

# Contents

Acknowledgements . . . . .	ix
Preface . . . . .	xi
<b>Part I – Theory</b>	
0. Introduction . . . . .	3
1. What cognitive semantics is. . . . .	4
1.1 Support for cognitive semantics from other disciplines. . . . .	7
1.1.1. Psychology . . . . .	7
1.1.2. Neurobiology . . . . .	8
1.1.3. Artificial Intelligence . . . . .	9
1.1.4. Summary . . . . .	10
1.2. Case as a semantic entity. . . . .	10
1.2.1. Case lacks formal autonomy . . . . .	10
1.2.2. Case bears subjective as well as objective meaning . . . . .	11
1.2.3. Case meaning and lexical semantics. . . . .	13
1.2.4. Summary . . . . .	15
1.3. What a cognitive description of case should look like . . . . .	15
1.3.1. Schematic representation of case meaning. . . . .	15
1.3.2. Network structure. . . . .	17
1.3.3. A test of the cognitive model. . . . .	24
2. Cognitive semantics compared with other descriptions of case . . . . .	25
2.1. Case semantics in previous traditions. . . . .	25
2.1.1. Inventories of uses (Mrázek, Potebnja). . . . .	25
2.1.2. Semantic features (Hjelmslev, Jakobson, van Schooneveld). . . . .	26
2.1.3. Semantic metalanguage (Wierzbicka). . . . .	27
2.1.4. Semantic/syntactic dichotomy (Kuryłowicz, Isačenko). . . . .	27
2.1.5. Case as a purely syntactic phenomenon (Chomsky). . . . .	29
2.1.6. Symbolic logic (Sørensen, Mel'čuk). . . . .	30
2.1.7. "Deep" case (Fillmore). . . . .	31
2.1.8. Localist theories of case (Anderson, Freidhof). . . . .	32

2.2.	How the cognitive model has been implied by various authors	33
2.2.1.	Relatedness of meanings . . . . .	33
2.2.2.	Hierarchical relations among meanings . . . . .	36
2.2.3.	Relational invariance . . . . .	37
2.3.	Advantages of the cognitive approach . . . . .	37
2.3.1.	A departure from empiricism . . . . .	38
2.3.2.	Both diversity and unity of case meaning are accommodated.	38
2.3.3.	Many of the best insights of various scholars are incorporated	38
2.4.	An ideal description of case: Skalička's challenge . . . . .	39

## Part II – Analysis

3.	Why the Czech dative and the Russian instrumental? . . . . .	43
3.0.1.	Schemas in pictorial and prose notation . . . . .	43
3.0.2.	Indirect object serves as the prototype of the Czech dative . .	47
3.0.3.	Cognitive network of the Czech dative . . . . .	52
3.1.	Schema 1 – indirect object . . . . .	54
3.1.1.	Schema 1 a – governed dative . . . . .	69
3.1.2.	Schema 1 b – dative in impersonal constructions . . . . .	79
3.2.	Schema 2 and variants – free dative . . . . .	81
3.2.1.	Schema 2 a – dative of beneficiary – transition to indirect object . . . . .	90
3.2.2.	Schema 2 b – intransitive expressions of free dative . . . . .	91
3.2.3.	Schema 2 c – free dative in copular sentences . . . . .	92
3.2.4.	Further syntagmatic variants of schema 2 . . . . .	93
3.3.	Dative network bound by syntagmatic variants of the schemas	95
3.4.	Reflexive uses of the dative . . . . .	97
3.4.1.	Reflexive network . . . . .	97
3.4.2.	Reciprocal network . . . . .	107
3.5.	Semantic extension via mapping – pragmatic uses of the dative	110
4.	Comparison of cognitive networks – the Russian dative . . .	113
4.1.	Schema 1 – indirect object . . . . .	113
4.1.1.	Schema 1 a – governed dative . . . . .	116
4.1.2.	Schema 1 b – impersonal dative . . . . .	128
4.2.	Schema 2 and variants – free dative . . . . .	130
4.3.	Dative reflexives . . . . .	134

5.	Analysis of the Russian instrumental . . . . .	139
5.0.1.	Overview of the network. . . . .	139
5.0.2.	Instrumental network paradigm . . . . .	139
5.0.3.	Summary of the instrumental's semantic role. . . . .	142
5.1.	Conduit instrumental – schema 1 and syntagmatic variants. . . . .	143
5.1.1.	Schema 1 a – instrumental of instrument and agent, verbal government . . . . .	150
5.1.2.	Schema 1 b – instrumental of inexplicable force . . . . .	162
5.1.3.	Schema 1 c – instrumental of sensation. . . . .	162
5.1.4.	Subnetwork of schema 1 and the paradigm of disappearing participants . . . . .	164
5.2.	Schema 2 – instrumental of setting . . . . .	164
5.2.1.	Instrumental of space. . . . .	166
5.2.2.	Instrumental of time . . . . .	167
5.2.3.	Summary of the instrumental of setting . . . . .	170
5.3.	Attributive instrumental . . . . .	170
5.3.1.	Attributive instrumental – quantitative . . . . .	173
5.3.2.	Attributive instrumental – qualitative . . . . .	175
5.3.3.	Attributive instrumental – comparative. . . . .	179
5.3.4.	Summary of the attributive instrumental . . . . .	182
5.4.	Instrumental used with a preposition. . . . .	182
5.4.1.	Comitative instrumental . . . . .	182
5.4.2.	Proximate instrumental . . . . .	185
5.5.	Instrumental network bound by paradigm of peripherality and by alliance. . . . .	188
6.	The Czech instrumental . . . . .	191
6.1.	Conduit instrumental. . . . .	191
6.2.	Instrumental of setting. . . . .	195
6.3.	Attributive instrumental . . . . .	196
6.4.	Instrumental with a preposition . . . . .	197
7.	Concluding remarks and possible universals . . . . .	199
	Notes . . . . .	203
	References . . . . .	218