACC with these (and other) verbs with the prefix pro-, which emphasized the totality of the action on the Obj, is perfectly in keeping with the TH. The pf. verb utratit and all its derivatives, including the impf. utráčet, can take only Objs in the ACC; this verb also emphasizes the totality of the wasting, i.e., the exhaustion of the resource.

When there is an emphasis on the completeness of the action and on the entirety of the object, the object is found in the accusative. The accusative always co-occurs with the perfective forms and with their derived imperfectives as well. Thus all these verbs of wasting display valencies that are perfectly in keeping with the TH.
6.5. Summary of Czech verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’

Czech verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’ conform rather closely to the expectations of the TH in that (relatively) affected Objs, i.e., resources accumulated, is always in the ACC, and in that only ACC Objs can occur with a pf. form of these verbs. Furthermore, there seems to be a strong emphasis on the telicity of derived imperfectives, which likewise can only take ACC Objs. We have also observed that HUM Objs can only be in the ACC with these verbs. Finally, singular count nouns and quantified Objs occur in the ACC overwhelmingly.

This last point, however, raises the potentially troublesome issue for the TH; that is, a definite quantified Obj, as in (8e) *Chceme šetřit těmi pěti korunami* ‘We want to save [on] those five crowns’. As we have noted, however, there is a good semantic explanation for this use of the INST, since the already established (amount of) money is money that is used wisely, or that one wants to make last as long as possible. Finally, as the ACC is also possible with ‘those five crowns’, there is ultimately no genuine contradiction of the TH to be found here.

In this chapter, as in the previous two, we have found a good deal of adherence to the Transitivity Hypothesis, but we have also found that it is often necessary to examine in detail more complex semantic issues involving three or more parameters of Transitivity. It seems that the behavior of certain clauses sometimes cannot be predicted by general (at least relatively simple) rules which could be applied across a wide range of expressions, even in a single language. Some such clauses, or comparable pairs or sets of clauses, must be taken on a case-by-case basis.
While we have noticed the impossibility of combining the INST with pf. verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’, we have also found that the derived imperfectives of many of the prefixed pf. (semantically altered) derivations of the basic form šetřít also are incapable of taking an INST Obj. Since these observations suggest that Telicity is perhaps as important to the choice of case as grammatical Aspect, we follow this chapter with a deeper consideration of Aktionsart. We also deal with the unusual semantics of the na- and po- perfectivizing prefixes, and this discussion will help to solve the paradox of their frequent co-occurrence with GEN Objs.
7.1. Aspect vs. Aktionsart

Given the definitional difficulties with H&T's notions of "aspect" and "Aktionsart," given the complexities of aspect and Aktionsart in Slavic, and given that the (apparent) contradictions of the TH thus far discussed have all involved aspect, a lengthy discussion on the various issues involved is needed. We begin with a discussion of the various uses of perfective and imperfective aspect, to observe how basic grammatical or formal aspect combines with other parameters of transitivity. This will be followed by a discussion of Aktionsart in the Slavic verb. First, however, let us consider again H & T’s statement that for all intents and purposes, aspect and Aktionsart are the same.

At the beginning of their discussion of aspect in section 2.7, the authors remark that until that point they had used the terms telic/atelic and perfective/imperfective interchangeably (270). They also state that, in descriptive grammars of languages, the distinction between the two types of contrast is rarely discussed explicitly; they therefore use at this point the term ‘perfective/imperfective,’ which is in their words “broader and therefore safer” (271), saving their discussion of discourse-based Aspect for their section
They then acknowledge that, although lexical aspect or ‘Aktionsart’
“partially intersects with Aspect,” “the two are separate phenomena” (271). While they
consider properties such as punctual and durative as belonging to the category of
Aktionsart, they do not discuss in any detail the numerous properties that may be
considered under Aktionsart, not to mention the finer distinctions that might also be
considered to belong to the category of Aspect.

Some such distinctions that might be listed as problematic for Slavic include
derived imperfectives, iterativity, inceptives, resultatives, termititives, etc. These factors
complicate matters a good deal, leading to contradictions or apparent contradictions to
the Transitivity Hypothesis. That said, general observations support the principal claims
of H & T, as well as other observations on the nature of Transitivity, and it is with those
more obvious supporting examples that we begin.

7.2. Two-participant events

One of the most obvious facts of Russian grammar in harmony with the TH is the
fact that, theoretically, it is impossible to use a transitive perfective verb without a direct
object in Russian. Thus, we find examples such as the following:

(1a) *Ona čitala.  ‘She read/has read.’
(1b) Ona čitala knigu. ‘She read/was reading a/the book.’
(1c) Ona pročitala knigu. ‘She read/has read a/the (entire) book.’
(1d) *Ona pročitala.  ‘She read/has read.’

Practically speaking, however, when considered in the context of discourse, it is possible
to use a transitive verb in the perfective without formally stating the direct object if that
object is understood:
Ona pročitala knigu? ‘Has she read the book?’
-Da, pročitala. ‘Yes, she has.’

It should suffice to say that the presence of a direct object in such sentences, even if implied, is sufficient to qualify the utterance as referring to a two-participant event. While it is possible to say včera ja pisal ‘yesterday I wrote,’ or to respond to the question vy napisali pis’mo ‘did you write/have you written the letter’ with the elided napisal, but a sentence such as včera ja napisal is meaningless in isolation (Forsyth, 91). (In fact, lack of a formally stated subject in the response in (1e) should not be taken to mean that there was no agent, or even that the speaker in this situation wishes to de-emphasize the agent.)

