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1 Introduction

- This talk investigates cross-linguistic and language-internal variation in the components of the left periphery, based on data from Kikuyu (or Gĩkũyũ), a Bantu language spoken primarily in Kenya.
- I identify two types of CPs in Kikuyu, illustrated in (1a-b).¹ Both CP types are finite and able to inflect for tense and agreement—but one is unable to host information-structural material in its left periphery (e.g., FocP).
- The absence of this material correlates with the ability for subjects to undergo A-movement (hyperraising) out of such clauses (see also Yoshimoto (2012) on Japanese).

(1) a. Mwangi a-r-ecir-i-a [CP₁ ati Njeri nī-a-ra-rug-a nyama] Mwangi 1SM-PROG-think-TR-FV that Njeri FOC-1SM-PROG-cook-FV meat ‘Mwangi thinks that Njeri is cooking the meat.’ (CT₁)

b. kū-haan-a [CP₂ ta Mwangi a-ra-iy-i-r-e kīndū] 15SM-seem-FV like Mwangi 1SM-PROG-steal-PST-FV thing ‘It seems like Mwangi stole something.’ (CT₂)

- **Proposal:** A CP is defective for phase impenetrability purposes whenever it lacks any featural or structural components that are otherwise expected to be present within the CP domain.

  ▶ In Kikuyu, defective CP domains are those that lack syntactic structure associated with information structure.
  ▶ Because these CPs are defective, A-movement can take place out of them.
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¹Many thanks to Eva Kubai for her judgments and data and for sharing her language with me. Thanks also to Adam Albright, Athulya Aravind, Nico Baier, Kenyon Branan, Michael Y. Erlewine, Claire Halpert, Shigeru Miyagawa, David Pesetsky, Norvin Richards, Florian Schwarz, and Martin Walkow for helpful comments and discussion. All errors are mine.

¹There are other CPs that can be categorized into the two clause types discussed in this talk. For reasons of space, however, I will illustrate the two clause types with *atí ‘that’-clauses and *ta ‘like’-clauses respectively throughout.
2 The Kikuyu left periphery

- In this section, I present an overview of the CP domain in Kikuyu, concentrating in particular on focus.

- Kikuyu has a prefix \( \text{nǐ} \) encoding focus.\(^2\) In declarative clauses and yes/no questions, \( \text{nǐ} \) may appear on the verb (2). \( ^{Note} \): The examples in this section all involve CT1.

\[(2) \quad \text{a. mùndù (nǐ)-a-kù-gùr-a ngari} \quad \text{man} \quad (\text{FOC}) \text{1SM-FUT-buy-FV car} \quad \text{‘The man will buy a car.’ (when present, ‘nǐ’ encodes something akin to assertion/verum focus)} \]

\[\text{b. Mwangi nǐ-a-rug-ag-a?} \quad \text{FOC 1SM-cook-HAB-FV} \quad \text{‘Does Mwangi cook?’} \]

- In \( \text{wh} \)-questions and focus fronting, the same prefix obligatorily associates with the extracted element instead (3).

\[(3) \quad \text{a. n-ùū ù-ror-ir-e mútumia} \quad \text{FOC-who AA.SM-look-PST-FV woman} \quad \text{‘Who looked at the woman?’} \]

\[\text{b. nǐ ibuku Mwangi a-he-ir-e Kamau} \quad \text{FOC book Mwangi 1SM-give-PST-FV Kamau} \quad \text{‘Mwangi gave a book to Kamau.’} \]

- Three ways to form a \( \text{wh} \)-question: (a) full movement to the matrix left periphery; (b) partial movement to an embedded left periphery; (c) \( \text{wh} \)-in-situ.

\[(4) \quad \text{a. nǐ kī Wambui a-r-ecir-ia} \quad \text{[atī Mwangi a-ra-thom-a ___]} \quad \text{FOC what Wambui 1SM-PROG-think-FV that Mwangi 1SM-PROG-read-FV} \quad \text{‘What does Wambui think Mwangi is reading?’} \]

\[\text{b. Wambui a-r-ecir-ia} \quad \text{[atī nǐ kī Mwangi a-ra-thom-a ___]} \quad \text{Wambui 1SM-PROG-think-FV that FOC what Mwangi 1SM-PROG-read-FV} \quad \text{‘What does Wambui think Mwangi is reading?’} \]

\[\text{c. Wambui a-r-ecir-ia} \quad \text{[atī Mwangi a-ra-thom-a kī] Mwangi a-ra-thom-a ___]} \quad \text{Wambui 1SM-PROG-think-FV that Mwangi 1SM-PROG-read-FV what} \quad \text{‘What does Wambui think Mwangi is reading?’} \]

- In (4b), the moved \( \text{wh} \)-phrase surfaces to the right of the complementizer \( \text{atī} \) ‘that.’

