PREFACE

The present publication is connected to a research project that has been set up in the Department of Slavonic Languages at Helsinki University to investigate the problem of case selection for the direct object in Russian negative clauses. As part of the project, a fairly extensive computer corpus has been created to facilitate the study of the rules governing the case choice. This book presents the results of a basic analysis of the material in the corpus.

The creation of the computer corpus and the preparation of this report have been a collective effort. The material for the corpus was assembled and the preliminary analysis conducted by Jari Aula, Inga Auvinen, Eeva-Liisa Korte, and Liisa Knuutila, in connection with the preparation of their Master's theses. Without their contribution, the computer corpus necessary for the present study could never have been produced. Liisa Vilkki helped with the laborious task of checking and correcting the coded material. Riitta Koivisto was responsible for the computerization of the example sentences, and Eeva Ilola provided assistance on a number of technical matters. Valuable advice on the finer points of Russian usage was received from visiting Soviet Lecturers in the Department. The finalization of the computerized material and the compilation of this report were largely the responsibility of Hannes Heino: he helped to clarify the definitions of many of the factors, and wrote the commentaries on the variables and factors discussed in the main body of the report. I sincerely thank all those mentioned above, and everyone else who contributed, for their assistance.

Helsinki, 24 February 1991

Arto Mustajoki
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### Infinitival constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>No headword (independent infinitive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Lack of) ability or opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Impossibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Absence of) necessity; (lack of) permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Volition on the part of the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>'Phasal verbs'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attempt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Intellectual activity (решить, собираться), etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 9 | 'to dare' (сметь, решаться)          |
| 10 | Other cases with infinitive referring to an action potentially performed by the notional subject of the clause |
| 11 | Infinitive with a 'subject' distinct from clause subject |
| 12 | Compound future                      |

| VARIABLE 15: Part of speech of the headword in an infinitival construction |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Adjective                  |
| 2 | Predicative adverb         |
| 3 | Noun                       |
| 4 | буду, будешь               |
| 5 | Imperfective verb (not in the infinitive form) |
| 6 | Perfective verb (not in the infinitive form) |
| 7 | Verb in the infinitive form |
| 8 | Other cases                |

| VARIABLE 16: Position of negation and word order in infinitival constructions |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|

### Idiomaticity

| VARIABLE 17: Degree of idiomaticity of the verb + object collocation |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | The verb + object collocation is idiomatic or fixed, or contains a metaphorical element |
| 2 | The verb phrase is idiomatic but the object is not part of the idiom |

### The Object

| VARIABLE 18: Part of speech of the object |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Noun                       |
| 2 | Pronoun                    |
| 3 | Adjective                  |
| 4 | Numeral                    |

| VARIABLE 19: Number          |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|

| VARIABLE 20: Gender of the object noun |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|

| VARIABLE 21: Declension of the object noun |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Strong declension          |
| 2 | Weak declension            |
| 3 | Adjectival and indeclinable nouns |

<p>| VARIABLE 22: Homonymy of the genitive singular and the accusative plural |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE 23: Degree of negativeness of the object noun</th>
<th>146</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Negative noun as object</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Positive noun as object</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 24: Semantic type of the object noun</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Animal</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Group of people, organization, etc.</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Concrete countable object</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Parts of the body</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Place</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Mass nouns denoting foodstuffs</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Liquid substance</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Non-edible solid substance</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Collective noun denoting a complex whole consisting of smaller units</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Relatively concrete, countable product of human intellectual activity</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - Relatively abstract, countable product of human activity (frequently oral)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Event or process in which one can participate</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Process which does not entail active participation</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 - 'Abstract place'; position, situation, etc.</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - Emotional or physical state</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - Relatively permanent characteristic</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - Field of human activity, or the products of such activity viewed collectively</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - Ideology, academic discipline, etc.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - Natural phenomenon</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - Temporal concept</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - Part of a whole</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - Quantity</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - Relationship</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - Other abstract concepts (countable)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - Other abstract concepts (uncountable)</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 25: Type of pronoun</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - это</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - то</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - что</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - который</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - что-нибудь, что-либо, что-то</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - все</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Other pronouns</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 26: Premodifier connected to the object</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - One adjective or participle</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Two or more adjectives/participles</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Ordinal numeral, with or without adjective following</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - такой</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - такой + adjective</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - этот (with or without adjective following)</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - тот (with or without adjective following)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - весь (with or without adjective following)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Possessive pronoun</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - Possessive pronoun + adjective</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - один</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - Other cases</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 27: Postmodifier connected to the object</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Postmodifier in the genitive case</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Relative clause</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Participal construction</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Prepositional phrase or adverb</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Other cases</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 28: Type of subject word</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 29: Intensifier or modifier connected to the subject</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - никакая, ни один, ни ... ни</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - этот</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Other modifier</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 30: Word order</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 31: Other clause constituents</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Indirect object in the dative</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Non-predicative instrumental</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Prepositional phrase governed by the verb</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Adverbial (phrase) of place</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Adverbial (phrase) of time</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Adverbial (phrase) of manner</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylistic Factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLE 32: Generic and individual differences</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the study

The following transformation obtains in modern Russian:

\[ N_n + V + N_a \rightarrow N_n + NEG + V + N_a/N_a \]

In other words, an object in the accusative case in an affirmative clause may take either the accusative or the genitive in the corresponding negative clause; for example,

Он читал журнал.
Он не читал журнал/журнала.

What are the factors governing the accusative/genitive variation in negative clauses? How strongly do they influence the choice of case? How do they interact? Questions like these have attracted the attention of many scholars in the field of Russian language studies throughout the past century. The first serious attempts to find an explanation were made by A. I. Thomson (1902, 1903). After him, numerous other scholars have considered the problem both in short articles and in extensive monographs. A bibliography compiled by G. G. Corbett (1986) gives a clear indication of the popularity of this topic: it lists a total of 106 studies in which the problem of case selection in Russian negative clauses is dealt with in one way or another. A number of theories have been put forward about the factors influencing the choice, but no general theory has proved infallible — and, indeed, it seems highly unlikely that such a theory can ever be arrived at. That the topic continues to be of interest is testified by the appearance of a number of important studies since the compilation of Corbett’s bibliography (e.g. Giusti Fici 1985, Meintema 1986, Neidle 1988, Nozsicska 1988).

Genitive/accusative variation in modern Russian is not an isolated phenomenon confined to the direct object in negative clauses: similar variation is found in certain types of affirmative contexts (e.g. Он ждет автобус/автобуса, Он принес воду/воды); and the same applies to the case form of the subject in a number of negative constructions (Для него не существует препятствий / Эти препятствия для него не существуют) (for further details, see Mustajoki 1985: 23-7). It must also be noted that this phenomenon is not a particularly recent one in Russian. Up until the end of the eighteenth century, however, the genitive clearly predominated in literary Russian. Greater variation began to
appear in the nineteenth century, and it would seem that the proportion of the accusative has slowly continued to rise during the present century (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 8-22).

1.2. Theoretical aspects of the quantitative study of case selection

The first publication relating to the present project was Падеж дополнения в русских отрицательных предложениях 1: изыскания новых методов в изучении старой проблемы (Mustajoki 1985). It contains a detailed survey of the various factors mentioned in earlier studies as influencing case selection; a theory section dealing with various methodological problems arising in connection with the study of this problem; and a description of the results of a test conducted at Moscow State University. Perspectives for further study are outlined at the end of the book; one potential line of enquiry mentioned in this connection is the creation of an extensive computer corpus as a basis for the statistical analysis of authentic language material. The present report is the first concrete result of this approach to the problem.

There have been earlier attempts to study the problem of case selection in Russian negative clauses in statistical terms (Restan 1959, 1960; Safarewiczowa 1959-60; Green 1979; Haka 1981; etc.). However, the complexity of the phenomenon makes it difficult to assess the reliability of the results. Every clause is bound to contain more than one factor which might potentially influence the choice of case; it is therefore frequently difficult to determine which factor has been decisive. Thus: although it may be possible to prove that clauses containing Factor X have a notably high genitive frequency, this does not necessarily prove the existence of a causal relationship, or even give a basis for postulating such a relationship. It is fully conceivable that clauses containing Factor X may also regularly contain Factor Z; and it could be Factor Z, rather than X, that ‘causes’ the preference for the genitive.

In order to achieve a higher degree of reliability and precision in the quantitative study of the problem, the following principles were observed in creating the computer corpus:

1. The corpus should be sufficiently large. Even a small corpus may be adequate for establishing the approximate overall frequency of each of the two cases; but in order to obtain meaningful data on the influence of rarer factors, it is necessary to use a corpus of several thousand negative clauses. Preferably, the clauses should number at least 10,000. Collecting such a number of examples would not be a difficult task in itself; but if every clause is to be coded in respect of more than 50 variables, the amount of work involved increases manyfold. It was therefore necessary to settle for a corpus of 4,037 clauses.

2. A wide range of styles should be represented in the material. As stylistic factors seem to have an influence on case usage, it is important that the material should contain typologically different texts. We selected texts representing four styles (cf. Zasorina 1977): plays, prose fiction, journalistic texts, and scholarly texts (for further details, see 1.4. below).

3. The number of variables considered should be as large as possible. In order to give sufficient attention to all the various aspects of the problem, practically all factors mentioned in the literature as potentially relevant were considered. In addition, a certain number of other factors (for example, the subject of the clause, or the 'degree of negativeness' of the object) were also taken into account to make the treatment as comprehensive as possible. The total number of variables was 51. In addition, it must be noted that in certain cases the different values of a particular variable may be regarded as separate factors.

4. The material should be in computerized form. This demand derives from the aim of obtaining a more detailed picture of the influence of the different factors. The use of a computer facilitates such procedures as the cross-tabulation of different variables, the elimination of a particular factor, etc. In its present form, the material in the corpus — that is, the clauses themselves and the coded information describing them — can be processed both on a microcomputer and on larger computers. During the preparation of this report, various checks and listings were conducted on an ordinary XT microcomputer with a hard disk, using the dBase III program. Some statistical calculations were performed on a VAX-VMS computer, using the SPSS-X program.

This report contains a basic statistical survey of the results obtained for the various factors. Most factors can be studied in much greater detail than was permitted by the scope of this report; it is hoped that further investigation can be undertaken on a number of points. Other aspects of the problem that remain to be dealt with include two ideas put forward in the concluding chapter of Mustajoki (1985): namely, establishing a hierarchical system of factors, and calculating the relative weight of each factor, to be expressed in terms of a weighted coefficient. The computerized material now
1.3. Symptoms (признаки) and causes (причины)

In order to enable the reader to arrive at a correct interpretation of the results presented in this report, it is necessary to emphasize one theoretical point mentioned in Mustajoki (1985: 133-40) and developed further in a separate article (Mustajoki 1990). In attempting to find an explanation for the accusative/genitive variation, we have to deal with factors of two different kinds. In the implication 'if X then Y', X may either be a 'real' cause of Y, or a linguistic phenomenon that regularly co-occurs with Y. In the former event, the relationship is causal; in the latter it is correlative. In a causal relationship, X may be properly described as 'a cause' (причина); in a correlative relationship, it will be referred to as 'a symptom' (признак). A symptom provides a quasi-explanation for the choice of case; a cause may be seen as providing a genuine explanation.

Let us assume, for instance, that we can prove with a sufficient degree of statistical reliability (eliminating the influence of other factors) that the concreteness of the object substantially increases the frequency of the accusative as the case form for a direct object with negation. This, however, does not mean that the native speaker uses this factor as a criterion in selecting the case form. The concreteness of the object is a symptom, which can be used (for example by the foreign learner) as a helpful indication on which case is likely to be preferable; but it is not an explanation for the use of a particular case in a particular situation. Instead, the native speaker may choose the accusative so as to indicate that the referent of the object is one that has been mentioned in the preceding context.

The factors dealt with in this report are mostly of the 'symptom' type. Thus, the 'rules' and tendencies that have been discovered do not usually explain the choice of case. However, results showing a correlative relationship between the presence of a particular factor and the use of a particular case have many applications. Firstly, they can frequently give us valuable indications on where to look for the real causes that determine the choice. Secondly, such results can be used to advantage in situations where the case form is chosen mechanically by referring to a specific rule: this is the approach used by a computer, or by those foreign learners who rely heavily on a network of rules in producing Russian text or speech.

It must further be mentioned that the investigation of symptoms is helpful in the search for linguistic explanations (языковые объяснения). The example given above illustrates a communicative explanation (речевое объяснение).¹ provides an answer to the question of why form Y was chosen by the speaker in a particular speech situation. Linguistic explanations belong to a different level: here the question is why case Y is generally preferred in Russian when contextual condition X is present. The discovery of linguistic explanations puts the scholar on the trail of the general mechanisms that condition the use of linguistic forms.

1.4. The material

As was noted above, the material for this study represents four different styles. Within each stylistic category, the necessary textual material was selected in a relatively random fashion, the choice depending partly on what texts were available. However, there were two fundamental principles affecting the selection of material.

Firstly, the texts should, as far as possible, reflect current usage. As is widely known, the Russian term 'современный русский язык' ('modern/contemporary/present-day Russian') may be interpreted in various ways: some define it as ranging 'from Pushkin to our day'; others from the Revolution to the present; etc. In our opinion, it is advisable to interpret this term as referring to the Russian language as spoken and written at the present day. This means that in studying the contemporary language, the material should be as recent as possible, particularly if the phenomenon under consideration is one that is undergoing a process of change — case selection for the direct object with negation being a good example. At the present moment, it seems a reasonable requirement that all language material used should date from the postwar

¹ The original terminology is in Russian (cf. Mustajoki 1990), and there are problems in finding precise equivalents as no satisfactory 'native' terminology is available in English to express the язык — речь dichotomy. In Saussurean terms, 'linguistic explanations' pertain to langue and 'communicative explanations' to parole.

² This is reflected by the different translations, 'modern Russian' surely admitting a rather wider interpretation than 'present-day Russian'.
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period; and even within this period there should be a definite emphasis
on texts from the last two decades.

Another question of principle is connected with the relationship of
norm and usage. In our understanding, 'usage' (узус) may be defined as
a statistical generalization based on authentic language material. How-
ever, in certain Soviet studies (e.g. Zasorina 1977) this has been inter-
preted in such a way that the language material used as a basis for the
generalization has been selected on strictly normative grounds: the texts
have been taken from 'exemplary writers'. This may be referred to as
'нормированный узус' (roughly: 'standardized usage'; cf. Mustajoki
1988: 175-6). From the point of view of the present study, restricting
the material in this way would have been a misleading procedure, as the
aim is not to study the norms of Russian, but actual usage; nor is this
study being conducted with a view to using the results as a basis for nor-
mative judgements. Thus, the authors whose texts were used as material
were not selected on their literary or stylistic merits. However, certain
stylistic requirements were applied: texts chiefly representing dialectal
or non-standard usage were not included.

Three of the stylistic categories (plays, fiction, scholarly texts) were
each originally represented by six samples of two hundred negative
clauses (with a smaller seventh sample in the case of the plays). Schol-
arly usage was represented by linguistic texts; the examples from drama
and fiction came from various modern authors. For the fourth style
(journalism), a corresponding number of examples (1,400) were taken
from thirteen different issues of 'Sputnik' magazine, 1981-82. All ex-
amples thus found were systematically included in the corpus at this
stage. Later, the number of clauses was reduced by the elimination of
certain examples that may be regarded as being marginal to the present
problem, or of limited interest owing to the presence of one particu-
larly strong factor (see 2.1. below); this meant that the total number of
examples used in the main part of this study was 2,722.

The material was collected from the following sources:

1. Plays
   В. С. Розов:
   Страница жизни (1953)
   В добрый час! (1954)
   В поисках радости (1957)
   Неравный бой (1960)
   В дороге (1961)
   А. Д. Салынский:
   Взорванный ад (1965)

2. Fictional prose
   С. П. Залыгин: Южноамериканский вариант (1973)
   Ф. А. Абрамов: Дом (1978)
   Б. Л. Васильев: Не стреляйте белых лебедей (1973)
   В. А. Солоухин: Прекрасная Адыгене (1973)
   В. В. Орлов: Альтыст Данилов (1973-77)
   Ю. В. Трифонов: Старик (1978)

3. Scholarly texts
   А. В. Калинин: Лексика русского языка (изд. 3-е, 1978). The first edition
dates from 1966.

Most sources give the title as 'Не стреляйте белых лебедей', but the above
version was used in the only edition of the novel available to us. We have no evidence
of the author's own preference; both forms are grammatical.
1.5. Criteria for inclusion

The following principles were applied in collecting the material:

1. **The verb had to be one that takes an accusative object in affirmative constructions.** Thus, those clauses in which the object is governed by a verb always requiring the genitive were excluded (e.g. clauses with the verbs *достигать* or *бойтись*). However, those clauses were included in which the object is governed by a verb that may
   a) take either the genitive or the accusative in affirmative clauses (e.g. *ждать*)
   b) take a genitive object with perfective verbs (e.g. *выпить воду* or *воды-*, with a difference in meaning; but only *пить воду* in the imperfective aspect).

2. **All clause types were included.** Thus, declarative, interrogative, and imperative clauses, dependent clauses of various types, as well as constructions with gerunds and participles, were all included in the corpus.

3. **The negation could be expressed by не, нельзя, or невозможно.** Clauses with intensified negation (with the particle *ни* or a word with the prefix *ни-*) were also included, as were those containing double negation (two negations cancelling each other out).

4. **The object could belong to any part of speech.** The object could be a noun, adjective, pronoun, or numeral.

5. **Quantitative expressions were included.** Quantitative expressions of time and distance appearing in the accusative in affirmative contexts, and in the accusative or the genitive with negation, were included, as were similar constructions with normally intransitive verbs (e.g. *не спать свои ночи / своих ночей*). However, such examples were deleted from the ‘final’ version of the corpus, on which the main part of this report is based; cf. 2.1.2. below.

1.6. The variables

Apart from a serial number assigned to all examples, fifty-one items of information about each clause were coded into the computer. These fifty-one variables are listed below in the order in which they appear in the material; this also corresponds reasonably well to the order in which they appear in the material; this also corresponds reasonably well to the order of presentation in this book. The variables have been grouped under general headings for the sake of clarity; it is acknowledged that these headings do not constitute a fully coherent system from a rigorously theoretical point of view. Brief commentaries are given where the title of the variable is not entirely self-explanatory. A complete list of the different factors coming under each variable will be found in an appendix at the end of the book.

1. CASE

Apart from the accusative/genitive distinction, it was also taken into account whether this distinction is morphologically unambiguous or based on semantic/contextual factors; there were also two separate categories for clauses in which the case of the object cannot be determined (these were excluded from the analysis at a later stage).
The force and scope of negation

2. THE CLAUSE IS FUNCTIONALLY AFFIRMATIVE
The manifestations of affirmative semantic content include double negation (e.g. не мог не заметить) and questions implying a positive answer.

3. AN INTENSIFIER OR A MODIFIER CONNECTED TO THE VERB
Includes intensified negation (совсем не знает, никак нельзя понять) and various modifiers restricting the negation in some way (еще не знает).

4. AN INTENSIFIER OR A MODIFIER CONNECTED TO THE OBJECT
Intensified negation with никакой, ни один, etc; restricted negation with только etc.

5. SCOPE OF NEGATION

Clause types

6. DECLARATIVE, INTERROGATIVE, OR EXCLAMATORY CLAUSE
Apart from this basic threefold division, interrogative clauses were analysed further in terms of their formal properties (the nature of the interrogative word, if any).

7. SEMANTIC FUNCTION OF AN INTERROGATIVE CLAUSE
Includes functions like 'suggestion', 'reproach', 'rhetorical question', and 'pure question'.

8. TYPES OF MAIN AND SUBORDINATE CLAUSES
Apart from the basic division into main and subordinate clauses, various types of subclauses were classified in greater detail. Constructions with participles and gerunds were also considered here.

Variables connected with the predicate

9. MOOD

10. TENSE

11. ASPECT OF THE VERB GOVERNING THE OBJECT
Verbs were classified into semantic categories such as 'verbs of perception', 'verbs of feeling and emotion', 'verbs of cognition', 'verbs of speech', 'verbs of movement', 'verbs of physical impact', 'verbs of creation', 'identifying verbs', and 'verbs of possession'.

14. VERBAL PREFIXES
Prefixal verbs were classified into word-formational types according to the prefixes that they contain.

Infinitival constructions

15. SEMANTIC TYPE OF HEADWORD IN INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTIONS
Constructions in which the verb governing the object stands in the infinitive were classified in accordance with the semantic type of the headword (if any): the factors include infinitival constructions denoting necessity, permission or prohibition, ability, attempt, etc.

16. FORMAL TYPE OF HEADWORD IN INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTIONS
Infinitival constructions were classified according to the formal properties of the headword, which may be an adjective, a predicative, an imperfective or perfective verb, etc. Constructions with two infinitives (не мог научиться терпеть) were considered separately.

17. THE POSITION OF NEGATION IN INFINITIVAL CONSTRUCTIONS
The three basic types are: negation preceding the headword (Не могу читать этой книги); negation immediately preceding the infinitive (Могу не читать этой книги); and double negation (Не могу не читать этой книги).

Idiomaticity

18. DEGREE OF IDIOMATICITY
The different categories included clearly non-idiomatic collocations; idiomatic, metaphorical, or fixed expressions appearing in both negative and affirmative contexts; and idioms always appearing with negation.

19. SEMANTIC TYPE OF IDIOMATIC EXPRESSION

Variables connected with the object

20. PART OF SPEECH OF THE OBJECT

21. GENDER OF THE OBJECT NOUN
Here, as under 22-5, objects belonging to other parts of speech were not considered.
22. DECLENSION OF THE OBJECT NOUN
Instead of the traditional classification of declension types, a 'strong' and a 'weak'
decision were distinguished for the purposes of cross-tabulation, with adjectival
nouns constituting a third group.

23. DEGREE OF NEGATIVENESS OF THE OBJECT NOUN
Nouns with clearly positive meaning (e.g. достоинство) and ones with clearly nega-
tive meaning (e.g. недостаток) were considered, the majority of nouns being con-
sidered neutral in this respect.

24. SEMANTIC TYPE OF THE OBJECT NOUN
All nouns appearing as objects were classified according to their meaning.

25. HOMONYMY BETWEEN THE GENITIVE SINGULAR AND ACCUSATIVE
PLURAL FORMS OF THE OBJECT NOUN
The classification was based on whether the noun in question has different or identical
endings for the genitive singular and the nominative/accusative plural (cf. парка
— парки, but книги — книга); where the endings were identical, stress was also
considered (cf. крёсла—крёсла, but слово—слово).

26. TYPE OF PRONOUN
The various types of pronouns found as direct objects were treated separately.

27. NUMBER
Although this variable is particularly interesting where nouns are concerned, all object
words were classified as singular or plural.

28. PREMODIFIER CONNECTED TO THE OBJECT
Various kinds of premodifying adjectives, pronouns, etc. were considered.

29. POSTMODIFIER CONNECTED TO THE OBJECT
Includes postmodifying genitives, relative clauses, participial constructions, etc.

30. DEFINITENESS OF THE OBJECT

Variables connected with the subject

31. TYPE OF SUBJECT
The grammatical and, to a certain extent, semantic properties of the clause subject
were taken into account.

32. INTENSIFIER OR MODIFIER CONNECTED TO THE SUBJECT

Syntactic factors (word order, minor constituents)

33. WORD ORDER
The classification was based on the order in which the verb, object, and subject (if
any), appeared in the clause.

34. INDIRECT OBJECT IN THE DATIVE
Indirect objects expressed by a dative were examined in terms of their presence and
their position in the clause. A similar procedure was applied to Variables 35-61.

35. INSTRUMENTAL
All functions of the instrumental were considered; predicative instrumentals were
singled out for special treatment at a later stage.

36. PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE CLOSELY CONNECTED TO THE VERB
This group included prepositional phrases which could be said to be either part of
the valency of the verb, or otherwise closely connected syntactically to the verb itself
or the combination of verb and object.

37. ADVERBIAL OF PLACE ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS КУДА? ОТКУДА?
Apart from adverbials proper, prepositional phrases were included if they were clearly
adverbial in function. (The same applies to 38-41.)

38. ADVERBIAL OF PLACE ANSWERING THE QUESTION ГДЕ?

39. ADVERBIAL OF TIME ANSWERING THE QUESTION КОГДА?

40. ADVERBIAL OF TIME ANSWERING THE QUESTION КАК ДОЛГО?

41. OTHER TIME ADVERBIALS

42. ADVERBIAL OF MANNER

43. OTHER CLAUSE CONSTITUENTS

44. AUTHORIZATION
Phrases like по-моему, согласно + dat., stating the source of the facts or opinions
cited.

45. FORM OF ADDRESS

46. INTRODUCTORY WORD OR PHRASE
Expressions like во-первых, пожалуй, к счастью, как ни странно.

47. TYPE OF INTRODUCTORY WORD OR PHRASE
A more detailed classification of the expressions noted under Variable 46.
48. INTENSIFIER OR RESTRICTING MODIFIER CONNECTED TO VARIOUS CLAUSE CONSTITUENTS
Intensifiers and restricting modifiers connected to constituents other than the subject, verb, or object.

49. CONSTITUENT TO WHICH INTENSIFIER OR MODIFIER RELATES
Identifies the clause constituent affected by the intensifiers and modifiers examined under Variable 48.

Stylistic factors

50. SOURCE
Specifies the author of the example, or in the case of the Sputnik examples the issue of the magazine from which it is taken.

51. PROSE VS. DIALOGUE
Indicates whether the example is taken from dialogue or continuous prose.

This list of variables may serve as a basis for an important observation relating to the statistical treatment of the various factors. Many of the factors contained within the variables may be given completely or almost completely unambiguous definitions. Thus, for example, there are generally no problems in determining the tense of the predicate verb or the part of speech of the object. However, some of the variables included in the list do require subjective interpretation (for example, the semantic type of the object, or the degree of idiomaticity of the Verb + Object collocation). It is essential in such cases that the reader should know the criteria used for defining the various factors. The matter has been given special attention in the commentaries in Chapter 2; illustrative examples are also given.

2. THE FINDINGS

2.1. Restrictions relating to the present report
The material was described above in the form in which it was coded into the memory of a computer. Before embarking on an examination of our findings, it is necessary to note the following restrictions that relate specifically to this report.

2.1.1. Variables not dealt with in the present report
A few of the variables listed above have been excluded from consideration in this report. Variable 5 (Scope of negation) and Variable 30 (Definiteness of the object noun) were omitted because any systematic treatment of these two variables will have to rely heavily on subjective interpretation. In its present form, our material was considered to contain too many inconsistencies on these points for the results to be fully reliable. However, although these variables are not treated systematically in this report, observations relating to them are occasionally made in connection with other factors.

Variables 44-7 were thought to be of such limited interest that they were also left out at the present stage. It seems practically certain that they do not influence case selection. Variables 48 and 49 were similarly excluded: although intuitively they might be assumed to be potentially relevant to the choice, our preliminary analysis indicated that they are not of statistical interest.

Additionally, the original Variables 34-43 were telescoped into one: in this report, they appear as separate Factors under Variable 31. Finally, the order of presentation has been altered slightly in one or two cases (cf. the Appendix). Although the number of variables dealt with in this report is thus reduced to 33, the size of the corpus is not affected.

2.1.2. Marginal Cases
For various reasons, clauses containing any of the following features were excluded from consideration:

1. The case of the object cannot be reliably determined (Variable 1, Factors 5 and 6). There were a total of eight such instances; for example, Двери не открывать ни в коем случае! [Вампилов]
These two examples were classified differently under Variable 1. In the first one, the ambiguity is 'real' in the sense that the speaker could be referring to one or more doors (depending on whether the form _двери_ is interpreted as a gen. sing, or as an acc. pl.); such instances were classified as '5'. The second example, however, can only be regarded as 'ambiguous' in a purely formal sense and was classified as '6'. The meaning is not affected whichever interpretation is preferred (the context makes it clear that there are several peaks, none of which casts a shadow; and therefore, even if we take the form _двери_ to be a singular, it clearly has plural reference in this context). However, although ambiguity can be of two types — formal + semantic, or only formal — it is obvious that clauses of both types must be excluded from consideration in the present study: it would be impossible to use them in the statistical analysis, as the main variable of the cross-tabulation (CASE) cannot be given an unambiguous value.

2. **The clause is so strongly idiomatic as to exclude any possibility of variation.** This includes clauses in which the negated verb and its object (possibly in connection with other words) constitute a fixed expression for which there is no affirmative equivalent; for example

> Владик в нём души не чает. [Салынский]

> Вышел бы в смокинге — ни черта не узнал. [Зорин]

Clauses of this type numbered ninety-three in the corpus; the object was always in the genitive.

Also excluded were certain clauses in which the idiomaticity is chiefly connected with the object itself rather than the whole collocation. This interpretation seems appropriate in the case of such expressions as _ничего_ — both used with the meaning 'nothing' or 'not the least bit (of)' — which can occur with a relatively wide variety of different verbs and could not therefore be said to form stock expressions with any particular verb. Examples:

> Мы пойдем, я буду рассказывать, а ты ничего не говори, ничего ... [Розов]

> Ничего в жизни она не любила так, как рыться своей пятерней в его кудрявой голове. [Абрамов]

Here, too, there is no real element of choice; and clauses with _ничего_ as object were therefore excluded from consideration.

4. **The verb governing the object is one that regularly appears with the genitive in affirmative contexts.** As noted above, verbs always requiring the genitive were not included in the corpus at all. At this stage, those verbs were eliminated which may appear in affirmative clauses with either the accusative or the genitive: namely, _ждать, искать, просить, обращать внимание, не дает возможно_см_у the.

> Все равно с вами кашу не сварит, раз у вас в башке дорогая сес... [Салынский]

> У кальчака в нем нет бокалов, в жизни он не любил так, как рыться своей пятерней в его кудрявой голове. [Абрамов]

> И вот уже ничего более не напоминает о разыгравшейся здесь трагедии. [Залыгин]

There were four such instances; thus, the total number of clauses excluded on the grounds of idiomaticity was ninety-seven.

It must also be noted here that certain idioms and fixed collocations which may be used in both positive and negative statements are extremely likely to prefer a particular case form with negation. Thus, for example, it is practically certain that the expression _не морочить голову_ will always take the accusative; whereas in expressions like _не обращать внимания, не дает возможности_ the genitive is very much the norm. However, expressions of this nature were allowed to remain in the 'final' version of the corpus for reasons explained in connection with the treatment of Variable 17 (p. 130).

3. **The object is ничего.** For all practical purposes, this pronoun invariably appears in the genitive when used as a direct object. There were 531 such instances in the corpus; and no exceptions were found. Examples:

> Не думай, я буду рассказывать, а ты ничего не говори, ничего ... [Розов]

> Ничего в жизни она не любила так, как рыться своей пятерней в его кудрявой голове. [Абрамов]

Here, too, there is no real element of choice; and clauses with _ничего_ as object were therefore excluded from consideration.

4. **The verb governing the object is one that regularly appears with the genitive in affirmative contexts.** As noted above, verbs always requiring the genitive were not included in the corpus at all. At this stage, those verbs were eliminated which may appear in affirmative clauses with either the accusative or the genitive: namely, _ждать, искать, просить,_

There was also one example in which _ничего_ 'not a drop' appeared in its fully literal sense with reference to a liquid substance; this was not excluded at the present stage, but came under Strong Factor 5 (see p. 27).
It would have been misleading to allow negative clauses with these verbs to remain in the final version of the corpus, as it is frequently impossible to tell which case would have been used in the corresponding affirmative clause (and in a number of instances one may be reasonably sure that this would have been the genitive). Thus, if the object of one of these verbs appears in the genitive with negation, this may not be attributable to the transformation which is the subject of this study; therefore, this group of verbs cannot be considered together with those that always take the accusative in the absence of negation.

Our corpus contained seventy-five examples with one of the verbs listed above; the genitive was used in all but three of these. The exceptions were:

- А другой балет не хочешь? [Салынский]
- А раз нет, значит, пенсии не жди. [Вампилов]
- — Бабушка Маша, я не хочу яблоки, я хочу мандаринки. [Спутник]

However, both of the verbs concerned appeared much more frequently with the genitive: there were ten instances of ждать + genitive, and twenty-two instances of хотеть + genitive.

In addition, prefixal verbs with one of the above-mentioned verbs as the stem were also eliminated at this stage for reasons of convenience; although some of these (e.g. сыскать, выпросить) always take the accusative in affirmative clauses, they were considered to be so rare that they could be legitimately excluded at this stage; moreover, certain other prefixal verbs (e.g. ожидать, захотеть) behave in the same way as the non-prefixal verbs listed above. The corpus contained twenty-five occurrences of the prefixal verbs in this group, including three with accusative.

It should be noted that clauses with a 'partitive genitive' were not excluded, partly because it can be difficult in negative contexts to determine whether partitive meaning is intended or not (cf. especially Variable 12, Factor 536 on p. 97). However, if it seems likely that partitive genitives might significantly influence the figures under individual factors, this has been noted in the commentaries.

5. The verb is intransitive (with an expression of time or distance as 'object'). Quantitative expressions denoting time or distance, appearing in connection with intransitive verbs, behave like direct objects in that they take the accusative in affirmative clauses, and may take either the accusative or the genitive with negation. In some cases similar constructions with normally intransitive verbs may appear without quantitative meaning (e.g. спать ночи). As noted under 1.5. above, clauses with such 'quasi-objects' were included in the corpus and coded in the standard way (they were classified as Factor 990 under the Variable 'Semantic type of the verb'). 'Objects' of this type were excluded from further consideration at this stage, as it was thought unwise to treat them together with 'genuine' objects. However, it seems clear that the genitive is always used if the clause contains an intensifier expressing the notion 'not even', or if this notion is implicit in the context:

- Я не спал ни одной секунды. [Розов]
- Не пройдете и трех километров. [Салынский]
- Уж минуты прожить без меня не может. [Софронов]

Otherwise, variation may be found, e.g.

- Как вернулся с юга, ночи не сплю, ... [Салынский] (ass.)
- ... ночей не спал ... [Орлов] (gen.)
- Тем более никто не дает им права просиживать рабочее время ...
  [Спутник] (ass.)
- Вы не прожили сорока двух лет в местности, где ... [Софронов] (gen.)

There were a total of twenty-one clauses with an intransitive verb followed by an object-like quantitative expression; the accusative was used in six of these. However, eleven of the examples with genitive were ones with the meaning 'not even' clearly present; thus, there were only four examples in which the genitive was used in the absence of intensified negation. Interestingly, as many as five of the examples with accusative had the word ночь (in the singular or plural) as the 'object' of спать; this collocation appeared only once with the genitive.

It must further be noted that the accusative is obviously compulsory if a temporal expression occurs as a time adverbial and falls completely outside the scope of negation; thus, in

- Дед в этот ящик сто лет не заглядывает. [Салынский]

there is no possibility of selecting the genitive as the idea is: 'For a hundred years it has been the case that ...': сто лет does not behave like an object in this clause, but functions as a perfectly normal time adverbial, showing for how long the statement (which happens to be negative) has been true. Eight examples of this type were included in the original version of the corpus; their inclusion may be justified by their structural similarity with clauses containing a negated object. However, it is obvious that examples of this type must be excluded from the final version of the corpus.
The Findings: Strong Factors

The total number of clauses omitted as Marginal Cases was 764. After their elimination, the number of clauses still remaining in the corpus was 3273. It must be noted that the decision to eliminate the Marginal Cases influences the statistical figures to a considerable degree; particularly significant is the elimination of ничего, as this factor occurs with an extremely high frequency. Thus, if clauses with ничего and those with other 'marginal' factors are included in the figures, the total accusative frequency is 30.7%; but when clauses with ничего as object are excluded from consideration, the corresponding figure is 35.3%; and after the exclusion of the remaining Marginal Cases an accusative frequency of 37.1% is arrived at.  

2.2. \textit{Strong Factors} \footnote{This does not correspond exactly with the sum total of the figures for the various individual Marginal Cases, as some clauses contain more than one of the features listed above: for example, \begin{itemize} 
\item А \textit{хрена} не хочь? [Трифонов] \end{itemize} is an idiom which cannot appear without negation, and also contains a (non-standard) form of the verb \textit{хотеть}.}

Some of the factors influencing the case of the object are extremely strong in the sense that other factors seem to be of negligible importance in their presence. This means that if the corpus contains a substantial number of clauses with such factors, this could to a certain extent 'distort' the results of a statistical analysis as far as the significance of other factors is concerned. However, it must be pointed out that even the Strong Factors cannot be said to dictate the choice of case with 100% certainty (although many of them come extremely close to doing so, and for some there is no evidence of variation). Our list of Strong Factors is based only on the results of the present analysis and does not, for example, correspond exactly to that given in the Academy Grammar (AG 1980-II: 416-17). The criteria for inclusion as a Strong Factor were extremely strict for constructions with a small number of occurrences in the corpus: no exceptions were allowed where the total number of occurrences was below twenty-five; and even in the absence of counter-examples, caution was exercised. However, certain factors which occurred more frequently (e.g. the verb \textit{иметь}) were included among the Strong Factors in spite of a small number of exceptions found in the material, as otherwise they might have significantly distorted the statistical figures in the main body of the report; but no construction was admitted as a Strong Factor if the proportion of the counter-examples was more than 5% of all occurrences. Furthermore, purely statistical criteria were not always regarded as paramount: in certain cases factors for which the statistical evidence might have been regarded as sufficient were nevertheless not included among the Strong Factors for various reasons. Thus, factors like 'question conveying a suggestion' or the existential use of the verb \textit{знать} might well have been regarded as powerful enough for inclusion in this group; but they were nevertheless 'disqualified', the former because of a certain element of subjectivity, the latter mainly because it was thought better to treat it in connection with the basic meaning of \textit{знать.}

It should also be observed that there were yet other factors which narrowly failed to meet the statistical criteria for inclusion among the Strong Factors, but which still might cause distortions in the study of other variables because of their relatively high frequency, or a tendency to occur in specific types of context. Thus, for example, the pronoun \textit{это} as object appears in the genitive in about nine instances out of ten and thus did not qualify as a Strong Factor. However, there are as many as 160 occurrences of this factor in the 'final' version of the corpus; and this pronoun has a strong tendency to appear as the object of a certain group of verbs (e.g. \textit{видеть, делать, знать, понимать}), quite often in dialogue, and 'disproportionately often' in imperative clauses. This means that distortions could arise in the analysis of these factors (and some others — an extreme example is Variable 2, Factor 2 on pp. 35-6). Therefore, an attempt has been made to take account of \textit{это} and other relatively powerful factors wherever it seemed possible that they might influence the results; and where they have indeed turned out to bias the figures to a significant degree, the matter is given special attention in the commentaries on the factors thus affected.
2.2.1. Factors generally demanding the accusative

Strong Factor 1: Predicative instrumental

Seventeen occurrences, all with accusative. Examples:

... никто из живущих по берегам Байкала не назовет озером этот уникальный водоем ... [Спутник]

Никто из многомиллионных его поклонников не считал это пределом ... [Спутник]

Но пока не спустишься до травы, восхождение нельзя считать законченным. [Солоухин]

The presence in the clause of a predicative instrumental (part of the valency of certain verbs in some of their uses — e.g. считать/называть/признавать/делать что-л. чём-л./каким-л.) is considered by many scholars to necessitate the use of the accusative or at least to make the genitive an extremely unlikely choice: this view is taken by Butorin (1953: 10), Deribas (1956: 24), Listvinov (1956: 193), Restan (1960: 99; accusative frequency 91.7%, n = 12; see below), Solonicev (1964: 110), Dončeva (1964: 98), Davison (1967: 40, 61), Borras & Christian (1971: 28), Ravič (1971: 261-2), Timberlake (1975: 130), Graudina et al. (1976: 35), the Academy Grammar (AG 1980-I: 417), and Rozental' (1985: 276). The reason behind this preference seems to be that the scope of negation, as noted by Timberlake (ibid.), is 'diffused' in such constructions: often the negation does not really affect the direct object at all, but only relates to the predicative (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 71). No authentic counter-examples that might be said to represent present-day usage have come to our attention. Restan’s single example with a genitive (... нельзя признать последовательным следующего определения винительного падежа) comes from the nineteenth-century linguist Potebnja — in fact, from a text which is not even supposed to be part of Restan’s corpus. This does not make the example non-existent, but does mean that it proves nothing about present-day usage; its gratuitous inclusion in the corpus also casts some doubt on the reliability of Restan’s statistical figures here.

The evidence from our corpus clearly confirms the existence of a strong preference for the accusative. Although a relatively high proportion of the examples (twelve) contain infinitival constructions, the fact that there are four clauses with the accusative это as object (three of these without an infinitival construction) seems indicative of a rather firm preference connected with the predicative instrumental construction, considering that otherwise this pronoun tends to appear in the genitive roughly nine times out of ten (see Variable 25, Factor 1). However, here as elsewhere, one must allow for the possibility of some fluctuation, rare as such instances may be. Interesting evidence is provided by Neidle (1988: 56), who notes that several of her informants accept the genitive in the following example, which actually contains two strong accusative-favouring factors (cf. Strong Factor 3 below):

? Он не считает Анну удивительной; это Женю он считает такой хорошей студенткой, (original emphasis; the question-mark is ours)

In this example, the logical stress falls on the object, and it seems reasonable to assume that in such cases the genitive may appear in this construction, as the object is clearly within the scope of negation (the importance of logical stress may be illustrated by means of synonymous transformations: if the object were not strongly stressed, the clause in question would mean more or less the same as Он считает Анну неудивительной; but with logical stress on the object, the meaning is Он считает удивительной не Анну, а ...). However, our informants explicitly rejected the genitive in the above example; nor did they find it acceptable in the following sentence, in which no other Strong Factor ‘interferes’:

? Я не нахожу русского языка трудным, но китайскому никак не могу научиться, (based on an example given by Morison, ibid.)

Our informants did accept the use of the genitive form этого in constructions with a predicative instrumental; but they considered it fully natural only in initial position:

Я не считаю это/(этого) возможным.

Этого/(этого) я не считаю возможным.

This is in accord with the view taken by Davison (1967: 45) that two-place verbs of this type tend to take the accusative even with это as object. The fact that этого in initial position is acceptable might be seen as supporting the ‘logical stress’ theory, for in this position the pronoun is, indeed, likely to be strongly stressed. However, the possibility of using the genitive here seems to be primarily connected with a genitive preference associated with esto itself (cf. pp. 166-8). Thus, although it is necessary to allow for the possibility of idiolectal variation, it is certainly clear that, contrary to what has been suggested by some scholars (e.g. Morison, ibid., and Ward 1965: 219), logical stress on the object does not make the genitive obligatory, or even usual: in the majority of instances it must be viewed as being at best marginally acceptable.
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Strong Factor 2: чуть не, едва не

Thirteen occurrences, all with accusative. Examples:
   Ты мне руку едва не сломал. [Слынков]
   Самые первые попытки в этом направлении чуть было не дискредитировали сам метод. [Спутник]
   А потом в окно поглядел и чуть вилку не выронил. [Васильев]

The constructions чуть (было) не, чуть ли не, едва (ли) не may be regarded as being functionally affirmative, even though in clauses containing these constructions the event denoted by the predicate verb does not take place and is therefore, in a sense, negated. However, a clause with чуть не etc. denotes an event which almost did take place, and the meaning is thus close to that of a formally affirmative sentence containing the word почти; it is therefore reasonable to treat чуть не and its variants as examples of positive meaning in spite of the formal presence of negation. Indeed, it would appear that clauses of this type are not perceived as being properly negative at all: the particle не evidently 'loses its independence' in these constructions, becoming part of a compound particle with a meaning of its own. It might further be noted that these constructions always relate to specific events by virtue of their semantics, and cannot occur where generality is implied — this may be seen as a further factor which makes the use of the genitive unlikely (cf. AG 1980-II: 418, Mustajoki 1985: 49).

Although our corpus contained only a small number of clauses with these constructions, it was felt that чуть не (and the synonyms mentioned above) should be regarded as a Strong Factor favouring the use of the accusative. Earlier research seems to point in this direction (see especially Butorin 1953: 10, Deribas 1956: 24, Davison 1967: 61, Safarewiczowa 1960: 109-26, Tsurikov 1967: 185); all of these scholars note that the accusative is clearly preferred, and in spite of the cautious formulations used by some of them, no examples with the genitive are given. Moreover, all the examples in our corpus were ones in which native-speaking informants considered the use of the genitive unacceptable, or at the very least highly unlikely; nor could they think of contexts where the genitive would seem natural (though this, of course, is not conclusive evidence against the existence of such contexts).

Eleven of our examples contained one of the constructions with чуть, while only two had едва; however, these two are virtual synonyms in this function, and the same conclusion seems to apply to both: the accusative is the norm, and there are no counter-examples at our disposal.

Strong Factor 3: Noun denoting a person as object

Seventy-six occurrences: Accusative 74 (97.4%), Genitive 2

Examples with accusative:
   Иван, почему Надежду сюда не позвал? [Дворецкий]
   На охоту я не взял бы с собой ни одну женщину. [Вампилов]
   А Пинг-Панг шел и спрашивал: не видал ли кто его маму? [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
   Мир не знал такой злодни, ... [Зорин]
   Я не помню своей матери, ... [Вампилов]

The following scholars note that the accusative is clearly preferred when the object is a noun denoting a human being: Butorin (1953: 12); Uglitsky (1956: 380, with particular reference to proper names and nouns denoting family relationships); Kout (1960: 31); Fleckenstein 1961: 217; Borras & Christian 1971: 29, with proper names singled out as a particularly significant factor). Some note a similar preference with animate nouns in general (Safarewiczowa 1960: 109-26; Timberlake 1975: 124; AG 1980-II: 417; Rozental' 1985: 275); for nouns denoting animals, see p. 150 of this report. In addition, proper names are mentioned by a number of scholars as clearly preferring the accusative (this frequently also includes inanimate proper names): Deribas (1956: 23); Kulagin (1959: 103); Restan (1960: 97; accusative frequency for proper names regardless of animacy 76.7%, n = 43); Dončeva (1964: 98-9); Ravić (1971: 264).

Our results show a very strong preference for the accusative; and it may be noted that proper names within this category were always in the accusative (40 occurrences; but cf. Strong Factor 1 for evidence of possible fluctuation on rare occasions). Of the two counter-examples found in our collection, the first one contains an 'existential знать' (cf. p. 87). The second one might also be explained as having implications of an 'existential' type ('My mother does not exist in my memory'; though it must be noted that the genitive is not de rigueur with the verb помнить, cf. p. 88). In the latter example it may also be relevant that the object noun is not one ending in -а/-я in the base form (cf. above). However, матери and дочь do appear in the accusative in our sample (twice each), as in the following sentence in which the verb is, in fact, one that usually favours the genitive.6

6 It would seem reasonable to assume that considerations of speech rhythm may play
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On the whole, the accusative is so strongly preferred that it seemed reasonable to include this group among the Strong Factors. However, exceptions are not unheard-of, and there is, for example, every reason to assume that if premodified by никакой, nouns of this type would probably tend to appear in the genitive (cf. Strong Factor 4 below). The results of Mustajoki’s experiment (1985: 156,161) also suggest that while an overwhelming majority of native speakers are likely to choose the accusative when the object is a noun denoting a person, the preference is not always unanimous.