7.3. Aspectual usage

7.3.1. Annulled action and affectedness

In the case of (at least potentially) two-way actions, such as open/close or turn on/off, Russian employs the perfective in the past tense in order to show that the result of the action is still "in force" and the imperfective to imply that the action has been reversed and is therefore no longer in effect. Wade (302-303) lists several such verbs and gives examples such as:

(2a) otkryl okno ‘opened the window (and it is still open)’
(2b) otkryval okno ‘opened the window (and closed it again)’

In this particular usage, the perfective would seem to be a reliable indicator of transitivity, in that it indicates a change of state which is “physical, obvious, concrete, accessible to observation, etc.” (Givón 1984: 97). Although phenomena of two-way
actions and annulled actions are not specifically mentioned by H&T, it would seem reasonable to include the kind of implications of such aspectual usage under the rubric of affectedness—to a limited extent. Examples (2a) and (2b) are both two-participant events, with the window being the object. Example (2a) indicates that the window is still open, although one must admit that the change of state of the window is probably not as important in such a clause as the change of condition of the room. Nevertheless, (2a) indicates more strongly than (2b) the change of position of the object, by virtue of the fact that it implies that the change of position is still observable, still in effect.

Other imperfective verbs involving explicit objects and listed under the heading “Use of the imperfective past to denote an action and its reverse” by Wade (2000: 302-303) are “vključal ‘switched on’ (and off again), vyključal ‘switched off’ (and on again), vstaval ‘got up’ (and sat or lay down again), daval ‘gave’ (and received back again), zakryval ‘closed’ ..., klad ‘put down,’ and nadeval ‘put on’ (and took off again). These examples all suggest a correlation between Aspect and Affectedness—in these cases, between the impf. and a lack of Affectedness.

7.3.2. Aspect and negation

The question of negation and aspect, except in imperative sentences or those involving negated modal + infinitive, would seem to have little import for the TH, as there are no contrasts or minimal pairs of sentences of the type we have thus far centered our discussion on. Negation in the past tense has to do with issues of completion or fulfillment, expectation, etc. Thus it is perfectly possible to say either of the following (Wade, 305):
The main implication is that that use of the impf. indicates that the action did not take place at all, and the pf. indicates that the action was begun or attempted but not brought to completion. If the impf. can be considered to have stronger negating force, then in that sense it can be seen as behaving in accordance with the TH.

However, that would seem to be an oversimplified argument. In cases such as the one immediately above, the imperfective has the discourse function of implying that the action in question never took place at all; that is, the imperfective extends the negation to cover the totality of the action. However, when speaking of totality, we must realize also that the perfective, in the affirmative, implies the totality of an action, i.e. its completion. At first sight, it is difficult to imagine that in both cases we are referring to the same sort of totality, or even taking a symmetrical view of totality. With “transitive” verbs, that is, those requiring in the traditional sense a subject and direct object, the perfective – again in the affirmative – indicates that the action extends to the whole of the object. The totality of the object, all the same, is inherently related to the totality of the action, namely as far as affectedness is concerned (the scope of the action extends to the entirety of the object).

With negated imperfectives, only the total absence of action is implied. Yet even this must be taken with some qualification: the scope of negation only extends to the context at hand, and in cases such as *Ja eščě ne čital ètu stat'ju*, that context is delimited by the object; contrast this last sentence with *Ja eščě níčego ne čital*. So a sentence like

(4a) *Ja eščě ne čital (impf.) ètu stat'ju.* ‘I haven't read this article yet.’
(4b) *Ja eščě ne pročital (pf.) ètu stat'ju* ‘I haven't finished this article yet.’
Ja ešče ne čital ětu stat’ju implies a potential object – or patient – that never was in reality an undergoer of an action, and the action itself is only a potential action, one that was never realized. With a negated transitive perfective, we find an uncompleted action and an object that is not totally affected.

To sum up, then, we do in fact come upon more or less the kind of transitivity continuum that we would expect under the TH: negated imperfective is the lowest in transitivity, the affirmative perfective is the highest, and the negative perfective lies somewhere in between. Only the affirmative imperfective remains to be considered, and Ja čital ětu stat’ju implies that some reading took place, but that the reading was not completed. This last sentence does differ from the negated perfective, it must be added, in that it emphasizes that some reading took place (with implied lack of completion), whereas the negated perfective emphasizes lack of completion (with the implication that some reading did take place). It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine which of these last two instances is higher in transitivity, certainly by the parameters of the TH, namely by any kind of “parameter count” (a measure of the “highs and lows” of the parameters of Transitivity). This observation is not meant to fault the hypothesis, since such a measure is beyond the scope of the authors and, indeed, would prove fairly difficult to determine even in very detailed, case-specific discourse analysis.

In a further example, “the imperfective past is also used to negate a statement or supposition expressed by a perfective” (Wade 2000: 305):

(5) -Počemu vy ušli iz cirka, počemu vas uvolili? (pf.)  
-Menja ne uvol'njali (impf.), ja ušla sama.  
'Why did you leave the circus, why were you dismissed?'  
'I was not dismissed, I left of my own accord'
In this instance of a positive supposition in the pf. contrasting with a negative in the impf., we observe a clause with two high transitivity features contrasting with a clause with two low transitivity features. It is quite possible to answer *Menja uvolili potomu čto...*, and the response is quite dependent on the situation. There is little question here of obligatory pairings of transitivity features.

