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Warlpiri adjoined finite CPs like (1)-(3), marked by the complementizer kuja, raise intriguing questions for the theory of modification.

(1) ngaju-lulu kapu-ni wawiri pura-mi [CP kuja-npa pantu-ru nyunjulu-lru] I-ERG AUX kangaroo cook-NPST COMP-AUX spear-PST you-ERG ‘I will cook the kangaroo which you speared’ (= (4), Hale 1976)

(2) ngaju-lulu lpa-ma karli jantu-ru [CP kuja-∅-npa ya-nu-mu njuntu] I-ERG AUX boomerang trim-PST COMP-AUX walk-PST HITHER you ‘I was trimming a boomerang, when you came up’ (= (5), Hale 1976)

(3) ngtjulu-lulu ∅-na yankiri pantu-ru, [CP kuja-lpa ngapa nya-nu] I-ERG AUX emu spear-PST, COMP-AUX water drink-PST
   a. ‘I spearred the emu which was drinking water’
   b. ‘I spearred the emu while/when it was drinking water’ (= (1), Hale 1976)

That a single structure can be interpreted as either a relative or adverbial clause suggests a commonality not well-captured in current theory. Can we give a unified semantics for what Warlpiri presents as a single construction?

Wedding Principle: “What natural language hath joined together let no linguist put asunder”

Cross-linguistically, distinct meanings for modifying clauses are typically encoded by distinct formal markings – e.g., by variable typing or by “subordinating conjunctions”. Warlpiri shows neither. How are inter-clausal relations established in the adjoined clause structure?

In this talk, I:

- Propose that Warlpiri adjoined finite CPs with kuja/kajji can be given a uniform semantic analysis as denoting properties (of individuals, times, events) that furnish restrictions on a main clause quantifier (over individuals, times or events). This (partially) explains their external syntax.

- Observe that Warlpiri adjoined finite CPs with yungulyi- are not construable as quantifier restrictions. Hence kuja/kajji vs. yungulyi- can be seen as a form of obviation marking on main-clause subordinate clause variables.

- Briefly contrast this view with that of Hale (1986), who proposes central-non-central-coincidence as the key distinction being marked.

- Note that Warlpiri correlatives appear to contrast syntactically and semantically with well-studied correlatives found in Hindi and other similar languages.

1.0 A Unified Semantics for Adjoined Clauses?
A unified semantics for the Warlpiri adjoined structure (4) faces immediate problems.

(4) [TP CP kuja … ]

1.1 Adverbial clauses (ACs)
ACs are typically analyzed either as semantic functors applied to the interpretations of their sisters (5a) or as event predicates composed with their sisters by conjunction (5b).

(5) a. [TP CP] ➔ [CP]([TP]) Thomason & Stalnaker (1973)
   b. [TP CP] ➔ λx([TP])(x) & [CP](x) Parsons (1991)

1.2 Relative clauses (RCs)
RCs are typically analyzed as individual predicates composed with their sisters by conjunction (6). But the relevant sister is invariably NP in the associated nominal not TP:

(6) [NP CP] ➔ λx([NP](x) & [CP](x)) Montague (1974)

Given this, peripheral relatives like (7) present a strong compositionality challenge. RC is not a constituent with the NP it modifies (man).

(7) A man came in [CP who I didn’t know].

Two broad solutions have been offered.

1.2.1 Syntactic Disassociation
Peripheral RCs derive their surface position by rightward movement (8a,b). CP is interpreted in base position.

