Kulikov, Leonid, Andrej Malchukov and Peter de Swart (eds.) 2006. *Case, Valency and Transitivity*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins [*Studies in Language Companion Series* 77]. xx+503 p. (ISBN 90 272 3087 0)

Reviewed by Peter M. Arkadiev (Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences)

The volume under review is a collection of papers originating from a conference on case and transitivity held at the University of Nijmegen in 2003. The contributions to the volume discuss issues related to case, argument structure, and transitivity, using data from a wide range of languages and approaching the topics from a variety of theoretical perspectives, both 'formal' and 'functional'.

Among the particular topics addressed in the volume are the following: relationship between syntactic and morphological facets of case marking (Spencer), diachronic evolution of case systems (Kulikov, Vydrine, Peterson, Ganenkov), differential object marking (DOM) and differential subject marking (DSM) (Abraham, Johanson, de Swart, Kittilä, Næss, Malchukov), argument structure of polyclausal constructions (Barðdal and Eythórsson, Sahoo), valency changing operations (Broadwell, Lyutikova and Bonch-Osmolovskaya, Letuchiy, Kalinina et al., Lehmann and Verhoeven), and some other. The volume consists of three major parts: "Morphological case" (papers 1–5), "Case marking and transitivity" (papers 6–16), and "Transitivity and valency change" (papers 17–21). The Introduction by the Editors briefly outlines the main topics of the volume and contains useful summaries of all the papers.

The first part of the volume, "Morphological case", is devoted mainly to surface realization of grammatical relations by means of case marking, and to various problems associated with its theory, synchronic description and diachronic development.

Andrew Spencer in the opening article "Syntactic vs. morphological case. Implications for morphosyntax" proposes to distinguish between syntactically and morphologically defined features ("s-features" resp. "m-features", cf. Sadler and Spencer 2001), which are often not in a simple one-to-one correspondence. This is especially evident in the domain of case, where the two kinds of features have different scope: s-case is a property of syntactic phrases, while m-case relates to words.[1] Spencer demonstrates the empirical necessity to separate syntactic and morphological case on the basis of data from Chukchee, Czech and German. In

Studies in Language 33:3 (2009), **738–748**. DOI 10.1075/sl.33.3.09ark
ISSN 0378–4177 / E-ISSN 1569–9978

Chukchee, there is strong evidence for an Ergative s-case, but the morphological system lacks a dedicated Ergative case marker: the Ergative syntactic function is taken over by either Instrumental or the Locative cases depending on the declension class. In Czech, the Dative with masculine animate nouns may be expressed by two endings: *-u* or *-ovi*, the choice being conditioned by the linear position of the noun in the NP. In German, the morphological expression of the Genitive depends on a complex array of factors, which cannot be properly understood unless we separate the morphological notions from the syntactic ones. In the last section of the article, Spencer outlines a realizational model of the relation between s-case and m-case, couched in the framework of paradigm-based lexicalism (Blevins 2001), which draws a strict line between the syntactic and the morphological levels of representation and postulates a (possibly non-trivial) mapping between the two.

Leonid Kulikov in "Case systems in a diachronic perspective. A typological sketch" identifies three major cross-linguistic tendencies in the development of case systems, i.e. case-increasing, case-reducing, and case-stability. In the first section of the article, Kulikov surveys the sources of new cases and mechanisms of expansion of case systems, such as grammaticalisation of adpositional phrases (New Indo-Aryan languages, Old Lithuanian) and demonstrative pronouns and other indexicals (Berber and possibly some Caucasian and Australian languages), multilayer case marking (Finno-Ugric languages), and such purely morphological processes as paradigmatic rearrangements and splits, attested in the history of Russian. The second section of the article focuses on the opposite process, i.e. reduction and decay of case systems, illustrated by several successive stages of the Latin and Romance. In the third section of the paper Kulikov discusses the mechanisms languages employ to preserve morphological case distinctions, such as borrowing of inflectional markers from other cases (e.g. the Slavic Genitive-Accusative), reinforcement by particles or adpositions (e.g. in Armenian), or recruiting originally derivational formations into the case paradigm (again Armenian). Kulikov concludes that the evolutionary type of case system does not necessarily correlate with the degree of phonological conservatism, since languages may find various means to successfully resist phonetic erosion of case markers (cf. Slavic vs. Romance), and that the factors which underlie the evolutionary type of case system and the mechanisms of their development are areal rather than genetic.