Wade also mentions that a negated perfective in the past can indicate that an event was expected but did not happen, whereas the contrasting negated imperfective makes no such implication. Though this last note does not seem to have much importance, consider the implications in the sense of Jakobson's "non-signalization of A." The imperfective here does not indicate anything special, whereas the perfective would seem to be the marked usage, indicating something more than the unmarked imperfective. If the negative usually occurs with the impf. in the past, then that general combination would still be in line with the assumptions of H&T generally, even if we are not in fact dealing with a specific issue addressed by the TH, i.e., an obligatory pairing. This brings us to the issue of aspect and affirmation/negation in the imperative.

7.3.3. Aspect and the imperative

We have noted that the perfective is preferred in affirmative commands and the imperfective in negative commands. It is therefore quite reasonable to consider the negative imperative in the perfective and the affirmative imperative in the imperfective as marked, thus bearing some special meaning. For the affirmative imperative in the imperfective, Wade (310-3) notes several usages:
general injunctions: *Beregite prirodu!* ‘Conserve nature!’
frequentative instructions: *Vsegda otnosi knigi v srok* ‘Always return your books on time’
instructions to continue an action: *Pišite dal’še!* ‘Carry on writing!’
in exhortations: *-Vstavaj, skazala ona* ‘“Do get up,” she said’
in expressing wishes: *Popravljates’!* ‘Get well soon!’
conveying an invitation: *Berite!* ‘Take one/some!’,

Note also that expected commands (particularly in certain social circumstances) tend to be impf., while unexpected ones are in the pf.

**7.3.4. Aspect in the infinitive**

In general, the imperfective is used following “modal” and other expressions, such as *nado* + inf. ‘it is necessary/one must’ + inf. and *pomoč’/pomagat’* (DAT) + inf. ‘help (s.o.) to do s.th.’, and *privyknut’* + inf. ‘get used to doing s.th.’, to denote repeated, continuous, or habitual actions and the pf. to denote the completion of a single action, in accordance with typical aspectual semantics. Less obvious aspectual usage in the infinitive occurs in certain situations, outlined just below, and these particularities seem to be in general accordance with the principles of TH. For instance the “perfective infinitive is used after a verb denoting a request or intention to perform a single completed action” Wade (2000: 318) as in

(6a) *On obeščal pomoč’ mne.* ‘He promised to help-pf. me.’

but with the negative *ne* between the finite verb and infinitive the imperfective is used:
Once again we see the general, but not obligatory, pairing of the negative and imperfective. The marked usage, combining the negative and perfective, expresses, as does this combination in the imperative, an “apprehension that an undesired actions might inadvertently take place” (Wade 2000: 318):

(6c) *Starajus' ne sdelat' ošibok* ‘I am trying not to make any mistakes’

Either aspect can be used following negated verbs or expressions of wish or volition, such as *ne xoču* ‘I don’t want (to)’ and *net želanija* ‘have no desire/wish (to)’, but the imperfective is “preferred after a categorical negative” such as (ibid.: 319):

(6d) *Ja ne dumal otkazyvat'sja* ‘I didn’t dream of refusing’

Following the negated impersonal *ne xotet'sja*, the impf. is “virtually compulsory” (Wade 2000: 319). It was noted in the section on the general critique of transitivity parameters that expressions with the “demoted” subject are lower in transitivity. It is not clear here that the demoted subject is responsible for the nearly mandatory use of the impf.; it seems that negation is the overriding factor, since the affirmative *xotet'sja* displays no strong tendency to take an infinitive in either the impf. or the pf.

Not only does formal, morphosyntactic negation seem to influence the choice of aspect in favor of the impf., verbs that contain some inherently negative meaning, such as *otgovarivat'/otgovorit'* ‘to dissuade’ and *razdumyvat'/razdumat'* ‘to change one’s mind’ also take an imperfective infinitive: *On otgovoril menja sprašivat’* ‘He dissuaded me
from asking’ (Wade 2000: 319). (The question of volitionality need not concern us here; we are dealing only with instances of negated volitionality.)

The examples and observations in this sub-section demonstrate a tendency to combine impf. verbs with negation (both formally expressed and inherent in the meaning), which is in agreement with the TH.

7.3.5. Aspect and interrogatives

In general the use of aspect in interrogatives (here we are dealing with the realis/irrealis parameter) seems to have little import for the Transitivity Hypothesis. H&T's general notions of aspect are, however, supported by the general facts of aspectual usage in the interrogative. For instance, Wade (2000: 309) notes, “Questions about intended actions are more often than not couched in the imperfective,” e.g., Čto vy budete zakazyvat’? (impf.) 'What are you going to order?' The exception is when “special emphasis is laid on successful completion: Vy najdete (pf.) etot dom? ‘Will you find the house?’” So the typical usage is the imperfective, and in combination with the fact that such questions are about potential actions, thus irrealis, this fact would seem to be in line with the general assertion of the TH.