(8) a. [TP [TP … [CP D NP CP] … ] CP ]
   b. [TP A man who I didn’t know came in [CP who I didn’t know] ]

This account is plausible for languages w/both embedded and peripheral RCs (e.g., Hindi). But embedded internal finite RCs do not occur in Warlpiri (Hale 1976). In fact embedding of any finite clauses in Warlpiri is highly controversial (see Legate 2009, 2011; Levinson 2013; Legate, Pesetsky and Yang 2014). And even if Warlpiri RCs are extraposed, what about ACs? What becomes of unification?
1.2.2 Semantic Association

Nominals are interpreted as containing a distinguished restriction variable $R$ (9a). $R$ is abstracted over when TP and CP are combined (9d). The result is to “lower” the RC denotation into the nominal denotation:

(9) a. $a \text{ man} \rightarrow \lambda P \exists x [\text{man}(x) \land R(x) \land P(x)]$
b. $a \text{ man came in} \rightarrow \exists x [\text{man}(x) \land R(x) \land \text{came-in}(x)]$
c. $\text{who I didn’t know} \rightarrow \lambda y [\neg \text{know}(I, y)]$
d. $a \text{ man came in who I didn’t know} \rightarrow$

$\lambda R \exists x [\text{man}(x) \land R(x) \land \text{came-in}(x)] \land (\lambda y [\neg \text{know}(I, y)])$

Even if this semantic analysis is applicable to Warlpiri adjoined CPs understood as RCs, what about ACs? (10) is plainly non-identical to either of (5a,b). What becomes of unification?

1.3 When-clauses as Temporal RCs?

Larson (1982) suggests assimilating some temporal Warlpiri ACs to RCs under the semantics in (10). Specifically:

- Analyze tenses as quantifiers with a similar restriction variable $R$.
- Take adjoined clauses to supply a temporal property for $R$.

Compare (7)/(11) and (9a)/(12a) and (10)/(13).

(11) A man came in $\text{[CP when I was alone]}$.

(12) a. $PST \rightarrow \lambda T \exists t [t < t^* \land R^*(t) \land T(t)]$
b. $a \text{ man came in} \rightarrow$

$\exists t [t < t^* \land R^*(t) \land AT(t, \exists x [\text{man}(x) \land R(x) \land \text{came-in}(x)])]$
c. $\text{when I was alone} \rightarrow \lambda t [t < t^* \land AT(t, \text{alone}(t))]$
d. $a \text{ man came in when I was alone} \rightarrow$

$\lambda R \exists t [t < t^* \land R^*(t) \land AT(t, \exists x [\text{man}(x) \land R(x) \land \text{came-in}(x)])] \land (\lambda t [t < t^* \land AT(t, \text{alone}(t))])$

(13) $[TP \text{ CP}] \rightarrow \lambda R [\text{TP}] (\lambda [\text{CP}])$

Combining (10) & (13) allows for interpretation of multiple peripheral clauses (14):

(14) A man came in $\text{[CP when I was alone]} [\text{CP who I didn’t know]}$.

1.4 ACs as Quantifier Restrictions

The proposal in (13) converges with a view in semantics that (contra 5a,b) adverbal clauses express restrictions on adverbial quantifiers. Adverbial quantifications commonly have unexpressed restrictions, with content drawn from context (15a)/(15.i), or derived from the sentence itself (15b.ii-iv):

(15) a. John usually talks too much.
   “In most contextually relevant situations, John talks too much.”
   b. John usually steams Chinese dumplings.  
      i. “In most contextually relevant situations, John steams Chinese dumplings.”
      ii. “In most contextually relevant situations where John steams something, John steams Chinese dumplings”
      iii. “In most contextually relevant situations where John steams dumplings, John steams Chinese dumplings”
      iv. “In most contextually relevant situations where John deals with Chinese dumplings, John steams Chinese dumplings”

Following Rooth (1985), sentence-internal restrictions like (15b.ii-iv) are assumed to arise by focus – i.e., adverbial Qs are focus-sensitive elements that associate with material in their scope. The restrictions in (15b.ii-iv) correspond to focal assignments (16a-c) (resp.):

(16) a. Usually John steams $[\text{focus Chinese dumplings}]$.
    b. Usually John steams $[\text{focus Chinese}]$ dumplings.
    c. Usually John $[\text{focus steams}]$ Chinese dumplings.