- An articulated CP (Rizzi 1997): The CP is not a single projection, but rather a set of hierarchically ordered subprojections.

\[\quad \triangleright \text{Force}^0: \text{locus of complementizers, e.g., \text{atī} ‘that.’} \]

\[\quad \triangleright \text{Foc}^0: \text{locus of focus-related elements, such as the prefix \text{nǐ}. Ā-extracted elements land in FocP.} \]

\[\quad \triangleright \text{(See Cable (2010) for a similar proposal for Tlingit.)} \]

\[(5) \quad [CP \text{ ForceP [ FocP [TP AgrP [ … ]]]]}] \]

\(^2\)This prefix is thought to have arisen from a copula diachronically (Nurse 2008), but is now generally analyzed as a focus marker (Clements 1984, Schwarz 2003, 2007, Schardl 2014).
I assume that ́ni is always generated in Foc⁰ regardless of whether it ends up affixed to an A-moved constituent or the rest of the verbal complex (Schwarz 2003, 2007). See Appendix for a full analysis.

Important: The availability of ́ni in a given clause will be used to diagnose the presence of left-peripheral structure (FocP) in that clause.

Section takeaway:
- Kikuyu allows both full and partial wh-movement, as well as wh-in situ.
- A-moved elements associate with a focus prefix ́ni. ́ni may also surface on the verb in yes/no questions and to express assertion or verum focus.
- I assume an articulated CP, consisting of (minimally) two subprojections: ForceP and FocP. FocP is where ́ni originates; it is also where A-movement lands.

3 Subordinate clause types

3.1 Overview
- The two clause types under investigation are repeated in (6a-b). The clause types are, for the most part, selected for by different predicates.

(6) a. Mwangi a-r-ecir-i-a [CP₁ ati Njeri ní-a-ra-rug-a nyama] Mwangi 1SM-PROG-think-TR-FV that Njeri FOC-1SM-PROG-cook-FV meat 'Mwangi thinks that Njeri is cooking the meat.' (CT₁)

b. kū-haan-a [CP₂ ta Mwangi a-ra-iy-i-re kīndū] 15SM-seem-FV like Mwangi 1SM-PROG-steal-PST-FV thing 'It seems like Mwangi stole something.' (CT₂)

- Both clause types are finite, make full tense/agreement distinctions, and have complementizers—suggesting that all the embedded clauses shown above are CPs.
- However, CT₁ and CT₂ display a number of differences (7):

(7) Properties of CT₁ and CT₂:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CT₁</th>
<th>CT₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus prefix ́ni</td>
<td>Available</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial movement</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>nd/ti</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal: The clusterings of properties above can be reduced to a single difference: CT₂ lacks the information-structural syntax that is otherwise present in an articulated CP domain.

(8) a. CT₁:

```
  ForceP
  |      |
  Force⁰ ati
  FocP
  |      |
  Foc⁰ ni
  XP
  ...```

b. CT₂:

```
  ForceP
  |      |
  Force⁰ ta
  XP
  ...```
3.2 No nǐ in CT2

- I showed earlier that ‘that’-clauses (and matrix clauses) allow nǐ to show up on verbs and on partially moved wh-words. Repeated below:

(9) a. Mwangi a-r-ecir-i-a □ CP1 atı Njeri nǐ-a-ra-rug-a □ nyama
Mwangi 1SM-PROG-think-TR-FV that Njeri FOC-1SM-PROG-cook-FV meat
‘Mwangi thinks that Njeri is cooking the meat.’

b. Wambui a-r-ecir-i-a □ CP1 atı nǐ kīī Mwangi a-ra-thom-a □
Wambui 1SM-PROG-think-TR-FV that FOC what Mwangi 1SM-PROG-read-FV
‘What does Wambui think Mwangi is reading?’

