According to the Guinness Book of World Records, Tabasaran holds the record for the largest number of cases. Second only to Tabasaran, Lak has the world’s next largest number of cases, as well as the next smallest number of speakers among the five Daghestanian literary languages. The student of Lak, however, will be confronted not merely by a large number of cases, but also by conflicting figures and definitions. Thus, for example, Uslar (1890:16) sets the number at “about 50” and actually gives examples of 48 (50 if the adverbials -nu and -nɑ—are counted). Dirr (1928:238-41) uses Uslar’s 48. Hjelmslev (1935:159-83) also sets the number at 48, but his inventory differs from both Uslar’s and Dirr’s. From Bouda’s (1949:38-53) account one can deduce 45 cases, but again some of them differ from those cited in previous works. Burčulajje (1986:80, 117) states “42 (sometimes 41),” while Žirkov (1955:35-37) gives only 40 forms in his “complete paradigm.” Both these authors cite desinences not cited in anyone else’s nor in each other’s work. Murkelinski (1971:128-134, 1980:492-93) leaves out one of Žirkov’s cases (the comparative -jar) to get 39. These last three authors also indicate that certain of the case desinences they cite are no longer in use. In addition to disagreeing on the inventory of Lak cases, authors also disagree on the classification of certain desinences, i.e., as primary or grammatical, secondary or local, and sometimes tertiary or adverbal. In this paper I hope to bring some order to this confusing state of affairs.

I shall begin with a few basic facts of Lak nominal morphology. There is a primary distinction in Lak between the nominative stem and the oblique stem. The oblique stem is often but not always characterized by an additional suffix. Vocalic and/or consonantal alternations or suppletion also occur. Some typical examples are illustrated in Table One.
TABLE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>nominative [class]</th>
<th>genitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eagle</td>
<td>barzu [3]</td>
<td>barzu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>game</td>
<td>tørku [4]</td>
<td>tørkulu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sister</td>
<td>ssu [3]</td>
<td>ssi-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>kanu [3]</td>
<td>kanttu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>head</td>
<td>baŋ [4]</td>
<td>bakra-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>daŋ [4]</td>
<td>daŋni-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>side</td>
<td>čul [3]</td>
<td>čulu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field, steppe</td>
<td>čul [3]</td>
<td>čuldanu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable</td>
<td>ppal [3]</td>
<td>ppani-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wolf</td>
<td>barč [3]</td>
<td>burči-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>barš [3]</td>
<td>burša-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>maq [3]</td>
<td>muqqu-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>nina [2]</td>
<td>niri-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sun</td>
<td>barz [3]</td>
<td>zuru-l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lak also has an important distinction between personal (first and second) and non-personal (third) pronouns, with suppletion in the oblique personal singular and class marking in the non-personal as well as in the emphatic/reflexive personal. Table Two gives the nominative and genitive of the personal pronouns and a typical non-personal one. Table Three gives two singular emphatic/reflexive pronouns — first and third singular — in enough cases to illustrate all the variants of the word-internal class markers. Also the the initial and plural markers are listed below the chart.

TABLE TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>gen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first person</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second person</td>
<td>ina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>third: class 1</td>
<td>ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>gani-l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With these basic facts in mind, I shall now attempt to synthesize as coherently as possible the various accounts of case in Lak cited above. For the time being, I shall follow all the scholars from Uslar to Burčulaje in taking as given the meaning of the term case. The first question is whether or not to ascribe an ergative case to Lak. As is illustrated by the example sentences below, that which corresponds to the English subject can be in the nominative, genitive, ablative, or dative case, while that which corresponds to the English object is in the nominative. The subject of an intransitive verb is nominative (1). The transitive verb (here axaxan ‘to sell’) always agrees with the object in class (here b-i [1] marks čvu [3] ‘horse’). In an ordinary simple transitive sentence, however, a personal pronoun will be nominative while anything else will be genitive (2 & 3). The nominative can control person agreement, but the genitive cannot (1, 2 & 4). Note that if the tense form is analytic, non-personal subjects have the option of being in the nominative and controlling the auxiliary (4b). According to Kibrik (1978:9), the different agreement patterns are used to signal degree of commitment to the statement (3 & 4), while the ablative can be used to signal unintentional performance of the action (5). The ablative is also required by verbs meaning ‘be able’ (7), and the dative is required by so-called ‘affective’ verbs, e.g., ‘want’ and ‘see’ (6).