Adverbial Qs show their full argument structure in conjunction with adverbial $\text{if/when/after/after}$-clauses (17a-d). The latter supply the restriction arg (18a-c):

(17) a. Sometimes $[\text{CP if John is sleepy}]$ he drinks green tea.
    b. Usually $[\text{CP when John cooked}]$ he steamed Chinese dumplings
    c. John always shaves $[\text{CP when he is in the shower}]$
    d. John never washed vegetables $[\text{CP before eating them}]$

(18) a. SOMETIMES $(\lambda e [\text{John is sleepy}(e)])$ $(\lambda e [\text{John drink green tea}(e)])$
    b. USUALLY $(\lambda e [\text{John cooked}(e)])$ $(\lambda e [\text{John steamed C. dumplings}(e)])$
    c. ALWAYS $(\lambda e [\text{John in the shower}])$ $(\lambda e [\text{John shaves}(e)])$

When $\text{if/when/after/after}$-clauses occur without an overt adverbial quantifier (19a), a covert one may be assumed (Heim 1982) (16b):

(19) a. When John visited Paris, he ate in a café.
    b. SOMETIME $(\lambda e [\text{John visited Paris}(e)])$ $(\lambda e [\text{John ate in a café}(e)])$
This permits ambiguity in (20). On reading (20a), the when-clause restricts always (21a); on reading (20b), the when-clause restricts a covert adverb; always quantifies over contextually relevant parts of the larger visitation-event (21b)

(20) When John visited Paris, he always ate in a café.
   a. “In all situations in which John visited Paris, he ate in a café.”
   b. “At the time John visited Paris, in all relevant situations, John ate in a café.”

(21) a. ALWAYS (κ[John visited Paris(ε)]) (κ[John ate in a café(ε)])
   b. SOMETIME (κ[John visited Paris(ε)])
      (κ[ALWAYS (κ[C(ε) & T(e′,ε)]) (κ[John ate in a café(ε)])])

(13) accords with this view: the adjoined temporal clause restricts a Q in the main TP. But the broader view seems necessary to accommodate additional Warlpiri examples where CP has conditional meaning (22), where CP can have locative meaning (23), (24b), and where CP has contrastive and ‘enabling’ meaning (25a,b), resp.

(22) (κ[ŋj%-npa yángka warlu-ngka purra-ŋ yi-ka-ŋu ]
     COMP-PERF-2 that fire-LOC cook-IRR meat-ERG.
   yink-ŋaj%-npa watiya-rlu kuyu yurdudyuruma-ni (= (17), Hale 1986)
   that POTENTIAL-2 stick-INST meat turn-NPST
   ‘If you were cooking meat on a fire, e.g., you might turn it over with a stick’

(23) a. ya-ni ka-ma, (κ[ŋj%-ka nyangku ngin-ni ]
     go-PST AUX-1.SG COMP-AUX him stay-NPST
     I’m going where he lives” (Hale nd, unpublished fieldnotes)
   b. nya-ngu-ŋa, nyangku-ŋu [κ[ŋj%-n-pa pu-ngu ]
      see-PST-1.SG him-OLDINFO snake COMP-AUX hit-NPST
     I saw him where you killed the snake’ (Hale nd, unpublished fieldnotes)

(24) (κ[yapa ŋj%-ka ŋaj%-rlu palu ]
     person COMP-PRES that-LOC die-(NPST)
   kula-ŋa-li ngula-ngka nyina kantu
   NEG-PRES-333 that-LOC sit-(NPST) nearby
   a. ‘When a person dies, they don’t stay closeby there’
   b. ‘Where a person dies, they don’t stay closeby there’ (= (18), Hale 1986)