Other papers of this section deal with phenomena of particular languages or language families. Valentin Vydrine in "Emergence of morphological cases in South Mande. From the amorphous type to inflectional?" discusses the development of case distinctions in several languages of the Mande language family (Western Africa). The 'newly-born' case systems in these languages display great diversity and show some typologically unusual features. Tyler Peterson in the article "Issues of

morphological ergativity in the Tsimshian languages. Agreement, determiners and the reconstruction of case" presents a synchronic analysis and a reconstruction of the complex system of morphological marking of syntactic relations in the Tsimshian languages of British Columbia, focusing on the interaction between agreement and the system of the so-called 'connectives', i.e. determiner-like elements which accompany NPs and may vary according to their syntactic functions. Jochen Trommer in the article "Direction marking and case in Menominee" argues against recent proposals that direct/inverse marking in the Algonquian languages can be adequately explained without recourse to prominence hierarchies. Trommer shows that the analyses reducing direct/inverse marking in Patawatomi and Passamaquoddy to (abstract) case assignment and context-dependent realization of features encounters both conceptual and empirical problems, and cannot be extended to very similar patterns in Menominee, for which he proposes an account in terms of Distributed Optimality (Trommer 2003).

The central part of the volume, "Case marking and transitivity", consists of eleven papers addressing various issues in the domain of core case marking of transitive clauses and the motivations for particular case marking patterns and case marking alternations.

"Control infinitives and case in Germanic: 'Performance error' or marginally acceptable constructions" by Jóhanna Barðdal and Thórhallur Eythórsson discusses the problem of non-nominative subjects in control constructions in German and Icelandic. It is usually claimed (e.g. Zaenen et al. 1985, Wunderlich 2003) that in German only nominative subjects can be left unexpressed in embedded infinitives, while Faroese and especially Icelandic do allow oblique subjects in this position. The paper presents the results of a corpus analysis of German and Icelandic data coupled with a statistical survey of grammaticality judgments of native speakers of these languages. Barðdal and Eythórsson show that the situation with oblique subjects in control infinitives in both languages is much more complicated than it is usually assumed. In German, such constructions are attested in the corpora, not only in casual speech of younger internet users, but in literary and academic texts as authoritative as Immanuel Kant's 'Kritik der reinen Vernunft'. The questionnaire survey also revealed that native speakers of German do not always judge such examples to be absolutely unacceptable. In Icelandic, the acceptability of non-nominative subjects in control infinitives is subject to variation, too; some examples found in the corpora are judged as infelicitous by the authors themselves, and all examples they checked with native speakers show non-uniform acceptability rates. The authors conclude that there is no significant difference between German and Icelandic in this respect. Further, examples of such constructions from Early Middle English, Old Swedish and Old Norse are provided. In the concluding section of the article the authors assert that such 'marginally acceptable'

or 'peripheral' data "cannot be categorically dismissed as 'performance errors', but deserve to be taken seriously".

Dmitry Ganenkov in "Experiencer coding in Nakh-Dagestanian" presents a survey of experiencer marking in 18 Daghestanian languages (the list of relevant verbs and their case frames is given in the Appendix). Ganenkov defines three main classes of experiencer verbs in these languages, basing his classification on formal grounds: (i) 'perceptional', i.e. those which mark their experiencer with a special Affective case (to this group usually belong verbs meaning 'see', 'hear', and 'know'); (ii) 'recipiential', i.e. those whose experiencer is marked in the same way as the recipient in ditransitive constructions, e.g. with the Dative case; this group comprises verbs of volition, emotional state, and the predicate 'be difficult'; (iii) 'involuntary', i.e. those verbs whose experiencer is marked similarly to the agent in the so called 'involuntary agent construction', e.g. with one of the locative cases (only three verbs, 'be able', 'find', and 'forget'). Ganenkov shows that the Dagestanian languages display considerable variation in experiencer marking; the number of classes of experiencer verbs distinguished ranges from no formal difference between the three groups of experiencer verbs (Ingush and Karata) to a three-way opposition (Bagwalal, Tsakhur and the Icari dialect of Dargwa). Ganenkov also sets up a path of diachronic extension of allative markers into experiencer markers and further into recipient markers, and proposes a semantic map of experiencer and related functions based on the meanings of different verbs.

