Hyperraising to Object as Altruistic Movement

Introduction. A central question about syntactic movement is what its *driving force* is. Three prominent views are: **Greed:** a featural requirement of the moving element (Bošković 2007, a.o.); **Enlightened Self-Interest:** a featural requirement of the moving element <u>or</u> the position moved to (Lasnik 1995, a.o.); and **Labeling:** the need to render relevant constituents labelable by the Labeling Algorithm (Chomsky 2013). Here, I present field data from the Mexican isolate P'urhepecha (Janitzio variety) that support Enlightened Self-Interest. Janitzio P'urhepecha (**JP**) allows *hyperraising-to-object*, wherein the subject of an embedded finite clause raises into the matrix, becoming its object. I argue this is <u>altruistic (target-driven) movement</u>, and that Greed- and Labeling-based analyses of it face serious difficulties.

Phenomenon. In JP, a finite complement-clause normally has a nominative (zero-marked) subject ((1a)). Under some verbs, however, the embedded subject can be accusative, preceding C ((1b)).

(1) a. Ikinari ueka-sïn-∅-di   **eska** ⌐Xumo⌐ jaruata-a-∅-ka   pauani.
      Ikinari want-HAB-PRS-IND3 that Xumo   help-FUT-PRS-SJV tomorrow
      'Ikinari wants Xumo to help him tomorrow.'

    b. Ikinari ueka-sïn-∅-di   ⌐Xumo-ni⌐ **eska** jaruata-a-∅-ka   pauani.
      Ikinari want-HAB-PRS-IND3 Xumo-ACC that help-FUT-PRS-SJV tomorrow   (= (1a))

The accusative DP (DP$_{ACC}$) in (1b)-type sentences is in the matrix: it can precede matrix adverbials.

Three facts show DP$_{ACC}$ <u>raises</u> into the matrix (hyperraising) rather than originating there and anteceding a *pro* within CP$_{eska}$ (prolepsis). **A.** When DP$_{ACC}$ is present, nothing can move out of CP$_{eska}$ ((2)), suggesting that DP$_{ACC}$ does (stopping off in [Spec,CP]). **B.** DP$_{ACC}$ must correspond to the embedded <u>subject</u>, not any lower argument (an intervention effect). **C.** The construction is island-sensitive.

(2) ?* ¿ ⌐Ambe⌐$_k$=ri ueka-sïn-∅-gi   ⌐Alicia-ni⌐ **eska** kusta-a-∅-ka   ___$_k$?
      what$_k$=2sS want-HAB-PRS-INT Alice-ACC that play$_{music}$-FUT-PRS-SJV ___$_k$
      intended: 'What (music) do you want Alice to play?'   *DP$_{ACC}$, though in the matrix, blocks the CP escape hatch*

I show further that (1b)-type sentences do not involve finite control. The phenomenon, then, is <u>hyperraising-to-object</u> (**HtO**; Halpert & Zeller 2015, a.o.).

Analysis. Constituent-order evidence shows JP-HtO targets (a second) [Spec,*v*P]. It is derived as follows. [$_C$ *Eska*] 'that' can optionally bear [EPP:D]. In HtO, *eska*$_{[EPP:D]}$ is merged, and attracts the embedded subject (closest DP) to [Spec,CP] ((3a)). Being on the phase-edge, DP is not spelled out with C's complement. Further structure-building yields (3b). Hyperraising *v* bears an unvalued Number-feature, which it values by Agreeing with DP in [Spec,CP] (overtly in the plural). Finally, *v*'s Number-feature bears an EPP-subfeature, satisfied by moving the agreed-with DP to (a second) [Spec,*v*P] ((3c)).

(3) a. [$_{CP}$ [$_{DP}$ Xumo] that$_{[EPP:D]}$ [$_{DP}$ Xumo] help *pro*$_{him}$ tomorrow]   (= (1b))

    b. [$_{vP}$ Ikinari *v*$_{[Num:\_\_\_[EPP]]}$ want [$_{CP}$ [$_{DP}$ Xumo] that$_{[EPP:D]}$ . . .]]

    c. [$_{vP}$ [$_{DP}$ Xumo] Ikinari *v*$_{[Num:SG[EPP]]}$ want [$_{CP}$ [$_{DP}$ Xumo] that$_{[EPP:D]}$ . . .]]   *(plus matrix subject- and verb-movement in (1b))*

Comparison: Greed. A *Greed-based* analysis might posit that DP hyperraises to satisfy its Case-feature, because it cannot get Case within CP$_{eska}$. However, DP$_{ACC}$ can be linked to a <u>nominative</u> floated quantifier in CP$_{eska}$ ((4)), showing Nominative <u>is available</u> within CP$_{eska}$.

(4) Ueka-sïn-∅-ga=ni   ⌐Alonsu-ni, Paku-ni   ka Puki-ni⌐ **eska**=sï ⌐iamindu-eecha⌐ ch'ana-a-∅-ka.
    want-HAB-PRS-IND1=1sS Alonzo-ACC, Paco-ACC and Puki-ACC that=pS all-PL(NOM)   play-FUT-PRS-SJV
    'I want Alonzo, Paco, and Puki [= three dogs] to all play.'

An alternative Greed-based analysis, on which DP hyperraises to a matrix [Spec,*v*P] to satisfy a Bošković-2007-style feature [*uv*], is also shown to be untenable.

Comparison: Labeling. A Labeling analysis might proceed thus: hyperraising *v* is too weak to label. Consequently, the embedded subject raises to "[Spec,*v*P]" to reinforce it, and "*v*P" is labeled ⟨Num,Num⟩ through feature-sharing. But HtO being optional, there would have to be two (otherwise identical) hyperraising *v*s, only one being weak. Furthermore, a JP <u>subject</u> can <u>stay</u> in [Spec,*v*P], but never agrees with *v*; *v*P is then an XP-YP structure without visible feature-sharing.

Conclusion. JP-HtO can be captured straightforwardly under **Enlightened Self-Interest**, which allows for **altruistic** movement. Greed- and Labeling-based approaches face severe problems in accounting for it. JP-HtO, then, strongly suggests that <u>purely altruistic (target-driven) movement</u> does exist.

References *(selected).* Bošković, Željko. 2007. "On the Locality and Motivation of Move and Agree: An Even More Minimal Theory." *Linguistic Inquiry* 38.4: 589-644. Chomsky, Noam. 2013. "Problems of projection." *Lingua* 130: 33-49. Halpert, Claire and Jochen Zeller. 2015. "Right dislocation and raising-to-object in Zulu." *The Linguistic Review* 32.3: 475-513. Lasnik, Howard. 1995. "Case and Expletives Revisited: On Greed and Other Human Failings." *Linguistic Inquiry* 26.4: 615-633.