Terminology of case

Martin Haspelmath

(July 2006, for A. Malchukov & A. Spencer (eds.), *Handbook of Case*, Oxford University Press)

1. Introduction

As in all areas of grammar, the terminology surrounding case phenomena is often not straightforward: Linguists with different backgrounds use the same terms for somewhat or radically different concepts, or they use different terms for very similar or identical concepts. It is unlikely that terminological consensus will emerge soon, primarily because there is no consensus about the concepts that we need, and terminological polysemy will continue to be rampant because there are many more concepts than handy terms. But it is useful to be aware of some of the most important terminological issues.

2. Basic notions

The term **case** can refer to an inflectional category-system (e.g. "Many Australian languages have case") or to the individual inflectional categories or values of that system (e.g. "Nhanda has seven cases"). In this respect, *case* behaves like other inflectional category-systems such as tense, aspect, mood, person, number, gender, i.e. we are dealing with a systematic ambiguity that does not lead to misunderstandings. Along with the status of an inflectional category-system comes a range of old habits of talking, such as saying that a word-class "**inflects for** case", that a lexeme "**stands in** the dative case", or that a form is the "**genitive plural**" of a lexeme. The latter expression not only illustrates a word order convention (we would not normally say "plural genitive") and an abbreviatory convention (we would not say "genitive case plural number"),[1] but also a third metonymic use of inflectional category words: they can also be used to denote words that express these categories (e.g. "The genitive case of Latin *pater* is *patris*") (cf. Mel'čuk 1986:37).

In an old terminology that is becoming obsolete, inflection for case is called **declension**, and a lexeme is said to **decline** when it changes its cases. This usage is the source of the term **indeclinable**, referring to words that do not show overt case distinctions although they would be expected to show them.[2] The term *declension* now mostly survives in the sense 'inflectional class defined by different case forms', a phenomenon that is best known from (especially the older) Indo-European languages.

The term *case* is from Latin *casus* 'fall(ing)', itself a loan translation from Greek *ptõsis* 'fall(ing)' (cf. loan translations in other languages such as German *Fall*,

[1] In German, such an abbreviation is virtually obligatory: 'nominative case' is *Nominativ* (not *?*Nominativkasus*), 'genitive case' is *Genitiv* (not *?*Genitivkasus*), and so on.

[2] Indeclinable words may well exhibit all the case values of corresponding declinable words. For instance, Russian indeclinables like *taksi* 'taxi' can be used as nominative, genitive, dative, etc. without any restriction. The case value has to be inferred from the context.

Russian *padež*, from *pad-* 'fall'). The idea seems to have been that of "falling away from an assumed standard form" (Blake 1994:19), and the terms *declension* (from *declinatio* 'turning away, deviation') and *inflection* (*inflectio* 'bending') are based on similar spatial metaphors for meaningful formal variations in the shapes of words.

Latin and Greek had five or six cases with relatively abstract syntactic-semantic functions, but linguists did not find it difficult to carry over the concept of case to languages with many more case distinctions (such as the Finno-Ugrian languages) or with rather different kinds of cases (such as the Australian languages). The function of cases is generally agreed to be that of "marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads" (Blake 1994:1),[3] so that other nominal markings such as head marking for person, head marking for possessedness (*status constructus*), and NP marking for definiteness, topic or focus have never been considered cases.

However, relational dependent-marking is also commonly achieved by **adpositions**. As Zwicky (1992:370) puts it, "anything you can do with cases you can also do with adpositions, and vice versa". There is no widely accepted cover term for cases and adpositions, but the terms **flag** and **relator** have sometimes been used as terms which are neutral with respect to the case/adposition distinction. In practice, we find considerable overlap between adpositions and case inflection. Normally adpositions are considered to be separate words, whereas case inflections are thought to be expressed by morphological means. But these means are typically invariable affixes, and such affixes may look much like short (and perhaps cliticized) words. A range of widely applicable criteria for distinguishing clitics and affixes have been discussed in the literature (Zwicky & Pullum 1983, Haspelmath 2002:§8.3), but there are many cases where these criteria do not yield clear-cut results or are not applicable. Thus, linguists will have to live with some indeterminacy in this area.

It is not uncommon to find dependent-marking elements that are written as one word together with their hosts described as "postpositions", and vice versa separately spelled elements are often described in terms of "case". While not rare, such notational and terminological practice is not standard. Some linguists prefer seemingly neutral terms such as "case particle" (a term often used in Japanese linguistics for elements like *ga* 'nominative', *o* 'accusative', *ni* 'dative') or "case marker", but if *case* is defined as an inflectional category-system, the term "case particle" is contradictory (because particles are by definition words, not inflectional elements), and "case marker" would have to mean 'inflectional case exponent'.

