

The Case 'Jakobson vs. Kuryłowicz' Dismissed

1. Introduction

1.1. In Břlý (1989a) I have analyzed the classical works of Hjelmslev (1935/37) and Jakobson (1936 and 1958) in the light of the findings made in several of my previous papers and, concurrently, by Kučera (1984). The analysis leads to the inevitable conclusion that the wide-spread belief in a number of semantic privative oppositions in the systems of tenses, aspects, cases, etc., must be reconsidered. As regards semantic privative oppositions between grammatical cases, some such oppositions do exist, but as exceptions rather than ordinary semantic relationships between cases.

1.2. The distinctive features of Jakobson, Hjelmslev and all their followers also suffer from another weakness. As was shown in Břlý (1989a), the features are used in order to discover the invariant case meanings, i.e. the *Gesamtbedeutungen*. The features themselves, however, seem to reflect some kind of intuitive categorization of grammatical cases, based on prototypical semantic roles corresponding to particular grammatical cases. The invariant meanings are searched for by way of an implicit analysis of an assumed one-to-one correspondence between a given case and a kind of semantic role. This equals an analysis in terms of core (main) meanings - Jakobson's *Hauptbedeutungen*.

1.3. Only if we are aware of all this, we may grasp Jakobson's postulation of, say, the /+Direction/ feature for all Russian accusatives. The accusative is simply the case typically corresponding to some sort of semantic object, patient, goal, or whatever one may call it. The core meaning of the Russian accusative, being the grammatical case of the semantic object and thus carrying the feature /+Direction/, is then overly generalized into an invariant meaning. When an instance of the Russian accusative is encountered where no such above-mentioned correspondence exists, one sticks to the same distinctive feature only for the sake of descriptional consistence. Obviously, there is no way to verify the relevance of such a feature. A temporal adverbial in the accusative as in *Весь день он писал эту статью* is, without any support or further explanation given, claimed to carry the feature /+Direction/. This is nothing but an *ad hoc* claim.

1.4. Do invariant case meanings describable in terms of semantic features really exist? As long as the de Saussurean/Hjelmslevian axiom of the language sign as the unity of an invariant expression form and an invariant content form is not superseded by something more satisfactory, a linguist must assume that such invariant case meanings do exist. However, they must be searched for on a level of abstraction higher than that of the case meanings usually postulated and the semantic features cannot be restricted to parametres with two values only: marked vs. unmarked.

2. Preliminaries to distributional parametres

2.1. In several papers, especially in Bily (1987), I have tried to apply a concept I have found more useful and realistic, viz. the concept of semantic features as multivalued parametres¹. The following parametrical trichotomy is used here: **positively marked**, /+feature/, **negatively marked**, /-feature/, and **unmarked**, /±feature/, i.e. unspecified as regards the plus-feature and the minus-feature. The trichotomy appears in a set of six parametres for the description of the invariant meanings of nine Russian cases: the nominative, the accusative, the genitive, the dative, the instrumental, the prepositional (called Prepositional I alias Locative I by Jakobson and others), the locative (the so-called Prepositional II alias Locative II or u-locative), the partitive (Jakobson's Genitive II alias u-genitive), and the vocative. The last-mentioned case, existing only in the so-called second declension, is usually ignored in grammars of Russian and other descriptions of the Russian case system, but does nevertheless exist and is therefore included in the analysis.²

2.2. The plus-marking amounts to the logical value called Necessary, i.e. all case forms of such a plus-marked case must necessarily behave in the way indicated by the parametre in question. The minus-marking amounts to the logical value called Impossible, i.e. no case form of such a minus-marked case may behave in the way indicated by the parametre in question. The value unmarked stands for the logical value Possible, i.e. case forms of a case unmarked for the parametre in question behave in the way indicated in some contexts, but in other contexts they do not.

2.3. In the following analysis two syntactic-semantic phenomena are excluded, viz. appositions and coordinations, as they are not suitable for the distributional differentiation between cases. Any two case forms belonging to the same grammatical case may appear in an apposition. Similarly, any

two case forms belonging to the same case may be coordinated. Consequently, nothing can be learnt from appositions and coordinations in the kind of analysis applied here.

