Long-distance agreement in Qunqi and Xuduc Dargwa: raising or clause union

N. Serdobolskaya serdobolskaya@gmail.com

1. Introduction

The term long-distance agreement (LDA) is used to refer to subordinate constructions where an argument of the dependent clause controls the agreement of the main verb:

QUNQI[1]

(1a) dammij   <u>aw-ne</u>   **d**=ik:-a-l-da   <u>as:-ij</u>.
I.DAT   dress-PL   **NPL**=want.IPF-POT-ATR-1   buy-SUBJ.1/3
I want to buy dresses.

Cf.:

(1b) dammij   <u>aw-ne</u>   **b**=ik:-a-l-da   <u>as:-ij</u>.
I.DAT   dress-PL   **N**=want.IPF-POT-ATR-1   buy-SUBJ.1/3
I want to buy dresses.

LDA is attested in many Nakh-Daghestanian languages (see Кибрик 2003; e.g. Tsez (Polinsky 2000); Godoberi (Haspelmath 1999); Tsakhur e.a.), languages of North America – e.g. Algonquin: Blackfoot (Frantz 1978); Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2001); Indo-Aryan: Hindi (Butt 1993), Chukchee-Kamchatkan: Itelmen (Bobaljik, Wurmbrandt 2005) e.a. To account for the LDA, various proposals have been made: restructuring in Bobaljik, Wurmbrandt 2005 and clause union in Haspelmath 1999, «copying from complements» in Frantz 1978, raising-to-object in Bruening 2001, raising to Spec of TopP in Polinsky 2000. Consequently, (as argued by Polinsky 2002) LDA seems not to constitute a homogeneous phenomenon, but a number of constructions that manifest the same superficial properties. This paper is aimed at revealing the syntactic structure of LDA in Qunqi and Xuduc Dargwa.

As in many Nakh-Daghestanian languages (Kibrik 2003), LDA constructions in Dargwa languages arise with phasal and modal verbs ("begin", "become/be.able", "know/can", "must", "want") and with verbs "to like" and "to order". Thus, the majority of these predicates are inclined towards grammaticalization and clause union, cf. Noonan 1985; Dixon 1995 (or restructuring in terms of Rizzi 1978). This leads to the hypothesis that LDA in Dargwa is due to **clause union**. On the other hand, the ability to control the agreement of the matrix verb is a property of an element of the matrix clause. This leads to the hypothesis that LDA in Dargwa is due to **raising**.

2. Morphosyntactic properties of the LDA constructions

Table 1. Agreement prefixes in Qunqi and Xuduc Dargwa:

	M	F	N
SG	*w=*	*r=*	*b=*
PL	*b=*	*b=*	*d=*

QUNQI

(2) rirs:i-li-j   **d**=ik:-il   ca=**d**-i   <u>aw-ne</u>   <u>d=arχ-aj</u>.
girl-OBL-DAT   N=want.IPF-ATR   COP=N-COP   shirt-PL   NPL=sew-SUBJ
The girl likes sewing shirts. <DAT S>

(3) t:at:i-li   rirs:i-c:e   <u>bagur-me</u>   <u>d=irc-uj</u>   q:arče   **d**=arq'-ib.
father-ERG   girl-INTER   bowl-PL   NPL=wash-SUBJ.3/3   order   NPL=do:PF-PRET
The father ordered the daughter to wash the bowls. <ERG INTER S>

There is no difference in the choice of the agreement pattern in subjunctival/converbial clauses.

Table 1. Matrix verbs that allow LDA (matrix verbs are given in 3[d] person singular, preterite, perfective stem; the predicates "want", "must" do not have a perfective stem; the bold font marks the agreement prefix).