The imperfective is preferred in interrogative sentences in which the emphasis is not on the action but on the identity of the agent or the place or time of the action (Wade 303-304):

(7a) Kto myl posudu? ‘Who washed the dishes?’
(7b) Gde vy pokupali “večěrku”? ‘Where did you buy the evening paper?’
(7c) Kogda ty pokazyval [emu čertěz]? ‘When did you show [him the blueprint]?’
The perfective is, however, preferred when the emphasis is on the quality of the action
“or when the result is specially emphasized” (Wade 2000: 304):

(7d) Kto tak xorošo ubral knigi v škaf? ‘Who made such a good job of tidying the books into the cupboard?’

One would almost have to consider the quality of the action to be inherently connected to the result, at least in the past tense. The other two types of instances when the perfective is preferred in the interrogative are verbs denoting discovery: Kto izobrēl radio? ‘Who discovered radio?’ and unintentional actions or undesirable results: Kto razbil čašku? ‘Who broke the cup?’ (Wade 2000: 304). Examples such as these do not do much to support the TH but do absolutely nothing to contradict it, and, to restate, are in general agreement with the principles outlined by H&T.

7.4. The prefix po-

The verbal po- prefix in Russian is said to have a delimitative function or meaning (Isačenko 1968: 391). Isačenko (ibid., 392) notes that “the delimitative meaning of the prefix po- is expressed especially clearly with intransitive verbs,” such as pobesedovat' and poveselit'sja (emphasis in original). But this delimitative Aktionsart is not so easily formed from transitive verbs; thus a sentence as the following is questionably grammatical (“man wird kaum sagen können,” Isačenko 1968: 392):

(8) ?On popisal svoj urok. ‘He wrote his assignment (a little).’

Isačenko's example is contradicted by examples given by Zaliznjak and Šmelev (1997: 94) such as popisat' stat’ju, počitat’ gazetu ‘write (a little on) an/the article, read
(a little on) a/the newspaper’. It seems that Isačenko has in mind the creation of an assignment (that is, of the written response required by a teacher or textbook); nevertheless the same creative act is involved in (po-)pisat’ stat’ju, so it is difficult to imagine why popisat’ urok is barely acceptable in Isačenko’s opinion. Ušakov’s entry for popisat’ indicates the possibility of popisat’ with or without an accusative obj., as does Ožegov (in an entry that is letter-for-letter identical to Ušakov’s for the first two lines); Dal’ doesn’t list popisat’. Ožegov also lists iterative popisyvat’, which can also take an accusative object. (Ušakov, Ožegov and Zaliznjak and Šmelev do not indicate the possibility of popisat’ na + prepositional.) Probably the best English translation for the sentence On popisal svoj urok would be ‘He worked on his assignment (a while).’

Isačenko (1968: 393) further notes that the delimitative Aktionsart expresses a temporal limitation of the event. Indeed, it must be added, these delimitatives are often modified by adverbial expressions of time. It is worth noting the observation of Zaliznjak and Šmelev (2000: 111) that delimitative verbs with the prefix po- retain some of the qualities of imperfective verbs, namely the emphasis on duration, as expressed by the use of an adverbial with the duration of time in the prepositionless accusative – počital knigu dva časa ‘he read the book for two hours – whereas the use of za + accusative is characteristic for perfective—pročital knigu za dva časa ‘he read (the whole) book in two hours’.

While Isačenko (1968: 391) claims that delimitatives are perfectiva tantum and do not form aspectual pairs with their corresponding imperfective simplexres, he notes that they are closely semantically “gekoppelt” with these imperfectives. Zaliznjak and Šmelev (2000: 112), however, claim – and exemplify – the fact that po- perfectives often do serve
asaspectual counterparts, while at other times they indicate delimitative Aktionsart. Their examples are:

(9a) Poeš’ poka moë morožene (delim.) ‘You will/can eat my ice cream for now’

(9b) Ty uže poel? (aspectual correlate of est’ ) ‘Have you already eaten?’

Note that the form usually considered the “true” aspectual counterpart of est’, s"est’, is reserved for transitive clauses:

(9c) *Ty uže s"el? ‘Have you already eaten up?’
(9d) Ty uže s"el piccu? ‘Have you already eaten the (whole) pizza?’

Note that like the examples with pročitat’ in (1d) and (1e) above, (9c) here would be possible only in a situation where the direct object would be implied/understood, such as

(9e) Gde naša picca? Ty uže s"el? ‘Where is our pizza? Have you already eaten [it]?’

The general conclusion to be drawn about delimitatives in po- is that they are clearly lower in transitivity than “true” perfective counterparts to their imperfective simplexes. This raises a more complex issue of what should be considered as “aspectual pairs.” According to some Slavists and linguists, there may be some cases of “aspectual triplets.”

7.5. Aspectual triplets

One can propose as sets of aspectual triplets groups of verbs such as (Bulygina and Šmelev 1999: 103):
According to these two authors, the latter two members of each triplet mean ‘to burn/eat X so that X no longer exists’ (my paraphrase). They further remark (ibid., 103) that the latter two constitute a genuine aspectual pair that belongs to the accomplishment-type: sžigat’ has (besides trivial senses of the imperfective aspect) an additional sense of an intentional attempt - i.e., it means 'to be burning X with the purpose to cause X to no longer exist'. In other words, in case sžigat’ has a processual (that is, not 'event') sense, it is always an activity directed toward destruction. By contrast, the imperfective verb žeč’ expresses an activity that pursues some other goal (e.g. for heat or light).

They further note (104) that both žeč’ and sžigat’ can bring about the total destruction of the object (in which case we are faced with what might be called “imperfectivized totality”), but only žeč’ and sžigat’ contain a “causative component”; thus, they reason, žeč’ should be considered an imperfectum tantum.