3. Distributional parametres

3.1. Parametre 1 - syntactic dependence

Syntactic dependence is a unilateral relationship of an attribute and the head of an endocentric construction (cf. Bloomfield 1933, 194-202; 235-240; 268) or a mutual relationship between syntactic constituents of an exocentric construction (cf. Bloomfield 1933, *ibid.*). Semantic dependence concerns nexus and junction. Nexus (cf. Hjelmslev's 1943 notion of interdependence alias solidarity) is a mutual relationship between several notions (adnexes). Junction (cf. Hjelmslev's determination alias selection) is a unilateral relationship between a notion specified and a notion specifying (adjunct).³

It should be noted that while an exocentric construction implies a nexus, the opposite is not necessarily true. I claim, for example, that all Russian noun phrases in the accusative express a nexal relationship. Thus even prepositionless time adverbials in the accusative express nexus. On the other hand, such time adverbials are apparently not parts of a corresponding exocentric construction - they are "attributes" to the syntactic kernel of the clause, and constitute an endocentric construction with such syntactic kernels. Similarly, a junction does not necessarily have a one-to-one correspondence with an endocentric construction. A noun in the Russian partitive, for example, constitutes an endocentric construction with its head-noun and is a syntactic attribute to the head-noun, but semantically it is the notion corresponding to the head-noun that is an adjunct to the notion specified (corresponding to the syntactic attribute in the partitive case). In other words, the syntactic dependence between *чашка* and *чаю* in *чашка чаю* goes counter to the semantic dependence, where *чаю* is the primary, specified notion, while *чашка* is a mere adjunct specifying the amount of tea.

Thus, as regards the parametre 1, its value is Possible for the nominative, Impossible for the vocative, and Necessary for all oblique cases in Russian. The reason for the unmarked value of the nominative is obvious - it is the case that may - but does not have to - enter into syntactic

dependence relationships of exocentric constructions. The vocative, being an asyntactic case, is never syntactically dependent. All the remaining cases express either explicit syntactic dependence relationships in exo- and/or endocentric constructions, or at least, by the very use of an oblique case, imply such a dependence.

3.2. Parametre 2 - immediate adnex in a nexus

The parametre value is Necessary for the accusative, which is a nexus case per definition, as well as for the prepositional and the locative. The notions corresponding to the latter two case forms are immediate constituents, adnexes in the nexus created by prepositions, which are obligatory with these Russian cases. (The syntactic relationship between a preposition and a noun phrase is the relationship between constituents of an exocentric construction - we cannot say that the preposition is an omittable attribute to the noun phrase and neither is the noun phrase an omittable attribute to the preposition. Similarly, the semantic relationship created by a preposition is a nexus. - cf. 3.1.). For the vocative the parametre value is Impossible, while for the remaining cases, the nominative included, it is Possible. The semantic constituent corresponding to the NP in the nominative may be an adnex (when the NP is a subject, nominal predicate, or an object - for the last alternative see Timberlake 1974), but it does not have to, as the NP in the nominative may be used without any predicate in a purely nominal, denotative function. The semantic counterparts to the noun phrases in the instrumental and the dative may be adnexes in a prepositional, clausal, etc nexus, while the genitive and the partitive may be adnexes in a prepositional nexus only (e.g. in *из лесу*), but they are not adnexes elsewhere (e.g. in *чашка чаю*, *чашка чая*).

3.3. Parametre 3 - a possible immediate exocentric construction and the corresponding nexus are constituted by a prepositional phrase.

The nominative and the vocative are negatively marked, i.e. impossible for this parametre. Neither may appear as the case of a noun in a prepositional phrase⁴. For obvious reasons, the prepositional and the locative are positively marked, i.e. the value is Necessary, but so are the genitive and the partitive. When the latter two cases appear as constituents of exocentric constructions, it is in prepositional phrases only.⁵ The accusative, the dative, and the instrumental are unmarked, i.e. the logical value is Possible for this parametre. These cases may appear in prepositional phrases, but do

not have to. They may appear as immediate constituents in other exocentric constructions, e.g. when their case forms are used as syntactic objects.