Lars Johanson in "Two approaches to specificity" addresses the much discussed topic of object marking in Turkish. He argues that a 'purely functional' approach, which "departs from general cognitive contents and looks at their implementation in various language-specific grammars", cannot fully account for the complex phenomena of DOM in Turkish and presents a 'structural' account, which "defines formally expressed language-specific values and specifies their contextual determination" and, according to Johanson, is "an indispensable prerequisite for a functional approach" (p. 225). Johanson shows that an attempt to account for the distribution of overt accusative suffix, indefinite article, and overt plural suffix in Turkish in terms of mapping from universal functional-semantic values such as 'definite', 'specific', 'singular' etc. to concrete forms results in a propensity of 'expression rules', none of which is exceptionless. By contrast, the 'structural' approach, which is based on three binary features [±SPECIFIC], [±SINGULAR], [±PLURAL], is argued to yield a better result. For instance, this approach allows one to better account for 'bare nominals' which are shown to be unmarked for the relevant oppositions.

Peter de Swart's article "Case markedness" discusses DOM from the perspective which considers 'distinguishability' to be the primary function of core case marking (cf. de Swart 2007). He argues for the principle of 'Minimal Semantic

Distinctness' of the two participants of a transitive event: "If the two arguments of a transitive relation are not minimally distinct they must be morphologically distinct. If they are minimally distinct they do not need to be morphologically distinct" (p. 253), where 'minimal semantic distinctness' is understood as the requirement for the agent to outrank the patient on the relevant semantic scales. The author presents data from a variety of languages which he argues to support the Minimal Semantic Distinctness principle. Of particular interest are such phenomena as the influence of world knowledge on DOM, exemplified by Malayalam, cf. (1) and (2):

(1) a. Kappal tiramaalakaḷe bheediccu.
ship wave.PL.ACC split.PAST
'The ship broke through the waves.'
b. Tiramaalakaḷ kappaline bheediccu.
wave.PL ship.ACC split.PAST
'The waves split the ship.'

(2) a. Tiiyyə kuʈil naʃippicu.
fire hut destroy.PAST
'Fire destroyed the hut.'
b. Veḷḷam tiiyyə keʈutti.
water fire extinguish.PAST
'Water extinguished the fire.'

In (1) overt marking of the patient is required because both 'water' and 'ship' may be understood as the agent and the patient of the verb; by contrast, in (2) the roles are uniquely inferable from the lexical semantics, and therefore no marking is necessary.

P. de Swart also addresses the debated issue (cf. Næss's article below) of the relation between two alternative conceptions of 'prototypical' transitivity: that of Hopper and Thompson (1980), who claim that in the 'canonical' transitive clause O must be individuated, and Comrie (1989), who argues to the contrary. P. de Swart proposes a model of the relation between semantic and formal markedness in which the notion of 'prototypical' transitivity is substituted by the mapping between the scales of formal and semantic markedness. The mapping model allows to capture such cross-linguistic strategies of encoding events with low resp. high individuated Os as lack resp. presence of case marking and incorporation resp. lack thereof. Finally, de Swart proposes a formalization of his conception in the framework of Bidirectional Optimality Theory (Blutner 2000) and compares it to another OT approach proposed by Aissen (2003).

Helen de Hoop and Monique Lamers in "Incremental distinguishability of subject and object" discuss the means which help to distinguish between the core

participants of a transitive event: case marking, agreement, selectional restrictions of the verb, word order, and prominence. On the basis of German data they propose an OT model of the interaction of these factors, and show that, though prominent to different degrees, all of them may play crucial role in determining the interpretation of sentences. Further, de Hoop and Lamers argue for an incremental optimization model of processing sentences, which computes the values of the relevant constraints on the constituent by constituent basis and allows for shifts in interpretation. Finally, they discuss the results of a psycholinguistic experiment which has shown that shifts in interpretation result in specific event related brain potentials (ERPs), which reflect the processing load of such sentences.