(25) a. (κ[ŋj%-ka-ŋal julu-ŋa, njaju-ŋal kankalu watiya-rla ]
     COMP-AUX nest build-NPST bird many-OTHER-ERG up
     tree-LOC
   mana-ŋaj%-ka-nju-yi jinjiwatu-rlu njant-ŋi yujuju padu
   spinifex-LOC COMP-AUX jinjiwarnu-ERG build-NPST shelter-DIMIN
   ‘Whereas many other birds build a nest up in a tree, the jinjiwarnu bird builds itself a small shelter in spinifex grass.’

b. (κ[ŋj%-ka-ŋa juna mada ni njaujulu-rlu ]
     this COMP-AUX knife have-NPST I-ERG
     ngula kapi-ma-ju njaujulu-rlu-ku paji-ŋi
     so AUX-REFLEX I-ERG-NOW/THEN cut-NPST
   ‘Now that I have this knife, I am going to cut myself’

1.6 Summary
Under the assumption that TP contains quantifiers ranging over individuals, times, and events with implicit restrictions (26a-c), the above observations can be unified as in (27) and (28):

(26) a. a man → λP∃x[man(x) & R(x) & P(x)] Nominal Q
   b. PST → λT∃t [t < t′ & R′(t) & T(t)] Tense
   c. come-in → λP∃e [come-in(e) & R′(e) & P(e)] Verbal Q
      always → λQAPPe[Q(e) & R′(e)] → P(e) Adverbial Q (approx.)

(27) a. [tp CP] → λR[TP] (λx[CP]) RC-reading
   b. [tp CP] → λR[TP] (λx[CP]) Temporal AC-reading
   c. [tp CP] → λR[TP] (λx[CP]) Cond/Loc/Etc. AC-reading

(28) [tp CP] → λR[TP] (λx[CP])

2.0 Meaning and Form
Main clause-adjoined clause relations are marked according to different patterns.

2.1 Variable Typing
Hindi/Marathi correlatives (25) (from Bhatt and Lipták 2009) exhibit variable typing. The adjoined clause provides a property λQ[CP] (29). Morphology marks the type of α (30):

(29) Construction Adjoined Clause Main Clause
   Relativization [...oj... ‘who’ [...o... ‘he/she’
   Comparative [...jtna... ‘how much’ [...us-se jyaada... ‘that THAN more’
   Equative [...jtna... ‘how much’ [...u... ‘that much’
   Conditional [...dzar... ‘if’ [...sar... ‘then’ Marathi
   When-clause [...jw... ‘when’ [...jw... ‘then’
   Until-clause [...jat-tak... ‘when-TILL’ [...jat-tak... ‘then-TILL’
   Since-clause [...jat-se... ‘when-SINCE’ [...jat-se... ‘then-SINCE’
(31) \[ t_2 \exists \alpha \beta ([Q(\beta) \leftrightarrow \beta = \alpha] \land R(\alpha) \land P(\alpha)) \] \[ \lambda \alpha \text{[CP]} \]

### 2.2 Subordinating Conjunctions

English uses the variable typing strategy with RCs, when/-where- clauses and possibly conditionals; the form of \( w h \) (or C) marks the property type (32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Subordinate Clause</th>
<th>Variable Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relativization</td>
<td>([\text{cp} \text{ who/what/etc. C } \ldots])</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative/ Equative</td>
<td>([\text{cp} \text{ when C } \ldots])</td>
<td>Degrees/Interval Intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>([\text{cp} \text{ where C } \ldots])</td>
<td>Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When-clause</td>
<td>([\text{cp} \text{ OP if } \ldots])</td>
<td>Worlds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But English also exhibits a range of “subordinating conjunctions,” analyzed since Emonds (1976) as clause-selecting Ps (33).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Subordinate Clause</th>
<th>Variable Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relativization</td>
<td>([\text{pp}\text{ cp} \ldots] \land [\text{tp}\text{ cp} \ldots])</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative</td>
<td>([\text{pp} \text{ than } \text{cp} \ldots])</td>
<td>Degrees/Interval Intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equative</td>
<td>([\text{pp} \text{ as } \text{cp} \ldots])</td>
<td>Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until/Since-clause</td>
<td>([\text{pp} \text{ until/since } \text{cp} \ldots])</td>
<td>Worlds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In semantic analyses, P encodes the inter-clausal relation: (34) from Dowty (1979) represents the meaning of *since* (where XN is the Extended Now predicate):

