AR Deal, UC Berkeley

Covert hyperraising to object

I present new evidence showing that Nez Perce (Sahaptian) has covert hyperraising to object: the highest DP in an A-position in the embedded clause covertly raises into the matrix, where it takes scope and agrees with the verb. Covert hyperraising contrasts with the surface-similar phenomenon of long distance agreement (LDA), documented in Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001) and Innu-Aimûn (Branigan & MacKenzie 2002), in showing evidence of constraints on improper movement. Whereas the controller of LDA in Tsez and Innu-Aimûn must be in an Ā position within the embedded clause, covert hyperraising (as A-movement) is not possible from an Ā position. The results extend the typology of cross-clausal A-dependencies and bear on the question of CP phasehood in hyperraising contexts (Halpert 2016).

(In)transitivity in clause embedding. The Nez Perce verbs *neki* 'think' and *cukwe* 'know' occur in both intransitive clauses, (1), and transitive clauses, (2). Intransitive clauses have nominative subjects and subject agreement; transitive clauses have ergative subjects and both subject and object agreement (Deal 2010a,b).

(1) Angel   hi-neki-se   [$_{CP}$ watiisx   mamay'as-nim poo-payata-siqa   Tatlo-na   ]
     Angel.**NOM** 3SUBJ-think-PRES [$_{CP}$ yesterday children-ERG   3SUBJ/3OBJ-help-PAST Tatlo-ACC]
     Angel thinks the children helped Tatlo yesterday

(2) Angel-**nim** hi-**nees**-nek-se   [$_{CP}$ watiisx   mamay'as-nim poo-payata-siqa Tatlo-na   ]
     Angel-**ERG** 3SUBJ-**PL.OBJ**-think-PRES [$_{CP}$ yesterday children-ERG   3/3-help-PAST   Tatlo-ACC]
     Angel thinks the children helped Tatlo yesterday

Plural object agreement in (2) apparently indexes the embedded subject *mamay'asnim* 'the children'. However, this DP is clearly inside the complement CP. It receives case in the embedded clause, and appears to the right of embedded adverb *watiisx* 'yesterday' in (2). In (3), it also appears to the right of scrambled embedded object *Tatlona*. By contrast, it may not appear unambiguously inside the matrix clause, *(4).

(3) Angel-nim hi-nees-nek-se   [$_{CP}$ watiisx   Tatlo-na   **mamay'as-nim** poo-payata-siqa]
     Angel-ERG 3SUBJ-PL.OBJ-think-PRES [$_{CP}$ yesterday Tatlo-ACC **children-ERG**   3/3-help-PAST   ]

(4) * Angel-nim **mamay'as-nim** hi-nees-nek-se   [$_{CP}$ watiisx   poo-payata-siqa Tatlo-na   ]
      Angel-ERG **children-ERG**   3SUBJ-PL.OBJ-think-PRES [$_{CP}$ yesterday 3/3-help-PAST   Tatlo-ACC]

The word order facts demonstrate that this is not a case of overt raising-to-object. It is also not covert prolepsis, where the matrix verb takes a syntactically independent *pro* object coindexed with the embedded subject. In contrast to prolepsis (Salzmann to appear), island-sensitivity is observed; e.g. plural object agreement on 'think' is not possible in the translation of *She thinks that if <u>the children</u> come, he'll be happy*.

Embedded scrambling. Object agreement on the matrix verb may index either an embedded subject, (2-3), or an embedded object, (5). However, the latter possibility requires the object to be preverbal, (6).

(5) T.-nim hi-nees-nek-se   [$_{CP}$ watiisx   **mamay'ac-na** A.-nim hi-naas-wapayata-ya   ]
     T.-ERG 3SUBJ-PL.OBJ-think-PRS [$_{CP}$ yesterday children-ACC   A.-ERG 3SUBJ-PL.OBJ-help-PST]
     Taamsas thinks Angel helped the children yesterday.

(6) * T.-nim hi-nees-nek-se   [$_{CP}$ A.-nim hi-naas-wapayata-ya   **mamay'ac-na**]
      T.-ERG 3SUBJ-PL.OBJ-think-PRES [$_{CP}$ A.-ERG 3SUBJ-PL.OBJ-help-PST children-ACC   ]

This is in keeping with Polinsky & Potsdam (P&P)'s and Branigan & MacKenzie (B&M)'s proposals for LDA: the LDA trigger must move to a left-peripheral Ā position in the CP to control matrix agreement.

