

Agreeing adverbials in Nakh-Daghestanian

G[rammatical] A[greement] of adverbials with core arguments of the clause is one of the distinctive traits of the N[akh]-D[aghestanian] (North-Eastern) branch of Caucasian, setting ND apart both from Kartvelian and NW Caucasian, and from the non-Caucasian languages of the region. Adverbial GA, though not unique to ND, is comparatively rare cross-linguistically; besides sporadic attestations in diverse linguistic phyla, it exhibits conspicuous areal-genetic clustering, being relatively widespread in Australian Aboriginal languages (as part of ‘case stacking’), the Panoan branch of Amerindian, Modern Indo-Aryan, and Classical I[ndo]-E[uropean]. Within ND, adverbial GA not only is areally pervasive, being synchronically attested to at least some extent in the majority of ND languages, but also doubtlessly constitutes a shared longeval trait inherited from earlier stages.

The present paper, being based on a near-exhaustive examination of major surveys, grammar and dictionary sources, summarizes the results of the author’s longer-term efforts at comprehensively documenting and analyzing adverbial GA in ND, 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 relevant languages.

In contradistinction to Australian Aboriginal and Panoan languages, where adverbials exhibit synchronic or diachronic case GA, ND adverbials agree in *gender-number* (N[oun] C[lass]), as do their counterparts in Modern Indo-Aryan and Classical IE. As for controllers, while various arguments (subject, direct object, indirect object) - and even adjuncts - can partly control optional adverbial GA in Australian Aboriginal, Panoan and Classical IE languages, ND - and Modern Indo-Aryan - adverbial GA invariably is with (one of) the *absolutive* NP(s) in the clause, and, moreover, strictly obligatory in ND, hence incapable of coding differential information.

ND agreeing adverbial items fall into four classes: (i) nominal case forms, mostly - but not exclusively - with locative-directional semantics (cf. antessive in (1) vs. dative in (2)); (ii) locative-directional postpositions-adverbs (3); (iii) lexical adverbs: (a) ADVs whose GA markers are, or go back to, NC-agreeing case suffixes (2, 4); (b) manner ADVs showing ‘adjectival’ GA (5); (c) others (lexicalized (con)verb forms and other formations). (Pertinent GA targets are bold or underlined; controllers in italics; GA markers set off by ‘=’):

- (1) *Halži* uškul-li-sa=**w** kejc:ul-li u-di
Halži(M) school-OBL-ANTESS[**M**] (M)stand-CONV (M)be-PAST
‘Haži was standing in front of the school.’ (Dargwa; Sumbatova 2003:29f.)
- (2) Reł ła=**r** dede=**r**=e ʕ ‘ičal(-gi) r=ošun r=o’a.
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)

- (3) *Xoče* Gaje-j-k_i awu=**b** wo=b=na.
snake.III stone-OBL-CONT under=**III** be=III=AA
 ‘The snake is under the stone.’ (Tsakhur; Kibrik et al. 1999:121f.)
- (4) *išt:u=b* *murti.dēl* *nemc:abi* *ʔer.b=ih-ub-ti-ca=b*
 here[**HPL**] once *German:PL* [HPL]live:PF-PRET-ATR.PL-PRS[HPL]
 ‘The Germans lived here once.’ (Dargwa; Sumbatova 2003:42)
- (5) **j/b=oca** **j/b=ijcira**
II.SG/H.PL=briefly **II.SG/H.PL=told**
 ‘**She/They** told briefly.’ (Chechen; Aloroev 1999:79)

Over and above the synchronic survey of ND adverbial GA, the paper briefly addresses its diachrony. While for much of adverbial GA, both outside and inside ND, a *secondary-predicative* (depictive) origin is either demonstrable or plausible, ND NC-agreeing case forms seem to be a noteworthy exception. Two hypotheses concerning their origin are discussed, viz. (i) NC-prefix-agreeing locational (< body-part) N > P > case suffix; (ii) suffixal NC-agreeing focus clitics (cf. Harris 2002).

Finally, the paper touches upon several questions of general theoretical significance, such as the syntactic and semantic viability of a complete descriptive assimilation of adverbial GA to standard GA cases by means of a predicative (re-)interpretation (cf. Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2005) - which, however, is demonstrated to be impossible -, and the implications of the phenomenon for the general theory and typology of GA, as the phenomenon of adverbial GA seems to be problematic, or even beyond reach, for virtually all existing GA theories.

1. References:

2. Aloroev, I.J.: Čečenskij jazyk. Moskva 1999.
3. Harris, A.C.: Endoclitics and the origins of Udi morphosyntax. Oxford 2002.
4. Kibrik, A.E.: Toward a typology of ergativity. In: J. Nichols & A. Woodbury (eds.): Grammar inside and outside the clause. Cambridge 1985, 363-413.
5. Kibrik, A.E. et al.: Elementy caxurskogo jazyka v tipologičeskom osveščeenii. Moskva 1999
6. Nordlinger, R.: Constructive case. Evidence from Australian languages. Stanford 1998.
7. Schultze-Berndt, E. & N. Himmelmann: Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: an introduction. In: E. Schultze-Berndt & N. Himmelmann (eds.): Secondary predication and adverbial modification. Oxford 2005, 1-67
8. Sumbatova, N.R. & R.O. Mutalov: A grammar of Içari Dargwa. München 2003