

Covert hyperraising to object*

Amy Rose Deal

University of California, Berkeley

1. Introduction

Canonically, an attitude verb has two syntactic arguments: a DP agent/experiencer and something clausal – a CP or a TP. This canonical arrangement is demonstrated by Nez Perce sentence (1), as well as by its English translation.

- (1) Taamsas hi-neki-se [_{CP} konmá hi-kuu-ye Angel].
 Taamsas.NOM 3SUBJ-think-IMPERF [_{CP} that.way 3SUBJ-go-PERF Angel.NOM]
 Taamsas thinks [_{CP} Angel headed that way]. (Nez Perce)

Yet crosslinguistic research has revealed several different ways that attitude verbs can deviate from this format, several of which involve registering an additional DP argument – call it ‘DP[⊕]’ – in the matrix. Three such cases are well known: in **raising to object**, DP[⊕] originates in the lower clause and moves into the higher one (Postal 1974). (When this raising vacates a finite clause, we have the special case of **hyperraising to object**.) In **prolepsis**, DP[⊕] originates in the matrix and binds a syntactically independent pronoun in the lower clause (Salzmann To appear). In **long distance agreement**, DP[⊕] originates downstairs and remains there, but the matrix verb nevertheless registers it in agreement morphology (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001, Branigan & Mackenzie 2002, Bhatt 2005).

In this paper, I will demonstrate a fourth option – **covert raising to object**, in particular covert *hyper*-raising to object – and discuss various of its theoretical and typological implications. In general, that such a construction exists in natural language should come as no surprise, given two types of recent discoveries. First, as Halpert & Zeller (2015) and Zyman (To appear) discuss, hyperraising – a species of A-movement – may target object positions. Second, as Polinsky & Potsdam (2013) and Deal (2013) show, A-movement may be covert. One implication of the discovery of covert raising to object is that all four cells of a simple typology for transitive attitude constructions are attested, as predicted:

*Thanks to Nez Perce teachers Florene Davis and Bessie Scott for their patient help, and to Karlos Arregi, Seth Cable, Danny Fox, Irene Heim, Stefan Keine, Jason Merchant, Sarah Murray, David Pesetsky, Norvin Richards, Roger Schwarzschild, Will Starr, and (other) audience members at NELS 47, MIT ling-lunch, and the University of Chicago Morphology and Syntax Workshop for helpful comments and suggestions.

(2) *A typology of transitive attitude constructions*

		<i>Does DP[⊕] move into the matrix?</i>	
		<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>DP[⊕] surfaces. . .</i>	<i>Upstairs</i>	Prolepsis	Raising to object
	<i>Downstairs</i>	Long-distance agreement	Covert raising to object

A second implication relates to the way we diagnose long-distance agreement (LDA). In Nez Perce, canonical attitude reports like (1) contrast with transitive counterparts like (3), which I will argue instantiate covert raising to object. Note that the attitude verb *peenekse* in (3) shows both subject and object agreement for 3rd person (the prefix *pee-* is a portmanteau ‘3-on-3’ marker). One of the two 3rd person arguments in the sentence, however, is visibly inside the lower clause.

- (3) Taamsas-nim pee-nek-se [CP konmá hi-kuu-ye Angel].
 Taamsas-ERG 3/3-think-IMPERF [CP that.way 3SUBJ-go-PERF Angel.NOM]
 Taamsas thinks [CP Angel headed that way]. (Nez Perce)

Such clauses present a significant surface similarity to LDA as attested in Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001) and Innu-aimûn (Branigan & Mackenzie 2002). Both construction types feature object agreement in the upper clause, but a DP[⊕] that only surfaces downstairs. A comparison of the Nez Perce data with Tsez and Innu-aimûn suggests that the key to distinguishing the two phenomena lies in A/ \bar{A} interactions: LDA is fed by \bar{A} -movement internal to the complement clause, but covert raising (as A-movement) is incompatible with an embedded \bar{A} step, on pain of violation of the ban on improper movement.

This points to a third implication, which relates to the typology of raising and the ways that hyperraising is constrained. If the hyperraising DP cannot transit through a clause-peripheral \bar{A} position, how does it vacate the lower clause? Halpert (2016) proposes that CPs block movement only by intervention: a probe that is satisfied by ϕ cannot probe past ϕ on a C head in order to look deeper into the embedded clause.¹ Hyperraising arises, then, not from the absence of Case features or defects of the embedded T, but from the absence of an intervening ϕ -bearer between the higher A-probe and the embedded target. A language like Nez Perce permits hyperraising from CP because the C head bears no ϕ -features. I will argue, however, that the most radical version of a Halpert-style theory – one that rejects all constraints of absolute locality (phases) in favor of relative locality (minimality) – is nevertheless incompatible with a broader range of Nez Perce data, some of which show that the same types of CPs that are permeable for hyperraising otherwise behave as barriers to ϕ -agreement and A-movement. To handle these instances of ‘selective opacity’ (in the terminology of Keine 2016), I propose a **Delayed Opacity** approach to the distribution of hyperraising, centered on the idea that CPs become opaque only when the next phase head up is merged (Chomsky 2001). CP phasehood is thus not abolished in favor of relative locality, but rather complements relative locality as a constraint on movement.