- Conversely, nǐ is wholly unavailable in CT2 clauses (on the verb or on a fronted nominal) (10). (10b) additionally shows that partial movement is also impossible in these clauses (though long-distance wh-movement and wh-in situ are fine). 3

(10) a. Mwangi a-haan-a □ CP2 ta (∗nǐ-)a-ra-rug-a
Mwangi 1SM-seem-FV like (∗FOC-)1SM-PROG-cook-FV
‘Mwangi seems to be cooking.’

b. (nǐ kīī) kū-haan-a □ CP2 ta (∗nǐ kīī) Mwangi a-ra-rug-a □ (kīī)
(FOC what) 15SM-seem-FV like (∗FOC what) Mwangi 1SM-PROG-cook-FV (what)
‘What does it seem like Mwangi is cooking?’

- Claim: These properties are related; wh-movement is contingent on the presence of nǐ. In (10), nǐ is impossible because FocP is missing in the CP domain; as a result, partial wh-movement is also impossible.

- Further support: Wh-movement is similarly blocked when nǐ is absent for other reasons—e.g., in certain negative contexts.

▷ As I will discuss later, nǐ and the negation morpheme nd- cannot co-occur (11). The presence of this negation morpheme (and consequent absence of nǐ) forces wh-in situ (12).

(11) mwana (∗nǐ-)nd-a-gū-thom-a ibuku
child (∗FOC-)NEG-1SM-FUT-read-FV book
‘The child will not read the book.’ (fine without nǐ)

(12) a. Njeri nd-a-kū-rug-a kīī
Njeri NEG-1SM-FUT-cook-FV what
‘What will Njeri not cook?’

b. ∗kīī Njeri nd-a-kū-rug-a □
 what Njeri NEG-1SM-FUT-cook-FV
Intended: ‘What will Njeri not cook?’

- Thus, we find two cases where the absence of nĩ correlates with the impossibility of wh-movement. For CT2, this is due to the absence of FocP.

---

3Interestingly, CT2 clauses allow a cleft-like construction in lieu of partial movement, as shown below. Whether this construction truly involves clefting is not clear; I will leave a more thorough investigation of this construction for future research.

(i) kū-haan-a □ CP2 ta ari kīī Mwangi a-ra-rug-a
15SM-seem-FV like COP what Mwangi 1SM-PROG-cook-FV
‘What does it seem like Mwangi is cooking?’
3.3 Different negations

- Further support for the proposal comes from the behaviour of negation.
- Kikuyu has two negation morphemes, used in different syntactic contexts.
- The first is NEG1: nd/tı (phonologically allomorphic); used in CT1 declarative clauses and yes/no questions.

(13) a. mwana nd-a-gū-thom-a ibuku
   child  NEG1-1SM-FUT-read-FV book
   ‘The child will not read the book.’

b. Mwangi nd-a-rug-ag-a?
   Mwangi NEG1-1SM-cook-HAB-FV
   ‘Doesn’t Mwangi cook?’

- As shown earlier, the focus prefix n̄ı is unavailable in the presence of NEG1. This suggests that n̄ı and NEG1 are both hosted in Foc⁰, but only one is allowed to surface at a time. See Laka (1990).
- In contrast, our second kind of negation, ta, can co-occur with n̄ı, e.g., in wh-questions:

(14) [CP₁ n-̄u ̄u FOC-who AA.SM-NEG2-COP under 9.of table
     rugu SM rwa metha]
     ‘Who is not under the table?’

- Proposal: NEG1 and NEG2 occupy different positions in the syntax; while NEG1 is found in Foc⁰, NEG2 is lower (for concreteness, I will refer to this position as Neg⁰).

▷ Prediction (in light of the above): NEG1 is unavailable in CT2. This is borne out (15), which shows that NEG2 must be used.

(15) a. *Mwangi a-haan-a [CP₂ ta nd-a-ra-rug-a]
    Mwangi 1SM-seem-FV like NEG1-1SM-PROG-cook-FV
    Intended: ‘Mwangi seems to not be cooking.’

b. Mwangi a-haan-a [CP₂ ta a-ta-ra-rug-a]
    Mwangi 1SM-seem-FV like 1SM-NEG2-PROG-cook-FV
    ‘Mwangi seems to not be cooking.’

3.4 Interim summary

- CT2 lacks FocP in its left periphery; as a result, such clauses disallow n̄ı and partial movement, as well as other focus-sensitive elements hosted in Foc⁰ such as NEG1.
- In contrast, the CT1 left periphery has FocP, so all of the above is available.
- The different clusterings of properties between CT1 and CT2 can therefore be reduced to the presence vs. absence of FocP in the left periphery.