2.2.2. Factors generally demanding the genitive

Strong Factor 4: The premodifier никакой

125 occurrences, all with genitive. Examples:

Я не извлекал лично для себя никакой выгоды. [Дворецкий]
Мы не ставим перед собою никаких историко-фонетических или историко-фонематических задач. [Аванесов]
Никуда не ходи и никаких заявлений не подавай! [Трифонов]

The premodifier никакой both extends the scope of negation and adds to its force, although there may be contexts in which the former function is largely irrelevant, никакой being used merely for emphasis. In any event, the genitive is to be expected (cf. Variable 4, pp. 46-50); and it is regarded as compulsory or near-compulsory by Kout (1960: 28), Restan (1960: 101), Dončeva (1964: 98), Listvinov (1965: 191), Davidson (1967: 61), Ravić (1971: 283), Timberlake (1975: 126), Graudina et al. (1976: 35), Green (1979: 179-80), Haka (1981: 47-50, 102), and the Academy Grammar (1980-II: 416-17). Our results clearly confirm this. Again, however, certain reservations have to be made: there are some indications in the literature that on rare occasions the accusative might at least be permissible. Thus, Timberlake (1975: 124) suggests that if the object is an animate noun, the use of the accusative may not be out of the question; the following example is given:

? Никакую женщину я не вижу!7

It may also be interesting to look at the information provided by an experiment described in Mustajoki (1985). The results show, generally speaking, that the genitive is almost unanimously chosen by native speakers in clauses with никакой premodifying the object. However, there were a few dissenters in some cases: and although the ‘deviant’ answers were in all instances so few that they may be regarded as idiolectal features relatively marginal to the collective norm as a whole, it does seem that variation is not totally impossible. However, no authentic examples with the accusative have come to our attention.

Strong Factor 5: The intensifying particle ни

Twenty-four occurrences, all with genitive. Examples:

Как быть с бирюкрами, которые не дают истратить ни копейки бездесятикратныхсогласований?[Салынский]
Не поверите, не принимал сегодня ни грамма и сейчас не хочу. [Вампилов]
Они и узнать друг о друге ни словечка не имели права. [Орлов]

Although the examples were relatively few, there is every reason to assume that this factor virtually necessitates the use of the genitive. Constructions of this type are comparatively rare except in a few basic types of context: ни в this function is typically connected to units of measurement and the like (including the names of monetary units); and не сказать ни слова is a reasonably frequent expression (11 occurrences). In addition, this group includes clauses of the following type in which the object is ни один, used independently rather than as a premodifier:

Он не оставил без внимания ни одного из вопросов,... [Мещерский];
this is, in fact, one of the few environments where it seems conceivable that the accusative could be used as a rare alternative. (Ни один as a premodifying construction is not included under this factor, and the same applies to ни малейший and the coordinating construction ни ... ни: all of these seem to allow some variation, and are dealt with under Variable 4 below.)

7 The question-mark indicates that this sentence may be regarded, in Timberlake’s own definition, as ‘marginally acceptable’, the version with a genitive being nevertheless clearly preferred. Unfortunately, our corpus yields no comparable examples.
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Strong Factor 6: The verb иметь

336 occurrences: Accusative 8, Genitive 328 (97.6%).

Examples with accusative:

Не имею права иметь собственное мнение, хотя и имею. [Дворецкий]
После согласных, а также после [i] редукция до неслоговости не имеет места: ... [Аванесов]
В сборную вернулись не имевшие право выступать за олимпийцев испытанные мастера ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Ну, знаешь, много ты от нас хочешь. Не пить уже, и не курить, и даже пистолета не иметь. [Дворецкий]
Сейчас это слово такого значения не имеет. [Калинин]
Пик назван именем англичанина Джорджа Эвереста, ... который к открытию Эвереста непосредственного отношения не имел. [Спутник]

The verb иметь has been noted by many scholars as strongly favouring the genitive; this may be seen as reasonably predictable, as constructions like я не имею машины, are synonymous with у меня нет машины, where the genitive is obligatory (cf. Solonicyn 1962: 106). A further contributory factor may be that иметь tends to be used mainly with abstract objects (у меня нет being clearly preferred when the object is a concrete noun). However, Solonicyn (ibid.) insists that the genitive is used without exception, and that this preference is totally unconnected with the semantics of the noun. Other scholars asserting the universality of the genitive with this verb include the following: Butorin (1953: 9, 11); Magnier (1955: 531); Fleckenstein (1961: 216); Doncheva (1964: 98); Ravič (1971: 263); Graudina et al. (1976: 35); and the authors of the Academy Grammar (AG 1980-II: 416).

A rather more cautious position is adopted by the following scholars, who regard the genitive as being strongly preferred but not obligatory: Deribas (1956: 23); Davison (1967: 98); Timberlake (1975: 130); Rozental’ (1985: 274). This is supported by earlier quantitative studies, which show the following accusative frequencies: Restan (1960: 101) — 2.6%, n = 155; Korn (1967: 491) — 3%, n = ?; Green (1979: 185) — 9.5%, n = 21; Haka (1981: 40-2, 102) — 2.8%, n = 72. Kulagin (1959: 85) regards the accusative as being generally impossible, but does give one authentic counter-example (which is functionally affirmative); whereas Tsurikov (1967: 180) goes as far as to state that 'the claim that the negated verb иметь, as such, automatically converts the direct object to the genitive case is indefensible'.

Some of the 'more cautious' scholars, notably Timberlake and Rozental’, consider иметь together with certain dynamic verbs connected with the idea of possession (получать, доставать), implying that case usage is governed by the same rules with all of these verbs. The argument is perfectly logical: after all, a sentence like Я не получил разрешения means, broadly speaking, the same as У меня нет разрешения (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 73). However, it is clear from our results and from the observations of many other scholars that получить and доставать allow for greater variation than иметь (see Variable 12, Factors 821 and 822).

The preference for the genitive was thought to be clear enough to warrant the inclusion of иметь among the Strong Factors (considering the large number of examples and the distortion that would have resulted had this factor not been eliminated from the 'final' data). There were, however, a substantial number of counter-examples in which the accusative was used. Seven of these ten clauses contained infinitival constructions (as did twenty-five of the examples with genitive); this means that the accusative frequency in the absence of an infinitive was as low as 1.2%. Among the clauses with an infinitival construction, there was at least one in which the motivation for the use of the accusative is clear: in the sentence

Для нервной системы ... это может иметь не менее пагубные последствия, чем для природы ... [Спутник]

it would in fact be logically wrong to use the genitive, as the negation relates only to менее, the verb and its object being completely outside the scope of negation; this example was, with considerable hesitation, allowed to remain in the corpus as one of our native informants maintained that the genitive would have been perfectly normal.8

While the use of the accusative is hardly anomalous in those examples where an infinitival construction is present, it is more difficult to account for in those three which did not contain an infinitival construction. Two

---

8 Such a view would be unlikely to find favour with prescriptive grammarians, as the use of the genitive here would have to be regarded as the consequence of a false analogy. However, the fact that the genitive does not seem intuitively wrong to an educated native speaker would seem to suggest that actual usage may well be somewhat unstable on this point.
of these, containing the constructions не имеет место and не имевшие право, were cited above; the third one was

... я знаю много людей, которые никогда не имеют дело с докторами

[Звегинцев]

According to normative rules, all of these three constructions ought to take the genitive; and this was indeed the case in the majority of instances (не иметь права: 47 occurrences; не иметь места: 11; не иметь дела: 2). It is not clear whether there is any logic behind the exceptions (in the example with не имевшие право, it might be argued that the object is perceived as definite, which might suggest the use of the accusative: but analogous examples with the genitive are abundant). It may be relevant, however, that all of the expressions concerned are ones in which the difference between the accusative and the genitive only manifests itself in writing: the two forms are pronounced exactly alike in standard Russian. It is conceivable that even in the written language random variation might be particularly likely to arise in such circumstances.

2.3. The findings after the elimination of Marginal Cases and Strong Factors

After the elimination of the Marginal Cases and Strong Factors discussed above, the number of examples still remaining is 2722; the analysis that follows will be confined to these examples. Various factors which might potentially influence case selection will be examined statistically and commented upon in such detail as has been deemed appropriate in each case. In the presentation of statistical figures, the influence of the infinitive factor (cf. Variables 14-16) will be taken into account throughout: the statistical difference between clauses with and without an infinitival construction is so considerable, and the frequency of infinitival constructions so relatively high, that it was thought necessary to present separate figures for each of the two categories (in addition to the total figures). 9

Ideally, this treatment should perhaps be extended to certain other factors, such as the degree of concreteness of the object; but considerations of space and clarity of presentation make more extensive systematic cross-tabulation unfeasible in this report. Attention will of course be given in the text, where relevant, to the potentially distorting influence of other factors.

9 partlly attributable to the exceptionally frequent co-occurrence of that factor with infinitival constructions.

VARIABLE 1: The case form of the direct object

For the purposes of statistical analysis, the case form of the direct object was itself treated as Variable 1. Originally, there were six possible classifications; but clauses belonging to categories 5 and 6 (object case unclear) were omitted from the final data, as explained above (p. 16).

Of the remaining four categories, the first two comprised those clauses in which it was possible to identify the case of the direct object on purely formal grounds; i.e. clauses in which the substitution of one case for the other would manifest itself either in the form of the direct object itself, or at least in the forms of one or more other words agreeing with it in case. Examples:

1 — accusative (formally unambiguous)

Хорошо, если не напишешь рапорт ты, тогда напишу я! [Салынскý]

(оbject itself unambiguously acc. sing.)

Но ведь мы не будем свои домашние обстоятельства, приемной комиссию излагать. [Розов]

(обстоятельства could be gen. sing, or acc. pi., but premodification in the acc. pl. form removes ambiguity)

2 — genitive (formally unambiguous)

Чая дают 12,5 грамма в месяц на человека, яйц вообще не дают. [Спутник]

(object unambiguously gen. pl.)

Ни один цирк не видывал такого номера. [Спутник]

(object itself potentially ambiguous in writing, but premodification in gen. sing.)

The clauses falling into groups 3 and 4 were ones in which it was possible to identify the case of the direct object on semantic or contextual grounds, but which contained no formal distinction between accusative and genitive owing to homonymy between two different forms, most frequently the genitive singular and the accusative plural of feminine and neuter nouns. (As written material was used, it was decided not to take account of differences in stress here; therefore, forms like рки/рукë were placed in categories 3 or 4, unless the form of a premodifier made the case distinction formally unambiguous even in writing.)
The Findings: VARIABLE 1: The case form of the direct object

The clauses classified here under 3 or 4 fall into two main categories: those in which the case and number are obvious from the context; and those in which the object is a noun which can normally be used either only in the singular or only in the plural (where there is no ambiguity about the number, the case will also be either an obvious accusative or an obvious genitive).

3 — accusative (formally ambiguous but clear on semantic grounds)

Не будешь же ты песни туристам петь, правда? [Васильев]
(plural meaning demanded by context)

Имеющиеся здесь реки и озера уже не могут полностью удовлетворить водой потребности народного хозяйства. [Спутник]
(singular would require a postmodifying construction: потребность в чем ?)

4 — genitive (formally ambiguous but clear on semantic grounds)

Психологии вы не понимаете. [Розов]
(singularia tantum)

Чешков отходит в сторону, надрывает тихвинский конверт, который все время держит в руке, но письма не читает. [Дворецкий]
(context)

The reason for making a distinction between categories 1 and 3 on the one hand, and categories 2 and 4 on the other, was that such a distinction was considered to be useful for analytic purposes, particularly for investigating whether the choice of object case is sometimes influenced by the fact that one of the possible forms contains an element of ambiguity and is therefore avoided (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 108-10). In the present study, this question is dealt with under Variable 22, pp. 139-46.

For the statistical analysis of the other variables, groups 1 and 3 (accusative) were combined, and groups 2 and 4 (genitive) likewise, as in all of these categories the case of the direct object could be reliably identified on either formal or semantic grounds.

The following table shows the total number and percentage of clauses belonging to each of the original categories 1-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>1039 (38.1%)</td>
<td>466 (25.4%)</td>
<td>573 (64.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>65 (2.4%)</td>
<td>28 (1.5%)</td>
<td>37 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>1226 (45.1%)</td>
<td>997 (54.5%)</td>
<td>229 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>392 (14.4%)</td>
<td>341 (18.6%)</td>
<td>51 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If all accusatives (groups 1 and 3 above) and all genitives (groups 2 and 4) are now combined, we arrive at the following figures, which show the total frequencies for each of the two cases after the elimination of the Marginal Cases and Strong Factors discussed above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>1104 (40.5%)</td>
<td>494 (27.0%)</td>
<td>610 (68.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>1618 (59.5%)</td>
<td>1338 (73.0%)</td>
<td>280 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Findings: VARIABLE 2: Affirmative function

Clauses that are negative in form may sometimes be positive in meaning; this is particularly true of questions (at least in Russian), but the same phenomenon is found in certain types of declarative sentences as well. Such cases of discrepancy between form and content are of considerable interest to the linguist, the question being whether the grammatical behaviour of linguistic elements is primarily determined by formal or semantic factors (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 44).

Factors connected to the force of regation

VARIABLE 2: Affirmative function

Clauses that are negative in form may sometimes be positive in meaning; this is particularly true of questions (at least in Russian), but the same phenomenon is found in certain types of declarative sentences as well. Such cases of discrepancy between form and content are of considerable interest to the linguist, the question being whether the grammatical behaviour of linguistic elements is primarily determined by formal or semantic factors (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 44).

10 Safarewiczowa’s study is not exclusively synchronic, and her material includes both nineteenth- and twentieth-century texts. The figures cited by us, here and elsewhere, are ones relating to the Soviet period.
In our particular case, formal considerations (i.e. the presence of negation) would permit the use of either the genitive or the accusative, whereas semantic considerations (the absence or weakness of negative meaning) would suggest the use of the accusative. It might, then, be reasonable to assume that the accusative rather than the genitive will normally be used in such instances. This has, indeed, been suggested by a number of scholars: Butorin states that only the accusative can be used in such contexts (1953: 11), while a number of others imply that positive meaning is a factor which is very likely to lead to the use of the accusative (e.g. Uglitsky 1956: 384, Deribas 1956: 24, Kulagin 1959: 98, Kout 1960: 30, Solonicyan 1962: 111, Popova 1973: 68-9, Rozental 1985: 275).

The findings of the present study do not fully confirm the importance of affirmative function as such in determining the case of the direct object. The combined figures for all the factors examined under this heading (excluding the Strong Factors чутя не and едва, не which were discussed above) do show a certain preference for the accusative, but the difference is not nearly as great as earlier research would have led one to expect:

- **Accusative:** 86 examples (60.1%)
- **Genitive:** 57 examples (39.9%)

Thus, while it is clear that the accusative frequency is unusually high in functionally affirmative clauses, the genitive can by no means be described as rare. However, there are great differences between the various individual constructions that we have regarded as being affirmative in function; some of them do show a clear preference for the accusative, but there are two others in which the opposite is the case. One possible explanation for the discrepancy between our findings and those of other scholars could be that we have considered a broader set of different constructions to be functionally affirmative than has been customary. However, as we will argue in connection with the analysis of individual factors, there are good reasons for treating all of these constructions as eliminating or at least significantly weakening the negative meaning suggested by the formal presence of negation; and we therefore believe it is necessary to consider all of them if one is to make generalized statements about the influence of positive meaning on case selection.

### Factor 1: Question that can be replaced by an affirmative question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>34 examples (81.0%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>8 examples (19.0%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples with accusative:**
- Послушайте, не пересмотреть ли мне кандидатуру жениха? [Салын-ский]
- Билет, говорю, не выбросили? [Зорин]
- А вы случайно ложку — не украдли? [Залыгин]

**Examples with genitive:**
- Козочки моей не видели? [Розов]
- Шеф не давал вам списка? [Зорин]
- ... не выбросили ли чего любопытного? [Васильев]

This category includes questions containing an 'optional' element of negation: in other words, the denotative meaning of the question would remain the same if the negation were omitted (although the tone of the question and various connotations would change).

In questions of this type, the accusative seems to be favoured. However, the genitive is a reasonably common alternative in the absence of infinitival constructions.

### Factor 2: Question with разве or неужели (неужто)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>6 examples (33.3%)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>12 examples (66.7%)</td>
<td>10 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples with accusative:**
- Неужели не помните ту разношерстную компанию, что собиралась по субботам в институтском бассейне? [Дворецкий]
- Неужели вам не хочется иметь семью, детей? [Петухов]
- А разве организм не отторгает чужеродный белок, уничтожая его с помощью антител? [Спутник]

**Examples with genitive:**
- Разве ты не заметила этого моего состояния? [Салынинский]
- А разве ты не испытала этого, когда встретила Петра? [Софронов]
- Неужели даже Нюрон, мать, и та не умеет объяснить ей своего огромного, чуть ли не всеобъемлющего опыта? [Залыгин]
Questions of this type were considered functionally affirmative as they correspond closely to affirmative declarative sentences: for example, Разве ты не замечала этого моего состояния? means more or less the same as Я уверен, что ты заметила мое состояние (cf. a close functional equivalent in English: 'Surely you must have noticed the state I was in').

On the basis of the comparatively small number of examples found in our corpus, this factor cannot be proved to have a significant influence on case selection. The figures given above should not be taken at face value: in as many as nine of the examples, the object was the genitive form of the pronoun это, itself an extremely powerful genitive-favouring factor (see Factor 25:1).

Factor 3: пока не

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 examples (64.3%)</td>
<td>10 examples (35.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the examples contained an infinitival construction.

Examples with accusative:

- Ни один человек не знает, сколько у него сил, пока он эти силы не испробовал до предела. [Розов]
- Пять раз останавливалось мое сердце, пока Вы, Семен Иванович, не нашли и не удалили осколок. [Спутник]
- Но я не решусь на разговор с вами, пока вы не посмотрите это. [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:

- Я не успокоюсь, пока не получу абсолютной ясности. [Салынский]
- Он не мог поверить, что это действительно акантофтальмусы, пока не получил от Сергея цветных фотографий, где ... [Спутник]
- Так от зубца до зубца альпинист уходит вверх, пока не выберет удобной площадки, ... [Солоухин]

This is another construction which can be said to have positive meaning in spite of its negative form: it is translated into many languages with an affirmative construction (e.g. English until), and within Russian itself, transformations like Я не успокоюсь, пока не получу абсолютной ясности — Я могу успокоиться только тогда, когда получу абсолютную ясность, while frequently resulting in somewhat artificial constructions, are certainly possible.

It seems, however, that this construction is not felt to be as obviously affirmative in function as some of the others dealt with under this variable. It is, after all, easy to interpret the meaning of пока не as containing a negative element: the example quoted above can be explained as 'I will not calm down while it is the case that the matter is not absolutely clear to me'. This may be one reason for the relatively high frequency of the genitive (compared to many of the other factors in this group); but even so, it is fair to say that пока не is a factor which does to a certain degree favour the accusative.

Factor 4: Rhetorical question with a notion of large quantity: constructions like что/чего + только + verb with negation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 example (6.3%)</td>
<td>15 examples (93.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the examples contained an infinitival construction.

Example with accusative:

- Чего не видала наша земля? [Салынский]

Examples with genitive:

- Мне за него, знаешь, чего только не предлагали... [Розов]
- Чего не видела наша земля? [Салынский]

These are rhetorical questions which function as statements containing the idea of a large quantity: i.e. a structure like 'What only have you not done' (translated literally) is used to express the idea 'You have done a great deal'. The word только often appears as an intensifier, but is not obligatory.

As can be seen from the figures, the genitive is greatly preferred in constructions of this type. However, it is sometimes possible to use the accusative.

Factor 5: Question that can be replaced by a modal expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 examples (88.9%)</td>
<td>1 example (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the examples contained an infinitival construction.

Examples with accusative:

- Дружок, почему бы тебе не бросить свою археологию? [Салынский]
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А чего с хорошими людьми радость не разделить? [Софронов]
— А не принять ли нам, ребята, душ изнутри, а? [Абрамов]

Example with genitive:
Волен же человек, как не понять этого! [Абрамов]

These questions are functionally comparable to statements containing a modal expression: for example, Почему бы тебе не бросить свою археологию means 'Тебе стоило бы бросить ...', and Как не понять этого means 'Этого нельзя не понять' (which, though itself formally a negative clause, is definitely affirmative in function — cf. Factor 6 below).

There is a strong preference for the accusative, chiefly connected to the fact that most of the clauses in this group are questions conveying a suggestion (cf. Factor 6:3). The only example with a genitive was not of this type; in addition, it had этого as object.

Factor 6: Double negation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>5 examples</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>7 examples</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the examples contained an infinitival construction.

Examples with accusative:
Я не мог не подписать акт. [Дворецкий]
... но это значит, что он теперь не вправе не учитывать огромные преобразовательные силы, заключенные в языке, ... [Звегинцев]
... чтобы перед каждым работником в каждый момент стояла ... задача, которую нельзя не выполнить. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
Это обстоятельство не могло не привлечь внимания к некоторым общим вопросам. [Звегинцев]
Это вторжение в доселе запретную область не может не произвести глубокого впечатления, ... [Спутник]
Чесноков понимал, что Данилов не мог не заметить его хитростей. [Орлов]

The term 'double negation' (двойное отрицание) as used in this book refers to constructions in which both an infinitive and its headword are negated separately, the two negations ruling each other out (e.g. Я не мог не подписать акт, i.e. Я должен был подписать акт).

Scholarly opinion is extremely divided on the possible influence of this factor. The accusative is the usual or recommendable choice according to Deribas (1956: 24), Kulagin (1959: 98), Listvinov (1965: 193), Haka (1981: 54-7, 102), and Rozental’ (1985: 275). However, Tsurikov (1967: 182) finds no supporting evidence for this view; and according to Solonin (1962: 112) and Restan (1960: 99), the genitive is in fact preferred. The figures provided by Haka and Restan are mutually contradictory to a surprising degree, showing, respectively, accusative frequencies of 68.4% (n = 15) and 22.2% (n = 27).

The situation is perhaps best summed up in the Academy Grammar (AG 1980-II: 418), according to which both cases are equally possible; this is also in accord with our findings. Evidently, the affirmative function of the sentence is not a strong enough factor to cause the accusative to be favoured with any degree of consistency. In assessing the statistical evidence, it should also be remembered that the results must be compared with the average figures for clauses with infinitival constructions; if these are used as a basis for comparison, the accusative frequency for the present category turns out to be relatively low, although the size of the sample precludes definite conclusions.

On the whole, double negation demonstrates that the choice of object case with negation is determined by an intricate combination of both formal and semantic factors.

Factor 7: Other cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Without Inf</th>
<th>With Inf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>14 examples</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>13 (86.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>4 examples</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Как же не отметить такой факт? [Софронов]
Археологи не теряют надежды обнаружить берестяные грамоты в слоях Н в. древнего Новгорода, ... [Мещерский]

Но Шурсямге не терпелось поскорее выяснить отношения, ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
Кто не любит трикотажных вещей? [Спутник]
Как бы и от Валентина Сергеевича не пришлось увидеть странность ..., [Орлов]

The clauses in this group contain none of the structural features listed under Factors 1-6, but can nevertheless be regarded as being functionally affirmative. The most frequent constructions here are rhetorical questions, often with the intensifying particle оке; and expressions like...
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The factors dealt with under this heading include various adverbial particles which either intensify or modify the negation.

Intensified negation (усиленное отрицание) is one of the factors almost unanimously cited by scholars as dictating the use of the genitive with very few exceptions; references are to be found under the various specific factors (see also Mustajoki 1985: 49-53).

Factors that may be included under the heading ‘intensified/generalized negation’ can be found both here and under Variable 4. If all the intensifying factors are combined, the total figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>53 examples (31.9%)</td>
<td>23 (20.4%)</td>
<td>30 (56.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>113 examples (68.1%)</td>
<td>90 (79.6%)</td>
<td>23 (43.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Includes Variable 3, Factors 1-3, 5, and parts of 9; and Variable 4, Factors 3, 5, 6, and parts of 9.)

Up to a point, the figures confirm earlier findings on the significant role of intensified or generalized negation in determining the choice of case, especially if one notes that никакой and ни have been excluded from consideration as Strong Factors virtually dictating the use of the genitive. At the same time, however, our findings belie any suggestion that the genitive might be obligatory in such instances. There are differences between the various different manifestations of intensified/generalized negation; these will be dealt with below.

Apart from the intensifiers, certain modifiers restricting the scope of negation or attenuating its force have also been considered. These are not generally mentioned in the literature, but they were included here because their meaning is such that they might be assumed to affect the force or the ‘generality’ of the negation. However, on the basis of this analysis they seem to be of little significance in determining the case form of the object.
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Negative clauses with вообще are probably best interpreted as containing generalized rather than intensified negation (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 52-3). However, the distinction is not always a sharp one, and in any case it has been hypothesized that both intensified and generalized negation tend to favour the genitive.

It is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the influence of вообще on case selection: the sample is rather small, and the frequent co-occurrence of this factor with infinitival constructions further obscures the picture. However, it is at least clear that вообще falls far short of being a factor necessitating the use of the genitive.

Factor 3: даже; и as a synonym of даже

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without inf.</th>
<th>With inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>11 examples (45.8%)</td>
<td>3 (21.4%)</td>
<td>8 (80.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>13 examples (54.2%)</td>
<td>11 (78.6%)</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Смотри, даже не сокращаешь смету? [Софронов]
Вы свой класс и не узнаете. [Петухов]
Он пишет о тонкой грани, которую многие люди даже не улавливают. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Избавилась от отца и даже не скрывает удовольствия. [Вампилов]
Они знали в общих чертах, куда ехали, но такого даже представить себе не могли. [Спутник]
Но Наташа будто и не услышала его слов. [Залыгин]

The intensifier даже is occasionally mentioned as a factor dictating the use of the genitive (Kulagin 1959: 94, Utkin 1963: 79), and the genitive is indeed the more frequent choice (eight examples); however, the accusative does occur (four examples), and it should be noted that two of the examples with genitive had этого as object, while in the remaining ones the objects tended to be abstract nouns, which generally show a preference for the genitive.

There were 12 examples of и as a synonym of даже: 7 with accusative and 5 with genitive. This may seem surprising in comparison with the figures for даже, but is easily accounted for by the fact that six of the seven accusative examples (but none of the genitive ones) contained an infinitival construction. In the absence of an infinitive, then, there is a preference for the genitive; but this could (as with даже) partly be a consequence of the objects being mostly abstract or pronominal. In any event, while this factor may be relevant in specific contexts, its overall significance seems limited.

Factor 4: также, тоже; non-intensifying и

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without inf.</th>
<th>With inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>5 examples (26.3%)</td>
<td>2 (16.7%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>14 examples (73.7%)</td>
<td>10 (83.3%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

И рожу с утра тоже не малюют, ...
... хотя слезу и не пускал. [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:

Я тебе тоже этого не забуду. [Розов]
Перевод также затруднений не вызывает. [Мещерский]

Тоже and также, while possibly making the negation somewhat weightier, cannot be described as actual intensifiers. И has two different functions: its use as an intensifier (synonymous with даже) was dealt with under Factor 3; in those of its uses included here, и is either a synonym of также, or at any rate appears without an actual intensifying meaning (though in some instances this may be subject to interpretation).

On the basis of our figures, также, также, and и as a synonym of do not seem to have a significant influence on case selection.

Factor 5: так и

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without inf.</th>
<th>With inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>7 examples (63.6%)</td>
<td>5 (55.6%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>4 examples (36.4%)</td>
<td>4 (44.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Смотрите, так и не взял свою музыку. [Розов]
На излете своих земных мыслей он вспомнил, что так и не посмотрел ноты композитора Переслегина. [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:

Однако, волчица так и не покинула укрытия. [Спутник]
... и как Харитина ни старалась, взгляда его так и не встретила. [Васильев]
The construction *так и* intensifies the negation, conveying the speaker's surprise (and often indignation) at the non-occurrence of an event which was expected by the speaker to take place, or ought to have taken place from the speaker's point of view. However, although *так и* is definitely an intensifier, it does not appear to be a genitive-favouring factor: the reverse seems closer to the truth, although the number of examples is small. The frequent use of the accusative might be explained by the fact that the object noun in clauses with *так и* is usually definite, as such clauses refer to events which were expected to take place.

**Factor 6: ещё, уже, пока**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>44 examples (40.0%)</td>
<td>28 (32.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>66 examples (60.0%)</td>
<td>59 (67.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- Мама, вы еще не достали пылесос? [Спутник]
- Никогда еще не внушали общественности так настойчиво идею ракетно-ядерного конфликта. [Спутник]
- Она сказала, что такие галстуки, как у меня, уже не носят. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
- Идея использована, а техническая разработка интереса уже не представляет. [Салынский]
- Однако один этот постулат еще не решает всей проблемы. [Звегинцев]
- Но пока все эти усилия не приносят достаточного эффекта. [Спутник]

These time adverbials modify the negation by emphasizing that while it is valid at present, this has not been the case in the past (*уже*) or is not likely always to be the case in the future (*еще, пока*). It might be hypothesized that at least *еще* and *пока* therefore, in a sense, weaken the negation and that this might result in the accusative being favoured (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 162). In the case of *уже*, one can hardly say that the force of the negation is significantly weakened by the fact that it is shown not to have applied in the past; but one could perhaps assume that the factor of definiteness might play a role in making the accusative more popular in clauses with *уже* followed by negation. Our data do not seem to substantiate these hypotheses; but further investigation might still prove fruitful.

**Factor 7: почти**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>1 example (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>7 examples (87.5%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the examples contained an infinitival construction.

Example with accusative:
- Юсуп шагал тяжело, почти не отрывая ступни от земли, ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
- В целом же книжный язык почти не испытывал воздействий со стороны устно-поэтической речи. [Мещерский]
- Остальное время прибор работает вхолостую, почти не потребляя энергии. [Спутник]

The modifier *почти* (‘almost’) restricts the negation by showing that it is not fully generalizable, which might be assumed to be an accusative-favouring factor. However, clauses with *почти не* frequently imply that the proposition contained in the sentence is largely untrue contrary to what might be expected. This, of course, makes the negation somewhat more emphatic — a potential genitive-favouring factor.

It seems that the genitive is, in fact, generally preferred. However, only one of the examples with the genitive had a fully concrete noun as object (… почти не разжимая губ ... [Спутник]; note that the verb is in the gerund form and the object is a part of the body — cf. pp. 59 and 151-3). The only example with the accusative also had a concrete object.

**Factor 8: больше, только, ни ... ни, просто, нисколько, etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>17 examples (48.6%)</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>18 examples (51.4%)</td>
<td>12 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- Но восхождение ни прервать, ни сменить нельзя. [Солоухин]
- Писал Егор из рук вон плохо и потому похвалу начальства не очень чтобы понял. [Васильев]
- Вот так Гордейчиков, сам не умея конструировать, рассчитывать и выдвигать технические идеи, мог учить всему этому других. [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:
- Я больше не допущу таких выражений. [Дворецкий]
- Страсть не люблю гостиничных стен. [Зорин]
В рядах случаев переливание крови не только не приносило ожидае-мого результата, но наносило большой вред. [Спутник]

If this rather mixed group is broken down into clauses with an inten-
sifier, and ones with a modifier with restrictive meaning, it transpires
that there are four clauses with an actual intensifier (like просто or
нисколько): one with accusative and three with genitive (none contain-
ing an infinitival construction). In addition, there are six clauses with
the construction ни ... ни, which is not an actual intensifier but does
emphasize the negation. In all of these six clauses, ни ... ни is connected
to a pair of coordinated infinitives (as in the first example above); and
in five of them, the object is in the accusative. In this position, then, ни ... ни is evidently not a genitive-favouring factor (but cf. Factor 5.2).

There were twenty-five clauses with restrictive modifiers like только
(often found in the constructions только бы не, не только не), больше,
and сам: the accusative was used in eleven of these, the genitive in
fourteen.

### VARIABLE 4: Intensifier or modifier connected to the object

We have already dealt with ничего as object under Marginal Cases (p.
17) and with никакой and ни under Strong Factors (p. 26-7).

#### Factor 1:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>3 examples (9.4%)</td>
<td>1 (4.3%)</td>
<td>2 (22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>29 examples (90.6%)</td>
<td>22 (75.7%)</td>
<td>7 (24.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Вез этого к полетам через водные пространства не допустят ни один
экипаж. [Спутник]

... мы не можем игнорировать ни один признак, указанный в опре-
dелении значения термина. [Караулов]

Examples with genitive:
Я, знаешь, ни одного письма от вас не читал. [Розов]

Непогода не обошла, пожалуй, ни одной хлопковой плантации.
[Спутник]

Но порванный бок козы и волчья следы на огородных грядках не
оставляли в этом ни малейшего сомнения. [Спутник]

#### Factor 2:  ни ... ни

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>5 examples (20.0%)</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>20 examples (80.0%)</td>
<td>13 (65.0%)</td>
<td>7 (35.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Когда соберешься в столицу-матушку, так ни туфли, ни сапоги не
надевай! Только лапти! [Петухов]

... чтобы затем исчезнуть навсегда, ни словом, ни тем более не
оказав малейшего внимания и заботы о своей дочери. [Софронов]

The intensifier ни is not formally present here, but semantically the
clauses correspond exactly to ones with ни малейший, и ни один\ it was
therefore considered prudent to include them here.
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These constructions are close in meaning to никакой, and are treated
together with it by some scholars (e.g. Kout 1960: 28, Dončeva 1964: 98,
Ravič 1976: 35, Graudina et al. 1976: 35, Timberlake 1975: 126); all of
these consider the genitive to be either obligatory or at least 'the norm'.
In the Academy Grammar, ни один, ни единий, ни малейший are listed
among the factors that necessitate the use of the genitive (AG 1980 II:
416-17). However, our analysis suggests that while we are certainly
dealing with a powerful factor, the accusative cannot be ruled out. It
may be that there is some difference here between ни один, ни единий,
and ни малейший: the last of these is generally used in connection with
abstract nouns, and the preference for the genitive might therefore be
particularly strong. Ни один is much the most frequent construction in
this group: our sample contained only six examples with ни малейший
and four with ни единий, all of these with the genitive.

The figures given above also include these two sentences:
Одного шага за ним не сделаю. [Розов]

... чтобы затем исчезнуть навсегда, ни словом, ни тем более не
оказав малейшего внимания и заботы о своей дочери. [Софронов]

Examples with genitive:
Я понимал, уже не вернешь ни твоего
детства, ни твоей юности. [Софронов]

Задумалась, нацелилась карандашом, но так и не провела ни
штриха, ни линии, опять взяла молоток. [Спутник]

Examples with accusative:
Когда соберешься в столицу-матушку, так ни туфли, ни сапоги не
надевай! Только лапти! [Петухов]

... чтобы затем исчезнуть навсегда, ни словом, ни тем более не
оказав малейшего внимания и заботы о своей дочери. [Софронов]
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... Было душно. Он стоял, не замечая ни ветра, ни грозного неба. [Спутник]

The genitive is definitely preferred, as noted by a number of other scholars (Magner 1955: 537-8, Kout 1960: 28, Restan 1960: 101, Korn 1967: 490). However, our findings come nowhere near substantiating the claim that the genitive is obligatory (AG 1980-II: 416-17, Ravič 1971: 283, Graudina et al. 1976: 35, Listvinov 1965: 191): while ни ... ни may favour the genitive other things being equal, it clearly does not always preclude the use of the accusative if this is suggested, for example, by the infinitive or concreteness factors.

Factor 3: даже; и as a synonym of даже

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>11 examples (33.3%)</td>
<td>7 (26.9%)</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>22 examples (66.7%)</td>
<td>19 (73.1%)</td>
<td>3 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Я не построю даже баню. [Салынский]

— Прошлое тоже забывать не стоит, — сказал Уваров. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Вместе с тем Б. А. Ларин не отрицал и сильного прогрессивного воздействия на древнерусский язык языка церковно-славянского. [Мещерский]

Они не знали взлета античной рабовладельческой цивилизации, но не узнали и ее долгого мучительного падения. [Спутник]

Муки также не давали, хотя можно было получить ее в 75% вместо хлеба. [Спутник]

The difference between the two uses of и is the same as under Variable 3. The preference for the genitive here is somewhat weaker than average; but it seems reasonably clear that this factor is of little if any significance.

Factor 5: только, лишь

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>4 examples (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>2 examples (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example with accusative:
Только имя свое не забыла, чтобы с кем-нибудь ее, красавицу, не спутали. [Спутник]

Example with genitive:
Одного я только не пойму: как ты дошел до такой жизни ... [Вампилов]

The object was одного in both of the examples with the genitive; however, it is impossible to comment on whether the presence of только or лишь affects case selection because of the small number of examples. Moreover, the status of только is sometimes unclear: for example, in the first example cited above it is difficult to determine whether it should be regarded as a modifying particle connected to the object, or as an adversative conjunction (a colloquial use).

Factor 6: вот (этот), какой бы ни, -то, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>8 examples (53.3%)</td>
<td>6 (54.5%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>7 examples (46.7%)</td>
<td>5 (45.5%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
А вот душу никто еще доселе не трогал, ... [Васильев]
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А знаете что? Дом-то мы новый еще ведь и не посмотрели! [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:
... что этот вежливый оборот не сопровождает какой бы то ни было конкретной просьбы. [Мещерский]
А ты думаешь, я не помню твоего добра-то? [Абрамов]

Few conclusions can be drawn as far as this small and rather diverse group is concerned. However, it may be worth noting that there were two examples with the construction какой бы то ни было, similar in meaning to никакой; the genitive was used in both of these.

Clause types

VARIABLE 5: Declarative, interrogative and exclamatory clauses

Interrogative clauses are mentioned by some scholars as favouring the accusative (Fleckenstein 1961: 218, Ravič 1971: 264, Safarewiczowa 1960: 109-126, Restan 1960: 98, Haka 1981: 57-60, Timberlake 1975: 129); however, Safarewiczowa’s figures only show a small difference between declarative and interrogative clauses, while those of Restan indicate, in statistical terms, a highly significant difference. Butorin (1953: 11) dissents from the majority view, stating that the genitive is preferred except in the case of ‘rhetorical questions’. Tsurikov (1967: 183) very sensibly makes a distinction between the ‘original’ function of interrogative clauses (request for information) and their various modal uses; in the present study, such distinctions are dealt with under Variable 6.

Interrogative clauses are divided below into sub-categories on formal grounds; the total figures for all formally interrogative clauses are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>92 examples (58.2%)</td>
<td>49 (46.2%)</td>
<td>43 (79.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>66 examples (41.8%)</td>
<td>57 (83.3%)</td>
<td>9 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These differ significantly from the figures for declarative clauses, which are as follows (excluding the figures for exclamatory clauses — see Factor 7 below):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>967 examples (39.2%)</td>
<td>412 (25.0%)</td>
<td>555 (68.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>1498 examples (60.8%)</td>
<td>1239 (75.0%)</td>
<td>259 (31.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the preference for the accusative in interrogative clauses is not necessarily attributable to interrogative form as such: the choice often seems to depend on other factors, such as positive meaning (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 54, and see Variable 6 below). Also, questions are most frequently found in dialogue, where the accusative is evidently somewhat more common than it is in continuous prose. (Note, however, that this category also includes dependent questions functioning as explicative sub-clauses, which do frequently appear in writing.)

Factor 1: Question with interrogative pronoun (кто, что, какой)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>6 examples (20.0%)</td>
<td>3 (13.6%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>24 examples (80.0%)</td>
<td>19 (86.4%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Кто не взял? Чего вы плетете? [Вампилов]
Правила поведения: что следует делать, а что не следует. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:
Чего он не может терпеть в неестественных композициях? [Спутник]
... и даже знала, что нужно, а чего совсем не нужно было делать. [Залыгин]

The preponderance of the genitive is partly explained by the fact that this group includes all the clauses dealt with under Factor 2:4 (rhetorical questions with a meaning of large quantity). If these are excluded, the figures are reasonably ‘normal’: accusative 5, genitive 9.

Factor 2: Question with почему or one of its near synonyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause type</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>21 examples (80.8%)</td>
<td>10 (71.4%)</td>
<td>11 (91.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>5 examples (19.2%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Анатолий Мартынович, почему вы не использовали рекомендацию ученых? [Салынский]
Дядя, почему ты не устроил свою судьбу? [Зорин]
Чего это она не наденет домашние туфли? [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:
Что же ты мне руки не подашь на прощанье? [Розов]
Тогда почему же выпускникам не дают возможности приложить свои знания к настоящему делу? [Спутник]
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Почему не видите, несчастные дураки, того, что будет завтра? [Трифонов]

This group includes questions with почему, зачем, отчего, за что, and also with что, него when used as colloquial equivalents of почему. There appears to be a clear preference for the accusative, although it should be taken into account that seven of the clauses with an accusative are of the type discussed under Factor 2:5 (почему бы не etc.).

Factor 3: Question with как

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>10 examples (76.9%)</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>3 examples (23.1%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Как же не берегут ваше время? [Зорин]

Но как же она сразу-то не увидела, не распознала беду? [Абрамов]

Как тут не вспомнить суворовские слова "тяжело в учение — легко в бою". [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Как же я раньше этого сходства не заметил? [Салынский]

Как ты не можешь этого понять? [Вампилов]

Как is relatively unlikely to occur in a negative context in its primary meaning ('in what way'); it has, however, various modal meanings and may express, for example, surprise or indignation. Как is followed by an independent infinitive (as in the third accusative example) is roughly equal in meaning to невозможно не, the overall sense being thus affirmative; there were five examples of this type, all of these with the accusative. In other cases, variation is more likely, but it might be relevant that in two of the three instances of genitive preference the object was этого.

Factor 4: Question with the particle ли

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>17 examples (81.0%)</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
<td>11 (91.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>4 examples (19.0%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

А не перегнул ли, Ваня, палочку? [Дворецкий]

И не выносят ли эти различия предложение за пределы языка? [Звегинцев]

The interrogative particle ли can be used to form yes/no questions, although this is not common in the informal spoken language. Moreover, in all registers, negative questions with ли are rare in the function of pure enquiry: they usually contain a suggestion that the speaker believes the proposition to be true in its positive form, or suspects that this might well be the case (thus, the first genitive example is, in fact, a tentative way of saying Мне кажется, что ты, совершил ошибку). Thus, formally negative questions with ли are frequently equivalent to affirmative questions, or even 'hedged' affirmative statements (cf. Factor 2:1). This would lead one to expect a preference for the accusative, and such a hypothesis is indeed supported by the data.

Factor 5: Question without an interrogative word

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>32 examples (61.5%)</td>
<td>22 (53.7%)</td>
<td>10 (9.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>20 examples (38.5%)</td>
<td>19 (46.3%)</td>
<td>1 (90.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Слушай, Галина, ты не могла бы найти более увлекательную тему? [Розов]

Ты не видела мой чемодан? [Петухов]

Или я что-то не понимаю? [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Ты что уходишь, ключа не оставляешь? [Розов]

Вы что, уважаемая, законов не знаете? [Вампилов]

"Что я, фронтовик, и не получу диплома, что ли?" [Залыгин]

Rising intonation (reflected in writing by a question mark) is the usual way to form a yes/no question in colloquial Russian; therefore, this category contains a relatively large proportion of 'real' questions. However, the negation is frequently optional as far as the meaning of the question is concerned: 24 of the examples were classified under Factor 2:1
as being more or less equivalent to affirmative questions; the accusative was used in 19 of these. The figures for the remaining examples show a moderate preference for the genitive.

**Factor 6:** Question with разве, неужели, неужто

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 examples</td>
<td>12 examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 examples</td>
<td>10 examples</td>
<td>2 examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same as Variable 2, Factor 2 (p. 35).

**Factor 7:** Exclamation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 examples</td>
<td>52 examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 examples</td>
<td>42 examples</td>
<td>12 examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Не люблю выходные дни! [Дворецкий]
- Не засоряйте русский язык! [Спутник]
- Чтобы он голову не расшиб! [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

- Ты не понимаешь этого счастья!.. [Розов]
- Равноправия ты у меня не увидишь! [Дворецкий]
- Но один цирк не видел такого номера! [Спутник]

Exclamations are not usually mentioned in the literature as a potentially significant factor; however, the figures given by Safarewiczowa (1960: 109-26) would seem to suggest that there is actually a stronger preference for the accusative here than in the case of interrogative clauses.

Our criterion for regarding a sentence as exclamatory was a purely formal one: the presence of an exclamation mark at the end. Writers are, of course, not fully consistent about their punctuation conventions; but no other satisfactory criterion was available.

A problem of classification arises in the case of interrogative clauses which are at the same time exclamations. These have been classified under the various subtypes of interrogative clauses, irrespective of punctuation (?! or !).

In our corpus, the proportion of accusative objects in exclamatory contexts was only slightly higher than average; and it was, in fact, somewhat lower than the average for all examples found in dialogue, which is, of course, the most usual context for an exclamation to appear in (about four-fifths of all exclamations in our corpus). There was no significant difference between imperative clauses and other exclamations. However, it should be noted that there were thirteen instances of этого as object — an unusually (though not unexpectedly) high proportion; but even if this is taken into account, the present sample does not allow one to consider exclamations to be a major factor as such in determining the choice of case.

**VARIABLE 6: Semantic content of interrogative clause**

Under this variable, all clauses classified above as interrogative were assigned to functional categories. It must be admitted that the classifications are frequently subjective: in a number of cases, elements of more than one category seemed to be contained in one clause. Particularly frequent were combinations of a genuine inquiry with one of the modal or evaluative meanings; in such cases, the 'real question' element was regarded as secondary. The co-occurrence of surprise and rebuke is also frequent; such clauses were classified as rebukes. Often, too, it is not entirely clear whether a particular clause should be classified as a rebuke or as a suggestion: for example, the sentence

Нельзя ли вести беседу на достигнутом всем языке? [Зорин]

both shows disapproval of the earlier state of affairs and contains a suggestion for improvement; it was regarded as being primarily a suggestion.

**Factor 1:** Suspicion or doubt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 examples</td>
<td>11 examples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 examples</td>
<td>10 examples</td>
<td>3 examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Ты не могла перепутать что-нибудь? [Салынский]
- Уж не собираешь ли ты изменить этот сюжет? [Софронов]
- А разве организм не отторгает чужеродный белок, уничтожая его с помощью антител? [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

- Скажите... Вы не давали ей прозвищ? [Зорин]
- ...может, мы живем не понимаем? [Вампилов]
- А этого не знают, как этот бедный эту самую Дуньку тиранил? [Абрамов]
Most of the clauses included in this group were classified as functionally affirmative under Variable 2: these included 14 with accusative and 6 with genitive. The remaining examples were equally divided between accusative and genitive.

**Factor 2: Rebuke**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 (57.1%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (42.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Почему все же вы не дали телеграмму о своем приезде? [Софронов]

Но как же она сразу-то не увидела, не распознала беду? [Абрамов]

Зачем оставил я штормовку, палатку Здарского не взял? [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

Как я раньше этого сходства не заметил? [Салынский]

Вы что, уважаемая, законов не знаете? [Вампилов]

"Почему же не видите, несчастные дураки, того, что будет завтра?" [Трифонов]

In the case of a rebuke containing negation, two factors frequently come into conflict: definiteness (the speaker is blaming the listener for failing to perform a specific action which often has a specific object), and intensified negation (a strong emphasis being placed on the fact that the action has not been performed). The first of these factors would suggest the use of the accusative, while the second might be a genitive-favouring factor. The accusative frequency in our sample is higher than average, but the definition of this category is inevitably highly subjective, and in any case the statistical reliability of the figures is doubtful owing to the size of the sample.

**Factor 3: Advice or suggestion**

There were twenty examples, all of them with the accusative. All of these clauses contained an infinitival construction.

Examples:

Дружок, почему бы тебе не бросить свою археологию? [Салынский]

Но тогда, спрашивается, почему бы не перенести торжество, ... [Зорин]

Не могли бы вы составить мне компанию? [Орлов]

**Factor 4: Rhetorical question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 (10.0%)</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18 (90.0%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Да как же ласку не принять? [Софронов]

Кто не любит трикотажных вещей? [Спутник]

Чего я не видела на крыльце-то? [Абрамов]

This category includes the rhetorical questions dealt with under Factor 2:4 (a powerful genitive-favouring factor). If these are excluded (as has been done in choosing the above examples), the figures for the remaining rhetorical questions are: accusative 7, genitive 6.

