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# **Introduction**

Сomplementation is a syntactic situation that arises when a notional sentence or predication is an argument of a predicate [Noonan 2007]. For our purposes, a predication can be viewed as an argument of a predicate if its functions as object of that predicate. The list of the clause taking predicates examined in Kina Rutul for the current research was selected on a base of typological generalisations about semantic groups of verbs most frequently occurring with сomplement clauses [Hengeveld 2008]. Nevertheless, predicates that are able to take a sentential complements are not limited by the following list.

As for Kina Rutul, the list contains verbs obligatory requiring a clause in their argument structure, such as:

*minnät waʔas* ‘ask, beg’ (< ‘request do’),

*mɨčebɨr haʔas* ‘pretend’ (< ‘witchcraft do’),

*ummud waʔas* ‘hope’ (< ‘hope do’),

*haˤjf hɨʔɨn* ‘regret’ (< ‘regret do’),

*čalɨš wɨkɨs* ‘try’ (< ‘try become’),

*wɨkɨs* ‘can’ (< ‘become’).

Most other predicates take either a standard nominal argument or a sentential complement:

*hɨgɨn* ‘want, love’ *gič' giwin* ‘threat’

*šad wɨkɨs* ‘happy’ (< ‘happy become’) *fikɨr wɨʔɨn* ‘think’ *haˤjf jɨʔɨn* ‘regret’ (< ‘regret become’) *χudkun* ‘ask’

*raʔazi jiʔin* ‘agree’ (< ‘agree become’) *hac'ɨn* ‘know’

*un/ses wɨkɨs* ‘hear’ (< ‘hearing become’) *ilamiš wɨkɨs* ‘believe’

*jik'ʲa: udxun* ‘forget’ (< ‘from heart ???’) *gič'in* ‘fear’

*lazim wɨkɨs* ‘need’ (< ‘need become’) *küč'un* ‘start’

*q'abɨl jiʔin* ‘like’ (< ‘???’) *hagun* ‘see’

*jik'i ʁa*  ‘remember’ (< ‘on heart remain’) *huxun* ‘say’

The most common argument frames for the verbs listed above are:

* <ERG, C[[1]](#footnote-0)> — a type of predicates unable to take any argument except for clausal ones, for example *ummud waʔas* ‘hope ’ ().

() ‘Muhammad hoped to get an award’

maχamad-a ummud ha<w>ɨ-rnagrada

Muhammad-ERG hope <3>do.PFV-CVB award

w-ɨsɨ-s-ɨ xur

3-give-INF-FUT QUOT

* Two other verbs that similar to the previous scheme is the argument structure of the predicates *čalɨš jišin* ‘try’ and *raʔazi jiʔin* ‘agree’ <ABS, C> (). <ABS, locatives> frame is also found, that is a peripheral scheme observed as *fikɨr wɨʔɨn* ‘think’, *ilamiš wɨkɨs* ‘believe’, *šad wɨkɨs* ‘be happy’ (XX).

() ‘I tried to climb on a tree’

zɨ čalɨš hiši-r huk-a leč'u-s xur

I try 1.become.PFV-CVB tree-IN.EL 1.climb-INF QUOT

() ‘Muhammad believes in Musa’s words’

maχamad musa-d č'el-ɨ ilamiš hiši-r

Muhammad Musa-ATTR word-SUPER trust 4.become.PFV-CVB

(XX) ‘Muhammad thought about Patimat’

maχamad-a fikɨr w-aʔa-r=a

Muhammad-ERG thought 3-do.IPFV-CVB=be

patimat-ɨ-k-la

Patimat-OBL-CONT-SUP.EL

* <DAT, ABS> and <DAT, C> for a dative experiencer and nominative or clause stimulus. That is standard schema for verbs of perception, for example, *hac'ɨn* ‘know’, *hɨgɨn* ‘want, love’, *jik'ʲa: udxun* ‘forget’ ().

() ‘I forgot a man’

za-s edemi jik'-ʲa: u<r>xu-r

I.OBL-DAT man heart-IN.EL <1>forget.PFV-CVB

() ‘Patimat forgot that she had already made khinkal’

patimat-ɨs jik'ʲ-a: u<d>xu-r χink’al hɨʔɨ-d

Patimat-DAT heart.OBL-EL <4>forget.PFV-CVB khinkal 4.do.PFV-ATTR

The word order of complementation is rather fixed: is begins with subject (if it exists) and strictly ends with a verb sometimes accompanied with quotative clitic *xur* (see section 2 for the details). The position of a verb may be changed in some cases of attributive strategy (see section 3.4). Sometimes, embedding of a dependent predication into the main clause is possible.