1a. na nā ura
   I am coming

1b. ga nā ur
   He is coming

2a. na baxxara čvu
   I sell the horse

2b. ganal baxxaj čvu
   He sells the horse
3a. na bavxxunu bur čvu
3b. ganal bavxxunu bur čvu
4a. na bavxxunu ura čvu
4b. ga bavxxunu ur čvu
5a. tušša bavxxunu bur čvu
5b. ganašša bavxxunu bur čvu
6a. tuu va čvu baxxan ččaj bur
6b. ganan va čvu baxxan ččaj bur
7a. tuušša va čvu baxxan bjuqlaj bur
7b. ganašša va čvu baxxan bjuqlaj bur

Apparently I sold the horse
Apparently he sold the horse
I have sold the horse
He has sold the horse
I accidentally sold the horse
He accidentally sold the horse
I want to sell this horse
He wants to sell this horse
I can sell this horse
He can sell this horse

Kibrik (1978:3) considers the ergative to be a separate case that is realized on the surface as either nominative or genitive depending on the lexical characteristics of the noun. As seen in 4 however, the semantics and shape of the tense form can also affect case choice. Kibrik’s formulation obscures the fact that like many of the world’s languages, Lak has a type of split ergative structure that conforms to the feature hierarchy described by Silverstein (1976).1 We thus agree with Burčulaje (1986:84) that Lak cannot be considered to have an independent ergative case.

The next question concerns the distinction between primary (grammatical, abstract), secondary (local, concrete) and tertiary (adverbial) cases. None of the Lak cases are purely grammatical in the sense that Mel’čuk (1986:84) uses for the Georgian ergative. All Lak cases carry some sort of semantic valence beyond that of syntactic role in the clause. Some do appear to be purely local or adverbial, but others are more difficult to classify. All scholars are agreed on at least three grammatical cases: nominative -φ, genitive -ι, and dative -α. Moreover, there is a series of agglutinatively formed local cases that everyone agrees form a coherent set, although the exact number of actually occurring and semantically distinct forms varies from one account to another, with no account attesting all forms and meanings.

The local cases are formed by adding one of six morphemes to the oblique stem and one of seven morphemes (including zero) to that

Table Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>suffix</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-v[u]</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>in-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-j₃</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>super-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-x</td>
<td>behind</td>
<td>post-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lu</td>
<td>below</td>
<td>sub-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ča</td>
<td>near</td>
<td>apud-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>at</td>
<td>ad-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>location</td>
<td>-essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>-ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-atu</td>
<td>away from</td>
<td>-elative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ux</td>
<td>through/across</td>
<td>-prolative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xčin</td>
<td>through/via</td>
<td>-vialative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-un</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>-lative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-unlaj</td>
<td>toward</td>
<td>-directive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vu  j  lu  x  ča  c
va  ja  la  xa  čaa  ča
vatu  jatu  latu  xatu  čatu  čatu
vux  jx  lux  xux  čax  cux
vuxčin  jxčin  luxčin  xuxčin  čaxčin  cuxčin
vun  jn  lun  xun  čan  čun
vunaj  jnaj  lunaj  xunaj  čanaj  čunaj
vunnaj  jnaj  lunaj  xunaj  čanaj  čunaj
vunnaj  jnaj  lunaj  xunaj  čanaj  čunaj
Before broaching the question of case vs clitic postposition as well as the question of tertiary or additional local cases, let us put this vast assortment of forms into perspective by defining who recognizes what as an independent case form.

As was already indicated, only Bouda (1949:46) separates -v from -vu, while all other authors treat -v as a variant of -vu (e.g., Žirkov 1955:41). Bouda claims that -v is lative while -vu is essive, giving examples such as the following:

8a. dušru ššinav naj bija the girls go for [to fetch] water

8b. bjarav bahu the having fallen in a pond

9a. ššinavu labivun hidden in the water

9b. Kavkaznavu dja'vi bija There was war in the Caucasus

Consider, however, the following examples, which clearly show -v as essive and -vu as lative:

10. Tuun ččaj bur, ... tula šjaravy Çaday o'rmu butlan. (Hamzatov 1972:19)
   I want ... to spend my life in my own aul, in Çada.