But unfortunately, the term *case* does not always mean 'inflectional category-system expressing dependency relations'. It can also refer to these relations themselves, following Fillmore's (1968) terminological choice. Fillmore's intention was to highlight the importance of abstract semantic roles for languages like English that have (almost) no case distinctions. Rather than introducing a new term, he used the term *case*, familiar from case-inflecting languages, where cases primarily serve to express semantic roles (although few if

[3] As Mel'čuk (1986:36) observes, agreement case (found especially in Indo-European languages, but occasionally also elsewhere) does not fall under this definition and should be considered a different category-system.

any languages show a one-to-one mapping between cases and semantic roles). To distinguish the Fillmorean cases from the usual case concept, they have sometimes been called *deep cases* (because Fillmore claimed that they were universally present at "deep structure"), *case roles*, or *case relations*, but it seems simpler and less confusing to call them *semantic roles*, a framework-neutral term that by now has wide currency (although it did not exist in the mid-1960s).

Another extension of the term *case* is due to Chomsky (1981), who used *Case* (often capitalized, to distinguish it from inflectional case) for an abstract property of noun phrases that in his Government-Binding theory licenses their occurrence (also called *abstract Case*). Case in this sense need not be overt, i.e. even isolating languages like Vietnamese require Case on all its NPs. But when a language has inflectional case, this is thought to be a manifestation of abstract Case. Thus, Case has a sense very similar to *grammatical relation* (a term that is generally avoided in Chomskyan syntax). Unlike Fillmore's extended case concept, Chomsky's extended Case concept has not been used beyond the framework in which it originated.

3. Kinds of cases

3.1. Grammatical cases vs. concrete cases. A distinction is often made between more abstract cases expressing core syntactic relations such as subject and object, and more concrete cases that express various specific semantic roles, especially spatial relationships (cf. Blake 1994:32-34). Different term pairs have been used for these two classes of cases:

(1)			
	grammatical cases	semantic cases	e.g. Blake (1994:32)
	relational cases	adverbial cases	e.g. Bergsland (1997)
	grammatical cases	concrete cases	e.g. Jespersen (1924:185)
	core cases	peripheral cases	e.g. Blake (1994:34)
	abstract cases	concrete cases	e.g. Lyons (1968:295)

The distinction is made in different ways by different authors and for different languages, but the basic intuition behind it seems to be the same.

3.2. Structural and inherent Case. In Chomskyan syntax, the distinction between *structural Case* and *inherent Case* is somewhat similar to the distinctions of §3.1. Structural Case is case that is assigned in a particular structural configuration (e.g. accusative in the complement position of VP, nominative in the specifier of INFL, in the framework of the 1980s), while the assignment of inherent case is tied to a particular semantic role ("theta-role"), or to lexical properties of the governing head (e.g. dative case assigned by the German verb *helfen* 'help').[4] The latter kind of case is also known as *quirky case*, especially when the NP bearing the lexically determined case can be regarded as the subject (as happens famously in Icelandic).

4 When inherent case is lexically determined, it is also called *lexical case* (see Woolford 2006 for the distinction between inherent and lexical case in the Chomskyan framework).

3.3. Oblique cases. In another spatial metaphor going back to the ancient Greeks, the term *oblique* is used for all cases apart from the basic case (in Greek and Latin, the nominative).[5] This term is useful especially when the oblique cases share a formal property that is not shared by the nominative (for instance, Latin nouns sometimes have a different stem for the oblique cases, as in nominative *homo* 'human being', accusative *homin-em*, dative *homin-i*, etc.). In languages with a two-term case system, the term *oblique* (also *general oblique*) is often used as a case label for the single non-basic case, and the basic case is then called *direct case* (e.g. in Iranian and some Uto-Aztecan languages).[6]

4. Labeling cases

4.1. Alternatives to labeling. Labeling individual cases, i.e. referring to them by case labels such as *nominative, dative, instrumental* has proved very practical in linguistics, and such case labels will take up the remainder of the discussion of this chapter. However, there are at least two alternatives: First, cases can be referred to by the shape of their (primary) exponents. Some grammars actually do this and avoid labeling the cases, e.g. Bromley's (1981) grammar of Lower Grand Valley Dani (see 1981:78), Seiler's (1977) grammar of Cahuilla (see 1977:81-83), and Gordon's (1986) grammar of Maricopa (see 1986:36).

Second, cases can be referred to by numbers. This is done, for example, in the traditional primary-school terminology for German cases (*1. Fall* 'nominative', *2. Fall* 'genitive', *3. Fall* 'dative', and *4. Fall* 'accusative'), and case numbering is occasionally used in modern descriptive grammars (e.g. in Tamura's (2000) grammar of Ainu). Numbering is particularly effective if the cases are arranged in a consistent, conventional order, and indeed, Plank (1991) observes that the Western tradition since the Stoics used to put a lot of weight on the order in which cases are presented.