# **Complementizer *xur***

The word *xur* is frequently used in complementations in the left periphery of a complement clause, cf.

*Xur* is most probably a reduced perfective converb *huxur* of the verb ‘say’ that has lost the initial syllable together with the agreement slot. Sometimes a full form can be used instead a reduced one, but that fact requires further research. This particle is frequently used in complementation and is located strictly at the end of a dependent clause, so that it immediately follows the dependent predicate. In a monoclausal constructions, it is rather frequently used as a quotative particle and can be translated, e.g.:

() ‘They said, go to that upper village, they said’

mij ele **xur** sa muˁɢʷ-a du-ruʔu-s **xur**=xa

here(ESS) up QUOT one village-IN HPL-go-INF QUOT=ADD

In a polypredication the semantics of *xur* itself is hardly perceived by native speakers, and the reasons for its use in complement clause are rather unclear. Our consultants frequently do not realize the separability of the particle and consider it as a special verbal form. While in complementation *xur* often attaches to a dependent predicate and never to a main predicate, is it possible to assume that in some cases *xur* is able to mark a dependency of a predicate as a complementizer. On the current data there is no evidence that Rutul *xur* has already overgone grammaticalization, but it is quite probably tends to it. All in all, there are some arguments for considering *xur* in complementation as complementizer rather than as mere quotative particle:

1. It is compatible with a wide range of semantic groups of predicates in different context, not only narratives;
2. The formation of complementizers from grammaticalized speech verbs via the stage of quotative is typologically frequent [some link].

The usage of *xur* is quite variable among native speakers, but it is possible to establish some trends:

* *xur* cannot be attached to some verbal forms, e.g. to *-jden* predicates (), though in general it is compatible with non-finite forms, for example, with infinitives ().

() ‘Muhammad asked what to do’

maχamad-a χu<d>ku-r ǯu šuw haʔa-s-i-**jden**

Muhammad-ERG <4>ask.PFV-CVB self.OBL what 1.do-INF-COP2-**IRR**

**(xur\*)**

**(QUOT\*)**

() ‘Muhammad hopes to return earlier’

maχamad-a ummud ha<w>ɨ-r=a-j k’ɨbka q-uru-s xur

muhammad-ERG hope <3>do.PFV-CVB=a-PST earlier RE-go-INF QUOT

* the predicates that tend to require the use of *xur*

*huxun* ‘say’ *šad jišin* ‘be happy’

*gič' giwin* ‘threat’ *raʔazi jiʔin* ‘agree’

*fikɨr wɨʔɨn* ‘think’ *hɨgɨn* ‘want, love’

*haˤjf hɨʔɨn* ‘regret’ *minnät wɨʔɨn* ‘ask, beg’

*mɨčebɨr haʔas*‘pretend’ *ummud waʔas* ‘hope’

*čalɨš wɨkɨs* ‘try’ *wɨkɨs* ‘can’

* the predicates that display variability: *xur* is possible in some contexts but not in the others (frequently depending on a form of predicate of inserted clause; for example, *xur* is forbidden with *-ijden* predicates)

*χudkun* ‘ask’

*un/ses wɨkɨs* ‘hear’

*jik'i ʁa* ‘remember’

* the predicates that forbid the use of *xur*

*hagun* ‘see’ *hac'ɨn* ‘know’

*küč'un* ‘start’ *ilamiš wɨkɨs* ‘believe’

*lazim wɨkɨs* ‘need’ *q'abɨl jiʔin* ‘like’

*jik'ʲa udxun* ‘forget’ *gič'in*  ‘fear’

# **Complementation strategies**

There are six ways to mark clausal complements in Kina Rutul: via infinitive, via participle, via action nominal, via converb and via finite verbal forms. Each predicate may accept or forbid some of the strategies. All the strategies are described below.

## *Finite strategy*

Finite marking is the most common surface representation of complementation in Kina Rutul. In this type, the main clause takes a finite sentential complement, with its own finite predicate.