Matrix verb (Qunqi/Xuduc)	Translation	Case of the experiencer	Agreement with the experiencer	Dependent verb encoding
baʔ biš:ib / **ba**ʔ **bi**š:ib	'start'	ABS	class, person	subjunctive, simple converb
ba**χ**ur / =	'know'	DAT	person	subjunctive
biχub / =	'be.able'	ABS	class, person	subjunctive, simple converb
ʔaˤʁunne ca**bi** / ʔaˤʁnil ca**b**	'must'	(DAT)	no agreement	subjunctive (simple converb)
bik:- / =	'want'	DAT	person	subjunctive, simple converb
b=ič:i barq'ib / -	'like'	DAT	person	subjunctive, simple converb
ʔaχ.ka=**b**-c:ur / ʔaχ.ka=**b**-ic:ur	'like'	DAT	person	masdar, simple converb
q:ar-**b**=arq'ib / =	'order'	ERG	person	subjunctive

NB: The verbs with the experiencer in absolutive also allow LDA – which is not typical for Nakh-Daghestanian (according to the data in Kibrik 2003). LDA is easily explained with verbs, by which the absolutive argument is the sentential one, the experiencer appearing in dative. By such verbs, LDA can be accounted basing on the assumption that a clause is not a prototypical agreement controller (cf. Bobaljik, Wurmbrand 2005 for similar argumentation for Itelmen LDA). An absolutive NP in the dependent clause is a "better" agreement controller than a clause. In the case when the absolutive slot is filled by a nominal argument such a reasoning is not possible. Hence, the ban on LDA by the Dargwa verbs "to start" and "to be able" can be expected. In fact, native speakers often do not allow LDA constructions with these verbs:

(4)   it   irχ°-il   ca=w-i   rirs:i   r=it:-uj.   (*ca=r-i)
          DEM be.able:IPF-ATR   COP=M-COP girl   F=beat.PF-SUBJ.3/3   COP=F-COP
          He can beat a girl.

          *{Comment: ca=**r**-i is possible if the experiencer refers to a woman "The girl can beat a girl."*
}

In larger context, however, such examples are given by native speakers:

(5)   qili=d   du   erela   d=arq'-ij   **d**=irχ°-an-da,   eš:a-la   dammij
          house-NPL I   dinner NPL=do.PF-SUBJ.1 **NPL**=be.able:IPF-POT-1 you-GEN I.DAT
          b=uχ°-l-ač:u-da   čina=b   ce   b=u-ji-l.
          N=know.IPF-ATR-NEG-1 where=N what N=be-Q-ATR
          At home, I can cook dinner; in your house I don't know where everything is.

(6)   il-e-li   bagur-me   na ˤs-le   d=irc-ib-q:alle,
          DEM-OBL-ERG bowl-NPL   dirty-ADV   NPL=wash:PF-PRET-BECAUSE
          d=aʔ-**d**=iš:-ib   č°i-gnaˤq'-li-j   ic-le.
          NPL=start-NPL=LV:PF-PRET two-MULT-OBL-DAT wash:IPF-CONV
          She washed the bowls carelessly at first, so she started to wash for the second time.

Long-distance agreement in Qunqi and Xuduc Dargwa: raising or clause union
N. Serdobolskaya (serdobolskaya@gmail.com)
It can be speculated that by these matrix verbs a concurrence of the two absolutive NPs is observed: the absolutive in the matrix clause and the absolutive in the dependent clause. Most often, the absolutive in the matrix "wins", and local agreement is chosen. However, some semantico-pragmatic contexts favour the choice of the LDA constructions (see 2.3 for the details).
Person LDA (unacceptable in Qunqi Dargwa):
XUDUC

(7) hi-j   ʔaˤʁnil-**da**-j   <u>du   či-r = až-ij</u>?
     who-DAT   must-1-Q   I   SUPER-F=see.PF-SUBJ.1
     Who wants to see me?

