

Maja Perschke

The shift from genitive to accusative government in Polish verbs

A synchronic corpus study on the change of transitivity marking



Regensburg Papers in Linguistics 28



Universität Regensburg

FAKULTÄT FÜR SPRACH-, LITERATUR-
UND KULTURWISSENSCHAFTEN

Herausgeber: Universität Regensburg

Universität Regensburg
Universitätsstraße 31
93053 Regensburg

© 2024, Maja Perschke

Published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Licence (CC BY 4.0):

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

DOI: 10.5283/epub.55419

Formatierung: Maja Perschke

Redaktion & Coverdesign: Maximilian Weiß

Der Text stellt eine überarbeitete Version der B.A.-Arbeit der Autorin dar, die sie 2023 an der Fakultät für Sprach-, Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaften der Universität Regensburg eingereicht hat.

Die *Regensburg Papers in Linguistics* werden in unregelmäßigen Abständen vom Lehrstuhl für Allgemeine und Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft veröffentlicht.

<https://www.uni-regensburg.de/sprache-literatur-kultur/allgemeine-vergleichende-sprachwissenschaft/regensburg-papers-in-linguistics/index.html>



Universität Regensburg

Abstract

The study provides synchronic corpus data supporting the observation of an incremental shift in case government of certain Polish verbs (e.g. *chcieć* ‘to want’ and *potrzebować* ‘to need’) and aims to illuminate the phenomenon based on the notion of transitivity. Since the second half of the twentieth century, scholars have observed a growing tendency of the use of the accusative case instead of the genitive case for the marking of the O argument of several Polish verbs. On the basis of empirical data gathered from a web corpus from 2019, the current state of the progression is outlined, indicating which semantic and morphological groups of verbs are affected, and, if so, to which extent. As a theoretical foundation accounting for a semantic contrast between the accusative and the genitive case, we rely on the notion of transitivity as described by Hopper and Thompson (1980) and refined by Tsunoda (1985). It is shown in this paper that, in the standard usage of Polish in accordance with prescriptive grammars, the O argument is marked in the genitive when its affectedness is low (i.e. in events low in transitivity), whereas it is marked in the accusative when its affectedness is high (i.e. in events exhibiting high transitivity). However, in colloquial Polish, this distinction is no longer indicated morphologically, and, in a process of analogical change, the use of the accusative as a structural case (i.e. mainly expressing the syntactic function of objecthood) becomes prevalent. The results of the corpus study suggest that only some groups of verbs governing the genitive case are affected by this shift, and that case government is also linked to the semantics of the O argument and the frequency of the collocation in the corpus.

Keywords: Polish verbs, case government, accusative, genitive, shift, transitivity, language change

Zusammenfassung

Seit der zweiten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts beobachten Forschende eine wachsende Tendenz zur Verwendung des Akkusativs anstelle des Genitivs bei der Markierung des Objekts einiger polnischer Verben. Basierend auf synchronen Korpusdaten stützt die Studie die Beobachtung einer Verschiebung der Kasusreaktion bei bestimmten polnischen Verben (z.B. *chcieć* ‚wollen‘ und *potrzebować* ‚brauchen‘). Auf der Grundlage empirischer Daten aus einem Webkorpus von 2019 wird der aktuelle Stand der Entwicklung skizziert und aufgezeigt, welche semantischen und morphologischen Gruppen von Verben betroffen sind und in welchem Umfang dies jeweils der Fall ist. Den theoretischen Rahmen für die Untersuchung bildet das Konzept der Transitivität. Die Transitivitätsbegriff von Hopper und Thompson (1980) und Tsunoda (1985) wird herangezogen, um den semantischen Kontrast zwischen Akkusativ und Genitiv zu erklären. Es wird gezeigt, dass im normgerechten Sprachgebrauch des Polnischen die Markierung des Objekts im Genitiv geringere Affiziertheit widerspiegelt (d.h. die Situation ist wenig transitiv), während stärker affizierte Objekte im Akkusativ stehen (d.h. die Situation ist sehr transitiv). In der Umgangssprache wird dieser semantische Unterschied jedoch z.T. nicht mehr morphologisch markiert, denn in einem Prozess des analogen Wandels setzt sich die Verwendung des Akkusativs als struktureller Kasus (d.h. als Indikator der syntaktischen Funktion) durch. Die Ergebnisse der Korpusstudie weisen darauf hin, dass der Wandel in der Kasusreaktion nur einige Gruppen der untersuchten Verben betrifft und dass die Kasusmarkierung des Objekts auch von dessen semantischen Eigenschaften und der Häufigkeit der Kollokation im Korpus abhängt.

Schlagwörter: polnische Verben, Kasusreaktion, Akkusativ, Genitiv, Verschiebung, Transitivität, Sprachwandel

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Current state of research	2
1.2	Preliminaries	4
2	The notion of transitivity from a general perspective	5
2.1	Prototypical transitivity	6
2.2	Prototypical objects	7
2.3	Clause-level features impacting transitivity	9
2.4	Prototypical transitive verbs.....	9
2.5	Middle verbs as an instance of low transitivity or intransitivity	11
3	Transitivity and case marking in Polish	14
3.1	The genitive as a case for the object in Polish and its relation to transitivity	15
3.1.1	Genitive of negation	16
3.1.2	Partitive genitive.....	17
3.1.3	Genitive of superficial or (slight) affectedness	18
3.1.4	Genitive of temporary affectedness	18
3.1.5	Genitive indicating indefiniteness	19
3.1.6	Genitive indicating abstractness	19
3.1.7	Genitive-like accusatives: differential object marking in Polish.....	20
3.2	Transitivity and case government of Polish verbs	21
3.2.1	Verbs of perception	24
3.2.2	Verbs of pursuit	24
3.2.3	Verbs with negative semantics	25
3.2.4	Prefix verbs.....	26
3.2.5	Verbs with the marker <i>się</i> governing the genitive case.....	27
3.2.5.1	Emotion middle verbs.....	29
3.2.5.2	Prefix verbs with <i>się</i>	29
3.2.6	Conclusional remarks on verbs	30
4	Corpus analysis	31
4.1	Choice of the corpus.....	31
4.2	<i>A priori</i> considerations regarding the corpus analysis	32
4.3	Choice of verbs	34

4.4	Results of the corpus analysis	34
4.4.1	<i>Śluchać</i> as a verb of perception.....	35
4.4.2	<i>Szukać</i> , <i>potrzebować</i> , and <i>chcieć</i> as verbs of pursuit.....	36
4.4.3	<i>Unikać</i> as a verb with negative semantics.....	39
4.4.4	<i>Dotykać</i> and <i>dopełnić</i> as prefix verbs	39
4.4.5	<i>Bać się</i> as an emotion middle verb.....	41
4.4.6	<i>Doczekać się</i> , <i>dorobić się</i> and <i>najeść się</i> as prefix verbs with <i>się</i>	42
5	Conclusions	44
5.1	Summary of the main findings	44
5.2	Prospects for further research.....	45
6	References	46
7	Websites cited	49
	Appendix	50

List of Tables

Table 1. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>śluchać</i>	36
Table 2. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>szukać</i>	37
Table 3. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>potrzebować</i>	38
Table 4. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>chcieć</i>	39
Table 5. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>unikać</i>	39
Table 6. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>dotykać</i>	40
Table 7. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>dopełnić</i>	41
Table 8. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>bać się</i>	41
Table 9. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>doczekać się</i>	42
Table 10. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>dorobić się</i>	43
Table 11. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb <i>najeść się</i>	43

Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
A	core argument of a transitive clause (actor or initiator of the activity described by the verb)
ABS	absolutive
ACC	accusative
DAT	dative
E	extension of an intransitive clause, argument which is not O
ERG	ergative
FEM	feminine
GEN	genitive
IMP	imperative
IMPERF	imperfective
INSTR	instrumental
LOC	locative
M	masculine
MM	middle marker
NEG	negative particle
NOM	nominative
NP	noun phrase
O	the other core argument of a transitive clause (participant affected by the activity described by the verb)
PAR	partitive
PERF	perfective
PRON	pronoun
POSS	possessive pronoun
PST	past tense
PL	plural
S	sole argument of an intransitive clause
SG	singular

1 Introduction

Some Polish verbs, usually codified as governing the genitive case, in colloquial contexts can occur with the accusative case instead. This alternation is illustrated by the following example from the plTenTen19 web corpus (Jakubiček et al. 2013, in the following as “plTenTen19”) featuring the verb *potrzebować* ‘to need’ governing the genitive case in (1) and the accusative case in (2):

- (1) Polish (kameraakcja.pl, plTenTen19 4150787527)¹
- | | | | | | | |
|-------|------|------------|--------------------|----------------------------|----------|-----------------------|
| A | więc | teraz | potrzeb-uję | jak-iego-ś | | program-u, |
| and | so | now | need-1SG | some-GEN.SG.M-INDEF | | program-GEN.SG |
| który | | podzieli-Ø | mi | ten | plik-Ø | na |
| which | | split-3SG | PRON.DAT.1SG | this.ACC | file-ACC | on |
- mniejsz-e.
smaller-ACC.PL
‘So now **I need some program** which will split this file into smaller ones for me.’
- (2) Polish (elektroda.pl, plTenTen19 940318035)
- | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------|----|
| Potrzeb-uję | jak-i-ś | | program-Ø | do |
| need-1SG | some-ACC.SG.M-INDEF | | program-ACC.SG | to |
- tłumaczeni-a stron-Ø.
translation-GEN.SG page-GEN.PL
‘**I need some program** for the translation of the pages.’

According to several native speakers asked, there is no striking difference in meaning regarding the verb *potrzebować* in the two sentences above, yet the use with the accusative case is perceived stylistically less accurate. Despite being present in the corpus, the structure *potrzebować* + ACC neither appears in the valency dictionaries by Morciniec et al. (1995: 86), and Mędak (2005: 346f), nor in the corpus-based online valency dictionary Walenty by Przepiórkowski et al. (2017, in the following referred to as “Walenty”), nor in the descriptive grammars by Engel et al. (1999), Bartnicka et al. (2004), Sadowska (2012) and Skibicki (2016). Most mono- and bilingual dictionaries consulted also exclusively allow the genitive after *potrzebować* (sjp.pwn.pl; wsjp.pl; langenscheidt.com), the only exception being pons.com, which allows the accusative as an alternative option. Apart from *potrzebować*, which is mentioned very frequently in this context, more verbs can be found codified as governing the genitive case but displaying a growing use of the accusative (Pastuchowa & Siuciak 2014: 78). A comprehensive list is provided by Muszyńska, which also includes verbs already having undergone the shift in case government (2009: 315f). This suggests that the synchronic alternation is part of a growing

¹ The source indicates the token number under which the example can be found in the corpus.

tendency in Polish to mark the O in the accusative case rather than in the genitive case (the terminology regarding participants is outlined in section 1.2).

In order to illuminate the phenomenon, it is necessary to first understand why some verbs in Polish govern the genitive, whereas the majority of verbs govern the accusative case (Moroz 2021). Here, the universal notion of transitivity based on Hopper and Thompson (1980: 253) and refined by Tsunoda (1985: 87) comes into the picture, signifying that in a prototypical transitive event, an action is transferred from one participant to another causing a change of state in the affected participant. Less prototypical transitive events deviate from this pattern for example in the way that the second participant is not affected by the action denoted by the verb, or when no change of state is induced. The degree of transitivity is often reflected at the level of morphosyntax, e.g. by means of transitive and non-transitive case frames (Tsunoda 1985: 387). In Polish, this accounts for the canonical marking of the O in the accusative case in very transitive events and the non-canonical marking of the O in the genitive in events low in transitivity, as is the case with the verb *potrzebować* in its codified use. The expansion of the accusative case in these contexts suggests that transitivity slowly ceases to be marked morphologically by the accusative-genitive distinction (functioning as semantic cases here), giving way for the accusative as a structural case, i.e. indicating only the syntactic function of the participant without reference to the semantics (Comrie 1989: 124).

The aim of this study is to give an account of the existence, the current status and potential underlying patterns of the shift in case government in Polish verbs. While the shift in case marking with some verbs is mentioned frequently in the literature, the status of others is not discussed as often. In order to find out which of the Polish verbs governing the genitive are affected by the shift, different categories of verbs based on their semantics and morphological features are established, from which we select exemplary verbs for the corpus analysis to see whether certain features make a shift more likely or preserve the government of the genitive case. One question will be whether simplex verbs whose low transitivity is deduced only from verb-inherent semantics are more inclined to a shift in case government than those verbs governing the genitive which feature a formal indicator for the government of the genitive case, i.e. a prefix, the middle marker *się* or a combination of both.

1.1 Current state of research

Much research has been done on the accusative and genitive as competing cases for the direct object in Polish. While the accusative case is commonly considered the standard case for direct objects, governed by the majority of two-place verbs (Richardson 2007: 2), the semantic

deviations implied by the use of the genitive case have attracted more attention and present scholars with a greater challenge (Heinz 1988: 283). So far, different functions of the genitive case for direct objects in Polish, such as the genitive of negation or the partitive genitive, have been described extensively (see e.g. Pisarkowa 1959; Zagorska-Brooks 1967, 1975: 126ff; Heinz 1988: 283ff; Holvoet 1991: 99f; Bartnicka et al. 2004: 517f; Muszyńska 2009: 30ff; Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher 2022). Also, semantic groups of verbs governing the genitive case have been identified (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 379). Among them, Skibicki names verbs denoting expectations, a lack or an increase of something, and verbs expressing a negative meaning (2016: 32). However, Heinz points out that there are difficulties detecting a common semantic pattern underlying the variety of uses of the genitive case for the direct object (1988: 283).

As this paper aims to demonstrate, the semantic link between many contexts, in which the O/E is marked in the genitive, is the low degree of transitivity. The term *transitivity* is used here in accordance with the semantic notion of prototypical transitivity originating from typological studies, developed by Hopper and Thompson (1980), and refined by Tsunoda (1985). Holvoet addresses the notion of transitivity in connection with Polish, but he develops his own concept of prototypical transitivity based on the feature of causativity (1991: 6), as opposed to Hopper and Thompson's multifactorial model (1980: 252).² Giving a detailed analysis of Polish and Fennic, he shows several discontinuities of Hopper and Thompson's transitivity parameters in the respective languages (1991: 157ff), but he does not mention that for the greater part, their theories can be applied fruitfully to Polish. In addition, he does not present a practical model which could serve as a proper alternative to the preexisting ones. Therefore, for this study we will stick with the notion of prototypical transitivity developed by Hopper and Thompson and Tsunoda, and we will only refer to Holvoet regarding the description of the semantics of the genitive case in Polish.

The second part of this study is dedicated to an ongoing shift in case marking in Polish, reducing incidences of non-canonical case marking with the genitive in Polish. General statements on an incremental shift in case government from the genitive to the accusative case can be found in Buttler et al. (1971: 305f), Fisiak et al. (1978: 85), Holvoet (1991: 105), Mazur (1993: 387), and Czardybon (2017: 138, 145). A detailed diachronic study on transitive verbs with competing government of the genitive and accusative case has been conducted by Muszyńska (2009), confirming that there is a shift from genitive government towards accusative government with

² According to Tsunoda, the notions of causativity and transitivity should not be considered the same, as there are transitive clauses (such as *He hit me.*) which cannot be paraphrased as causative clauses (1994: 4675, 4677).

some Polish verbs.³ Her comprehensive list of verbs already having undergone the process, or displaying an alternating case government, constitutes a starting point for the analysis conducted in this work. Czardybon conducted a survey among native speakers asking for the acceptability of the accusative with the verbs *potrzebować* ‘to need’ and *szukać* ‘to look for’ (2017: 138). Pastuchowa and Siuciak (2014) deal with the question of language norm, pointing at the discrepancy between the codified norm and the actual language usage regarding the alternation of case government in Polish.

