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Abstract

This dissertation examines variation in nominal (unbound) address forms and related constructions in contemporary (post-Soviet) Ukrainian. The data come from 134 randomly selected articles in two Ukrainian newspapers dating from 1998–2013.

Among the morphological and syntactic issues that receive particular attention are the allomorphy of the Ukrainian vocative and the spread of vocative markings to new categories (e.g., last names). In addition, the dissertation examines how the vocative behaves in apposition with other noun phrases; this sheds light on the controversial question of the status of the vocative in the Ukrainian case system. Another syntactic issue discussed in the study is the collocability of the unbound address and deferential reference term pan, which has become widespread in the post-Soviet period.

The dissertation also examines several pragmatic issues relevant for the variation in contemporary Ukrainian address. First, it investigates how familiarity and distance affect the choice of different unbound address forms. Second, it examines how the gender of the speech act participants (addresser and addressee) influence preferences for particular forms of address. Up to now, there have been scarcely any investigations of Ukrainian from the viewpoint of either pragmatics or gender linguistics. Thus the dissertation lays the foundation for future investigation of these important issues.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. The Topic Investigated

In contemporary standard Ukrainian, there are numerous possible terms of address. In this dissertation, I focus on unbound address, i.e., forms of address that appear in noun phrases separate from the main clause. This is an area in which there is considerable variation in contemporary Ukrainian. For example, there are striking variations in the possible endings (vocative and/or nominative) in noun phrases consisting of the characteristic polite unbound nominal address form nan.¹ All of the following are attested ways of greeting a visitor; the Ukrainian literally translated as “I greet you, Mr. Viktor!” is equivalent to English “Greetings to you, Mr. Victor!”

(1a)  Вітаю вас, пан Віктор!²

‘I greet you [2PL], Mr. [NOM.SG] Viktor [NOM.SG]!’

---

¹ The vocative can be defined as a distinct element in the paradigm of a noun used for calling or addressing. The vocative endings are used only in addressing.
² http://begemot.dp.ua/arhive/1/894.html accessed on 10/26/13 from the post made on 11/02/2012 at 19:51:57
In examples (1a–1c), address is conveyed in several ways. In the main clause, it is expressed by the object pronoun in the second person; here the accusative of the deferential pronoun ви is used rather than that of the familiar ти. Address is also expressed by the two appositive nouns in the detached noun phrase. In example (1a), the title пан and the first name Віктор both have the nominative-case ending. In example (1b), пане occurs in the vocative form, but Віктор has the nominative ending. Finally, in example (1c), both пане and Вікторе take the vocative endings. Examples of these kinds are well attested in edited printed texts.

The issue becomes more complicated when the number of noun collocates in the nominal phrase increases. The following set of examples illustrates variation between the nominative and vocative forms in appositive phrases. Examples (1d–1f) have three nominal collocates: Mister, President, and Juščenko in a detached noun phrase:

---

3 http://begemot.dp.ua/arhive/1/1224.html accessed on 10/26/13 from the post made on 30/07/2012 at 14:46:42.
4 http://blogs.pravda.com.ua/authors/ukolov/4a31d396b0148/ accessed on 10/26/13 from the post made on 28.06.2009 at 11:27.
5 Vy is a second-person plural pronoun is associated with distance (negative politeness). Ty is a second-person singular pronoun associated with familiar discourse and positive politeness.
6 A collocation is a habitual co-occurrence of individual lexical items (collocates) (Crystal 1992: 55).
Example (1d), the last name, like the other nouns in the address phrase, appears
in the vocative. This is unusual for last names, and goes undiscussed in the previous
literature, but is attested for some speakers in the data I have assembled.

The variation between nominative and vocative endings in address collocations is
one of the the primary focuses of my research. I also consider the question of whether the
number of collocates influences the choice between nominative and the vocative.

As Braun (1988: 9) notes in her cross-linguistic study of forms of address, “In
most languages forms of address are concentrated on [sic] three word classes: (1)
pronoun, (2) verb, (3) noun, supplemented by words which are syntactically dependent
on them.” In Ukrainian, all three of these word classes factor in the system of address.

Any sentence involving a second-person form with a singular referent involves a choice

---

7 See example D59b (пане президент де Ющенко).
8 Cf. the headline “ПАНЕ ЮЩЕНКУ НЕ РОЗПОВІДАЙТЕ СВОЇ БАЙКИ!!!” (“Mr. Juščenko, don’t
tell your fables!!!”). http://tabloid.pravda.com.ua/person/512b4d484d0d1/view_comments/, accessed on
between an intimate pronoun ти (formally singular) and a distant pronoun ви (formally plural). If the pronoun is the subject, the verb or predicate adjective has to match its number and, for categories that make the distinctions, its person or gender, as shown in (2a–b).9

(2a) Я думаю, шановний пане, що Ви помиляєтесь!10

‘I think, dear Mr. [VOC.SG], that you [2PL] are mistaken [2PL]!’

(2b) Я думаю, що ти помиляєшся!

‘I think that you [2SG] are mistaken [2SG].

(2c) Я думаю, шановний пане, що ти помиляєшся!11

‘I think, dear Mr. [VOC.SG], that you [2SG] are mistaken [2SG].

In (2a), the pronoun Ви in the complement clause, though referring to a single individual, is in the second plural, typical in polite address, and the verb помиляєтесь agrees with it in person and number. In the parenthetical appellative clause, the noun пане is in the vocative singular, with a syntactically dependent adjective шановний. (Adjectives do not distinguish the vocative, so the nominative is used instead.) In (2b), the familiar second person singular pronoun ти is used in the complement clause, and the verb помиляєшся agrees with it in person and number. In the starred example (2c), the pronoun in the complement clause and the detached appellative phrase шановний пане

---

9 As Ukrainian is a pro-drop language, the subject does not have to be explicit; as Stone notes (1977: 491) “In all second-person verbal forms the existence of the pronoun is implied if not expressed.”
10 Den’ newspaper www.day.kiev.ua/173206/
11 This example is hypothetical but well formed. I have included it to show that пан can be co-referential with the pronoun ти ‘You’ [2SG], though it is more frequently co-referential with ви [2PL].
are both used in the singular, though there is no syntactic agreement between the supplementary clause and embedded clause, i.e., neither controls the other. The nominal address form \textit{pane} is in the vocative. Thus \textit{nau}, while normal in \textit{bu}-address, can also be used in \textit{mu}-address to establish a middle ground of politeness.

Address forms like those illustrated in examples (1–2) have long been a major topic of investigation in the fields of sociolinguistics and pragmatics, though Ukrainian has been little studied in this regard.\textsuperscript{12} Why are such forms of address interesting? To begin with, forms of address are one of the main linguistic forms of social indexing; they convey the speaker’s or writer’s perception of the addressee’s (relative) social status. As Crystal (1992: 7) observes, “Forms of address are the linguistic means by which people express their personal and social orientation towards those with whom they are communicating.”

In addition, forms of address are one of the major ways of expressing linguistic \textit{politeness}, i.e., features of language that “serve to mediate norms of social behavior” (ibid.: 307). The issue of politeness has been a subject of linguistic research since Brown and Gilman’s (1960/1978) pioneering study of pronouns of address. This work focuses on the cross-linguistically widespread phenomenon in which a single individual can be addressed with either singular or plural pronouns. According to Brown and Gilman, singular pronouns serve to establish and maintain relations of solidarity between the speaker and the addressee, and plural pronouns relations of power and hierarchy. Thus it

\textsuperscript{12} See, e.g., Brown and Gilman (1978); Brown and Levinson (1987); Braun (1988); and Taavitsainen and Jucker (2002).
is the social relationship between the participants of the given speech act that determines which type of pronoun speakers will choose.

Another major impetus to the study of address terms was the publication of Brown and Levinson’s seminal theory of politeness (1978, second edition 1987). Proceeding from Erving Goffman’s concepts of face and facework, Brown and Levinson (ibid.: 13) identify two supercategories of politeness, each based on a different kind of “face want”—“the desire to be unimpeded in one’s action (negative face), and the desire (in some respects) to be approved of (positive face).” Speakers use positive politeness strategies to offset perceived possible threats to their addressees’ positive face wants, and negative politeness to offset perceived possible threats to their addressees’ negative face wants. Second-person singular pronouns and in-group address are typically associated with positive politeness, and second-person plural pronouns and honorific address with negative politeness (ibid.: 23–25, 107–11, 182–85, 198–204).

Braun (1988) looks at politeness specifically through the prism of forms of address. In her view (ibid.:49),

Forms of address are called and considered polite when they are adequate for the situation. Thus, a form of address which is appropriate to the relationship of speaker and addressee, and which is in accord with rules of the community, or at least those of dyad, will always be regarded as adequately polite. Vice versa, any

13 Though it remains the most influential theory of politeness, Brown and Levinson’s approach has also been widely criticized on a number of grounds. According to Taavitsainen and Jucker (2002: 11), the major problem with the theory is the fact that it can only distinguish between polite and impolite behavior, thus leaving little room for a middle ground for expressions which are conventionally appropriate to a given speech situation but do not involve any politeness strategies—what Watts (2003) calls politic behavior (“socio-culturally determined behavior directed towards the goal of establishing and/or maintaining in a state of equilibrium the personal relationships between the individuals of a social group, whether open or closed, during the ongoing process of interaction”; cited in ibid.).
form of address not corresponding to the relationship or to the rules can be perceived as impolite—no matter which variant is used for a break of the rule.

There have also been many studies devoted to the systems of address in the Slavic languages in general (Stone 1977) and in particular Slavic languages, especially Polish and Russian.\textsuperscript{14} However, while Ukrainian terms of address have been mentioned briefly in a few specialized works,\textsuperscript{15} to date they have not been studied in detail as a system. Significantly, the numerous grammars of Ukrainian do not give sufficient explanations on the use of the address forms and its collocations.\textsuperscript{16} This is an unfortunate gap, since Ukrainian address forms are a fascinating topic, used in ways that differ from the better studied systems in the neighboring languages, Polish and Russian, and presenting much variation in syntax, morphology, and pragmatics. For example, in noun phrases expressing address, there are constraints on the kinds of lexemes that can collocate with one another; for example, the honorific пан can collocate with first names, but not with first names in apposition to patronymics. Constraints of this kind have not yet been well described and are a specific focus of this dissertation. In addition, there can be variation in whether nominative or vocative is used; cf. the vocative/nominative variation in examples (1a)-(1g), above. This issue becomes more complicated when the number of collocates in the address phrase increases. There are also limitations on the kinds of nouns that can appear in the vocative. The form of the vocative is also in flux, which is of interest from the perspective of morphology. Among the many other unanswered


\textsuperscript{15} See especially Stone 1977 and Shevelov 1980.

\textsuperscript{16} See, e.g., Luckyj and Rudnyckyj 1958; Slavutych 1987, Pugh and Press 1999.
questions are what the pragmatic difference is between пан plus ви and пан plus ти; how often the address term пан ‘Mr., sir’ (feminine пані ‘Mrs., ma’am’, plural пани) is used in a given conversation (once or consistently); and whether collocations behave the same way in deferential reference (third person) as in deferential address (second person).

Originally, I became interested in the question of address collocations in Ukrainian after I noticed the “official return” of the deferential address forms пан, ‘Mister/Sir’, пані ‘Ms./Ma’am’, пани ‘Ladies and Gentleman’. (For convenience, I will refer to пан, пані, and пани collectively as $P$.\textsuperscript{17}) Growing up in largely Russophone eastern Ukraine and habitually speaking Russian made my learning of Ukrainian a somewhat difficult task, despite the high degree of mutual intelligibility. I was familiar with P forms in written text of the pre-Soviet period; for example, they were common in works of the classic Ukrainian authors of the eighteenth–nineteenth centuries, such as Taras Ševčenko and Ivan Kotljarevs’kyj: Я люблю вас, Пане возний ‘I love you [2PL], Mister Carriage Driver’.\textsuperscript{18} Similarly, the prominent early-twentieth-century author Myxajlo Kocjubyns’kyj employs addresses P as a bound form, i.e., as a quasi-pronoun: Пан позволить яще кави? ‘Will the gentleman permit [me to give him] more coffee?’ from his Дебют (1909) (Kocubyns’kyj 1979: 256).

Nevertheless, I was unfamiliar with P forms in actual conversation. During Soviet times, P address largely disappeared, at least in Eastern Ukraine, since it was not favored by the Soviet authorities. The reason for this is that it had class associations; its second

\textsuperscript{17} There is another possible form of address for a female in Ukrainian, пана. Пана is traditionally referred to an unmarried young woman, but the form is rarely used nowadays. No examples of this form were found in the researched articles.

\textsuperscript{18} From Kotljarevs’kyj’s Natalka-Poltavka
(originally primary) meaning is ‘landlord.’ Therefore, the address term P was partially replaced with the favored socialist form of address, товариш ‘comrade’.19 (In all probability, the address term P continued to exist in the vernacular in more western parts of Ukraine, where the Russian influence was weaker.)

In the course of the past twenty years, Ukrainian has successfully established itself as the state language of Ukraine. In the media, press, and the internet, Ukrainian citizens feel at ease using the language on an everyday basis, whereas many were anxious about using it during the Soviet era. After Ukraine gained independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, striking changes began to occur in the system of politeness, including common nominal address terms. The “fall” of the Soviet Union led to the “fall” of the Soviet address term товариш in most social contexts; and at the same time it led to the re-emergence of the address form P in written texts and in the spoken media. This new implementation of the form was a difficult transition for me and, I believe, many eastern Ukrainians. In fact, my research shows that there is great variation in the use of this specific address form, which makes me believe that there is, as yet, no uniform set of rules governing its usage and, in particular, the words with which it can collocate. Nevertheless, P has become one of the most common nominal address terms in Ukrainian in the beginning of the twenty-first century. Thus it would not be surprising that the collocations with P undergo standardization in Ukrainian in the near future.

19 Pragmatically ‘comrade’ can not satisfy the meaning of P, because first, comrade has only masculine form while P has both masculine and feminine. Both address term though are respectful nominal forms of address only at different times and different social environments. Both forms are commonly used with the last names and can be substituted by ви.
1.2. Purpose of the Investigation

Given the many unanswered questions mentioned in Section 1.1, there is clearly a need for detailed investigations of the system of address in Contemporary Ukrainian. This subject is too large for a single study, given that “systems of address consist of all the possible choices open to the speaker between linguistic elements referring to the addressee…” (Stone (1977: 491). Therefore, in this dissertation I will concentrate on one part of the system, nominal address (nouns and noun phrases), though I will also make observations about pronominal address where appropriate. In addition, because the use of P forms is not limited to the second person, I will on occasion discuss referential collocations, third-person collocations referencing a person not present at the moment; however, detail study of Ukrainian referential deference is beyond the scope of the present work.

The particular questions on which I will focus are as follows:

- Which categories of lexemes can collocate with P address terms in Contemporary Ukrainian?
- Do the collocation possibilities differ for P used in referential deference (third person) as opposed to address (second person)?
- Is there any variation in the inflectional morphology of the vocative in Contemporary Ukrainian?
• What factors (lexical, grammatical, or pragmatic) influence the choice of the vocative or nominative case in address collocations, and in particular those that include the address term P?

• Does the gender of the speaker and/or the addressee influence the choice of terms in address collocations and referential collocations?

• Which forms of addresses are commonly used in Ukrainian newspapers and which forms of addresses are rarely found?

1.3. Methodology and Database

The chief material from which I drew my data is articles published in Київ (Kiev) daily newspaper День (‘Day’). This newspaper was founded in September 1996, so its editorial practices were defined in the post-Soviet period. It has a daily circulation of 92,000 copies, not counting online readership. The following description of the newspaper is found on the website of Mediacroup, a corporation that sells advertisement in Ukrainian newspapers:

Deep analytic and objective information about the economic and political life in Ukraine… [The newspaper] focuses on discussing the [national] political and economic order, as well as assessment of world events. Due to its timeliness and “signature” supply of materials, the newspaper has earned consistently high ratings in Ukraine and abroad. The editors have annual international photography competitions. Also, one of the features of the newspaper is collections of historical essays about ‘blank pages’ in history.”

---

The 110 articles from which I gathered my data cover the years 1997–2013, i.e., from shortly after the start of publication to the present day. День is one of the few Ukrainian periodicals that have searchable electronic archives, which cover precisely those sixteen years. The articles, which were selected by a random process, provide a good sample of the usage of Ukrainian forms of address. I group the 110 articles into two collections—D1-D80, dating from 1998 to 2010, and D81-D110, dating from 1997 to 2013, based on the lexemes that I used to extract relevant articles from the electronic archive. Each article is identified by the generic rubric under which it appeared in the newspaper. Here is the distribution of the articles in accordance to those rubrics, in descending order:

(19) День Планети “Day of the Planet”
(16) Подробиці “Details”
(13) Панорама «Дня» “Panorama of ‘Day’”
(9) Суспільство “Society”
(8) Інтерв’ю “Interview,” Пошта «Дня» “Mail of ‘Day’”
(7) Культура “Culture”
(6) Медіа “Media,” День України ‘Day of Ukraine’
(4) Україна Incognita “Ukraine Incognita,” Nota bene
(2) Світові діскусії “World Discussions,” Акція «Дня» “Action of ‘Day’”
My original collection of 80 articles from День, which focused on P, included 82 examples of address and 960 examples of reference. These first 80 articles provided a wide variety of different examples which covered the twelve-year period. Additionally, the articles were written by 72 different authors, so they provide a representative sample of different Ukrainian styles. Here is a brief description of the authorship of some of the articles. Two articles were translated from other printed sources (The Washington Times (article D1) and The Economist (article D14). Another article (D45) was written by the correspondent from Radio Svoboda, not a staff journalist. Article D66 consists of short passages addressed to different people, including the editor of the newspaper День. Some authors are represented by multiple articles: D30 and D44; D7 and D19; D6 and D24; D16, D27, and D56; D10, D67, D68, D78 and D8; D12, D46, and D53; and D20, D34, D39, D40, D47, D48, D51, D54, D74. Each of the remaining articles was written by a different author.

In forming the database, my principal goal was to collect articles which included the address terms P. In order to find these lexemes, I typed the words пан and пані in Ukrainian in the search engine on the День website (http://www.day.kiev.ua/uk/archivenewspaper). This search brought up numerous links.

21 Not every article has a different author. There are a few articles written by a single author, while others have multiple authors.
Next, I accessed the first 80 links to articles, and copied the entire articles into Microsoft Word-format files, with metadata including the date and URL. Later, I carefully read each article and extracted all the examples relevant to my research. I copied these data into a Microsoft Excel file and classified them by categories. Some of the categories provided general metadata: Number of the article in my database; Newspaper name; Year of the article; Author(s) of the article; Gender of the author(s); Rubric under which the article appeared. One column contained the Examples in their precise Ukrainian wording. Subsequent categories analyzed the noun phrases themselves, including the presence or absence of Address and the Gender of the addressee or referent. If the noun phrases were collocations, each of the constituents present was placed in a separate category in its linear order: Adjective; Pan (i.e., P term); Title (if there was a common noun other than P); First name of the addressee or referent; Initial of the addressee or referent (if the full first name was not given); Second name; Patronymic; Last name; and Number of times the collocation was used in the article.

Searching for P form alone would not reveal articles in which other terms of address were used to the exclusion of P. As it was impossible to know all the possible terms in advance, I typed the word інтерв’ю ‘interview’ into the День search engine in order to identify all of the articles which included only interviews. From the numerous hits, I selected 30 articles (D81-110), which range in date from 1997 to 2013. I selected only articles that consisted of interviews reported in dialogue format. These articles were written by 26 different authors; D86 and D98 had three co-authors, and D94, D100, D101, D109 two co-authors. In four of the articles, the name of the authors is not stated.
(D84, D102, D103, D105); therefore, it was not possible to determine the gender of the authors, and the given articles are not included in the discussion of gender in Chapter 4.

From the 30 supplementary articles, I collected 42 examples of nominal and pronominal address, many of which did not include a P term. Then I extracted the examples and categorized them in the Excel database, using the same categories as in the earlier classification plus the category *Ви*, which noted whether the pronoun of address was 2PL or 2SG.

To supplement the materials from *День* and ensure that there was regional diversity, I also collected 24 articles from the website of the Lviv-based newspaper *Львівська Газета* ‘Lviv’s Newspaper’ ([http://gazeta.lviv.ua/](http://gazeta.lviv.ua/)).

*Львівська Газета* is a weekly newspaper with circulation of 113,000 copies. It is described as follows:

*Lviv’s Newspaper* is the leading socio-political publication of Lviv and its region. Among other newspapers, *Lviv’s Newspaper* stands out for its analytical materials on various topics, its original style of presentation, and the presence of numerous interesting interlocutors on its pages. [The newspaper] has a variety of columns: “Politics”, “Law”, “Education”, “Style”, “Gourmet”, “Auto”, “Wandering”, which includes the comments on the subjects by specialists.22

My purpose in gathering additional materials from *Львівська Газета* was to check and compare the findings from the newspaper *День*, and, in particular, to see whether the usage of P address forms varies in different parts of the country. The city of Lviv is located in western Ukraine, which was annexed by the USSR during World War

---

II. It is characterized by the western dialect and habitual use of Ukrainian rather than Russian in everyday language and the media.

I followed the same procedures for gathering and classifying the examples from *Львівська Газета* as with the materials from *День*. The articles I collected date from between 2004 and 2010; they provide 48 address phrases and 149 reference examples. The articles were written by 20 different authors. Three of the articles (LH5, LH6, and LH13) were written by the same author. One article (LH8) was written by a collective and does not state the last name of its authors.

The length of the articles collected from both newspapers varies greatly; the minimal was around 600 words (D100), and the maximum around 3 240 words (D98). As shown in Figure 1, the articles are distributed unevenly between 1997 and 2013, because they were not selected for their year of publication but for the presence of relevant terms of address. A lower number of the articles in a given year do not imply a lower usage of certain address terms.
1.4. Translation of the Address Term P to English

Since there is no perfect term of address for P to use in English, there will be some variation in how I translate it. The following translations of P appear in my dissertation. In address, by itself, нане [M.VOC. SG] is translated as sir or mister; нани [F. VOC/NOM. SG] as ma’am, madam, or miss for нани; панове [M.VOC.PL] as gentlemen; нани [F.PL] as ladies; and нани та панове as ladies and gentlemen. In referential usage by itself, нан is translated as gentleman; нани as lady; and нани as gentlemen or (where
appropriate) *ladies and gentlemen.* Finally, before a noun, the translations are *Mr. X, Ms. X,* and *Messrs. X and Y,* respectively.

### 1.5. Structure of the Dissertation

In Chapter 2, I will survey significant previous research on terms of address in Ukrainian and other Slavic languages. I will pay special attention to the vocative in those Slavic languages that have morphologically distinct vocative forms—Ukrainian and Rusyn (East Slavic branch); Czech and Polish (West Slavic branch); and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Macedonian and Bulgarian (South Slavic branch). (In the other Slavic languages, the nominative case is used in address.) In Chapter 2, I also discuss the following topics: so-called “neo-vocatives” in Russian; recent morphological changes in the Ukrainian vocative; and similar changes in other Slavic languages (see section 3.3.4.) As part of this discussion, I present a brief historical overview of the vocative in Ukrainian and discuss in details innovative morphology of vocative in regards to the surnames. Finally, I address the variation between nominative and vocative endings as well as apposition in Ukrainian unbound nominal address forms.

In Chapter 3, I first categorize the possible collocations of *P* based on the semantic category of collocates. The following categories of collocations are discussed in this chapter: *P* with first names (further *P+FN*); *P* with last names (further *P+LN*); and *P* with first name and patronymic (further *P+PN*). I discuss the extent to which each collocation is attested in my corpus. I also briefly discuss the use of honorific adjectives
in address collocations, e.g., івановий ‘dear’, which is often used at the beginning of articles.

Subsequently in Chapter 3, I examine the collocation of P and professional titles (T). The professional titles include various political titles such as president, minister, vice-minister, ambassador, etc.; other professional titles such as professor, university president, historian, military general, consultant, editor, director and manager; religious titles such as priest, nun, and father. Then I compare and contrast P collocations in address phrases and P in reference and discuss whether there are differences in the number of nouns that can collocate with P in each syntactic environment.

In Chapter 4, I start with a very brief overview of research on gender linguistics. Then I discuss characteristics of male and female speech in written Ukrainian, paying special attention to specific expressions and general strategies that male and female interlocutors tend to prefer in my data. Next, I compare my findings with previous research on gendered language in Ukrainian internet forums and press.

Further, in Chapter 4 I address the question of whether gender plays any role in the choice of one address form over another in address collocations. Here I consider the possible influence of both the addressees’ and the authors’ gender on their preferences.

In Chapter 5 I focus on interviews. My goal is to determine whether there are patterns of the usage of specific address terms over a course of a single interview. I discuss the frequency and pragmatic use of the common Ukrainian address terms, which include bound T and V address forms, third-person singular address, names in unbound address (fist names, first names and patronymics), and P collocations in address. I
analyze the pragmatic use of these forms in relation to each other and to the degree of intimacy or distance between the interlocutors. Finally, I examine the usage of the former Soviet address term товариши ‘comrade’ in newspaper articles, as well as the attitudes that authors evince toward this address form.
Chapter 2: Collocations with Pan

2.1. Overview of P-Address in Contemporary Ukrainian

In this chapter, I will look at the collocability of the Ukrainian address forms masculine Pan, feminine nanі, plural nanі (collectively abbreviated P). I use the term collocability to refer to “the potential of items to collocate” (Crystal 1990: 55). The issue of the collocability (or “collocation range,” ibid.) of P-terms originally struck me after I became aware of the “official return” of P-address to Ukrainian—or, at least, to the eastern Ukrainian dialect—after 1991. On a personal note, I grew up in the city of Kharkiv, in eastern Ukraine. Kharkiv was mostly a Russophone area. I habitually spoke Russian, a language without P-terms, and the Soviet variety of Ukrainian, which I learned in school likewise, did not involve that style of address. Thus, for me, the revival of P-forms was a striking phenomenon which raised my curiosity and desire to understand how to use P-forms in Ukrainian.