3. Syntactic properties of the absolutive NP in LDA constructions

3.1. Mono-/ biclausality of the LDA constructions

Clause union arises due to the grammaticalization of the matrix verb, whereby the arguments of both verbs are marked as if belonging to one and the same clause, and the construction becomes monoclausal (cf. Noonan 1985). Clause union is most often attested with phasal and modal verbs, as LDA in Dargwa.
Clause union (restructuring: Rizzi 1978; verb raising: Aissen 1974; clause union: Aissen, Perlmutter 1983)

(8) Gianni   <u>la</u>   dev-e   <u>present-are</u>   a   Francesco.
     Gianni   F.SG.ACC   must.PRS-3SG   present-INF   to   Francesco
     Gianni must present her to Francesco. (Rizzi 1978: 119)

The Dargwa LDA constructions show the following biclausal properties:
- agreement pattern of adverbials that belong to the dependent / matrix clause;
- negation in the dependent / matrix clause;
- possibility of two adverbials of the same type in both clauses;
- acceptability of two NPs with the same case marker
- complex reflexives binding;

Agreement pattern of adverbials that belong to the dependent / matrix clause
Adverbials can semantically modify either the matrix, or the dependent situation:
QUNQI

(9) galli urq'le kraskili dač:ib.
     he = **d**-a   **d** = aʔ-**d** = iš:-ib   <u>urq'-le   č'ˌi-gnaˤq'-li-j   **d** = ik:-le</u>.
     then=NPL-ST   NPL=start-NPL=LV.PF-PRET   board-PL   two-MULT-OBL-DAT NPL=paint.PF-CONV
     The boy started painting the boards for the second time.
     The boy painted the boards. Then he began painting for the second time (since the paint is to be put twice) – the second painting

(10) gali urq'le bik:nar telepunnyj zank: daq:ib. ileli otvečat barq'ib,
     he = **d**-a   č'ˌi-gnaˤq'-li-j   **d** = a-**d** = iš:-ib   <u>urq'-le   **d** = ik:-le</u>.
     then=NPL-st   two-OBL-DAT   NPL=start-NPL=LV.PF-PRET   board-PL NPL=paint.IPF-CONV
The boy was painting the board when someone called on the phone. He answered the phone, then began painting for the second time. – the second beginning

Negation in the dependent / matrix clause
Negation on matrix/dependent verb is interpreted differently:
XUDUC

(11) aba-j   <u>nerʁˌ   **d** = arq'-ij</u>   **d** = ik:-ul-ak:ˌi.
     mother-DAT   soup   NPL=do:PF-SUBJ.3/3   NPL=want:IPF-ATR-PST
     Mother didn't want to make soup. (because she was tired, and didn't want to do anything).

3

(12) dam   <u>nerʁ̥   ʕa-d=arq'-ij</u>   **d**=ik:-ul-da.
    I.DAT   soup   NEG-NPL=do.PF-SUBJ.3/3   NPL=want:IPF-ATR-1

lit. I want [not to make soup]. (I've made it yesterday and the day before yesterday, I'm sick of it).

Possibility of two adverbials of the same type in both clauses

The LDA construction can host two adverbials of the same type; one of them semantically modifies the matrix clause, and another one the dependent clause:

QUNQI

(13) t:at:i-li   s:a   q:ar-če-**d**=arq'-ib   gal-li-c:e   <u>ijale</u>
    father-ERG   yesterday   order-PV-NPL=do:PF-PRET   son-OBL-INTER   today

    <u>patinka-be   as:-uj</u>.
    shoe-PL   buy:PF-SUBJ.3/3

    The father ordered yesterday his son to be shoes today.

Acceptability of two NPs with the same case marker:

In a monoclausal construction, two NPs with the same case marking would not be expected; however, cf.:

QUNQI

(14) t:at:i-**li-j**   <u>cin-na   cin-**i-j**</u>   <u>patinka-be as:-uj</u>   ʔaʕʁun ca=**d**-i.
    father-OBL-DAT   RFL-GEN   RFL-OBL-DAT shoe-PL   buy:PF-SUBJ.3/3 must   COP=NPL-
COP

    The father must buy shoes for himself.