The paper is laid out as follows. In the next section, I introduce Nez Perce attitude reports with *neki* ‘think’, demonstrating canonical complementation (as in (1)) along with

¹ ‘Satisfied’ here should be understood in terms of the interaction/satisfaction theory of agreement (Deal 2015a).

prolepsis. In section 3, I make the case for covert hyperraising to object, examining in depth the structure of sentences like (3). In section 4, I discuss the question of CP phasehood and constraints on hyperraising across languages, contrasting approaches in terms of Activity (Chomsky 2001) and Intervention (Halpert 2016) with the new proposal in terms of Delayed Opacity. In Section 5, I briefly discuss a contrast with Keine's (2016) findings on selective opacity, and conclude.²

2. Basics of Nez Perce attitude reports: ordinary and proleptic complementation

Nez Perce is a highly endangered Sahaptian language spoken in Idaho, Washington, and Oregon, USA. The data in this paper come from fieldwork on the Nez Perce Reservation in Lapwai, Idaho, with two native speaker consultants (Bessie Scott and Florene Davis) over a ten-year period. The orthography used here is that adopted by the language program of the Nez Perce Tribe. IPA correspondences and glossing conventions are listed in Deal (2016b).

Nez Perce has flexible word order (especially at the clausal level), extensive *pro*-drop for both subjects and objects, and rich systems of both case and agreement. Case is organized on a tripartite basis: transitive clauses feature ergative subjects and accusative objects, whereas intransitive clauses feature only nominative subjects. (Further details are discussed in Deal 2010a,b, 2016b.) Agreement, meanwhile, is on a nominative-accusative alignment, and encodes the person and number of both the subject and the object. Agreement is directly morphologically visible with third person and plural subjects and objects. Agreement prefixes are listed in (4). (For further details of the agreement system, see Deal (2015b).)

(4) Agreement prefixes on verbs

<i>hi-</i>	3rd person subject	<i>pe-</i>	plural subject
<i>'e-</i>	3rd person object	<i>nees-</i>	plural object
<i>pee-</i>	3rd person subject and 3rd person object		

Formal transitivity is thus marked both in the case system and in the agreement system: only transitive clauses feature ergative case, accusative case, and object agreement.

These markers of transitivity help to distinguish two initial types of attitude complementation. As a first option, the verbs *neki* 'think' and *cukwe* 'know' can form attitude reports by combining with finite CP complements in the canonical attitude complementation pattern. (The examples throughout this paper feature 'think', though as far as I am aware all of the data that hold for 'think' reports hold equally well of 'know' reports.) Such clauses, exemplified in (5), are intransitive at the matrix level: the subject is nominative (not ergative), and there is no object agreement on the attitude verb.

- (5) Taamsas hi-neki-se [_{CP} Angel-nim hi-naas-wapayata-ca
 Taamsas.NOM 3SUBJ-think-IMPERF [Angel-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-help-IMPERF
 mamay'as-na].
 children-ACC]
 Taamsas thinks Angel is helping the children.

²For reasons of space, I omit all discussion in this paper of the semantics of covert raising to object (and prolepsis). The interested reader is referred to Deal (2017).

Alternatively, *neki* ‘think’ and *cukwe* ‘know’ may take a matrix object, marked with accusative, as in (6). This produces a notable shift in the morphosyntax of the attitude clause: the subject is now ergative, and both subject and object agreement appear on the verb (here in the portmanteau form *pee-*, ‘3 on 3’). Meanwhile, the embedded clause is required to contain a bound element, typically *pro*. (In both (5) and (6), the embedded clause is an ordinary finite CP; there is no dedicated subjunctive or other embedding morphology.)

- (6) Taamsas-nim pee-nek-se **Angel-ne**[⊕] [_{CP} *pro* hi-naas-wapayata-ca
Taamsas-ERG 3/3-think-IMPERF Angel-ACC [3SG 3SUBJ-O.PL-help-IMPERF
mamay’as-na].
children-ACC]
Taamsas thinks Angel is helping the children.

This latter type of clause can be diagnosed as prolepsis: the accusative object of the attitude verb is externally merged in the matrix clause. We should first note, as foreshadowed by the bracketing in (6), that the accusative is indeed in the matrix clause on the surface. Accordingly, it may surface anywhere in the matrix clause, including between the matrix subject and verb:

- (7) ’Aayat-onm **mamay’as-na**[⊕] hi-nees-nek-se [_{CP} watiisx *pro*
woman-ERG **children-ACC** 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [1.day.away 3SG
hi-pa-paay-no’].
3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT]
The woman thinks the children will arrive tomorrow.

It may not, by contrast, surface to the right of an embedded adverb:

- (8) * ’Aayat-onm hi-nees-nek-se [_{CP} watiisx **mamay’as-na**[⊕]
woman-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [1.day.away **children-ACC**
hi-pa-paay-no’].
3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT]
Intended: the woman thinks the children will arrive tomorrow.