---

4That n̄ı and NEG1 occupy Foc⁰ is supported by the observation that n̄ı and NEG1 trigger Beck (2006)-style intervention effects, as shown in Branan (2015) and Yuan (in prep.) for Kikuyu and Abels & Muriungi (2008) for the closely related language Kiitharaka. Crucially, Yuan (in prep.) moreover demonstrates that NEG2 does not induce intervention effects.
4 Defective phases and hyperraising

- **Hypothesis:** The absence of certain CP-level material that is otherwise expected to be present results in the CP being *defective* for phase impenetrability purposes.

  ▷ Because the content within a defective phase is not sent to the interfaces upon Merging $C^0$, it is visible to content *outside* of the phase.

- For example, it has been long noted that *subjunctive CPs* permit their subjects to undergo *hyperraising* (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999, Uchibori 2000, Zeller 2006). An example from Zulu (Zeller 2006) in (16):

  (16) **Zulu:**
  a. ku-fanele $[_{CP_{subj}}$ ukuthi abantwana ba-fund-e]£
     LOC-ought that child2 SM2-study-SUBJ
     ‘It is necessary that the children study.’
  b. abantwana ba-fanele $[_{CP_{subj}}$ ukuthi ___ ba-fund-e]£
     child2 SM2-ought that SM2-study-SUBJ
     ‘The children must study.’

  • That the construction in (16b) truly involves A-movement is demonstrated in (17): the idiomatic reading of (17a) is preserved in the raising construction in (17b).

  • (cf. English: *It seems that the cat got out of the bag* and *The cat seems to have gotten out of the bag.*)

  (17) **Zulu:**
  a. izandla zi-ya-gez-an-a
     hand8 SM8-FOC-wash-REC-FV
     ‘The hands wash each other.’
     (→ Two people do something for each other, implying benefits for cooperation)
  b. izandla zi-fanele $[_{CP_{subj}}$ ukuthi ___ zi-gez-an-e]£
     hand8 SM8-ought that SM8-wash-REC-FV
     ‘It is vital that one hand washes another.’
     (idiomatic reading available)

---

5In addition to Zeller’s work, Halpert (2015) demonstrates that Zulu permits A-movement out of finite (phasic) CPs, as shown in (i). Halpert argues that this is possible because matrix $T^0$ agrees with the embedded CP, as shown by the optional clausal agreement, thus ‘unlocking’ the phase (in the sense of Rackowski & Richards 2005). Assuming that the Agree step does not take place with subjunctive CPs, we may conclude that non-defective (strong) phases permit hyperraising only once something extra has taken to place to ensure that such phases are no longer opaque.

(i) **Zulu:**
  a. uZinhle u-bonakala [ukuthi ___ u-zo-xova ujeqe ]
     AUG.1Zinhle 1s-seem that 1S-FUT-make AUG.1bread
     ‘It seems that Zinhle will make steamed bread.’
  b. uZinhle ku-bonakala [ukuthi ___ u-zo-xova ujeqe ]
     AUG.1Zinhle 17s-seem that 1S-FUT-make AUG.1bread
     ‘It seems that Zinhle will make steamed bread.’

  (Halpert 2015)
• The proposal in the literature is that $T^0$ in subjunctive clauses is deficient, in that it lacks certain $T^0$-related features such as tense (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999, Uchibori 2000, Zeller 2006).

  ▷ Putting this together with the notion of feature inheritance (that the features of $T^0$ originate in $C^0$ (Chomsky 2008, Miyagawa 2010; a.o.)): the absence of certain formal features on $C^0$ causes it to be a defective phase head.

• However, Kikuyu exhibits hyperraising out of finite clauses (18).

  ▷ Unlike the subjunctive clauses above, these clauses are fully finite, inflecting for subject-verb agreement and tense/aspect.
  ▷ These are the CT2 constructions. While the analysis for subjunctives cannot extend to Kikuyu, CT2 in Kikuyu and subjunctives are similar in that something is missing at the CP-level.
  ▷ The CP-domain of CT2 is missing syntactic structure.

(18) a. kū-haan-a [$_{CP2}$ ta andū othe m-arī njaa]
   15SM-seem-FV like people 2.every 2SM-COP.LOC outside
   ‘It seems like everyone is outside.’

   b. andū othe ma-haan-a [$_{CP2}$ ta ___ m-arī njaa]
      people 2.every 2SM-seem-FV like 2SM-COP.LOC outside
      ‘Everyone seems to be outside.’