In most cases, the dependent clause bears a complementizer *xur*, which is a reduced perfective converb *huxur* of the verb ‘say’. Nevertheless, any dependency marking may be absent in a sentence at all, for instance, native speakers see no difference between () and ():

() ‘Muhammad said that Musa did it’

maχamad-а huxu-r musa-ra ha-d

Muhammad-ERG 4.say.PFV-CVB Musa-ERG that-ATTR

hɨʔɨ-r=a

4.do.PFV-CVB=be

()

maχamad-a huxu-r musa-ra ha-d

Muhammad-ERG 4.say.PFV-CVB Musa-ERG that-ATTR

hɨʔɨ-r=a xur

4.do.PFV-CVB=be QUOT

Within this strategy, any form of a dependent clause is acceptable. Moreover, speech verbs usually seems to introduce direct quotation, so, such forms as imperative or optative are also possible in complement clause.

() ‘Muhammad ordered me to leave’ (< ‘Muhammad said to me “go back”’)

maχamad-a ruxa-r=a za-da **q-ɨrɨχ**

Muhammad-ERG 1.say.IPFV-CVB=be I.OBL-APUD.ESS RE-1.go.IMP

The subject of a dependent clause normally may be dropped if it may be restored from the context, or it may be expressed with a pronoun *uǯ*.

There are predicates for which the finite type of complementations is the only possibility:

*huxun* ‘say’ *gič'in* ‘fear’

*šad wɨkɨs* ‘be happy’ *haˤjf hɨʔɨn* ‘regret’

*hagun* ‘see’ *minnät waʔas* ‘ask, to beg’

*χudkun* ‘ask’ *mɨčebɨr haʔas* ‘pretend’

*ilamiš wɨkɨs* ‘believe’ *jik'i ʁa*  ‘remember’

Other predicates take finite type as one of the possibilities. Quite frequently, the finite strategy alternates with the attributive strategy depending on factivity of the contexts (see section 4).

## *Infinitive strategy*

In this strategy, a dependent clause is headed by an infinitive verb form. The Rutul infinitive is marked with a suffix *-s* attached to the infinitive stem. If the predicate of a dependent clause is in the infinitive, no overt subject is allowed, and the relation to the main clause is strictly same-subject.

() ‘Muhammad can swim well’

maχamadɨ-s hɨχa-na xed haʔa-s hac’a-r=a

Muhammad.OBL-DAT good-ADV water 1.do-INF 4.know.IPFV-CVB=be

With some predicates, the infinitive strategy is used as one of the alternatives alongside with finite and attributive strategies. The predicates that only allow the infinitive strategy are:

*wɨkɨs* ‘can’ (< ‘become’)

*küč'un* ‘start’

## *Future strategy*

In this strategy, the verb takes a finite form, the future tense in *-s-ɨ* (< infinitive + copula). Normally, it is combined with infinitive strategy (see section 4.2)

()

maχamad-a ummud ha<w>ɨ-r=a-j musa

Muhammad-ERG hope <3>do.PFV-CVB=a-PST Musa

q-uru-s-ɨ huxu-r

RE-1.go-INF-FUT 4.say.PFV-CVB

It is established that the choice of form is justified with the fact, that predicates accepting that strategy allow only future-oriented reference. For instance, with ‘hope’, it is impossible to shift the reference of the predicate in the complement clause to the past tense, as we can do in English. Such a stimulus cannot be translated properly, cf. (9) with the predicate *ummud waʔas* (in this case native speakers try to replace it with a predicate of thought):

(9\*) ‘Muhammad hoped that Musa has done work properly’

maχamad-a ummud ha<w>ɨ-r(=a-j) musa-ra

Muhammad-ERG hope <3>do.PFV-CVB(=a-PST) Musa-ERG

düz-dɨ gwalaχ ha<w>ɨ-r=a

right-ATTR work <3>do.PFV-CVB=be

There are only two predicates requiring the strategy:

*gič' giwin* ‘threat’

*ummud wɨʔɨn* ‘hope’

## *-jden strategy*

In case a dependent predication is an indirect question, its predicate is marked with a specific irrealis marker *-jden*, cf.:

() ‘I know how my mother makes khinkal’

za-s hac’a-r=a nin-e šuw-na χink’al

I.OBL-DAT 4.know.IPFV-CVB mother-ERG what-ADV khinkal

haʔa-r-i-jden

4.do.IPFV-COP2-IRR

## *Attributive strategy*

In this strategy, the dependent predicate occurs in an attributive form (with the maker *-d*), i.e. in the form of the perfective, imperfective or future participle.