Surprisingly, though some Ukrainian grammars mention the existence of P-forms, the collocability of P has not, to my knowledge, been discussed in details in Ukrainian grammars or other linguistic studies. In Pugh and Press (1991: 9), a work published in

---

23 The inhabitants of Kharkiv are primarily Russian-speaking and were so in 1980–2000, during my youth. 
24 During the Soviet period, standard Ukrainian was significantly changed in order to bring the literary language closer to literary Russian. Therefore, P-terms were omitted, first, due to their association with the gentry and, second, due to the absence of Russian equivalents.
North America, this 25 P-address is described as a Polonism occasionally used in western Ukraine. Grammars published during Soviet times (1919–1991), even abroad, may include examples with P from classical literature, but they do not define it or discuss its function in the Ukrainian language (see, e.g., Luc’kyj and Rudnuc’kyj 1958). However, even works published in post-Soviet Ukraine fail to describe the use of P, though these forms have become quite frequent in mass media and in colloquial speech in both address and third-person reference. One can only conjecture whether the recent grammatical works ignore P-address because they assume that it is common knowledge or, conversely, because they consider it a marginal phenomenon. (Another possibility is that the authors of the grammars are themselves not certain how to use P-address.)

In contemporary Ukrainian, the noun пан (VOC.SG пане) has several senses. Besides being used as an honorific in addressing or referring to males, it can also mean ‘landlord, landowner’ and also ‘Lord’ in reference to ‘God’, e.g. Пан Біг ‘the Lord God’ (Bohdan 1998). The indeclinable feminine пані has equivalent meanings in address and in reference to females. Formerly, the masculine patronymic derivate панич ‘young lord’ was used instead of пан to address or refer to a young male; it is now primarily found in folklore. Similarly, the derivate панна ‘young lady; maiden’ (VOC.SG панно) was formerly used of unmarried women but is now archaic except in lexicalized uses such as Панна Марія ‘the Lady Mary’. There are no forms of панич or панна in any of the articles from День or Львівська Газета from which I took my data.

25 The fact that a given work from before the 1990s was published outside Ukraine is relevant because, due to Soviet ideology, officially there was no пан/пани address in Ukrainian.

26 For example, панич (plural пани) is common in riddles, шедривки and колядки (traditional songs and sayings performed at New Year and Christmas).
The plural forms of пан—пани [NOM.PL], etc.—are used for groups of adult males or groups of mixed gender. The form панове [VOC.PL] is used in address; this is the only distinct vocative plural in the language. For groups consisting only of women, the indeclinable form нани is used, as in the singular.

2.2. Historical Sketch of the Honorific Pan

The etymology of P is interesting and somewhat controversial. It does not have clear Indo-European cognates; its status as a Proto-Slavic lexeme is problematic, as it is not attested in the South Slavic languages or in Russian (except as a borrowing). On the other hand, it is abundantly attested not only in Ukrainian but also in West Slavic (Czech, Slovak, Upper and Lower Sorbian, and Polish) and in pre-Soviet Belarusian. In Old Czech, the term occurs in the forms hpán and пан, with a wide variety of semantically connected meanings: ‘freeman; member of the lesser nobility; landlord; owner; family head; lord’. The fuller form hpán points to Common Slavic *gūpānas, Late Common Slavic *gъpanъ; the initial consonant was apparently lost as a result of consonant-cluster simplification after the fall of weak jer (*ъ).

According to the Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages (Trubačov (ed.) 1981) *гъпанъ was a compound word, of which the first component was the root *гу- ‘cattle’ (cf. Old East Slavic говѧдо); the second may perhaps be *пад- ‘lord’ (cf. Old East Slavic господь ‘lord’) plus the suffix -n-. Thus the word originally meant ‘master of

---

27 On the history of address terms in other Slavic languages, especially Czech, see Betsch 2003.
the cattle’, i.e., denoted the person in the kinship group who oversaw the herds.29

Similarly, in his etymological dictionary of Russian, Vasmer links *гърапъ with Old Indic गोपास ‘shepherd, guard’, गोपायति, गोपायati ‘protects’, गोपानम ‘protection’.30 By contrast, in his etymological dictionary of Polish, Brückner (1989) links *гърапъ with OCS and other South Slavic županъ (i.e., e-grade *geupānas). Brückner traces both terms through Scythian (Iranian) to Turkic source. He posits that they were borrowed in Slavic in the fifth century A.D. and that *гърапъ originally referred to tribute-collectors of the Avar khan, and later to any lord (cf. also Machek 1968).

The term панъ was already in widespread use in Ukrainian in the Middle Ages, and it was no longer associated with either cattle or tribute-collecting. According to Vasmer (1989), панъ is first attested in the East Slavic languages in the fourteenth century. The Dictionary of Old Ukrainian31 (1978 vol. 2: 125) defines панъ as “an officer, or an official form for addressing or referring to a man who belonged to the feudal class.” In the second sense, it became used for the ‘landlord, landowner’ to whom peasants were bound. Subsequently, пан began to be used more generally as an honorific. According to Poliščuk (2013: 2), this started in the fifteenth century: “First P was used as a reference to people with high status, and later as an address term for commoners as a sign of respect.”

P was adopted as a polite way of addressing the nobility and gentry in the period when much of what is now Ukraine was a dominion of the Polish-Lithuanian state (see

\footnote{29 See also Poliščuk at http://kulturamovy.univ.kiev.ua/KM/pdfs/Magazine46-47-27.pdf, page 4, accessed on 11/30/2013.}

\footnote{30 http://dic.academic.ru/contents.nsf/vasmer/, accessed on 12/10/13.}

Huszcza 2005: 219). P-address is also attested in the Polish of that period, often in combination with the deferential use of second-person plural and third-person singular: *wasza miłość mój miłściwy pan* ‘your grace, my gracious lord’ (Stone 1984: 54). Present-day Polish retains the honorific address P with a similar meaning to Ukrainian P. In addition, unlike Ukrainian, Polish P can also be used as a bound form (quasi-pronoun) with the third-person singular. This bound usage (discussed further in Section 2.3) appeared sometime after *nań* had been adopted as a title in unbound address.\(^\text{32}\)

In Ukrainian texts of the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries, P-forms are already in general use for expressing deference; this can be seen, for example, in (1), which dates from 1731. The fact that the word *наше* is abbreviated *пнє* here suggests that the honorific was already a familiar form of address at that time.

```
(1a) Намъ зичливи(ї) прїтлю, пїє Григори(ї) .

    Скорупа.
    Skorupa [ NOM.SG]

    “[O] kind friend of ours, Mr. Hryhoryj Skorupa” (Peredrijenko 1987:54, letter #44).
```

With the rise of the Ukrainian literary language in the later eighteenth–nineteenth centuries, P-address was registered (and normatively modeled) in works of influential Ukrainian authors like Ivan Kotljarevs’kyj (1769–1838) and Taras Ševčenko (1814–61).

\(^{32}\) In the fifteenth century, the primary form of bound address in the territories of Ukraine and Poland was *ty* ‘you (SG)’. In the early sixteenth century, *vy* ‘you (PL)’ began to be used to show deference to singular addressees; this was possibly due, at least in Polish, to German influence (Stone 1984: 52). (In contemporary Polish, the use of *vy* to address individuals is considered “artificial” (idem 1977: 493).
A втім, як знаєш, пане-брате. Не дурень, сам собі міркуй.

‘Anyway, as you know, Mister-Brother, you are not a fool; judge for yourself’ (Ševčenko).\textsuperscript{33}

In example (1b), the vocative пане collocates with the second-person singular pronoun, which was the norm in peasant usage even in the nineteenth century. However, in other social environments, unbound P address typically collocated with bound address in the second-person plural. As noted above, this usage is attested in sixteenth-century Polish. In Ukrainian, the further spread of the polite second-person plural in bound address was most likely influenced by contact with Russian, where that usage became typical in the eighteenth century (see Benacchio 1999). Eastern Ukraine was at that time a territory of the Russian Empire, and the Russian language had a dominant position there until 1991, if not to the present day. In contemporary Ukrainian, 

vy is regularly used for bound polite address, and the pronoun remains the most commonly used form of deferential address in the mass media.

For polite unbound address and deferential reference, P gradually became accepted among all social classes, including the lower classes—a process completed by the early twentieth century. While there is limited evidence for peasant usage in the nineteenth century, it can be noted that P-address and P-reference are frequent in oral folk traditions, many of which were recorded at that time—for example, колядки and щедрівки (joking carols sung during the period from Christmas to Epiphany): “The

words пане, пані, панно, паничу, by our observations, appear surprisingly often in колядки and щедрівки” (Bohdan 1998: 154–55). When carolers came to a house, they would address the male household head as пане, his wife as пані, his unmarried daughter as панно, and his young unmarried son as паничу. Various diminutive forms of P were also used (ibid.). According to Bohdan (ibid.: 156-157), пан, пані, панна, and панич could be collocated in колядки and щедрівки with first names (2a) and with the word господар ‘owner’ (2b).

(2a) Що у пана Василя хороша жона.

“… that Mr. [GEN.SG] Vasyl’ [GEN] has a good wife.”

(2b) Добрий вечір тобі, пане господарю!

“Good evening to you [DAT.SG], Mr. [VOC] Owner [VOC].”

P-forms could also collocate with diminutive forms of kinship terms, e.g., дядику-пане ‘uncle-pan’, пані бабуя ‘пані grandmother’; and with certain general social terms, e.g., дівочки-паниночки ‘young girls-panny’ (where the second word is a diminutive derived from the noun панна ‘Miss’) (ibid.).

The use of P-deference is found in other genres of folklore as well, e.g., in riddles: Пані на майдані. “[What is] a lady [NOM.SG] on the square.” The key to this riddle is дівоча коса ‘a girl’s braid’. Other examples are found in proverbs, e.g. З хама не буде пана. “One cannot make a gentleman [GEN.SG] from a lout.” (Bohdan 1998:157) It is

---

34 Translations from Ukrainian to English are mine.
35 These forms are given in the vocative; the nominative (dictionary-entry) forms are pan, pani, panna, and panyć, respectively.
also interesting to note that *пан* collocates with *Біг* ‘God’ (ibid.): *Пан Біг*, cf. at Polish *Panbóg*, Czech *Panbůh*.\(^{36}\)

As shown, e.g., in B. Hrinčenko’s dictionary, *пан* was an everyday honorific in Ukrainian in the nineteenth century. At that time, it was possible to produce derivates of the root with various hypocoristic suffixes, e.g., *панонько, паненя, паночок, пануся, панусенька*, etc. In addition, it was compounded with kinship terms to form titles of respect for older people: *панотець* ‘my father’, *паніматка* ‘my mother,’ as well as endearing derivatives such as *панотченько, паніматочка*; cf. Czech *pantato, панімата* (Machek 1968). There are similar to Ukrainian words: *панімама, пантато*. These derived words expressed respect towards one’s closest relatives (Polіščuk 2013).

Despite its status as everyday politeness in nineteenth- and early-twentieth century Ukrainian, P-politeness became disapproved in the form of Ukrainian written and spoken (at least, in public communications) in the Ukrainian S.S.R.\(^{37}\) due to its association with pre-revolutionary landowners and gentry (cf. the second meaning of *пан*, ‘landlord, landowner’) rather than with the working class. Instead, another address form was adopted– *товариши* ‘comrade’ (cf. Russian *товарищ*), a calque of the non-class-based terms used in the international Socialist movement (French *camarade*, German *Kamerad*, etc.). This term was used to address both males and females who either were members of the Communist Party or at least favored Communist ideology.\(^{38}\)

\(^{36}\) The collocation *Пан Біг* is associated with the Byzantine Catholic and Roman Catholic Church, but not with the Eastern Orthodox Church.

\(^{37}\) The P-address continued to be used by Ukrainians outside the Ukrainian S.S.R.

status and gender were disregarded when the address-form товариши was used.\textsuperscript{39} By contrast, the address term П always required marking for gender (masculine пан vs. feminine пані); in some regions, at least, it also involved marking for marital status (masculine married/adult пан vs. unmarried/young паніч; feminine married пані vs. unmarried панна).

In the Ukrainian S.S.R., the function of товариши was, to some extent, similar to that of the traditional Ukrainian address term П. That is, it was a common unified address term to strangers, acquaintances and Soviet party comrades rather than to intimates.\textsuperscript{40} Thus address involving товариши can be classified as negative politeness, given that it indicated distance and respect (Brown and Levinson 1987), despite its invocation of Party solidarity. On the other hand, there was no special term of address associated with positive politeness available during Soviet times. Typically, positive politeness was conveyed through the use of the first name alone, and negative politeness through the first name plus patronymic.\textsuperscript{41}

Despite the normative status of товариши in Soviet Ukrainian, П continued to be used in private speech,\textsuperscript{42} especially in western Ukraine (Weissenbok 2006: 20.4), which had never been part of the Russian Empire and was only annexed by the U.S.S.R. in 1945. Because it had been less subject to Russification, the Ukrainian spoken in the

\textsuperscript{39} It should be noted that the term товариши was common in pre-Soviet times among classmates.

\textsuperscript{40} The major function of товариши was to address citizens of the Soviet Union in a way that avoided social as well as gender references. Occasionally, the plural form товариши could be used to address a group of friends, but mainly because it was very frequent in other contexts, not because it was intimate in tone.

\textsuperscript{41} See more details on the forms of the address in Chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{42} To verify Weissenbok’s statement about the use of П in colloquial speech, I had a conversation with my colleague Larysa Stepanova, who used to live in Luck, western Ukraine (1970–2000) and taught at the university there. Dr. Larysa Stepanova told me that at work she was addressed as пані Лариса ‘Ms. Larysa’.
western regions was typically perceived as more “authentic” than the dialects of the eastern part of the country; thus, western Ukrainian speech came to serve as a model of Ukrainian which was free from Russian influence.

With the establishment of an independent Ukrainian state in 1991, the use of P-politeness was gradually revived in written Ukrainian, including national media like the newspaper like День, and also in spoken interactions. However, the reintegration of the address P into post-Soviet Ukrainian was not always an easy process. As I noted in the introduction, the (re)introduction of the form led to difficulties in usage for many eastern Ukrainians, including myself, and even for many speakers in regions where Ukrainian was more widely used in everyday speech. Thus, at the turn of the twenty-first century, Ukrainian journalists were promoting the use of P, but not everyone was ready to accept it. For example, the journalist Klara Hudzyk wrote in her article «Пан» чи «товариш»? “Mister or comrade?” in the August 28, 1998 issue of newspaper День,

Частина суспільства, однак, ніяк не може абстрагуватися від радянського стереотипу форми і змісту, зокрема, від одного із значень слова «пан» (експлуататор).

“Part of society, however, cannot in any way move beyond the Soviet stereotype of form and meaning, especially from the one of the meanings of the word pan (exploiter).”

Another article in День discusses a peculiar case of conflict caused by the use of the address term P. In the article Ввічливе звертання “Polite address”, published in September 23, 2000 issue, the author, O. Cyhryk, describes a conversation that he had in
a trolley in the Kiev area. During the conversation, the author addressed a person next to him as пан, but the addressee was evidently offended by the form.

‘With unbelievable difficulties I got out small change and asked a neighbor to pass the payment for the ride. And, as politely as I could I added, “Прощу пана” [literally, ‘I ask the gentleman’, i.e., ‘Please, sir’].” The thing is that I had been in Lviv and, since then, constantly address everyone as пан and пані. I had decided to spread the western culture further to the east. That is why I addressed my neighbor, who was tired out by the prolonged reforms, in the Lviv manner: “Прощу пана.” Oh Lord, what did I do! He became irate; his face—not very pleasant even before that—became red all over, and he cried out, spraying saliva, “What kind of пан I am to you?” I mobilized all my will-power and courtesy and even more politely showed my sympathy: “I am very sorry that you are not a pan.” These words of mine added even more fuel to the fire of his anger. He started to yell and insult me even more.’

From Cyhryk’s anecdote, it is apparent that P-address was not yet common in colloquial Ukrainian in the Kiev region in 2000, even though, according to the author, P was the standard address form in Lviv in the same time period.

Even among those who were reluctant to accept P-politness, the use of товариш, with its Soviet associations, underwent a fast decline in both written and colloquial
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43 This article is not part of the data collected for my analysis of P.
language in independent Ukraine. According to Weissenbok (2006: 20.4), товариш is chiefly used in an “ironical, joking fashion” in present-day Ukrainian. Even though товариш can occasionally be used in colloquial language, the address пан/пани is increasingly preferred over the Soviet address form by many Ukrainians.

Today, the address titles пан and пани are undoubtedly integral parts of standard Ukrainian. By my observations, the honorific P became a common form of address in Ukrainian mass media. Besides the examples from the newspaper День, I also looked at additional media sources, which confirmed my assumption that P is commonly used in mass media. Below are three examples from the websites of the BBC (2007), Радіо Свобода (2008), and Львівська Газета (2009).

(3a) Пане професоре Кузьо, погоджуюсь, що професор Магочій є дуже популярний науковець в The University of Toronto але дуже часто так звані популярні науковці плутають науку з історією.

Mister [VOC.SG] Professor [VOC] Kuz’o [VOC]. I agree that Professor Magocsi is a very popular scientist at the University of Toronto, but very often so-called popular scientists confuse science and history.44

(3b) Добре було б, пане міністре, щоб у нас в Україні було 25 міст, готових прийняти будь-яку гру, для «Євро-2012».

It would be good, Mister [VOC.SG] Minister [VOC], if we had 25 cities in Ukraine which were ready to accommodate any game for “Euro-2012.”45

45 http://www.radiosvoboda.org/search/?k=%D0%BF%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B5&ob=2&df=01.01.2008 &dt=31.03.2009, accessed on 3/31/2009.
(3c) Пане Володимире, минулого тижня ви сказали, що в українського уряду є лише два тижні на перегляд газових угод.

Mister [voc.sg] Volodymyr [voc], last week you said that the Ukrainian government has only two weeks to review the gas agreements.46

2.3. Unbound vs. Bound use of Pan

As noted in Section 2.2, Polish, like Ukrainian (not to mention Czech and Slovak), uses P in both unbound address and referential deference.47 In addition, the Polish P forms are used not only as a part of noun phrases but also as grammaticalized (bound) pronouns of address, with third-person agreement, as in (4).

(4) Czy pan jedzie do Warzawy?


This sentence is technically ambiguous between reference and address but in context “the gentleman” is clearly the addressee. Polish is a pro-drop language; for established topics, nouns and pronouns are often omitted. However, this is not possible when P is used as a pronominal address form. If a third-person singular verb is used alone, without the pronoun P, then the third-person is unambiguously a form of reference.

47 The following forms of P are used in Polish address: panie ‘Sir/Mr. [voc.sg]’, panowie ‘Gentlemen [nom.pl]’, pani ‘Lady/Ms. [nom.voc.sg]’, panie ‘Ladies’ [nom.pl], and państwo ‘Ladies and Gentlemen’ (a neuter with plural agreement). These nouns decline in all the grammatical cases to express referential deference.
rather than address (Stone 1981: 58). Likewise, Polish P can never be replaced by regular third-person anaphoric pronouns (on, ona oni, one) (ibid.: 70).

By contrast, the P forms in Ukrainian are mostly used as components of noun phrases or else in parenthetical address clauses. When used in address, they ordinarily have second-person agreement. Third-person agreement in address is attested, but it is quite rare in my data. Nonetheless, the article “Polite Address” from День by O. Cyhryk, cited at length in Section 2.2, provides an excellent example of the usage and how it is perceived by some Kievan Ukrainians.

І якомога ввічливіше додав: «Прошу пана». Річ у тім, що я був у Львові і відтоді незмінно звертаюся до всіх «пан» та «пані». Я вирішив поширювати західну культуру далі на схід.

‘And, as politely as I could I added, “Prošu pana” [literally, ‘I ask the gentleman’, i.e., ‘Please, sir’].’ The thing is that I had been in Lviv and, since then, constantly address everyone as pan and pani. I had decided to spread the western culture further to the east.’

First of all, this example indicates vividly that the P form is associated with the western variety/dialect of Ukrainian and is not necessarily associated with the urban dialect of Kiev. Second, the author was aware that Ukrainians in Kiev were familiar enough with the P address term to understand the request. Third, the author has a desire to promote the western Ukrainian style of address; evidently, he thinks that the ‘authentic’ Ukrainian address term P needs to be used more frequently. Finally, he considers the address term P to be a very polite form of address, as he states in the article. (‘And, as politely as I could I added, “Прошу пана ‘Please, Sir’.”)
The reaction of the addressee seemed to surprise the author. Presumably, the addressee got angry because he associated with the P form with “hyper-polite” irony, because of the unfavorable attitude to P in Soviet times, or perhaps because of the author’s “non-Ukrainian” use of third-person agreement. The speaker uses P as a pronoun, while in Kiev you would expect to hear *Прошу вас, пане. ‘I ask you [2PL], Sir [voc.sg].’ This expected variant features the bound personal pronoun ви instead of пан in a quasi-pronominal usage.

Another case of a quasi-pronominal (bound) use of P with third-person agreement can be seen in example (5), taken from День:

(5) Як би пан директор охарактеризував пересічного українського студента, якого він знає? (D50c)

‘How would Mr. [nom.sg] Director [nom.sg] describe [pst.m.sg] an average Ukrainian student whom he [m.3sg] knows [prs.3sg]?’

Though the noun phrase Mr. Director has agreeing forms in the third-person singular (він знає ‘he knows’), it actually refers to the addressee of the interview; thus this example can be paraphrased as ‘How would you, Mister Director, describe an average Ukrainian student whom you know?’ However, the Ukrainian sentence has an anaphoric (third-person) pronoun in the relative clause, where Polish would have pan in pronominal use. As noted above, Polish pan in Polish cannot be replaced anaphorically by third-person pronouns.

48 One of the ironic uses of pan is to denote ‘a person who shows depraved behavior, licentious habits, over-refined manners and so on’ (http://sum.in.ua/s/pan/, accessed on 4/17/2014).
The article from which (5) is excerpted features an interview with a Pole; thus the third-person agreement may be an intentional (though ultimately unsuccessful) imitation of Polish rather than a colloquial Ukrainian usage. The interviewer uses third-person agreement with P only that once, at the beginning of the interview. Elsewhere in the interview, he uses P solely as an unbound honorific address noun—e.g., the underlined vocative in (6).

(6) *Пане Малицький, для чого підтримувати іноземців, навчати їх, давати гроші на професійне стажування в Польщі?* (D50d)

‘Mr. [voc.sg] Malic’kyj, why support foreigners, teach them, give them money for a professional internship in Poland?’

Moreover, the same correspondent elsewhere addresses the interviewee with the second-person plural pronoun ви ‘you’ with plural agreement (не стали ‘[you] did not become’), as in (7).

(7) *Як сталося, що ви, будучи відомим опозиціонером у 90-х роках, стали ані міністром, ані дипломатом?* (D50)

‘How did it happen, that you [2pl.nom], being a famous opposition leader in the ’90s, did not become [pst.2pl] either a minister or a diplomat?’

This kind of use of the second-person plural in polite address is not characteristic of Contemporary Polish. However, it is absolutely the normal pattern in my Ukrainian data, as illustrated by (8a–b).
Thus, the usage in (5) probably demonstrates that the correspondent has some familiarity with Polish. At the same time, the fact that he only uses P only once in a superficially Polish-like way points to the correspondent’s understanding that P is a noun and not a pronoun in Ukrainian. This treatment of P as a noun is otherwise the norm in the data that I have gathered.

2.4. Analysis of Pan Collocations in the Newspaper День

In my database of 80 articles from the Kiev-based newspaper День, there are 237 noun phrases that include an address term P—187 masculine singular, 44 feminine singular, 5 plural which are either all masculine or a group possess at least one male, and one with conjoined masculine and feminine singular forms (see example (9)).

(9) Вважаю, немає жодного поважного пана чи пані, які б не знали в обличчя пана професора. (D4i)

‘I think there is not one respected gentleman [пан] or lady [пані] who would not recognize Mr. [пана] Professor’.

49 There is a possibility to have only feminine plural term пані for a group of females.
Out of the 237 examples, there are only 26 examples (12 masculine, 9 feminine and 5 plural), including the two in (9), where P does not collocate with a name, patronymic, last name or a title. Of these 26 examples of P alone, 19 are used in reference to a third-person, as in example (10), and 7 examples are used in address, as in example (11):

(10) У львівській опері мама підвела його до красивої пані. (D28l).

‘In Lviv’s opera [his] mom brought him to the beautiful lady [пані]’

(11) Завтра вранці з усмішкою він знову промовить до нас: «Добrego ранку пані й панове, вас вітає львівське телебачення». (D28h, D28i).

‘Tomorrow morning, he again will tell us with a smile, “Good morning, ladies and gentlemen”50, Lviv Television greets you”’

Example (11) is interesting because the address separates feminine plural P and masculine plural P. Under ordinary circumstances, there is no need to separate females from males in the plural because the plural address form панове can indicate a mixed-gender group. Apparently, the quoted speaker either intends to make an analogy with the common English collocation Ladies and gentlemen (or similar expressions in Polish нані i панові), or else he wants to mention both genders explicitly for some other reason.