**Factor 5: ‘Real’ question (request for information)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15 (60.8%)</td>
<td>11 (42.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7 (31.8%)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Почему вы не заняли пост начальника цеха? [Дворецкий]

Не знаешь, пенсию не дадут? [Вампилов]

Кто не может нести рюкзак? [Солоухин]

Evidently, the accusative is the usual choice, as these clauses are clearly affirmative in function (cf. Пону гы тебе не бросить — Тебе следовало бы, бросить). However, we are not fully convinced that this factor should be included among our Strong Factors. The number of examples is rather small, and the defining criteria, as indicated above, are more subjective than in the case of most factors. Moreover, there is evidence that the use of the genitive would be natural in some circumstances; for example, in this example from Комсомольская правда quoted by Solonicyn (1962: 112):

Почему бы не сделать исключения?; here the abstractness of the object seems to have influenced the choice.
Examples with genitive:

Чему же ты у меня училась? Ошибок моих не повторять? [Зорин]
Чего он не может терпеть в неестественных композициях? [Спутник]
Почему не удалось организовать защиты? [Грифонов]

In order to draw conclusions about the importance of interrogative function, and not merely interrogative form, it is necessary to give special consideration to those questions which can be regarded as being simply requests for information. Although there are various kinds of problems connected with the classification, the figures for this category seem to suggest that hypotheses about the accusative being more frequent than the genitive are valid even if only 'pure' questions are considered.

Factor 6: Surprise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>9 examples (32.1%)</td>
<td>8 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>19 examples (67.9%)</td>
<td>16 (66.7%)</td>
<td>3 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Но высказать частное замечание разве я не могу? [Зорин]
Месяц под одной крышкой прожила и поговорить время не выбрала? [Софронов]
Чего это она не наденет домашние туфли? [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:

Неужели я этого не заслужил? [Вампилов]
Че, и писем не пишет? [Вампилов]
Но ты-то, ты сам — неужели не уразумел этой замены?! [Залыгин]

The figures suggest a relatively strong preference for the genitive, but closer analysis puts a rather different complexion on the matter: as many as eleven of the examples with genitive turn out to have этого as object (cf. Factor 2:2 - questions with разве and неужели, which are all included here). For the remaining examples the distribution is approximately equal.

VARIABLE 7: Type of subordinate clause (or equivalent)

Under this variable, various types of subordinate clauses are discussed; and we have also included constructions with gerunds and participles, which, while not usually regarded as having clause status, are equivalent to subordinate clauses (or sometimes, in the case of gerunds, to main clauses).

Subordinate clauses are rarely mentioned as a factor influencing case selection. Gerunds and participles, however, are almost unanimously regarded by scholars as favouring the genitive, which is obligatory according to Fleckenstein (1961: 216-17), and greatly preferred according to various other sources (Magner 1955: 540; Uglitisky 1956: 387; Kula-gin 1959: 98; Kout 1960: 30; Restan 1960: 100; Solonicyen 1962: 107-8; Davison 1967: 62; Korn 1967: 490; Ravič 1971: 265; Green 1979: 178; AG 1980-II: 417; Haka 1981: 35-8, 102; Rozental' 1985: 274). The only dissenter is Dončeva (1964: 99), who sees no clear preference either way.

Although participles and gerunds are often dealt with as a single group, the figures provided by some scholars who consider them separately would seem to suggest a rather stronger preference for the genitive in the case of gerunds.

Some scholars have remarked upon the influence of particular kinds of subordinate clauses on the choice; their observations will be dealt with in connection with the relevant type of sub-clause.

Main clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>824 examples (41.1%)</td>
<td>358 (27.0%)</td>
<td>466 (68.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>1179 examples (58.9%)</td>
<td>968 (73.0%)</td>
<td>211 (31.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are presented for comparison only.

Factor 1: Gerund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>16 examples (12.6%)</td>
<td>11 (9.1%)</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>111 examples (87.4%)</td>
<td>100 (90.9%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

И долго они стоят молча, не решаясь произнести первое слово. [Софронов]
Нельзя употреблять в тексте диалектизмы редкие, не облегчая их понимание читателю. [Калинин]
... уже не пытаясь переворачивать лодку ... [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:

Не нужно судить, не зная обстоятельств. [Зорин]
Впрочем, не делая пока окончательных выводов, ... [Звегинцев]
Женщина отрицательно покрутила головой, не отнимая ладоней от лица. [Спутник]
While the genitive is certainly much the more frequent choice overall, certain qualifications have to be made. Firstly, the presence of an infinitival construction, while comparatively rare, appears to reverse the preference in most instances. Secondly, as might have been expected (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 62), the vast majority of the object words were abstract nouns or pronouns. As for fully concrete nouns, words referring to parts of the body clearly favoured the genitive (accusative 1, genitive 7; cf. Factor 24:4); otherwise there was more variation, though the genitive was still clearly preferred: Accusative 5, Genitive 10.

Factor 2: Participle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>12 examples (26.1%)</td>
<td>11 (24.4%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>34 examples (73.9%)</td>
<td>34 (75.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

в особенности когда логики высказываются по вопросам, непосредственно не затрагивающим формальный апарат логики. [Ломтев]

... всякая жизнь тут захирела бы, а затем и вовсе покинула скудные, не редко бывшие хлеб земли. [Спутник]

Яго-Ворошило — человек, не принимающий существующий порядок вещей ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... некоторое соединение слов, не образующее, однако, еще предложения. [Звегинцев]

Далее — выбор пути развития, не нарушающего грань наши взаимоотношений с окружающей средой. [Спутник]

Кунгурцев, не разобравший имени, пробормотал: “Что я, дикарь какой?” [Спутник]

The figures indicate a clear preference for the genitive; at the same time, however, they confirm earlier findings that this preference is not as marked as in the case of gerunds, especially if one notes that there were no infinitival constructions in the examples with the accusative. Moreover, the accusative was not uncommon even in constructions with abstract objects. Even so, it seems a reasonable hypothesis that the preference for the genitive may well be primarily due to the objects being mostly abstract, rather than to the presence of a participle as such.

Factor 3: Relative clause with a noun as antecedent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>56 examples (50.5%)</td>
<td>22 (31.4%)</td>
<td>34 (82.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>55 examples (49.5%)</td>
<td>48 (86.8%)</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These clauses are of two different types: in some of them, the relative pronoun который itself is the object of the relative clause, while in other cases it has a different function (e.g. subject). These two types differ considerably from each other with regard to case selection: where который is the object, the accusative is much preferred (see Factor 25:4); but in other cases, there is a stronger-than-average preference for the genitive:

Factor 4: Relative clause with other antecedent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>9 examples (29.0%)</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>5 (45.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>23 examples (71.0%)</td>
<td>17 (81.0%)</td>
<td>6 (54.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples with accusative:

... человек может иногда продать в себе нечто очень дорогое, что он уже никогда не купит ни за какие деньги. [Розов]

... чтобы выяснить все, что она не поняла в бланке-заявке. ... [Залыгин]

Сухари были нужны всем, кому нельзя доставлять свежий хлеб. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

"Свойство есть то, что, характеризуя вещи, не образует новых вещей." [Караулов]

нужно внимательно и пристально вглядеться в человека, постараться увидеть в нем то, чего раньше не замечали. [Спутник]

Он был, пожалуй, единственным тут, в подземелье, кто не утратил впечатлительности, нервного отношения ко всему, чему был свидетелем. [Спутник]

In these cases, the antecedent of the relative clause is not a noun, but an adjective, a pronoun, or the whole preceding clause.

As with the previous category, a distinction must be made between relative clauses with the relative pronoun as object and ones in which the pronoun has another function.

The relative pronoun что was the object in 20 examples; the accusative was used in 6 of these (30%), the genitive in 14. This corresponds almost exactly to the overall ratio for clauses with pronominal objects.

There were 12 examples of clauses with the relative pronouns кто and что fulfilling other functions; 3 of these (25%) had the object in the accusative, 9 in the genitive. All of these examples came from the scholarly and journalistic texts, and the objects were mostly nouns denoting abstract concepts.

Factor 5: Relative clause without an antecedent

Six occurrences: five with genitive (чего), one with accusative (что).

Example with accusative:

Что сами не съедаем — продаем кооператорам или на городском рынке. [Спутник]

Example with genitive:

Чегоне знаю, того не знаю. [Зорин]

Видят, чего раньше не замечали: свои ошибки и добрые качества других людей. [Софронов]

These constructions are of a colloquial nature, and four of the examples were found in plays. The sample is not large enough for definite conclusions to be drawn about the influence of this syntactic position as compared to relative clauses with antecedents; however, this category serves as a further indication of a preference for the genitive with pronominal objects.

Factor 6: Sub-clause with the conjunction что

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>66 examples (40.7%)</td>
<td>96 examples (59.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>26 (25.5%)</td>
<td>76 (74.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>40 (66.7%)</td>
<td>20 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Пускай еще спасибо скажет, что руку не оттяпали. [Розов]

Предполагается, что значения классов слов ... не характеризуют модель предложения. [Ломлев]

Знаменательно, что Западная Европа не принимает всерьез американский тезис о стратегической зависимости от СССР. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Мне жаль, что я не слышал всего процесса. [Дворецкий]

Понятно, что это не исключает некоторого процента ошибок. [Караулов]

Она как-то уже свыклась с мыслью, что сена по верховью речонки не ставят, ... [Абрамов]

This group comprises explicative sub-clauses with the conjunction что 'that' (excluding cases in which что is part of a 'compound conjunction'). The percentage figures for case usage correspond closely to those for the whole corpus.

Factor 7: Temporal sub-clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>25 examples(59.5%)</td>
<td>17 examples(40.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>21 (60.0%)</td>
<td>14 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>4 (57.1%)</td>
<td>3(42.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Веда пришла в тот день, когда утром не привезли воду. [Спутник]

... он начал красться вдоль бревенчатой стены, пока не заметил низенькую дверь. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Какая уж категоричность, когда элементарного вопроса решить не могу! [Софронов]
"Синоним — это слово, которым пользуется писатель, когда не находит нужного." [Калинин]

This group includes clauses with пока (покуда) не (cf. Factor 2:3). If these are omitted, the figures for the remaining temporal sub-clauses are: accusative 7, genitive 7. Thus, it would appear that Butorin (1953: 10-11) may well be right in noting a clear preference for the accusative in temporal sub-clauses; but at the same time it seems necessary to qualify this statement by observing that it only applies with any degree of certainty to clauses with пока не.

Factor 8: Causal sub-clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>18 examples (41.9%)</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
<td>11 (84.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>25 examples (58.1%)</td>
<td>23 (76.7%)</td>
<td>2 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Я не хочу быть физиком потому, что не люблю науку. [Розов]

Позиция подлежащего не является приглагольной, так как именительный падеж не раскрывает валентные свойства глагола как части речи. [Ломтев]

Решили и второе: звать на помощь соседей, поскольку своими силами урожай не собрать: богатым обещает быть. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... ибо сокращение сочетаний с начальным "h" ... не затрагивает отношений между другими фонемами с интересующей нас точки зрения. [Аванесов]

Мечтаю о личной встрече, поскольку своими силами урожай не собрать: богатым обещает быть. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

В новое время скандинавских заимствований практически не наблюдается (если не считать немногих экзотизмов: ...) [Калинин]

... если бы она, Раневская, не испытала на сцене всю боль этой безгранично одинокой женщины, ... [Спутник]

According to Butorin (1953: 10-11), the accusative clearly predominates (‘явно преобладает’) in conditional clauses; however, according to Safarewiczowa (1960: 109-26) both cases are in equally common use. Our figures seem to support Safarewiczowa’s view. The difference between clauses with and without an infinitive is smaller than usual because nearly all the infinitives were independent ones (these have a weaker influence on case selection than dependent infinitives — cf. Factor 14:1).

It is arguable that the accusative might be particularly common in clauses of unreal condition (если followed by бы + past-tense form of the verb): such clauses, of course, imply that the proposition is in fact true in its positive form. However, our sample offers little evidence for this theory: there are three clauses of this type with accusative, and two with genitive, and it is clear that the genitive may perfectly well appear in such constructions at least in abstract contexts.

Factor 9: Conditional sub-clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>27 examples (50.0%)</td>
<td>12 (44.4%)</td>
<td>15 (55.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>27 examples (50.0%)</td>
<td>15 (55.6%)</td>
<td>12 (44.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Если в зимнее время им не давать рыбий жир и витамин "Л", ... [Петухов]

Ясно, что если лингвист не исключает из задач синтаксиса изучение указанных различий, ... [Ломтев]

...если бы она, Раневская, не испытала на сцене всю боль этой безгранично одинокой женщины, ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... пленных освобождает потому, что не может победить в себе сочувствия к брату-казаку. [Трифонов]

Factor 10: Concessive sub-clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>2 examples (18.2%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>9 examples (81.8%)</td>
<td>7 (85.7%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example with accusative:

Хотя она не успела надеть "выходную" шубку, можно полагать, что это крестовка. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

И, хотя грамматика Белинского не получила широкого признания у современников, ... [Мещерский]

...карабкаются на скалы, хотя им не нужно давать зачета. [Солоухин]
All the concessive clauses in our sample were introduced by the conjunction хотя; another possibility would be несмотря на то что.

While the genitive seems to be more frequent in concessive clauses than on average, this may well be due to other factors: two of the genitive examples had ни один preceding the object word; and the object nouns were concrete in both of the examples in which the accusative was used, but abstract in all but one of the examples with the genitive.

**Factor 11:** Sub-clause with чтобы

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>28 examples (59.6%)</td>
<td>8 (50.0%)</td>
<td>20 (64.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>19 examples (40.4%)</td>
<td>8 (50.0%)</td>
<td>11 (35.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- Чай, не полная дура, чтобы не понять такой намек! [Петухов]
- Чтобы не повторять примеры Дж. Лакоффа, мы можем привести их русский аналог. [Звегинцев]
- Даже не поворачивался, чтоб время зря не терять. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:
- Да, мы тоже заинтересованы, чтобы пароходство не несло убытков. [Спутник]
- Эту девочку просто умертили, чтобы она не испытала мучений после смерти матери ... [Софронов]
- Мне хотелось действовать в перчатках, как преступнику, чтобы не оставлять следов. [Спутник]

Sub-clauses with чтобы are of two main types: on the one hand, they include explicative clauses (such as the first example with accusative and the first one with genitive); and on the other hand, clauses expressing purpose (the remaining four examples above).

Butorin (1953: 10-11) suggests that the accusative is preferred in clauses of purpose; however, Solonicyn (1962: 113) holds a different view, asserting that the accusative is more frequent in explicative sub-clauses with чтобы, but that there is no such preference in clauses of purpose.

Our figures break down as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>7 examples (53.8%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>6 examples (46.2%)</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In colloquial speech, explicative sub-clauses sometimes appear without the conjunction что; in more formal registers the conjunction cannot normally be omitted, and, indeed, all our examples were instances of direct speech.

It may occasionally be difficult to determine whether we are dealing with a case of что-omission or not. The following is an example of a sentence in which it would clearly be a mistake to think that a conjunction had been left out:

И знаете, ни у кого не вызывало сомнений, что... [Дворецкий]

The word знаете does not carry its full lexical meaning in this context, but is used in an introductory function as a convention of colloquial speech (cf. the use of you know in colloquial English). In some cases,
however, the distinction is less clear-cut: for instance, the first example above could also have been regarded as a main clause, with пойми as a separate element not belonging to the basic grammatical structure of the sentence. Our principle was to regard sentences of this type as cases of что-omission if it was possible to add что without changing the meaning or producing a completely unnatural sentence.

The accusative frequency was relatively high, even if contrasted with the average figures for direct-speech contexts only, rather than the whole material. However, it is difficult to determine whether что-omission as such might be a factor contributing to the use of the accusative.

Factor 13: Other sub-clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without inf.</th>
<th>With inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>12 (48.0%)</td>
<td>7 (41.2%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>13 (52.0%)</td>
<td>10 (58.8%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Меня этот тип спрашивает — почему нельзя было картину кончить, а потом другую сделать? [Спутник]
...ему и в голову никогда не придет, будто он что-то в ней не знает. [Залыгин]
Данилов забеспокоился, как бы Кармадон, грешным делом, не затопил нижние квартиры. [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:
Килограммы терялись и от постоянного беспокойства о том, как бы кто-нибудь не нарушил эксперимента. [Спутник]
...что они находят в заоблачной снежной выси, где даже глотка воздуха как следует не сделаеть. [Спутник]
...и были они спокойны и свежи, словно и не совершали подъема. [Солоухин]

This group contains certain types of both explicative and non-explicative clauses. The former were of two basic sub-types: ones introduced by conjunctions other than что and чтобы (such as как бы не, будто); and ones taking the form of subordinated questions. Both sub-types were infrequent, and no significant preferences were found; in all, there were twelve examples of explicative clauses falling into this group: two with accusative and two with genitive objects.

Non-explicative clauses in this group include those of place (accusative 2, genitive 3), comparison (ace. 2, gen. 3), and manner or degree (ace. 2, gen. 2). No conclusions can be drawn about the possible influence of any of these on case selection.

The Predicate

VARIABLE 8: Mood

A number of scholars have remarked upon the possible influence on case selection of the two non-indicative moods. The imperative, in particular, is frequently said to favour the accusative; while tentative suggestions have also been made as to the possible influence of the conditional.

Apart from the imperative and the 'conditional proper', we have decided to treat separately those cases in which бы appears without a finite verb in the past tense, and is therefore traditionally not regarded as a conditional marker.

Factor 1: Imperative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without inf.</th>
<th>With inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>75 (54.0%)</td>
<td>67 (52.8%)</td>
<td>8 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>64 (46.0%)</td>
<td>60 (47.2%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Не планируйте эти расходы. [Дворецкий]
Нет уж, вы скажите, не таите обиду про себя. [Петухов]
Мотор не трогай, на веслах иди! [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:
Не делай драматических жестов! [Розов]
Не нарушайте протокола. [Зорин]
Не осложняйте своего положения, Бурьянов. [Васильев]

The following scholars note a preference for the accusative after verbs in the imperative mood: Deribas (1956: 24), Borras & Christian (1971: 29), Fleckenstein (1961: 218), Soloncyn (1962: 108), Dončev (1964: 99), Listvinov (1965: 193), Ravič (1971: 264), Timberlake (1975: 129), and Rozental’ (1985: 275). The figures provided by Restan (1960: 98) also indicate a preference for the accusative (53.7%, the average being 31%); however, according to Safarewiczowa’s figures (1960), the accusative is only used in 40.0% of all imperative clauses (average 33.9%). Korn’s results (1967: 490) correspond to those reached by Safarewiczowa; and Kout (1960: 31) states that case selection in imperative clauses is determined entirely by other factors.

If we are to investigate the possible influence of the imperative on case selection, it is necessary to eliminate certain contexts in which the choice is clearly determined by other factors. The figures given above include.
all imperative clauses found in the corpus. However, more revealing figures may be arrived at by making at least two omissions: idiomatic or fixed expressions which seem to make the use of either the accusative or the genitive more or less obligatory (не обратил внимания, не первый надежды, не морпой голову); and clauses with это as object (ten examples, with no occurrences of the accusative form это as object). Both of these features are relatively frequent in imperative clauses, and the distortion created by them might therefore be greater than usual here. In addition, it may be advisable to omit clauses in which the imperative does not appear in its primary function (e.g. Не приведи бог еще раз пережить голод [Абрамов]); however, there were only two such instances in our sample.

If imperative clauses belonging to these categories are excluded, the figures reveal a somewhat stronger preference for the accusative (all further analysis will be based on these figures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preference for the accusative is not accounted for merely by the fact that imperatives usually occur in the context of dialogue: the total figures for all direct-speech contexts in the corpus (omitting это as object and the stock expressions discussed above) only show a 50.9% accusative frequency.

Existing literature offers two alternative explanations for our finding. According to Timberlake (1975: 129), the imperative (as well as the conditional) describes 'potential, nonactual events'; negated imperatives and conditionals 'seem to presuppose that the positive action is a possibility'. This, in Timberlake's view, weakens the force of negation. Listvinov (1965: 193), on the other hand, states that the use of the accusative is determined by the fact that the object is usually "(как правило)" a concrete noun; and it might be added that the object noun frequently also carries a notion of definiteness (Mustajoki 1985: 57).

Timberlake's explanation is open to criticism at least as far as the imperative is concerned: it is unlikely that the force of a negative imperative is at all weaker than that of a negated indicative, particularly with reference to exclamatory imperative clauses, in which the negation is in fact particularly emphatic (interestingly, these only show a 51.7% accusative frequency in our sample, with 15 accusatives and 14 genitives). However, an alternative explanation along similar lines seems more reasonable. Timberlake is quite clearly right in noting that with negated imperatives 'the positive action is a possibility' — in other words, the (notional) subject clearly has a choice of either performing or not performing the action. It seems rather contrived to see this as reducing the actual force of the negation; but we would suggest that it does add to the sentence a clear notion of what might be called 'situation definiteness', or 'topicality' (актуальность') — in other words, the proposition which is negated is viewed as 'more definite' (or less unreal) in the context of the speech situation, as it is something that could easily become true (unlike, for example, in the case of a negated past-tense form in the indicative; cf. also Variable 9 (Tense), where it might be postulated that a similar explanation applies to the comparatively frequent use of the accusative in future contexts; and see Factor 14:6 for the construction не стать + inf., where this may be particularly relevant).

The factor of concreteness also goes some way towards explaining the frequency of the accusative, for the proportion of concrete nouns among all objects, while hardly as great as assumed by Listvinov (even allowing for possibly different defining criteria), is certainly far higher than average (about one-third of all objects omitting это, the average being less than one-fifth). However, this explanation is not adequate on its own, because the accusative is commoner than average even within the 'abstract' and 'concrete' groups; the figures for clauses without an infinitive show that concrete objects in imperative clauses were in the accusative in thirty-four instances out of a total of thirty-six (average 60.1%).

Further research is needed to establish whether definiteness or some other factors are relevant here; but in any case it is evident that negated imperative clauses are a relatively felicitous environment for the accusative to appear in, at least in the absence of Strong Factors and barring the influence of это and some idiomatic expressions.

Factor 2: Conditional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Благовею, но никогда бы не посягнал жизнь делу, в котором каждый разбирается больше меня. [Зорин]

— А ты не мог бы без удовольствия дать мне тринадцать копеек на мороженое? [Спутник]
The Findings: VARIABLE 9: Tense

Examples:

Past, accusative:

Веда пришла в тот день, когда утром не привезли воду. [Спутник]

Past, genitive:

Неужели он не сознавал своего значения для России и ничтожества Мартынова по сравнению с собой? [Солоухин]

Present, accusative:

Я не люблю современную модерновую живопись. [Спутник]

Present, genitive:

Природа не знает искусственных постановок, а математика знает. [Спутник]

Future, accusative:

И если ты не будешь соблюдать порядок, то тебе не работать дояркой! [Петухов]

Скажем, ни один серьезный специалист не поставил сейчас задачу ... [Караулов]

Future, genitive:

Ну, уж я думаю, вы при нем таких замечаний делать не будете. [Розов]

Чужие знания вам не принесут пользы. [Дворецкий]

The tense of the predicate verb is not usually mentioned among the factors influencing the case choice. However, our figures do indicate a certain difference between the future and the other tenses, and also between the past and the present when the infinitive factor is eliminated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>318 (38.2%)</td>
<td>440 (39.9%)</td>
<td>122 (46.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>515 (61.8%)</td>
<td>662 (60.1%)</td>
<td>143 (54.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Without infinitive:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>169 (27.6%)</td>
<td>141 (20.9%)</td>
<td>77 (37.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>443 (72.4%)</td>
<td>534 (79.1%)</td>
<td>127 (62.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With infinitive:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>149 (67.4%)</td>
<td>299 (70.0%)</td>
<td>45 (73.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>72 (32.6%)</td>
<td>128 (30.0%)</td>
<td>16 (26.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before attempting to explain the high frequency of the accusative in the 'future' column, it is necessary to draw a distinction between the 'simple' and the 'compound' future. With the compound future, the frequency of the accusative was 72.7% (16 vs. 6 occurrences, all naturally with an infinitive, which is, however, not an embedded one; see Factor 14:12). Thus, the figures for the simple future are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>106 examples (43.6%)</td>
<td>77 (37.7%)</td>
<td>29 (74.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>137 examples (56.4%)</td>
<td>127 (62.3%)</td>
<td>10 (25.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the simple future is frequently used in various modal senses without future reference, or with the idea of futurity playing a secondary role, does not seem to affect the results to a significant degree. If one eliminates all instances of the most frequent of such uses, i.e. the second-person singular with generic reference denoting impossibility (cf. Variable 11), the figures differ hardly at all from those given above (total accusative frequency 43.3%).

It is perhaps not surprising that the future should behave differently from the past and the present. While it is possible to say with a reasonable degree of certainty what has happened in the past, what is happening now, or what happens usually/often/etc., there is always some element of uncertainty in any statement about what is going to happen in the future; thus, the future is, to a certain extent at least, a modal category. In our particular case, it may be particularly relevant that the future tense refers to an event that may or may not take place and is therefore 'potentially imminent'; as was the case with imperatives (which, of course, normally refer to potential future actions — cf. Factor 8:1 above), the future tends to have a notion of contextual definiteness, which makes the use of the accusative relatively likely.

The difference between the past and the present in clauses without an infinitival construction disappears if one compares the present with only those past-tense clauses where the verb was imperfective; it might be argued, then, that the difference between past and present is primarily related to aspect rather than tense, as verbs appearing in the present-tense form are always imperfective (see Variable 10 below, where the interrelationship of tense and aspect is discussed systematically).

VARIABLE 10: Aspect

Examples:

**Imperfective, accusative:**

Муки также не давали, хотя можно было получить ее в 75% вместо хлеба. [Спутник]

Однако и скорость вращения зеркал нельзя увеличивать беспрерывно ... [Спутник]

**Imperfective, genitive:**

Впрочем, многие языковеды честно не замечали и не замечают двойственности своего предмета, ... Не нужно судить, не зная обстоятельств. [Зорин]

**Perfective, accusative:**

Такую трату драгоценной влаги многие не одобрили. [Спутник]

Ладно, иди — я дверь не закрою. [Розов]

**Perfective, genitive:**

Но Наташа будто и не услышала его слов, ... [Орлов]

А не поймешь жизни — жить не научишься. [Васильев]

Чесноков понимал, что Данилов не мог не заметить его хитростей, ... [Орлов]

The aspect of the verb governing the object is regarded as a significant factor by some scholars. The accusative is likelier, at least in some contexts, to appear in connection with perfective verbs than with imperfective ones according to Magner (1955: 535), Kulagin (1959: 99), Restan (1960: 97), Ravič (1971: 264-5), Timberlake (1975: 128-9), Green (1979: 175), Haka (1981: 29-35, 102), and Rozental’ (1985: 275). However, several of these couch their observations in rather cautious terms; and a few scholars explicitly state that their research has not revealed a significant difference between the two aspects in this respect (Butorin 1953: 8; Doncheva 1964: 99; Tsurikov 1967: 181; Schaller 1968: 98). On the other hand, the concrete figures provided by some scholars do seem to support the notion that aspect might be of some significance. Restan finds that the proportion of the accusative is 40.1% with perfective verbs and 25% with imperfective verbs; in Haka’s study, the corresponding figures are 48.0% and 31.8% respectively. Green’s results are interesting in that there is a similar, though smaller, difference when the whole material is considered (imperfective aspect: accusative 30%, n = 72; perfective: 21%, n = 70); but the difference disappears if one only analyses spoken contexts.
Our figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>imperfective</th>
<th>perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>573 (34.7%)</td>
<td>498 (49.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>1076 (65.3%)</td>
<td>502 (50.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without infinitive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>imperfective</th>
<th>perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>287 (23.1%)</td>
<td>195 (35.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>953 (76.9%)</td>
<td>352 (64.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With infinitive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>imperfective</th>
<th>perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>286 (69.9%)</td>
<td>303 (66.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>123 (30.1%)</td>
<td>150 (33.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clauses with a biaspectual predicate verb (e.g. использовать, дискредитировать) have been excluded from consideration here because it is occasionally impossible to decide which aspect such a verb represents in a particular context. Although the aspect could have been reliably determined in most instances (e.g. in the case of verbs transparently in the present tense), it was felt that it might be safer and more consistent to exclude all cases of biaspectuality; the number of such examples is small (33 with accusative, 30 with genitive) and their inclusion would therefore have had very little effect on the results.

The results suggest that aspect does have a relatively strong claim to be regarded as a significant factor; but it is interesting that the figures for clauses with an infinitive reveal practically no difference between the two aspects. It must be observed, however, that the classifying criterion here was the aspect of the verb governing the direct object — i.e. the infinitive where there was one. The figures under Factors 15:5 and 15:6 (cf. pp. 124-5) show that while the aspect of the infinitive seems to make little difference to case selection the aspect of the auxiliary verb in clauses with an infinitive does appear to have an influence comparable to that found here in the absence of infinitival constructions.

It is also interesting, in the light of Green’s findings, to consider the difference between dialogue and other contexts. Our results do not rule out the influence of the aspect factor in direct speech. The difference between imperfective and perfective verbs is admittedly reduced if direct speech only is considered: the accusative frequency is 42.3% for imperfectives (n = 537) and 50.9% for perfectives (n = 316); but even so the difference remains significant (the same is true for clauses without an infinitive: imperfective 33.5%, perfective 46.1%). It must, of course, be born in mind that Green’s material included transcriptions of authentic speech, whereas our examples of direct speech come from literature (mainly drama); on the other hand, the reliability of Green’s figures is seriously impaired by the small size of the sample. (See also pp. 207-8 for some of the general difficulties involved in comparing written and authentic spoken materials.)

In any event, the figures given above indicate a significant difference between the two aspects, allowing for the fact that the aspect of a verb appearing in the infinitive does not seem to be significant. It seems fruitful, however, to examine the interrelationship of tense and aspect before making further comments. It must be remembered in this connection that under the variable ‘Tense’ the criterion of classification was obviously the tense of the main verb in the clause, whereas under ‘Aspect’ the classification was based on the aspect of the verb governing the object (i.e. the infinitive if there was one). For this reason, we have only examined those clauses here which did not contain an infinitival construction.

The figures for imperfective verbs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>past</th>
<th>present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>67 (26.4%)</td>
<td>135 (28.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>254 (73.6%)</td>
<td>517 (71.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding figures for perfective verbs are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>past</th>
<th>future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>98 (34.6%)</td>
<td>76 (37.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>185 (65.4%)</td>
<td>127 (62.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures would seem to suggest that aspect is much the more important of these two factors, perfective verbs being on the whole considerably more likely than imperfective ones to take the accusative. However, it still remains to be established whether this generalization applies to all the various uses of the two aspects. According to Rozental’ (1985: 275), for example, only the resultative meaning of the perfective aspect is an accusative-favouring factor; while Timberlake (1975: 128-9) offers an explanation (based on a difference between the two aspects regarding the scope of negation) which would seem to cover all the various ‘particular aspectual meanings’. For the time being, little concrete evidence is available either way; but in any case it seems that a more detailed analysis of the connection between aspectual semantics and case selection is definitely a line of enquiry worth pursuing in the future.
The number and the person of the predicate verb are not mentioned in the literature as factors influencing the choice of case. However, certain interesting observations can be made in connection with this variable, even though it does seem quite likely that these factors as such do not affect the choice.

The analysis of this variable is complicated by morphological differences between the past and the nonpast tenses. In the past tense, the verb itself does not have separate forms for the various persons, but does display (in the singular) the grammatical category of gender. Below, however, past-tense forms have been classified as representing the first, second, or the third person, depending on the subject of the verb (with impersonal constructions classified as third person). The figures for the second person also include imperative clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>1st p.</th>
<th>2nd p.</th>
<th>3rd p.</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>119 (36.7%)</td>
<td>113 (49.1%)</td>
<td>35 (11.1%)</td>
<td>267 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>205 (63.3%)</td>
<td>117 (50.9%)</td>
<td>763 (58.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>1st p.</th>
<th>2nd p.</th>
<th>3rd p.</th>
<th>Total:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>49 (51.0%)</td>
<td>47 (52.2%)</td>
<td>144 (37.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>47 (49.0%)</td>
<td>43 (47.8%)</td>
<td>240 (62.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without infinitive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>1st p.</th>
<th>2nd p.</th>
<th>3rd p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>62 (26.7%)</td>
<td>92 (45.1%)</td>
<td>171 (21.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>170 (73.3%)</td>
<td>112 (54.9%)</td>
<td>619 (78.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>1st p.</th>
<th>2nd p.</th>
<th>3rd p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>16 (28.6%)</td>
<td>39 (50.6%)</td>
<td>91 (29.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>40 (71.4%)</td>
<td>38 (49.4%)</td>
<td>215 (70.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With infinitive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>1st p.</th>
<th>2nd p.</th>
<th>3rd p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>57 (62.0%)</td>
<td>21 (80.8%)</td>
<td>364 (71.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>35 (38.0%)</td>
<td>5 (19.2%)</td>
<td>144 (28.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plural</th>
<th>1st p.</th>
<th>2nd p.</th>
<th>3rd p.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>33 (82.5%)</td>
<td>8 (61.5%)</td>
<td>53 (67.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>25 (32.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher-than-average accusative frequency in the first person plural seems to be primarily a consequence of the infinitive factor; this also accounts for the apparent discrepancy between the first person singular and plural in the total figures.

In the second person (both singular and plural) the frequency of the accusative is comparatively high. However, before analysing these figures further, it is necessary to differentiate between the primary and the generic use of the second person singular.

The 'simple future' form of the second person singular is frequently used with generic reference to denote impossibility, as in:

Чего ревешь! Пустыню слезами не намочишь. [Спутник]

Лучшего наказания ему не придумаешь! [Вампилов]

In such contexts the accusative is used at a frequency which at first sight appears only slightly higher than average: accusative 19 (45.2%), genitive 23. However, it should be noted that only one of these examples (with accusative) contained an infinitival construction; this means that the figures are best compared with the total for clauses with a finite verb form governing the object. The average accusative frequency in such cases is only 27.0%, and the construction under consideration may therefore be regarded as a relatively favourable environment for the accusative to appear in. The colloquial nature of this structure may be offered as an explanation, which may, however, be insufficient on its own.

It is also sensible to exclude the imperative from consideration when analysing the 'ordinary' second-person forms here, as imperative clauses were dealt with above (Factor 8.1). By only considering indicative and conditional clauses, as well as excluding the generic use with the meaning of impossibility, we arrive at the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second person singular</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>42 examples (48.8%)</td>
<td>28 (40.0%)</td>
<td>14 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>44 examples (51.2%)</td>
<td>42 (60.0%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second person plural</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>25 examples (50.0%)</td>
<td>19 (47.5%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>25 examples (50.0%)</td>
<td>21 (52.5%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the deviation from the average figures is undeniably significant, the relatively high frequency of the accusative may well be chiefly attributable to the influence of other factors. Understandably, the examples mostly represent direct speech; and considering that the average accusative frequency for 'spoken' contexts was 45.8%, the figures are in fact fairly close to what one might expect (particularly in the singular). A possible explanation for the difference between singular and plural is the less frequent occurrence of этого as object in connection with the plural.
On the whole it seems that, leaving aside the findings relating to the generic second person singular, the differences found under this variable are hardly caused by number and person as such, but are primarily related to the patterns of co-occurrence of the various verb forms with other, more powerful factors.

**VARIABLE 12: Semantic type of the verb governing the direct object**

The semantic properties of the verb governing the direct object have been mentioned by a number of scholars as a factor which probably influences case selection. However, their observations pertain largely to certain individual verbs or groups of verbs (and will be noted below under the relevant categories); so far this variable has not been studied systematically.

In the present study, an attempt has been made to develop a system of classification whereby all verbs could be assigned to semantic classes and these classes then analysed in terms of their possible influence on case selection. An attempt to produce such a classification is fraught with difficulties, and undoubtedly the version presented here leaves room for improvement; but we hope that it can shed at least some light on the role of verb semantics in determining the choice of case.

One major problem in making a semantic classification of this type is the treatment of polysemantic verbs. Our solution has generally been to keep all the different meanings of a verb together for the sake of clarity; consequently, some verbs with two or more different meanings have been given a single classification which may not, in actual fact, be fully applicable to all uses of the verb concerned. However, where this procedure might significantly distort the results, the problem is given special attention in the text; and in a few cases it was thought wiser to separate two or more completely different meanings by placing them in different classes.

As space is limited, the presentation of data is generally confined to verbs with a minimum of ten occurrences in our corpus, and only those individual verbs, or relatively homogeneous groups of verbs, with a minimum of twenty-five occurrences are examined in detail. The remaining verbs are treated as larger, and inevitably somewhat heterogeneous groups; a more detailed analysis should be carried out in future.

Group 1 (едать etc.) has already been dealt with under Marginal Cases, p. 17-18.

**Group 2: Verbs of perception**

Verbs denoting sensory perception are listed in the majority of sources as a genitive-favouring factor (e.g. Restan 1960: 100; Davison 1967: 42-4; Listvinov 1967: 191; Tsurikov 1967: 184; Timberlake 1975: 130; AG 1980-II: 417; Rozental’ 1985: 274). This is confirmed by our combined figures for all the verbs in this group (excluding some cases which were included here on formal grounds but clearly do not denote perception):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative</strong></td>
<td>28 examples (17.1%)</td>
<td>12 (9.3%)</td>
<td>16 (45.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>136 examples (82.9%)</td>
<td>117 (90.7%)</td>
<td>19 (54.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The figures in our 'total' column correspond almost exactly to those given by Restan for verba sentiendi.)

As a general observation, it may be noted that the contrast between definite and indefinite objects seems to be particularly relevant here. The objects are usually indefinite in negative contexts, the very existence of the object frequently being doubtful from the subject’s point of view. Such existential connotations clearly favour the genitive, and, indeed, clauses with видеть etc. are frequently used to illustrate the general importance of existential connotations in determining case selection: Hunyadi (1981: 54), for example, compares the following pair of sentences: Я не у карандашей — Я не вижу карандаши, interpreting the former as 'Я вижу, что нет карандашей', and the latter as 'Я не вижу существующие карандаши' (or 'Я не вижу, что есть карандаши'). This observation is clearly valid as a general rule, although the genitive is sometimes found where this rule would yield the accusative (the reverse seems much less likely).

Apart from those verbs universally regarded as perceptual, we also included in this group what might be termed verbs of 'active perception', mainly смотреть and слушать. The number of occurrences was fourteen, and the accusative was used in seven of these clauses. This suggests that these verbs, unlike those denoting 'passive' perception, are not predisposed towards the genitive (there is no connotation of non-existence here; on the contrary, смотреть and слушать frequently imply definiteness). These verbs have been excluded from the analysis presented below.

**Subgroup 21: Visual perception**

It must be noted that the verbs in this group do not in fact always
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The findings indicate that the verb видеть, for example, is often used metaphorically with abstract objects. We have included here all uses of verbs with the basic lexical meaning of visual perception.

**Factor 211:** видеть — увидеть; видать; видывать

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 examples (14.6%)</td>
<td>6 (8.3%)</td>
<td>7 (41.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76 examples (85.4%)</td>
<td>66 (91.7%)</td>
<td>10 (58.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with genitive:

- Ты не видела мой чемодан? [Петухов]
- Если вы не отличаете таланта, не считаете, что он нужен ... [Салынский]
- Свободной ото льда земли экспедиция не обнаружила. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

- Активный (не замечает состояния Бориса). [Салынский]
- Недвусмысленно: а) не вижу следов; б) ещё не обнаружил. [Аванесов]

The verb заметить clearly has the meaning of perception in all the examples, although this perception is not always literally visual. The general tendency to prefer the genitive with verbs of perception is evident here as well.

**Factor 212:** замечать — заметить

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 examples (15.6%)</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 examples (84.4%)</td>
<td>23 (88.5%)</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Исследовали место под плотину и не заметили трещину в каменном дне реки. [Салынский]
- Деревья для него вырастали бы мгновенно, а смену дня и ночи оно вовсе не успевало бы заметить ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

- Антипав (не замечает постоянной Бориса). [Салынский]
- Два месяца, проведенных в пробирке, зародыши просто не "заметили". [Спутник]

The verb заметить clearly has the meaning of perception in all the examples, although this perception is not always literally visual. The general tendency to prefer the genitive with verbs of perception is evident here as well.

**Factor 213:** Other verbs of visual perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 examples (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 examples (66.7%)</td>
<td>11 (91.7%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Археологи не теряют надежды обнаружить берестяные грамоты в слоях X в. древнего Новгорода, ... [Мешерский]
- Ни не, ни другие нельзя было разглядеть: ... [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:

- Если вы не отличаете таланта, не считаете, что он нужен [Салынский]
- Свободной ото льда земли экспедиция не обнаружила. [Спутник]

The most frequent verb here was обнаруживать — обнаружить. The total figures for it were: accusative 3 (21.4%), genitive 11. However, this verb has two completely different meanings, one of which (‘to display’ — e.g. with reference to feelings) is obviously not connected with perception. There were six examples of this non-perceptual use, and the
genitive appeared in all of these (the objects being abstract). In the remaining eight examples, the meaning of the verb was 'to discover', which may be regarded as perceptual; the accusative was used in three of these (all containing infinitival constructions).

This group also contains verbs such as отличать, разглядеть, наблюдать; these were not frequent enough to allow for meaningful statistical observations. The valent construction отличать что-л. от чего-л. — not necessarily perceptual in meaning — probably favours the accusative (but there were only two occurrences); отличать without a prepositional structure is much more likely to take the genitive.

Subgroup 22: Aural perception

Factor 221: слышать — услышать; слыхать; etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>3 examples (10.7%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>25 examples (89.3%)</td>
<td>23 (92.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- Вот эти ваши слова, кроме нас, никто здесь не слышит, ... [Зорин]
- Я этот глагол слышать с тех пор не могу. [Софронов]
- ... название которого она и не слышала никогда прежде! [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:
- "Простите, а я не слышал вопроса." [Розов]
- Он не услышал выстрела. [Спутник]
- Впрочем, Валяхха не расслышал последнего замечания жены, потому что был уже за порогом. [Спутник]

There seems to be an even stronger preference for the genitive here than in the case of visual perception (although the evidence for this possible difference is not conclusive); moreover, all examples in which the accusative was used contain the idea of definiteness. If the difference between visual and aural perception is real, a possible explanation might be that in the latter case the object can only be a concrete noun in exceptional circumstances (apart from animate nouns, most of which were excluded from consideration).
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Он терпеть не мог табачного дыма в доме, ... [Трифонов]

This group includes the verb терпеть and various perfectives derived from it: потерпеть, стерпеть, вытерпеть; and also, on formal grounds, претерпевать, whose actual meaning (‘undergo’, ‘be subject to’) is not that of feeling (there were three examples with the genitive form изменений as object). The genitive seems to be perfectly normal even with infinitives and concrete objects (although the latter are notably few in number). However, variation is not totally impossible.

Factor 313: Other verbs of feeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>36 examples (30.8%)</td>
<td>19 (20.4%)</td>
<td>17 (70.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>81 examples (69.2%)</td>
<td>74 (79.6%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
... если бы она, Раневская, не испытала на сцене всю боль этой безгранично одинокой женщины ... [Спутник]
Сердечную недостаточность молодые, как правило, не чувствуют ...
Хоть нет, музыку я еще совсем не разлюбил ... [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:
А ведь скажи, в Ройтенфурте проклятом вроде никогда усталости не чувствовал? [Салынский]
Так размышлял Олег Васильевич, намыливая самые потные места, не испытывая облегчения ...

This group contains a number of different verbs, the most frequent of which were испытывать (accusative 4, genitive 18 — accusative frequency 18.2%); and чувствовать (accusative 2, genitive 12 — accusative frequency 14.3%). The objects of these verbs most frequently denote human emotions and are therefore highly abstract.

Group 4: Verbs of cognition

Factor 411: понимать — понять and near synonyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>32 examples (31.7%)</td>
<td>15 (21.4%)</td>
<td>17 (54.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>69 examples (68.3%)</td>
<td>55 (78.6%)</td>
<td>14 (45.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Я не понимаю это слово. [Дворецкий]

Я адрес не разобрал. [Зорин]

Прежде классическую музыку он не понимал. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
Женщины никогда не понимают склада мужского ума. [Розов]
Мне нравится ваша любовь к заводу, но я не понимаю вашего чванства. [Дворецкий]
Ирина Викторовна тоже не представляла сущности этой проблемы, ...

The verb понимать is mentioned by a number of scholars as favouring the genitive (e.g. Davison 1967: 42-4, 62; Graudina et al. 1976: 35; AG 1980-II, 417). Our figures confirm this (accusative 16, genitive 57; accusative frequency 21.9%). However, the object was это in as many as twenty instances; this partly accounts for the deviation from the average figures, and since the noun objects are generally abstract, one can hardly draw any far-reaching conclusions about the influence of the verb itself.

The other verbs in this group took the accusative more frequently, partly as a consequence of their frequent appearance in the infinitive, but partly also because there were no pronominal objects in the genitive and because some of these verbs (e.g. разобрать) may take objects of a less abstract nature than понимать usually does.

Factor 412: знать

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>10 examples (9.2%)</td>
<td>7 (7.1%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>99 examples (90.8%)</td>
<td>92 (92.9%)</td>
<td>7 (70.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Погоди же, Сидор Фомич, ты еще не знаешь мой характер! [Петухов]
Зубной врач, по сведениям Айкена, был одновременно и личным врачом Гитлера, но его фамилию он не знал. [Спутник]
... видно, не очень-то знал эту историю, ...

Examples with genitive:
С этой разницей, простите, что Никулин не знал цен черного рынка. [Дворецкий]
Он впервые работал с Раневой и не знал некоторых особенностей ее характера. [Спутник]
Природа не знает искусственных постановок, а математика знает. [Спутник]
A number of scholars find a preference for the genitive after знать (e.g. Davison 1967: 42-4, 62; Graudina et al. 1976: 35; AG 1980-II: 417). This is clearly confirmed by our findings. However, этого occurred as the object of не знать in as many as eighteen examples. Also, it should be borne in mind that знать has, apart from its 'intellectual' meaning, an existential use, as in the third example with the genitive (природа не знает искусственных постановок = в природе не существует искусственных постановок, i.e. the existence of the referent of the object word is denied). There were as many as twenty-six examples in which не знать had clear existential implications; all of these had the object in the genitive, and the accusative would evidently be unacceptable in such contexts. However, even if one excludes the existential use, and clauses with этого as object, the accusative frequency remains as low as 15.4%.

**Factor 413: Other verbs of cognition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>99 examples (53.5%)</td>
<td>34 (35.1%)</td>
<td>65 (73.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>86 examples (46.5%)</td>
<td>63 (64.9%)</td>
<td>23 (26.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

С тех пор теорему не могут решить больше трехсот лет. [Зорин]

Это обстоятельство не забывают "высотные" кулинары ... [Спутник]

Философия не рассматривает суть того содержания, личается от другого содержания. [Ломтев]

Examples with genitive:

Не помню подробностей ... [Софронов]

Выражение "делушка русской авиации" не предполагает наличия "отца русской авиации". [Ломтев]

... заявил, что никто и никогда не узнает конца этой истории, ... [Залыгин]

There were a number of different verbs in this group, the following being the most frequent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acc.</th>
<th>Gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>учитывать</strong></td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (63.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>забывать</strong></td>
<td>10 (50.0%)</td>
<td>10 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>помнить</strong></td>
<td>5 (29.4%)</td>
<td>12 (70.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>узнавать</strong></td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>считать</strong></td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
<td>9 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>предполагать</strong></td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>решать</strong></td>
<td>9 (81.8%)</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must, of course, be remembered that считать followed by a predicative instrumental was excluded from consideration here, coming under Strong Factor 1 (however, the above figures do include one instance, with accusative, in which the synonymous prepositional construction считать что-л. за что-л. was used). It should also be noted that предполагать appeared mostly in a sense which does not denote intellectual activity (as in the second example with the genitive above); there were only four examples of the cognitive meaning of this verb, two with each case.