As expected in a prolepsis construction, the relationship between the matrix DP[⊕] and the bound element in the embedded clause is not island sensitive. In (9), for instance, the embedded *pro* is found in subject position inside an adjunct island. (On the impossibility of extraction from such positions in Nez Perce, see Deal 2016a, 432.)

- (9) ? ’Aayato-nm **mamay’as-na**_{*i*}[⊕] hi-nees-nek-se
woman-ERG children-ACC 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF
[_{CP} [ke kaa *pro*_{*i*} hi-pa-paay-no’], hi-lloy-no’ qiiwn].
[[when 3PL 3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT], 3SUBJ-be.happy-FUT old.man.NOM]
The woman thinks that when the kids arrive, the old man will be happy.
lit. ≈The woman thinks the kids that when they arrive, the old man will be happy.

A relevant takeaway is that *neki* ‘think’ (and, likewise, *cukwe* ‘know’) provides a matrix object position. It is this position that is filled by the accusative object in prolepsis.

3. Covert hyperraising

In addition to ordinary complementation and prolepsis, Nez Perce ‘think’ and ‘know’ reports also allow a third option, morphosyntactically intermediate between the previous two. Here, as shown in (10) and (11), transitive morphosyntax occurs in the upstairs clause – the attitude holder appears in ergative case, and the attitude verb hosts object agreement – but there is no apparent gap or bound element in the embedded clause and no accusative matrix object. Instead, in these examples, plural object agreement (*nees-*) indexes an argument that is either nominative or ergative, as determined by the transitivity of the lower clause.

- (10) Harold-nim hi-**nees**-nek-se [CP **hitemenew’eet**[⊕] hi-wsiix
 Harold-ERG 3SUBJ-**O.PL**-think-IMPERF [student.NOM 3SUBJ-be.PRES.PL
 wiweepcux].
 smart]
 Harold thinks the students are smart.
- (11) Taamsas-nim hi-**nees**-nek-se [CP **mamay’as-nim**[⊕]
 Taamsas-ERG 3SUBJ-**O.PL**-think-IMPERF [children-ERG
 poo-payata-six Angel-ne].
 3/3-help-IMPERF.S.PL Angel-ACC]
 Taamsas thinks the children are helping Angel.

In examples of this type, unlike in prolepsis, the DP triggering object agreement on the attitude verb cannot be located inside an embedded island:

- (12) *’Aayato-nm hi-**nees**-nek-se [CP [*adjunct* ke kaa **mamay’ac**[⊕]
 woman-ERG 3SUBJ-**O.PL**-think-IMPERF [[when children.NOM
 hi-pa-paay-no’], hi-lloy-no’ qiiwn].
 3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT], 3SUBJ-be.happy-FUT old.man.NOM]
 Intended: the woman thinks that when the kids arrive, the old man will be happy.
 (Cf. prolepsis in (9))

Such facts suggest that DP[⊕] stands in a syntactic dependency to the matrix clause; this is not a binding-based, “backwards prolepsis” (cataphoric) structure. I will argue instead that clauses like (10) and (11) instantiate covert hyperraising to object. To make this argument, I will first demonstrate that DP[⊕] indeed surfaces in the lower clause, in keeping with the bracketing represented in (10) and (11), and then that it undergoes covert movement.

In sharp contrast to the matrix object behavior seen in prolepsis, DP[⊕] in the construction of interest behaves like an embedded argument for purposes of case-marking and word order. In terms of case, DP[⊕] is nominative when it serves as the subject of an intransitive lower clause (e.g. in (10)) but ergative when it serves as the subject of a transitive lower clause (e.g. in (11)). (We will also see that DP[⊕] can be accusative when it serves as an embedded object, provided other conditions are met.) In terms of word order, DP[⊕] may surface to the right of an embedded adverb, (13); contrast prolepsis example (8).

- (13) 'Aayat-onm hi-nees-nek-se [CP watiisx **mamay'ac**[⊕]
 woman-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [1.day.away **children.NOM**
 hi-pa-paay-no'].
 3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT]
 The woman thinks the children will arrive tomorrow.

DP[⊕] may also surface to the right of other material that originates in the lower clause, such as a scrambled object. Example (14) features embedded Adv O S V order; DP[⊕] is the embedded subject.

- (14) Angel-nim hi-nees-nek-se [CP watiisx Tatlo-na
 Angel-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [CP 1.day.away Tatlo-ACC
mamay'as-nim[⊕] poo-payata-si-no'].
children-ERG 3/3-help-IMPERF.S.PL-FUT]
 Angel thinks the children will help Tatlo tomorrow.

In contrast, DP[⊕] cannot surface to the left of the matrix verb: compare the ungrammatical (15) with the grammatical prolepsis example (7).

- (15) * 'Aayat-onm **mamay'ac**[⊕] hi-nees-nek-se [CP watiisx
 woman-ERG **children.NOM** 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [1.day.away
 hi-pa-paay-no'].
 3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT]
 Intended: the woman thinks the children will arrive tomorrow.