50 In combination with a noun, пані would be translated as ‘Ms./Mrs.’ in the singular, but in this example I chose to translate it as ‘ladies,’ since it is a plural form. In regards to панове, I decided to translate it ‘gentlemen’ not ‘misters’.
Another interesting grammatical phenomenon shown in (11) is the use of the special vocative plural form панове. The address term пан is the only noun in Ukrainian which has a vocative plural distinct from the nominative (панове vs. пани). As was mentioned above, панове is often used to convey a mixed-gender group. In this example, however, панове is used exclusively for males. The feminine пани is indeclinable and therefore does not have a special vocative ending either in the singular or in the plural.

Looking further at these 26 examples, we can find 14 examples of P collocations with adjectives, as in (12); and 12 examples where the honorific address P is used along with no collocates, as in (11) above.

(12) Йому щодня погрожували розправою, говорили: «Вас вб’ють націоналісти, журнал закриють!» — а він спокійно відповідав: «Я думаю, шановний пане, що Ви помиляєтесь!» (D56x)

‘Every day he received threats, [they] say, “You will be killed by nationalists, the magazine will be shut down!”—and he calmly answered, “I think, respected sir, that you are mistaken!”’

In the newspaper День, all of the plural examples are found without collocates, among them three examples are in the vocative, as in (13), and two examples are in reference.

(13) … відповідає шири й відкрито: «Отсе я, панове, люблю! (D16v)

‘… [he] answers honestly and openly, “This I love, gentlemen[VOC.PL]”’

39
However, this does not mean that plural P cannot have collocates. Proof of the existence of collocates with P can be found in articles in Львівська Газета. In my data from that newspaper, there are four examples with plural P. One example has only панове without collocates similar to the examples from День and three examples of P and collocated nouns. Among the last three examples, two examples feature the vocative plural панове plus collocates in the nominative plural (14a–b). As noted above, пан is the only word in Ukrainian that has a vocative plural distinct from the nominative.

(14a) Панове Президенти (LH2d)

‘Messers Presidents’

(14b) панове соціал-демократи-об’єднані (LH10a)

‘Messers Social-Democrats-United’

The third example has the dative plural панам with several collocates, also in the dative plural (15):

(15) Таким чином, панам В. Богуслаєву, В. Сацькому, В. Куцину, Л. Байсарову, Л. Хлапенову, А. Бугайцеві та А. Лієву ненависні гласність (“демагогія”), національне відродження і здобуття Україною незалежності (“націоналістичний екстремізм”), натомість найлюбішою є сталінська в’язниця народів, тоталітарне кладовище економіки, варварська загроза світу, словом—усе те, що асоціюється в освіченої людини, в громадянина України, який свого часу на всеукраїнському референдумі проголосував на користь державної незалежності України, з СССР.(LH10i)

‘Therefore, gentlemen [DAT.PL] V. Boguslajev[DAT.PL], V. Sac’ko[DAT.PL], V. Kucin[DAT.PL], L. Bajsarov[DAT.PL], L. Xlapenov[DAT.PL], A. Buhajcev[DAT.PL]
and A. Lijev[DAT.PL] hated publicity ("demagoguery"), a national revival and achievement of the independence by Ukraine ("nationalist extremism"), while the most favorite is Stalin's prison of peoples, totalitarian cemetery of economy, barbaric menace to the world, in short—everything that is associated by an educated man, a citizen of Ukraine, which at one time on the national referendum voted in favor of Ukraine's independence from the USSR.

In example (15), address term P (plural) collocated with the initials of first names followed by last names. It is important to note that the first name initials can be used only in reference to the third-person, not in address.

2.4.1. Collocations of Pan and First Names (P + FN)

In this section, I will look at examples, which include collocation of masculine address form пан and feminine address пані with first names. In the data from the newspaper День, there are 37 examples of P + FN collocations (24 masculine and 13 feminine). Only 15 of the examples are used in address; the rest of the examples (22) are used in a reference to a third-person. Both foreign and Ukrainian names are used in both address and reference. One of the examples (16) has the form пані abbreviated as п.:  

(16) Пригадую собі, що Шухевич був невисокого зросту і стрункий, так само постала пані Марії невисока, тенідна, струнка. (D64n)  

‘I recall that Šuxevyč was of short stature and slender, just as the figure of Ms. Marija [was] short, fragile, slender.’
This example is especially interesting because the abbreviation of *nani* to just the first letter assumes that the readers are already familiar with this form, which, as noted in Section 2.2, has only recently been reintroduced.

Among the examples of P+FN there are only 3 examples which also include adjectives besides P and FN. All three examples occur in direct address or in *pseudo-direct address*, i.e., the situation when the authors of articles, for rhetorical purposes, address someone who is not actually present.

(17a) *Щановний пане Романе!* (D3f)

‘Respected Mr. Roman!’

(17b) *Щановна пані Наталю!* (D66q)

‘Respected Ms. Natalja!’

(17c) *Глибокошановна пані Ларисо!* (D66ah)

‘Deeply respected Ms. Larysa!’

The exclamation point is used in all the cases of P + adjective collocations. All these examples follow the etiquette of salutations in formal letters, where the adjectives ‘respected’ and ‘very respected’ are typical. Example (17a) is found at the very beginning of an article, while (17b–c) appear at the beginning of letters contained within an article. Most likely, these address collocations are typical formulas which are used for addressing someone for the first time in formal letters.

Table 2.1 (P+FN) provides the total number of examples found in *День* for P+FN collocations. The examples are divided in three columns ‘masculine names’, ‘feminine
names’ and ‘foreign names’. The examples are also classified according to whether they are used in address (e.g., Пане Майkle ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Michael [VOC]’ (54b)) or in reference collocations (e.g., пан Юрій ‘Mr. [NOM.SG] Jurij [NOM]’ (56aa), пані Людмили ‘Ms. Ljudmyla [DAT]’ (64h)). The address collocations are then subdivided according to whether the vocative case is used for both P and FN, e.g., Пане Андрію ‘Mr. Andrij’ (45e), Пані Інна ‘Ms. Inna’ (65e); or for P alone, e.g., Пане Назар ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Nazar [NOM]’ (58b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Foreign names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only P in VOC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + FN in VOC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: P + First Names

I have singled out foreign names to show that the given collocation patterns are productive. Foreign names with stem-final consonants can decline in Ukrainian, e.g., Pane Majkle ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Michael [VOC]’ (D54b), Пані Вайра ‘Ms. Vaira [NOM]’ (72a)). On the other hand, foreign names with stem-final vowels do not fit the expected structure of Ukrainian nouns and do not decline, even when their collocates do, e.g., пана Мустафи ‘Mr. [ACC.SG] Mustafa’ (12g), Пан Хо ‘Mr. [NOM.SG] Hur’ (19b); cf. the

51 It is sometimes difficult to determine whether a first name is foreign or Ukrainian. In the column “Foreign names,” I give examples of names that, in my judgment, are unlikely to be native Ukrainian. Most names of Russian and Polish origin are not considered foreign, since they are quite common among Ukrainians.

52 I have classified the indeclinable пані as vocative if its collocate is vocative, given that the masculine equivalent will always be vocative if its first noun collocate is vocative.
mention of the same name without nau in (18), where a dative-case form would be expected but does not occur:

(18) Проте ціла любов до України і бажання вивчати нашу мову, культуру та традиції, допомагали Хо Сун Чьолу скоріше адаптуватися до країни і до посади. (D19c)

‘Nevertheless, sincere love for Ukraine and the desire to learn our language, culture, and traditions helped Xo [NOM] Sun [NOM] Č’ol [DAT] to adapt to the country and to the appointment faster.’

2.4.2. Collocations of Pan and Last Names (P + LN)

In this section, I will look at examples of the collocation of P with last names. There are 92 examples of P + LN collocations (82 masculine and 10 feminine). Only 22 occur in direct or pseudo-direct address; the other 70 are references. Both foreign and Ukrainian names are used in direct address and in reference. One example uses an abbreviation for pan instead of the whole word (н. Чорному ‘Mr. Čornyj [DAT] (D11e)), which as noted previously, presupposes that the readers have some familiarity with the given address term.

(19) «Напевно, «День» не відмовить мені в публікації... моїх заперечень...» Так, «День»-то, пане Дмитрієву, не відмовить, а ось могли б Ви назвати хоча б одну впливову російську газету (опозиційні листки не рахуються), яка б не відмовила українським історикам у публікації їхніх міркувань і висновків? (D46j)

“Probably,” Day “will not deny me to post ... my objections ... “Yes,” Day “, then, Mr. Dmytrijev, will not deny, but can you name at least one influential Russian
newspaper (opposition papers are not considered), which would not deny to Ukrainian historians to publish their reasoning and conclusions?“

In the example (19) P and the last name (пане Дмитрієву) are both in the vocative. The possibility of masculine last names declining in the vocative seems to be a recent development, dating probably from the past 20–30 years. It is noteworthy that not only traditional Ukrainian last names but also Russian last names, as in (19), and foreign names with stems in consonants, e.g., Пане Міксера ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Mikser [VOC]’ (D51b), can take vocative endings. The change has evidently not yet been completed, as there is variation between the vocative and the nominative. Moreover, the vocative may not evidently have been extended to feminine last names, if example (20) is any indication.

(20) Щановна пані Івшина! (D66ac)

‘Respected Ms. Ivšyna [F.NOM]!’

Significantly, masculine last names declining according to the first declension, which consists predominantly of feminine nouns, take vocative endings: пане Лемехо ‘Mr. [VOC.SG]’ Lemexa [VOC]’ (D28a). For further discussion of the vocative in surnames, see Section 3.3.1.

Table 2.2 (P+LN) provides the total number of examples found in День for P+LN collocations. The examples are divided in three columns ‘masculine names’ (e.g., Пан Марчуков ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Marčukov [VOC]’ (D53o)), ‘feminine names’ (e.g., пані
Катеринчук ‘Ms. Katerynčuk’ (D63b); and ‘foreign names’ (пані Северинсен ‘Ms. Severinsen’ (D70a). The examples are also divided into address collocations and reference collocations. The address collocations are further divided into two groups—examples where only P is in the vocative, e.g., пане Щоголь ‘Mr. [voc.sg] Ščohol’ [nom] (D35e)) and where both P and LN are in the vocative (пане Лапікуро ‘Mr. [voc.sg] Lapikura [voc]’ (D37c)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Foreign names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only P in VOC</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + FN in VOC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: P + Last Names

2.4.3. Collocations of Pan, First and Last Names (P+FN+LN)

In this section, I will look at examples, which include collocation of P with both first and last names. There are 24 examples of P+FN+LN collocations (15 masculine, 8 feminine and one foreign name). Only one example occurs in pseudo-direct address; the remaining 23 are used in third-person references, as in (21a).

53 Last names belonging to the Ukrainian second declension, which is predominantly masculine and neuter, do not decline if they have a female referent.
(21a) Якогось українського життя в післявоєнні роки не було, не було з ким організувати, — продовжує свої спогади пані Віра Вибаč.(D621)

‘There was no type of Ukrainian life in after war years, there was no one to organize it with,—continues her memories Ms. Vira Vybač.’

Both Ukrainian and foreign last names are attested in the reference function; the name used in pseudo-direct address happens to be foreign. One of the masculine examples collocates with an adjective:

(21b) Шановний пане Білл Клінтон, пане президент великої держави, яку поважають у всьому світі, сподіваюся, що колись цей лист потрапить до Ваших рук особисто. (D52a)

‘Respected Mr. Bill Clinton, Mr. President of the great state which is respected around the world, I hope that sometime this email gets to your hands personally.’

Five examples (4 masculine and 1 feminine) have an initial instead of the first name пан А. Байраківський ‘Mr. [NOM.SG] A. Bajkarivs’kyj [M.NOM.SG]’ (D4d). All these examples are used in reference; cf. see the commentary on example (15), above.

Table 2.3 (P+FN+LN) provides the total number of examples found in Den’ for P+FN+LN collocations. The examples are divided in three columns—‘masculine names’, e.g., пана Михайла Зубаря ‘Mr. [ACC.SG] Myxajlo [ACC] Zubar’ [ACC]’ (D3c); ‘feminine names’, e.g., пані Наталії Горбаневської (D56s) ‘Ms. Nataliji [GEN] Gorbanevs’ka [GEN]’; and ‘foreign names’, e.g., пані Йоланти Квасневської ‘Ms. Jolanta [DAT] Kwaśniewska [F.DAT.SG]’ (D22n). The examples are also divided between address collocations and reference collocations. Address collocations include only examples
where only P is in the vocative because there are no examples which have P and FN and/or LN in the vocative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Foreign names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only P in VOC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: P + First Name + Last Name

No examples of collocations of pan with first names and patronymics (P+FN+PN) are found in the researched articles. This is perhaps unsurprising, because P+FN and FN+PN index approximately the same level of distance and deference in Ukrainian. Both types of addresses indicate respect towards the addressee (negative politeness). Additionally, the prohibition of the “bourgeois” honorific address пан during the Soviet period (see Section 2.2) led to the overwhelming dominance of FN+PN, the construction preferred to Russian), especially in the media. While, as noted above, the honorific address P has become widespread in the post-Soviet Ukrainian media, e.g., in the newspaper День, collocations of FN+PN are still common and are attested in my data (see Sections 2.5., 2.6. and also chapter 5).

In sum, the most common collocations overall are P+LN (92 examples); the next most frequent collocations are P+FN (37 examples); the least common in this category are P+FN+LN (24 examples). In direct or pseudo-direct address function, P+LN (22 examples) is used more frequently than P+FN (15). There is only one example of a
P+FN+LN collocation in direct or pseudo-direct address among the researched articles form День. In reference function, the most frequent collocations are P+LN (70), then P+FN+LN (23) and P+FN (22).

2.4.4. Collocations of Pan and Titles (P+T)

I will now look at collocations of пан with titles only (P+T). There are 43 examples of these collocations (40 masculine and 3 feminine) in the data from День. Of these, 26 examples are in direct or pseudo-direct address, and 17 are used in reference. One of the examples of address collocations includes third-person plural agreement. The address term P is used quasi-pronominally (22)

(22) Як би пан директор охарактеризував пересічного українського студента, якого він знає? (D50e)

‘How would Mr.[NOM] Director[NOM] described[3SG] the average Ukrainian student, whom he knows?’

There are also five examples of P+T collocations which include adjectives (4 in direct address and 1 in reference). The adjectives can modify either the P or the T portion.

(23) Я переконаний, що за підтримки більшості населення України Вам, шановний пане Президенте, вдасться це зробити. (D49b)

‘I am sure, that due to the support of the majority of the population of Ukraine, You, respected Mr. President, will be able to do this.’

(24) Пане народний депутат, праворуч від вас розміщено блямбочку, яка на будь-якому ТБ-каналі України вважається комерційною рекламою. (D13b)
‘Mr. National representative, on your right side there is a sign, which is considered to be a commercial advertisement on any type of TV channel of Ukraine.’

Of the four examples of P+T collocations with adjectives in direct/pseudo-direct address, only the one in (24) has an adjective describing the title, and it is also the one example where P is in the vocative and the T is in the nominative case. The remaining three collocations have both P and T in the vocative. Although in this specific example title does not appear in the vocative, this it does not imply that it would be impossible. For example, the following examples were found in Львівська Газета:

(25) Пане міський голово! (LH4e)

‘Mr. (City’s Head) Mayor of the city!’

Example (25) shows that both P and T can be in the vocative even if there is an adjective between P and T.

Table 2.4 (P+T) provides the total number of examples found in День for P+T collocations. The examples are divided in two columns: ‘masculine’, e.g., пан американський президент ‘Mr. [NOM.SG] American [M.NOM.SG] president [NOM.SG]’ (D6d); and ‘feminine’, e.g., пані президент ‘Madam President [NOM.SG]’ (D72c). The examples are also divided into address collocations, e.g., Пане амбасадоре ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] ambassador [VOC]’ (D39c); and reference collocations, e.g., пан студент ‘Mr. [NOM.SG] student [NOM.SG]’ (D11b). Address collocations include examples where both P and T are in the nominative, e.g., пан директор ‘Mr. [NOM.SG] Director [NOM.SG]’
(D50e); where P in the vocative, but T is in nominative, e.g., Пане посол ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] ambassador [NOM.SG]’ (D34c), пане прем’єр-міністр ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Prime Minister [NOM.SG] (D38a); and where P and T are both in the vocative, e.g., Пане міністре ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Minister [VOC]’ (D48b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+T in NOM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only P in VOC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0^[54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + T in VOC</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.4: P + Titles

2.4.5. Collocations of Pan, Titles and Last Names (P+T+LN)

In this section, I will look at collocations of P+T+LN, but first it is necessary to explain the fact that there are no collocations of пан with titles plus first names in my database. In Ukrainian, traditionally professional titles are mostly followed either by last names or by first names and patronymics. The majority of the titles used in the newspaper День newspaper are, in fact, professional titles. On the other hand, while пан is a title, as a pure honorific it is semantically general. In some ways, then, it is more similar to kinship terms like mother, sister, father, etc., than to professional titles. Consequently, it

^[54] Since feminine P has the same form in the vocative and nominative case, it is hard to differentiate whether Pani is in the vocative or in nominative case. In this particular instance there are no examples of Pani+T, where Title in address is in nominative case.
can collocate with first names alone, whereas professional titles like ‘president’, ‘ambassador’, and ‘professor’ cannot.

There are only six collocations of the P+T+LN type in my data (5 masculine and 1 feminine). All but one are used in reference to a third person. In the one example of direct address, both P and T are in the vocative, but the LN is in the nominative case:

(26)  "Я готовий, щоб мені наділи ваші кайдани, пане Президенте Ющенко, я готовий сьогодні сидіти у в'язниці за те, що я відмовляюся виконувати ваш злочинний антиконституційний указ, але не зачіпайте інших депутатів!" (D59b).

“I am ready to put your shackles me, Mr. [M.VOC] Presydent[M.VOC] Yuščenko[M.NOM], today I am ready to sit in jail because I refuse to carry out your maleficent unconstitutional decree but do not affect other representatives!”

A similar example is found in Львівська Газета where P and T are in the vocative, while the last name appears in the nominative case.

(27)  пане генеральний прокуроре Васильєв (LH10b)


Regarding the vocative it is important to note that there are no examples of three words collocations with P where only P is in the vocative and other collocates are in nominative case. Likewise there are no examples in which all three collocates P, T and LN are in the vocative. Of course, the fact that there are no such examples in the articles of День does not mean that such examples are impossible.

Collocations with adjectives are found among the examples used in reference:
(28) «русинський» лідер пан Жупан (D53c)
‘Rusyn (adj.) leader (T) Mr. (P) Župan (LN)’;

(29) пана таємного радника фон Гете (D29d)
‘Mr.(P) secrete (adj.) adviser (T) Fon Gete (LN)’.

From a syntactic perspective, there is no fixed position for P in regards to T. It can either precede (28) or to follow T (29) in collocations. However, there is a tendency for P and T to precede LN in the collocations.

Table 2.5 (P+T+LN) provides the examples found in День for P+T+LN collocations. As in the previous tables, the examples are divided into three columns ‘masculine names,’ ‘feminine names’ and ‘foreign names.’ These examples are also divided between address collocations and reference collocations. There are five collocations which are used in reference, e.g., Уповноваженої із прав людини пані Карпаčової ‘Commissioner [F.DAT.SG] for Human Rights Ms. [DAT.SG] Karpačova [DAT]’ (D53a). The address collocation section includes one example where only P and T are in the vocative and LN is in the nominative case used in pseudo-direct address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Foreign names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total #</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + T in VOC, LN in NOM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: P + Titles + Last Names
2.4.6. Collocations Pan, Titles, First Names and Last Names (P+T+FN+LN)

In this section, I will look at collocations of P+T+FN+LN. There are 8 examples of this type of collocations. All the examples are masculine and are used in reference to a third person. Seven follow a pattern in which T takes first position in the collocation and P second:

(30) Заступник пан Анджей Товпик (D221)


(31) У студії — ведучий разом з одним із членів Національної ради і генеральним директором ТРК «Ера», а ще якось раптово запрошенним заступником голови Державної адміністрації м. Києва паном Володимиром Яловим (D13g)

‘In the studio is the host with one of the members of the National Council and the CEO of the Television Broadcasting Company “Era”, and, somehow suddenly invited, the assistant [INST.SG] to the head of the State Administration of the city of Kiev, Mr. [INST.SG] Volodymyr [INST] Jalovyj [M.INST.SG].’

There is only one example which shows the opposite order with P before the T.

(32) паном Президентом України Леонідом Кучмою (D37j)

‘Mr. (P) President (T) of Ukraine Leonid Kučma’

---

55 The same order of P + T + LN is used in пане Президенте Ющенко (D59b) ‘Mr. President Juščenko’
Examples (30), (31) and (32) demonstrate similar variation to P+T+LN collocations in regards to the position of P and T. However it appears that T usually precedes P in collocations with names (LN and/or FN).

Another example shows that the honorific address пан can be abbreviated:

(33) голова прес-центру штабу Кучми п. Ярослав Фейло (D37m)


The fact that the address term P can be shortened to its first letter and still is expected to be recognized by the readers as пан is evidence that P has already been a commonly used form of address. Moreover, this example indicates that readers recognize the fact that the word пан is frequently used in similar collocations consisting of professional titles and first and/or last names. When a collocation has FN or/and LN, it may be expected to have the honorific address P preceding FN + LN.

Table 2.6 (P+T+FN+LN) provides the total of eight examples found in День for P+T+FN+LN collocations. As noted above, there are no examples of this type in address function in my data; nor are there are feminine collocations in my data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Foreign names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6: P + Titles + First Names + Last Names

2.5. Pan in Reference to the Third Person

The collocations with P in reference to the third person are similar to the address collocations discussed above in many ways. For example, P can collocate with T, LN and FN. The use of P with T is very similar in address and reference, although I have noted a difference in use when P is collocated with LN and FN: P can collocate either with FN or with LN in address, but not with both. All the collocations which included both FN and LN were used in reference. In the articles researched, people can be addressed by FN+PN and FN e.g. Борисе Івановичу ‘Borys [voc] Ivanovyč [voc]’ (D21p), Богдане ‘Bohdan [voc]’ (D41f); and sometimes by LN in combination with T or/and P, e.g. пане [voc.sg] Президенте [voc] Ющенко [nom] ‘Mr. President Juščenko’ (D59b). FN and LN are not found together in address. On the other hand, it is not uncommon to have both FN and LN in reference to the third-person e.g. пан Джеймс Аппатурай (D9d) ‘Mr. [nom.sg] James [nom] Appathurai [nom]’.

Not surprisingly, one often finds the most complete description of a person discussed in an article either at the very beginning of the article or the first time the person is mentioned. This type of description often includes FN+LN completed with a T.
and sometimes with P, e.g., а ще якось раптово запрошеним заступником голови Державної адміністрації м. Києва паном Володимиром Яловим. (D13g) ‘and, somehow suddenly invited, the assistant to the head of the State Administration of the city of Kiev, Mr. Volodymyr Jalovyj’ (see (31), above)

Consequently it becomes apparent that more collocates are possible in reference to the third person than in address, because of the possibility of including full titles as well as full names. After the first full mention, subsequent address collocations often consist of FN, FN + PN, P, T, P + FN, P + LN and P + T, e.g. Шановна пані Наталю! (D66q) ‘Respected [F.NOM.SG] Ms. Natalja [VOC.SG]!’ Шановна Ларисо! (D66aa) ‘Dear [F.NOM.SG] Larysa [VOC]!’ The only exception to this pattern is example (34), where both FN and LN collocate with P in address, not in reference.

(34) Шановний пане Білл Клінт (D52a).


Here the collocation is used in pseudo-address. It is the opening sentence of article D52 and gives readers an introduction to the addressee, who was not mentioned in the title. Example (34) thus functions like an initial reference to a third person, for which it is common to collocate FN + LN.

In reference collocations, one can also find abbreviations for пан, titles, first names and/or patronymics of referees, e.g. п. Марії ‘Ms. Marija [DAT]’ (пані is abbreviated) (D64n), о. Августин ‘father Avhustyn [NOM]’ (religious title ‘father’ отець is abbreviated) (D67i), пан А. Байраківський ‘Mr. [NOM.SG] A. Bajrakivs’kyj [NOM.SG]’
(with the FN is abbreviated) (D4d). Such abbreviations are usually not pronounced as such in speech, which is why they are not found in address collocations. In writing, on the other hand, abbreviations are common, often for FN and sometimes for PN, when they are followed by the last name. Unlike the tradition of shortening names, the T and P can be abbreviated only if readers are familiar with the T and P.

2.6. Summary of Collocations with Pan

There are 237 different collocations with П (пан, пані, and панове) in the researched articles from Kiev’s newspaper День. The vast majority of П collocations are masculine (187), but there are also 44 feminine, 5 plural forms of P among those collocations and one collocation which includes П (мас.) and П (фер.),

(35) Вважаю, немає жодного поважного пана чи пані, які б не знали в обличчя пана професора. (D4i)

‘I think there is no venerable Mr. or Ms., who did not know in person, Mr. Professor.

Most of the collocations are used in reference (165); 72 examples are used in direct or pseudo-direct address. The address term П primarily collocates with FN and/or LN. The most common collocations are П+LN (92 examples), П+Т (43), П+FN (37), and П+FN+LN (24). Taken in the aggregate, then, collocations with names are much more frequent than collocations of П+Т in my material.

It is striking that П does not collocate with first names and patronymics in my data. I would even suggest that it is impossible to have a collocation of *П+FN+ПN,
because the pragmatic meaning of FN+PN as a social index is virtually equivalent to that of пан. Both strategies are used to indicate respect and distance to an acquaintance. Evidently, then, it would be redundant or “hyper-formal” to use both P and PN.