The implications of these observations or interpretations for the Transitivity Hypothesis are quite remarkable. If, indeed, žeč’ stands apart from sžec’ and sžigat’ as suggested, then sžec’ and sžigat’ contain elements of the following parameters of transitivity that are not present (or not necessarily present, not emphasized, not inherent) in žeč’: volitionality, telicity, and individuation (in this case, because of the implication of totality) of the object. Thus the validity of TH is apparently “rescued” from some of the apparent contradictions of that hypothesis if we focus on telicity and insist upon a strict interpretation of H & T’s comment about aspect and Aktionsart being essentially the same thing, a comment that was made, after all, largely as a methodological convenience.
Not only is the validity of the hypothesis rescued, it is further bolstered by the fact that several high transitivity features occur together.

There is more to consider, nevertheless, since we have only considered a list of lexical items and (some of) their features. We have yet to consider how these lexical items interact with other phrases in the types of clauses suggested by H&T. According to Bulygina and Šmelev (105-6), the sentences suggested by Wierzbicka (1988: 352) cited previously in the present work, On vypil moloka/On pil moloko (*moloka), involve two verbs, pit’ and vypit’, which “can never be used as” what they term “trivial counterparts,” since the “imperfective verb vypivat’... is a trivial correlate of vypit’ and forms an aspectual pair with it.” The authors then cite the following sentence (106, from Yu. Kazakov, Easy Life, these glosses from Bulygina and Šmelev) as evidence that vypivat’ “can collocate with a partitive object (since the collocational properties of the two members of the same aspectual pair should be the same)” (105).

(10) Na drugoj den’ Vasilij Pankov vypivaet kon’jaku....
    ‘The next day, Vassily Pankov drinks-up:IMPF some-cognac ....’

If it is true that the “collocational properties” or case government of two aspectual counterparts should be the same, then the question of grammatical (or, for that matter, lexical) aspect, at least for Russian and probably for most of Slavic, is a moot point, at least as far as the interaction of case and aspect are concerned, and we should focus specifically on issues like telicity instead.
7.6. Another possible contradiction of the Transitivity Hypothesis

A similar counterexample would seem to occur with certain Czech verbs with the perfective prefix na-. Grepl and Karlík give the following examples of (pl.) count nouns used in conjunction with such perfectives:

(11a) Nachytali ryb. ‘They caught (some) fish-GEN.’
(11b) Babička napěkla koláčů. ‘Grandma baked (some) pies-GEN.’

They describe this genitive as “quantitative,” i.e. it expresses an INDEFINITE quantity. Other combinations are worth noting:

(11c) Nachytali ryby-Apl.
(11d) *Nachytalí rybu-Asg
(11e) *Nachytali ryby-Gsg

Thus, as in the examples in Chapter 2 with s'est’ and vypit’, it is impossible to use a singular count noun in such phrases. Once again, we have an instance where several parameters come into play, in these examples Aspect, Quantity, and Individuation. The combination of the na- prefix with a genitive (non-individuated) object is a specific means of expressing a limited action on an indefinite quantity. In this particular instance however, the na- + GEN typically indicates a large quantity rather than a smaller one; nevertheless it indicates an indefinite portion of all possible fish (or pies). But the important issue here is that the quantity is indefinite; that indefiniteness means lower individuation. One should also note that this na- prefix is often described as giving the verb a “cumulative” meaning; this helps explain the use of the GEN in našetřit.

111 The prefix na- also has, in other uses, a “small” meaning.
While the combination of perfective (which in the small-quantity examples is arguably punctual) with genitive would seem to contradict the “generalization which correlates perfective aspect with high transitivity,” it is still not a contradiction to the TH, since there is no obligatory pairing of the two. More importantly, the fact that the sg. obj. (more highly individuated) is banned altogether, would seem to be quite consistent with the TH. Furthermore, it is precisely because the prefix na- puts an emphasis on quantity (and an indefinite one at that) that it obviates the use of an individuated object. (See Filip 1996.)

An additional fact to consider here are Russian (rough) equivalents, also using the na- prefix (Fowler 1996: 522):

(12a) On nakupil knig.
    ‘He bought [a whole lot of] books-GEN.’

(12b) On nakupil kuču knig.
    ‘He bought a bunch-ACC of books-GEN.’

In example (12a), nakupit’ governs a GEN Obj, but when an explicit quantifier is present, as in (12b), that quantifier appears in the ACC, followed by the entity in the GEN.

These examples with the na- prefix, in both Czech and Russian provide yet one more demonstration of a complex interplay of factors that make a precise application of the TH very difficult. They nevertheless show that the interaction of quantity and definiteness with the other factors under consideration here, Aspect and case, is still in general accord with the TH.
CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

8.1. Summary of observations

In this work, we have observed the semantic qualities and morphosyntactic behavior of a variety of verbs in Czech and Russian which can take either INST or ACC Objs. These verbs have included verbs of general movement, verbs of throwing, and Czech verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’. We have noted how these verbs and their Objs, as well as other clausal elements, interact with the semantics of clauses and (other) discourse factors, and we have remarked upon the implications of several H & T parameters of Transitivity for determining the choice of case of the Obj. We have also observed that the TH has a great deal of both explanatory and predictive value; i.e., it goes a long way in terms of explaining the choice of case in many of the utterances we have explored, and it often accurately predicts what implications a change in one feature of a clause will have for other features of the clause.