The generalization, comparing these clauses with their prolepsis counterparts, is that DP[⊕] surfaces in the same clause in which it gets its morphological case. In prolepsis, DP[⊕] surfaces upstairs and is marked, accordingly, in accusative, as a matrix object. In the construction now of interest, DP[⊕] surfaces downstairs and has the case appropriate for its role in the embedded clause.

We turn now to the evidence that DP[⊕] (covertly) moves into the matrix clause. The argument begins with the observation that movement inside the embedded clause can feed the cross-clausal dependency. This is visible most readily for embedded objects: DP[⊕] can be an embedded object, but *only if* the embedded object is preverbal in its clause. Thus the matrix verb may show plural object agreement with embedded object *mamay'asna* 'the children' in (16), with embedded OSV order, but not in (17), with embedded SVO.

- (16) 'Aayat-onm hi-nees-nek-se [CP watiisx **mamay'as-na**[⊕]
 woman-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [CP 1.day.away children-ACC
 Angel-nim hi-naas-wapayata-ya].
 Angel-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-help-PERF]
 The woman thinks Angel helped the children yesterday.
- (17) * Taamsas-nim hi-nees-nek-se [CP Angel-nim
 Taamsas-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [CP Angel-ERG
 hi-naas-wapayata-ya **mamay'as-na**[⊕]].
 3SUBJ-O.PL-help-PERF children-ACC]
 Taamsas thinks Angel helped the children.

In principle, the object movement we see in (16) might be either A- or \bar{A} -movement. The language certainly allows \bar{A} -movement within and across clauses; for instance, it has obligatory (single) *wh*-fronting (Deal 2010b) and word order variation within simple clauses is correlated with information structure (Rude 1992). Alongside this evidence of \bar{A} movement, it also shows two behaviors characteristic of languages with A-scrambling (Mahajan 1990). First, WCO effects are absent within clauses, (18), but present across them, (19):

- (18) 'Isii-ne₁ ['ip-nim₁ lawtiwaa-ma-pim] pee-cepinmi-siix ₋₁?
 who-ACC₁ [3SG-GEN friend-PL-ERG] 3/3-mock-IMPERF.S.PL ₋₁
 Who₁ are his₁ friends making fun of ₋₁?
- (19) 'Isii-nm₁ ['ip-nim_{2/*1} lawtiwaa] 'ee hi-hi-ne
 who-ERG₁ [3SG-GEN_{2/*1} friend.NOM] 2SG.CL 3SUBJ-tell-PERF
 [₋₁ 'ee hi-'pewi-se]?
 [₋₁ 2SG.CL 3SUBJ-look.for-IMPERF]
 Who₁ did his_{2/*1} friend tell you ₋₁ is looking for you?

Second, superiority effects are absent within clauses, (20), but present across them, (21):

- (20) a. 'Isii-nm 'ituu-ne pee-p-e?
 who-ERG what-ACC 3/3-eat-PERF
 Who ate what?
- b. 'Ituu-ne 'isii-nm pee-p-e?
 what-ACC who-ERG 3/3-eat-PERF
 What did who eat?
- (21) a. 'Isii₁ ₋₁ hi-neki-se ['isii-nm pee-p-e k'ałk'ał-na]?
 who.NOM ₋₁ 3SUBJ-think-IMPERF [who-ERG 3/3-eat-PERF cookie-ACC]
 Who₁ ₋₁ thinks who ate the cookies?
- b. *'Isii-nm₁ 'isii hi-neki-se [₋₁ pee-p-e k'ałk'ał-na]?
 who-ERG who.NOM 3SUBJ-think-IMPERF [₋₁ 3/3-eat-PERF cookie-ACC]
 Intended: Who₁ does who think ₋₁ ate the cookies?

Both sets of behaviors follow if objects may A-scramble over a local subject before undergoing \bar{A} movement. In its derived A-position, the object may bind into the subject (obviating WCO) and counts as closer to C_{wh} than the subject does (obviating superiority). WCO and superiority effects reappear in multiclausal contexts because A-scrambling is clause-bounded. (We return to implications of this clause-boundedness below.)

In the particular case of (16), the choice between A- and \bar{A} -analyses of object scrambling comes with important consequences for the distinction between covert raising and long-distance agreement (LDA). On an LDA analysis, we expect embedded \bar{A} -movement: LDA triggers must move to a left-peripheral \bar{A} position in the embedded CP in Innu-aimûn (Branigan & Mackenzie 2002) and Tsez (Polinsky & Potsdam 2001). By contrast, on a raising analysis, we expect embedded A-movement only. Raising, as A-movement into the matrix, should apply to the highest DP in an embedded A-position. Transit through \bar{A} positions constitutes improper movement.

To compare these hypotheses, we must force the embedded DP^{\oplus} to occupy an embedded \bar{A} -position. We can do this, for instance, by scrambling it out of a doubly-embedded finite clause. Such scrambling is demonstrated in baseline sentence (22). (Here the medial verb is ‘say/tell’, which allows neither prolepsis nor covert raising to object (Deal 2017). Movement of *mamay’ac* ‘the children’ must therefore proceed from inside the most deeply embedded clause.)