There were also no examples of P+T+FN type of collocations in the articles from День. This is not surprising, because the majority of the titles, apart from P itself, were professional ones, which would be expected to collocate with LN due to the socially established norms of professional interactions in Ukrainian. The last name would be an important component (the established norm) in collocations with T; hence FN can be a part of P+T collocations, but only along with a LN. Otherwise, FN can collocate either with P or with T, but then only if the title is a kinship term, e.g., тетка Олена ‘aunt Olena’, or else similar in function to a kinship term, e.g., ‘sister’ as the title of a nun, e.g., сестра Олена ‘sister Olena.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>P + FN</th>
<th>P + FN + PN</th>
<th>P + LN</th>
<th>P + FN + LN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P + T</td>
<td>P + T + FN</td>
<td>P + T + FN + PN</td>
<td>P + T + LN</td>
<td>P + T + FN + LN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.7: Summary of the Collocations with Address Term P

---

56 The table below excludes example (35)
Finally, it is important to note that numerous nominal collocations include adjectives. The adjectives that are attested in reference collocations vary, but the adjectives in address collocations tend to be predominantly honorific. The most common adjective in address is Щановний ‘Respected/Dear’ which is frequent in salutation phrases, which ordinarily are singled out by means of the exclamation point. The given adjective appears in 12 out of the 15 examples. There are also two instances of the semantically similar (more formal) adjectives Глибокошановна ‘Deeply respected’ and Вельмишановний ‘Very respected.’ The only non-honorific adjective to appear in an address collocation in my data was народний ‘national’, but this was part of a fixed title (народний депутат ‘national deputy’).
3.1. Syntactic Status of the Vocative

In the Slavic languages and in Ukrainian in particular, the *vocative* (from Latin *vocare* ‘to call’) is an appellative form derived from a noun. Within the sentence, the vocative functions as an independent noun phrase, syntactically disconnected from the other words in the predication. This can be seen from the fact that the vocative is not governed by (an argument of) the head of the sentence, the verb. The separate status of the vocative is typically signaled by intonation and pauses setting it out from the rest of the sentence; graphically, this is indicated by a comma. Alternatively, the vocative can form a sentence of its own; graphically, this is frequently indicated by an exclamation point.

There has been much debate among Slavic linguists about the position of the vocative in the system of the nominal declension. Some treat the vocative as a case, while others see it as a denominal *form* separate from the grammatical cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, and locative).

The disagreement lies largely in how *case* is defined. Linguists who view the vocative as a case argue that it is part of a noun paradigm like the other (grammatical)
cases. Moreover, it has a definable pragmatic meaning (to appeal to the listener, to draw attention, and to establish lines of communication between the speaker and the listener).

Linguists who deny that the vocative is a case emphasize its syntactic disconnection with the other words in a sentence; the vocative is “least like a ‘case’ because the case usually reflects the relationship between words or phrases in a sentence” (Pugh 2012)\textsuperscript{58}. A second problem lies in the fact that the vocative endings occur in only a restricted subset of nouns. Thus neuter and plural nouns generally do not have vocative endings distinct from the nominative. In addition, adjectives and possessives modifying nouns in the vocative cannot show agreement; they invariably in the nominative case, as in the Ukrainian example in (1).

(1) \begin{small}Шановний пане Романе! (Зi)\end{small}

‘Respected [M.VOC.SG] Mr. [VOC.SG] Roman [VOC]!’

An additional problem is that, in Ukrainian and some of the other Slavic languages, the nominative case can be used in address instead of the vocative for both feminine and masculine nouns (Ivčenko 1960: 260). Likewise, in the Slavic languages that lost the vocative, its function was taken over by the nominative case. I am not claiming that this is the ultimate reason for the loss of the morphological vocative, but it points to a possible functional overlap between the vocative and the nominative (addressing and naming respectively).

\textsuperscript{58} The book is in the process of publishing therefore page number is unavailable.
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Conversely, nouns in the vocative can sporadically be used as the subjects of sentences in Ukrainian folklore, according to Shevelov: ᪇и плаче, плаче молодий козаче. ‘Oh, the young Cossack cries and cries’ (козак [NOM.SG] ~ козаче [VOC]; cited in Shevelov 1963: 48). According to Shevelov, historically the subject in the vocative “was supposed to: 1) to express the sympathy of the author with the character or hero, 2) to make it more concrete since normally the vocative form is used to one who is present and who could be seen and heard, 3) to bring the hero or the character closer to the listeners.”

In the following discussion, I will use the term vocative only for forms morphologically distinct from the nominative. To avoid confusion, I will refer to what is sometimes called “vocative meaning” as address function, as this can be conveyed by nominatives as well as vocatives (see below).

3.2. Functions of the Vocative Forms

Pragmatically, the vocative phrase or sentence is directed towards the recipient of the speech act (the hearer or addressee). The main function of the vocative is phatic—to establish and maintain a channel of communication between the speaker and the hearer, i.e., to get or hold the hearer’s attention; also possibly to incorporate the addressee in the conversation or to single out one participant in an exchange with multiple speakers.

The vocative is typically used in familiar discourse, often “in conjunction with intensifying, apppellative particles e.g., the particle oї in Ukrainian” (Stankiewicz 1986:

---

59 For example, according to Volodin (1995: 75), “There are no languages without the vocative, just as there are no languages without imperatives. It is a different matter that, in some languages, the vocative is morphologically expressed and in the others not. This is a matter of form. Hence the category of the vocative stands out because of its meaning, its semantics.”
The intensifying function of such words points to the fact that the vocative can have emotive as well as phatic functions.

In ordinary communication, the recipient is physically present during the speech act; thus, according to Crystal (2004:413), “The vocative in Slavic languages is used when the noun phrase is used in the function of direct address.” However, it can also be used in delayed address, e.g., in written or recorded communication or in reported speech that will hypothetically be uttered in the future. Moreover, it is possible to use the vocative in pseudo-direct address when the conversation is imaginary (even if the recipient is a real entity), as in example (2):

(2) Ой, вербо, вербо, де ти зросла? (Ivčenko 1960: 266).

‘Oh, willow [VOC.SG], willow [VOC.SG], where did you grow?’

3.3. Morphology of the Vocative

3.3.1. Morphology of the Vocative in Ukrainian

In Ukrainian, the vocative is formed from nouns only, and generally only from singulars; the sole plural is, as noted in Chapter 2 панове ‘(ladies and) gentleman’

---

60 Cf. the Bulgarian vocative particles móre (masc.), mari (fem.), bre, le, be…(Stankiewicz 1986: 315) See also Joseph 1997
61 For an overview of the vocative in Ukrainian, see Press and Pugh 1994: 55–56.
(nominative plural *pany*).\(^{62}\) As noted above, there are no distinct vocative endings for neuter nouns; in the rare cases when neuters are used in address function, the nominative endings (*-o* for hard stems and *-e* for soft stems) are used.

3.3.1.1. *Masculine o-/jo-stems with Stems in Consonants Other than -r and Velars*\(^{63}\)

For hard-stem masculines (the historic *o*-stem declension), the basic ending is *-e*:


For most soft-stem masculines (the historic *jo*-stem declension), the ending *-u* is used:


For historical reasons, stems in *-c* (soft), which reflect a prehistoric palatalization of velars, undergo mutation before the ending *-e* (see Press and Pugh 1994: 56): *хлопець* [NOM] ~ *хлопче*! [VOC] ‘boy, fellow.’ In Ukrainian, the vocative is only formed from singular nouns; the sole exception is *панове* ‘gentlemen’\(^ {65}\).

3.3.1.2. *Masculine Nouns with Stems in Velars*

For masculine nouns with stems in velars, there is extensive variation between the endings *-e* and *-u*, which has not been adequately addressed in scholarly studies. According to Ivčenko (1960: 274), the normative ending is *-e*, which causes the stem-

---

\(^{62}\) The term can refer either to a group of men or to a group consisting of at least one male and one female. The vocative form is distinct from the nominative plural *pany*. It appears that the vocative ending comes from the nominative plural of *u*-stems in Late Proto-Slavic (Comrie and Corbett 2006: 87).

\(^{63}\) Masculine nouns ending in a consonant belong to the II declantion in Ukrainian (Ivčenko 1960: 264)

\(^{64}\) The *-r* in this name is an underlying soft consonant; it undergoes hardening when no ending follows.

\(^{65}\) It can also be used for ‘Ladies and Gentlemen’
final -k, -x, -h to undergo mutation to -č, -š, -ž, respectively: чоловік ~ чоловіче!

‘husband’. While this type still exists, there has been a strong tendency to implement stem-leveling by extending the ending -u from the soft masculines. Thus, according to Stankiewicz (1986: 318), -u is in free variation with or even prevails over -e in masculine velar stems, e.g. синко [NOM] ~ синку [VOC] ‘son’, беріг [NOM] ~ берегу [VOC] ‘river bank.’ My data include several cases of velar stems with vocatives in -u, e.g. Синку ‘son’ (D76g) However, there does not seem to be a preference for -u for stems in –h: Олеже ‘Oleh’ (D98a).

Slavutyč (1987: 102) claims that the avoidance of mutation in the vocative is characteristic for inanimate rather than animate nouns: словник [NOM] ~ словнику [VOC] ‘dictionary’. However, this is not supported by actual usage; the vocative in -u is well attested for animates, as exemplified by (3a–b).

(3a) Пане раднику

‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Counselor [VOC.SG]’ (LH5c)

(3b) Шановний пане Гулику

‘Dear [M.NOM.SG] Mr. [VOC.SG] Hulyk [VOC].’ (LH12a)

In my database, (3b) is the only example of a surname with stem-final k taking the vocative ending -u. However, the combination can be found in other sources, e.g., the popular newspaper Pravda (4):

‘Help him yourself, “Mr. Kravčuk’…”

Stankiewicz (1986: 321) gives examples of animate nouns with the suffix –ник that can take either -e or -u in the vocative, e.g., будівник [NOM] ~ будівниче / будівнику [VOC] ‘builder’; робітник [NOM] ~ будівниче / робітнику [VOC] ‘worker.’ According to Stankiewicz (ibid.), the variation is connected with stress: “…the variants with the ending –e generalize the penultimate (stem final) stress, and the variants with the ending –y the final stress.” This observation, if valid, applies chiefly to nouns with the -nik suffix. It does not explain, for example, the last name Гулик ‘Hulyk’ in (D2b), which has fixed stress on the initial syllable but nevertheless takes the vocative ending -u.67

3.3.1.3. Masculine Nouns with Stems in -r

Stems in -r exhibit complications, due to the hardening of Old East Slavic r’ in the history of Ukrainian. In particular, the final -r’ underwent hardening in the nominative singular of jo-stem and consonant stem nouns, e.g., Old East Slavic Игорь, Ukrainian Ігор ‘Ihor’; Old East Slavic гробарь, Ukrainian гробар ‘gravedigger.’ For masculine nouns of this type, the stem consonant is soft when followed by a vocalic

---

67 There is one example of the -u/-e variation in the vocative ending after –š in article LH9 (товаришу ~ товаришем’): товаришу Янукович (LH9d) and Товариш Янукович! (LH9g) ‘Comrade[VOC] Janukovyč![NOM]’

3.3.1.4. Masculine Nouns with Nominative Singular in -o

There is variation with hard-stem masculine nouns with -o in the nominative singular. For Михайло [NOM] ‘Myxajlo’, the vocative can be Михайлe! but Михайло! is also common. When the final -o is stressed in the nominative, the stress shifts to the stem in the vocative (Press and Pugh 1994: 55): Петро [NOM] ~ Петре! [VOC], Павло [NOM] ~ Павле! [VOC] (again, just Петр̄о! is perfectly acceptable).

(5) пане Петре (D44k)

‘Mr. Petro [VOC]’

Remarkably, the vocative ending -e for the masculine names in -o is not as common as the nominative ending. This may be due to several factors. First, though lexically masculine, these nouns are viewed as morphologically neuters; as noted above, neuter nouns do not have distinct vocative in Ukrainian. Second, the nominative ending – o resembles a well-established vocative form — that of the feminine hard-stems, e.g. Olena [NOM] ~ Oleno [VOC] and Larysa [NOM] ~ Laryso [VOC]. Indeed, some Ukrainian

---

68 This is valid for the dialects that underlie standard Ukrainian, in which r’ was preserved word-medially, as in Russian: ряд ‘row,’ моря ‘seas’. In northern and southwestern Ukrainian dialects, r’ underwent hardening in all positions, e.g., зора ‘dawn,’ писар ‘clerk’. The same change occurred in Belarusian: рад ‘row’, мора ‘seas’. On the other hand, r’ was preserved in southeastern Ukrainian, e.g. зоря, писарь. (Ivčenko 1960: 22, 27–28, 32).

69 This type of masculine nouns also belong to II declention in Ukrainian (ibid.: 264)

70 Feminine and masculine nouns ending in –а/-ja belong to the I declantion in Ukrainian (ibid.)
names in –o, e.g. Іванко, are actually former vocatives according to Stankiewicz (1986). Therefore it is not surprising that masculine names in –o do not take the expected ending –e in the vocative.

The suffix -k-o is common in diminutives of names and in surnames, e.g., Андрійко [NOM] ~ Андрійку! [VOC] ‘Andriko’; Пане Павленко (D45j) ‘Mr. [VOC] Pavlenko[NOM]. Press and Pugh (1994) single out names in -k-o as a separate category of morphologically neuter nouns which have the vocative endings, though syntactically they show masculine agreement. However, the claim that -k-o nouns are morphologically neuter is challenged by the fact that, unlike ordinary neuters, they can take a vocative ending -u. In my data, surnames in -k-o show variation between vocative and nominative forms in the address function: Пане Удовенку (D77a) ‘Mr.[VOC] Udovenko[VOC]’, пане Бондаренку (D78l) ‘Mr.[VOC] Bondarenko[VOC]’, but Пане Павленко (see above), пане Президенте Іошенко (D59b) ‘Mr.[VOC] president [VOC] Juščenko [NOM]’.

3.3.1.5. Variation in Names Derived from Possessives

Ukrainian surnames in -ov- are historically derived from patronymic possessive adjectives. According to Slavutyc (1987: 153), place names derived from possessive adjectives in -ov-, e.g., Київ ‘Kyjiv’ (from a first name Киї ‘Kyj’) can take the vocative ending –e: Київ [NOM], Києв [VOC]. One might expect surnames like Дмитрієв, which involve the same morpheme, to behave in the same way. Nevertheless, in my corpus, the given surname has the vocative ending -u rather than expected -e: пане Дмитрієву (D46j) ‘Mr. [VOC] Dmytrijev [VOC]’. 69
3.3.1.6. A-/ja-stem Nouns

For a-stem nouns, whether feminine or masculine, the vocative ending is -о:
(masculine). In ja-stem feminine nouns, the original vocative ending is -е, e.g., земля
[NOM] ~ земле! [VOC] ‘earth’, Мария [NOM] ~ Маріє! [VOC] ‘Marija’. However, there is
a tendency to replace this with -у, extended from the soft-stem masculines: Галина [NOM]

3.3.1.7. Пані

The noun пані, which was originally a ja-stem, has become indeclinable in
Ukrainian; hence the same form is used for the address function and for all the
grammatical cases.

3.3.1.8. Morphological Peculiarities of Masculine and Feminine Last Names

There are certain differences in the use of the vocative with male and female
addresses in Ukrainian. Most of the masculine nouns that are used in address are
delinable and grammatically capable of having the vocative ending. These nouns include
address term пан; numerous titles such as ‘president’ and ‘minister’; first names,

---

71 Ukrainian I declension nouns (ibid.)
72 The original i-stem vocative ending -i is archaic except for Господь [NOM] ~ Господи [VOC] ‘Lord!’
    (used in addressing God and presumably a fossilized form.)
patronymics, and, most importantly, last names. As it was mentioned above masculine names, including last names in -о can have the vocative endings, e.g. пане Бондаренку (D78l) ‘Mr.[voc] Bondarenko [voc].’ Indeed in recent two decades, there has been noticeable change regarding the use of the vocative for masculine last names. Not only masculine last names in –о, but also masculine last names ending in –а, (пане Глобо (D76c) ‘Mr.[voc] Globa [voc]’) and last names ending in a consonant (пане Дмитрієву (D46j) ‘Mr.[voc] Dmytriev [voc]’) can take the vocative endings. Additionally foreign origin declinable masculine last names also show ability to take the vocative (Пане Міксере (D51b) ‘Mr [voc] Mikser [voc]’)

Traditional Ukrainian last names ending in -ко, e.g., Ющенко, or -чук, e.g., Кравчук, decline only when they refer to a male addressee but remain indeclinable as feminine last names. Similarly, masculine last names ending in a soft consonant (Щоголь) and masculine last names in –а (Леванда) are declinable solely if they refer to a male, but indeclinable if they refer to females. Ukrainian masculine last names can have both the vocative and the nominative endings in address collocations, as illustrated in (6):

(6)  Так, «День»-то, пане Дмитрієву, не відмовить, а ось могли б Ви назвати хоча б одну впливову російську газету (опозиційні листки не рахуються), яка б не відмовила українським історикам у публікації їхніх міркувань і висновків?(D46j)

‘Yes, Day, Mr. Dmytriev, will not deny, but can you name at least one influential Russian newspaper (opposition papers are not considered), which would not deny Ukrainian historians [the opportunity] to publish their arguments and conclusions?’
‘Speaking of Western civilization and the involvement with it by Western Ukrainians—the only thing with which you, Mr. Ščohol’, disagree with Mr. Karas’ov, and what is prompting your irony…’

Traditionally, Russian and Polish last names are common among Ukrainians. Russian origin last names in –ов (Іванов) and -ін (Путін) as well as Polish and Ukrainian last names in –ський (Рильський) and -цький (Щербицький) are declinable as both masculine and feminines. As adjectives, these last names have gender-differentiating endings; for example, in the nominative case the masculine last names end in –ов, -ін, –ський, -цький, and the feminine forms end in –а: Іванова, Путіна, Рильська, Щербицька, respectively.

From the above examples, one can see that there are certain constraints in relation to the usage of the vocative endings for certain patterns of feminine last names in Ukrainian. Additionally, there is a morphological constraint on the use of the vocative ending for the feminine address term пані, which is indeclinable. At the same time, other nouns denoting females can have the vocative ending. Among these nouns are various titles, Ukrainian first names ending in vowels –а, -я (Ґалина, Наталя), patronyms, and certain last names, as mentioned above. These nouns can collocate, in declined forms, with indeclinable пані. That is, the inability of пані to decline does not extend to the nouns which collocate with it.
(8)  Шановна пані редакторе! (D33с)

‘Respected [F.NOM.SG] Madam Editor! [VOC]’

(9)  Шановна пані Наталю! (D66q)


Hypothetically, some feminine last names should be able to have the vocative endings in address, but among the researched articles there is only one context in which this might be possible (10):

(10)  Шановна пані Івшина! (66ас)

‘Respected [F.NOM.SG] Ms. Ивšyna [F.NOM.SG]’

This collocation consists of an adjective, address term P and declinable last name Івшина. Nevertheless, the last name has the nominative ending, not the vocative.

Considering that the vocative endings for masculine last names are inconsistent and not obligatory, it may be possible that the vocative endings for masculine last names are an innovation in the language. It is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding feminine last names due to the lack of data. However, example (10) shows that the nominative ending can be used for the feminine last names in address collocations.
3.3.1.9. *Foreign Names and the Use of the Vocative*

Traditional Ukrainian masculine names have no morphological constraints that prevent the use of the vocative endings. On the other hand, some masculine names of foreign origin cannot form the vocative because they do not fit morphologically in to the paradigm of the masculine declension. These names remain mostly indeclinable, as seen in (11a)–(11b) where *Xo* and *Сун* are indeclinable, but *Чьол* declinable,

(11a) Корейський професор пан *Хо* Сун *Чьол*, опублікував мемуари про своє перебування в Україні, зі знаковою назвою «Україна — моя любов» (D19a)

‘Korean professor Mr. Hur Seung-chul [ NOM] published a memoir about his stay in Ukraine, with the significant title “Ukraine - my love”’

(11b) Проте щира любов до України і бажання вивчати нашу мову, культуру та традиції, допомагали *Хо* Сун *Чьолу* скоріше адаптуватися до країни і до посади. (D19)

‘However, sincere love for Ukraine and the desire to learn our language, culture and traditions helped Hur Seung-chul [DAT] to adapt to the country and to the position faster.’

In these examples, the surname *Xo* (English transliteration *Hur*) will always be indeclinable because its stem ends in a vowel, but the first name *Сун* *Чьол* (English transliteration *Seung-chul*) can decline because its stem ends in a consonant. Other foreign first name which fit into the paradigm of Ukrainian declensions usually decline in accordance to the traditional paradigms.
(12) Пане Майкле, як, на вашу думку, має діяти Україна, щоб досягти успіху на переговорах з ЄС, як щодо угоди про поглиблену зону вільної торгівлі та нової поглибленої угоди? (D54b)

‘Mr. [voc] Michael [voc], how do you think Ukraine should act in order to achieve success in the negotiations with the EU, say, about agreement on enhanced free trade and the new enhanced agreement?.

This example shows that the English first name Майкле ‘Michael’ can form a vocative ending similar to Ukrainian names, e.g. Пане Тарасе (D84a) ‘Mr. [voc] Taras [voc].

3.3.2. Vocative in the South Slavic Languages

All of the South Slavic languages except Slovenian preserve the vocative endings. Vocative endings are attested for all the nominal declension types, and also for adjectives in Old Church Slavonic, Serbian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian, according to Greenberg, the vocative is mostly limited to masculine and feminine singular nouns, often “animate substantives, such as kinship terms and proper names.” In Serbian, a few original collectives that have been reanalyzed as plurals can have distinct vocative plural forms: (dete [NOM.SG] ‘child’) deca [NOM.PL] ~ deco [VOC.PL] ‘children’, (gospodine [NOM.SG] ‘sir’) gospoda [NOM.PL] ~ gospodo [VOC.PL] ‘gentlemen” (Greenberg 1996:18). Unlike masculine and feminine nouns, which possess special endings, certain neuter nouns distinguish between nominative and the vocative by having different intonation, e.g., Serbian дете [NOM.SG] and дете [VOC.SG] Here, in the nominative, the root vowel has

73 Similarly, Ukrainian has a plural vocative for the collective noun panove ‘ladies and gentlemen’ (see Section 2.4.)
rising intonation, but in the vocative it has falling intonation. In Macedonian, the difference in the neuter noun is expressed by the length of the final vowel, e.g. *dete* (NOM.SG) vs. *detě* (VOC.SG) (Vidoeski 1950:235)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>OCS</th>
<th>BCS(^{74})</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ď-stems</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e OR –u</td>
<td>-e AND/OR -u</td>
<td>-e OR -e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŭ-stems</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jŏ-stems</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>-o OR -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ā-stems</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jā-stems</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĩ-stems</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Vocative Endings in the South Slavic Languages\(^{76}\)

The unmarked vocative ending \(–e\), which originally was used after hard consonants for masculine hard stem nouns (ď-stems) and palatal consonants resulting from jotations (jā-stems), is still alive, especially in Serbian, but it is gradually retreating due to the expansion of the endings \(-u\) and \(-o\).\(^{77}\) According to Greenberg (1996: 18-20) the ending \(-u\) ending is marked for masculine nouns in Serbian and Macedonian but not always for Bulgarian, e.g.: Serbian *muž* [NOM] ~ *mužu* [VOC] ‘man’, *konj* [NOM] ~ *konju* [VOC.SG] ‘horse’ and Macedonian *maž* [NOM] ~ *mažu* [VOC], *konj* [NOM] ~*konju* [VOC] versus Bulgarian *măž* [NOM] ~ *măžo* [VOC], *kon* [NOM] ~ *konju /kon’o*[VOC]. In Bulgarian,\(^{78}\)

\(^{74}\)BCS stays for Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian, although in in Greenberg it is Serbian.

\(^{75}\)According to Greenberg i-stems vocative \(-i\) is lost in Modern Slavic languages (except gospodi! ‘God!’) for feminine III declension stems the vocative is replaced by the nominative.

\(^{76}\)Copied from Greenberg (1996: 19).

\(^{77}\)Supposedly similar expansion of the \(-e\) ending for the vocatives is noted in West Slavic Language (Greenberg 1996:19)
and to some extent also Macedonian, the originally a-stem ending -o has gradually spread to other declensions: Bulgarian momūk, siromax [NOM] ~ momko ‘young man’, siromaxo [VOC] ‘poor one’; Macedonian momok, siromav [NOM] ~ momoku, siromavu [VOC], and čovek [NOM] ~ čoveku /čoveče [VOC] ‘man’; cf. conservative Serbian momak, siromax [NOM] ~ momče, siromaše [VOC]. (On variation between -e and -u in Ukrainian, see section 3.3.1.)


In Serbian, Macedonian and Bulgarian, the prevalent vocative ending for feminines is -o. In Common Slavic and Old Church Slavonic, this was restricted to ā-

78 In Stankiewicz’s terminology it is Serbo-Croatian.
stem nouns, while CS jā-stem nouns had the ending -e. In the modern South Slavic languages, some historic jā-stem nouns have the ending -o, e.g., dušo [VOC] ‘soul’, while others retain the older ending -e, e.g., hypocoristic kinship terms with the suffix -ic- like sestrice [VOC] ‘sister’, majčice [VOC] ‘mommy’ (Serbian/ Bulgarian/ Macedonian).79 According to Greenberg (1996: 23), “The -e desinence is identified with expressive forms, imparting... 'affectionate and intimate nuances.'” This may be the motivation for the extension of -e to historic ā-stems, particularly those with hypocoristic suffixes—e.g., with the suffix -k-, Macedonian Jovanke [VOC], Bulgarian Ivanke [VOC], but conservatively Serbian Jovanko [VOC]; Macedonian and Bulgarian babičke [VOC] ‘grandma’. Conversely, when the suffix -ic- is used in “marked pejorative forms,” only the -o ending is found, e.g., common gender pijanico [VOC] ‘drunkard’ in all three languages (Greenberg 1996: 24).