We have also had the opportunity to observe how well or poorly “behaved” many comparable pairs or sets of utterances are in terms of the Transitivity Hypothesis, both as originally proposed by H & T and in our revised, stricter interpretation, our Hypothesis A. We have had the chance to observe some instances of markedness, or non-canonical
semantic Transitivity expressed by non-canonical morphosyntactic means. We have managed to answer, to some extent, our questions on the number of H & T parameters (and other factors) and the complexity of their interaction, on the possibility of a hierarchy of parameters, and on extremely low Transitivity events or clauses (as well as on non-canonical Transitivity). In this chapter, I will summarize these results, as well as noting those issues that have not been resolved. Finally, I will point out those and other questions that suggest good subject matter for future research.

8.2. The accurate predictions of the Transitivity Hypothesis

Among the better “behaved” verbs encountered in this study are those Czech verbs of ‘saving’ and ‘wasting’ whose pf. forms cannot take an INST Obj. In another example of close adherence of the predictions of the TH, Objs of ‘throwing’ verbs in Russian tend very strongly to be in the ACC when they are the focus of the action, and in the INST when the focus is on the target rather than on the object thrown. (There are, of course, more complicated factors of foregrounding and backgrounding of the Obj, as well as whether the focus is on the action rather than on the Obj.)

We have also noted that the Objs of certain verbs of movement are quite well-behaved in terms of the predictions of Levine (1980); that is, inalienably possessed Objs are overwhelmingly in the INST, reflecting their lower Individuation (as explained in our previous discussion), and Objs that are not inalienable possessions of the Subj are overwhelmingly in the ACC. In fact, the word ‘overwhelmingly’ may be too weak here; I have found no examples to contradict the notion, but there is a grey area in terms of which Objs are definable as inalienably possessed and which are not. In our observations,
body parts of the Subj may be considered inalienable possessions in all situations except those in which the Subj/Ag moves a body part deliberately, especially when moving that body part as if it were an object separate from himself/herself (and, in Levine’s observation, when one body part is used to move another, as in fingers twirling a moustache). Many Objs which are not body parts are nevertheless treated as such, especially when they are attached to the body (namely clothing) or are in some way seen as connected with the Subj as part of a greater entity acting as a whole.

The choice of case for the Objs of verb s of saving and wasting follows very closely the predictions of the TH. All of these verbs show a close correlation between the ACC and high Affectedness. The verb šetřít, in particular, displays a very close correlation among Affectedness, Individuation, and Aspect. Not only singular, count nouns, but also most quantified Objs, tend very strongly to co-occur with both the ACC and the pf. The derived imperfective forms related to these verbs express telic, but repeated, actions, and it is apparently due to their telicity that they can only take ACC Objs. This last fact demonstrates that telicity, and not just grammatical aspect, has strong implications for the TH. We noticed, however, one notable deviation from the predictions of the TH with the verb šetřít: the tendency for the verb to take an INST Obj when that Obj is definite. However, this is a deviation that is explainable in terms of discourse context and semantics.

8.3. Hypotheses tested

We have had the opportunity to analyze numerous examples of clauses involving a choice between ACC and INST Obj and how well “behaved” these examples are in
terms of the TH, in both H & T’s original version and our revision. Our suggested revision is restated here in our Hypothesis A, reprinted from Chapter 2:

Hypothesis A—If a situation can be found in which two features can differ in terms of high or low transitivity, and they can be compared in a set of four minimally differing clauses in which no other parameters of transitivity differ, there will never arise a situation in which both combinations of HIGH-LOW and LOW-HIGH transitivity are mandatory and, conversely, neither pairing of both high (HIGH-HIGH) and both low (LOW-LOW) is possible in such minimally differing utterances.

A genuine counter-example to the TH, according to this revision, would be the type of situation represented by Figure 8.1 (Figure 2.3 repeated):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*clause w</th>
<th>√clause x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspect-HIGH</td>
<td>Aspect-HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-HIGH</td>
<td>Case-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>√clause y</td>
<td>*clause z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect-LOW</td>
<td>Aspect-LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-HIGH</td>
<td>Case-LOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.1

We have not found any genuine contradictions of this revised hypothesis, although we have found a number of violations of the looser interpretation of the TH as it appears in the original H & T article.

We have not had the opportunity to observe examples relevant to our Hypothesis B, stated again here for the convenience of the reader:

Hypothesis B—When possible combinations of any two formal transitivity features are considered, and any of those combinations are marked, those
utterances combining of high and low transitivity features will involve more semantically marked usage than those combinations of both high or both low. That is, no combination of both high or both low will be marked if neither of the combinations of low and high (HIGH-LOW or LOW-HIGH) is marked.

Although we have not considered Hypothesis B systematically throughout this work, we have made observations relevant to it. Perhaps the best illustrations of this hypothesis are found in examples (8b) and (8c) from Chapter 6, *Chceme šetřit těmi penězi/těmi pěti korunami* ‘We want to save-impf. that-INST money-INST/those-INST five-INST crowns-INST’. These utterances are semantically marked in that they can only occur in very limited contexts of discourse, namely when a previously mentioned entity or quantity is used sparingly; they also combine the low feature of INST with the high feature of definiteness (and quantity). Strictly speaking, definiteness is not a formal feature but a semantic one, although it is formally indicated by the use of the demonstrative adjective. It therefore seems reasonable to admit this example as a confirmation of Hypothesis B, and in any event, we have found no counter-examples to Hypothesis B in this study.