"The woman showed the baby to her sister: On resolving humanness-driven ambiguity in ditransitives" by Seppo Kittilä is a typological study of the strategies languages employ to distinguish the Recipient (R) and the theme (T) of ditransitive constructions when both of them are animate. Kittilä first discusses three main strategies of object marking in ditransitives (cf. Kittilä 2006): (i) 'object-based' strategy in which T and R, both being objects, are marked in the same way, and differently from the A (e.g. Martuthunira); (ii) 'animacy-based' strategy in which the marking of T and R is determined by their animacy (e.g. Maithili); and (iii) 'role-based' strategy where T and R are marked according to their semantic roles (e.g. Finnish). Then Kittilä addresses the typology of means languages employ in the situations where both T and R are animate, and proposes to distinguish between 'theme-prominent' and 'recipient-prominent' languages on the basis of which object is formally treated as a direct object. The paper presents some very interesting material and makes a valuable contribution to the typological study of ditransitive constructions; however, I would like to object to a specific claim which Kittilä makes, i.e. that "markers of animacy" (such as Accusative clitic in Awa Pit) develop into markers of R; as far as I know, diachronic evidence (e.g. from the Romance and Indo-Iranian languages) suggests the opposite direction of development (cf. Lehmann 1995/1982: 97–100).

Åshild Næss in "Case semantics and the agent-patient opposition" argues against current conceptions of case marking which highlight only one facet of its functional load, i.e. the 'discriminatory' (e.g. Comrie 1989, Aissen 2003) or the 'indexing' (e.g. Wierzbicka 1983) functions of cases (cf. Næss 2007). Næss claims that an adequate theory must recognise both functions as crucial for determining case marking. Her argument is based on the data from a variety of languages which show that, on the one hand, **object** marking may depend on such properties of the **subject**, such as volitionality or humanness, and, on the other hand, properties of the **object**, such as referentiality, affectedness etc., may play a role in determining the marking of the **subject**. Further, Næss discusses languages where situations with agents somehow affected in the course of the event are encoded differently

from those which do not share such characteristic. Then she proposes a conception of case marking which relies on the notion of **opposition** of agent and patient: the prototypical transitive clause is one where agent and patient are maximally distinct from each other with respect to the nature of their involvement in the event (cf. Dowty 1991, where similar ideas are advocated; curiously, Næss does not refer to this paper). Thus, according to Næss, "the basic function of core case markers is to discriminate between arguments in a clause where there is maximal semantic distinction of arguments" (p. 323), and morphosyntactic marking of agents (resp. patients) typically applies to clauses where the relevant argument is opposed to a typical patient (resp. agent). Næss then shows how the two dimensions of case marking (the need to discriminate between the two arguments, and the requirement that case marking apply to prototypically transitive clauses) may compete with each other and result in different strategies of case marking.

Andrej Malchukov in "Transitivity parameters and transitivity alternations: Constraining co-variation" proposes a reformulation of the conception of transitivity of Hopper and Thompson (1980) in terms of the 'transitivity scale' (3), where properties listed by Hopper and Thompson are divided into three major classes according to whether they are related to the Agent, to the Patient, or to the predicate (p. 333):

(3) Transitivity scale

Agent-related features	*Verb-related features*	*Patient-related features*
animacy volitionality	kinesis factivity tense/aspect	affectedness
		O-individuation

Then Malchukov proposes the following Relevance Principle, which constrains the mapping between the different values of transitivity features and different constructions: "Mark the Transitivity Parameter on the relevant constituent (i.e. on the constituent to which the feature pertains)" (p. 335). Thus, the Relevance Principle "predicts that all other things being equal features pertaining to A (e.g. volitionality) should be marked on A (exclusively or not-exclusively), and features of O (e.g. affectedness, O-individuation) should be encoded on O (again, exclusively or not-exclusively)" (p. 335). Malchukov discusses various evidence for the Relevance Principle, e.g. person-based split ergativity, DOM, and DSM. Then he proceeds to some counterexamples to the Relevance Principle (in some respects similar to those discussed by Næss), when a particular transitivity feature is encoded on the 'wrong' constituent. To motivate this, he adduces the Primary Argument Immunity Principle (PIAP; cf. Tsunoda's (1981) 'Unmarked case constraint') (p. 340): "Avoid manipulating the case marking of the primary argument exclusively". 'Primary argument' is "the transitive clause argument that is encoded identically to the intransitive subject" (p. 340), i.e. A in the accusative languages and

O in the ergative languages. For PIAP speaks the fact that, e.g. ergative languages show DSM more often than the accusative languages, which, by contrast, are more prone to DOM; when a transitivity feature manipulated pertains to the primary argument, special constructions (antipassive resp. passive) are used. Then Malchukov discusses possible exceptions to PIAP, and proposes an OT-based model of the interaction of PIAP and the Relevance Principle which he rightly considers to be two mutually independent competing motivations.