3.4. Parametre 4 - immediate attributes in endocentric constructions correspond to immediate adjuncts in junctions.⁶

The value is Impossible for the nominative, the vocative, and the accusative, as well as for the prepositional and the locative. It is obvious that the former three cases do not appear as attributes in endocentric constructions at all. It is worth noticing that the value Impossible for the accusative appears cross-linguistically, in a number of case languages with the accusative case. The prepositional and the locative on the other hand cannot be anything else than nexus cases, as they cannot appear without a preposition. The value is Impossible, i.e. negatively marked, even for the partitive. As mentioned before - cf. 3.1 - in, e.g. *чашка чаю* the attribute *чаю* of the endocentric construction is not an adjunct to *чашка* semantically. The only case unmarked for this feature, i.e. with the value Possible, is the genitive. The property expressed by the parametre in question is excluded in the partitive use of the genitive, as in *чашка чая* (cf. the above-mentioned *чашка чаю*) while it appears in other adnominal uses of the genitive, as in *письмо отца, желание славы*, etc. For the instrumental and the dative the value is Necessary. When these cases occur as immediate attributes in endocentric constructions, they are always immediate adjuncts semantically, e.g. in *письмо отцу, избрание Ивана председателем*, etc.

3.5. Parametre 5 - the case forms occur as immediate constituents of adverbials

There are two possibilities: either the adverbials are prepositionless, or they are prepositional phrases. Under all circumstances the parametre concerns the case forms in question as the main constituent (the head noun) of the adverbial or the main constituent of the NP forming the adverbial together with a preposition. The value is Possible for all cases, except for the vocative, with the value Impossible, and the locative, with the value Necessary. All other cases may appear as main constituents of adverbials. The reason why the prepositional is not assigned the value Necessary is the existence of prepositional objects - cf. *говорить о чем-нибудь*. The prepositional is not always an adverbial case, while the locative is - hence the value Necessary for the locative. The rather surprising value Possible (instead of the expected Impossible) for the nominative is motivated by the

colloquial use of nominatives as adverbials - e.g. in *Он работает почтовый ящик.*, or *Он будет вторник и пятница теперь бывать.* (Cf. Zolotova 1973, 76, who presents even some examples from written literary texts.)

3.6. Parametre 6 - if the case in question constitutes an adverbial, this adverbial is a prepositional phrase, i.e. a nexus from the semantic point of view

The value is Impossible for the nominative and the vocative, for obvious reasons. It is Possible for the accusative and the instrumental, as these cases appear both in prepositionless adverbials and adverbial prepositional phrases. It is Necessary for the remaining cases, i.e. the prepositional and the locative (again for obvious reasons), but also for the genitive and the partitive - the latter two cases are adverbial cases only in prepositional phrases, e.g. *из лесу, вокруг стола.* Finally, it is worth noticing that the dative, not only in Russian, but in many other languages as well, also has the parametre value Necessary. As an adverbial, a dative form must be a part of a prepositional phrase, e.g. *к окну.*

3.7. The following table presents the values of the six parametres for Russian cases. As regards values, N stands for Necessary, i.e. positively marked for the feature in question (+), P stands for Possible, i.e. unmarked for the feature in question ($\pm$), and I stands for Impossible, i.e. negatively marked for the feature in question (-):

CASE NOM. VOC. ACC. INSTR. DAT. GEN. PART. PREP. LOC.
PARA-
METRE

1	P	I	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
2	P	I	N	P	P	P	P	N	N
3	I	I	P	P	P	N	N	N	N
4	I	I	I	N	N	P	I	I	I
5	P	I	P	P	P	P	P	P	N
6	I	I	P	P	N	N	N	N	N

As one can see in this chart, there is no Jakobsonian thoroughly unmarked case - the nominative is unmarked as regards three parametres,

whereas the vocative is negatively marked for the same three parametres. For the remaining three parametres the nominative is specified, negatively marked.

4. Ivić's analysis

4.1. After having finished the first draft of this paper I learnt that Ivić (1983) had tried to present a distributional analysis of the Serbo-Croatian cases. We may assume with Ivić that the Serbo-Croatian case system differs from the Russian one by the lack of the two innovations characteristic of Russian, viz. the partitive and the locative (plus by the lack of the vocative).⁷

4.2. The distributional analysis made by Ivić (1983) concerns the following three distributional features: A, the existence of "free forms", i.e. head nouns without prepositions or obligatory attributes, B, the occurrence of the case form in question in prepositional phrases, and C, the existence of the case form as the head noun to an obligatory attributive determination - e.g. in the so-called temporal genitive. (Cf. *prošlog petka* 'last Friday', *ovog petka* 'this Friday' but never **petka* 'Friday (gen.)'.) The distribution obtained is as follows:

the nominative - only A, the instrumental - A, B, and C, the accusative - A, B, and C, the dative - A and B, the genitive - A, B, and C, the prepositional (called locative by Ivić) - only B.