We have also had the opportunity to observe instances of highly marked (semantic) Transitivity, namely very low Transitivity, such as the following, previously given as example (9) from Chapter 4:

(1) *Kakie podvodnye tuly, donnye tečenija, tajnye znaki preispodnej dvižut eë plavnikami.*

‘What underwater rumblings, bottom currents, secret signs of the nether regions move her fins-INST.’
In this example, we have two features of low Transitivity, low Volitionality (on an INAN Subj) and low Affectedness of the Obj. There is one feature of high Transitivity present in this sentence, the Individuation of the body parts of the Obj, which, as body parts of an entity distinct from the Subj (i.e., they are not inalienable possessions), would normally be found in the ACC. We have also noted instances in which INAN Subjs act on INAN Objs, such as wind blowing grass and treetops, and in most of these instances as well, the Obj is in the INST. Two of the most striking examples of non-canonical Transitivity are found in the following examples:

(2a) (14a, ch. 5) Slhů vítr házel praporem ze strany na stranu.  
‘The strong wind tossed the banner-INST from side to side.’

(2b) (26f, ch. 4) Voda vířila, otáčela jím, obracela ho hlavou dolů.  
‘[The] water whirled, turned him-INST, turned him upside down’

(2b) is particularly interesting, since it involves an INAN Subj acting on an ANIM Obj. There is high Affectedness, since the action is very violent and turns the Pat on his head. Despite the presence of Animacy (of the Obj) and Affectedness, we find the Pat in the INST. This sentence has, moreover, several low Transitivity features: low Volitionality and Agency of the Subj, and an imperfective (atelic) verb. Sentences involving highly non-canonical Transitivity seem to behave in rather unpredictable ways. This example seems to demonstrate for the INST what Klenin (1983: 108-12) suggested for the GEN, namely that abnormal Transitivity (whether high or low) may be marked by the GEN, which is usually a marker of low Transitivity. In other words, the INST may often mark abnormal Transitivity whether high or low, but in (2a), it is not clear whether we are
dealing with high or low Transitivity, since there is such a strange combination of low and high features.

8.4. Questions answered

In addition to the two main hypotheses raised, three additional matters for consideration were brought up in Chapter 2. Those three questions are repeated here:

Q1 - How many parameters can be considered at once? Isn’t the interaction of 10 parameters (or factors) more complex than H&T suggest?

Q2 - Is there a universal hierarchy of parameters? Or language-specific hierarchies?

Q3 - Does the TH really apply to extremely low-Transitivity events (or clauses)? Does it apply to events involving unusual sorts of Transitivity?

The study has managed to give at least partial answers to these questions.

With regard to Q1, we have found that the interaction of several parameters of Transitivity can lead to results that are hard to predict. As suggested by Mustajoki’s (1985) study of the GEN of negation, not only may the number of factors involved complicate matters, but also if a number of native speakers are surveyed, those individual speakers may place different priorities on different factors, making it difficult to predict which form may be preferred in a given context by a given speaker. One of the better sets of examples in which we have observed this complication is in the following set of NKRJa results for the Ru. verb brosat’ ‘throw’ (examples (26a)-(26d) in Chapter 5):

(3a) (NKRJa 9) Potom brosali v neë mjačikom i daže pytalis’ stukat’ po mjaču palkoj.
‘Then they threw a ball-INST at her and even tried to strike the ball with a stick.’
(3b) (NKRJa result 25) ...zaščitniki „kreposti” brosajut snežki v napadajuščix.
‘...the defenders of the “fortress” throw snowballs-ACC at the attackers.’

(3c) (NKRJa result 1) Čtoby dobyť frukty, nužno brosať kameški v obez’janu.
‘In order to get fruit-pl, you have to throw pebbles-ACC at the monkey.’

(3d) (NKRJa result 1) Togda ona budet rvat’ frukty i brosat’ imi v vas.
‘Then it will tear fruit-ACC-pl  off and throw them-INST at you.’

In these examples, we observed that brosať kameški may perhaps be a frozen collocation, which would explain the choice of the ACC, even though the INST would, according to the factors we have discussed, seem to be the more logical choice. We have also noticed that there are several factors which may affect the foregrounding or backgrounding of an object thrown relative to the target, such as the matter of whether the object thrown is stressed as a dangerous thing to throw, in which case the thing thrown may take precedence over a HUM target. In such instances, it is hard to imagine a theory that could accurately account for all such situations, which often must differ in subtle ways on a nearly case-by-case basis. In spite of such complications, the TH and the Transitivity parameters of H & T must still be taken as highly valuable, for H & T have given us a language and a logic around which we can organize our analysis of such matters.

We have not, thus far in our observations, specifically addressed Q2: Is there a universal hierarchy of parameters? Or language-specific hierarchies? We have noticed that different speakers place different emphases on certain features, as in some of our observations on the Russian throwing verbs, where some speakers regard backgrounding
and foregrounding, or focus, as an important determinant, others the Affectedness of the object thrown vis-à-vis that of the target.  