But in general, linguists opt for descriptive case labels, just as with most other inflectional category-systems (an exception being person, where numbering of the individual categories has been prevalent since antiquity).

4.2. Non-case uses of case labels. Not uncommonly, the descriptive labels that were created for cases are also used to label adpositions, e.g. by Guillaume (2004:ch. 14) in his grammar of Cavineña, and by Kießling (1994:192-193) in his grammar of Burunge. This is perfectly reasonable, because adpositions function in much the same way as cases in languages, the main difference being that they are analytic means of expression. Thus, talking about the English "dative preposition *to*" or the French "genitive preposition *de*" is completely unproblematic (just as we can have both future-tense affixes and analytic future-tense auxiliaries).

Case labels can also be used to label semantic roles. Fillmore (1968) used some of the labels from the Latin tradition for his semantic roles, e.g. dative and

---

[5] The nominative is sometimes called *casus rectus* 'direct case' in the older tradition. (The vocative is also considered a non-oblique case.)

[6] More recently, the term *oblique* has also come to be used for peripheral grammatical relations (expressed by peripheral cases or adpositions), following the terminology of Relational Grammar.

locative. Especially the labels of the peripheral cases are quite close to semantic roles, so they can be used for the semantic roles also when these are not expressed by cases. Thus, we can say that in some languages, "the comitative relation" is expressed by a serial verb construction, or that "an instrumental applicative" is used where other languages would have an instrumental case or adposition.

Finally, the abstract case labels can be used to describe the alignment of other phenomena apart from case. In an ergative construction, the intransitive S and the monotransitive P are typically treated in the same way with respect to case-marking, but they may also be treated in the same way with respect to indexing on the verb. We may then say that a verb has "ergative" and "absolutive" person-number affixes, even when the language has no case-marking at all (as is the case in the Mayan languages, for example). Likewise, for languages with accusative alignment of person-number affixes, speaking of "nominative" and "accusative" person-number markers is appropriate (though the less precise labels "subject markers" and "object markers" are more common).

4.3. Cases as language-particular categories. Like all other morphosyntactic categories, cases are language-particular entities.[7] This means that case labels are valid only for particular languages. When talking about Latin, an expression like "the dative case" has to be interpreted as "the Latin dative case"; it is a kind of proper name for a unique category. For convenience, similar case labels are used for different languages, so that we also talk about "the dative case" in Turkish, for example. But the transfer of case labels from one language to another should not be understood as meaning that we are dealing with "the same case". It is not meaningful to talk about "the dative case" as such, regardless of particular languages, and when comparing categories of two languages, it is senseless to use formulations such as "The dative case has a broader range of uses in Latin than in Turkish"[8] (the correct version of this would be: "The Latin dative case has a broader range of uses than the Turkish dative case").

That categories are language-particular entities has been widely recognized at least since Saussure and Boas, and American structuralists have sometimes drawn the conclusion from this that idiosyncratic, opaque category labels (e.g. numbers) should be used in order to avoid the impression that one language is described in terms of the categories of another language (such as Latin or English). This concern is well-founded, but the more recent consensus is that opaque category labels make using a description very cumbersome. Grammatical descriptions are far easier to understand and remember by human readers if transparent and familiar labels are used. To make clear that we are dealing with language-particular categories, some authors have advocated capitalization of language-particular category labels, in the manner of proper names (Comrie

[7] Some linguists seem to assume that many categories (or the underlying features defining them) such as noun, verb, singular, future, animate, are innate, so that language-particular categories are instantiations of these innate universal categories. I disagree with this view but have no space to discuss it here. In any event, innateness has not been explicitly been claimed for cases in any recent prominent publications, as far as I am aware.

[8] This sentence makes about as much sense as the sentence "San Cristóbal has more inhabitants in Mexico than in Venezuela" (talking about two different cities both called San Cristóbal).

1976:10, Bybee 1985, Croft 2001:51), and many grammars now follow this proposal (e.g. Haspelmath 1993, Malsova 2003). The above statement would thus read: "The Latin Dative case has a broader range of uses than the Turkish Dative case."

4.4. Case polysemy. Some cases have just a single identifiable meaning, and ideally their label should reflect this meaning. For example, Chantyal has a special case for expressing the standard of comparison, and it is appropriately labeled *comparative case* (Noonan 2003:320). But very often, cases have a range of meanings, and they are best described as being polysemous. To give a simple example, the Turkish Dative expresses recipient (*kıral-a* 'to the king') and direction (*Trabzon-a* 'to Trabzon'), and the Latin Dative case expresses possessor (*Flavi-o est liber* 'Flavius has a book') and beneficiary (*vitae discimus* 'we learn for life'), among other functions.

