Data sheet: a timing approach to escape hatch dependencies (GLOW 47)

Gautam Ottur

March 25, 2025

The main new prediction of the system I sketch in my poster is that edges of locality domains are not themselves transparent (cf. Adger 2024), but rather that a subset of elements which are transparent for extraction appear at these edges. This document includes some datapoints which look to be consistent with this prediction.

1 Absence of LBE in Malayalam

Bošković (2005) (*et seq.*) suggests that left-branch extraction (LBE) only occurs in languages without a definite DP layer in the nominal domain. But most languages without definite articles do not allow LBE. An especially interesting subset of these are languages like Malayalam, which allow adnominals to Ā-move to the edge of NP/DP.

Despite the appearance of the displaced adnominal at the left edge of the NP in (1b), it cannot undergo further Ā-movement to outside of the nominal domain. In other words, the movement in (1b) cannot feed LBE/successive-cyclic movement (SCM), as shown in (1c).

(1) a. *rāmaṉ* [*orŭ* *bhaṃgiyuḷḷa* *vīṭŭ*] *vaṅṅi*
R. INDEF beautiful house bought
'Raman bought a beautiful house.'

b. *rāmaṉ* [*bhaṃgiyuḷḷa*$_i$ *orŭ* ——$_i$ *vīṭŭ*] *vaṅṅi*
R. beautiful INDEF house bought
'Raman bought a *beautiful* house.'

c. **bhaṃgiyuḷḷa*$_i$ *rāmaṉ* [——$_i$ *orŭ* ——$_i$ *vīṭŭ*] *vaṅṅi*
beautiful R. INDEF house bought
'Raman bought a *beautiful* house.'

Interpretation: languages require something in addition to being at the edge of NP/DP to be visible for extraction, which I suggest is the timing of the movement.

2 *Wh*-expletive constructions in Hungarian

According to Horvath (1997), Hungarian allows both successive-cyclic movement of *wh*-expressions through the edge of object CPs, shown in (2a), and also allows an alternative construction, which descriptively involves the insertion of a *wh*-expletive in the left-periphery of the matrix clause (2b).

(2) a. *kivel akarod hogy beszeljék*
with whom want;2SG;DEF_OBJ that
'With whom do you want me to talk?'

(Hungarian; Horvath 1997: 533)

b. *mit gondolsz, hogy kit látot János*
what think;2SG that who;ACC see;PST;3SG John;NOM
'Who do you think that John saw?'

(Hungarian; Horvath 1997: 510)

As evidence that this is not underlyingly a case of movement, she shows that this construction is available where the embedded *wh*-expression is inside of a strong island. So in (3), regular SCM out of the subject clause is not possible, but the *wh*-expletive construction with the "resumptive" *wh*-expression in the lower clause is allowed.

(3) a. *mi zavarta Marit, hogy kinek telefonáltál*
what;NOM disturbed Mary;ACC that who;DAT phoned;2SG
≈ 'Who is *x* such that it disturbed Mary that you phoned *x*?'

b.*? *kinek zavarta Marit, hogy telefonáltál*
who;DAT disturbed Mary;ACC that phoned;2SG
≈ 'Who is *x* such that it disturbed Mary that you phoned *x*?'

(Hungarian; Horvath 1997: 530)

Interpretation: there is a condition that makes it necessary to insert a *wh*-expletive: if the lower *wh*-element is inaccessible to matrix Spec,C for some reason. For subjects (3), this may be freezing, but for (unfrozen) objects, there may be optionality which is incumbent upon when the lower *wh*-element moves late enough to be visible to operations outside the embedded CP.

3 Hyperraising in Brazilian Portuguese and Mongolian

3.1 A-movement + *wh*-movement across finite clauses

In whatever sense the edges of CPs are transparent, they must be sufficiently transparent to allow multiple kinds of elements to escape, at least in some languages. This is shown in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) hyperraising, where A-movement is allowed across finite causes, and this may be accompanied by *wh*-movement.

(4) [*Quais livros*]$_i$ *elas*$_j$ *parecem* [$_C$ ____$_?$ *que* ____$_j$ *leram* ____$_i$]
which books they seem that read
'Which books do they seem to have read?' (Kobayashi 2020: 18)

Interim interpretation: if the edge of CP is an obligatory stopping point for *all* cross-clausal movement, it must allow more than one element to appear there (*pace* Kayne 1994; Brody 2000; Adger 2024).

Note: I refer the interested reader also to Zyman (2017), for a comparable case of hyperraising with only one embedded Spec,C position available.

3.2 A-movement through embedded Spec,C

Mongolian exhibits cases where subjects appear at the edge of embedded CPs. In Mongolian, there are two variations of embedded subjects. The first of these is marked accusative, and triggers Condition B effects (5a), whereas the second is marked nominative and does not (5b).

(5) a. *Odgerel*$_i$ [*margaash tüün-iig*$_{*i/j}$ *ir-ne gej*] *khel-sen*
O. tomorrow 3SG-ACC come-N.PST gej say-PST
'Odgerel$_i$ said that (s)he$_j$ is coming tomorrow.'

(Fong 2019: 13)

b. *Odgerel*$_i$ [*margaash ter*$_{i/j}$ *ir-ne gej*] *khel-sen*
O. tomorrow 3SG.NOM come-N.PST gej say-PST
'Odgerel$_i$ said that (s)he$_{i/j}$ is coming tomorrow.'

(Fong 2019: 13)

While in BP it is unclear whether the A-movement proceeds through the edge of CP, (only) the construction in (5a), where the embedded subject is marked accusative, feeds hyperraising (6).

(6) a. *Bat chang-aar* [*Dorj sain seheetin gej*] *khel-sen*
Bat loud-INS Dorj.NOM good noble COMP say-PST
'Bat said loudly that Dorj is good and noble.'

b. *Bat Dorj-iig$_i$ chang-aar* [____$_i$ *sain seheetin gej*] *khel-sen*
Bat Dorj-ACC loud-INS good noble COMP say-PST
'Bat said loudly that Dorj is good and noble.'

(Fong 2019: 17)

In other words, Mongolian descriptively has a three way optionality between embedded subjects which are invisible to outside syntactic operations (case assignment and binding), those that are visible, but remain in the lower clause, and those that are visible and hyperraise to an A-position in the main clause.

Interpretation: the difference in accessibility to outside operations is dependent on *when* the embedded subject moves to embedded Spec,C, and not, as Fong (2019) claims, ambiguity in whether the complementizer has the features necessary to trigger A-movement to embedded Spec,C. The difference in whether further A-movement occurs in that case is determined independently.

References

Adger, David. 2024. Mereological syntax and successive cyclicity*. In *Proceedings of NELS 54*. Cambridge, MA.

Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP*. *Studia Linguistica* 59(1). 1–45.

Brody, Michael. 2000. Mirror Theory: Syntactic Representation in Perfect Syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(1). 29–56.

Fong, Suzana. 2019. Proper movement through Spec-CP: An argument from hyperraising in Mongolian. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 4(1).

Horvath, Julia. 1997. The status of 'wh-expletives' and the partial wh-movement construction of Hungarian. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 15(3). 509–572.

Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Vol. 25. MIT press.

Kobayashi, Filipe Hisao. 2020. Proper interleaving of A- & Ā-movement: a Brazilian Portuguese case study. *lingbuzz*.

Zyman, Erik. 2017. P'urhepecha hyperraising to object: An argument for purely altruistic movement. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 2. 1–15.