In spite of this complexity of factors determining the choice of case, one parameter does seem to take precedence over the others, Affectedness. With the verbs of throwing, in both Czech and Russian, there is a clear preference for the ACC if the displacement of the object thrown is emphasized. Animacy would seem to take a close second place behind Affectedness, at least for the verbs of throwing. We have observed that animate targets, namely in the constructions \( v + \text{ACC} \) in Russian and \( po + \text{LOC} \) in Czech, require that the object thrown be in the INST, with very few exceptions. There is greater variation between the ACC and INST when the target is INAN, at least in Russian. Thus, it seems that, for verbs of throwing in Czech and Russian, we can discern a hierarchy in which Affectedness and then Animacy take precedence. However, this is by no means an absolute hierarchy, since we have to take into account the Affectedness and Animacy of the target relative to those of the object thrown; furthermore, other parameters such as the focus of the utterance sometimes take precedence over these two main parameters. In a particularly illustrative pair of examples, there may be exceptions due to definiteness (examples (6d) and (6e) from Chapter 5):

\[\text{\textsuperscript{112}} \text{We have explored to a limited extent the hierarchies of implementation in the spread of the } s + \text{INST construction. The direction of implementation of } s + \text{INST, as opposed to the bare INST, for verbs such as Czech } \text{hnout seems to have begun with HUM Objs first and to be currently spreading to inanimate nouns. We have also noted a preference for the preposition } s \text{ with personal pronouns. In order to determine the exact order of implementation, a more detailed diachronic examination should be undertaken.}\]
Earlier traffic cops would throw their police sticks at motorcyclists, and now they just turn away, in order not to open an old wound—it’s impossible to fine a biker.

‘He threw leaves and buttons from his shirt at the beast.’

Here, the definite Objs in the ACC are one would expect, given the predictions of the TH. That is, if there is going to be an exception to the general rule of INST with v kogo, then the definiteness of the Obj would tend to explain the choice of ACC; the problem is that definiteness is interacting with other factors, namely the Animacy and Affectedness of the police sticks vs. those of the bikers. There is the further complication that, in (4b), the (presumably) indefinite list’ja ‘leaves’ coordinates with the definite pugovicy ot rubaški ‘buttons from his shirt’. Thus, definiteness can take precedence over other factors, but the TH, while it may help explain the choice of case due to definiteness, does not predict when one parameter takes precedence over another.

Given the complex interplay of factors involved in the choice of case merely for verbs of throwing in Czech and Russian, it is questionable whether a universal set of hierarchies could be found that would be applicable to a wide variety of utterances. Nevertheless, despite the lack of a firm hierarchy in Czech and Russian, Affectedness and Animacy would seem to be among the top factors for any given verb.

This brings us to our third question: Q3—Does the TH really apply to extremely low-Transitivity events (or clauses)? Does it apply to events involving unusual sorts of Transitivity? We have already suggested repeatedly that it is difficult to apply the TH in
an exacting way when a sentence displays abnormal Transitivity, as suggested above for example (2).

8.5. Implications and applications of this study

In addition to suggesting the refinement of the Transitivity Hypothesis suggested above, this dissertation has engaged in a detailed, nuanced study of verb meanings and usages that have potential applications in lexicography, translation, and language pedagogy.

On several occasions we have noted that some of the meanings listed in dictionaries are merely “categorizations of convenience.” While lexicographers or dictionary editors have to make practical decisions about how many definitions to present for a given entry, improvements can always be made. One notable instance of such a “categorization of convenience” was pointed out in section 5.3.1. for SPP’s definition 3 of *házet/hodit*, which lumps together movement of body parts, as in *hodit hlavou* ‘toss [one’s] head [back]’, with movement of INAN Objs by INAN Subjs (usually forces of nature), as in example (2a) above ((14a), ch. 5). While the verb *házet/hodit* in both meanings takes an INST Obj, there is a significant difference between an Obj inalienably possessed by an ANIM Subj, on the one hand, and a natural force acting on a completely distinct Obj, on the other. The more generally applicable point to be drawn from such observations is that the Animacy and Individuation of Subj and Obj are often relevant to the division of a lexical item into two or more meanings.

A number of the observations made on verbs of saving and wasting have implications not only for lexicography, but for translation and pedagogy as well. We have
suggested that the Czech verb šetřít ‘save’ can be broken down into four main meanings, only one of which takes the INST. The most common two meanings are ‘use economically’ (INST) and ‘accumulate’ (ACC); the other two basic meanings are ‘spend less than usual’ (ACC) and ‘preserve’ (ACC). Only in the meaning ‘use economically’ does the Obj have any instrument-like qualities. Two piles of money (or some other entity) were proposed as a means of visualizing the difference between the meanings of economical use and accumulation, and this sort of imagery could have useful applications in helping students, especially at the intermediate or advanced level, conceptualize different uses of case. These differentiations in meaning and type of Obj of the verb ‘save’ may also assist translators in the choice of foreign-language equivalents for šetřít.

Finally, we have observed in the study of šetřít a strong correlation among Affectedness, Aspect, Individuation (quantification), and the ACC case. We have also noted a strong correlation between the ACC and Affectedness other verbs with the valency ACC/INST, as well as the correlation between the ACC case and Individuation in Russian for negated verbs and verbs that have historically governed the GEN. A language instructor with a knowledge of the Transitivity Hypothesis will likely find it easier to communicate to students of Czech or Russian the association among the factors that go into the choice of case. It is the sincere hope of this author that the present work helps to refine that sort of pedagogically useful knowledge, in addition to expanding our current linguistic understanding of Transitivity and case.
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