(22) *Baseline: ordinary complementation*

Tatlo hi-neki-se [_{CP} *mamay’ac*_i Angel-nim pee- \emptyset -ne
 Tatlo.NOM 3SUBJ-think-IMPERF [_{CP} children.NOM Angel-ERG 3/3-tell-PERF
 Harold-ne [_{CP} _{-i} hi-pa-paay-no’]].
 Harold-ACC [_{CP} - 3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT]]
 Tatlo thinks that the children_i, Angel told Harold _{-i} would arrive.

Crucially, once we have forced *mamay’ac* ‘the children’ to occupy an \bar{A} -position, the matrix verb can no longer agree with it:

(23) * Tatlo-nm hi-**nees**-nek-se [_{CP} ***mamay’ac***_i[⊕] Angel-nim
 Tatlo-ERG 3SUBJ-**O.PL**-think-IMPERF [_{CP} **children.NOM** Angel-ERG
 pee- \emptyset -ne Harold-ne [_{CP} _{-i} hi-pa-paay-no’]].
 3/3-tell-PERF Harold-ACC [_{CP} - 3SUBJ-S.PL-arrive-FUT]]
 Intended: Tatlo thinks that the children_i, Angel told Harold _{-i} would arrive.

The contrast between the grammatical (16) and the ungrammatical (23) is expected on the raising analysis: in the former case only, object scrambling is internal to a single clause and may be A-movement. A-movement of the object puts it in the highest A-position in the embedded clause, facilitating further A-movement into the matrix. In (23), on the other hand, raising of *mamay’ac* ‘the children’ would involve movement from an \bar{A} -position to an A-position, and is accordingly impossible. This data point thus reveals a core empirical difference between Nez Perce covert hyperraising to object and LDA in Tsez and Innu-aimûn: covert raising is ruled out, rather than facilitated, by movement of the would-be trigger to an \bar{A} -position.

We can now lay out the basic structure of the construction of interest: covert hyper-raising to object. We have seen that this construction involves covert A-movement and that it occurs with verbs that independently license a matrix object position. (Indeed, I argue in Deal (2017) that it occurs with all and only verbs that license a matrix *res* object position within VP.) This suggests that, in an example like (24), the embedded subject moves through the highest A-position in the embedded clause (assumed here to be Spec,TP) and subsequently into the matrix object position in the higher VP. Object ϕ -agreement (with *v*) then operates locally inside the matrix clause.

(24) Taamsas-nim pee-nek-se [_{CP} **Angel-nim**[⊕] hi-naas-wapayata-ca
 Taamsas-ERG 3/3-think-IMPERF [_{CP} **Angel-ERG** 3SUBJ-O.PL-help-IMPERF
mamay’as-na].
 children-ACC]
 Taamsas thinks Angel is helping the children.

- (25) [ν [VP ~~Angel~~ think [CP [TP Angel T [VP ~~Angel~~ help the children]]]]]
- └ Agree -
- └ covert (hyper)raising └ A-mvmt └

Largely similar structures obtain in covert object-to-object raising, where the object first A-scrambles through the embedded TP.

- (26) 'Aayat-onm hi-nees-nek-se [CP watiisx **mamay'ac-na**[⊕]
 woman-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-think-IMPERF [CP 1.day.away children-ACC
 Angel-nim hi-naas-wapayata-ya].
 Angel-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-help-PERF]
 The woman thinks Angel helped the children yesterday.

- (27) [ν [VP ~~children~~ think [CP [TP ADV [TP children T [VP Angel help ~~children~~]]]]]]
- └ Agree -
- └ covert (hyper)raising └ overt A-scrambling └

Given the impossibility of raising from an \bar{A} position, (23), these structures feature no intermediate movement through the CP edge. This implies that CP is not a phase in these structures – or at least, not in the simplest or most familiar way. We take up this issue in the next section.

4. Hyperraising, phases, and Delayed Opacity

The clauses that launch raising may stand alone as matrix declaratives, as we see in comparing (24) to (28), or to (10) to (29):

- (28) Angel-nim hi-naas-wapayata-ca mamay'as-na.
 Angel-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-help-IMPERF children-ACC
 Angel is helping the children.
- (29) Hiteminew'eet hi-wsiix wiweepecux.
 student.NOM 3SUBJ-be.PRES.PL smart
 The students are smart.

Overall, the Nez Perce clauses that launch covert hyperraising to object are identical to matrix clauses in their range of TAM marking; their case array; their support of null arguments (i.e. null arguments are permitted in all positions, but not required); and their support of both A- and \bar{A} -scrambling.³ This is notably different from the behavior of the nonfinite clauses to which raising is restricted in languages like English. The Nez Perce facts thus present an opportunity to study the factors underlying the distribution of hyper-raising across languages. Why is hyperraising possible in some languages but not others? When, in general, can syntactic dependencies reach into finite clauses?

