

Selective Opacity

Structure Building, Selection & Selective Opacity, Meeting 6

McFadden/Sundaresan/Zeijlstra, EGG 2019

August 5-6, 2019

Back to selective opacity:

- ☞ We are ultimately interested in using this new structure-building model to derive certain types of selective opacity effects.
- ☞ But before we dive into this data, let's look a bit more closely at what selective opacity is, and what types of selective opacity effects we get in language.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Back to selective opacity:

Selective opacity: — *cases where, in a particular context, locality effects obtain under a set of conditions α , but not under another set of conditions β — force us to confront tensions between different views of locality.*

Selective opacity effects seem naturally classifiable into the following (potentially orthogonal) classes:

- i. Selective opacity across domains
- ii. Selective opacity across operations
- iii. Selective opacity across languages/dialects

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.

SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

I. Selective opacity across domains:

SelOP_{Domains}: when a syntactic operation α is allowed out of a domain XP , when the structural context fulfills certain properties, but is blocked otherwise.

Some concrete instantiations:

- A. Scrambling vs. hyperraising-to-object in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017)
- B. Island violations (CED effects (Huang, 1982; Chomsky, 1986))

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

When movement seems non-local – hyperraising:

- Standard raising (to subject): *Mary_i seemed [t_i to be irritated]*.
- Hyperraising to subject (discussed in Halpert, 2019, for Zulu): *Mary_i seemed [that t_i was irritated]*.
- Standard raising (to object): *Mary_i made Susan_j out [t_j to be a genius]*.
- Overt Hyperraising to object: *Mary_i made Susan_j out [that t_j is a genius]*. (non-existent??)
- Covert Hyperraising to object: *Mary_i made t_j out [that Susan_j is a genius]*. (Deal, 2017, for Nez Perce).

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Issues for locality:

- In cases of hyperraising: either the PIC or improper movement is violated.
- It also raises questions about the Activity Condition.
- ☞ Halpert's solution: get rid of phases and derive locality in terms of Relativized Minimality alone (A over A principle of Rackowski and Richards, 2005); also get rid of the Activity Condition.
- ☞ Deal's contribution: Selective opacity in Nez Perce makes Halpert's solution problematic and suggests we need phases after all.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

A. SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

- In Nez Perce, an embedded object may be **hyperraised** to matrix object position (Note: the matrix clause is **transitive**) (Deal, 2017, 2, Ex. 3):

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

- But the same finite CP *blocks* A-scrambling across it:

(2) * Ísii-nm₁ ísii hi-neki-se [CP
who-ERG who.NOM 3SUBJ-think-IMPERF
t₁ pee-p-e k'alk'al-na]?
3/3-eat-PERF cookie-ACC
Intended: 'Who₁ does who think [CP t₁ ate the
cookies]?' (Deal, 2017, 7, Ex. 21b)

Back to selective
opacity:

Back to selective
opacity:

I. Selective opacity
across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains}
in Nez Perce (Deal,
2017):

II. Selective opacity
across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A}
confound:

Making things
complicated – A vs.
 \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity
across
languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu
(Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a
phase-less universe:

References

This is a type of $\text{SelOp}_{\text{Domains}}$:

- ☞ Finite CPs in Nez Perce are **selectively opaque**: assuming both hyperraising and scrambling involve ϕ -Agree, one and the same CP blocks one type of ϕ -Agree, while licensing another.

- ☞ Deal's solution – **Delayed Opacity**: “phases become impenetrable only when the next higher phase head is merged.” (Deal, 2017, 12).
 - Thus, A movement out of a finite CP phase is possible only when the probe triggering this movement is merged *below* the next higher phase head (hyperraising to object),
 - ... but is blocked otherwise (long A-scrambling).

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.

$\text{SelOp}_{\text{Domains}}$ in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

II. Selective opacity across operations:

SelOP_{Operations}: when one and the same domain XP is opaque for a syntactic operation α but is transparent for another syntactic operation β (this is the sense in which Keine, 2019, uses the term).