3.3.3. Vocative in the West Slavic Languages

Of the West Slavic languages,80 the vocative is extinct in Slovak,81 but it is a thriving category in Czech, Polish, and Kashubian (or Cassubian, located northwest, southwest and west of Gdańsk). For present purposes, Polish is the most relevant, because historically it has had a strong influence on Ukrainian, particularly in the western regions, due to its neighboring location and shared history. The situation in Kashubian is

---

79 Masculine a-stems nouns also can end in –ica.
80 Unlike East and South Slavic, the West Slavic languages do not always possess internal unity they are grouped in one branch primarily due to their geographical contiguity and their consistent differences from East and South Slavic.
81 It also seems to have died out in Polabian, a West Slavic language of central Germany that became extinct in the eighteenth century.
very similar to that in Polish. Masculine o-stems have ending –e e.g., chłop [NOM] ~ chłopie [VOC] ‘man’, and jo-stems -iu e.g., kóń [NOM] ~ koniu [VOC] ‘horse’. Grammatically feminine nouns (semantically both feminine and masculine) have -o in the vocative, e.g. rzéka [NOM] ~ rzéko [VOC] ‘river’. Occasionally, the masculine nouns of this type can have an alternative vocative which is identical to the nominative form, e.g., słëga [NOM/VOC] ~ słëgo [VOC] ‘servant’ (Stone 2006:772)


Czech ‘Soft’ stem masculine nouns (former jo-stems) have the ending –i (historically, an umlaut of -u) in the vocative e.g., muži ‘man’, stroji ‘machine’. The exception is animate nouns with stems in –c, which have -e in the vocative. In the colloquial speech, nouns ending in –ec will show the effects of the Common Slavic Third Palatalization: chlapec [NOM] ~ chlapče [VOC] ‘boy’. The same pattern is found in Ukrainian: хлопець [NOM] ~ хлопче [VOC] ‘boy’.
Czech *a*-stem nouns have vocatives in -o, e.g., žena [NOM] ~ ženo ‘woman’; hrdina [NOM] ~ hrdino [VOC] ‘hero.’ The *ja*-stems have been divided into two sub paradigms. The first has the same form in the nominative and vocative as a result of medieval umlaut: duše [NOM/VOC]; lžice [NOM/VOC] ‘spoon’; cf. borrowed nouns with Greek or Latin roots like revoluce [NOM/VOC] ‘revolution’. (Short 2006: 468). The second sub paradigm of the *ja*-stems represents feminine nouns which “may occur with or without final –e/-ě; this type has vocatives in –i: kuchyně/kuchyň [NOM] ~ kuchyni [VOC] ‘kitchen’ (Short 2006: 468). The same ending is the marker of the vocative in the feminine *i*-stem nouns, e.g., kost’ [NOM] ~ kosti [VOC] ‘bone.’

For comparative purposes, Polish is the most relevant because historically it has had a strong influence on Ukrainian, particularly in the western regions, due to its neighboring location and shared history. In the course of the few centuries Western Ukraine and Poland were part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. It was only in 1939 that Western Ukraine was attached to the Soviet Republic of Ukraine. Today, Poland shares its eastern border with Ukraine. The southwestern Ukrainian dialect is characterized by numerous lexical borrowings from Polish, as well as some grammatical similarities In Polish, as in Ukrainian, the basic vocative singular for masculine *o*-stems nouns is -e; however, unlike Ukrainian, Polish has stem-softening, e.g. gród [NOM] ~ grodzie [VOC] ‘medieval castle’. Stems in soft consonants (including the historic masculine *i*-stems and consonant-stems) have vocatives in -u, again like Ukrainian: męż [NOM] ~ mężu [VOC] ‘husband’; gość [NOM] ~ gościu [VOC] ‘guest’; kamień [NOM] ~ kamniu [VOC] ‘stone’; Rothstein 2006: 698). Most Polish masculines with stems in
velars take the vocative ending -u, e.g., rok [NOM] ~ roku [VOC] ‘year’. In Ukrainian, by contrast, velars often have the ending -e, which causes mutation of the consonant: čolovik [NOM] ~ čoloviče [VOC] ‘husband’. Nevertheless, my research shows that there is a tendency for stems in -k, at least, to avoid the mutation to -č by taking the ending –u, e.g., Пане радники [VOC] (LH 5c) ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Counselor [VOC]’ (радник [NOM.SG]).

Polish a- stem feminine nouns have the vocative endings similar to Ukrainian—namely, -o, e.g., žona [NOM] ~ žono [VOC] ‘wife’. Unlike Ukrainian, however, Polish feminine ja-stems have the ending –i for both nominative case and the vocative e.g. bogini82 [NOM, VOC] ‘goddess’ and pani ‘you feminine, Ms., woman.’ In Ukrainian, ja- stems feminine nouns have the vocative -e: земля [NOM] ~ земле [VOC] ‘earth’. The Polish feminine i-stems have ending -i in the vocative: kość [NOM] ~ kości [VOC] ‘bone’. By contrast, the vocative ending -i is obsolete in Ukrainian except for nani ‘Ms., woman’ and Господи ‘Lord’ (Господь [NOM]) (Rothstein 2006: 700–2)

3.3.4. Vocative in the East Slavic Languages other than Ukrainian

Ukraine borders areas where Russian and Belorussian are spoken. In addition, Eastern Ukraine is the Black Sea littoral and predominantly Russian-speaking, especially in the urban areas. This fact leads to extensive language contact between Russian and Ukrainian. Therefore, the status of the vocative in Russian and Belorussian is relevant to this research.

82 (Robert A. Rothstein 2006: 700)
The old vocative has been lost both in Belarusian and in the Russian literary language, except in a few fossilized forms. In Belarusian, “The vocative case can no longer be regarded as a living category in the standard language, which has only the remnants boža from bog ‘god’ (as an exclamation), brate from brat ‘brother’, druža from drug ‘friend’ and synku from synok ‘son’ (as modes of address)” (Mayo-2006: 900).

Similarly, standard Russian has retained the old vocative endings only in the words Bože ‘God’ and Gospodi ‘Lord’. However, since the nineteenth century, a new vocative has emerged in some declension types in colloquial Russian (Xrakovskij and Volodin 1986: 248–49). Unlike the vocatives in other Slavic languages (but like Rusyn, see below), these Russian neo-vocatives feature the bare stem (i.e., a zero ending): мама [NOM] ~ мам [VOC] ‘mom’; пapa [NOM] ~ пап [VOC] ‘dad’; Аня [NOM] ~ Ань [VOC] ‘Anja’


Rusyn (also known as Ruthenian or Carpatho-Rusyn) is a Slavic language whose speakers are primarily situated in the region of the Carpathian Mountains in Slovakia and, controversially, also in far western Ukraine. Rusyn has official status in Slovakia and

---

83 Orthographically by adding a soft sign if needed: Аня [NOM] ~ Ань [VOC] ‘Anja’
some degree of international recognition, though Ukrainian linguists tend to classify it as a standardized regional dialect of Ukrainian. Like Ukrainian, Rusyn has a morphologically distinct vocative, which is restricted to masculine singular nouns and feminine singular nouns of the a-/ja-declension (Pugh 2012). Nouns of the Second Feminine declension, which have zero endings in the nominative singular, do not have a morphological vocative. Additionally, the vocative endings occur mostly with nouns referring to people. Grammatically feminine nouns\(^8^4\) have vocative -о: hard stem: • Анна [NOM] ~ Аїна [VOC] ‘Anna’; soft-stem • Аня [NOM] ~ Аїя [VOC] ‘Anja’. Masculine soft-stem nouns have the vocative ending -у: • учитель [NOM] ~ учітелю [VOC] ‘teacher’. Hard-stem masculine nouns mostly take the ending -е, e.g., • Іван [NOM] ~ Іване ‘Ivan [VOC]’. Stems ending in –к and –у stems mutate to –ч before vocative -е, e.g., • вовк [NOM] ~ вовче [VOC] ‘wolf’; • отець [NOM] ~ отче [VOC] ‘father.’ Masculine nouns with the suffix –к take the vocative ending -у, e.g., • Руснак [NOM] ~ Руснаку ‘male Rusyn [VOC].’ The same ending is also applied to some hard stem nouns denoting a family member, e.g. • сыну ‘son’, as well as to semantically masculine nouns in –о, e.g., • дідо [NOM] ~ діду [VOC] ‘grandpa’. However, colloquially, masculine nouns in -о and also feminines in a-/ja can drop the ending, like Russian neo-vocatives, e.g., • Юрко [NOM] ~ Юрку ~ colloquial Юрк [VOC] ‘Yurko;’ • мама [NOM] ~ мамо ~ мам [VOC] ‘mama’; • Маря [NOM] ~ Марє ~ colloquial Марь [VOC] ‘Marja’; (Pugh 2012).

\(^8^4\) Grammatically feminine nouns, in Pugh’s (2012) treatment, also include semantically masculine nouns in –a, such as староста ‘Mayor/Elder’
3.3.5. Summary\textsuperscript{85}

The ending \textit{-e} remains the basic vocative for hard-stem masculine nouns in Ukrainian (e.g., \textit{Богдан} [NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{Богдане} [VOC] ‘Bohdan’; \textit{президент} [NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{президенте} [VOC] ‘president’), as in Polish, Czech, and Macedonian. However, across the Slavic languages, there is a tendency for it to be displaced by the endings \textit{-u} and \textit{-o}; this process is virtually complete in B/C/S (see Greenberg 1996).

The ending \textit{-u} is the most productive of the historic vocative endings. In Common Slavic, this was the ending for masculine \textit{u}-stem and \textit{jo}-stem nouns (cf. Ukr. \textit{Олексію} ‘Oleksij’) as well as for the soft- stem feminine nouns (Ukr. \textit{Tanju}). It has spread into the former domain of the ending \textit{-e} in B/C/S, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Polish, Czech, and Ukrainian. For example, it is now used for stems in velars in Polish and Czech (e.g., Czech \textit{kluk} [NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{kluku} [VOC] ‘boy’; \textit{vrah} [NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{vrahu} [VOC] ‘murderer’) and for stems in the velar -\textit{k} in Ukrainian (e.g., \textit{будівник} [NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{будівнику} [VOC] ‘builder’; \textit{синко} [NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{синку} [VOC] ‘son’). In my data, it can also be seen after a hasher –\textit{š} in article LH9 \textit{товариш}[NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{товаришю}[VOC] \textit{\sim} \textit{товаришє}[VOC], and in masculine last names with stems in \textit{č} and -\textit{k}-\textit{o}: \textit{пане Януович} (LH 9f) ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Janukovyč [VOC]’ and \textit{Пане Удовенко} (D77a) ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Udovenko [VOC]’. Historically, the spread of \textit{-u} in velar stems has probably been favored to avoid the palatalization of velars caused by \textit{-e}. (Similarly, \textit{-o} has spread at the expense of \textit{-e} in masculine velar stems in Bulgarian, e.g., \textit{војник} [NOM] \textit{\sim} \textit{војнико} [VOC] ‘warrior’.)

\textsuperscript{85} For detailed information on the vocative in South Slavic and in the West Slavic languages apart from Polish see appendix 1.
The vocative ending –o is the usual ending for feminine nouns across the Slavic languages. In Bulgarian, it has spread to masculine nouns ending in soft consonants, velars and –c: vojniko (see above); glupec [NOM] ~ glupeco [VOC] ‘stupid person’ (Stankiewicz 1979:102-103).

3.4. Apposition in the Vocative

The term *apposition* is used to denote two juxtaposed noun phrases with the same referent and syntactic function—“a substantive agreeing with a substantive” (Shevelov 1963: 215). The appositive substantive function is similar to an adjective. The difference between substantive apposition and adjectival modification is that “the latter usually indicates a peculiarity in the object, while the former conveys a concurrence of two seemingly independent substances. Cf. *krasyva divčyna* (a beautiful girl) and *divčyna-krasunja* (a girl, the beauty)” (ibid.: 216). Usually, apposition consists of a common noun (e.g., a title, kinship term, occupational term, or, with inanimate referents, a genre of literary or artistic works, geographical term, etc.)—plus a proper noun, which can be the name of a particular being, artistic work, or geographical feature (a river, city, mountains etc.). “The common noun names the category to which the proper noun belongs.” (Timberlake 2004: 151). According to Timberlake (2004) there are two categories of apposition in Russian: (1) occupations, titles and proper names, e.g., с генералом Власовым ‘with General Vlasov’, с врачем Верой Афанасьевной ‘with doctor Vera Afanasevna’ (ibid.: 152) ; and (2) geographical name or titles of artistic works with the noun to which the artistic work belongs, e.g., состояние реки Волги
‘the state of the River Volga’ but also берег реки Иордан ‘the shore of the River Jordan’ and в летнем номере журнала „Foreign Affairs“ “in the summer issue of the journal Foreign Affairs” (ibid:152). Some corresponding examples in Ukrainian would be (1) Пане Василю (D83a) ‘Mr. Vasyl’ and (2) місто Київ ‘the city of Kyjiv’.

In my research, the first category of apposition is the most relevant. Based on the data from День and Львівська Газета, I would suggest subdividing Timberlake’s category (1) into three subcategories: (1a) honorific address terms P plus first names and/or last names (FN, LN) (see example (13)); (1b) P plus titles (examples (14) and (15)); and (1c) titles plus first names, patronymics, and/or last names (FN, PN, LN) (example (16)). Even though P is a type of a title, it still differs from other titles because it is an honorific address term; moreover, P is often combined or collocated with other titles (T).

(13) Шановний пане Білл Клінтон (D52a)
‘Respected Mr. [VOC] Bill [NOM] Clinton [NOM]’

(14) Пане народний депутат (D13b)
‘Mr. [VOC] National [M.NOM] representative [NOM]’

(15) Пане студенте (D11c)
‘Mr. [VOC] student [VOC]’

(16) український лідер Віктор Ющенко (LH20s)

Certainly there is another type of name, which can be included into the category ‘names’—the patronymic (PN). PN can not be included in category (1a) because patronymics cannot collocate with honorific address P, but they can collocate with other titles (T).

86 Certainly there is another type of name, which can be included into the category ‘names’—the patronymic (PN). PN can not be included in category (1a) because patronymics cannot collocate with honorific address P, but they can collocate with other titles (T).

87 FN and PN always agree in case, number and gender in Ukrainian. Вадиме Петровичу (D94a) ‘Vadym [VOC] Pertovych [VOC]’ LN agree with FN when they are declinable Федором Стригуном (LH22j) ‘Fedor [INST] Stryhun [INST]’

According to Shevelov (1963: 216), appositives must agree in case, but “concord in gender and number is not obligatory.” However, if we look at appositions with the vocative in Ukrainian, we notice that there can be inconsistencies in agreement88, as in (17):

(17) пане Президенте Ющенко (D59b)

‘Mr. [VOC] President [VOC] Juščenko [NOM]

(18) Вельмишановний пане Президенте (D49b)

‘Respected [M.NOM] Mr. [VOC] president [VOC]

Like examples (13–14), above, (17) involves a juxtaposition of the vocative and the nominative. By contrast, examples (15) and (18) show the expected agreement. These examples are of type (1b) P+T; type (1a) can also show agreement with the vocative, as in examples (19) and (20):

(19) Пане Олеже (D98d)

‘Mr. [VOC] Oleh [VOC]’

(20) пане Дмитрієву (D48j)

‘Mr. [VOC] Dmytrijev [VOC]

88 Perhaps an intonational break in speech can cause the lack of the morphological agreement in address collocation the apposition. This topic may be researched in the future. In the newspaper articles the intonation of the speakers is not recorded.
Examples of apposition type (1c) are not found for the vocative in my data, but they found with other cases—for instance, the nominative (see example (16)).

The variation in agreement with the vocative raises the question of whether the same can be observed with appositives involving the grammatical cases. In my data, the agreement predicted by Shevelov (1963) is indeed found consistently with the other cases, as in (16), above, and (21–23).

(21) За словами колишнього заступника помічника держсекретаря у європейських і євразійських справах Девіда Крамера (D11)  

(22) саме тоді зародилась та ніжна, задушевна дружба, що багато десятиріч пов’язувала Осипа Степановича і видатну письменницю Ольгу Юліанівну Кобилянську (D16)  

(23) …спочатку запропоновані президентом Джорджем У. Бушем (D1n)  
‘…originally proposed by President [INST] George [INST] W. Bush [INST]’

In other words, the usual pattern in Ukrainian for appositions involving animate nouns is for the two appositives to agree in case; the only exceptions are found when the first appositive is in the vocative. However, according to Shevelov (1963: 216), inanimate nouns do not necessarily agree in case when in apposition:
The apposition may manifest the loss of its independence not only through intonation, but also by the loss of its inflectional flexibility. This normally happens with the names used figuratively: “na paroplavi “Lebid”” (on the boat “the Swan”)…, but often the loss of the inflectional flexibility extends also to proper nouns denoting lakes, mountains, islands, castles, little known towns, stations, rivers, and to certain stock word groupings.

However, the names and title in (21)–(23) are not similar to the nouns which supposedly lose “inflectional flexibility” because they are animate and refer to people. Perhaps the answer to the discrepancy lies in the peculiar status of the vocative in relationship to other cases (see Section §3.1.)— the fact that the vocative, to cite Press and Pugh, is “less like a case” than the grammatical cases. In apposition, the vocative appears to be rather a form of the noun than a grammatical case. Thus, the inconsistent case agreement in the vocative increases difference of the vocative from other grammatical cases and may lend further support to the idea that vocative is a form of the noun in Ukrainian.

**3.5. Semantic Categories of Nouns that Form the Vocative**

There is some variation in the categories of the nouns that can have the vocative form. According to Ivčenko (1960: 266), whose work is representative of Soviet Ukrainian grammars,

---

89 An interesting fact about the vocative in Bulgarian and Macedonian is that the vocative is still present in the languages, while other cases for nouns are lost or in decline.
Only human first names, patronymics, and, rarely, last names are used in the vocative form. In folk songs and poetic works, the vocative form is used in names of inanimate objects, which are personified: Ой, вербо, вербо, де ти зросла? ‘Oh, Willow, Willow, where did you grow?’

This brief explanation is unsatisfactory, as it overlooks the use of vocatives of common nouns in non-poetic language, e.g., newspaper discourse.

In my data, vocative forms are limited to nouns referring to humans; there are no cases of vocatives formed from inanimate or non-human animate nouns. The form is indeed very productive with first names (including hypocoristics): Богдан [voc] ‘Bohdan [voc]’ and patronymics: Борисе Івановичу (D21p) ‘Borys [voc] Ivanovič [voc]’, Вікторе Андрійовичу (D59a) ‘Viktor [voc] Andrijovič [voc]’. In addition, vocatives formed from surnames are common rather than rare, as Ivčenko claims: пане Бондаренку (D78l); ‘Mr. [voc.sg] Bondarenko [voc]’ (see also section 3.1.). Moreover, there are many cases of vocatives formed from common nouns—specifically, kinship terms, as in example (24a), titles, and nouns denoting professions, as in example (24b).

(24a) Синку, покажи-но мені чийсь знімок і я розповім тобі, як поводилася зображена на ньому людина за будь-якої відомої тобі ситуації. (D76g)

‘Son [voc], show me someone’s picture and I will tell you how the man shown on it behaved in any situation known to you.’

(24b) Пане студенте, якщо ви намагаєтесь дивитися з точки зору діалектики, то принаймні треба знати, що таке діалектика. (D11c)

‘Mister [voc] student [voc], if you are trying to look in terms of the dialectics, then at least you have to know what the dialectics is.’

Certainly pets’ names and inanimate nouns in poetic context can take the vocative.
It is not surprising that kinship terms and titles occur frequently in the vocative, since they are common in the address function. In particular, the vocatives of the P-honorifics пане [M.SG] and панове [M.PL], which Ivčenko (1960) does not mention, appear quite frequently in newspapers, as in example (25). (As mentioned above, панове ‘(Ladies and) Gentlemen’ is the only distinct vocative plural form in Ukrainian.)

(25) Добного ранку пані й панове, вас вітає львівське телебачення. (D28h)

‘Good morning, ladies [NOM/VOC.PL] and gentlemen [VOC.PL], Lviv TV greets you.’

Unlike Ivčenko, Press and Pugh (1994: 56) mention the use of the vocative with P-honorifics as well as with other titles: “Пан ‘Mr.’ will appear in the vocative, as will titles used with it: пане професоре! Пане Кравчук! ‘Mister [VOC] professor [VOC]! Mister [VOC] Kravchuk [NOM]!” The authors’ first example is actually attested in the data from День: пане професоре! (D43h) ‘Mister [VOC] professor [VOC]!’ On the other hand, Press and Pugh’s second example, in which the title is in the vocative form and the appositive name in the nominative, implies that last names do not take the vocative. However, the data from my research shows that the vocative can indeed be used with last names—at least, masculine ones; there are no examples in my database of the vocative being used with feminine last names.

91 Later, Ivčenko (1960: 274) refers to the use of the vocative in collocations of “general nouns” and personal names: “the general name is used in the Vocative form, but the personal name can be used both in the vocative form and in the nominative case.” While Ivčenko does not define general nouns or provide any examples, he may be talking about titles, e.g., P-address.
3.5.1. Use of the Nominative Instead of the Vocative

According to Shevelov (1963: 48), “In modern times this confusion was probably intensified by the process of the disappearance of the vocative form as a category, a process which spread over the area of Eastern Ukraine. Under the influence of this process the vocative forms are no longer differentiated from the nominative cases.” However, this claim is not supported by my research. In the data from the newspaper День, the vocative is ordinarily found with at least the first noun in the address clause, and sometimes with subsequent nouns:

(26a) Отже, ти, Богдане, заявляєш про перехід до внутріпартійної опозиції? (D41f)

‘So do you, Bohdan [VOC], declare the transition to party-internal opposition?’

(26b) Шановний пане Романе! (D3i)

‘Dear [M.NOM.SG] Mr. [VOC.SG] Roman [VOC]!’

There is only one example in which the nominative case was used for the first appositive in my data. Сафінар-ханум\(^\text{92}\) ‘Ms. Safinar.’(D95a) The consistent presence of the vocative in my data shows that the vocative is thriving in Ukrainian, not disappearing or being displaced by the nominative, contrary to Shevelov’s opinion that “the use of the nominative as the form of address is quite common” (1963: 49).

\(^{92}\) Title ханум is added to feminine first names in Crimean Tatar language. Even though it is not typical address term for Ukrainian, still people familiar with the culture of Crimean Tatar may use this hyphenated title.
3.5.2. Collocability of the Vocative in Ukrainian

Press and Pugh’s example of Пане [тог] Кравчук [ном] shows the possibility of collocating a vocative with a nominative. In fact, this is an area of considerable variation in contemporary Ukrainian. In my data, both vocative-vocative and vocative-nominative collocations are attested, sometimes with identical content: пане [тог] президент [тог] (D75d) vs. пане [тог] президент [ном] (D52b), both ‘Mr. President’; Пане [тог] Майкл [тог] (D54b) vs. Пане [тог] Майкл [ном] (D54c), both ‘Mr. Michael.’ In twelve examples from День and one example from Львівська Газета, collocations consisting of first names and patronymics consistently take the vocative endings in address:

(27a) Вікторе Андрійовичу, у вас є унікальний шанс вчинити, як загальнонаціональний лідер. (D59a)

‘Viktor [м.тог. M. VOC] Andrijovych [м.тог. M. VOC], you have a unique chance to commit as a nationwide leader.’

(27b) Миколо Олексійовичу (D85a).


(27c) Ірино Еріківно (D92a)


These two examples come from the same article written by the same author. It is interesting to see variation in the use of the vocative for the second noun in address.
While my data corroborate Ivčenko’s observations about first name plus patronymic (see above), they do not bear out his claim that the nominative is used instead of the vocative with last names that follow “general names” (1960: 274), if by that he means common nouns like titles. On the contrary, in the articles in my corpus, I found both possibilities: пане Дмитрієву (D46j) ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Dmytrijev [VOC]’; Пане Удовенку (D77a) ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Udovenko [VOC]’ (cf. also example (28)):

(28) Ми хочемо запитати вас, пане Путін, чому така корупція? (D79k)

“We want to ask you, Mister [VOC] Putin [NOM], why is there such corruption?”

There is also variation when P forms are collocated with common names (e.g., titles). The usual pattern is for both nouns to be in the vocative: Пане амбасадоре (D39c) ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] ambassador [VOC.SG]’. However, the title посол ‘ambassador, which is frequently used in the articles of День, does not appear in the vocative form after P-address: Пане посол ‘Mr. [VOC] Ambassador [NOM]’ (D34c, D47c), Пані посол ‘Madame [NOM/VOC] Ambassador [NOM]’ (D97a). This may be a form of lexical gap. In the nominative, there is a stressed fill vowel o, which would be missing in the expected vocative” *после. On the other hand, if the vowel were preserved in the vocative (*посоле), it would violate a morphological rule, because the fill vowel must be omitted when there is a vowel in the next syllable of the word.” The expected outcome of this rule is actually attested in the Ukrainian last name Пословський.
None of Ukrainian grammars that I was able to consult mentioned the use of the vocative in collocations consisting of three or more words. My data include several three- and four-word collocations with first names and/or surnames used in address function: Шановний пане Романе! (D3i) ‘Dear [M.NOM] Mr.[VOC] Roman [VOC]’; пане Президенте Ющенко (D79b) ‘Mr. [VOC] President [VOC] Yushchenko [NOM]; Шановний пане Білл Клінтон (D52a) ‘Respected [M.NOM] Mr. [VOC] Bill [NOM] Clinton [NOM],’ As noted above, adjectives do not have vocative forms in Ukrainian.