Two theories are prominent in recent discussion of this issue. According to the *Activity Theory*, the absence of hyperraising in certain languages is due to the activity condition

³ \bar{A} -scrambling in a raising clause is seen in (14): here the object fails to intervene on subject raising, as expected if it occupies an \bar{A} -position.

(Chomsky 2001): a DP can have its case checked only once. Since finite clauses in languages like English contain no arguments with unchecked case, raising out of such clauses is impossible. Hyperraising becomes possible in a language only if T fails to license the lower subject (Zeller 2006, Ferreira 2009, i.a.) or if the language simply lacks Case altogether (Carstens & Diercks 2013). Yet neither of these factors provides an attractive analysis of why hyperraising should be possible in Nez Perce. There is certainly no case against case/Case in the language: Nez Perce has both rich morphological case and (as I have argued in Deal 2013) at least some case-driven movement. Likewise, “defective T” theories offer no ready application to this language: as we have seen, Nez Perce ergatives, accusatives, and nominatives can hyperraise, but presumably T does not case-license ergatives, accusatives, *and* nominatives. Moreover, given that hyperraising is covert, it is hard to argue that the raising DP obtains no case in the embedded clause; its case is visible on the surface, after all. For this reason, Nez Perce covert hyperraising appears to be a rather clear instance of movement between case positions (Béjar & Massam 1999) – the very type of movement that the Activity Theory is designed to prevent.

A second option, the *Intervention Theory* of Halpert (2016), provides an approach to the distribution of hyperraising which is better able to accommodate the Nez Perce facts. Halpert argues that CP phasehood should be reconceptualized in terms of intervention: CP blocks extraction when it itself satisfies a ϕ -probe that might otherwise reach its subject. This is the case in English, where CPs bear a partial set of nominal features, and so hyperraising out of CP is blocked. Halpert proposes that, in general, raising to Y out of XP requires that either of two conditions hold:

- (30) a. XP has no ϕ -features (e.g. English raising from TP), or
 b. Y ϕ -Agrees first with XP and then with material inside of XP (e.g. Zulu hyperraising from CP)

In Nez Perce, CPs are unable to ϕ -agree or to serve as subjects.⁴ Sentences such as (31) are ungrammatical:

- (31) * [*pro* hii-’ni-ye *pro* pii’nit] hi-waqa cicwaay’s.
 [3SG 3SUBJ-give-PERF 1SG gift] 3SUBJ-be.PAST surprising
 Intended: that he gave me a gift was surprising.

On the Intervention Theory, the absence of ϕ -features on CP is predicted to render Nez Perce CPs entirely transparent for ϕ -Agree. If Agree and movement are regulated only by intervention, rather than by phases, probes for ϕ outside of CP may freely ignore the CP layer in their search for goals. Thus, hyperraising in structures (25) and (27) moves a DP directly from the embedded TP into the matrix VP.

One significant prediction of Halpert’s theory is uniformity in the opacity behavior of XPs for ϕ -probes across a language: if, for instance, CP is permeable for the (covert) ϕ -Agree involved in hyperraising, it should also be permeable for other types of ϕ -Agree. This prediction raises an immediate question about A-scrambling (assuming A-movement

⁴Preliminary fieldwork also suggests that Nez Perce CPs are unable to antecede *pro*, in keeping with the prediction of Iatridou & Embick (1997) for a language where CPs lack ϕ -features.

is generally driven by ϕ -Agree). If the object can A-move over the subject (as we have seen), then ν P must not block A-movement; if CP does not, either, then A-scrambling should be unbounded. We expect, then, that languages with both hyperraising and A-scrambling should be languages in which WCO and superiority effects are totally absent, not just absent within single clauses – contrary to the facts of Nez Perce. Rather, as we saw in (18)-(21) above, A-scrambling in Nez Perce behaves as a clause-bounded phenomenon. Example (21) shows in particular that A-scrambling is not possible out of the complement of *neki* ‘think’ in the canonical complementation pattern. These facts demonstrate *selective opacity* (Keine 2016) among A-operations: the CP complement of ‘think’ is opaque for one type of A-movement (A-scrambling) but not for another (hyperraising).

A further issue of the same general type is made visible by Nez Perce complementizer agreement. Nez Perce shows complementizer agreement (CA) on various C heads, e.g. relative C head *ke*. As discussed in Deal (2015a), CA features omnivorous behavior, indicating person features on the subject *or* the object. In (32), either the subject or the object is 1st person, and relative C takes the form *kex*. In (33), by contrast, both arguments are 3rd person, and C appears in bare form *ke*. (Visible agreement is found for 1st person, 2nd person, and plural; see Deal 2015a for various additional details.)