With забывать, it may be observed that pronominal objects (этого, того) account for half the occurrences of the genitive. It would be perfectly reasonable, in fact, to assume that the accusative may generally be preferred with this verb, as it is semantically negative (the overall meaning becoming positive when grammatical negation is added: не забывать = помнить).

Finally, узнавать appeared with two different meanings: 'to recognize' and 'to find out'. With the primarily perceptual meaning of recognition, there was an even distribution of genitives and accusatives (four examples of each, none with an infinitive; the objects were more often than not concrete); but the purely cognitive sense of this verb, appearing with abstract nouns or pronouns in the object position, evidently prefers the genitive (six examples as opposed to one).

**Group 5**

**Subgroup 51: Verbs of speech**

This subgroup consists of verbs which can be said to denote speech activity in their primary (or most usual) senses. Of course, most of these verbs may also refer to the written use of language; moreover, some of them have completely 'non-linguistic' meanings as well.

**Factor 511: говорить — сказать**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative</strong></td>
<td>12 examples (25.5%)</td>
<td>5 (14.3%)</td>
<td>7 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>35 examples (74.5%)</td>
<td>30 (85.7%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Не говори глупости. [Софронов]

Давно я это приметила, только сказать все случаи не представлялось. [Петухов]
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91 Сроки мне отодвинь, я свое не сказал. [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

Не говори глупостей. [Вампилов]
А без вина правды не скажешь! [Петухов]
Самого-то главного он еще не сказал. [Спутник]

The objects were mostly pronouns and adjectives, which, generally speaking, favour the genitive. On the other hand, the figures for clauses with noun objects were, in fact, even more convincing (accusative 3 examples, genitive 14); but this, in turn, is easily explained by the abstractness of the nouns.

Factor 512: Other verbs of speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>47 examples (41.2%)</td>
<td>11 (18.3%)</td>
<td>36 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>67 examples (58.8%)</td>
<td>49 (81.7%)</td>
<td>18 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

так же, как ее доверчивость нельзя объяснить неосведомленностью и легкомыслием, ... [Вампилов]

Почти никто из владеющих русским языком не произносит твердо конечный согласный звук "с". [Мещерский]

Но ведь никто из ученых в мире повторить опыты Вакстера с тем же успехом не смог. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Никто не ахает, не выражает соболезнования по поводу того, что плохо выглядишь ... [Софронов]

Ну, а болельщики не прощают судейских ошибок. [Спутник]

Некоторые критики считали, правда, что молодой прозаик все еще не нашел свою истинную тему ... [Спутник]

It must be noted that some of these verbs do not necessarily involve the idea of speech (or linguistic activity of any kind); this is, for example, the case with прощать, and notably with повторять. The latter, when used with reference to speech, took the accusative in four instances out of six.

Subgroup 52: Abstract verbs

Factor 521: обращать — обратить

36 occurrences, all with genitive. Examples:

А почему ты раньше не обращал на меня внимания? [Розов]

Не обращая внимания на стоящего рядом охотника, они бросились к поверженному волку. [Спутник]

This verb only occurred in the corpus with the object внимание. Although it is clear that the genitive is very much the norm here, this expression was not included among the Strong Factors for reasons explained on p. 130. Also, it might be noted that none of the examples contained an infinitival construction; and there is evidence that this expression may sometimes occur with the accusative, particularly when the verb is in the infinitive.

Factor 522: находить — найти

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>10 examples (17.9%)</td>
<td>7 (15.9%)</td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>46 examples (82.1%)</td>
<td>37 (84.1%)</td>
<td>9 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Эту медь, возможно, никто никогда не найдет, ... [Дворецкий]

— Видишь ли, папа, я не нашел на карте Австралию, — беззаботно объяснил мне сын причину своей школьной неприятности. [Спутник]

Некоторые критики считали, правда, что молодой прозаик все еще не нашел свою истинную тему ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Я ездил на Тверской бульвар, сорок два — и дома такого не нашел. [Розов]

Нельзя пройти мимо вопроса, который не нашел своего окончательного решения. [Аванесов]

Пресуппозиция в лингвистике еще не нашла своего определенного места. [Звегинцев]
This verb is listed by Solonicyn (1962: 106-7) as one of those generally taking the genitive; and Green (1979: 185) found that the genitive was used in eight instances out of nine. Our results, broadly speaking, agree with these observations, although it seems that certain accusative-favouring factors, notably concreteness and definiteness, may easily reverse the preference.

Factor 523: выдерживать — выдержать

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>5 examples (17.2%)</td>
<td>3 (13.6%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>24 examples (82.8%)</td>
<td>19 (86.4%)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Но до сих пор ... не удаётся выдержать все три нужных параметра плазмы — температуру, плотность и время жизни. [Спутник]

Бывают случаи, когда аутовена ... не способна выдерживать нагрузки, обычные для ... [Спутник]

... если ты не выдержал пахот на Аксай, то об Алыгене надо забыть сразу и навсегда. [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

Не выдержали проверки и отдельные собственно историко-грамматические положения, ... [Мещерский]

Плотина не выдержала удара. [Спутник]

На второй день Колька не выдержал добровольного затворничества и сбежал. [Васильев]

The objects are normally abstract; and although the 'total' column shows an unusually high genitive frequency even considering the semantic nature of the objects, the figures for clauses without an infinitive correspond closely to the average figures for clauses with abstract objects (the proportion of clauses with an infinitive being low).

Factor 524: Other verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>129 examples (55.1%)</td>
<td>46 (33.6%)</td>
<td>83 (85.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>105 examples (44.9%)</td>
<td>91 (66.4%)</td>
<td>14 (14.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Ты мне свою сознательность не показывай. [Розов]

Жаль, не могу продолжить приятную утреннюю беседу, у меня уроки. [Сылынский]

Однако власти еще ни разу не применили этот закон для пресечения бесчинств против советских граждан ... [Спутник]

This is an extremely heterogeneous group of verbs, and any generalizations concerning the whole group would be meaningless. The following verbs were represented by a minimum of ten examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>нархать</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>чить</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the verb превышать — превысить appeared twelve times, always followed by a genitive; in most cases it had a cardinal numeral as its object.

Apart from the verbs appearing in the table, it is interesting that there is a clear preference for the accusative after verbs with the general meaning 'to use' (применять, использовать, употреблять: accusative 18, genitive 2); although the frequent appearance of these verbs in the infinitive complicates the picture.

Subgroup 53: Verbs of movement

Most of the verbs included here denote an action causing a movement of the object; this subgroup therefore covers a considerably wider range of transitive verbs than merely those conventionally designated as 'verbs of motion'. The distinction between this and the following subgroup ('physical impact') is not always self-evident; our basic principle was to include here all those verbs which seem to us (in their primary senses) to place more emphasis on the movement of the object than on any changes that the object may undergo as a result.

Factor 531: нести, вести, везти (with or without a prefix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>46 examples (48.9%)</td>
<td>23 (34.3%)</td>
<td>23 (85.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>48 examples (51.1%)</td>
<td>44 (65.7%)</td>
<td>4 (14.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Мы этот вопрос с ней не выносили на обсуждение. [Софронов]
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When denoting concrete actions, the verbs in this group generally appeared in the accusative. None of the various figurative and idiomatic uses were frequent enough to be of statistical interest, though it may be surmised that some of these more or less dictate the choice: for example, the genitive seems impossible in не ставить ножки в колеса but more or less obligatory in не возлагать надежд.

**Factor 533:** бросать — бросить, покидать — покинуть, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15 (66.7%)</td>
<td>8 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 (31.6%)</td>
<td>1 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- не покидаящее империалистическую реакцию стремление... [Спутник]
- Но работу с молодежью композитор не бросил. [Спутник]
- Не отталкиваю рюмку, нет. [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

- Ночью была тревога. Били зенитки, но бомб немцы не бросали. [Спутник]
- Казалось, Север никогда не скинет оцепенения. [Спутник]
- Данилов пробился в угол буфета, не расплескав пива на спины любителей, ... [Орлов]

The verb бросать is included here both in its concrete sense 'to throw' and in the metaphorical sense 'to leave, to forsake'. Its near synonym in the second sense, покидать, is also included; and in addition there are certain other verbs in this category that may be said to be semantically akin to бросать (as illustrated by the last two examples).

A concrete action of throwing or the like was involved in eight examples, five out of which had the object in the accusative. However, a more influential factor explaining the overall accusative preference could be that покидать, and also бросать in its metaphorical use, contains an element of negativeness in itself, and grammatical negation therefore makes the overall meaning positive (e.g. не бросил = продолжил in the second example with the accusative above).

**Factor 534:** закрывать, открывать, раскрывать, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11 (68.8%)</td>
<td>13 (76.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 (31.2%)</td>
<td>4 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Examples with accusative:

Дверь плотно не прикрывай. [Розов]

но они не могут раскрыть семантическое содержание слов. [Ломтев]

Если облака не закрывали, словно ватой, все уцеле... [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

И рта человеку раскрыть не дает! [Петухов]

... не вскрывают таящихся за этими фактами общих закономернос-

tей ... [Аванесов]

Мелькали, правда, отдельные личности, но облюбованных Егором

ворот никто не отпирал. [Васильев]

The concrete meanings ('to open' and 'to close') clearly prefer the accusative: they appeared in 14 examples out of 17 (82.4%). The verbs were in the infinitive in only five of the examples with an accusative (and in one with a genitive).

Of the non-concrete uses, the most frequent was the use раскры-

вать and вскрывать in the sense 'to reveal', appearing almost exclu-

sively in scholarly texts: there were six accusative examples and six geni-

tive (however, infinitival constructions were frequent, and the accusative

was used only once after a finite verb form).

Factor 535: пускать — пустить (with or without prefix); поднимать — поднять

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>23 examples (32.4%)</td>
<td>14 (28.0%)</td>
<td>9 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>48 examples (67.6%)</td>
<td>36 (72.0%)</td>
<td>12 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Галстук не надевай, так свободнее ... [Розов]

Только не хватай ты мою рукку! [Дворецкий]

У больших мастеров слова диалектизмы никогда не переживают, не вытесняют литературную речь. [Калинин]

Examples with genitive:

Васенька (не поднимая головы, негромко, нетрезвым голосом): ...

[Вампилов]

И, не вытащив руку из карманов, он боком протиснулся в комнату. [Спутник]

Generally speaking, the verbs in this group denote concrete actions with concrete objects, and this evidently makes the accusative the more frequent choice. The genitive is mainly associated with abstract objects, or ones denoting a part of the body (but even in such cases the accusative is frequent). Special mention should be made of verbs referring to eating and drinking (whose inclusion here may, of course, seem somewhat con-

trived). These took the accusative in eight examples, and the genitive in twelve. It is worth noting that perfective verbs with this meaning can take the genitive in affirmative contexts as well (the partitive meaning of the genitive); the meaning is different depending on the case of the object in affirmative clauses. It seems that this distinction is frequently, but not necessarily, carried over to negative contexts as well where perfective verbs are concerned. Although the verbs here were mostly imperfective, it might be surmised that the partitive meaning possibly influences case
selection with negation even in connection with imperfective verbs (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 90-1).

Subgroup 54: Physical impact

Factor 541: менять etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Я бы вот тот свой диван ни на что в мире не променял. [Розов]

Да и люди в большинстве своем не захотели менять привычный уклад жизни. [Спутник]

Хирургию коронарных артерий они не заменят, ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Полина стоит, не меняя позы. [Петухов]

... сохранение дифференциального элемента смычности не изменяет количества фонем ... [Ломтев]

Ни какие бумаги, никакие телефонные звонки не заменят встреч с людьми и знаний жизни. [Спутник]

This group contains the verb менять 'to change' and various prefixal derivatives (изменять; заменять, подменять, променять, сменять), some of which have the meaning 'to replace' rather than referring to an 'internal' change.

Unlike most verbs in Subgroup 54, менять and its derivatives are frequently used in abstract contexts; therefore the preference for the genitive is hardly surprising. However, the 'verbs of replacement' (заменять etc.) had a high proportion of concrete objects and took the accusative in 8 examples out of 13, whereas the figures for the remaining verbs (менять, изменять) were: accusative 2, genitive 14 (the accusative only appearing after infinitival constructions).

Factor 542: Other verbs of 'physical impact'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Не растиши ли бороду? [Зорин]

Examples with genitive:

А вот душу никто еще доселе не трогал, ... [Васильев]

... и в очереди за пивом морду не побьют, ... [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:

И что бы она ни делала, это не растопит льда. [Спутник]

Я неграмотна, он железа, кроме ружья, в жизни в руках не держал. [Абрамов]

... которые явно не покрывают собой всего поля языка. [Звегинцев]

This group contains a large number of different verbs, mostly ones referring to concrete actions, although metaphorical uses are also to be found. The most frequent verbs in this category were трогать (accusative 10, genitive 3) and держать (accusative 7, genitive 3); and there is a strong overall preference for the accusative.

Group 6: Verbs of 'creation'

Factor 611: делать — сделать

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Поверьте, не делайте эту глупость. [Дворецкий]

На основании этой посылки нельзя делать такое умозаключение, что ... [Ломтев]

Но экипаж лишен доступа в отсек и не может сделать, если по- надобится, ремонт. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Не делайте опрометчивых поступков. [Дворецкий]

И не делай вид, что тебя это волнует. [Вампилов]

Правила очереди серьезные и незыблемые, мы исключений не делали и делать не намерены. [Орлов]

One reason for the high genitive frequency is the appearance of этого as object in 33 clauses (with это in 3). However, even by excluding these clauses, we only arrive at a 29.2% accusative frequency; moreover, accusative usage is mostly connected with infinitival constructions. On the other hand, fully concrete objects were extremely few.

Factor 612: вызывать — вызвать

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples with accusative:

Не вызовут ли подобные действия нежелательный резонанс? [Зорин]
Они окружили их плотным кольцом, чтобы не дать возможности вызвать полицию или сесть в такси. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Лингвистическая значимость различительных признаков сомнений не вызывает. [Аванесов]
... и такая его трактовка не вызывает возражений, пока ... [Караулов]
... однако освоение электронной техники сама по себе трудностей не вызывало. [Спутник]

This verb has, in its most frequent use, the meaning 'to create', 'to bring about' and is used virtually exclusively with abstract objects. These are apparently always in the genitive unless a strong accusative-favouring factor is present (which is the case in the first example, which is functionally affirmative; in the second accusative example, the verb is used in a different, much more concrete sense). Evidently, the implication of non-existence contained in negative constructions with these verbs is of major significance.

Factor 613: Other verbs of creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>78 examples (40.4%)</td>
<td>25 (17.1%)</td>
<td>53 (59.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>115 examples (59.6%)</td>
<td>79 (82.9%)</td>
<td>36 (40.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

норма же — совокупность явлений, не выполняющих такие функции. [Аванесов]
... что выбранная модель не описывает наши экспериментальные данные. [Аванесов]
Нельзя строить новое, разрушая то, что было создано поколениями. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Иdea использована, а техническая разработка интереса уже не представляет. [Салынский]
Пришел, чтобы сообщить, что заявления я писать не буду. [Зорин]
... но совершенно очевидно, что он не образует высшей границы языка ... [Звегинцев]

Among the most frequent verbs in this group were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>образовать</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>15 (93.7%)</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>писать</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>10 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>высказывать</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>составлять</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>строить</td>
<td>9 (75.0%)</td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verbs образовать and представлять (as in не представляет интереса) tend to occur with abstract objects; hence a strong preference for the genitive. The verb строить, on the other hand, would appear to favour the accusative even when used figuratively (строить коммунизм, строить счастье etc); examples of this nature provide at least some evidence for the claim that the accusative is preferred with 'concrete' verbs even when they are used metaphorically.

Group 7 (= Factor 711): Identifying verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>15 examples (28.8%)</td>
<td>7 (41.1%)</td>
<td>8 (58.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>37 examples (71.2%)</td>
<td>34 (91.9%)</td>
<td>3 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Пршу вас не называть друг другу собственные фамилии, имена, адреса. [Салынский]
Потому что "убил" в этом случае не обозначает прошедшее действие, предшествующее ... [Ломтев]
Но выделение этого словосочетания не позволяет определить природу выражения "в отношении". [Ломтев]

Examples with genitive:

Любое конкретное словосочетание не представляет собой акта речи, ... [Звегинцев]
... просил своего имени в печати не называть ... [Спутник]
Но и это не означало окончательного решения проблемы. [Спутник]

This group includes the verbs означать, обозначать; представлять — назвать; называть — обозначать; определять — определить (предопределить). The verb представлять appeared eleven times in the relevant sense, invariably followed by a genitive object. For о(бы)значать, the figures were: accusative 4 (18.2%), genitive 18; in its 'scholarly' use ('to denote'), о(бы)значать did not display a particularly strong preference for the
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GROUP 8: Verbs of possession

Subgroup 81: 'to possess', 'to contain', 'to retain', etc.

**Factor 811:** содержать, хранить, сохранять

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>7 examples (20.6%)</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>27 examples (79.4%)</td>
<td>25 (92.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Ты физически не способен хранить доверенную тебе тайну. [Зорин]
- Противопоставление падежных окончаний ... не содержало в себе необходимости устранения одного из противочленов. ... [Ломтев]

Examples with genitive:

- ... чужие глаголы, становясь русскими словами, почти никогда не сохраняют — ни в одной форме — родного грамматического облика. [Калинин]
- ... так как слова "баран" и "гиря" не содержат семантического компонента "способность летать". [Звегинцев]
- ... я не храню газет и журналов. [Солоухин]

The most frequent and semantically the most general verb of possession, иметь, was regarded as a Strong Factor favouring the genitive: see p. 28.

Of the remaining verbs in this category, by far the most frequent was содержать, which also generally takes the genitive: 2 examples with accusative, 24 with genitive. It occurred mainly in scholarly texts with abstract objects. The rest of the examples were with the verbs хранить, сохранять.

Subgroup 82: 'to receive', 'to obtain', etc.

**Factor 821:** получать — получить

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>7 examples (18.4%)</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>31 examples (81.6%)</td>
<td>31 (91.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Если раньше вы не получите десять лет. [Дворецкий]
- Этот вывод нельзя получить, если просто исследовать возможные пары: ... [Аванесов]
- думал о том, что и сегодня, верно, он снова не получит из химчистки синие брюки. [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:

- Или, может, давно не получала писем? [Вампилов]
- Советские ученые не получали информации о конструкции атомного оборудования от бывших сотрудников. [Спутник]
- Правда, до 1980 года ... широкого распространения оно не получило. [Спутник]

Apart from the fact that the objects were mostly abstract, the contrast between definite and indefinite objects seems to play a significant role here: the objects are typically indefinite, and frequently regarded as 'non-existent' (in this respect, получить is semantically akin to иметь, cf. p. 29). This makes the genitive much the likelier choice; but there is more variation here than with иметь, possibly because of the dynamic nature of получать.

**Factor 822:** Other verbs of 'receiving' or 'obtaining'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>16 examples (43.2%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>21 examples (56.8%)</td>
<td>15 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Меня поразило, как огорчился, что не получит вознаграждения и не купит машину. [Дворецкий]
- Я тебя не понимаю, неужели за свою идею ты не заслужил рюмку водки...? [Вампилов]
- Мама, вы еще не достали пылесос? [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

- Картина идет последний день, а на другие сеансы билетов не достали. [Розов]
- Никто из них не заслужил такой жратвы. [Вампилов]
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... никто не купил бы у Егора его заветных сапог. [Васильев]

None of the individual verbs were frequent enough to merit separate consideration. The objects were concrete considerably more often than with получить, which at least partly explains the weaker preference for the genitive. (It should be noted that the verb заслуживать may take the genitive even without negation. The accusative is, however, obligatory in affirmative clauses with the perfective заслужить. The procedure adopted in this study was to include clauses with заслужить, but exclude those with заслуживать; although aspect is not an infallible criterion here — the accusative being possible in certain affirmative contexts with the imperfective verb — this procedure was thought to be defensible, as it certainly excludes all doubtful cases.)

Subgroup 83: 'to take'

**Factor 831: брать — взять**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>16 examples (64.0%)</td>
<td>11 (57.9%)</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>9 examples (46.0%)</td>
<td>8 (42.1%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Добротин не берет трубку. [Салынский]
Порядочные женщины подарки не берут. [Софронов]
... не брать на себя заботу о долгосрочном обучении молодежи. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Так просто Москвы им не взять. [Спутник]
Не брал Колька конфет. [Васильев]
Мы не берем лишнего. [Союзник]

The figurative uses of брать turned out to be comparatively rare, and the majority of the objects were concrete nouns. This may partly explain, for example, the difference between брать on the one hand and получать, давать, etc. on the other; but the implication of non-existence is more frequently irrelevant here. Moreover, it may be relevant that this verb denotes a deliberate action: this could frequently be construed as giving the action a notion of 'contextual definiteness'. Definiteness in a more traditional sense (i.e. that of the object) may also be postulated as a significant factor in determining the choice, although

some of the examples above go against the general tendencies in this respect.

**Factor 832: принимать — принять**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>17 examples (58.7%)</td>
<td>11 (57.9%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>12 examples (41.2%)</td>
<td>8 (42.1%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Не взьшите, а не приму ваше милое предложение. [Зорин]
Тогда соответствующий конституент предложения не принимает форму "предлог на + винительный падеж", ... [Ломтев]
... только пишу не принимал от дикой тоски по хозяину, но водя пил ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Такого объяснения я не приму. [Дворецкий]
... истощение невозобновляемых ресурсов будет в мире продолжаться и вперед, если не принять соответствующих мер. [Спутник]
... не принимал подачки, которой мы пытались его утихомирить. [Спутник]

The accusative was surprisingly frequent, considering that concrete uses of this verb were not nearly as frequent as abstract ones. It may be noted as a partial explanation that the objects tended to be definite; but further investigation is probably needed.

**Factor 833: Other verbs with the general meaning 'to take'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>32 examples (60.4%)</td>
<td>16 (50.0%)</td>
<td>16 (76.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>21 examples (39.6%)</td>
<td>16 (50.0%)</td>
<td>5 (23.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

(Смотрит на аппарат, не снимал трубку.) [Софронов]
Золото я не краду, валютой не торгую. [Вампилов]
— А — а ... Тиша ... — сказал Кембридж, не вынимая трубку из рта ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... и не собираю статей, написанных о моих книгах, ... [Солоухин]
There were no individual verbs meriting separate consideration. However, the overall ratio corresponds closely to the figures for брать; and, as was the case with брать, the verbs in this group mainly referred to concrete actions.

Subgroup 84: 'to give'

**Factor 841:** давать — дать

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative</strong></td>
<td>25 examples (27.2%)</td>
<td>14 (20.3%)</td>
<td>11 (47.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>67 examples (72.8%)</td>
<td>55 (79.7%)</td>
<td>12 (52.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Не знаешь, пенсию не дадут? [Вампилов]
  ... что ни традиционная грамматика, ни логика в готовом виде не дают нам систему категорий, ... [Звегинцев]
  Жена не дала мне ключ от гаража. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

- Уеду, раз вы не даете мне настоящей работы! [Петухов]
  Естественно, один пример еще не дает оснований для заключения обо всех дефинициях, ... [Караулов]
  — Нет, я Руслану мяса не даю! — решительно сказала блондинка. [Спутник]

The preference for the genitive is connected with a high proportion of abstract objects; these tended to take the genitive even when the verb was in the infinitive. The genitive is particularly firmly established in certain semi-idiomatic expressions such as не дает основания/оснований (ten occurrences), and не дает права, не дает возможности (five occurrences each). None of these expressions was found in our sample with the accusative; however, the occasional variation found in the expression не имеешь права (права) (cf. Strong Factor 6) suggests that at least in не дает права (права) the accusative might be a possible, if rare, alternative. (Cf. also Variable 17.)

**Factor 842:** Other verbs with the general meaning 'to give'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative</strong></td>
<td>28 examples (33.7%)</td>
<td>8 (15.1%)</td>
<td>20 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive</strong></td>
<td>55 examples (66.3%)</td>
<td>45 (84.9%)</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Напоминаем, что журнал рукописи не возвращает. [Спутник]
There were seven examples of the idiomatic expression не терять надежды, in which the genitive seems virtually compulsory (but see p. 130, on why it was not regarded as a Strong Factor). Otherwise, too, it seems that the genitive is preferred (unless the verb is in the infinitive), in spite of the fact that this verb could frequently be construed as being, in a certain sense, semantically negative (не терять = хранить), which might lead one to expect a high accusative frequency.

Factor 852: Other verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative: 25 examples (43.9%)</td>
<td>10 (30.3%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive: 32 examples (56.1%)</td>
<td>23 (69.7%)</td>
<td>9 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Наследство он тебе не оставил. [Салынский]
Не теряйте нервы понапрасну. [Софронов]
— Долг, — вздохнул Филя, но улыбку не спрятал. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:

Ключ от комнаты не оставлял?! [Розов]
Созданные полевка назад, эти ленты и сегодня не утратили своей остроты и злободневности. [Спрут]
... тем более, что Анюта еще не скрывала своих лет, ... [Захаров]

The two most frequent verbs in this group were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acc.</th>
<th>Gen.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>оставлять</td>
<td>11 (52.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>скрывать</td>
<td>4 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively frequent use of the accusative with оставлять — оставлять seems to be mainly due to the infinitive factor. As for скрывать — скрывать, the genitive frequency is perhaps partly connected with the majority of objects being abstract; but even relatively concrete objects (e.g. слезы, улыбка) were found in the genitive, and the accusative frequency in connection with infinitival constructions was also surprisingly low.

VARIABLE 13: Verbal prefixes

A verb was regarded as having a prefix if it fulfilled at least one of the following two conditions: that there should be a corresponding verb without a prefix (e.g. записать, написать, cf. писать); or that there should exist other prefixal verbs with the same root (thus, for example, понимать, отнимать, принимать, занимать, etc. were regarded as having prefixes, even though *нимать does not exist as an independent verb).

A statistical analysis gives the following results (in the case of infinitival constructions, the verb considered here was the one governing the object, i.e. never the auxiliary):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 (52.4%)</td>
<td>10 (47.6%)</td>
<td>4 (30.8%)</td>
<td>9 (69.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... some of the prefixes have variant forms and allographs which have not been listed separately above; thus, for example, the figures for о- also include verbs with об(о)-.

The category 'other' consists mainly of verbs with two prefixes (e.g. произносить, предполагать). Also included here are the 'compound' prefixes недо- and обез- (which were relatively infrequent); and certain verbs (such as создавать — создать), which did not fulfill either of the above-mentioned criteria, but contain, from a diachronic viewpoint, a prefix which is likely to be recognized by the average educated native speaker.

The figures given above must be treated with some caution: generally speaking, it seems that verbal prefixes as such are unlikely to have much influence on case selection, and one must beware of attaching undue significance to minor deviations from the average figures. In a number of cases, even significant deviations are obviously caused by the frequent
appearance of one or more individual verbs: for example, the figures for \textit{дo-} show a high genitive frequency, but if one excludes the verb \textit{допускать} — \textit{допустить} (cf. Factor 12:535), there remain fourteen examples with the accusative and thirteen with the genitive.

However, the possibility that prefixes might be of some significance cannot be dismissed out of hand, even though this variable has not generally been discussed by scholars. It is true that the mere presence of a prefix is almost certainly irrelevant to case selection as a formal factor; but the semantic properties of certain prefixes might be of some significance. Prefixes are connected with aspect: prefixation is the commonest way of forming perfectives from imperfectives, whereas, on the other hand, many prefixal perfective verbs can be turned into prefixal imperfective verbs by means of suffixation. It has been noted above (Variable 10) that there is a certain connection between perfective verbs and the use of the accusative. The questions one should ask here are, firstly, whether certain prefixes are particularly likely to favour the accusative when the verb is perfective; and, secondly, whether it might be the case that secondary imperfectives (or secondary imperfectives with particular prefixes) are more favourably disposed towards the accusative than imperfective verbs in general.

The present report cannot present fully reliable answers to these questions: closer investigation is needed, with more attention given to semantic factors (as is well known, one and the same prefix can have various different functions). Some observations can, however, be made at this stage by looking at prefixes showing an unusually high accusative frequency which is not readily accounted for by other factors. Notable among these are \textit{раз-} and \textit{от-}. The figures for these prefixes, cross-tabulated with the aspect factor, are as follows:

\begin{tabular}{cccc}
 & imperfective & & perfective \\
 & Acc. & Gen. & Acc. & Gen. \\
\textit{om-} & 15 (36.6\%) & 26 (63.4\%) & 17 (81.0\%) & 4 (19.0\%) \\
\textit{paz-} & 27 (77.1\%) & 8 (22.9\%) & 32 (72.7\%) & 12 (27.3\%) \\
\end{tabular}

The expected accusative frequencies are 34.7\% for imperfective verbs and 49.8\% for perfective ones. In the case of \textit{paž-}, a clear preference for the accusative is found regardless of aspect. With \textit{om-}, however, the preference for the accusative seems to be chiefly connected with perfective verbs. Considering the typical semantic content of these prefixes, one might have reason to suspect that the 'resultative' meaning of perfective verbs makes the use of the accusative particularly likely (as, indeed, has sometimes been suggested — cf. p. 77); and that the same may also apply to certain types of secondary imperfective verbs retaining the same meaning (referring, for example, to repeated resultative actions). So far, however, this is merely a hypothesis which will need much more rigorous testing than could be undertaken here.

### Infinitival constructions

The influence of infinitival constructions on case selection has been the subject of some dispute among scholars. Some have asserted that the presence of an infinitive does not affect the choice (Utkin 1963: 82, Dončeva 1964: 99; and, with certain reservations, Deribas 1956: 25, Kout 1960: 30-1). However, those scholars who present concrete figures all find a preference for the accusative in clauses with an infinitive (Safariewic-zowa 1960: 109-26, Restan 1960: 94, Korn 1967: 495, Green 1979: 177-8, Haka 1981: 50-3, 102; the observations of the last three only apply to dependent infinitives). A preference for the accusative is also asserted by Magnier (1955: 540), Davison (1967: 62), Popova (1973: 69), Rozental’ (1985: 276), and by the compilers of the Academy Grammar (AG 1980-II: 418). Kulagin (1958: 96-7, 101) agrees with this, but notes a tendency to prefer the genitive where the infinitive is an independent one. (For a more detailed discussion of existing literature, see Mustajoki 1985: 62-8.)

Our results confirm beyond any reasonable doubt that the accusative is generally preferred with infinitives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>610 examples (68.5%)</td>
<td>494 examples (27.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>280 examples (31.5%)</td>
<td>1383 examples (73.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one only considers dependent infinitives, the accusative frequency is 70.9\% (n = 772); and see Variable 16 for the influence of the position of negation.

Although the infinitive factor has attracted some scholarly attention, possible differences between various formal and semantic types of infinitival constructions have not been discussed in detail, and have certainly not been studied systematically. In the present study, an attempt has been made to classify infinitival constructions into sub-categories on semantic grounds (Variable 14) and on formal grounds (Variable 15). The position of negation in infinitival constructions has not only been con-
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VARIABLE 14: Semantic type of the headword in infinitival constructions

Factor 1: No headword (independent infinitive)

Accusative: 63 examples (52.9%)
Genitive: 56 examples (47.1%)

Examples with accusative:
- Ну, выпьем? Чтобы не терять время даром. [Вампилов]
- Вещь почти невероятная, если не предположить вмешательство посторонних разумных сил. [Спутник]
- Конечно, золотой середины в искусстве не отыщешь, его пути не рассчитать на компьютере. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
- Не найти тебе, друг, уж ответа ... [Салынский]
- Не отведать мне юбилейной утки и юбилейного пирога ... [Зорин]
- Если не считать обязательных краеведческих каменных топоров, чучел лисиц и зайцев, ... [Спутник]

Some of the scholars quoted above regarding infinitives in general as an accusative-favouring factor believe that this is true for independent as well as dependent infinitives. However, Kulagin (1958: 96-7) states that the genitive is usual in connection with independent infinitives (the reverse being true for dependent ones); and Kout (1960: 30-1) regards the use of the genitive as being almost the norm in infinitive clauses (i.e. in clauses with an independent infinitive functioning as the predicate verb), especially if the meaning is that of impossibility or categorical prohibition. According to Rozental' (1985: 274), the genitive is preferred in infinitive clauses denoting impossibility. However, Solonicyn finds no preference either way in infinitive clauses of the type discussed by Kout and Rozental', but does note that the accusative is usual in the construction почему бы не + inf. (cf. Factor 6:3).

Our figures show that the accusative frequency is clearly higher than average, but independent infinitives evidently have less influence on case selection than infinitives governed by a headword. This may be seen as a consequence of the fact that where a headword is present, it 'absorbs', in most cases, some of the force of the negation; whereas in the absence of a headword the infinitive and its object are directly affected by the negation (as is the case in constructions without an infinitive). It may be argued, in fact, that in the absence of a headword there is no formal reason why the accusative should be preferred to the genitive.

In any case, it must be noted that this group contains various different types of 'infinitive clauses', and there are differences between these in case usage. At least the following subgroups can easily be distinguished:

1. (что)бы followed by a negated infinitive
   - Acc. 26 (65.0%), Gen. 14 (35.0%)
2. если followed by a negated infinitive
   - Acc. 7 (38.9%), Gen. 11 (61.1%)
3. negated infinitive denoting impossibility (perfective verb)
   - Acc. 13 (40.6%), Gen. 19 (59.4%)

These differences can hardly be written off as coincidental without further investigation, although the role of other factors may be significant: for example, если не + inf. appeared relatively often in scholarly texts with abstract objects in the genitive; whereas Group (1) includes a number of functionally affirmative clauses with почему бы не. 

Factor 2: (Lack of) ability or opportunity

Accusative: 168 examples (62.5%)
Genitive: 101 examples (37.5%)

Examples with accusative:
- ... ваши старые директора, может, и умели понимать рабочих, но не умели выполнять планы. [Софронов]
- ... пишущий никогда не сможет "породить" такие сочетания, как ... [Караулов]
- Маловозрастной интеллектуал ... оказывается эмоционально глухим, не способным воспринимать все богатство и краски окружающего мира. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
- Он просто не может обосновать своего сумасбродства. [Розов]
- ... однако прямого экспериментального подтверждения этого вывода найти не удалось. [Аванесов]
- Попадались только отдельные записи и адреса, смысла которых девочка не могла объяснить. [Спутник]

The headwords in this group, when used with negation, have the meaning 'cannot', referring to the subject's inability (whether internal or...
caused by external circumstances) to perform the action concerned (however, two headwords with such a meaning, нельзя and невозможно, have been treated separately as Factor 3).

Much the most frequent headword was the auxiliary verb мочь — смочь. In clauses with the imperfective мочь, no significant preference for either case was found: accusative 86 (51.8%), genitive 80. With the perfective смочь, however, the accusative was clearly preferred, with 24 examples as opposed to 7 (accusative frequency 22.6%).

Other verbs appearing as headwords included удаваться — удаться and уметь — суметь. The figures were: (с)уметь — accusative 16, genitive 5; удав(а)ться — accusative 25, genitive 4. There appeared to be no significant difference between уметь and суметь. As for удав(а)ться, the genitive was only found in clauses with the perfective удаться (acc. 15, gen. 4), which would appear to contradict the finding discussed in connection with (с)мочь; however, this may have been due to other factors.

Another reasonably frequent headword was the adjective способный (usually in the short form); there were eight occurrences, and the accusative appeared in all of these clauses.

Factor 3: Impossibility

Accusative: 57 examples (75.0%)
Genitive: 19 examples (25.0%)

Examples with accusative

В то же время, однако, нельзя не отметить правильность высказанного им соображения о том, что... [Аванесов]

Но боевой дух рабочего класса нельзя было сломить. [Спутник]

Его поступки невозможно предвидеть. [Трифонов]

Examples with genitive:

В этом списке формам аориста уже нельзя приписать традиционного значения... [Ломтев]

Сделал это, естественно, не один Виктор, но не подчеркнуть его личные заслуг — просто невозможно. [Спутник]

На Новой Земле нельзя было совершить такого обряда. [Спутник]

The two headwords belonging to this category are нельзя (followed by a perfective infinitive) and невозможно. These are semantically close to Factor 2, but have been given separate treatment because they refer less explicitly to the idea of 'ability' or 'opportunity'; moreover, negation here is contained within the headword itself, which might affect the grammatical behaviour of these words.

While the accusative is clearly preferred with both нельзя and невозможно, there was also a significant difference between the two:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headword</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>нельзя</td>
<td>Acc. 40 (69.0%)</td>
<td>Gen. 18 (31.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>невозможно</td>
<td>Acc. 17 (94.4%)</td>
<td>Gen. 1 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both нельзя and невозможно can appear with не in constructions with double negation (нельзя не + inf.). Such structures are functionally affirmative and might therefore be expected strongly to prefer the accusative. They were, however, too infrequent to permit any conclusions: a total of four, three of these with accusative. In any case, it is notable that the only example with a genitive in connection with невозможно was found in such a construction.

Factor 4: (Absence of) necessity; (lack of) permission; etc.

Accusative: 114 examples (71.3%)
Genitive: 46 examples (28.7%)

17 instances of negation directly preceding infinitive: accusative 9, genitive 8. Two instances of double negation, both with accusative. The figures for clauses with negation connected to the headword were: accusative 103 (73.1%), genitive 38.

Examples with accusative:

Мне думается, обращение к материалу истории не должно связывать фантазию художника. [Салынский]

Идите, Люся, нарушать закон мы не можем. [Дворецкий]

По новому способу давление создавать не нужно... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Товарищ Куницын, а вы лично можете не затрачивать физических усилий, поскольку голосуют только члены парткома. [Софронов]

...определения не должны содержать лишних слов... [Караулов]

Важно и то, что не понадобилось создавать новых рецептов резины, ...

The clauses in this group may have either the meaning 'need not' (absence of necessity) or the meaning 'must not', 'should not' (lack of permission, strong expression of preference, etc.); thus, we are dealing with ways of expressing deontic modality.
The general idea 'must not' can be expressed by constructions in 
which a headword with the meaning of necessity governs a negated in-
finitive (e.g. должен не + inf.). More common, however, are the con-
structions не должен + inf. and не надо + inf., in which Neg-raising 
takes place; and the construction не следует / следовало 'should not', 
as well as нельзя followed by an imperfective infinitive. The auxiliary 
verb мочь, while perhaps more commonly referring to ability, may 
also appear in a deontic function.

A clear preference for the accusative was found in clauses with нельзя 
(accusative 33, genitive 9) and не следует (accusative 12, genitive 5). 
There was a similar tendency in the case of не надо: accusative 8, geni-
tive 3 (надо не: acc. 2, gen. 0). These figures contrast interestingly with 
those for не должен / должен не: accusative 3, genitive 10. A sample 
of this size obviously cannot provide conclusive evidence, but должен 
at least might need further investigation.

The auxiliary мочь may, depending on the position of negation, refer 
either to 'lack of permission' or 'absence of necessity'. When preceded 
by не, it has the former meaning (when used deontically); the figures for 
this use were: accusative 14, genitive 8. When не precedes the infinitive 
in a construction with мочь, the meaning is 'need not': there were only 
four occurrences, two with each case.

Factor 5: Volition on the part of the subject (хотеть/ся, желать, 
любить)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative: 38 examples (76.0%)</th>
<th>Genitive: 12 examples (24.0%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Я не миллионщица и растрату делать не желаю. [Вампилов]

Только природа не любит легко отдавать свои тайны; ... [Спутник]

Не хотел он, ох как не хотел нарушать свой принцип ... [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:

Вовка книгу читать не любил: ... [Васильев]

... а таких условий игры ... Данилов принять не желал. [Орлов]

Шура не хочет давать согласия. [Грифонов]

By far the most frequent headword was (за)хотеть(ся) in its auxiliary 
use: accusative 26, genitive 8 (accusative frequency 76.5%). For the 
remaining headwords, the figures were as follows: желать — accusative 6, 
genitive 3; любить — accusative 6, genitive 1.

Factor 6: 'Phasal verbs'; успеть

|                     | Accusative: 40 examples (72.7%) | Genitive: 15 examples (27.3%) |

Examples with accusative:

Опасаясь новых взрывов, пожар не стали тушить. [Спутник]

Тех из вас, кто не успел принять в ней участие, мы приглашаем 
делать это сейчас. [Спутник]

Больше Виктор не стал терять время на разговоры. [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

Сотой доли рассказать не успею. [Розов]

Тот Яков, который не стал защищать диплома. [Зорин]

оно даже не успело наложить своего отпечатка на мою 
личность, ... [Залыгин]

The most frequent verb in this group was успевать — успеть (to-
gether with its occasional synonym поспе(ва)ть): there were 19 exam-
ples with the accusative and 11 with the genitive (accusative frequency 
63.3%).

The verb статься also appeared frequently: accusative 17, genitive 4; 
accusative frequency 85.0%. The genitive was thus exceptionally rare, 
and the powerful factors ни ... ни and этого accounted for three of 
its four occurrences. The strong preference for the accusative might be 
explained by the fact that in negative contexts, the basic meaning of 
статься (‘to begin’) is modified: the construction не стать + inf. refers 
to the non-performance of an action, based on a conscious decision on 
the part of the subject. It is thus emphasized that the subject has a 
real option of performing the action (and usually the idea is that 
there are external circumstances — frequently pressure applied by the 
interlocutor or someone else — that might provide the subject with a 
reason to perform it). This means that the situation which is negated 
has a clear notion of contextual definiteness. As we have suggested above 
(cf. Variable 8, Factor 1; Variable 9), this might, at least in the absence 
of stronger factors pointing to the contrary, cause the accusative to be 
preferred.

There were only isolated examples with an infinitive governed by the 
actual phasal verbs начать and перестать.

Factor 7: Attempt (стараться, стремиться, пытаться, пробо-
вывать)

|                     | Accusative: 9 examples (60.0%) | Genitive: 6 examples (40.0%) |

Examples with accusative:

...
The Findings: VARIABLE 14: Semantic type of the headword

There were seven instances of negation immediately preceding the infinitive (acc. 1, gen. 6).

Examples with accusative:

Я не стремлюсь привлекать к себе внимание. [Дворецкий]
А ты не пробовала прибить доски гвоздями? [Вампилов]
В рассматриваемой работе Филмор, впрочем, вовсе не пытается реализовать свою теоретическую программу, ... [Звегинцев]

Examples with genitive:

Старайтесь не портить отношений. [Дворецкий]
Наш четырежды орденоносный мотострелковый полк ... старается не растерять однажды приобретенных навыков. [Спутник]
... стремятся во что бы то ни стало не допустить огласки "тегеранских тайн". [Спутник]

Although the preference for the accusative seems at first sight to be a relatively weak one, this is evidently connected with the high frequency of constructions in which the infinitive is directly negated; in fact, the present sample (albeit a small one) yielded no examples of genitive usage in clauses in which the negative word preceded the headword.

Differences within this group also seem to be chiefly attributable to the position of negation: стараться (acc. 2, gen. 5) was frequently used with a negated infinitive following (acc. 1, gen. 5), but only twice with negation preceding; whereas, for example, all four examples of пытаться (with accusative) had negation connected to the headword.

**Factor 8: Intellectual activity (решить, собираться, etc.)**

| Accusative: 21 examples (87.5%) | Genitive: 3 examples (12.5%) |

There were five instances of negation immediately preceding the infinitive (acc. 4, gen. 1; see below).

Examples with accusative:

Уж не собираешься ли ты изменить этот сюжет? [Зорин]
Изгнан же ни в какую не согласился покинуть свое старое жилье. [Спутник]
Группа инициативников устроила нелегальную типографию, которую решила не регистрировать. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Тем, кто не собирается готовить традиционного новогоднего блюда, ... предлагаем пойти по более простому пути. [Спутник]

There were five instances of negation immediately preceding the infinitive (acc. 4, gen. 1; see below).

Examples with accusative:

... суд не счел необходимым применить статью сорок восьмую ... [Дворецкий]
И не забудьте купить ей цветы. [Спутник]
... но командир отряда матрос Чевгун не спешит покидать станицу. [Трифонов]

The Findings: VARIABLE 14: Semantic type of the headword

... суд не счел необходимым применить статью сорок восьмую ... [Дворецкий]
И не забудьте купить ей цветы. [Спутник]
... но командир отряда матрос Чевгун не спешит покидать станицу. [Трифонов]
Examples with genitive:

которая регулярно перехватывает письма Роману от Кати и исхитряется не допустить их телефонных разговоров. [Спутник]
И она дала зарок — не начинать слова первой. [Залыгин]
Тогда он думал о Кармадоне и о своем намерении не допустить на корриде бед. [Орлов]

This group contains all the remaining clauses in which the 'subject' of the infinitive (i.e. the potential performer of the action referred to by the infinitive) is the same as the semantic (and often formal) subject of the clause. No single headword in this group was frequent enough to merit separate consideration; but as a partial explanation for the particularly strong accusative preference one may note that this group included such expressions as не терпится (four occurrences), не забыть + inf. (three occurrences), and не преминет, не полениться, не терять надежды + inf. (one occurrence each), which are functionally affirmative.

Factor 11: Infinitive with a 'subject' distinct from clause subject

Accusative: 53 examples (85.5%)
Genitive: 9 examples (14.5%)

Fourteen instances of negation immediately preceding infinitive: accusative 9, genitive 4.

Examples with accusative:

Не советую вам афишировать свои отношения. [Вампилов]
Я было хотел попросить Юрика ехать помедленнее, не обгонять попутные машины. [Спутник]
Если конструкция машины и спасательные средства не позволяют выполнить это требование, самолет не допускается к эксплуатации ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Только оберегая ваше имя, я и посоветовал Богину не писать в партком заявления. [Софронов]
И рта человеку раскрыть не дает! [Петухов]
Мы призываем правительство Соединенных Штатов не чинить искусственных препятствий переговорам по ОСВ ... [Спутник]

This group includes those infinitival constructions in which the notional subject of the infinitive phrase is distinct from the notional subject of the clause, and usually appears as the object (frequently indirect) of the governing verb. (The term 'объектный инфинитив', as distinct from 'субъектный инфинитив', is used by some Russian grammarians to refer to such cases.)

By excluding those clauses in which the negation immediately precedes the infinitive, we arrive at an accusative frequency of 88.9% for the remaining examples; this is far above the average for clauses with an infinitive.

The most frequent single headword of this type was позволять: accusative 14, genitive 1, in spite of the objects generally being abstract. The accusative was also strongly preferred after the expressions не дает права/возможности/основания + inf. (acc. 5, gen. 0), although the objects tended to be abstract.

Factor 12: Compound future

Accusative: 16 examples (72.7%)
Genitive: 6 examples (27.3%)

Examples with accusative:

Я не буду есть сыр, хорошо? [Дворецкий]
Чтобы не повторяться, мы не будем разбирать их значение для речевого акта по отдельности, ... [звегинцев]
... мы не будем раскрывать полную фамилию этой женщины и назовем ее для удобства рассказа Клавдией ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Не будем продолжать вчерашнего диспута, папа. [Розов]
Сочетания "парящий голубь", "парящий самолет" не будут содержать противоречий между семантическими компонентами... [Звегинцев]
Но он не будет понимать сути дела ... [Спутник]

The 'compound future' differs structurally from other combinations of a headword and infinitive: this is not an instance of a verb and its object being embedded into the clause; instead, the predicate is 'expanded'. However, the accusative : genitive ratio was approximately the same as the average for clauses containing an infinitival construction; and even abstract objects generally preferred the accusative. This 'tense' frequently has modal connotations similar to those of не стать + inf. (cf. Factor 6): this is mainly true of the use of the compound future in first-person statements. In any event, as suggested under Variable 9, there seems to be a certain connection between futurity and the use of the accusative; this also applies to the 'compound future' construction.
VARIABLE 15: Part of speech of the headword in an infinitival construction

Under this variable, infinitival constructions are classified according to the formal properties of the headword. Apart from the total figures, separate data are provided, where relevant, for those clauses in which the negation is in its 'usual' position, i.e. precedes the headword (cases of double negation are not included in these latter figures).

