

Data and references: escape hatches are phase edges, but not all phase edges are escape hatches (NELS 56)

Gautam Ottur and Lieke Hendriks

Dutch

In Dutch *what-for*-constructions (WFCs), we take *wat* ‘what’ to always move DP-internally to Spec-DP (see e.g. Bennis et al. 1997). It can then either move into the left periphery together with the rest of the DP as one constituent (1a), or as a single element (1b). There is a slight difference in interpretation between (1a) and (1b).

- (1) a. $[_{DP} \text{ Wat voor wijnen}]_i$ heeft Emma t_i uitgezocht?
what for wines has E. chosen
‘What kind of wines did Emma choose?’
- b. $[\text{Wat}]_i$ heeft Emma $[_{DP} t_i \text{ voor wijnen}]$ uitgezocht?
what has E. for wines chosen
‘What kind of wines did Emma choose?’

Dutch Split Topicalization (ST) involves obligatory movement of the predicate NP to Spec-DP, followed by movement of this NP into the left periphery (cf. Hendriks, to appear).

- (2) $[\text{Boeken van Chomsky}]_i$ heb ik maar $[_{DP} \text{ een } t_i]$ gelezen.
books of Chomsky have I but one read
‘As for books by Chomsky, I have read only one.’

For both Dutch WFCs and Dutch ST, information structure is taken to play a pivotal role in the movement mechanism and the ultimate interpretation of the sentence.

Malayalam

In Malayalam, adnominals may be scrambled over the indefinite article, to the edge of DP (or maybe NP). However, despite the fact that Malayalam doesn’t have a definite article, LBE is never permitted. In other words, DPs/NPs (including in complement positions) are always islands for extraction.

- (3) a. Rāman_i $[_{DP} \text{ bhaṁgiyuḷḷa}_i \text{ orū } t_i \text{ vīṭū}]$ vaṇṇi.
R. beautiful INDEF house bought
‘Raman bought a beautiful house.’
- b. $*\text{Bhaṁgiyuḷḷa}_i$ Rāman_i $[_{DP} t_i \text{ orū } t_i \text{ vīṭū}]$ vaṇṇi.
Beautiful R. INDEF house bought
‘Raman bought a beautiful house.’

Interpretation: merge to the edge of DP/NP doesn't not implicate visibility for movement. Cases where elements merge at the specifier of a DP phase are a proper superset of the cases where they are able to move out.

Hungarian

Hungarian exhibits a construction where *wh*-elements may either move out of an embedded clause via canonical SCM, or may stop moving within embedded CP (Horvath 1997). In the latter case a scope-taking *wh*-expletive occupies matrix Spec,C.

- (4) a. *Kivel_i akarod t_i hogy beszéljek*
 with_whom want;2SG;DEF_OBJ that speak;SBJV;1SG
 'With whom do you want me to talk?'
 b. *Mit gondolsz, hogy kit látott János*
 what think;2SG that who;ACC see;PST;3SG John;NOM
 'Who do you think that John saw?'

Mongolian

Embedded subjects in Mongolian be marked accusative and be subject to Condition B effects (and optionally feed hyperraising), or may be marked nominative and escape such effects (Fong 2019). Our take: it's possible that they are in the same position (which makes it unnecessary to posit an optionally present probe on embedded C), and simply differ in whether Spec,CP is opaque or transparent.

- (5) a. *Odgerel_i [margaash tüün-iig_{i/j} ir-ne ge]* *khel-sen*
 O. tomorrow 3SG-ACC come-N.PST COMP say-PST
 'Odgerel_i said that (s)he_j is coming tomorrow.'
 b. *Odgerel_i [margaash ter_{i/j} ir-ne ge]* *khel-sen*
 O. tomorrow 3SG-NOM come-N.PST COMP say-PST
 'Odgerel_i said that (s)he_{i/j} is coming tomorrow.'

Interpretation: the edges of CPs are not necessarily transparent. They may be opaque in some cases, which leads to elements at that edge being invisible to various operations. This variability is borne out in both \bar{A} - and A-movement.

For more info, see our dissertations, Ottur (to appear) and Henriks (to appear)!

References

Bennis, H., Corver, N., & Den Dikken, M. (1997). Predication in nominal phrases. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 1, 85–117.

- Boeckx, C., & Grohmann, K. (2004). Barriers and phases: Forward to the past. *Tools in Linguistic Theory*.
- Bošković, Ž. (2005). On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica*, 59(1), 1–45.
- Corver, N., van Koppen, M., Kranendonk, H., & Rigterink, M. (2005). The noun phrase: Diversity in Dutch DP design (DiDDD). *Scandinavian Dialect Syntax*, 73–85.
- Corver, N., van Koppen, M., Kranendonk, H., & Rigterink, M. (2011). Database Diversity in Dutch DP Design [Dataset]. https://didd.meertens.knaw.nl/dp_vragenlijst/
- Fong, S. (2019). Proper movement through Spec-CP: An argument from hyperraising in Mongolian. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics*, 4(1).
- Hendriks, L. (to appear). Discovering Discontinuous DPs in Dutch Dialects. PhD dissertation, University of Göttingen.
- Horvath, J. (1997). The status of ‘wh-expletives’ and the partial wh-movement construction of Hungarian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 15(3), 509–572.
- Ott, D. (2012). Local instability: Split topicalization and quantifier float in German (Vol. 544). Walter de Gruyter.
- Ottur, G. (to appear). Dependency and order. PhD dissertation, University of Göttingen.