1.2 Preliminaries

Before we start with the main part, it is necessary to clarify the terminology used in the text, as well as the structure of the paper. When speaking of participants, we follow Onishi (2001: 1f), who applies the following terminology for the participants of a clause:

- A the core argument of a transitive clause, which prototypically denotes the controller or initiator of the activity described by the verb;
- O the other core argument of a transitive clause, which prototypically denotes the participant affected by the activity described by the verb;
- S the sole argument of an intransitive clause;
- E extension to core argument which is not O.

Resulting from this, four clause types, illustrated in (i), can be derived (Onishi 2001: 2):

(i)	Plain transitive	A	O	
	Extended transitive (ditransitive)	A	O	E (or O)
	Plain intransitive	S		
	Extended intransitive	S	E	

Onishi states that sometimes, it can be difficult to distinguish between the A and S, and the O and E respectively, as there are intermediate stages, and the arguments should be treated as semantic prototypes (2001: 3). Thus, in ambivalent cases, we will refer to the argument functioning as the subject of a clause low in transitivity as A/S and to the argument functioning as the second participant as O/E.

The paper is structured as follows: In chapter 2, the notion of transitivity based on Hopper and Thompson and Tsunoda is outlined from a general perspective. The different parameters having an impact on the level of transitivity of a clause are subdivided into reference-related conditions, i.e. features of the A and O, clause-related conditions, i.e. the parameters of MODE, AFFIRMATION, and ASPECT modifying the meaning at clause-level, and predicate-related conditions, i.e.

³ Another direction of language change is the more and more frequent analytical expression of the O by means of a prepositional phrase (Muszyńska 2009: 4), as is the case with the verb *czekać* ‘to wait’, which used to govern the genitive case but now requires the preposition *na* + ACC ‘to wait for’.

the semantics of verbs. Each of them is discussed in one section. Regarding verbal semantics, there is an extra section dealing with the notion of middle voice based on Kemmer (1994), which sheds light on the semantics of low-transitivity verbs and allows a further specification of semantic verb categories. In chapter 3, the theoretical notions introduced in chapter 2 are applied to Polish, creating the basis for the corpus analysis to be conducted in the empirical part of this study. Chapter 4 contains an outline of the methodology applied in the corpus study and an analysis of the results of the individual verbs examined in the corpus. In chapter 5, the findings with the individual verbs are brought together and correlated to the original hypothesis. In the appendix, a comprehensive, albeit incomplete, list of Polish verbs governing the genitive is provided.

2 The notion of transitivity from a general perspective

There are different ways to understand the notion of transitivity. In the most common sense, it is understood as a distinction between intransitive (3) and transitive (4) clauses based on the absence or presence of an O argument (Cranmer 1976: 18; Tsunoda 1994: 4670f).

(3) Robert is sleeping.

(4) Ola is painting a portrait.

A further criterion for transitive clauses is the possibility of passivization (Tsunoda 1994: 4670f; Onishi 2001: 13; Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher 2022), as is illustrated in (5). This makes a distinction difficult for clauses like (6), which feature an object but cannot be passivized.

(5) a. Jan is cooking lunch.

b. The lunch gets cooked (by Jan).

(6) Robert has a pencil.

The term *transitive* (from Latin *transire* ‘go across’) also implies that there is an action ‘going across’ from the A to the O (Tsunoda 1994: 4670). This is the case in (5), but not in (6) or in the following example (7), in which a stimulus passes over “from the object to the subject” (Tsunoda 1994: 4671). However, unlike (6), (7) can be passivized.

(7) a. Anna sees Zosia.

b. Zosia is seen by Anna.

Thus, a view of transitivity which is solely based on the presence of participants in a clause falls short, as the semantic level plays an important role for the notion of transitivity (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 254; Tsunoda 1994: 4671). Hopper and Thompson (1980) developed a

model of transitivity based on several semantic parameters, which has been commented on and refined by scholars ever since. The aspects relevant for the analysis of Polish, and the corpus study to be conducted in the empirical part of this study, will be discussed in the following sections.

2.1 Prototypical transitivity

According to Hopper and Thompson, the notion of transitivity can be understood as a continuum ranging from intransitivity, through low and intermediate stages, to high transitivity (1980: 253f). In the languages of the world, all clauses can be located along this continuum (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 251). Consequently, some clauses are more transitive than others. Thus, Hopper and Thompson define a transitive prototype, positioned at the high end of the continuum, according to the following semantic criteria (1980: 252):

	HIGH	LOW
(8) A. PARTICIPANTS	2 or more participants, A and O	1 participant
B. KINESIS	action	non-action
C. ASPECT	telic	atelic
D. PUNCTUALITY	punctual	non-punctual
E. VOLITIONALITY	volitional	non-volitional
F. AFFIRMATION	affirmative	negative
G. MODE	realis	irrealis
H. AGENCY	A high in potency	A low in potency
I. AFFECTEDNESS OF O	O totally affected	O not affected
J. INDIVIDUATION OF O	O highly individuated	O non-individuated

It becomes apparent that the number of PARTICIPANTS is just one feature decisive for the degree of transitivity of a clause – albeit a rather important one, as can be seen on the case marking pattern of ergative-absolutive languages, where the presence of an O decides whether the A/S is marked in the ergative or absolutive case (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 254). Similar, Tsunoda stresses that not all parameters are equally relevant, e.g. the AFFECTEDNESS OF O is regularly reflected in morphosyntactic marking, whereas VOLITIONALITY of A is not (1985: 386). He also suggests condensing the features of AGENCY and VOLITIONALITY into one single aspect, as he cannot find an example in which the two do not correlate (1985: 392).

While the semantics and the respective degree of transitivity along the continuum are underlying every clause, the morphosyntactic manifestation of the notion of transitivity, e.g. by the means of transitive and non-transitive case frames (Tsunoda 1985: 387), varies significantly across the languages of the world: some features of 8A–J may be reflected in morphosyntax in one language, but not in others, and typically, not all features are relevant in a single language

(Hopper & Thompson 1980: 255). In order to explain the relation between the semantic level of transitivity and morphosyntax, Hopper and Thompson formulated the “transitivity hypothesis”, saying that “[i]f two clauses (a) and (b) differ in that (a) is higher in Transitivity according to any of the features [8]A–J, then, if a concomitant grammatical or semantic difference appears elsewhere in the clause, that difference will also show (a) to be higher in Transitivity” (1980: 255). Tsunoda argues that this hypothesis is too strong, especially regarding the feature of AGENCY/VOLITIONALITY, whose respective degree of transitivity may diverge from the morphosyntactic representation of the notion (1985: 394f). We will come back to this aspect in section 2.4 on prototypical transitive verbs.

While the degree of transitivity is generally determined at clause-level (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 253), some of the transitivity parameters listed in (8) are related specifically to individual components of the clause. Næss calls these inherent properties, in opposition to relational properties, which are a result of the interplay of the components (2007: 30ff). In this chapter, we follow Haspelmath’s classification of conditions having an impact on transitivity, namely “(i) reference-related conditions, (ii) clause-related conditions, and (iii) predicate-related conditions” (2001: 56). Reference-related conditions refer to the nature of the A and the O and their respective referents. As Tsunoda notes, the semantics of the A, i.e. the parameters of AGENCY and VOLITIONALITY, does not impact the morphosyntactic manifestation of transitivity to the same extent as the features of O, i.e. its INDIVIDUATION and AFFECTEDNESS (1985: 393). Thus, we will not go into depth about the nature of A, but only examine which features constitute prototypical Os (see section 2.2). (Grammatical) ASPECT, AFFIRMATION, and MODE are clause-related conditions, modifying the degree of transitivity independently from the lexical meaning of the single components. They are dealt with in section 2.3. Predicate-related conditions, treated in 2.4, are linked to the semantics of the verb of a clause, which includes Hopper and Thompson’s parameters KINESIS, (lexical) ASPECT, and PUNCTUALITY. For a more precise view on verb semantics, we will refer to Tsunoda, who, in his affectedness scale, specifies what constitutes prototypical transitive verbs and which semantic verb classes typically deviate from the transitive prototype (1985: 388). Section 2.5 will deal with verbs denoting middle situations, as these typically deviate from prototypical transitive verbs.

2.2 Prototypical objects

The inherent properties of the O are relevant for the level of transitivity of a clause and are often reflected in morphosyntax, e.g. by specific case frames or incorporation of O into the verb (255ff). According to Hopper and Thompson, a partial AFFECTEDNESS OF O can be associated

with low transitivity, whereas a clause in which the O is affected wholly is considered very transitive, as the action is transferred more effectively in the latter case (1980: 252f). In many languages, partial affectedness, as opposed to complete affectedness, is reflected at the level morphosyntax by special, marked case frames, such as the partitive case in Finnish illustrated in (9):⁴

- (9) Finnish (Luraghi & Kittilä 2014: 20)
 Aino ju-o mehu-**a**.
 Aino drink-PST.3SG juice-PAR
 ‘Aino is drinking (some) juice.’

A second relevant aspect concerning the semantics of the O is its level of INDIVIDUATION, i.e. a clause is more transitive when the O is a highly individuated entity (1980: 252f). The following criteria contribute to the level of INDIVIDUATION OF O (Timberlake 1975, 1977 cited in Hopper & Thompson 1980: 253):

(10)	INDIVIDUATED	NON-INDIVIDUATED
	proper	common
	human, animate	inanimate
	concrete	abstract
	singular	plural
	count	mass
	referential, definite	non-referential

The feature of ANIMACY has received special attention among scholars discussing prototypical transitive events and prototypical objecthood (see e.g. Haspelmath: 2001: 56f; de Swart: 2006: 249ff; Næss 2007: 30f): Unlike Hopper and Thompson, who associate a high INDIVIDUATION OF O due to animacy and definiteness with high transitivity, Næss claims that a prototypical O is “indefinite and inanimate, or at least lower in definiteness and animacy than the clause’s subject” (2007: 30). In this view of transitivity stemming from cognitive linguistics, the parameter AFFECTEDNESS OF O is subordinate to the so-called “principle of distinctness of participants”, which implies that the A and the O need to be maximally semantically distinct in order not to be misinterpreted by the listener (Næss 2007: 30). As animacy, humanness, and definiteness are properties associated with prototypical As, an O carrying one or more of these features is often marked in a special way, whereas inanimate or indefinite Os are not marked. This pattern is referred to as “differential object marking” (de Swart 2006: 249). It is illustrated in the following sentences (11a) and (11b) from Spanish.

⁴ The partitive case in Finnish also expresses indefiniteness (Luraghi & Kittilä 2014: 28f), which is, according to Hopper and Thompson’s transitivity parameters (1980: 252), likewise a feature of events low in transitivity.

- (11) Spanish (Haspelmath 2001: 56)
- | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| a. | Ayer | vi | tu | libro. |
| | Yesterday | see.1SG.PST | POSS.2SG | book. |
| | 'Yesterday I saw your book.' | | | |
| | | | | |
| b. | Ayer | vi | a tu | hermana. |
| | Yesterday | see.1SG.PST | ACC POSS.2SG | sister |
| | 'Yesterday I saw your sister.' | | | |

Thus, the properties of animacy, humanness, and definiteness are viewed differently in separate approaches to transitivity and the morphosyntactic marking of their level of affectedness can intersect with the need to clarify their syntactic function in the clause.

2.3 Clause-level features and transitivity

The features MODE, AFFIRMATION, and grammatical ASPECT belong to the clause-level (Onishi 2001: 5). They can be said to have an impact on the AFFECTEDNESS OF O on a formal, very predictable level: MODE impacts the degree of transitivity of a clause insofar, as the O becomes less affected in a clause in which only the likelihood of the action to take place is expressed (epistemic modality), or in which it is expressed that the action cannot take place (irrealis mood) (Næss 2007: 117). Similarly, in case of negation, the action simply does not take place and, consequently, the O remains unaffected (Næss 2007: 114f). The parameter ASPECT operates both at clause-level, as grammatical aspect, and at the level of the verb phrase, as lexical aspect. This distinction is not made by Hopper and Thompson, who understand ASPECT as (a)telicity (1980: 252). When ASPECT is induced grammatically, e.g. by the use of an aspect marker, it is referred to as boundedness (Richardson 2007: 15ff), allowing the speaker to shift the focus to the endpoints of a situation (Smith 1991: 103). A more detailed account on the relation of the viewing of situations and transitivity is given in section 3.2 on Polish verbs.

2.4 Prototypical transitive verbs

As indicated at the beginning of the chapter, in the light of the notion of transitivity, transitive verbs are no longer just defined as “verb[s] which require two argument NPs to form a grammatical clause” (Næss 2007: 85). There are additional properties at the level of semantics which make a verb more or less transitive. Of Hopper and Thompson’s parameters, KINESIS, (lexical) ASPECT, PUNCTUALITY, and VOLITIONALITY are linked to the semantics of the verb. KINESIS refers to the distinction between dynamic and stative verbs: Only in dynamic situations, a change of state in the O is possible, whereas with stative verbs no action is transferred to the O, and it is not affected (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 252). In terms of lexical ASPECT, each verb can be assigned to one of the five situation types, namely “States, Activities, Accomplishments,

Semelfactives, and Achievements” (Smith 1991: 6). While states cannot be determined in terms of telicity, as they do not describe an action, activities and semelfactives are atelic and accomplishments and achievements are considered telic (Smith 1991: 30). Telicity can either be a verb-inherent feature or a feature of the verb in combination with a delimitating O.⁵ If an action is telic, the AFFECTEDNESS OF O is often increased, compared to an action which does not possess a natural endpoint (Hopper and Thompson 1980: 252). A punctual (or semelfactive) event also correlates with a higher AFFECTEDNESS OF O, as it lasts for such a short time that there is usually no “focus on the internal structure of the event” (Saeed 2016: 116f). The action is viewed as a whole then, and the O is more affected than in a durative situation (Hopper & Thompson 1980: 252). One important objection was made by Tsunoda, who states that, in contradiction to Hopper and Thompson’s assumption, the parameter of VOLITIONALITY does not necessarily have an impact on the degree of transitivity of a clause, as the AFFECTEDNESS OF O does not depend on whether the action was conducted volitionally or not-volitionally, and as the AFFECTEDNESS OF O normally overrides the VOLITIONALITY OF A in the morphosyntactic reflection of transitivity (Tsunoda 1985: 392ff). Tsunoda uses non-volitional (e.g. *to see*, *to hear*) and volitional verbs of perception (e.g. *to look*, *to listen*) to illustrate his point, the former necessarily implying the affectedness of O, whereas the latter can also be used when there is no affected O present (1985: 393f). For instance, in the clause *I looked out of the window* the verb *to look* does not require a stimulus. With the verb *to see*, on the contrary, this would not be possible, as there always needs to be a participant acting as the stimulus, i.e. a clause like **I saw* is ungrammatical (Næss 2007: 192f). Thus, a non-volitional verb with a greater affectedness (or attainment) of O is more transitive than a volitional verb, which does not require an affected (or attained) O (Tsunoda 1985: 388). This distinction is reflected in the morphology of several languages (Tsunoda 1985: 393). We will return to this thought in section 3.2.1, where verbs of perception and their case marking in Polish are discussed.

From the outline above it becomes apparent that the most important feature for measuring the degree of transitivity of verbs is the level of AFFECTEDNESS OF THE O, based on the inherent semantics of the verb. Tsunoda, in his refinement of Hopper and Thompson’s model of transitivity, thus provides the “affectedness scale” (see (12)), a hierarchy of bivalent verbs in terms of transitivity, consisting of seven semantic categories, of which group 1 includes the most and group 7 the least prototypical transitive verbs, and a. is always higher in transitivity than b. (1985: 388).

⁵ That is, *to run* is an activity, and therefore atelic, whereas *to run a marathon* is an accomplishment, and therefore telic (Binnick 1991: 146; Bartnicka et al. 2004: 372).