The cited examples show that the presence of the nominative adjectival modifier does not block the noun from occurring in the vocative. However, the subsequent words in both collocations are proper names in the nominative. This is an area of variation of contemporary Ukrainian, as the following examples illustrate:

(29a) Вельмишановні пане Народний Президенте України, пані Прем’єр-міністре94 України! (LH15c)


(29b) пане генеральний прокуроре Васильєв (LH10e)

‘Mr.[VOC] general [M.NOM] prosecutor [VOC] Vasyl’jev [NOM]’

(29c) Шановний пане Богдане Панкевичу (LH 3a)

‘Respected Mr. [VOC] Bohdan [VOC] Pankevyć [VOC]’

(29d) Шановна пані Прем’єр-міністр, шановний пане Президенте, шановний пане Голово! (LH 8a,b,c).95

---

94 This hyphenated title/ compound noun declines as one lexeme (in all 42 examples from my data only the final word declines). Similarly another hyphenated title віце-прем’єр-міністр ‘Vice-Prime-Minister’ (D47) is also declines as one lexeme.

95

These examples again show that the modifying adjectives do not block the use of the vocative in the modified nouns. While the first noun collocate is in the vocative in all these examples, there is variation in the subsequent nouns. In examples (29a) and (29b), the second and third noun collocates are in the nominative case, and a similar treatment may be noted for first names and last names. On the other hand, in examples (29c) and (29b), the second and third nouns in the collocations are vocative. If the second noun collocate designates an office like Prosecutor, the vocative is used in most cases; the exception is Прем’єр-міністр. In (29a) and (29d), this is used to address a female (then-Prime-Minister Yuliya Tymošenko) and follows the indeclinable feminine honorific address пані; it is in the vocative in (29a) but in the nominative case in (29d). However, the use of the nominative here cannot be explained by gender; cf. пане прем’єр-міністр (D38b) ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] prime minister [NOM.SG]’.

3.5.3. Variation in the Vocative Endings

In Ukrainian, there is variation in the endings in the vocative. One of the reasons for this inconsistency is the fact that the vocative’s domain is address nouns, the majority of which are names, kinship terms and titles. Address nouns are most commonly used in
colloquial speech, where there is greater latitude for variation in endings than in the standard language. This does not mean that a speaker can invent a new vocative ending, but rather that s/he can use one of available vocative endings outside its usual domain.

Variation in the vocative endings can be connected to the traditional variation in forms of personal names. Slavic languages are known for their productive derivation of hypocoristic and diminutive forms, especially with proper names and kinship terms. These forms are more common in colloquial language. One can easily create a new diminutive for a given name, which will be readily understood by the audience; this shows that there is little constraint on the creation of new forms. Similarly, there may be less constrains towards the variation among the vocative endings because they are often used with these types of nouns in spoken language.
Chapter 4: Gender in Address

4.1. Relevance of Addressee’s Gender

In previous chapters, I have discussed various collocations which can be used in Ukrainian deferential address and reference. One factor that has not yet been considered is whether the gender of the speech-act participants plays any role in the choice of deferential terms. This chapter deals with questions related to the gender of the addressee: Is there a difference between the terms used for males and those used for females? Do male and female speakers display the same preferences for deference strategies? In order to answer these questions, we need to look at gender as a linguistic category as well as to the sociolinguistic studies of gender in written communication.

4.2. Sociolinguistic Research on Gender in Communication

Sociolinguistic research of gender in communication ties together a number of topics in sociolinguistics. Perhaps one of the most important notions is the definition of ‘face’ presented by Erving Goffman in his essay *On Face-Work* (1955) “The positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has during a particular contact.”(cited in Tanner 2009:300) A second body of research related to the concept of ‘face’ includes an abstract idea of face presented in Brown and Levinson’s *Politeness Theory* (1978/1987) and their notions of positive and negative
face. The theory discusses universal ‘face wants’ or two desires: to be unimpeded in one’s action (negative face), and the desire (in some respects) to be approved of (positive face). Erving Goffman’s fundamental notion of ‘self’, which appears in his *Forms of Talk* (1981) is essential for research of gender in linguistic discourse, because it appears that the presentations and references to ‘self’ may differ among males and females in linguistic discourse. This was noted by Calsamiglia Blancafort 1996, Yokoyama 1999, and Nedashkivska 2009 among others. Goffman suggests “that self is a social construction, that impressions of self are ‘given off’ rather than ‘given,’ and that they are interpreted according to conventionalized or socially agreed-upon ‘rituals.’” (Tanner 2009: 300) A third topic related to the study of gender in linguistic discourse involves Address forms. Address forms have been a fruitful topic among sociolinguists; pronominal address forms have been a focus of work by Brown and Gilman 1978, Broun 1988, and Stone 1977/1981/1984, among others. The choice of pronominal forms in communication “relates to how the interlocutors define themselves, perceive their role and locate themselves on continua of status and solidarity (Brown and Gilman 1978)”96

In every speech act participants use linguistic devices to construct their own identity, present ‘self’ to other participants and negotiate the relationship among the participants of the speech act. It is important to emphasize that the relationship between the speech act participants is itself in a state of flux. In other words, the linguistic relationship between the participants of the speech act is (re)constructed in a course of the conversation. Thus, in Ukrainian, simply the choice between the familiar pronoun Ty

---

96 See Brown and Gilman 1978, Broun 1988 but also Nedashkivska 2009:223
and the distant pronoun \(Vy\) can define, or redefine, the relation between the speakers. If judged appropriate, it can create solidarity and goodwill; if judged inappropriate, it can lead to hostility and estrangement.

Besides the linguistic choices which speakers make when they are addressing each other, they are also making pragmatic choices when referencing themselves. This idea is well addressed by Goffman (1981), who states “the impressions of self are ‘given off’ by the speaker, rather than ‘given’. Signs that are given are what is conventionally thought of as “communication”: using words to convey information. Signs that are given off are aspects of speaker’s performance’ that gives others the impression of speaker’s ‘self’.” (cited in Tanner 2009:300). Linguistically, the most obvious indicators of status are the words which define the self-image of the speaker and the words which the speaker chooses to refer to the addressee. In addition, while a minimum of two dimensions, ‘I’ \(\leftrightarrow\) ‘You’, is needed to establish a conversation, a third dimension, ‘Others’, can also be present and can have influence on linguistic choices. The presence of such “overhearers” is an obvious factor, for example, in interviews in newspapers.

An important gender study in linguistic discourse of Slavic languages is done by Olga Yokoyama (Russian Genderlects and Referential Expressions.1999) Yokoyama discovers that females tend to use the “grammar of closeness” while males favor “grammar of restrain.” Expression of personal opinion and presenting of the information from the self centered point of view is associated with the “grammar of closeness.” “Grammar of restrain” is associated with the speaker, who displays “distant attitude towards addressee, avoids an explicit dialogue.” (Cited in Nedashkivska 2009:231-232)
Gender research in Ukrainian by Alla Nedashkivska is very relevant to my research. Her sociolinguistic studies of Ukrainian press (2002) and electronic data from web forums (2009) showed that Ukrainian men and women tend to use different strategies to establish and negotiate their relationships with addressees. In her 2009 work on internet forums, Nedashkivska points three participants of the forum communications, in relation to which male and female communication models are formed. These references are: speaker’s presentations of self (‘I’), addressee (‘You’) and others (‘Others’). The author suggests that Ukrainian men tend to avoid the most direct contact with their interlocutors by establishing the model ‘I’ ↔ ‘Others’. By contrast, Ukrainian women tend to opt for the most direct contact with the addressee establishing the ‘I’ ↔ ‘You’ model. (Nedashkivska 2009: 223)

Nedashkivska’s studies (2002, 2009) suggest that there are gender specific features (genderlects) found in male and female writings. The notion of genderlects is used in accordance with Yokoyama’s (1999) definition, in which genderlects are ‘bundles’ of typical “male” or “female” linguistic features: “The composition of the bundles is admittedly not fixed, but enough gender specific features ‘bundle together’ to justify a working notion of a ‘lect’ along gender lines” (ibid.: 402). Thus, in Ukrainian online forums “female genderlect is characterized by subjectivization, closeness and intimacy of the speaker with addressee. Male genderlect displays objectivization and distance of the speaker from the addressee and the text” (Nedashkivska 2009: 224). Her conclusions are relevant to the analysis of the newspaper articles, where gender is often the only sociolinguistic factor available.
4.2.1. **Characteristics of the Female Speech in Written Ukrainian**

According to Nedashkivska (ibid.: 224), Ukrainian women show a greater tendency than men to use *ja* ‘I’ and other referential to ‘self’ forms, e.g., oblique cases of *ja*: *mene* (Acc, Gen)/*meni* (Dat) as well as possessive pronoun *moja* ‘my’ and its forms in oblique cases in forums. My database has numerous examples of *ja* ‘I.’ There are over 20,000 examples in the nominative case, ~230 examples in dative case and ~250 examples in accusative/genitive case. First of all, I believe that it would be difficult to see ‘I’ in the nominative case as a genderlect. This pronoun is beyond a doubt the most frequently used pronoun in Ukrainian by both genders. Interview articles would have to have the pronoun ‘I’ regardless of gender of the interviewee. Oblique cases of ‘I’ may have a better chance to be classified as feminine genderlect in articles because they can be omitted. Forms of the possessive pronoun ‘my’ are the best candidates for being feminine genderlect because its usage is not obligatory and stresses self reference. In my data I found that female authors tend to provide examples of their personal experiences. Personal experiences I believe are self referential. Naturally, the passages of personal experiences include numerous self-references pronouns.

(5) *І від коли після проголошення незалежності, десь через рік, мене запитали:* «Ну що вам дала ця ваша незалежність?», я на мить замислилася і сказала: «*Х* забула, що розмовляю українською** (D35).

---

97 Forms of address associated with female and male speech are discussed in details in section 4.3
98 This topic would be interesting to investigate in the future research.
99 In parenthesis are the number of the article and the newspaper’s name ‘D’ stays for *Den’ and ‘LH’ stays for *Lvivs’ka Hazeta*
And that’s when, after independence, about a year later, I [ACC] was asked, “Well, what did this independence of yours give you?” I [NOM] pondered for a moment and said, “I [NOM] forgot that (I) speak Ukrainian.”

(6)  
А коли переді мною постала проблема: стати заложницею або оберегти свою душу од скверни, я обрала останнє. (D37)

When the problem appeared in front of me: to become a hostage [F.INST.SG] or protect my own soul from the filth, I chose [PST.F.SG] the latter.

Examples (5) and (6) are especially striking due to repeated use of the self-referential pronouns, e.g. ‘I’: я [NOM], мене[ACC], мною[INST], and the reflexive possessive pronoun ‘my own’: свою [ACC]. In example (7) the author uses the possessive pronoun ‘my’: моє[ACC], which is also self-referential.

(7)  
На пам’яті моє покоління, що народилося на початку 1960-х років, кризи було дві.(D75)

‘On the memory of my generation born in the early 1960s, there were two crises.’

Example (8) demonstrates all the above self referential pronouns. In fact there are five cases of the use or self-referential pronouns.

(8)  
З Анатолієм Івановичем я познайомилася вісім років тому, шукаючи роботу в столиці. Мій науковий керівник, коли я їй розповіла, які в мене успіхи в пошуках роботи, спитала, чи була я у Київському інституті зв’язку, що на Солом’янській площі. (D4)

‘I [NOM] met Anatolij Ivanovyč eight years ago, while looking for a job in the capital. My [NOM] adviser, when [I [NOM] ] told her what achievements in job search [I [ACC] ] (have) , she asked if I [NOM] was at the Kiev Institute of Communications, which Solom'jans'ka Square.’
In describing personal experiences female authors are establishing close relationship with their audience. ‘Closeness’ is typically associated with feminine genderlects in Ukrainian. “Women mark their language with the dialogical structure of narration, overt personalization, closeness and intimacy with the addressee, as well as elaboration and expressiveness of syntax and text when communicating in writing with the imagined other, female or male, with whom they perceive to have some bonding or closeness.” (Nedashkivska 2002:99) Personal experiences perhaps are the steps towards establishing closeness with the audience seen in examples (5) - (8). Self experiences are characteristic of non interview articles written by females. My data does not have many examples of male authors referring to self experiences.

Another feature of female writing on internet forums is a tendency to use the first person plural pronoun мы ‘we’, which is inclusive of the speaker: “References to the pronominal ‘we’ stresses the fact that the speaker considers herself as a member of the group.” (Nedashkivska 2009:225). My data consists of over 500 tokens of my ‘we’ which are common for males and females. I believe that this pronoun can hardly be associated with specific gender. I agree that pronoun ‘we’ stresses unity of the speaker with somebody else. Moreover I would argue that ‘we’ can also be impersonal and can be used to mask self reference. Therefore it can be associated with male speech. In fact in my data there are six examples of an expression мы з вами ‘you and me’ (literally, ‘us [NOM] with you [2PL]’). This expression is used exclusively by male speakers, contrary to Nedashkivska who associates the same expression with female speech in forums (2009:225).
Certainly six examples are not enough to claim that ‘we’ is male genderlect, but 6 examples of male usage and no examples of female usage found in 134 articles would be enough to question the association of this expression with female speech.101

Below are examples from my articles:

(9)  
_Ми з вами чудово розуміємо, що означає подібне твердження._ (D35)
‘You and I understand well what similar statement means.’

(10)  
_Дозволю собі принагідно нагадати, що старовинна Святоуспенська церква Львова, у якій ми з вами зараз знаходимося...(D88)
‘Let me on occasion to remind that ancient Lviv Dormition Church in which we are now located…’

There are other expressions which are associated with female speech. The following expressions tend to express female opinions non-categorically by using hedging self-referential phrases: _моя точка зору_ ‘my point of view’ and _мені здається_ ‘it seems to me.’102 First expression _моя точка зору_ ‘my point of view’ is not present in my data, but the second expression _мені здається_ ‘it seems to me’ is found in my data. There are eight examples of this expression in my data: six examples are used by males and two examples are used by females. The numbers do not show that females prefer these expressions more than males.

---

100 Nedashkivska gives this expression in dative case for ‘us’ _nam з вамy_ ‘you and me’ (literally, ‘us [DAT] with you [2PL].’)

101 Another expression associated with female speech, which is not found in my data, is _davajte ne budemo… z вамy_ ‘let’s you and I not….’ (literally, ‘let’s we will not… with you [2PL]’ (ibid. 2009:225)

102 (ibid. 2009:225)
(11) *Ale мені здається, що тільки хороші за своєю суттю люди здатні зрозуміти тексти і музику «Тартака»* (D101)

‘But it seems to me that only good people are by nature able to understand the lyrics and music of "Tartak"’.

(12) *Ви знаєте, мені здається, що тут важливо ще сказати про те, а якою мала бути поведінка відповідальних політиків в Україні у зв’язку з такими реаліями, які нас оточують.* (D45)

You know, it seems to me that here it is also important to say about what was supposed to be the responsible behavior of politicians in Ukraine in connection with such realities which surround us.

Another characteristic of female speech in internet forums is the usage of deferential phrase вибачте ‘excuse [2pl.]’ and an honorific adjective шановний ‘respected’. Often, these expressions are followed by first or/and last names. In my data, there is evidence of female authors using honorific adjectives шановний ‘respected’ and глибокошановний ‘deeply respected’, but mostly in salutation sentences.

(13) *Шановна пані Івшина!* (D66ac)

‘Respected Ms. Ivšyna!’

(14) *Глибокошановна пані Ларисо!* (D66ag)

‘Deeply respected Ms. Larysa!’

However, it is important to mention that male authors use these honorific adjectives perhaps as frequently as females. Such honorific adjectives certainly are staple expressions that are used commonly in writing. In contrast to Nedashkivska, my data does not suggest that the use of these adjectives is a feature of female genderlect.
According to Biber, “uses of the second person pronouns and their derivatives indicate writer’s high degree of involvement with the addressee.” Similarly, Nedashkivska (2009) suggests that second person plural pronoun ви ‘you’, its derivatives and possessive second person plural pronoun ваш ‘your’ are more typical for women than men in forums. However, in my data, almost all the articles employ the second person plural pronoun extensively, not only for multiple addressees (where it is trivial) but also for single addressees, as a way of showing politeness or deference. In the newspaper articles, both male and female correspondents use the pronoun extensively, so it is not an issue of genderlects for newspaper articles. Perhaps in Nedashkivska’s research the writer has a choice to omit direct address by using impersonal constructions or addressing the audience. Perhaps this statement can be relevant to non interview articles. In the newspaper articles which are interviews authors cannot completely omit direct address.

4.2.2. Characteristics of the Male Speech in Written Ukrainian

According to Nedashkivska (2009), Ukrainian men writing online tend to avoid the first person singular pronoun and the possessive pronoun ми ‘my’. “These linguistic strategies place the speaker outside of the presented information” (ibid.: 226). “This distancing of the ‘self’ from the addressee and the text is further seen in the constructions similar to як можна говорити про... ‘how can (one) speak about...’” (ibid.: 226) When expressing their opinions and ideas males tend to use impersonal constructions or general

---

103 Biber 1988
expressions such as здається ‘(it) looks like’ and до речі ‘by the way.’104 Hence instead of directly expressing their own opinions males tend to present their opinion as generally approved opinion.

The strategy to rely on general information is commonly associated with male strategies in Ukrainian. This is illustrated by the examples below, in which male speakers use impersonal constructions. Impersonal constructions can be used to add approval value to male statements and to avoid self references.

(15) Пане посол, очевидним є те ...(D34)

‘Mr. Ambassador, it is evident…’

(16) існує думка... (D39)

‘the thought exists…’

Nedashkivska suggests that self-references can appear in male discourse, but they typically appear at the end. This fact makes the structure of the male messages different from those of females. Females on the other hand first express their personal opinions and later move to the authoritative opinions. By contrast, males start with generally accepted opinions and only later express their personal opinions.105

According to Nedashkivska (2009), Ukrainian men typically evade direct address in forums, whereas Ukrainian women typically use direct address, first and last names, and the adjective шановний ‘respected’. Thus, she found that men rarely use the second

104 For more examples see Nedashkivska 2009:227
105 This was noted by Nedashkivska 2009 for Ukrainian forums. Similar pattern was noted by Davis and Brewer 1997 for English in electronic communications.
person pronouns *tu* and *vi* in communicating in internet forums. When they do use them, it is often in indirect references, e.g., *так, як ви* ‘like you’, or even as background to the main information. Even expressions such as *як бачите* ‘as (you) see’ are often used in the meaning of ‘evidently,’ according to Nedashkivska. Nevertheless the expressions do have second person plural forms. The absence of second person in Ukrainian male speech in internet forums is not similar to the patterns in my data. The difference in results is perhaps due to the difference in genre. Maybe it is possible to omit direct address in the forums, but it is almost inevitable in the articles I researched, especially in articles which include interviews. Addressing the interviewee is essential for any interviewer. Hence names, titles, P and second person pronouns are typical for most ‘interview’ articles. Even the articles, which are not interviews, but have pseudo address sentences, have V and T forms. For example article D49 is written by a male author who used an honorific adjective *велимишановний* ‘very respectful,’ second person plural pronoun *ви* and possessive pronoun *ваш* ‘your’ in almost every sentence of his letter to the Ukrainian president. The author, a member of the Ukrainian diaspora, who wants every Ukrainian to learn Ukrainian language, even if they are Russian speakers; he is also concerned about the president not encouraging Russian speakers to learn Ukrainian in author’s opinion.

(17)  

Велимишановний пане Президенте!  
Я слідкував за Вашими відповідями на запитання студентів під час першої в Україні трансляції «Президент і студенти. Розмова про майбутнє» (10 листопада. — Ред.) і, гадаю, більшість була задоволена Вашими відповідями. Певний, що більшість російськомовних та іншомовних в
Україні теж були задоволені Вашим вболіванням за їхнє право вживати мову, якою володіють. Це правильно, бо Ви є Президентом всіх громадян України.

‘Deeply respected Mr. President!
I followed your answers to students’ questions during Ukraine’s first broadcast “The President and Students: A Conversation about the Future” (November 10.—Ed.) and [I] guess the majority was satisfied with your answers. I am certain that the majority of Russian speakers and speakers of other languages in Ukraine were also pleased by your support for their right to use the language that they speak [natively]. That is right, because you are the president of all citizens of Ukraine.’

What can be noted in regards to the male authors is how and when in the interview they use V. Male authors tend to start with general information and move to the direct address forms later in the interview. For example in article D65, a male author postponed the use of the pronoun until the end of the conversation. This article is an interview with a female doctor who uses herbal medicine.

(18a) Пані Інна, з чого все починалося? Як лікар-невропатолог став невропатологом-фітофармакологом? (D65)

‘Ms. Inna, how did it all begin? How did a doctor-neurologist become, neurologist-phytotherapeutist?’

The first question to the doctor includes P+FN (Ms. Inna) but no V form. Instead the author uses impersonal construction ‘…how did it all begin?’ In the second question instead of using the pronoun ви or a second person verb, the author chose to use an indirect third person reference, as if the interviewee were not the same person as the one the interviewer was addressing. Thus, in the second sentence of the example, direct address forms are also omitted. I would expect a female author to have the following
sentence: *‘Ms. Inna, I wonder how you became a neurologist-phytotherapeutist, even though you were a doctor-neurologist?’ In other words I would expect more V forms and perhaps reference to self. Instead there are no V forms and references to self.

Next, the interviewer asked three more questions. Each of them was followed by the answers of the doctor. All the questions omitted forms of direct address to the interviewee, such as second person verbs or pronouns. Notably, the name of the doctor and the honorific пані were not present in these three questions, as seen in example (18b):

(18b) Чим пояснюються такі швидкі й блискучі результати? Які етапи має пройти рослина, щоб стати лікарською? Які хвороби найефективніше лікуються травами? (D65)

‘What explains such fast and bright results? Which phases does the plant must undergo to become a medicine? Which diseases are treated the most effectively with herbs?

Finally, the interviewer uses pronoun ви with V predicate in his last question to the interviewee.

(18c) Чим ви пояснюєте певну недовіру хворих до лікування травами?(D65)

How do you explain a certain distrust of patients towards herbal treatment?

The interview article D65 highlights the male strategies, discussed by Nedashkovska (2002). The strategy is characterized by omission of the direct address
forms in the beginning of the interview and introduction of direct address forms later in the interview.

Another observation which was noted by Nedashkivska regarding male speech on internet forums is that men tend to use the треба/ потрібно/ необхідно ‘it is necessary’ more than women did. The words are used in impersonal constructions, as in examples (19)-(21) from my data. These impersonal modal expressions are common in my data: треба (145), потрібно (102), and необхідно (21).

(19) Треба підняти статус пенсійної реформи (D89)
‘It is necessary to raise the status of the pension reform’

(20) Потрібно, щоб Росія визнавала Україну як незалежну вільну державу. (D74)
‘It is necessary that Russia recognized Ukraine as an independent free state.’

(21) Це необхідно подолати. (D39)
‘This must be overcome.’

Similarly to Nedashkivska’s findings these impersonal modal expressions are used more by males, than females in my data: треба (M: 112, F: 28, Unidentified:5), потрібно (M: 81, F: 13, Unidentified: 8), необхідно (M: 14, F: 6, Unidentified:1). The number of male authors (77) is higher than female authors (37) in the articles I have researched. There are also more male than female interviewees (55 and 12). Therefore, the ratio of female to male speakers is 1:2.7. We can compare how frequently females and males use these expressions: треба (F:M is 1:4), потрібно (F:M is 1:6.2), and
необхідно (F:M is 1:2.3). It is clear that male speaker use треба and потрібно more frequently than females, but not необхідно (1:2.3), which is slightly more frequent for females. The use of impersonal constructions is associated with remoteness of the speaker from the audience. Cross-linguistically, many linguists have noted that males often distance themselves from the audience and seem to lack a dialogue with the audience. Males try to create an effect “of generality and objectivity of the presentation.”

Overall, I found that male and female authors do not show significant differences in their use of direct address, i.e., in using the pronoun ви and various address terms consisting of names. This observation differs from Yokoyama’s (1999) and Nedashkivska’s (2009) suggestions regarding forms used in direct address by males and females. Both linguists seemed to agree that males and females establish the relationship with audience in different ways.

Depending on the style of the writing there can be variation in frequency of self referential forms such as ‘Я’ and ‘ми.’ Additionally, certain forms may not be associated with either male or female genderlects if the style of writing obligates the interlocutors to use specific forms. For example, if a given article is an interview, then address terms such as P, FN, T, LN and their collocations must be used during the conversation at least once. Hence the use of direct address is inevitable for males and females in interviews. Consequently direct address can not be associated with female genderlect in

106 See similar conclusion to Nedashkivska’s research of the male speech in electronic communications as well as researches by Davis and Brewer 1997 for English and Calsamiglia 1996 for Spanish.
107 I do believe that the use of the last names versus first names establishes a different degree of proximity. Certainly first names even after P establish rather familiarity, but the last names establish the relationship of distance and respect.
interviews. Additionally, newspaper articles may be overall less expressive of the author’s gender than messages in Ukrainian forums. Internet forums are not likely to be edited, while the articles in the newspapers most certainly go through the editorial control.