This section of the book also includes the following papers:

"Bare and prepositional differential case marking: The exotic case of German (and Icelandic) among all of Germanic" by Werner Abraham, where various kinds of case marking alternations attested in Germanic languages are surveyed. Abraham focuses on such issues as possible case combinations in German, non-nominative subjects in Icelandic vs. German, classes of three-place verbs in different Germanic languages, case government by verb-incorporated prepositions in German, the usage of object-marking preposition in Afrikaans, on possible connections between availability of case marking and scrambling, and on how the degree of semantic erosion of prepositions affects their usage for object-marking. "'Argument sharing' in Oriya serial verb constructions" by Kalyanamalini Sahoo discusses the possible ways of formally representing the serial verb constructions in the Indo-Aryan language Oriya in terms of Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. "Transitivity in Songhay" by Julia Galiamina is a survey of lexical and grammatical means of encoding transitive events in Songhay of Gao, an African language, with particular attention to the classes of verbs which show different grammatical behaviour.

The third and last part of the book is devoted to case studies of valency changing operations (passives, causatives, and applicatives) in different languages. The articles in this section are both data- and theory-oriented and present valuable discussions of very interesting and sometimes quite peculiar phenomena.

George Aaron Broadwell in "Syntactic valence, information structure, and passive constructions in Kaqchikel" discusses two passive constructions in a Mayan language of Guatemala, and shows that there are two 'passive' constructions in Kaqchikel, which share all major syntactic properties but differ on the level of information structure possibilities.

Ekaterina Lyutikova and Anastasia Bonch-Osmolovskaya in "A very active passive: Functional similarities between passive and causative in Balkar" analyze the passive derivation in Balkar, a Turkic language of the Caucasus.[2] They show that the 'passive' morpheme *-l/-n* in Balkar, besides such typical uses as passive proper, potential passive, decausative, experiential passive, has also such an unexpected function as 'causal' passive. 'Causal' passive is formed from verbs with a single patientive argument (including those which already contain the passive

affix), and is used to indicate that the situation described by the verb is caused by some external force, cf. *Cojun tol-du* 'The pot filled' vs. *Cojun zawun-nan tol-**un**-du* 'The pot filled because of the rain'. The authors present quite interesting data on the double passive in Balkar, and speculate on possible ways by which the typologically unusual 'causal' meaning of the passive could arise.

"Case marking, possession and syntactic hierarchies in Khakas causative constructions in comparison with other Turkic languages" by Alexander Letuchiy provides an interesting discussion of case marking of the causee in Turkic causative constructions. Letuchiy shows that the well-known 'Comrie's rule' for the case marking of causee (cf. Comrie 1976: "In causative construction, the causee (the original subject) occupies the highest vacant position in the hierarchy Subject > Direct object > Indirect object > Oblique") is only one of the factors regulating the case marking of causee. Thus, in Khakas, Altai and Balkar, causee in causatives from transitive verbs may be marked not only by the Dative (in accordance with Comrie's rule), but also by the Accusative, depending on various factors. Letuchiy also presents a syntactic analysis of the constructions with accusative causees, and shows that they display a greater degree of syntactic prominence (as evidenced in control of reflexives and scrambling possibilities) than dative causees.

Elena Kalinina, Dmitry Kolomatsky, and Alexandra Sudobina in "Transitivity increase markers interacting with verb semantics: Evidence from Finno-Ugric languages" present detailed case-studies of transitivity increase phenomena in Mari and Komi. In Mari, they focus on the interaction of the so called transitiviser (suffix *-alt*) and two series of agreement markers ('set I' and 'set II'), which they show to be sensitive to the agentivity of the subject, and claim that type I is associated with unaccusative argument structure (including passive), which explains why the *-alt* suffix, which they argue to be "a placeholder for the agent argument", is employed in agent-demoting constructions. In Komi, the authors discuss the range of functions of the suffix *-ǝd*, which serves to form causatives from intransitive verbs but with transitive verbs may indicate total affectedness of the object, intensity of the action, or volitionality of the agent, or may function as an applicative derivation introducing a peripheral animate participant (e.g. *to dance ~ to dance with somebody*). Thus, this suffix is rather a marker of high semantic transitivity than a causative proper.