() ‘Muhammad knows that Musa has gone to the forest’

maχamadɨ-s hac’a-r=a musa

Muhammad.OBL-DAT 4.know.IPFV-CVB=be Musa

dam-a haʁxɨ-d

forest-IN 1.go.PFV-ATTR

Sometimes the predicate is accompanied with an additional clitic *=i-d* (COP2-ATR), which is probably used as a focus particle, cf. (). The standard position for the attributivized predicate, as in any other complementation strategy, is the right periphery of the sentence. The farther is the predicate from the end of the clause, the more it affects the focus, and thus needs to be supported by an additional focus clitic. For example, native speakers do not see the difference between () and ():

() ‘Patimat forgot to make khinkal’

patimatɨ-s jik’-ja: u<d>xu-r χink’al

Patimat.OBL-DAT hear-IN.EL <4>forget-CVB khinkal

hɨʔɨ-d

4.do.PFV-ATTR

()

patimatɨ-s jik’-ʲaa u<d>xu-r χink’al

Patimat.OBL-DAT heart-IN.EL <4>forget-CVB khinkal

hɨʔɨ-d=i-d

4.do.PFV-ATTR=COP2-ATTR

Nevertheless, in view of unusual position of attributivized predicate, () is better, than () due to support of =i-d focus clitic.

(XX?) ‘Muhammad knew that Musa had gone [but hadn’t flown]’

maχamadɨ-s hac’a-r=a hɨxɨ-d

Muhammad.OBL-DAT 4.know.IPFV-CVB=be 1.go.PFV-ATTR

musa

Musa

()

maχamadɨ-s hac’a-r=a

Muhammad.OBL-DAT 4.know.IPFV-CVB=be

hɨxɨ-d=i-d musa

1.go.PFV-ATTR=COP2-ATR Musa

There are no predicates that use the participle strategy as the only way to encode complementation. Usually this is a peripheral way that is used in a restricted number of specific cases. The attributive strategy can be used in complementary distribution with the finite strategy in case a differentiation between factive and non-factive contexts is conveyed. For example, predicates *hac'ɨn* ‘know’, *un/ses hišin* ‘hear’ use *-r(a)* for non-factive clause complements that are usually equal to indirect question, but employ the attributive strategy in case a context is strictly factive. For example, the difference can be seen between sentences () and ().

() ‘Patimat knows that Musa has gone to the forest’

fatima-s hac’a-r=a musa dam-a

Fatima.OBL-DAT 4.know.IPFV-CVB=be Musa forest-IN

jiʔi-d (\*jiʔir=a/jiʔi-na).

1.go.PFV-ATTR

(16) ‘I know how mother makes khinkal’

za-s hac’a-r=a nin-e šuw-na χink’al

I.OBL-DAT 4.know.IPFV-CVB mother-ERG what-ADV khinkal

haʔa-r-i-jden

4.do.IPFV-COP2-IRR

## *Converb strategy*

In the strategy a dependent predicate is marked with suffix *-r(=а)*. As Kina Rutul converb has finite usage, finite and converb strategies match in context of complementation, though some features differ. For example, non-finite converbs do not have time reference in a way finite converb has. Also negation expression differs: finite predicates take a negative auxiliary(*-diš*, *-adiš*), while non-finite accept only prefixal (or much more rarely infixal) negation marker *ǯ-*. That may be illustrated by (17) and (18). Both clauses have a negative affix on their dependent predicates, but (17) is peculiar for finite strategy and (18) is for converb.

(17) ‘I saw that father didn’t come to the forest’

za-s ʁagu-r did dam-a hɨxɨ-r-dɨ*š*

I.OBL-DAT 4.see.PFV-CVB father forest-IN 1.go.PFV-CVB-NO

(18)‘I want you not to come there’

za-s hɨga-r=a haj-e ǯ-ɨxɨ-r

I.OBL-DAT 4.want.IPFV-CVB=be that-IN NEG-1.go.PFV-CVB

The strategy is available for predicate *hɨgɨn* ‘want, love’, and possibly also for *lazim wɨkɨs* ‘need’, *küč'un* ‘start’, but that is difficult to be established via negative marker test as native speakers prefer to place a negative marker on the main clause.