However, in addition to overt Ā movement, Nez Perce also has overt clause-internal A-scrambling. (See Deal (2015) for evidence from WCO and superiority obviation.) Embedded OSV order in (5) therefore might be due either to A- or Ā-movement by the object. To confirm whether the agreeing DP does indeed obtain an Ā position inside the CP, we must inspect examples where it has scrambled out of a finite clause. Such scrambling is generally permitted in Nez Perce, both in matrix and embedded contexts, and behaves like standard Ā movement: it obeys superiority and yields WCO effects (Deal 2015). Crucially, when a DP has unambiguously Ā moved inside the 'think' complement, it cannot agree with the matrix verb:

(7) { * Tatlo-**nim** hi-**nees**-nek-se / ✓ Tatlo hi-neki-se }
    { Tatlo-ERG 3SUBJ-**PL.OBJ**-think-PRES / Tatlo.NOM 3SUBJ-think-PRES }

[CP **mamay'ac**$_i$ Angel-nim pee-∅-ne Harold-ne [CP t_i hi-pa-pay-no']]
[CP **children.NOM** Angel-ERG 3/3-tell-PAST Harold-ACC [CP t 3SUBJ-SUBJ.PL-arrive-FUT]]
Tatlo thinks that the children$_i$, Angel told Harold t_i would arrive

The contrast between (5) and (7) indicates that it is A-scrambling, rather than Ā-movement, that feeds the cross-clausal dependency in (5). The matrix verb agrees with the highest DP in an A-position in the embedded clause. This need not be the leftmost DP; in (3), the object has presumably Ā-scrambled over the subject. The facts contrast with the core facts that motivate P&P and B&M's LDA analyses, suggesting that Nez Perce should not be analyzed as displaying LDA. Rather, (7) suggests covert A-movement: an embedded DP may A-move from an A-position but not an Ā-position. The proposed structure of (5) is schematized in (8).

(8) [vP Taamsas *v* [VP ~~children~~ think [CP [TP yesterday [TP children T [vP Angel *v* help ~~children~~]]]]]]
     ⌐ covert (hyper)raising ¬ ⌐ overt A-scrambling ¬
     └ Agree ┘

The movement analysis additionally correctly predicts that the raised DP will take scope in the matrix clause. I show in particular that the raised DP scopes over the attitude verb, and thus must be interpreted *de re* (and specific). Accordingly, covert raising of the underlined phrase is not possible in the Nez Perce translation of *He thinks a giant purple cat stole the cat food*, given that giant purple cats do not exist.

(Hyper)raising and locality. Unlike English ECM complements, the complements of *neki* 'think' and *cukwe* 'know' are in all known respects morphosyntactically similar to matrix clauses; they show identical possibilities for TAM, case-marking, scrambling, and *pro*-drop. This supports an analysis of these complements as ordinary full CPs. A-movement into the matrix is therefore hyperraising-to-object (cp. Halpert & Zeller 2015 on Zulu). Hyperraising in Nez Perce poses challenges for several prominent accounts of hyperraising, however. First, hyperraising cannot be motivated by a defective embedded T (Rodrigues 2004, Nunes 2008), given that ergatives, (2), accusatives, (5), and also nominatives can hyperraise, but presumably T does not case-license ergatives, accusatives, *and* nominatives. Second, hyperraising cannot reflect a total absence of Case features (Carstens and Diercks 2012), given that Nez Perce has overt case-marking.

Halpert (2016) proposes that raising to Y out of XP requires that either (i) XP has no ϕ-features (as in English raising from TP), or (ii) Y ϕ-Agrees first with XP and subsequently with material inside of XP (as in Zulu hyperraising from CP). I suggest that Nez Perce instantiates possibility (i) in raising out of CP, since CPs in Nez Perce are totally unable to ϕ-Agree. On Halpert's proposal, they should therefore be totally transparent for ϕ-Agree. However, although the CP complement of *neki* 'think' permits hyperraising, it blocks true long-distance complementizer agreement (CA) in cases where raising has not occurred:

ᒋ − − − − − − − !!Agree impossible!! − − − − − − − ᒍ
(9) ke(*x) kaa Beth hi-nak-saqa [CP 'iin-e-cim *pro*$_{subj}$ hi-weqy-uu-yu']
    C-(*1) then Beth.NOM 3SUBJ-think-PAST [1SG-ACC-only PRO.3SG 3SUBJ-rain-APPL-FUT]
    when Beth thought it was going to rain on only me

CA is possible for subjects and objects, but not into further embedded CPs (Deal 2015). This is unexpected if CP phasehood is entirely abolished in favor of A-over-A locality constraints, as Halpert suggests. I propose instead that CP becomes impenetrable when the next higher phase head (*v*) is Merged (cp. Embick 2010). In a language where CP is not a ϕ-goal, this opens the door to hyperraising to object: CP is not yet a phase when the object A-moves out in (8). Nevertheless, for movement targeting the *v*P edge or higher, or Agree with a probe outside of VP, PIC effects re-emerge even for the same type of CP that permits hyperraising.

Refs (selected). Branigan & MacKenzie 2002. Altruism, Ā-movement, and object agreement. *LI*. ● Deal 2015. Interaction and satisfaction in ϕ-Agreement. Handout, U. Leipzig. ● Halpert 2016. Raising parameters. WCCFL 33. ● Polinsky & Potsdam 2001. Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *NLLT*.