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------------|--|
| (12) | 1. Direct effect on the patient | |
| | a. Resultative | e.g. <i>kill, break, bend</i> |
| | b. Non-resultative | e.g. <i>hit, shoot, kick, eat</i> |
| | 2. Perception | |
| | a. Patient more attained | e.g. <i>see, hear, find</i> |
| | b. Patient less attained | e.g. <i>listen, look</i> |
| | 3. Pursuit | e.g. <i>search, wait, await</i> |
| | 4. Knowledge | e.g. <i>know, understand, remember, forget</i> |
| | 5. Feeling | e.g. <i>love, like, want, need, fond, fear, afraid, angry, proud, boast</i> |
| | 6. Relationship | e.g. <i>possess, have, lack, lacking, resemble, similar, correspond, consist</i> |
| | 7. Ability | e.g. <i>capable, proficient, good</i> |

As illustrated above, the decisive factor for the classification is the AFFECTEDNESS OF O, as implied by the semantics of the verb. With verbs from the first group, the O is affected most, towards group 7, the AFFECTEDNESS OF O steadily decreases. In terms of KINESIS, group 1 describes prototypical actions involving an agent and a patient, groups 2 and 3 include less prototypical actions (i.e. involving semantic roles other than agent and patient) without inducing a change of state in the O/E,⁶ whereas groups 4–7 describe states which leave the O/E unaffected (Tsunoda 1985: 389). PUNCTUALITY is most present in 1 (in 1a. more than 1b.) and to some extent in group 2, but less present in the other groups. The feature of VOLITIONALITY, as demonstrated above, does not correlate with the scale, as it does not necessarily coincide with the AFFECTEDNESS OF O.

The hierarchy of verbs in terms of transitivity is reflected at the level of morphosyntax, for instance, prototypical transitive verbs are usually realized within transitive case frames, i.e., depending on the language type, either NOM-ACC, ERG-ABS, or NOM-NOM, where the former stands for the case of the A and the latter for the case of the O (Tsunoda 1985: 387). Less transitive verbs, on the other hand, appear in alternative structures, called non-transitive case frames, e.g. within a NOM-GEN case frame (Tsunoda 1985: 387).

2.5 Middle verbs as an instance of low transitivity or intransitivity

As has been illustrated extensively now, prototypical transitivity is linked to the AFFECTEDNESS OF O. In contrast, middle verbs stress the AFFECTEDNESS OF THE A/S by the action they denote

⁶ Regarding the terminology and the possible clause types introduced at the beginning of the paper, it can be said that the affectedness scale reflects the continuum between plain transitive clauses (featuring A and O) and extended intransitive clauses (featuring S and E). The intermediate stages are indicated by referring to the participants as A/S and O/E, leaving open the question of classification.

(Bakker 1994: 24). In many languages, middle verbs are derived from transitive verbs by the addition of a middle marker (MM), which may be a distinct form, or may be identical with the marker for reflexive, reciprocal, impersonal, and/or passive meanings (Kemmer 1994: 179f, 185). A marker of this kind is often called “detransitivizer” (Onishi 2001: 7, for the Russian MM *-sja*), as it in some way reduces the transitivity of the root verb. In the following, we take a closer look at the semantics of middle situations and its link with the notion of transitivity, first at the semantic level, and then regarding the consequences at the morphosyntactic level.

There are several semantic groups of verbs setting up middle situations. Kemmer, for instance, lists ten different middle situation types (1994: 182f), which are depicted in (13).

- | | | |
|------|--------------------------------|---|
| (13) | 1. Grooming or body care | <i>e.g. wash, shave, get dressed</i> |
| | 2. Nontranslational motion | <i>e.g. turn, bow, stretch one's body</i> |
| | 3. Change in body posture | <i>e.g. sit/lie/kneel down, rise, get up</i> |
| | 4. Translational motion | <i>e.g. climb up, go away, walk, stroll, fly</i> |
| | 5. Naturally reciprocal events | <i>e.g. embrace, wrestle, converse, agree, speak together</i> |
| | 6. Indirect middle | <i>e.g. acquire (for oneself), ask, request, desire, crave</i> |
| | 7. Emotion middle | <i>e.g. be angry, be/become frightened, grieve, mourn</i> |
| | 8. Emotive speech actions | <i>e.g. complain, lament</i> |
| | 9. Cognition middle | <i>e.g. cogitate, reflect, think over, believe</i> |
| | 10. Spontaneous events | <i>e.g. geminate, sprout, come to a stop, vanish, recover, originate, occur</i> |

According to Kemmer, there is a “semantic proximity of middle situations to one-participant events” leading to an association with intransitivity (1994: 187). Compare the sentences in (14a) and (14b):

- (14) Polish (personal knowledge)
- a. Bartek mówi. ‘Bartek is speaking.’
- b. Bartek modli się. ‘Bartek is praying.’
- c. Bartek kroi chleb. ‘Bartek is cutting the bread.’

In each sentence, there is only one participant (‘Bartek’), however, (14b) depicts an event in which the S is affected by the action, reflected at the level of morphosyntax by the MM *się*, which is not the case in (14a). In the prototypical transitive event in (14c), on the contrary, a separate participant, the O, is affected. Thus, Kemmer states that “the reflexive and the middle

can be situated as semantic categories intermediate in transitivity between one-participant and two-participant events” (1994: 181).⁷

Kemmer’s analysis of middle and reflexive situations in terms of transitivity is based on the relation of the initiator and the endpoint, whose identicalness can either be expected (with reflexives) or obligatory (with middle verbs) (1994: 201).⁸ Regarding additional participants, she only states that “[m]oreover, in some languages, certain MM verbs are themselves transitive, for example Icelandic *undra-st* ‘wonder at’ and *óttast* ‘fear’, Latin *vereo-r* ‘fear’ and Hungarian *ütköz-* ‘bump into’” (1994: 186). These verbs and their case government will be central to our analysis of Polish verbs. Since they are bivalent, they would appear in Tsunoda’s affectedness scale, albeit rather towards its lower end, as the middle semantics stresses the affectedness of the A/S and implies that the O/E is not (strongly) affected by the action. For instance, INDIRECT MIDDLE verbs correspond to 3. PURSUIT, and EMOTION MIDDLE verbs correspond to 5. FEELING.

Thus, at the level of morphosyntax, if, in a language, a distinction in terms of transitivity is marked morphologically, it can be expected that middle verbs occurring with another participant appear in a non-transitive case frame, as opposed to prototypical transitive verbs, which appear in a transitive case frame (Tsunoda 1985: 387f). In the German sentence in (15), the positive effect of good health on the S is stressed (EMOTION MIDDLE), reflected at the level of morphosyntax by the presence of a MM and the marking of the O in the genitive case.

- (15) German (personal knowledge)
- | | | | | |
|---------|-----------|-------------|----------|-------------|
| Sie | erfreu-t | sich | beste-r | Gesundheit. |
| she.NOM | enjoy-3SG | MM | best-GEN | health.GEN |
- ‘She enjoys the best of health.’ or ‘She is in the best of health.’

⁷ Some scholars consider reflexives a subtype of middle situations (Saeed 2016: 172). Kemmer, on the other hand, distinguishes between middle and reflexive situations based on the *relative distinguishability of participants* (1994: 206), which can be illustrated by the following examples (ii) and (iii).

- (ii) German (personal knowledge)
- Er freut sich. ‘He is glad.’
 - *Er freut seinen Hund. ‘*He is glad his dog.’
- (iii) German (personal knowledge)
- Er bemitleidet sich (selbst). ‘He pities himself.’
 - Er bemitleidet seinen Freund. ‘He pities his friend.’

In German, the marker for middle and reflexive is identical (*sich*). However, in middle situations, such as (iia), *sich* cannot be exchanged by another O, as becomes visible in (iib.). On the contrary, (iiiia) depicts a reflexive situation, in which the action is performed on the A itself, but it is possible to replace the referent by a separate O, as is depicted in (iiib). As a consequence, Kemmer considers the reflexive slightly more transitive, i.e. closer to a clause with two participants, than the middle (1994: 207ff).

⁸ Kemmer (1994), in her outline of middle situation types and transitivity, makes use of the terms *initiator* and *endpoint* to stress the fact that, in less prototypically transitive clauses, participants may also fill other semantic roles than agent and patient.

After having discussed the notion of transitivity from a general perspective, we will now shed light on the manifestation of transitivity in Polish, focusing on the interplay of transitivity and case marking.

3 Transitivity and case marking in Polish

Above, the distinction between transitive and non-transitive case frames following Tsunoda (1985: 387) has been introduced. In Polish, a nominative-accusative language, the most common case for a direct object in a basic transitive and affirmative clause is the accusative (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 256; Moroz 2021), as is illustrated by the sentence in (16) containing the very transitive verb *zabić* ‘to kill’.

- (16) Polish (personal knowledge)
 Ona zabi-ł-a much-ę.
 she.NOM kill-PST-3SG.FEM fly-ACC
 ‘She killed the fly.’

Events low in transitivity, on the other hand, regularly exhibit non-transitive case frames (Tsunoda 1985: 387). For instance, they can be formulated with an experiencer in the dative case and a theme in the nominative (Haspelmath 2001: 66; Næss 2007: 189f), as demonstrated by the following example (17).

- (17) Polish (personal knowledge)
 Podoba **mi** się **ta** książk-a.⁹
 please.3SG PRON.DAT.1SG MM this.NOM book-NOM
 ‘I like this book.’

Another way to mark the distinction between high and low transitivity in Polish is the use of the accusative case as opposed to the genitive case for the marking of the O of bivalent verbs. This opposition will be the main focus of the following sections, the hypothesis being that the genitive case is – or in some cases used to be – employed systematically in Polish in events expressing low transitivity, thus indicating a low degree of AFFECTEDNESS OF O.¹⁰ Low-

⁹ The transitive construction with the verb *lubić* ‘to like’ in (iv) is also possible, but it is not preferred by speakers. Its use is obligatory when the theme is a verb in the infinitive, as in (v).

- (iv) Polish (personal knowledge)
 Lubi-ę **tę** książk-ę.
 like-1SG this.ACC book-ACC
 ‘I like this book.’
- (v) Polish (personal knowledge)
 Lubi-ę chodz-ić po mieście.
 like-1SG walk-INF through city.LOC
 ‘I like to stroll around the city.’

¹⁰ Verbs governing an O in the instrumental case will not be explored in this work. Three-place verbs governing the genitive case for one of the dependent participants are mentioned when they contribute to the establishment of

transitivity features relevant for the morphological marking in Polish can be found in all three classes of parameters proposed by Haspelmath (2001: 56): the semantics of the O can trigger the use of the genitive (reference-related condition), as well as negation and aspect (clause-related conditions), or the genitive can be induced by the verb-inherent semantics, occasionally in combination with morphosyntactic features (predicate-related condition). While the verb semantics is considered the most important factor for non-canonical marking of the O (Haspelmath 2001: 58), the other conditions, especially features of the O and affirmation, are relevant for the setup of the corpus study as well, as it is not possible to examine verbs and verbal government without regarding the context in which they appear.

For the following chapter, the structure has been adapted, leaving only two main sections: 3.1 is concerned with Os low in transitivity, which are marked with the genitive case, and section 3.2 is concerned with the semantics and morphological characteristics of Polish verbs governing the genitive. The two clause-level features reflected in the marking of transitivity in Polish, i.e. AFFIRMATION and ASPECT, have been allocated to these two main sections: AFFIRMATION, reflected by the genitive of negation, is discussed together with other functions of the genitive in 3.1; ASPECT, which is linked to the semantics and morphological shape of verbs, is dealt with in section 3.2. As it will be relevant for the setup of the corpus study, at the end of section 3.1, we will shortly explain the notion of differential object marking in Polish. Eventually, the semantics and the morphological structure of Polish verbs governing the genitive case or displaying an alternation between the genitive and the accusative case will be analyzed. The different categories resulting from the analysis will then form the basis for the corpus study conducted in the empirical part of this work in chapter 4.

3.1 The genitive as a case for the O in Polish and its relation to transitivity

In the following sections, the main semantics of the genitive case, as a case for the O in Polish, will be outlined and related to the notion of transitivity, relying now on grammars and scientific literature on Polish. As this study is concerned with case marking of Os and verbal government, we will not deal with nouns in the genitive case functioning as attributes or adverbial modifiers of other NPs (for this, see e.g. Zagorska Brooks 1975: 124ff), or those governed by prepositions like *bez* ‘without’ or *do* ‘to’, but only with those dependent on verbs.

The uses of the genitive case depicted in the following (except the genitive of negation, which is independent of verb semantics) typically occur with verbs displaying an alternating case

semantic categories, but the case marking of the second participant, usually the recipient or beneficiary, will not be discussed.

government dependent on the semantics of the O, which is also referred to as “fluid case alternation” (Czardybon 2017: 143) or “double government” (Tabakowska 2014). It occurs frequently with verbs denoting a change of possession or the incremental theme verbs *to eat* and *to drink* (Czardybon 2017: 142f). The alternation is usually codified, but in some cases becomes rare (e.g. it is limited to idiomatic expressions) and the use of the genitive is perceived archaic (Holvoet 1991: 107f). Regarding abstract and concrete Os, the case alternation dependent on the features of O is observed frequently in spoken language and is predicted to become more stable in the future (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 380).

3.1.1 Genitive of negation

One well-documented phenomenon in Polish, and to a greater or lesser extent in other Slavic languages, is the genitive of negation, i.e. an O marked in the accusative case in an affirmative clause, appears in the genitive case in the negated clause (Pisarkowa 1959: 9; Zagorska Brooks 1975: 127f; Sadowska 2012: 61, 75; Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher 2022), as is illustrated in (18).¹¹

- (18) Polish (personal knowledge)
- a. Natalia rysuj-e kwiat-y.
 Natalia draw-1SG flower-ACC.PL
 ‘Natalia is drawing flowers.’
- b. Natalia **nie** rysuj-e kwiat-ów.
 Natalia **NEG** draw-1SG flower-GEN.PL
 ‘Natalia is not drawing (*or* does not draw) flowers.’

As it replaces the structural accusative, the genitive of negation is often also considered a structural case in Polish, its use “not depending on semantic factors” (Holvoet 1991: 94). However, the assignment of the genitive case is not arbitrary and there have been many attempts to provide semantic explanations at clause-level for the use of the genitive in negated sentences, which fit to the overall semantics of the genitive case indicating low transitivity: Pisarkowa refers to previous grammars of Polish, according to which the phenomenon is perceived as an extension of the partitive genitive (see section 3.1.2), which, in a negated sentence, stresses that the O is “not even a bit” affected (1959: 9). According to Sadowska, the genitive of negation denotes “absence or unfulfillment of the action” (2012: 75). Luraghi and Kittilä see a connection to indefiniteness, as, when the action does not take place, the O often is non-referential (2014: 35f). These remarks show the interrelatedness of Hopper and Thompson’s transitivity parameters, in this case negation, low AFFECTEDNESS OF O and non-referentiality (as part of low

¹¹ The accusative case after negation is more widespread for instance in Russian than in Polish (Zagorska Brooks 1967: 396).

INDIVIDUATION OF O) are somewhat mutually dependent and all together set up an event low in transitivity.

Under some circumstances, e.g. when the O comes first in the sentence or the negated verb and the O stand far apart, the use of the genitive of negation decreases to the benefit of the accusative case (Pastuchowa & Siuciak 2014: 84; Stefan 2016: 136; Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher 2022).

3.1.2 Partitive genitive

Another function of the genitive in Polish is to express partitive meanings (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 126f; Bartnicka et al. 2004: 517f; Sadowska 2012: 77). In this case, the genitive indicates that the object is only partially affected and not as a whole, yet the affected part is affected thoroughly by the action (Luraghi & Kittilä 2014: 40f). The partitive genitive appears after verbs of giving and taking, and only with Os which are mass or plural nouns (Czardybon 2014: 147). The sentence in (19a) displays partitive semantics reflected morphologically by the genitive, while in (19b), the object is affected wholly, which is in turn reflected by the accusative.