In summary, my data showed that the main difference between male and female writing is the frequency of self referential pronouns, expressions and experiences. The higher frequency of self reference is noted for female authors in comparison to male authors. Hence if self reference strategy indicates the establishment of closer relationships (see Nedshkivska 2009) with the interlocutors then female authors indeed tend to develop closer contact with the interlocutors, than males. Male authors on the other hand tend to postpone the usage of the second person forms and rely on impersonal constructions in an opposite manner than females.

4.3. Address Forms used in День and Львівська Газета

The goal of this section is to analyze various forms used to address males and females in numerous interviews. The data includes only interviews which come from three sources. First, they come from the original 80 articles from День (numbered #D1-D80), but only articles that included address forms used in interviews or pseudo-interviews were collected for the subcorpus. These articles were found by searching for P forms. The second source is 30 articles from День (numbered #D81-110), which were

---

108 Nevertheless the interlocutors still have choices which address form to use (P+T, P+FN, P+LN, etc.). This choice still can be associated with female or male speech.
109 See examples (14) and (15)
110 Ibid. and example (17)
collected by searching for the word ‘interview’ in Ukrainian. The third source for the data is articles from Львівська Газета (numbered #LH1-24), which were identified by searching for P forms. All the collocations are used only in address, not in reference.

Overall number of the nominal collocations is 122 (females to females: 8, females to males: 7, males to females: 37, and males to males: 60). In this sub corpus, the number of nominal address forms used towards females is much smaller than the number of examples used to address males\(^{111}\) (15 and 97 respectively). While it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from the fairly limited data, they can still reveal certain tendencies or preferences.

Out of 16 examples, 8 appear in articles written by females, and 7 in articles written by males (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2). The remaining example occurs in an article whose author is not identified (“An open letter to the public”); therefore, it will be disregarded in Tables 4.1 and 4.2. (The given example is Шановна пані Прем’єр-міністр! (LH8a) ‘Respected [F.NOM.SG] Madame [NOM/VOC.SG] Prime Minister [NOM.SG]!’)

Only nominal address form examples are analyzed in the Tables 4.1-4.4. Examples of the second-person plural pronoun ви are disregarded, but quasi-pronominal examples, where a name or P has third-person singular agreement with the predicate but refers to the addressee, are included. Such third-person singular agreement is inconsistent and is usually used interchangeably with the second person plural or singular agreement. Article D98 is a good example of 2PL/3SG agreement with predicate. The article is an

\(^{111}\) The number of male interviewees is significantly higher due to the facts that in Ukrainian society the leading and managing positions in society, especially in politics are primarily occupied by males.
interview with a popular singer Oleh Skrypka. The following two examples demonstrate different predicate agreement (2PL and 3SG) used in the interview.

(22a) Олеже, ви вмієте створювати прецедент.(D98)
Oleh [voc], you [nom.2pl] are able [prs.2pl] to create a precedent.

(22b) Будь ласка, кілька слів про музичну складову фестивалю та про те, що на події представить Олег Скрипка.(D98)
Be [imp.2sg] so kind, [give us] a few words about the musical part of the festival and about what Oleh [voc] Skrypka [voc] will present [prs.3sg] on the stage.

4.3.1. Address Forms Used in Addressing Females
Table 4.1 gives the nominal forms used by female authors to female addressees.

The total number of examples is 8.
As Table 4.1 shows, the most frequent form of address among females is FN, followed by P and P +FN, then FN+PN. According to Nedashkivska (2009), women in Ukrainian online forums show a preference for establishing personal contact with their addressees. My data seem to bear this out, since first names appear in 6 out of 8 of the examples.

Table 4.2 gives the nominal forms used by males to address females. The total number of examples is 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address forms</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Number of examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P</td>
<td>Шановна пані редакторе! (D3a) ‘Respected Ms. Editor’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T</td>
<td>Пані посол (D97a) ‘Ms. Ambassador’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>пані Прем’єр-міністр України! (LH15e) ‘Ms. Prime Minister of Ukraine’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T+LN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+LN</td>
<td>пані Івшина (D45b) ‘Ms. Ivšyna’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN</td>
<td>Пані Інно (65e) ‘Ms. Inna’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Шановна пані Наталю! (D66q) ‘Respected Ms. Natalja’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN+LN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN + Honorific</td>
<td>Сафінар-ханум (D95a) ‘Safinar-xanum/ Ms. Safinar’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+LN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+PN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) T+LN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2 Nominal Forms Used by Males to Address Females**

As Table 4.2 shows, the tendency among males addressing females seems to be to use P + T or P in combination with the FNs or LNs. Overall, males reveal a preference for using titles, including P. (See also the use of the titles among males in Table 4.4) Men do not use FN without P and their choices of address are more formal and impersonal, because they opt primarily for T and P. The address *Сафінар-ханум* (D95a) ‘Safinar-xanum’ refers to a woman of Crimean Tatar ethnicity. In Crimean Tatar, it is typical to add ‘xanum’ after first names as an honorific title. The spelling of the word ханум is not
accurate perhaps it should be ханым. In Russian dictionary the word is spelled ханым and the meaning of the word in Russian госпожа, дама\(^\text{112}\) ‘Ms./Lady, Madam’ and in Ukrainian this honorific title is similar to пані.

4.3.2. Address Forms Used in Addressing Males

There are 97 nominal forms used to address males. Of these, 37 have female addressers, and 60 male addressers. The remaining 14 examples include 4 from articles whose author is not identified\(^\text{113}\) and 10 examples from articles which have multiple authors (usually two or three authors), and all the authors for each article are of the opposite gender. The later makes it impossible to classify the articles as written by males or females. Therefore 14 examples of address forms must be disregarded for the purpose of this classification.

In Table 4.3, only representative examples of the nominal forms used by females to address males are given. The total number of examples is 37.

\(^{112}\) Crimean Tatar-Russian and Russian Crimean Tatar dictionary http://www.classes.ru/all-crtatar/dictionary-crtatar-russian-cyr-term-12683.htm (accessed on 02/02/14)

\(^{113}\) Two examples out of four come from article LH8. The author of this article is listed as ‘An open letter to the public.’ Other two examples do not list the author.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address forms</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Number of examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P</td>
<td>Пане народний депутат (D13b) ‘Mr. National Representative’</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T</td>
<td>Пане Шток (LH5f) ‘Mr. Štok’</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T+LN</td>
<td>Шановний пане Богдане Панкевичу (LH3a) ‘Respected Mr. Bohdan Pankevyč’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN</td>
<td>Пане Володимире (D15c) ‘Mr. Volodymyr’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN+LN</td>
<td>Шановний пане Богдане Панкевичу (LH3a) ‘Respected Mr. Bohdan Pankevyč’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) FN</td>
<td>Сашко (D101a) ‘Saško’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+LN</td>
<td>Андрій Клюєв (D90b) ‘Andrij Kljujev’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+PN</td>
<td>Борисе Івановичу (D21p) ‘Borys Ivanovyč’</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) T</td>
<td>Високопреосвящений владико! (D88a) ‘Most Reverend Bishop’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Шановний придворний журналісте (D37a) ‘Respected Court Journalist’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Nominal Forms Used by Females to Address Males

Females noticeably prefer P+LN over other collocations. In tone, the LN can hardly be considered an (intimate form of address), especially in combination with P. The next types in frequency are collocations P+T and P+FN. P+T collocations are relatively impersonal; such collocations are commonly preferred by males. Address forms used between females show greater intimacy (due to the usage of FN and FN collocations) in
comparison to mixed-gender address, which tends to be formal (due to the extensive use of P and collocations: P+T, P+LN and P+FN). FN+PN collocations occur more in addressing males than females (see Table 4.5).

In Table 4.4, only representative examples of the nominal forms used by males to address males are given. The total number of examples is 60.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address forms</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Number of examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P</td>
<td>Шановний пане Президенте (D49d) ‘Respected Mr. President’</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T</td>
<td>Пане посол (D108a) ‘Mr. Ambassador’</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T+LN</td>
<td>пане Президенте Ющенко (D59b) ‘Mr. President Juščenko’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>пане генеральный прокурор Васильєв (LH10e) ‘Mr. General Prosecutor Vasyl’jev’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+LN</td>
<td>пане Глобо (D76c) ‘Mr. Hloba’</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Шановний пане Гулику (LH12a) ‘Respected Mr. Hulyk’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN</td>
<td>Пане Андрію (D45e) ‘Mr. Andrij’</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Пане Майкле (D54b) ‘Mr. Michael’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN+LN</td>
<td>Шановний пане Білл Клінтон (D52a) ‘Respected Mr. Bill Clinton’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) FN</td>
<td>Богдане (D41f) ‘Bohdan’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+LN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) FN+PN</td>
<td>Миколо Олексійовичу (D85a) ‘Mykola Oleksijovyč’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Вельмишановний Сергію Борисовичу! (D86a) ‘Very Respected Serhij Borysovyč’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) T</td>
<td>товаришю лідер Партиї регіонів (LH9b) ‘Comrade Leader of the Regional Party’</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) T+LN</td>
<td>товаришю Янукович (LH9d) ‘comrade Janukovyč’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Товарише Янукович! (LH9g) ‘comrade Janukovyč’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Nominal Forms Used by Males to Address Males
Table 4.4 shows a striking preference for men to use P+T collocations. This type of collocations is one of the least personal in tone due to the absence of names. P+LN are second most frequently used collocations. Even though LN are names, still in combination with P they indicate distance rather than intimacy. The third most common type is P+FN. These collocations are more personal than the previous two types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address forms</th>
<th>Females to Females</th>
<th>Males to Females</th>
<th>Females to Males</th>
<th>Males to Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+T+LN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+LN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) P+FN+LN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) FN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+LN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+PN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN+Honorific</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) T</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adj+) T+LN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Comparison of the Examples Discussed in Tables 4.1-4.4 by Type

As Table 4.5 shows, the following collocations are hardly used in interview articles: P, FN+LN, P+T+LN, P+FN+LN, T+LN. P without collocates is rarely used in my data. Titles, without P are used infrequently, especially towards females. The attested titles in my data are: religious terms Високопреосвященний владико! (D88a) ‘Most

---

115 There are two examples where FN+LN has 3sg address (D98b and D98c)
Reverend Bishop,' Його Високопреосвященства\(^{116}\) (D88b) ‘His Eminence’, sarcastic Шановний придворний журналісте (D37a) ‘Respected Court journalist’, and former communist party address term ‘comrade\(^{117}\),’ as in товариш лідер Партії регіонів (LH9b) ‘Comrade Leader of the Regional Party.’

\(^{116}\) This T is has 3sg agreement.

\(^{117}\) See discussion of this address term in section 5.1.6.
Chapter 5: Ukrainian Address Terms

5.1. Address forms classifications

In this chapter, I will discuss the system of address in contemporary Ukrainian. In speaking of a *system of address*, I adopt Stone’s inclusive definition (1977: 491):

Systems of address consist of all the possible choices open to the speaker between linguistic elements referring to the addressee, i.e. the elements to which if they are pronouns or verbs, the grammatical term ‘second person’ is applied. However, address forms also include nouns and noun phrases, and it is thus convenient to make a two-fold classification into nominal and pronominal address forms. In all second-person verbal forms the existence of the pronoun is implied if not expressed.

Likewise, according to Braun (1988: 9), “In most languages forms of address concentrated [*sic*] on three word classes: (1) pronoun, (2) verb, (3) noun, supplemented by words which are syntactically dependent on them.” Indeed, the Ukrainian system of address includes all three of the word classes mentioned by Braun. I will discuss bound pronominal address forms and unbound nominal address forms or nouns used in address in detail below. Verbs will be mentioned in connection with pronouns.
5.2. Pronouns of Address in Ukrainian

Second-person pronouns are the most common form of address in Ukrainian.\textsuperscript{118} There are two second-person pronouns that can be used to address a single person: singular "мi" and (syntactically) plural "ви" (hereafter T and V, respectively). The same pattern is found in neighboring Russian, Belarusian, and all the other Slavic languages apart from Polish.\textsuperscript{119} Even when the pronouns are not present, T or V address is implied by the second person singular and plural verb forms. Most second-person pronouns in my data are bound address forms. I will use a definition given by Michael Betsch, (2003:125). Bound address forms are “address forms that are syntactically integrated into the sentence.”\textsuperscript{120} Example (1) demonstrates pronominal agreement with the predicate.

(1) \textit{Як ви вважаєте, чи розуміє це українська еліта? (D47)}

‘What do you[2PL] think[2PL], Ukrainian elite understands it?'

In Ukrainian, V address became predominant in the course of the eighteenth century, judging from my previous research of Ukrainian private letters.\textsuperscript{121} After Eastern Ukraine became part of the Russian Empire with the collapse of the Cossack state in 1709, Russian influence on Ukrainian became stronger in the course of the eighteenth century: “The \textit{prostaja mova} [vernacular] was in use as the language of administration in

\textsuperscript{118} The use of T and V pronouns in various languages has been widely discussed in studies of linguistic politeness. (See Brown and Gilman (1958), Braun (1988), Taavitsainen and Jucker (2002), Huszcza (2005) and among others.)

\textsuperscript{119} On the use of T and V in the Slavic languages, see Stone (1977, 1981) and Shevelov (1963).

\textsuperscript{120} The unbound T and V forms are possible, but they are not found in my data.

\textsuperscript{121} See Yuliya Walsh (2005), \textit{Ukrainian Address Forms in the 18th Century}. M.A. thesis, The Ohio State University.
the provinces longer, until the introduction of the Russian administrative system by Catherine II in 1780-1784, but then it was relegated to private use only…” (Shevelov (1980: 150–51). It seems likely that the change to V in Ukrainian, as opposed to the P used in Polish, was reinforced by the use of V in Russian. In the early part of the eighteenth century, T was the primary form of address in private letters. By the end of the century, it had been replaced by V, which has retained its position to the present day as the standard form of address in non-intimate discourse, including newspaper articles.

The pronouns ми ‘you[SG] and ви ‘you’[PL] are used as bound address forms in direct address (2a), and indirect address when ми and ви in oblique case (2b). Possessive forms of these two pronouns are also common in the researched data (2c).

(2a) Якою ви бачите власну роль в разі перемоги кандидата, якого ви підтримуєте? (D60)


(2b) Синку, покажи-но мені чийсь знімок і я розповім тобі, як поводилася зображена на ньому людина за будь-якої відомої тобі ситуації. (D76)

‘Son [VOC], show me somebody’s picture and I will tell you [DAT.SG] how the person depicted on it behaved in any situation known to you [DAT.SG].’

(2c) Цього року закінчується ваш термін роботи як молодого спеціаліста в Національній опері. (D81)

‘This year, your [ACC.PL] term of work as a young professional at the National Opera ends.’
According to my observations the pronoun T is used in familiar discourse symmetrically among immediate family members (mother, father, brother, sister, husband, wife), between grandparents and grandchildren, and between friends and classmates. "In a symmetrical system two speakers address each other with the same pronoun of address, either mutual T or mutual V. In non-reciprocal system, on the other hand, they use different pronouns, either on the basis of their respective social statuses or on basis of their relative age." (Taavitsainen and Jucker 2003:15), T It is also used asymmetrically (in non-reciprocal system) between adults and children, when adults use T and receive V. Finally T is used toward animals. The pronoun T is marked for familiarity and intimacy; it is often associated with the positive politeness. If used improperly, i.e., with the wrong category of person, T can be perceived as rude. For example, if an adult is addressed with T by an unfamiliar adult or a child, s/he will perceive the addressee as impolite and disrespectful, unless the addressee is a much older person than the addresser. Finally, as a singular, the pronoun T is individual can be used only towards one addressee.

The pronoun V, on the other hand, is located at the opposite end of the politeness spectrum. It is chosen in addressing strangers, public authorities (police, government representatives, teachers), people of higher social status, colleagues at work, older people, and extended family members who belong to an older generation (aunts, uncles, and parents in-law). V can also occur in addressing grandparents and parents in rural areas of Ukraine, where the hierarchy among family members is more pronounced than in the

---

122 In Ukraine it is typical to use symmetrical T between grandparents and grandchildren in urban areas.
cities. In general, the pronoun V manifests respect and distance and is often associated with negative politeness in Ukrainian. As a plural, V is a neutral way of addressing a group of people as well as a respectful term of address to an individual.

In short, the pronoun V indicates distance, respect, power and formality while T indicates closeness, solidarity and informality. Therefore in relation to Politeness Theory V is often associated with the negative politeness and T subsequently with the positive politeness.

Even though there are social expectations of which pronoun should be used a given situation, variation in usage of T and V occurs. According to Weissenbok’s research on pronominal address in Western Ukraine (2006: 20.6), “there are situations that stand out because of high level of variation.” In particular, there can be variation in the use of T and V among colleagues at work, family members, and young people who are strangers to one another. Generally speaking, V is used between colleagues at work; however, once the colleagues get to know each other, some of them can switch to T. Among immediate family members, variation in the choice of address pronouns is more common in rural areas of Ukraine that in urban settings. As noted above, in rural areas, V can be used in addressing grandparents and parents, but in larger towns and cities T is used towards grandparents and parents. Weissenbok noted that Ukrainians, who were brought up in “a modern way,” tend to use T with all family members. (2006: 20.12).

Pronouns T and V are marked for gender, because the forms are the same for males and female, unlike many nominal unbound address forms which are marked for gender, e.g. common address term P. Therefore, the usage of T and V pronouns allows
the addressee to avoid gender reference. Additionally V forms when used toward a single addressee give “the addressee options, in particular of not feeling directly addressed or not feeling “singled out”. (Taavitsainen and Jucker 2003:11)\textsuperscript{123} Of course, in Ukrainian the use of V forms to a single addressee is “highly conventionalized” and therefore the addressee knows that s/he is addressed, which was also noted by Taavitsainen and Jucker’s (ibid.).

Address form V is the most commonly used address term in the Ukrainian newspapers which I have researched. V forms appear to be the standard address form in the articles from День and Львівська Газета. Among the factors which favor V address in newspaper genres are the typical formality of the situation, respect towards interviewees who are often government officials (ministers, ambassadors, president etc.), and lack of personal familiarity between the participants of the interview.\textsuperscript{124}

Indeed, there are seven interviews in День where the only forms of address are V pronouns (with agreeing predicates). These are short pieces entitled Блиц Интерв’ю ‘Blitz-Interviews’. Presumably, in the live conversation nominal address forms were used at least once, perhaps at the beginning of the interview. Later on, the interviews were edited down, and the nominal address forms were removed due to the stylistic characteristics of this rubric.

In fact, the pronoun T is used as an address form in only one article (D41) from Den.’ This article reports an interview between a male correspondent of the newspaper

\textsuperscript{123} According to Brown and Levinson, “To give the addressee such an option is an instance of negative politeness because it pays token to addressee’s negative face. By leaving the option, it acknowledges the addressee desire to be free from impositions.” (1987:133)

\textsuperscript{124} Even when the interlocutors know each other privately, the newspaper interview is intended for public consumption. Therefore the interaction will be formal and “appropriate” for the newspaper interview.
and Bohdan Telen’ko, regional head of the Ukrainian Republican Party (URP) in Xmel’nyc’kyj. The pretext for this interview was Telen’ko’s decision not to follow the directive from his party leader to support the socialist party’s candidate. At the beginning of the interview, the correspondent shows a skeptical attitude towards Telen’ko and his decision to disobey the party leader.

(3a) Невже не було директиви від лідера партії пана Лук’яненка? — запитав кореспондент «Дня» в голови облорганізації УРП Богдана ТЕЛЕНЬКА.

“Was there really no directive from the party leader, Mr. Luk’yanenko?” the correspondent of День asked the head of the regional organization of the URP Bohdan Telenko.”

The correspondent uses the particle невже ‘really’, which expects a positive answer, to show that the question is rhetorical; he knows that there actually was a directive. Notice the omission of direct address towards Telen’ko. Instead, the reporter uses an impersonal sentence with no pronouns and continues to do so in the next two questions.125 Evidently, then, the correspondent is avoiding any linguistic strategy that might establish a more personal relationship with the interviewee. Finally, in the fourth question of the interview, he uses both FN and a second-person singular pronoun, along with an agreeing verb form.

(3b) Отже, ти, Богдане, заявляєш про перехід до внутріпартійної опозиції?

So are you [2SG], Bohdan, declaring [2SG] [your] transition to the internal opposition?

125 Depersonalization is a typical strategy for male speech; see Chapter 4 for additional information.
This pragmatic suggests confrontation and open dissatisfaction with the actions of Telen’ko, the regional head of the Ukrainian Republican Party. In the next statement the correspondent retreats from this strategy (or, perhaps, pragmatic error) and addresses the interviewee more formally as ‘Mr. Bohdan,’ but he avoids second-person forms.

(3c) Що ж із цього випливає, пане Богдане? Лідер партії — то одне, а партія — то інше...(D41)

What is implied by this, Mr. Bohdan? The leader of the party—that’s one thing, but the party, that’s another...

The correspondent’s next statement includes the nominal address P+FN ‘Mr. Bohdan’ and a second-person singular possessive pronoun (2d).

(3d) Отже, пане Богдане, твоя позиція щодо опозиції — займати посаду і працювати.(D41)

So, Mr. Bohdan, your [2SG] position on the opposition [is] to keep the office and to work.

The possessive pronoun indicates retreating towards disrespectful T. Certainly it is not surprising that the following statement (3e) consists of a second-person pronoun and the first name without the title пан. In other words, the correspondent retreats towards his original position of disapproval and disrespect.

(3e) Довкола того, про що ти кажеш, Богдане, не зчиняються скандали місцевого значення.(D41)

‘There are no scandals of local importance Bohdan, regarding the matter about which you[2SG] are talking[2SG].’
Overall, the interviewer’s use of the T forms is unusual for the newspaper genre. These forms seem to indicate a high level of emotional involvement on the part of the addresser. Otherwise, examples of T in my database are found only in reported speech, when conversations among close relatives are recounted—e.g., in discussions involving the address terms ‘son’ (D76g) and ‘mother’ (LH16z, LH23e).

5.3. Third-Person Singular Address

In addition to T and V, three articles in my database provide examples of third-person singular bound address forms. The three articles come from the newspaper День (50, 91, 98), and each article is an interview. All the interviewees are males. In article D50, the correspondent is interviewing the director of a scholarship program in a Polish university, who is a Pole. In the course of the interview, the correspondent uses bound V forms, which follow unbound nominal addresses: P+T (Пане директоре (D50c) ‘Mr. Director’), and P+LN (Пане Маліцький (D50d) ‘Mr. Malickyj’), as illustrated by the opening question (4a):

(4a) Як сталося, що ви, будучи відомим опозиціонером у 90-х роках, не стали ані міністром, ані дипломатом? (D50)

‘How did it happen that you [2PL], being a well-known opposition figure in the ’90s, did not become [2PL] either a minister or a diplomat?’
Later on, the interviewee is again addressed with P+T, and P+LN collocations and V forms, except in one question where P+T seem function quasi-pronominally, with third-person agreement in the verbs.

(4b) Як би пан директор охарактеризував пересічного українського студента, якого він знає?(D50)

‘How would Mr.[NOM.SG] Director [NOM.SG] describe [3SG.PAST] an average Ukrainian student, whom he [MAS.NOM.SG] knows[3SG.PRES.]?’

The sentence in example (4b) is a compound sentence, which consists of two clauses. Each clause shows third-person predicate agreement: the first clause consists of the nominal address P+T plus an agreeing past tense verb; the second clause has a third-person singular masculine pronoun, which agrees with a present-tense verb. Perhaps the correspondent of the article D50 chooses third-person singular agreement after P because the interviewee is a Pole; the use of P as a quasi-pronominal address with third-person singular agreement is common in Polish. On the other hand, where the second clause has the pronoun ‘he,’ authentic Polish would have P instead.

Similarly, third-person singular address with P + LN is observed in examples (5a) and (5b). The interviewee of article D91 is a Ukrainian writer and translator.

(5a) Відомо, що пан Дзюб є поліглотом. (D91)

‘It is known that Mr.[NOM] Dzjub[NOM] is[3SG] a polyglot.’

---

126 See Chapter 3 for more information about Polish.
(5b) Які плани на майбутнє має пан Дзюб? (D91)

‘What future plans does Mr. [Nom] Dzub [Nom] have [3sg]?’

This type of address is not consistent throughout the interview; in fact, the primary address pattern in the article is second-person plural with V, as seen in example (5c):

(5c) Скільки мов ви знаєте? (D91)

‘How many languages do you [2pl] know [2pl]?’

In the third article (D98), the interviewee is a popular singer. The sentence with third-person singular agreement (6) stands out in the article because elsewhere bound V address forms and unbound nominal forms are found.

(6) Будь ласка, кілька слів про музичну складову фестивалю та про те, що на події представить Олег Скрипка. (D98)

‘Please, a few words about the musical component of the festival and about what events Oleh [Nom] Skrypka [Nom] will present [3sg].’