Complex reflexives binding:

QUNQI

(15) t:at:i-li   q:ar-če-**d**=arq'-ib   gal-li-c:e
    father-ERG   order-PV-NPL=do.PF-PRET   boy-OBL-SUPER

    <u>cin-na   cin-i-j</u>   patinka-be   as:-uj.
    RFL-GEN   RFL-OBL-DAT   shoe-PL   buy:PF-SUBJ.3/3

    The father ordered his son to buy himself (to the son) shoes.

XUDUC

(16) ʁasul-li-j   ʔaʕʁnil ca=**w**   <u>ca=**w**</u>   ʔaχ-li   <u>w=arq:-ar-aj</u>.
    Rasul-OBL-DAT   must   COP=M   RFL=M   good-ADV M=bring.up.PF-TH-SUBJ.3/3

    Rasul needs to be brought up well.

    Comment: *cinna caw is possible in case if he will bring himself up.

These properties give evidence in favour of the biclausality of LDA constructions in Qunqi and Xuduc.

3.2. Criteria in favour of analyzing the absolutive NP as part of the dependent clause
The absolutive NP that controls LDA, hence shows the properties of an element of the matrix clause. This suggests that LDA could arise due to raising in terms of Postal 1974:

(17) I believe **<u>him</u>** to be a linguist (cf. I believe that he is a linguist).

Linear order

If the absolutive NP (from the dependent clause) is put before the matrix verb non-adjacently to the dependent verb, local agreement is rare or even unacceptable for some native speakers (18b):

QUNQI

(18) a. du <u>redil-ra unc:-urbe če-d=ač'-i</u>   ʔaʕʁun-ne   ca=**b**=i / ca=**d**=i.
    I all-&   door-PL   PV-NPL=close:PF-SUBJ.1   must-ADV   COP=N-COP COP=NPL-COP

6. du   unc:-urbe   ʔaˤʁun-ne   ca=**d**=i   <u>če-**d**=ač'-i</u>   (*ca=**b**=i)
   I   door-PL   must-ADV   COP=NPL-COP   PV-NPL=close:PF-SUBJ.1   COP=NPL-COP
I must close all the doors.

However, LDA is possible even if the absolutive NP is adjacent to the dependent verb (18a).

Quantifiers' scope

Quantifiers modifying the absolutive NP have wide scope by LDA, narrow scope by local agr.:

(19)   dammij   <u>redil-ra   bagur-me   **d**=irc-i</u>   **d**=ik:-l-ač:u-da.
    I.DAT   all-&   bowl-PL   NPL=wash-SUBJ.1/3   **NPL**=want-ATR-NEG.PRS.1-1
    I don't want to wash the bowls at all. (*I want to leave a part of the bowls)

    $\forall(x) [\neg \text{wash}(x)]$

(20)   dammij   <u>redil-ra   bagur-me   **d**=irc-i</u>   **b**=ik:-l-ač:u-da.
    I.DAT   all-&   bowl-PL   NPL=wash-SUBJ.1/3   **N**=want-ATR-NEG.PRS.1-1
    I want to wash not all the bowls (I want to leave a part of the bowls).

    $\neg\forall(x) [\text{wash}(x)]$

Dependent clause ellipsis (Right Node Raising)

Ellipsis of a group of words is used in some works (Postal 1974 and others) as a constituency test:
QUNQI