- (19) Polish (Sadowska 2012: 77)
- | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| a. | Daj | mi | win-a. |
| | give.IMP | PRON. DAT.1SG | wine-GEN.SG |
| | 'Give me some (of the) wine.' | | |
| b. | Daj | mi | win-o. |
| | give.IMP | PRON. DAT.1SG | wine-ACC.SG |
| | 'Give me the wine.' | | |

The partitive genitive is sensitive to aspect, i.e., it can only occur with the perfective form of a verb (Czardybon 2014: 147; Biskup 2019: 15f). For instance, this is the case with the perfective verb *kupić* 'to buy', which can occur either with the genitive or with the accusative, whereas the imperfective equivalent *kupować* can only occur with the accusative (Holvoet 1991: 104; Czardybon 2017: 144). Czardybon notes that the partitive genitive after verbs of giving and taking is "falling out of use", i.e. it is accepted only by a minority of speakers (2017: 144f; see also Holvoet 1991: 109).

There is a frequent occurrence of the partitive genitive after verbs with the prefix *na-* expressing perfectivity and adding a cumulative meaning to the basic semantics of the verb (Holvoet 1991: 68; Bartnicka et al. 2004: 218; Biskup 2019: 16, 19), as can be seen in the following sentences, where (20a) shows the base verb governing an accusative and (20b) features the derived verb with an O in the genitive case.¹²

¹² Following Richardson, we use term "base verb" to describe "a verb stripped of any prefixes" (2007: 52).

- (20) Polish (Bartnicka et al. 2004: 218)
- a. Zbiera-ł-em grzyb-y.
pick-PST-1SG.M mushroom-ACC.PL
'I picked mushrooms.'
 - b. Na-zbiera-ł-em grzyb-ów.
PERF-pick-PST-1SG.M mushroom-GEN.PL
'I picked enough mushrooms.'

This kind of prefix is classified superlexical and modifies the meaning of the verb similar like an adverb without changing its basic meaning (Richardson 2007: 52f).¹³ A detailed account on prefixation is given in section 3.2.4.

3.1.3 Genitive of superficial (or slight) affectedness

As a subtype of the partitive genitive, Holvoet names the genitive of superficial (or slight) affectedness, which is obsolescent now in most contexts but preserved in some very frequent collocations and idiomatic expressions, e.g. containing the verb *uchylić* 'to half-open, reveal, lift' (1991: 107ff), as is illustrated in (21).

- (21) Polish (azdoc.pl, plTenTen19 3811030350)
- a. [...], uchyli-ł-Ø tylko kapelusz-a.
lift-PST-3SG.M only hat-GEN.SG
'[...], he only lifted the hat.'
- Polish (historiawisly.pl, plTenTen19 2205255)
- b. Uchyli-ł-Ø jednak rąbka tajemnic-y.
lift-PST-3SG.M nevertheless seam.GEN.SG secret-GEN.SG
'He nevertheless lifted (the seam of) the secret.'

The meaning of *uchylić* contrasts with *zdejmować* 'to take off', signifying that the *hat* in (21a) is only slightly affected by the action. Luraghi and Kittilä state that this reading of partitives as a sign of lower affectedness, unlike with the partitive genitive described above, does not stress a part-whole contrast in the affected O, but rather the incompleteness of the action leading to a partial or lower affectedness of O (2014: 42). The semantics may in some cases resemble imperfective aspect stressing the unboundedness of an event (Luraghi & Kittilä 2014: 57).

3.1.4 Genitive of temporary affectedness

Another subtype of the partitive genitive indicates that the O is affected only for a short time (Zagorska Brooks 1967: 396; Zagorska Brooks 1975: 127; Holvoet 1991: 109f; Bartnicka et al. 2004: 518; Czardybon 2017: 144), as is illustrated by the following example (22).

¹³ The regular perfective form of the verb *zbierać* 'to pick, to collect', which does not imply a change of the lexical meaning, is *zebrać*.

- (22) Polish (Bartnicka et al. 2004: 518)
 Da-j mi młotka.
 give-IMP PRON.DAT.1SG hammer.GEN.SG
 ‘Give me the hammer (for a short time).’

Similar to the above, the temporariness of the event indicates a lower affectedness of the O (Holvoet 1991: 110). Czardybon states that an O marked in the genitive case in a comparable construction was not accepted by most native speakers, which indicates that this function of the genitive case is no longer in use (2017: 144).

3.1.5 Genitive indicating indefiniteness

According to Zagorska Brooks, the genitive may also signify indefiniteness or indetermination of the O (1967: 395; 1975: 127), which is consistent with Hopper and Thompson’s statement of indefiniteness as a low-transitivity feature (1980: 259). Luraghi and Kittilä show up a relation to the partitive semantics, stating that “[t]he removed part is less definite than the specified whole” (2014: 57). Czardybon, in his extensive discussion of the matter, also deduces the indefinite reading from the partitive genitive, but stresses that this may be a result of a pseudo-partitive reading, signifying ‘a certain amount’ but not specifying the source or the whole from which the amount is taken (2014: 145ff), as is illustrated in (23).

- (23) Polish (Czardybon 2014: 146, gloss adapter by the author)
 Da-ł-em mu zup-y.
 give-PST-1SG.M PRON.DAT.3SG soup-GEN
 ‘I gave him **some of the** soup.’ or ‘I gave him (**some**) soup.’

With an O in the accusative case, on the other hand, both interpretations are possible (Czardybon 2014: 146), as is shown in (24).

- (24) Polish (Czardybon 2014: 146)
 Da-ł-em mu zup-ę.
 give-PST-1SG.M PRON.DAT.3SG soup-ACC
 ‘I gave him (**the**) soup.’

According to Czardybon, the genitive in contexts like (23) is not accepted anymore by many speakers of Polish, the percentage varying depending on the O and the verb (2014: 147).

3.1.6 Genitive indicating abstractness

Several verbs exhibit double government with regard to the feature of abstractness, i.e. when the O is abstract, it is marked in the genitive case, whereas a concrete O is marked in the accusative case (Richardson 2007: 45). This is in accord with Hopper and Thompson’s transitivity parameter INDIVIDUATION OF O, where abstractness contributes to a low INDIVIDUATION OF O

and thus to lower transitivity, whereas a concrete O is highly individuated and contributes to higher transitivity of the clause (1980: 252f). An often-cited example is the verb *chcieć* ‘to want’ (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 127), which appears with an abstract O in the genitive in (25) and with a concrete O in the accusative in (26).

- (25) Polish (home.pl, plTenTen19 4634086)
 Chc-emy realizacj-**i** klarown-ej polityk-i Państw-a; [...].
 want-3PL implementation-GEN clear-GEN policy-GEN state-GEN
 ‘We want the implementation of a clear state policy; [...].’
- (26) Polish (emebel.pl, plTenTen19 1599525)
 Chc-emy mebel-**Ø** prost-y, klasyczn-y [...].
 want-3PL piece.of.furniture-ACC simple-ACC classic-ACC
 ‘We want a simple, classic piece of furniture [...].’

A further verb expected to exhibit double government with regard to abstractness is *wzywać* ‘to call for’, which governs the genitive in the collocation *wzywać pomocy* ‘to call for help’ and the accusative in *wzywać pogotowie ratunkowe* ‘to call the ambulance service’).

3.1.7 Genitive-like accusatives: differential object marking in Polish

Above, the function of the genitive case to express semantics deviating from the transitive prototype has been discussed. However, case has also a function on the syntactic level, namely allowing the listener to identify the syntactic role of the participant in a bivalent clause (Næss 2007: 154, 159f). Polish, as a highly inflectional language with a flexible word order (Fisiak et al. 1978: 64; Moroz 2021), makes use of the principle of differential object marking in order to enable the listener to distinguish between the A and the O argument (Stefan 2016: 133). As has been illustrated in the section 2.2 on prototypical objects, an animate O can easily lead to misinterpretation by the listener, as ANIMACY is a typical feature of the A (Næss 2007: 19). Thus, in Polish, there is a split in case marking separating between masculine animate (in the singular) and masculine personal (in the plural) nouns on the one hand, and all feminine and neuter nouns as well as masculine inanimate (in the singular) and masculine impersonal nouns (in the plural) on the other hand. The former display a syncretism of genitive and accusative endings (thus the term *genitive-like accusatives* (Holvoet 1991: 112ff)) in the singular and plural, whereas the latter have identical forms in the nominative and accusative, or in the case of feminine nouns in the singular, have a distinct ending in the accusative (Czardybon 2017: 133ff).¹⁴ The split system is illustrated for the singular in (27), where in each sentence the morphological marking

¹⁴ For a diachronic account of the matter see Kulikov (2006: 38f).

of an animate O is contrasted with that of an inanimate O, (27a) depicting masculine nouns, (27b) depicting neuter nouns, and (27c) depicting feminine nouns as the O.

- (27) Polish (personal knowledge)
- | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a. | Jacek | widzi-Ø | pracownik- a . | /wazon-Ø. |
| | Jacek.NOM | see-3SG | worker-ACC (=GEN) | vase-ACC (=NOM) |
| | ‘Jacek sees the worker/the vase.’ | | | |
| | | | | |
| b. | Jacek | widzi-Ø | dzieck- o . | /narzędzi- e . |
| | Jacek.NOM | see-3SG | child-ACC (=NOM) | tool-ACC (=NOM) |
| | ‘Jacek sees the child/the tool.’ | | | |
| | | | | |
| c. | Jacek | widzi-Ø | kobiet- ę . | /filiżank- ę . |
| | Jacek.NOM | see-3SG | woman-ACC (≠NOM/GEN) | cup-ACC (≠NOM/GEN) |
| | ‘Jacek sees the woman/the cup.’ | | | |

Only in (27a), do the case endings vary depending on the feature of ANIMACY, the ending for animate nouns being identical to the genitive ending and the ending for inanimate being identical to the nominative ending. Neuter nouns, as in (27b), display identical endings in the nominative and in the accusative case. The animate noun *dziecko* ‘child’ constitutes a rare exception in this class, which for the major part contains only inanimate nouns, rendering a distinction into inanimate and animate Os obsolete (Czardybon 2017: 136). Feminine nouns, on the contrary, display a unique ending in the accusative singular, and thus always allow correct interpretation by the listener (see (27c)). In the plural, however, feminine nouns have identical endings in the nominative and in the accusative case, which makes the interpretation dependent on the context and the word order.

The pattern of animate masculine nouns (as in (27a)) is also attested for a limited set of inanimate masculine nouns belonging to several semantic groups, such as dances (e.g. *polonez* ‘polonaise’), sports (e.g. *tenis* ‘tennis’), currencies (e.g. *dolar* ‘dollar’), and names of car brands (e.g. *Fiat*) or cigarette brands (e.g. *Giewont*) (Czardybon 2017: 135f). In colloquial language, genitive-like accusatives are also applied to other Os, e.g. concepts of digital life (e.g. *e-mail*) (Stefan 2016: 134, 138). In the corpus study, Os exhibiting differential object marking need to be excluded, as it cannot be determined whether they are marked in the genitive or accusative case. The same holds for feminine and neuter nouns which exhibit identical forms in the genitive singular and in the accusative plural.

3.2 Transitivity and case government of Polish verbs

After having discussed different properties of O linked to low transitivity and their reflection in case marking, we now turn to the semantics of Polish verbs. Most bivalent verbs in Polish synchronically and diachronically govern the accusative case for the O, while at the same time

exhibiting features of high transitivity (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 256; Moroz 2021). However, a number of Polish verbs govern the genitive case or display an alternation between the two cases (some have been mentioned in the previous sections). The aim in this section is to categorize these verbs at the basis of their semantics and morphosyntactic features.

Before we start with the categorization, some pre-considerations need to be made. When dealing with verbs in a Slavic language, the category of ASPECT cannot be disregarded. Polish verbs setting up a dynamic event appear in aspectual pairs consisting of one imperfective and one perfective verb form, this regular opposition being referred to as grammatical aspect (Richardson 2007: 15ff).¹⁵ As Hopper and Thompson list ASPECT as one of their transitivity parameters, saying that a telic verb (or situation) is more transitive than an atelic one (1980: 252), it is necessary to clarify the relation between grammatical aspect in Polish and transitivity, i.e. the feature of telicity. The main question is therefore whether the choice of the imperfective or the perfective form of a verb, apart from its inherent semantics (i.e. lexical aspect), impacts the degree of transitivity of a situation. The matter has been discussed extensively by scholars (see e.g. Bartnicka et al. 2004: 374; Richardson 2009: 53; Biskup 2019: 13, 15), but we can only give a very superficial account of it here. Biskup holds the opinion that aspectual prefixes can indeed function as “telicizers” (2019: 13, 15), as he demonstrates with the test on telicity illustrated by the sentences in (28), where (28a) features the imperfective verb form *pisać* ‘to write’, and (28b) features the perfective equivalent *napisać*.¹⁶

- (28) Polish (Biskup 2019: 13, gloss adapted by the author)
- a. Joanna **pisala** mail godzinę / *w godzinę.
 Joanna **wrote** email hour in hour
 ‘Joanna **was writing** an email for an hour/ *in an hour.’
- b. Joanna **na-pisala** mail *godzinę / w godzinę.
 Joanna **PERF-wrote** email hour in hour
 ‘Joanna **wrote** an email in an hour/ *for an hour.’

In (28b), the perfective aspect stresses the endpoints of the action, whereas in (28a), the action is viewed as ongoing using the imperfective aspect (Smith 1991: 93). At first glance, the examples imply a higher AFFECTEDNESS OF O in (28b) than in (28a). However, it is not possible to

¹⁵ Stative verbs, on the other hand, often only appear in the imperfective form. For instance, the verbs *wiedzieć* ‘to know’, *chcieć* ‘to want’, *potrzebować* ‘to need’, and *mieć* ‘to have’ lack a perfective form and thus are called mono-aspectual verbs (Skibicki 2016: 285).

¹⁶ Assuming that there is no lexical difference between the two verb forms but only a grammatical one (some scholars would disagree, stating that lexical meaning is preserved to a certain degree in all prefixes, see Binnick 1991: 137), another concept than telicity applies here, namely the closely related notion of boundedness (Richardson 2007: 15ff). Depraetere (1995: 1f) describes the distinction as follows: boundedness refers to the existence of “potential endpoints”, whereas telicity refers to “actual temporal boundaries” (which are inherent to the semantics of the verb or the whole clause).

say that the AFFECTEDNESS OF O is generally higher with the perfective aspect, as could be seen with the verb *kupić* ‘to buy’, which allows the partitive genitive (i.e. a non-transitive case frame) as an alternative to the accusative only after the perfective form (see section 3.1.2). It is rather the case that the perfective form, by shifting the focus to the endpoints of the action, allows to specify the degree of AFFECTEDNESS OF O, whereas with the imperfective verb, the focus lies on “the internal structure of the situation” (Comrie 1976: 16) and the degree of AFFECTEDNESS OF O is simply not relevant, as the situation is “open informationally” (Smith 1991: 11). Consequently, there is no direct reflection of imperfective and perfective verb forms in non-transitive and transitive case frames. On the contrary, the use of the accusative is often obligatory despite the use of the imperfective form of a verb and a not further specified O. This is due to the fact that the accusative functions as a structural case here, i.e. it only expresses the syntactic relation of objecthood, and is otherwise semantically empty (Comrie 1989: 124), as opposed to semantic or lexical case assignment in the rare case of a part-whole contrast after a perfective verb. This explains why the imperfective and perfective forms of a verb in Polish generally govern the same case for the O and allows us to disregard grammatical aspect in the following sections and in the corpus analysis.

In the following categorization and analysis, the focus lies on bivalent verbs governing, or having governed, the genitive case for the O at a historical or present stage of the language. Three-place verbs are included in order to draw a more complete image of genitive semantics, but the case marking of the third argument (usually the recipient or beneficiary) will not be examined, as the topic lies beyond the scope of this study. Some of the verbs display an alternation between the genitive and the accusative case for the O, which, unlike with the verbs from the previous sections, is not motivated semantically, but as part of a tendency in Polish to reduce the complexity of the language system by replacing non-canonical forms with canonical ones (Pastuchowa & Siuciak 2014: 81). This alternation may or may not be codified yet (often depending on medium consulted). For the classification, we rely on the information on case government provided in Walenty and Mędak (2005), before looking at the actual language usage in the empirical part. An extensive list of Polish verbs governing or having governed the genitive case or exhibiting double government is attached in the Appendix.