Christian Lehmann and Elisabeth Verhoeven in "Extraversive transitivization in Yucatec Maya and the nature of the applicative" present an in-depth analysis of a derivational process in Yucatec Maya which is in many respects similar to applicative but which they argue to be of a different nature. They use the term 'extraversion' (cf. Paris 1985) to refer to derivations which add an Undergoer argument to an intransitive verb. Discussing the Yucatec Maya facts, Lehmann and Verhoeven show that the extraversive suffix *-t* is used to introduce direct objects not only

with such peripheral semantic roles as stimulus, location, addressee, but also with central roles, e.g. patient and theme. The authors show that the argument of the extraversive verb can not be usually adjoined to the intransitive verb, which makes it different from typical applicative formations. Further, they argue that extraversion and applicative cross-linguistically tend to show different behaviour with respect to a whole range of parameters, and conclude that the distinction between applicative and extraversion is important both for the theory and for the typology of valency-increasing derivations.

The volume 'Case, Valency and Transitivity' is a fine collection of papers by authors coming from different countries and belonging to different theoretical frameworks but sharing some fundamental assumptions on what case and transitivity are and how they work, even though these assumptions are often couched in quite different terminology and illustrated by very different data. The book is abundant in very interesting material from a whole array of languages, some of them quite 'exotic', and contains valuable contributions to language description, typology, and linguistic theory. The major outcome of this volume, besides the purely empirical one, consists, in my opinion, in clearly showing that the interaction and collaboration of linguists working on different aspects of a single notional domain and approaching it from divergent perspectives may be very fruitful.

Abbreviations

ACC accusative, PAST past tense, PL plural.

Notes

1. Actually, the types of mismatch between syntax and morphology of case were for the first time systematically addressed in Zaliznyak (1973), which Spencer, being fluent in Russian, could have quoted.

2. For a detailed description and an insightful theoretical discussion of the system of valency changing operations in Balkar see Lyutikova et al. 2006

References

Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21(3): 435–483.

Blevins, James. 2001. Realization-based lexicalism. Review of *A theory of predicates*, F. Ackermann & G. Webelhuth. *Journal of Linguistics* 37: 355–365.

Blutner, Reinhard. 2000. Some aspects of optimality in natural language interpretation. *Journal of Semantics* 17: 189–216.
Comrie, Bernard. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and divergences. *Syntax and semantics,* Vol. 6, *The grammar of causative constructions,* Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), 261–312. San Diego CA: Academic Press.
Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.
de Swart, Peter. 2007. *Cross-linguistic variation in object marking*. Utrecht: LOT Publications.
Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3): 547–619.
Hopper, Paul & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251–299.
Kittilä, Seppo. 2006. Object-, animacy- and role-based strategies: A typology of object marking. *Studies in Language* 30(1): 1–32.
Lehmann, Christian. 1995/1982. *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. Munich: Lincom.
Lyutikova, Ekaterina; Sergey Tatevosov; Mikhail Ivanov; Anna Pazelskaja & Andrej Shluinskiy. 2006. *Struktura sobytija i semantika glagola v karachajevo-balkarskom jazyke* (Event structure and verb semantics in Karachay-Balkar). Moscow: IMLI.
Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins [Typological Studies in Language 72].
Paris, Catherine. 1985. Relations actancielles et valence verbale en avar: Effacement de l'actant et mise au jour du sens. *Actances* 1: 135–153.
Sadler, Louisa & Andrew Spencer. 2001. Syntax as an exponent of morphological features. *Yearbook of morphology 1995*, Geert Booij & Yaap van Marle (eds.), 71–96. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Trommer, Jochen. 2003. Distributed optimality. Ph.D. Diss., University of Potsdam.
Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1981. Split case-marking patterns in verb-types and tense/aspect/mood. *Linguistics* 19(5/6): 389–438.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 1983. The semantics of case marking. *Studies in Language* 7(2): 247–275.
Wunderlich, Dieter. 2003. The force of lexical case: German and Icelandic compared. *The nature of the word: Essays in honor of Paul Kiparsky*, Kristin Hanson & Sharon Inkelas (eds.). Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
Zaenen, Annie; Joan Maling & Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and grammatical functions: The Icelandic passive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3: 441–83.
Zaliznyak, Andrej A. 1973. O ponimanii termina 'padezh' v lingvisticheskikh opisanijakh (On the interpretation of the term 'case' in linguistic descriptions). *Problemy grammaticheskogo modelirovanija* (Problems of grammatical models), Andrej A. Zaliznyak (ed.), 53–88. Moscow: Nauka.

Reviewer's address

Department of Typology and Comparative Linguistics
Institute of Slavic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences
Leninskiy prospekt 32-A
119334 Moscow
Russian Federation