(21)   a.   ajba-li-j   <u>murad   w=aχ:-w=ax:-uj</u>   ʔaˤʁun   ca=**b**-i,
       mother-OBL-DAT   Murad   M=bathe-M-LV:PF-SUBJ.3/3   must   COP=**N**-COP
       a   azaj-li-j   ʔaˤʁun-ak:u.
       and   sister-OBL-DAT   must-NEG.PRS.3

    b.   ?? ajba-li-j   <u>murad   w=aχ:-w=ax:-uj</u>   ʔaˤʁun   ca=**w**-i,
       mother-OBL-DAT   Murad   M=bathe-M-LV:PF-SUBJ.3/3   must   COP=**M**-COP
       a   azaj-li-j   ʔaˤʁun-ak:u.
       and   sister-OBL-DAT   must-NEG.PRS.3

    c.   ajba-li-j   <u>murad   w=aχ:-w=ax:-uj</u>   ʔaˤʁun   ca=**w**-i,
       mother-OBL-DAT   Murad   M=bathe-M-LV:PF-SUBJ.3/3   must   COP=**M**-COP
       a   azaj-li-j   w=aχ:-w=ax:-uj   ʔaˤʁun-ak:u.
       and   sister-OBL-DAT   M=bathe-M-LV:PF-SUBJ.3/3   must-NEG.PRS.3
       The mother has to, and the sister doesn't have to [wash Murad].

By LDA ellipsis of the dependent clause with the absolutive NP is not acceptable.

Idioms' test
As these tests suggest for the raising analysis, it can be hypothesized that the NP in question is an argument of the matrix verb, i.e. that the discussed construction is an obligatory control one. In that case, it does not show LDA, but local agreement with the argument of the matrix verb.
The traditional idioms' test:

(22)   I believe <u>the cat to be out of the bag.</u>

(23)   I persuaded the cat <u>to be out of the bag</u>.

In (24) LDA is controlled by the NP *č'uli* «forks» (part of the idiom "to vote" or "to throw lots", lit. "to kill a fork").
XUDUC

(24)   <u>leb-t-a-j   č'ul-i   kaχ̣-ij</u>   ʔaˤʁn-il   ca=d.
    all-PL-OBL-DAT   fork-PL   DOWN+kill.PF-SUBJ   must-ATR   COP=NPL
    Everybody must vote (lit. kill forks).

Not a TopP

For Tsez a raising to TopP analysis has been suggested (Potsdam, Polinsky 1999; Polinsky 2000). One of the arguments is that the absolutive NP that triggers LDA is a topic (Polinsky 2000). In Qunqi and Xuduc Dargwa, the LDA is chosen if the absolutive NP is the topic:

QUNQI

(25) jašti   mac:a   d = elχ̥-an-aj   ʔaˤʁun   ca = d-i   meq:-li-j.
     DEM.PL sheep   NPL=kill:PF-TH-SUBJ.INTR.3   must   COP=NPL-COP wedding-OBL-DAT
     These sheep are to be killed for the wedding.

(26) ʔaˤʁun   ca = d-i   t:ur-d = arq'-ar-aj   ʔirʔ-le,   il-t:i
     must   COP=NPL-COP OUT-NPL=do:PF-TH-SUBJ.INTR.3   hen.OBL-PL   DEM-PL
     qili   d = urč:e   d = iq'̥-a-d = iq'̥-an-aj.
     house.ILL   NPL=inside   NPL=go-NEG-NPL=go-TH-SUBJ.INTR.3
     The hens should be driven out of the yard, else they will go into the house.

However, contrary to Tsez, the absolutive NP can also trigger LDA if it constitutes the question focus (27), contrast focus (28), or if it is modified by focus particles (29).

XUDUC

(27) ci-ʁuna   xureg   d = arq'-ij   b = /d = uχ̥-i-t:-ij   ʕat:ij?
     what-like   food   NPL=do:PF-SUBJ.1   N=/NPL=know.IPF-PRS-2-Q   you.DAT
     What kind of food can you cook?

QUNQI

(28) ajba-li-j   ʔaˤʁun   ca = w-i   w = aχ:-w = ax:-uj   murad, rasul   ač:̥i-nu.
     mother-OBL-DAT must   COP=M-COP M=bathe-M=LV:PF-SUBJ.3/3 Murad   Rasul   NEG-
PTCL
     Mother has to bathe not Murad, but Rasul.