Some concrete instantiations:

- I. A vs. \bar{A} -phenomena (Postal, 1971; Chomsky, 1981, a.m.o.);
- II. Perspectival vs. non-perspectival anaphora;
- III. **Movement vs. agreement asymmetries across adjuncts and complements.**

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.

SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Classic A-movement is possible across non-finite CPs, TPs and ν Ps, but not finite CPs (3):

(3) Cyclic Locality (Raising):

- a. Maria_i appears [TP_1 t_i to be likely [TP_2 t_i to like beer]].
- b. * Maria_i appears [CP that t_i is likely [TP t_i to like beer]].

But classic \bar{A} -movement is crucially *also* (cyclically) possible out of finite CPs (4):

- (4) What_i does it appear [CP_1 t_i that it is likely [CP_2 t_i that Maria likes t_i]]?

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

This is a case of $\text{SelOp}_{\text{Operations}}$:

- ☞ One and the same finite CP is opaque to one type of operation (e.g. raising) but is transparent to another (e.g. wh-movement).

- Classic solution: syntactic operations are sensitive to specific distinctions between **A** and $\bar{\text{A}}$ -positions.
- For instance, the **Ban on Improper Movement** (Chomsky, 1973) states that movement from an $\bar{\text{A}}$ -position must be to another $\bar{\text{A}}$ -position: (3b) violates this, and is thus ungrammatical.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
 $\text{SelOp}_{\text{Domains}}$
in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. $\bar{\text{A}}$
confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. $\bar{\text{A}}$ in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

- In Dinka (Nilo-Saharan), cyclic long-distance (\bar{A} -) topicalization must be accompanied by **changes to case and ϕ -agreement** along the dependency path (van Urk, 2015, 19, Ex. 7c):

(5) Ye *kôc-kó* [_{CP} Op *é-kè-cíi*
be people-which PST-3P-PRF.OV

Áyèn gàam gálàm]]?

Ayen.GEN give.NF pen

‘Which people had Ayen given a pen to?’

- Van Urk further shows that such movement bears the fingerprint of conventional A movement with respect to binding (Fox, 1999; Lebeaux, 2009; Takahashi and Hulse, 2009): e.g. it does not trigger Weak Crossover effects and does not reconstruct for Condition C.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

- ☞ Long-distance movement is thus characterized by both A and \bar{A} properties.

Van Urk's solution:

- Replace the idea of distinct A vs. \bar{A} -positions in syntax with A vs. \bar{A} -features.
- When both A and \bar{A} -features occupy the same syntactic head, they will trigger syntactic operations of both kinds to this head yielding the kinds of **mixed effects** we see in (5).
- Classic A vs. \bar{A} asymmetries (cf. (3) vs. (4)) reduce to selective opacity for A vs. \bar{A} -features: i.e. Relativized Minimality for A vs. \bar{A} -features.
- Van Urk proposes that \bar{A} -features, in contrast to A-features, are optional on a probing head.
- An intervening ZP with only A-features (like ϕ - or Case) will thus only constitute a barrier for A-operations while remaining transparent for \bar{A} -operations (like $[wh]$).

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Potential problem with Van Urk's solution:

- Data from Hindi (Keine, 2016, 2019) and Nez Perce (Deal, 2017) suggest that a featural distinction in terms of A vs. \bar{A} -bar may still be too coarse.
- After all, Nez Perce allows selective opacity across CPs *within* types of A-dependency: cf. (1) vs. (2).

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

SelOp_{Languages}: When a domain XP appears to be a locality domain for a syntactic operation α in Language/Dialect A, but not in Language/Dialect B.