4.3. However, in spite of two extra distinctions added to the three basic distributional types (Ivić 1983, 202ff) Ivić's analysis cannot differentiate distributionally between three cases: the accusative, the genitive, and the instrumental. In order to achieve unique distributional specifications also for these three cases, one would have to add three more features used by Ivić (1983, 207-214) or the four (only partially coinciding) additional features of Ivić (1965) concerning the use of cases in describing space relations. The genitive is unmarked as regards these additional features, and so is the nominative, while the remaining four cases show various combinations of the three or four localistic distributional features.

4.4. But not even this is enough. Ivić has to split the accusative and the instrumental into an accusative₁ and an accusative₂ and an instrumental₁

and an instrumental, respectively, to be able to capture the distribution of the relevant case forms with the help of all the features proposed.⁸

In other words, Ivić's distributional analysis may be accused of the worst kind of arbitrariness: when the eight (or nine) proposed distributional features cannot cope with the system of six (or rather five) Serbo-Croatian cases, the overall distributional patterns of difficult cases are chopped into several distributional subpatterns of a corresponding number of "subcases". The analysis can never be wrong - one can always add to the description a new subpattern of a new subcase.

5. Advantages of the parameters proposed

5.1. All this is something completely different from the six parameters I propose, the values of which do concern case invariance. Every parameter value of a given case is true for all occurrences of the case forms in question, without any arbitrarily exempted subdistributions.

The parameters have come about as a mixture of intuitive guesses - sometimes redefined after confronting them with language data, the necessity to choose such parameters whose values would define every case in a unique way, and the desire to capture all general distributional properties of Russian cases.

The last-mentioned factor exerts an influence in two ways. A distributional property of a given case may be captured directly by the value of a parameter. The Russian dative, for example, is one of the cases that may appear as the immediate constituent of an adverbial only in those adverbials that consist of a prepositional phrase. (This fact is expressed directly by the positive marking, the value Necessary of the parameter 6 - cf. 3.6.). Alternately, important distributional properties that are not expressed directly by the six parameters used must be inferable from the implications given by the values of these parameters. The Russian genitive and the partitive, for example, cannot be used as immediate forms of syntactic objects (cf. Note 5.). This property is inferable from the values of the parameters 2 and 3 for the two cases in question: they are unmarked for 2, i.e. the two cases are possible as the cases of immediate syntactic constituents (in exocentric constructions) corresponding to adnexes, but they are positively marked for 3, i.e. a nexus must have a prepositional phrase as its syntactic counterpart - it cannot be a higher nexus constituted by a verbal

predication. On the other hand, owing to the necessity for the genitive and the partitive to express syntactic dependence (cf. the Necessary-value of the parametre 1 for these cases), if there is no nexus with a prepositional phrase as its syntactic counterpart, then the genitive and the partitive forms must be nominal attributes to another noun.

5.2. Many other important distributional properties of all Russian cases may be inferred in a similar way from the value of a relevant parametre or from the values of several relevant parametres. Such additional parametres are: the parametre of an immediate syntactic constituent of a major (viz. non-prepositional) exocentric construction, the parametre of the syntactic counterpart of an immediate semantic unit of a major (i.e. non-prepositional) nexus, the parametre of the immediate constituent in a prepositional phrase, etc. Also such derived parametres have three possible values, corresponding to the distributional properties described as Necessary (plus-marked), Possible (unmarked), and Impossible (minus-marked) for the grammatical case forms in question.

5.3. Thus, the set of the distributional parametres proposed has the following advantages in comparison with Ivić's analysis:

- 1) The analysis is general enough to cover the distributional properties of all occurrences of a given case.
- 2) The parametrical values identify each case in a unique way, without resorting to such emergency solutions as the postulation of different, distributionally defined, "subcases".
- 3) The parametrical values of the six parametres do not constitute the end of the distributional analysis. The individual parametrical values pertaining to a case, or combinations of such values, imply a number of additional distributional patterns. Nothing like that can be inferred from Ivić's features.