To reflect the meanings of such cases faithfully in their labels, one could use multiple-term labels, e.g. *dative-allative* for Turkish, and *possessive-benefactive* for Latin. And indeed, such double names are very common in the literature (e.g. *allatif/datif* and *instrumental/locatif* for Tunumiisut Eskimo, Mennecier 1995:252; *loactive/allative* and *locative/illative* for Classical Tibetan, DeLancey 2003:258). However, it should be kept in mind that case labels can never capture the full range of semantic and other properties of case. Case labels are primarily mnemonic devices, and they should reflect some important semantic properties of the case they designate. But the full range of uses has to be described separately anyway, so complex case labels are not really necessary. As long as readers are aware that cases are language-particular categories, they will not draw the wrong inferences from short case labels which fail to be fully descriptive of the cases they designate. Since many cases have a fair range of distinguishable meanings, fully descriptive case labels are not practical anyway (the Latin Dative case would have to be called at least "dative-possessive-benefactive-experiential"). The best method for comparing the range of uses of cases across languages is the semantic-map method (Haspelmath 2003; see Narrog & Ito (2007) for a recent application to cases).

Another way of dealing with case polysemy that is occasionally found is to split a case into several different labeled entities. For instance, Miller (2001:157-158) uses several different names for the *-m* case of Jamul Tiipay ("instrumental, comitative, allative"), and glosses the case differently depending on the English equivalent. Since the different translations into other languages seem to be the main reason for these label choices, a better option would be to pick one of the labels as a mnemonic device (say, Comitative), and specify that the Jamul Tiipay Comitative can also be used in instrumental and allative senses.

5. Case labels: abstract cases

The term **nominative** is generally used for the S (single argument of intransitive clause) and A (most agent-like argument of the transitive clause), and in most languages this is also the (zero-coded) citation form of the noun (*nominativus*, the Latin rendering of Greek *onomastikē´,* originally meant 'naming form'). In

languages with ergative alignment of case-marking, the citation form of the noun almost always occurs both as S and as P (most patient-like argument of transitive clause), and this case is now mostly called **absolutive**.

The case of the P in accusative alignment is called **accusative**, and the case of the A in ergative alignment is called **ergative** (in fact, the alignment types were named after the cases). The terms *nominative* and *accusative* are very old, whereas the term *ergative* only became widespread in the first half of the 20th century (starting with Caucasian linguistics; see Manaster-Ramer 1994, Butt 2006), and the term *absolutive* only became widespread in the second half of the 20th century (starting with Eskimo linguistics). However, especially in Caucasian linguistics, this case is still often called *nominative*, thus reflecting the etymological sense of the term (Mel'čuk 1988:208, Blake 1994:187, n. 4). For 'ergative', other terms are still used in some traditions (*relative case* in Eskimo linguistics, *narrative case* in Kartvelian linguistics). Earlier term pairs for 'ergative/absolutive', which are now obsolete, are *casus activus/casus passivus* (Jespersen 1924:166) and *nominativus agentis/casus indifferens* (Pilhofer 1933:44).

A problem arises in languages where the S and A are coded alike, but exceptionally the S/A case is not zero-coded, but is overtly coded ("marked nominative" constructions). In such languages, there is a tendency to call the (zero-marked) case of the P *absolut(iv)e case*, and to call the marked nominative not "nominative", but *subject(ive) case*.

The labels **subjective case** and **objective case** are sometimes used for English instead of *nominative/accusative* (e.g. Quirk et al. 1985:337), perhaps in order to highlight that the English (pronominal) case system is organized very differently from the Latin case system. Iggesen (2005:92) points out that in languages where the P case is also used for the recipient of ditransitive clauses, it cannot properly be called *accusative* and proposes to call it *objective*.

A general problem with the terms *nominative, accusative, absolutive, ergative* is that they are well-defined only for idealized systems without splits. But splits are very common—for instance, we find many languages with accusative marking only on definite and/or animate Ps. Some authors find it awkward to call the case of the zero-coded P in such languages nominative (e.g. Gorelova 2002:163 calls the case in Manchu *casus indefinitus*). Similarly, in languages that have a subclass of nominals with overt ergative marking in A function (e.g. all third person nominals), and a subclass of nominals with overt accusative marking in P function (e.g. all personal pronouns), it is unclear what label should be used for the zero-coded case(s), *nominative* or *absolutive*. No general solution seems to be available, but since case labels are primarily menomonic devices, ad-hoc solutions are adequate as well.