• The alternation in (18) is truly due to A-movement:

  (i) Unlike copy raising constructions (in which the matrix subject is base-generated in its surface position; Rogers 1974, Asudeh 2002, Landau 2011, Asudeh & Toivonen 2012; a.o.), the Kikuyu examples do not presuppose that the matrix subject is cognitively/perceptually available to the speaker:

  (19) Context: A and B walk into Tom’s kitchen. There’s no sign of Tom, but there are various things bubbling away on the stove and there are several ingredients on the counter, apparently waiting to be used.
    a. It seems like Tom is cooking.
    b. Tom seems to be cooking.
    c. #Tom seems like he is cooking. (Asudeh & Toivonen 2012)

  (20) Context: You enter Mwangi’s house, and Mwangi is nowhere to be found. However, you see peeled vegetables next to a pot of boiling water in the kitchen. You say:
    a. kū-haan-a [$_{CP2}$ ta Mwangi a-ra-rug-a irio]
       15SM-seem-FV like Mwangi 1SM-PROG-cook-FV food
       ‘It seems like Mwangi is cooking food.’ ($\approx$ (19a))
    b. Mwangi a-haan-a [$_{CP2}$ ta ___ a-ra-rug-a irio]
       Mwangi 1SM-seem-FV like 1SM-PROG-cook-FV food
       ‘Mwangi seems to be cooking food.’ ($\approx$ (19b))

  (ii) Further evidence for A-movement comes from the fact that quantificational expressions reconstruct under the matrix verb:

  (21) Context: You are inside a small auditorium and notice that all the seats are filled. Later, you look around again and notice three empty seats. You say:
    a. kū-haan-a [$_{CP2}$ ta andū atatū ma-thi-e]
       15SM-seem-FV like people 2.three 2SM-leave-PST-FV
       ‘It seems like three people left.’ (seems > 3)
b.  **andū atatū ma-haan-a [CP ta ___ ma-thi-ir-e]**  
**people 2.3 SM-seem-FV like 2SM-leave-PST-FV**  
‘Three people seem to have left.’ *(seems > 3)*

- By now, we have seen two distinct properties of CT2 clauses:
  1. They lack the left peripheral subprojection associated with focus.
  2. They permit their subjects to undergo raising across a CP boundary.

- **Proposal:** (ii) follows from (i). Just as subjunctive CPs are defective because they lack C\(^0\)-related features, CT2 clauses in Kikuyu are defective because they lack *syntactic structure* associated with CP.
  
  ▷ This defectiveness allows embedded subjects of these clauses to be accessible for higher operations.

## 5 Parallels with Japanese factive complements

- **A parallel with Japanese:**
  
  
  ▷ A-scrambling a quantificational expression above a pronoun feeds variable binding; Ā-scrambling does not (because the scrambled element reconstructs to the position of the gap).
  
  ▷ However, long-distance A-scrambling *is* possible out of certain kinds of CPs (Nemoto 1993, Uchibori 2000, Yoshimoto 2012). I illustrate with complements of factive verbs below:

(22) **Japanese; A-scrambling out of factive complements:**

a. *soko-, no sotugyoosei-ga [CP Ken-ga mittu-izyoo-no daigaku,-ni syutugansu-ru it-GEN graduate-GEN Ken-NOM three-or.more-GEN university-DAT apply-PRES koto-o/no-o ] wasure-ta C-ACC/C-ACC forget-PST*

*Intended:* ‘Their graduates forgot that Ken had applied to three or more universities.’

b. ?mittu-izyoo-no daigaku,-ni *soko-no sotugyoosei-ga [CP Ken-ga ___ three-or.more-GEN university-DAT it-GEN graduate-GEN Ken-NOM syutugansu-ru koto-o/no-o ] wasure-ta apply-PRES C-ACC/C-ACC forget-PST*

‘To three or more universities, their graduates forgot that Ken had applied.’ *(Yoshimoto 2012)*

- **Yoshimoto (2012) demonstrates that topicalization\(^6\) happens to be prohibited in these CPs.\(^7\)**

(23) **Japanese; no topicalization within factive complements:**

Ken-wa [CP zibun-no kodomo-?*wa kono hon-o yon-da no-o/koto-o ] kookaisi-ta Ken-TOP self-GEN child-TOP this book-ACC read-PST C-ACC/C-ACC regret-PST*

*Intended:* ‘Ken regretted that, as for his child, s/he had read this book.’ *(Yoshimoto 2012, citing Miyagawa 2011)*

\(^6\)Note that topicalization here refers only to thematic topics, not contrastive topics, though both are marked with -\(^*\)wa. Yoshimoto points out that the contrastive reading is still available; however, the thematic topic reading disappears in the CPs that permit long-distance A-scrambling.