11. Šikku, Moskavl wax, dukra dan vilaxaxw cu qqadišajwa xxanssar, (Hamzatov 1972:19)
    Here, in Moscow, it appears fires aren’t lit in the hearth to cook.

    They slaughtered an animal, put it into a sack and put it on the bed, having thrown clothes on top.

    I took a month’s holiday and went to my native aul to Çada.

It thus does not appear that -v and -vu are distinguished on the basis of an inherent meaning. It is more likely that there is free variation with many nouns, and a tendency to favor one or the other ending in certain nouns or types of syntagma, e.g., compound verbs.

The pre-1950 authors, i.e., Uslar, Dirr, Hjelmslev and Bouda, all separate -a and -atu, whereas the post-1950 authors, i.e., Žirkov (1955:38), Murkelinskij, Burčulaj, as well as Gajdarova (1977), all treat -atu as a facultative variant of -a. Xajdakov (1966:15) states quite explicitly: “The affix -atu performs the same function as -a and never occurs without it. Its use is facultative.” With the apud-formant -fa, only Hjelmslev (1935:167) opposes an apudablative -faa to an apudative -fatu. All other authors either clearly imply or explicitly state that only -fatu occurs (e.g., Uslar, 1980:45, Gajdarova 1970:315, Burčulaj 1986:81). Given that Hjelmslev’s account is based entirely on secondary sources and that this is the one case for which he adduces no textual examples, it must be dismissed as the apparent result of Hjelmslev’s wish to describe Lakh in terms of a perfectly symmetrical local case system. The pre-1950 authors all follow Uslar (1890:37) in claiming that although -a and -atu are often synonymous, -atu nonetheless adds a nuance of distance or removal. Bouda (1949:47) describes -a as more ablative and -atu as more elative. He suggests the relationship of -a to -atu is comparable to that of the lative -iun and the directive -unlaj.

The following example is typical:

14. Çiravatu šatta buvkummi. (Murkelinskij 1971:130-33)
   The snake came out from inside the wall,

but also:

15. Šatta buvkummi marx'irala. (Murkelinskij 1971:130-33)
   The snake crawled out from under the tree.

Here, however, are some examples with -atu where the sense of “distance” or “removal” is difficult if not impossible to identify:
16. Vin čatu kulli. (Xalilov 1976:228)
How (From where) do you know? 

17. Musijatu usturnal kissa buvna. (Gajdarova 1977:278)
The master-craftsman made the ring out of gold.

18. Onnassa čumlal ga janneljatu žura-žurassa qqušri, kkačči-ččitri jalaq ciqmi šix’ri ďulaq ikajiva. (Gajdarova 1977:278)
He made various spoons and toys and other things out of wood in his free time.
Although -un and -unlaj also have similar, sometimes near-synonymous, uses, there are also examples where they are clearly not interchangeable:

19. Na tanaj jakanza šsun baq (Xajjakov and Zhirkov 1962:327)
I hit [onto] him with my fist.

20. mağunaj uruglaj ur. (Murkelinski 1971:131)
He is looking towards the ceiling.

21. ... o’veča vilta dustomaj va mallahaj pulav bukan, ... (Xalilov 1976:205)
... invite [onto] your friends and the mullah to eat pilaf, ...

To the best of my knowledge, such examples do not exist for -a and -atu.
Of the authors whose works were available to me, only Burčulajje identifies the series based on the terminal desinence -ččin, which he credits Topuria(1940) with having first observed. He does not make clear how -ččin differs from -u/-x. So far I have found only two examples, both of them super-:

22. Zu zula durtajččin hattava qqušiqaj ara, parajat ara,—kunu. (Xalilov 1976:216)

LAK SUBSTANTIVAL DECLENSION

By means of your prayers make it so he doesn’t come running back from the grave, make him rest in peace—she said.

23. Čalaj buriv zava ussurval bjavqalaj bivyšiu vault ravussa duššu vžiščin duššu—kunu. (Xalilov 1976:225)
’Do y’all see that you brothers are mistaken [you brothers’ being mistaken] and that the family friendship is through us [the family friendship’s being through us]—she said.’

While both these examples are non-local, i.e., non-literal, such usage also occurs with the superprolitative -x, although I found only one example as opposed to twelve with local meanings.

24. Ina ura, tūl muqurtijx uvkkan, qqalmaqqallaj. (Xalilov 1976:225)
Through my words, you are disgraced.

It is not possible to comment on this case further at this time.

With regard to the remaining cases, while the post-1950 authors state that some of them are obsolete, they are all attested as distinct. There are clearly differences among dialects and between spoken and written usage in this regard. Thus while the system of local cases in Lak is undergoing change (Burčulajje 1986:82), at this point in time the remaining cases must all be counted in a complete inventory.6

We must now return to the question of whether all these local cases are really cases or clitic postpositions. Lak has a number of non-clitic postpositions. Of this number, five correspond more or less closely to the six primary local case desinences as shown in Table Five:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>case</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>postposition</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-vu</td>
<td>in-</td>
<td>inside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-j</td>
<td>super-</td>
<td>jalu</td>
<td>above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-x</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td>maq</td>
<td>behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lu</td>
<td>sub-</td>
<td>luv</td>
<td>below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE FIVE
Although these local cases are clearly postpositional in origin, there are several arguments in favor of analyzing them as synchronic cases.

1. Secondary local cases can be followed by postpositions and postpositions can govern more than one case:

25. qqatra-<i> maq</i> behind/at the back of the house [pl]
   After that [superrelative] the son swore off those three things.

2. Constructions with postpositions and their semantically related cases have different meanings:

27a. qqatlu-vu ‘in the house’
27b. qqatul viv ‘inside the house’

3. Secondary local cases can have non-local meanings, postpositions are restricted to concrete meanings:

28. ... o’veça vila dustura-<i>j-u</i> va mallana-<i>j-u</i> (≠ dustural va mallanal jalan) pulav bukan. ...(Xalilov 1976:205)
   ... invite [onto] your friends and the mullah to eat pilaf, ...

   They made food from the pluck [liver & lungs].

30. Tana-<i>j-a</i> (≠tanal jala) rasxat lasi. (Merkelinskij 1971:131)
   Get permission from him

31. qqatlu-<i>x</i> (≠qqatul maq) cij dulav? (Merkelinskij 1971:132)
   What did you pay for the house?

32. tana-<i>x-a</i> (≠ tanal maqa) uvkkun huvav? (Merkelinskij 1971:133)
   Are you leaving because of him?

33. Niitil buruvxxussa huqra-x-xa (≠ huqral viva) Tamaril jatjulssu huqa buvčuna. (Gajdarova 1977:277)
   From the dresses sewn by mother Tamar chose a red dress.

34. Vana lax’x-u raciolu-vu-x (≠ radiolul vivux) buslaj bija dušmannal şužum bijişin bunni jij. (Gajdarova 1977:279)
   Yesterday they announced on the radio that the enemy’s assault had been repelled.

35. A’qduulu-x-xa šajar čanah-x-a (≠ a’qbdulul/čannal čara) x’unu qimsar. (Gajdarova 1977:280)
   Than deprived of reason deprived of sight (lit. light) is better.

4. Some postpositions are formally very different from the semantically similar case:

36a. qqatlu-<i>l</i> maq ‘behind/at the back of the house [pl]’
36b. qqatlu-<i>x</i> ‘behind/at the rear of the house’

5. Postpositions can take secondary case suffixes that differ significantly from the ones used in nominal declension:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE SIX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-essive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-prolative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Postpositions can govern conjoined genitives, case forms are repeated each time:
37. ... śṣjalmaṭral va tajlamunil dijan'/gu xxjuva kṣaśa bhiśiṃsa ḷanu bussar. (Xalilov 1976:211)
... and the distance between truth and falsehood is five fingers.

38. ... o'vča vilja dustura-ji-ŋ va mallana-ji-ŋ pulav bukan, ...(Xalilov 1976:205)
... invite [onto] your friends and the mullah to eat pulav, ...

7. Class markers are bound morphemes, not clitics, and case desinences occur before class markers in emphatic pronouns. Clitics and postpositions follow the class marker.

It is I myself (I-class-am)

40. Ina-va-gu (Xalilov 1976:219)
You yourself, too (you-class-and)

41. ca-l-o-a x’x’iège ‘in front of him himself’ (him-gen-class + postposition) (Xalilov 1976:204)

Similarly:

ttu-čan-o-a - tttu-čan-m-a - ttu-čan-n-a ‘over by me myself’
ca-čan-o-a - ca-čan-m-a - ca-čan-n-a ‘over by him himself’

8. Postpositions can occur separated from the words they govern by other parts of the sentence:

42. Ttud x’x’iège murx’, maq čira bur. (Merkelenskij 1983:184)
Before me is a tree, behind a wall.

The remaining cases are summarized in Table Seven. I have used the author’s term wherever possible. When the author used a preposition instead of a term, I have supplied an appropriate term:

Two questions are involved here. The first is which if any of these are cases? The second is whether they are to be classed as local, grammatical, or something else. Let us begin by dismissing Hjelmslev’s (1935:10;) claim that -gu forms a separate, similitive, case. He cites the following sentence:

43. Ussu-gu sṣju-kṣsa qinssa uri
Brother is as good as sister.

In fact, however, -gu is a clitic whose basic meaning is ‘and/even,’ not a case suffix. It can attach to any case and to any part of speech. Examples (37) and (40) show it attached to a postposition and following the class marker on an emphatic/reflexive pronoun. In example (44) it is attached to a dative and in (45) it clearly has no comparative/similitative meaning and is moreover attached to oblique case suffixes:

44. Na uusi-n-ukṣsa ssi-n-gu dukalav. (Žirkov 1955:44)
As much to brother also to sister I gave = I gave as much to sister as to brother.

45. Dak čuṇ dullan ikun ur, ussi-ʃ-ʃ-ṣ-ṣ arx uvcun, cavaj višala daqqassa dusa-l-ɡu buvnu,... (Xalilov 1976:225)
He became arrogant and turned away from his brother, and made some faithless friends,...
The suffixes -/a/kssa, 'as, like (quantity),' -/a/kun'la 'as, like (quality)’ both attach to the unaltered nominative. Moreover, as seen in example (44), they can also attach to oblique cases (asa/nuksa), as well as to other parts of speech, e.g., the adjective in (46), and kunu can even stand alone as in (47):

46. Ganal a'rikinssa-kssa arcu dartun, ñaxwučunnax'unu dullunu, kumag buvnu bur burž laqan. (Xalilov 1976:223)
He gathered as much money as necessary, gave it to his neighbor, and helped him to pay off his debt.

47. Na ta kuna jarxnu aqqara. (Murkelinskij 1971:248)
I am not as far away as he.

We thus side with Žirkov and the other scholars who do not consider these case suffixes.

The vocative is always problematic. There is the primary question of whether the vocative is a case at all in any language. In Lak, it only has a distinct form if the noun ends in a vowel other than -/a, in which case the suffix is -/r added to the nominative. While functional arguments against the vocative as a case are not language specific, we can add here the specific fact for Lak that cases are added to an oblique stem and are formed agglutinatively for all nouns whereas the vocative meets neither of these criteria.9

One other troublesome suffix is the comparative in -jar. This suffix attaches to the oblique stem, e.g. tujar ‘than me,’ vijar ‘than you’ and in the emphatic/reflexive it comes before the case marker: vijarva ‘than you yourself.’ The apparently completely synonymous -nijar, however, attaches to the nominative stem. Bouda’s analysis of it as the superrelative -/a plus -/r (case marker?), while tempting, leaves the problem of -/r unresolved. Another point that Bouda makes that seems stronger is the fact that -jar has functions that could be interpreted as broader than that of a strict comparative:

48a. Camur xxullijx x'unu, gana-jar x'xičun uvkkun, (Xalilov 1976:213)

Taking another road, he came out [having come out] in front of him [ahead of him]

On the other hand, consider also this use with a gerund:

49. A’qululça sajar čannača x'unu qinsar. (Gajdarova 1977:280)
It is better to be deprived of light [=sight] than of reason (Reason-ad/relative being-than light-ad/relative having-become good-is).

Murkelinskij (1971:248) treats it as an adverbal suffix like -kun'la, although this does not explain away the oblique stem. The attachment to non-nominal forms as in (48) favors Murkelinskij’s view. If we take a strictly formal view, -/jar must be viewed as a case suffix because it attaches directly to the oblique stem of any noun.

The remaining cases all attach unambiguously to oblique nominal stems. Of these -/nu and -/xlu/[n]u/ are more “adverbal” while the other four form a set similar in some respects to the local series but much more highly grammaticalized. Here are some typical examples of usage of each case:

Possessive/addressive -/x':
50. Tana-x’ trul lu bussar. (Murkelinskij 1971:129)
He has my book.

Note especially the ergative pattern with verbs of speaking:

51. Dušnik butta-x’ kuńu bur: — Ina lavgun xanna-x’ uča: (Xalilov 1976:211)
Daughter to father said: “You go and say to the khan:

52. Žula 15 o’l bur, amna canni-x’-ra-gu vakša naňussa nak daqqar. (Xalilov 1976:210)
We have 15 cows, but not one of them has such tasty milk.
Dative-2/admotive -X’UN:
53. Muni-x’un qqualaṣsa tahargu dirimu dur. (Xalilov 1976:204)
A convenient situation occurred for this.

54. Nadiršahnan čečan bivkun bur lakral bilajat cala kuntti-x’un lasun. (Xalilov 1976:207)
Nadir Shah wanted to take the Lak country into his hands.

55. Lavsunu čarulliv ca-canna-x’un ca-ca bullunu bur cala arsnan va ussil arsnan. (Xalilov 1976:225)
Taking the kidneys he gave one apiece to each of them—one to his own son and one to his brother’s son.

Ablative/involuntary/possibility -SSA:
56. Na tana-ssa lu lasav. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
I got a book from him.

57. Xuxči-ssa nic bivkunni. (Merkelinskij 1971:129)
The shepherd killed the ox by accident.

58. Va davu tana-ssa qqurtal dan qqašajjar (Merkelinskij 1971:129)
This job can’t be finished by him.

59. Tana-ssa ca 羰tant aṣan qqašaj. (Merkelinskij 1971:129)
He can’t stand in one place.

60. Tu-ssa ʰisav dan buquNNI. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
I can solve the problem.

Comitative -SSAL:
61. Uusu ssi-ssal bazalluvun lavgunni. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
Brother with sister went to the bazaar.

62. Čaraldanu-ssal mikgu bija. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
The town, too, was with rain.

Instrumental/causative -JNU:
63. Vil kumarga-jnu tušša zanan bjuqanssar. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
With your help I can walk.

64. Tana-jnu davu qqurtal x’unssa. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
Through him the job will be completed.'

Motivative -XLU[NU]:
65. Tuul ussu buttal kantu-xlu o’ eqi butlaj ussija. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
My brother shed blood for the fatherland.

66. Ina tana-xlu arcu dula. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
Pay the money for him.

67. Ta tu-tlu upkunni. (Merkelinskij 1971:130)
He acted for me.

As can be seen from the foregoing examples, if we eliminate those suffixes that attach to the nominative stem and leave to one side the problematic -jar, the remaining six suffixes divide into two types which could be called pseudo-local and, following Burğulajis (1986), postpositional. The so-called possessive, dative-2, and ablative clearly are more grammatical than local in their functions. The comitative, while clearly etymologically related to these first three, does not appear to have the same types of purely grammatical functions. The last two cases both look rather adverbial; in fact, -nu is the derivational suffix for forming adverbs. Moreover, the functions of -xlu can also be performed by the postposition ca-ni. Still, their syntagmatic features, i.e., attachment to the oblique stem of any noun, as well as their semantics appear to be declensional. Žirkov’s (1955) separation of the possessive/addressive and dative-2 into a seventh, defective series of local cases on a par with the more strictly local cases does not seem justified in view of their primary functions to indicate possession and indirect objects of verbs of speaking and
giving. The so-called ablative has important grammatical functions, and the comitative can be placed with the other three fairly easily. Mukelinskij's treatment is reminiscent of Žirkov's, but Gajdarova and Burčulaje clearly do not consider any of these cases part of the strictly local case series. Burčulaje's description of all these cases as "postpositional" appears to be too extreme. It seems more justifiable to consider the etymologically related possessive/addressive, dative-2, ablative and comitative as part of a (perhaps secondary) grammatical series, leaving two or three (depending on the status of -jar) cases as postpositional or adverbial. With regard to the distinction local/grammatical, while it is clear that the possessive/addressive and dative-2 have non-local meanings/uses, it is equally clear that some of the so-called local cases have important non-local functions. If what sets the local cases apart is the formal criterion of their use with the secondary suffixes that are also added to postpositions, then -x', -x'nut does look like a "defective" series. The suffix -əša could even fit here, but not -šal. If, on the other hand, the semantics are taken into account, then these last are grammatical.

It would appear that the potential inventory of these Lak local cases is restricted in three ways: one does not occur at all (-ča), some appear to be facultative variants of others (-v - -v, -ə - -atu, possibly -x - -x'in), and some are or are said to be no longer productive (some or all of the ad-, apud- and/or directive cases [-č, -ča, and -nš], and the subjunctive -šut), depending on the author. Apparently, as Burčulaje states (1986:82), the system of local cases in Lak is undergoing change. Nonetheless, I would say that taking the formal criterion of oblique stem formation as primary, keeping in mind arguments against postpositional treatment of the local series, Lak can be said to have 10 grammatical and adverbial cases (including -jar) and, rejecting the differentiation of -v and -vu and -a and -atu but preserving judgment on -x and -x'in, 30 or 36 local cases for a total of 40 or 46.
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1 On the other hand it can be argued that since na and tanal have the same agreement pattern in (3), they must be treated as realizing the same case, which would have to be the ergative. In Mel'čuk's (1986) sense, the ergative is a case 2 whose case 3 realizations are identical with either the nominative or genitive.
The markers are the same as those given for the dative emphatic/reflexive pronouns in Table Three above. In simple sentences, the noun will agree with the nominative to which it refers, i.e., the subject of an intransitive or (facultatively) analytic transitive and the object of a transitive (obligatory if synthetic) as in the following examples based on Kibrik (1978:10-1-1):

8a. ppu qałatluv(ə)-naj ə-ur  
"father goes into the house"  
8b. nina qałatluv(ə)-aj ə-dur  
"mother goes into the house"

9a. niti qałatluv(ə)-aj čəat[3] la-v-sun ə-bur  
"mother brings bread into the house"

9b. niti qałatluv(ə)-aj čeęt la-v-sun bu-rəd-ur  
"mother brings bread into the house"

10a. ppu qałatluv(ə)-aj čeęt la-v-sun ə-ur  
"father brings bread into the house"

10b. ppu qałatluv(ə)-aj čeęt la-v-sun ə-ur  
"father brings bread into the house"

11a. nina qaลาดlv(ə)-aj čeęt la-v-sun ə-dur  
"mother brings bread into the house"

11b. nina qaลาดlv(ə)-aj čeęt la-v-sun ə-dur  
"mother brings bread into the house"

In 10/11a the focus is on the bread, in 10/11b on the parent.

If the oblique stem ends in -u, this will front and unround to -i before the suffixes of this series. The -i will disappear except in final position (Zirkov 1955:40). This is characteristic of the dialect Kumux (the basis of literary Lak) as opposed to that of Vicaxi (the basis of earlier descriptions) (Bučuladze 1986:80).

An entirely separate issue is the fact that certain nouns can form the inessive (and other local cases) on a base other than the oblique as derived from the genitive. Thus, for example, the genitive of Çada is Çadallal but the inessive is Çadav in (17) and (20). Consider also the following:

ppal 'stable'  
gen. ppalnil  
but: ppalav baqhin 'to drive into the stable'

rat 'cliff'  
gen. ratril  
but: inessive rαtv (Murqhillinski 1989)
also: rαxan  han 'to fall off a cliff, to perish'  

Uslar (1890:38) gives a number of similar examples. It is difficult to tell at this point if this is a manifestation of a tendency to shift the local cases to a simpler stem or is a lexical/adverbial phenomenon limited to toponyms and similar nouns. All the