Where the intransitive S is split into agent-like S_A (coded like A) and patient-like S_P (coded like P), the case for S_A/A is best called **agentive**, and the case for S_P/P is best called **patientive** (see Iggesen 2005:93), though such cases are not common. *Agentive case* is also used for the case of the demoted passive agent (e.g. in Poudel's (2006) grammar of Dhankute Tamang, p. 102).

The term **genitive** for the case of the possessor is relatively unproblematic, and there seems to be no strong reason to rename it *possessive case* (as is done, for instance, in Charney's (1993) grammar of Comanche). However, it should be borne in mind that in typological studies, *genitive* is also often used to refer to the possessor in possessed NPs, regardless of whether it is expressed by a case (or

adposition). Some languages have an overt marker on the possessum in possessive constructions, and calling such a marker "genitive" as well is confusing (see, e.g., Frajzyngier 2002:50 for Hdi). (A label such as *antigenitive* for such markers seems more appropriate, but since they are not cases, I will not say more about them here.)

The term **dative** for the case of the indirect object (i.e. the recipient argument that is marked differently from the monotransitive P; see Dryer 1986, Haspelmath 2005) presents no difficulties. Since the recipient is often coded in the same way as a direction, linguists sometimes vacillate between *dative* and *allative*, but both are equally good terms for a case with both uses. When the recipient (or R) of a ditransitive construction is coded like the monotransitive P, we are dealing with a "primary object", and following Haspelmath (2005) the corresponding case could be called **primative** (or *objective case*, as suggested by Iggesen (2005)). Where there is a special case for the ditransitive theme (the "secondary object"), this could be called **secundative** (though primative and secundative cases are rare; secundativity is mostly found in indexing patterns).

Somewhat more concrete cases related to datives are **benefactive** (used e.g. in Basque, Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina 2003:183) and **destinative** ('intended for'), e.g. in Kâte (Pilhofer 1933:44), Basque, and Udihe (Nikolaeva & Tolskaya 2001:126). A special case for experiencers is called **affective** in Daghestanian linguistics (e.g. in Godoberi, Kibrik (ed.) 1996:16).

Some languages have special cases for predicate nominals, called **essive** (e.g. Finnish), or **predicative** (e.g. Yukaghir, Maslova 2003:91), and also for predicate nominals of verbs of change ('become something, turn into something'), called **mutative** (in Ainu, Refsing 1986) or **translative** (in Khanty).

The term **partitive** is used for a very special case (having to do with partial affectedness of an object argument) in Finnish, and for a similar case in Basque, but has apparently not been found useful for other languages.

Finally, the *vocative* form of the noun is often considered a case, following the Greek and Latin tradition, but it clearly does not fall under the standard definition of case.

6. Case labels: concrete nonspatial cases

What is called here "concrete nonspatial case" is a very heterogeneous group that is set up here only for expository convenience. The most important case labels in this group are **instrumental** ('with, using') and **comitative** ('together with'). Since none of the older Indo-European languages has a comitative, this label was slow to catch on, and competing terms are still sometimes used: *associative* (e.g. for Sahaptin, Rude 1997; Maricopa, Gordon 1986:42; and Abun, Berry & Berry 1999), *sociative* (especially for South Asian languages, e.g. for Dhivehi, Cain & Gair 2000; Korku, Nagaraja 1999:49), *accompanitive* (Sye, Crowley 1998:293). Another case label related to the comitative is **proprietive** 'with, having', common especially in Australian languages. The *ornative* case of Dumi ('endowed with, equipped with', van Driem 1993:76) is similar.

The negative counterparts of these 'with' cases are 'without' cases, variously called **abessive** (e.g. in Uralic languages), *caritive* (e.g. in Kâte, Pilhofer 1933:45),

privative (e.g. in Chukchi), *anticomitative* (also in Chukchi, Kämpfe & Volodin 1995:30), or *deprivative* (e.g. in Gooniyandi).

Some languages have a **comparative** case for the standard of comparison of inequality (e.g. Chantyal, Noonan 2003:320; Dumi, van Driem 1993:78), and quite a few have a **similative** case to express 'like'. Alternative labels for the latter are *simulative* (Eskimo, Mennecier 1995), *similitive* (Sye, Crowley 1998:220; Sedang, Smith 1979:125), *similaritive* (Yamphu, Rutgers 1998:75), and *equative* (Eskimo, Holst 2005:94).

Various causal relations are also sometimes expressed by cases. Some authors mention a **causal** case (e.g. Hosokawa 1991:275 for Yawuru), and the *motivative* of Basque ('because of', Saltarelli 1988:300), as well as the *consequential* of Kayardild (Evans 1995) are equivalent terms. Many Australian languages are described as having an **aversive** case ('for fear of', 'to avoid'), also called *negative causative* (e.g. yallop 1977:75 for Alyawarra). Evans (1995) distinguishes a *utilitive* case in Kayardild ('used for').