\(^7\)Yoshimoto discusses focus as well, though the facts here are less straightforward. I will set focus in Japanese aside and refer readers to Yoshimoto (2012; p.31-37) for details.
• Crucially, these two properties are related. As (24)-(25) demonstrates, CPs that do permit clause-
internal topicalization do not permit A-scrambling.

▷ In (25), scrambling a quantificational constituent above the pronoun does not feed variable bind-
ing.

(24) Ken-wa [CP kono hon-wa Naomi-ga yon-da to] it-ta / omot-ta / kii-ta
Ken-TOP this book-TOP Naomi-NOM read-PST C say-PST think-PST hear-PST
‘Ken said/thought/heard that, as for this book, Naomi had read it.’

(25) a. *soitu-no hahahaoya-ga [CP Hanako-ga dare,-ni deatta to] omotta no?
the.person-GEN mother-NOM Hanako-NOM who-DAT met C thought Q
Intended: ‘His mother thought Hanako met whom?’

b. *dare,-ni soitu-no hahahaoya-ga [CP Hanako-ga ____ deatta to] omotta no?
who-DAT the.person-GEN mother-NOM Hanako-NOM met C thought Q
Intended: ‘Whom did his mother think that Hanako met?’ (Goto 2014)

• Thus, Japanese makes a split between CP-types that is remarkably similar to Kikuyu.

▷ The CPs that do not allow left-peripheral topics do allow A-movement across the CP edge. (∼
CT2 in Kikuyu)

▷ The CPs that do allow left-peripheral topics do not allow A-movement across the CP edge. (∼
CT1 in Kikuyu)

• Yoshimoto’s (2012) analysis on the basis of this Japanese data ends up very similar to mine.

▷ Following Haegeman’s (2006) treatment of adverbial clauses, the left periphery of Japanese CPs
that permit A-scrambling is truncated. These clauses lack ForceP and the subprojections licensed
by Force such as TopP and FocP.

▷ Truncated clauses are defective phases.

6 Conclusion

• In this talk, I provided evidence from Kikuyu that the distinction between strong and defective CP
phases has to do with the content of the articulated left periphery:

▷ In Kikuyu, CPs come in two types: ones that have CP-level subprojections associated with informa-
tion structure and ones that do not. The ones that do not permit long-distance A-movement out of
them.

• I showed that this is reminiscent of the behaviour of subjunctive clauses cross-linguistically, suggest-
ing that CPs are defective whenever some CP-level material is missing, whether featural or structural.

• I moreover showed that Japanese behaves similarly to Kikuyu, in that long-distance A-scrambling is
permitted only out of CPs that independently lack left-peripheral structure.

• An avenue for future work: Cross-linguistic (and especially cross-Bantu) exploration of hyperraising!

▷ Within Bantu, various (disparate) analyses have been proposed regarding why languages allow
hyperraising (Harford Perez 1985, Carstens & Diercks 2013, Halpert 2015; a.o.). Can any of these
be conflated or combined under broader principles?
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### A Wh-movement in Kikuyu

- **Proposal**: Wh-movement and focus fronting instantiate complement-forming movement (Pesetsky 2007, 2013), triggered by the presence of *ñi*.

  - That is, wh-movement and focus fronting to FocP results in the extracted element forming a complement to Foc$^0$ rather than a specifier. Schematized in (26):
Motivations:

- First, this accounts for the $n\ddot{i}$-XP word order straightforwardly without recourse to additional morpheme-reordering operations.
- Second, this provides an explanation for why $n\ddot{i}$ cannot surface on the verb in these cases. Assuming that word formation requires structural adjacency (Bobaljik 1994, Harley 2013), the structure in (26) shows that this is blocked by the presence of the Undermerged XP.
- Finally, and more importantly, I assume with Abels & Muriungi (2008) that $n\ddot{i}$ is a focus-sensitive operator that computes the focus semantic value of its sister (see also Cable 2010, Schardl 2014, Kotek 2014).

▷ Complement-forming movement is necessary in order to establish this syntactic configuration, if $n\ddot{i}$ is to take a $wh$-word or focus fronted element as its sister (in the absence of movement, $n\ddot{i}$ takes the clause, AgrP, as its sister). See Yuan (in prep.) for details.