- (32) a. **ke-x** kaa *pro* 'e-cew'cew'-teetu Angel-ne
 C-1 then 1SG 3OBJ-telephone-HAB Angel-ACC
 1sg/3sg: when I call Angel
- b. **ke-x** kaa Angel-nim hi-cew'cew'-teetu *pro*
 C-1 then Angel-ERG 3SUBJ-telephone-HAB 1SG
 3sg/1sg: when Angel calls me
- (33) **ke** kaa Angel-nim pe-cew'cew'-teetu Tatlo-na
 C then Angel-ERG 3/3-telephone-HAB Tatlo-ACC
 3sg/3sg: when Angel calls Tatlo

While CA is able to reflect features of either argument in a transitive, it also shows signs of locality restrictions – in particular, those characterized by the classical phase theory. CA cannot reach into oblique phrases, which are plausibly PPs, (34). It cannot reach into the NP complement of DP, (35). Crucially, it also cannot reach into the complement of *neki* ‘think’ in the canonical complementation pattern, (36).

- (34) ke(*m) 'isii hii-wes [_{PP} 'im-im-x] qetu kuhet
 C-(*)2 who.NOM 3SUBJ-be.PRES [2SG-OBL-from] more tall
 someone who is taller than you
- (35) ke(*x) kaa [_{DP} \emptyset [_{NP} ne-'iic]] hi-pnim-ce
 C-(*)1 then [D [1SG-mother.NOM]] 3SUBJ-sleep-IMPERF
 when my mother is sleeping
- (36) ke(*x) kaa Harold hi-neki-se [_{CP} 'iin wees Lapwai-pa]
 C-(*)1 then Harold.NOM 3SUBJ-think-IMPRF [1SG.NOM be.PRES Lapwai-in]
 when Harold thinks I am in Lapwai

CA may index an argument originating in a lower clause only if covert hyperraising takes place, (37).⁵

- (37) ke-x kaa Harold-nim hi-neki-se [CP 'iin wees Lapwai-pa]
 C-1 then Harold-ERG 3SUBJ-think-IMPERF [1SG.NOM be-PRES Lapwai-in]
 when Harold thinks I am in Lapwai

The possibility of CA in (37) provides additional support for the analysis in terms of covert hyperraising: the 1st person pronoun surfaces in the lower clause (where it receives nominative case), but participates in CA like a matrix argument. The challenge for the Intervention Theory is to explain why this example should be distinguished from its ordinary complementation counterpart in (36). Again, the selective opacity of CP for ϕ -Agree is unexpected if CP phasehood is entirely abolished in favor of intervention-based locality constraints. Why should Agree with a ν P internal ϕ -probe (big V) be possible, whereas Agree with a more distant C probe (for CA) or T probe (for scrambling) is not?⁶

I would like to suggest an answer that restores some role for phases *qua* absolute locality domains, but which assumes that phases become impenetrable only when the next higher phase head is merged (Chomsky 2001, Grohmann 2009, Embick 2010). Thus CP is not opaque immediately upon construction; it becomes opaque only when ν is merged. In a sense, this could be taken as a friendly amendment to Halpert's general analysis: within ν P, it is only intervention that plays a role in regulating ϕ -dependencies (e.g. raising) – CP is not yet a phase when the object A-moves out. Within ν P, then, Halpert's view can be adopted. It is in movement targeting the ν P edge or higher, or Agree with a probe outside of VP, that effects of the phase impenetrability condition re-emerge, even for the same type of CP that permits hyperraising. Thus intervention effects replace phases only in the very local circumstance where the next higher phase head has not been merged.

In terms of the typology of hyperraising, this *Delayed Opacity* theory offers the possibility of explanations both in terms of intervention (as on the Intervention Theory) and in terms of the location of the relevant ϕ -probes. A-movement out of finite clauses is possible if the probe driving the movement is quite low (below the first phase head above CP). A language will lack hyperraising if its CPs themselves satisfy ϕ -probes, preventing further probing, or if there are simply no probes in the domain between CP and the next phase head up. Halpert appeals to the first of these to rule out hyperraising in English; on the Delayed Opacity theory, one might equally well appeal to the second. This means that, cross-linguistically, the discovery that C does not in fact host ϕ -features in a language (e.g. in the range of Indo-European languages discussed by Iatridou & Embick 1997) would not be sufficient to predict that CPs in that language are generally ϕ -transparent. In addition, if this proposal is correct, we should expect that cases of subject-to-subject hyperraising (e.g. of the type found in various Bantu languages) in fact feature cyclic A-movement through the VP domain – there can be no “long” hyperraising from Spec,TP to Spec,TP.

⁵Note that there is no visible object agreement with the 1st person singular object in the matrix clause here as a consequence of the general fact that agreement is only overt for 3rd person and plural arguments, (4). Covert hyperraising is thus visible only in the presence of ergative case on the higher subject.

⁶Recall that ν P phasehood provides no ready answer all by itself, given that A-scrambling and CA are both possible for elements inside ν P. (CA with an object in SVO order is demonstrated in Deal (2015b, 410).)