The aim in the next sections is to find out which semantic (and morphological) features lead to the use of genitive case with certain verbs, and to make out several classes of verbs depending on the motivation for the government of the genitive case. Some classes have already been described in the literature, among them are “verbs of ‘negative’ meaning (*zabraniać*,

zakazywać, odmawiać), verbs denoting need, desire, request (*potrzebować, szukać, chcieć*), verbs denoting emotions (*zazdrościć, nienawidzić*), some reflexive verbs (*bać się, spodziewać się*), verbs with prefixes *do-*, *na-* (*dotykać, nasypać*)” (Fisiak et al. 1978: 65). In the following, a more in-depth perspective on these and further classes of Polish verbs governing the genitive case will be provided based on the semantic notion of transitivity and the category of middle verbs, which have been described above.

3.2.1 Verbs of perception

As illustrated in 2.4, verbs of perception (group 2 in Tsunoda’s affectedness scale) can be subdivided into verbs with a more attained patient (*see* and *hear*) and verbs with a less attained patient (*look* and *listen*), the former being slightly more transitive than the latter (Tsunoda 1985: 388). Næss explains that with the former, the “‘effect’ of being perceived is achieved for the O argument of *see* but not necessarily for that of *look at*” (2007: 191ff, italics by the author). In Polish, this distinction is reflected in the case government of the verbs *szuchać* ‘to listen’, which governs the genitive case, and *szyszeć* ‘to hear’, which governs the accusative case. The case government of the two verbs contrasts with Hopper and Thompson’s parameter of VOLITIONALITY and the transitivity hypothesis: in fact, *szuchać* denotes a volitional action and *szyszeć* a non-volitional one, but *szuchać* appears in a non-transitive case frame and *szyszeć* in a transitive case frame. Thus, the morphological manifestation of transitivity in Polish supports Tsunoda’s objection to Hopper and Thompson’s parameter of VOLITIONALITY and the transitivity hypothesis. Interestingly, the equivalents for visual perception (*widzieć* ‘to see’, *patrzyć* ‘to look’, and *oglądać* ‘to watch’) all govern the accusative case (in the case of *patrzyć* with the preposition *na* + ACC),¹⁷ similar to *czuć* ‘to feel, to smell’ and *odczuwać* ‘to sense’. *Kosztować* ‘to taste, to try’ governs a partitive genitive (Pastuchowa & Siuciak 2014: 78).

Alongside mental verbs and verbs of cognition, Luraghi and Kittilä list verbs of experience as likely to appear in non-transitive case frames (2014: 43). For reasons of simplification, they are included in this section. Indeed, *doświadczać* ‘to feel, to perceive, to experience’ and *doznawać* ‘to sustain’ govern the genitive case. As the two are derived verbs with the prefix *do-*, a combination of semantic and morphological motivations is plausible (see section 3.2.5 on prefix verbs).

¹⁷ The embedding of an O within a prepositional phrase may be another way of expressing low transitivity. Due to the limited scope of this study, this issue cannot be examined more in-depth here.

3.2.3 Verbs of pursuit

Verbs of pursuit (group 3 in Tsunoda's affectedness scale) are codified as governing the genitive case in Polish. These include verbs denoting searching (*szukać* 'to look for', and *doszukiwać się* 'to look for, to want to find out'), waiting (*czekać* 'to wait', which historically governed the genitive but is used with the preposition *na* + ACC nowadays, and *doczekać się* 'to wait until'), and awaiting (*oczekiwać* 'to await', and *spodziewać się* 'to expect'). Verbs signifying necessity (*potrzebować* 'to need', *żądać* 'to demand', *domagać się* 'to demand', *wymagać* 'to require', and possibly also *wzywać* 'to call for'), and those expressing desire (*chcieć* 'to want', *pożądać* 'to desire', *pragnąć* 'to long for', *łaknąć* 'to crave', as well as the three-place verb *życzyć komuś/sobie* (DAT) 'to wish someone/oneself') also regularly govern the genitive. According to Tsunoda's affectedness scale (1985: 388), they belong to group 5. FEELING, as they have a stative meaning. However, they are semantically related to group 3. PURSUIT, since all the verbs listed here share the implication that the O is absent. In Kemmer's categorization of middle verbs, verbs expressing desire correspond to the group of INDIRECT MIDDLE verbs (1994: 182f).

3.2.4 Verbs with negative semantics

Verbs expressing negative semantics do not appear explicitly in Tsunoda's affectedness scale (1985: 388), however, as mentioned by Fisiak et al. (1978: 65) and Pastuchowa and Siuciak (2014: 83), they constitute a class of verbs governing the genitive case in Polish. Similar to the previous section, the genitive denotes the absence of O.¹⁸ Among the verbs with negative semantics governing an O in the genitive there are the three-place verbs *zabraniać komuś*(=DAT) *czegoś*(=GEN) 'to prohibit somebody from doing something' and *pozbawiać komuś*(=DAT)/*sobie*(=DAT) *czegoś*(=GEN) 'to deprive someone/oneself of something', and the two-place verbs *pozbywać się* 'to get rid of', *zapominać* 'to forget' (alternatively with the preposition *o* + LOC), *odmawiać* in the meaning of 'to refuse, to deny, to cancel',¹⁹ *unikać* 'to avoid' and *wystrzegać się* 'to beware of', as well as *uchodzić* 'to escape' (the latter can also govern the dative case (Mędak 2005: 537)).

¹⁸ When the S is absent, as is the case in the existential construction *nie ma* 'is not there' (lit. 'has not') and with the semantically related verb *brakować* 'to miss, be absent', it is also marked with the genitive.

¹⁹ The verb *odmawiać* has been derived with divergent meanings. It can be used as the three-place verb *odmawiać komuś*(=DAT) *czegoś*(=GEN) meaning 'to deny somebody something', which governs the genitive for the argument appearing as the theme. With the semantically related meaning 'to cancel' and a concrete O (e.g. *spotkanie* 'an appointment') it is also found exclusively with the genitive in p1TenTen19. In the context of church, however, *odmawiać* appears in the semantically unrelated meaning 'to say, to recite', usually in the phrases *odmawiać modlitwę*(=ACC) or *odmawiać różaniec*(=ACC) 'to say a prayer', or 'to say a rosary'. Here, the verb does not express negative semantics, which is in turn reflected by the use of the accusative case.

The verb *żałować* ‘to regret’ and the three-place verb *zazdrościć* ‘to envy’ can also be allocated to the class of verbs with negative semantics, the former expressing the wish that something did not happen, the latter expressing the wish to possess something that is possessed by another person but not by oneself. With the verb *nienawidzić* ‘to hate’, the negative semantics is reflected also morphologically by the fusion of the negative particle *nie* with the verb *nawidzić* ‘to hit, to strike; to obsess, to haunt’ governing the accusative (Richardson 2007: 243). Richardson assumes that the negative particle triggers the genitive of negation here (2007: 243). Similarly, the – morphologically still more transparent – semantically related expressions *nie cierpieć* ‘to be unable to stand’ and *nie znosić* ‘to be unable to bear’ govern the genitive case (Sadowska 2012: 82).

3.2.5 Prefix verbs

By means of a prefix, a simplex (or non-composite) verb becomes complex (or composite) (Binnick 1991: 142). Three different kinds of verbal prefixes are distinguished in Slavic: “purely perfectivizing, superlexical, and lexical prefixes” (Richardson 2007: 52). By means of the former two, a perfective verb form is derived from an imperfective base verb. While a purely perfectivizing prefix does not change the lexical meaning of the base verb, a superlexical prefix adds “additional information about the action denoted by the verb – often with respect to time or intensity” (Richardson 2007: 53).²⁰ Lexical prefixes, on the other hand, “often contribute directional or idiosyncratic meanings to the verb” (Richardson 2007: 53), e.g. the complex verbs *wsiadać* ‘to enter (a bus, a tram etc.)’ (lit. ‘to sit in’) and *posiadać* ‘to possess, to own’ derived from *siadać* ‘to sit’.

Deriving a complex verb from a simplex verb by means of prefixation can bring a change in lexical aspect (Richardson 2007: 52ff). For instance, an action (atelic) can become an accomplishment (telic), as is the case e.g. with *czytać* ‘to read’ and *przeczytać* ‘to read through’, where the superlexical prefix *prze-* induces perfectivity and also lexically contributes to the telicity of the situation, the latter not being the case with the purely perfectivizing prefix *po-* (Bartnicka et al. 2004: 374). The different semantics expressed by superlexical (and sometimes also lexical prefixes) have become known as *Aktionsarten* (Richardson 2007: 5). They may interact with case marking in Polish, which is not the case with the example of *czytać* and *przeczytać*, which both govern the accusative. The prefixes *na-* and *do-*, however, do impact the case government of the verb (Bartnicka et al. 2004: 518). The superlexical prefix *na-* carries a cumulative

²⁰ Some scholars do not agree to this, stating that lexical meaning is preserved to a certain degree in all prefixes (Binnick 1991: 137).

meaning (Biskup 2019: 16) or denotes satiation (Sadowska 2012: 335), which is why a complex verb with the prefix (in one of these meanings), unlike the base verb, requires the partitive genitive (Muszyńska 2009: 5; see also section 3.1.2). Examples are the derived verbs *nanosić* ‘to bring a great amount of’ from *nosić* ‘to carry’, or *naprosić* ‘to invite many’ from *prosić* ‘to ask, to plead’ (Walenty).

Likewise, the derivation with the prefix *do-* denoting ‘addition’ often evokes a shift in case government with the base verb (Holvoet 1991: 105). While the base verb usually governs the accusative case, the prefixed verb governs the genitive case with a partitive meaning, as with the pairs *lać* ‘to pour’ and *dolewać* ‘to add by pouring’, *dawać* ‘to give’ and *dodawać* ‘to add by giving’, and *kladać* ‘to put’ and *dokładać* ‘to add by putting’ (Muszyńska 2009: 5). The prefix *do-* also appears with a resultative meaning, denoting that the action was brought to an end or a destination or temporal boundary has been reached (Bartnicka et al. 2004: 319; Sadowska 2012: 330). Examples are the verbs *dopełnić* ‘to fulfill, to accomplish’, or *dobiegać* ‘to reach (an age)’, both governing the genitive case, as opposed to their simplex counterparts (Walenty). The prefix verb *dotykać* in the meaning of ‘to touch (physically)’ can also be explained with the resultative meaning of *do-*, the affected O (marked in the genitive in the codified usage) functioning as a physical boundary which is reached. *Dotykać* can also appear in a figurative sense with the meaning ‘to touch (emotionally)’, then said to govern the accusative case (Pastuchowa & Siuciak 2014: 78; Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher 2022). This is in accord with the fact that in this figurative sense, no boundary is reached.

Strikingly, the greater telicity (and thus higher degree of transitivity) of complex verbs with the prefixes *na-* denoting satiation or cumulation and *do-* with a resultative meaning does not coincide with a transitive case frame, but with a non-transitive case frame here. This is because the prefixation with *na-* resembles the use of a quantifier, which requires the partitive genitive in Polish (Sadowska 2012: 82f), and the prefix *do-* still contains the lexical meaning of the preposition *do* ‘to’, from which it originates and which also governs the genitive, albeit not indicating low-transitivity semantics in this case (Biskup 2019: 20). The frequent occurrence of the middle marker *się* with derived verbs, such as in *naczytać się* ‘to read (plenty of)’ from *czytać* ‘to read’ and *domyślać się* ‘to assume’ from *mysleć* ‘to think’ (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 256), could be a strategy to fix this discrepancy between high transitivity and the government of the genitive by offering an alternative motivation for the government of the genitive which is consistent with the notion of transitivity, i.e. middle semantics. In the next section, we will examine this notion in greater depth.

3.2.6 Verbs with the marker *się* governing the genitive case

The polysemous marker *się* appears with many verbs governing the genitive case (see Appendix). It is akin to the accusative form of the Polish reflexive pronoun in the accusative. In the event structure, *się* fills the slot of the affected O (indicated by the accusative case), but it does not raise the number of arguments, as it contains the information that the A/S and the O are identical entities. Thus, it expresses the affectedness of A/S by the action, whereas the affectedness of a further argument (if present) is not emphasized, reflected by the marking with the genitive case. This can be illustrated by the verb *chwycić* ‘to grab’, which can appear as a regular transitive verb governing the accusative case, as in (29), and in combination with the marker *się* governing the genitive case, as in (30).

- (29) Polish (benc.pl, plTenTen19 255331)
 Mąż bez namysłu **chwyt-a** telefon-Ø i
 husband without thought **grab-3SG** **phone-ACC** and
 bierz-e dzień wolny.
 take-3SG day free
 ‘Without thinking, the husband **grabs the phone** and takes the day off.’

- (30) Polish (fit.pl, plTenTen19 79267437)
Chwyt-amy się poręcz-y i pochyl-amy się do
grab-1PL MM **handrail-GEN** and bend-1PL MM to
 przodu [...].
 front
 ‘We **grab the handrail** and bend forward [...].’

While in (29), the ‘phone’ appears as a regular affected O, in (30), the construction with the marker *się* stresses the effect of the action on A, namely ‘finding balance by grabbing the handrail’, whereas the effect on the ‘handrail’ is irrelevant.

In archaic contexts, *się* can also indicate that a further argument is only temporarily or slightly affected, as can be seen in the following example (31) featuring the verb *dotykać* ‘to touch’ in combination with the marker.

- (31) Polish (eszkola.pl, plTenTen19 804280566)
 Kędy wąż ślisk-ą piersi-ą **dotyk-a** się ziół-a...
 where snake slippery-INSTR breast-INSTR **touch-3SG** MM **herb-GEN**
 ‘Where the snake **brushes the herb** with its slippery breast...’

Here, the construction with the marker *się* and the genitive case can emphasize the effect of the action on the A, but also emphasizes the low affectedness of the argument in the genitive case, i.e. a very slight or brief ‘contact’ between the ‘snake’ and the ‘herb’. However, there are very few similar examples in the corpus, often stemming from literary sources, and the construction

with *dotykać* and *się* (in a non-reflexive and non-reciprocal use) is no longer considered natural by native speakers questioned on this matter. Examples like (29) and (30), on the other hand, are frequently used. What all these contexts have in common is that *się* in some way reduces the transitivity of the clause. While the verbs listed here can appear with or without the marker, others obligatorily feature *się*. Of these, two major groups are outlined in the following sections.

3.2.5.1 Emotion middle verbs

Verbs denoting emotions regularly require the middle marker *się* in Polish, thus belonging to middle voice and corresponding to Kemmer's category of EMOTION MIDDLE (1994: 182f).²¹ They express stative meanings and consequently do not possess perfective forms. In Tsunoda's affectedness scale, they belong to category 5. FEELING, thus exhibiting low transitivity. Consequently, the dependent argument, if present at all, is marked in the genitive. Examples are the verbs *bać się* 'to be afraid', *brzydzić się* 'to be disgusted', *obawiać się* 'to fear', and *wstydzić się* 'to be ashamed'.²²

3.2.5.2 Prefix verbs with *się*

In section 3.2.4, prefixation and its interrelation with case marking of the O and transitivity have been discussed. Zagorska Brooks (1975: 256) and Wróbel (2001: 210) state that prefixation is often paralleled by the presence of the marker *się*. This is not just the case with *na-* and *do-*, but also with other prefixes (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 256). However, due to the scope of this paper we will limit the analysis to these two prefixes.