Overall, the rare appearance of third-person address is a stylistic device rather than a norm in Ukrainian newspapers. Perhaps it is used pragmatically to show the importance of the interviewee. For example, religious titles use 3sg possessive pronouns, as seen in example (7), an honorific address form used towards a bishop of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church.
5.4. Names in Unbound Address

5.4.1. First Names

FNs are not used frequently as address terms in interview articles due to the fact that authors of the newspapers interview adult strangers. Adult strangers are usually not addressed by the first names. People who are significantly younger (children) or have an inferior and less powerful position: students in university can be addressed by their first names; a secretary who is addressed by her superior at work etc. Additionally first names could be the only names by which people are known - for example in show business. In my data there is an interview with Ukrainian singer Джамала. She is known by this name and the article does not mention her last name. Additionally this is the only name used to address her by the interviewer. Overall the domain of usage of first names in Ukrainian includes primarily familiar and intimate discourse. It is used towards immediate family members, friends, children and pets. My data includes seven examples of FNs—four of them used towards male addressees and three towards females. In four articles the interviewers are females (including one who uses FN in two different articles) and in two articles the interviewers are males. All of the interviews but one ((D41), analyzed in detail in section 5.2.) are conducted using V forms outside the address clause consisting of unbound FNs. The use of the V forms compensates for fairly informal strategy of FN in my opinion; thus, some degree of formality is preserved.
It is noteworthy that five of the interviewees belong to show business—four interviewees are singers and one is a film director. Perhaps the popular culture is less formal, which influence the choice of address towards the representatives of pop-culture. All interviewees are addressed by the first names. I suggest that pop-culture figures are perceived to be less formal. The luck of formality is expressed by the use of first names. Additionally two singers are addressed by the short forms of their names/nicknames: Оля (D81b) from the full name Ольга and Сашко (D101a) from the full name Олександр, which are even more informal than the full names.

The other two interviewees are a regional head of Ukrainian Republican Party\(^{127}\) and the chief editor of День. Next example has the chief editor of the newspaper is addressed by the full form of her FN in the salutation sentence. The FN is preceded by the honorific adjective Шановна ‘Respected’, e.g. example (10). Perhaps the honorific adjective neutralizes the somewhat informal address form choice. On the other hand the

\(^{127}\) This article is discussed in details in section 5.2., examples (3a)-(3e).
addresser is a female and a journalist. These two factors explain the choice of FN address form.  

(10) Шановна Ларисо! (D66aa)  

‘Respected Larysa!’

All the first names consistently have the vocative endings. The examples of FNs in address were found only in the newspaper День; none appeared in Львівська Газета.

5.4.2. First Names and Patronymics

First names with Patronymic (FN+PN) are a common form of unbound address in Ukrainian, as is shown by numerous examples from my data. There are twelve examples of this type of address in articles from День. In Львівська Газета, on the other hand, there are no examples of FN+PN collocation in address. Interestingly, ten out of twelve examples come from articles collected by searching for the word интерв’ю ‘an interview’ (10 out of 30 interview articles in День). On the other hand, FN+PN are quite rare in the data collected by searching for the word пан ‘Mr.’ (There is 1 example out of 30 interview articles - 23 from День and 7 from Львівська Газета). Perhaps there is an overlap in the pragmatic usage of some P collocations and FN+PN.

---

128 See section 4.3.1. for the address forms used by females toward females.
129 The only example of FN+PN collocation in Lvivs’ka Hazeta is found in reported speech. Overall the data base for Lvivs’ka Hazeta is smaller. Moreover the articles were searched by using P and the FN+PN perhaps overlap in usage with some P collocations. See more details in section 5.4.1.
There are articles where interviewee is addressed with FN+PN and with P collocation. This variation is shown in following examples (11a) FN+PN and (11b) P+LN from the article D94.

(11a) Вадиме Петровичу, охарактеризуйте, будь ласка, коротко стан сучасного розвитку українського суспільства. (D94)

‘Vadym[voc] Petrovyč[voc], please describe briefly the state of development of the contemporary Ukrainian society.’

(11b) У нашому парламенті вас, пане Гетьмане, вважають одним із найбільш відомих депутатів. (D94)

‘In our parliament you, Mr. [voc] Het’man[voc], is considered to be one of the most experienced deputies.’

If we look at the nominal address forms in reference, we notice a greater variation among the forms. For example, in article D21 the interviewee is addressed with FN+PN (12a) but he is referenced to with FN+LN (12b) and P+LN (12c).

(12a) Борисе Івановичу, нас відділяє один рік від ейфорії під час помаранчевої революції..(D21)

‘Borys[voc] Ivanovyč[voc], we are separated for one year from the euphoria of the Orange Revolution.’

(12b) Борис Тарасюк правильно сказав: потрібно зафіксувати те, що членство — наша спільна ціль. (D21)

‘Borys[NOM] Tarasjuk[NOM] correctly said: you have to capture that membership is our common goal.’

(12c) Хотів би повторити слова пана Тарасюка. (D21)

‘I would like to repeat the words of Mr. [GEN] Tarasjuk [GEN].’
In the majority of the newspaper articles I researched, FN+PN in unbound address
alters with pronominal and predicative V forms in bound address, as seen in article
D86.

(13) І останнє запитання, Сергію Борисовичу. Ви дивитеся в майбутнє нашої
країни з оптимізмом?(D86)

the future of our country with optimism?’

5.5. Pan in Address

The nominal address term P provides a rich variety of address forms in Ukrainian.
As noted above, Ukrainian has the possibility of polite address with FN and with FN+PN,
as in Russian. On the other hand, unlike the Russian address system, in which FN and
FN+PN are the two primary forms of unbound address,\(^{130}\) the Ukrainian address system
enables speakers to convey slight gradations of politeness by combining P with various
collocates.\(^{131}\)

The importance of the nominal address term P in Ukrainian was noted previously
by Krouglov (1996) in his comparative research of Russian and Ukrainian address forms.
Krouglov ranks the most common nominal address forms by their degree of politeness,

\(^{130}\) Certainly господин/госпожа ‘Mr./Ms.’ occur in Russian, but these terms are used almost exclusively
in reference to national officials (domestic and foreign). LN can hardly be considered a basic address form
in Russian; it is used primarily in conveying power relationships: teachers over students or army officers
over lower ranks. Additionally, LN can express familiarity when it is used among friends and peers.

\(^{131}\) The address term can be used on its own without collocates, but it is too rare in my data to draw any
conclusions. P without collocates appear mostly in reported speech (8 out of 10 tokens). The two
remaining examples in address are Шановна пані ‘Respected Madam’ (D64l), which follows the etiquette
of letter-writing, and Панове ‘Messers’ (LH 24g).
from the most formal, FN+PN, to the least formal, FN, according to Krouglov’s scale\textsuperscript{132}. He indicates that there is a large gap between FN+PN and FN in Russian. According to Krouglov, the possibility of using P+FN gives Ukrainians a middle ground between the most formal, FN+PN, and the least formal, FN. The switch among address forms can be more gradual on the scale ‘strangers – acquaintances – intimates.’ For Russian speakers, the switch between most common nominal address forms FN+PN and FN is more drastic, because there is no ‘middle ground’ possibility in nominal address (Krouglov 1996: 104). Krouglov’s observations about Ukrainian are generally true, although one have to take into consideration the fact that P+FN may not be the precise ‘middle ground.’ In fact, the given address form can itself fluctuate on the scale ‘strangers – acquaintance – intimacy.’ P+FN can be closer to the FN if the agreeing predicative forms are T, as opposed to the more usual V. As noted above, the P+FN пане Богдане ‘Mr. [\textsc{voc.sg} Bohdan [\textsc{voc}’ alternates with the plain FN Богдане ‘Bohdan [\textsc{voc}’ in article D41; both address forms occur with the second-person singular T (see examples (3d) and (3e)). It is important to mention that T in this article does not contribute to solidarity and intimacy; rather, it is a face-threatening strategy used by the interviewer to challenge the interviewee (see examples (3a)-(3e)).

Another example where FN alternates with P+FN is found in article D98, an interview with a Ukrainian pop singer: FN Олеже ‘Oleh [\textsc{voc}’ \textasciitilde Пане Олеже ‘Mr. [\textsc{voc.sg} Oleh [\textsc{voc}’ \textasciitilde. The predicative agreement in both instances is V. In the given article, P+FN is moved further away from ‘intimacy’ and closer to ‘acquaintance’ due to

\footnote{Krouglov does not include more formal form of address, e.g. P+T and less formal that FNs forms, e.g. hypocoristic FNs in his analysis.}
its combination with the more formal/distant V predicative agreement. Overall, FN address has a tendency to be replaced by pronominal V in my data (6 out of 7 tokens).

In addition, the address collocation of P+FN followed by V forms can be replaced by the more formal and distant P+LN - e.g., P+FN па́не Євге́не ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Jevhen [VOC]’ ~ P+LN па́не [VOC.SG] Щоголь [NOM] ‘Mr. Ščohol’’ in article D35 (similar example is found in D45). This substitution of P+FN in D35 and D45 by P+LN is further away from the ‘intimacy’ category in compassion to P+FN in D98, which was substituted by FN.

The address term P+LN may also alternate between relatively more familiar address form P+FN (as in D35 where P+LN is substituted by P+FN) and the most distant P+T, as in article D50, e.g., P+LN Па́не Малі́цький ‘Mr. [VOC.SG] Malic’kyj [NOM]’ ~ P+T Па́не [VOC.SG] директо́ре [VOC] ‘Mr. Director.’

Additionally, P+LN can alternate with another distant and formal address form FN+PN. Address form FN+PN belongs to the ‘strangers’ category on Krouglov’s scale of ‘strangers – acquaintance – intimacy’ (1996:104). This type of the substitution is found in article D94: P+LN па́не [VOC.SG] Гетьма́не [VOC] ‘Mr. Het’man’ is replaced by FN+PN Ва́диме [VOC] Петро́вичу [VOC] ‘Vadym Petrovyč’ (see example (11a) and (11b)). As might be expected, the agreement pattern is V rather than T.

The examples above suggest that neither the address form P+FN nor the address form P+LN holds a fixed position on the suggested by Krouglov (1996) scale of ‘strangers – acquaintance – intimacy’. Rather, P+LN can move between the less formal category of ‘acquaintance’ (similar to P+FN as in D35) and the formal category of ‘strangers’, similarly to FN+PN (D94) and P+T (D50).
The interrelationship between FN+PN and address forms with P is difficult to define, because these address forms tend not to be used in the same articles (see section 5.4.1). It is much easier to see the interrelationship between P+LN and P+T in my data. These two address forms are the most common ones (apart from pronouns) in my data; P+LN has 33 tokens, and P+T 43 tokens. Evidently, these are the preferred forms of address in the newspapers researched. This is not surprising, because these address forms are more formal, distant and impersonal—especially P+T, due to the lack of names in the collocation. The majority of the interviewers and interviewees can be classified as ‘strangers’ to each other.\(^{133}\) That is why the most common forms are those which can be easily classified as ‘strangers’ on Krouglov’s scale. Additionally, some of the interviewees are foreigners from cultures in which have no patronymics. For them perhaps FN+PN address may not be an option while there are other address forms which can convey similar meaning\(^{134}\). The following address forms: P+LN, P+FN+LN, and P+T are all acceptable in addressing foreigners. For example, address terms P+T and P+LN are used in article D74: Пане [VOC.SG] сенаторе [VOC] ‘Mr. Senator’ ~ Пане [VOC.SG] Плянкад [NOM] ‘Mr. Plancade’ interchangeably. Similarly, P+FN+LN alternates with P+T in article D52: Шановний пане Білл Клінтон ‘Respected [M.NOM.SG] Mr. [VOC.SG] Bill [NOM] Clinton [NOM]’ and P+T пане [VOC.SG] президент [NOM.SG] ‘Mr. President’.

In sum, the abundance of collocations with P permits a gradation in address forms in Ukrainian. Furthermore, collocations with P can alternate with other kinds of address

\(^{133}\) Even if an interviewer and interviewee are acquainted, the social roles of the interlocutors in the newspaper interviews would still favor formality in the assumed the presence of the audience (newspaper readers).

\(^{134}\) Additionally foreigners’ proficiency in Ukrainian and their familiarity with Ukrainian culture may influence the choice of address forms.
terms in Ukrainian newspapers. Finally, the use of specific P collocations may vary from article to article. One unbound nominal address form can be replaced by another nominal address or by a bound pronominal address form V/T. Authors’ perception of the address terms and intended pragmatic message may play role in the choice of address forms.

5.6. Nominal Address Form Товариши ‘Comrade’

The uniform address term товариши ‘comrade’ was one of the most frequently used forms of address during the Soviet period, but it has been gradually diminishing from Ukrainian. According to Krouglov (1996: 100), in 1994 only six percent of Ukrainians would address a stranger as товариши. Krouglov suggests the “domain of use of товариши is getting smaller” (Krouglov 1996: 94), especially among Ukrainians.135 Despite the fact that this address term has become almost extinct in Ukrainian, there is one example of товариши which is used in address in my database (LH9 dated 2006). In this article, Ukrainian prime minister and the leader of the Party of Regions Viktor Янукович is addressed as товаришу (LH9b) ‘comrade [voc]’ and товаришу [voc] Янукович [nom] (LH9d)136 ‘comrade Janukovyč.’ Janukovyč is known for his pro-Russian stance; perhaps that is why he is referred to as ‘comrade’ by the reporter from Львівська Газета, a western Ukrainian newspaper with an anti-Russian stance. The

135 It is not clear from Krouglov’s article, whether Ukrainians who were the subject of his field study are all from Ukraine and whether they were all native speakers. Krouglov does mention that certain results are more relevant to Western Ukraine; therefore my assumption is that all Ukrainians in his field study were from the territory of Ukraine and they are citizens of Ukraine. The number of Ukrainians participated in his field study was 121 respondents (Krouglov 1996:100)

136 This address collocation is used three times in article LH9. Once it shows the variation in the vocative between -u/-e after š in the word ‘comrade’: товариши ‘comrade’ (Товариши Янукович!(LH9g) ‘Comrade Janukovyč’)
author of the article is openly upset by one of Janukovyč’s decisions. Considering the tone of the article, it is easy to surmise that the address form ‘comrade’ is unlikely to express approval of the prime minister. However, ‘comrade’ is not the only address form used in the article; it alternates with P+LN пане [VOC.SG] Янукович [NOM] ‘Mr. Janukovyč.’ Both address forms show V agreement following the address clauses and the nominal address forms are replaced in bound address by the pronoun V.

Other two articles which include the term ‘comrade’ use the term in reference to the third person. First article D11 dated 2000 uses the term ‘comrade’ sarcastically. The term directly refers to the Soviet term of address and this is why. This article is a response to the previous article written by Mr. Kovalenko, who appears to be somewhat supportive of the communist ideas. The author of this article cites Mr. Kovalenko’s idea: «соціалізувати комуністичну ідею, плавно спрямувати її дрейф до європейської соціал-демократії» ‘To socialize the Communist idea, by steering smoothly its drift towards European social democracy.” Below is an example of the use of ‘comrade’:

(14) Пан Коваленко (а може, «товариш»?) докоряє п. Чорному, що той звертається до минулого. Невже в минулому можна знайти шляхи розвитку?! Хоч сам пан студент звертається в минуле аж до Ісуса Христа! Якесь протиріччя? (D11)

‘Mr. Kovalenko (or maybe “comrade”?) reproves Mr. Čornyj for being drawn to the past. Can one really not find paths of development in the past? Though Mr. Student 137 himself is drawn back to the past, right back to Jesus Christ! It is some sort of contradiction?’

137 This address refers to Mr. Kovalenko, who is a student.
The other example comes from article D41 (dated 2001). Here the leader of Ukrainian Socialist Party, Moroz is referred to as товариш ‘comrade’. Additionally, he is said to be ‘treacherous’:

(15) Морозові не можна вірити. Він, як і всі ліві, зрадливий. Згадайте драму «канівської четвірки». Поступився Марчукові, а потім його покликали перелякані олігархи, нагадали про фінансові зобов'язання... Де тоді товариш Мороз опинився? Хто ж іще буде вірити особі, яка публічно дає слово, а потім його «назад» бере?

‘Moroz can not be trusted. He, like all leftists, is treacherous. Let us recall the drama of the “Kanivs’ka Four.” He gave way to Marčuk, and then the frightened oligarchs summoned him, they reminded [him] about financial obligations... Where was Comrade Moroz then? Who else will believe a person who publicly gives his word and then takes it back?’

All the above examples indicate that the address term товариш has a very unfavorable association.

Perhaps it is appropriate to ask which term of address has replaced the Soviet-era ‘comrade’. One possible answer is found in article LH9, where P+LN is used interchangeably with товариш + LN and товариш alone. A similar suggestion is made by Krouglov (1996: 104), who states that the term ‘comrade’ has been replaced by пан/пани ‘Mr./Ms.) and добродій/добродійка 138 ‘gentleman/lady’ in Ukrainian.

---

138 In my database, the nominal address form добродій ‘gentleman’ is found only in one article (D16) in reported speech. The lack of other examples make impossible to discuss the function of this address form.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1. This dissertation has analyzed forms of address in contemporary Ukrainian from the perspective of morphology, gender and pragmatics. One of the goals of my research was to determine which categories of lexemes can collocate with the address term P in address and reference to the third person. My findings showed that address term P primarily collocates with names, which include FN and/or LN. The most common type of collocations are P+LN (92 examples\(^{139}\)), followed by P+T (43 examples), P+FN (37 examples), and P+FN+LN (24 examples). Overall, then, P collocates with different kinds of proper name far more than with common nouns.

There were no collocations of P+FN+PN in my data. This probably reflects an actual constraint rather than an accident of the corpus. Pragmatically, FN+PN and certain P collocations (P+LN and P+T) are used to convey similar social indexing.\(^{140}\) Both FN+PN and P are used to indicate respect and distance; in other words, they are both markers of negative politeness. Combining them would thus be redundant. Moreover, it would intensify the deference to the level of overkill, as far as contemporary Ukrainian social reality is concerned. The use of more politeness strategies than usual in a given situation can be interpreted as sarcasm, i.e., as impolite (Watts 2003).

\(^{139}\) The number indicates how many different collocations of this type are present in my data. This number does not show how frequently each collocation was used in an article. Due to the different length of the articles, it would be hard to compare the frequency of each type of collocation.  
\(^{140}\) See also section 5.5.
Another type of collocation that is absent from my data is P+T+FN. The lack of this type of collocations is due to the fact that majority of the titles attested in the corpus are professional titles. Given their context of usage, such titles commonly collocate with LN, but not with FN, which is associated with private and familiar contexts. To be sure, FNs can be collocated with P+T, but only if there is an additional collocate – LN. This type of collocation, P+T+FN+LN, is present in my data in contexts where the given addressee or referent is being introduced. Otherwise, FN collocates only with P and kinship T (‘aunt’, ‘uncle’, ‘sister’ in reference to a nun).

6.2. A second research question which was addressed in my dissertation was the morphology of the vocative endings. As it proves, there is variation in the vocative between –e and –u in noun stems ending in a velar –k. Traditional Ukrainian grammars (e.g. Ivčenko 1960) state that the expected second-declension vocative ending after velars is -e, which causes the stem-final -k, -x, -h to undergo mutation to -č, -š, -ž, respectively (чоловік [NOM] ~ чоловіче! [VOC] ‘husband’). While this type still exists, there is now a strong tendency to implement stem-leveling by extending the ending -u from soft stems to velar stems or, at least, stems in k, e.g., синку [VOC] ‘son’ (D76g), Пане раднику ‘Mr. Counselor[VOC]’ (LH 5c), Шановний пане Гулику ‘Dear Mr. Hulyk[VOC]’ (LH 12a).

In contemporary Ukrainian, as evidenced by my data, the most productive of the historic vocative endings is -u. Originating in the Common Slavic u-stems, this ending has spread into the former domain of the ending -e in Ukrainian, as in B/C/S, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Polish, and Czech, probably in order to avoid mutations in velar
stems caused by -e. In my data, vocative -u is found not only in its older domain of the soft second-declension masculines (Олексіо [VOC]) and (as noted above) velars but also in soft first-declension feminines (Таню [VOC]), but also, innovatively, in other masculines, e.g., товаришу Янукович (LH9d) ‘Comrade [VOC] Janukovyč [NOM]’ alongside conservative Товарише Янукович! (LH9g).

Previous research had not noted the extension of the vocative to surnames. My data indicate that this is now a widespread and accepted phenomenon. It is attested, in particular, with second-declension masculine names, including those formed with the suffix -k-o; first-declension masculine names in –a (7) and last names ending in a consonant other than -č or velar (8) can take the vocative endings: пане Януковичу ‘Mr. Janukovyč [VOC]’ (LH 9f), Пане Удовенку ‘Mr. Udovenko [VOC]’ (D77a); пане Глобо ‘Mr. Globa [VOC]’ (D76c); пане Дмитрієву ‘Mr. Dmytrijev [VOC]’ (D46j). Additionally, declinable masculine last names of foreign origin also show the ability to take the vocative: Пане Міксере ‘Mr. Mikser [VOC]’ (D51b).

6.3. A third research question that I examined was agreement in noun phrases used in address. Generally speaking, agreement in apposition is the norm in Ukrainian for all the grammatical cases, but it is not always present in the vocative. In apposition, there is variation among the nominative and the vocative endings: пане прем’єр-міністр (D38a) ‘Mr.[VOC] Prime[NOM]-Minister[NOM]’; пане генеральний прокуроре Васильєв (LH10b) ‘Mr. [VOC] General Prosecutor [VOC] Vasyl’jev[NOM]’. This lack of agreement points towards the peculiar status of the vocative in nominal paradigms; the vocative, to
cite Press and Pugh, is “less like a case” comparing to the grammatical cases. In apposition, the vocative appears to act as a variant of the nominative specialized for address. This may lend further support to the idea that vocative is not a case in the strict sense but “a form of the noun” in Ukrainian.\footnote{Cf. the vocative in Bulgarian and Macedonian, which is used regularly in this languages, while other cases for nouns have been lost or are in a steep decline.}

My research clearly shows that the morphological vocative, despite its syntactic anomaly, is not only alive in Ukrainian but also spreading to the nominal categories which in the past did not have vocative endings, such as last names. These findings contradict Shevelov’s claim that the morphological vocative is being displaced by the nominative in Ukrainian (1963: 48).

6.4. A fourth research question was sociolinguistic—whether male addressers tend to prefer certain forms of address and female addressers others, and whether the preferred forms show any variation based on the gender of the addressee and addresser. Here my data indicated that, in addressing women, female journalists showed a stronger tendency than male ones to use address forms consisting a first name, which can be FN, P+FN, FN+PN. This can be interpreted as an emphasis on closeness and solidarity, which is characteristic among Ukrainian women, or at least a desire to establish a more intimate style of communication. On the other hand, in addressing males, female journalists preferred to use P+LN, a type of collocation that does not indicate familiarity or closeness but rather formality and distance. Other forms which female journalists
tended to use in addressing males, included P+T and P+FN, but generally not FN alone or FN+PN.

When addressing female addressees, male journalists generally avoided using FN (unlike female journalists with female addressees. Male authors tend to use T and/or collocations of P. The latter can include P+FN towards females. There was a striking preference among males to use P+T collocations, which are one of the least personal forms of address due to the absence of names. The next most frequent collocation type among males was P+LN, which again shows formality rather than intimacy. In short, the male journalists gravitated towards address forms that indicate distance and respect.

In my dissertation, I showed the interrelations between the commonly used unbound address forms, ranging from the most personal to the least: FN, P+FN, P+LN, FN+PN, P+T. Within a given text, FN could alternate with P+FN, P+LN with FN+PN, and P+LN with P+T. I also showed how some collocations can fluctuate between less and more intimate, depending on other elements in the context.

Finally, my research showed that the abundance of collocations with P permits a gradation in address forms in Ukrainian. Furthermore, collocations with P can alternate with other kinds of address terms in Ukrainian newspapers. Therefore the use of specific P collocations could vary from article to article. One unbound nominal address form can be replaced by another nominal address or by a bound pronominal address form V/T. The choice of address forms was influenced by authors’ perception of contextual fit, their intended pragmatic message, and the gender of both the addressee and the addressee.
6.5. Prospect of future research. This research does not claim to be the final step in the analysis of forms of address in Ukrainian. Rather, its aim is to provide a foundation of linguistic knowledge to support future sociolinguistic research in Ukrainian. Such research is especially important for teachers of Ukrainian as a second language, but it is also important for more theoretical work on Slavic pragmatics, which up to now has paid little attention to Ukrainian.

There is certainly room for further linguistic investigations of Ukrainian address forms. In particular, address collocations in Ukrainian had not been investigated prior to my study, apparently because they fell outside the traditional categories in Ukrainian grammars. While this dissertation focuses on two- and three-word collocations in address (e.g., Шановний пане Романе! (D3i) ‘Dear [M.NOM.SG] Mr. [VOC.SG] Roman [VOC]!’), there are also longer collocations, which likewise needed to be researched from the perspective of apposition and agreement among the address collocates. There are only few examples of four-word address collocations in my data (пане генеральний прокуроре Васильєв (LH10e) ‘Mr.[VOC.SG] general [M.NOM.SG] prosecutor [VOC] Vasyl’jev [NOM]’; Шановний пане Богдане Панкевичу (LH3a) ‘Respected Mr. [VOC] Bohdan [VOC] Pankevyč [VOC]’).

Other nominal address forms can also be a potential topic for future research in Ukrainian. For example, the usage and pragmatic meaning of the honorific term добродій/добродійка ‘gentleman/lady’ has not been investigated at all. It would be interesting to see how this address term is similar or different from P. Additionally,
collocations with kinship terms, which are naturally infrequent in my journalistic database, have not investigated sufficiently.

My discussion of male and female speech in the press was only a first step in a largely uncharted territory. Future research could examine specific expressions associated with each gender and gender-based differences in the pragmatic preferences for politeness strategies. The data could be researched either by genre - e.g., for journalism, interviews, editorial, readers’ letters, etc. or by specific rubrics within the newspaper—sport, politics, society, economics, and so on.

Finally, it would be very interesting to investigate how the topics analyzed in this dissertation are reflected in oral communication in Ukrainian, especially with reference to variables such as gender, age, education level, and region of residence.
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