## *Nominalizational strategy*

That is a peripheral strategy that is attested only with a predicate *lazim (laʔazɨm) wɨkɨs* ‘need’. In this strategy, the dependent predicate takes a nominalizational marker *-n*. With *lazim wɨkɨs,* the nominalization is used in case the dependent predicate precedes the main clause (19). In the opposite case (20), the dependent predicate takes another non-finite form (*-r(=a)* converb or *-s* infinitive).

(19) ‘I don’t need to buy a chicken’

za-s k’ad li<w>šu-n lazim dɨ*š*

I.OBL-DAT chiken <3>buy.PFV-NMLZ need NO

(20) ‘I need to buy a chicken’

za-s lazim w-iši-r=a k’ad le<w>šu-s

I.OBL-DAT need 3-become.PFV-CVB=be chiken <3>buy.IPFV-INF

# **Parameters affecting the choice of strategy**

## *Factivity*

With some predicates (*hagun* ‘see’, *χudkun* ‘ask’, *un/ses wɨkɨs* ‘hear’, *hac'ɨn* ‘know’, *fikɨr wɨʔɨn* ‘think’, *q'abɨl jiʔin* ‘like’, *jik'ʲa udxun* ‘forget’, *hɨgɨn* ‘want, love’) factivity affects the choice of a kind of strategy. Normally, it is the choice between *-jden* strategy in case of infactivity (that is usually looks like indirect question [Dobrushina 2018]) and finite or attributive strategy in case of factivity.

() ‘I heard which house Rasul redecorated’

za-s un hi*š*i-r rasul-a šuw-dɨ hal

I.OBL-DAT voice 4.become.PFV-CVB Rasul-ERG what-ATTR house

haʔa-r-i-jden

4.do.IPFV-CVB-COP2-IRR

() ‘I heard that Musa had caught a snake’

za-s un hi*š*i-r Musa-ra χ<ow>ku-r=a-j

I.OBL-DAT voice 4.become.PFV-CVB Musa-ERG <3>catch.PFV-CVB=be-PST

ɣar

snake

## *Amount of subjects*

The choice between infinitive and future strategies depends on amount of subjects that a predication has: in case a subject is only one, infinitive strategy is chosen, future strategy is chosen otherwise.

As the infinitive cannot have its own overt subject, it cannot be used in a different-subject construction, and future strategy is used instead if a main clause predicate allows it. The choice of the form is justified from the semantic point of view as both the future tense and the infinitive refer to potential situations that may happen in future. For instance, the verb *ummud wɨʔɨn* ‘hope’ realizes the finite-infinite strategy in () and ():

() Same-subject

‘Muhammad hoped to leave earlier’

maχamad-a ummud ha<w>ɨ-r=a-j k’ɨbka

muhammad-ERG hope <3>do.PFV-CVB=a-PST earlier

q-uru-s xur

RE-1.go-INF QUOT

Different-subject:

()

maχamad-a ummud ha<w>ɨ-r=a-j musa

Muhammad-ERG hope <3>do.PFV-CVB=a-PST Musa

q-uru-s-ɨ huxu-r

RE-1.go-INF-FUT 4.say.PFV-CVB

# **Agreement in complementations**

Kina Rutul has a gender agreement system with four class opposed by biological gender (feminine and masculine), rationality and animacity. Almost all verbs have an agreement slot (prefixal or infixal).

As expected of an ergative language, the nominative usually is the most acceptable agreement target. The main predicate looks for the positionally closest available nominative argument in its domain to agree with, and normally finds it. However, in complex sentences gender agreement crossing the clause boundaries is also possible. This is attested in Kina Rutul as well, moreover, some cases of non-nominative agreement controller are found (see section 5.3 below).

## *Local main clause agreement*

This is the canonical type of gender agreement that takes place when the main predicate has a nominative subject in its argument structure. For example (21):

(21) ‘Patimat believes that he has done that’

patimat ilami*š* r-iʔi ha-nuw-a ha-d

Patimat trust 2-COP1 that-OBL.H-ERG that-ATTR

hɨʔɨ-r=a xur

4.do.PFV-CVB=be QUOT

Also, there are a variety of complex predicates that consist of a a lexical component and a light verb. Such predicates do not have a position for any other nominative argument. Among clause complement-taking verbs, the typical argument structure of complex verbs is <ERG, C>. Class marker remains unchanged with any combination of ERG- and C- arguments, and that gives a reason to suppose, that a light verb agrees with its inner nominative in appropriate gender (usually it is Class 3 or 4) in its minimal local domain. In (23) *fikɨr* as part of a complex verb ‘think’ (< ‘thought do’) is a Class 3 noun.