**Factor 1: Adjective**

- **Accusative**: 14 examples (56.0%)
- **Genitive**: 11 examples (44.0%)

Examples with accusative:

... ни одно частное лицо не правомочно блокировать такие открытия. [Дворецкий]

... но ни одна даже самая быстродействующая ЭВМ не способна безошибочно решить эту задачу. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... и теория должна не снимать амбисиллабизма в пользу того или иного — одного — способа слогоделения ... [Аванесов]

... текст не должен превышать двух машинописных страниц. [Спутник]

The headword is generally a short form of an adjective, although long forms may also occur. The figures indicate a relatively weak preference for the accusative; this, however, is chiefly attributable to the frequent use of the genitive after должен (cf. 115), and the figures for the remaining cases were: accusative 10, genitive 1.

**Factor 2: Predicative adverb**

- **Accusative**: 127 examples (76.0%)
- **Genitive**: 40 examples (24.0%)

Examples with accusative:

... но личную жизнь недооценивать нельзя. [Дворецкий]

... что не дает возможности выделить предложения как различные единицы особого уровня ... [Звегинцев]

Examples with genitive:

... и теория должна не снимать амбисиллабизма в пользу того или иного — одного — способа слогоделения ... [Аванесов]

... текст не должен превышать двух машинописных страниц. [Спутник]

The continuing debate as to whether or not the Russian predicatives (or words belonging to the so-called категория состояния) should be regarded as having word-class status need not concern us here: for the purposes of the present study, it seemed expedient to divide such a group of headwords. It includes not only those words that can only be used predicatively (e.g. нельзя, надо, нужно, можно), but also comparable uses of words such as легко, трудно, хорошо, лучше, or грех, which can have other functions as well.

The accusative frequency is somewhat higher than the average for clauses with dependent infinitives, but much depends on the identity of the headword (cf., for example, Factor 14: 3, which shows a marked difference between нельзя and невозможно, two roughly synonymous words belonging to this category).

**Factor 3: Noun**

- **Accusative**: 21 examples (87.5%)
- **Genitive**: 3 examples (12.5%)

Examples with accusative:

... но личную жизнь недооценивать нельзя. [Дворецкий]

... что не дает возможности выделить предложения как различные единицы особого уровня ... [Звегинцев]

Examples with genitive:

... и теория должна не снимать амбисиллабизма в пользу того или иного — одного — способа слогоделения ... [Аванесов]

... текст не должен превышать двух машинописных страниц. [Спутник]

The headword is generally a short form of an adjective, although long forms may also occur. The figures indicate a relatively weak preference for the accusative; this, however, is chiefly attributable to the frequent use of the genitive after должен (cf. 115), and the figures for the remaining cases were: accusative 10, genitive 1.
The accusative frequency is exceptionally high, and the genitive was only found in clauses with negation immediately preceding the infinitive (but even here it was not the norm). The most frequent individual construction was не иметь права + inf., appearing in seven clauses (always followed by the accusative).

**Factor 4:** буду, будешь, etc. — see Factor 14:12

**Factor 5:** Imperfective verb (not in the infinitive form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative: 233 examples (64.9%)</th>
<th>Genitive: 126 examples (35.1%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Я не люблю мутить воду, и, кажется, была откровенной. [Розов]

Люба сидела возле клумбы и не могла удержать слезы. [Спутник]

Я советую ... не акцентировать внимание на "советских материалах". [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

А во-вторых, он мог не сдать экзамена. [Розов]

Валентина старается не обнаруживать своих чувств. [Вампилов]

Шура не хочет давать согласия. [Трифонов]

For commentary, see Factor 6 below.

**Factor 6:** Perfective verb (not in the infinitive form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative: 116 examples (75.8%)</th>
<th>Genitive: 37 examples (24.2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Я не дам тебе развальить дело! [Салынский]

С другой стороны, в слове "finish" никто не станет выделять морфему "-ish" ... [Звегинцев]

Конечно, в одиночку Азербайджан не смог бы осуществить переориентацию своей экономики. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Я приказал начальникам корпусов не выполнять указаний производственного отдела. [Дворецкий]

Определенные империалистические круги не сумели извлечь уроков из мировой истории ... [Спутник]

... но даже любовь не смогла подавить в нем страха смерти. [Спутник]

As was noted under Variable 10, the aspect of the verb governing the object seems to affect case selection in clauses without an infinitival construction; but in the presence of infinitival constructions, the aspect of the infinitive itself does not appear to be of much relevance. Against this background it is interesting that there is some difference between this factor and Factor 5 above, the accusative being more strongly favoured when the headword is a perfective verb; this seems to suggest that the aspect of the finite verb in the clause may have some influence on the choice even where it is followed by an infinitival construction. Similar evidence is to be found in Green (1979: 177-8): the accusative frequency was 39% when the auxiliary verb was of the imperfective aspect (n = 23), but 56% when it was perfective (n = 25). However, further investigation is still needed; and it must be noted that the difference is to a significant degree attributable to a considerable discrepancy between the imperfective можь and its perfective counterpart сможь (cf. Factor 14:2), these two being the most frequent verbs to appear as headwords.

**Factor 7:** Verb in the infinitive form

|                  | Accusative: 6 examples (85.7%) | Genitive: 1 example (14.3%) |

Two instances, with the accusative, of negation immediately preceding the infinitive which governs the direct object.

Examples with accusative:

... стоит ... ежедневно уменьшать количество выкуренных сигарет ..., стараться не выкуривать сигарету до конца. [Спутник]

Пытаться сохранить все, как и помнить все, невозможно. [Спутник]

Я было хотел попросить Юрика ехать помедленнее, не обгонять попутные машины. [Спутник]

Example with genitive:

Мыкался, маялся, ругань терпел, но этой поскаковской работы терпеть никак не мог научиться. [Васильев]

The double infinitive construction, while comparatively rare, is regarded by some scholars as a strong accusative-favouring factor. Ravič (1971: 261) and the Academy Grammar (AG 1980-II: 417) claim that the use of the accusative is obligatory; and Timberlake (1975: 128) finds the use of the genitive even less likely than after single infinitive constructions. This factor has also been studied experimentally (Mustajoki 1985: 152, 160); the results seem to be in agreement with Timberlake's view, though not without some reservations.
The findings of the present study also suggest a clear preference for the accusative, although the percentage figures are not fully reliable in statistical terms; and it is clear that the genitive would be inconceivable in many cases (as in the second example above). However, our corpus also provides a counter-example in which the use of the genitive seems perfectly natural; it is therefore obvious that we are not dealing with a hard-and-fast rule.

Factor 8: Other cases

Eleven examples, all with the accusative, including one instance of double negation, and one with negation immediately preceding the infinitive.

As negation precedes the headword in the vast majority of cases, most of what has been said of infinitival constructions in general applies to this category; it therefore need not be examined in greater detail here. It may be noted, however, that word order may be of some significance within this category: when the headword was in clause-final position, as in:

... конечно, отец таких денег при всем желании платить бы не мог. [Спутник],

the accusative frequency was only 65.7% (n = 114); whereas, for example, clauses with the word order 'object — negation — headword — infinitive' showed an accusative frequency as high as 79.5% (n = 78).

Double negation has been discussed as Factor 2:6; the only category demanding closer examination here is thus the type in which negation directly precedes the infinitive, the headword not being negated. The following examples may be given:

Examples with accusative:

В этом отражается требование не смешивать объекты разных планов или уровней. [Ломтев]

Вольному ... рекомендуется не лелеять травмированную руку или ногу, а заставлять ее по возможности больше работать. [Спутник]

Недостатки первым делом надо не осуждать, а высмеивать. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

И знаете, лучше не обострять отношений. [Розов]

Ситуация может не дать вам времени. [Зорин]

... при наличии тридцати шести скрипок молчания одной из них в оркестре, пусть и нежнейшей, можно было не заметить. [Орлов]

Predictably, constructions of this type do not favour the accusative to the same degree as those in which the headword falls within the scope of negation: the explanation is the same as in the case of independent infinitives (i.e. the infinitive and its object are more directly affected by the negation); and, indeed, the percentage figures bear a striking resemblance to those for clauses with an independent infinitive (Factor 14:1).
Here too, however, word order seems to be significant. In the majority of cases, the word order is 'direct', with the infinitive preceding the object; the figures for such clauses were 46.0% (n = 50). However, in clauses with the object preceding the infinitive (as in the last examples under both accusative and genitive above), the accusative frequency was 75.0%; although the sample size here was relatively small (n = 15), the figures do seem to suggest a real difference.

**Idiomaticity**

**VARIABLE 17: Degree of idiomaticity of the verb + object collocation**

**Factor 1:** The verb + object collocation is idiomatic or fixed, or contains a metaphorical element

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>148 examples (28.0%)</td>
<td>62 (15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>380 examples (72.0%)</td>
<td>330 (84.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- Не тратьте нервы понапрасну. [Софронов]
- И вообще не морочь мне голову! [Петухов]
- Не следует закрывать глаза на тот бесспорный факт, что ... [Звенигов]

Examples with genitive:
- Вам никто не давал права на варварство! [Салынский]
- Не вижу необходимости. [Дворецкий]
- До Егора иногда долетали их слова, но значения он не придавал. [Васильев]

This group includes all those instances where the verb and the object form an idiomatic or metaphorical expression which can appear either with or without negation; also included are certain frequent stock expressions which cannot be properly regarded as either idiomatic or metaphorical, but may be seen as 'fixed collocations' (устойчивые словосочетания). Relatively loose criteria were employed, and the degree of idiomaticity varies considerably within the group: thus, for example, морочить голову is obviously a properly idiomatic expression, whereas дать основание is clearly less idiomatic. However, although in the latter case the word основание is used in its primary sense, it might be argued that the use of дать with an abstract object is, if not idiomatic, at least metaphorical; and this may be seen as justification for the inclusion of such expressions in this group. This means, of course, that the group consists to a considerable extent of expressions with abstract objects; and this is presumably the most fundamental reason for the high genitive frequency.

At the same time, however, it is probably true to say that the preference for the genitive is particularly overwhelming in certain relatively frequent stock expressions; indeed, some of these have occasionally been mentioned in the literature as demanding the genitive (see, for example, AG 1980-II:416). In our corpus, the following expressions always took the genitive, with a minimum of five occurrences: не обращать внимания (36 occurrences, cf. also p. 91), не вызывает сомнения (gen. sing.) / сомнений (gen. pl.) (12 occurrences), не терять надежды (7 occurrences), не оказывать (воздействия / влияния (6 occurrences), не дает основания (gen. sing.) / оснований (gen. pl.) (6 occurrences, variation between gen. sing. and gen. pl.), не дает возможности (5 occurrences), не дает права (5 occurrences), не носит (какого-л.) характера (5 occurrences). Many of these have existential implications. There were a number of other expressions with fewer occurrences that took the genitive without exception and have been mentioned by scholars as requiring the genitive (e.g. не доставлять удовольствия, не играть роли, не придавать значения); the results obtained for these are obviously of no real statistical value, but intuitively the preference does seem extremely strong.

The genitive is also more or less obligatory with certain metaphorical uses of particular verbs. The most frequent of these are the existential use of знать (26 occurrences) and the metaphorical use of видеть with abstract objects (не видеть смысла етс.: 18 occurrences); no exceptions were found in either case.

On the other hand, there are certain expressions in which the accusative appears to be required: the most obvious example is не морочить голову (6 occurrences in our corpus; mentioned in AG 1980-II:417 as requiring the accusative). The same might be postulated for certain other idioms, e.g. не закрывать глаза на что-л. and не пускать пузыри; but there were only two occurrences of each of these.

There are also some idioms that definitely permit variation, as is...
The Findings: VARIABLE 17: Degree of idiomaticity

apparent from the following two examples:

Девочка, не вешай кос! [Салынский]

А воспитывал он нас в тех традициях, которые так свято чтут в "Спартаке": не вешать носа при неудачах, выкладываться до последних сил на тренировках ... [Спутник]

These were the only two examples with не вешать нос(а). More frequent expressions admitting variation included не терять время/времени (acc. 4, gen. 4) and не говорить глупости/глупостей (acc. 1, gen. 4).

Finally, it must be pointed out that the majority of the expressions in this group were metaphorical collocations of the following type: не вести беседу; не хранить тайну; не портить отношений; не прерывать связей. Some of these can hardly be regarded as fixed expressions, and usually the choice of case would seem to be determined by other factors (as noted above, the abstractness of the objects is highly significant, but can sometimes be overruled by the infinitive factor).

Returning to those expressions which seem to demand either the genitive or the accusative with a great degree of consistency, we must now face the question of whether it might have been advisable to include such expressions among the Strong Factors, or even the Marginal Cases. We decided against this for the following reasons. Firstly, there is some evidence that exceptions might be found in a larger sample (cf. Strong Factor 6, where the accusative was found as an occasional alternative in certain comparable expressions with иметь). Secondly, with the exception of не обращать внимания, all of these expressions, taken individually, were so relatively infrequent that it would be rather courageous to regard the figures as providing conclusive evidence of the genitive being obligatory (or virtually obligatory); in any case, the possible distortion that might result from not eliminating them is not a particularly large one (for it must be remembered that the majority of the collocations in this group, while obviously metaphorical, are not fixed expressions and would be likely to admit variation). Thirdly, if some of these expressions do affect the figures under other variables, this might not be much of a real distortion, considering the importance of the concreteness/abstractness factor as a basis for the overall genitive preference found here — although it is probably true that the frequency and the 'fixedness' of certain collocations makes the preference particularly firm (this would presumably apply especially to those expressions which are typically, though not always, found in negative contexts). For these reasons it was thought sufficient to give special attention to such expressions in the commentaries wherever they might significantly influence the statistical figures.

Factor 2: The verb phrase is idiomatic but the object is not part of the idiom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>14 examples (73.7%)</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
<td>7 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>5 examples (26.3%)</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
<td>1 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Ведь не полезно сейчас валить в одну кучу эти два вопроса. [Салынский]

Однако современники не оценили по достоинству талантливое сочинение. [Спутник]

... писатели не обходят вниманием трудности и недостатки, тор-мозящие прогрессивные процессы развития. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... ни на миг при этом не теряя из виду того, что мыслительное принадлежит мысли, а языковое — языку, ... [Звегинцев]

не принимая в расчет многочисленных плохо сохранившихся отрывков ... [Мещерский]

Как же с Петром про политику, про Россию толковать, когда Петр не может вбить в башку дорогой сестрице такого пустяка насчет ... [Абрамов]

A common feature of all these clauses is that the verb is part of an idiomatic expression (often with a prepositional construction); but the object is not part of the idiom (that is, the idiom does require the presence of an object, but the identity of the object is not fixed).

Although the evidence is inconclusive, the accusative often seems to be preferred. In a number of instances the reason for this might be that the negation primarily affects the 'adverbial phrase' contained within the idiom (the second example above is a good illustration of this).

The Object

VARIABLE 18: Part of speech of the object

Factor 1: Noun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>982 examples (42.7%)</td>
<td>445 (28.6%)</td>
<td>537 (72.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>1320 examples (57.3%)</td>
<td>1113 (71.4%)</td>
<td>207 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nouns appear as objects in the vast majority of our examples, and are dealt with in more detail under Variables 19-24.

**Factor 2: Pronoun**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>99 examples (28.4%)</td>
<td>44 (19.0%)</td>
<td>55 (47.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>249 examples (71.6%)</td>
<td>188 (81.0%)</td>
<td>61 (52.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that pronouns, taken as a single group, have a stronger tendency than nouns to appear in the genitive. However, there are considerable differences within the group (the two extremes being *это*, with the genitive in roughly nine instances out of ten, and *который*, with a similar preference for the accusative). Further discussion is therefore deferred to Variable 25, where different pronouns are examined separately.

**Factor 3: Adjective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>13 examples (31.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>11 (61.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>29 examples (69.0%)</td>
<td>22 (91.7%)</td>
<td>7 (38.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Нельзя объять необъятное. [Калинин]
... что губные сонанты не обрамляют переднеязычные ... [Аванесов]
... своими силами мы долго не смогли бы восстановить разрушенное. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Ты не сказал мне самого главного. [Вампилов]
До сих пор вспоминаю ее домашней выделки лапшу: никогда такой вкусной не ел ... [Спутник]
Да и дурного солдат Губанов не делает, ... [Трифонов]

Two different uses of adjectives were included here: firstly, an elliptical use (as in the second examples under both accusative and genitive), in which a noun that has usually been mentioned earlier in the context is omitted to avoid repetition, and is 'represented' by the adjective, whose gender, number, and case are determined by the omitted noun; and secondly, the use of the neuter form (e.g. новое, плохое, главное) in the generalized sense 'that which is (new, bad, most important, etc.)'. However, adjectival nouns such as столовая were treated as nouns (see 138); the problem of whether to classify the so-called ordinal numerals as adjectives (which they are from a morphosyntactic point of view), or as numerals, did not arise as there were no examples of this type (although an ordinal numeral could perfectly well appear as a direct object).

Some scholars note a genitive preference for the fully independent, 'conceptual' use of the neuter form (Uglitsky 1956: 387, Dončeva 1964: 98, Safarewiczowa 1960: 116, Restan 1960: 103). This is confirmed by our figures (accusative 8, genitive 25; accusative frequency 24.2%). The elliptical use showed no clear preference either way (five accusative examples, four with genitive); the difference between the two uses is probably connected with the fact that adjectives used elliptically frequently 'represent' concrete (or at least relatively concrete) nouns, whereas the independent use of the neuter form — as noted, for example, by Corbett (1979: 9-10) — involves a higher degree of conceptualization.

**Factor 4: Numeral**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>10 examples (33.3%)</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>7 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>20 examples (66.7%)</td>
<td>15 (83.3%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Ведь не полезно сейчас валить в одну кучу эти два вопроса. [Салынский]
... что губные сонанты не обрамляют переднеязычные ... [Аванесов]
Двух месяцев, проведенных в пробирке, зародыши просто не "заметили". [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Двух месяцев, проведенных в пробирке, зародыши просто не "заметили". [Спутник]
Не успел сделать и двух шагов, как на него напал голодный медведь. [Спутник]
Одного я не мог вообразить — себя на их месте. [Солоухин]

This group contains, on the one hand, all grammatically independent uses of the word один (as opposed to its use as a premodifier — cf. Factor 26:11); and, on the other hand, all those cases in which one of the other cardinal (or, in one case, collective) numerals appears as the headword of a numeral phrase (e.g. два шага) in the object position. 13

13 Here, of course, the numeral rather than the noun is the word whose case may be subject to accusative/genitive variation in negative clauses, although with the numerals 2-4 this is also reflected in the form of the noun, cf. два шага — двух шагов.
There were three examples of the independent or elliptical use of один in its purely numeral function: the accusative was used in all of these. However, the use of the neuter form in what might be regarded as a pronominal function (as in the last example above) showed a reverse picture: four examples, all genitive. The evidence is obviously far from conclusive in both cases.

With numerals other than один, the genitive appears to be relatively frequent (accusative 7, genitive 14); in seven of the clauses with a genitive object, the verb was превышать (cf. Factor 12:524). With other verbs the accusative was frequent, but this may have been because it was usually connected to a verb in the infinitive form. In any case, it may be noted that in clauses with numeral objects the presence of the intensifier и (as in the second genitive example) seems to make the use of the genitive obligatory (there were only two examples, but they were ones in which the accusative would clearly have been unacceptable).

Whether the object is a singular or a plural word has been regarded as a significant factor, particularly where nouns are concerned. In the first table below, number has been assigned to all objects regardless of part of speech, apart from numerals other than один, which do not have the morphological opposition singular — plural (even though they are ‘semantically plural’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>844 (40.6%)</td>
<td>253 (40.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>1236 (59.4%)</td>
<td>369 (59.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is probably more relevant, however, to look separately at the figures for nouns. Some scholars have suggested that the accusative is more frequent with singular nouns than with plural ones (Magnier 1955: 536, Fleckenstein 1961: 217, Solonicyn 1962: 104-5, Timberlake 1975: 125). On the other hand, the figures given by Restan (1960: 97), Green (1979: 161), and Haka (1981: 60-2, 103) seem to indicate that there is little or no difference between singular and plural; and this view is also taken by Butorin (1953: 8) and Tsurikov (1967: 177).

The assumption that the genitive might be more frequent in the plural seems perfectly reasonable: as Timberlake puts it (1975: 125), ‘a plural participant is less individuated than a singular participant’; or, in other words, plural nouns are frequently less definite and more generalized than singular ones (cf. also Mustajoki 1985: 101-2, where this pair of examples is given to illustrate the point: Он спортивных игр не любит — Он футбол не любит). However, the statistical figures are not particularly convincing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>249 (71.3%)</td>
<td>80 (59.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>100 (28.7%)</td>
<td>55 (40.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A different picture emerges if one only considers the figures for contexts in which the direct object is a concrete count noun. Here the preference for the accusative is significantly stronger when the object is a singular noun, as the following table demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>744 (43.7%)</td>
<td>238 (39.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>958 (56.3%)</td>
<td>362 (60.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be realized, though, that this difference between singular and plural nouns may not be purely a consequence of the number factor as such: there are other factors connected with the object noun which may play a significant role in causing the accusative to be preferred in the singular and the genitive in the plural. Firstly, it has been asserted by many scholars that the accusative is preferred in the singular when the object is a noun ending in -а/-я in the nominative; and secondly, the avoidance of ambiguity in cases of homonymy may in certain contexts be a reason for the use of the accusative in the singular and the genitive in the plural. These two factors will be discussed in more detail below; in the present connection, their influence may be eliminated by considering only those clauses in which the direct object is not an -а/-я noun, and in which the ambiguity factor is also irrelevant. The figures for such clauses reveal only a negligible difference between singular and plural:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>279 (41.3%)</td>
<td>396 (42.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>125 (38.7%)</td>
<td>167 (57.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes all masculine nouns except for those with homographic forms for the gen. sing. and the acc. pl.; neuters in -мя and irregular neuters like плечно; and nouns not in -а/-я, with homonymous forms, but with the possibility of ambiguity removed by a modifier. Nouns classified as singularia tantum under Variable 22 were not included.
These figures, of course, include nouns of various semantic types; but, interestingly, the difference between singular and plural is still comparatively insignificant if one considers only concrete count nouns which are not subject to the influence of the -а/-я and homonymy factors.

It can hardly be a coincidence that the singular/plural distinction is ostensibly significant only in those cases where other factors could also have a similar influence. Thus, it seems reasonable to claim that number is of little significance to case selection at least from a statistical point of view, even though it may well influence the choice in some specific contexts. The figures certainly suggest that when the -а/-я and homonymy factors are analysed below, it will be reasonably safe to reckon without the possible influence of the semantics of number.

VARIABLE 20: Gender of the object noun

The criterion of classification was 'syntactic gender' (which can be determined by observing the grammatical behaviour of words which agree in gender with the noun concerned), rather than what has been called 'morphological gender' (determined by the declension of the noun itself). Syntactic gender as such is not usually regarded as a factor influencing case selection, whereas morphological gender is mentioned by a number of scholars (see Variable 21). However, some scholars do give figures for the different syntactic genders in the singular: Korn (1967: 492-3) finds a 63.0% accusative frequency for feminines, as compared with 20.3% for masculines and 29.2% for neuters; while Green (1979: 180-3), whose figures are based on a comparatively small sample, finds no significant difference between masculines (acc. 36%) and feminines (acc. 35%), whereas the accusative frequency for neuters is considerably lower (16%).

Separate figures are presented below for singular and plural nouns; in comparing our results with those of other scholars, it should be borne in mind that their figures usually pertain to the singular only. Because our classifying criterion was syntactic gender, the separate treatment of nouns in -а/-я is deferred to Variables 22-3; but here, too, their influence is certainly in evidence in the figures for feminines.

In addition, there were a few occurrences of pluralia tantum nouns (e.g. деньги, брюки, ворота), whose gender cannot be determined. The figures for these nouns were as follows: accusative 10, genitive 13; accusative frequency 43.4% (one example with each case containing an infinitival construction).

Although there are significant differences between the figures for the different genders in both the singular and the plural, it is unlikely that syntactic gender is of relevance in itself. The differences between masculines and feminines are probably attributable to morphological factors (see Variables 21 and 22); whereas the high genitive frequency for neuter nouns seems to reflect the fact that the proportion of abstract nouns is particularly high here.

VARIABLE 21: Declension of the object noun

Under this variable, declension types were divided into two main categories, 'strong' and 'weak' declension. The weak declension consists of nouns with identical forms for the nominative/accusative and dative singular; this is traditionally known as the third declension. The term 'strong declension' as it is used here embraces both the 'first' and the 'second' declension of the traditional classification. Apart from these
two main types, adjectival and indeclinable nouns were considered separately.

**Factor 1: Strong declension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>865 examples (42.7%)</td>
<td>1161 examples (57.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>386 (28.3%)</td>
<td>978 (71.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>479 (72.4%)</td>
<td>183 (27.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One particular variety of strong declension — that of nouns with the ending -а/-я in the nominative singular — is widely regarded as influencing case selection. A number of scholars state that singular nouns ending in -а/-я are generally more likely to appear in the accusative than other singular nouns (Restan 1960: 95; Davison 1967: 62; Tymek 1975: 131; Haka 1981: 62-5, 103). Reasonably convincing figures are presented by Restan (accusative frequency for singular nouns in -а/-я: 47.6%; for other singular nouns, 24.9%) and by Haka (56.1% and 38.2% respectively). However, Tsurikov (1967: 176) regards the argument that the accusative is favoured here as being 'based either on incorrect formulation or misconception'.

A cross-tabulation with the previous variable, and with number, allows one to obtain figures for singular nouns ending in -а/-я in the base form, i.e. strong-declension feminines. The figures are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>298 examples (60.8%)</td>
<td>192 examples (39.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>151 (47.8%)</td>
<td>165 (52.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>147 (84.5%)</td>
<td>27 (15.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The high accusative frequency seems to confirm the strong influence of the -а/-я factor, although some scholars might still remain sceptical about this, pointing out that the homonymy factor could be more important than declension type as such. This question will be dealt with under the following Variable.

**Factor 2: Weak declension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>114 examples (42.5%)</td>
<td>154 examples (57.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>57 (30.5%)</td>
<td>130 (69.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>57 (70.4%)</td>
<td>24 (29.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nouns of the weak declension are mainly feminines ending in a consonant (e.g. тетрадь, возможность); in addition, the group contains:

\[13\] Bearing in mind that all masculines in -а/-я in our corpus were animate nouns referring to people and therefore came under Strong Factor 3.
The Findings: VARIABLE 22: Homonymy factor

It seems reasonable to hypothesize that speakers of Russian might have a certain tendency to avoid ambiguous forms like книги or кресла where misinterpretations could take place, preferring to use the accusative in the singular and the genitive in the plural. Such a tendency has been postulated by Deribas (1956: 23), Kulagin (1959: 89-90, 92, 103-4), Utkin (1963: 79), Tsurikov (1967: 185), and Ravič (1971: 262). However, Timberlake (1975: 131) explicitly denies this view, implying that its proponents have failed to take into account the influence of nouns ending in -а/-я as a morphological group.

The picture is indeed complicated by the fact that a sizeable proportion of those nouns in which ambiguity of this type may arise have the ending -а/-я in the nominative singular; as was demonstrated under Variable 21, this morphological type would appear to be in its own right a significant accusative-favouring factor in the singular. (Furthermore, it has been hypothesized by some scholars that singular nouns in general have a tendency to appear in the accusative more frequently than plural nouns, which would be a further complication in the study of the ambiguity factor; but our findings do not support such a theory, as demonstrated on p. 134-6.)

In spite of these difficulties, however, it should be possible, on the basis of a large enough sample, to conduct a statistical analysis taking account of all these factors simultaneously. Such an analysis has been undertaken below on the basis of the material in our corpus; but at first it is necessary to look at the classification used in order to establish the status of the object nouns in respect of the homonymy factor. It should be noted at this stage that only inanimate nouns have been taken into account (feminine nouns denoting animals being thus excluded; nouns in -а/-я denoting humans were considered a Strong Factor in any case). Animate nouns were excluded from consideration because they are the only group consisting largely of nouns in -а/-я where homonymy between the genitive singular and the accusative plural does not arise (the latter being identical with the genitive rather than the nominative); the inclusion of these nouns might therefore distort the results, particularly if one subscribes to the theory that animacy is an accusative-favouring factor in its own right.

The following classification was used:

1 — Different endings for genitive singular and accusative plural

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular nouns:</th>
<th>Plural nouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>211 examples (44.3%)</td>
<td>91 (29.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>265 examples (55.7%)</td>
<td>222 (70.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural nouns:</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>85 examples (47.8%)</td>
<td>40 (35.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>93 examples (52.2%)</td>
<td>73 (64.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For commentary, see 3 below.

2 — Identical endings but different stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular nouns:</th>
<th>Plural nouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>92 examples (51.7%)</td>
<td>49 (40.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>86 examples (48.3%)</td>
<td>72 (59.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural nouns:</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>27 examples (37.0%)</td>
<td>13 (25.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>46 examples (63.0%)</td>
<td>38 (74.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 — Identical endings and identical stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular nouns:</th>
<th>Plural nouns:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>305 examples (47.3%)</td>
<td>145 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>339 examples (52.7%)</td>
<td>291 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural nouns:</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>116 examples (35.6%)</td>
<td>46 (21.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>210 examples (64.4%)</td>
<td>173 (79.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In groups 2 and 3, the genitive singular and the accusative plural are spelt identically; however, in group 2 they are differentiated by stress, whereas in group 3 the forms are completely homonymous. As our corpus
consists of written texts (although the play texts are, of course, primarily meant to be spoken aloud), it is an interesting question whether stress is a relevant factor in spite of this — i.e. whether forms with identical spelling but different stress are regarded as being distinct even when written down.

At first sight the figures seem to suggest exactly the contrary: the accusative appears to be more popular in group 2, whereas one would expect the reverse to be true if the influence of the homonymy factor were stronger in group 3 than in group 2. However, it is not difficult to find an explanation for this: it would appear that the difference between the two groups is largely caused by semantic factors. Group 3 comprises all countable feminine and neuter nouns with fixed stress, including a large number of abstract ones (e.g. all countable feminines in -ость); whereas in group 2 the proportion of concrete nouns is considerably higher. In fact, if one computes the figures for concrete singular nouns only, the total accusative frequencies turn out to be 65.6% for group 2 (n = 90) and 79.0% for group 3 (n = 138). Thus, it seems that the stress factor in fact retain some of its relevance even in written contexts, but this is not reflected in the overall figures. In the more detailed analysis that follows, separate figures will be shown for nouns belonging to these two different groups, but in some tables below we have also felt it to be justified to present combined figures.

4 — *Singularia tantum* nouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>135 examples (33.6%)</td>
<td>267 examples (66.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>52 (18.4%)</td>
<td>231 (81.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>83 (69.7%)</td>
<td>36 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This group comprises nouns that belong to one of those declension types where homonymy could in principle arise, but which are used, at least in the relevant sense, only in the singular. They are predominantly abstract; the relatively high genitive frequency is not therefore surprising.

* * *

As noted above, the -а/-я factor and the homonymy factor are probably best examined together; and in considering the latter, some attempt should also be made to take into account the question of whether the presence of two identical forms can lead to the possibility of ambiguity in the relevant contexts. It is therefore necessary to make a more elaborate classification of those object nouns with identical endings for the genitive singular and the genitive plural, taking account of the following factors: whether the genitive singular and the accusative plural not only have identical endings, but are also stressed on the same syllable; whether the noun in question ends in -а/-я in the nominative singular; whether a disambiguating premodifier (or in certain cases a postmodifier) is present; and whether the noun is in the singular or in the plural. This gives us sixteen different cases, representing all the possible combinations; those differing from each other in respect of stress pattern only may be regarded as 'subtypes' of the same basic scenario, and have been designated by the same number but a different letter (a or b) in the table below. In addition, *singularia tantum* nouns have been subdivided into those ending in -а/-я and others. Although this produces a relatively complicated classification, it will be found that in most cases the figures are of a sufficient magnitude to have statistical value:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>same stress</th>
<th>-а/-я premod.</th>
<th>plural</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55 (31.8%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>41 (77.4%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>8 (66.7%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83 (28.2%)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>64 (52.5%)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26 (40.6%)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>55 (31.8%)</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>53 (34.4%)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3 (16.7%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29 (42.6%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>34 (46.6%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>12 (32.4%)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24 (25.3%)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>9 (40.9%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>29 (32.2%)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nouns which are generally only used in the singular:

1. -а/-я ending in the nominative: 51 (49.0%)  53
2. Other singularia tantum nouns:  84 (28.2%)  214

In the light of these figures, a number of interesting observations can be made about the influence of the -а/-я factor and the ambiguity factor.

(1) The -а/-я factor (see also pp. 138)

The most conspicuous finding is that the significance of the -а/-я factor seems to be clearly confirmed even if one takes into account the possible simultaneous contribution of the homonymy factor. Figures for those cases in which the avoidance of ambiguity is clearly irrelevant to
case selection may be obtained by considering only clauses with a singularia tantum noun as object, and ones with disambiguating modifiers. The figures for singular nouns in -а/-я in such contexts are: accusative 123 (51.7%), genitive 115; the accusative frequency is way above average, while the corresponding figure for neuters and weak-declension feminines is only 30.6% (acc. 152, gen. 345). Further evidence is supplied by a comparison of those instances where ambiguity is possible (at least in principle) with similar cases where the noun is a neuter or a weak-declension feminine. For singular nouns in -а/-я, the figures in such contexts are: accusative 167 (69.6%), genitive 73; for other singular nouns: accusative 81 (34.2%), genitive 156. Evidently, it must be concluded that the ambiguity factor, while possibly making some contribution to the total figures for nouns in -а/-я, is not nearly important enough to account for the frequent use of the accusative. This seems to provide evidence for the view that nouns ending in -а/-я have, as such, a tendency to favour the accusative.

However, before declaring this declension type significant as a purely morphological factor, it is necessary to consider the possibility that the evidence might not be reliable because of the influence of the concreteness/abstractness factor. As was noted above (p. 142), nouns ending in -а/-я are, on the whole, less frequently abstract than neutrals and weak-declension feminines. Thus, the question arises whether the accusative preference in the -а/-я group is a consequence of semantic or morphological factors, or a combination of both. The following figures may throw some light on the matter: for concrete singular nouns ending in -а/-я, the accusative frequency was 79.3% (n = 164), as against 63.2% for concrete nouns of other morphological types with homonymous forms (n = 76); as for abstract count nouns, the accusative frequency for nouns in -а/-я was 49.4% (n = 176), and for other nouns with homonymous forms 27.6% (n = 301). Thus, the concreteness/abstractness factor seems partly to account for the magnitude of the difference between nouns in -а/-я and other nouns in respect of case selection; but it is obviously not solely responsible for the existence of the difference. Therefore, the -а/-я factor does appear to be significant in itself as a purely morphological factor; but at the same time it is reasonably clear that its place in the hierarchy of factors is below the semantic factor of concreteness/abstractness. It seems unreasonable to suggest that the apparent significance of the -а/-я factor might be an illusion created by the combined influence of the ambiguity and concrete-

(2) The ambiguity factor

It may seem tempting to draw conclusions about the significance of the ambiguity factor by simply comparing the figures for clauses in which ambiguity is possible with those for clauses in which it is not; but such a straightforward method is likely to produce misleading results, mainly because it fails to eliminate the simultaneous influence of the -а/-я factor. However, the possible influence of the ambiguity factor can, in principle, be determined fairly reliably by contrasting with each other the figures for clauses which correspond exactly to one another in respect of the number and the morphological type of the object noun, but differ in respect of the presence or absence of a disambiguating premodifier. As far as the morphological type of the noun is concerned, it is probably sufficient to give separate attention to nouns in -а/-я and to other nouns with homonymous forms for the genitive singular and the accusative plural. If this factor were significant, the expected result would be that, in the absence of a premodifier, there should be a preference for the accusative in the singular and for the genitive in the plural (as compared with the corresponding figures for clauses with a premodifier).

The figures for singular nouns ending in -а/-я support the view that the ambiguity factor is relevant to case selection. If singularia tantum nouns are excluded (which is clearly necessary here), the figures for singular nouns in -а/-я are as follows: in cases of potential ambiguity (without premodifier), accusative 167 (69.6%), genitive 73; and in cases where ambiguity is definitely ruled out, accusative 72 (53.7%), genitive 62. The figures for -а/-я nouns in the plural seem to provide further evidence: where a modifier is present, there is no clear preference — accusative 37 (47.4%), genitive 41; but in the absence of modifiers the genitive is much more frequent: accusative 32 (37.2%), genitive 54.

However, the figures for nouns not in -а/-я with identical forms for the genitive singular and the accusative plural present a more complicated picture. The plural figures do show a particularly clear preference for the genitive in the absence of premodifiers: with premodifier, accusative 38 (33.9%), genitive 74; without premodifier, accusative 36 (27.3%), genitive 96. In the singular, however, we do not find the ex-
The Findings: VARIABLE 23: Degree of negativeness of the object noun

As far as the semantic properties of the object noun are concerned, it might conceivably be of some relevance whether the noun contains a clear element of positiveness or negativeness. Problems inevitably arise in defining 'positive' and 'negative' for the purposes of such an analysis: our general principle was only to include words whose basic lexical meaning can be said to include one of the components 'good', 'desirable' or 'bad', 'undesirable'. However, exceptions were made for certain nouns denoting concepts which might be evaluated in different ways, but which quite clearly had been evaluated in a particular way in the relevant context (thus, for example, коммунизм was regarded as a positive noun in the one context in which it appeared as object because such an interpretation was clearly intended by the author; and, similarly, the object of the sentence Не устраивай драм, though neutral in its basic meaning, was regarded as contextually negative).

Most nouns were regarded as neutral in this respect; and in considering the figures below, it must be noted that both explicitly positive nouns and explicitly negative ones tend to be abstract: the presence of evaluative meaning in concrete nouns, while certainly possible, is rarer. This explains the fact that the genitive is frequent in both categories discussed below.

Factor 1: Negative noun as object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>55 examples (34.6%)</td>
<td>19 (34.2%)</td>
<td>36 (65.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>104 examples (65.4%)</td>
<td>85 (81.7%)</td>
<td>19 (34.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

И все равно, мы не имеем права сохранять старые пороки, присущие заводу. [Софронов]

Такую трату драгоценной влаги многие не одобрили. [Спутник]

Никакими молитвами, никакими покаяниями не замолить вину перед Степаном Андреяновичем. [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

Простить себе не могу своего малодушия. [Салынский]

Потом не выдержала трезвона, вышла в коридор. [Спутник]

... а Гриша не замечал ее тоски, ее ревности. [Спутник]

The figures are reasonably normal for clauses with abstract nouns in the object position (and there were only four clauses in which the object was not abstract).

Factor 2: Positive noun as object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>23 examples (22.1%)</td>
<td>7 (9.5%)</td>
<td>16 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>81 examples (77.9%)</td>
<td>67 (90.5%)</td>
<td>14 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Костенька, не отпускай удачу, потом не спойманешь, улетит квартира! [Салынский]

— Мне кажется, ты не учитывает изворотливость разума, мой мальчик, — мягко сказал молчавший все время капитан. [Спутник]

Правда, они еще не оставляют надежду превратить Польшу в очаг дестабилизации в Европе. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Оботри левую щеку, не афишируй успеха. [Розов]
The semantic properties of the object noun are regarded as significant by the majority of scholars. Observations relating to specific categories, such as parts of the body, will be noted below under the relevant factors; but before embarking on a more detailed analysis, it seems expedient to consider the factor of concreteness vs. abstractness, which is almost universally recognized as having an influence on the case choice.

Most scholars agree that concrete nouns are more likely to appear in the accusative than abstract nouns (e.g. Butorin 1953: 12; Uglitsky 1956: 381; Deriba 1956: 22; Fleckenstein 1961: 217; Utkin 1963: 80; Ravič 1971: 263-5; Timberlake 1975: 124-5; AG 1980-II: 417). This is also supported by the figures given by Safarewiczowa (1960: 109-26). However, those given by Restan (1960: 96) go against the majority view: an accusative frequency of merely 25.5% (n = 1480) is given for 'concrete nouns' (although the overall accusative frequency being 31% (cf. also Schaller 1978: 88-9).

A major problem in the study of this factor is the definition of 'concrete' and 'abstract' nouns. It does not seem entirely satisfactory to regard concreteness/abstractness as a binary opposition: that there are varying degrees of concreteness can be illustrated, for example, by a consideration of the words стол — город — слово — праздник — счастье. The first refers to a tangible object and is definitely concrete; while the last one is purely conceptual and unquestionably abstract. However, the noun город, denoting a place, clearly refers to something less tangible than стол, requiring a higher degree of conceptualization; therefore, it might reasonably be claimed that it is 'less concrete'; but clearly it must still be rated 'relatively concrete'. Similarly, the word слово has an intangible referent, but one which can be conceived visually or aurally and which can be referred to as a 'partitive genitive'. Both стол and праздник would have to be regarded as 'abstract', yet they are evidently less abstract than счастье, which denotes an emotional state and is therefore highly conceptualized. Quite apart from this, the problem of concreteness/abstractness is also bound up with that of 'countability': it might be argued that collective nouns like одежда, or mass nouns like вода, while unquestionably denoting something tangible, are not as obviously concrete as nouns referring to clearly defined countable objects. Thus, concreteness/abstractness is clearly a continuum, and the problem with a binary classification is not only the difficulty of deciding where to draw the line: it is also arguable that 'relatively concrete' nouns may behave differently from 'definitely concrete' ones, etc.

In view of these difficulties, one must exercise some caution in giving figures for concrete nouns on the one hand, and abstract ones on the other (and, similarly, in making comparisons between the findings of different scholars, whose definitions of 'concrete' and 'abstract' may not be identical). For the purposes of this study, we have regarded as 'concrete' the nouns treated below under Factors 1-5, and as 'abstract' those under Factors 11-25.17 The same principle of classification is followed throughout this report wherever the figures for 'concrete' and 'abstract' nouns are referred to.

The figures for concrete and abstract nouns, as defined above, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>329 (68.0%)</td>
<td>497 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>155 (32.0%)</td>
<td>997 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 A substantial group of nouns, including mass nouns with concrete referents, are thus left outside this classification. At least as far as the present study is concerned, such nouns cannot be regarded as typically concrete: apart from semantic considerations, one must also take into account the possibility of their appearance in the 'partitive genitive'.

---

149 The Findings: VARIABLE 24: Semantic type of the object noun

Ne дали мне заслуженной славы мои ночные алмазные строки, ...
Зорин
Деловой и рассудочный молодой человек не понимает старомодной восторженности отца ...
Спутник

This group contained only one object (добыча) that was not an abstract noun. However, even with this taken into consideration, there is an unexpectedly clear preference for the genitive, and the genitive frequency is significantly higher than for negative nouns. To a certain extent this might be attributable to the presence in this group of idiomatic expressions such as не терять надежды, не доставлять удовольствия, which favour the genitive; but this is not a sufficient explanation. However, it seems that the positive or negativity of the object is unlikely to be of much significance in itself; but it may well be the case that the positiveness or negativeness of the object is un-

---
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The semantic properties of the object noun are regarded as significant by the majority of scholars. Observations relating to specific categories, such as parts of the body, will be noted below under the relevant factors; but before embarking on a more detailed analysis, it seems expedient to consider the factor of concreteness vs. abstractness, which is almost universally recognized as having an influence on the case choice.

Most scholars agree that concrete nouns are more likely to appear in the accusative than abstract nouns (e.g. Butorin 1953: 12; Uglitsky 1956: 381; Deriba 1956: 22; Fleckenstein 1961: 217; Utkin 1963: 80; Ravič 1971: 263-5; Timberlake 1975: 124-5; AG 1980-II: 417). This is also supported by the figures given by Safarewiczowa (1960: 109-26). However, those given by Restan (1960: 96) go against the majority view: an accusative frequency of merely 25.5% (n = 1480) is given for 'concrete nouns' (although the overall accusative frequency being 31% (cf. also Schaller 1978: 88-9).

A major problem in the study of this factor is the definition of 'concrete' and 'abstract' nouns. It does not seem entirely satisfactory to regard concreteness/abstractness as a binary opposition: that there are varying degrees of concreteness can be illustrated, for example, by a consideration of the words стол — город — слово — праздник — счастье. The first refers to a tangible object and is definitely concrete; while the last one is purely conceptual and unquestionably abstract. However, the noun город, denoting a place, clearly refers to something less tangible than стол, requiring a higher degree of conceptualization; therefore, it might reasonably be claimed that it is 'less concrete'; but clearly it must still be rated 'relatively concrete'. Similarly, the word слово has an intangible referent, but one which can be conceived visually or aurally and which can be referred to as a 'partitive genitive'. Both стол and праздник would have to be regarded as 'abstract', yet they are evidently less abstract than счастье, which denotes an emotional state and is therefore highly conceptualized. Quite apart from this, the problem of concreteness/abstractness is also bound up with that of 'countability': it might be argued that collective nouns like одежда, or mass nouns like вода, while unquestionably denoting something tangible, are not as obviously concrete as nouns referring to clearly defined countable objects. Thus, concreteness/abstractness is clearly a continuum, and the problem with a binary classification is not only the difficulty of deciding where to draw the line: it is also arguable that 'relatively concrete' nouns may behave differently from 'definitely concrete' ones, etc.

In view of these difficulties, one must exercise some caution in giving figures for concrete nouns on the one hand, and abstract ones on the other (and, similarly, in making comparisons between the findings of different scholars, whose definitions of 'concrete' and 'abstract' may not be identical). For the purposes of this study, we have regarded as 'concrete' the nouns treated below under Factors 1-5, and as 'abstract' those under Factors 11-25.17 The same principle of classification is followed throughout this report wherever the figures for 'concrete' and 'abstract' nouns are referred to.

The figures for concrete and abstract nouns, as defined above, are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc.</td>
<td>329 (68.0%)</td>
<td>497 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>155 (32.0%)</td>
<td>997 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 A substantial group of nouns, including mass nouns with concrete referents, are thus left outside this classification. At least as far as the present study is concerned, such nouns cannot be regarded as typically concrete: apart from semantic considerations, one must also take into account the possibility of their appearance in the 'partitive genitive'.

---
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Не дали мне заслуженной славы мои ночные алмазные строки, ...
[Зорин]
Деловой и рассудочный молодой человек не понимает старомодной восторженности отца ...
[Спутник]
Whether or not our method of classification is regarded as fully reliable, it is reasonably clear that this is a factor of considerable importance. However, a more detailed classification is also necessary and has been attempted below.

**Factor 1: Animal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>8 examples (72.7%)</td>
<td>6 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>3 examples (27.3%)</td>
<td>3 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- А спустя минуту старик уже радовался, что не убил дорогую лису. [Спутник]
- Я не заставляю в соревнованиях лошадь делать то или другое, а морально готовлю ее к элементу. [Спутник]
- Не утащили твою козу, не беспокойся. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
- Козочки моей не видели, ребята? [Розов]
- Козы мы не видели, не видели козы! [Розов]

The accusative is evidently preferred; and the genitive frequency in our corpus may in fact be uncharacteristically high for accidental reasons (all three genitives occurring in a single conversational exchange in Rozov’s play). Most of the words included here are ones ending in -а; and all are obviously animate. Both of these factors have been regarded as accusative-favouring ones, although it is difficult to pin down the precise nature of their interrelationship in determining case selection for words belonging to this category.