(29) dammij   bagur-me   gina   d = irc-i   d = ik:-a-l-da.
     I.DAT   bowl-PL   only   NPL=wash:PF-SUBJ.1   NPL=want.IPF-PRS-ATR-1
     I only want to wash bowls {not pans}.

Hence, if the absolutive NP is focused, it can also trigger LDA.
The generalization is as follows: LDA is chosen if the absolutive NP itself is either the topic or the focus. If it belongs to the topic or focus together with the verb (lit. *Wash dishes she can / It is washing dishes that she is able to do*), local agreement is chosen. Hence, the relative information properties of the verb and the absolutive NP are relevant.

4. Sufjunctival and converbial clauses with local agreement

Section 3 suggest for the raising analysis of the LDA constructions in Qunqi and Xuduc Dargwa. Noteworthy, raising in Dargwa is only possible with clause union verbs. Also, LDA is only possible with the subjunctive and the simple converb [2], both of them heading clauses with "lowered biclausality":
The subjunctive and the converb allow different structures impossible for other types of subordinate clauses:
1) Linear order: an element of the matrix clause can appear in the middle of the dependent clause:

XUDUC

(30) rasul-li-j   w = it:-ar-aj   b = ik:-u-l   ca = b   murad
     Rasul-ERG   M=beat.PF-TH-SUBJ.3/3   N=want.IPF-PRS   COP=M   Murad

---

[2] The simple converb is also used by non-clause union matrix verbs, however, no LDA is possible with these verbs.

asaj   ʁ̥aˁ-b = arqʼ-na-j.
Asja-DAT   evil-N=do.PF-MSD.OBL-DAT
Rasul wants to beat Murad to spite Asja.

This is impossible in other complement clause types (in masdar, complementizer clauses etc.).
2) Relativization of an element of the dependent clause is possible in subjunctive/converb clauses:

(31)   ajba-li   w = ax-w = aˁχ̥:-uj   irχ̥-an
      mother-ERG   <bathe>M=ST–M=LV.PF-SUBJ   [M]be.able-POT

      gali   murad   ca = w-i.
      boy   Murad   COP=M-COP
      The boy whom mother wants to bathe is Murad.

It is impossible with masdar/complementizer clauses:

(32)   dammij   s:a   weh.g-un-da   insan   du   qazet-li-c:e = w
      I.DAT   yesterday   see.PF-PRET-1   man   I   newspaper-OBL-SUPER=M

      b = elčʼ-un-ce   hej-a-r-ka   iχ   qačaʁ   iχ-ni.
      N=read.PF-PRET-ATR   DEM.OBL-SUPER-EL-DOWN   DEM   robber   become.PF=MSD
      Yesterday I've seen a man about whom I read in the newspapers that he is a robber.

This suggests that even local agreement constructions with the subjunctive/simple converb do not show biclausal properties to a full extent.
There are constructions with phasal and modal verbs that show monoclausal properties to a full extent (according to all the tests in section 3). These are the constructions where the matrix verbs do not have a nominal argument, i.e. they are used as one-place predicates:
XUDUC

(33)   (*dam)   muzur-bi   či-d = ig-u-l   d = aʔ-d = iš:-ib.
      I.DAT   mountain-PL   PV-NPL=see.PF-PRS-CONV   NPL=start-NPL=LV.PF-PRET
      The mountains started to be visible.

      Comment: be visible at all, not to any particular person

It is not possible to express the experiencer in (33), contrary to (34) with the two-place usage of the verb "start":

(34)   dam   muzur-bi   či-d = iž-ij   w = aʔ-iš:-ib-da.
      I.DAT   mountain-PL   PV-NPL=see.IPF-PRS-CONV   M=start-LV.PF-PRET-1
      I began to see the mountains.