5.4. The table of the parametrical values is not without redundancy. It would have been possible to drop the parametre 1 - the remaining values of the parametres 2-6 would suffice for the unique identification of every Russian case. However, the parametre 1 is needed for several implications concerning the additional distributional properties of Russian cases.⁹

6. Kuryłowicz vs. Jakobson

6.1. Kuryłowicz's (1949) case theory rejects the Jakobsonian and Hjelmslevian maximalist claims, concerning one invariant meaning per case. However, one cannot accept Kuryłowicz's position without some misgivings. He draws the basic opposition between the nominative, the accusative, and the genitive, which are classified as primarily syntactic, abstract cases, and the remaining semantic, concrete cases.¹⁰ According to this view, all cases in prepositional phrases belong primarily to the subsystem of the semantic, concrete cases. But the primarily syntactic cases may become semantic due to the context and vice versa. Thus it is the context that decides whether a case is used in its primary or secondary function. In other words, there is no invariant meaning at all. In this Kuryłowicz joins the "nihilistic" view of the category of morphological case that can be found in Fillmore (1968), or, to name a slavist, in Isačenko (1962), or, to invoke a more distant past, in Jespersen (1924).

6.2. On the other hand, one cannot deny the semantic invariance of the morphological case in the previously mentioned old chestnuts as *Он прыгает на столе.* vs. *Он прыгает на стол.* (Cf. Note 8.) The only way out of the dilemma is to postulate a number of invariant meanings of a case, each of which "is born" in a particular context. In other words, the interpretation of a particular invariant case meaning depends on in which subsystem of the language the case appears.

6.3. This kind of methodology is not without considerable merits. While Ivić (1983) does not seem to realize that by dividing up the accusative and the instrumental, she abandons Jakobson and becomes a moderate follower of Kuryłowicz, Laskowski (1988) is a consciously true heir to Kuryłowicz. He shows that a case system can "be reasonably interpreted as a hierarchical structure of grammaticalized and semantically defined subsystems. The markedness relations are to a large extent specific to these particular case systems. Such a view on the case system, as a complex structure of subsystems, has more predictive power than the standard uniplanar interpretation /.../"

6.4. Both Ivić and Laskowski are relatives of Wierzbicka (1980; 1986), though less conspicuous. Wierzbicka believes in the existence of a score of interrelated, but distinct, invariant meanings of the Russian instrumental case and in about two scores of equally interrelated, but distinct, invariant case meanings of the Polish dative. The main difference is the disturbingly

large number of invariant case meanings of each case postulated by Wierzbicka and the fact that Wierzbicka's subsystems are not as general as Laskowski's, which are, in a way, similar to the parametres proposed by me. (Every parametre constitutes a subsystem.) Instead Wierzbicka's subsystems are mainly lexically determined. Cases are, for example, described as complements to verbs constituting a certain semantic field, etc.

6.5. Obviously, one invariant meaning per case has its inevitable disadvantages. The common denominator for all instances of a given case is necessarily an invariant with a minimal semantic content. Thus Wierzbicka's (1980) criticism of the non-existent predictive power of Jakobson's case descriptions concerns even genuine invariance - in a way even to a greater degree, since Jakobson's case models express the prototypical semantics of cases in their dominating uses. (Thus Jakobson's models may be reinterpreted as a kind of modest probabilistic models with certain **stochastic** predictive power.)

6.6. On the other hand, the system of distributional parametres described in this paper is not without predictive power of a different sort: from the parametre values of a particular case it is possible to infer a number of further distributional patterns pertaining to the case in question. These inferred patterns may be checked in confrontations with linguistic data. Moreover, this predictive power is not of the mere probabilistic sort - the inferences concern certainty as regards the parametrical values corresponding to the distributional patterns inferred.