(23)‘Muhammad thought that Musa had led the cattle’

maχamad-a fikɨr w-ɨʔɨ-r=a-j musa-ra

Muhammad-ERG thought 3-do.PFV-CVB=be-PST Musa-ERG

dawar-ar q-i<d>q'ɨ-r=a xur

cattle-PL RE-<NPL>lead-CVB=be QUOT

## *Default agreement with the dependent clause*

There is a number of predicates that have a slot for a nominative P-argument in the structure. In case of clause complements, this position is taken by a dependent clause, so the main predicate agrees with the clause as a whole. In this case the complement controls agreement in Class 4 (22).

(22)‘Muhammad wants his son to read Quran’

maχamadɨ-s hɨga-r=a ǯu-du

Muhammad.OBL-DAT 4.want.IPFV-CVB=be 1.self.OBL-ATTR

duχa-ra ɢuran q'ɨle ha<w>ɨ-r

son.OBL-ERG Quran reading <3>do.PFV-CVB

This agreement pattern is observed with the following predicates:

*huxun* ‘say’ *hagun* ‘see’

*χudkun* ‘ask’ *hac'ɨn* ‘know’

*jik'ʲa: udxun* ‘forget’ *jik'i ʁa* ‘remember’

*gič'in* ‘fear’ *hɨgɨn* ‘want, love’

*wɨkɨs* ‘can’

## *Non-canonical agreement in Kina Rutul*

There are two cases that are somewhat unexpected, as the agreement is neither with the nominative of the main clause nor with the complement clause as a whole. These cases were not inspected properly and need further investigation.

### Agreement of a predicate *lazim jiʔi* ‘need’

This predicate shows the effect of Long-Distance Agreement (following the terminology of [Postdam & Polinsky 2002] for Tsez). Its standard argument structure requires a nominative argument. Similarly to Tsez, in case of clausal complementation it seems to agree with a nominative noun phrase inside the dependent clause. In (24), *k’ad* is a Class 3 noun, and not only the verb in a complement clause, but also the main predicate *hišin* agrees in Class 3.

(24) za-s lazim w-iši-r=a k’ad le<w>šu-s

I.OBL-DAT need 3-become.PFV-CVB=be chiken <3>buy.IPFV-INF

‘I need to buy a chicken.’

Approaches to LDA theory suggest the nominative argument appears in the main clause in the underlying representation of the phrase, and then undergoes a syntactic movement to the position that can be seen in the surface representation. Thus, the main clause predicate agrees with an subsurface underlying of the nominative argument.

### Agreement of a predicate *ʁagun* ‘see’

This predicate demonstrates mixed agreement. In some cases, it agrees according to the LDA schema, as in (25).

(25) maχamadɨ-s ʁ<ow>gu-r-dɨ*š* šuw-na zer w-eza-r-ij-den.

Muhammad.OBL-DAT <3>see.PFV-NO what-ADV cow 3-milk.IPFV-CVB-COP2-IRR

*‘Muhammad didn’t see how cow was milked’.*

The most unusual thing about this verb is its ability to agree with the non-nominative argument of the dependent clause (for example, with the ergative one) in spite of the presence of nominative argument in the same dependent clause.

(26)za-s ʁo<w>gu-r=a-j šuw-na zer-ra uq’ ile-r-ij-den.

I.OBL-DAT <3>see.PFV-CVB=be-PST what-ADV cow-ERG grass 4.eat.IPFV-CVB-COP2-IRR

‘I saw how a cow was eating grass.’

In (26) *zerra* belongs to Class 3 and *uq’* belongs to Class 4. Apparently, *ʁowguraj* agrees with *zerra*, although it is not the nominative argument but the ergative subject. There is a discussion on the similar agreement type based on Dargwa [Belyaev 2016, Сумбатова 2014], but there is no commonly accepted syntactic solution. There is some evidence for the existence of “topical agreement”, but in [Belyaev 2017] the idea is criticized based on a statistic research of a corpus of Dargwa texts. Belyaev establishes no relation between the information structure of a sentence and gender agreement of its predicates. The issue of availability of the nominative agreement remains unsolved. Our current knowledge does not allow us to check the “topic agreement” theory against the data from Kina Rutul, as the examples are too scarce.