(34) \[ \lambda P \lambda P', \lambda P_1 \{ \land \left[ \forall t_2 [t_2 < t_1 \land XN(t_2)] \rightarrow P(t_2) \right] \} \]

Here the type structure of *since* dictates how its complement must be interpreted (viz., as a property of times) not anything within the complement itself.

Warlpiri adjoined clause syntax does not seem to deploy either of these strategies.

- No variable typing (\( \text{comp} \) is a constant form *kuja/kajii*)
- No overt subordinating conjunctions

**Question:** How does Warlpiri work?

### 2.3 Yungu/Yi- Clauses

Hale (1986) notes a second set of \([\text{tp} \text{ tp CP}]\) structures marked by *yungu/yi-*(vs. *kuja/kajii*). These are interpreted as rationale or purpose clauses, depending on tense (35a-c):

(35) a. ngagulu-rulu kapi-na maliki yalumpu paka-rni

I-ERG AUX dog that strike-NPST

[cp yungu-∅ kuru nu yalumpu yalku-nu ]

COMP-AUX child this bite-PAST

‘I am going to strike that dog because it bit this child’ (= (9), Hale 1976)

b. ngarka-jara-rulu ka-pala pariku pangi-ni

[cp yungu-∅-pala wawiri pura-mi]

man-DUAL-ERG AUX trench dig-NPST

COMP-AUX kangaroo cook-NPST

‘The two men are digging a cooking trench in order to cook the kangaroo’ (= (10), Hale 1976)

c. Nyamni ka-ri-a waturi-nya-yi wawiri

this pres-1:3SGDAT around-see-NPST tree-DAT

[cp yungu-ma rdilykirdiyki-paka-rni ]

COMP-∅1 broken-chop-NPST

‘I am looking around for a tree to chop up’ (= (22), Hale 1986)

Interestingly, rationale/purpose clauses appear never to be interpreted as Q-restrictions (Johnston 1994). Consider (36a) with ambiguity (36b,c):

(36) a. Leopold always sold shares because he needed money.

b. **Reading 1:** “On all relevant occasions, Leopold sold shares, and the reason for this pattern of behavior was that he needed money”

c. **Reading 2:** “On all occasions that Leopold sold shares, his reason for doing so was that he needed money”

(37) a. Frankie always misses the bus because he is a slow runner.

b. Leopold always robs a bank because he needs to make money fast.
(38) **High Attachment (R1)**

a. 

```
  DP  
  |         |
  |         |  
  |         |  
  IP  
  |         |
  |         |  
  |         |  
  PP  
```

```
Adv: always <Leopold> sold shares
because ... money
```

b. $\exists e[\text{Leo need money}(e) \land \exists e' [\text{always}(C, \lambda e'[\text{Leo sell shares}(e')], e')] \land Q \land \text{Restr} \land \text{Scope}]$

(39) **Low Attachment (R2)**

a. 

```
  DP  
  |         |
  |         |  
  |         |  
  IP  
  |         |
  |         |  
  |         |  
  PP  
```

```
Adv: always <Leopold> sold shares
because ... money
```

b. $\text{always}(C, \lambda e[\text{Leo sell shares}(e) \land \exists e'[\text{Leo need money}(e) \land \text{cause}(e', e')])]$

c. $\text{always}(\lambda e[\text{Leo sell shares}(e)], \Rightarrow \text{Restr})

In (36b)/(38), the Q-restriction is supplied contextually. In (36c)/(39), the Q-restriction is supplied is supplied by the smaller VP.