6.7. The basic issue is not Jakobson, Hjelmslev, and their followers vs. Kuryłowicz, Wierzbicka, Ivić, Laskowski, etc. An explicit description of a language is hardly possible without genuine, and consequently rather abstract, invariant meanings of grammatical categories. The distributional (functional) generalization of such invariants is as necessary as the more concrete descriptions of limited subsystems within the morphological category studied. Thus Kuryłowicz's, Wierzbicka's, and Laskowski's concrete partial meanings as well as Jakobson's, Hjelmslev's, and my own invariant meanings are in fact two sides of the same coin. Both the abstract invariants and the concrete partial meanings are legitimate and necessary components in the description of a language system, de Saussure's *langue*. The real issue is: What is the best description of a grammatical category in terms of semantic invariance **and** what is the best description within the framework of hierarchized language subsystems.¹¹

- ¹ Of course, it is always possible to translate purely formally any multi-valued parametre into a combination of binary ones, but such an approach loses its appeal if its logical consequences are taken into consideration - cf., e.g., Bílý (1984), (1987), Kučera (1984), and esp. Bílý (1989a).
- ² A notable exception is Klobukov (1986). For the sake of economy with space I have to abstain from discussing the criteria leading to the recognition of the nine cases in question and the exclusion of other possible candidates for "casehood" in Russian, e.g. the numeral of Zaliznjak (1967, 46ff). I shall take up this question elsewhere. For the same reason I cannot be fully explicit in the following text as regards definitions of the six distributional parametres, as the explicitness would lead to a necessary regress I cannot deal with within the limits of this paper. I could, for example, have presented an explicit, stringent definition that would give unequivocal answers to the question what an adverbial is and what it is not (what a prepositional object is, etc). In order to do that I would need to introduce additional undefined notions, etc. Consequently, terms such as adverbial are understood in the intuitive sense of the notion in question. (Explicit diagnostic criteria for the recognition of adverbials shall appear in Bílý 1989b.) Other terms are introduced by references to the linguists who coined them. They are applied with minimal modifications, even though I am fully aware of the necessity to make explicit revisions of terms such as Bloomfield's (1933) exocentric and endocentric constructions, Jespersen's (1924) nexus and junction, or Mel'čuk's (1981 and 1986) syntactic and semantic dependence.
- ³ The terms syntactic and semantic dependence are taken from Mel'čuk (1981 and 1986), but are not quite identical with Mel'čuk's concepts. For example, I do not accept Mel'čuk's claim according to which even subjects are syntactically dependent on predicates, or, which is even less palatable, his postulation of syntactic dependence expressed by nouns in the nominative case in purely denotative functions such as titles, inscriptions, signs, lexicon entries, etc. (For a brief presentation of some basic problems connected with Bloomfield's notions see Lyons 1968, 232f.)

- 4 In accordance with Mel'čuk (1985, 484) I consider the exceptional construction *Что ...за...*, e.g. in *А что он за человек?* an unanalyzable idiom.)
- 5 I regard prepositionless genitive and partitive forms that are not attributes to overt head nouns as attributes to covert head nouns. For example, *Я не вижу мамы* is viewed as implying the internal structure of the object as something like 'a piece of mother'. On the other hand, I have rejected the idea I myself am guilty of in Bílý & Pettersson (1984), viz. the interpretation of prepositional phrases with the noun in the genitive or the partitive as containing a similar covert head noun. While there are semantic reasons to postulate such covert head nouns for the genitive and the partitive in noun phrases (cf. Bílý 1988), the invention of such covert head nouns in prepositional phrases is *ad hoc*, solely motivated by an effort to obtain as simple definitions of the genitive and the partitive as possible.
- 6 I do not have to get involved in an analysis of appositions and coordinations, since I have excluded them from the distributional analysis presented here - cf. 2.3.
- 7 Though it is hardly the whole truth. In fact, the existence of two separate cases, the dative and the prepositional, may be questioned. The distinction is retained in Serbo-Croatian in optional separate locative forms in the declension of a couple of pronouns and in different word-tones of some dialects. (On the other hand, Ivić's recognition of two distinct cases, instead of only one dative case, has some justification within Ivić's methodological framework, as will be shown in the following.)

Ivić (1983, 197-214), which is a revised version of Ivić (1961 and 1965), invokes Jakobson (1936; 1958), but Jakobson is misrepresented. In the model of Jakobson (1958), which is not compatible with the model of Jakobson (1936) - cf. Bílý (1989a) - the nominative is the unmarked case, the instrumental is marked for the feature /periphery/, the accusative is marked for /direction/, the dative for both /direction/ and /periphery/, the (general) genitive for both /direction/ and /scope/, and the prepositional is marked for all the three features mentioned. However, in Ivić's (1983, 201ff) presentation the genitive is marked only for the feature /scope/, not for /direction/, while the prepositional is marked for /scope/ and /periphery/, but is not marked

for /direction/ either. According to the figure on p. 200, even the genitive would be marked for two features - presumably /direction/ and /scope/, but this would clash with the repeatedly claimed double marking of the prepositional for /scope/ and /periphery/ - *ibid.* pp. 200-203 - without any marking of the prepositional for /direction/.