By one-place verb "start" two adverbials of the same semantic type are not allowed (cf. (13)):

(35)   *   ajba-li   ijale   nerʁ̥   d = arqʼ-uj
        mother-ERG   today   soup   NPL=do:PF-CONJ.3/3

        s:a   d = ik:-il-de.
        yesterday   N=want:IPF-ATR-PST
        Mother wanted to cook the soup yesterday, {and now she's changed her mind }.

These constructions do not pass the idioms' test, cf. (37) and (24):
XUDUC

(36)   ˁela   nuˁq-bi   če-r-ka-d = ik!
      you.GEN   arm-PL   PV-EL-DOWN-NPL=fall.PF
      Curse you! (lit. let your arms fall down from your shoulders)

(37)   ˁela   nuˁq-bi   če-r-ka-d = ik-ar-aj   d = aʔ-d = iš:-ib.
      you.GEN   arm-PL   PV-EL-DOWN-NPL=fall.PF-TH-SUBJ.3   NPL=start-NPL=LV.PF-PRET
      ˀ*Your arms started to fall down from your shoulders. Comment: only literal meaning*

Thus, monoclausal constructions with the same verbs are attested; the LDA constructions in question are clearly different from them. However, the fact that there is a weakening of the clause boundary with phasal and modals verbs can not be ignored. An intermediary type of construction (between biclausal and monoclausal) is then to be postulated to account for these data.

Cf. for the analysis of clause union in German: it has been argued that constructions with *lassen* are a result of clause union, while "verb of perception constructions are not as simplex as are *lassen* constructions" (Harbert 1977: 127); cf. also Rizzi 1978 analysis of the constructions with Italian causative verbs (*fare, lasciare*).

Types of restructuring by causative verbs:
- Verb raising.   V[+aux]+V   Aissen 1974

TSAKHUR

(38) a. jed-ẽ   jiq'   hã?-as   Gati̅ = w = xan-as.
        mother-ERG   broth.3   3.do-POT   finish-POT
     Mother finished to make the broth.

      b. *jed-ẽ   jiq'   hã?-as   Gati̅ = p = xɫn.
        mother-ERG   broth.3   3.do-POT   finish.PF
     Mother finished to make the broth. (Kibrik 1999)

- VP complement.   V' [V   VP[   ]VP]V'   Rosen 1992

SPANISH: RESTRUCTURING (ROSEN 1992)

(39) a. María   le   hizo   arreglar   el   coche.
        Maria   SG.DAT   made   repair   ART.M.SG   car
     Maria made him repair the car. (Rosen 1992: 80)

      b. María   lo   hizo   arreglar   a   Juan.
        Maria   M.SG.ACC   made   repair   PREP Juan
     Maria made Juan repair it. (ibid.: 84)

These two types are opposed to the third type of constructions that, according Rizzi 1978; Moore forthc., do not belong to restructuring type.

- S/TP complement: VP[V   S/TP[   ]S/TP]VP   Bordelois 1988

SPANISH: S/TP COMPLEMENT (BORDELOIS 1988)

(40) a. Luis   insistió   en   [comer-las].
        Luis   insisted   PREP   eat-F.PL
      б. * Luis   las   insistió   en   [comer].
        Luis   F.PL insisted   PREP   eat
     Luis insisted on eating them. (Aissen and Perlmutter 1983, 363)

Conclusions

Therefore, the syntactic tests show that the constructions in question demonstrate the properties of raising, and not those of control or clause union. However, it should be noticed that LDA in Qunqi and Xuduc is only possible with verbs that are inclined towards hosting clause union. LDA is only acceptable if the dependent clause is formed with the subjunctive and the simple converb. I then show that the subjunctive and the simple converb form clauses with a lowered degree of biclausality, even with local agreement. First, in subjunctive and converb complements the dependent clause elements can be scrambled to the main clause (5). This is not allowed in other complement clauses, those headed by the masdar or introduced by the complementizer. Next, by subjunctives and converbs the NP in the dependent clause can be relativized (6), which is totally unacceptable by masdar complements and complements introduced by the compementizer. However, the tests as outlined in section 1 above argue for the biclausality of the subjunctival and

converbial complements: the Spanish and Italian causative constructions do not allow negation in the dependent clause (Rosen 1992), while in Dargwa, however, this is possible with LDA; reflexives' binding is possible in Italian across the subjunctival clause boundary, which is impossible for Dargwa.