**Factor 2: Group of people, organization, etc.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>23 examples (88.5%)</td>
<td>14 (87.5%)</td>
<td>9 (90.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>3 examples (11.5%)</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- К сожалению, он и техническую интеллигенцию не балует особым вниманием. [Софронов]
- Никто, понятно, не заставлял население тратить драгоценный в то время керосин на обозначение улицы. [Спутник]
- Никандров тоже не бросит семью. [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:
- Это, в общем, смешно, что они нам ключей от двери не доверяют. [Розов]
- Я этого ножа в руках не держал, — бесцветным, но твердым голосом ответил Ивлев. [Спутник]
- ... Лиза терпеть не могла электрических чайников, ... [Абрамов]

This group represents 'concrete, countable nouns' at their most typical. Earlier research would lead one to expect a preference for the accusative; such a preference is certainly found, but the genitive is by no means uncommon, and has a much higher frequency than in the case of animate nouns.

**Factor 4: Parts of the body**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>66 examples (66.0%)</td>
<td>40 (57.1%)</td>
<td>26 (86.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>34 examples (34.0%)</td>
<td>30 (42.9%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples with accusative:

Зато я никауда не залезу, не упаду и не сломаю себе шею. [Салынский]

Не опускай голову, ты же не видишь, что ты делаешь. [Софронов]

Даже мальышкой никогда я первым не подымал руку. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Противнику спины не показывают. [Зорин]

Инженер в форменной фуражке, в пальто с бархатным воротником, никогда бы не подал руки рабочему ... [Спутник]

'Никогда не забуду его лица: ...' [Трифонов]

Scholarly opinion is somewhat divided on the influence of this factor: it is listed by Uglitsky (1956: 22), Restan, and Borras & Christian (1971: 29) as favouring the accusative without reservations; but Davison (1967: 45-6, 62) asserts that the 'reflexive' use of these words (see below) is a factor which makes the genitive virtually compulsory (cf. also Schaller 1978: 88).

Our figures suggest that the accusative is, on the whole, the dominant choice. It must be noted, however, that the picture is complicated by a relatively large number of idiomatic expressions, some of which clearly prefer one of the two cases (e.g. не морочить голову, six occurrences), whereas others admit variation (e.g. не вешать носа — one occurrence with each case). The figures for non-idiomatic collocations are: accusative 29 (54.7%), genitive 24; and in the absence of infinitival constructions: accusative 19 (46.3%), genitive 22.

Finally, we must consider Davison’s hypothesis of a genitive preference in certain cases. The part of the body denoted by the object noun may belong either to the (notional) subject of the verb, or to another person or animal (cf. поднимать руку 'raise one’s hand' — хватать руку 'seize somebody else's hand'). According to Davison, the first, 'reflexive' use strongly favours the genitive in negative clauses. However, the present sample indicated no significant difference between these two types of constructions, the figures for non-idiomatic reflexive uses being: accusative 17 (53.1%), genitive 15. That the accusative frequency is somewhat lower than for concrete nouns in general is perhaps largely accounted for by the fact that nouns of this type in the reflexive function frequently appeared with gerunds, as in не поднимая головы (although, interestingly, it does seem that the genitive was preferred more clearly than with concrete nouns in general after gerunds: Accusative 1, Genitive 7; cf. Factor 7:1). But where the verb form was not a gerund, the accusative was strongly preferred; and one must therefore conclude that Davison’s hypothesis does not stand up to scrutiny.

Factor 5: Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>67 examples (63.8%)</td>
<td>42 (58.3%)</td>
<td>25 (75.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>38 examples (36.2%)</td>
<td>30 (41.7%)</td>
<td>8 (24.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Истинные патриоты никогда не тянули Россию к национальной ограниченности, шовинизму и мракобесию! [Салынский]

они не способны разрушить иерархическое здание лингвистических уровней. [Звегинцев]

Они не спрашивали дорогу, наслаждаясь незнакомостью, сюрпризами, которые ожидали их за поворотом. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Иной человек всю жизнь своего места найти не может. [Софронов]

... которые явно не покрывают собой всего поля языка. [Звегинцев]

Я пытался высмотреть мастерскую, ... но не увидел даже сараичика. [Спутник]

The nouns in this group are ones which are primarily perceived as denoting a place. Such nouns may be regarded as relatively concrete. However, they may also be used figuratively, as in the Zvegincev examples; and the word место in particular has certain idiomatic uses where the concreteness of the noun either disappears or becomes irrelevant (though the most frequent of these, не найти себе места in the sense 'to behave nervously, to fidget', was excluded from consideration as an idiom with a negative form only).

Factor 6: Mass nouns denoting foodstuffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>11 examples (44.0%)</td>
<td>5 (29.4%)</td>
<td>6 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>14 examples (56.0%)</td>
<td>12 (70.6%)</td>
<td>2 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Миндаль не трогай — это для Аркадия. [Розов]

Я не буду есть сыр, хорошо? [Дворецкий]

Главная сложность — не "пересушить" и не "переварить" нежное кушанье. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

И хлеба не едят. [Петухов]
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Factor 7: Liquid substance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>17 examples</td>
<td>13 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>6 (33.3%)</td>
<td>12 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>11 (91.7%)</td>
<td>1 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Оказывается, в субботу они выезжают только на серьезные аварии, когда жильцы сами не могут остановить воду. [Салынский]

Да я и клоповник этот, коньjak, не больно уважаю. [Абрамов]

И цепной пес, пену с клыков не сбросив, комнатной собачонкой у ног его ластился. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:

Что толку увеличивать рацион, например, твоей Белянке, если она не прибавит молока, хоть закорми ее! [Петухов]

И все-таки пива не достал. [Спутник]

Мы не пьем вина, не целуемся. [Солоухин]

These nouns denote various kinds of liquids (frequently, but not necessarily, drinkable ones); they are typically uncountable apart from the word слезы, whose presence did not, however, significantly affect the figures. This factor being semantically close to the previous one, the higher accusative frequency may be a little surprising; however, the difference in the figures for clauses without an infinitival construction is not significant. As in the previous group, the partitive meaning of the genitive may well have influenced the choice in a number of instances.

Factor 8: Non-edible solid substance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>12 examples</td>
<td>6 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>8 (61.5%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>4 (80.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

И он не пожалеет мрамор, ... [Салынский]

Он вырыл капкан, яростно грыз цепочку, но одолеть железо не сумел. [Спутник]

Кровь почти не транспортируется по сосудам, не переносит питательные вещества к тканям организма. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

На чемпионате мира в Риме в том же году она не выиграла золота, но ее признали самой обаятельной участницей. [Спутник]

Есть еще одно требование: материалы для искусственного сердца не должны выделять вредных веществ, ... [Спутник]

Термоядерный процесс не дает в ощутимых количествах радиоактивных шлаков ... [Спутник]

The nouns in this group appeared in the accusative more frequently than other nouns denoting substances. Evidently, the partitive meaning is less frequently relevant here (partly because of the absence of verbs denoting eating and drinking). Even so, the frequency of the accusative may be regarded as surprisingly high.

Factor 9: Collective noun denoting a complex whole consisting of smaller units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>22 examples</td>
<td>28 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>14 (35.9%)</td>
<td>25 (64.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>8 (72.7%)</td>
<td>3 (27.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

... добиться того, чтобы никто и никогда ни применял первым ядерное оружие. [Спутник]

Мы из Москвы чемоданами добро не возим. [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

... полученное в итоге лингвистическое описание не отражает всей совокупности факторов, ... [Звегинцев]

... конечно, отец таких денег при всем желании платить бы не мог. [Спутник]

Ежели через два дня на третий имущества не обрету — милицию подключим. [Васильев]
While most of the nouns in this category refer collectively to concrete objects, some denote relatively abstract concepts; this may be a partial explanation for the genitive frequency being somewhat higher than for other types of collective nouns. Perhaps even more significant, however, is the frequent appearance in the genitive of the commonest noun in this group, деньги ( accusative 3, genitive 9); partitive meaning would appear to be the reason for this preference, the verb being in most cases one with a basic meaning of giving or receiving.

Factor 10: Relatively concrete, countable product of human intellectual activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>43 (33.3%)</td>
<td>56 (70.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>51 (56.7%)</td>
<td>36 (29.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Вот эти ваши слова, кроме нас, здесь никто не слышит. ... [Зорин]
Законы природы не обойдешь — эту истину не всегда учитывают в поисках путей решения энергетической проблемы. [Спутник]
Данилов поначалу делал вид, что не может держать в голове все статьи документа, но ему и вправду напоминали. [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:

Мне ведь он такого стихотворения не написал. [Розов]
Хороших слов ты, видно, не понимаешь. [Вампилов]
В начале письма ... мы не находим имени лица, к которому направлено письмо, ... [Мещерский]

This is a rather broadly defined group; it includes products of human activity which have relatively ‘concrete’ manifestations (in many cases, they refer to things which may be written down). This group includes one of the most frequent object nouns in the corpus, слово (which obviously owes part of its frequency to the fact that linguistic texts constituted a substantial part of the material); this word appeared 13 times in the accusative and 35 times in the genitive.

Factor 11: Relatively abstract, countable product of human activity (frequently oral)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>28 (33.3%)</td>
<td>55 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>141 (86.4%)</td>
<td>23 (29.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Этот вывод, понятно, не решает нашу задачу, ... [Караулов]
Поверьте, не делайте эту глупость. [Дворецкий]
"Девятнадцать секунд и вся жизнь". Рассказ о летчике, не выполнившем приказ. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

А товарищу, который не понимает шуток своей жены, скажите, что он — дурак! [Салынский]
Не повторяйте прежних ошибок. [Софронов]
Я удавляюсь, ни разу не поднимали вопрос и вообще стирили куда-то, пропали ... [Трифонов]

The nouns in this group are abstract, but their referents can generally be perceived by the human senses, and the degree of conceptualization is therefore not particularly high. Against this background, a moderate preference for the genitive may be regarded as predictable.

Factor 12: Event or process in which one can participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14 (34.5%)</td>
<td>15 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27 (64.1%)</td>
<td>5 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Examples with accusative:

Конечно, в одиночку Азербайджан не смог бы осуществить переориентацию своей экономики. [Спутник]

... для жизни организмов, не ведущих, как растения, фотосинтез — от вирусов и микробов до человека. [Спутник]

И жизнь самолично никогда не осмыслишь. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:

Щеголева не понимает молчания. [Салынский]

... многие из сегодняшних так называемых факторов риска существовали и раньше, однако не провоцировали массового распространения сердечных недугов. [Спутник]

In contrast to the previous group, these nouns denote processes which are not usually associated with the idea of active, deliberate participation (although the subject is likely to be involved in them in some way or other). The genitive was considerably more frequent than in the previous category; this may be related to the fact that the nouns in this group are generally of a somewhat higher degree of abstraction.

Factor 14: 'Abstract place'; position, situation, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19 examples (43.2%)</td>
<td>25 examples (56.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>7 (24.1%)</td>
<td>22 (75.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>12 (80.0%)</td>
<td>3 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Семейный рай в шалаше не построишь. [Салынский]

... Саул Исаакович удалялся, дабы не мешать ей и не навлечь на себя раздражение. [Спутник]

... нельзя было рассеять свои страхи, боязнь и опасения. [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:

Калошин, до сих пор жадно прислушивающийся к разговору, теперь не может скрыть своего волнения и испуга. [Вампилов]

... что их причастность к международному терроризму не вызывает сомнений. [Спутник]

While this group contains some nouns denoting physical sensations (notably боль), the majority refer to emotional states and are therefore of a highly abstract and conceptualized character. A preference for the genitive is therefore predictable; but the genitive frequency is, in fact, notably high even when compared to other groups of abstract nouns. One major reason for this is the frequent co-occurrence of these nouns with the causative verb вызывать, which is a powerful genitive-favouring factor owing to its existential implications (cf. 99); there were sixteen such instances, all with the genitive, including twelve occurrences of the expression не вызывает, сомнений (or сомнения gen. sing.).

Factor 15: Emotional or physical state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>19 examples (16.4%)</td>
<td>97 examples (83.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>4 (5.2%)</td>
<td>73 (94.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>15 (38.5%)</td>
<td>24 (61.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Коммунисты никогда не составят счастье для вашей земли, никогда! [Салынский]

... Саул Исаакович удалялся, дабы не мешать ей и не навлечь на себя раздражение. [Спутник]

... нельзя было рассеять свои страхи, боязнь и опасения. [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:

Калошин, до сих пор жадно прислушивающийся к разговору, теперь не может скрыть своего волнения и испуга. [Вампилов]

... что их причастность к международному терроризму не вызывает сомнений. [Спутник]

This group includes abstract, metaphorical uses of words denoting place. Also included are some words (e.g. ситуация) which may now be regarded as primarily abstract concepts, but are ultimately based on the idea of location; and, by extension, some words roughly synonymous with these (обстоятельства, условия). Although the overall figures show a smaller difference than is usual for abstract nouns, the genitive is clearly preferred in the absence of infinitival constructions.

Factor 16: Relatively permanent characteristic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>49 examples (35.8%)</td>
<td>88 examples (64.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>15 (15.6%)</td>
<td>81 (84.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>34 (82.9%)</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Погоди же, Сидор Фомич, ты еще не знаешь мой характер! [Петухов]

Наш крестьянин старается изо всех сил ..., однако никак не может преодолеть нищету ... [Спутник]
— Инстинкт, когда он половой — не заменишь головой! [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:
Она не утратила коренного свойства глагола как части речи. [Ломтев]
Однако комедии не исчерпали его творческих сил. [Спутник]
Подозрительными считались те из бывших дворян, кто не проявлял беспрестанной преданности революции. [Трифонов]

As with temporary states, the nouns that describe more permanent characteristics tend to be of an abstract nature; but the preference for the genitive is not as marked here. This may be partly because this group contains a larger proportion of objects which are not purely conceptual. However, the role played by collocational factors may be even more significant; for example, the nouns in this group do not typically appear with verbs of causation.

It is also worth noting that the infinitive factor seems to have been particularly significant here.

**Factor 17:** Field of human activity, or the products of such activity viewed collectively

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9 (69.2%)</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 (30.8%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Ты же все равно юридическую литературу не читаешь. [Софронов]
Прежде классическую музыку он не понимал. [Спутник]
... и никак пресечь это хулиганство было нельзя ... [Трифонов]

Examples with genitive:
Ковалева не знает ремесла. [Дворецкий]
Писцы того времени ... еще не успели выработать строго стилизованного на церковнославянский лад литературного языка. [Мещерский]

This group consists of words like литература, музыка, искусство, which denote various types of human activity, and many of which may also refer collectively to the products of such activity. Also included is the word язык in the sense 'language'. Particularly when they are used as a collective designation for the product of the activity in question, words like литература may have relatively concrete referents, which might partly explain the frequent use of the accusative; but it may be even more significant that as many as eight of the accusative objects were of the -а/-я morphological type.

**Factor 18:** Ideology, academic discipline, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Таким образом, не следует превращать историю литературного языка в серию очерков по языку отдельных писателей. [Мещерский]
о Юрии Ракше заговорили как о вполне сложившемся живописце, не исповедующем какую-либо одну школу [Спутник]
... никто до недавнего времени не изучал его геометрию. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
Психологии вы не понимаете. [Розов]
Хоть я, со своей стороны, не одобряю какой бы то ни было мистики и прочей агностики, ... [Зорин]

Although the accusative is uncharacteristically frequent for a group of abstract nouns, no conclusions can be drawn on the basis of a sample of this size, particularly if one considers the high proportion of clauses with infinitival constructions.

**Factor 19:** Natural phenomenon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8 (34.8%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15 (65.2%)</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Сумерки не люблю, напоминают о старости. [Салынский]
Комбайн-водомет не запыляет воздух, безопасен в условиях газовых шахт, не сложен в обращении. [Спутник]
... вздыхает и уходит из столовой, не забыв погасить свет ... [Орлов]

Examples with genitive:
Пусть я никогда не увижу рассвета, но солнце свободы все равно взойдет над моей родиной. [Спутник]
... потому что все остальное время стальные части самолета не выдерживают мороза и крошаются как стекло. [Спутник]
Когда течешь в лаве, не замечаешь жара. [Трифонов]
Apart from truly natural phenomena, we included here certain artificially created 'nature-identical' phenomena, such as the use of the word свет with reference to electric light. The choice of the case form seems to depend largely on other factors.

**Factor 20: Temporal concept**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Form</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>14 examples (51.9%)</td>
<td>5 (33.3%)</td>
<td>9 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>13 examples (48.1%)</td>
<td>10 (66.7%)</td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Не люблю выходные дни! [Дворецкий]
- Ну, выпьем? Чтобы не терять время даром. [Вампилов]
- Прошлое тоже забывать не стоит, — сказал Уваров. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

- Сделайте заявочку, не указывая даты открытия. [Дворецкий]
- ... я давно и твердо решил посвятить себя науке и не хотел бы терять времени даром ... [Вампилов]
- ... тем более что Анюта еще не скрывала своих лет, ... [Залыгин]

The accusative would appear to be somewhat more frequent than with abstract nouns in general, although this is partly ascribable to the relatively high proportion of infinitival constructions. Much the most frequent temporal concept was the word время itself, which appeared nine times in the accusative and six times in the genitive; it was used particularly often in the expressions не терять/тратить время/времени, which seem to admit the use of either case, the form of the verb probably influencing the choice.

**Factor 21: Part of a whole**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Form</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>13 examples (36.1%)</td>
<td>3 (13.6%)</td>
<td>10 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>23 examples (63.9%)</td>
<td>19 (86.4%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Эту стадию уже нельзя было формализовать. [Спутник]
- Объем американских поставок ... составлял лишь незначительную часть потребностей СССР. Но и эту часть США не поставили вовремя и в полном объеме. [Спутник]
- Это сейчас у всех трактористов так — никогда не заделывают концы полей. [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

- Если противопоставление предложений по двум рассматриваемым основаниям не образует полной четверки предложений, ... [Ломтев]
- И ни один не позволил себе лишнего глотка. [Спутник]

The accusative would appear to be somewhat more frequent than with abstract nouns in general, although this is partly ascribable to the relatively high proportion of infinitival constructions. Much the most frequent temporal concept was the word время itself, which appeared nine times in the accusative and six times in the genitive; it was used particularly often in the expressions не терять/тратить время/времени, which seem to admit the use of either case, the form of the verb probably influencing the choice.

**Factor 22: Quantity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Form</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>9 examples (56.2%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>5 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>7 examples (43.8%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Я тебя не понимаю, неужели за свою идею ты не заслужил рюмку водки? [Вампилов]
- Никто лично не потребляет за год тонну зерна. [Спутник]
- Теперь ничто в мире не помешает мне выпить эту чашку самого вкусного, самого сладкого, какой только может быть на земле, напитка ... [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

- Если противопоставление предложений по двум рассматриваемым основаниям не образует полной четверки предложений, ... [Ломтев]
- И ни один не позволил себе лишнего глотка. [Спутник]

The nouns in this group are usually followed by another noun (plural or mass) in the genitive case, though this second noun may also be implicit, as in the last example. In addition, certain units of measurement and the like (сантиметр; процент) have been included. The figures are not statistically reliable, and in any case other factors may play a more significant role here. It could be interesting to investigate whether normally concrete nouns such as чашка, рюмка (names of containers) might have a tendency to behave in a way characteristic of concrete
nouns even when used quantitatively. The present sample offers no evidence: there are three examples with an accusative, but all of these are functionally affirmative and two contain infinitival constructions, so that the object word itself is unlikely to have had much influence on the choice.

**Factor 23: Relationship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 examples (47.1%)</td>
<td>34 examples (52.9%)</td>
<td>50 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
<td>28 (96.6%)</td>
<td>29 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>15 (71.4%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>21 examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples with accusative:**

В частности, не сумела наука наладить правильные взаимоотношения с природой. [Спутник]

Они долго не различают разницу между русскими словами "мұқа" и "мұқа"... [Аванеспов]

... с Землей-то контакт не хотят установить? [Орлов]

**Examples with genitive:**

Итак, даже разрыв, который произошел, не прервал создавшихся связей. [Зорин]

... и одновременно носитель языка не фиксирует между ними интуитивно ощущаемой смысловой соотнесенности...

... находятся такие, кто не видит коренных различий в классовой сущности НАТО и ОВД... [Спутник]

Words denoting various kinds of relationships between two or more people or things are invariably of a high degree of abstraction; and indeed, the genitive is preferred (quite overwhelmingly so in constructions without an infinitive).

**Factor 24: Other abstract concepts (countable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111 examples (29.5%)</td>
<td>265 examples (70.5%)</td>
<td>376 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>38 (14.5%)</td>
<td>224 (85.5%)</td>
<td>262 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>73 (64.0%)</td>
<td>41 (36.0%)</td>
<td>114 examples</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples with accusative:**

Я не умею такие вещи, Александр Степанович. [Салынский]

что при построении адекватной теории языка никак нельзя игнорировать тот аспект языка, который именуется творческим. [Звегинцев]

... что писатели якобы "ишут ценности, которые могли бы заменить марксистско-ленинскую идеологию, которая совершенно очевидно не удовлетворяет многие основные духовные потребности". [Спутник]

This group is as heterogeneous as the preceding one, but consists of uncountable nouns of an abstract nature. The figures are relatively close to those for the previous category. Nevertheless, it might seem reasonable to assume that uncountable abstract nouns are even more likely to appear in the genitive than countable ones; if such a hypothesis could be proved correct, this would strengthen the case for regarding countability as a feature in some ways parallel to concreteness. The evidence
is not conclusive, but if one considers singular only nouns from the previous group (which seems sensible as all nouns in the present group are automatically singular), there does emerge a difference which might be taken to suggest that the countability factor may be of some relevance: the accusative frequency for the abstract count nouns examined under Factor 24 is 29.5%, as opposed to 27.2% for the uncountable group. However, the difference is not great, and there are a number of factors which might distort the comparison (for example, a slightly higher proportion of nouns in -а/-я among the countables); and in any case, if one wanted to make a proper comparison, nouns belonging to the other ‘abstract’ semantic groups would also have to be considered. On the whole, it seems clear that the distinction between countable and uncountable abstract nouns is not as significant as is the case with concrete nouns. It might, however, be of some relevance; the matter needs further investigation.

VARIABLE 25: Type of pronoun

As noted under Variable 18, pronominal objects as a group generally prefer the genitive more strongly than nouns. Here different pronouns are considered separately.

**Factor 1: это**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without Inf.</th>
<th>With Inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>15 (9.7%)</td>
<td>7 (6.5%)</td>
<td>8 (17.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>139 (90.3%)</td>
<td>100 (93.5%)</td>
<td>39 (83.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

- Это уж никак не скроишь, даже по дружбе! [Салынский]
- Даво вам слово, так я это не оставлю. [Вампилов]
- Миша, не надо бы теперь это говорить, ... [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

- Не понимаю, как я раньше этого не замечал ... [Вампилов]
- Он и ученикам не позволяет делать этого. [Спутник]
- За кем, за кем, а за небом Ирина Викторовна в жизни не подозревала этого. [Залыгин]

The pronoun *это* failed to qualify as a Strong Factor in our study, but our results do clearly support the view that the genitive is the usual choice, as has been noted by Uglitsky (1956: 386), Kout (1960: 29), Solonicyn (1962: 114-15), Davison (1967: 44-5, 62), Restan (1960: 102; accusative frequency 9%, n = 85), and Tsurikov (1967: 179). Green (1979: 173) does find the accusative in five examples out of twelve, but such an observation has no real statistical value; Butorin’s assertion (1953: 13) that 'both the genitive and the accusative' can be used has the appearance of a half-truth in the light of the evidence.

A preference as strong as this, combined with the availability of a substantial number of counter-examples, makes it tempting to analyse these ‘unusual’ cases in more detail in an attempt to discover in what sort of circumstances the less frequent choice is particularly acceptable. However, no obvious pattern emerges here, apart from the predictable fact that the accusative is somewhat more likely to appear with infinitives than with finite verb forms (and even the figures for clauses with infinitival constructions show a clear preference for the genitive).

One possible reason for the frequent use of *это* in the genitive might be that it tends to correspond semantically to abstract nouns, as pointed out by Tsurikov (1967: 81). However, the preference for the genitive is much stronger here than in the case of abstract nouns. As a possible explanation for this, it might be noted that *эта* often appears very frequently with verbs which tend to favour the genitive in any event: for example, *знать* (18 instances), *понимать* (20 instances), and *видеть / слышать / замечать* (11 instances altogether); none of these were found with the accusative form of this pronoun. One may be led to ask whether the genitive preference in these contexts might be connected with the verb rather than the pronoun itself; but the fact that nouns do sometimes appear in the accusative after these verbs seems to suggest that *это* probably has some special (presumably formal) characteristics which make its appearance in the accusative particularly unlikely. This impression can only be strengthened if one considers that *это*, by virtue of its basic meaning, carries a clear notion of definiteness; this would normally be a factor favouring the use of the accusative (though it might be objected that since *это* is explicitly definite, there is no need to indicate definiteness by choosing the accusative; cf. Factor 26:6).

One possible hypothesis could be that the form *это*, owing to its shortness and the fact that it seldom carries a strong stress, may be felt by speakers of Russian to be rhythmically awkward in certain positions. The possible relevance of factors connected with speech rhythm may be illustrated by the first example with an accusative above. As it stands, the sentence is ‘padded out’ with intensifying particles, and is well suited to the natural rhythm of Russian speech (in fact, it would even scan per-
fectly as poetry). However, if the particles уже and никак were removed, the rhythm would clearly suffer; and if faced with the choice Это/Этого не скроешь, most speakers would probably choose the genitive purely in order to insert an extra syllable for prosodic reasons.18

There may be other reasons for the genitive preference: for example, это as object frequently appears in clause-initial position, and in some such cases at least it could be speculated that, by choosing the genitive, the speaker/writer wishes instantly to signal to the listener/reader that this word is the object rather than the subject. Further hypotheses could no doubt be developed; but in any case the fact remains that the use of the accusative must, with certain qualifications, still be regarded as exceptional here.

Factor 2: мо

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>7 examples (16.7%)</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
<td>4 (36.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>35 examples (83.3%)</td>
<td>28 (90.3%)</td>
<td>7 (63.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Объяснительные записки не компенсируют тебе мо́, за чем ты пошёл в школу. [Розов]

Ни тебе, ни другим нельзя было разглядеть: ... [Залыгин]

никак не назвав мо, что с ними произошло и происходило.
[Орлов]

Examples with genitive:
... что он не сделал того, что хотел и мог. [Зорин]

Автор заметки не учёл того, что слово "полотно" многозначно.
[Калинин]

А того не знают, как этот бедный эту самую Дуньку тиранил?
[Абрамов]

The pronoun мо is acknowledged by many scholars to prefer the genitive: this view is taken by Uglitsky (1956: 386), Kout (1960: 29), Restan (1960: 102; accusative frequency 15%, n = 27), and Solonincyn (1962: 114-15). However, Butorin (1953:13) considers both cases equally possible; and Tsurikov (1967: 179) claims, in fact, that the accusative is usually preferred.

18 It might, of course, be objected that speakers of Russian are quite happy to use the form это in affirmative contexts where no other form is available; but this is no reason why this form should be equally attractive where there is a choice; and in any case, the very presence of negation affects sentence rhythm.

On the basis of our results, there can be little doubt that the genitive is the usual choice. A closer analysis does not reveal any factors that come anywhere near guaranteeing the use of the accusative; but one clear tendency does emerge. The pronoun мо is rarely used on its own: it may be used in expressions like мо или другое, as in the second accusative example above; but most frequently it is followed by an explicative subordinate clause (usually one introduced by the conjunction что, or else a subordinated question). Most often the sub-clause immediately follows мо; and it is in such contexts that the accusative can normally be found, though here, too, the preference for the genitive is clear enough. Sometimes, however, other constituents of the main clause come between мо and the sub-clause, as in the last example above; or the sub-clause may in colloquial speech precede the main clause, as in:

Ты чего не знаешь, того не говори. [Розов]

Evidently, when the pronoun is 'isolated' in this way, the form мо, owing to its shortness, is generally felt to be 'too insubstantial' to be rhythmically comfortable, and the genitive is used. There is one example in our corpus that seems to go against this:

A мо не знаете? [Софронов]

Here мо appears fully independently, which is a rare usage (it has been verified that мо is indeed a pronoun here, and not part of the conjunction a мо, which might also be a plausible interpretation out of context). However, the prosodic structure of this example is rather special in any case, and would be different if there were a sub-clause following. Thus, if we append the sentence from the context in which it occurs in Sofronov’s play, the result is this:

А того не знаете, кто у нас за качеством так наблюдает?

In the original, shorter version of the sentence, the pronoun receives a stronger stress than in the expanded version; and this probably makes мо acceptable. There is little doubt that того would be preferred in the latter version (cf. the last genitive example above, which is very similar). Thus, we need not abandon our overall hypothesis that prosodic factors are to a certain extent relevant to case choice with мо (as they probably are with это).

Factor 3: что

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>11 examples (21.2%)</td>
<td>7 (18.4%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>41 examples (78.8%)</td>
<td>31 (81.6%)</td>
<td>10 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples with accusative:
У меня была острая необходимость повидаться с вами и сказать то, что я не могу сказать Наташе. [Софронов]
Что сами не съедаем — продаем кооператорам или на городском рынке. [Спутник]
Только вывез оттуда все, что еще червь не сточил, ... [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:
Чего тут не понять? [Салынский]
Владимир видел то, чего не могли видеть с земли. [Спутник]
Он катастрофически заболевает, чего пока не знает никто, ... [Трифонов]

The most frequent use of что in the sample was as a relative pronoun: in this function it appeared in the accusative in 6 instances (25%), and in the genitive in 19 instances (cf. Factors 7:4 and 7:5). There is seemingly an even stronger preference for the genitive when что appears as an interrogative pronoun (including subordinated questions used in an explicative function): accusative 4 (16.7%), genitive 21. However, thirteen of the genitives (but only one accusative) are accounted for by rhetorical questions of the type discussed under Factor 2:4 (the type Чего только не ...); for the properly interrogative use, the figures are accusative 3, genitive 7. In addition to these, there was one example (genitive) in which что was used as a colloquial equivalent of что-то: ... не выбросили ли чего любопытного? [Васильев].

It seems that the genitive is obligatory in constructions of this type.

Factor 4: который

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>41 examples (89.1%)</td>
<td>14 (77.8%)</td>
<td>27 (96.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>5 examples (10.9%)</td>
<td>4 (22.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
В своих рисунках они создают образ родины, которую никогда не видели. [Спутник]
Но в последнее время появляется все больше данных о поверхности Луны, которые метеоритная теория объяснить не в состоянии. [Спутник]
в этой тетради оказалось стихотворение, которое прежде я никогда не встречал. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
... выступление арбатов-вольтижеров на лошадях — это жанр, которого не знала история мировой арены. [Спутник]
... изложил все подряд, правда без вводных, которых Уваров терпеть не мог ... [Спутник]

The relative pronoun который has usually been regarded as an accusative-favouring factor by those scholars who have commented upon it: Kout (1960: 29) is a notable dissenter, mentioning который as one in a group of pronouns that favour the genitive; but a high accusative frequency is noted by Butorin (1953: 13), Uglitsky (1956: 386), Restan (1960: 103; accusative 52%, n = 21), Solonicyn (1962: 114-15), Tsurikov (1967: 178), and Green (1979: 173).

Our figures indicate that the accusative is indeed clearly preferred: in fact, the accusative frequency is perhaps even higher than one would have expected on the basis of previous observations. The total figures would actually suggest that this factor is almost as powerful as это; this is evidently to some extent due to the frequent appearance of infinitival constructions, but in any case there is no doubt that the accusative is clearly favoured in most contexts. Moreover, a look at the examples in which the genitive was used suggests that a strong genitive-favouring factor is often needed to reverse the preference: among the five examples, there was one with the verb слышать (see pp. 84), two with 'existential' знать (p. 87), and one with терпеть (p. 85). It would also appear that the accusative is sometimes used in contexts where one would expect the corresponding noun to appear in the genitive.

Factor 5: что-нибудь, что-либо, что-то

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>6 examples (40.0%)</td>
<td>2 (18.2%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>9 examples (60.0%)</td>
<td>9 (81.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Ты не могла перепутать что-нибудь? [Салынский]
К чести ее, она и не пыталась выгадать у них что-либо, оставалась самой собой ... [Спутник]
Или я что-то не понимаю? [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:
... и к себе был требовательным: если не знал чего-либо, не стеснялся спрашивать других, ... [Спутник]
Чувствовал, что, если не предприму что-то, плохо дело кончится. [Спутник]
Кое-чего он совсем не знал, ...
These indefinite pronouns have attracted relatively little scholarly comment; but Uglitsky (1956: 386) and Tsurikov (1967: 179), while not suggesting a clear overall preference, both draw attention to the factor of definiteness, suggesting that the accusative is preferred when the speaker uses these pronouns to refer to something comparatively definite.

Although the total figures indicate a weaker preference for the genitive than for some other pronouns (including the 'parent' word что), no precise conclusions can be drawn as the figures are relatively small and accusatives were mainly found in connection with infinitives. Moreover, it is conceivable that the various pronouns in this group may not behave identically, as there are subtle differences in meaning between them: for example, at least when referring to past events, что-то tends to be 'more definite' than что-нибудь. However, if one attempts to examine the different pronouns separately, it becomes particularly clear that the size of the present sample is inadequate to allow meaningful observations. The figures are as follows: что-нибудь, accusative 2, genitive 2; что-либо, accusative 2, genitive 1; что-то, accusative 3, genitive 5; and кое-что, one example with a genitive. As for the factor of 'comparative definiteness', its possible relevance sounds plausible enough, but is difficult to prove (and would be even on the basis of a larger sample): with these pronouns, it seems next to impossible to arrive at an objective and reliable definition of what constitutes 'comparative definiteness'; and it would therefore be all too easy, if one were trying to prove a point, to resort (perhaps unconsciously) to artificial interpretations so as to make the facts fit one's preconceived theory.

**Factor 6: все**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>12 examples (48.0%)</td>
<td>6 (40.0%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>13 examples (52.0%)</td>
<td>9 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- Ты никогда не заведешь все. [Розов]
- Абсолютно все исследовать нельзя. [Караулов]
- И мотало его по объектам и бригадам, пока не перебрал он их все, что были в поселке. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:
- Соседней почвой всего не объяснишь ... [Салынский]
- ... он реагирует только на эти признаки и не воспринимает всего остального в той огромной акустической массе, ... [Аванесов]

Other scholars’ views on case usage here are to some degree contradictory: Butorin (1953: 13) states no preference either way; Uglitsky (1956: 387) asserts that все is 'rarer still in the accusative' than то, and Kout (1960: 29) agrees that the genitive is 'almost the norm'; but Solonicyn (1962: 114-15) notes that все is frequently found in the accusative, and actually likens it to который in this respect.

From our figures, it would appear that both cases are about equally frequent; in constructions without an infinitive, the genitive does appear to be favoured, but the preference is relatively weak. However, the frequency of the accusative is not nearly as high as with который. (It should be noted that the singular всё accounted for all but two of the occurrences of this pronoun as object; the plural все was found in one example with each case.)

As with это and то, clause rhythm may well play a role in determining the choice. Thus, for example, ве всего occurred in clause-initial position four times in our sample, whereas всё was not found at the absolute beginning of a clause in any of the examples; presumably, it would normally be felt to be too weak to appear in this position.

**Factor 7: Other pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>7 examples (43.8%)</td>
<td>5 (38.5%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>9 examples (56.2%)</td>
<td>8 (61.5%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
- Разве день моего рождения объявлен всенародным праздником? Даже твой не объявили. [Салынский]
- Когда нам не говорят такое, мы как цветы на грядке, раз-раз — и завяли ... [Софронов]
- Растения очень чувствительны к свету ..., улавливают столь малые дозы его, какие человеческий глаз не замечает. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
- Никогда таких не едал. [Петухов]
- Такого своей дочери я не позволю! [Спутник]

Most of the pronouns here are of the adjectival type (see below); but before dealing with these, one exception should be mentioned. In this example, case can be assigned to a personal pronoun on the basis of a modifier:
The Findings: VARIABLE 26: Premodifier connected to the object

В общем, именно на себя прежнюю она и махнула рукой, распро-шалась без сантиментов, а себя нынешнюю еще не знает. [Залыгин]

The remaining 'pronouns' in this group are, in fact, regarded as adjectives by those scholars who base their word-class divisions primarily on morphosyntactic factors. A more traditional position has been adopted here; but even if possessives like мой and words such as такой, какой are classified as pronouns, it is essential to note that they are definitely adjectival in function, as opposed to the 'substantival' pronouns (местоимения-существительные, in the terminology of the Academy Grammar) which have been dealt with above. Thus, when used independently, they typically appear in elliptical constructions, or in the neuter form with a generalized sense; in addition to this, какой can be used in a relative function.

There were four examples of elliptical uses: one accusative and three genitive. The neuter form такое in its generalized appeared three times in the accusative and five times in the genitive; there was also one similar occurrence, in the accusative, of свое.

**VARIABLE 26: Premodifier connected to the object**

If one accepts the view that the ambiguity factor may influence case selection (see Variable 22), the mere presence of a modifier agreeing with the direct object may in certain cases be a disambiguating factor and therefore relevant to the choice. Apart from this, however, there are more fundamental reasons why the presence of modifiers may be construed as a potentially significant factor.

It is evident, as noted by Timberlake (1975: 126), that most modifiers give a notion of definiteness to the noun that follows (or make it more 'individuated'); and a connection between the presence of such modifiers and the use of the accusative has been postulated by a number of scholars (Timberlake, ibid.; Uglitsky 1956: 383; Tsurikov 1975: 126). Many point out a preference for the accusative when the object has several premodifiers (Deribas 1956: 25; Kulagin 1959: 104; Solonicyn 1962: 113; Rozental’ 1985: 276). Specific types of modifiers are singled out by some scholars as accusative-favouring factors: Fleckenstein (1961: 217) mentions demonstrative and possessive pronouns, and these are also regarded by Tsurikov (ibid.) as particularly significant; while the Academy Grammar refers to 'pronouns indicating the definiteness of the object' (AG 1980-II: 417).

However, Safarewiczowa (1960: 109-26) found no significant difference in case usage between objects with and without premodification, the accusative frequency being 35.0% (n = 307) in the presence of modifiers, as compared with an average of 33.9%. Our figures present similar evidence: premodified nouns had an accusative frequency of 41.7% (n = 932), whereas the average accusative frequency for all nouns was 42.7% (n = 2302). This includes all types of premodification, and the figures do not therefore contradict all the views cited above; but they do seem to make it clear that the mere presence of premodifiers does not in itself influence case selection. It is clearly necessary to treat individually the various types of modifiers that may be found in this position (giving special attention to clauses with more than one premodifier).

Factor 1: One adjective or participle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>48 (37.2%)</td>
<td>81 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>215 (80.4%)</td>
<td>51 (19.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

И еще — не берите на себя комиссиарские функции. [Софронов]

14-летний Андрей не узнал родной город — всюду были страшные следы войны. [Спутник]

"Чего это она не наденет домашние туфли?" [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:

Не дали мне заслуженной славы мои ночные алмазные строки ... [Зорин]

— Тебе не жалко, детка? — перебил ее Гриша, и она не узнала Гришиного голоса. [Спутник]

Однако дальнейшие беседы советского посла с Гопкинсом и с другими представителями американского правительства положительных результатов не дали. [Спутник]

Contrary to what has been suggested by some scholars, the genitive frequency appears, in fact, to be somewhat higher than average. Thus, a single adjective is apparently not an accusative-favouring factor; but see Factor 2 below for groups of two or more adjectives. (Ordinal numerals, which are quite reasonably classified as adjectives by many scholars, are nonetheless treated separately as Factor 3 for semantic reasons.)

Factor 2: Two or more adjectives/participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11 (40.7%)</td>
<td>16 (59.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27 (79.4%)</td>
<td>7  (20.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Findings: VARIABLE 26: Premodifier connected to the object

Examples with accusative:

И совсем непростительно, что при написании этих слов исследователи опускают самый нужный элемент, не ставят восклицательный и вопросительный знак после вторых компонентов приведенных пар слов. [Аванесов]

Ни одно из литературных произведений того времени так полно и ярко не отразило живую разговорную речь тогдашнего московского дворянства. [Мещерский]

Создать идеальный безопасный автомобиль еще никому не удалось. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... но все это не нарушает указанного эмпирического способа определения наличия или отсутствия значения. [Звегинцев]

Правда, что птица не знает человеческих — моральных, психологических и государственных — границ. [Солоухин]

All the clauses in this group have two modifiers preceding the object, but the relationship between these may vary: they may be coordinated (with or without a coordinating conjunction), both having a similar connection with the object; or they may differ in status, the first modifier relating to the collocation formed by the second modifier and the object.

Although the accusative frequency is not significantly higher than the average figure for all nouns, the accusative does appear to be a likelier choice here than with a single premodifying adjective. Moreover, constructions of this type occur most frequently in relatively formal contexts: more than 50% of our examples were found in scholarly texts; and considering the fact that the objects tended to be relatively abstract, it seems reasonably clear that there is a certain preference for the accusative (though possibly not a very strong one). The reason for the difference between one adjective and a group of adjectives is open to speculation; the possibility that the distance between the negated verb and the object might be of some relevance (cf. Fleckenstein 1961: 217, Mustajoki 1985: 93-4) certainly cannot be discounted.

Factor 3: Ordinal numeral, with or without adjective following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>5 examples (62.5%)</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
<td>2 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>5 examples (37.5%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Еще два раза слышал Изгин лязг металла. Четвертый капкан так и не нашел. [Спутник]

The Findings: VARIABLE 26: Premodifier connected to the object

Первую попавшуюся березу обламывать ни в коем случае нельзя. [Спутник]

Мигулин поехал в Питер с наказом от станичников, чтоб вторую и третью очереди не тянули; ... [Трифонов]

Examples with genitive:

Сотой доли рассказать не успею. [Розов]

Фотография не передает и тысячной доли того, что изображено ... [Софронов]

Спасский и Керес еще не сделали 11-го хода (жертва коня) ... [Спутник]

The number of examples is small, but it may be indicative that there was only one occurrence of the genitive with ал object other than доля: the first two examples are special cases, with the combination of ordinal numeral + доля representing a vulgar fraction, and with the meaning 'not even' either stated or implied; the accusative would clearly be completely out of place here. On the other hand, some of the accusative examples do contain elements which, while not necessitating the use of the accusative, certainly make it relatively likely: apart from two infinitival constructions, пока не and так и each appeared in one clause.

Finally, it may be noted in passing that in the last example with an accusative above, the accusative seems to be the only acceptable choice if the noun is to be in the plural form: the use of the genitive (чтоб второй и третий очереди не тянули) results in a highly inelegant construction which most speakers would definitely wish to avoid. Of course, the singular could also be used in spite of the noun having plural reference; here the object could perfectly well appear in either case.

Factor 4: такой

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>27 examples (45.0%)</td>
<td>9 (25.0%)</td>
<td>18 (69.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>33 examples (55.0%)</td>
<td>25 (75.0%)</td>
<td>8 (30.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Не шути, Федор Григорьевич, милиция такие шутки не любит. [Вампилов]

Однако эти факты свидетельствуют не о том, что различие в фонемах не разделает такие слова, а о том, что в языке существуют дублирующие дифференциальные средства. [Лотмев]

Она сказала, что такие галстуки, как у меня, уже не носят. [Спутник]
The Findings: VARIABLE 26: Premodifier connected to the object

Examples with genitive:
Мне ведь он такого стихотворения не написал. [Розов]
"Насколько нам известно, никто в мире такой попытки еще не предпринимал"— говорит Лев Желонкин. [Спутник]
Но только старательность и терпение не дали бы таких результатов без фантазии, изобретательности. [Спутник]

The figures do not show a significant deviation from the average distribution, particularly since the number of infinitival constructions is relatively large. In any case, this premodifier could hardly be assumed to favour the accusative, as it has, in fact, a generalizing function. However, this does not lead to a particularly strong preference for the genitive, probably because the generalization expressed by такой applies to a specific group of objects (cf. такие шутки = шутки этого типа); in other words, definiteness and generalization are combined in an interesting way (one might describe this as generalization within the framework of definiteness). What seems to be an important factor in determining the choice is whether the clause as a whole has implications of non-existence: where this is the case, the genitive is preferred.

Factor 5: такой + adjective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>5 examples</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>6 examples</td>
<td>6 (85.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Как же с ней говорить об умственном подъёме, когда она такие простые вопросы, как подъём животноводства, не понимает? [Софронов]
что столько людей не могут разгадать такие, казалось бы, простые трюки, ... [Спутник]
Без централизованных ассигнований она не смогла бы сама ни начать, ни продолжить такое дорогое строительство. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
К сожалению, не слышал такого устного предложения. [Софронов]
Такого бурного развития, как эти нефтяные корабли, не переживает ни один из известных ныне типов кораблей. [Спутник]
Я среду не видел таких огромных, таких раздувшихся рюкзаков. [Солоухин]

In some of its uses, this construction has little in common semantically with такой directly followed by a noun: in a phrase like такое дорогое строительство, такое is perceived as modifying дорогое, but having no direct link with строительство; this could be represented as '(такой + Adj) + N'. On the other hand, the interpretation такой + (Adj + N) is certainly applicable in some contexts — this is quite obvious in the first example with the genitive above, owing to the semantic properties of the adjective. Moreover, in many instances both interpretations are available, the difference between them losing much of its significance (in the first two accusative examples, for instance, it does not ultimately matter very much which reading we prefer). In any event, this construction is probably best considered separately from такой + noun.

At least in the absence of infinitival constructions, the genitive appears to be much more frequent than the accusative. Most of the examples are ones in which the most likely interpretation of the relationship between the words would be (такой + Adj) + N. It may be noted that this is an emphatic construction, and as such likely to increase the force of negation; it is therefore not surprising that the genitive tends to be preferred.

Factor 6: этот (with or without adjective following)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>58 examples</td>
<td>21 (44.7%)</td>
<td>37 (90.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>30 examples</td>
<td>26 (55.3%)</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
На, и больше никогда не оставляй у меня эту штуку. [Вампиолов]
... стала вдумываться в смысл заявки, бланк которой Никандров там и здесь исчеркал цветными фломастерами, и не поняла этот исчерканный бланк. [Залыгин]

Examples with genitive:
Тамара Тимофеевна, милая, не устраивайте вы этой глупой засады! [Розов]
Разночтения к данному месту показывают, что и остальные писцы не воспринимали этого слова. [Мещерский]
... ураган, пронесшийся несколько дней назад здесь, в подземелье, не задел этого закутка. [Спутник]

The pronominal adjective этот is a clear indicator of definiteness, and it is therefore not surprising that the accusative is relatively popular. However, as is clearly revealed especially if one looks at the figures for clauses without an infinitival construction, the genitive is frequently preferred; and the infinitive factor appears to have influenced the total
figures to a greater extent than is usual. It may be that the definiteness factor in itself is not strong enough to have a more widespread influence; but one must also consider the possibility that, since the notion of definiteness is explicit in the premodifier, users of the language may not always feel the need to express it in the form of the object as well (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 93).

The construction "этот + adjective + noun may be treated together with "этот + noun, for unlike with "такой, the pattern here is always "этот + (Adj + N). (The same applies to "том, весь, and "один below.) There were thirteen examples with a premodifying adjective between "этот and the object: eight with accusative, five with genitive.

Factor 7: "том (with or without adjective following)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>6 examples (46.2%)</td>
<td>7 examples (53.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>5 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

К тому же время не пошадит то прекрасное лицо, которое ты изваял на Красной планете. [Спутник]

Не счешь, никакой мерой не вымерить то зло и горе, которое причинил ей Егорша. [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

Хотя последнее предложение истинно, но оно не содержит той информации, которую содержало первое предложение. [Ломтев]

Но и добившись власти, мы все равно не сумеем дать детям тех преимуществ, которыми сами, увы, не обладаем. [Спутник]

Она отметила, что не замечает в себе того чувства, которое можно было бы назвать чувством любви ... [Залыгин]

The figures provide no evidence of a clear preference either way; but note the influence of infinitival constructions. There were three clauses with the construction "том + adjective + noun; the accusative was used in all of these, and both occurrences of the accusative in the absence of an infinitival construction were of this type.