Examples for the pattern *do-... się* are the verbs *doczekać się* 'to wait until', *domagać się* 'to demand', *domyślać się* 'to assume, to guess', *dopominać się* 'to need, to require', *dorabiać się* 'to obtain', and *doszukiwać się* 'to search for, to want to find out'. Often, these verbs have an almost synonymous partner without *się*, for instance *czekać* 'to wait', *wymagać* 'to demand', *przypuszczać* 'to assume', *potrzebować* 'to need', *dostać* 'to get, to obtain', *szukać* 'to search for'. Remarkably, except for *przypuszczać*, these also all govern the genitive case or have done so in the past, as is the case with *czekać* (Richardson 2007: 242). This indicates that the base verbs are already low in transitivity, but without any reflection of middle semantics at the formal level. With the derived forms featuring *się*, speakers can express the middle semantics overtly.

²¹ In the literature on Polish, these are often called *reflexiva tantum* (Skibicki 2016: 317) or plainly *reflexive verbs* (Fisiak et al. 1978: 65). In this paper, a distinction between middle verbs and reflexives following Kemmer (1994) is maintained.

²² *Brzydzić się* can also govern the instrumental case. Other emotion middle verbs, such as *cieszyć się* 'to be glad', only govern the instrumental case. Thus, it would be an interesting question whether the instrumental case also marks low transitivity in Polish. However, due to the scope of this paper, we cannot answer this question here.

The difference in meaning expressed by the verbs with *do-... się* then lies in the combination of the resultative meaning of the prefix *do-* and the emphasis of the effect of the action on the A, which is indicated by the middle marker. Sadowska describes the semantics of the derived verbs with the marker *się* as follows: “*Do-...się* suggests obstacles on the final leg just before reaching the finishing line: *doczekać się sprawiedliwości* ‘to wait and achieve justice,’ *doczekać się awansu* ‘to finally get promoted’” (2012: 330, italics by the author).

The pattern with *na-... się* works in a similar way, yet the prefix has a quantitative or cumulative meaning, which can be considered a motivation for the government of the partitive genitive (compare section 3.1.2). The second motivation for the government of the genitive case, like above, is the middle semantics, expressed morphologically by the middle marker *się*. Examples for the pattern with *na-... się* are the ingestive verbs *najadać się* ‘to eat one’s fill’ from *jeść* ‘to eat’, and *napić się* ‘to drink one’s fill, to have a drink’ from *pić* ‘to drink’, as well as *napalić się* ‘to smoke a lot’ from *palić* ‘to smoke’, *nawozić się* ‘to drive around many’ from *wozić* ‘to drive around’ and *naprosić się* ‘to invite many, to ask for a long time’ from *prosić* ‘to ask for’ (Walenty). With all these examples, the effect of the action on the A is emphasized, e.g. having eaten or drunk enough or a lot, or having to wait long for an answer. However, unlike with the verbs of the *do-... się* pattern, the base verbs are usually very transitive (except for *prosić*, which semantically belongs to verbs of pursuit and can govern the genitive case).

3.2.6 Concluding remarks on verbs

What became clear in the previous chapter is that there are multiple, heavily intertwined factors having an impact on verbal case government in Polish: alongside the basic semantics of the verb and its respective degree in transitivity, prefixation, as well as the presence of the middle marker *się* can motivate the government of the genitive case. Following the hypothesis of this paper and the statements on a shift in case marking found in the literature on Polish, i.e. a growing, yet often still uncodified, use of the accusative case, we can now specify the research question and ask for the relationship between a (potential) shift in case marking and each of the semantic and morphological aspects named above. For instance, we can ask whether all semantic groups are affected of the change to the same extent. Another aspect to be examined is whether an uncodified use of the accusative case appears to the same extent with verbs featuring the middle marker *się* and those which only carry low-transitivity meanings but are not marked morphologically for low transitivity. It can be expected that *się*, overtly expressing low-transitivity semantics, preserves the government of the genitive case and that the shift can be detected more often with the unmarked verbs. Similarly, it can be asked whether the prefixes *do-* and

na- have a stabilizing effect regarding the government of the genitive case. As we cannot examine all verbs listed in the appendix, it will be necessary to choose appropriate representatives of each group and contrast pairs of verbs which differ in regard to the aspects just named.

4 Corpus analysis

After the theoretical outline of the notion of transitivity and its manifestation in case marking in Polish, we will now focus on the actual language usage regarding the verbs which have been described so far. While the previous statements were based mostly on the existing literature and valency dictionaries, for the following part we will examine authentic primary data. As an empirical method, a corpus analysis has been chosen. The advantage of this method for our purposes is the greater validity of the corpus material compared to judgements of speakers, as these might not approve of a certain structure but nevertheless make use of it in unplanned utterances (Lemnitzer & Zinsmeister 2015: 27f; Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher et al. 2017: 51). This might often be the case with the non-standard use of the accusative to be examined in this study.²³ Another advantage of a corpus analysis is the possibility of making statistical statements on the frequency of a construction based on a large data set (Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher et al. 2017: 53). This allows us to draw conclusions on the existence and the status of the potential shift in case marking proclaimed by scholars and in the hypothesis of this paper. In order to do so, a corpus-based quantitative-qualitative approach will be applied (Lemnitzer & Zinsmeister 2015: 37), allowing us to not only ascertain the frequency of certain constructions, but also to interpret the circumstances under which they appear, and to find potential patterns (Scherer 2014: 37). In concrete terms this means that we will first search for a verb in combination with a chosen object, counting the occurrences of the genitive and the accusative case with the O. The procedure is conducted with five different objects for each verb. After that, we will analyze the distribution of the two cases with each verb, also paying attention to variation depending on the Os, and we will compare the results according to the groups of verbs illustrated in the previous sections.

4.1 Choice of the corpus

Innovations in language usually appear first in spoken language, as it is much less restricted, i.e. subject to normalizing forces, than written language. However, the disadvantage of spoken

²³ On the other hand, the assessment of individual tokens from the corpus by native speakers is helpful when evaluating the relevance or naturalness of an example (Lemnitzer & Zinsmeister 2015: 53f). This can compensate for the “lack of control of text variety and the high level of author anonymity” in corpora (Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher et al. 2017: 53). For the present study, native speakers have been asked for their approval of a construction when it occurred only rarely in the corpus or its use seemed restricted to very specific contexts or domains, thus raising doubts on its appropriateness in more general contexts or contemporary language usage.

language is that it needs to be captured in order to be available for analysis. As transcription is very time consuming, corpora of spoken language tend to be rather small, as is the case with the spoken section of the Polish National Corpus (NKJP), which contains only 2.8 million tokens (Peżik 2012: 39). Web corpora can be considered a functional alternative here, as they consist of an immense dataset of web content representing different (albeit unbalanced) text genres, which include both public texts and private utterances, e.g. from online forums (Lemnitzer & Zinsmeister 2015: 152ff). The latter exhibit features which resemble those of spoken language, as they serve similar communicative purposes like those in real-life interpersonal communication, and as private users often do not adhere to norms established by language norm authorities when contributing to forums. For the analysis to be conducted in this paper, the plTenTen2019 web corpus has been chosen. It contains 4,253,636,443 tokens gathered from the Polish web in the year 2019, the size enabling us to find a statistically relevant number of occurrences, if a construction exists at all.

4.2 *A priori* considerations regarding the corpus analysis

Several aspects need to be considered when searching the corpus for relevant results. First, the interplay of verbs and Os regarding the search results has to be illuminated. The evaluation of all occurrences of a verb with any O would cost an enormous amount of time and would not provide us with insight on a potential shift in case marking, as the respective features of the Os (see section 3.1) and the frequency of the collocation might impact its case marking. The search for a verb in combination with a specific O, on the other hand, allows us to determine the distribution of the two cases under comparable circumstances. A relevant semantic feature to be considered in the choice of an O for a query is its INDIVIDUATION, especially the subfeatures of abstractness and concreteness and the opposition of count and mass nouns (see (10) in the section on prototypical Os), as these are most likely to be reflected in case marking. Furthermore, any Os exhibiting differential object marking need to be excluded from the search, as their case marking cannot be determined due to the syncretism of the accusative and the genitive endings. This concerns mostly animate Os of masculine gender in the singular as well as human Os of masculine gender in the plural as well as several other semantic groups (see section 3.1.7). Similarly, feminine and neuter nouns are excluded from the search when they exhibit identical forms in the genitive singular and in the accusative plural and one would have to rely on congruent forms or the context to determine the case marking of the noun, which would be too time consuming for this project. An exception has been made for feminine nouns which tend to appear in the singular only with certain verbs, e.g. *śmierć* ‘death’ in combination with *bać się* ‘to

fear’. Another pre-consideration for the choice of an O is the frequency of the cooccurrence with the verb, as it can be expected that the case marking in very frequent collocations or idiomatic expressions is more stable than that in infrequent collocations. For the analysis, for each verb a selection of Os reflecting these thoughts has been chosen: those frequently collocating with the verb and those rarely appearing with the verb, as well as Os with abstract and concrete denotation. In a few cases, homonyms with one abstract and one concrete meaning have been contrasted (e.g. *pokój* in the meanings of ‘peace’ and ‘room’ with the verb *chcieć* ‘to want’) in order to detect a potential split in case government. With this, the results needed to be evaluated manually and allocated to one of the meanings, which turned out very time-consuming.

A second aspect to be considered when creating queries and evaluating the results is the fact that genitive and accusative case marking can be evoked by the presence of other elements in the clause. For instance, the O is marked in the genitive regularly in negated sentences (see example (18) in section 3.1.1 on the genitive of negation), which makes it impossible to determine whether a marking of the O in the genitive case is due to verb government or negation (Muszyńska 2009: 5).²⁴ Thus, sentences featuring the negative particle *nie* have to be excluded from the search *a priori*, which can be achieved by means of a corresponding regular expression. Similarly, quantifiers, adverbs of quantity, and numbers ending with the digits 5 to 9 or 0, as well as the numbers 11 to 19, all require a dependent O in the genitive in Polish (Sadowska 2012: 82ff). Thus, any Os modified by one of these items need to be excluded from the search results, as its case marking is no longer dependent on the verb.

A marking of the O with the accusative case, on the other hand, can result from its being dependent not on the verb to be examined, but on a second verb in the infinitive, as is depicted in the following example (32).

- (32) Polish (tustolica.pl, plTenTen19 4228625582)
 Rzecz zaczęła się na Aluzyjnej, gdzie policjanci
 thing began MM in Alusia.Street where policemen
chcie-li **samochód-Ø s-kontrol-ować.**
want- PST.3PL.M car-ACC PERF-inspect-INF
 ‘The thing began in Alusia Street, where the policemen **wanted to inspect the car.**’

²⁴ For our study regarding the marking of transitivity in Polish it would have also been of interest to examine occurrences of Os marked in the accusative case after negation to see whether the genitive of negation likewise is affected by the proclaimed shift. However, in order to answer this question, the factor negation would have needed to be tested in isolation, whereas including the matter into this corpus study would have complicated the analysis, as the number of hits would have risen immensely, and the factor of negation would have distorted the statistic in favor of the genitive case.

Stefan (2016: 137) states that there is no explicit rule for the case assignment of the O in cases like (32). It could be assumed that constructions like this can constitute a source for a shift in case marking leading towards an expansion of the accusative case. However, for this project, clauses featuring a second verb in the infinitive need to be excluded, as no statement can be made on the case government of the verb to be examined when the O is no longer dependent on it but on another verb.

As mentioned above, aspectual pairs are expected to generally exhibit the same case government. Thus, aspectual partners will not be contrasted in the study. When deciding for one of the two forms, we always chose the one with more occurrences to generate a greater sample space.

4.3 Choice of verbs

The following sections will present the data gathered for exemplary verbs from the semantic and morphological groups outlined above. For each class of verbs from section 3.2, at least one exemplary verb has been chosen. In addition, the decision on the concrete verb to be examined depended on the frequency of the appearance in the literature dealing with the shift in case government (see e.g. Pastuchowa & Siuciak 2014: 78). We choose a roughly equal amount of verbs which are mentioned often (among them *szłuchać*, *szukać*, *chcieć*, *potrzebować* and *dotykać*) and verbs which are not mentioned very frequently (among them *unikać* ‘to avoid’, *dopełnić* ‘to fulfill, to complete’, *bać się* ‘to fear’, *doczekać się* ‘to await’, *dorobić się* ‘to get, to obtain’, *najeść się* ‘to eat one’s fill of’), on the one hand to contribute new information on the documented shift of the frequently mentioned verbs, on the other hand to illuminate the situation with those verbs which are not at the center of attention. A practical reason limiting the choice of verbs is the frequency of the verb in the corpus: as we aim to make statistic statements, there need to be enough hits to enable the analysis of at least five collocations with the verb to be examined. Thus, the more frequent a verb is, the more precise and reliable will be the results and the conclusions regarding its case government.

4.4 Results of the corpus analysis

In the following, the results of the corpus search will be presented and outlined. For each verb examined, a table with the results is provided. The first column always shows the O dependent on the verb. The second column shows the total number of hits generated by the search. It is important to note here that all results featuring the negative particle *nie* in the position preceding the verb have been excluded from the search by means of the regular expression *[lemma!="nie"]*. Furthermore, the O was not entered in its lemma form, but only in the word

forms of the accusative and genitive case in the singular and plural, as the searches for the lemma form and for individual word forms generate different results: For instance, when searching for individual word forms the results also include instances where the verb and the noun are separated by a sentence boundary, which is not the case with the lemma search. Also, in order to avoid any deviation of the outcome, case-sensitivity was switched off in the search by means of the regular expression (?i), and tokens with missing diacritics have been caught by allowing the corresponding character without diacritic as an option, e.g. by the regular expression [eē]. When searching for the noun *dostęp*, for instance, this raised the number of results by eleven occurrences, in which the noun was written without the ogonek. The excluded results listed in the third column contain – among many sources of mistakes – clauses in which the word order was reversed and the noun following the verb did not function as an O, clauses in which the O was dependent on a second verb in the infinitive, results in which the verb and the following noun were separated by a sentence boundary or where a boundary between two utterances was not indicated by the corpus manager but obvious, and identical results which appeared exceedingly often. The latter was the case for example with the verb *chcieć* in combination with the O *pokój*, where the same sentence appeared 91 times. To prevent a distortion of the statistic, only one instance was counted, and 90 instances were excluded from the results. Due to the limited scope of the survey, the procedure just described has usually been applied only to the results marked in the non-codified case, i.e. the accusative, whereas the results marked in the genitive have not been checked when the sample space was too large. This might lead to an outcome where the number of valid results exhibiting the genitive case is smaller than stated in the respective column, and that, in turn, the percentage of the marking in the accusative case is higher than proclaimed. However, the reversed case, i.e. the number of incidents with the accusative being smaller than indicated in the table, is impossible, thus not distorting our findings to the benefit of the hypothesis.

4.4.1 *Sluchać* as a verb of perception

The appearance of the verb *sluchać* ‘to listen’ in a non-transitive case frame, i.e. with an O in the genitive, supports Tsunoda’s observation of the existence of a subgroup of verbs of perception in which the patient is less attained (1985: 388). Following the hypothesis that low transitivity becomes marked less frequently in Polish, this verb, being a simplex verb with no morphological indication of low transitivity, might be a likely candidate for a shift in case marking. However, as indicated in Table 1, the percentage of Os in the accusative case is rather low, both with very frequent Os (*muzyka* ‘music’, *głos* ‘voice’) and less frequent Os.

Table 1. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *sluchać*²⁵

<i>sluchać</i> ‘to listen’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>muzyki</i> ‘music’	22,252	32	22,047	173	0.78
<i>głos</i> ‘voice’	2,153	10	2,116	27	1.26
<i>rozkaz</i> ‘order, command’	451	0	451	0	0.00
<i>rap</i> ‘rap’	357	2	350	5	1.41
<i>program</i>	346	6	333	7	2.06

A closer look at the examples in the accusative reveals that there are several specific expressions or environments in which the accusative appears after *sluchać*: For instance, the impersonal infinitive construction *sluchać glosy* appears in five similar clauses, one of which depicted in the following example (33).

- (33) Polish (zwierciadlo.pl, plTenTen19 805045748)
 Coraz mocniej **slucha-ć** **glos-y**, że pszenica
 increasingly stronger **listen-INF** **voice-ACC.PL** that wheat
 lub gluten są winne rozprzestrzeniając-ej się otyłości.
 or gluten are guilty spreading-GEN MM obesity.GEN
 ‘Voices are getting louder (lit. are increasingly to listen) that wheat and gluten are to blame for the spreading obesity.’