# **Overview**

The table below summarizes the properties of the inspected predicates. All the signs should be understood as a point in the continuum of features. For example, sign ‘0’ may signal either the impossibility of using the feature with a given predicate or the reluctance of native speakers to do so.

The first column introduces a predicate, the second column shows its standard arguments structure <subject, (in)direct object>. The third column shows the allowed agreement strategies (with the subject of the main clause, with the dependent clause as an argument, with the inner noun phrase of a main predicate, long-distant agreement), the fourth column indicates the possible complement encodings (finite strategy, infinitive strategy, finite-infinitive strategy, participle strategy, converb strategy, nominalizational strategy, respectively). The last column indicates compatibility of complementizer *xu*r with the predicate.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **sign** | **definition** |
| + | the feature is peculiar for the predicate (may be in an appropriate case) |
| — | using of the feature is ungrammatical for the predicate |
| 0 | the feature is not main/peripheral for the predicate, sometimes anomalous but still may be used |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| main predicate | arg structure | allowed agreement | | | | allowed syntax representation | | | | | | xur |
|  |  | subj | dep clause | inner N | LDA | fin | inf | fin-inf | part | conv | nmlz |  |
| *huxun*  ‘say’ | <ERG;  ABS; APUD> | — | + | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | + |
| *šad wɨkɨs*  ‘be happy’ | <ABS;  SUP.ESS /  IN.ESS> | + | — | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | + |
| *hagun*  ‘see’ | <DAT;  ABS> | — | + | — | + | + | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| *χudkun*  ‘ask’ | <ERG;  ABS;  APUD> | — | + | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | 0 |
| *un/ses wɨkɨs*  ‘hear’ | <DAT;  ATR???> | — | — | + | — | + | — | — | + | — | — | 0 |
| *hac'ɨn*  ‘know’ | <DAT;  ABS> | — | + | — | — | + | + | — | + | — | — | — |
| *küč'un*  ‘start’ | <ERG;  INTER.ESS> | ? | ? | ? | ? | — | + | — | — | 0 | — | — |
| *ilamiš wɨkɨs*  ‘believe’ | <АBS;  SUPER.ESS> | + | — | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | 0 |
| *lazim wɨkɨs*  ‘need’ | <DAT;  C> | — | — | — | + | — | + | — | — | 0 | + | — |
| *gič' giwin*  ‘threat’ | <ERG;  DAT; ABS> | — | — | + | — | — | — | + | — | — | — | + |
| *raʔazi jiʔin*  ‘agree’ | <ABS;  C> | + | — | — | — | + | — | — | 0 | — | — | + |
| *fikɨr wɨʔɨn*  ‘think’ | <EGR;  SUPER.EL/ ATR> | — | — | + | — | + | — | — | 0 | — | — | + |
| *q'abɨl jiʔin*  ‘like’ | <DAT;  ABS> | — | — | + | — | + | — | — | 0 | — | — | — |
| *jik'ʲa udxun*  ‘forget’ | <DAT;  ABS> | — | + | — | — | + | + | — | + | — | — | — |
| *jik'i ʁa*  ‘remember’ | <DAT;  ABS> | — | + | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | 0 |
| *gič'in*  ‘fear’ | <DAT;  SUPER.EL???> | — | + | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | — |
| *hɨgɨn*  ‘want, to love’ | <DAT,  ABS> | — | + | — | — | — | + | — | + | + | — | + |
| *haˤjf hɨʔɨn*  ‘regret’ | <ERG;  C> | — | — | + | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | + |
| *minnät waʔas*  ‘ask, beg’ | <ERG;  C> | — | — | + | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | + |
| *mɨčebɨr haʔas*  ‘pretend’ | <ERG;  C> | — | — | + | — | + | — | — | — | — | — | + |
| *ummud waʔas*  ‘hope’ | <ERG;  C> | — | — | + | — | — | — | + | — | — | — | + |
| *čalɨš wɨkɨs*  ‘try’ | <ABS;  C> | + | — | — | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | + |
| *wɨkɨs*  ‘can’ | <APUD;  C> | — | + | — | — | — | + | — | — | — | — | — |
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1. *C* stands for “clause” [↑](#footnote-ref-0)