5. Conclusions

There are three primary implications from this study of Nez Perce covert hyperraising to object. First, the mere existence of the phenomenon vindicates the predictions of theories that permit covert A-movement and hyperraising to object positions. Second, given the surface similarity between covert hyperraising and long-distance agreement, any future diagnosis of one phenomenon or the other must pay close attention to the A-/Ā-status of the DP that agrees as a matrix object (DP^{\oplus}). Third, the distribution of raising and hyperraising across languages cannot be regulated purely in terms of Activity, as Halpert (2016) has argued already, but it cannot be regulated purely in terms of Halpert's Intervention Theory, either. Instead, we require a theory of CP opacity that permits the very same type of CP to block some instances of ϕ -Agree while permitting others – CP is opaque not absolutely, but selectively. I have suggested that the right distinction can be made in terms of Delayed Opacity: CP does not behave as a phase for probes immediately above it, but it does behave as a phase for probes on or outside the next higher phase head up.

I close by noting that this generalization offers a notable contrast to the crosslinguistic generalization that Keine (2016) calls the *Height-Locality Connection* (HLC):

- (38) The higher the location of a probe is in the clausal structure, the more kinds of structures are transparent to this probe. (Keine 2016, 156)

In English, for instance, a probe on T cannot reach into CP edges, but a probe on C can; in German, a probe on T (for scrambling) cannot reach into nonfinite TPs, but a probe on C (for relativization) can (Keine 2016, ch 4). How to reconcile the Nez Perce data with the HLC is not obvious: hyperraising certainly does not target a position higher than the matrix C, for instance, even though the probe driving hyperraising (V) may see into CPs and the probe driving complementizer agreement (C) may not. On the Delayed Opacity theory, the prediction is in fact the opposite of the HLC: the lower the probe, the greater the chance it will be able to probe into CP before opacity sets in. Why the Nez Perce facts should contrast so starkly with those showing HLC-obedience remains to be seen.

References

- Béjar, Susana, & Diane Massam. 1999. Multiple case checking. *Syntax* 2:65–79.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 2005. Long distance agreement in Hindi-Urdu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:757–807.
- Branigan, Phil, & Marguerite Mackenzie. 2002. Altruism, A'-movement, and object agreement in Innu-aimûn. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:385–407.
- Carstens, Vicki, & Michael Diercks. 2013. Parameterizing case and activity: Hyperraising in Bantu. In *NELS 40*, 99–118. Amherst: GLSA.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2004. Beyond explanatory adequacy. In *Structures and beyond: The cartography of syntactic structures*, ed. Adriana Belletti, 104–131. Oxford: OUP.

- Deal, Amy Rose. 2010a. Ergative case and the transitive subject: a view from Nez Perce. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28:73–120.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2010b. Topics in the Nez Perce verb. Dissertation, UMass Amherst.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2013. Possessor raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44:391–432.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2015a. Interaction and satisfaction in ϕ -agreement. In *Proceedings of NELS 45*, ed. Thuy Bui & Deniz Ozyildiz, 179–192. Amherst: GLSA.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2015b. A note on Nez Perce verb agreement, with sample paradigms. In *Proceedings of ICSNL 50*, ed. Natalie Weber et al., 389–413. Vancouver: UBCWPL.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2016a. Cyclicity and connectivity in Nez Perce relative clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 47:427–470.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2016b. Person-based split ergativity in Nez Perce is syntactic. *Journal of Linguistics* 52:533–564.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2017. Dedicated *de re* attitude reports. Manuscript, UC Berkeley.
- Embick, David. 2010. *Localism versus globalism in morphology and phonology*. MIT Press.
- Ferreira, Marcelo. 2009. Null subjects and finite control in Brazilian Portuguese. In *Minimalist essays on Brazilian Portuguese syntax*, ed. Jairo Nunes. John Benjamins.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2009. Exploring interfaces. In *Explorations of Phase Theory: Interpretation at the Interfaces*, ed. Kleanthes K. Grohmann. De Gruyter.
- Halpert, Claire. 2016. Raising parameters. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 33*, ed. Kyeong-min Kim, 186–195. Cascadia Press.
- Halpert, Claire, & Jochen Zeller. 2015. Right dislocation and raising-to-object in Zulu. *The Linguistic Review* 32:475–513.
- Iatridou, Sabine, & David Embick. 1997. *Apropos pro*. *Language* 73:58–78.
- Keine, Stefan. 2016. Probes and their horizons. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 1990. The A/A-bar distinction and movement theory. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Polinsky, Maria, & Eric Potsdam. 2001. Long-distance agreement and topic in Tsez. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19:583–646.
- Polinsky, Maria, & Eric Potsdam. 2013. Diagnosing covert A-movement. In *Diagnostics in Syntax*, ed. Lisa L.-S. Cheng & Norbert Corver, 210–234. Oxford: OUP.
- Postal, Paul. 1974. *On raising*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Rude, Noel. 1992. Word order and topicality in Nez Perce. In *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*, ed. D. Payne, 193–208. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Salzmann, Martin. To appear. Prolepsis. In *Companion to Syntax, 2nd edition*, ed. Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2006. Raising out of finite CP in Nguni: the case of *fanele*. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24:255–275.
- Zyman, Erik. To appear. P’urhepecha hyperraising to object: An argument for purely altruistic movement. In *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, volume 2.