What we do not appear to get is a reading where the because-clause itself supplies the Q-restriction (40):

(40) $\text{always}(\lambda e[\exists e'[\text{Leo need money}(e) \land \text{cause}(e', e')]], \lambda e[\text{Leo sell shares}(e)], e')$

"Every eventuality caused by the state of Leopold needing money is an eventuality of Leopold selling shares."

Why? Larson & Sawada (2014) conjecture such readings are out because of **sortality.** Qs require sortal preds (= countable preds) as their restrictions.

(41) a. Marty always shaves when he is in the shower. **Ambiguous**
   b. Marty always SHAVES when he is in the shower. **(Adjunct Restriction)**
   c. Marty always shaves when he is in the SHOWer. **(MC Restriction)**

(42) a. Marty is always in the shower when he shaves. **Unambiguous!**
   b. Marty is always in the SHOWer when he shaves. **(Adjunct Restriction)**
   c. Marty is always in the shower when he SHAVES. **(Adjunct Restriction)**

In (41) both Adjunct and Main Clause provide sortal predicate:

- Adjunct Clause provides a sortal predicate of times
- Main Clause provides a sortal predicate of events (shaves is telic)

In (42) only the Adjunct Clause provides a sortal predicate:

- Adjunct Clause provides a sortal predicate of times
- Main Clause provides a nonsortal predicate of events (in the shower is nontelic)

Compare also (43) (due to Westerstahl) to (44):

(43) a. Many Norwegians have **won the Nobel Prize** **Ambiguous**
   b. Many Norwegians have **WON THE NOBEL PRIZE** **(NP Restriction)**
   c. Many NORWEGIANS have won the Nobel Prize **(MC Restriction)**

(44) a. Many Norwegians are tall. **Unambiguous**
   b. Many Norwegians are TALL. **(NP Restriction)**
   c. Many NORWEGIANS are tall. **(NP Restriction)**

- **cause** relates eventualities of all types (telic/non-telic)
- $\lambda e[\exists e'[\text{Leo need money}(e) \land \text{cause}(e', e)]]$ is thus indeterminate wrt telicity
- $\lambda e[\exists e'[... \land \text{cause}(e', e)]]$ cannot restrict a Q-adverb

**Implication:** If *kuja* marks Warlpiri clauses that (co-)restrict a main clause Q, then rationale/purpose meaning should not be expressed via *kuja*-clauses.

**Speculation:** *Kuja vs. yungu/yi* choice represents a form of **obviation marking.**

- Adjoined restrictions end up sharing a variable with a quantifier in the main clause ($x, t, w, e$ etc.).
- Adjoined non-restrictions do not.
- *Kuja vs. yungu/yi* amounts to marking shared vs. non-shared reference (resp.).
2.4 Central vs. Non-Central Concidence (Hale 1986)

Hale (1986) offers a related, but somewhat different specification:

- *kuka*/kaji-CPs express “a central coincidence” of some aspect of the dependent clause with a corresponding aspect of the main clause” – e.g., “referential, temporal, circumstantial and condition”
- *yungul/yu*-CPs express non-central coincidence; denote “a sequential relation … in which one event or process precedes or follows another.”

(45) Local Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Non-Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><del>ngkal</del>rāa</td>
<td>~kura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~wana</td>
<td>~nguru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERL</td>
<td>EL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(46) Directional Deictics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Non-Central</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(~y) DURATIVE</td>
<td>~mi HITHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(~m) PERL</td>
<td>~rra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(~n) HITHER</td>
<td>(~d) PERL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(~a) EL</td>
<td>(~t) PERL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hale’s view is plausible for event relations. Rational clauses give e1 from which Main Clause e2 results (48a). Purpose clauses give e2 that the Main Clause e1 enables (48b). These are essentially ELATIVE/ALLATIVE (SOURCE/GOAL) relations.