The use of the accusative here can be explained by the absence of an A, the effect on it consequently not being emphasized in the situation. As the ‘voices’ are the only present argument, their affectedness is stressed by the marking in the accusative case. A second reason accounting for four occurrences of the accusative case after *sluchać* with the O *program* is the coordination of the verb with the verb *oglądać* ‘to watch’. As the latter governs the accusative case, the speaker is forced to choose between the accusative and the genitive case for the marking of the O, which often results in the marking with the accusative case. With this in mind, the appearance of the accusative case becomes more marginal than what can be assumed from the table, and we can conclude that it is, if justified at all, still too early to proclaim a shift in case marking

²⁵ We provide only one exemplary regular expression here, representing the general pattern applied throughout the study (as otherwise, 15 separate queries would have to be listed for each table below). The CQL query for all appearances of *sluchać* with the O *program* in the genitive and accusative was as follows: `[lemma!="nie"] [lemma="sluchać"] [word="(?)program" | word="(?)program[uy]" | word="(?)program[oó]w"]`. For the search of Os in the genitive and accusative, only the respective word forms have been entered.

with the verb *szukać*. However, the sporadic occurrence of the accusative case might already indicate a potential future shift.

4.4.2 *Szukać, potrzebować, and chcieć* as verbs of pursuit

The verbs *szukać* ‘to look for, to search’, *potrzebować* ‘to need’, and *chcieć* ‘to want’ have been allocated to the semantic group of verbs of pursuit. They are high-frequency verbs and are not marked morphologically for low transitivity. Of the three verbs examined, *szukać* exhibits the lowest percentages of Os in the accusative case (see Table 2 below). The frequency of the accusative is slightly lower with the verb’s third most frequent collocation in the corpus, *sposób* ‘way, manner’, than with the three following Os, and there is no noticeable tendency for abstract Os to behave differently than concrete Os. Similar to the above, the occurrences of the accusative case are (still) too rare to proclaim a shift in case marking, but they might indicate a beginning development to the benefit of the accusative case.

Table 2. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *szukać*

<i>szukać</i> ‘to look for’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>sposób</i> ‘way, manner’	9,498	15	9,418	65	0.69
<i>nocleg</i> ‘overnight stay’	4,879	17	4,805	57	1.17
<i>klub</i> ‘club’	612	5	599	8	1.32
<i>program</i> ‘program’	609	11	576	22	3.68
<i>plik</i> ‘file’	318	17	300	1	0.33

With *potrzebować* ‘to need’, a clearer picture arises (see Table 3). While the most frequent collocation with *pomoc* ‘help’ is very rarely marked in the accusative, other, less frequent Os exhibit relevant percentages of case marking in the accusative, representing up to roughly one third of the results. In order to determine whether there is a difference between abstract and concrete Os regarding the development, no clear statement can be made on the bases of the five exemplary Os examined here. Unfortunately, the concrete O *pomoc drogowa* ‘roadside assistance’ did not exhibit enough occurrences in the corpus to grant for a reliable comparison with the abstract O *pomoc* ‘help’. The examination of other exemplary Os could provide more solid

data. Nevertheless, looking at the numerous occurrences of examples displaying the accusative case, a shift of case marking with the verb *potrzebować* needs to be acknowledged.

Table 3. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *potrzebować*

<i>potrzebować</i> ‘to need’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>pomoc</i> ‘help’	34,472	20	34,380	72	0.21
<i>pomoc drogowa</i> ‘roadside assistance’	56	0	54	2	3.57
<i>dostęp</i> ‘access’	542	0	506	36	6.64
<i>program</i> ‘program’	524	4	371	149	28.65
<i>plik</i> ‘file’	125	3	79	43	35.25

The verb *chcieć* ‘to want’ differs from the previous verbs in the way that it is used commonly as a modal verb followed by an infinitive. This is why the sample space of *chcieć* in combination with the respective Os is rather small. Nevertheless, from the data in Table 4 below, a clear pattern can be inferred, namely a semantic split between the marking with the genitive and the marking with the accusative case, the former being used mainly with abstract Os, the latter exceedingly often with concrete Os. This is illustrated in particular by the manually evaluated results of the polysemous O *pokój*, whose two most important meanings, the abstract ‘peace’ and the concrete ‘room’, show almost inversed case assignment. A somewhat less clear situation appears with the O *woda* ‘water’, which, in roughly a quarter of cases, is marked in the accusative. As it is a mass noun, the genitive might indicate partial affectedness of the O. Yet to determine whether the partitive genitive is still used widely by speakers, a qualitative analysis of other mass nouns in combination with typical verbs triggering the partitive genitive would be necessary. From the limited number of examples, however, it can be cautiously deduced that the accusative case is the predominant case for concrete Os which are count nouns. Whether this circumstance is an innovation and whether there will be a development towards a general government of the accusative case is subject to a diachronic analysis and a more in-depth investigation going beyond the scope of this study.

Table 4. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *chcieć*

<i>chcieć</i> ‘to want’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>miłość</i> ‘love’	225	66	156	3	1.89
<i>pokój</i> ‘peace’	691	7	681	3	0.44
<i>pokój</i> ‘room’	131	96	3	32	91.43
<i>samochód</i> ‘car’	152	54	16	82	83.67
<i>woda</i> ‘water’	171	32	99	34	24.46

4.4.3 *Unikać* as a verb with negative semantics

For verbs with negative semantics, the verb *unikać* ‘to avoid’ has been chosen as an exemplary case. Looking at Table 5, it can be stated that with none of the examined Os a notable number of examples in the accusative could be found. Thus, based on the data presented here, it can be assumed that there is no shift in case marking with the verb.

Table 5. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *unikać*

<i>unikać</i> ‘to avoid’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>kontakt</i> ‘contact’	4,654	0	4,651	3	0.06
<i>temat</i> ‘topic’	833	5	827	1	0.12
<i>stres</i> ‘stress’	907	1	906	0	0.00
<i>słońce</i> ‘sun’	768	0	768	0	0.00
<i>kolor</i> ‘color’	71	0	71	0	0.00

4.4.4 *Dotykać* and *dopełnić* as prefix verbs

Dotykać appears in the two meanings ‘to touch (physically)’ and ‘to touch (emotionally)’ (see section 3.2.5). Providing data on the actual case government in relation to the two meanings could be an aim of the corpus analysis, however, with the methodology applied, it would be difficult to distinguish between the two meanings and to find enough occurrences with Os whose case marking can be determined unambiguously, as it can be expected that the Os occurring with the verb are animate and many of them exhibit differential object marking. Thus, only the verb in its concrete meaning has been examined. From Table 6, we can deduce that there are varying frequencies of the accusative depending on the respective O, all of them

(except the collocation with the O *przedmiot* ‘subject, topic’, which did not generate enough results) indicate that the use of the accusative can become more frequent with the verb. Unfortunately, the test on the impact of abstractness by contrasting the two meanings of the O *przedmiot*, the abstract ‘subject, topic’ and the concrete ‘thing’, did not work out, as the number of results with the former was too small. The high frequency of the accusative with the O *piłka* ‘ball’ confirms the observation that in the context of sports (e.g. in sports commentaries), the shift in case government has already progressed further (Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher 2022).

Table 6. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *dotykać*

<i>dotykać</i> ‘to touch’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>temat</i> ‘topic’	720	5	706	9	1.26
<i>przedmiot</i> ‘subject, topic’	3	0	3	0	0.00
<i>przedmiot</i> ‘thing’	242	23	206	13	5.94
<i>twarz</i> ‘face’	237	1	227	9	3.81
<i>piłka</i> ‘ball’	204	0	144	60	29.41
<i>klamka</i> ‘door-handle’	71	0	70	1	1.41

As a second exemplary prefix verb, *dopełnić* in the meaning of ‘to fulfill, complete’ was examined. Often, the verb functions as a light verb gaining a meaning only through the respective O. The nominalized forms *dopełnienie/niedopełnienie* ‘fulfillment/unfulfillment’ appeared exceedingly often in the corpus and needed to be excluded, as the following O would be marked in the genitive not as a result of the case government of the verb but of its dependency on the previous nominalized verb. For this reason, the sample space turned out rather small, and with *życie* ‘life, existence’ and *los* ‘fate’ an item in between the verb and the O was admitted by means of the regular expression *[]?*.

As depicted in Table 7 below, despite the small sample space and the therefore unreliable percentages, a notable number of occurrences of the accusative case could be found with four out of five Os, indicating that the verb might exhibit a change in case government. This is striking, as the collocations analyzed often belong to a formal register or are very idiomatic.

Table 7: Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *dopełnić*

<i>dopełnić</i> ‘to fulfill, to complete’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>obowiązek</i> ‘duty’	453	43	391	19	4.63
<i>wymóg</i> ‘requirement’	42	9	30	3	9.09
<i>obrzęd</i> ‘ritual, custom’	36	1	34	1	2.86
<i>życie</i> ‘life, existence’	32	2	30	0	0.00
<i>los</i> ‘fate’	67	42	17	8	32.00

4.4.5 *Bać się* as an emotion middle verb

For emotion middle verbs, i.e. verbs featuring the middle marker *się* and denoting an emotional state, *bać się* ‘to be afraid’ has been chosen as an exemplary verb. The small sample size can be ascribed to the frequent appearance of the verb in negated clauses, which consequently had to be excluded from the statistic. As no incident of an O marked in the accusative case could be found (see Table 8), no shift in case marking can be proclaimed for the verb.

Table 8. Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *bać się*

<i>bać się</i> ‘to be afraid’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>śmierć</i> ‘death’	1,185	1	1,184	0	0.00
<i>ból</i> ‘pain’	413	0	413	0	0.00
<i>sen</i> ‘dream, sleep’	80	0	80	0	0.00
<i>atak</i> ‘attack’	61	0	61	0	0.00
<i>samochód</i> ‘car’	13	2	11	0	0.00

4.4.6 *Doczekać się, dorobić się* and *najeść się* as prefix verbs with *się*

The first exemplary verb to be examined in this section is *doczekać się* ‘to wait until’. It appears very frequently in the idiomatic expression *nie móc się doczekać czegoś* ‘to cannot wait until, to be looking forward to’. Despite the presence of the negative particle, the general meaning of the phrase is positive and it can be expected that the marking of the O in the genitive case still

reflects the case government of the verb.²⁶ For the examples in this section, the methodology was slightly adapted: Taking account of the flexible word order in Polish, sentences in which *się* precedes the verb have been included by inserting the regular expression $[(?i)si[eę]]?$ before and after the verb.²⁷ Also, to increase the sample space, an optional element ($[/?]$) before the O was allowed in the search, which could be either a determiner, a premodifying adjective, or rarely also adverbs or pronouns, the only important thing being that the element has no impact on the case marking of O. With *doczekać się* and *odcinek* ‘episode’, for instance, this adaption of the methodology raised the number of hits from 69 to 718.

Table 9: Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *doczekać się*

<i>doczekać się</i> ‘to await, wait until’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>realizacja</i> ‘realization’	1,061	0	1,061	0	0.00
<i>remont</i> ‘renovation’	1015	13	1002	0	0.00
<i>powrót</i> ‘return’	1041	18	1022	1	0.10
<i>odcinek</i> ‘episode, segment’	718	71	647	0	0.00
<i>moment</i> ‘moment’	768	38	728	2	0.27

From the results in Table 9, we can deduce that the accusative case almost never occurs after *doczekać się*. Interestingly, during the search, a notable number of occurrences of *doczekać się* in combination with the preposition *na* + ACC has been found (three with *remont*, seven with *powrót*, and six with *moment*). This indicates a potential development towards an alternative way of marking low transitivity, namely by means of an analytical construction instead of the genitive case. Its base verb *czekać* + *na* + ACC has already undergone the shift (Muszyńska 2009: 207f) and might have served as a model for the use of the derived verb with the analogous analytical construction.

²⁶ There are no consistent rules for the use of the genitive of negation after a transitive verb in the infinitive which is preceded by a modal verb (Zagorska Brooks 1975: 128).

²⁷ As indicated in the query by $?$, the element was optional in both slots. Thus, sentences featuring the verb without the marker *się* are also included. However, this usage was observed only rarely and no interaction with case government could be found, as the genitive appeared likewise in all sentences without *się*.

The second verb to be examined here is *dorobić się* ‘to get, to obtain’. Similar to the above, the admission of a further element between the verb and the O was used to increase the sample space in order to provide more reliable results. In Table 10, a clear picture arises, as there are no occurrences of the accusative case after the verb *dorobić się*. Thus, no shift in case government can be observed with the verb.

Table 10: Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *dorobić się*

<i>dorobić się</i> ‘to get, to obtain’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>majątek</i> ‘property’	912	2	910	0	0.00
<i>status</i> ‘status’	117	0	117	0	0.00
<i>samochód</i> ‘car’	33	0	33	0	0.00
<i>domek</i> ‘hut’	17	0	17	0	0.00
<i>brzuch</i> ‘belly’	7	0	7	0	0.00

With *na-... się*, the verb *najeść się* ‘to eat one’s fill of’ was examined. More often than with concrete objects, the verb occurs in the idiomatic expressions *najeść się wstydu* ‘to be thoroughly ashamed’, *najeść się strachu* ‘to have a scare, to be afraid’ and *najeść się szaleju* ‘to rage, to go crazy (lit. to eat a lot of water hemlock)’. As can be deduced from table 11, no occurrence of the accusative case could be detected with the verb *najeść się*, thus showing that the verb is not affected by a shift in case government.

Table 11: Distribution of the genitive and the accusative with the verb *najeść się*

<i>najeść się</i> ‘to eat one’s fill of’ with lemma...	Total number of results	Number of excluded results	Occurrences of O in the GEN	Occurrences of O in the ACC	Frequency of the ACC (in %)
<i>strach</i> ‘fear’	136	1	135	0	0.00
<i>wstyd</i> ‘shame’	106	1	105	0	0.00
<i>chleb</i> ‘bread’	31	1	30	0	0.00
<i>szalej</i> ‘water hemlock’	24	0	24	0	0.00
<i>czosnek</i> ‘garlic’	14	3	11	0	0.00

5 Conclusions

The paper aimed to give an account of the current status of a proclaimed shift in the marking of transitivity with Polish verbs, where low transitivity is reflected in the marking of the O with the genitive. We have examined eleven verbs representing six separate verb classes governing the genitive in Polish, and each verb has been analyzed at the basis of five collocations. In the following, we will quickly generalize the results and give an outlook on further research opportunities related to this project and the topic of shifts in case marking.

5.1 Summary of the main findings

Based on the limited set of verbs examined, it can be concluded that the proclaimed shift in case marking is visible in the corpus, albeit only in some of the verb classes elaborated in this paper (most prominently with verbs of pursuit), and only with verbs without the middle marker *się*.²⁸ Occurrences of accusative government were found both with simplex verbs (*chcieć*, *potrzebować*) and with complex verbs (*dotykać*, *dopełnić*), thus a preserving effect of the prefix *do-* could not be observed. A curious finding is the strong influence of the frequency and the semantics of the O on case government: Very frequent collocations tend to exhibit smaller percentages of accusative case marking than less frequent ones, and the feature of abstractness, relevant for the level of transitivity of a clause, has a notable impact on case government, as abstract Os exhibit accusative marking less frequently than concrete Os (e.g. with the verb *dotykać* ‘to touch’). With the verb *chcieć* ‘to want’, there even is a regular split in case marking along the feature of abstractness, as the abstract Os examined appeared almost all in the genitive and the concrete Os in the accusative case. The synchronic cross-section conducted in this paper offers an insight into the evolution of verbal case government in Polish. However, a greater sample of verbs needs to be analyzed and backed up also with diachronic data in order to make a more precise statement on the proclaimed shift in case marking and its presence in the different categories of verbs outlined in this paper.

