In *Case*, Mark Baker develops a unified theory of how the morphological case marking of noun phrases is determined by syntactic structure. Designed to work well for languages of all alignment types – accusative, ergative, tripartite, marked nominative, or marked absolutive – this theory has been developed and tested against unrelated languages of each type, and more than twenty non-Indo-European languages are considered in depth.

While affirming that case can be assigned to noun phrases by function words under agreement, the theory also develops in detail a second mode of case assignment: so-called dependent case.

Suitable for academic researchers and students, the book employs formal-generative concepts, yet remains clear and accessible for a general linguistics readership.

**Mark Baker** is a Distinguished Professor in the Department of Linguistics at Rutgers University.
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Agreement morphemes are glossed by a complex symbol that begins with a number indicating the person of the agreed-with phrase (1, 2, or 3), then has a lower-case letter indicating the number or gender of the agreed-with phrase (s, singular; d, dual; p, plural; m, masculine; f, feminine; n, neuter), and then a capital letter indicating the grammatical function or case of the agreed-with phrase (S, subject; O, object; P, possessor; A, absolutive; D, dative; E, ergative). Thus, 1pS means first person plural subject agreement, 3mO means third masculine (singular) object agreement, and so on. Sometimes one member of this triple is missing when the corresponding category is not marked – for example, when the agreement indicates person but not number, or vice versa. In Choctaw, I follow Broadwell (2006) in using I, II, and III rather than S, O, P, for reasons mentioned in the text. Please note also that WP, XP (as in, e.g., SpecXP – see below), YP, and ZP are variables, and can stand for TP, vP, VP, etc., and range over phrases of any category.

Other abbreviations used in the glosses of linguistic examples are as follows.
### Abbreviations and conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>absolutive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEL</td>
<td>accelerator aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADESS</td>
<td>adessive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMON</td>
<td>admonitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>affirmative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>agentive (nominalizer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>aorist tense/participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP</td>
<td>aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUX</td>
<td>auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>cislocative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>comitative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>completive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE</td>
<td>“core” (unmarked) case (Tukang Besi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVSIM</td>
<td>simultaneous converb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
<td>declarative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEP</td>
<td>dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>distal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIST</td>
<td>distributive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPAST</td>
<td>distant past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>different subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>dual number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV</td>
<td>event nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>gerund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Abbreviations and conventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>habitual tense/aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLAT</td>
<td>illative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPER</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>indicative mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INEL</td>
<td>inelative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INESS</td>
<td>inessive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>instrumental case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>irrealis mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAT</td>
<td>lative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
<td>Linear Correspondence Axiom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LK</td>
<td>linker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>light verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MABS</td>
<td>marked absolutive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MED</td>
<td>medial (Ika)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MID</td>
<td>middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNOM</td>
<td>marked nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>neuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOML</td>
<td>nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPST</td>
<td>nonpast tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>partitive case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASS</td>
<td>passive voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>past tense (different kinds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERI</td>
<td>peripheral participant (Ika)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNI</td>
<td>pseudo-noun incorporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations and conventions

PRES present tense
PRF perfective aspect
PROG progressive
PRT particle (especially 2nd position evidential clitic in Shipibo)
PTPL (past) participle
Q question particle
REAL realis mood
REC reciprocal
REF point of reference (Ika)
REFL reflexive
REL relative
SG singular number
SIM simultaneous
SS same subject
ST stative
SUF suffix
TNS tense (unspecified)
TOP topic
TR transitive
UNM unmarked case (Chamorro)
VBZR verbalizer
VN verbal noun
WIT witness (Ika)

The following are abbreviations of the names of grammatical categories:

A, AP adjective, adjective phrase
C, CP complementizer, complementizer phrase
D, DP determiner, determiner phrase
N, NP noun, noun phrase
P, PP adposition (preposition or postposition), adpositional phrase
SpecXP Specifier of XP
T, TP tense head, tense phrase
v, vP light verb (abstract verbal element, assigner of external argument)
V, VP verb, verb phrase

Other abbreviations used in the text include:

B&V Baker and Vinokurova (2010)
CDAP Case Dependency of Agreement Parameter
CQ Cuzco Quechua
Abbreviations and conventions

CT  Coast Tsimshian
DM  Distributed Morphology
DOC double object construction
DOM  differential object marking
EPP “Extended Projection Principle” feature (triggers the movement of a phrase to the category that bears it)
IE  Indo-European
L&M  Lefebvre and Muysken (1988)
LF  “Logical Form”
P&P  Polinsky and Potsdam (2012)
PF phonological form
VSO, SOV, etc.  Verb-subject-object word order; subject-object-verb order, etc.
WALS  The world atlas of language structures

Finally, the following are some conventions used in presenting examples:

*X  The example is ungrammatical.
(X)  The example has the same grammatical status with or without X included.
(*X)  The example is good without X, but bad when it is included.

In some cases, an agreement morpheme and the NP that it agrees with are both italicized.
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Accusative Languages (■)
CQ Cuzco Quecha
Fn Finnish
Am Amharic
Ta Tamil
Sa Sakha
Ko Korean

Ergative Languages (●)
Sh Shipibo
Gr Greenlandic (West)
In Ingush
Bu Burushaski
Wa Wardaman
Tk Chukchi
Tw Tewa

Tripartite Languages (▲)
CT Coast Tsimshian
NP Nez Perce
Sm Semelai
Wp Warlpiri
Di Diyari

Marked Nominative (□)
Ma Maricopa
Ch Choctaw
Or Oromo
TB Tukang Besi

Marked Absolutive (○)
Ni Nias