Some languages have a case whose only use is with (certain) adpositions. Since such cases have no meaning, they can be called simply *prepositive/ prepositional* (the best-known example is Russian).

7. Case labels: Spatial cases

Cases expressing spatial relations can be grouped into four broad directional classes: cases expressing location ('at'), goal ('to'), source ('from'), and path ('through, along'). The basic terms for the first three are **locative**, **allative**, and **ablative**. Alternative synonym terms for 'allative' are *directional* (e.g. in Basque, Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina 2002:186), *directive* (e.g. in Sumerian, Balke 1999:121), and *lative* (e.g. in Udihe, Nikolaeva & Tolskaya 2001:124).

For cases denoting a path, there is little terminological agreement. Perhaps the most common label is **perlative** ('along, through'), e.g. in Wambaya, Nordlinger (1998:91); Lavukaleve, Terrill (2003:64); Cavineña, Guillaume (2004:550). Synonyms are *prosecutive* (e.g. in West Greenlandic Eskimo, Fortescue 1984:206), *prolative* (e.g. in Udihe, Nikolaeva & Tolskaya 2001:125), *traversal* (e.g. in Ainu, Refsing 1986:168), *translative* (e.g. in Archi, Kibrik et al. 1997.2:59), *vialis* (the older literature on Eskimo), and *mediative* (e.g. Belhare, Bickel 2003:549).

For a movement that goes all the way to its endpoint, the case label **terminative** has been used (e.g. in Basque, Hualde & Ortiz de Urbina 2003:186), or its synonym *limitative* (e.g. Ika, Frank 1990:38).

For a movement that goes only in the direction of (or "toward") its goal, the term **orientative** has been used (e.g. for Kham, Watters 2002:690), or its synonym *adversive* (for Kâte, Pilhofer 1933:46-47), and *versative* (for Tsez, Comrie & Polinsky 1998:104).

In addition to these directional distinctions, cases sometimes also express orientational contrasts such as 'in' vs. 'on' vs. 'at'. In Hungarian, for instance, there is a contrast between the **inessive** (e.g. *a táská-ban* 'in the bag'), the **superessive** (e.g. *a ház-on* 'on the house'), and the **adessive** (*a hajó-nál* 'at/near the ship'). This three-way orientational contrast can be combined with the directional contrast between location, goal, and source, yielding nine spatial cases:

(2)	'in'	'on'	'at'
location	inessive (*-ban*)	superessive (*-on*)	adessive (*-nál*)
goal	illative (*-ba*)	sublative (*-ra*)	allative (*-hoz*)
source	elative (*-ból*)	delative (*-ról*)	ablative (*-tól*)

The case labels used for Hungarian (and similarly for other Uralic languages) are mostly based on Latin verbs such as *il-lat-* 'carry in', *e-lat-* 'carry out', *sub-lat-* 'carry up', *de-lat-* 'carry off'. A more transparent system for labeling the Hungarian cases would be the system in (3), where the three directions are consistently expressed by the prefixes *in-*, *super-* and *ad-*, while the three orientations are consistently expressed by the stems *-essive*, *-allative* and *-ablative*.

(3)	'in'	'on'	'at'
location	in-essive	super-essive	ad-essive
goal	in-allative	super-allative	ad-allative
source	in-ablative	super-ablative	ad-ablative

In some Daghestanian languages, which tend to have very transparent systems of spatial cases expressing direction and orientation by different markers, such a system is used. For Lezgain, Haspelmath (1993:74) uses the following labels (he used *-directive* and *-elative* instead of *-allative* and *-ablative*):

(4)	location	goal	source
'in'	in-essive (*-a*/*-e*)	(dative)	in-elative (*-aj*/*-äj*)
'on'	super-essive (*-l*)	super-directive (*-l-di*)	super-elative (*-l-aj*)
'at'	ad-essive (*-w*)	ad-directive (*-w-di*)	ad-elative (*-w-aj*)
'behind'	post-essive (*-q^h*)	post-directive (*-q^h-di*)	post-elative (*-q^h-aj*)
'under'	sub-essive (*-k*)	sub-directive (*-k-di*)	sub-elative (*-k-aj*)

Other Daghestanian languages are much richer and have additional directions such as translative 'through, along' and versative 'toward', as well as further orientations sich as 'on (horizontal)' vs. 'on (vertical)' (*cont-*), 'near' (*apud-*), 'among' (*inter-*) (e.g. Kibrik (ed.) 1996:17, van den Berg (1995:45)). By combining directions and orientations with each other, and adding further markers for deictic distinctions, over 100 spatial cases can be distinguished. But Comrie & Polinsky (1998) and Comrie (1999) point out that these "cases" are not single inflectional categories, but combinations of categories from at least two different inflectional category-systems. Already Kibrik et al. (1977(2):51) had set up a separate inflectional category-system **localization** for the different orientation markers, which combine with different spatial case-markers. On this view, a label such as *super-elative* would not stand for a single case, but for a localization-case combination (analogous to labels such as *past perfect* or *pluperfect*, which stands for a particular tense-aspect combination).