Some concrete instantiations:

- Raising vs. Hyperraising (to subject and object) (Zeller, 2006; Halpert, 2019; Carstens, 2011; Deal, 2017)
- A vs. “Hyper-A” phenomena more generally: e.g. (long) passivization, indexical shift, restructuring (see recent work in Wurmbrand, To Appear; Wurmbrand and Lohringer, To Appear).

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Hyperraising in Zulu is illustrated below (Halpert, 2019, 18, Exx. 50a-c):

(6) **uZinhle** **u-/ku-bonakala** [ukuthi **u-xova**
AUG.1Zinhle **1S-/17S-seem** **that** **1S-make**
ujeqe].

AUG.1bread

Literal: ‘Zinhle_i seems [_{CP} that t_i is making bread now].’

Intended: ‘Zinhle seems to be making steamed bread now.’

Challenges:

- (6) should be ruled out either due to the PIC, the Ban on Improper Movement, or the Activity Condition.
- It cannot obviously be reconciled with classic raising in languages like English.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Halpert's solution (similar in spirit to Béjar and Rezac, 2009) derives selective opacity in terms of IL:

- Zulu-hyperraising (6) obtains just in case the embedded CP intervenes for ϕ -Agree between T and the embedded subject, for a *proper subject* of features.
- Relativized Minimality matrix T to Agree with the CP first for this feature-subset.
- This Agree cycle “unlocks” the CP, allowing matrix T to continue probing for the remaining features with the next closest candidate, the embedded subject.
- There are no phases; there is no Activity Condition.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

- ☞ How can we deal with selective opacity effects like those in Nez Perce (cf. (1) vs. (2))?
- ☞ How can we deal with **successive cyclicity** (i.e. intermediate movement)?

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References

References I

- Béjar, Susana, and Milan Rezac. 2009. Cyclic agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:35–73.
- Carstens, Vicki. 2011. Hyperactivity and hyperagreement in Bantu. *Lingua* 121:721–741.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In *Festschrift for Morris Halle*, ed. Stephen A. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, 232–285. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2017. Covert hyperraising to object. In *Proceedings of NELS 47*, 256–270. Amherst: GLSA.
- Fox, Danny. 1999. Reconstruction, binding theory, and the interpretation of chains. *LI* 30:157–196.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References II

- Halpert, Claire. 2019. Raising, unphased. *NLLT* 37:123–165.
- Huang, Cheng-Teh. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Keine, Stefan. 2016. Probes and their horizons. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Keine, Stefan. 2019. Selective opacity. *LI* 50:13–62.
- Lebeaux, David. 2009. *Where does the binding theory apply?*. LI Monographs. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Original version published in 1999.
- Postal, Paul. 1971. *Cross-over phenomena*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Rackowski, Andrea, and Norvin Richards. 2005. Phase edge and extraction: a Tagalog case study. *LI* 36:565–599.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe:

References III

- Takahashi, Shoichi, and Sarah Hulsey. 2009. Wholesale late merger: Beyond the a/ā-distinction. *LI* 387–426.
- van Urk, Coppe. 2015. A uniform syntax for phrasal movement: a case study of Dinka Bor. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. To Appear. Cross-clausal A-dependencies. In *Papers from CLS 54*.
- Wurmbrand, Susi, and Magdalena Lohringer. To Appear. An implicational universal in complementation – Theoretical insights and empirical progress. In *Propositional arguments in cross-linguistic research: Theoretical and empirical issues*, ed. Jutta M. Hartmann and Angelika Wöllstein. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zeller, Jochen. 2006. Raising out of finite CP in Nguni: the case of *fanele*. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 24:255–275.

Back to selective opacity:

Back to selective opacity:

I. Selective opacity across domains:

A.
SelOp_{Domains} in Nez Perce (Deal, 2017):

II. Selective opacity across operations:

The A vs. \bar{A} confound:

Making things complicated – A vs. \bar{A} in Dinka:

III. Selective opacity across languages/dialects:

Hyperraising in Zulu (Halpert, 2019):

Main problems for a phase-less universe: