

Agreeing adverbials: rare but (mostly) areal.

G[rammatical]A[greement] of adverbials with core arguments of the clause, although sporadically attested in diverse linguistic phyla, exhibits a conspicuous areal-genetic clustering, being comparatively widespread in (i) Australian Aboriginal languages (as part of the more general phenomenon of ‘case stacking’), (ii) NE Caucasian (Nakh-Daghestanian), and (iii) Modern Indo-Aryan - while not being completely alien to the rest of IE, both classical and modern (Romance).

Cf. the following examples (GA controllers italicized, GA markers underlined, pertinent GA targets in boldface; (noun class) IV):

Jalangu-(**rlu**) ka-lu-jana puluku turnu-ma-ni *yapa-ngku*.

‘today(-**ERG**) PRES-3.PL.SUBJ-3.PL.DO bullock.ABS muster-CAUS *man*-ERG’

“The people are mustering the cattle today.” (Warlpiri; SIMPSON 1991:208)

Reĭ ĩa-**r** dede-**r**-e *ŕičal(-gi)* **r**-ošun **r**-oʔa.

‘she.ERG here-**IV** father-**IV**-DAT *apples*(IV).ABS(-PTC) **IV**-buy **IV**-AUX’

“She was buying apples for father here.” (Avar, Antsukh dialect; KIBRIK 1985:318)

Baabu tin-**u** kor-**u** go?

‘*father*(M).SG.NOM your-**M.SG** where-**M.SG** went’

“Where did your father go?” (Poguli; HOOK 1989)

The present paper concentrates on gender-number GA of adverbials in Nakh-Daghestanian and Modern Indo-Aryan, which has received less attention in the literature so far, compared to Australian ‘case stacking’. It summarizes the results of the author’s longer-term efforts of comprehensively documenting and analyzing the phenomenon in both groupings, by cataloguing its instances and extent in the languages under analysis, by examining, *inter alia*, grammatical functions and participant roles of GA controllers and targets, syntactic categories and lexical subclasses of targets, semantic liability to GA, functions of adverbial GA, and the interrelations of these properties, and by correlating the phenomena with the over-all grammatical architecture of the resp. languages.

Furthermore, the paper touches upon several questions of general theoretical significance, such as the implications of the phenomenon for the general theory and typology of GA, the syntactic and semantic viability of descriptively assimilating it to standard GA cases, esp. by means of a predicative (re-)interpretation (cf. SCHULTZE-BERNDT & HIMMELMANN 2004), and plausible/probable diachronic scenarios giving rise to adverbial GA; cf. e.g. HARRIS (2002).

References:

HARRIS, A.C.: Endoclitics and the origins of Udi morphosyntax. Oxford 2002

HOOK, P.: Natural Absolutivity in Indo-Aryan. In: CARLSON & AL. (eds.), Proceedings of the 4th Meeting of the Pacific Linguistics Conference. University of Oregon, Dept. of Linguistics, 1989, 256-265

KIBRIK, A.E.: Toward a typology of ergativity. In: J. NICHOLS & A. WOODBURY (eds.): Grammar inside and outside the clause. Cambridge 1985, 363-413

NORDLINGER, R.: Constructive Case. Evidence from Australian Languages. Stanford 1998

SCHULTZE-BERNDT, E. & N.HIMMELMANN: Depictive secondary predicates in crosslinguistic perspective. In: Linguistic Typology 8.1(2004), 59-131

SIMPSON, J.: Warlpiri Morpho-Syntax. A Lexicalist Approach. Dordrecht 1991