References

Balke, Thomas. (1999). 'Kasus im Sumerischen', *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 52.2:118-129.

Bergsland, Knut. (1997). *Aleut Grammar: Unangam Tunuganaan Achixaasix.* Fairbanks: ANLC (Alaska Native Language Center).

Berry, Keith and Berry, Christine. (1999). *A description of Abun: a west Papuan language of Irian Jaya.* (Pacific Linguistics B, 115.) Canberra, Australia: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

Bickel, Balthasar. (2003). 'Belhare', in Thurgood, Graham and LaPolla, Randy J. (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London: Routledge. 546-70.

Blake, Barry. (1994). *Case*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bromley, Myron H. (1981). *A Grammar of Lower Grand Valley Dani*. (Pacific Linguistic Series C. No.63.) Canberra: Australian National University.

Butt, Miriam. (2006). *Theories of case.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Bybee, Joan L. (1985). *Morphology: A study of the relation between meaning and form.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cain, Bruce D. and Gair, James W. (2000). *Dhivehi (Maldivian).* München: Lincom Europa.

Charney, Jean O. (1993). *A grammar of Comanche.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding.* Foris: Dordrecht.

Comrie, Bernard. (1976). *Aspect.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. (1999). 'Spatial cases in Daghestanian languages', *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 52.2: 108-117.

Comrie, Bernard and Polinsky, Maria (1998). 'The great Daghestanian case hoax', in Siewierska, Anna and Song, Jae Jung (eds.), *Case, Typology and Grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 95-114.

Croft, William. (2001). *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crowley, Terry. (1998). *An Erromangan (Sye) grammar: Oceanic linguistics special publication; no. 27.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

DeLancey, Scott. (2003). 'Lhasa Tibetan', in Thurgood, Graham and LaPolla, Randy J. (eds.). *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. London: Routledge, 270-288

Dryer, Matthew S. (1986). 'Primary Objects, Secondary Objects, and Antidative', *Language* 62: 808-845.

Evans, Nicholas D. (1995). *A Grammar of Kayardild.* Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fillmore, Charles J. (1968). 'The Case for Case', in Bach, Emmon and Harms, Robert T. (eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1-88.

Fortescue, Michael. (1984). *West Greenlandic.* Croom Helm Descriptive Grammars. London; Sydney; Dover: Croom Helm.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. (2002). *A grammar of Hdi.* Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Frank, Paul S. (1990). *Ika Syntax.* (Studies in the languages of Colombia; 1). Arlington,Tx.: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Gordon, Lynn. (1986). *Maricopa syntax and morphology.* (University of California