5.2 Prospects for further research

One aspect that has been widely excluded in this study is the alternative development of a shift from the governed genitive towards an analytical construction featuring a preposition and an oblique case (Muszyńska 2009: 4). As can be seen in the list in the appendix, this development poses an important competition for the phenomenon analyzed in this study. It would be

²⁸ However, the alternative development featuring a preposition and an oblique case can be found after verbs with the middle marker *się*, e.g. *doczekać się na* + ACC ‘to await’, or *dopominać się o* + ACC meaning ‘to require’.

interesting to determine factors contributing to a development in one or the other direction. In section 3.2.5.1, it has been said that some motion middle verbs govern the instrumental case instead of the genitive case, which could be yet another way to mark low transitivity in Polish and could be examined in a future project. Another aspect to be investigated is the status of the genitive of negation in the current language usage, which is, as illustrated in this work, also a manifestation of the morphological marking of low transitivity. A topic for a study of its own would be a comparative approach (analogous to Haspelmath 2001), examining the case government of low-transitivity verbs across several languages and comparing diachronic developments, for instance with other Slavic languages like Russian or Czech. For Czech, e.g., the shift in case government has been widely attested and is fully completed with many verbs like *potřebovat* ‘to need’ or *poslouchat* ‘to listen’ (Grković-Major 2010: 67). Since the advanced state of the shift in Czech might be ascribed to the intensive contact with German, the development could also be regarded as a contact phenomenon, making the *Sprachbund* theory another fruitful approach to shed light on the issue of shifts in verbal case government.

6 References

- Bakker, Egbert J. 1994. "Voice, Aspect and Aktionsart. Middle and Passive in Ancient Greek". In: *Voice. Form and Function*. Ed. by Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 23-47.
- Bartnicka, Barbara, Björn Hansen, Wojtek Klemm, Volkmar Lehmann, and Halina Satkiewicz. 2004. *Grammatik des Polnischen*. München: Otto Sagner.
- Binnick, Robert I. 1991. *Time and the Verb. A guide to Tense and Aspect*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biskup, Petr. 2019. *Prepositions, Case and Verbal Prefixes. The case of Slavic*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Buttler, Danuta, Halina Kurkowska, Halina Satkiewicz. 1971. *Kultura Języka Polskiego. Zagadnienia poprawności gramatycznej* [Culture of the Polish Language. Issues of Grammatical Correctness]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1989. *Language Universals & Linguistic Typology. Syntax and Morphology*. 2nd ed. Oxford: The University of Chicago Press.
- Cranmer, David J. 1976. *Derived Intransitivity. A Contrastive Analysis of Certain Reflexive Verbs in German, Russian and English*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Czardybon, Adrian. 2017. *Definiteness in a Language without Articles. A Study on Polish*. Düsseldorf: düsseldorf university press.
- Depraetere, Ilse. 1995. "On the Necessity of Distinguishing between (Un)Boundedness and (A)Telicity". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18.1, pp. 1-19.
- Engel, Ulrich, et al. 1999. *Deutsch-polnische kontrastive Grammatik: Band 1*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos.
- Fisiak, Jacek, Maria Lipińska-Grzegorek, Tadeusz Zabrocki. 1978. *An introductory English-Polish contrastive grammar*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Grković-Major, Jasmina. 2010. "The Role of Syntactic Transitivity in the development of Slavic Syntactic Structures". In: *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax: Gradual Changes in Focus*. Ed. by Björn Hansen, and Jasmina Grković-Major. München/Berlin: Kubon & Sagner, pp. 63-74.
- Haspelmeth, Martin. 2001. "Non-canonical marking of core arguments in European languages". In: *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*. Ed. by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R.M.W. Dixon, and Masayuki Onishi. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 53-83.
- Heinz, Adam. 1988. *Język i językoznawstwo* [Language and linguistics]. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Holvoet, Axel. 1991. *Transitivity and Clause Structure in Polish. A Study in Case Marking*. Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.
- Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse". In: *Language* 56.2, pp. 251-299.
- Jakubíček, M., A. Kilgarriff, V. Kovář, P. Rychlý, and V. Suchomel. 2013. "The TenTen corpus family". In: *7th International Corpus Linguistics Conference CL*, pp. 125-127.

- Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher, Edyta, Zrinka Kolaković, and Björn Hansen. 2017. “Web Corpora – the best possible solution for tracking rare phenomena in underresourced languages: clitics in Bosnian, Croatian and Serbian”. In: *Proceedings of the Workshop on Challenges in the Management of Large Corpora and Big Data and Natural Language Processing (CMLC-5+BigNLP) 2017 including the papers from the Web-as-Corpus (WAC-XI) guest section*. Ed. by Piotr Bański, Marc Kupietz, Harald Lungen, Paul Rayson, Hanno Biber, Evelyn Breiteneder, Simon Clematide, John Mariani, Mark Stevenson, and Theresa Sick. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache, pp. 49-55.
- Jurkiewicz-Rohrbacher, Edyta. 2022. *Object, Direct and Indirect*. Brill. URL: https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-slavic-languages-and-linguistics-online/object-direct-and-indirect-COM_036013 (accessed May 24, 2023).
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1994. “Middle Voice, Transitivity, and the Elaboration of Events”. In: *Voice. Form and Function*. Ed. by Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 179-230.
- Kulikov, Leonid. 2006. “Case systems in a diachronic perspective”. In: *Case, Valency, and Transitivity*. Ed. by Leonid Kulikov, Andrej Malchukov, and Peter de Swart. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Pp. 23-47.
- Lemnitzer, Lothar, and Heike Zinsmeister. 2012. *Korpuslinguistik. Eine Einführung*. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempo.
- Luraghi, Silvia, and Seppo Kittilä. 2014. “Typology and diachrony of partitive case markers”. In: *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Ed. by Silvia Luraghi and Tuomas Huomo. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, pp. 17-62.
- Mazur, Jan. 1993. *Geschichte der polnischen Sprache*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Mędak, Stanisław. 2005. *Praktyczny Słownik Łączliwości Składniowej Czasowników Polskich* [Practical Dictionary of the Syntactic Combinability of Polish Verbs]. Kraków: Universitas.
- Morciniec, Norbert, Lesław Cirko, and Ryszard Ziobro. 1995. *Słownik walencyjny czasowników niemieckich i polskich* [Valency Dictionary of German and Polish Verbs]. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Moroz, George. 2021. Bivalent patterns in Polish. In: *BivalTyp: Typological database of bivalent verbs and their encoding frames*. Ed. by Sergey Say. St. Petersburg: Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS. (Data first published on July 26, 2021; last revised on September 24, 2021.) URL: <https://www.bivaltyp.info/languages/descriptions/Polish.html> (accessed May 22, 2023).
- Muszyńska, Marzena. 2009. *Składnia dopełniaczowa czasowników w dawnej i w współczesnej polszczyźnie* [Genitive Syntax of Verbs in Early and Contemporary Polish]. Opole: Stowarzyszenie Instytut Śląski PIN, Instytut Śląski w Opolu.
- Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical Transitivity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Onishi, Masayuki. 2001. “Non-canonically marked subjects and objects. Parameters and properties”. In: *Non-canonical marking of subjects and objects*. Ed. by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R.M.W. Dixon, and Masayuki Onishi. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 1-51.
- Pastuchowa, Magdalena, and Mirosława Siuciak. 2014. “Współczesne zmiany rekcji czasowników jako przejaw stałej tendencji w dziejach polszczyzny (na przykładzie

- dopełniacza i biernika)” [Contemporary changes in the case government of verbs as the manifestation of a continual tendency in the history of the Polish language (based on the example genitive and accusative)]. *Forum Lingwistyczne* 1, pp. 77-87.
- Pęzik, Piotr. 2012. “Język mówiony w NKJP” [Spoken language in the Polish National Corpus]. In: *Narodowy Korpus Języka Polskiego*. Ed. by Adam Przepiórkowski, Mirosław Bańko, Rafał L. Górski, and Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, pp. 37-47.
- Pisarkowa, Krystyna. 1959. “Przypadek dopełnienia w polskim zdaniu zaprzeczonym” [The case of the object in the Polish negated clause]. *Język Polski* 39.1, pp. 8-32.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam, Elżbieta Hajnicz, Anna Andrzejczuk, Agnieszka Patejuk, and Marcin Woliński. 2017. “Walenty: gruntowny składniowo-semantyczny słownik walencyjny języka polskiego” [Walenty: an essential syntactic-semantic valency dictionary of the Polish language]. *Język Polski* 97.1, pp. 30-47.
- Richardson, Kylie. 2007. *Case and Aspect in Slavic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sadowska, Iwona. 2012. *Polish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Saeed, John I. 2016. *Semantics*. 4th ed. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell.
- Scherer, Carmen. 2014. *Korpuslinguistik*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag WINTER.
- Skibicki, Monika. 2016. *Polnische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Hamburg: Buske.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stefan, Anna. 2016. “Kilka Uwag o Wymienności Dopełniacza i Biernika w Języku Polskim i Słoweńskim” [Several considerations on the exchangeability of the genitive and accusative in Polish and Slovene]. In: *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej ŁTN* 62, pp. 131-143.
- de Swart, Henriëtte. 2012. “Verbal aspect”. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Tense and Aspect*. Ed. by Robert I. Binnick. New York: Oxford University Press, pp.752-780.
- de Swart, Peter. 2006. “Case markedness”. In: *Case, Valency, and Transitivity*. Ed. by Leonid Kulikov, Andrej Malchukov, and Peter de Swart. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 249-267.
- Tabakowska, Elżbieta. 2014. “Double Government in Polish. A Case Study”. In: *Partitive Cases and Related Categories*. Ed. by Silvia Luraghi and Tuomas Huomo. Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter Mouton, pp. 399-414.
- Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1985. “Remarks on Transitivity”. In: *Journal of Linguistics* 21.2, pp. 385-396.
- 1994. “Transitivity”. In: *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics Vol. 9*. Ed. by R.E. Asher. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp. 4670-4677.
- Wróbel, Henryk. 2001. *Gramatyka Języka Polskiego. Podręcznik akademicki* [Grammar of the Polish Language. An academic textbook]. Kraków: Spółka Wydawnictwa „OD NOWA”.
- Zagorska Brooks, Maria. 1967. “The Accusative-Genitive Contrast in Some Polish Constructions”. In: *To Honor Roman Jakobson. Essays on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. The Hague: Mouton, pp. 395-401.
- 1975. *Polish Reference Grammar*. The Hague: Mouton.

7 Websites cited

Langenscheidt: langenscheidt.com

Polish Web 2019 (plTenTen19): https://app.sketchengine.eu/#concordance?corpname=pre-loaded%2Fpltenten19_rft1

Pons: pons.com

Słownik Języka Polskiego: sjp.pwn.pl

Walenty: <http://walenty.ipipan.waw.pl/>

Wielki słownik języka polskiego: wsjp.pl

Appendix

Alphabetical list of Polish verbs governing the genitive case or displaying an alternation between the accusative and the genitive case for the O:

The list presented here is a conflation of similar listings by Zagorska Brooks (1975: 379), Bartnicka et al. (2004: 330), Richardson (2007: 242f), Sadowska (2012: 75), Skibicki (2016: 32), and Czardybon (2017: 137f). Further verbs have been added from Mędak (2005), but no claim can be made on completeness. The case government has been verified in the valency dictionary by Mędak (2005) and in Walenty. Options with other cases than the genitive and the accusative case (e.g. government of the instrumental case, the dative, or complementation with a prepositional phrase) are mentioned when they constitute a competition for the two cases under scrutiny without a significant deviation of meaning. Verbs governing an A/S in the genitive case (e.g. *brakować* ‘to miss, be absent’, *namnożyć się* ‘to multiply (oneself)’) have been excluded. Ditransitive verbs governing the genitive case for one of their participants (e.g. *udzielać komuś(=DAT) czegoś(=GEN)* ‘to grant someone something’, *uczyć kogoś(=ACC) czegoś(=GEN)* ‘to teach someone something’) are included in italics.

<i>bać się</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to fear’
<i>bronić</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to defend’, ‘to prohibit’
<i>brzydzić się</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or INSTR	‘to find disgusting’
<i>chcieć</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to want’
<i>chwycić się</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to grab (for a short time)’
<i>czekać</i> ^{IMPERF 29}	+ GEN or <i>na</i> + ACC	‘to wait’
<i>dać</i> ^{PERF}	+ <i>GEN or ACC</i>	‘to give’
<i>dobiegać</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or <i>do</i> + GEN	‘to reach (an age)’
<i>dobierać</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to take more’
<i>dochodzić</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to claim (a law)’, ‘to learn (the truth)’
<i>docierać</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to grate more’
<i>doczekać się</i> ^{PERF}	+ GEN	‘to wait until’
<i>dodawać</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to add by giving’
<i>dokładać</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to add by putting’
<i>dokonywać</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to commit’, ‘to accomplish’
<i>domagać się</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to demand’
<i>domyślać się</i> ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to assume’, ‘to guess’

²⁹ The use of the verb *czekać* with the genitive case is archaic (Richardson 2007: 242).

donosić ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to bring more’
dopełnić ^{PERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to fulfill’, ‘to accomplish’; ‘to fill’
dopominać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or <i>o</i> + ACC	‘to need’, ‘to require’
dorobić się ^{PERF}	+ GEN	‘to obtain’
dostarczać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to provide’
dostawać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to receive’, ‘to get’
doszukiwać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to search for’, ‘to want to find out’
doświadczać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to feel’, ‘to perceive’, ‘to experience’
dotyczyć ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to concern’, ‘to affect’
dotrzymać ^{PERF}	+ GEN	‘to keep (one’s word, a secret)’
dotykać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to touch (emotionally, physically)’
dowodzić ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to prove’
doznawać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to experience’, ‘to sustain’, ‘to suffer’
gratulować ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to congratulate’
kosztować ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to taste’, ‘to try’
kupić ^{PERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to buy’
łaknąć ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to crave’
nabierać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to scoop’; ‘to reach’
nabywać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to purchase’, ‘to acquire’
nadużywać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to overstrain’
najeść się ^{PERF}	+ GEN	‘to eat one’s fill’
nalewać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to pour in’
nanosić ^{PERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to fetch (a great amount of)’
napić się ^{PERF}	+ GEN	‘to drink one’s fill’, ‘to have a drink’
narzucać ^{PERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to throw (a lot)’
nienawidzić ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to hate’
obawiać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to fear’
objadać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or INSTR	‘to stuff oneself’
oczekiwać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to await’, ‘to expect’
odmawiać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to refuse’, ‘to deny’, ‘to cancel’
oszczędzać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to save’, ‘to spare’
pilnować ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to take care of’
potrzebować ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to need’
pozbawić ^{PERF}	+ GEN	‘to deprive of’
pozbywać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to get rid of’

pożądać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to desire’
pożyczać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to borrow’, ‘to lend’
pragnąć ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to long for’
prosić ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or o + ACC	‘to ask for’
próbować ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to try’, ‘to test’, ‘to rehearse’
przestrzegać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to follow (advice)’, ‘to obey’
słuchać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to listen’
spodziewać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to expect’
strzec ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to keep (a secret)’, ‘to guard’
szukać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to look for’, ‘to search for’
trzymać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to hold oneself’, ‘to hold on to’
uchodzić ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or + DAT	‘to escape’
uczyć ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to teach’
uczyć się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to learn’
udzielać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to grant (in small amounts)’
unikąć ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to avoid’
używać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to use’, ‘to make use of’
wstydzić się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to feel ashamed of’
wymagać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to require’, ‘to request’
wystrzegać się ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to beware’
wzywać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC or na + ACC	‘to call for’
zabraniać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to prohibit’
zadawać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC	‘to impose’
zapominać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC or o + LOC	‘to forget’, ‘to neglect’
zazdrościć ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to envy’
zwalniać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN or ACC or z + GEN	‘to slow down’; ‘to free’
żałować ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to regret’
żądać ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to request’
życzyć ^{IMPERF}	+ GEN	‘to wish (for)’