(48) a. John left because Mary arrived. e1 |→ e2
    b. John left in order to visit Mary. e1 |→| e2

What about temporal relations? *Since*-clauses left-bound Main Clause time (49a). *Until*-clauses right-bound the Main Clause time (49b). Both are paraphrasable by ELATIVE/ALLATIVE (SOURCE/GOAL) forms.

(49) a. I have been here since the time Mary left. t1 |→ t2
    b. I will be here until the time Mary leaves. t1 |→| t2

We might expect Warlpiri to encode *since/until*-clauses via *yungul/yu*. But *since* is not encoded by an adjoining clause at all (50b); *until* is encoded by *kuka*/kaji (51b). (Mary Laughren p.c.)

(50) a. We have been waiting at this soakage [since Jangala left ]
    b. Jangala yanu, ngula-jangu ka-malu nyampa-ria-ku
       Jangala left, from AUX-1PL.ex.NOM here-LOC-THEN/NOW(changed state) nyina-mi mulju-ngka.
       sit-NPST soakage-LOC
       ‘Jangala left, after that we are sitting at this soakage’ (implied that we were not here before Jangala left)

(51) a. Wait for me here [until I return]
       HERE-LOC-still-1SG.DAT sit-IMP kaji-1SG.NOM return go-NPST-HITHER.
       ‘Wait for me here until I come back.’

What is the prediction for the obviation analysis? *Until* clauses, like *before/after*-clauses, certainly restrict main clause adverbial-Qs (52-53). With *since* clauses, the situation is more subtle.

(52) a. Marcia always drank a beer before she visited her uncle. (Johnston 1994)
    b. ← Beer---Visit1---Visit2---Visit3---...--->
       *← Beer---Visit1---Beer2---Beer3---Visit3---...--->
    b. ← Beer1---Visit1---Beer2---Visit2---Beer3---Visit3---...--->

(53) a. Marcia always stays inside until it is dark.
    b. Marcia has always rejected spinach since eating it in 2005.

Hypothesis: *Since*-clauses seem only to restrict a higher Q, equivalent to (21b).

(20) a. “In all situations in which John visited Paris, he ate in a café.”
    b. “At the time John visited Paris, in all relevant situations, John ate in a café.”

(21) a. ALWAYS (λe[John visited Paris(e)]) (λe[John ate in a café(e)])
    b. SOMETIMES (λe[John visited Paris(e)])
       (λe[ALWAYS (λe'[C(e) & Π(e').e]) (λe' [John ate in a café(e')])]

Conclusion: The obviation analysis seems compatible with these results.

3.0 Hindi Correlatives

Warlpiri adjoined clauses diverge syntactically & semantically from Hindi correlatives (Srivastav 1991, Dayal 1996 a.o.):
[54] a. [cp jo laRkii khaRii hai] vo (laRkii) lambii hai
   REL girl standing is that girl tall is
   'Which girl is standing, that one/girl is tall?/The girl who is standing is tall'

(55) Hindi Leading Correlatives
   a. Demonstrative required in the main clause
   b. Possibility of spelling out nominal head in both clauses
   c. "Maximalizing semantics"

(56) a. vo laRkii lambii hai [cp jo (*laRkii) khaRii hai] that girl tall is REL girl standing is
   'That girl is tall who is standing'
   b. do laRkiiyaaN lambii haiN [cp jo khaRii haiN] two girls tall are REL standing is
   'Two girls are tall who are standing'

(57) Hindi Trailing Correlatives
   a. Demonstrative not required in the main clause
   b. No possibility of spelling out nominal head in relative clause
   c. Normal restrictive semantics

Warlpiri trailing adjoined clauses show restrictive semantics, but allow spell out in either clause, including (for some speakers) with a non-identical nominal (59e)/(60):

(58) a. ...NOMi,...NOMi,... (where NOMi, NOMj are formally identical)
   b. ...NOMi,...PRO,...
   c. ...PROj,...NOMi,...
   d. ...NOMi,0,...
   e. ...0,...NOM,...
   f. ...NOMi,...NOMj,... (where NOMi, NOMj are not formally identical)