- 8 For example, the prepositional accusatives denoting spatial relations in Serbo-Croatian are divided by Ivić into those that denote the place where the action ends and those that denote the place where the whole action, from the beginning to the end, is carried out. Cf. *Putuje u Beograd*. 'He is travelling to Belgrade.' with the accusative₁ vs. the accusative₂ in *Putuje kroz Beograd*. 'He is travelling through Belgrade.' Ivić's analysis is vulnerable to objections. It may be claimed that there is only one prepositional accusative expressing space relations and the distinction "the locum where the action ends" vs. "the locum where the whole action takes place" is expressed by the choice of the preposition. (Either *u* + the accusative₁, or *kroz* 'through', *uz* 'up', or *niz* 'down' + the accusative₂.) By this I do not deny the semantic content of the morphological case - cf. the classical Russian *Он прыгает на столе*. vs. *Он прыгает на стол*, where the case suffix is the only overt marker of the semantic difference. Nor do I deny, to resort to the Serbo-Croatian preposition *u*, that it is compatible, not only with the accusative, but also with the locative and with the genitive, with appropriate changes of the meaning of the whole prepositional phrase.

I leave aside the question whether Ivić is right when claiming that the preposition *uz* meaning 'beside, by' is homonymous (and its accusative is of the accusative₁ sort) with *uz* meaning 'up'. Even in, say, *Staja uz mene*. 'He is stepping beside me' the locum can be interpreted as "where the action takes place", i.e. the accusative is an accusative₂, not an accusative₁. The difference concerns the two ways of defining the locum where the action takes place: either it is defined by the limits of an area (as with *kroz*, *uz*, *niz*) or by the proximity to a "point" (as with *uz* meaning 'beside, by'). Nevertheless, the accusative should be of the accusative₂ kind in both instances.

- 9 For example, the impossibility of partitive case forms to appear as syntactic counterparts to immediate adjuncts is the consequence of the values of parameters 1, 2, and 4: the partitive may appear as the syntactic counterpart of an immediate adnex in a nexus (2), but does

not have to. As exocentric constructions imply nexus, the absence of nexus implies the absence of exocentric constructions. Consequently, partitive forms that are not immediate constituents of exocentric constructions must be attributes in endocentric constructions being necessarily syntactically dependent (1). Then from the value of 4 it is concluded that partitive forms that are attributes cannot be syntactic counterparts to adjuncts. Therefore the partitive is the only case that can never occur as the syntactic counterpart to adjuncts - all other cases can, e.g. in *стакан чаю*, *стакана чаю*, *стакане чаю* etc the syntactic head is the counterpart to the adjunct, but there cannot be anything like **стакану* (part.) *чаю* (part.) or **чаю* (part.) *чаю* (part.).

- 10 In the revision presented in Kuryłowicz (1977, 141-156), the dative is reinterpreted as a primarily syntactic case. This is in tune with what is perhaps the dominating modern view - cf., e.g., Brecht & Levine (1986b, 27).
- 11 Time seems to be ripe for distributional analyses. Klobukov (1986) is another work I obtained too late to incorporate into this paper. Needless to say, I (as any scientist) publish here my own ideas because I like them more than the competing proposals, including those made by Klobukov (1986), to whose ingenious work I intend to return elsewhere.

B i b l i o g r a p h y

- Bílý, M.: 1984, 'Preliminaries to an Aspect Heuristic That Makes Sense to Learners of Slavic Aspect System', *X Nordiska Slavismötet 13-17 augusti 1984 - Föredrag* (= Meddelanden från Stiftelsen för Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitutet Nr 102), 13-26.
- Bílý, M.: 1987, 'Some Thoughts on Quantification in Russian', *Scando-Slavica* 33, 141-167.
- Bílý, M.: 1988, 'Russian Quantification Expressed via Grammatical Number and the Construction *idti v soldaty*', *Scando-Slavica* 34, 69-93.
- Bílý, M.: 1989a, 'The Case of the Invariant Case Reconsidered', *Slovo* 37, 5-33.