publications in linguistics; 108). Berkeley: University of California Press.
Gorelova, Liliya M. (2002). *Manchu grammar*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
Guillaume, Antoine. (2004) *A Grammar of Cavineña, an Amazonian Language of Northern Bolivia.* PhD Thesis, Research Centre for Linguistic Typology. La Trobe University (Melbourne, Australia).
Haspelmath, Martin. (1993): 'More on the typology of inchoative/causative verb alternations', in Comrie, Bernard and Polinsky, Maria. (eds.), *Causation and Transitivity.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Haspelmath, Martin. (2002). *Understanding morphology.* London: Arnold.
Haspelmath, Martin. (2003). 'The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison' in: Tomasello, Michael (ed.), *The new psychology of language.* vol. 2. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 211-242.
Haspelmath, Martin. (2005). 'Argument marking in ditransitive alignment types', *Linguistic Discovery* 3.1:1-21.
Holst, Jan Henrik. (2005). *Einführung in die eskimo-aleutischen Sprachen.* Hamburg: Buske.
Hosokawa, Komei. (1991). *The Yawuru language of West Kimberley: a meaning-based description*. Ph.D. Thesis. Canberra: Australian National University.
Hualde, Jos Ignacio and Urbina, Jon Ortiz de. (2003). *A Grammar of Basque.* Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Iggesen, Oliver. (2005). *Case-asymmetry.* München: Lincom Europa.
Jespersen, Otto. (1924). *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
Kämpfe, Hans-Rainer and Volodin, Alexander P. (1995). *Abriß der tschuktschischen Grammatik auf der Basis der Schriftsprache*. (Tunguso Sibirica, 1). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
Kibrik, Aleksandr E. (ed.), *Godoberi*. München: Lincom Europa.
Kibrik, Aleksandr E. (1979). 'Canonical Ergativity and Daghestan Languages', in Plank, Frans (ed.), *Ergativity*. Academic Press, London, 61–77.
Kibrik, Aleksandr E., S. V. Kodzasov, I. P. Olovjannikova and D. S. Samedov. (1977). *Opyt strukturnogo opisanija arčinskogo jazyka. 4 vols.* (Publikacii otdelenija strukturnoj i prikladnoj lingvistiki, 11). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
Kießling, Roland. (1994). *Eine Grammatik des Burunge*. (Afrikanistische Forschungen 13.) Hamburg: Research and Progress.
Lyons, John. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Manaster-Ramer, Alexis. (1994). 'The origin of the term "ergative".' *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 47.3, 211-214.
Maslova, Elena. (2003). *A Grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Mel'čuk, Igor' A. (1986). 'Toward a Definition of Case', in: Brecht, Richard D. and Levine, James S. (eds.). *Case in Slavic.* Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 35-85.
Mel'čuk, Igor' A. (1988). 'Is there an ergative construction in Lezgian?', in Mel'čuk, Igor' A. *Dependency syntax: theory and practice.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 207-249.
Mennecier, Philippe. (1995). *Le tunumiisut, dialecte inuit du Groenland oriental : description et analyse.* Paris: Klincksieck.
Miller, Amy. (2001). *A Grammar of Jamul Tiipay.* (Mouton Grammar Library; 23). Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Nagaraja, Keralapura Shreenivasaiah. (1999). *Korku Language: Grammar, Texts, and Vocabulary.* Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa

Narrog, Heiko and Ito, Shinya. (To appear 2007). 'Reconstructing semantic maps — the comitative-instrumental area.' Ms., Tohoku University & Hokkaido University.

Nikolaeva, Irina and Tolskaya, Maria. (2001): *A grammar of Udihe*. (Mouton Grammar Library) Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Noonan, Michael P. (2003). 'Chantyal', in Thurgood, Graham and LaPolla, Randy J. (eds.). *The Sino-Tibetan Languages.* London: Routledge, 315-335.

Nordlinger, Rachel. (1998). *A Grammar of Wambaya, Northern Territory (Australia).* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics

Pilhofer, Georg. (1933). *Grammatik der Kâte-Sprache in Neuguinea.* Berlin: Reimer.

Plank, Frans. (1991). 'Rasmus Rask's dilemma', in Plank, Frans (ed.), *Paradigms: The economy of inflection.* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 9.) Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 161-196.

Poudel, Kedar Prasad. (2006). *Dhankute Tamang grammar*. München: Lincom Europa.

Quirk, Randolph; Sidney Greenbaum; Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman.

Refsing, Kirsten. (1986). *The Ainu language*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Rude, Noel. (1997). 'Dative shifting and double objects in Sahaptin', in Givón, Talmy (ed.), *Grammatical relations: A functionalist perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 323-349.

Rutgers, Roland. (1998). *Yamphu: grammar, texts, and lexicon.* Leiden: CNWS

Saltarelli, Mario. (1988). *Basque*. London: Routledge.

Seiler, Hansjakob (1977). *Cahuilla grammar*. Banning, Calif.: Malki Museum Press.

Smith, Kenneth D. (1979). *Sedang grammar: Phonological and syntactic structure*. (Pacific Linguistics B, 50.) Canberra: Australian National University.

Tamura, Suzuko. (2000). *The Ainu Language*. Tokyo: Sanseido.

Terrill, Angela. (2003). *A Grammar of Lavukaleve.* Mouton Grammar Library, 30. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

van den Berg, Helma. (1995). *A grammar of Hunzib: with texts and lexicon*. München: Lincom Europa.

van Driem, George. (1993). *A Grammar of Dumi*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watters, David E. (2002). *A grammar of Kham.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolford, Ellen. (2006). 'Lexical case, inherent case, and argument structure.' *Linguistic Inquiry* 37.1:111-130.

Yallop, Colin. (1977). *Alyawarra: An Aboriginal Language of Central Australia.* Canberra: AIAS Press.

Zwicky, Arnold M. (1992). 'Jottings on adpositions, case inflections, government, and agreement', in: Diane Brentari, Gary Larson, and Lynn MacLeod (eds.), *The joy of grammar: A Festschrift for James D. McCawley.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 369-83.

Zwicky, Arnold M. and Geoffrey K. Pullum. (1983). 'Cliticization versus inflection: English *n't*', *Language* 59: 502-513.