Factor 8: "весь (with or without adjective following)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>14 examples (50.0%)</td>
<td>14 examples (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>7 (43.8%)</td>
<td>9 (56.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>7 (58.3%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Именно потому, что логическими пресуппозициями невозможно описать всю совокупность отношений "естественных текстов"... [Звегинцев]

Несмотря на то что из ее сознания почти ни на минуту не исчезал Василий Никандрович, она не связывала все происшедшие перемены только с ним. [Залыгин]

Понимаешь, сынок, турист все едино сюда проникнет, потому как весь лес не огородишь, а один я не успею. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:

Не могу пересмотреть всех точностей. [Салынский]

... их использование не является последовательным и не охватывает всего фразеологического состава испанского языка, ... [Караулов]

Но ни авторы проекта, ни сами строители не могли предвидеть всех неожиданных препятствий, которые ожидали их. [Спутник]

The accusative frequency is very close to the average for all nouns. There might be grounds for expecting an accusative preference: the meaning of "весь precludes the notion of partitivity frequently associated with the genitive; and it might also be regarded as reducing the scope of negation ('not all' having the implication 'some'). However, it seems that the contrast between that part of the object which is affected by the action, and the part which is not, may in fact add to the force of negation, thus making the use of the genitive equally acceptable.

It may also be interesting that the construction "весь + adj. + noun appeared four times with a genitive but only once with an accusative; although this could easily be accidental, it accords badly with the theory that multiple premodification is an accusative-favouring factor.

Factor 9: Possessive pronoun  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>69 examples (52.7%)</td>
<td>62 examples (47.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>31 (37.8%)</td>
<td>51 (62.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>38 (77.6%)</td>
<td>11 (22.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Нельзя употреблять в тексте диалектики редкие, не облегчая их понимание читателю ... [Калинин]

— Чего кричать-то? Не утащили твою козу, не беспокойся. [Розов]

Работая в ужасных условиях, он в опасные, трагические дни не покидал свой пост. [Спутник]
The Findings: VARIABLE 26: Premodifier connected to the object

Examples with genitive:
... и они, остановившись в дверях, ничем не выдают своего присутствия. [Вампилов]
... что не снижает, на наш взгляд, ее эффективности. [Караулов]
Спасибо "Спутнику" за то, что он не обманывает наших ожиданий. [Спутник]

The accusative frequency is clearly above average; and it is quite evidently true that the presence of a modifier of this type gives the noun a greater degree of definiteness. However, the factor of concreteness/abstractness, along with the infinitive factor and others, may well be of greater importance.

**Factor 10: Possessive pronoun + adjective**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>16 exemplars (38.1%)</td>
<td>6 (23.1%)</td>
<td>10 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>26 exemplars (61.9%)</td>
<td>20 (76.9%)</td>
<td>6 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
Лифт и уборка мою главную квалификацию не испортили ... [Салынский]
Остатки ужина не смогли удовлетворить его молодой appetit, ... [Спутник]
... ей не дано было разумно экономить свои внутренние силы в турнирной борьбе ... [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:
Компонентный анализ еще не выработал своих строгих процедур ... [Звегинцев]
... нельзя пройти мимо вопроса, который не нашел своего окончательного решения. [Аванесов]
Однако комедии не исчерпали его творческих сил. [Спутник]

As the majority of objects were abstract (appearing, in particular, in scholarly texts, which were the source of nearly half the examples), it is understandable that the accusative should not be particularly frequent, and this does not necessarily mean that this factor is in itself a genitive-favouring one. However, it certainly seems clear that multiple premodification here does not cause the accusative to be preferred (though one cannot be certain whether its influence is non-existent, or just frequently overruled by other factors).

**Factor 11: один**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>4 exemplars (18.2%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
<td>3 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>18 exemplars (81.8%)</td>
<td>13 (92.9%)</td>
<td>5 (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example with accusative:
Вам не удастся затеять еще один разговор до утра. [Дворецкий]

Examples with genitive:
Но одной штуки ты все же не рассчитал. [Софронов]
... она не перестает быть серией однородных предложений и не образует одного сложного предложения. [Ломтев]

Included in this group are most of those clauses containing the intensifier ни один (see Factor 4:1); and these constitute a clear majority within the group. There were only six clauses with один as a non-intensifying premodifier; these are illustrated by the examples given above. The accusative was used in no more than one of these six clauses, but evidently other factors (notably the abstractness of the objects) were more significant in determining the choice.

**Factor 12: Other cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>34 exemplars (42.5%)</td>
<td>16 (28.6%)</td>
<td>18 (71.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>46 exemplars (57.5%)</td>
<td>40 (71.4%)</td>
<td>6 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:
В этом ряду отношений выражение "какую хочешь" имеет обще- личное значение, оно не предполагает тот же субъект, который представлен при другом глаголе. [Ломтев]
Я не понимаю саму идею. [Спутник]
... потому что озадаченный собеседник никак не может подобрать подходящую к внешности специальность, которая допускала бы надомничество. [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:
И ни одна страна не внесла в эти перемены более весомого вклада, чем Союз Советских Социалистических Республик ... [Спутник]
Можно было бы сказать, что авторы не учили некоторых случаев употребления интересующей вас предложной конструкции. [Ломтев]
Но нельзя уехать из гор ... не ощутив податливого, крупно-зернистого, слегка подтаивающего сверху, но никогда не таящего снега под широким и тяжелым своим ботинком. [Солоухин]
This group includes clauses containing various types of premodifying constructions which do not fit the above classification. Some of the most frequent types are illustrated above: these include certain 'pronominal adjectives' not dealt with above, and expanded constructions with premodifying adjectives or participles, as, for example, in the last accusative example. Few conclusions can be drawn about the group as a whole. However, it may be noted that in a number of instances the premodifying constructions were relatively lengthy; but no significant preference for the accusative was apparent in such cases. Examples like the last one quoted above are particularly convincing evidence that even the most elaborate premodifying structures by no means necessitate the use of the accusative.

**VARIABLE 27: Postmodifier connected to the object**

Postmodifying constructions, like premodifying ones, frequently make the object 'more definite'; and a preference for the accusative would therefore not be surprising. References to comments made by other scholars will be found under the relevant factors.

**Factor 1: Postmodifier in the genitive case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>169 examples (45.9%)</td>
<td>59 (26.2%)</td>
<td>110 (76.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>199 examples (54.1%)</td>
<td>166 (73.8%)</td>
<td>33 (23.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

*По всей генеративной грамматике сама по себе не предписывает характер или функционирование модели восприятия или модели производства речи. [Звегинцев]*
*Внешняя политика США не отражает волю американского народа. [Спутник]*
*Этот простой мотив исчезновения, столь хорошо знакомый, мать почему-то никак не связывала с Марией Адольфовной. [Трифонов]*

Examples with genitive:

*множество интервалов абсолютного времени не нарушают тождества интервала времени функционирования противопоставленности звонких и глухих согласных в структуре языка. [Ломтев]*
*Ведь такого количества гидроэнергии на душу населения не вырабатывает ни одна страна мира ... [Спутник]*
*Шум, смех, звон посуды — никто не заметил ухода Павла Евграфовича, ... [Трифонов]*

The presence of a postmodifying genitive as such does not seem to have much influence on the case choice; however, one may point out that the notion of definiteness which it usually brings about may be of varying degrees, depending on contextual factors. A more detailed investigation might therefore be profitable.

As far as the stylistic factor is concerned, it is certainly conceivable that some users of the language may feel the need to avoid the genitive in certain contexts where further genitives follow, particularly when the words concerned are of the same morphological type. The following sentence, for example, would sound rather awkward with yet another masculine noun in the genitive singular:

*Почему вы не заняли пост начальника цеха? [Дворецкий]*

although it is not clear whether euphony was the main reason for choosing the accusative, definiteness for one being another strong candidate. However, our results do seem to indicate that we can hardly postulate a general rule dictating the use of the accusative: we found thirty-two occurrences of genitive objects postmodified by at least two interrelated nouns in the genitive; the accusative was used in nineteen such cases (37.3%; the figures do not include constructions like ноты композитора Переслегина, where the first genitive is in apposition to the second). On the whole, it seems that the choice in such circumstances is usually determined by other factors; and the first genitive example above, while its stylistic elegance may well be in doubt, is certainly good evidence that even a lengthy string of genitives can easily be produced by a competent writer.

**Factor 2: Relative clause**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>15 examples (55.6%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
<td>11 (73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>12 examples (44.4%)</td>
<td>8 (66.7%)</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples with accusative:

Я думаю, можно успешно создавать новый промышленно-экономический комплекс, электростанцию, все, что угодно, и при этом не уничтожать почву, на которой мы стоим. [Салынский]

Из сказанного становится понятным, почему имена отношений не покрывают все 691 множитель, которые ... [Караулов]

Корягу, которую с таким трудом приволок на себе Валерий Георгиевич, мы Сжечь не успели. [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

Хотя последнее предложение истинно, но оно не содержит той информации, которую содержало первое предложение. [Ломтев]

... Тело мое становится упругим, я не чувствую тяжести, которая давит на меня. [Спутник]

... не могли предвидеть всех неожиданных препятствий, которые ожидали их. [Спутник]

Ravič (1971: 264) and the Academy Grammar (AG 1980-II: 471) suggest that an object followed by a relative clause with the relative pronoun который is likely to occur in the accusative as the relative clause makes the noun more definite. Such a theory seems entirely reasonable; but our results offer little support for it, considering the frequency of infinitival constructions. Other factors, particularly the abstractness of the objects, are evidently weightier. (The second example with an accusative can probably be seen as another illustration of the occasional influence of morphological factors seemingly unconnected to the problem under consideration. A figure like 691 obviously refers to a large number of objects, and the premodifier все therefore naturally appears in the plural; yet Russian compound numerals with один as the last element are morphologically singular and this means that the following noun must also appear in a singular form. Even with the accusative, the resultant construction is inevitably somewhat awkward; an attempt to use the genitive would, however, create even greater problems.)

Factor 3: Participial construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>6 examples (37.5%)</td>
<td>10 examples (62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
<td>9 (75.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>3 (75.0%)</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Мы поэтому не принимаем критерий, выставленный Е. С. Истриной, для определения того, что ... [Ломтев]

Examples with genitive:

"Информация о конъюнкциях признаков используется в том смысле, что мы не можем игнорировать ни один признак, указанный в определении значения термина." [Караулов]

... писатели не обходят вниманием трудности и недостатки, тормозящие прогрессивные процессы развития. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

которое, однако, в общем строе не содержит информации, заключенной в предложении "x= у". [Ломтев]

Вряд ли можно думать, что человечество ... будет наблюдать за отрицательными изменениями в биосфере, не принимая новых решений, кардинально меняющих положение. [Спутник]

Пес едва шевельнул хвостом, но даже морды, опущенной на лапы, не поднял. [Трифонов]

Functionally equivalent to relative clauses, participial constructions may also be seen as characterizing the object more explicitly and therefore making it more definite. Here, however, there is definitely no preference for the accusative to be detected on the basis of our material; though one may note that such constructions tend to appear in literary contexts, the objects being most frequently abstract.

Factor 4: Prepositional phrase or adverb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>34 examples (39.5%)</td>
<td>52 examples (60.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>13 (21.0%)</td>
<td>49 (79.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>21 (87.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Но, с другой стороны, общество это не смогло продолжить борьбу против Шишкова в силу своей внутренней неоднородности ... [Мещерский]

Жена не дала мне ключ от гаража. [Спутник]

А не принять ли нам, ребята, душ изнутри, а? [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

Не допускает же подобных манипуляций над предложениями дикурс. [Звегинцев]

Они воздействуют прежде всего на тех родителей, которые не выполняют обязанностей по воспитанию. [Спутник]

Недостатка в мое не испытывали ни зимовщики (Саша с женой), ни огромный и свирепый беркут, ... [Солоухин]

Constructions of this type with a prepositional phrase as postmodifier are regarded by Timberlake (1975: 126) as favouring the accusative. Our results, however, do not support this view; in fact, the accusative is
somewhat less frequent than on average. Evidently, while Timberlake is right in saying that a noun followed by such a postmodifier is 'characterized more explicitly', this explicitness does not in this particular case normally affect the degree of defmiteness of the object (at least not to a significant extent).

Sometimes the grammatical status of a prepositional phrase is subject to interpretation. Thus, in the following example, the prepositional phrase with без was treated as an adverbial of manner, and the clause was therefore not included in the present group:

Виктор Гаврилович помидоры без постного масла ну ни в коем случае не ест ... [Софронов];

but it must be acknowledged that the contrary interpretation would have to be considered equally possible, the difference between the two readings being irrelevant to communication. In the vast majority of cases, however, there is a clear-cut distinction between prepositional phrases functioning as postmodifiers on the one hand, and as clause adverbials on the other (see Variable 31).

Apart from prepositional phrases, certain types of adverbs may also act as postmodifiers (as in the last accusative example above, where the expression 'internal shower' refers to an alcoholic drink); and constructions like бобъба с тем, что ... were also included here. However, prepositional phrases constituted the vast majority of the postmodifying constructions in this group.

Factor 5: Other cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without inf.</th>
<th>With inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18 (24.7%)</td>
<td>14 (43.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55 (75.3%)</td>
<td>18 (56.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

А. Мартине не рекомендует учитывать случаи, когда с помощью различия в одной фонаеме отделяются слова, принадлежащие различным частям речи, ... [Ломтев]

... в соответствии с которым нельзя префикс "вы-" представить в форме "ыв-"... [Звегинцев]

И на второй год силу свою не показала. [Абрамов]

Examples with genitive:

Когда бы я ни выступал в роли обвинителя, я никогда не получал у него того, что просил. [Дворецкий]

Тем более никто не дает им права просиживать рабочее время ... [Софронов]

This group includes various types of postmodifying constructions which do not fit any of the groups dealt with above; the examples illustrate the most frequent types. The genitive frequency is relatively high; but this is to a notable extent due to a strong preference for the genitive in certain constructions where the postmodifier is an infinitive (such as не дает право/возможности/основания + inf. — here the preference is clearly due to other factors). The total figures for objects with a postmodifying infinitive were accusative 4, genitive 20; the accusative was never found in the above-mentioned expressions with дать.

Other typical constructions included the following: 'postponed pre-modifiers', i.e. words normally appearing in front of the noun they modify (placing these after the noun is a typical characteristic of colloquial speech, and not infrequent in literary usage): accusative 13, genitive 24; relative clauses with the relative pronoun что (as opposed to который), the antecedent being usually a pronoun but occasionally a noun: accusative 5, genitive 10; and noun phrases with appositive constructions such as префикс "вы-": accusative 6, genitive 7. Evidently, where the object is a noun which is comparatively individuated, the accusative is quite frequent; but even in such cases it is hardly preferred with any degree of consistency.

The Subject

Factors connected with the subject have generally not been commented upon by scholars in connection with the problem under consideration; and, indeed, it seems intuitively unlikely that the subject could have much influence on case selection, with the exception of some special contexts (see Schaller 1978: 122-4). However, subject words of different types, and modifiers connected to the subject, will be briefly considered here, if only to make the description as comprehensive as possible; this might also help future scholars to decide whether there are any individual factors connected with the subject that it might be advisable to take into account, or whether it is reasonably safe to dismiss the subject completely as irrelevant to case selection.

VARIABLE 28: Type of subject word

The table below shows the figures for clauses with different types of
subject, or with no subject at all. All clauses were placed in one of the following categories:

- **Group 1:** Infinitival construction without a semantic subject
- **Group 2:** Semantic subject (appearing in the dative) connected to a modal word or independent infinitive
- **Group 3:** Subject not overtly expressed, but implied by the form of the predicate verb
- **Group 4:** Personal pronoun
- **Group 5:** Other pronoun or numeral
- **Group 6:** Concrete noun (other than proper name)
- **Group 7:** Abstract noun
- **Group 8:** Proper name

### The Findings: VARIABLE 28: Type of subject word

The figures for groups 3, 4, 6, and 8 only show minor deviations from the average figures; and it is probably safe to say that these four groups can be instantly dismissed as ones which do not affect case selection. The same also applies to groups 1 and 2: considering that all the clauses in these groups contain infinitival constructions, the figures are very close to what one would expect (the average accusative frequency for clauses with an infinitive being 68.5%).

Group 5 shows a more significant deviation from the average figures; but even here it is probably best to avoid rash conclusions. The high genitive frequency may be attributable to other factors: for example, the proportion of examples from scholarly texts is somewhat higher in this group than in most others. (See Factor 29:1 for a brief discussion of certain constructions in this group which intensify or generalize the negation.)

As for group 7, there is obviously a fairly strong preference for the genitive, and in purely statistical terms this factor would appear to be significant. However, its influence might well be assumed to be at best of an indirect nature: a clause with an abstract subject is extremely likely also to have an abstract object, and in such circumstances the genitive is naturally likely to be preferred. Still, it might be reasonable to argue that the more abstract the context is as a whole, the greater the chance of the object appearing in the genitive: thus, the combination ‘abstract subject + abstract object’ might be more likely to yield the genitive than ‘concrete subject + abstract object’. Intuitively, this hypothesis may not seem particularly attractive; but if we try to test it on the present data, the following results emerge:

- **Concrete subject + abstract object:** acc. 80 (35.7%), gen. 144
- **Abstract subject + abstract object:** acc. 39 (13.8%), gen. 243

Concrete subjects were deemed to include groups 6 and 8 above. It must, of course, be remembered that our definitions of abstract and concrete may be regarded as controversial (and the criteria used here were in fact different in the case of subjects and objects). Thus, although the present figures certainly do not allow one to reject the hypothesis, more rigorous testing procedures must clearly be applied before any firm conclusions are drawn. The difference in the figures might, for example, be connected with the types of predicate verb that typically collocate with concrete subjects on the one hand and abstract ones on the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td>218 (70.8%)</td>
<td>90 (29.2%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td>35 (66.0%)</td>
<td>18 (34.0%)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td>300 (36.9%)</td>
<td>512 (63.1%)</td>
<td>211 (31.0%)</td>
<td>469 (69.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4</td>
<td>276 (42.7%)</td>
<td>381 (57.3%)</td>
<td>141 (31.1%)</td>
<td>313 (68.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 5</td>
<td>52 (32.7%)</td>
<td>107 (67.3%)</td>
<td>28 (22.0%)</td>
<td>99 (78.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 6</td>
<td>114 (43.8%)</td>
<td>146 (56.2%)</td>
<td>55 (30.4%)</td>
<td>126 (69.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 7</td>
<td>58 (17.0%)</td>
<td>284 (83.0%)</td>
<td>34 (11.6%)</td>
<td>259 (88.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 8</td>
<td>51 (55.9%)</td>
<td>91 (44.1%)</td>
<td>25 (25.8%)</td>
<td>72 (74.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

where the subject appears in another clause and is carried over to the clause under consideration without being repeated in it (or represented by a pronoun). Secondly, a binary classification of concrete and abstract nouns was used, with the criterion of tangibility regarded as decisive; it would seem that the shortcomings of such a classification, discussed on p. 148-9, are not likely to have particularly serious consequences here. Certain liberties were also taken in the classification of adjectives appearing in the subject position in elliptical constructions: these were grouped with either concrete or abstract nouns, depending on the semantic nature of their referents.
VARIABLE 29: Intensifier or modifier connected to the subject

As was seen under Variables 3 and 4, intensifies attached to the object or the verb evidently influence case selection; and the same may be true of certain other modifiers. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether such intensifiers and modifiers also have some significance when they relate to the subject; however, it seems obvious that their influence is certainly not going to be as great as that of intensifiers and other modifiers connected to the verb or the object, and therefore the treatment has been kept as brief as possible.

Factor 1: никакой, ни один, ни ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>9 examples</td>
<td>15 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>3 (21.4%)</td>
<td>11 (78.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Причем ни один диктор последовательно не реализовал эканье. [Аванесов]

... что ни традиционная грамматика, ни логика в готовом виде не дают нам систему категорий, ... [Звегинцев]

... Самолет уже не могли спасти никакие меры. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

... ни диалектные материалы, ни старописьменные тексты не обнаруживают следов более древнего состояния парадигмы. [Аванесов]

... и никакое увеличение корпуса не дает пополнения этих правил. [Звегинцев]

Вероятно, ни один дескриптор не может реализовать всего набора отношений ... [Караулов]

All of these premodifiers are ones which intensify or at least emphasize the negation; when they relate to the object, there is a clear preference for the genitive (cf. Strong Factor 4, and Factors 4:1 and 4:2). It is therefore reasonable to ask whether they have any impact on case selection when modifying the subject.

The figures above are of little statistical value; but one may also consider in this connection those clauses in which the subject is ни кто, ничто, or ни один in one of its independent uses (appearing in the construction ни один из(+ gen.), or elliptically on its own). The combined figures for all these different manifestations of generalized or intensified negation are as follows: accusative 37 (39.8%), genitive 56. It seems reasonably clear, then, that intensified negation within the sphere of the subject is not normally a significant factor — though one may wish to be wary of completely discounting the possibility that it might on rare occasions affect the semantics of the whole clause to such an extent as to be at least a contributory factor favouring the genitive.

Factor 2: этот

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>7 examples</td>
<td>23 examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without inf.</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>21 (87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with inf.</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>2 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

... и так как сам народ не воспринимает всерьез подобного рода подделки. [Мещерский]

... что столько людей не могут разгадать такие, казалось бы, простые трюки, ... [Спутник]
Examples with genitive:

Но такие примеры не составляют общего правила в древнейших русских памятниках. [Ломтев]
Естественно, один пример еще не дает оснований для заключения обо всех дефинициях. ... [Караулов]

This heterogeneous group shows a low accusative frequency; but it looks unlikely that the subject modifiers themselves could have much relevance to case selection. As with этот, it is evident that many of these modifiers are particularly likely to occur in contexts where the genitive would be the expected choice for other reasons. There were no sub-groups or individual premodifiers within this category that could plausibly be asserted to influence case selection.

Syntactic factors

VARIABLE 30: Word order

Many scholars have suggested that inverted word order (object before verb) is a factor favouring the accusative; this view is taken by Magner (1955: 535, with specific reference to the spoken language), Uglitsky (1956: 383), Deribas (1956: 25), Fleckenstein (1961: 218), Listvinov (1965: 192), Tsurikov (1967: 183), Popova (1973: 36), Timberlake (1975: 126), and Graudina et al. (1976: 36). However, the evidence from earlier quantitative studies is contradictory: Safarewiczowa (1960: 109-26) found a 38.8% accusative frequency with inversion (n = 201; average 33.9%); but in Restan's study the accusative frequency was 35.2% with inversion (n = 603) and 40.5% with direct word order (n = 2173). Green (1979: 179) found a 46.3% accusative frequency (n = 67), as opposed to 29.1% on average; but Haka's figures do not show a significant difference (41.1% with inversion, n = 280; average 38.2%). Some scholars have explicitly stated that this factor is of little if any significance (e.g. Kulagin 1959: 103).

If one considers only the mutual relationship of the verb and the object, our results are as follows (excluding clauses in which the object comes between an infinitive and its headword):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V before O</td>
<td>702 (38.2%)</td>
<td>1134 (61.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O before V</td>
<td>37 (41.8%)</td>
<td>469 (58.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between these two basic types of word order is definitely significant when the influence of the infinitive factor is eliminated. However, before drawing any conclusions, it seems advisable to conduct a more detailed analysis by also considering the position of the subject (if any) in relation to the verb and the object. This gives the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVO</td>
<td>360 (34.4%)</td>
<td>688 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>12 (40.0%)</td>
<td>18 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOS</td>
<td>4 (21.1%)</td>
<td>15 (78.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VO</td>
<td>326 (44.1%)</td>
<td>413 (55.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOV</td>
<td>59 (28.4%)</td>
<td>149 (71.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>76 (44.2%)</td>
<td>96 (55.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>11 (34.4%)</td>
<td>21 (65.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVS</td>
<td>191 (48.4%)</td>
<td>203 (51.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples (one accusative and one genitive for each type of word order):

SVO
Я не учу слова. Я запоминаю роль, когда уже живу жизнью человека, которого буду играть на сцене. [Спутник]
Мне жаль, что я не слышал всего процесса. [Дворецкий]

VSO
Видеть не могу я это мясо, а не то что варить. [Абрамов]
Не найдешь ты счастья, батя, пока главному не обучишься. [Салынский]

VOS
Не затопит ли шахты вода, не завалит ли их породой, ... [Спутник]
Не допускает же подобных манипуляций над предложениями дискурс. [Звегинцев]

VO
... во-первых, чтобы не травмировать их психику, во-вторых, чтобы не отталкивать их от себя. [Спутник]
Не повторите прежних ошибок. [Зорин]

SOV
Ладно, иди — я дверь не закрою. [Розов]
The Findings: VARIABLE 30: Word order

The SOV word order type may in fact be even closer to the V...O type than the total figures would suggest, for apart from the infinitive factor it is necessary to consider the influence of 3mo(ce) as object. This powerful genitive-favouring factor frequently co-occurs with O...V patterns, including SOV; and if such clauses are excluded, the total accusative frequencies are 38.7% for V...O, 38.2% for SOV, and 49.5% for other O...V patterns.

It is clear, then, that the accusative is significantly more frequent when the object appears in initial position than with other word order types. On the question of why this should be the case, two different schools of thought exist. Some scholars support the view, first expressed by Peškovskij (1938: 278), that when the word order is inverted the speaker, when uttering the object word, may not yet be fully conscious of the fact (‘может не держать еще в уме’) that the verb is going to be negated; this explanation has been favoured e.g. by Magnér (1955: 536), Listvinov (1965: 192), Popova (1973: 69), and Papp (1977: 479); but it has been criticized by Korn (1967: 496), Timberlake (1975: 126), and Mustajoki (1985: 96). Other scholars (e.g. Tsurikov 1967: 148) believe that the object receives special emphasis in clause-initial position and is likely to have a higher degree of definiteness. Both of these theories may be subjected to powerful counter-arguments (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 98-7); the first one in particular may be regarded as being highly implausible — and in any case not applicable to the written language. However, there may well be some truth in the ‘special emphasis’ theory: while initial position clearly does not guarantee extra emphasis, it is probably true that an object in clause-initial position is more likely to be strongly stressed than one coming towards the end of the clause.

Apart from this, inverted word order may sometimes create situations in which one case or the other is preferred for communicative reasons. Thus, as pointed out at the end of the commentary on Variable 22, the need to use an unambiguous form in cases of homonymy could be at

---

19 Even with reference to authentic speech it would need to be modified: cf. Mustajoki (1985: 96).

its most pressing in clause-initial position, where few (if any) contextual clues are available to the reader/listener to help them determine whether the noun is singular or plural. On the other hand, other communicative needs might also be relevant: the genitive might sometimes be preferred for clause-initial objects in order to signal to the reader that the word in question is the object rather than the subject. This obviously would not apply to nouns ending in -a in the nom. sing.: these have a totally unambiguous accusative form in the singular, which makes clear both the number and the syntactic function of the word in question. It would therefore seem reasonable to assume that a particularly strong connection might exist between nouns of this morphological type and the use of the accusative in initial position. However, our data do not confirm this: the accusative frequency for nouns of this type is 54.4% (n = 90) when the word order is OSV, OVS, or OV (average for nouns in -a/-я: 60.8%). On the whole, it seems that even if communicative factors of this type can be used to explain the choice in certain specific contexts, their overall influence on the statistical figures is probably limited, considering especially that different communicative needs may pull in different directions.

Whatever the real explanation may be, word order does seem to influence case selection; but its importance should not be exaggerated. One may probably agree with Tsurikov (1975: 183), who says of inverted word order that 'this syntactic feature ... might be decisive in complex "borderline" cases'.

VARIABLE 31: Other clause constituents

Apart from the verb and the object, clause constituents of certain other types have been mentioned by many scholars as exerting an influence on case selection; their significance is usually explained by the observation that they diffuse the scope of negation and therefore make the use of the genitive less likely (see the discussion of predicative instrumentals: Strong Factor 1, p. 22-3).

Various types of such constituents were taken into account in producing the corpus. They were analysed not only in terms of their presence or absence, but also with regard to their position in the clause; however, as far as position is concerned the results are generally of little statistical value, and will not be referred to in this report.

Factor 1: Indirect object in the dative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>67 examples (38.3%)</td>
<td>36 (30.3%)</td>
<td>31 (55.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>108 examples (61.7%)</td>
<td>83 (69.7%)</td>
<td>25 (44.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

... какой ты мне вообще, к черту, муж и какой у тебя авторитет, раз тебе комнату не дают, женатому человеку ... [Салынский]

Жена не дала мне ключ от гаража. [Спутник]

Представить себе не могу такую дикость — деникинцы в городе. [Трифонов]

Examples with genitive:

Ситуация может не дать вам времени. [Зорин]

А ты мне таких подарков не подносил. [Софронов]

До Егора иногда долетали их слова, но значения им не придавал. [Васильев]

While not generally regarded as particularly significant by other scholars, at least some types of constructions with an indirect object in the dative case might be regarded as a variant of 'двойное управление', i.e. divalent constructions where the indirect object absorbs part of the force of negation. However, this construction does not seem to influence the choice to a significant degree: evidently, the indirect object does not generally affect the scope of negation in such a way as to create especially favourable conditions for the use of the accusative (although it is possible that this might take place in certain specific contexts) (cf. Lehfeldt 1990: 20).

Factor 2: Non-predicative instrumental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accusative:</strong></td>
<td>31 examples (59.6%)</td>
<td>11 (42.3%)</td>
<td>20 (80.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genitive:</strong></td>
<td>21 examples (40.4%)</td>
<td>16 (57.7%)</td>
<td>5 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

К сожалению, он и техническую интеллигенцию не балует особым вниманием. [Софронов]...

... в начале своего поэтического творчества Пушкин еще не ограничивал употребление традиционных речевых элементов какими-либо стилистическими задачами. ... [Мещерский]

Спаси планету своими силами им не удается, так как там властвует жестокий диктатор Туранчокс ... [Спутник]
Examples with genitive:

... и они, остановившихся в дверях, ничем не выдают своего присутствия. [Вампилов]

... то этим мы не выявим семантического содержания слов "курица", "гусыня", "львица", ...

... целовал мокрое лицо, не ощущая губами слез, ... [Трифонов]

This group includes various non-predicative uses of the instrumental case. It must be noted at the outset that these were deemed to include the form собой in the expression представлять собой; this construction generally requires the genitive and there were seven such examples in our sample. If these are excluded, the accusative frequency goes up to 66.0% (50% without infinitive). It should further be pointed out that certain uses of the instrumental were not included here: for example, the construction 'adj. + образом' is so obviously an adverbial of manner that it was dealt with under Factor 6 below.

The instrumental is most frequently used to denote the means by which the action described is performed. In this use, the instrumental has an adverbial function and is usually optional in grammatical terms. However, it frequently absorbs much of the force of negation, thus making the use of the accusative likelier. Moreover, in certain constructions the instrumental may be part of the valency of the verb (as, for example, in the second accusative example above); in such instances the use of the accusative is particularly likely.

Factor 3: Prepositional phrase governed by the verb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>50 examples (74.6%)</td>
<td>17 (60.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>116 examples (45.1%)</td>
<td>57 (33.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

И ты не связывай свою жизнь с моей. [Розов]
Более того, они, вероятно, все же не смогли бы отличить перформативные высказывания от констативных. [Звегинцев]
Современную советскую сцену нельзя упрекнуть в инертности. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Бора, ты на Мишу зла не носи. Слышишь? [Салынский]
Наоборот, о себе самом проситель должен был неизменно писать лишь в уничтожительной форме, не прибавляя к своему имени отчества. [Мещерский]
Запасной альт дурных слов от хозяина не услышал. [Орлов]

The figures would seem to indicate, if anything, a slightly stronger preference for the genitive than is usual. However, they conceal a considerable amount of internal variation within this group, and closer analysis is therefore necessary.

The most significant difference within the group is between those prepositional phrases that are part of the valency of the verb, and those that are fundamentally of an adverbial nature. The former type is clearly represented by constructions like сводить что-л. к чему-л.; the latter by most constructions with the preposition для. Some constructions are, however, very much on the borderline: for instance, the prepositional phrase in получать что-л. у/от кого-л., while not an obligatory part of the valency, is a typical construction with this verb; on the other hand, it has something of the nature of an adverbial phrase.

It has been suggested by some scholars that prepositional phrases which are part of the valency of the verb are likely to appear with the accusative. Separate figures for these are given below; in borderline case, fairly rigorous elimination procedures have been adopted. Thus, constructions like получать что-л. у/от кого-л., вызывать что-л. у кого-л. were not included in these figures. The expressions that were considered here were of the type сводить что-л. к чему-л., in which the prepositional phrase is obligatory in the relevant sense of the verb. The figures for these are as follows:

Factor 4: Adverbial (phrase) of place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative:</th>
<th>Genitive:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>without inf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>116 examples (45.1%)</td>
<td>57 (33.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>141 examples (54.9%)</td>
<td>112 (66.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Но доску на этом доме не повесят, успокойся! [Розов]
И совсем непростительно, что при написании этих слов исследователи опускают самый нужный элемент, не ставят восклицательный и вопросительный знак после вторых компонентов приведенных пар слов. [Аванесов]

... и, естественно, не могла увидеть эдельвейсовую ромашку там, где она растет. [Солоухин]

Examples with genitive:

Мария Сергеевна, в вашем подходе к этому случаю я не вижу мудрости. [Салынский]

В этом списке формам аориста уже нельзя приписать традиционного значения ... [Ломтев]

Женщина отрицательно покрутила головой, не отнимая ладоней от лица. [Спутник]

The group as a whole only deviates slightly from the average figures. However, an interesting difference emerges when the clauses are subdivided according to whether the adverbial or the adverbial phrase answers the question где? or куда?/откуда? (the latter two may be treated together as both involve movement; besides, they are much less frequent than где?, and may easily appear in conjunction with one another). The figures for где? are: accusative 75 (36.9%), genitive 128; and those for куда?/откуда?: accusative 41 (74.5%), genitive 14 — a highly significant difference, and one which would seem to make the latter type of place adverbial a relatively strong accusative-favouring factor.

At least two possible reasons for this difference may be postulated. Firstly, expressions of the куда?/откуда? type tend to be more closely connected to the verb, and may actually be part of its valency (e.g. положить что-л. + куда?), thus coming close to the type of constructions dealt with under Factor 3 on p. 201 above, where the accusative was preferred. Expressions of the где? type are usually more purely adverbial. Secondly, non-concrete, figurative uses of где? expressions are frequent (e.g. в данном случае; cf. also the frequent appearance of здесь and тут in a non-concrete sense in scholarly texts and similar contexts); expressions of the куда?/откуда? type are mostly confined to uses where they have concrete reference; this means that they are relatively less likely to appear in contexts that are favourable to the use of the genitive.

Factor 5: Adverbial (phrase) of time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>133 examples (42.5%)</td>
<td>64 (29.2%)</td>
<td>69 (73.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>180 examples (57.5%)</td>
<td>155 (70.8%)</td>
<td>25 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Конечно, я никогда свою работу не брошу, ... [Салынский]

Когда мы с Пашей, как я ласково окрестил верблюжонка, позвонили, дверь долго не открывали. [Спутник]

Работая в ужасных условиях, он в опасные, трагические дни не покидал свой пост. [Спутник]

Examples with genitive:

Цех три года не выполнял плана. [Дворецкий]

... чужие глаголы, становясь русскими словами, почти никогда не сохраняют — ни в одной форме — родного грамматического облика. [Калинин]

Многие страны до сих пор не производили собственного атомного оружия в основном лишь по той причине, что не располагали надежными средствами доставки. [Спутник]

The figures for this group taken as a whole are very close to the average figures for the whole corpus. Nor does a closer analysis reveal any significant differences within the group: for example, clauses with time expressions answering the question как долго? (including surface structures of the type 'since when?' as well as 'for how long?') had an accusative frequency of 40.5% (n = 42) — with most of the remaining clauses containing time expressions of the semantic type когда?.

Factor 6: Adverbial (phrase) of manner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>total</th>
<th>without inf.</th>
<th>with inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>151 examples (66.8%)</td>
<td>44 (45.8%)</td>
<td>107 (82.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>75 examples (33.2%)</td>
<td>52 (54.2%)</td>
<td>23 (17.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples with accusative:

Дверь плотно не прикрывай. [Розов]

Церковная реформа графики, не перестраивая коренным образом систему русского письма, ... [Мещерский]

Даже не поворачивался, чтоб время зря не терять. [Васильев]

Examples with genitive:

я давно и твердо решил посвятить себя науке и не хотел бы терять времени даром. [Софронов]

Сложность этих случаев состоит в том, что они внешне ... не образуют разных форм единого слова, ... [Звегинцев]

... те, кто, как и он, стремятся во что бы то ни стало не допустить огласки "тегеранских тайн". [Спутник]
The high accusative frequency is to a considerable extent accounted for by the unusually large number of infinitival constructions. However, even the figures for clauses without an infinitival construction do show an accusative frequency that is clearly above average; and it is probably reasonable to assume that the scope of negation is relatively often affected by the presence of an adverbial of manner.

Stylistic Factors

Stylistic factors are regarded as significant by the majority of scholars. As a general observation, it is widely held that the use of the accusative is particularly characteristic of colloquial speech, while the genitive is usual in more formal contexts (Kout 1960: 32; Tsurikov 1967: 185; Tim berlake 1975: 132, Rozental’ 1985: 276; and see Variable 33 below for earlier statistical figures). Some scholars have also made more specific observations on differences between written texts of various genres; and statistical studies have revealed significant differences between the idiolects of individual writers (see Variable 32).

VARIABLE 32: Generic and individual differences

Leaving aside the alleged difference between literary and colloquial language, a certain number of more specific observations are also to be found in the literature. Uglitsky (1956: 378) comments that a definite tendency to use the accusative is to be observed among Soviet writers of prose fiction, and in scientific and ‘publicistic’ writing; but she considers the use of the accusative ‘exceptional’ in the newspapers of the 1950s. Various studies (Restan 1960: 105; Safarewiczowa 1960: 109-23; Haka 1981: 28, 102) have also revealed significant individual differences between the writers whose texts have been used as source material. A summary may be found in Mustajoki (1985: 107); in Restan’s study, for example, the figures for various writers of prose fiction showed accusative frequencies ranging from 19% (Erenburg) to 48% (Paustovskij).

Our figures for texts from sources of different types were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Accusative Total</th>
<th>Genitive Total</th>
<th>Accusative Without Inf</th>
<th>Genitive Without Inf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plays</td>
<td>306 (42.8%)</td>
<td>409 (57.2%)</td>
<td>192 (34.0%)</td>
<td>341 (64.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>161 (27.6%)</td>
<td>422 (72.4%)</td>
<td>53 (12.6%)</td>
<td>367 (87.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sputnik</td>
<td>395 (46.4%)</td>
<td>456 (53.6%)</td>
<td>139 (27.7%)</td>
<td>363 (72.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>242 (42.2%)</td>
<td>331 (57.8%)</td>
<td>110 (29.3%)</td>
<td>266 (70.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that the figures for the plays include not only dialogue, but also stage directions (see Variable 34 for figures from which the latter have been excluded). Similarly, the Sputnik figures are not entirely representative of a ‘journalistic’ style, as some of the texts are of a fictional nature; however, unless the fictional texts in Sputnik differ widely from the texts in the ‘fiction’ category in respect of case selection, it seems that the ‘true journalistic’ texts in our corpus may well have a higher-than-average accusative frequency (but even then the reservation has to be made that newspapers and magazines of different types are likely to differ significantly amongst themselves; Sputnik, while being something of an amalgam, may probably be regarded as representing, on the whole, a relatively informal journalistic style).

Categories other than the Sputnik texts may now be examined more closely in order to establish whether there are significant individual differences between the various writers in each group. The following results emerge:

Playwrights:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Accusative Total</th>
<th>Genitive Total</th>
<th>Accusative Without Inf</th>
<th>Genitive Without Inf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rozov</td>
<td>33 (29.7%)</td>
<td>78 (70.3%)</td>
<td>28 (30.1%)</td>
<td>65 (69.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salynskij</td>
<td>78 (58.6%)</td>
<td>55 (41.4%)</td>
<td>30 (52.1%)</td>
<td>46 (47.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvoreckij</td>
<td>55 (47.8%)</td>
<td>60 (52.2%)</td>
<td>28 (34.6%)</td>
<td>53 (65.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zorin</td>
<td>35 (34.7%)</td>
<td>66 (65.3%)</td>
<td>19 (27.5%)</td>
<td>50 (72.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofronov</td>
<td>57 (52.8%)</td>
<td>51 (47.2%)</td>
<td>37 (46.8%)</td>
<td>42 (53.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vampilov</td>
<td>28 (26.2%)</td>
<td>79 (73.8%)</td>
<td>18 (20.9%)</td>
<td>68 (79.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petuxov</td>
<td>20 (50.0%)</td>
<td>20 (50.0%)</td>
<td>12 (41.4%)</td>
<td>17 (58.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appear to be highly significant individual differences. However, it must be remembered (here and below) that one cannot draw particularly far-reaching conclusions about a writer’s idiolect on the basis of such a relatively small collection of examples. Thus, for example, the accusative frequency in Zorin’s plays is 34.7% in the present study; but Haka (1981: 28), who also used Zorin as one of her sources, found a significantly lower frequency (26.9%, n = 160). Some of the differences

---

20 This type of analysis is obviously impossible in the case of the Sputnik examples. However, these have been classified according to the issue in which they appeared; and although this information was included merely ‘for the record’ and could not be expected to yield meaningful results, some of the figures may serve as illustrations of the influence that purely accidental factors may have under this variable. Thus, for example, the accusative frequency was 52.6% in Sputnik 10/1981, but only 35.3% in the very next issue — surely nothing to do with changing fashions in usage!
might conceivably be explained by the subject-matter of the plays (e.g., whether abstract issues are the subject of much of the dialogue), and to a certain extent even by factors like the frequency in each play of clauses with *smoee* as object. In spite of these reservations, it is highly probable that the differences recorded above are, at least to a certain degree, connected with each writer’s idiolect.

Linguists:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kalinin</td>
<td>12 (31.6%)</td>
<td>26 (68.4%)</td>
<td>3 (13.0%)</td>
<td>20 (87.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomtev</td>
<td>54 (30.7%)</td>
<td>122 (69.3%)</td>
<td>22 (16.7%)</td>
<td>110 (83.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avanesov 21</td>
<td>27 (31.4%)</td>
<td>59 (68.6%)</td>
<td>8 (14.3%)</td>
<td>48 (85.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zvegincev</td>
<td>31 (23.7%)</td>
<td>100 (76.3%)</td>
<td>6 (6.8%)</td>
<td>82 (93.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karaufov</td>
<td>21 (25.9%)</td>
<td>60 (74.1%)</td>
<td>5 (8.3%)</td>
<td>55 (91.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meščerskij</td>
<td>16 (22.5%)</td>
<td>55 (77.5%)</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>52 (85.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation here is not as significant as was the case with the dramatists; this is predictable, as the subject-matter of all the writers in the present group is relatively uniform, with the majority of objects being of an abstract nature throughout the group. Moreover, academic writing with its numerous set patterns obviously leaves less scope for individual variation than is the case with creative writing. However, different academic disciplines do differ so widely in subject-matter that it is debatable whether these figures can be regarded as being representative of academic writing in general: it might be presumed that a scientist, or, say, a historian, would have occasion to refer to concrete objects more frequently, and the accusative might therefore be more common. (In addition, linguists and philologists taken as a group have, whether or not deservedly, a special reputation for linguistic conservatism — also a potential contributory factor.)

Fiction writers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zalygin</td>
<td>39 (38.6%)</td>
<td>62 (61.4%)</td>
<td>19 (25.7%)</td>
<td>55 (74.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abramov</td>
<td>40 (41.2%)</td>
<td>57 (58.8%)</td>
<td>25 (37.3%)</td>
<td>42 (62.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasil’ev</td>
<td>31 (35.6%)</td>
<td>56 (64.4%)</td>
<td>17 (25.8%)</td>
<td>49 (74.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solouxin</td>
<td>49 (42.2%)</td>
<td>67 (57.8%)</td>
<td>14 (21.9%)</td>
<td>50 (78.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlov</td>
<td>44 (55.0%)</td>
<td>36 (45.0%)</td>
<td>23 (44.2%)</td>
<td>29 (55.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifonov</td>
<td>39 (42.4%)</td>
<td>53 (57.6%)</td>
<td>12 (22.6%)</td>
<td>41 (77.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readers are reminded that this is a collective volume edited by Avanesov and therefore contains a mixture of idiolects.

Again, some individual variation may be observed, though most writers have accusative frequencies in the region of 40%. In this group, however, it is probably relevant to consider dialogue and narrative separately: both are reasonably frequent, and Restan’s study (1960: 105) shows that this distinction may be highly relevant — among the writers studied by him, Soloxov, for example, has the lowest accusative frequency in narrative (11%, n = 38), yet the highest one in dialogue (67%), though the latter figure may be suspect (n = 12).

Our corpus yields the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
<th>Accusative</th>
<th>Genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zalygin</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
<td>7 (58.3%)</td>
<td>34 (38.2%)</td>
<td>55 (61.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abramov</td>
<td>13 (43.3%)</td>
<td>17 (56.7%)</td>
<td>27 (40.3%)</td>
<td>40 (59.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasil’ev</td>
<td>12 (60.0%)</td>
<td>8 (40.0%)</td>
<td>19 (28.3%)</td>
<td>48 (71.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solouxin</td>
<td>9 (75.0%)</td>
<td>3 (25.0%)</td>
<td>40 (38.5%)</td>
<td>64 (61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlov</td>
<td>8 (66.7%)</td>
<td>4 (33.3%)</td>
<td>36 (52.9%)</td>
<td>32 (47.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trifonov</td>
<td>7 (53.8%)</td>
<td>6 (46.2%)</td>
<td>32 (40.5%)</td>
<td>47 (59.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The possible significance of dialogue as opposed to continuous prose is considered in more detail under the next Variable.

**VARIABLE 33: Dialogue vs. continuous prose**

As noted above, Restan (1960: 105) found a significant preference for the accusative in dialogue as compared to literary narration; but his figures show little difference between literary dialogue and the language of newspapers. Haka’s figures (1981: 23-9, 102) would in fact seem to indicate that the accusative is commoner in at least some genres of non-fictional prose than in the dialogue found in modern plays. This fits in badly with scholarly assertions about the accusative being favoured in everyday speech (see p. 204): of course, plays do not provide ‘real’ examples of colloquial language, but one would expect the language of modern drama to be a relatively close approximation to the ordinary spoken Russian of today.

In Green’s study, recordings of authentic dialogic speech were used as material alongside written sources. A significant difference was found between oral and written contexts: in speech, the accusative frequency was 41.8% (n = 122); in writing, 20.7% (n = 184). However, one doubts whether these results are reliable. Apart from the small size of the corpus, and the possible influence of other factors such as concreteness (see below), it must be borne in mind that the study of authentic speech
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It involves certain problems arising out of the phonological structure of modern Russian. Thus, while even in the written language forms like кресло, состояние are ambiguous (gen. sing. or nom./acc. pi.), the spoken language does not normally even distinguish between кресло, состояние (nom./acc. sing.) and кресло, состояния. This means that in the absence of inflected modifiers, it is generally impossible, when studying the spoken language, to determine with any degree of certainty whether the speaker intended the accusative or the genitive when using a singular noun of the neuter gender with stress on the stem; and it may be necessary to leave such ambiguous forms out of consideration (or otherwise the case will have to be determined by what amounts to guesswork). If at the same time these forms are taken into account in studying the written language, certain distortions may arise when comparisons are attempted between speech and writing (bearing in mind, for example, that neuters, particularly ones with fixed stress, tend to appear in the genitive more often than masculines and feminines by virtue of their semantics — cf. p. 137). Moreover, it might be pointed out that while a form like места is ambiguous in writing, the gen. sing. and the nom./acc. pl. have different stress and are therefore clearly differentiated in speech. This means that speakers might in some circumstances feel more comfortable than writers about using the acc. pl. места (and the acc. pl. of other neuter nouns with mobile stress); but if the same applied to the gen. sing, места, this could not always be recorded with certainty as места and места are phonetically identical. It is not clear from Green’s article how these problems have been dealt with.