- Bílý, M.: 1989b, *Valence and Semantic Roles* (to appear in Umeå University, Department of General Linguistics, Report Series)
- Bílý, M. & Pettersson, T.: 1984, 'Kasusteori - en modell för morfologiskt kasus', *Slovo* 28, 5-24.
- Bloomfield, L.: 1933, *Language*, New York.
- Brecht, R.D. & Levine, J.S. (eds.): 1986a, *Case in Slavic*, Columbus. Ohio.
- Brecht, R.D. & Levine, J.S.: 1986b, 'Case and Meaning', in: *Brecht & Levine* (1986a) 17-34.
- Fillmore, C.J.: 1968, 'Case for Case', in: Bach, E. & Harms, R.T. (eds.), *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, New York, 1-88.
- Hjelmslev, L.: 1935/1937, 'La catégorie des cas. Étude de grammaire générale 1', *Acta Jutlandica* VII (= Aarskrift for Aarhus Universitet 1935), I-XII and 1-184. 'La catégorie des cas. Étude de grammaire générale 2', *Acta Jutlandica* IX. (= Aarskrift for Aarhus Universitet 1937), I-VII and 1-77.
- Hjelmslev, L.: 1943, *Omkring Sprogteoriens Grundlaegelse*, København.
- Ivić, M.: 1961, 'On the Structural Characteristic of the Serbocroatian Case System', *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* IV, 38-47.
- Ivić, M.: 1965, 'The System of Serbocroatian Cases Denoting Space Relations', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia, International Journal of Structural Linguistics* 9:1, 50-55.
- Ivić, M.: 1983, *Lingvistički ogledi*, Beograd.
- Isačenko, A.V.: 1962, *Die Russische Sprache der Gegenwart*, Teil I. Formenlehre, Halle.
- Jakobson, R.: 1936, 'Beitrag zur allgemeinen Kasuslehre', *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague* 6, 240-288.

- Jakobson, R.: 1958, 'Morfologičeskie nabljudenija nad slavjanskim sklonenijem', in: *American Contributions to the Fourth International Congress of Slavists*, The Hague, 127-156.
- Jespersen, O.: 1924, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, London.
- Klobukov, E.V.: 1986, *Semantika padežnych form v sovremennom russkom literaturnom jazyke*, Moskva.
- Kučera, H.: 1984, 'The Logical Basis of the Markedness Hypothesis', in: Stolz, B.A., Titunik, I.R., & Doležel, L. (eds.), *Language and Literary Theory. Papers in Slavic Philology 5*, Ann Arbor, Mich., 61-75.
- Kuryłowicz, J.: 1949, 'Le problème du classement des cases', *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 9, Kraków, 20-43.
- Kuryłowicz, J. et al.: 1977, *Problèmes de linguistique indoeuropéenne*, Wrocław.
- Laskowski, R.: 1988, 'Markedness and the Category of Case in Polish', in: Miśeska-Tomić, O. (ed.), *Papers from the Societas Linguistica Europaea Meeting*, Ohrid 1986, in print.
- Lyons, J.: 1968, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge.
- Mel'čuk, I.A.: 1981, 'Types de dépendance syntagmatique entre les mot-formes d'une phrase', in: *Bulletin de la Société linguistique de Paris* 76:1, 1-59.
- Mel'čuk, I.A.: 1985, *Poverxnostnyj sintaksis russkich čislovych vyraženij*, (= Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. Sonderband 16), Wien.
- Mel'čuk, I.A.: 1986, 'Toward a Definition of Case', in: Brecht & Levine (1986a, 35-85).
- Timberlake, A.: 1974, 'The Nominative Object in North Russian', in: Brecht, R.D. & Chvany, C.V. (eds.), *Slavic Transformational Syntax*, Ann Arbor, Mich., 219-243.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1980, *The Case for Surface Case*, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Wierzbicka, A.: 1986, 'The Meaning of a Case: A Study of the Polish Dative', in: *Brecht & Levine* (1986a), 386-426).

Zaliznjak, A.A.: 1967, *Russkoe imennoe slovoizmenenie*. Moskva.

Zolotova, G.A.: 1973, *Očerki funkcional'nogo sintaksisa russkogo jazyka*, Moskva.