(59) a. [cp marlu kuja-rama nya-ngu] ngajulu-ru 0-ma pantu-ru marlu-ju
   'roo COMP-1SG see-PST 1SG-ERG AUX-1SG spear-PST 'roo-OLDINFO
   'I speared the kangaroo that I saw'
   b. [cp marlu kuja-rama nya-ngu] ngula-ju 0-ma pantu-ru ngajulu-ru
   'roo COMP-1SG see-PST that-OLDINFO AUX-1SG spear-PST 'roo
   'I speared the kangaroo that I saw'
   c. [cp ngula-ju kuja-rama nya-ngu] ngajulu-ru 0-ma pantu-ru marlu
   that-OLDINFO COMP-1SG see-PST 1SG-ERG AUX-1SG spear-PST 'roo
   'I speared the kangaroo that I saw'
   d. [cp marlu kuja-rama nya-ngu] ngajulu-ru 0-ma pantu-ru
   'roo COMP-1SG see-PST 1SG-ERG AUX-1SG spear-PST
   'I speared the kangaroo that I saw'
   e. [cp nya-ngu kuja-rama] ngajulu-ru 0-ma pantu-ru marlu-ju
   see-PST COMP-1SG 1SG-ERG AUX-1SG spear-PST 'roo-OLDINFO
   'I speared the kangaroo that I saw'
   f. [cp marlu kuja-rama nya-ngu] ngajulu-ru 0-ma pantu-ru wawiri-ji
   'roo COMP-1SG see-PST 1SG-ERG AUX-1SG spear-PST 'roo-OLDINFO
   'I speared the wallaby that I saw'

(60) ?[cp pirli-ngawurrpa kuja-rama kuja-rama nya-ngu ]
   hill-dweller AUX-1SG see-PST 1SG-ERG
   ngajulu-ru 0-ma pantu-ru wakulyari-ji
   1SG-ERG AUX-1SG spear-PST 'wallaby-OLDINFO
   'I speared the wallaby that I saw'

Warlpiri leading adjoined clauses show an obligatory demonstrative element (ngula) found in left-dislocations (61):

(61) ngapiri yangka, ngula ka kari-mi wulpayi-la
   eucalyptus DEF it AUX stand-NPST creek-LOC
   'The red river gum, it grows in creeks' (= 43 Hale 1976)

(62) [cp maliki kuja-0 wanti-ja] ngula-kura 0-ma yarda-paka-ru ngajulu-ru
   dog COMP-AUX fall-PST THEN-COMP AUX REP-strike-PST 1SG-ERG
   'When the dog fell, thereupon I struck it' (= 44a Hale 1976)

(63) [cp ngajulu kuja-0 wanti-ja] ngula-kura 0-ju maliki-fla-ki yanda-pu-ngu
   I COMP-AUX fall-PST THEN-COMP AUX dog-ERG-THEN REP-bite-PST
   'When I fell, thereupon the dog bit me' (= 44a Hale 1976)

But although CP in (61)/(62) has temporal semantics, the demonstrative is inflicted with a complementizer reflecting object coreference between main and adjoined clauses. (see Simpson 1991). This is not paralleled in Hindi when-clauses (cf. 29).

Conclusion: Warlpiri adjoined clauses of both types appears to differ significantly in properties from Hindi correlatives.

SUMMARY

- Warlpiri kuja/kaji adjoined clauses appear to express a unified semantic concept: restriction on a main clause Q (nominal, tense, proadverb/AdvQ).
- Warlpiri yungu/yi- adjoined clauses appear to express adjunct meanings not associated with Q-restriction.
- Hypothesis: kuja/kaji vs. yungu/yi- expresses overlap vs. obviation on main clause variables. This contrasts with Hale’s (1986) realistic view, but is close to his 1976 view of kuja/kaji as having “referential function”.
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