In this connection, it may also be relevant to note that one of the special characteristics of modern colloquial Russian is the use of the nominative where the rules of the written language would require one of the other cases. It could therefore be argued that where the nominative and accusative are formally identical and the nominative is used in a colloquial context, it is impossible to be certain whether this reflects a (more or less) deliberate choice of the accusative over the genitive, or whether the form used by the speaker is really a ‘colloquial nominative’. This would mainly apply to objects in initial position.

On the whole, then, it seems that while comparisons between written and authentic spoken materials can certainly be made, it is probably necessary to retain some degree of scepticism about their results.

Most of the problems discussed above need not concern us in the present study, as all our material is written, even though some of the examples are an attempt to reflect the oral use of the language. Whether or not they reflect it adequately is a matter for debate; in any case, the figures for dialogue on the one hand, and continuous prose on the other, are given below on the assumption that any difference between these could be suggestive of a difference between speech and writing in general as far as case selection is concerned.

The figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Dialogue total</th>
<th>Dialogue without inf.</th>
<th>Continuous prose total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>395 (45.8%)</td>
<td>331 (44.0%)</td>
<td>303 examples (44.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>468 (54.2%)</td>
<td>392 (61.9%)</td>
<td>386 examples (56.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also Variable 32, where the figures for dialogue and narrative in works of prose fiction were compared.

Plays are obviously the most frequent source of examples of direct speech in our study — and probably also the most ‘reliable’ one as far as proximity to real speech is concerned, bearing in mind that a play must normally stand the test of oral performance which is likely to reveal any artificial linguistic features in it (whereas linguistically unnatural dialogue in a prose work has a better chance of passing unnoticed, as long as it is not blatantly artificial). It may therefore be sensible to give separate figures for those examples taken from the plays which represent direct speech (as opposed to stage directions). These are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Without inf.</th>
<th>With inf.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>303 examples (44.0%)</td>
<td>191 (36.6%)</td>
<td>112 (63.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>386 examples (56.0%)</td>
<td>331 (63.4%)</td>
<td>55 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures may be seen as providing further evidence for a stylistic difference between prose and dialogue; but clearly, before any far-reaching conclusions are drawn, certain other factors must be taken into account. For example, it must be borne in mind that the pronoun я, which usually takes the genitive, appears in the object position proportionately much more often in dialogue than in prose: 86 out of its 160 occurrences represented direct speech, whereas the proportion of ‘spoken’ examples in the whole corpus was only 30%. At the same time it may be noted that in everyday speech situations concrete objects are
likely to be mentioned relatively more often than in writing; the objects are perhaps also more likely to be contextually definite, and these factors may partly account for a relatively high accusative frequency (cf. Mustajoki 1985: 132). Where the total figures are concerned, the influence of *это* and that of concreteness/definiteness may well cancel each other out; but in any event it seems fruitful to consider separately the figures for concrete nouns on the one hand, and abstract ones on the other. These are as follows:

**Concrete nouns:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (150)</th>
<th>Total (179)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>123 (82%)</td>
<td>159 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>27 (18%)</td>
<td>20 (11%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (179)</th>
<th>Total (110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>138 (78%)</td>
<td>101 (92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>41 (22%)</td>
<td>9 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abstract nouns:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (149)</th>
<th>Total (348)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>120 (81%)</td>
<td>262 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>29 (19%)</td>
<td>86 (24%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total (247)</th>
<th>Total (741)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accusative:</td>
<td>182 (74%)</td>
<td>405 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive:</td>
<td>65 (26%)</td>
<td>336 (45%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken as a whole, these figures make it reasonably clear that the style factor is of some significance: the accusative frequencies are consistently higher for dialogue than for continuous prose. However, it also seems indisputable that the factor of concreteness vs. abstractness is of more fundamental importance, setting, as it were, the framework within which stylistic variation may occur. It is also interesting to compare the 'total' and 'without inf.' figures, noting particularly the small difference in dialogue with concrete objects: it may be surmised that the combined influence of stylistic factors and concreteness causes the accusative to be favoured so strongly that the further contribution made by the infinitive factor is no longer of much significance.

### 3. CONCLUSION

#### 3.1. Background

The purpose of the study was to investigate the factors influencing case selection for the direct object in Russian negative clauses. This problem has been studied during the present century by dozens of linguists. In comparison with earlier research, one of the new features of the present study is that the statistical analysis is based on more extensive material than has been customary. Also, the use of computers has facilitated a more detailed and sophisticated analysis of the different factors. The present report gives a general overview of the material; further research will be undertaken to examine separate factors in greater detail.

The material consists of texts belonging to four basic types: plays, fictional prose, scholarly texts, and journalistic texts. The aim in each case was to use source material reflecting contemporary usage. This is important in all studies concerned with the present state of the language; when the phenomenon under consideration is subject to change, the use of recent source material is a necessity.

In determining the range of factors to be investigated, the aim was to achieve comprehensive coverage of potentially significant factors. All factors mentioned in the literature were naturally included: among such 'classic factors' are intensive negation, иметь as predicate, gerundal constructions, the number of the object, the presence of an infinitive, etc. In addition, we included a number of new factors whose influence on case selection has not been previously investigated: these included the number and tense of the predicate verb, factors connected with the subject, the negativeness or positiveness of the direct object, etc.

In the case of the 'widely-acknowledged' factors, a more detailed analysis was frequently attempted than has been the case in previous studies. For example, instead of only considering gerundal and participial constructions and certain types of subordinate clause, all clause types were investigated systematically. The important factor of the concreteness/abstractness of the object was analysed in greater detail by distinguishing twenty-six semantic classes. In examining the significance of word order, all possible combinations of the mutual ordering of subject, verb, and object were considered; in clauses containing an infinitival construction the mutual order of the infinitive and its headword was also taken into account. Verbs were classified into numerous sub-categories.
by their semantic type. The interesting claim that the accusative is favoured in colloquial speech was investigated not only by distinguishing between different stylistic registers, but also by considering the difference between dialogue and continuous prose as a separate variable.

In determining the scope of the material, the basic consideration was that a clause was to be included if the direct object of the corresponding affirmative clause would appear in the accusative. By applying this general principle (with some specific modifications and restrictions), we arrived at a total of 4,037 example sentences. Before carrying out the quantitative analysis, we excluded some of these examples because they could not be regarded as examples of genuine variation between accusative and genitive. This category included clauses containing one (or more) of the following features: the case of the object could not be reliably determined; the clause was strongly idiomatic; the object was ни что; the predicate belonged to the group of verbs which may govern either the accusative or the genitive in affirmative clauses (ждать etc.). Also excluded as a special case were clauses with an 'object' indicating time or distance in connection with an intransitive verb.

After this further deletion of these 'marginal' examples, there were 3,273 clauses still remaining. The next stage was to investigate whether there were factors determining the choice of case to such a degree that the influence of other factors was negligible in their presence; previous studies allowed one to assume that such factors might exist. Identifying such 'strong' factors is, of course, a subjective decision. Our criterion was that the number of counter-examples was not to exceed 5% of the total number of examples containing the feature concerned; if the total number of examples was small, even more stringent criteria were applied. A total of six 'strong' factors were found. Three of these were ones normally requiring the use of the accusative (predicative instrumental; чуть or едва with negation; noun denoting a person as object). The remaining three normally required the genitive (the premodifier никакой; the intensifying particle ни; иметь as predicate).

After the exclusion of clauses containing a 'strong factor', the number of examples still remaining was 2,722. These examples constituted the material for the main part of the study: for each remaining factor, separate figures were provided indicating the frequencies of each of the two cases in clauses with and without an infinitival construction. No other cross-tabulations were performed systematically, but additional calculations were carried out where this was necessary in order to arrive at a correct interpretation of the figures. In addition, the reliability of the figures and possible explanations for them were discussed in the commentaries.

3.2. The results of the analysis

In connection with studies of this type, it is tempting to ask what the overall proportions of the accusative and genitive are in clauses with negated objects. In our material, excluding the Marginal Cases, the figures were: accusative 37.1%, genitive 62.9%. However, these figures must be treated with caution: they are significantly influenced by the nature of the material used and by the decisions affecting the treatment of marginal cases. Thus, even the large size of the corpus does not guarantee the reliability of the overall percentages. It is also necessary to exercise particular caution in comparing our findings with those of other scholars who provide quantitative data.

3.2.1. Strong Factors

In connection with the factors regarded by us as 'strong', it may be asked whether they determine the choice of case with 100% certainty, or whether counter-examples can be found. The answer to this question cannot be entirely unambiguous. Firstly, the possibility of a strong genitive-favouring factor co-occurring with a strong accusative-favouring factor in a single clause makes it theoretically impossible that both could dictate the case of the object with 100% certainty. Secondly, pronouncements on whether a given factor determines the choice without exception cannot be made purely on the basis of quantitative evidence from empirical material, because possible exceptions — even though they may be perfectly acceptable and natural usage — may only appear in contexts not found even in a large corpus of authentic material. An analysis of the quantitative data and the reactions of native speakers to selected test sentences suggests that the six factors concerned may be divided into two groups. The first group consists of factors which can only admit of variation in the presence of another Strong Factor pointing to the alternative case selection, or if there is a strong contrastive emphasis deriving from the context. Among the accusative-favouring factors, predicative instrumentals and чуть не, едва не fall into this category; the
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Other genitive-favouring factors belonging here are ни какой and ни as intensifiers connected to the object. There is slightly more scope for variation — though within strict limits — in the case of a noun denoting a person as object (accusative) and иметь as predicate verb (genitive).

3.2.2. Other factors

The main part of this report (pp. 30-210) deals with the significance of factors other than the Strong Factors. The quantitative data on the frequencies of the two cases in specific circumstances were compared with assertions made in the existing literature. In addition, attention was paid to the question of whether the figures reflect the 'real' significance of a given factor or its patterns of co-occurrence with other factors. The intention here is not to repeat the figures and comments that are to be found in the main part of the study, but to pick out those findings which are of particular theoretical interest or provide significant new quantitative information.

The examples may be divided into two main structural groups depending on whether the object is governed by an infinitive or a finite verb. When the object is governed by an infinitive and the negation precedes the headword (e.g. Они не умели выполнять планы), the language could in principle follow one of two unambiguous rules. On the one hand, since the object is directly governed by a verb which is not in itself negated, it might be assumed that it will behave as it would in an affirmative clause (this is, of course, what happens with other government features: the infinitive determines the case form and preposition, e.g. Они /не/ старались привыкать к климату). On the other hand, since the clause as a whole is negative, it might be assumed that the force of the negation will extend fully to the object governed by the infinitive (this is the case, for example, in Finnish negative clauses). If the first rule applied in Russian, negative clauses with an infinitival construction would always have an object in the accusative. The latter rule would mean that the proportions of the genitive and accusative would not differ between clauses with and without infinitival constructions. As is widely known, neither of these rules is valid for Russian: the presence of negation may influence case selection for the object of an infinitival construction, but does not always do so. This is clearly reflected in the figures derived from our corpus: the accusative frequency is 68.5% in clauses with an infinitival construction (n = 890), and 27.0% in clauses without one.

We also examined the influence of the semantics of the headword of the infinitive on case selection; it did not seem to be of major significance. Somewhat clearer differences were to be observed when different structural types were compared: when the infinitive had no headword (independent infinitives, as in Выпьем, чтобы не терять время даром), the accusative frequency was 52.9% (n = 109); in cases where the infinitive had a headword and the verbs had the same (notional) subject (e.g. Мы не можем нарушать законы), the figure was 69.5%; and when the verbs had different subjects (e.g. Несоветую вам афишировать свои отношения), it was 85.5% (n = 62). The figures can be easily explained in terms of the 'strength' of the negation affecting the objects to varying degrees. A similar explanation will account for the finding that the accusative was most clearly favoured when the headword was a noun (e.g. Я не имею права брать взятки).

When other factors are examined below, the figures used will be those for clauses without an infinitival construction (i.e. with an average accusative frequency of 27.0%). The percentage figures always refer to the frequency of the accusative.

Many scholars point out that the accusative is more frequent when the object is a concrete noun than when it is abstract. In order to arrive at a more detailed understanding of the influence of this important factor, we divided the object nouns into twenty-five semantic categories. Demarcation lines between the categories are obviously not absolute; however, difficulties in interpreting the status of some individual words do not significantly reduce the reliability of comparisons between the groups.

The results for the various groups indicate that the words concerned form a continuum not only in relation to concreteness/abstractness but also in relation to case usage. The accusative is most strongly favoured by animate objects (among which those denoting humans were included among the Strong Factors). Examples of other categories are listed below (the figures refer to the frequency of the accusative):
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The results indicate that as the degree of concreteness increases, the accusative frequency becomes consistently higher. As a certain kind of special group, foodstuffs and fluids (хлеб, сыр, пена, пиво) seem to fall between the concrete and abstract groups (31.4%, n = 35), whereas words denoting concrete materials (мрамор, железо, золото) seem to favour the accusative as expected (61.5%, n = 13).

If the words are divided into three groups according to semantic type — definitely concrete, definitely abstract, and various intermediate types — the figures relating to the two basic groups show a clear difference: the accusative frequency for concrete nouns is 60.1% (n = 328), whereas the figure for abstract nouns is only 17.0% (n = 1024). This rough categorization was employed whenever it was necessary to investigate the possible influence of the semantics of the object on the results obtained for other factors.

The tense of the predicate verb is not usually mentioned among the factors influencing the choice of case. Our results were as follows: past — 27.6% (n = 621), present — 20.9 (n = 675), future — 37.7% (n = 199). These results are, however, partly misleading if one does not simultaneously take into account the aspect of the verb: after all, only imperfective verbs can appear in the present tense, and the future in this case is always the perfective future, after the elimination of infinitival constructions. When the influence of the aspect factor is eliminated, the difference between the past and present tenses becomes insignificant.
but the future retains a higher accusative frequency (in comparison with past perfectives). Explanations for this may be found in the semantic peculiarities of the future — unlike the past and present tenses, it denotes activities which are potential in a specific way.

Aspect in itself is an interesting factor: scholarly opinion is divided regarding its influence on case selection. The best material for comparisons is provided by clauses in the past tense without an infinitival construction. These show a slightly higher accusative frequency in connection with perfective verbs (34.6%, n = 283; cf. 26.4%, n = 341 with imperfective verbs).

An interesting detail on the significance of aspect is provided by clauses with an infinitive. An examination of the aspect of the infinitive itself revealed no significant difference: the accusative frequency was 69.9% in connection with imperfective verbs (n = 413) and 66.9% with perfective verbs (n = 453). However, when the aspect of the auxiliary verb was examined, the difference was clearer: 64.9% with imperfective verbs (n = 359), 75.8% with perfectives (n = 153). This seems to suggest that it is the aspectual nature of the clause as a whole, rather than the aspect of the verb immediately governing the object, that may be said to have an influence on case selection. However, as some scholars point out, the precise influence of aspect on the choice of case can only be adequately described by taking into account the various semantic functions of each aspect.

The examination of imperative clauses revealed no significant new information as such: the accusative frequency (52.8%, n = 127) was far higher than in indicative clauses. A close analysis of the material, however, allows one to assess the various explanations which have been suggested for the high frequency of the accusative. It is appropriate to start by excluding from consideration those relatively numerous examples in which the choice is heavily influenced by an idiomatic expression of the type обращать внимание or by the pronoun это appearing as object. When these are omitted, the accusative frequency is 61.4% (n = 101). The first seemingly plausible explanation for the frequent use of the accusative is the fact that imperatives normally appear only in dialogue, where the accusative is generally more frequent. However, this explanation is not sufficient: in indicative clauses taken from direct speech (again eliminating the constructions mentioned above), the proportion of the accusative is 50.9%. Listvinov offers another possible explanation: concrete objects are more frequent in imperative clauses than elsewhere. Our material indicates, however, that the accusative frequency in imperative clauses is higher than usual even if clauses with abstract and concrete objects are examined separately. It seems that the slight preponderance of the accusative in imperative clauses cannot be accounted for in terms of a single quantifiable background factor. Timberlake has indeed suggested that the reason for the frequency of the accusative might be the potential, non-actual nature of the events described in imperative clauses: this, in his view, reduces the force of negation. This, however, seems implausible. Rather, imperative clauses may be said to be more situationally definite than indicative clauses. Further investigation is clearly necessary here.

Under the variable Semantic type of the verb governing the direct object, we attempted to make the analysis as detailed as possible. The verbs were therefore originally classified into 107 sub-categories, many of which were later combined to make the analysis and presentation clearer. The concrete/abstract distinction appears to be significant not only in relation to the object, but also where the verb itself is concerned: the accusative turned out to be more frequent with verbs denoting concrete actions than with abstract verbs; this applied even when the influence of the concreteness/abstractness of the object was eliminated. However, it is not possible to give precise quantitative figures: the degree of abstractness of a verb is even more difficult to define than that of a noun, especially in contexts where verbs are used figuratively.

In any event, the results confirm the notion that certain verbs denoting mental, more or less abstract activities strongly favour the use of the genitive. This finding is of some general significance because some of the verbs concerned are frequent in negative clauses with direct objects. These groups include verbs of perception (acc. 9.3%, n = 135), verbs of speech (16.8%, n = 95), and verbs of cognition, among which the verb знать showed a particularly low accusative frequency (7.1%, n = 99), partly because of its existential connotations in some contexts.

The material gives one a good opportunity to examine the influence of the 'иметь effect' on other verbs semantically close to it. The verb иметь was itself included among the Strong Factors owing to the extreme rarity of the accusative in connection with it; and many scholars explain this preference for the genitive by drawing a parallel between clauses with the verb иметь and clauses expressing possession by means...
of the construction У меня нет ..., in which the genitive is, of course, obligatory. This raises the question of whether similar tendencies may be observed in clauses with a verb close in meaning to иметь (e.g. содержать, хранить, сохранять). It turned out that these verbs, too, are very rarely followed by the accusative (7.4%, n = 27). The position was similar with the verb получать (8.8%, n = 34); but the accusative frequency was higher with other verbs with the general sense 'to receive', 'to obtain'. An interesting point of comparison for an examination of the influence of existential implications is provided by the verb терять: it might be assumed that since it is the semantic converse of possession (не терять = иметь/хранить), the accusative ought to be dominant. This, however, is not the case: here too the accusative is rare (12.9%, n = 31).

The material and its computerized format provide excellent opportunities for the investigation of two problematic factors, which will be referred to here as the -a factor and the homonymy factor. The former is based on the assertion that nouns ending in -а/-я, when used in the singular, take the accusative more commonly than other nouns; the 'homonymy factor' is based on the notion that the choice is influenced by a tendency to avoid homonymous forms (genitive singular = accusative plural). Contradictory assertions have been made about the significance of each factor, and quantitative evidence has been brought to bear on the matter. Both factors are also of theoretical interest. If it should turn out that the -a factor is relevant to the choice, this would confirm the bold assertion that the physical form of the ending influences the popularity of the two cases. If, on the other hand, the homonymy factor turned out to be significant, this would provide information on the strategies employed by native speakers in making the choice when other factors allow for variation: the choice would turn out to be made with a view to making the number of the object unambiguous.

The two factors in question are closely interwoven: nouns ending in -a are the largest group of words with identical forms for the genitive singular and the accusative plural. Indeed, the interpretation of previous research findings has been complicated by the problems of analysing these two factors separately. Our aim was to utilize the facilities provided by a computer to arrive at a more detailed analysis of the significance of these two factors. To make this possible, those example sentences with homonymous object forms were divided into sixteen groups, using four criteria: (a) whether the two forms with identical endings also had identical stress; (b) whether the word had the -a ending in the nominative singular; (c) whether the word was preceded (or followed) by an attribute revealing the case and number; (d) whether the word was in the singular or in the plural. In addition, singularia tantum words were considered separately. At a further stage, the concreteness of the object was also taken into account because the group of nouns ending in -а contains a significantly smaller proportion of abstract nouns than the group consisting of neuters and soft-stem feminines (i.e. words which also have homonymous forms and have an important role in the study of the -а factor as a basis for comparison).

The analysis revealed that when the influence of other factors is eliminated, singular words ending in -a have a stronger tendency to appear in the accusative than other words with homonymous forms. The following figures illustrate the scale of the difference. The accusative frequency for concrete nouns ending in -a was 79.3%; the corresponding figure for concrete neuters and soft-stem feminines was 63.2% (n = 76). With abstract nouns the difference was even greater (49.4%, n = 176: 27.6%, n = 301). The figures cited also put the role of this factor into perspective: although significant, its place in the hierarchy is clearly below the concreteness factor. In any case, the result gives some grounds for the claim that the morphological form of the ending has, in this case, a bearing on case selection. It will be interesting to compare these findings with data from the studies of Ahti Nikunlassi, who has investigated the same phenomenon in contexts like Он принёс усталый/усталым: Она пришла усталая/усталой.

The methods used in examining the homonymy factor were similar to those employed in connection with the -а factor. The results on the influence of this factor are reasonably convincing up to a point, but some reservations have to be made. It may be assumed that attempts to avoid ambiguity should result in a difference between contexts in which the possibility of ambiguity is removed by a modifier and contexts without a modifier agreeing with the object. The figures for objects ending in -а do indeed suggest this: the presence of a modifier lowers the accusative frequency in the singular (53.6%, n = 134; cf. 69.6%, n = 240 without modifier); while in the plural the accusative frequency is, predictably, higher in the presence of a modifier (47.4%, n = 78; cf. 37.2%, n = 86). However, other words with the possibility of ambiguity show a similar difference only in the plural. It may be that even a multifaceted
Among pronouns appearing as direct objects, two extremes may be discerned: the accusative is dominant (77.8%, n = 18) when the object is кото́рый, whereas есть and мо́е strongly favour the genitive (accusative frequencies respectively 6.5%, n = 107; 9.7%, n = 31). In the case of кото́рый, the accusative seems to be favoured quite strongly: a relatively powerful genitive-favouring factor must normally be present for this preference to be reversed.

Various explanations have been offered to account for the genitive preference in the case of мо́е and, especially, есть. Some of these are valid in some contexts, e.g. the fact that есть frequently appears with genitive-favouring verbs (знать, понимать, etc.). It has also been pointed out that есть is, in a sense, a replacement for an abstract noun. However, even this explanation is not sufficient on its own because the preference for the genitive is even stronger with есть than with abstract nouns; and it seems that none of the explanations previously put forward can be regarded as sufficient. Quantitative calculations did not suggest fundamentally new ways of accounting for the preference. However, by examining and modifying certain example sentences, we arrived at a hypothesis suggesting that the preference for the genitive may be connected with factors of speech rhythm. The addition of one syllable to a short word significantly alters the status of that word in the flow of speech (см. это не скроешь: Это не скроешь). The hypothesis that prosodic factors may be of significance seems plausible, but the matter requires further investigation.

Many scholars claim that inverted word order is a factor increasing the use of the accusative. Further clarification was sought here by taking into account the mutual ordering of all three main elements: the subject, the predicate verb, and the direct object. As far as the verb and object are concerned, the accusative seems to be slightly more frequent when the object precedes the verb (33.2%, n = 591; cf. 24.0%, n = 1240, when the object comes after the verb). However, the decisive factor does not seem to be the placing of the object before the verb, but the fact that the object appears in clause-initial position: cf. V...O 24.0% (n = 1240), SOV 26.7% (n = 191), O...V 36.3% (n = 400). It might be assumed that the genitive-favouring pronoun есть might distort the figures owing to its frequent use in clauses with inverted word order. However, this turned out not to have been the case: the elimination of clauses with есть did not significantly change the above figures. Nor did other supplementary quantitative analyses (e.g. the separate examination of nouns ending in -a) reveal new factors which might be used to explain the differences noted above. The conclusion seems to be that the placing of the object in clause-initial position increases the frequency of the accusative, but only slightly.

When the influence of the presence of other clause constituents was examined, there emerged an important (if not surprising) fact: if the clause contains, apart from the direct object, an additional constituent closely connected to the verb, the negation will often focus on this other constituent, in which case the object will be in the accusative. Clauses with a predicative instrumental (regarded as a Strong Factor) are an extreme example; the results for other constructions point in the same direction, though less emphatically. The accusative frequency was much higher than average e.g. in clauses with a fixed prepositional construction following the verb (см. сходить что-л. к чему-л.; 60.7%, n = 28), or a prepositional construction indicating direction (e.g. положи́ть что-л. куда-л.; 74.5%, n = 55). When the additional constituent had only a loose connection with the verb, there was no tendency to prefer the accusative. In addition, it was found that the appearance of an adverb significantly increased the use of the accusative only in the case of adverbials of manner (e.g. Дверь плотно не прикрывай); these too are capable of absorbing the force of the negation.

The results on the influence of style were completely predictable. The accusative frequencies for the various categories were: plays 36.0% (n = 533), fiction 29.3% (n = 376), Sputnik 27.7% (n = 599), academic texts 12.6% (n = 420). Another stylistic variable, the distinction between dialogue and continuous prose, was investigated in more detail than has been done before. The overall figures reflect a somewhat stronger tendency for the accusative to appear in dialogue (38.1%, n = 533; cf. 21.1%, n = 1199). In view of the fact that certain other factors influencing the choice are more characteristic of one type of context or the other, they might be reflected in the total figures. Clauses in which the
object was *это* were therefore excluded from consideration, and concrete and abstract objects were examined separately. The accusative frequencies were: concrete object — dialogue 75.5% (n = 151), continuous prose 46.9% (n = 177); abstract object — dialogue 24.6% (n = 284), continuous prose 14.0% (n = 730). Although the results show a far greater tendency to use the accusative in dialogue than in continuous prose, it would be premature to claim that the reasons are purely stylistic. Other possible explanations which still need to be considered include the hypothesis that the definiteness of the object (in addition to its concreteness) and the contextual definiteness of the entire clause are accusative-favouring factors and tend to be more widely applicable in dialogue than in continuous prose. No attempt was made at this stage to investigate these matters systematically.

When completely new 'potential' factors were examined, the results frequently revealed statistically significant differences in case usage. In a number of instances these were, however, undoubtedly due to the influence of other factors. This applies, for example, to the number and person of the predicate verb. The results showed the accusative was significantly more frequent in the second person (singular and plural) than in the other persons (singular 45.1%, n = 203; plural 50.6%, n = 77; cf. figures between 21.6% and 29.7% for the other persons). The differences remained clear after the removal of clauses with an imperative or with a generic use of the second person singular. However, a 'natural' explanation is provided by the factor of text types: in spoken contexts, regardless of person, the frequency of the accusative was of the same order as the total figure for the second person, which is, of course, normally used only in dialogue.

Another new factor was the prefix of the verb. There emerged considerable differences between the various prefixes: the accusative frequencies varied from 5.0% (n = 20) to 57.1% (n = 35). The result is not surprising in itself, as most of the differences are explained by the influence of individual verbs of high frequency. Nevertheless, there are some details requiring further investigation. For example, there is an interesting contrast between the prefixes *раз*- and *от*-: with the former prefix the aspect of the verb seems to have a decisive influence on case selection, whereas with the latter prefix there is no evidence of such influence. The use of the verbs in specific aspeccial meanings may be reflected here.

**3.3. Evaluation of the results and directions for further research**

Attention must be drawn once again to the relative nature of quantitative data, necessitating a certain amount of caution in the interpretation of the results. This may be illustrated by means of a simple example: on the basis of the material used in this study, it is perfectly reasonable to claim that the total frequency of the accusative was 30.7%; however, 35.3% would be an equally 'correct' figure. The former figure includes clauses with the object *ничего*; the latter figure has been obtained by excluding these from consideration. The choice of material has an equally strong influence on the figures, as we have shown above. In view of the above factors, the data emerging from the present study have not been subjected to systematic testing of statistical significance: this would have led to the misleading impression that the results are absolute.

As has been pointed out above, the present report is of a preliminary nature in its treatment of many of the factors. It is our intention to examine the influence of individual factors in more detail in further studies. Another possibility which will be investigated is that of utilizing the computerized data to create an algorithm which would predict the choice of case in any given context with a high degree of accuracy. In addition to more detailed statistical analysis, native-speaking informants will be
consulted in an attempt to test some of the hypotheses formulated on the basis of the quantitative analysis that has been conducted.

Most of the variables studied are reasonably unambiguous: there is generally little difficulty in identifying, for example, the mood, aspect, and tense of the predicate verb, or the number and part of speech of the object. Some variables are, however, partly subjective: these include the semantic type of the object and the degree of idiomaticity. In this report, we have excluded from systematic consideration two variables involving a particularly high degree of subjective interpretation: namely, the scope of negation and the degree of definiteness of the object noun. Before these variables are subjected to statistical analysis, it will be necessary to ensure that the data used as the basis of such analysis are reliable. Native informants will, of course, be consulted on these matters.

Finally, it should be borne in mind when interpreting the results that most of the factors studied have the nature of symptoms (признаки): they indicate correlations rather than actual causes. In other words, it cannot be claimed that case form Y is used in clauses of a particular type because they contain factor X. The proper formulation is: case form Y is used in clauses containing factor X. It is, for example, scarcely a tenable position to argue that the speaker has chosen the genitive in the sentence Эта́го он не пони́ма́ет because the object is это́. One may say instead that the genitive is normally used in clauses with это́ as the object. If one wishes to discuss the actual reasons behind the choice, it could be argued with some caution that the speaker has chosen the genitive at least partly for reasons of speech rhythm. By analysing the various symptoms in some detail and by investigating other potentially relevant background factors, one will arrive at a better understanding of the underlying reasons which cause a particular case form to be preferred in a given context.

### Appendix: The Variables and Factors as originally coded into the computer

As noted in the Introduction, this report does not always strictly adhere to the original order and numbering of the different Variables and Factors. In some instances the original classification is more detailed than was thought to be necessary for the purposes of this report; some of the original Variables have been left out altogether; and further changes have been made to achieve a logical order of presentation. The original classification is briefly set out below, with notes about its correspondence with the present study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1: Case</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 — accusative: formally unambiguous (= Factor 1:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 — genitive: formally unambiguous (= Factor 1:2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 — accusative: clear from context (= Factor 1:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 — genitive: clear from context (= Factor 1:2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 — case unclear (= Marginal Case 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 — case unclear but irrelevant to meaning (= Marginal Case 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2: Affirmative function</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 — functionally negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 — question that can be replaced by affirmative question (= Factor 2:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 — question with разве, неужели (= Factor 2:2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 — чуть не, чуть ли не (= Strong Factor 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 — rhetorical question with notion of large quantity (Factor 2:4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 — едва не, едва ли не (= Strong Factor 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 — пока не (Factor = 2:3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 — question that can be replaced by a modal expression (= Factor 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 — double negation (= Factor 2:6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 — other cases (= Factor 2:7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3: Intensifier or restricting modifier connected to the verb</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 — совершенно, совсем, отнюдь, вовсе (= Factor 3:1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 — вообще (= Factor 3:2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 — еще, уже, пока (= Factor 3:6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 — сам</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 — даже; и (= даже) (= Factor 3:3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 — также; и (= также) (= Factor 3:4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 — так и (= Factor 3:5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 — почти (= Factor 3:7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 — other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4: Intensifier of restricting modifier connected to the object</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5: Scope of negation

(Not dealt with in this report.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>verb + object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>modifier connected to object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>modifier connected to subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>indirect object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>adverbial of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>adverbial of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>adverbial of manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>other constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>more than one of the above, or unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6: Declarative, interrogative, or exclamatory clause

(= Variable 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>question with interrogative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>question with почему or a near synonym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>question with other interrogative adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>question with interrogative particle ли</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>question without an interrogative word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>question with разве, неужели</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>exclamatory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7: Semantic content of interrogative clause

(= Variable 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>not interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>hesitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>suspicion, doubt (= Factor 6:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>rebuke (= Factor 6:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>suggestion (= Factor 6:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>rhetorical question (= Factor 6:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>real question (= Factor 6:5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8: Surprise (= Factor 6:6)

### 8: Clause type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>main clause of the type Xxxx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>main clause of the type Xxxx, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>main clause of the type ..., Xxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>main clause of the type ..., Xxxx, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>construction with a gerund (= Factor 7:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>construction with a participle (= Factor 7:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>relative clause connected to a noun (= Factor 7:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>relative clause connected to a pronoun or a whole clause (= Factor 7:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>relative clause without antecedent (= Factor 7:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>explicative sub-clause with что (= Factor 7:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>sub-clause of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>sub-clause of time (= Factor 7:7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>causal sub-clause (= Factor 7:8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sub-clause of manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>sub-clause of comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>conditional sub-clause (= Factor 7:9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>concessive sub-clause (= Factor 7:10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>sub-clause of consequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>sub-clause of purpose (= Factor 7:11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>explicative sub-clause without a conjunction (= Factor 7:12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>other sub-clauses (= Factor 7:12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9: Mood

(= Variable 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>conditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Main clauses of various types were not examined in the report; this information was mainly included for various cross-tabulation purposes rather than for its intrinsic interest. Sub-clauses of place, manner, comparison, and consequence were not treated separately in the report owing to their low frequency.
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3 — бы without a past-tense verb form

10: Tense

(= Variable 9)

0 — cannot be defined (conditional, imperative, participle, gerund, independent infinitive)
1 — past
2 — present
3 — future

11: Aspect of the verb governing the object

(= Variable 10)

1 — imperfective
2 — perfective
3 — biaspectral verb

12: Person and number

(= Variable 11)

0 — infinitive clause, gerund, or participle

present/future:

1 — 1st person singular
2 — 2nd person singular
3 — 3rd person singular
4 — 1st person plural
5 — 2nd person plural
6 — 3rd person plural

past:

1 — я as subject
2 — ты as subject
3 — мы as subject
4 — вы as subject
7 — 3rd person singular, feminine or masculine
8 — 3rd person singular, neuter
9 — 3rd person plural

13: Semantic type of the verb governing the object

(= Variable 12 with slight differences)

1 — the ждать group (= Marginal Case 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>ждать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>ждать with prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>искать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>искать with prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>хотеть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>хотеть with prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>(по)просить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>просить with prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>(по)требовать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>требовать + prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>verbs of perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>(у)видеть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>видеть, видывать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>(по)смотреть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>смотреть with prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>замечать/заметить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>обнаруживать/взять</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>other verbs of visual perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>(по)слушать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>слушать with prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>(у)слышать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>other verbs of aural perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>ощупывать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>verbs of feeling or emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>испытывать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>(по)жалеть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>любить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>ощущать/ощутить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>подозревать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>(по)переть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>(по)чувствовать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>verbs of cognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>(по)думать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>думать with prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>понимать/понять</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>соображать/сообразить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>others with general meaning 'to understand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>знать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>узна(ва)ть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>знать with other prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>забы(ва)ть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>помнить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>вспоминать/вспомнить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>запомнить etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>рассматривать/рассмотреть, обсуждать/обсудить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>оценивать/оценить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>verbs of speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>говорить/сказать</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>высказывать etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>prefixal with говорить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514</td>
<td>others with neutral or positive meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515</td>
<td>with negative meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>abstract verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521</td>
<td>neutral or positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>обращать/обратить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>читать (+ prefix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525</td>
<td>находить/найти</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>встречать/встретить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>verbs of movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531</td>
<td>нести, вести, везти (+ prefix)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532</td>
<td>кладь/положить, (по)ставить, вешать/повесить, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533</td>
<td>посетить/навестить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>бросать/бросить, покидать/покинуть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>открыть/закрыть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536</td>
<td>'small movement': есть, пить, одеть, связать etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>537</td>
<td>возвращать/вернуть, посылать/послать, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538</td>
<td>допускать/допустить</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539</td>
<td>other (e.g. ловить/поймать, крутить, хватать)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>verbs of physical impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>быть, резать, etc. ('destruction')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>542</td>
<td>трогать/тронуть</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>change for the better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544</td>
<td>change for the worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>549</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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61 — verbs of creation
610 — устраивать/строить; 611 — (с)делать; 612 — others with concrete meaning, e.g. (п)остроить; 613 — писать (+ prefix); 614 — сочинять/сочинить, создавать/составить; 615 — совершать/совершить; 616 — вызывать/вызвать; 617 — производить/произвести, осуществлять/осуществить, представлять/представить (e.g. представлять интерес); 618 — 'temporary' creation — e.g. (с)петь; 619 — other (e.g. выполнять/выполнить)

62 — identifying verbs
621 — значить, о(бо)значать; 622 — представлять (собой); 623 — называть/назвать; 629 — other

7 — verbs of possession
711 — иметь, 712 — содержать; 713 — хранить, сохранять; 721 — получать/получить; 722 — доставать/достать; 723 — покупать/купить; 729 — others with meaning 'to receive' or 'to obtain'; 731 — брать/взять; 732 — отнимать/отнять, снимать/снять etc.; 733 — занимать/занять; 734 — принимать/принять; 735 — (у)красить; 739 — other with general meaning 'to take'; 741 — давать; 742 — давать with prefix; 743 — одалживать/одолжить; 744 — продавать; 749 — other with general meaning 'to give'; 751 — (п)отерять; 752 — (п)обещать, угрожать/угрожать, etc.; 753 — скрыть/крыть; 759 — other; 761 — оставлять/оставить.

990 — intransitive verb followed by quantitative expression of time or distance (= Marginal Case 5); 991 — clause with time adverbial morphologically identical to direct object (= Marginal Case 5)

14: Verbal prefixes
(= Variable 13)
00 — none; 01 — по-; 02 — в-; 03 — в-; 04 — вы-; 05 — до-; 06 — за-;
07 — из-; 08 — на-; 09 — над-; 10 — не-; 11 — недо-; 12 — о-; 13 — от-;
14 — обез; 15 — пере-; 16 — пер-; 17 — при-; 18 — под-; 19 — пред-; 20 — про-;
21 — раз-; 22 — с-; 23 — у-; 99 — other prefix or more than one prefix

15: Semantic type of headword in infinitival constructions
00 — no infinitive
10 — independent infinitive (= Factor 14:1)

17: Position of negation in infinitival constructions
(= Variable 16)
0 — no infinitive
1 — neg V Inf Obj; neg V Obj Inf (V representing any headword)
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2 — Inf neg V Obj; Obj neg V Inf
3 — Inf Obj neg V; Obj Inf neg V

negation directly preceding the infinitive
4 — neg Inf V Obj; Obj V neg Inf
5 — (V) neg Inf Obj; (V) Obj neg Inf
6 — neg Inf Obj V; Obj neg Inf Obj

double negation
7 — neg V neg Inf Obj; neg V Obj neg Inf
8 — Obj neg V neg Inf; neg Inf neg V Obj
9 — Obj neg Inf neg V; neg Inf Obj neg V

18: Idiomaticity of the V + Obj collocation
0 — completely non-idiomatic
1 — non-idiomatic but semantically restricted collocation
2 — idiomatic, metaphorical, or fixed; also appears without negation (Factor 17:1)
3 — idiomatic, only appears with negation (= Marginal Case 2)
4 — object itself idiomatic (= Marginal Case 2)
5 — verb phrase idiomatic (= Factor 17:2)

19: Semantic content of idiomatic expression
(Not dealt with in this report)
0 — non-idiomatic (0 or 1 under Variable 18)
1 — perception
2 — feeling
3 — intellectual activity
9 — other

20: Part of speech of the object
(= Variable 18)
1 — noun
2 — pronoun
3 — adjective
4 — numeral

21: Gender of object noun
(= Variable 19)
0 — not a noun
1 — masculine
2 — feminine
3 — neuter
4 — pluralia tantum

22: Declension of object noun
(= Variable 20)
0 — not a noun
1 — 'strong' declension
2 — 'weak' declension
3 — adjectival declension
4 — indeclinable

23: Degree of negativeness of object noun
(= Variable 23)
0 — not a noun; neutral noun
1 — noun with positive meaning
2 — noun with negative meaning

24: Semantic type of object noun
(= Factor 24:1)
00 — not a noun
10 — person (= Strong Factor 3)
11 — animal (= Factor 24:1)
12 — group of people (= Factor 24:2)
13 — concrete countable object (= Factor 24:3)
14 — part of the body (= Factor 24:4)
15 — place (= Factor 24:5)
16 — foodstuff (mass noun) (= Factor 24:6)
17 — liquid (= Factor 24:7)
18 — material (= Factor 24:8)
19 — mass noun denoting collection of countable objects (= Factor 24:9)
20 — relatively concrete product of human intellectual activity (= Factor 24:10)
21 — relatively abstract product of human activity (= Factor 24:11)
22 — process in which one can participate (= Factor 24:12)
23 — 'abstract place', situation, etc. (= Factor 24:14)
24 — process precluding the idea of active participation (= Factor 24:13)
25 — emotional or physical state (= Factor 24:15)
26 — relatively permanent characteristic (= Factor 24:16)
27 — collective product of organized human activity, or the activity itself (= Factor 24:17)
28 — ideology, scholarly discipline, etc. (= Factor 24:18)
29 — natural phenomenon (= Factor 24:19)
30 — temporal concept (= Factor 24:20)
31 — part of a whole (= Factor 24:21)
32 — quantity (= Factor 24:22)
33 — relationship (= Factor 24:23)
34 — other abstract concept (countable) (= Factor 24:24)
35 — other abstract concept (uncountable) (= Factor 24:25)

25: Homonymy between the gen. sing. and the acc. pl.
(= Variable 22)
0 — object not a noun; *pluralia tantum* noun as object
1 — different endings
2 — endings identical but different stress
3 — endings and stress identical
4 — endings and stress in principle identical, but plural never used in practice

26: Type of pronoun
(= Variable 25)
0 — not a pronoun
1 — это
2 — то
3 — что
5 — который
6 — что-нибудь, что-либо
7 — что-то
8 — все
9 — other

27: Number of the object word
(= Variable 19)
1 — singular
2 — plural

Factors 6 and 7 treated together in the report.

3 — unclear

28: Premodifier connected to the object
00 — none
01 — one adjective or participle (= Factor 28:1)
02 — two or more adjectives/participles (= Factor 28:2)
03 — ordinal numeral (= Factor 28:3)
04 — ordinal numeral + adjective/participle (= Factor 28:3)
05 — такой (= Factor 28:4)
06 — такой + adjective (= Factor 28:5)
07 — этот (= Factor 28:6)
08 — этот + adjective (= Factor 28:6)
09 — тот (= Factor 28:7)
10 — тот + adjective (= Factor 28:7)
11 — весь (= Factor 28:8)
12 — весь + adjective (= Factor 28:8)
13 — целый (= Factor 28:12)
14 — целый + adjective (= Factor 28:12)
15 — possessive pronoun (= Factor 28:9)
16 — possessive pronoun + adjective (= Factor 28:10)
17 — сам (= Factor 28:12)
18 — самый (= Factor 28:12)
19 — самый + adjective (= Factor 28:12)
20 — всякий/любой/каждый (= Factor 28:12)
21 — всякий/любой/каждый + adjective (= Factor 28:12)
22 — более + adjective (= Factor 28:12)
23 — один (= Factor 28:11)
25 — некоторые, некоторые (= Factor 28:12)
99 — other (= Factor 28:12)

29: Postmodifier connected to the object
(= Variable 27)
0 — none
1 — genitive

4 Only applicable to numerals, and to those nouns classified as '5' or '6' under Variable 1.
5 Several of the individual factors are not examined separately in the report.
3 — relative clause
4 — participial construction
5 — prepositional phrase or equivalent
9 — other

30: Definiteness of the object
(Not dealt with in the present report.)
0 — unclear
1 — proper name
2 — definite noun
3 — indefinite noun with generic meaning
4 — partitive meaning

31: The subject
(= Variable 28)
0 — subject (formal or semantic) not expressed
1 — no formal subject, but semantic subject expressed by a dative
2 — subject implied by the form of the predicate verb
3 — formal subject: personal pronoun
4 — formal subject: other pronoun
5 — formal subject: concrete noun
6 — formal subject: abstract noun
9 — formal subject: proper name

32: Intensifier or restricting modifier connected to the subject
(= Variable 29)
00 — none
01 — никто as subject
02 — ни один, ни единий
03 — ни ... ни
04 — такй
05 — весь, целый
06 — все (plural)
07 — некоторые
08 — каждый/всякий/любой
09 — numeral

10 — other quantitative structure
11 — даже
12 — и, также
13 — именно
14 — только
15 — two or more of the above
16 — этот
99 — other cases

33: Word order
(= Variable 30)
1 — SVO; 2 — SOV; 3 — VSO; 4 — VOS; 5 — OSV; 6 — OVS; 7 — VO; 8 — OV;
9 — unclear (object or subject between infinitive and its headword)

34: Indirect object in the dative case
(= Factor 31:1)
0 — none
If such a constituent was present, the classification depended on its position. The following notation is used below: o = the constituent under consideration (here: indirect object in the dative); X = subject, verb, or object; x = other constituent.
1 — o X X (X)
2 — x o X X (X)
3 — X o X (X)
4 — X o x X (X)
5 — X x o X (X)
6 — (X) X o X
7 — (X) XX X o
8 — (X) XX o
9 — other position

35: Instrumental form
(= Strong Factor 1 and Factor 31:2)
0 — none
1 — 9: as under Variable 34

Several of the individual factors are not examined in this report.

Only the presence or absence of these constituents is examined in the report (position ignored).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Code</th>
<th>Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36: Prepositional phrase connected to the verb</td>
<td>(= Factor 31:3)</td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Adverbial (phrase) answering the question куда? or откуда?</td>
<td>(= Factor 31:4)</td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Adverbial (phrase) answering the question где?</td>
<td>(= Factor 31:4)</td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Adverbial (phrase) answering the question когда?</td>
<td>(= Factor 31:5)</td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Adverbial (phrase) answering the question как долго?</td>
<td>(= Factor 31:5)</td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Other adverbial (phrase) with temporal meaning</td>
<td>(= Factor 31:5)</td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: Adverbial (phrase) of manner</td>
<td>(= Factor 31:6)</td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: Other clause constituent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: Authorization</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45: Form of address</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: Introductory word, phrase, or clause</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47: Type of introductory construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 — none</td>
<td>1 — 9 as above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The constructions analysed under Variables 44-47 are not clause constituents; they are syntactically independent elements relating to the whole sentence. These were not thought to be of statistical interest in the present connection, and were therefore not examined in the report.
48: Intensifier or restricting modifier connected to constituent other than subject, verb, or object
(Not dealt with in the present report.)
0 — none
1 — pronoun or adverb with ни-
2 — ни один, ни единый
3 — ни ... ни
4 — такой
5 — весь, целый
6 — даже; и (= даже)
7 — тоже, также; non-intensifying и
8 — two or more
9 — other cases

49: Constituent affected by intensifier or modifier
(Not dealt with in the present report.)
0 — none
1 — indirect object in the dative
2 — instrumental form
3 — prepositional phrase connected to the verb
4 — adverbial of time
5 — adverbial of place
6 — adverbial of manner
7 — adverbial of cause
8 — other
9 — intensifier or modifier related to more than one constituent

50: Source of example
(= Variable 32)
plays
11 — Rozov; 12 — Salynskij; 13 — Dvoreckij; 14 — Zorin; 15 — Sofronov; 16 — Vampilov; 17 — Petuxov
prose fiction
21 — Zalygin; 22 — Abramov; 23 — Vasil’ev; 24 — Solouxin; 25 — Orlov; 26 — Trifonov
academic writing
32 — Kalinin; 33 — Lomtev; 34 — Avanesov et al.; 35 — Zvegincev; 36 — Karaulov; 37 Mescerskij
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