In other words, the local agreement constructions with the subjunctive and the converb do not show all the biclausal properties; however, they are clearly not clause union structures. Thus, it can not be ignored that the LDA constructions do show properties of raising, but it is raising across a weaker clause boundary than the one in masdar and complementizer clauses.

I suggest to analyze these facts as an evidence against the binary opposition of mono vs. biclausal structures. An intermediate type of constructions is needed to explain the discrepancy shown above, i.e. the constructions with "weakened" clause boundary. (This parallels the properties of German Accusative cum Subjunctive constructions as analyzed in Harbert 1977: it is shown that they are not Clause Union structures, however clearly demonstrating some properties of Clause Union.) The LDA constructions in Qunqi and Xuduc Dargwa are then to be accounted for as a type of constructions with weakened clause boundary.

References

Aissen J. L. Verb Raising // *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 5, № 3, 1974, 325-366.
Aissen J. L., Perlmutter D. M. 1983. Clause Reduction in Spanish. In D. M. Perlmutter (ed.) *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 360-403.
Bhatt R. 2003. The Phenomenon of Long-Distance Agreement // *Topics in the Syntax of Modern Indo-Aryan Languages*, web.mit.edu/rbhatt/www/24.956/syll.pdf.
Bobaljik J. D., Wurmbrand S. 2005. The domain of agreement // *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 23*, 809-865.
Bordelois I. 1988. Causatives: From Lexicon to Syntax. In *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 6*, 57-94.
Bruening B. 2001. *Syntax at the Edge: Cross-Clausal Phenomena and the Syntax of Passamaquoddy*. Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, Ph.D. Diss., MIT.
Corbett G.G. 2006. *Agreement* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Dixon R. M. W. Complement Clauses and Complementation Strategies // F. R. Palmer (ed.). *Grammar and Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995, 175–221.
Harbert W. 1977. Clause Union and German Accusative plus Infinitive Constructions // P. Cole, J. M. Sadock (eds.). *Syntax and Semantics 8: Grammatical Relations*. New York: Academic Press, 121-149.
Haspelmath M. 1999. Long-distance agreement in Godoberi complement clauses // *Folia Linguistica 33*, i.1-2, 131-152.
Kibrik A. E. (ed.) 1999. *Elementy tsakhurskogo jazyka v tipologicheskom osveschenii*. Moscow: Nasledije.
Kibrik A.E. 2003. *Konstanty i peremennyje jazyka*. Saint-Petersburg: Aleteja.
Moore J. forthc. Object controlled restructuring in Spanish // Gerdts D., Moore J., M. Polinsky (eds.) *Hypothesis A / Hypothesis B: Linguistic explorations in honor of David M. Perlmutter*. Cambridge: MIT Press, MA.
Polinsky M. 2002. *Control and raising in Bezhta*. Ms, UCSD.
Polinsky M., Potsdam E. 2002. *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 33, № 2, 2002, 245-282.
Polinsky M., E. Potsdam. 2007. Expanding the scope of control and raising // W. Davies, S. Dubinsky (eds.) *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*. Springer.
Postal P. M. 1974. *On Raising*. Cambridge (Mass.), London: MIT Press.
Rizzi L. 1978. A Restructuring Rule in Italian Syntax. In S. J. Keyser (ed.) *Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 113-158.
Rosen 1992. The case of subjects in the Romance causative // *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics*, v.17, №1, 79-115.
Sumbatova N.R., Mutalov R.O. 2003. *A Grammar of Icari Dargwa*. Munich and Newcastle.