
How A-movement can lead to extraction restrictions

Michelle Sheehan
Anglia Ruskin University
Michelle.sheehan@anglia.ac.uk

Jamie Douglas
*University of
Cambridge*
Jad71@cam.ac.uk

Rodrigo Ranero
Maryland University
ranerorodrigo@gmail.com

This talk considers cases where it appears that A-movement leads to extraction restrictions either of the moved argument itself or of some competitor(s). We examine syntactic ergativity in Mayan (Campana 1992; Tada 1993; Coon et al. 2014, Assmann et al. 2015) and show that it comes in two different guises. In predominantly VSO languages any argument can be A-bar extracted *except* the ERG and partial syntactic ergativity is possible. In predominantly VOS languages only the ABS argument can escape vP and we find no partial syntactic ergativity. The two systems arise because T needs to agree with the internal argument and there are two ways to resolve the defective intervention of the ERG: sidestepping or leapfrogging. In VSO languages, the transitive subject sidesteps to specTP making it too local to C (Erlewine 2016). In VOS languages, object leapfrogging to specVoiceP traps all other material inside VoiceP (Coon et al. 2014).

References: • Assmann, A., Georgi, D., Heck, F., Müller, G., & Weisser, P. (2015). Ergatives Move Too Early: On an Instance of Opacity in Syntax. *Syntax*, 18(4), 343–387 • Campana, Mark. 1992. A movement theory of ergativity. Doctoral dissertation, McGill University, Montreal, QC. • Coon, Jessica, Pedro Mateo Pedro & Omer Preminger. 2014. The role of case in A-bar extraction asymmetries: Evidence from Mayan. *Linguistic Variation* 14(2):179–242. • Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka. 2016. Anti-locality and optimality in Kaqchikel Agent Focus. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34(2):429–479. • Tada, Hiroaki. 1993. A/A-bar partition in derivation. Doctoral dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA. •